

THE ADVOCATE

TESTIMONY OF GOD.

EDITED BY WRITERS IN THE DOCTRINE

BY NATHANIEL ANDREW BARNES

CONDUCTED BY

JOHN THOMAS, M.D.

The invisible attributes of God, even his eternal power and deity, 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 reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect—completely fitted for every good work.—
PAUL.

VOL. IV.

LIBERTY, AMELIA, VA.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR

1836.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
On Poetry	1
On the Bond of Union among Christians,	2
Letters from M. Winans on the Deacons office, &c.	4, 96
Community of Goods—The Fellowship of the Apostles—Jewish and Gentile Deacons—Modern Deacons,	5
Letters to Mr. A. Campbell,	10, 231, 312
A. Fragment,	20
Objections Considered,	23
Haldane on the Epistle to the Romans,	27
Queries and reply,	33
Dr Beattie's opinion of the Christian Religion,	35
Ancient and Modern Bishops,	35
Constantine's way of reconciling Bishops,	36
Character given to Wickliff by an enemy,	36
Metaphysics,	36
History of Priestcraft,	37, 73, 109, 145
The Veil, Sleeping Saints, Resurrection of the First Fruits	43
On Anabaptism,	46
Truth vs Human Tradition,	53
Elder Henley's 'Defence,'	58
Presbyterian zeal against Popery,	63
Mekara and Kincaid on the Pagan and the Missionary,	67
Differences between Sectarianism and Christianity,	69
Infalibility,	71, 286
Schism,	82
Traditions of the Ancients concerning the Soul,	84
Strictures on Campbellism, by W. Jones,	90, 118, 153
Egypt,	104, 394
Popery in England,	106
The Earthquake in Syria,	107
Apostolical Fathers,	143
The Church of Christ,	124, 165, 192, 170, 303
The Miller and the Holy Office,	131
'Materialism Campbellism,'	133
Protestantism,	139
Debate,	145
A Few Strictures on Mr. Jones' Strictures,	150
Hannicut's Report	175
Fables,	180, 247, 266, 323
Christianity the Religion of Civilized Man,	182
An Experience,	183
The Gospel in Buckingham,	185
Remarks on Hannicut's Report Concluded,	205

Remarks on Prophecy,	217
Illustrations of the Apocalypse,	218, 254, 288, 350
'Materialism and Anti-Materialism,'	224
Notes by the Editor,	227
Jesus and the Sadducees'	229
The Christian and his Persecutors,	251
Immortality of the Soul,	252
The Many against the Few,	265
Difference between Earthly and Heavenly Love,	267
Latest News from Bethany,	280
Burke on Reformation,	285
Dr. Watt's Testimony	285
Milton on Christian Doctrine,	286
The Church at Paineville and the Harbinger,	299
The Paineville Address,	300
'Dr. Thomas' Second Letter,'	311
The Earth as it was, a Type of the World as it is,	321
Anecdote	322
Christian Worship and its Order,	324
Messrs Campbell, Hunnicut, Watt, Fhppo, and Others,	330
Dr. Thomas' Speech,	332
My Infidelity,	342
Letters from Messrs Henley and Duval,	342
Reply,	344
Things Contended for,	350
Testimony in vindication of the Editor,	354, 368
Address of the Fork Church,	355
Certificate of Col Richardson,	368
Dr. Thomas not a Schismatic Mr Campbell being Judge,	359
Address of the Jetersville Church,	373
A few Reflections,	380
Letters from A. Anderson,	383, 419
Wmans on 'the Salvation of Infants,'	384, 418
'Evid' J. B. Watt's 'Yecacy'	387
The arraignment of the Editor before the Tribunal of the World	
" instead of the Church by Messrs Glenn, Bragg, and	
" Carter of Richmond,	388
My Defence,	389
Address from Oak Grove Church,	398
Extract from a letter to Mr. Wallis in England,	400
Rules for reading the Scriptures, their design, and Excellency,	401
An Unanswerable Argument,	404
Letter from Ferguson,	408
Lessons from D. Watts and others,	411
Remarks on 'Peace' in a letter from the Editor to a Correspondent,	415
Letter from Tennessee,	420
"It is fallen! It is fallen! Even Babylon the Great!"	422

THE ADVOCATE

Vol. 4. Amelia County, Va.; May, 1837. No. 1

From the London Millennial Harbinger.

ON POETRY.

Poetry, like her sister art, Music, is full of charms to a mind attuned to harmony: and we say with Shakespeare, "the man that has no music in his soul, is fit for treason, stratagems and spoils." That one end of Poetry, in its first institution was to give pleasure, will not admit of doubt. If men first employed it to express their adoration of superior and invisible beings, their gratitude to their benefactors, their admiration of moral, intellectual, or corporeal excellence, or in general, their love of what was agreeable in their own species, or in other parts of Nature, they must be supposed to aim at making their poetry *pleasing*, otherwise it would have been unsuitable to the occasion that gave it birth, and to the sentiments it was intended to enliven. But is it not the end of this art to *instruct* as well as to *please*? Verses that give pleasure only, without profit, what are they but chiming trifles? And if a poem were to please, and at the same time, instead of improving, to corrupt the mind, would it not deserve to be considered as a poison, rendered doubly dangerous and detestable by its alluring qualities?

Homer's beautiful description of the heavens and the earth as they appear in a calm evening by the light of the moon and stars, concludes with this circumstance, "And the heart of the shepherd is glad." In the mere outside of Nature's works, there is a splendour and a magnificence to which even untutored minds cannot attend without great delight. But, neither all peasants, nor all philosophers are equally susceptible of these charming impressions. It is strange to observe the callousness of some persons before whom all the glories of heaven and earth pass in daily succession, without touching their hearts, elevating their fancy, or leaving any durable remembrance. Even of those who pretend to sensibility, how many are there to whom the lustre of the rising or setting sun—the sparkling concave of the midnight sky—the mountain forest tossing and roaring to the storm, or warbling with all the melodies of a summer evening—the sweet interchange of hill and dale, woods and sunshine, grove, lawn, and water, which an extensive landscape offers to the view—the scenery of the ocean, so lovely, so majestic, and so tremendous, and the many pleasing varieties of the animal and vegetable kingdom—could never afford so much real satisfaction, as the steam and noise of a ball-room.

the insipid fiddling and squeaking of an opera, or the vexations and wranglings of a card-table.

There are, however, minds of a different construction, and whom the God of Nature has cast in a different mould—persons who, even in the early part of life, received from the contemplation of the great Creator's works, a species of delight which they would not exchange for any other. Such minds have always in them the seeds of true taste and frequently of imitative genius. To such favored individuals, no part of creation is indifferent. In the crowded city and in the howling wilderness; in the cultivated province and solitary isle; in the flowery lawn and craggy mountain; in the murmur of the rivulet and in the uproar of the ocean; in the thunder of heaven, and in the whisper of the breeze; such a one still finds something to rouse or to soothe his imagination, to draw forth his affections, or to employ his understanding.

This happy sensibility to the beauties of Nature should be cherished in young persons. It engages them to contemplate the Creator in all his wonderful works; it purifies and harmonizes the soul, and prepares it for moral and intellectual discipline; it supplies an endless source of amusement; it contributes even to bodily health; and as a strict analogy subsists between material and moral beauty, it leads the heart by an easy transition from the one to the other, and thus tends to recommend religion for its transcendent loveliness, and makes vice to appear the object of contempt and abomination.

How often a from an steep
Of echoing hill or thicket have we heard
Celestial voices to the midnight air,
Sole—or responsive to each other's note,
Singing to their great Creator—*Poet. Lost. B. iv.*

From the London Millennium Harbinger.

ON THE BOND OF UNION AMONG CHRISTIANS.

[Extracted from a letter written in 1796, by the late Mr. ANDREW FULLER, to Mr. SAMUEL PALMER* of Hackney.]

Christian love appears to me to be, "for the truth's sake that dwelleth in us." Every kind of union that has not truth for its bond is of no value in the sight of God, and ought to be of none in ours.

I have heard a great deal of *union without sentiment*; but I can neither feel nor perceive any such thing, either in myself or others. All the union that I can feel or perceive arises from a *similarity of views and pursuits*. No two persons may think exactly alike; but so far as they are unlike, so far there is a want of union. We are united to God himself by becoming of

* A congregational "minister" and author of the Nonconformist's Memorial—Mr. Fuller was of the English Baptists.—Ed. Adv.

one mind and one heart with him. Consider the force and design of Amos iii. 3, "Can two walk together except they be agreed?" You might live neighborly with Dr. Priestley; but you would not feel so united with him in heart as if he had been of your sentiments, nor he with you as if you had been of his. You may esteem a churchman, if he agree with you in doctrine, and be of an amiable disposition; but you would feel much more united with him if in addition to this he were a dissenter. You may regard some men who are rigid Calvinists, on some consideration; but you would regard them more if they were what you account more liberal in their views, and more moderate towards others who differ from them; that is, if they were of your *mind* upon the doctrine of Christian forbearance.

Men of one age may quarrelled about religious differences and have persecuted one another, as papists and protestants have done in France; and the same descriptions of men in another age may despise these litigations, as the French have lately done, and not care at all whether a man be papist or protestant, provided he enters heartily into revolutionary principles. But all this arises from their having substituted the importance of an agreement in a political creed in the place of one that is religious. Agreement in sentiment and pursuit is still the bond of union.—Even those who unite in church-fellowship upon the principle of what they term *free inquiry*, or universal toleration. They consider this as the all in all, and consent to exercise forbearance towards each other in everything else.—Such a connection, I confess, appears to me just as scriptural and as rational as if a number of persons should agree to worship together, on the ground that every one should be at liberty to act as he thought proper, and so admit the universal toleration of every species of immorality. Nevertheless, even here, a similarity of sentiments would be the bond of union.

You can unite with men "who are not exactly of your sentiments."—So can I.—But that in which I unite with them is not anything in which sentiment has no concern. It is that *wherein we are agreed* that is the bond of our union; and those things wherein we differ are considered as objects of *forbearance*, on account of human imperfection. Such forbearance ought undoubtedly to be exercised in a degree, especially in things which both sides must admit to be not clearly revealed, which are properly called opinions, and are little other than mere speculations. And even in things which in our judgment are clearly revealed, there ought to be a degree of forbearance, much in the same way as we forbear with each other's imperfections of a practical nature, where the essential principles of morality are not affected.

You are "not a party man, and hope you never shall please any set of people whatever."—I hope so too, and inflexibly adhere to the side of truth and right.

far as I understand them, in every punctilio, in order to please God.

"A decided judgment on some points," you consider "as unimportant, and think there is room for mutual candor." If those points are unrevealed, I say so too; but I do not consider either the deity or the atonement of Christ as coming under this description, and I hope you think the same. Without the former, we cannot with any consistency call on the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, which is the characteristic of a primitive believer; and without the latter, I need not say to you, sir, that the Gospel is rendered of none effect. As to "candor," it is due to all men, even infidels and atheists; but candor will not lead me to treat them as objects of divine favor, but to speak the truth to them in love.

Possibly you may think it unfair to reason as I have done from practices to principles, and that we ought to make a wide difference between the one and the other. But the difference, as it appears to me, is only as the difference between root and branch. Faith is not a mere speculation of the understanding, nor a belief of a mere mistake in judgment. They are both of a moral nature, or salvation would not be connected with the former, and final condemnation with the latter.

I ought perhaps to apologise for having written so much, in the manner I have done; but I think you will not take it amiss. The collision of thoughts from persons who have been in different habits and connexions is sometimes of mutual advantage. If you should disapprove of my remarks, try and see me right, and you will be entitled to my grateful acknowledgments.

THE DEACON'S OFFICE.

Jamestown, Ohio, April 11th, 1837.

Brother, Thomas,

I would not be considered as dictating to you or giving advice relative to the course you should pursue in your periodical. But from the notice taken of the "Apostolic Advocate" in the late "Harbinger" I should conclude that an "Armistice" would perhaps lead to a favorable termination of the war without the death of either of the belligerents.

I wish you would write something about the Deacon's Office for it seems to be almost a useless appendage as the church now practices.

The first Deacons we read of were appointed to "attend tables" at "the daily ministration." We do not practice any daily ministration, nor do we use tables so as to make it likely that widows or others will be neglected. What have we then, for Deacons to do? Do you think the Lord's supper is alluded to in the vi. of Acts, where the Hellenists murmured against

he Hebrews, because their widows were neglected in the daily ministrations?

If the Lord's supper is here meant, then it was attended to daily—instead of weekly. But if something else than the Lord's supper is meant, then it was for some other purpose the Deacons were appointed than to attend to the table at the Lord's supper. And that other thing be it what it may is not practiced now.

What is said by Paul to Timothy relative to Deacons does not lead us to understand what they did in the Church. They were to be first proved, and then to exercise the office of a Deacon, but it is not said what they had to do, therefore we have to suppose that they were appointed "to attend tables at the daily ministration" else we cannot tell for what purpose they were appointed. Then as we have no daily ministration, nor tables to attend to, we shall be puzzled to tell the use of Deacons in the church.

I have read several essays on the Bishop's Office. And the best was from the pen of our beloved brother Ballantine, now deceased. But I have never seen one on the Deacon's Office else I have forgotten it.

Affectionately Yours,
M. WINANS.

Community of Goods—the Fellowship of the Apostles—Jewish and Gentile Deacons—Modern Deacons.

Dear Brother,

I thank you for the suggestion contained in the first paragraph of your letter. I am entirely agreed, that an "armistice" as to "tone, temper, and manner" would be attended with the happiest results to both "belligerents." I did not begin "the war" with Brother Campbell. I wrote on subjects, which I believe I was free to do, if I pleased. He attacked my "matter, and manner;" I did not assail him. On my part, the campaign has been throughout defensive. If he should continue the same style, which I have hitherto been unable to regard otherwise than as supercilious and dictatorial, I will endeavor not to see it. Human nature is apt to view such a style when allied to popular influence or power, moral, or physical, as oppressive. I am human. I have felt, but I will endeavor to feel no more. I will remember that *to forget is human to forgive divine*. The "armistice" then, with me is a cessation of "the war" in this respect. Let me not be understood, however; the matter is still at issue between me and all opponents. I agree to no "armistice" upon any moment. The conditionalality of eternal life and all so it I shall still maintain. I believe it to be part

the Apostolic doctrine, and shall therefore not cease to plead for it, as long as I have the means of doing so. With these qualifications, then, I dismiss the subject.

As to the Deacons, I agree with you, that as things now are, they do seem to be a very useless appendage to the congregations. As far as my observation extends they appear to have no other functions than that of handing about the bread and wine, and the providing of wood, coals and candles. The original appointment of Deacons or Servants to the church was to meet a pressing necessity. It is needless to show that the Daily Ministration and the Lord's Supper, are not the same, inasmuch as it must be obvious to every understanding. We may however, with propriety, dwell a few moments on the 'Daily Ministration.'

It will be remembered, that the Hellenists and Hebrews were the Jews, who had obeyed The Gospel on Pentecost, and subsequent occasions, in the City of Jerusalem. Of these it is testified that they had all things common; that "they sold their possessions and effects, and distributed to every one according to his necessity." That they "broke bread from house to house and partook of this their food with joy and simplicity of heart" Acts ii. 44.—That "the heart and soul of the multitude of believers were one; nor did any one call any of his possessions his own; but all things were common amongst them. Neither was there one indigent (or poor) person among them; for as many as were proprietors of lands or houses, sold them and brought the price of the things they sold, and laid it down at the feet of the Apostles; and distribution was made to each according to his need."—Acts iv. 32.

From these premises it is clear,

1. That the Christian Jews had a Community of goods, which consisted in the monies acquired by the sale of their real and personal estates;
2. That this fund was to supply the necessary wants of the whole church in Jerusalem;
3. That this sacrifice of personal luxury gave the rich no regret; for all who had previously been separated by poverty and riches now ate together from house to house with joy and simplicity of heart; and with unanimity;
4. That all this time there were no poor in the congregation;
5. That the fund was committed to the custody of the Apostles;—and,
6. That the Apostles distributed to each according to his need.

It has been asked, why was there a community of goods among the Jews and not among the Gentiles? The reason is obvious. It consists in this:—The Holy Spirit when he was sent, was, by the Apostles, to convince the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment. "Of judgment, because the prince

of this world is judged." The Apostles had convinced the Jewish world a portion of which was convened on the day of Pentecost, in Solomon's porch, and on other occasions, of sin and of righteousness; and they failed not to "testify of the judgment that was coming upon the perverse generation of the Jews; for, it is written, that with many other words Peter testified, and exhorted, saying, Save yourselves from this perverse generation."—What could be the subject of Peter's testimony as to the judgment about to come upon the Jewish world?—What but the apprehension of the Chief Priests, that "the Romans would come and destroy their place and nation?" And this was in truth what Jesus had foretold, and the thing of which he had warned them; saying, "when you shall see Jerusalem invested with armies, know that its desolation is nigh. Then let those in Judea flee to the mountains; let those in the city make their escape, and let not those in the country enter the city; for those will be days of vengeance, in which all the denunciations of the scriptures shall be accomplished."

Now the Christian Jews believed the prophecy delivered by Jesus. What then was manifestly the best and most prudent conduct for these believers in the coming judgment to pursue? We should say, to do precisely what they did—to turn all their real and personal estate into money, and commit it to the care of confidential persons for their daily necessities. Having done this, they were prepared at a moment's notice to flee to the mountains, and to make their unimpeded escape. In doing this, they would leave no farms, or houses, or effects behind to gratify the insatiable rapacity of the Roman soldiery; whose vengeance would be expended on those, who would not have Jesus for their king. These circumstances were peculiar to the Jews in Judea, and thus rendered a community of goods necessary to them, which to the Gentile Brethren in other countries would have been out of place. Thus it is that circumstances alter cases.

From "the multitude of disciples" who depended upon this fund or "fellowship of the Apostles," it would be matter of surprise if some of them were not neglected by the Twelve in their daily attendance to the tables of the community. Some were neglected. This caused dissatisfaction on the part of the Grecian Jews, who murmured against their Hebrew Brethren; "because their widows were neglected in the daily ministration." Upon this the Apostles determined to surrender the whole business of the Fellowship into the hands of seven persons who should be set over the matter. They called the disciples together, and told them to "look out, from among themselves, seven men of an attested character, full of spirit and wisdom," while they would continue steadfast in the "doctrines and prayers;" as it is written, "we will consociate seven men, to be set over the prayers, and to the ministry of the word." These reasons

throw some light on Acts, ii. 42. To this the disciples agreed and subsequently, without murmuring, "continued steadfastly in the teaching, in the fellowship, and in the prayers of the Apostles," until "the persecution against the congregation in Jerusalem," which dispersed them all, except the Apostles, through the regions of Judea and Samaria. Acts viii. 1, 2.

From these premises we learn the business and qualifications of the seven first deacons of the model christian assembly. All the funds of the community were in their hands they would have to provide food, raiment, and lodging for the whole Body of Christ in Jerusalem; from the Apostles or ministers of the word, down to the least disciple. Hence the importance of selecting for so responsible and onerous an office, "men of an attested character, full of spirit and wisdom." Furthermore, they would have to look after the sick, and the imprisoned. So that if any were sick among them, they might send for the Elders to pray over him, and anoint him with oil, in the name of the Lord, for his recovery. James v. 14; and if any were in prison for the testimony, they might minister to him substantial consolation by supplying all his necessary wants. In short, there was nothing, save the prayers and the ministry of the word, among the brethren, which was not their especial concern.

Now, the circumstances relating to the Community of good among the Christian Jews alone excepted, the deacon's office was precisely similar among the Churches of Christ in the Gentile world. The Seven served the tables of the Elders in the Jerusalem Church who devoted themselves exclusively to prayer and the ministry of the word; so did the servers of tables among the Gentiles; they took care of their "spiritual men," that is, of their "Apostles, Evangelists, Prophets, Pastors, and Teachers;" the former fulfilled the duties of a pure and undefiled religion, by taking care of their orphans and widows, so did the latter. The seven took care of the sick and the imprisoned, and so did the latter. Their duties being the same, their qualifications were alike; for, if the Seven were to be of "an attested character, full of spirit and wisdom," the deacon's of the Gentiles were required to be "first proved being without blame." They were to hold fast the secret of the faith with a pure conscience. Their wives were to be unexceptionable. They were not to be polygamists, but were to have only one wife, and were to rule their children and families or servants well. But I need not descend further on these things at this time.

From these considerations you will see the force of the Apostle's exordium to his letter to the brethren at Philippi, in which he especially names "the bishops and deacons;" and you will be reflecting upon what the duties of the primitive deacons were, plainly perceive that every one of them "who performed the office of a deacon well, procured to himself an excellent

degree and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus." Experience will attest to your mind the existence or otherwise, of an identity between the deacons of the first and nineteenth centuries in the region where you dwell. They have not yet come within the range of mine. If the identity do not exist to what is the deficiency owing? Though there may be in the churches many called "deacons" of a christian character as those who in former times were deacons in deed and in truth, my belief is, that there is either a want of the genuine spirit of Christ in these communities, under the axis of which the bishops and deacons can perform their functions; or, they have not the funds at their disposal to do what the scriptures teach they ought to do. How can a brother, on behalf of the church, which ought to be "the pillar and support of the truth," and the medium through which is publicly developed that "pure and undefiled religion" which James sets forth,—how can he in the capacity of a deacon take care of the widows, who are widows indeed, and the orphans of the church with the scanty pittance of the meagre fellowship of "reformed churches." How can he provide food and raiment, and lodging for the bishops who devote themselves exclusively to "the ministry of the word," and for the Evangelists of whom each and every community in proportion to the wealth of its members, ought to send throughout the country to teach the people the words of eternal life? It is impossible. My advice to such brethren is, have nothing to do with the bishop's or deacon's offices until they are *scripturally* appointed. This may induce an examination, and sifting of the matter to the bottom.

As to the distribution of the bread and wine, I find no evidence in the scripture of its being a part of the deacon's office. My opinion is, that the Bishops ought to distribute it to the disciples, as Jesus did to the Apostles. Jesus did not call upon a particular one to hand it round to the rest. He gave the bread and the wine to them and told them all to eat of it. I see no reason why the shepherds of the Chief Shepherd should not with their own hands give it to the Disciples indiscriminately, and let these pass it along among themselves. This simple practice would do away with a great deal of stiffness and formality, which, in appearance at least, resolves "the deacons" into nothing more nor less than the body-servants of the Elders.

I shall conclude by the relation of an incident from Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History, which will show that even in the third

* I can plead for the Bishops, the Evangelists and the Deacons with a good conscience, for I am neither of the first, the second, nor the third—Let me not be misunderstood. I am pleading for these orders of brethren whose qualifications and duties are in conformity with the doctrine of Holy Writ.

10

century of our era, when the church had become exceedingly corrupt, the deacons had very different duties to perform, and of a much more scriptural character, than those of our deacons now." "The Numidians" says he, "alleged two important reasons to justify their sentence against Cæcilianus. The second reason for their sentence against him was drawn from the harshness and even cruelty that he had discovered in his conduct, while he was a deacon, towards the christian confessors and martyrs during the Dioclesian persecution, whom he abandoned in the most merciless manner, to all the extremities of hunger and want, leaving them without food in their prisons, and procuring the grant of relief from those who were willing to succor them." Vol. I. p. 122.

With every consideration of respect
Affectionately Yours
The Editor

Letter to Mr. A. Campbell.

Dear Brother,

With my fifth article on "Materialism," the discussion of the topics so termed, as far as the Harbinger is concerned, is closed. For myself, as to feelings, all the past is as though it had never been. With the conclusion of the third volume, your paper would have ceased to be named in connection with the material or immaterial questions which have been thrown up in the revolutions of the last two years. The present volume would have commenced without any reference to the positions or the oppositions, which have appeared in yours. But you know, *all things are conditional*, and you had published your "extracts from private letters," your "Conversations," and your Essays on "Materialism No. 1, 2, 3, and 4," according to your judgment of propriety; I supposed I was equally privileged to do the same things. Having justly, in my reconsideration, it remained with you to continue or not the controversy. Until your intentions were elicited, all I had to do was to pursue the course I supposed correct, in perfect silence, however, as regarded you. This was the *condition* of the matter. But, though you have retired from the old field of battle, you have broken new ground in flank. Having therefore, no opposition to contend against in the van, you have compelled me to face to the left, and to encounter a slight skirmishing; you have opened upon me in that direction. A skirmish, but a small affair in the estimation of military chiefs; and I dare say this will prove to be of little moment between you and me.

But to speak plainly, and without a figure. You have, my dear brother, published, in your March number, an article concerning me which, I think claims some little attention on my

11

part. In this piece you say, you have "hastily read" over certain portions of the Nov., Dec., and Jan., numbers of the Advocate relating to yourself. "The first impressions," you admit, "may not always be the best, yet persons are apt to utter it, and others are curious to know it." You then proceed to inform us of your first impressions, which, I suppose would be a very appropriate title to the whole article; that is, *Brother Campbell's First, but not Best, Impressions of certain numbers of the A. Adv.* Now, I would venture to suggest, that when you give the public first impressions upon any subject, it would be well to read or consider what is said or written, not hastily but deliberately. The first impressions would then be more likely to be lasting, and not so evanescent as they generally are. Now, when first impressions are acquired hastily we should be cautious how we publish them lest they should become the subject of recantation; and especially, lest they should lead us to do injustice to our neighbor. I know it is fashionable now-a-days to publish "First Impressions" for the amusement of the Public.—Willis's First Impressions of things he saw in Europe, for instance; many of which we have heard, would have been better not impressed on paper for his own credit at least. I learned a lesson under this lead upon a certain occasion which I have never forgotten. I was subpoenaed as a witness in a medical case in which my testimony was demanded as to the character of a certain surgical operation, which terminated fatally; unused to the technicalities of Westminster Hall, or perhaps speaking "hastily," I observed that my *impression* was so and so. Lord Tenterden immediately corrected me by saying, that the Court did not ask me for my impressions, but for the facts of the case. Ever since this incident, I have made it a rule not to trouble the Public with my impressions, first, second, or third; but if I have anything to say to them, to do it not "hastily" but deliberately; not according to impressions, but according to the I saw, I heard, or thus it is written. Now, *charity hath all things*; it would even hope that the first impression was possibly incorrect; and it would suggest the importance of not gratifying the curiosity of the world at the expense of one who is called a brother.—These are a few of the ideas which present themselves to my mind as to the propriety or otherwise of publishing first impressions, hastily made, for the curiosity of the Public. I trust they will be received as they are offered in the spirit of benevolence.

Again, you say, "If in the judgment of my brethren of Eastern Virginia, I merit such treatment, they certainly have mistaken me, or I have mistaken them."—Now, the phrase, "such treatment" is rather ambiguous. Have I, Brother C, said anything of you which is not sustained by "the tone, manner, manner," and matter of the extracts from private letters; con-

versations, and Essays which have appeared in the Harbinger: If I have said any thing which is sustained neither by the appearance nor the reality of things, let it be pointed out, and I will acknowledge, as far as conviction carries me, that I have misinterpreted you. My Brother, be less general and more particular in your terms. The Apostle says, in many things we all offend. This is true, and equally applicable to you and me. You have offended me and it seems that I have offended you. But I have not intentionally offended you, because you have offended me. However bad a spirit may be imputed to me, revenge is no part thereof. From the context, I suppose the treatment complained of is summed up in what you term: your first impressions, "style of scurrillity and abuse." Now Brother C., of all men in the world you are the last that ought to speak of a scurrilous and abusive style. I was once reading from the Christian Baptist in the audience of a certain person, for their conviction, when I was peremptorily requested to forbear on account of the style much in the same way that you make your friend Goodal command the Advocate to be closed. Brother C., there is such a thing as having notes and splinters in the eyes. Perhaps you and I have one in each of ours. If so we cannot well restore each other's sight to a healthy state. I will endeavor to extract mine, and may you be successful in the same operation upon your-self; for, I perceive, that in these cases of spiritual ophthalmia, the most successful oculist is a man's self. "Pull out," says Jesus, "the mote that is in thine own eye"—an excellent prescription from the best of all physicians.

There are some, who plead eloquently on behalf of a Christian Spirit, while they act as though they considered themselves privileged to violate with impunity all its requirements. For my own part, I endeavor to act the Christian more, and talk about the christian spirit less! The christian spirit is much desecrated on, but, I believe, it is little understood. The model of a Christian spirit, I am sure you will agree with me are Jesus and his Apostles. Now when I wish to "try the spirits" and see whether they be of Christ; I recur to the examples they have left on record. By comparison I am enabled to arrive at pretty accurate conclusion.

You consider I have been scurrilous and abusive. This be far from me, my brother. My aim has been to use not to abuse you. In some places I have treated some of your sayings jocularly. I have played with you in good humor. I have neither used you for my mirth, nor my laughter, when you were waspish; but when you have seemed disposed to play upon me I have piped to you in return. You may term this levity; be it so. We are both guilty. Yet we need not be offended on this account; for neither your sayings nor mine are dictates of inspiration. But, I perceive, that on account of what you term

my scurrillity and abuse, you consider that any further notice of me, beyond these "first impressions" would be to stoop, and to descend to a level with, the articles referred to; that is, to me their author. Now, my brother, does this sentiment indicate that you penned these first impressions in a christian spirit. I hope I do you no injustice when I say, that I think not. You recollect that Jesus was the subject of a great deal of scurrillity and abuse. He was called a Samaritan and charged with having a devil. Did he tell his disciples, that these sayings, as respected their authors commanded his silence? That it would be stooping to a level with them to meet their style of scurrillity and abuse by a rejoinder? No; though so much abused, so cruelly maltreated, he reasoned with them, and showed that they charged him falsely. He did not deliver to his disciples, his first impressions, and then, appealing to his own dignity, put them under the ban of his profound silence for a year or two. Now all I ask is, that if you consider me as bad as a Samaritan diabolically possessed, you will yet condescend "in the spirit of meekness to restore such an one" as myself. There would, my brother, be far more efficacy in this experiment than any you have yet instituted. Be less careful for my honor, usefulness, and happiness, and address yourself to the matter already before you. I will take care of my own honor, usefulness, and happiness. I will be the guardian of these, and I trust with a godly jealousy.

Furthermore, you term my proceedings "a career of speculation which," say you, "I clearly foresaw would terminate in nullifying his usefulness to that cause which I plead." Brother C. this word speculation has a wonderful effect in scaring the ignorant. There was a time when all you wrote about Baptism or Remission of Sins, &c., was termed speculative and untaught; and your "career" was then deemed one of speculation. Every doctrine of scripture, untaught in the theological systems of men, when first brought to light is denounced as a speculation. It was once a speculation that the earth moved round the sun; but it is now received as one of the incontestible truths of astronomy. In every age of the world I find, that when truths as old as nature are newly presented to public notice, they are termed "strange things," "speculations," "untaught questions," &c. My surprise is that a man of your intelligence should join in such a senseless cry; especially in the face of the motto of your Christian Baptist—"Prove all things and hold fast that which is good." It would be difficult, I conceive, to do this and not be involved in what are termed speculations and things untaught. My career, I trust, will ever be to speculate on, or to contemplate the things of Holy Writ; though untaught, my brother, either in your talent of periodical, or any other uninspired document.

In the above sentence you announce to your readers, in of

fect, that I am no longer of any use to the cause you plead. Now this item respecting my usefulness I have no disposition to dispute. It may be nullified or it may not according to circumstances. A few words however, as to the individual causes may be said to plead. First, I would enquire in the most friendly manner, what cause, my brother, is it that you de-
 plead? As far as I can understand you, you plead for Baptism for pardon or the Remission of Sins; by which baptism a man who believes, that Jesus is the Son of God, is adopted into the family of God; in other words, becomes a citizen of the Kingdom of Heaven that now is. Though you plead for this, you maintain, that men, or rather certain men under this dispensation, may attain to the resurrection of the just though they have not been immersed into Christ. That this does not nullify baptism for remission; that eternal life is not conditional. This I infer from what you have written on "materialism," though you have not ventured to affirm it in so many words. And to sum up all the other items of your brief, you plead for PROTESTANTISM. This last item you announced in the Cathol. Debate; and in your letter to Mr. Hammond, in which you say, "I have for many years been seeking to unite all Protestant Christians on one great bond of union, as Catholic as Protestant Christendom." And that baptism for remission is no great obstacle to this Catholic experiment is obvious, seeing that, in effect, you tell Mr. Hammond that there are as great and as good men on the one as on the other side of that sin-purifying institution: for speaking of baptism, you say, "I regret only that (of it) which is sectarian, or held by a part of Christendom, because it is partisan, and not Catholic, and because it alienates and divides as great and as good men as this or any other age has produced."

Now, my dear brother, as this is the avowed cause for which you plead, allow me to say in the best possible way, that I do not plead for such a cause. You plead for baptism for the remission of sins. And so do I without any compromise or abatement. Here I go with you the whole length of your premises and further than your conclusions. Some, perhaps, would like me at this crisis to sum up in brief the cause I plead as I have done yours. Candor and justice to all concerned, demand that we should be well understood in this matter. Well then, I maintain

1. That all, both Jews and Gentiles, without respect of persons called great and good by men, are, by the scriptures, viewed as under sin; that is, are all sinners in the sight of God.

2. That being thus constituted sinners, they are therefore all, without exception, under sentence of the Second or Eternal Death.

3. That God being pure and holy, before they can be where

God shall be, they must be released from sin, and delivered from the sentence of death.

4. That the only way, in which they can be released from sin, is by believing and obeying THE GOSPEL.

5. That the Gospel is a whole. That one item of the Gospel is no more The Gospel, than that a part of any thing is the whole of that thing.

6. That it is a truth, that Jesus is the Christ the Son of the Living God; that this truth is the foundation corner-stone of the gospel; but that it is not THE GOSPEL, any more than that the corner-stone of the foundation of a house is the house itself.

7. That the Gospel is glad tidings of great joy to all people, both Jews and Gentiles, and consists in the offer of a Release from Sin, and of Eternal life to all, who believing in the sin-cleansing efficiency of the blood of Jesus, shall be immersed into the belief of his death and resurrection; and shall keep the faith to the end.

8. That all who will not conform to these conditions will be raised at the Second Resurrection to suffer the punishment of the Second Death; and that all who cannot "will not see life" eternal.

9. That Jesus will shortly return to the country from which he ascended; that he will then confer life eternal on the righteous dead and on the righteous living; and that he will then commence his reign as the absolute Monarch of the universal world.

10. That the outline of the Christian worship is that recorded Acts ii. 42.

11. That the Holy Scriptures are the only authorized standard of good and evil.

12. That under this dispensation, not one will be recognized by God as "great and good" who has not obeyed THE GOSPEL; and whose subsequent conduct is not conformed to the apostolic model.

13. That there is but one road to eternal life; and that is, by obedience to the one only true and genuine gospel preached by the Apostles of Christ; and that there are but two ways by which men can enter upon this life, which is by a resurrection or a transformation.

14. That Protestantism is not the Religion of Jesus, but a Horn of Antichrist; and that it is therefore, in its spirit and constitution, subversive of, and inimical to, pure and undefiled religion.

These are the prominent features of the cause I maintain by pen and speech. If I see eye to eye with others in these things, I rejoice; not because they agree with me, but because they acknowledge what I firmly believe to be the truth. I present them in the form in which they appear for the sake of order.

and perspicuity; and especially that I may be clearly and infinitely understood.

My good brother, to talk of Protestant Christians is to speak of Antichristian Christians; for Protestantism is the antichrist of anti-papal countries. How much to be regretted it is that such talents as yours should have been expended in such a vain effort as that of uniting such anomalous "Christians" as these? Where, my brother, in all the Prophets or Apostles are you sustained in such an incongruous enterprise? They teach us the desolation of the countries both of Protestant and Catholic Christendom, by the lightning, the sulphur, the earthquake, and the great hail. I should be sorry to see the sects united. There is no great deal of liberty of religious speech to boast of either in church or world, what alas! would be the case then? My "career of speculation" would soon be stopped to the joy no doubt of many who amuse themselves with the cry of peace, peace when there is none; but sudden destruction at the door.

"On the subject of re-baptism and the intermediate state," say you, "I touched with all gentleness; always leaving the door open before and behind me for my friend to relieve himself from all that I intimated or alleged! But this it appears was not what he desired."—You are right brother Campbell. I had no inclination to retreat, but to maintain my ground until fairly beaten. This you have failed to do, either in relation to "re-baptism" or "Materialism" as you term them. You have long been sensitive on the former of these. I like consistency; and if I embrace a religion I like it to be consistent in all its parts. If the gospel be the power of God to the salvation of every one that believes, then there is no salvation in any other way; for God's power to save is deposited no where else. This idea strongly impressed my mind when I obeyed it.—Perhaps you may recollect a conversation we had on this at the house of a mutual friend in Philadelphia. If, said I, baptism be for the remission of sins can one arrive at heaven without it? You did not answer me satisfactorily. While yet conversing, a clergyman named Chambers called to see you. If immersion be the only baptism, said he, and baptizing be necessary for salvation, then infants must be immersed to be saved, which you do not pretend to say.—This he considered as an evidence that immersion was not necessary to salvation. I will remember your reply. Brother Thomas, said you, has just been irritating me on that subject. I replied, that was not my intention, but that I wanted the difficulty explained. You continued to Mr. Chambers, that he admitted that infants were saved without faith, would he, therefore, say that faith was not necessary to salvation? Mr. C. was silenced; I was amused at your ingenuity, but unrelieved. Had the doctrine of eternal life as taught by Jesus and his apostles been understood, we should all have been extricated from the dilemma. You both

reasoned on an assumption that eternal life can be attained by other means than by an intelligent obedience to the gospel, and hence you could only throw stumbling blocks in each other's way. From this time I began to reason independently of all you have written on this subject. I saw a want of consistency in your positions, which I could not believe to be an attribute of the Christian Religion. The results you know.

I perceive, there is no subject upon which I have written excites so much irritation as that of "re-immersion." What is the cause of this? I can only attribute it to misgivings as to the Apostolicity of their spiritual foundations. I am persuaded I had not touched the immersion of the Baptists; I might have speculated for ever on eternal life and the things thereto belonging without losing a dozen subscribers. If a man or woman have obeyed the gospel they know it, and are not to be irritated by the reasonings or speculations of any one. We know whether we have purified our souls by obeying the truth or not. Those who have, have nothing to fear if they do well; and those who have not, do well to be in a state of probation until their irritation be allayed by a purification from sin.

You say, my brother, that you are glad to learn that every region except my immediate location, that your lectures and arguments have been duly appreciated, and the cause you feel relieved from the crude notions of the Christian Institution, and those wild and untaught speculations which all men's understandings are pleased to call Materialism. In general, I would observe, that you may perhaps sometimes or other find out your mistake. As to the almost universal appreciation of your arguments, my brother, that is easily accounted for.—For your own admission, where I and my writings or "wild untaught speculations" are best understood, your arguments are best appreciated; whereas those who are almost exclusively your readers and are least acquainted with me, are least likely to appreciate your efforts. I thank you for the compliment, though it is no means so intended. Of course you are entitled to the "all men of understanding;" and by inference, I and others in this region are devoid of that manly virtue. We thank you and proceed.

You complain of my tone, temper, and manner. No doubt these three are all susceptible of improvement. Perhaps we may both mend our manners with advantage. Let us then both begin, and see who can be more manly. Let this letter be my first effort, as contrasted with your "first impressions." The thing, brother C. I wish you would pay a little more attention to the MATTER.

You seem to disapprove of my publishing extracts from my letters. Now, I presume, that this concerns the writing of these letters and not you my brother. But why should you be concerned in me the thing you practice so often yourself? Do you

not publish an extract of a private letter of brother Church, Pittsburg, in the Harbinger under the title of The Gates of Paradise? Do I misrepresent you when I say it was done to effect? There was no argument in the extract. It was merely an opinion—perhaps of an influential brother. I have sought to enlist no sympathies in my favor. I am not an intriguer. My fault, if it be a fault, is that I sprak my mind as truly as I think; that I make no effort to gain men, otherwise than by the force of truth. There exists not the man in these States that can say, that I ever did any thing more than what all who read my paper know, to gain his sympathy, or to elicit his support in opposition to you or any one else. Had I pursued a different course I could have been wonderfully popular. Had I any sinister views, I would have floated in the breeze, and you for my Captain along the stream. I would have winked at errors, inconsistencies, and a fetitious reism. But no, I will follow in the wake of none but Jesus if I can help it. I wish to lead no man. Let truth lead them. My good brother, shall we have you or Jesus for our Captain? That you are the Leader of many there is no doubt. I do not say you wish to be so; but, I have seen too much not to know the truth of this. Now the sum and substance of the existing difference is this: I do not believe that you are pleading a cause that can and should its parts be sustained by the scriptures; if I am not taken care you are pleading as God would have you, then God will prosper and may you proslyte men abundantly. If you be right, that may every Advocate I have written questioning the scriptures of your views be consumed. If you be wrong, then may the truth prevail come what will.

As to the attestations of the brethren in Philadelphia and Richmond, I know, and they know too, that no just accusation can be brought to bear against me. I remained in Philadelphia at the earnest solicitation of the brethren there; and when about to leave I was urged to stay. I left, and the old adage was verified, "no longer pipe no longer dance." I was in Richmond between two and three years. I sustained myself by my profession. The rectitude of my walk and conduct can be amply attested by the brethren there. I oftentimes neglected my pecuniary interests, that I might serve what I supposed the common cause. I can truly say, I labored more in the cause of truth and righteousness than the whole church together. When I went there, there were but half a dozen strangers attended their meetings: when it was fair weather, and I was expected our congregation was always good. Let truth guide their attestations, and I know they will redound to my honor.

You brought me forward brother C., "in the hope that I would use my influence in behalf of the faith, and worship, and spirit of the primitive church." Whether or not I plead for the faith and the worship, of the primitive church of Jesus Christ, those

who understand the Scriptures, and know me better than you do, can attest. I do not plead for the faith or the worship, or the spirit of the primitive Protestant Church. You, my brother, proclaim yourself the champion of these things in avowing yourself the defendant of protestantism. I doubt not then, but I have abused my influence in your estimation. This is your honest opinion. You suppose that the cause you plead is the cause of truth. I give you full credit for this supposition. I have as honest an opinion likewise. I do not believe that it is the cause of God, and therefore I cannot honestly use my influence in seconding your efforts. I rejoice at your success, wherever you succeed in persuading men to be baptized in the name of Jesus for the remission of sins; but I regret to see you entangling yourself in the sectarian snares. Your opponents could do nothing with you in argument in relation to baptism. They found this out at last. Hence they determined to fight you, as you have resolved to do me, by letting you alone. But you have now come forward as the champion of their Protestantism, and now they crowd about you, and neutralize your efforts for a genuine, radical, and thorough reformation, by their deceitful flatteries. If what is called "this reformation" stand where it now is; it will in a very short time, need to be reformed as much as any sect in Christendom. The world needs or rather the Lord Jesus requires, something more than a reformation of Protestantism. An entire and uncompromising return to first principles is what is needed. The grand object the apostolic doctrine sets before us is not the conversion of the world at large, but *A Preparation of true Disciples, the Lamb's wife, to meet the Master who is at the door.* I will use my influence in behalf of this as scripturally as I know how. Leave then, my good brother, the Catholics and Protestants to fight their own battles; and do you devote your acknowledged talents to the good work of preparing The Bride to meet her Lord. This only is worthy of your efforts; this is work enough for the remnant of your days.

You put me under a profound silence for a year or two. You will stoop to notice nothing I may say, write, or do for that period of time at least. Permit me to say, without intending to "abuse" you and without the least acrimonious feeling, that this is a very convenient way of evading very inconvenient arguments. Besides, it is a violation of that christian spirit so much talked about. Will you allow the brethren's minds to be poisoned by my "errors;" will you calmly look on while the truth damaged, perhaps destroyed, and not make a manly effort to silence me; instead of silencing yourself, you are bound by every consideration to be instant in season and out of season; and never to cease your defence of truth.

assault of error until you shall repose in the profound silence of the grave.

Remember, my brother, you have yet to discuss the conditionality or unconditionality of eternal life. When you shall have done this, we will then bring your arguments to the test of scripture. We have much to say from all the prophets and apostles on this interesting topic.

I have now done with your "first impressions." You are at liberty to do with this as you please. I have written to you in tone, temper, manner, and matter as we once talked together, face to face. I know I have said many things at a hazard.—For I have never yet ventured to dispute the scripturalty of your sayings and doings, but I have been visited with the only argument some people know the force of, which is "discontinue your paper to me." But I will speak out and maintain what I believe to be true, though every subscriber should order his name to be erased from my list. The Advocate would then of course cease. The false peace of this reformation would then cease to be disturbed; but the victory would reflect little credit upon them; for a question of dollars and cents, though a powerful argument, is an argument of force, and not a force of argument.

May the evil genius you speak of depart. May we respect each other's rights. May we continue to love as brethren, though we cannot as yet coincide in the several causes to which we plead. May we be superior to those petty jealousies which are the plague spots of little minds. If either of us conflict upon the other the appearance of evil, may we each endeavor to return good for evil. May past offences be forgotten by us both. That truth may prevail over sect; and that it may be our mutual happiness to sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob at the royal banquet in the Everlasting Kingdom of themanuel is the devout aspiration of

Dear Brother,

Your Fellow Citizen of Heaven.

JOHN THOMAS.

A FRAGMENT.

What follows is an examination of the 16th and 17th "arguments" of The Harbinger on the subject at issue between our two papers. They would have been comprehended within the limits of the last volume, but were crowded out by the title-page and table of contents. The reader is requested to consider them as a part of No. 5. For further observations upon this matter, he is respectfully referred to our letter to Brother Campbell.

Ed. Adv.

"Argument 16."—The disciple said, it is not Peter—it is his angel. The Harbinger says, that Luke intended to signify

that it was not Peter, but "Peter's spirit or angel; for surely," says he, "it could not be his body, incarcerated as it was in Hell; was his angel!"—We shall show, that it was neither Peter's body nor spirit supposed by the disciples to be knocking at the door, when they affirmed it was his angel. But to the context: Herod had commenced a persecution against the disciples in Jerusalem. He put James to death, and cast Peter into prison. God sent an angel or messenger to set Peter at liberty. As soon as Peter recovered from his surprise, he found himself in the open street, and forthwith made his way to the house where John Mark and Mary his mother resided; and where many other disciples were assembled, praying. He knocked at the outer door for admittance, and was answered by a female, named Rose. This maiden, transported with joy at the sound of Peter's voice, which she recognized, waited not to open the door, but ran in and told the disciples in an excited way, that Peter was there. The disciples had not heard his voice, and they knew that he was securely lodged in the City gaol, and that humanly speaking, it was impossible for Peter to escape, they therefore did not believe the declaration of Rose, whom they charged with being distracted, for uttering such an improbable thing. But she confidently affirmed that it was so. Then, as if they had said, if there be any one there connected with Peter, "It is his (aggelos) angel" or a messenger from him. Perhaps he has sent some one to us expressive of his wants. But Peter continued knocking, and to their astonishment they found it was Peter himself, and not an angel or messenger. Peter then related the story of his deliverance; and there we leave it for the present.

"Argument 17." Ah! here's the rub; what shall we unfortunate Materialists, Sadducees, lurking sceptics or rather atheists do with this? Here is a thunderbolt to dissipate our whole "Sadducean hypothesis."—God is not the God of the dead; "therefore Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are not dead.—This is the point of this most triumphant refutation of Materialism and Sadduceanism."—Alas! how some people reckon without their host. We shall soon see how easily may be demolished this vaunted triumph—this climax of mystical perversion of scripture. But to the text and context.

"I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. God is not a God of the dead, but of the living; for they are all alive to him." Luke xx. 38. "No one can get at the true meaning of this without examining the context." Let it be observed by those who consult the octavo edition of the New Version, that there is a sentence interpolated into the original—"for they are all, though dead, alive to him."—Though dead to us was not spoken, and has been very properly left out in the pocket edition. It tells us, that the Sadducees denied a future state.

introduction is obtained by a resurrection; and these two things they rejected—a future state, and a resurrection of the dead. Jesus maintained the existence of both. These were the disputants, and these the questions in debate between them. The Sadducees thought to puzzle Jesus by propounding to him the case of the woman and her seven husbands—"to which of them will she be wife at the resurrection; for she has been married to all the seven?"—They were unprepared for the revelation he made to them. He told them there was no such thing as marriage in the future state among those who shall be honored to share in it and the resurrection. Having disposed of their catch question, he proceeds to insist upon the truth of a resurrection. "THAT THE DEAD ARE RAISED" said he, "even Moses has suggested." He then goes on to show how and where Moses suggests that the dead are raised; for, continued he, Moses called the Lord who appeared in the bush, "the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob."—This then is the passage of Moses' writings in which there is a resurrection suggested; and the names of some of the subjects of it are mentioned. Having quoted Moses' suggestion, Jesus comments upon it, saying, that God "is not a God of the dead, but of the living;" that is, he is not the God of the dead who are not to be raised, as you Sadducees suppose; but of the living, or of those who are to be honored to share in the resurrection. and the other world; and thus it is, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are all alive to him: for "God who makes alive the dead, calls things (persons) which exist not as though they existed."—Rom. iv. 17.—This reasoning was so convincing in proof of a resurrection of the dead, and so gratifying to the opponents of the Sadducees, that even the Scribes applauded his excellency of spirit, for, said they to Jesus, "Rabbi, you have spoken well."

If Jesus was aiming at establishing the doctrine of abstract human spirit, he failed to do it; and his reasoning was quite irrelevant to the occasion. Supposing we admit the independent existence of ghosts, which, in fact the pagans did, does this necessarily involve a resurrection of dead bodies. The pagans, though as firm believers in the dogma, as the Harbinger, yet mocked Paul for a vain babbler when he announced a resurrection of the dead. The existence of abstract human spirits was not the subject in debate between Jesus and the Sadducees; it was the resurrection of the dead, and not a reunion of human spirits with human bodies; it's not a human spirit that is to reanimate a human body at the resurrection, but the "spirit of God, who raised up Jesus from the dead—it is He who will make even our MORTAL BODIES ALIVE through HIS spirit." Rom. viii. 11.

Thus we have brought to the scrutiny of the context the dislocated passages of the word of God, selected for the purpose

of a special pleading. We have with little or no labor, but that most tedious of all labor, the driving the quill, driven from the field the false witnesses of a spurious theology. The truth, having vindicated itself, we consign, as far as relates to ourselves, the Conversations and Essays to entire forgetfulness. As to what we have written, though warmly attacked, it still stands on record unrefuted. A few breaches may have been made in the outworks—the batteries of tone, of temper, and of manner, may not have been so low, so lymphatic, or so agreeable as they might—their cannonading may have been too sharp, too brisk, too unceremonious for nervous temperaments; but the Citadel of Truth they have enclosed has suffered no hurt for a moment of time. We have the truth, we have honestly defended the Truth, and there exists not the individual in the Old or New World who can show that we have not successfully maintained it.

EDITOR.

OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED.

A respected correspondent from Pennsylvania writes as follows:—"While I wish you Brother Thomas to go on with your Advocate and prosper, I wish you to guard against any matter that would tend to counteract the truth or teaching of the scriptures; or publishing any thing as scriptural, which is not so. I have very strong doubts as to the accuracy of the following expressions and its connection, namely, "That natural death becomes eternal to all those nations to whom God has not made known his will." I desire you to examine carefully such portions of scripture as appear to be against your views as expressed. Such as John v. 23. Rev. xx. 11-14. Rom. ii. 12-15. and many such passages. Take care and be cautious Brother, and see that those who say you will come out an infidel be disappointed."

E. D.

First then, as to John v. 28. "Wonder not at this; for the time comes when all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth."—The objection I presume turns upon the word all. And here I would observe that the word, all is never used absolutely, but is always limited by the context to which it stands related. The position I assume here is, that all does not refer to all the men, women, and children who have ever lived upon the earth as many suppose, but it is limited to those persons who are indicated in the text. Let us see, then, if we can find out who those persons are.

Jesus was reasoning with the Jews concerning the resurrection he had received from God, to whom they accused him of being himself, by calling Him his Father. Jesus, to show that

intimate relationship subsisting between God and himself, affirmed, that as the Father raises and makes alive the dead, so also the Son raises from the dead whomever he will. His power to do this, the Jews had evidence of in the son of the widow of Nain the daughter of Jairus, and Lazarus. This miraculous power he adduced to show, that God was indeed his real Father. Founded upon these premises he propounds to them this principle of the truth,—“I say,” says he, “to you (Jews) he who hears my doctrine, and believes him who sent me, has eternal life, and shall not suffer condemnation, having passed from death to life.” The converse of this is, that if they would not hear his doctrine, and would not believe Him who sent him they shall not see eternal life, but should suffer condemnation, or be punished, having refused to pass from death to life. The all concerning whom he speaks to the Jews are all those who hear his doctrine. These we perceive are divisible into two classes of persons, namely, the believers, and those who will not believe. The destiny of the former he declares, is eternal life; that of the latter condemnation. He goes on to tell them that He is the distributor of the reward of life, and the punishment of death to all such. The Father, says he, has given the Son even the judicial authority, because he is a Son of Man. Wonder not at this, he continues; for the time comes when all that are in their graves (not in Heaven) shall hear his voice, and shall come forth. All who? “They who have done good,” and “they who have done evil.” What is the standard of the good and of the evil they shall have done? The “doctrine” of Jesus spoken of in the context. Those who receive it are the all who have done good under this dispensation; and they who receive it not are the all who have done evil. What is the destiny of the former?—“To arise and enjoy life,” says the Son. What is that of the latter?—“To arise to suffer punishment,” says the Judge.

Now in general terms the answer to the question, who are the all referred to in the text? The reply is all who are morally and physically capable of doing good or evil according to the doctrine of the Son of Man.—Can a person receive or reject the doctrine of Jesus, who is ignorant or human speech, and can neither think nor act for itself?—Who will say he can? Then such are not comprehended in the all of the text. Can men and women, who are not thus physically incapacitated, but who have never heard even of the name of Jesus, receive or reject his doctrine? Who will say they can?—Then such are not comprehended in the all of the text. We conclude then, that the all is limited by the context to all those, who, having heard the doctrine of Jesus, either receive or reject it. The next in order is Romans ii. 13-15.—As many therefore, as have sinned without law; shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned under law shall be condemned by

law; for not those who hear the law, are just before God; but those who obey the law shall be justified, in the day when God shall judge the hidden things of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel. When, therefore, the Gentiles who have not a law, do in effect the things of the law, these persons, though they have not a law, are a law to themselves; who show plainly the work of the law, written on their hearts; their conscience bearing witness, and also their reasonings between one another, when they accuse or excuse each another.”

From the context, the Gentiles here alluded to by the Apostle appear to be the idolators; the fruits of whose superstition he enumerates in ch. i. v. 26-32. He declares that by the law of God, they who practice such things are worthy of death; that is, as I understand it, eternal death. Of this sentence, on account of their idolatry, they have no reason to complain; for God has sufficiently manifested his eternal power and divinity by his works, so that they are inexcusable. Besides, they show plainly the work of the law written on their hearts, which pronounces sentence of death upon them, by their reasonings on virtue and vice, by which they condemn or acquit each other of good or evil. Now the Jew is no better than the Gentile: for some of them who clearly understand the law of God, not only do the abominable things he mentions, but even commend those who practice them. For which cause the Jew is as inexcusable as the Gentile. Hence the sentence of death, which is the punishment of sin, rests both on the Jew and the Greek. The one perishes under the law of Moses, the other also perishes though never placed under that law. To die is not to perish, though to perish we must die. Jewish and Gentile sinners will perish both; and this perdition will be according to the gospel Paul preached, v. 14. In this gospel he announced to the Gentiles, that the times of their ignorance God had winked at or overlooked; but now they were called upon to reform, as a day was appointed for the judgment of the world by Jesus Christ, who, we have seen, instructs us, that the reception or rejection of his doctrine shall determine to which of the resurrections they shall attain. What else can he mean by God's overlooking the times of Gentile ignorance, but that their “receiving in themselves that recompense of their error which was due” while living, and death natural should be a perdition to them unsuspected and eternal? But the Jews and Gentiles, who reject the doctrine of Jesus will perish by a resurrection to “the damnation of Hell,” in which “their soul and body are destroyed.”

The third objection is founded on Rev. xxi. 1-3. I saw a great white throne, and him who sat on it, and the earth and heaven fled away, and were laid bare before him. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened, and each man was judged according to his works.

opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of the things written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead that were in it; and death and hades gave up the dead that were in them; and they were judged every one according to his works. And death and hades were cast into the lake of fire; this is the second death."

The objection, I presume, turns upon the terms "small and great," and "every one."—First, as to the *small and great* dead who are to stand before God. I believe the many imagine, that by the word *small* is meant those of diminutive size and stature. But reason enlightened by scripture will not justify such an unimportant distinction in relation to those who are to be judged. Suppose we were to read it according to this interpretation, it would then be, And I saw the dead, small infants and other diminutive persons, and large men, standing before God. And they were every one, small infants and large men judged according to their works. According to what works are small infants to be judged? You perceive then that the interpretation is reduced to an absurdity.

Now in the original, the dead are termed *mikros kai megalos* small and great. The word *small* is but a lame translation of *mikros*. We speak of "great men" when we mean celebrated, renowned, noble men, but we do not say "small men" when we speak of men of low degree. Now *mikros* signifies, according to Parkhurst and all other lexicographers, besides other meanings, little in dignity, mean, that is in appearance. You and I are *mikros*, little, mean, ignoble in the estimation of the *megalos* or great world; which does not know us, because it neither knows the Son nor the Father, whose we are. The passage then ought to read, and I saw the dead, ignoble and renowned stand before God. Now this accords with the doctrine, that God is no respecter of persons. Now the question is, who are the *every one of the ignoble and noble dead* spoken of here? The context replies, those whose names were either written or unwritten in the book of life, and whose works were either good or evil, according as they shall be so determined by the things of the law recorded in the books.

Now, we learn from Paul, that some of the dead are to perish by law and others without law. But here we find dead of high and low degree who are "every one" raised to life that they may be judged "by law" or according to the things written in the books. Now it is worth your while to remember, that not one of the dead John saw standing before God, is reported to have been judged to life or death by any unwritten rule. The rule of judging their works is all written, so that they are inexcusable. It will be no excuse to them to say, they did not know the works or things God required of them, for the things are all written in The Books to which when alive before, they

had free access. But where at this great judgment of the wicked are those who die without having been placed under any divine law, but were a law to themselves? They were not there, for John did not see them; if he had he would have told us. What then had become of them? They had all died and perished away—their natural death had become eternal, which was the question in debate.

EDITOR.

Observations on Paul's Epistle to the Romans.

BY ROBERT HALDANE, ESQ.

All Scripture is given by inspiration of God. Every page of the sacred volume is stamped with the impress of Deity, and contains an inexhaustible treasure of wisdom, and knowledge, and consolation. Some portions of the word of God, like some parts of the material creation, may be more important than others,—but all have their proper place, all proclaim something of the character of their glorious Author, and all ought to be earnestly and reverentially studied. Whatever be their subject, whether it relates to the history of individuals or of nations, whether it contains the word of precept or exhortation, or whether it teaches by example, all is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for instruction in righteousness. But, while every part of the word of God demands the most serious attention, it is not to be doubted that certain portions of the sacred volume call for more frequent and deeper meditation.—Among these, the Epistle to the Romans is entitled to peculiar regard. It is the only part of Scripture which contains a detailed and systematic exhibition of the great doctrines of Christianity. The same doctrines, it is true, are inculcated in every other part of the Bible, but here they are brought together in a condensed and comprehensive form. Especially the great doctrine of justification by faith is clearly unfolded, and placed in the strongest light. This doctrine is so far above the discovery of man, that human wisdom is ever attempting to set it aside, or to modify it into accordance with systems, that represent salvation as more or less the effect of merit on the part of man.

The Epistle to the Romans has always attracted the peculiar notice of those whose attention has been directed to the interpretation of Scripture. To this portion of the divine record, all who look for salvation by grace have constantly appealed, and here they have proof the most solid and abundant. No considerable difference of interpretation has ever been given of its contents by those who have renounced their own wisdom, and have determined to follow implicitly the obvious meaning of the word of God.

This epistle has been equally an object of attention

who admit the authority of Scripture, but follow their own wisdom in forming their own system of religious doctrine.—Salvation by grace, and salvation by works, are so inconsistent with each other, that it might well be supposed no attempt would ever be made to harmonize them. Yet the attempt has been made. Human wisdom cannot receive the doctrine of the Epistle to the Romans, and men professing Christianity cannot deny it to be a part of Scripture. What, then, is to be done? A compromise and peace are proclaimed between the wisdom of man and the revelation of God. All the ingenuity of Mr. Locke, one of the acutest philosophers that ever existed, has been excited to bring Paul into accordance with human science. He and others have labored to give a view of this epistle that may reconcile human merit with divine grace.

The mind of every man, by nature, is disaffected to the doctrine of this epistle; but it is only in proportion to the impudency of his unbelief that any one will directly avow it. While some, by the wildest suppositions, will boldly set aside every thing it contains that opposes their own preconceived opinions, others will receive its statements, only with the reserve of certain necessary modifications. Thus, in the deviations from truth in the exposition of its doctrines, we find various shades of the same unhallowed disregard for the divine testimony.

The spirit of speculation and of novelty, which is now abroad, loudly calls upon Christians to give earnest heed to the truths inculcated in the Epistle to the Romans. There is hardly any doctrine which has not been of late years exposed to the corruptions and perversions of men. Many, altogether destitute of the spirit of God and the semblance of true religion, have nevertheless chosen the word of God, and its solemn and awfully-momentous truths, as the arena upon which to exercise their learning and display their ingenuity. In consequence of the Scriptures being written in the dead languages, there is doubtless scope for the diligent employment of critical research. But if they were enquired how much additional light has been thrown upon the sacred volume by the refinements of modern critics, it would be found to bear a very small proportion to the evil effected by the influence of unsanctified learning applied to the holy doctrines of Revelation. It has become common, even among Christians, to speak of the critical interpretation of Scripture as requiring little or nothing more than mere scholarship, and many seem to suppose that the office of a critical and that of a doctrinal interpreter are so widely different that a man may be a safe and useful critic who has at the same time no reliance for the grand truths of the Bible. There cannot be a more lamentable delusion, or one more calculated to debase the character and obscure the majesty of the word of God. To suppose that a man may rightly interpret the Scriptures, while he is ignorant of the truths of the Gospel, or disaffected

to some of its grand fundamental doctrines,—to imagine that he can be to him a useful or even an innocent occupation; is to regard these Scriptures as the production of ordinary men, instead of subjects of ordinary importance, instead of containing, as they do, the message of the Most High God, revealing life or death to every soul of man by whom they are read.

If the Scriptures have not testified in vain that the carnal mind is enmity against-God; if we are bound to believe that there is no middle state between the Christian and unbeliever; how can we wonder at the manner in which they have been perverted, not only by the ignorance, but the inveterate prejudices of men from whom the Gospel is hid? Is it reasonable—is it agreeable to the dictates of common sense, to believe that the critical interpretations of such men are not tinged with their own darkened and hostile views of the divine character and the divine revelation? And yet such is the opinion entertained of the labors of some of the most unenlightened commentators, that their works have obtained a celebrity altogether unaccountable on any principle of sound Christian wisdom.

Christians ought to be particularly on their guard against tampering in any degree with the word of God. We should never forget, that when we are explaining any expression of Scripture we are treating of what are the very words of the Holy Ghost as much as if they had been spoken to us by a voice from heaven. The profane rashness of many critics is well emboldened by the circumstance that men have been employed in communicating revelation. A sort of modified inspiration only is granted to the Scriptures, and they are often speculatively treated as the words merely of those who were employed to write them. When God is thus kept out of sight, the ceremony is used in treating the words of the Apostles with the utmost freedom. That profound reverence and awe with which the Scriptures ought to be read and handled is, in many instances too little exemplified. The poor man's Bible is the Word of God, in which he has no suspicion that there is any thing but perfection. The Bible of the profoundly erudite scholar is often a book that is not so necessary to instruct him, whose that needs his hand for alteration, or amendment, or confirmation. Learning may be usefully employed; but if learning ever forgets that it must constantly sit at the feet of Jesus, it will be a curse instead of a blessing. It will raise clouds and darkness, instead of communicating light to the world.

The evil of studying the Scriptures, and commenting upon them with as little reverence as a scholar might commonly be expected to play off Aristophanes or Terence, has extended much farther than might be supposed. This is the case which the German neologians have written upon, and which we feared, that as the neologian form of the

from this profane method of criticising the Scriptures, so the same cause may produce the same effect in this country. Certain it is, that works have been re-published or translated here, which are very little calculated to uphold the ancient faith of the Church of Christ, or to advance the knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus.

From present appearances, there is every reason to fear that Britain will be inundated with German neology. The tide has strongly set in, and unless the Christian public be on their guard, the whole country will be brought under its influence. It is a solemn thing to be employed in ushering into more extended notoriety publications that have a tendency to lower the character of the Holy Scriptures, to introduce doubt and confusion into the minds of those who are weak in the faith, and to embolden others who seek an apology for casting away the fetters of education and authority, and desire to launch out into the ocean of wild and dangerous speculation. While some appearances in Germany of a return to the Scripture doctrine of salvation by Jesus Christ should be gladly hailed by every Christian, yet it must be admitted, that those who in that country seem to have made the greatest advances in the knowledge of the Gospel, are still far from being entitled to be pointed out as guides to the Christians of this country. Their modifications of divine truth are manifestly under the influence of a criticism too nearly allied to neology. There is great danger that, in the admiration of German criticism, a tincture may be received from continental errors. It would be much preferable, if the learned Christians of Britain would pursue truth in a diligent examination of its own sources, rather than spend their time in retailing the criticisms of German scholars. "Their criticisms," it is observed by Mr. Carson, in his very able review of the Unitarian controversy lately maintained at Belfast "are arbitrary, forced, and in the highest degree fantastical.—Their learning is boundless, yet their criticism is mere trash. The vast extent of their literary acquirements has overawed British theologians, and given an importance to arguments that are self-evidently false."

In these days of boasted liberality, it may appear capacious to oppose with zeal the errors of men who have acquired a name in the Christian world. The mantle of charity, it will be said, ought to be thrown over the mistakes that have resulted from a free and impartial investigation of truth; and they ought either to be overlooked, or noticed with a slight expression of disapprobation. Such, however, was not the conduct of the Apostle Paul. He spared neither churches nor individuals, when the doctrines they promulgated tended to the subversion of the Gospel; and the zeal with which he opposed their errors was not inferior to that with which he met the open enemies of Christianity. He admits that the doctrine introduced

into the Galatian churches is another Gospel, and denounces a curse against all who promulgated it. Instead of complimenting the authors of this corruption of the Gospel, as only abusing in a slight degree the liberty of free examination, he decides that they should be cut off as troublers of the churches. Let not Christians be more courteous in expressing their views of the guilt and danger of corrupting the Gospel, than faithful and compassionate to the people of Christ who may be injured by false doctrine. It is highly sinful to bandy compliments at the expense of truth.

The awful responsibility of being accessory to the propagation of error, is strongly expressed by the Apostle John. "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds." If the imputation of Adam's sin, and of Christ's righteousness, be doctrines contained in the Word of God, commentaries that labor to expel them from that Word must be grossly pestiferous books, which no Christian ought to recommend, but which on the contrary, to the utmost of his power, it is his duty to oppose.

A very dangerous misrepresentation of some of the great doctrines of the Epistle to the Romans, has lately come before the public, in a commentary on that epistle from the pen of Professor Stuart of America. As that work has obtained an extensive circulation in this country, has been strongly recommended, and is likely to produce a considerable effect, it has appeared to me proper to make frequent references, in the exposition of the first five chapters, to his glaring perversions of their important contents. On the same principle I have introduced various remarks on the well-known commentary of Dr. Macknight, and have also alluded occasionally to that of Professor Tholuck, lately published.

In the following exposition I have availed myself of all the assistance I could obtain, from whatever quarter. Especially, I have made use of every thing that appeared to be most valuable in the commentary of Claude, which terminates at the beginning of the twenty-first verse of the third chapter. I have also had the advantage of the assistance of Mr. Carson, whose thorough acquaintance with the original language, and well-known critical discernment, peculiarly qualify him for rendering effectual aid in such a work. As it is my object to make this exposition as useful as possible to all descriptions of readers, I have not always confined myself simply to an explanation of the text, but have occasionally extended, in length, remarks on such subjects as seemed to demand particular attention, either from their own importance, or from mistaken opinions entertained concerning them, which required a more full discussion than the

ently introduced, I have referred to my larger work 'On the Evidence and Authority of Divine Revelation.'

In the first five chapters of this epistle, the great doctrine of justification by faith, of which they exclusively treat, is more fully discussed than in any other part of Scripture. In the first chapter, the Apostle commences by directing the attention of those to whom he wrote to the person of the Son of God, in his incarnation in time, and his divine nature from eternity, as the great subject of that Gospel which he was commissioned to proclaim. After a most striking introduction, every way calculated to arrest the attention, and conciliate the affection of those whom he addressed, Paul briefly announces, what he intends afterwards to establish, that the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, because in it is revealed the righteousness of God. Unless such a righteousness had been provided, all men must have suffered the punishment due to sin, seeing God hath denounced his high displeasure against their ungodliness and unrighteousness. These are the great truths which the Apostle immediately proceeds to unfold. And as they stand connected with every part of that salvation which God has prepared, he is led to exhibit a most animating and consolatory view of the whole of that great plan of mercy, which proclaims "glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good-will toward men."

The first point which the Apostle establishes, is the ruined condition of men, who by nature are all under sin. The charge of ungodliness and of consequent unrighteousness, he proves first against the Gentiles. They had departed from the worship of God, although, in the works of the visible creation, they had sufficient notification of his power and Godhead. In their conduct they had violated the law written in their hearts, and sinned in opposition to what they knew to be right, and to the testimony of their consciences in its favor. All of them, therefore, lay under the sentence of condemnation which will be pronounced on the workers of iniquity in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men. In the second chapter a similar charge of guilt and transgression is brought against the Jews, notwithstanding that they had been favored with the superior advantage of a written revelation.

Having proved in the first two chapters, by an appeal to undeniable facts, that the Gentiles and the Jews were both guilty before God, in the third, taking them both together, Paul exhibits a fearful picture, drawn from the testimony of Old Testament Scriptures, of their universal guilt and depravity. And thus, having established it as an undeniable truth that every man in his natural state lies under the just condemnation of God, as a rebel against him in all the three ways in which he has been pleased to reveal himself, he arrives at the inevitable

conclusion, that by obedience to law* no man living shall be justified; that so far from justifying him, the law proves him to be a transgressor.

The way is thus prepared for the grand display of the grace and mercy of God announced in the Gospel. What the law could not do, nor from any deficiency in itself, but owing to the depravity of man, God has fully accomplished. Man has no righteousness of his own which he can plead, but God has provided a righteousness for him. This righteousness infinitely superior to that which he originally possessed, is provided solely by grace, and received solely by faith. It is placed to the account of the believer for his justification, without the smallest respect either to his previous or subsequent obedience. Yet, so far from being contrary to the justice of God, this method of justification, "freely by his grace," illustrates his justice, and vindicates his former dealings to men. So far from making the law void, it establishes it in all its honor and authority. This way of Salvation equally applies to all, both Jews and Gentiles—men of every nation and of every character: "there is no difference" here, for all, without exception, are sinners.

The Apostle, in the fourth chapter, in obeying certain obligations, farther confirms and illustrates his doctrines. And in order to complete the view of the great subject of his discussion, he describes in the fifth chapter the blessed effects connected with a state of justification. He then gives a striking account of the entrance of that sin and of that righteousness, both of which he hath been exhibiting; and shows the reason of the introduction of the written law; by means of which the extent of the evil of the one, and of the effectual remedy brought by the other, was fully made manifest to the glory of the grace of God.

These five chapters disclose a consistent scheme in the divine conduct, and exhibit a plan of reconciling sinners that never could have occurred to the human understanding. It is the perfection of wisdom, yet in all its features it is opposed to the wisdom of this world.

QUERIES.

"You will please answer in The Advocate the following enquiries. How do you understand these expressions in the New Testament—*Except a man be born of water and of spirit he cannot enter the Kingdom of God; also, who drinks of this water will thirst again; but whosoever drink of the water, which I shall give him will never more; but this water I shall give him, shall be*

* The law of Moses.—ED. ADV.

fountain springing up into everlasting life; also, and the Spirit and the Bride, say: come; and let him that hears, say, come, and let him that is thirsty, come, whoever will, let him take of the water of life freely. Do you understand the water in each to be material or figurative? Or do you understand the first to be material water, and the two latter figurative? Please give your views concerning the passages, and your reasons for those views. I have made these inquiries in consequence of a conversation I had with a baptist who contended that they were figurative in each case.

Reply.

The attributes of the water in each passage are sufficiently indicated by the passages themselves. In the first, or John iii. 5, the water can be no other than material because we are required to be born of it. Now to be born of anything is to emerge from that in which we had been previously concealed. To be born of water therefore, is to emerge from water in which we had previously been hid from view. It is obvious that figurative water cannot be intended; for to interpret it thus, would be to reduce the passage to an absurdity. Except a man be born of spirit and spirit is nonsense. God who is a Spirit, is the begetter of spiritual sons and daughters by his incorruptible seed which is the word of the Lord which has been proclaimed a gospel to the world. 1 Peter i. 23-25. Now, who ever heard of any thing being begotten and born, in the material or moral kingdom of God, without a material medium. A plant cannot be born of the earth unless it be begotten in the earth. The earth is the mother or material medium of all the citizens or subjects of the vegetable kingdom. So of the animal kingdom; the corruptible seed of the flesh must be deposited in an animal before an animal can be born either of its sire or dam. To say, that a plant is born of the earth and mature when the seed is only just now sown in the earth, is about as rational as to say, that a man is born of water and the spirit who has only received the principle of spiritual life by a belief of the word of the Lord. To be born of water, a man thus begotten of the Spirit by a belief of the truth, must go into the water; which in no way can be even plausibly made to mean, that he must go into the spirit, which a figurative rendering of water would imply.

In the other passages, the subject of discourse is not a being born of water, but a drinking of water. In John iv. 14. Jesus speaks of material and spiritual water. He asked the woman of Samaria to give him some water from the well of Jacob.—Having commenced a conversation with her, he offered her of the water of life or living water, so that she might drink and never thirst again. When we long after any thing with an

ardent desire we are said to thirst after it. Now the object of natural thirst, is water; so the object of a spiritual thirst is called water, living or running water which appears to be endless in its flow. In spiritual language, to long ardently after eternal life, is to thirst for living water; and to attain to a title to eternal life is never to thirst more because having become heirs of this inestimable life, the assurance of this is as a fountain within us springing up to everlasting life.

In his discourse with the woman Jesus adopted the style of the prophets; especially of Isaiah who calls upon every one, that is thirsty to come to the waters. But enough has been said upon so self-evident and palpable a subject.

EDITOR.

Dr. Beattie's Opinion of the Christian Religion.

"The Christian Religion, according to my creed, is a very simple thing, intelligent to the meanest capacity; and what, if we are at pains to join practice to knowledge, we may make ourselves acquainted with without turning over many books. It is that distinguished excellence of this religion, that it is entirely popular and fitted, both in its doctines and its evidences, to all conditions and capacities of reasonable creatures—a character which does not belong to any other religious or philosophical system that ever appeared in the world. I wonder to see so many men eminent both for their piety and for their capacity, labouring to make a mystery of this divine institution. If God vouchsafe to reveal himself to mankind, can we suppose that he chooses to do it in such a manner that none but the learned and contemplative can understand him? The generality of mankind can never, in any possible circumstances, have leisure or capacity for learning or profound contemplation. If, therefore, we make christianity a mystery, we exclude the greater part of mankind from a knowledge of it: which is directly contrary to the intention of its author, as is plain from his explicit and reiterated declarations. In a word, I am perfectly convinced that an intimate acquaintance with the SCRIPTURE, particularly the gospels, is all that is necessary to the accomplishment in true christian knowledge. I have looked into some systems of theology, but I never read one of them to an end, because I found I could never reap any instruction from them. To darken what is clear, by wrapping it up in a veil of system and science, was all the purpose that the best of them seems to me to answer."

Ancient and Modern Bishops.

"Let none," says Dr. Mosheim, alluding to the first and second centuries, "confound the bishops of this period."

golden period of the church, with those of whom we read in the following ages. For though they were both designated by the same name, yet they differed extremely, in many respects. A bishop, during the first and second centuries, was a person who had the care of one christian assembly, which at that time was generally speaking, small enough to be contained in a private house. In this assembly he acted not so much with the authority of a master, as with the zeal and diligence of a faithful servant. The churches also, in those early times, were entirely independent; none of them subject to any foreign jurisdiction, but each one governed by its own rulers and its own laws. Nothing is more evident than the perfect equality that reigned among the primitive churches; nor does there ever appear, in the first century, the smallest trace of that association of provincial churches, from which *councils* and *metropolitans* derive their origin."—[*Ecc. Hist. vol. I. p. 105-107.*]

Constantine's Imperial Way of Reconciling Bishops.

Socrates says, that the bishops having put into the emperor's hands written libels containing their complaints against one another, he threw them altogether into the fire, advising them according to the doctrine of Christ, to forgive one another as they themselves hoped to be forgiven. Sozomen says, that the bishops having made their complaints in person, the emperor bade them reduce them all into writing, and that on the day which he had appointed to consider them, he said, as he threw all the libels unopened into the fire, that it did not belong to him to decide the differences of Christian bishops, and that the settling of them must be deferred till the day of judgment.—[*Life of Constantine, Book, iii. ch. 10-11.*]

Character given Wickliffe by one of the Enemies of Reformation.

Jesse says—As the clergy had hated and persecuted him with great violence during his life, they exulted with indecent joy at his disease and death, ascribing them to the immediate vengeance of heaven for his heresy—"On the day of St. Thomas the Martyr, Archbishop of Canterbury," says Walsingham, a contemporary historian, "that limb of the devil, enemy of the church, deceiver of the people, idol of heretics, mirror of hypocrites, author of schisma, sower of hatred, and inventor of heresy, John Wickliffe, was, by the immediate judgment of God, suddenly struck with a palsy, which seized all the members of his body, when he was ready, as they say, to vent forth his blasphemies against the blessed St. Thomas, in a sermon which he had prepared to preach that day."

METAPHYSICS.

"Metaphysics is two men talkin' together. He that's listenin' does na ken what he that's talkin' means, and he that's talkin' does na ken what he means himself."

THE ADVOCATE

Vol. 2. Amelia County, Va.; June, 1837.

HISTORY OF PRIESTCRAFT,

BY WILLIAM HOWITT.

No. I.

POPERY.

Popery—Christ and Christianity—The latter speedily corrupted—Acts by which the Papal Church seized Power.

O that the froe would stamp the impious name
Of Pope into the dust! or write it there,
So that this blot upon the page of fame
Were as a serpent's path, which the light air
Erases, and the flat sands close behind!
Ye tho' oracle have heard;
Lift the victory-flashing sword,
And cut the snaky knot of this foul Gordian word,
Which, weak itself as stubble, yet can bind
Into a mass irrefragably firm
The axes and the rods which awe mankind.
The sound has poison in it—'tis the sperm
Of what makes life foul, awkward, and abhorred;
Dust! not then, at thine appointed term,
To rot thine armed heel on this reluctant worm. *SUMMIT.*

CHRIST appeared; the career of paganism was checked; the fate of Judaism was sealed. A character and a religion were placed before the eyes of men hitherto inconceivable in the beauty and philanthropy of their nature. Unlike all other founders of a religious faith, Christ had no selfishness, no desire of dominance; and his system, unlike all other systems of worship, was bloodless, boundlessly beneficent, inexpressibly pure, and, most marvellous of all, went to break all bonds of body and soul; and to cast down every temporal and every spiritual tyranny. It was a system calculated for the whole wide universe; adapted to embrace men of all climes, all ages, all ranks of life, or intellect; for the rich and for the poor, the savage and the civilized; for the fool and the philosopher, for man, woman, and child; which, recognising the grand principle, that "God made of one blood all the nations of the earth," represented the Almighty as the father, and all men as born to one universal love,—to the same inalienable rights, to the same eternal hope. He himself was the first section of his principles; Denouncing Custom, and

truth which he taught should make all men free; by declaring that the gentiles lorded it over and oppressed one another, but that it should not be so with his followers; by pulling down with indignation spiritual pride in high places, and calling the poor and afflicted his brethren, and the objects of his tenderest regard,—he laid the foundations of civil and religious freedom, of mental power growing out of unrestrained mental energies, and of love and knowledge co-equal in extension with the world. This perfect freedom of universal man he guarded by great and everlasting principles, intelligible to the mind and conscience of the whole human race; and on which men in all countries might found institutions most consonant to their wants. By declaring that "wherever two or three were met together in his name, he would be in the midst of them," he cut off, for ever, every claim, the most specious, of priestly dominance;—and by expressing his unqualified and indignant abhorrence of every desire of his disciples "to call down fire from heaven upon his enemies," or to forbid those to preach and work miracles in his name who did not immediately follow him, and conform to their notions, he left his church a light more resplendent than that of the sun, on the subject of non-interference with the sacred liberty and prerogatives of conscience.

One would have thought that from this epoch, the arm of priestcraft would have been broken,—that it would never more have dared to raise its head: but it is a principle of shameless avidity and audacity; and it is exactly from this time that we trace the most amazing career of its delusion and atrocities, down to the very day of our own existence.

Who is not familiar with the horrors and arrogant assumptions of the papal church? Scarcely had the persecution of the pagan emperors ceased, when the Christian church became inundated with corruptions and superstitions of every kind.—Constantine embraced Christianity; and almost the whole world embraced it nominally with him. From a conversion of such a kind, the work of regal example and popular interested hopes, what effects were to be expected? The martial tyranny of ancient Rome, which had subdued the world, was coming to an end. The wealth of which a thousand states had been stripped had turned to poison in her bosom, and brought upon the stern mistress of bloodshed and tears that retribution from which national rapine and injustice never eventually escape. But as if the ghosts of departed despotism hovered over the Seven Hills, and sought only a fresh body to arise in a worse shape, a new tyranny commenced in the form of priestcraft, ten times more terrible and hateful than the old,—because it had seen which ought to subjugate not merely the persons of men, but to extinguish knowledge; to enshrine into everlasting chain the human mind; and to rule it, in its faculty, with mystery and terror. The times favored the attempt

With the civil power of the Roman empire, science and literature were disappearing. A licentious army controlled the destiny of a debauched and effeminated people; and the Gothic and Hunnish nations rushing in immense torrents over the superannuated states of Europe, scattered, for a time, desolation, poverty, and ignorance. At this crisis, while it had to deal with hordes of rough warriors, who, strong in body and boisterous in manner, had yet minds not destitute of great energies, and many traditional maxims of moral and judicial excellence, but clothed in all the simple credulity of children,—up rose the spirit of priestcraft in Rome, and assumed all its ancient and inflated claims. As if the devil, stricken with malice at the promulgation of Christianity, which threatened to annihilate his power, had watched the opportunity to inflict on it the most fatal wound, and had found no instrument so favorable to his purpose as a priest,—such a glorious and signal triumph never yet was his from the creation of the world. Had he devised a system for himself, he could not have pitched upon one like popery; a system which, pretending to be that of Christ, suppressed the Bible,—extinguished knowledge,—locked up the human mind,—amused it with the most ludicrous baubles,—and granted official licenses to commit all species of crimes and impurity. Satan himself became enthroned on the Seven Hills in the habit of a priest, and grinned his broadest delight amid the public and universal reign of ignorance, hypocrisy, venality, and lust.

As if the popes had studied the pagan hierarchies, they brought into concentrated exercise all their various engines of power, deception, and corruption. They could not, indeed, assert, as the pagan priesthood had done, that they were of a higher origin than the rest of mankind; and therefore entitled to sit as kings, to choose all kings, and rule over all kings; for it was necessary to preserve some public allegiance to the doctrines of Christianity,—but they took ground quite as effectual. They declared themselves the authorised viceregents of Heaven; making Christ's words to Peter their charta—"On this rock I will build my church,"—hence asserting themselves to be the only true church, though they never could show that Peter ever was at Rome at all. On this ground, however, enough for the simple warriors of the time—they proceeded to rule over nations and kings. On this ground they proclaimed the infallibility of the pope and his conclave of cardinals, and thus excluded all dissent. Their first act, having once reached this station, was that which had been the practice of priests in all countries,—to shut up the true knowledge of the world. As the priests of Egypt and Greece had done, they wrapped the simple truths of the Bible in a mystic veil, and the Brahmins forbidding exposure of the sacred Vedas,—they shut up the sacred

given to enlighten the world,—the very book which declared of its own contents, that “they were so clear that he who ran might read them” that they taught a way of life so perspicuous that “the wayfaring man, though a fool, could not err therein.” This was the most daring and audacious act the world had ever seen; but this act once successful, the whole earth was in their power. The people were ignorant; they taught them what they pleased. They delivered all sorts of ludicrous and pernicious dogmas as scripture; and who could contradict them? So great became the ignorance of even their own order, under this system, so completely became the Bible a strange book, that when, in after ages, men began to inquire, and to expose their delusions, a monk warned his audience to beware of these heretics, who had invented a new language—called Greek, and had written in it a book called the New Testament, full of the most damnable doctrines. By every act of insinuation, intimidation, forgery and fraud, they not only raised themselves to the rank of temporal princes, but lorded it over the greatest kings with insolent impunity. The BANN, which was employed by the priests of Odiu in the north, they adopted, and made its terrors felt throughout the whole Christian world. Was a king refractory—did he refuse the pontifical demand of money—had he an opinion of his own—a repugnance to comply with papal influence on his affairs?—the thunders of the Vatican were launched against him; his kingdom was laid under the ban; all people were forbidden on pain of eternal damnation, to trade with his subjects; all churches were shut; the nation was of a sudden deprived of all exterior exercise of its religion; the altars were despoiled of their ornaments; the crosses, the reliques, the images, the statues of the saints were laid upon the ground; and, as if the air itself were profaned, and might pollute them by its contact, the priests carefully covered them up, even from their own approach and veneration. The use of bells entirely ceased in all churches; the bells themselves were removed from the steeples, and laid on the ground with other sacred utensils.—Mass was celebrated with shut door, and none but the priests were admitted to the holy institution. The clergy refused to marry, baptize, or bury; the dead were obliged to be cast into ditches, or lay putrefying on the ground; till the superstitious people, looking on their children who died without baptism as gone to perdition, and those dead without burial amid the ceremonies of the church, and in consecrated ground as seized on by the devil, rose in rebellious fury and obliged the prince to submit and humble himself before the proud priest of Rome.

Stones quake by turns: proud arbiters of grace
 The church, by manna shadowing forth the power
 The gates of heaven, by mystic symbols
 Close the gates of every sacred place.

Straight from the sun and tainted air's embrace
 All sacred things are covered; cheerful morn
 Grows and as night—no seemly garb is worn,
 Nor is a face allowed to meet a face
 With natural smile of greeting. Bells are dumb;
 Ditches are graves—funeral rites denied;
 And in the churchyard he must take his bride
 Who dares be wedded! Fancies thickly come
 Into the pensive heart ill fortified,
 And comfortless depairs the soul benumb.

Worsworthe

But not merely kings and kingdoms were thus circumstanced, every individual, every parish was liable to be thus excommunicated by the neighboring priest. The man who offended one of these powerful churchmen, however respected and influential in his own neighborhood over night, might the next morning behold the hearse drawn up to his hall door,—a significant emblem that he was dead to all civil and religious rights, and that if he valued his life, now at the mercy of any vile assassin, he must fly, and leave his family and his property to the same tender regards which had thus outlawed himself.

The invention of monkery was a capital piece of priestly ingenuity. By this means the whole world became inundated with monks and friars,

Black, white, and gray, with all their trumpery.

A standing army of vigilant forces was set up in every kingdom: into every town and village they entered; in every house they became familiar spies, ready to communicate the earliest symptoms of insubordination to the papal tyranny, ready at a signal to carry terror into every region, and rivet faster the chains of Rome. Like the frogs of Egypt, they came up and covered the earth; they crept into every dwelling; into the very beds and kneading tubs, sparing not those of the king himself—till the land stunk with them.

That they might have something to occupy the imagination of the people equivalent to the numerous idols, gorgeous temples, imposing ceremonies, and licentious festivals of the heathen; not only had they paintings of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but images of Christ, of his mother, and of a thousand saints, who were exalted to be objects of a veneration little to be distinguished from worship in the minds of the credulous people. To these they prayed; to these they made offerings. Splendid churches were built, and adorned with every fascination of statuary and painting; and carnivals, solemn festivals, and processions obtained without number. In all the levity and license of the heathen worship, the sacredness of the church, and the respect due to the images, were entirely forgotten. A thousand other pieces of

be parts or to have been the property of the saints, and were endowed with miraculous powers. Thus were men made fast prisoners by ignorance, by the excitement of their imaginations, and by objects on which to indulge their credulity. But other engines equally potent were set to work. Every principle of terror, love, or shame in the human mind was appealed to.— Oral confession was invented. Every person was to confess his sins to the priest. Thus the priest was put into possession of every thing that could enslave a man to him. Who was so pure in life and thought that, after having unbosomed himself to his confessor—made him the depository of his most secret thoughts, his weakest or worst actions, dare any more to oppose or offend him? But the chains of shame and fear were not all: those of hope were added. The priest had not only power to hear sins, but to pardon them. He could shut up in hell, or let out; he was not content with enslaving his follower in this world—he carried on his influence to the next, and even invented a world, from the tortures of which no man could escape without his permission.

How all this could be built on the foundation of Christianity might he wondered at; but it should never be forgotten that the Bible was locked up, and every thing was directed to the acquisition of power and gain. Every thing was a source of gain. Besides the direct tribute to the popeedom, every shrine had its offerings; every confession, every prayer had its price. Escape from purgatory and indulgence in sin were regulated by a certain scale of payment. The rich, the foolish, and the penitent were wheeled out of their property to maintain the endless train of pope, cardinals, priests, monks, nuns, confessors, and their subordinates. By them abbeys, cathedrals, and churches were endowed with ample lands; and every one who had incurred the censure of the church added also by fines to its funds. For a thousand years this system was triumphant throughout Europe:—

Thou heaven of earth! what spells could pall thee then,
In ominous eclipse! A thousand years
Bred from the shame of deep oppression's den,
Dyed all thy liquid light with blood and tears.

Over a greater part of it, it reigns still.

Millions of monks and secular priests, all forbidden to marry—all pampered in luxurious ease and abundance to voluptuousness, were let loose on the female world as counsellors and confessors, with secrecy in one hand, and amplest power of absolution from sin in the other; and the effect on domestic purity may be easily imagined. So, smoothly ran the course of slavery for many a century; but when, spite of all the efforts to the contrary, the human mind again began to stir; when

knowledge again revived; and the secrets of the church were curiously pried into; then this terrible hierarchy, calling itself Christian let loose its vengeance. Fire and faggot, chains and dungeons, exterminating wars and Inquisitions, those hell on earth, into which any man might, at a moment's notice, be dragged from his family, his fireside, or his bed, at the instigation of malice, envy, cupidity, or holy suspicion, to torture and death. These were the tender mercies of the papal priesthood in the hour of its fear.

This is a brief sketch of what the popish church was: we will now go on to give evidence of its spirit and proceedings from the best authenticated histories. 1. Of the means employed to obtain power. 2. Of the uses of that power. 3. Of the arrogance of the popish priesthood in power. 4. Of their atrocities.

The evidence I shall select must necessarily be a very small portion from the immense mass of the deeds of this church; for its history is such a continued tissue of ambition, cupidity and vice in its most hateful shapes, dissensions, frauds, and bloodshed, that nothing but the desire to draw from it a great moral and political lesson could induce me to wade through it.

The Veil—Sleeping Saints—Resurrection of the First-Fruits.

"The blue Veil," says a correspondent, "I take to be a type of the blue firmament above us, beyond which Christ has gone." To correct this with other notions which we believe to be erroneous we make the following remarks upon Matt. xxvii. 51.

Behold the Veil of the Temple was rent in two from top to bottom, the earth trembled, and the rocks split. Graves also burst open; and after his resurrection, (polla somata) many bodies (toon kekoiomemnoon agioon) of the having-been-sleeping-saints were raised, came out of the graves, went into the Holy City, and were seen by many.

Such were some of the phenomena attendant upon the resignation of the life of Jesus into the hands or keeping of the Father. His mortal career had just been closed by the withdrawal of the life-sustaining energy of God. He felt it ebbing forth, and with a loud cry exclaimed, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"—The Land was veiled in darkness for three successive hours. The night of death veiled the undeveloped future; the flesh of Jesus was now wrapped in its winding sheet, and he himself was placed in the new hallowed rock to rest in sleep profound, until the true veil should be rent in twain, for his entrance into the Most Holy. This is the mystery or secret of the veil. Till that time the body of Jesus, the entrance into heaven was security. Heaven or "the future state" was not entered by Abraham and his seed.

Places by which they might be entered, 'was not laid open' till Jesus died, was buried and rose again. He suffered and slept till the third day; as it is written in the Psalms concerning him—"I lay me down, and sleep." His dormitory was secured from all intrusion by a wall of stone by which its inlet was blocked. He had no apprehensions of the result. Though a prisoner under a troop of guards he was previously assured of his deliverance; as it is written in the Psalms, "I will place him in safety on whom they pour contempt;" and again,—"Thou causest my lamp to shine, Jehovah, my God, enlighten my darkness. For through thee I have broken through a troop; through my God I have leaped over a wall." His prayer for a rescue was before Jehovah. Nine hundred years before he suffered, the Holy Spirit by whom he performed his wonderful works, had dictated the supplications for his deliverance in the Songs of Zion; as it is written, "O Lord, how long—return O Lord, and deliver me; O save me according to thy mercy! For in death no praise ascends to thee; in the grave, who can give thee thanks?" The morning of the third day had just arrived. The hour—the appointed hour—for the rising of the Sun of Righteousness, even the early dawn had now begun: as it is written, "I will wake with the early dawn." The earth had been rent, and the way from the chamber of death unveiled. The expected messenger had descended from heaven to roll away the stone,—to unveil the tomb—for the enlargement of the sleeping Jesus. He was the expected messenger; for it is written in the Psalms, "He will send from heaven, and save me." The troop through which Jesus broke, trembled, at the presence of the Angel, and became as dead men. But he soothed the fears of the friends of Jesus, and, announcing to them his resurrection, invited them to come and see the place where the Lord lay.

The tomb being thus opened by the Angel and the rending of the earth, and Jesus having issued from its recesses, "A NEW AND LIVING WAY" was manifested, by which Heaven, the Future State or the True Most Holy May, and can alone, be entered by Christians—the kings and priests of God. This "new and living way" is the new way of life. The old way of life is the being born of the flesh; the new way of life is the being born of the Spirit of God by a resurrection from the grave. In this was verified the prediction of David concerning the resurrection of Messiah—"My flesh dwelleth in security. For thou wilt not give me up to the grave; nor wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see the pit. Thou wilt show me the path of life." Forty days after Jesus awoke from his repose, he left the earth; ascended to the Father, and "sat down at the right hand of God; thenceforth, waiting till his enemies be made his footstool." He will then descend and

commence his reign over the House of Israel according to the prophets.

This the true veil was rent, and thus Jesus, proceeding, entered into the place within the veil, where as a runner, he entered on our account. In the footsteps of this Forerunner, ran the Saints who had been sleeping in their graves before his death. The Scriptures say, that these holy ones were sleeping the sleep of death. Let the reader examine the text, and he will find that it was the Lord, as the angel who had been laying in the tomb; not an abstraction of the Lord. It was the Lord himself, inanimate and unconscious that lay in the hollowed rock; as he said after his resurrection, "I have not yet ascended to my Father." So it was the Saints themselves who slept, inanimate and unconscious, according to the type of the great Forerunner.

The wise and prudent of the world have agreed among themselves, that for a Saint to sleep the repose of death is for his body to return to dust, and for the Saint himself, which they call his spirit or ghost, to be borne away to heaven instantaneously to enjoy, in the full exercise of his faculties—wide awake—the delights of Paradise. This they call "sleeping in Jesus;" I should call it being awake in him. The Forerunner they confess died, was buried, rose from the dead, and then ascended to heaven; but those who are to follow him that runs before, they send by another rout. Marvellous inconsistency this, as though men could follow the track of a runner before, and not keep close to the steps of his feet!

Though the graves were opened by the earthquake which accompanied the rending of the temple veil, the sleeping saints did not awake, and come forth to life till the forerunner had led the way; as it is written, "after his resurrection many bodies of the having been sleeping saints arose." Sleeping saints and dead bodies are the subjects of a resurrection. As soon as a saint falls asleep in Jesus his body dies; and as soon as his body rises he awakes, and not before. These conditions are inseparable; notwithstanding all the metaphysics in the world.

Under the word *koimaomai* to sleep the sleep of death, Parkhurst has the following remarks in brief—"Estina (Rom. vi. 9.) 1 Cor. vii. 39, that sleeping is thus applied only to men who are dead, and this because of the hope of their resurrection; we had no such think of brutes." This is an excellent explanation; he; for sleeping implies waking. He then says were so sensible that when they were dead they would have been able to rise in order to receive their resurrection. This is the same as saying that the dead are able to rise before they are resurrected.

and plants, after seeming to die, yet revive in the succeeding year, rejoice

But we, or great, or wise, or brave,
Once dead, and silent in the grave,
Senseless to misery; one rest we keep,
One long, eternal, unawaken'd sleep.

So Catullus lib. 1. 5.

The sun that sets, again will rise,
And give the day, and gild the skies;
But when we lose our little light,
We sleep in everlasting night.

Homer says of a hero who was slain,

He slept a brazen sleep.

So Virgil,

An iron sleep o'erwhelms his swimming sight
And his eyes close in everlasting night.

But on the contrary it was doubtless with a view to the joyful hope of a resurrection both of body and soul, that the departed saints in the Old Testament as well as in the New, are said to *fall asleep*, to *sleep*, to *sleep with their fathers*.

How truly may the Heathen be said to have been without hope. "Be not grieved," says Paul to the Thessalonians "even as the other (Gentiles) who have no hope." As if he had said, "Do not grieve for your departed friends as do the heathen, who when their relations die, suppose them locked in the arms of an eternal sleep; having no hope of their being raised again to life." No; it remained for God to dispel the gloom of a perishing world; hence a *resurrection* was the burden of the proclamation to the nations. How cheering the announcement, that the destiny of a desponding world should not be "one long, eternal, unawaken'd sleep;" but that every one who would believe the gospel and obey it should not perish thus but at an appointed day be awake from his *iron sleep* by the voice of the Son of Man, and raised to the enjoyment of a never ending life, free from trouble, toil, and care.

EDITOR.

From Robinson's History of Baptism
OF ANABAPTISM.

It is not a little diverting to see with what perfect self-complacency many authors have given the world histories of the Anabaptists. Indiscriminately, without any definition of terms, or any distinction of times, places, persons or circumstances, without suspecting any thing to be false, or proving any thing

to be true, they roll the narration rapidly along, and conclude without giving the reader any information. There is not a plainer tale in the world than that of the Anabaptists, yet there is not a tale more confused in the telling. One page of criticism is of more worth than a whole volume of declamation, and the critical accuracy of the history of Anabaptists is nothing in the world but a fair narration of distinct facts. To mix all these facts into one general history is to create a chaos.

An Anabaptist is one who is re-baptized; but if it be granted that baptism may be administered wrong, what possible reason can be given why it should not be re-administered right?—Something certainly is essential to baptism; if that something be omitted in an administration, the act is not a baptism but a fiction, and consequently reason requires that the fiction be superseded by conferring the essence, otherwise it is as if gold were left out of a guinea. The little boy Athanasius, when he was twelve years of age, at play dipped his play-fellows in the sea, and it was adjudged by the bishop and his consistory a valid baptism, because it appeared on inquiry, he had previously asked the usual questions, and the boys had made the proper answers, and he had pronounced as he dipped them the same words, which he had heard the bishop pronounce when he baptized Catechumens. Had any of these parts been omitted, the baptism would have been thought invalid, and the children must have been re-baptized, or rather they must have been baptized, for the first would have been adjudged no baptism, but the mere sport of boys, who knew not what they were about. The bishop of the church did not hold a consistory on the question of Anabaptism, but on the fact before them, whether the boys had been baptized, or not, and when it was determined they had, nobody thought of re-baptizing them. If it had been determined they had not, would any accurate writer have called them Anabaptists for being afterward regularly baptized by the bishop? Here then lies the whole mystery of Anabaptism. Nobody holds, or ever did hold, at least in this part of the world, a repetition of baptism: but different Christians in the same ages have thought differently of what makes the essence of baptism, as a narration of facts will prove.

DIFFERENT KINDS OF PERSONS CALLED ANABAPTISTS

There are in general six sorts of Christians, who have been called Anabaptists, as different from one another as can well be imagined. The first placed the essence of baptism in the virtue of the person baptized: the second placed it in the force of words pronounced in the administration: the third in the virtue of the administrator: the fourth in the faith of the person baptized: the fifth in dipping: and the sixth in the possession of milk and an immersion.

1. The class is very large and extremely respectable. It was about the close of the second, or the beginning of the third century, that Tertullian began to complain of the corruption of baptism, and he wrote a book in the Greek language, against the administering of it to immoral persons. After his death, Agrippinus, bishop of the church at Carthage, and many neighboring bishops, agreed to reject the vague baptisms administered, they knew not how or by whom, on account of the immorality of the people, who had been baptized, and to re-baptize all such as should come over from those communities to join their churches. A few years after Cyprian and seventy-one neighboring bishops renewed this agreement. Then Firmilian bishop of Caesaria in Cappadocia, and great many bishops of Galatia, Cilicia, Phrygia, and other parts of Asia, determined for the same reason to re-baptize. Dionysius and his followers in Egypt, the Acephali, Novatus of Rome, Novatius of Carthage, all the Novatian churches, Donatus and his numberless followers, called after him Donatists, all rejected the baptism administered by those, who have since been called Catholics, whom they reputed heretics, and whose churches they called habitations of impurity, and all such as came from those churches to them they re-baptized. All those, and they were very numerous, considered the probity and good faith of the person baptized, the very essence of baptism, and if a professor of Christianity were an unwholy man, they adjudged his baptism like his profession, vain and invalid, and himself not a weak believer of Christianity, but a mere unprincipled Pagan. These rigid moralists, however, did not count themselves Anabaptists: for they thought there was but one Lord, one faith, one baptism, and that their own.

2. The second class consists of such as placed the essence of baptism in the form of words pronounced by the administrator, or, to speak more correctly, in a belief of that concerning the nature of God, which the form of words was supposed to express. In the year three hundred and twenty-five, the council of Nice was held under the direction of the Emperor Constantine the Great. In this council the Trinitarian Judaizing Christians got themselves established, and it was decreed that such as should come over to the established church from the congregations of the Novatians or Puritans, should be admitted by the laying on of hands: but that such as should come from the Paulianists, both men and women, should be re-baptized. Commentators assign a very true reason for this distinction.—The Nicene council held the doctrine of the Trinity, so did the Puritans, and both expressed their faith in the Trinity by administering baptism in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; but the Paulianists, who denied the Trinity, administered their rite with a mere man, omitted the laying on of hands, and therefore, the Catholics rejected as as-

gatory and of no value. The Arians for the same reason rejected the baptism of the Catholics, and they also re-baptized such as came from them to join their societies. Anabaptism, as it is called, at that time, was thought by all parties necessary to the purity of their churches: yet in their own opinions they did not re-baptize: but supposing what was essential to baptism to have been omitted, they administered it rightly as they thought, for the first and only time.

3. The third division comprehends all such as placed the essence of baptism in the virtue or competency of the administrator. If this be an error, as it should seem, it is one of the most popular and pardonable mistakes in the Christian world. To see a bad man perform the most solemn rites of religion, to see him perform them with carelessness, or it may be with contempt, is to behold a spectacle shocking to the most vulgar eye, the cause, naturally, of prejudice and infidelity in the people. It was on this account that many of the ancient Bohemian brethren re-baptized, and were denominated by the priests, whose services they disowned, Anabaptists. The truth is, the brethren estimated baptizing as they did praying, and as they thought a vicious priest did not pray because he chanted, so they supposed he did not baptize because he administered the form rightly. They complained that their parish priest administered baptism laughing, and in a manner so profane, that it had more the air of a ludicrous comedy than of a religious institute. Bishop Bossuet properly enough observes, this re-baptizing was an open declaration, that in the opinion of the brethren the Catholic church had lost baptism. This was precisely their meaning. They did not pretend to re-baptize: but supposing what was done in the church to be no baptism, they baptized as they thought, properly.

4. The fourth class consists of such as think a personal profession of the Christian religion essential to baptism. This was the opinion of Socinus, as it is of the Baptist churches in Holland and Germany. In what light soever Christianity be represented, whether as a law to be obeyed, a declaration to be believed, or a covenant to be acceded to, it should seem, there is no such thing as reconciling either with allowed ideas of justice and propriety, without admitting, that the consent of both parties is of the very essence of the transaction. The forcing of a Jew or Pagan to be baptized without his consent is no more days considered as an unwarrantable and unprofitable violence; but the baptism of a babe, who may be said to be up to manhood be an idiot, or a madman, or a man who is an infidel and a persecutor, doth seem to be a more wonderful in the tyranny of custom, than the baptism of the man himself. The baptism of a man, who is an infidel and a persecutor, doth seem to be a more wonderful in the tyranny of custom, than the baptism of the man himself.

name. Such a deed, and such a baptism, for the very same reasons, they hold null and void, and consequently baptize people on their own profession of faith. They do not imagine they re-baptize, though others call them Anabaptists.

5. The fifth class place the essence of baptism *in dipping in water*, and had a person been sprinkled ever so decently in any period of life, they would not therefore, think him baptized, because, in their opinion, to baptize is to dip, and nothing else. The Greek church doth not hold sprinkling to be baptism, yet the Greeks ought not to be called Anabaptists. A man, who holds every part of baptism indifferent is, if he repeats it in any way, on his own principles, an Anabaptist: but he, who holds any thing essential to baptism, must necessarily determine that there is no baptism where that essential is omitted. Dipping is that essential with the Greeks.

4. In the last class are included the churches of the British Baptists, and those of Poland, Lithuania, Transylvania, America, and many more, which however diversified in speculation and the practice of positive rites, all hold that dipping in water and a personal profession of faith and repentance are essential to baptism. On the first of these principles they disallow sprinkling: on the last they reject infants. Not one of these churches holds two baptisms: not one of them ever repeats baptism. If it be said they dip in mature age, those who had been sprinkled or dipped in infancy, they reply, sprinkling is not baptizing, and dipping a rational being *without his consent* is not baptism. They strenuously decry a repetition of baptism, and when any one calls them Anabaptists, they always understand it as the language either of ignorance or malice.

Dr. Wall, the champion of infant baptism, was aware of the impropriety of this name, Anabaptist, and he wrote against these people under the name of Anti-pedobaptists, that is, opposers of the baptism of children: but, as many have observed, the term is defective and improper, for these people are Anti-pedobaptists in comparison with many other classes of men, and particularly with the people called Quakers, many Socinians, and others, who administer no baptism at all. Moreover they are not sprinklers, and think the baptism of adults by pouring or sprinkling *incruent*. The Doctor thought to call them Baptists would imply a reproach to other Christians: but they reply, God forbid we should reproach any body of Christians! But what? If some men call themselves Christians, does that imply that other denominations are not Christians? In answer it is deemed unpolite to wish a person a happy new year, when such a wish implies the possibility of the year proving otherwise. There is no accounting for the habits and prejudices of mankind. Certain it is, that not of these churches are so far from being Christians, who are conscientiously satisfied that infant baptism, that they count such to become

members of their community, on a principle of Christian liberty.

NOTES.

1. "Something certainly is essential to baptism."—This is precisely what we have contended for all along. If plunging into water be the mode and medium of Baptism, of which we have no doubt, there must be a something in connection with a plunging into water to make it a Baptism, or an act peculiar and dissimilar from all other plungings, accidental or designed. This something it is, which constitutes what Mr. Robinson terms, the *essence of Baptism*. If this essence be wanting, then the plunging, dipping, or immersion is of no more efficacy in the washing away of sin, than the plunging of his play-fellows into the sea by the little boy Athanasius; "it is not a baptism, but a fiction." This essence is a conviction of righteousness or, in other words, a BELIEF OF THE TRUTH.—"Do you," said a Presbyterian lady to the writer recently, "believe that none are Christians but those who have been immersed?"—"Yes Madam, I replied, that is my belief; but I believe likewise, that multitudes are immersed who are not Christians, either in faith or practice."—"I never will believe," said she, "that people's sins are not forgiven unless they are baptized; I don't believe in sprinkling, but I am certain my sins were all pardoned when I was converted long ago." "Do you think," she continued, "if I was to go and be immersed to-morrow, I should be any better than I am now?"—"No Madam," I rejoined, "I do not believe you would undergo a great change took place in your faith. You must believe the truth which it is obvious you do not; you are as yet unconvinced of righteousness. The justification of God you will not receive; for you say you never will believe that baptism is necessary to the forgiveness of sins: God says it is, you say it is not; to immerse you then would be to place you on the conditions of men, and not upon a belief of the truth, which would do you no good—for the essence of Baptism resides in the truth, and not in human traditions."

2. "Nobody holds, or ever did hold, a repetition of baptism."—This is applicable to the Editor as well as to the orthodox.—We declare again, as we have often done, that we OUGHT NOT TO BE REPEATED. If we do, we do not believe to be baptizing. (See the *Notes* under note 1. The Greek and Roman Churches all contend for a repetition of baptism. No Greek or Roman Church ever received a man into their communion, who had been baptized in any other church.)

the Baptist Faith. All these several immersions are severally approved of by these several Faiths; though each, it is probably, would deny the immersion of the other, and require a proselyte from one to either of them to be re-immersed. But in doing this, they would not consider that by immersing a second time they were repeating baptism; for they all acknowledge only one baptism "and that their own." In this light we view the subject. We do not believe that the immersions of a false, corrupt, or worldly religious community are baptisms; and therefore, it is, we say the subjects of such spurious baptisms should be immersed again with the genuine baptism into Christ.

3. "*Six sorts of Christians.*"—We apprehend that Mr. Robinson, here used the word Christian in its *perverted* signification, and not in its scriptural sense. When he speaks of "sorts of Christians" we suppose he means *spurious ones*.—He had too much discernment to confound Christ and Antichrist together. Those only are truly Christians who have been baptised into Christ and continue to walk in him.

4. *Extremely respectable.* In these times, this is a word of very doubtful signification. There are in general two standards of respectability; that of the world, and of the word of God. Both these standards are opposed to one another. The world's standard of respectability is a false standard; that of the word of God the only true one. He alone is a truly respectable man who is a Christian in deed and truth. The world can neither add to nor detract from his respectability in the eye of God. Though there may have been exceptions among those enumerated by Robinson, we presume he means they were respectable in the scripture sense; for these respectable men, who contended for purity first, and peace afterward, were the objects of the scorn and malignity of the respectable Apostles of Romanism.

5. "*Rigid moralists.*"—A rigid moralist is one, who believes, that it is the duty of every Christian to walk worthy of the high vocation with which he has been called. Rigid moralists in a church are very troublesome people. When they see a community, professing to be apostolic, walking in the practice and permission of "every evil work" they believe it to be their duty to move heaven and earth for its purification. In obeying their convictions they become obnoxious to the corrupt; and are speedily branded as factious, and captious.—They are more frequently unsuccessful, than otherwise: and become the subjects either of *expulsion* or of a *voluntary separation*. Jesus was a rigid moralist. The system of moralism he taught, was so rigid, discouraging, and unyielding, that the Pharisees, and the scribes, and the chief priests, and the people, put him to death. Since that time, the disciples of his system have

invariably been, so long as they adhere to his instructions, the subjects of severe and unrelenting persecution in word and deed.

6. "*The Catholic Church had lost baptism.*"—The Catholic Church, we believe, is not the only community which has lost baptism since the days of the Apostles. The fact is, the institution is so generally lost that it is, in this day and country, difficult to find it at all. We say it is difficult; for the immersed are so engrossed with the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life; are so devoted to the idolatry of riches; are so ignorant of the wisdom and revelation of God, in fine, are in general so destitute of the fruits which grow on the tree of life—the fruits of the spirit; that it is rare to find a church, whose converts are the evidence of its institutions being those of Holy Writ. We know not a Denomination (though we doubt not there are individual Churches of small numbers) which has not lost baptism if it ever had it. If we err in this we shall be glad to renounce the error as soon as possible; but from history and observation we are brought to this conclusion for the present at least.

7. "*Dipping in water, a personal profession of faith and repentance are essential to Baptism.*"—The Baptists of all countries are said to hold this, that is, we presume, in theory. All Baptists then contend that something is essential to constitute dipping in water, baptism; they therefore do not believe that mere immersion or dipping is baptism. In this we agree with them. The difference between us is the *faith*. They contend practically for a faith founded on human traditions and *passion* as the ground of action; we, for a faith based upon the testimony of scripture and *reason* as the only true moving power to "the obedience of faith." A profession of a man's faith is one thing; a profession of the faith is another. A man's faith may comprehend many things that are untrue; the faith which is definable, contains nothing that is false. It is for *the* faith, the truth, the gospel we plead, as the subject matter of a rational conviction, to constitute the immersion of men baptism in the name of Jesus.

TRUTH versus HUMAN TRADITION.

In the "*Virginia and North Carolina Conference Record*" for May 12 1837, is an article quoted from the "*Christian Advocate and Journal*" on "*An Original Church of Christ*" and signed "*Eccleria*."—The writer's proposition is, that Episcopal Methodism, preponderate toward the Episcopal Church, the second daughter of the Great Apostasy, is the Great Apostasy itself. According to "*Eccleria*" Unitarianism is the very far similitude of the Original Church, and English Episcopacy with its traditions, is the very far similitude of the traditions of these two churches.

high honor they *assume* to themselves, that we now introduce the article aforesaid to the notice of our readers; few, whose minds are not blinded by human tradition, will concede the justness of these pretensions. There can be no fellowship between Christ and Belial: and assuredly wherever the church of Christ may be, Protestantism, whether as a whole or in part, being an offspring of Belial, does not contain it; and therefore neither Methodism, nor its English mother Episcopacy, have any scriptural pretensions to the honor they severally assume.

The Episcopal tradition combatted by Ecclesia is that of "Confirmation," which, as practiced by the Church of England, he very properly denies to be any part of the original church of Christ. Protestant Episcopacy confirms persons of the age of twelve to twenty or more years, who had been the subjects of the Protestant ordinance of Infant Sprinkling. This rite of confirmation can be performed by the bishop of a diocese only. By submitting to it, the subject takes upon himself the responsibility formerly assumed by his god-father and god-mother, sponsors, at his sprinkling; when being unconscious of every thing, he was irresponsible himself. The bishop having finished the ceremony, the confirmed is pronounced to be regenerated by the Holy Spirit, and is entitled to all the privileges of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Only think of the Episcopal and Spiritual Lords of England imparting the regeneration of the Holy Spirit by the imposition of their "right reverend," but ungodly, hands! Imposition, indeed; it is all an imposition, and a solemn mockery of the creculty of mankind!

Ecclesia believes that confirmation was practiced by the Apostles; which indeed Luke himself testifies; but denies the identity between this and the "confirmation" of the church of England. He maintains that the Apostolic confirmation or imposition of hands was performed at the time of baptism of which institution it constituted an essential appendage. This is a Methodist tradition, but little removed from the tradition of Episcopacy. Confirmation or the laying on of hands was not considered a part of baptism; for Paul and Barnabas, having made many disciples in Lystra, Iconium and Antioch, did not confirm them until their return thither from Derbe. Hence it was neither a part of, nor performed at the time of baptism, which was the discipling act.

In order to sustain himself in this anti-traditional Tradition, Ecclesia summons up to his aid the testimony of some, whom Antichrist has honored with the title of "Fathers of the Church." He receives their testimony as far as suits his purpose and then rejects the rest. Their evidence, however, is admissible as to facts, though the things in their day of which they testify, are not worthy of reception though performed by men who were contemporaries of the Apostles. Paul tells us, that

the mystery of iniquity was working secretly in his day; no wonder then, that so early as the second and third centuries, the age of "the Fathers," many practices should be testified of as facts, or things done, which have no counterpart in the scriptures of truth. Of the number of these facts is Ecclesia's tradition of Confirmation being an essential appendage to baptism.

One of his witnesses is Tertullian, who says; "as soon as we come out of the baptismal laver, we are anointed, and then are confirmed." This, says Ecclesia, must set the matter at rest with all those who confide in the testimony of scripture, and of the Greek and Latin Fathers here quoted. Of course then it must set the matter at rest with Ecclesia as to the mode of baptism; for Tertullian says, "we come out of the baptismal laver." But Tertullian testifies too much for pedo-baptist Ecclesia.

Another witness is Ambrose, bishop of Milan, who testifies that in his day, the fourth century, "by the imposition of hands, it is believed, the Spirit may be received, which is wont to be done after baptism, by the bishop, for the confirmation of unity in the church." From all which Ecclesia concludes that "the ceremony of baptism in itself is but half performed, unless it be followed by imposition of hands, and prayers."

But the witness, who speaks too plainly for Ecclesia is "Father" Cyprian, who says, "in the second creation God first prepares the man, before he gives his Spirit, he first makes a man a fit temple for the Holy Ghost. Now the way by which a man is prepared and fitted is by baptism by which he is cleansed and purged from sin, and fitted for the reception of the Spirit of God, in which respect he is to be regarded as a body."—Here the Catholic Father Cyprian, who wrote in the third century, testifies, that an adult is the subject of the new or second creation—that the Holy Spirit is not given until a man is purified from sin, and that this purification is effected by baptism. And he further witnesses, that if given, the Holy Ghost is infused by prayer and imposition of hands, or by confirmation. Now from this, it is obvious, that whatever Protestantism may be, it has no oneness with Father Cyprian's religion before the reign of the tyrant Constantine "the Great." Methodism and Presbyterianism, and Baptistism, et cetera, pray that sinners, uncleaned from sin, may be "baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire;" and they expect this baptism to ensue without the laying on of priestly hands upon their heads. They contend that the Holy Spirit must be given to sinners to enable them to believe, and consequently believe, that they term baptism, though singular the contradiction of thousands of their sinners have been baptized in their own word, in babyhood, the Baptists alone excepted. Now we stop here, for they all without exception command that

purged by the Spirit before baptism. Their creeds and confessions of faith may tell a story somewhat different, but judging from their practices and sayings they care little for the testimony of these. A bright light and a voice from heaven, saying, "Son or daughter thy sins are forgiven thee" is quite sufficient for a purification from sin for these religionists of the Protestant faith.

But the saying of Cyprian, that by baptism a man is cleansed and purged from sin, gives the Methodist "Ecclesia" the most trouble. He has appended a note in which he says, "I do not vouch for the correctness of these sentiments of Cyprian respecting the efficacy of baptism. It certainly should not be considered any thing more than a divinely appointed means of grace, which when rightly administered, is accompanied as all duties are, with God's blessing. It is 'not the putting away the filth of the flesh'—it is not to be considered in the light of a common washing resorted to for the cleansing of the body, 'but the answer of a good conscience'—it has a moral or spiritual influence on the mind when done in obedience to God's command, in the spirit of his requirement. The fact is when Cyprian wrote, which was in the third century, too much stress was laid upon outward ceremonies, and hence the strong, and as I think unscriptural saying in the text, that *baptism cleanses and purges the soul from sin*. Though we ought not to doubt, that when rightly administered, it is always accompanied with God's blessing; yet it should be considered only as a means, in the use of which we are to look for the 'inward and spiritual grace' prefigured by this outward rite, which is wrought in the soul by the Spirit of God." So jargonizes "Ecclesia," one of the spiritual guides of Methodist Protestantism! The reader must be as muddle-headed as the writer to give credence to such contradictory absurdities. Yet this is a part of the divine theology of enlightened Protestantism! Talk not of the 19th century contrasted with the dark ages of Popery while such nonsense can be penned and assented to with a solemn face by "Protestant Christians."

In one place "Ecclesia" tells us he confides in the testimony of the Greek and Latin Fathers: but in this note he says, he does not vouch for the correctness of Father Cyprian's sentiments on baptism! And why not? Because Cyprian's sentiments are anti-Methodistic; in other words, it is plain, that Cyprian was not an Episcopal Methodist; for the simple reason, that he lived to near the Apostolic Age to receive among his other errors such a flimsy system of religion, had it even existed; which it did not.

Baptism, says Ecclesia, "certainly should not be considered any thing more than a divinely appointed means of grace, which, when rightly administered, is accompanied, as all duties are, with God's blessing." This is estimating "the divine-

ly appointed means of grace" very cheaply. Baptism is "any thing more" than this. In the name of reason, what *could* Ecclesia have it? Any institution of God that is "a means of grace" or favor, is the most precious of all appointments in the universe of the Supreme. It is a means of grace which, when rightly administered is accompanied with God's blessing; and yet there is no favor or blessing in it; for it is "only an outward rite," the blessing or favor being "wrought in the soul by the Spirit of God!" For ourselves, we ask for nothing more in religion than "a means of grace;" for we know that if the "means" are placed within our reach, we shall obtain all the grace, favor, and blessings of God, by using them, that he has to bestow upon us. The connexion between "the means of grace" and "the blessings" or "grace of God" is as intimate in this system of means as the alliance between cause and effect, so that the rule obtains universally—NO MEANS NO BLESSINGS; and contrariwise, NO BLESSINGS BECAUSE THERE ARE NO MEANS—in other words, THE FAVORS OF THE MOST HIGH ARE ALL CONDITIONAL ON THE USE OF MEANS. Ecclesia's testimony, that baptism is "a means of grace" is the highest character, that he can, though he intended it not, confer upon it.

Baptism, says he, "is not the putting away the filth of the flesh." This is true, though he does not understand what Peter means by this saying. Peter says in the text where this sentence is found, that "BAPTISM NOW SAVES US" as effectually as the flood saved Noah. He was writing to "the elect sojourners of the dispersion," that is to the Christians of the Hebrew Nation. Now Peter was emphatically the Apostle to the circumcision, or Jews. It was consistent therefore, that, in speaking of salvation or purification in connexion with water, he should allude to the super-excellence of the Christian over the Mosaic ablutions; which were for the washing away of the filth or contamination of the flesh or body, contracted by touching unclean things, as a leper, a grave, a dead body, a human bone, &c. &c. See Numb. xix. Now Christian Baptism or Ablution was not designed for this purpose; for now there is nothing unclean, which the Law of Moses made unclean as Peter had himself been taught, by the vision he saw at Joppa. Sin under the Christian Dispensation is not "the filth of the flesh" it is the filth of the heart, an evil conscience. It is to save or purify us from an *evil conscience* that baptism is now efficacious. And this efficacy of baptism is *cleansing and purge from sin*, as Cyprian says, is based upon "the resurrection of Jesus Christ," as saith Peter, "because we are not risen our faith is vain, and we are yet in our sins, unless we be immersed in water into his death." So says he to the brethren at Corinth, "Let us not have an empty answer of a good conscience, as though we were cleansed."

and applicable only to the enjoyment of a peace with Him in the life that now is. A good conscience is the effect of a purification from sin; it is the effect of "having the heart sprinkled" with the blood of Jesus, and "the body washed with pure water;" now this effect is to be found only in those who have "full assurance of faith" which/admits of "no doubts and fears;" for where these are there is "an evil conscience" which is the effect of being still in bondage to sin; it is the consequence of never having been "cleansed and purged from sin." Whoever therefore, has such a conscience is a sinner and not a saint, or purified person; and consequently where God is he cannot come. All which is respectfully submitted to Protestants of every name and denomination.

Ecclesia thinks, that the saying, THAT BAPTISM CLEANSETH AND PURGES THE SOUL FROM SIN, is unscriptural. Perhaps he will think this saying is also unscriptural, BE BAPTIZED IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS; and again, HE THAT BELIEVES AND IS BAPTIZED SHALL BE SAVED.—What no others? No; none others; for it is the gospel which is the power of God for salvation to every one that believes; for in it (the gospel) a justification (to eternal life) by faith is revealed in order to faith; as it is written, the just (not the unjust) shall live by faith.

Ecclesia terms baptism, "an outward rite" or ceremony; we should like to be instructed as to the attributes of "inward rites or ceremonies!" Who but the disciples of Antichrist ever heard of such inconceivables as "inward ceremonies!"—Until he can explain this mysticism of mysticisms with an adieu for the present to Ecclesia and all his Protestant brethren of every name, with this one word of the Messiah—"in vain do ye worship me teaching for doctrine the commandments of men."

ENTON.

"ELDER HENLEY'S DEFENCE."

Though "sent to Coventry" for a year or two, Brother Campbell cannot resist the temptation of directly or obliquely noticing the sayings and doings of one, whom he terms "Dr. Thomas." In the May number of the Harbinger we observe two oblique, and one direct notice. The oblique are intimated "Christian Courtesy" and "Railing Accusations." We know that these are aimed at us by comparing them with a recent *autograph* of our brother's in our possession. The same sentiments and most ungracious epithets pervade them all. We do not think that calling a brother names, however obnoxious he may be esteemed, is one of the traits of a "Christian Spirit." Jesus called the Scribes and Pharisees "offspring of vipers," "sons of hell," "hypocrites," and so forth; these terms they

richly deserved, but then they were not "brethren." We have been called "beloved brother;" is it treating a beloved brother with "Christian Courtesy" to speak of him in the opprobrious terms that have been recently applied to us by our brother;—but we forbear for his sake. It is a satisfaction to us to know, that we are clear of that spirit that would prompt one brother to call another "a fool," or any other *evil name*. If the spirit in which these articles are conceived be brother Campbell's conception of a "Christian Spirit," we congratulate ourselves on not possessing it. We should not have noticed these effusions and allusions, had not our attention been directed to them in connexion with brother Henley's letter, *ostentatiously* set forth, as it is thought, under the caption of his "defence." It is the opinion of some, that we should notice them; though for ourselves we were inclined to pass them by unheeded.

We have no personal controversy with brother Henley. We mean to have none with any other man, if it can possibly be avoided; for, we perceive, that however well-intentioned, and friendly the disputants may be at the beginning, they too often before the end of the fray identify themselves with their opinions; so that, if these be hardly dealt with they appropriate all the harshness to themselves, and so end the dispute in mutual proscription. Brother Henley has his views of propriety and truth;—we have ours. If they differ, we do not mean to quarrel with him on that account. He has a right to his views, and may he enjoy them; we are entitled to ours, and claim the privilege of maintaining them by speech and pen.

We shall not touch on all the topics which might be touched in brother H's "defence." We have nothing to say at present about publishing extracts from his private letters. When brother Campbell shall have justified himself for doing the same thing, we will then begin our justification, adopting his defence as our own. The extracts referred to may be found on pp. 182, 213; also his letter to the Editors of the Gospel Advocate p. 232 of last volume. Their contents can be compared with his "defence." The change in the sentiments expressed in these articles seems to be referred to the January number. This fatal number has done all the mischief; or rather Brother Campbell's "first impressions" on hastily perusing its contents.

What I was when brother Henley first knew me I am not sure. If he was pleased with my "talents" then, I still retain them, having never bartered them for a mess of pottage or a bag of bread;—if he was pleased with my "character" then, it is now sustained by the breath of a just accusation. I am now independent now as I was then—why then, should I be dependent on him to be strengthened? The answer is, "I am not." I and it there written. I should apologize for his conduct, and change of

summer, spirit, and the subjects upon which he writes, he will still find me the same friend I have always been."

I have no apology or defence to make for my conduct beyond what is already before the reader in my letter to Brother Campbell. Really one would suppose from the tone of some writers, that I was alone in fault—that all the wrong lay on my side. Now the contrary of this is true. It is I that am the party aggrieved, if proscription, misrepresentation, and evil names be a grievance. I ask for no apologies, though they are due; I am willing rather to forgive and forget. As to "manner and spirit" no doubt brother Henley's exhortation is appropriate both to me and many others. This is an affair in which it would be well for all to look at home. A Christian spirit is the spirit of Christ, dwelling in believers *by faith in and obedience to the truth*. Where the law of Christ is violated the Christian spirit is defective. In this view of the case I cannot help saying to the writer and publisher of the "defence," "physicians heal yourselves." And the reason of this advice will be found in the following considerations.

These brethren, the one writing and the other publishing the charge do, *in effect*, accuse me of *uttering a lie*. Now, I think the "conduct, manner, and spirit" of this are all exceptionable. If they believe me guilty of this sin, why have they not privately informed me of this offence; why have they not acted according to the spirit of Christ, as exemplified in Matt. xviii. But no, they have so far forgotten that "feeling," "charitableous," and "christian" spirit enjoined by Christ on one brother towards another supposed to have offended, that they have forthwith published me to the world as an utterer of deceit—have I not reason to complain of this "unfeeling," "unconscious," unchristianlike conduct, manner, and spirit? I think I have; but I will not; I would only remind these brethren of the motes and splinters to which we are all liable.

The accusation is contained in the following passage—"In continuing this controversy about re-immersion and materialism, when he has denied he held any such sentiment, immortified me very much."

In reply to this I would observe, that *I never did deny holding re-immersion*. The matter in dispute between the Re-immersed and the Baptists is not *water* but *FAITH*. The former say, they did not know the truth when first immersed, and therefore could not have believed it; and not having believed it, could not possibly have obeyed it: they conclude therefore, that their first immersion being predicated on *human tradition*, it was a *fiction* and not a baptism. I have all along maintained the same things. To repeat the immersion is *not* to repeat a fiction; because the second immersion is predicated on a *belief of the truth*. This immersion upon a be-

of the truth, though a second dipping in water, is in reality *only baptism for the first time*. I hold with re-immersion, but *not with re-baptism*. If a person have been immersed *once* as a profession of THE faith he ought in no wise to be re-immersed. To be immersed twice upon a belief of the truth each *time*, would be re-baptism, and highly to be deprecated. This I reject and not the other.

I have been charged with the "Materialism" of Doctor Priestley. I have denied holding this, and do again deny it, in the most emphatic manner. I have never read one page of Priestley's writings. The Bible is the only book I have read on Materialism. If I hold any thing in common with Priestley, I am indebted to the Bible and not to him for it. I believe in the Constitution and Destiny of Man, and of the External World as God has revealed it in the scriptures; for which I have as profound a veneration as any man on this Continent. *Matter* or substance, be the subject matter of my belief, and such a belief is to constitute me a "Materialist," I presume that brother Healey is as much a materialist as any one. Man and the World Exterior to him are the subjects of the revelations of God. Man is a material being, that is, he consists of matter—organized and living dust;—the World is also material. It is matter, substance, or body, which is to rise again from the dead; for the redemption of the body is the doctrine of Paul; it is matter that is to be renovated—for, says Jesus, "Behold I make *all things new*."—Thus we see that *matterism* or as some term it, materialism, in a certain sense, is the doctrine of Holy Writ. But Lexicographers, define a "Materialist" to be "*one who denies spiritual substances, one who holds that all beings are material*" or consisting of matter. How can I then be a "Materialist" when I believe, that God is a spirit? That the Holy Spirit was seated from the throne of God, and distributed in the form of gifts to men;—and in the existence of unclean spirits?—I believe in "*spiritual substances*," for I believe in the existence of the angelic orders of other worlds. What more then is required of me?—Am I required to conceive, and write of men, angels, heaven, spirits, &c. according to the views, sentiments, and opinions of "the wise and prudent" of the metaphysical world?—We cannot;—no! we cannot thus surrender the exercise of reason and our convictions of what the scriptures teach

"Nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri."

To the opinions of no master do I devote myself.

As to the subjects on which we write, what shall we say to this item of the reformation prescribed to us? This enters into the hypothetical change deemed necessary for the retention of our worthy brother's friendship; for, says he, "if brother

Thomas change the subjects upon which he writes he will still find me the same friend I have always been." The contrary of this reads thus,—if he do not change the subjects upon which he writes he will not find in me the same friend.—For ourselves, this is not the sort of *spirit* by which we are actuated. Brother Henley might write all his life upon whatever subjects he pleased and he would still find me his friend if these formed the only difference between us. The ground of friendship and love among Christians is not or rather ought not to be this or that subject descanted on, but the belief and practice of the truth. If we are to love our enemies, how much more ought brethren, if they are brethren in deed and not in word only, to love one another for the truth's sake. True christian love and friendship is not to be broken or interrupted by so trifling a matter as a dissimilarity of views as to the expediency of writing on this or that. But I cannot help thinking that, if I were to forbear writing upon what I believe to be subjects of truth and soberness, for the purpose of retaining his friendship, brother H. would be one of the first to despise me for my servility and sycophancy. And well he might. I propose to retain no person's friendship by offeringsacrifice to their views of right and wrong, of expediency or otherwise. If I undertake to edit a paper, the only standard of fitness or unfitness of subjects, of propriety or impropriety, &c, I can consent to acknowledge, is the Holy Scriptures, according to the sense most obvious to my own understanding. I am thankful for advice, when unaccompanied with evil names, from whomsoever it may come. I will endeavor to correct my own views by the view of others, if they recommend themselves by argument; still however, it is my own judgment of what the scriptures teach, that must direct me at last. The subjects I have written upon, all bear upon three points—*purifying the soul by obeying the truth;—the necessity of well doing in order to attain to eternal life;—and the Eternal State.* These have been resolved by others into "re-baptism and materialism;" for this simple reason, as it appears to me, because our views of these things do not square with the "aged wisdom" of "the wise and prudent" of the "Christian World"—a world that has for ages been lying under the midnight influence of mental imbecility. "Has not God shown the wisdom of this world to be folly?" He has, and continues the same Apostle, "God has chosen the foolish of the world to put the wise to shame" and so forth, 1 Cor. 1. It would be a singular escape if "the foolishness of God" (as Paul terms his wisdom and knowledge revealed by the Holy Spirit contrasted with the spurious wisdom of the world,) concerning the Constitution of Man, the Hope of the Gospel, which includes our destiny and that of the world we inhabit, and so forth, had been handed down to us pure and uncontaminated by the traditions

of Platonists, Arians, Trinitarians, Augustinians, Romanists of every grade of orthodoxy, Protestants of every variety and shade, &c, &c,—while the more simple and intelligent institution of Baptism has been so mangled, perverted, and almost entirely lost. Every part of the doctrine of Christ has been obscured, darkened, or eclipsed, yet the many affect to believe that the more or the gospel as believed by "Christendom" is precisely the mind of God on the subject—exactly what it ought to be!—This we can in no wise believe. "The religious world" is as dark upon the hope: as they are concerning "the strong delusion" God has sent upon them for their iniquity.

When the time arrives, that we can sustain our paper by writing only upon such subjects as will not disturb the prejudices, received opinions, and consciences of our readers, we shall surrender the at best but unwelcome task of public instruction to others, who may be greater adepts in the art of pleading the truth, and the whole truth, without giving offence to the flesh, the church and the world of a corrupt, wicked, and perverse generation. We do not willfully or wantonly offend; we err no doubt in many things, but where is the man, or saint, or sinner, who does not? "In many things," says James, "we all offend." Let us then mete to others the same measure we would that they should mete to us.

June 14th, 1837.

Editor.

Abblenun.—Some think, that in the January number we have termed brother Campbell "the pope," a name tantamount to the Man of Sin. This is a mistake. The whole paragraph on p. 209 is an illustration. We have no more termed him "pope" or "angel" than we have styled ourselves Martin Luther or Satan. We would just as soon be Martin Luther as brother Campbell would be pope Leo. Leo X and pope Martin Luther were but the two rival popes of the two rival horns of the same Ecclesiastical Beast. Let not the reader be so ready to put the worst emphasis and the worst construction upon the things we write.

Ed. Adv.

From the London Millennial Harbinger.
PRESBYTERIAN ZEAL AGAINST POKERY.
To the Tory Ministers of the Church of Scotland,
Manse of——, Oct. 31, 1837.

Sirs,—Many of you have begun, of late, to lift up the cry against Pokery, and in resisting the progress of this enormous combination of human inventions which is so rapidly spreading, you cannot be too zealous. In being zealous upon this you can scarcely pass the bounds of propriety.

imitate the example of the Scottish Reformers, in prosecuting the object, which, at least, professedly you have in view. — But, as one of your number, being myself a minister of the Church of Scotland, I entreat you to re-consider, whether you are or are not equally enlightened with the Scottish Reformers on this subject, and whether you are or are not impressed in mind, that the reformers set their face against the principle of popery, wherever, and by whomsoever it was avowed. — This principle they denounced, whether it appeared in the inventions of men which are more directly idolatrous, or merely superstitious; or in those unauthorised opinions which invest the ministers of religion with the power of absolving sin, or the people with the power of dividing with the Saviour the work of human redemption, as being involved in the errors of their Arminianism. All this the Reformers hated, as constituting the popery that is denounced in scripture. They, as I repeat, never sanctioned the principle of popery, whether exhibited in the idolatry, or in the Arminianism, or in the ritual inventions of the church of Rome. Now, brethren, I venture to affirm, without the fear of contradiction from any of you, that the spirit by which you were animated does not in any respect resemble the spirit which actuated the Scottish Reformers. Not until your fears were foolishly awakened as to the *temporalities** of the Church, as established by law, did you manifest any fear as to the prevalence of Popery. Your zeal slumbered when Tory counsels led to the establishment of Popery in Canada. You bowed in acquiescence when the Tories gave up thirty thousand pounds of the public money for the establishment of Maynooth College as a Seminary for Irish priests. You assented when a Tory Ministry proposed the perpetuity of popery in Ireland. Unfaithful to your vows, you have supported by your preaching, what is in fact the most detrimental element of popery, namely its Arminianism. Our forefathers reprobated Prelacy as it is established in England, because it involves the essential principle of Popery; but you hail the Church of England as a pure and sister church, although Lord Chatham said of it—“We have Calvinistic articles, an Arminian clergy, and a popish liturgy.” Bishop Gray tells us in his ‘Bampton Lecture,’ that the American Episcopalians have severed themselves from the English Church by “relinquishing aricular confession of sins” and the authoritative power of absolution in the priesthood constitutes, as we are told by this distinguished prelate, “its essential and important claim, without which the sacerdotal commission is destitute of sanctions.” Holding this opinion, the late Archbishop

* The *livings and salaries*.—Ed. Adv.

McGee maintained that “the Presbyterians have a religion without a church, and that the Catholics have a church without a religion.”

In connexion with this opinion, holding, as they do, the necessity of episcopal ordination to give validity to the sacraments and spirituality to the services of religion, nearly nine-tenths of all the clergy in the united establishments of England and Ireland consider the ministrations of Presbyterian churches as *unauthorized and nugatory*. In by far the great majority of instances, the preaching of the ministers of the churches of England and Ireland is a mixture of popish doctrine as to the necessity of *episcopal ordination* to give efficacy to the Sacraments, and more especially to secure the benefit of baptismal regeneration, with unedifying remarks on abstract morality. This, I aver, is, almost universally, the wretched and popish character of the ministrations of the Episcopal Church, and although the tendency of all this is to keep the people in a state of religious ignorance, and under spiritual domination —all this, notwithstanding, you, the *Tory ministers of the Church of Scotland* have been accustomed to *live in no measured terms, and by so doing to perpetuate, in as far as depended upon you, all the leading and characteristic principles of Popery*. In this way you have hindered the progress of the truth, and opened up a way for the advance of Popery throughout the breadth and length of the land.

Again, I remind you, that because the principle of popery is acknowledged and is dominant in the Episcopal communion, and because it has been allowed hitherto to pursue a silent, but deep and wide extended course, without any check from any barrier raised by your efforts,—Popery has increased, is increasing, and is no longer looked upon with that universal dread which it formerly awakened among Protestants. Moreover, we have popery in our church, in as far as popery consists in unauthorized domination over the people,—for what tyranny is more intolerable, or more detrimental, than lay patronage in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, for the exercise of which you have long and strenuously contended? But now, as it seems, after a long period of lukewarmness, inconsistency, and dereliction of Protestant principle, your zeal has at length burst forth for the destruction of Popery,—but it has done so, I apprehend, under circumstances of a most questionable character and with most suspicious appearances. At a time when you were not in the least degree moved by the appalling fact of Popish legends, from apocryphal writings being weekly read by the Episcopalians in their churches, under the character of holy writ: and at time when sermons, as in those of Mr. Wether of Bath, were frequently founded upon texts selected from the Apocrypha, and addressed as Gospel truth to the people;—at this very time you, the *Tory ministers*

Church of Scotland, embraced an opportunity of raising a hue and cry against the Reform Ministry for introducing into Ireland a system of education for the benighted people of that country, under which, only excerpts from the Bible were to be introduced into schools. *Here then was no Popery*; and if there were any error, it was one of omission only; and surely you, who have so long been utterly regardless of the great and prevalent sin of commission in the inculcation of popish legends, as if they were holy writ, *you surely deserve no credit for your sudden assumption of zeal, in resisting the progress of Popery.*

But, indeed, this burst of zeal had nearly spent itself, and had become almost dead from inherent weakness,—when, all of a sudden, fuel was cast upon the dying embers, and again your zeal was emblazoned in giving resistance to the purpose, as a certain sapient doctor in the west has glowingly observed, “of extinguishing many Protestant lights” of the sister Island.

But if the threatened evil is to be averted, or if we are to keep ourselves free from the charge of countenancing Popery, this, I take leave to remind you, is not to be accomplished by the formation of *political associations*, under the denomination of Protestant Societies, in alliance with the Orangemen of Ireland, who know little indeed of Protestantism in theory, and still less in practice. The desirable end is to be secured, in the first instance, by removing from our own church every thing that involves the principle of Popery—as, for instance *Arianism* in preaching, and the domination of patronage in the settlement of parishes—and further, by warning all around us, in the second instance, of the necessity of being Protestant, not in *name* only, but also in *principle*, and that, too, in every particular, however minute. Short of this line of conduct, as ministers, and as a church, no measure can be followed up, with any hope of success, in promoting the honor of our church, and the spiritual prosperity of our land. This, believe me, will never be accomplished, either in whole or in part; but, on the contrary, will be greatly retarded, by your imitating, as has been done, more especially in the west, the ravings of Irish Orangemen in defence of what they call “the Protestant Church.” Convinced, as I am, that such efforts neither strengthen, as they are intended to do, the Conservative cause, nor promote the interests of true religion—but, on the contrary, excite either the pity or the indignation of every liberal man and enlightened Christian, I beseech you to desist from political combinations against the Government of the country; and, in the hope that you will yet see the wisdom of complying with this advice, I remain, reverend sir, your obedient servant,

A MINISTER OF THE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND.

MEKARA AND KINCAID
OR
THE PAGAN AND THE MISSIONARY.

From the Baptist Missionary Magazine we learn that the following conversation took place between a Borneo Prince, named MEKARA, and a Mr Kincaid, a teacher of the Baptist Religion in that country.

Mekara. What do you think about the planets being inhabited?

Kincaid. There is much reason to think they are inhabited.

Mekara. And what reasons do you give?

Kincaid. From the best observations they appear to be fitted up with just as much design for the support and comfort of created beings, as the earth we inhabit, and it is difficult to conceive why they were created, unless it was to be the abode of intelligent beings.

Mekara. Yes, this is the only reasonable conclusion, if we say there is an Eternal God, who created and governs all things and this is a doctrine I like.—Now I will ask you about the law of God;—do the good go immediately to heaven when they die, and do the wicked go immediately into hell.

Kincaid. They do.

Mekara. You say they do; then why in the end of the world, is there a judgment day? If the righteous go immediately into happiness, and the wicked into misery, at the time of death, I do not understand why there should be a judgment day.

Kincaid. Your Highness has doubtless read those passages which speak of the resurrection of the dead. In the end of the world, the dead, both small and great, will come forth from their graves, and stand before the judgment seat of Christ, the spirits and bodies being again united. Then in one vast assembly each one will be judged according to the deeds done in the body.

Mekara. Every thing I read in your books, I admire. It is a pure and holy religion, different from any other.

This pagan prince appears to have been very much of a philosopher; and at no loss to detect incongruities between the alleged laws of God and the dictates of sound reason. He saw clearly, that if the good and bad went direct to their respective and final abodes at death, the necessity of a judgment day was superseded. This must be obvious to all whose minds are not darkened by the metaphysics of a sectarian philosophy. Kincaid's reply was that of a sophist, and manifestly failed to carry conviction to the mind of the Prince. Mekara then said he, “has doubtless read those passages which speak of the resurrection of the dead.” It is probable that the question concerning the judgment day was not closed.

to his mind by the discrepancy he discovered between Mr. Kincaid's traditions on this subject, and the doctrine those passages concerning the resurrection taught. It is clear, that the Prince discerned the meaning of the scripture on this topic better than the Baptist teacher. The latter told Mekara that the good and bad went immediately to heaven and to hell at the time of death. "You say they do" said the Prince; as if he had said, "You say so indeed; but where is the proof?" If it be as you affirm, "why then in the end of the world is there a judgment day?"—Kincaid assures him that "in the end of the world the spirits and the bodies of the dead would be reunited." But mark the reply of the ingenious Mekara, "Every thing I read in your books, I admire" as if he had said, "this doctrine of yours is incomprehensible; it does violence to reason, and it is therefore, irrational; but your sacred books in which are the passages concerning the resurrection of the dead, these are intelligible, rational, comprehensible; I can understand them, and therefore, I admire them." "It is a pure and holy religion" which they contain, "different from any other."

This reminds me of an incident of yesterday. While resting at a *cajansera* on my way to Nottoway, an individual made the following remark in my hearing— "that we must die certain; but what becomes of us hereafter is all dark. The preachers know no more of our destiny than we do ourselves." After a few minutes, I closed the book I was reading and observed,— "that we must die was indeed true; and that the preachers were for the most part ignorant of the destiny of our race was also true; for if you asked them for information as to the abodes of the blest they had nothing definite to say.— And as to the hereafter, I agreed that it was dark and uncertain, *provided the Scriptures were not true*. If, however, they were what they professed to be, of which I had no doubt, then indeed the destiny of our race was certain, and clear as the light of day. The Scriptures, I continually teach us that God views the world as composed of pardoned and unpardoned persons. All these we know are subject to death. Now concerning these dead people, the word of God says in his address to the Jews, "most assuredly, I say to you; the time comes or rather is come, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and hearing they shall live." Wonder not at this; for the time comes when all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth. They that have done good shall arise to enjoy life; they that have done evil, shall arise to suffer punishment." *Jno. v.* Now, said I, if we exercise the faculty of reasoning which God has given us, we are taught by this, that the subjects of the resurrection from the dead, are those who have had the *ability* to do or not to do, what God esteems good and evil. We see that these persons are to be raised for a definite purpose, namely, that the pardoned or just

who did well while living, may enter upon the enjoyment of life; and that the unpardoned, who have refused to do God's will, and therefore are convicted of having done evil, may suffer the punishment their actions deserve."—"Oh" said he with whom I conversed "I believe in rewards and punishments." "Yes" I replied, "there can be no doubt, but they whom God deems virtuous will be rewarded, and their opposites severely punished." But continued I, seeing the "Universalist Magazine" lying on the bench, "reason teaches us, that, as the wicked in this state, to a great extent escape the miseries of life, and the just suffer many of its evils, the distribution of rewards and punishments must be in a future state; and the passage I have quoted shows that that distribution will take place after a resurrection from the dead. The idea therefore, that rewards and punishments is certain only to the time being is a mere human tradition. But, I observed, the scripture further instructs us in our destiny, for it informs us that the dead are not to be raised all at the same time; but that a thousand years will intervene between the resurrection of the pardoned or just and the unpardoned or unjust. The former is called the *FIRST RESURRECTION*, the latter the *second*.— Now it is not a matter of doubt or speculation where the first will be after they have come to life again. They are to inhabit the earth and to rule over the nations, under Jesus Christ, the then universal monarch of the world we now inhabit. At that time this monarch will be reigning in Jerusalem as King of Israel on the throne of David his father, as the prophets have foretold. There will then be no more human governments, such as the kingdoms and republics that now exist. But time fails me to tell a hundredth part of what the scripture teaches concerning the destiny of our race; and of which, I agree with you, few have any conception. But, sir, all depends on this— are the scriptures what they profess to be;—do they contain God's revelation to man? If they do, then all is clear and certain; but if they do not, then all is dark and vague.

What a pity Mr. Kincaid was ignorant of what the Scriptures teach concerning the resurrection! What a fine opportunity was lost of captivating the mind of this intelligent pagan with the sublime destiny of those who obey the truth, as set forth in the Hope of the Gospel! But bow true is it in this instance, as in that of the ancient Jewish Doctors who "made the commandment of God of none effect by their traditions."

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SECTARIANISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

The Christian Religion is distinguished by the sublimity of the style and sentiments of the writings which contain its revelations,—it exhibits the most rational and

sistent views of the attributes of the Divine Being,—it gives us full assurance of a future state of immortality,—it points out the way by which pardon of sin and deliverance from moral evil may be obtained,—it exhibits the purest and most comprehensive system of morality,—it explains certain moral phenomena which would otherwise have been inexplicable,—it affords strong consolation under the evils of life,—it communicates the knowledge of interesting facts and doctrines which can be found in no other record,—it has produced the most beneficial effects on the state of society wherever it has been received,—it is completely adapted to the necessities of men,—it is calculated for being universally extended over the world,—in all which we might have added, that it is consistent in all its parts, when viewed through the medium of enlightened criticism, and harmonizes with the principles of sound reason, and the dictates of an enlightened conscience. These are characteristics that will apply to no other system of religion that ever was proposed to the world; and if christianity accompanied with such evidences, is not divine it is original, we may safely affirm that there is no other religion known among men that can lay claim to this high prerogative. But we do not think it possible that the mind of man can receive a more convincing demonstration of the truth of christianity than is set before us in the authentic facts on which it rests, in its tendency to produce universal happiness, and in the intrinsic evidence by which it is distinguished. That man, therefore, by whatever appellation he may be distinguished, who sets himself in opposition to the spirit of this religion, and endeavours to retard its progress must be considered as not only destitute of taste and moral excellence, but as an enemy to the happiness of his species. If the religion of the bible be discarded, we are left completely in the dark with regard to every thing that is most interesting to man as an intellectual being, and as moral and accountable agent. We should, in this case, have the most manifest conceptions of the attributes of Deity, and should know nothing of his designs in giving us existence, or placing us in this part of his empire,—we should remain in ignorance whether the world had a beginning or had existed from eternity, or whether we shall ever have an opportunity of beholding the grand system of the universe a little more unfolded—we should be destitute of any fixed moral laws to direct us in our social transactions and intercourse,—we should be entirely ignorant of the principles and objects of the moral government of the Almighty—we should be destitute of any consolations under the afflictions and calamities of life.—we should hang continually in doubt whether death was to put a final termination to their being, or convey us to another and eternal state of existence; and, at length we should be plunged into

the gulph of universal scepticism, into which every rejection of revelation ultimately sinks.

The religion to whose characteristics I have now adverted is not to be considered as precisely that form of christianity which has been established in Italy, in Germany, in Russia, or in Britain; or as it is professed by Episcopalians, Independents, Presbyterians, or any other sectary; or as it is expounded in the catechisms, confessions, or systems of divinity, which have been published by the different denominations of the "Christian World." In all these cases, its true glory has been obscured, its beauty defaced, and its purity contaminated by passing through the atmosphere of human folly and corruption; and opinions and practices have been incorporated with its principles altogether repugnant to the liberal and expansive spirit for which it is distinguished. It is the CHRISTIANITY OF THE BIBLE ALONE to which I refer. It is there alone to be seen in its relative purity, simplicity, and glory, and he who neglects to study the scriptures, unfettered by the trammels of human systems, will never be able fully to perceive or appreciate the true excellence of that religion, which is, "pure and peaceable," "full of mercy and good fruits," and which breathes "a good-will towards men." For in some of the forms which christianity has assumed in certain countries, it has been so much blended with human inventions as to be scarcely distinguishable from heathenism; and consequently, in such cases, it has seldom been accompanied with those beneficial effects which it is calculated to produce. And among almost all the sectaries in every country, either some of its distinguishing features have been overlooked, or its doctrines mixed up with metaphysical dogmas, or its practical bearings disregarded, or opinions respecting its forms and circumstantialities set in competition with its fundamental truths and moral requisitions.—"Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure,"—and the true fabric of christianity will remain unshaken and unimpaired, so long as the Scriptures are preserved uncontaminated and entire.

(Dick on the Improvement of Society, p. 245-7.)

Infallibility.

Extract from Dr. Chalmers' Sermon on "the Doctrine of Christian Christianity applied to the case of Religious Differences."

It is said of the Papists that they ascribe an infallibility to the Pope; so that if he were to say one thing, and the Bible another, his authority would carry it over the authority of God. And, think you, brethren, that there is no such Popery among you? You all have, or ought to have, bibles; and how often is it repeated there, "Hearken diligently to me?" Now

you obey this requirement, by making the reading of your bible a distinct and earnest exercise? Do you ever dare to bring your favorite minister to the tribunal of the word, or would you tremble at the presumption of such attempt, so that the hearing of the word, carries a greater authority over your mind than the reading of the Word? Now this want of doing, this troubling at the very idea of a dissent from your minister, this indolent acquiescence in his doctrine, is just railing another man Master: it is putting the authority of man over the authority of God: it is throwing yourself into a prostrate attitude at the foot-stool of infallibility; it is not just kissing the face of reverence, but it is the profound degradation of the mind. I of all its faculties; and without the name of Popery—that your bosoms, your souls may be infected with the deadly poison, and your consciences be weighed down by the oppressive shackles of Popery. And all this in the noon-day effulgence of a protestant country, where the bible, in your mother tongue, circulates among all your families; where it may be met with on almost every shelf, and is soliciting you to look to the wisdom that is inscribed on its pages."

Copy of the Indulgence, sold by the authority of Pope Leo, by Tetzel, which occasioned the Reformation.

"May our Lord Jesus Christ have mercy upon thee, and absolve thee by the merits of his most holy passion! And I, by the authority of his blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, and of the most holy Pope, grant and committed to me in these parts, do absolve thee, first from all ecclesiastical censures, in whatever manner they have been incurred, and then from all sins, transgressions and excesses, how enormous soever they be, even from such as are reserved for the cognizance of the holy see, and as far as the keys of the holy church extend, I remit to thee all punishment which thou dost deserve in purgatory on their account; and I restore thee to the holy sacraments of the church, to the unity of the faithful, and to innocence and purity which thou didst possess at baptism: that when thou dost die, the gates of punishment shall be shut, and the gates of the paradise of delights shall be opened; and if thou shalt not die at present, this grace shall remain in full force when thou art at the point of death! In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

There are too many who reverse both the principle and the practice of the apostle! they become all things to all men, not to serve others, but themselves; and they try all things, only to hold fast that which is bad.—LACON.

THE ADVOCATE

Vol. 4. Amelia County, Va.; July, 1837. No. 3

HISTORY OF PRIESTCRAFT.

BY WILLIAM BOWITT.

NO. 2.

POPERY.

Popery—Struggles of the Popes for power—Emperors favor them—Scandalous transactions between them and the French Monarchs—Pepin and Charlemagne—Gregory VII. asserts absolute power over Kings—His intercourse with the Countess Matilda—Claims the right of installing Bishops—Enormities of Popes—Their example followed by Bishops and Clergy—Evil influence of Councils.

They willeth to be king's peres,
And higher than the emperor;
And some that wexen but pore ferres
Now woollen wax a warnour.—

But, Lords, we lowded men knowen no God but thee, and we, with thyne help and thy grace, forsoken Nabugodonoor and hys lawes. For he, in his proud estate, wole have all men under hym, and he nold be under no man. He ondoeth thy lawes that thou ordnest to be kept, and maketh hys awne lawes as hym lyketh, and so he maketh him kynge above all other kynges of the erth; and maketh men to worschepen hym as a God, and thye get sacryfice he hath ydone away.

THE PLOWMAN'S PRAISE.

The earliest means which the bishops of Rome employed to acquire power was, to assert their supremacy over all other bishops of the Christian Church. This was not granted at once, but led to many quarrels with their contemporaries.—The bishop of Constantinople, in particular, contended with them for the superiority; the emperor Constantine having placed there the seat of civil government. These odious quarrels I must necessarily pass over, and confine myself chiefly to the Romish Church. I may state, once for all, that the patriarchs of Constantinople maintained the contest with Rome through every age to the very time of the Reformation; and many disgraceful expositions of priestly wraths were made on both sides. Of the Greek church it will be sufficient to say that its prelates partook largely in the arts and vices of popery in general, and plunged that church into an abundance of notorious puerilities, in which it remains to this day.

The attempts of the Romish pontiffs to grasp at the empire, or contemporary princes. It was a work of great art and stratagem, and the boldest acts of usurpation, to establish of papal dominion over the Christian world, which was not admitted, indeed, till the 11th century.

In the 4th century, Mosheim says, in the Episcopal order the bishop of Rome was the first in rank; and was distinguished by a sort of pre-eminence over all other bishops. Prejudices, arising from a variety of causes, contributed to establish this superiority; but it was chiefly owing to certain circumstances of grandeur and opulence, by which mortals, and which they generally confound with the reasons of a just and legal authority. The bishop of Rome surpassed all his brethren in the magnificence and splendour of the church over which he presided; in the riches of his revenues and possessions; in the number and variety of his ministers; in his credit with the people; and in his sumptuous and splendid manner of living. These dazzling marks of human power, these ambiguous proofs of true greatness and felicity, had such an influence on the minds of the multitude, that the see of Rome became, in this century, a most seducing object of sacerdotal ambition.— Hence it happened, that when a new pontiff was to be elected by the suffrages of the presbyters and the people, the city of Rome was generally agitated by dissensions, tumults, and cabals, whose consequences were often deplorable and fatal.— One of these in 366 gave rise to a civil war, which was carried on within the city of Rome with the utmost barbarity and fury and produced the most cruel massacres and depopulations.

The picture of the church which Milton makes Michael fore-show to Adam was speedily realized:—

The Spirit

Poured first on his apostles, whom he sends
To evangelize the nations, then on all
Baptized, shall them with wondrous gifts endue
To speak all tongues and do all miracles,
As did their Lord before them. Thus they win
Great numbers of each nation to receive
With joy the things brought from Heaven: at length,
Their ministry performed, and race well run,
Their doctrine and their story written left,
They die; but in their room, as they forewarn,
Wolves shall succeed for teachers, grievous wolves,
Who all the sacred mysteries of Heaven
To their own vile advantages shall turn
Of love and ambition: and the truth
With superstitious and traditions taint,
Left only in those written records pure,
Though not but by the spirit understood.
Then shall they seek to avail themselves of names,
Places, and titles, and with these to join
Secular power; though feigning still to act
By spiritual; to themselves appropriating
The Spirit of God, promised alike and given
To all believers; and from that pretence
Spiritual laws by carnal power shall force
On every conscience; laws which none shall find
Left them enrolled, or what the Spirit within

Shall on the heart engrave. What will they then
But force the Spirit of Grace itself, and bind
His consort Liberty? What but unbuild
His living temple, built by Faith to stand,
Their own faith, not another's? For, on earth,
Who against faith and consciences can be heard
Infallible? Yet many will presume:
Whence heavy persecution shall arise
On all who in the worship persevere
Of spirit and truth; the rest, for greater part,
Will deem in outward rites and specious forms,
Religion satisfied: truth shall retire
Bestuck with slenderous darts, and works of faith
Rarely be found: so shall the world go on,
To good malignant, to bad men benign:
Under her own weight groaning; till the day
Appear of respiration: to the just,
And vengeance to the wicked.

In this century many of those steps were laid by which the bishops of Rome afterward mounted to the summit of ecclesiastical power and despotism. These steps were laid, partly by the imprudence of the emperors; partly by the dexterity of the Roman prelates. In the 5th century the declining power of the emperors left the pontiff at liberty to exercise authority almost without control; and the interruptions of the barbarians contributed to strengthen this authority: for, perceiving the subservency of the multitude to the bishop, they resolved to secure his interest and influence by loading him with benefits and honors.

This was the second mode by which they acquired power, flattering the surrounding kings; serving them occasionally; without regard to honor or principle, or as they grew stronger, subduing them by menaces to their will. In the 7th century the Roman pontiffs used all sorts of methods to maintain and enlarge the authority and pre-eminence they had acquired by a grant from the most odious tyrant that ever disgraced the annals of history. Boosiface III. engaged Pooças, that abominable despot, who waded to the imperial throne through the blood of the emperor Mauritus, to take from the patriarch of Constantinople the title of *Ecumenical, or Universal Bishop, and confer it upon him*. In the next century a still more glaring stretch of assumed priestly power was exhibited. We observe, says Mosheim, in the French annals, the following remarkable and shocking instance of the enormous power of the papacy, at this time, invested in the Roman pontiff. Pepin was mayor of the palace to Childeric III.; and in exercise of that high office was possessed, in reality, of the royal power. Not content with this, he formed the design of detaching himself from the sovereign. He therefore sent ambassadors to Rome, to inquire whether the divine law did not permit a velleitous pope to like people to dethrone a pusillanimous and indolent monarch.

who was incapable of performing any of the functions of royalty, and to substitute in his place one more worthy to rule? Zachary had need of the aid of Pepin; and his answer was all that could be wished. When this decision of the pope was published in France, Pepin stripped poor Childeric of his royalty; and stepped immediately into his throne. This decision was solemnly confirmed by his successor, Stephen II., who went to France; and being under the necessity of soliciting Pepin's aid against the Lombards, dissolved the act of allegiance and fidelity the usurper had sworn to Childeric; and, to render his title as firm as possible, anointed, and crowned him his wife, and two sons.

This compliance of the Roman pontiffs proved an abundant source of opulence and credit to them. Pepin marched into Italy, subdued all the pope's enemies, and put him in possession of the Grecian provinces in Italy. The Exarch of Ravenna, when Pepin retired, threw off the yoke, and besieged Rome; but Pepin returned, and compelled him again to deliver up the exarchate of Ravenna and Pentapolis to the pontiff; and thus raised the bishop of Rome to the rank of a temporal prince. After Pepin's death a new attack was made upon the papal territory, by Didier, king of the Lombards. The then pope, Adrian I., fled to Charlemagne, the son of Pepin; who having need of the pope's sanction to seize on the Eastern Roman Empire, hastened to Rome; repelled the pope's foes, and in consideration of his sanction of his ambitious views, added fresh territories to the papal see. Thus, by the most shameless and unprincipled trafficking between the pretended Vicar of Christ and these bold bad kings, did the popes acquire royalty and dominion, and gave to treason and regal robbery the assumed sanction of heaven! Once placed by kings on temporal thrones, these audacious priests soon showed their royal contemporaries what companions they had admitted among them. Not contented with what royal robbery had given them, they speedily assailed their princely neighbors: sought to hurl them from their throne, and stirred up some of the most bloody wars on record.

The notorious Hildebrand, a Tuscan monk, of mean origin having arrived at the pontificate, styled himself Gregory VII., and displayed to the world the full measure of the priestly spirit. He was a man, says Mosheim, of uncommon genius, whose ambition in forming the most arduous projects was equalled by his dexterity in bringing them into execution. Sagacious, crafty, and intrepid, he suffered nothing to escape his penetration, defeat his stratagems, or daunt his courage.—Haughty and arrogant beyond all measure; obstinate, impetuous, and intractable: he looked up to the summit of universal empire with a wistful eye; and labored up the steep ascent with uninterrupted ardor, and invincible perseverance. Void

of all principle, desirous of every virtuous feeling; he suffered little restraint in his audacious pursuits from the dictates of religion or the remonstrances of conscience. Not content to enlarge the jurisdiction and augment the opulence of the see of Rome, he strove to render the universal church subject to its despotism; to dissolve the jurisdiction of kings and princes over the various orders of the clergy; and exclude them from the management of the revenues of the church. Nay, he would submit to his power the kings, emperors, and princes themselves; and render their dominions tributary to Rome. Such were the pious and apostolic exploits that employed Gregory VII. during his whole life; and which rendered his pontificate a continual scene of tumult and bloodshed. His conduct to France was worthy of the country which had first given prince-power to Roman priests, and of himself. It was just that the realm which had put power into such hands for such purposes as it did should be bitten by a fiendish ingratitude.—Hildebrand declared France tributary to the see of Rome; and ordered his legates to demand yearly, in the most solemn manner, the payment of that tribute. Nothing can be more insolent than the language in which the priest addressed himself to Phillip of France, recommending an humble and obliging carriage, from the consideration, that, both his kingdom and his soul were under the dominion of St. Peter, i. e. his vicar, the pope, who had the power to bind and to loose him both on earth and in heaven. Nothing escaped his all-grasping ambition: He drew up an oath for the emperor of the Romans, from whom he demanded a profession of subjection and obedience. He pretended Saxony was a feudal tenure, having been a pious offering of Charlemagne to the see of Rome. He claimed Spain: maintained it had been the property of the apostolic see from the earliest times of the church; and the Spanish princes paid him tribute. He made the like attempts on England; but found in William the Conqueror a different subject. William granted his Peter-pence, but refused to do homage for his crown. He wrote circular letters to the German princes, to Geysa, King of Hungary, and Sweno, King of Denmark, demanding submission. The son of Demetrius, Czar of the Russias, went to Rome, in consequence of his letters, to obtain the kingdom which would devolve to him on his father's death as a gift from St. Peter, after professing subjection and allegiance to the prince of the apostles,—a gift readily granted by the officious pope, who was extremely liberal of what did not belong to him. Demetrius Suinimer, Duke of Croatia and Dalmatia was raised to royalty by him in the year 1076. He solemnly proclaimed king of Salona, on condition that he should pay annually two hundred pieces of gold for the Easter festival. Boleslaus II., King of Poland, killed Stanislaus, Bishop of Cracow, Gregory

municated him, but hurled him from his throne; dissolved the oath of allegiance which his subjects had taken; and forbid, by an express imperious edict, the nobles and clergy of Poland from electing a new king without his leave.

In Italy his success was transcendent. Matilda the daughter of Boniface Duke of Tuscany, the most powerful and opulent princess of that country, found that neither ambition nor years had extinguished the tender passion in the heart of Gregory. — and as a testimony of the familiarity which existed between them, settled all her possessions in Italy and elsewhere upon the church of Rome; an act, however, strongly resisted by her successor, and the cause of many struggles and much bloodshed.

To complete his despotic power over every Christian prince, this odious priest claimed the sole right of installing bishops in their office. It had been the custom of every prince to appoint the bishops of his own land. At the death of any one of these, the ring and crosier, the insignia of his office, were sent to the monarch, and were by him delivered to the one he appointed. This right Gregory claimed as the sole prerogative of the pope; thus designing to make the whole church dependent on him, and entirely subservient to all the papal views — powerful instruments in the pontifical hands against both prince and people, the world over. The resistance this claim met with led to terrible wars: and we shall have occasion to mention that with the Emperor of Germany, and his humiliation before the haughty priest, under the head of priestly arrogance.

Thus did this race of most shameless and audacious men, while they called themselves the pastors of the flock of the meek and tender Christ, daringly and recklessly advance to a pitch of the most amazing, enduring, and universal despotism over the loftiest and most powerful monarchs. But to display effectively the full character of the Roman pontiffs, we must write volumes on their deeds in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, which were filled with their arrogant demands from, and assumptions over, the sovereign powers of Europe; for, at once, Conrad Duke of Suabia, and Frederick of Austria, were actually beheaded at Naples by order of Clement IV.; and another emperor, Henry IV., is supposed to have been poisoned by a wafer, in taking the sacrament from a Dominican monk. Their excommunications, — their wars, — their vindictive quarrels with kings, and with each other, — these things swell the numerous volumes of ecclesiastical history. Nothing indeed, is so revolting in all the annals of the world as the malignant bitterness of these vicars of Christ against each other upon different occasions. Their unbridled ambition led more than once to the election of two popes at the same time,

and to the consequent tearing asunder of all Europe with their petty factions.

The example of the pontiffs was not lost on the bishops, abbots, and inferior clergy. These, even in the time of Charlemagne, had actually obtained for their tenants and their possessions an immunity from the jurisdiction of the counts and other magistrates; as also from taxes and imposts of all kinds. But in this century they carried their pretensions still further, aimed at the civil government of the cities and territories in which they exercised a spiritual dominion; and even aspired to the honors and authority of dukes, marquises, and counts of the empire. The nobles were for ever resisting, in their respective domains, the assumptions of the clergy in matters of jurisdiction and other affairs. These, therefore, seized the opportunity which was offered them by the superstitions of the times, to obtain from the kings these, the ancient rights of the nobles; and, as the influence of the bishops over the people was greater than that of the nobility, the kings, to secure the services of so powerful a priesthood, generally granted their requests. Thus they became bishops and abbots clothed with titles and dignities so foreign to their spiritual office, — reverend dukes, marquises, counts, and viscounts!

It was not however by these means only that they sought dominion over the world. They had a thousand arts to rivet their power into the souls of the people. Councils were one of them. As if the sacerdotal name and inculcations were not influential enough, they sought, by collecting together all the dignities of the church into one place, to invest them with a more awful character: and to render the enactments of these priestly congresses everlasting and indissoluble laws. These enactments were such as — the worship of images, decreed in the council of Nice 787; the holding of a festival to the Virgin Mother, instituted by the council of Mentz in the 9th century; taking the cup of the sacrament from the laity; and a declaration of the lawfulness of breaking the most solemn engagements made to heretics, by the council of Constance in the fifteenth century, with a thousand other despotic or absurd decrees against all sects, and all freedom of opinion; and for the institution of exclusive rites and festivals.

LUTHERAN PROTEST AGAINST REVIVALS.

The distinguishing characteristic of "the religious world" in this period of its existence, is an alternate revival and depression of the passions of its devotees. To day, they are in gloom and melancholy foreboding, anticipating with gloomy fears the era of retribution; — to morrow their passions are in the ascendency, and burst forth under the auspices of the "pious" appeals, in all the agonies of despair, until the passion subsides into a calm or destroys the patient.

as natural tendency. The delirium of religious excitement for the most part subsides, and the votary exhausted by his unnatural efforts, regains his wonted equanimity. This subsidence of the storm of animal feeling, when it results in a verbal profession, that peace with God has been effected, or in the identification of its subject with some Sectarian Institution, is termed a *Revival of Religion*. This is the body, soul, and spirit of the ecclesiastical system of the day. It is a spirit of delusion that has seized the world, termed by the Apostle "a strong delusion;" which God has sent upon the children of disobedience, "that they may believe a lie;" because they have not embraced the love of the truth that they might be saved. But we forbear, preferring rather to present our readers with the following well-conceived protestation of the Lutheran Synod against Revivals.

The Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Ohio, which held its 15th session at Columbus (Ohio), on Trinity Sunday, passed the following preamble and resolution.

Whereas we have been informed, through the medium of the Evangelical Magazine and the Lutheran Observer, that several of the *junior* members of one or two of the Lutheran Synods, have commenced to introduce, or according to their own phraseology, to get up (so called) Revivals and four days meetings; and whereas we believe, that our church will thereby be polluted with sectarian forms and principles; that the measures so much in vogue at these four day meetings, have the tendency to heget and nourish fanaticism and disorder, which do more to promote the spirit of unbelief and scepticism, than the writings of Voltaire and Paine have done: that the incoherent and indigested speeches, the chief contents of which are hell and damnation, the sole object of which is to awaken and raise fear and despair to the utmost, and the consequence of which is a general confusion; here one prays aloud, there one sings, a third groans, a fourth goes into hysterics—we believe, that such harangues of such contents end and consequently bring a disgrace upon the ministry; that such discourses are in union with the dark and terrible Mosaic, but not with the clear and mild Gospel dispensation, as St. Paul saith in the Epistle to the Hebrews, xii. 18, 20, 21, 22, 24. "For ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness, and darkness, and tempest, &c. And so terrible was the sight, that Moses said I exceedingly fear and quake; ye are come unto mount Zion, &c. and to Jesus the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling." &c. We believe that such four day meetings, which disgust every reasonable christian, are an abomination in the sight of God, as St. Paul saith, 1 Cor. xiv. 33, 40. "God is not the author of confusion. Let all things be done decently and in order." That the christian religion is a sober

and reasonable thing in itself, and should not, by the ministers of it, be made to look wild or senseless; that scripture truth, plainly and duly taught, had a marvellous aptness to awaken the conscience and touch the heart, and if at this is much more for the honor of our religion and our evangelical church, than that infidels should conclude the ministers of it, a set of mad men, or wild fanatics, and our religious exercises only fits or frenzy. Whereas, we further believe, that the favorite *new measures*, so essential at four day meetings, the calling of the (so called) awakened before the altar, and praying *over* them, is neither commanded in God's word, nor sanctioned by the example of Jesus, inasmuch as *He* called none before *Him*, to pray *over* them after his sermon on the mount, (see Matt. vii. the end;) that the zeal wherewith those fanatics are intent upon publishing to the world, the numbers converted by *them*, is very similar to the conduct of those, of whose example Jesus warns us, (see Matt. vi. 20;) whereas, we further believe, that those "got up" revivals, are a *new measure* invented by those sects, who, disobedient to the command of Jesus, do not regularly and fully instruct their youth, in order to make proselytes of those who have grown up in heathenish ignorance, in the shortest possible manner and without much trouble; and finally, whereas we are convinced, that that way in which we walk, that usage which has obtained in our church since the time of the reformation, according to which we "feed the lambs" with the milk of the gospel, after we have carried them through holy baptism into the fold of Jesus, and after having thoroughly instructed them in all the doctrines of the christian religion, authorize them in the apostolic rite of confirmation, (Hebrews vi. 2. "laying on of hands;") to participate in all the privileges of the church,—is the *old way*, the way commanded by Jesus, (in those words, St. John xxi. 15, "Feed my lambs," and St. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, "Go ye therefore and teach, (*disciple* mathetesate,) all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; *teaching them* (*didaskontes*) to observe *all things whatsoever I have commanded you*,")—the way followed by the apostles, and enjoined anew by the immortal Luther, and as we desire to continue to walk in it, and neither to the right nor the left; be it

Resolved, That we hereby express our disapprobation, and protest against those *new ways and measures*, which accommodate themselves to the *fanatical "spirit of the times"*, and hereby publicly declare our intention to remain immutably *evangelical Lutheran*, in faith, form, and discipline, according to the Bible and the symbolical books of the Lutheran Church.

"The Scriptures having much insisted on the Unity of the Church of CHRIST, and as strongly condemned the sin of Schism," Sir CULLING EARDLEY SMITH wishes to offer a PRIZE of 100*l* for the BEST ESSAY on this SUBJECT. The Essayist should write in a Christian spirit. He should derive his views of the nature of the Sin exclusively from the Scriptures. He should be eminently candid and impartial in specifying the instances in which either Churches or individuals are guilty of it. While leading his readers to perceive a schismatical spirit, where it exists, in creeds, formularies, or laws, he should al*o* comp*l*iment them to detect and condemn it in themselves. He should expose the various disguises which it assumes. He should exhibit its exceeding sinfulness. He should develop*e* the mischievous consequences to which it leads. And, lastly, he should suggest the means by which we should endeavor to expel it from our hearts, from our societies, and from the whole Church of Christ. The Arbitrators are the Hon. and Rev. Baptist Noel, and the Rev. James Sherman. Each Essay should be sent to Captain Peavor, Church street, Chelsea, on or before the first day of October, 1837, with a sealed letter, containing the address of the writer; the manuscripts will then be sent to the arbitrators, without the letters, and they hope to make their decision on the first day of February, 1838.

When we first cursorily perused this little document, we imagined nothing would be more easy than to carry off the prize. But upon more maturely considering the matter, we have concluded, that no task would be more difficult than for us to gain the one hundred pounds of Sir Culling Eardley Smith. We agree with him, that the Scriptures have much insisted on the Unity of the Church of CHRIST, and have as strongly condemned the sin of Schism in that holy and heavenly community. Now, although there is no question in dispute between us as to this matter, yet, we suspect, that our agreement as to what the Church of Christ is will be very remote indeed. Sir Culling and the arbitrators he has appointed, to wit, "the Honorable and Reverend" Baptist Noel, and "the Reverend" James Sherman—are members of the National Church of England and Ireland. Before, then, we could hope to be understood on the subject of schism, we should be under the necessity of defining the institution called the Church of Body of Christ! Now, we are persuaded, that this definition would be fatal to all our hopes of gaining the prize; for we should be most assuredly compelled to unchurch Sir Culling

joined with his Honorable and Reverend Arbitrators. It will be obvious then, that our chance of the one hundred pieces of *locre* would be very slender indeed; unless we could convince these gentlemen of the truth as it is in Jesus. Could this be effected, we doubt not but the piece of mammon would be ours; for Sir Culling Eardley and his Honorable and Reverend friends once convinced, and brought to the obedience of the truth, would see at once, that they themselves and the National Religion of England likewise, were deeply imbued with the sin; and that all our rival essayists of Church and Dissent, not knowing the truth, could not so scripturally execute the invitation of the advertisement as we. From the premises before our mind, we are compelled to say, that they cannot as yet discern the Body of Christ; they have been born of the flesh into the Church of England and can therefore discern the Reign of William IV as head of the Ecclesiastical Kingdom of England and Ireland; but not having been born of water and the Spirit they cannot discern the Reign of God or Kingdom of Heaven: therefore, we say, it would all be labor lost to contend for the prize under the adjudication of such arbitrators until they were born from above. Our first concern then in this matter will be to teach the worthy knight and his "Reverend" friends a few things by way of opening the eyes of their understandings to their own schismatical state in particular, as well as to the sin of schism in general; so that they may be the better able to award the prize in faithfulness and all scriptural consistency.

In acquitting ourselves of this obligation, we shall endeavor to recollect the requirements of Sir Culling, that what is written be written in a christian spirit; though we fear, however scripturally christian our spirit may be, it will be adjudged by the arbitration unchristian on account of our drawing such a line as may possibly leave them out of the Church of Christ entirely. But we are required to "derive our views of the nature of this sin exclusively from the scriptures;" in following these therefore, we trust Sir Culling and the Honorable and Reverend Arbitration will acknowledge our spirit to be a christian one, so far at least, as we shall "lead them to perceive a schismatical spirit, and to detect and condemn it in themselves" by the testimony of sacred scripture. We shall "endeavor to expose the various disguises which it assumes; and shall not fail of faithfully exposing that particular disguise which it assumes in the National Religion of Messrs Smith, Noel, Sherman, and Peavor. We shall "exhibit its exceeding sinfulness;" and "the mischievous consequences to which it has led" in its operation upon the unfortunate and miserably oppressed people of England, Ireland and other countries of the Earth; and shall certainly endeavor to show the worthy gen-

men how it may be expelled from their own hearts and societies.

Their advertisement however takes a wide range, comprehending premises of great importance and interest. We prepare to consider the sin of schism in the Epistolary form. It will occupy two or more letters, which we shall address to Sir Colling, the Honorable Baptist Noel, and James Sherman his "reverend" coadjutor and brother in "Holy Orders." Our first letter will appear in the next number. We shall send them in the order of their publication to the gentlemen addressed, and to the care of the gallant captain Peavor, Church Street, Chelsea. The advertisement being conceived in so liberal a spirit, we doubt not they will receive it in the spirit of good will and free inquiry. That truth may be elicited by the notice, and fairly and honorably vindicated by our answer to the call is the sole object and desire of the

July 3d, 1837.

Editor.

Traditions of the Ancients concerning the Soul.

At the time of Christ's appearance in Judea, there were two species of philosophy that generally prevailed throughout "the civilized world;" the one that of Greece, the other what is usually termed the Oriental. Both these were split into various sects, but with this distinction, that those which sprang from the Oriental system all proceeded upon one common principle, and of course had many similar tenets, though they might differ as to some particular inferences and opinions; whilst those to which the philosophy of Greece gave rise, were divided in opinion respecting the elements or first principles of wisdom, and were consequently widely separated from each other in the whole course of their discipline. The Apostle Paul in his writings is thought to have adverted to these systems—to that of Greece in Col. ii. 8, and to the Oriental in 1 Tim. i. 4; iv. 7; and vi. 20—in all which places he strongly warns Christians to beware of blending the doctrines of either with the simple gospel of Jesus Christ. "Happy," says an excellent writer, "had it been for the Christian Church, could they have taken the admonition which was thus given them by the apostle; but vain and presumptuous man could not rest satisfied with 'the truth as it is in Jesus'—the wisdom that leads to eternal life, as it came pure from above; but must exercise his ingenuity in fruitless attempts to reconcile it; first of all with the principles of the Oriental Philosophy, and afterwards to many of the dogmas of the Grecian sects."

Of all the departments of revealed truth none has been more successfully obscured by mythological philosophy, than the Constitution and destiny of Man. While the Mystery of Iniquity was secretly working, it blended the traditions of the

Greeks and Orientals with the pure doctrine of Jesus and his Apostles; so, that, when he, who restrained his uncontrolled operations was taken out of the way, he had prepared a system of opinions, which gave birth to the dogmas of Purgatory, and its Protestant offspring of an æthereal intermediate State and all the traditions thereto belonging. Illustrative of this remark, we shall present the reader with the traditions held by the ancients of the several sects of Greek and Oriental philosophy. If he is acquainted with the traditions of Romanists and Protestants he will be able to compare them with the tenets of the Pagans, and to judge for himself of the justness of our remarks.

THE EPICUREANS, who placed the chief good in voluptuous gratification, maintained, that *the souls of men are born and perish*. Paul seems to refer to their dogmas when he says, "If after the manner of men, I have fought with beasts at Ephesus what does it advantage me, if the dead rise not? Let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die"—according to the doctrine of the Epicureans. It may be observed here, that Paul fixes his attention upon the period of the resurrection, when he will reap the advantage of having fought with wild beasts at Ephesus on account of the faith of Jesus. In none of his writings does he look for the great recompense of reward before that coming event. The scriptures deny this dogma of the Epicureans; for they teach, that "living souls" or animal men, die, but do not perish under certain conditions.

THE ACADEMICS considered it a matter of doubt and uncertainty whether "the soul" was perishable or immortal.

THE PERIPATETICS insinuated, though they did not plainly teach, a disbelief of the soul's future existence.

THE PLATONISTS considered the Deity as totally unconnected with any material substance. *The souls of men they conceived to proceed from this pre-eminent source; and as partaking of its nature, to be incapable of death.* This is what is meant by the soul's being *divina particula aura*—a particle of the divine essence. They believed, that the soul, during its continuance in the body, was in a state of imprisonment, and that we ought to endeavor, by means of contemplation, to set it free, and restore it to an alliance with the divine nature.

THE STOICS denied "the immortality of the soul."

Several Philosophers, though divided into a great variety of sects, seem to have been generally agreed in believing, that the deity, whom they named *Dæmonius*, was the spirit of the world, which he peopled with men and other animals. This was originally dark, but that he shined forth as a light of celestial light, either secretly or openly, according to the bounty of *Burnos* the pre-eminent deity.

Alion Pleroma, or everlasting light, was communicated to the likewise communicated to the

would otherwise have been

reason and uninstructed, except in what relates to mere animal life, particles of the divine essence, or souls of a kindred nature to the Deity.

Man therefore, while he continued in this world, they supposed to be compounded of two principles, acting in direct opposition to each other;—an earthly, corrupt, and ciliated body—and a soul partaking of the Deity, being derived from the region of purity and light. The soul or etherial part, being through its connexion with the body, confined as it were within a prison of matter, was constantly exposed to the danger of being involved in ignorance, and acquiring every sort of evil propensity, from the impulse and contagion of the vitiated mass by which it was enveloped. To remedy this they supposed that BUTHOS sent inspired teachers into the world, much to the displeasure of DEMIGRUS and his associate geni, who had rebelled against him; and who not only tormented, but slew the messengers of heaven. The minds or souls, that listened to the calls of BUTHOS by his messengers, they supposed, ON THE DISSOLUTION OF THEIR BODIES TO BE DIRECTLY BORNE AWAY, PURE, ERIAL, AND DISENGAGED FROM EVERY THING GROSS OR MATERIAL, TO THE IMMEDIATE RESIDENCE OF GOD HIMSELF;—while those who rejected their admonitions, were denied the hope of exaltation after death, and could only expect to migrate into new bodies, suited to their base, sluggish, and degraded condition. When the grand work of setting free, all these minds or souls should be accomplished, God, it was supposed, would dissolve the fabric of this lower world.

The moral discipline deduced from this system of philosophy by its votaries, was all made to bear upon the mortification of the body; so that the material frame being thus by every means weakened and brought low, the celestial spirit might the more readily escape from its contagious influence and regain its native liberty.

Such were some of the things, which constituted “the wisdom of the wise” and the “knowledge of the prudent” of the Gentile world, at the time of Christ’s appearance upon the earth. Those who held them were wise and prudent in their own esteem. After all their speculations upon the Deity and the soul and body, or constitution of man, they were unable to find out the truth. But this “wisdom of the world” and of its rulers was not the wisdom taught by Paul among “THE PERVERT.” The wisdom that he spoke was a secret to the world, and had been concealed until the proclamation of “the truth, as it is in Jesus.” The wisdom of God though esteemed foolishness, as at this day by the wise, the prudent and the great did not teach “the perfect” the Oriental philosophy of a

* Or as Protestants sing—“Borne on angels’ wings to heaven
Glad the summons to obey.”

“two principles.” Had it done so, it would have taught a “wisdom” unconcealed and therefore not a “mysterious wisdom.” This wisdom of the Greeks and Orientals God has determined to destroy; as it is written, “I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and the knowledge of the prudent.” Much of this spurious wisdom and knowledge has been destroyed; though much still remains to be done away. The original proclamation of the gospel emancipated many from the besetting influence of this foolish wisdom; the controversies of our age will disenfranchise a few of our contemporaries; but the world waits for the authoritative proclamation of the gospel of the Everlasting Age for the final extinction of the traditions, tales, and fictions, palmed upon it for “the mysterious wisdom of God.”

It is manifest, from the evidence adduced by various learned men, that in addition to superstitious observances, drawn from the religious worship of heathen nations, which were introduced and blended with those of divine institution, the Jews held many erroneous principles, probably brought from Babylon and Chaldea, by their ancestors at their return from captivity, or adopted by the inconsiderate multitude, in conformity to the example of their neighbors, the Greeks, the Syrians, and the Egyptians. We cannot therefore, expect to find their intelligence as to divine things of a very superior description.—Their opinions and sentiments, however, respecting the Deity, the divine nature, the angels, demons, the souls of men, &c., appear to have been less extravagant, and formed on more rational grounds, than those of any other nation. Though this was the case, they had gradually incorporated with them so large a mixture of what was fabulous and absurd, as nearly to deprive the truth of all its force and energy.

The Spiritual guides of Israel, whom Jesus terms blind leaders of the blind, were principally divided into Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes. They held various and opposite traditions: which were for the most part any thing but the wisdom and revelation contained in the Law, the Prophets and the Psalms. They were spiritually blind, though they said “we see;” and the people who believed them were blind also. Their opinions and sentiments therefore, are but of little consequence to those who would learn the true character of God, of his institution, or of the constitution of man.—The Pharisees believed in a resurrection to eternal life, and of a future state of rewards and punishments. The Sadducees denied the resurrection of the dead, and therefore, doomed mankind without exception to perdition. Hence, as there was no after life in their judgment, they considered that all their punishments were restricted to this life. Jesus, rejecting this unscriptural notion, by propounding to them the parable of the Rich man and Lazarus; in which he plainly shows that the life to be referred to Moses and the Prophets in confirmation of

be said.—that there was a future state, and that in that state there were both rewards and punishments.

The *Essenes* a third sect among the Jews, are divided by some historians into the *practical* and *theoretical* *Essenes*.—The former were distributed over the countries of Syria, Palestine, and Egypt. Their faith was based on the Oriental philosophy. They supposed the souls of men to have fallen, by a disastrous fate, from the regions of purity and light, into the bodies which they occupy; during their continuance in which they supposed them to be confined, as it were, within the walls of a loathsome dungeon. For this reason they do not believe in a resurrection of the Animal Man; although it was their opinion that the soul would be rewarded or punished in a future state according to its deserts. This is practically the doctrine of Protestants. They cultivated great abstinence, as do the Romanists on certain days, allowing themselves but little bodily nourishment or gratification, from an apprehension that the immortal spirit might be thereby encumbered and weighed down. It was their endeavor, too, by constant meditation, to withdraw the mind as much as possible from the contagious influence of the corrupt mass by which it was unhappily enveloped.

The theoretical *Essenes* withdrew themselves to solitary places. In this state of seclusion from the world and its concerns, they studied to reduce and keep the body low, by allowing it nothing beyond the most slender subsistence, and as far as possible, to detach and disengage the soul from it by perpetual contemplation, so that the immortal spirit might in defiance of its corporeal imprisonment, be kept constantly *aspiring after its native liberty and light, and be prepared immediately on the dissolution of the body, to re-ascend to those celestial regions from whence it originally sprang.* They practised in their weekly assemblies certain parts of Shakerism with considerable energy. They followed up a feast on bread, water, and salt with a "sacred dance." At first the men and women danced in two separate parties; but at length their minds or souls according to their own account, kindling with a sort of divine ecstasy, the two companies joined in one, mutually striving, by various shouts and songs of the most vehement kind, accompanied with the most extravagant motions and gesticulations of the body, to manifest the fervent glow of that divine love with which they professed to be inflamed.—"To such an extent of folly" says Mr. Jones, "may men be led by the spirit of enthusiasm, and in consequence of their entertaining erroneous principles respecting the Deity, and the origin of the human soul!"

When we review these opinions of the ancients, we cannot wonder at the reception which Paul's proclamation met with by the Epicureans and Stoics at Athens. He announced to

them, as he did to all, not the resurrection of "immortal souls," or the "re-union of human spirits with their bodies,"—but the re-animation of mortal bodies by the Spirit of God, in order that they might live for ever in the enjoyment of life, or that they might be punished with the second death; as it is written, if the spirit of Him who raised up Jesus from the dead, dwell in you, (this is the condition;) he who raised up Christ from the dead, will also make alive your mortal bodies, by his Spirit that dwells in you.—And again, "if you live according to the flesh you shall die;" that is, you shall die the second death; but if, through the Spirit, you put to death the deeds of the body, you shall live;" that is, for ever in the enjoyment of life.

The doctrine of Christ concerning a resurrection from the dead and an eternal judgment was well calculated to put to silence the ignorance of the heathen philosophers and sectarists of the Jewish and Gentile worlds. It taught them the absolute mortality of Man as a whole; that this mortality was superinduced by the transgression of God's law by the first Man, and that consequently, the world was in a *perishing* state; that as all men were entirely mortal as well as actual transgressors, no man could redeem his brother at any price; that God, notwithstanding the wickedness of man, loved the world which he had made, and which once he had pronounced "all very good;" that his unrequited love prompted him to save the world from extinction; that in order to do this, he sent his Son into the world, that whosoever of the world should believe on him may not *perish*, but obtain the opposite, which is *eternal life*. The doctrine of Christ taught men, that in him, The Word of God, was life; that life, and not "immortal souls"—was the Life of the World; that He was the Lord of Life;—that those who would not receive him should not see life, but should abide the vengeance of the Almighty, who would destroy them with "an everlasting destruction," depriving them of "soul and body," by "the damnation of Hell" which is "the Second Death."

How different is this doctrine from the traditions of the ancient and modern schools of the wise and prudent of the world. It presents eternal life as the reward of virtue, or obedience to God. It sets it forth as the spontaneous gift of his own benevolence; it makes Him, and not mortal bodies, the depository of the life of man. It magnifies the grace and renown of Jesus through whom alone the grace, gift, and favor of life is bestowed. It makes him the object of earnest expectation; of an ardent hope, that he will soon appear, and bring his reward of life with him for all his faithful followers. It increases the value of the gospel a hundred fold; for it, and it alone, is the power of God to salvation from sin and the second death.

CAMPELLISM;*

Reprinted from the Appendix to W. Jones's Sermons.

HAVING towards the close of the preceding Sermon, made a slight allusion to some of the tenets of a contemporary author, viz. Mr. Alexander Campbell, of Bethany, Brooke county, in the State of Virginia, U. S., I have thought it might not be altogether without its use, but, indeed, in some measure, necessary, to add further particulars, in this place, concerning that distinguished individual, and his writings, so far as they have hitherto come under my inspection; it being manifest, that these things could not, with any propriety, have been introduced into a Sermon.

In a monthly publication, which I edited during a part of the years 1835 and 1836, under the title of the "MILLENNIAL HARBINGER," and which extended to two volumes, 12mo., I laid before the public a short account of my first acquaintance with that gentleman, accompanied with some details of his personal history, copies of a correspondence which had passed between him and myself, together with copious extracts from his writings.

* These are printed in a pamphlet of 20 super-royal pages, which has just been forwarded to us by our friends in England. We have not room for the whole of it in this number. It will be continued in the next. The cause of these "Structures" seeing the light may be gleaned from page 14, where Mr. Jones says—"these structures are extracted from me by the indiscretion of certain persons in this country who have much too hastily adopted Mr. Campbell's opinions as the standard of their creed, and are now industriously propagating them, to the unsettling of churches, and are greatly to be lamented, to the subverting of many individuals from the faith of the gospel."—In connection with this, the following extracts from a letter from England, accounts pretty satisfactorily for the spirit of something which the reader can characterize, displayed throughout the performance.—"Yesterday, Saturday May 5th, we received by post from Mr. Jones, a 'Structure on Campbellism.' I intend sending these said structures to you by this packet as it treats of your ability in reducing souls to nonentities by a chemical test. The 'dearly beloved brother Campbell' whom Mr. Jones proved them so highly approved, has been by his writings more extensively approved of the people. It was just as the old gentleman likes, and now he cannot stop the minds of his limits in teaching."—"I cannot meet with any likened here (in London)—I cannot now agree with the existing state of things, for I am quite unsettled in the faith and order of 'the churches' though not in the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ. As for Mr. Jones', where for a few months I did unite, they are reduced to about five or six. Such splitting, and dividing, and slandering, that really, though they came the nearest to primitive order, it was not possible to stay quietly; therefore it was better to depart. There were many who approved of _____'s teaching, while he attended there;—and really, I believe, the old gentleman was rather jealous, and exceedingly watchful lest he should express a sentiment not exactly in accordance with his own creed."

But we forbear any further remarks upon these "Structures" all they are fully before the reader.

EDITOR.

tings, which are now become voluminous. To those who have perused the pages of the work just referred to, it can be no secret, that my sentiments, on some doctrinal points, differ from those of Mr. Campbell, as I then understood him; and it was a maternal object with me, both in commencing and continuing the correspondence, to elicit further information, and come to a better understanding of the doctrinal sentiments, maintained by him and his friends, as well as of the general principles on which they proceed in contending for a Reformation of the Christian Church in that extensive region, in which they are said to have succeeded to an astonishing degree.

Mr. Campbell was known to have obtained considerable celebrity, by several public disputations which he had held, during a course of years; two of them on the subject of Baptism, with ministers of the Presbyterian denomination (I believe)—and a third with Robert Dale Owen, Esq., formerly of New Lanark, in Scotland, an avowed infidel, on the Evidences of Christianity,—a debate held at the city of Cincinnati, State of Ohio, and which lasted from the 13th to the 21st of April, 1829. On these occasions, and more especially the last of them, Mr. Campbell was considered to have evinced extraordinary talents, such as secured him a well earned popularity, and could not fail to gain attention to the various productions of his prolific pen. To which let me add, that the extracts which were produced from month to month in the *London* Millennial Harbinger, and which comprise some of the very choicest of his writings, could scarcely fail to whet the appetite of his readers on this side the Atlantic, and make them anxious for a more general acquaintance with them.

Mr. Campbell has now been before the public as an author, but chiefly as the Editor of a monthly publication, or religious magazine, for about fifteen years. His first work, entitled the "Christian Baptist," commenced in 1823, and having run a successful career of seven years, comprising a volume a year, came to its termination at the end of 1829. This work, after going through two or three editions, in its original form, viz. seven volumes 12mo., and having undergone a careful revision by its able editor, was once more issued from the press, in a greatly improved form, the entire seven volumes, with the omission of a few trifling and unimportant articles, being cast into one large volume of the size of royal octavo, in double columns, and stereotyped.

Of this work, though I differ from its able conductor on several things, as already mentioned, I have no hesitation in saying it as my opinion, that it comprises much that is worthy of the serious attention of the people of this part of the world, and viewing it in that light, I imported, in the present year, about twenty-five copies for the gratification of the

friends, none of whom were, I believe, disappointed with the book.

In the year 1830, Mr. Campbell commenced a new periodical of a more elaborate cast, under the title of the "Millennial Harbinger," printed in octavo, and of which also seven volumes are now before the public. Of this production, however, I am compelled to speak in far more qualified terms than I have done of his "Christian Baptist." I would not, indeed, be understood as denying, that Mr. C. is still in the Harbinger, the same uncompromising advocate of Reform, as he was in the Christian Baptist; but, then, many of the topics which occupied his pen in this last-mentioned work, were exhausted in it; and such of them as have, from time to time, been introduced into the new work, have lost their freshness—they want the grace of novelty: the reader is apt to say, "we have had this before, again and again—it palls upon the appetite;"—but this is not all.

While engaged in publishing the Christian Baptist, Mr. Campbell presented himself to us in a different attitude from what he does in the Harbinger. In the former, we view him in the light of an enquirer after truth. He looks around him, and surveying the professing world, he finds it a mass of corruption—a sink of iniquity. Even among the strictest sect of professors, "their fear of God is taught by the precepts of men,"—and he forms the noble resolution of essaying a Reformation. He adopts from the "living oracles," a few first principles, and endeavors to carry them out to their legitimate consequences. But he advances with slow and cautious step—ever and anon looking back to the principles from which he set out, and rarely dogmatizing. He is ready to receive light from whatever quarter it may spring up and shine upon his path. In proof of this, I might adduce his correspondence with Messrs. Seiple and Broadus, two able ministers of the Baptist denomination, residing in his vicinity, and whose letters will be found in my *Millennial Harbinger*. But in the publication which succeeded to the Christian Baptist, Mr. Campbell is no longer the enquirer after truth; he has changed that character for the bold dogmatist—the champion of a party; he is surrounded by a host of writers, who pour in their lucubrations upon him in endless profusion; and instead of calling into exercise a discriminating judgment, and selecting such papers as are calculated to advance the cause of truth, he throws open the columns of his Journal to all kinds of trash, till the whole is little better than a chaotic mass, with which the Editor himself is evidently bewildered. And glad should I be, did the evil extend no further than this; but a careful examination of his later productions excites my deep alarm, that he is, himself, subverted from the faith of the Gospel! I am well aware of the surprise, and perhaps, indignation, which

this avowal will excite in the breasts of some, whom I formerly numbered among my friends; but, having expressed my apprehensions, I consider myself imperiously called upon to state the grounds on which they are founded.

As the limits of an "Appendix" will not allow me to go at full length into the subject, and that I may also abridge my labor, I shall, for the present, confine myself to three points, on each of which I consider Mr. Campbell as having departed from "the form of sound words"—"the faith once delivered to the saints." These are, 1st,—the corruption of human nature, or the innate natural depravity of mankind. 2.—The necessity of divine influence to give the Gospel its saving effect in regeneration and sanctification. And 3.—His maintaining the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, and the *actual* washing away of sin by immersion.

Now as respects the first of these points, namely, "the total depravity" of mankind, in consequence of the corruption of human nature, through the fall of our federal head, I am free to confess, that, if anything contrary to the *received* doctrine, on that subject, is to be found in the "Christian Baptist," it has excited my vigilance, and I think I have searched with some care. I admit, indeed, that we no where find Mr. Campbell stating the doctrine with the clearness, perspicuity, and power, that is done in the writings of the prophets and apostles, in the passages referred to in my last two Sermons. Nevertheless, I have not found him any where in that work entering his protest against it; and my opinion is, that *at that time*, he had no intention of impugning it. The first violent attack that I find made upon it in his publications, may be seen in the "Millennial Harbinger," vol. ii. for the year 1831, in which are three essays, signed "Moses," which are respectively entitled "Total Depravity and Metaphysical Regeneration." In these papers we are told, that the phrase "*total depravity*" was christened by Austin, baptized by Calvin, and immersed by Doctors Gill and Fuller,"—p. 361. We are further informed, that "this doctrine is the honey of a poisoned cup, and the sting of a serpent's embrace." And, as though this were not enough, it is further added, that "such heresy as this is worse than all the pride, avarice, ambition, and lewdness, and all the other crimes which are committed in the land of orthodoxy. It is more deadly than the fangs and stings of the aspid,"—p. 363.

Now, the reader will naturally expect, that a writer who would not scruple to use language like this, as to a doctrine that has been currently received among Christians, according to his own confession, for fourteen or fifteen hundred years, would, as a matter of course, furnish us with a satisfactory explanation of those direct testimonies, both of prophets and apostles, which appear to us to inculcate the doctrine of human depravity, such as Gen. vi. 5, and viii. 21.—Psalm

and li. 5; Rom. iii. *passim*; Eph. ii. 1-3; with many others; but we look in vain for any thing of that kind. The only thing attempted, is to cull a few texts from the Old Testament, not one of which does he understand or rightly apply, seeing that they all refer to the Sinai Covenant, and its temporal blessings, though adduced by the writer to prove the liberty of the human will, and that man has the power and ability to repent and turn to God without divine aid!

I am aware, however, that it will be objected to me, that the Editor of a periodical cannot justly be held accountable for every sentiment that may be contained in the writings of those who contribute to his journal; and that unless it can be proved that the person who signs himself "Moses," is Alexander Campbell, my complaints go for nothing.

Now this I freely admit,—that I do not believe Mr. Campbell was the writer of those three papers. I believe they were written by his friend Walter Scott, of Carthage, in the State of Ohio; and I shall produce my reasons for thinking so.

I have now lying before me, a publication of which that gentleman is the Editor, entitled, "The Evangelist," and in vol. iii. p. 351, I find a DIALOGUE, relating to this same subject, from which I shall produce a short extract.

"JONATHAN.—Sir, it would gratify your humble servant a little, to know precisely what are your views of human depravity, and the relation of that doctrine to the Gospel as preached for the remission of sins.

EDITOR.—My dear Jonathan, I am happy it is permitted, to even enjoin us by our holy religion, to study to please, and to edify each other in the great matters of faith and hope. The doctrine about which you enquire, however, comes not within the purview of either faith or hope, and cannot, therefore, form a legitimate topic of Christian conversation. In fact, it has no foundation either in nature or religion, so far as I am a judge; for neither the phrase, nor even the words which form the phrase, are once found in the Holy Scriptures; and, in short, I know nothing about it.

JONATHAN.—Brother Scott, you surprise me; are you a preacher of the Gospel, and know nothing of human depravity? And is it possible that neither the phrase, nor the words that compose the phrase, are found in the whole field of the divine vocabulary? I must have mistaken the phrase: Yes, it was total depravity, I meant.

EDITOR.—My dear Jonathan, pardon me; but I know nothing about depravity human or total: the word *total* is as perfectly an exotic in the field of Christian theology, as the word *human*, or even depravity itself. None of all of them is a Bible word; and therefore their use is very questionable; at all events, I know nothing about the doctrine, and it is most certain, "I care nothing about it."

This, I think it will be allowed on all hands, is pretty pointed and explicit! But, had the same question been put to the apostle Paul, does the reader think that he would have returned the same answer? Nay, verily; we may easily judge what answer he would have returned, by a reference to Rom. iii. & Eph. ii.; and if Mr. Walter Scott, neither knows, nor cares, anything about "human depravity," he is a very unfit man to preach the Gospel; at any rate *his* Gospel cannot be the identical,—original Gospel, &c.

"Sovereign balm for every wound,
And conchal for our fears."

which the first heralds of salvation proclaimed: for in their message of peace and reconciliation, the doctrine of "human depravity"—total depravity, and the Gospel of divine grace, answered to each other, as disease and remedy. Yet this same Walter Scott is one of the persons in whom Mr. Campbell glories as being so able a coadjutor in the work of Reform! If the reader will take the trouble to turn to my "Millennial Harbinger," vol. i. p. 312, he will find the following lines as a part of one of his letters to me.

"Brother Jones, tell Scotland that one of her sons, Walter Scott, of Edinburgh, has been my associate for more than twelve years, and now edits the 'Evangelist,' in Carthage, Ohio. He came to America a Presbyterian, was immersed by one of the Haldanean School, and was the first of our Evangelists to re-publish, *in a* *voce*, with effect, the Jerusalem Gospel, in the forests of Ohio, reclaimed from the Indians."

But I proceed to another article of Campbellism. In one of his letters to me, written during the last year, Mr. Campbell remarks, that there is no one doctrine of the Gospel that has given rise to more controversy, or been the source of more litigation among them, in the United States, than that of the "influences of the Holy Spirit." (See *Millennial Harbinger*, vol. i. p. 328.) I was no way surprised at this; I should, in a deed, have been greatly surprised, had the case been otherwise. He might, with great justice, have taken up, or ended the complaint with, "*quorum pars magna fui*," for though he has written elaborately on the subject—what has he done? He has continually been philosophising on an article of pure revelation—saying and unsaying—until he has come, at last, to deny the doctrine altogether, in its most essential points, namely, its absolute necessity to give effect to the written word, causing it to enter the mind of a sinner, enlighten his understanding, make its way to the conscience and the heart, and bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ. In fact, his conduct, as relates to the point in hand, exhibits a melancholy instance of human verbiage, and

it with unfeigned regret; but having made the charge, I feel bound in honor to substantiate it.—*To be continued in our next.*

Jamestown, Ohio, June 17th, 1837.

Dear Brother Thomas,

I have no disposition to enter into controversy with you, believing as I do, that when a man once takes a stand he hates to be beaten, and that when he is beaten he hates to acknowledge it.

But at the same time I feel disposed to speak freely upon some of the topics introduced by you in the "Advocate."—That of ETERNAL LIFE being the most important. Your proposition is that Eternal life is conditional, and your conclusion is, that none but such as comply with the conditions can obtain it. This reasoning seems fair and conclusive, and I have no disposition to impugn it. But notwithstanding this may be strictly true in regard to all that are spoken to in the Scriptures, still I am not sure that it is true in regard to all that are spoken of in the scriptures. God has spoken of infants frequently, but he has not spoken to them, consequently there are no conditions submitted for their acceptance or refusal, and because they cannot comply with the conditions proposed to adults, you conclude they cannot be saved at all.

You are not the first I think that has come to this conclusion, from reasoning upon the premises. I think it probable that the Apostles once before Pentecost, came to the same conclusion—and forbid that infants should be brought to Jesus to receive blessings from him, but Jesus reproved their interference in the matter, and commanded them to be brought, and he laid his hands on them and blessed them; and I conclude that they remain blessed to the present day no one having had the power to curse them, or to wrest them from him.

Men have at different times, busied themselves about the Salvation of Infants, and have tried in some way to apply the Gospel to them, finding that faith and repentance could not be applied. They have tried to save them by proxy, taking the faith of parents, or of godfathers and godmothers, in the room of the child's faith, and then baptising the child for the remission of its hereditary sin, inherited from Adam, &c.

All these untaught proceedings might have been saved, had men used common sense about the matter, and not in their own vain imaginations supposed that God ought to have given some directions to men about the salvation of infants in the scriptures. But God knowing that men could do nothing for them in that respect, gave no directions about them. But he gave many charges to parents, guardians, and christians in regard to their sustenance, and education. Hence the care of widows and orphan children was committed to the saints,

and Jesus will hold them accountable for neglect of duty, when he comes to settle up with his stewards.

This shews that God cares for Infants, and that he has use for them, as well as for adults. And he has wisely withheld a direct revelation in relation to their future destiny, lest some fanatic should command that they should be killed in order to give them a sure passport to heaven.

If infants are not included in the common salvation, through Jesus Christ our Lord, why did he himself enter into the womb of the virgin, and pass through all the stages of life, from embryo to manhood?

As by Adam's transgression all die, so by Christ's obedience shall all be made alive. And this is all the salvation that infants need, never having transgressed the law of God, they need no salvation from sin.

Affectionately yours,

M. WILANS.

P. S. I am well pleased with your Essay on the Deacon's Office.

M. W.

REPLICATION.

Dear Brother,

You will perceive that another of your interesting and pithy epistles has come to hand. They are always acceptable, whether their design be to teach, convince, correct, convert, or approve my sayings or doings. Their spirit being anything but that of denunciation, I cannot but welcome their visits. I like to peruse them, though I may not always agree with the things they speak. They contain many things in few words, which is a most excellent quality in a letter or in any other document. Well then, as to the one before us,

I hope you will be always disposed to convert whatever of mine you believe to be contrary to the word of truth. Mind contrary to the word of truth, not because contrary to the word of men; for then I should have more writing to do than I could well effect without the aid of numerous amanuenses or sub-editors. I hope the reason you assign will not operate against this disposition; for, believe me, nothing will afford me the real satisfaction than to be beaten from every erroneous position; and when beaten—fairly and argumentatively beaten, I trust I never shall be so mean-spirited as not to acknowledge that I have everything to lose by error, and everything to gain by truth.

I cannot admit the distinction you make as to those who are spoken to, and who are spoken of. What is religion worth if it is only upon the earth for? I conceive, as a part of a grand scheme of things; to contribute its influence to the world, and to the state in which they were before man was created. I saw all that he had made, and behold it was

It is designed then to establish upon the renewed earth, a race of inhabitants—men and women—who shall be all "very good." To whom has religion in its several dispensations, been addressed?—I reply, to *intellectual, moral and animal beings**—that is, to individuals in the exercise of these faculties. These very good people who are to be the population of the renovated earth will every one of them be persons who have been the intelligent inhabitants of the old earth as it now is. I say in their then antecedent state, they will have been intelligent; else how can they sing the new song concerning their redemption by the blood of Jesus: can one who is unconscious of having sinned sing of redemption by blood? God promised Abraham, that he should be "the heir (tou kosmou) of the world." This world is yet to come. It was promised Abraham "through a righteousness of faith." Do you think any can possibly constitute a part of that world, who do not partake of it as Abraham will—*through faith*? Whoever is recognized as a citizen of the Great Nation of the Redeemed, who are to inhabit the earth renewed, must be the descendant of Abraham. As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.—"You are all the sons of God through the faith by Christ Jesus." Faith in the blood of Jesus and immersion there are necessary to become sons of God, and Christ's. "And if you are Christ's, certainly you are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise" made to him while a Gentile, that he should be the heir of the world.—Pray, my brother, can you tell me how unconscious babes can become Abraham's seed by faith in Christ? The fact is, the only difficulty in the case arises from the traditions of the spiritualists. Calvinists are for sending them to hell if non-elect;—and Universalists are for sending them *all* to heaven. But, in my judgment, they "err not knowing the scriptures." Babes are born into the world unconscious of everything intellectual, moral, or animal. What loss would the extinction of their being be to them?—What honor or glory would accrue to God by a world of such inhabitants? Place them in the world of which Abraham is the heir; what then? Are they there as babes or full grown men and women? I cannot now write all that suggests itself to my mind; but my conviction is, that they are neither "lost" nor "saved" in a religious or scriptural sense; but being *born unconscious*, having *existed unconscious*, and *dying unconscious*, unconscious they remain—that is, *they cease to be*.

What an outcry some well-meaning people make at the idea of unconscious beings not flourishing in heaven, which will be pre-eminently a moral and intellectual state! Calvinists be-

* By Paul's expression, "the whole person, the spirit, the soul, and the body," I understand, an intellectual, moral, and animal person. The words spirit, soul, and body are constantly and interchangeably used for one another as well as for the whole man.

lieve that some infants are elected to eternal life without either faith or obedience; and that others are elected to damnation to all eternity; yet these believers in such a monstrous absurdity can raise a hue and cry against me, because I maintain that the scriptures leave an unconscious being that dies unconscious in his unconsciousness for ever.

Some imagine that because nothing is said in scripture as to the destiny of infants that *therefore* they will go to heaven. I confess, I can discover no such *therefore* in the premises.—Shall I say, that because the scriptures says nothing about the destiny of Julius Cæsar *by name*, that therefore he will partake in the resurrection of the righteous? And yet one is just as consequent as the other; and that is not at all. It appears to me that God deals more in *positives* than *negatives*. He is not like some "divines" who say, "I cannot tell you what the thing is; but I can tell you what it is not." It is not "yea and nay," with Him: but "Amen" when he reveals a thing.

But God has as certainly revealed the destiny of infants and of Julius Cæsar as he has plainly made known the way of eternal life. Man whether we regard him as male or female, infant or adult, is *absolutely mortal*. This the scriptures teach. People talk about "the immortality of the soul;" but Jehu says "the soul that sinneth it shall die;" that is, eternally. Some souls then are not to die; and who are they? They are of the race of man who obey the truth. This the scriptures teach. The condition then upon which Mortals can become Immortal *is* their *obeying the truth*. It is obvious then, that those who do not obey the truth cannot live for ever; hence the eternal existence of Julius Cæsar is certain as far as regards his natural existence in the heavenly state. Whether Julius Cæsar who never heard the truth, will be raised with the reprobates to suffer punishment is another question; this I am persuaded by the positive tenor of the doctrine of Jesus as to eternal life, that infants will be raised neither to suffer punishment nor to enjoy a life of which they were never conscious.

It is surprising that ever the doctrine of the eternal life of infants should have been discovered in the saying of Jesus—"Permit the children to come to me and do not forbid them; for of such is the kingdom of God;" yet one need scarcely

* That this is no fiction will appear from the writings of Calvin the founder of Presbyterianism, and the Arch-perverter of the faith of Christ. He says: "and so even infants bring their damnation with them from their mother's womb, for although they have not yet produced the fruits of iniquity, they have the seed of it inclosed within them. Nay, their nature, in, as it were, a seed of sin: so that it cannot be otherwise than odious and abominable to God." See *Instit. Lib. iv. c. 15. § 104.* The elect, his disciples say, "Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ, through the Spirit, who works when they are thus in the womb, and how he pleaseth."—*Confession of Faith.*

wonder at this, since "divines" can see in it the dogma of baby sprinkling!

The passage in which this text is, when stripped of the mysticisms of human folly and conceit, appears to me simply to amount to this: Jesus was renowned for the efficacy of his touch. By touching the sick, he healed many diseases; as also by laying on of hands or by touch, the Apostles, subsequently imparted to their disciples the gifts of the Spirit. On the present occasion Jesus was conversing with the people and teaching them by similitudes. In the context, he had been showing, that "every one who exalts himself shall be abased; and he that humbles himself shall be exalted." About this time, he was interrupted in his discourse by certain (perhaps mothers, who seem ever since to have been more absorbed in their infants than in the wisdom of the Holy One of God; I mean no offence however, to the ladies by this remark) who brought infants to him that he might touch them. If I were asked why they did this; I should say, I suppose, they expected some virtue would be imparted to them. Or they might have come it in the same spirit that fond parents introduce their little ones to the notice of their visitors; that they may admire them, and pronounce them fine boys and girls, and predict some happy life in store for them. However this may have been, the disciples, whose minds were engaged in listening to the gracious words which distilled from his lips, considered the presentation of the infants as inappropriate; for they rebuked them, or ordered them to stand back. This well-intentioned officiousness of the disciples, the Master corrected, by calling them to him, and saying, "Permit the children to come to me, and do not forbid them; and, as he had just been insisting upon the necessity of humanity in the disposition of those who would be justified of God, he took occasion still further to urge it upon their attention by setting forth these children as the type of the dispositions of those who constitute the kingdom of God; saying, "for of such is the kingdom of God." He did not mean by this that the kingdom of God was to be made up of natural infants; for "that which is born of the flesh is flesh;" and unless it be "born again it cannot enter the kingdom of God." But he evidently intended to teach, that all who would "enter therein" must be of as docile or teachable, tractable, and humble a disposition as a child; for, says he, "whosoever will not receive the kingdom of God as a child shall never enter it."

The humble and teachable disposition that is required in candidates for the citizenship of the Kingdom, is a humility and docility towards God. Not that we are to be imperious towards men; but this is not the idea contemplated in the text. When our minds come into contact with the scriptures then they should dismiss every prejudice, every notion, every conceit that has been instilled into them by the Purse, the priest, or

schoolmaster. As to the instructions of these we should not be too teachable, too docile, or too humble. We should take nothing they say for granted; but prove all things regardless of who propounds them, and hold fast that which is good, though believed by the pope himself. But the childlike humility inculcated by Jesus is beautifully illustrated in the similitude of the Publican and the Pharisee, the former humbled himself before God, the latter exalted himself; the consequence was that God exalted the Publican by justifying him, and abased the Pharisee by paying no attention to his prayer. The Publican, had the right disposition to enter the kingdom from which the self-righteous Pharisee was excluded.

You conclude that these children remain blessed to this day. Very well, I will not dispute your conclusion. Their remaining blessed, however, will depend upon their having been born again when of mature age, if indeed they ever arrived at that stage of human life. I presume, you do not mean to say, that because a particular blessing was pronounced upon these whom Jesus touched, therefore all other infants are blessed in like manner. If they remain blessed at this day, it is because, after being born again, they have "persevered in well doing" and will therefore be "requited at the resurrection of the just."

As to infants being subject to a blessing or a curse, I would observe, that in a certain sense, we are all under a curse and pay with us. They partake of the curse of disease, pain, and death. This I believe is about the sum and substance of the curse they are the subject of. If war, famine, pestilence, or earthquake come upon a country they partake of the calamities which are shewn however, of all their horrors inasmuch as they are devoid of suffering by anticipation, which is certainly a blessing.

No one who understands the Gospel need puzzle himself about "the salvation of infants." It is a dogma of the priests by which they make money, and build up their unholy craft. They have invented the dogma of the imputation of original sin by which they make out that infants are in danger of hell fire.* They have invented a rantism or rite of sprinkling, by which to wash away this sin, and fit them for heaven. If they die unsprinkled, some of them will not bury them in "consecrated ground;" for "they have died as dies a dog." They "regenerate" a sinful child, and wash away its original sin by sprinkling it in the name of the Father, &c! Infants are subjects for the rites of superstition; for its all men to these. And thus it is by these inventions, that Antichrist has conjured up a "Salvation" and "damnation of infants," and so forth.

* They have taught, though I believe they are getting ashamed of the dogma, that "there are infants in hell a span long!" Besides this, and nothing can save them but besprinkling their faces with holy water.

broodwinked the world as to cajole the most of it into its deception!

God does indeed care for infants and has use for them. They are the men and women of a rising race. It is the duty therefore of Christian parents to train them up in the way they should go, and when they are old they will not depart from it. It is parents who are responsible for the future destiny of their infants. If they bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, then indeed these infants will partake with their parents in the resurrection of the just. It is lamentable to behold the neglect of Christian parents in this matter. They seem as if they cared for the salvation only of themselves. Their little innocents are left to follow the natural tendency of their minds to evil. This appears to be no offence in their sight, while to say, that the scriptures teach in respect the everlasting unconsciousness of unconscious babies, is viewed with a pious horror, in my judgment more pretended than real. But away with such hypocrisy! Let parents show their philoprogenitiveness by leading them into the way of eternal life; and not by rapid hackadassical exclamations about a matter, which after all effects them neither one way nor the other.

The reason why the Word became a natural infant was that it might become the Son of Man, having a nature in the likeness of the seed of Abraham, or of the Jews. Had he not passed through all the stages of life from embryo to manhood he could never have become the man Christ Jesus. As an infant he could have been no sin offering; for where would have been the fitness of the sacrifice of an unconscious infant for the sin of a conscious world. The infant was called Jesus, not because as an infant he saved his people from their sins; but because he should when the infant had been surrendered by the man. The infant Jesus and the man Christ Jesus, though the one necessarily preceded the other, were very different indeed. An infant man and an adult man, and an infant Christ and a man Christ are very different. Jesus was never an infant Christ, though he afterwards became the man Christ. Put the natural infancy of the Word was indispensible to Jesus the Anointed Man, for, Christ signifying Anointed, can be applied to Jesus only from the time the Father took up his abode in him by anointing him with his Holy Spirit on the banks of the Jordan. But all these things are self-evident; I should never have been led to make the remarks in this paragraph but for your singular, and I think, far-fetched idea—that infants must be included in the common salvation because, The Word to become the Man passed through the womb of the Virgin, and the stage of infancy. We might as well say, that infants must be heirs of the promise equally with the father of the faithful because Abraham was once an infant, and unchosen.

That little monosyllable *all* seems to be a great stumbling-

block to many. You make it include infants, and Universalists make it comprehend all the wicked and unconverted. I do not venture the observation, that the word *all* is never used absolutely but is always limited by the context to which the word in which it is found stands related. Now the context of the passage you refer to in the last paragraph of your letter is that the all there refers to Christ and not they that are Christians. Though it be true, that all mankind die by Adam, it is not true that all will be made alive by Christ to live eternally. Even the declaration that "all die by Adam" has its limit; for the Apostle says, "we shall not indeed all die;" and we know that Enoch and Elijah two descendants of Adam, did not die. The tenor of Cor. xv. shows that the Apostle, when he speaks of all dying and all being made alive, had reference more immediately to those with whom he was reasoning. He declared that Christ had risen from the dead, and had become the first fruit of those who had fallen asleep in the hope of the promise of life. He remarks, that as death came by one man it was necessary that life should come by another. Therefore it is necessary that "who have fallen asleep in Christ," have also by Christ shall they all be made alive. But every one of them in his own order: Christ the first-fruit; and they thereafter, Christ's, afterward, at his coming. You will perceive that the wicked and unconverted are not of the order of the resurrection. Paul was not speaking of them. He was speaking only to the resurrection, in which those to whom he was writing, were interested. That infants have nothing to do with the matter is obvious from the phrases "they who are Christians" and "they who are fallen asleep in Christ."—*Who are Christians?*—"As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ;" and if you be Christians, certainly you are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.—*Who are they who have fallen asleep in Christ?* Stephen is one of them. Having put on Christ, when asleep he fell asleep. As dead as it is in Jesus, it is testified that he fell asleep. And Paul was well pleased with his slaughter. They are all of this dispensation, who having in like manner put on Christ, have like him, persevered in well-doing until death, and have like him, laid him asleep. I conclude, then, that if infants have been put on Christ and walked in him; as these have done, they also have fallen asleep in Christ, and will be partakers of "the common salvation;" but if not, then they have nothing to do with the matter. These are my views, for which I am alone responsible to God and not to men. You can either receive them or reject them at your pleasure. They have been elicited by your epistle, and though ticklish subjects, I have upon, I have freely, though in a desultory manner, written myself, as in honor of the truth I am in, my own affectionate

EGYPT.

14. xii. 22.—*And Jehovah shall smite Egypt, smiting and healing her; and they shall turn unto Jehovah, and he will be intreated by them, and will heal them. In that day there shall be a highway from Egypt to Assyria, and the Assyrian shall come into Egypt, and the Egyptian into Assyria; and the Egyptian shall worship with the Assyrian. In that day, Israel shall be reckoned a third, together with Egypt and Assyria; a blessing in the midst of the earth: whom Jehovah God of Hosts hath blessed, saying, Blessed be my people Egypt; and Assyria, the work of my hands; and Israel mine inheritance.*—A prediction in progress of fulfilment.

The present sovereign of Egypt has ruled it ever since 1868, on European principles; and seems ready to introduce every thing European into his dominions. The existing state of the country is well set forth in the following extract of an address by Sir Alexander Johnston before the Asiatic Society.

"The Pacha of Egypt, one of our Honorary Members, a chief of a clear and vigorous mind, observing the advantage which European States have derived from a similar policy, has publicly encouraged the introduction into Egypt of all those arts and sciences which are calculated to improve the understanding of the people, to mitigate the effects of their religious feelings, and to secure the stability of the local government.

"He has assimilated his army and his navy to those of Europe, and subjected them to European discipline; he has formed corps of artillery and engineers on European principles; he has attached regular bands of military music to each of his regiments, with European instructors, who teach the Arab musicians, according to the European notes of music, to play on European instruments, the marches and airs of England, France, and Germany; a short distance from Cairo, he has established a permanent military hospital, and placed it under European surgeons, and the same rule as prevail in the best regulated hospital in Europe; and he has formed a school of medicine and anatomy, in which not only botany, mineralogy, and chemistry are taught, but human bodies are publicly dissected by students who profess the Mohammedan religion, and who are publicly rewarded in the heart of a great Mohammedan population, according to the skill and the knowledge which they display in their different dissections. At Alexandria he has established a naval school, in which the Mohammedan students are instructed in the several branches of geometry, trigonometry, mechanics, and astronomy, connected with naval architecture and the science of navigation; and a dockyard, under the control and superintendance of an European naval architect, distinguished for his talents and his skill, in which several frigates and other vessels of smaller dimensions, four

ships of the line, three carrying 110 guns upon two decks, and one of 130 guns, have been recently built: he has opened the Old Port, which was formerly shut against them, to all Christian vessels. He has encouraged the formation of regular Indian vessels. He has encouraged Christian merchants to acquire property in lands, houses, and gardens. He has employed an English civil engineer of great eminence on a very liberal salary, to improve all the canals in the country and the course of the Nile; he is about to construct carriage-roads from Alexandria to Cairo, and from Alexandria to Ro-etta and Damietta; and M. Abro, the cousin of his minister, is about to establish on them public stage coaches, built on a model of one sent to him by a coach-maker from this country (England); he has introduced steam-boats, which navigate the Nile, and steam-engines, which are used for cleansing and deepening the bed of that river, and for various other public works. He has patronized the employment, by Mr. Briggs, of two Englishmen, to bring water to the purpose from this country, in boring for water in different parts of the Desert; and he has discovered, through their operations, some very fine water in the Desert between Cairo and Suze. He has encouraged the growth of cotton, indigo, and opium; and the former of these productions is now a great article of trade between Egypt and England, France, and Germany. He has established schools in the country for the instruction of all orders of his people in reading, writing, and arithmetic; he has sent, at great expense to himself, young men, both of the higher and lower ranks of society, to England and France, for the purpose of acquiring useful knowledge; those of the higher rank, in those branches of science and literature which are connected with their service in the army, the navy, and the higher departments of government; those of the lower, in those mechanical arts which are more immediately connected with their employment as artisans and manufacturers. He has constituted a public assembly at Cairo, consisting of a considerable number of well-informed persons, who hold regular sittings for forty days in each year, and publicly discuss, for his information, the interests and wants of his different provinces. He patronizes the publication of a weekly newspaper in Arabic and Turkish, for the instruction of his people; and, finally, he protects all Christian merchants, who are settled in his country; not only in time of peace, but also in time of war; and afforded the European merchants, who were settled at Alexandria, and at Cairo, a memorable instance of his determination to adhere under all circumstances to this policy, by forming them, as soon as he had received intelligence of the battle of Navarino, that their persons and their property should continue as secure as if no such event had occurred.

The above representations are peculiarly cheering, and seem to us like the first rays of morning, after a

dious night. They promise the return of learning and knowledge to their mother country, after having kindled their radiance in all the west.

POPERY IN ENGLAND.

Popery—the *ne plus ultra* of human weakness, wickedness, and folly—in alliance with its legitimate offspring, infidelity of all revealed truth, is looking up in England, very much to the dismay of its daughter, the Religious Establishment of that country. Its priests are very active, and persevering as ever; in preaching controversial sermons, interrupting public meetings, visiting the humble and poorer classes, conversing with and impressing their superstition upon them; preaching in the open air and public streets, and withdrawing the children of protestants from their schools to those founded on the principles of Catholicism. They have put into extensive circulation among the protestants a number of tracts pregnant with the grossest absurdities of the dark ages; replete with the grossest idolatry, and the strongest hatred against their opponents. During the past year the foundations of ten Romanist Chapels have been laid. They have now in England 569 temples open for service, and 43 in progress of erection.

"I wish," said a Churchman to his audience on a recent occasion, "to point your attention to the great fact, that the Roman Catholics are gaining an extraordinary influence in this country. Though we have heard, that popery is failing in its power, yet the history of France is a strong proof to the contrary. After two revolutions there it was thought that popery had received a death blow, yet we now see on the marriage of the Duke of Orleans, that the Pope has granted a dispensation to him to marry a protestant, but on condition that the princess every day to pray and entreat her to join the 'pure faith,' and that their children should be brought up in the doctrines of the 'true church.'" This proves, in my opinion, that popery is still exerting itself strongly.—The climax of this piece of folly consists in this, that the parsimonious Louis Philippe has paid 300,000 francs for this papal document.

For ourselves, we do not sympathize with the fears of Protestants on either side of the Atlantic on account of the extraordinary and renewed activity of Romanism. We doubt not that it will, in alliance with the infidelity it has begotten, dissolve the constitution of things as they exist in Britain. This is a consummation devoutly to be wished; for that kingdom can never "become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ," until the harlotry of its ensanguined superstitions cease by an unequalled separation from the State. This would shake the empire to its foundation as with the shock of an earthquake; for the National Religions are so wrought up with the institutions of the country, that to uncharter them would be to over-

throw the constitution of King, Lords, and Commons; a crisis however, that must come, and at no remote period either.

What we have expressed in literal, the Holy Spirit has announced in the figurative language of the Apocalypse:—"And the seventh angel poured forth his vial into the air; and there came forth a great voice from the temple of heaven, from the throne, saying, IT IS DONE. And there were voices, and thunders, and lightnings; &c. AND EVERY ISLAND FLED AWAY, AND THE MOUNTAINS WERE NO MORE." Such is to be the effect of the convulsion of the political atmosphere of the world, by which the Small States and powerful Governments of which it is constituted, will be utterly overthrown.

We say, we have no sympathy with the fears of Protestants for the scripture clearly shows, that however Romanism may gain an ascendancy over their faiths, it never will again be let loose upon the world. Its influence is exerting itself to pull down protestant act-of-parliament-religions; but the very effort it is making to do that, will effectually exclude itself from again becoming supreme.

But the true disciples of Jesus have nothing to fear, though the political heavens pass away with great noise, and its elements burning be dissolved. Their protector is the Avenger, who coming with power and a blaze of glory, will utterly dissolve the Constitution of "Christendom," and dethrone its sovereign—ANTICHRIST, with a signal discomfiture.

EDITOR.

From the *Charleston Courier*.

EARTHQUAKE IN SYRIA.

Mr. J. F. Lanneau, a clergyman, in a letter from Jerusalem, to his friends in this city, proceeds on the 13th of January to say,

"The first day of January, 1837, will ever be a memorable one to the people of this land. About sunset on that day (the Sabbath), a severe shock of an earthquake was felt in this city and throughout the whole length and breadth of the Holy Land, which has laid several towns in ruins, and destroyed many of their inhabitants. Our little Missionary family were preparing to sit around the tea table, when suddenly the massive walls of our dwelling were shaken to their foundations, and threatened us with immediate destruction, but blessed be God, the shock, though severe enough to throw down the tops of the Turkish Minarets on Olivet and Mount Zion, and a part of the city walls, was but momentary, and so far as Jerusalem and the immediate neighborhood are concerned, very little injury was sustained. But the tidings which continue to come in to us from the country north, is awful and distressing. A nobleman near the site of the ancient capital of Samaria

Lyeth, Tiberias, and Safet, have each suffered severely. Reports have of course been exaggerated, and as yet authentic information has not been received. We have reason however to believe that 40 or 50 persons have perished amid the ruin of fallen houses in Nablous. A few days since a letter from Nazareth stated that of the Roman Catholic Convent there and a part of its splendid chapel had been thrown down, several other houses destroyed, and some lives lost. Tiberias and Safet, both holy cities of the Jews, are said to be almost entirely ruined and great numbers killed. This intelligence has been peculiarly afflictive to the descendants of Abraham here. When the information arrived they all repaired to their synagogue and sat all day on the floor, mourning and weeping, and bitterly lamenting this judgment of heaven, which they consider as sent upon them for their sins.

The Jews have despatched messengers with clothing and money to assist in burying their dead at Tiberias, and wish soon to have a definite and particular account of this heart-rending catastrophe. Since the heavy shock on the first, we have had four or five other slight ones, and the people are alarmed and fearful of a repetition of them. There are now wanting Prophets, confined principally to the Jews, who predict another and more severe one, but they are not agreed as to the time when it will occur. The predictions vary from 17 to 24 days. After the last earthquake here, in 1831, it was predicted by one of these Seers, that on a certain day, the whole city would be destroyed. The day arrived, and multitudes of Moslems, Jews, and Christians who were apprehensive that the prophecy might prove true left the city, and remained in the fields until night came on, when there being no signs of the predicted destruction, their confidence was restored sufficiently so as to allow them to return to their homes. Whether the fallacy of the prophecy then, will allay the fears of the people now, under similar circumstances remain to be tested. So far as I have been able to learn, I think that few will be found credulous enough to place any dependence upon their present predictions."

Declaration of a Jew.

With respect to the Jews, they constitute a large portion in some of the cities, as Jerusalem, Hebron, and Safet, and it is sufficient to say that the veil still remains on their hearts—the blindness that happened unto Israel long since, has descended in all its darkness to the present generation. It is an interesting fact that great numbers of them are now flocking to Palestine, anxiously expecting their Messiah to appear very soon—some say, in seven years. A rich Jew, in Jerusalem declared to the writer, that if the Messiah did not make his appearance in eight years, he would become christian.

THE ADVOCATE

Vol. 4. Amelia County, Va.; August, 1837. No. 4

HISTORY OF PRIESTCRAFT.

BY WILLIAM HOWITT.

NO. 3.

POPERY.

Establishment of Monks—Numbers and Enormities of the Monks—Space and Champions of Popery—Their Quarrels—Strange History of Jews—Frauds practised in England—Maid of Kent—Pilgrimage of Grace—Forgery of the Decretals—Modes of enslaving the Populace—Maid—Rites, Pilgrimages, Crusades, Festivals, Confessions, Purgatory, Pardons, Mass, Excommunications, Impostion—Treatment of learned Men.

CHARITY SPEAKS.

I blame the Emperor Constantine,
That I am put to sicurine,
And banest from the kirk;
For since he maid the Pap a king,
In Rome, I could get no lodging;
But he seldom in the dark,
But he'll be scoldish;
Save thou, has quit this church,
And none of the rest;
And now schol' reals all this land
And has decreed, at her command,
That I should be support.

SIR DAVID LINDSAY'S SATIRE OF THE THREE ESTATES.

The establishment of monkery was another means of building up a perfect despotism by the papists. These orders originated in the third century, and, multiplying through successive ages, became not only various in name, but countless in number; spreading in swarms throughout every part of Christendom; propagating superstition, lewdness, and ignorance; acting as spies and supporters of the papal dominion; fixing themselves in every fertile and pleasant spot; awing, or wheedling the rich and foolish out of their lands and possessions; and at length bursting out into the most bitter quarrels among themselves, became like so many rabid dogs before the public eye; and hastened in no small degree the downfall of the church which had set them up for its own support. They, as well as the secular clergy, were forbidden to marry; and hence flowed a torrent of corruption throughout the world. In the third century they formed, says Mosheim, communities of those women who had made vows of chastity; and it was an ordinary thing for an ecclesiastic to admit into his

ains to his bed, but still under the most solemn declarations that nothing passed contrary to the rules of chastity and virtue: These holy concubines were called *Mulieres Subintroductæ*.

Yet more,—round many a convent's blazing fire
Unhallowed threads of revelry are spun;
There Venus sits disguised like a Nun,—
While Bacchus clothed in semblance of a Friar,
Pours out his choicest beverage, high and higher
Sparkling, until it cannot choose but run
Over the bowl, whose silver lip hath won
An instant kiss of masterful desire—
To stay the precious waste; through every brain
The domination of the sprightly juice
Spreads high conceits, to maddening Fancy dear,
Till the arched roof with resolute abuse
Of its grave echoes, swells a choral strain.
Whose vague burden is—"OUR KINGDOM'S HERE!"

WORDSWORTH.

These fellows too, especially the mendicants, wandering over Europe, were the most active venders of relics, and propagators of every superstitious notion and rite. Their licentiousness, so early as the fifth century, was become proverbial; and they are said to have excited thus early, in various places the most dreadful tumults and seditions. In the next century they multiplied so prodigiously in the East, that whole armies might have been raised of them without any sensible diminution of their numbers. In the western provinces also they were held in the highest veneration, and both monks and nuns swarmed. In Great Britain, an abbot, Cougal, persuaded an innumerable number of persons to abandon the affairs, duties, and obligations of life, and to shut themselves up in idleness; or to wander about in holy mischief. In the seventh century the contagion spread still more enormously. Heads of families striving to surpass each other's zeal for the advancement of monkery, shut up their children in convents, and devoted them to a solitary life as the highest felicity. Abandoned profligates, terrified by their guilty consciences, were comforted with the deceptive hopes of pardon, by leaving their fortune to monastic societies. Multitudes deprived their children of their rich lands and patrimonies, to confer them on the monks, whose prayers were to render the Deity propitious. In the following century the mania had reached such a height, that emperors and kings conferred whole provinces, cities, and titles of honor on these creatures. In the succeeding ages, so much did their licentiousness and ignorance increase, that in the tenth century few of the monks knew the rules of their own orders which they had sworn to obey, but lived in the most luxurious and prodigal magnificence with their concubines. The fourteenth century was distracted with the contentions of the various or-

ders of the monks, who had grown so full of wealth, luxury, pride, and all evil passions, that they not only turned their wrath against each other, but against the popes themselves.—Their bitter and presumptuous bickerings filled this century with the most strange and hateful scenes.

We must pass over the monkish history, and content ourselves with a few remarks of Mosheim, on their state in the sixteenth century, at the time when their crimes and excesses were bringing on them the Reformation. The prodigious swarms of monks, says this historian, that overran Europe were justly considered as burdens to society; and, nevertheless, such was the genius of the age, an age that was just emerging from the thickest gloom of ignorance, and was suspended, as it were, in a dubious situation between darkness and light, that these monastic drones would have remained undisturbed, had they taken the least pains to preserve any remains even of the extraneous air of decency and religion, which distinguished them in former times. But the Benedictines, and other monkish fraternities, who were invested with the privilege of possessing certain lands and revenues, broke through all restraint, and made the worst possible use of their opulence; and forgetful of the gravity of their character, and of the laws of their order, rushed headlong into the shameless practices, and vice, in all its various kinds and degrees. On the other hand, the mendicant orders, and especially the Dominicans and Franciscans lost their credit in a different way; for their rustic impudence, their ridiculous superstitions, their ignorance, cruelty, and brutish manners tended to alienate from them the minds of the people. They had the most barbarous aversion to the arts and sciences, and expressed a like abhorrence of certain learned men, who, being eagerly desirous of enlightening the age, attacked their barbarism in both their discourse and their writings; this was the case with Reuchlerius, Erasmus, and others.

The Dominicans possessed the greatest power and credit of all monks; they presided in church and state; were confessor to the great and judges of the horrible Inquisition—circumstances which put most of the European princes under their control; but, not content with these means of influence, they resorted to the most infamous frauds, to enslave the ignorant of the age. One of the most singular instances of this is that recorded by Reuchat, in his *Histoire de la Reformation en Suisse*; by Hottinger, and by Bishop Burnet, in his *History of the Continent*. So remarkable is it, that I must state it compendiously as I can.

"The stratagem was in consequence of a private controversy between the Dominicans and Franciscans, and more especially a controversy concerning the immaculate conception of the virgin Mary. The latter maintained that she was

the blemish of original sin; the former asserted the contrary. The doctrine of the Franciscans, in an age of superstitious ground daily. To obviate this they resolved, at a chapter held at Vimpsen in 1504, to have recourse to fictitious visions, determined to make Bern the scene of their operations: and they de- brother of the name of Jetzer, an extremely simple fellow, was fixed on as the instrument of these delusions. One of the Dominicans who had undertaken the management of this plot conveyed himself secretly into Jetzer's cell, and about midnight appeared to him in a horrid figure, surrounded with howling dogs, and seeming to blow fire from his nostrils. He approached Jetzer's bed, and told him he was his mouth; a Dominican who had been killed at Paris as a gladiator of Heaven for laying aside his monastic habit; that he was demanded to purgatory for this crime, and could only be rescued from his horrible torments by his means. The story accompanied with horrid cries and howlings, frightened poor Jetzer out of what little wits he had, and engaged him to do all in his power to rescue the Dominican from his torment. The impostor then told him that nothing but the discipline of the whip applied for eight days by the whole monastery, and Jetzer's lying prostrate on the chapel floor in the form of a cross during mass could effect this. He added these mortifications would secure Jetzer the peculiar favor of the Blessed Virgin; and told him they would appear to him again with two others.

"Morning was no sooner come than Jetzer related these particulars to the whole convent: who enjoined him to undergo all that he was commanded, and promised to bear their part. The deluded simpleton obeyed, and was admired as a saint by the multitude who crowded about the convent; while the four friars who managed the imposture, magnified in the most pompous manner, the miracle of this apparition in their sermons and conversations. Night after night the apparition was renewed, with the addition of two other impostors, dressed like devils; and Jetzer's faith was augmented, by hearing from the spectre all the secret of his own life and thoughts, which the impostors had got from his confessor. In this and subsequent scenes, whose enormities we must pass over, the impostor talked much to Jetzer of the Dominican order; which, he said was peculiarly dear to the Blessed Virgin; that the Blessed Virgin knew herself to be born in original sin; that the doctors who taught the contrary were in purgatory; that she abhorred the Franciscans for making her equal to her son; and that the town of Bern would be destroyed for harboring such plague within it.

"In one of these apparitions, Jetzer, silly as he was, discovered the similarity of the spectre's voice to the prior—who is actually was—yet he did not suspect the fraud. The prior appeared in various disguises: sometimes as St. Barbaro, sometimes as St. Bernard, and at length as the Virgin herself, clothed in the habit which adorned her statue at festivals. The little images that on these days are set on the altar were used for angels, which being tied to a cord which passed through a pulley over Jetzer's head rose up and down, and danced about the pretended virgin to increase the delusion. The virgin-addressed a long discourse to Jetzer; gave him a marvellous wafer,—a host, which turned, in a moment, from white to red; and after various visits, in which the greatest enormities were acted, the virgin prior told Jetzer she would give him the most undoubted proof of her son's love, by imprinting on him the five wounds that pierced Jesus on the cross as she had done before to St. Lucia and St. Catherine. Accordingly she took his hand, and thrust a large pail through it, which threw the poor dupe into the greatest torment. The next night, this masculine virgin brought, as she pretended, some of the linen in which Christ had been buried, to soften the wound; and gave Jetzer a soporific draught, composed of the blood of an unbaptized child, some incense, consecrated salt, quicksilver, the hairs of a child's eyebrows, with some poisonous and stupefying ingredients, mingled by the prior with some magic ceremonies, and a solemn dedication of himself to the devil, in hope of his aid. This draught threw the poor wretch into a lethargy, during which the other four wounds were imprinted on his body. When he awoke and discovered them, he fell into unspeakable joy, and believed himself a representation of Christ in the various parts of his passion. He was, in this state, exposed to the admiring multitude on the principal altar of the convent, to the great mortification of the Franciscans. The Dominicans gave him some other draughts and threw him into convulsions, which were followed by a voice conveyed through a pipe into the mouths of two images, one of Mary, the other of the child Jesus; the former of which had tears painted upon its cheeks in a lively manner. The little Jesus asked his mother why she wept; she answered, for the impious manner in which the Franciscans attributed to her the honor that was due to him.

"The apparitions, false prodigies, and abominable stratagems were repeated every night; and were, at length, so grossly overacted, that even the simple Jetzer saw through them, and almost killed the priest. Lest this discovery should be hid, they thought it best to own the whole to Jetzer, and to entreat him to join in the imposture; engaging him with the same promises of opulence and glory, to cause the town of Bern to be destroyed for harboring such plague within it. Jetzer appeared to be persuaded, but lost his mind.

ful and secret, they attempted to poison him: and it was alone owing to the vigor of his constitution that they did not succeed. Once they gave him a rich spiced loaf, which growing green in a day or two, he threw a piece to a wolf's whelps, kept in the monastery, and it killed them immediately. Again they poisoned the host, or consecrated wafer; but he vomited it up. In short, the most detestable means to destroy him and his evidence were employed; but he succeeded in getting out of the convent, and throwing himself into the hands of the magistrates. The whole thus came to be sifted out; commissioners were sent from Rome to examine the affair; and the four friars were solemnly degraded, and burnt alive on the last day of May, 1560. Jeter died soon after. Had he been destroyed before this exposure, this execrable plot would have been handed down to posterity as a stupendous miracle."

Rome could hasten to punish such vile frauds when they were made public, but she was not the less ready to practise them herself in the most daring manner, as I shall proceed to show; but before leaving this strange case of Jeter, it may be remarked, that audacious and even incredible as it may appear to many, it rests upon too good authority to be doubted. Hundreds, indeed of similar instances might be brought, for the whole history of the Romish church is that of fraud and delusion: but we need not go out of our own country for similar transactions. Who does not call to mind the affair of the Maid of Kent, enacted in the reign of Henry the Eighth, at the very moment he was aiming a death-blow at popery, and in the face of a people whose eyes were opening to the acts and impostures of the papal sorceress? The case may be seen at large in Hume. The substance of it is this: some monks, and one Masters, the vicar of Aldington, in Kent, got hold of a girl of the name of Elizabeth Barton, one who was subject to convulsive fits, and induced her to enter into a system of deception on the public mind. They gave out that she was inspired, and in these fits delivered the words of the Virgin Mary. Having once imposed, not merely on the common people, but engaged the Archbishop of Canterbury and other dignitaries of the church in the affair, they proceeded to promulgate heavenly messages against the reforming principles, and even threatened destruction to the king if he proceeded in them. The friars throughout the country, countenanced the delusion, and propagated it with all their zeal and might. But they had a man to deal with very inauspicious for their purpose. He arrested the holy maid and her accomplices, brought them before the Star Chamber, and soon terrified them into a full confession of their imposture. A most scandalous scene was laid open. Her principal accomplices, Masters the vicar, and Dr. Rocking, a canon of Canterbury, were found to have a private entrance to her chamber, and to have led a most licentious life with her. The

girl and six of her coadjutors were executed; and the Bishop of Rochester and others were condemned for misprision of treason, because they had not revealed her criminal speeches, and were thrown into prison. This was in England in the sixteenth century, and is a good specimen of the spirit of monkery: but another of a more menacing kind was soon given. Their "Diana of the Ephesians" was in danger: the king threatened not only to destroy popery, but to root out the monasteries; and it was not in the nature of priests and monks to resign their ill-gotten booty without a struggle. They set up the standard of rebellion. A monk, the Prior of Barlings in Lincolnshire, was at the head of it. He marched with 20,000 men at his heels, till he fell into the king's hands. But another army from the north was not so easily scattered. This, which consisted of 40,000 men, called its enterprize the *Pilgrimage of Grace*.—Some priests marched before in the habits of their order, carrying crosses in their hands; in their banners was wove a crucifix, with the representation of a chalice, and the five wounds of Christ. They wore on their sleeve an emblem of the five wounds, with the name of Jesus wrought in the middle; and all took an oath that they had no motive but *love to God, care of the king's person and issue; and a desire to purify the nobility*, drive base-born persons from about the king, and restore the church, and suppress heresy. With those pretensions they marched from place to place; took Hull, York, and other towns; excited great disturbance and clamor, and were not dispersed but with great difficulty. This was a trial of force where fraud could not succeed of itself, according to the established papal policy; but FRAUD was alone one of its most successful means of acquiring power,—and in order to contemplate this instrument more clearly we must go back again to an earlier age.

To advance their power the popes did not shrink from the most audacious FORGERY. Such was that of the notorious PREGRETS of ISIDORE; documents purporting to be written by the early pontiffs, and containing grants of the Holy See from Constantine; of the supremacy of the pope, and other privileges; all proved by the clearest evidence to be most barefaced inventions.

FRAUDS were multiplied abundantly to besot and blind the popular spirit. Monks, bishops, warriors, and men of the worst characters, nay, of neither character nor real existence, as St. George and his dragon, were canonized, made into Saints, and their lives written in a manner most calculated to beguile the ignorance of the times. Shrines were set up, and churches dedicated to them, where people might pray for their aid. Dreams and miracles were pretended to throw light on the places of their burial; solemn processions were set on foot to discover and take them up; and the most marvellous stories attributed to them. Bones were buried, and distributed to the

ed to be found, and declared by heaven to belong to saints and martyrs; and bits of bone, hairs, fragments of filthy rags, and other vile things, chips of the true cross, &c., were sold at enormous prices, as capable of working cures and effecting blessings of all kinds. The milk of the Virgin, and the blood of St. Januarius, which liquefied on the day of his festival, were particularly famous in Italy. In England, at the dissolution of the monasteries, many very curious ones were found. The parings of St. Edmund's toes; some of the coals that roasted St. Lawrence; the girdle of the Virgin shown in eleven several places; the belt of St. Thomas of Lancaster, an infallible cure for the headache; part of St. Thomas of Canterbury's shirt: but chief of all the blood of Christ brought from Jerusalem, and shown for many ages at Hales in Gloucestershire.—this sacred blood was not visible to any one in mortal sin; but in doing sufficient good work, *i. e.* paying money enough, it revealed itself. It was preserved in a vial, one side of which was transparent, the other opaque. Into this the monks every week put a fresh supply of the blood of a duck; and, on any pilgrim arriving, the dark side was shown him, which threw him into such consternation for his sinful state, that he generally purchased masses and made offerings, till his money or fortune began to fail; when the charitable monks turned the clear side toward him—he beheld the blood, and went away happy in his regenerate condition.

Rumours were spread of prodigies to be seen in certain places: robbers were converted into martyrs; tombs falsely given out to be those of saints; and many monks travelled from place to place, not only selling, with matchless impudence, their fictitious relics, but deluding the eyes of the people with ludicrous combats with spirits and genii. Ambrose, in his disputes with the Arians, produced men possessed with devils, who upon the approach of the relics of Gervasius and Protatius, were obliged to cry out that the doctrine of the Council of Nice on the Trinity was true, and that of the Arians false. One of the precious maxims of the fourteenth century was, "that it was an act of virtue to deceive and lie when it could promote the interest of the church,"—a maxim never afterward forgotten. PILGRIMAGES to distant holy places were hit upon as a strong means to employ the minds and enslave the affections of numbers: houses, as that of the Virgin at Loretto, were even said to descend from heaven to receive the sacred enthusiasm of men; and Crusades, those preposterous and tremendous wars, whose details are filled with the most exquisite miseries, and most abhorrent crimes and licentiousness, were promoted as potent means of employing the power and exhausting the treasures of kings. In those crusades, millions of miserable wretches, men, women, and children,—the low, the ignorant, the idle, the dissolute,—after wandering from kingdom to kingdom, the wou-

des and horror of the inhabitants, were consumed; and from those crusades, in return, loads of relics were pouled out of Syria over all Europe.

All kinds of *superstitions* and *festivals* were imported from paganism for the same end. ATTRIBUTION CONFESSION was invented by which the clergy became the keepers of the consciences of the whole world; and the spiritual tyrants, not merely of the weak and the wicked, but of every one capable of a sense of shame or of fear. INDULGENCES were granted for the commission of crimes, and past sins pardoned for money and gifts of lands;—and PENOBYRY! that most subtle and profitable invention of priestcraft, was contrived to give the church power over both living and dead. Thus was the religion of Christ completely disfigured by pagan ceremonies, and made to sanction all wickedness for the sake of gain. The very CELEBRATION of worship was ordered to be in LATIN; an unknown tongue; to the great mass of those who heard it, so that they were reduced, not only to feed on the chaff and garbage of priestly fables, but in the very temple of God himself to fill themselves with mere wind and empty sounds. The bread was taken from the children, and given to the clergy. MASS was invented—that splendid piece of mummery, which, filling the eyes while it enlightened not the mind, was at once an instrument of keeping the people in ignorance, of fixing them fast by the imagination to the hollow trunk of formality; and of filling the pockets of the priests, by whom it was never performed without a fee; for the souls of the dead paid more or less according to the imagined need. For nearly a great number of masses were established for ever; and whole lordships were given to the church, to support chapel and chantries for the peace of souls that were already beyond rescue, or need of redemption.—Every prayer and put the temple had its price. Thus was heaven, earth, and all therein turned into a school of lewdly gain. The rage of dominion in the popes, says Mosheim, was accompanied by a most insatiable avarice. All the provinces of Europe were drained to enrich these spiritual tyrants, who were perpetually gazing after new acquisitions of wealth.

Another mode of influence was, constituting churches *ASYLUMS* for robbers and murderers; another, that dark one of EXCOMMUNICATIONS; another the borrowing of *ORDBALS* from the pagans; another, the right of *PATRONAGE*; and lastly, the terrors of the *INQUISITION*.

Such were the multiplied means employed for the monopoly of all the wealth, power, and honor of the universe by this infamous race of vampires; and we have but too many instances of their determination to quench and keep down knowledge; their treatment of Bacon, Petre d'Abano, Arnold of Villa Nova, and Galileo; to say nothing of the Reformers whom they regarded as their natural enemies, and destroyed without mercy.

Mankind owes to the Roman church an everlasting reward of indignation for its attempts to crush into imbecility the human mind, and to insult it in its weakness with the most pitiful lies and puerilities.

And for what end were all these outrages on humanity,—these mockeries of every thing great—these blasphemies of every thing holy, perpetrated? That they might wallow undisturbed, in the deepest mire of vice and sensuality, and heap upon those they had deluded and stripped of property, of liberty, and of mind, insult and derision. Let every man who hesitates to set his hand to the destruction of state religions look on this picture of all enormities that can disgrace our nature, and reflect that such is the inevitable tendency of all priestcraft. Is it said we see nothing so bad now? And why? Because man has got the upper hand of his tyrant, and keeps him in awe,—not because the nature of priestcraft is altered; and yet let us turn but our eyes to Catholic countries, Spain, Portugal, Italy, and the scene is lamentable; and even in our own country, where free institutions check presumption, and impress terrors many monsters from the light of day,—we behold things which make our hearts throb with indignation.

STRICTURES ON

CAMPBELLISM;

Reprinted from the Appendix to W. Jones's Sermons.

Continued from page 90.

If the reader will take the trouble to look into my "Millennial Harbinger," vol. i. page 136, he will find a letter from Mr. Campbell, which has a particular bearing on this subject. I there mention having read a series of essays, nine in number, which appeared in the "Christian Baptist," on "the office and work of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of man," which papers I had perused with considerable satisfaction, but which, nevertheless, I thought left the main point untouched, as in none of them did the writer insist upon the absolute necessity of the Holy Spirit's agency to give the Gospel its saving effect. The letter also mentioned two other essays on the same subject, signed PAULINUS, who, as Mr. Campbell subsequently informed me, was a Mr. Andrew Broadus, a very respectable Baptist Minister in his neighborhood, who had read Mr. Campbell's nine essays with similar impressions as myself, that is, with equal disappointment, and which two essays were intended to supply Mr. Campbell's deficiencies. These two valuable essays will be found in my "Millennial Harbinger," vol. i. p. 130, and 169. Now, I beseech the reader to remark the recorded judgment of Mr. Campbell on these two essays. I quote his own words:—

"The readers of the Christian Baptist, are, and no doubt will feel themselves, indebted to Paulinus for the very forcible and elegant Essays he has furnished on this subject. He has, unquestionably, thought very closely, examined the Scriptures very fully, and has arranged and exhibited the testimonies in so methodical and forcible a manner, as to give the greatest and best possible effect to his sentiments on this theme. Few of the intelligent readers of this work will dissent from his conclusion of the whole matter, viz. 'The substance of the leading sentiment contained in these two Essays, is that we are dependent on the influence of the Holy Spirit to render the word effectual to our conversion and final salvation.'" "Let no man say that in explicitly opposing [the common notion of physical operations,] we argue that men are converted without the Holy Spirit. By no means. The Spirit of God works upon the human mind, as well as dwells in it. It dwells in the record which God has given of his Son, as the Spirit dwells in the body of a man; clothed with this record, it enlightens, convinces, and converts men. They are enabled to believe by the Holy Spirit, and without his aid, no man ever could have believed in Jesus, as God's own Son."

Now, I beseech the reader once more to ponder well the amount of concession comprised in this extract, and I ask him, is it less or more than this? "My nine Essays were defective—Paulinus has done well in supplying that deficiency in his two very forcible and elegant Essays. We are dependent on the influence of the Holy Spirit to render the word effectual to our conversion and final salvation—the Spirit of God works upon the human mind, as well as dwells in it—men are enabled to believe by the Holy Spirit, and without his aid no man ever could have believed in Jesus, as God's own Son."

Such was Mr. Campbell's decided judgment, when he published the fifth volume of the Christian Baptist, A. D. 1827.—We shall now enquire—what are his present opinions on the same subject. In the year 1835, he gave to the world a volume of 400 pages, entitled "Christianity Restored," professedly comprising the marrow of all his writings on Theological subjects; it is his *chef d'œuvre*, according to his own account of the matter; its object being, as he tells us in the title-page, "to restore the Original Gospel and Order of things." Well, on p. 280, we have a pretty long note, in which he favors us with an extract from a contemporary Journal, and it is thus introduced to our notice:—

"August 1st.—I have just now opened the Cincinnati Baptist Journal of 26th July, from which I read an approved definition of regeneration. It is orthodox, spiritual, physical, practical, and metaphysical Regeneration. It is quoted from the 'STANDARD.' Regeneration, in the Evangelical sense, is thus defined:—

"Is the sinner active in regeneration? Certainly he is. His mind is a thinking, rational principle, which never ceases to act; and, therefore, when the word *passive* is applied to it, by Old Divines, or by Calvinists, they do not mean that it is literally dead, like inert matter, which requires a physicial impulse to put it in motion. They only mean to convey the scriptural idea, that the Holy Spirit is the *sole* agent in regeneration, and that the sinner has no more *efficient* agency in accomplishing it, than Lazarus had in becoming alive from the dead. Still they grant that his mind is most active, but unhappily its activity is all *against* the Divine influence: as the Scriptures assure us, unregenerated persons 'do always resist' the stirrings of the Spirit. 'Every imagination of the thoughts of man's heart, is only evil continually.' 'There is none that doeth good, no, not one.' The sinner, therefore, instead of voluntarily co-operating with the Holy Spirit, does all he can to *resist* his divine influence, and *prevent* his own regeneration, until he is *made* willing by almighty power."

Such is the text:—now for Mr. Campbell's comment.

"What a comfortable thing is this theory of regeneration! The sinner is to be regenerated when actively striving against the Divine influence. At the moment of regeneration, 'he has, in one sense, no more efficient agency in accomplishing it, than Lazarus had in becoming alive from the dead;' and in another sense, he is *not* passive, but, 'does all he can to *resist* the divine influence, and *prevent* his own regeneration, until he is *made* willing by almighty power.'" This is *standard* divinity; and he that preaches this divinity, is a pious, regenerated, Regular Orthodox Baptist Christian Minister! Of how much value, on this theory, is all the preaching in Christendom? The Holy Spirit may be busily at work upon some drunken sot, or some vile debauchee, who is as dead as Lazarus on one side, and on the other, resisting the Spirit, with all his moral and physical energy, up to the moment that the almighty arm pierces him to the heart with a sword, and makes him alive by killing him!!!

"The absurdity and licentiousness of such a view of the great work of renovation, we had thought so glaring, that no editor in the West would have had boldness to have published it. This is a proof of the necessity of our present essay, and will explain to the intelligent reader, why we have given to the whole process of renovation, the name of regeneration, which properly belongs to the last act," p. 260.

Who, now, that reads this, can help being shocked at the *insouciance* which it evinces? But such is the manner in which the operations of the Holy Spirit are caricatured, in a book which is "to restore the Original Gospel and order of

things?" Let us only expunge the terms, "drunken sot," and "vile debauchee," and substitute in their stead—"the Phillippian jailor," ready to commit suicide,—or the name of Saul of Tarsus, breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the saints, when on his way to Damascus,—or the murderers of the Lord of life and glory, on the day of Pentecost,—and I would beg leave to ask Mr. Campbell, where is "the absurdity;" or the "licentiousness," of such a view of the great work of renovation to be found, as then took place in all the instances referred to? The cases to which I have adverted, are *real* ones, not fictitious, like those supposed by Mr. Campbell; they actually took place, and they remain upon record, to illustrate that very doctrine, which Mr. Campbell deprecates and abhors—namely, the sovereignty of divine grace, preceding the will of man.

The difference between the actual state of the persons supposed by Mr. C. and those which I have proposed to substitute is one of quality or complexion only, and not of moral turpitude. The atrocity, for aught I know, may be greater in the case of the persons to whom I have referred, than in the other; yet we see that they were "pierced to the heart by the sword of the Holy Spirit, and were made alive by killing them!!!" We cannot reasonably doubt that multitudes of unconverted Jews, who were spectators of what took place at Jerusalem, on the day of Pentecost, when three thousand of their countrymen were pricked to the heart, and cried out, in the anguish of their souls,— "Men and brethren, what shall we do?"—regarded the whole as a religious juggle—a trick—a piece of fanaticism—and laughed at the "absurdity," and "licentiousness" of the thing;—pray, is Mr. Campbell prepared to concur with them? *Or are those in this country, who have recently adopted his creed?* For myself, when I seriously review these things, I cannot help asking the question—"WHAT NEXT?"

The reader has now a sample of Mr. Campbell's consistency; but to do anything like common justice to the subject, would require a pamphlet of no ordinary size. Any one who thirsts for more," has only to look into Mr. C's writings and compare the "Christian Baptist" with the "Millennial Harbinger" and his "Christianity Restored," and he may get full draughts." I have already produced, in the pages of the "Millennial Harbinger," letters from various correspondents addressed to him in his editorial capacity, charging him with denying the operation or agency of the Holy Spirit in the process of regeneration, all which he flatly and peremptorily denies. See, *London* Millennial Harbinger, vol. II. p. 100. "Did you ever read anything I have written?" says Mr. Campbell, denying the operation of the Holy Spirit in the regeneration of sinners? No; you did not. Neither have I written anything to that effect." In this way, he would, all

his readers to think, that he is a sound believer in the doctrine of divine influence. But what does it all amount to? According to his theory, the written word is *the sower*, and "besides what is written in the book, (or Bible) there can be no new light communicated to the mind; for all the converting power of the Holy Spirit is exhibited in the divine word." See his *Millennial Harbinger*, vol. ii. p. 396. And so delighted is he with this same Aphorism, that we have it repeated in his latest production, viz. his "Christianity Restored," p. 361. His meaning in all this was well enough understood by some of his readers; and accordingly, a correspondent from England, writes to him, under date of the 25th of March, 1836, in the following terms:—

"Greatly esteemed Sir!

I addressed a letter to you about four months ago, to express the gladness with which I, and the friends connected with me, learned that you and a large company in America, were of the same mind and judgment with us, in following the faith and obedience of the first churches of Christ, without regard to more recent inventions. As I mean what is termed "the work of the Holy Spirit in Regeneration," or, more fully, "the necessity of Divine influence to give the word of God its proper effect in the conversion of a sinner," every sect here, however differing in other respects, holds this to be a "fundamental doctrine." For ourselves, I beg to say we are content to regard the apostles' words, as speaking of the Holy Spirit through their true sinners." And then the writer proceeds, throughout the remainder of the letter, to explain away the plain import and meaning of the apostle's words, 1 Cor. iii. 6—"I have planted, Apollo watered; but God gave the increase." And this he does by a ingenious device, which consists in affirming, that it does not seem correct to say, "Paul *planted* the word; the sower indeed sows the seed, but the planter plants the plants. Also, that it applies to him, both on account of abundance, to say, Paul sowed the word, and Apollo watered with the same word; it being unusual to water sown barley with barley."—Enough of this.

Now, supposing that Mr. Campbell stood firm in the belief of the necessity of divine influence to give effect to the Gospel, what might we reasonably expect would be his answer to this correspondent, who claims affinity to him on the ground of their being of the same mind and judgment? Would he not have said—"My friend, you have mistaken me on the point in question. I cordially for the necessity of divine influence to give us the effect. I cannot, therefore, acknowledge the relationship." But does he do anything of the kind? Nay, verily: on the contrary, the letter is introduced to the readers of his *Millennial Harbinger*, with these words:—"The following extract from a letter of an esteemed correspondent, upon an important subject, will, no doubt, be interesting to the readers of the *Harbinger*;" and the title given to it is, "DIVINE INFLUENCE IN CONVERSION!" but, surely, its more appropriate title would have been, "CONVERSION WITHOUT DIVINE INFLUENCE!"

When I commenced the publication of my *Millennial Harbinger*, I was aware that Mr. Campbell was understood by some to deny the necessity of divine influence, and I therefore determined if it were possible, to ascertain the truth of this. Accordingly, I addressed him on the point, in a letter, which will be found in my *Millennial Harbinger*, vol. i. p. 174-181, in which I endeavored to show the importance of this doctrine, and to distinguish between divine teaching and that which is merely human; and I

now entreat the particular attention of all, who would enter into the merits of this question, to that letter; as their doing so, will relieve me from the necessity of enlarging upon the subject in this place. I cannot help entertaining a surmise or suspicion, that Mr. Campbell declined laying that letter before the readers of his *Harbinger*; and I found it on this fact: that though I have repeatedly applied, both to himself and others, I have never been able to procure a complete copy of his *Harbinger* for 1835, in which my letter ought to have appeared! I wish I may be mistaken in my fears on this head.

Now, as to the subject of "Baptismal Regeneration,"—to which I have already alluded in the foregoing Sermon—it is needless to dwell at any length on this. It seems to follow, almost by necessary consequence, from a denial of the doctrine of human depravity, and the necessity of Divine influence to give the Gospel effect, in the conversion of a sinner to God. The reader will find, that I have entered pretty largely into an examination of these doctrines in several of the Sermons contained in this volume; particularly, in Sermons vi. vii. viii. xii. xiii. xiv. xv. and xxi. and it is needless to repeat here what I there said. I will, however, trespass on the reader's patience with one remark, and I beg attention to it. Mr. Campbell is totally silent about Baptismal Regeneration, while pointing to the volumes of the "Christian Baptist." The reader will be in vain for that doctrine in all its pages. In several of the volumes of his *Millennial Harbinger*, also, the thing is kept out of sight, though we have now and then occasional hints of it. But in the volume entitled, "Christianity Restored," the whole matter is developed! We are there assured, that "all the apostolical Fathers, as they are called; all the pupils of the apostles, and all the ecclesiastical writers of note, of the first four Christian centuries, whose writings have come down to us, allude to, and speak of Christian Immersion, as the "Regeneration," and "remission of sins," spoken of in the New Testament, p. 223. Here, then, we have a full development of that which had hitherto been only glanced at. And now, as though apprehensive that this disclosure might occasion some alarm, for the moment, Mr. Campbell anticipates the consequences, and thus skillfully wards off the blow:—"but the reader shall have it in his own words: "If any ask, why this matter," namely the perfect identity of "Immersion" and "Regeneration" was not fully developed in our first essays on this subject: our answer is, because we could not anticipate, that our opponents would have so represented, or misrepresented our views. Were a general asked, why he did not surround his troops in the beginning of the action, as he had arranged when he triumphed over his enemy, he would say, that the manoeuvres and assaults of the enemy were the disposition of his forces."—*Christianity Restored*, p. 223.

note. So much, then, for Mr. Campbell's generalship! He while I give him full credit for his dexterity and address, I am of opinion, that he would have found a more substantial apology in 2 Cor. xii. 16, *latter clause of the verse*. "To me it is a most irksome and ungracious task to offer these strictures on the writings of one, whom I was once gratified in calling my friend; but they are extorted from me by the indiscretions of certain persons in this country, who have much too hastily adopted Mr. C's opinions as the standard of their creed, and are now industriously propagating them, to the unsettling of churches, and it is greatly to be feared, to the subverting of many individuals from the faith of the Gospel; and this must plead my excuse for still detaining the reader on so unpleasant a subject!" *Isaicus Socrates, Amicus Plato, sed magis Amicus Veritas.*—*To be continued.*

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

To Sir Charles Barclay Smith, the Honourable and Reverend Baptist Noel, and "the Reverend" James Sherman.

Excellent Sirs,
In fulfilment of my promise I present to the consideration of the interesting and important inquiry relative to the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ. You will I am sure, agree with me, that the subject is both interesting and important; and that it is a necessary investigation preliminary to the full, fair, and satisfactory examination of "the Sin of Schism." It is interesting, because it is your interest and mine, as well as the interest of all Christendom, to know for certain what and where it is; for to it belong all the rights, privileges, and immunities which God has to bestow on the sons of men. It is very important, because there are so many rival institutions in the world, all claiming to be the Churches of Christ: we should therefore ascertain the true definition of the genuine institution of God and of Christ, that we may not by an irretrievable mishap, miss those inestimable blessings which come to us alone through the spiritual Temple of the Father and the Son.

The Church of Christ—I do not find this precise phrase in the New Testament. It is exact enough, however, to convey your meaning; which, I suppose, judging by your practice, is that the National Church of England and Ireland is the Church of Christ. If we had no New Testament in Christendom, I might perhaps admit that that renowned Establishment was identical with the Institution set up in Judea by the Apostles of Jesus Christ. But, unfortunately for the identity of the two establishments, that little volume exists as the acknowledged standard of all religious truth. I find in reading the book, that the Church of Jesus is not of this world, and that his servants

do not fight with carnal weapons for the defence or maintenance, or propagation of his religion. But when I close this inestimable book, and regard the theory and practice of the United Church of England and Ireland, I perceive that they give the lie to the word of God, and declare that the Kingdom or Church of Christ is of this world, that Christians ought to fight with cannon, sword, and musket for the ascendancy of their religion, and that the shepherds of the flock ought to compel by law, or wound, or slay all factious men and brethren, who, considering they have a right to dispose of their own as they please, refuse to pay tithes of "wheat, oxen, sheep," &c. to the rich and well-stalled gentleman of your Church in Holy Orders. The New Testament teaches me that Jesus is both Lord and Christ, and that he is Head over all things to the Church. But when I look at the Religion of England and Ireland, I see the Lord of Lords and King of Kings dethroned by a young lady, named Victoria, who sits in the temple as Head over all Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; as the translatarea of Prelates from See to See; as the patroness of 1048 livings; I see the troops-headed by her archdeacons and rectors spilling the blood of the poor for the sake of filthy lucre; I see this Lady Patroness of religion the life, soul, and center of English and Irish Christianity, surrounded by the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of fashionable life, patronizing theatres, routes, balls, and every conceivable folly of *haut ton*—I see all these things, and I am told, that she is the visible head over all things to the Church of Christ! Excellent Sirs, do you think it possible, that with a mind enlightened by the Scriptures of truth, I can admit the position as true, that the Church to which you belong, is the Church of Christ? Is it possible that a Church with such a visible head can be His! That a Church charged as it is to the full with every evil thing, with every folly, with almost every vice, that it can be the Body of the pure and undefiled one! I conclude that it is not; and, though, I admit, that there are many well behaved and decent people within its pale, I cannot believe that they can escape the contamination of the spiritual malaria which is fast destroying the Body they compose.

I presume that we are agreed as to the signification of the word "Church." But lest we should differ under this head, I would observe that some philologists derive it from *Kirk*, or *Kirkos*, house of the Lord. Hence the abbreviation *Kirk*, or *Kirk*, as your Scottish neighbors term the same thing. The word in the original, which is frequently rendered *ecclesia* in King James' version, is *ecclesia*, and signifies an assembly, convocation, congregation, &c. It is a noun, and is used in the preposition *ek* out of, and the verb *ek* out of, to summon, to invite: hence any number of persons, or many, called out of society in general into one assembly.

business whatever, is an ecclesia, congregation, or church. The kind of call, summons, or invitation determines the nature of the assembly, church, or ecclesia. Thus, if they be called together for political, philosophical, commercial, or religious purposes, they will be a political, philosophical, commercial, religious ecclesia, assembly, congregation, or church; for the word ecclesia, rendered church in English, was used by the Greeks to designate any assembly of the people, whether legally or illegally convened. As it is written Acts xiv. 19, "But if you are inquiring any thing of other matters, it shall be determined in the common ecclesia in the lawful assembly." Again in verses 22 and 29 for an assembly of the people though not thus lawfully called out—"Some, therefore, were crying one thing, and some another, for *hee* *ekklesia* this congregation was confused, and the greater part did not know what they were come together to"—and when he had said these things, he dismissed *teen* *ekklesia* the congregation; or as the Tories and Conservatives of Method Church do say of a tumultuous congregation of title-resisters.—*hee* dismissed *teen*.

As we have said, the nature of the ecclesia or church depends on the purpose for which the people composing it are convened. A church or ecclesia, or congregation of Christ, then, is an assembly of people called out of the world to the call of the gospel of Christ. They are an assembly lawfully convened in the name of The Christ. But Everlasters, how can it be said, that the National Church of England, or Ireland is an assembly called out of the world in the name of Christ? A national church comprehends the whole nation, men, women, and children, believers and unbelievers, as the members of its body; where then is the world out of which they are convened? A learned writer has remarked with reference to this singular state of things in these words—"those who practice infant baptism have been requested to consider whether the baptism of babes had not effected a reclusion greater in disfavor of the evidences of Christianity by exhibiting whole nations of Christians, who were all forced to profess the religion of Jesus without their knowledge or consent. Is it, they ask, because Christianity will not bear examination, or have the children of Christians less right to judge for themselves than the first converts had? In the days of the Apostles, it was argument to tell, multitudes were added both of men and women (Acts v. 10); The word of God increased, and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem, and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith (ch. vi. 7) the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls, (ch. ii. 41.) This is no argument now.—Further, it is inquired, whether the turning of whole nations into Christian Churches, so that there is no world, but all is church, have

not deprived Christianity of that noble argument which the purity of the doctrine of Christ afforded. The few upright lives, the evidence of their shining as lights in the world in the vast multitude of wicked characters, among whom they are observed, confounded, and lost. Of what national church can it be said the people are holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners? What nation, if they observe the direction of apostolical epistles, must claim a letter directed to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints (1 Cor. 1. 2)?—To such a change say they, it is owing that infidelity abounds; and a Christianity of this kind admits of no defence."

The National Church of England and Ireland, then, is not identical with the Congregation of Christ in this particular, namely, that the churches of Christ are assemblies called out of the world, whereas all national churches are made up of the world in the several countries in which they exist; I infer then from this consideration, that since the churches of Christ do obtain in England, the National Establishment in regard to them, is related as the world to the congregation of the Lord.

Again, in determining the true church we must examine the foundation upon which it is built. The Church or "Holy Temple of the Lord" the Scriptures teach, is built upon Jesus the Apostles, and the Prophets. The corner stones are the foundation stones, and Jesus is the chief of the corner stone, or the chief of the corner. He is the Alpha and the Omega of the whole. If it can be proved that Jesus is not the Christ, then he is not the chief or head of the corner; that the declaration of Peter is true, and as firm as a rock, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, the Living One. To this Jesus replied, "on the rock I will build my (gathering) church," over which the gates of Hades shall not prevail." You will observe then, that the truth is the Rock upon which the Holy Temple of the Lord is to be built; and that The Builder is Jesus himself. Now in order to learn how Jesus built up his Temple, we must accompany him and his Apostles in their subsequent career.

During his residence in Judea subsequently to this notable declaration, he continued to afford abundant evidence both to his disciples and to others, that he was the Christ, the Seed of Abraham, whom God had promised before the times of the Mosaic Age. He ate the passover with his Apostles, and on that celebrated occasion, announced his death and the day for which he suffered. He took the cup of wine, and said, "this is, (or signifies) MY BLOOD, THE BLOOD OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, SHED FOR MANY, FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS."—On following, he suffered the death he had often foretold, for sin, he was buried and on the third day he rose from the dead." He was delivered for our offences,

for our justification." This justification which is of God is exhibited without requiring an obedience to the law of Moses, though attested by the law and the prophets: "even a justification which is of God, *through faith in Jesus Christ*, for all, and upon all, *would BELIEVE.*" The blood of Jesus, then, was shed for the remission of the sins of believers in the justification of God to life eternal by the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. Permit me, Excellent Sirs, to urge this upon your attention—that it is *believers only that can be benefited by the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus.*

After he rose from the dead, he assembled his disciples together and addressed them to this effect:—This is what I told you while I remained with you, that all the things which are written concerning me in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms must be accomplished. 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."

The same in substance though different in phraseology, is recorded by others of the sacred writers. Thus Matthew testifies, that Jesus said, "All authority is given to me in heaven and upon the earth; so disciple all the nations, baptizing them into 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" *my Apostles.* You will observe that the discipling all the nations does not imply the converting them into National Churches; for, in the prophecy on Mount Olivet, Jesus said that the gospel was to be published throughout all the (Roman) world, for the *information* of all (the) nations" then comprising that empire; and further, James terms the proclamation of repentance and the Remission of Sins to the circumcised Gentiles by Simon Peter, God's first looking down on the Gentiles, to take *from among them* a people for his name. Acts 15, 14.

Mark testifies, that Jesus said to the eleven Apostles, "Go throughout all the world (then civilized,) proclaim the glad tidings to every creature. He who shall believe and be baptized, shall be saved (or have the Remission of Sins;) but he who shall not believe shall be condemned (or, shall not see life).—These baptized persons, during the ministry of the Eleven were to be endowed with certain miraculous powers. "As for the Eleven, they went out proclaiming the tidings every where" which explains the going into all the world to every creature; and it is said, that "the Lord co-operated with them, and confirmed their doctrine by the miracles with which it was accompanied."

The Apostles having received authority from Jesus to remit and retain sins is an appointed way, (John xi. 22, 23; Matt.

xvi. 19; x. 10.) and having been ordered to begin their work at Jerusalem, it behoves us, Excellent Sirs, as inquirers after truth to accompany them thither, and to observe their proceedings there; for you must agree with me, that their operations in the Holy City are an exact illustration of the commission as they understood it.

Well then, having been endowed with power from on high to fulfil their Lord's commands, we find them in Acts ii. addressing a concourse of Israelites speaking all the languages of the Roman World. These persons, it would seem, were well acquainted with Jesus and the mighty works he performed. They were charged with having apprehended him, and by the hands of sinners (the Pagan Romans) crucified and slain. But Peter affirmed, that *God had raised him from the dead.* The proof of this was deduced from the sixteenth psalm, which showed that the Messiah was to rise again without being corrupted; and Peter declared that Jesus whom they had put to death, had been raised again, of the truth of which the twelve then before them were appealed to as witnesses; thus by his resurrection identifying Jesus as the Messiah spoken of by David. Having testified to his resurrection, he announced the fact of his ascension to heaven. In proof that the Messiah was to ascend, he again quotes from the psalms; and that Jesus was by Angels on made Lord as well as Messiah, he established to their thorough conviction, by declaring that the eleven tongues they saw, and the many languages they heard, was the promise of the Spirit from the Father, shed forth upon them by the exalted Jesus.

Believing these things they were cut to the heart, and demanded of the Apostles *what they should do.* Peter (whom Jesus had constituted *The* Apostle to the Circumcision, Matt. xvi. 19; Gal. ii. 8.) announced to them, Repentance and the Remission of Sins (Luk. xxi. 17) in the name of Jesus, in the following words:—"REPENT, and BE EACH OF YOU BAPTIZED IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS.—They therefore (of these believers) who received his word with readiness, were baptized; and there were added to them that very day about 3000 souls.—And the Lord daily added (tous zozomenous) to the congregation."

From these premises it appears, that Jesus is the Master Builder of the Church of God; that in the days of the Apostles, he built it up by the Holy Spirit through them, that the materials for the building were men and women; that these were converted into "living stones" by believing the doctrine concerning the Messiah, namely, that he was to suffer for us, rise again the third day, and to ascend to the right hand of God; and that Jesus was that same sufferer whom we are to be saved for the remission of sins, and who rose again from the dead for the justification of believers:—and by

that is, by being buried in water with him by the burial into the likeness of his death; and that these living stones—these baptized believers, were believers on testimony, and not credulous from hearsay. The process by which these men and women were transformed into living stones for the spiritual temple appears to be this; things were proposed to their intellectual faculties concerning sin, righteousness, and judgment to come; these things were sustained by testimony, which when sufficiently strong, recommended their approval and acceptance to their moral sentiments; hence the things proposed, demonstrated, and approved were believed by them; because they believed they repented; their views and feelings were changed, hence, they proceeded forthwith to put themselves under the government of Jesus by being immersed into his death for the remission of their sins. These baptized persons being the subjects of a perfect remission, were purified and perfected, and built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the foundation corner-stone. These persons were transformed into living stones every day, and had not to wait as in certain national churches till Easter or Whitsuntide before they could be added to the congregation.

Men and women of this description when assembled together in the name of the Lord, constituted a Church of Christ. When written to by Apostles they were addressed in such language as this: "to the congregation of God which is in Corinth, sanctified by Christ Jesus, called saints"—"you are God's field, you are God's building"—"you are the temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwells among you"—"the temple of God is holy, which temple you are"—"You are all the sons of God, through the faith which is by Christ Jesus"—"As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.—And if you are Christ's, certainly you are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise"—"You who were dead on account of trespasses, and by the uncircumcision of your flesh, he has made alive together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses;—let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith; having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and your bodies washed with pure water, let us hold fast the hope unmoved; for he is faithful who has promised"—"to him who has loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and has made us kings and priests to his God and Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen."—"You also as living stones are built up a spiritual temple, a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices, most acceptable to God, through Jesus Christ."—"You are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people; that you should declare the perfections of him who has called you from darkness into his marvellous light."

From this you perceive that Christians are all the heritage,

lot, or clergy of God without distinction of Orders. Men and women, whether Jew or Gentile, bond or free, high or low, rich or poor, are all one in Christ Jesus. A poor Christian Man is as noble and excellent in the sight of God as the Archbishop of Canterbury in the estimation of the Lady Patroness of the Church of England. Yes, and much nobler too; for the least in the Kingdom of Heaven is greater than he. But I must conclude for the present, by subscribing myself,

Excellent Sirs,
Yours &c.
THE EDITOR.

THE MILLER AND THE HOLY OFFICE

OR

CANDOR TORMENTED BY ORTHODOXY.

In the Religious Herald of the eleventh instant is a story, selected from the writings of one Hieron Bartolomeo Piazza, an Italian, who was himself one of the delegate judges of the court of the Inquisition at Osimo; a part of it is so applicable to the present times *quorum pars magna fui* that I cannot refrain from laying it in substance before my readers.

According to the maxims of the Inquisition, which will not allow of any expostulation, or endeavor to correct the error of a friend or relation previously to conveying intelligence of the matter to the Holy Office; a poor miller was accused by his own wife, under several different heads. Among these was a sentiment concerning the Immortality of the Soul; for the said miller had been heard to say, *I think all our preachers tell us so many great things about our souls, only to frighten us, for I have seen several persons dying, who, after their last breath, left nothing behind them.*

The witnesses named by her, were examined, and related nearly the same which she had done; but, being asked about the character of her husband, they declared that he was as far as they knew, a very honest man and a good christian, and eminently religious, as they all agreed, by his having always showed a peculiar respect and consideration for the souls which were suffering in Purgatory, according to the Romish doctrine, as he often gave alms, in order to have masses celebrated for their relief. They also all declared, without being asked about his wife, that she was very jealous of him, and by no means celebrated as an extraordinary good woman.

The Miller being sent to prison, and examined, confessed immediately, every thing of which he was accused. It is worthy of remark here, that in all other Courts, where a man has confessed the crimes laid to his charge, he remains but sentence and condemnation; but in the

that is, not the case. In this court they wish to ascertain what he really believes, what he has declared in confession, and the rack is the means ordinarily employed for this purpose.

The poor Miller, therefore, having plainly avowed every thing laid to his charge, was next particularly examined about his belief, as is always done before the rack is applied. Having answered to the best of his second Leant, they interrogated him concerning the principal point—*whether he believed what the preacher commonly said about the soul, namely, that it goes to mortal and never dies, but is eternally happy with God and his Holy angels in heaven or everlastingly miserable with the devils in hell?* or whether he thought the preachers said these things only to frighten people?—He answered, “Sir, I don’t believe it with my heart; but sometimes only with my mind—*Non colimus, sed solum colimus colla iurata.* And being asked what he meant by not believing with his mind, he could give no better answer, but always replied, that with his heart he truly and indeed believed that the soul never dies, that it is immortal, and goes either to heaven or to hell; but with his mind he was sometimes believing to the contrary. Being an ignorant man, he was incapable of expressing himself better. This poor miller was confined for a long time, while waiting for the definitive sentence of the Holy College, to which the general Inquisitor holds the interest of the case. After many years there came a new sentence—*Let the prisoner be put in a torture about his intention and belief, if he return good and catholic answers, let him first be obliged to take adequate penitents, and then imprisoned at the pleasure of the court.* He was accordingly removed and packed according to the custom of Rome, where he answered exactly as he had done before, he was consequently obliged to make public penitence, and then confined for the last months in a close prison, before he could obtain his Liberty.

When I look back and reflect upon the days of years I spent, I cannot but sigh for myself, that my lot is cast in “The time of the End,” when priestly tyranny and cruelty is stern of its power to inflict the poison of its malignity on the victims of its hate. Our recent debate has confirmed our conviction of the unholy and unheavenly attributes of clerical officials. As we told the people upon that occasion, we are persuaded, that the clergy have now, as formerly, the will to persecute, though not the power. They are like John Bunyan’s Pope, who sits by the wayside grinning despite at the passers by; but unable to injure them, because he is chained and his nails are pared.

But thanks be to God, who, in his merciful providence, has caused ‘the Earth to help the Woman’ in placing the foot of Infidelity upon the neck of Superstition and Priestcraft. It is to the “Liberty and Equality” of the New World, and not to the amelioration of the disposition of the clergy, that we are

jabbed, under God, for the freedom, ecclesiastical and political, we enjoy. If their "Reverences" be improved, it is to the World, and not to their religions, they owe acknowledgments. That they are less cruel and despotic, we admit; but, as we have said, it is, *ex necessitate rei*, and not of their own free will. If they cannot now control the racks, and rods, and axes of the secular arm, they yet resort, though with pointless energy, to misrepresentation and slander, by which they rack and torture, and would destroy the good name of all who unsheath the Spirit's sword—the Word of God—against their craft and superstitions. But we are encouraged when we reflect, that others have suffered even death in defence of the very things we now contend for; under circumstances, when none can or dare, however willing, make us afraid. We are upon the whole much strengthened in mind, though somewhat impaired in health: and God being our helper, we propose to continue the fight until means or life shall fail. Meanwhile we would diligently strive to excel our antagonists in the superior temper of our trusty steel. For, while they and their allies would crush us by the malignity of their assaults; we would overcome their evil with good. We have given proof, that we do not fear them on the most unpopular themes: we can assure them we owe them as men and citizens, no ill-will, but freely forgive us from time to time, all trespasses, imaginary or real, which they may have perpetrated against our well-being and standing in society; though they should even have treated us as deserving no better at their hands than the poor Miller at the instance of the Holy Office.

Edmou.

August 25th, 1837.

"MATERIALISM CAMPBELLISM"

The article subjoined, appeared in the July number of *The Harbinger* under the foregoing caption. It is certainly a very curious, one and were it not for some allusions, citations, and misconceptions, which seem to be aimed at and to concern me, I should assuredly have passed it over without a formal review. The style more especially concerns Mr. Kidwell. He can at his leisure criticise "the tone, temper, and manner" of the document, if he please. It is with the truth or error of the proposition with the peculiar attire, that I have to do. The sagacity and penetration of the reader will be sufficiently occupied in appreciating their merit or demerits; we will leave it therefore to the exercise of an impartial and candid scrutiny, always suggesting the propriety of "judging nothing before its time."

"Such is the designation of an article in the *Harbinger*."

cyclopedia of January last, to which my attention was this day (June 13th) called for the first time by seeing posted between two hands, on the cover of the May number of said magazine. "A. CAMPBELL AGAIN." Mr. Kidwell, the Editor, some years ago was extremely anxious to engage me in a controversy with himself on the subject of Universalism. This I declined, because of the coarseness and abusiveness of his style, and the vulgarity of his manner as a disputant with those who dissented from him.

It is said that he has reformed somewhat, and that he is recognized and sustained by many Universalists in the West, and that I have been unable to reply to him either on his Universalism or Materialism. All this may be true. There are many men who never can be confuted—very many that I am unable to answer. I am, indeed, very easily vanquished when my opponent substitutes scurrility and abuse for reason and sacred scripture, or when I see more conceit, superciliousness, and dogmatism, than good sense or sound logic. The gentleman himself on the subject of Materialism, alleges that his "total silence" as respects his beautiful philosophic theory of an atmospheric soul, based on the *true physiology of man*, is "probably owing to a loss to find arguments to reply." Had I seen his piece before to day, this might have been true; but indeed, now that I have read it, I am at a loss for arguments to reply. I am not "physiologist enough" for these learned Doctors of atmospheric spirits that fill the cavities of the human lungs. The discoveries of modern science are far in advance of my prosing genius. They have discovered that man—the whole man, body, soul, and spirit—is but "organized and animated dust." It is alleged that the knife of the anatomist and the theory of the physiologist, irradiated by phrenology, have actually found out that man has "four spirits" instead of one: that the four gases, oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, and carbon, are the four "invisible spirits" that make one "living soul." This soul has been discovered to reside in the vesicles or small air tubes in the lungs: for, as Nature abhors a vacuum, the bronchial vessels must have been made for its residence: so that the human soul enters by the nose, descends the windpipe, and resides in all the vesicles of the lungs. The thinking is indeed performed by the brain; for thought is but a "secretion of the brain," as bile is of the liver, or gastric juice of the stomach. These splendid discoveries were made some years since by the French physiologists; and Mr. Lawrence, so profound in physiology and anatomy, has incontrovertibly proved that the marrow thinks, or to express it more learnedly in his own words, "medullary matter thinks." The marrow in the leg, the marrow in the spine, and the marrow in the brain secrete different sorts of thoughts—spiritual, animal, sensual, &c.

It is alleged that this felicitous discovery effectually rids the

world of ghosts, and the universe of both hades and gehennas; for in this theory there is no spirit, no ghost, nor separate state; no hell but the grave. This is an essential way of disproving infant baptism; for infants dying are never raised to life again, nor are "the heathen who have had no written law." Hence a general resurrection and general judgment are metaphorical nonsense; and from these chimeras the world is happily relieved.

I do not know, however, that Mr. Kidwell goes quite so far; but other Materialists have in the present century gravely taught as corollaries from the new doctrine of atmospheric souls, that all infants and all Pagans dying naturally, die eternally, and shall never be raised to life again; so that a general "resurrection of the just and unjust," and a judgment of the world, or a general judgment, are parts and parcels of the metaphysics of Scotch theology.

The whole world, "Old World and New World," is challenged to disprove this theory—and the whole Bible is quoted to prove it.—Now that I should fear and tremble, and feel myself unable to encounter such giants in physiology, anatomy, phrenology, and daemonology will appear plain as a self-evident proposition, from the slightest attention to the proof these gentlemen have to offer.

Their first chapter consists of all those arguments drawn from our inability to see, hear, smell, taste, or feel an abstract spirit. And, of course, we are all stricken dumb.

The second chapter contains all the Bible, not newly translated, but newly interpreted: for example, it is said that when God made the body of man out of the dust, he gave him a soul, or made him "a living body" by causing the wind to blow in his face. "He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life:" i. e. "the vital air," the atmosphere composed of two spirits, oxygen, and azote or nitrogen, and then he became a living soul. So that he received his "living soul" from the vital air; or rather, his spirit is so much of the vital air as he can at any one inspiration inhale. Thus was man made in the image of God! But were not all the other breathing animals inspired as well as man? Did not God breathe into the nostrils of the goat and the swine a breath of life, and make them living souls too!!! Here, then, I am fairly conquered—unable to reply, and shall have to succumb to Mr. Kidwell, and beg of him in his tender mercies to spare my life, and call upon some mightier spirit, some stronger wind, from the Old World or the New, to reason with him or his brother Materialists.

I shall therefore crave his permission to continue the discussion of Universalism, as far as I can, with his brother Skinner, and leave him to luxuriate in his splendid theories. His souls, pill he give up his oxygen and nitrogen ghost to the vital air which gave it him. Should Mr. Kidwell lay

before his readers, I will from that fact prove that he has one idea which his brain never did secrete: for might I not suppose, even in his case, to prove, that looking at these printed words and being moved to reprint them on his pages, is an idea which owes its existence to my secretions. So that his idea of republication will be a secretion of a secretion, an emanation from an emanation, possessing him by the eye rather than by the nose. But should he not be influenced to give these singular speculations upon his speculations to his readers, then his theory will stand triumphant; for it will then be clear as the sun that his soul is a pure compound of oxygen and nitrogen, with a very slight tincture or alloy of carbonic acid gas.—But they say love is blind, and that peculiar love which authors have for their own discoveries and inventions is the blindest of all the blind affections; and therefore there are those who would rather prove themselves to be all animal, than to be found mistaken in any of their crude speculations."

A. C.

REMARKS.

"It is alleged that the four gases, oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, and carbon, are the four "invisible spirits" that make one "living soul." This soul has been discovered to reside in the vesicles or small air tubes in the lungs."

If this have reference to my views, I would observe, that it is a burlesque, and not a true statement of them. It makes me say, that a man resides in the vesicles of his own lungs! For I maintain that "an animal body" is a "living soul;" and this I have affirmed on the authority of the Apostle Paul, who says there is an ANIMAL BODY, and there is a SPIRITUAL BODY. For, thus it is written, the first man, Adam, was made a living soul—the last Adam, a vivifying spirit." Here he makes "animal body" and "living soul" synonymous, which must be apparent to the most prejudiced.

As to the "invisible spirits," or, to speak chemically, "the gases"—this is the substance; the elementary principles of the Animal Kingdom are resolved by experimentalists into oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, and carbon. These therefore, are the ultimate constituents into which men and animals are resolved when they return to the dust from which they were originally produced. As these when combined and solidified, and formed under the plastic hand of the Creator, constitute Animal Men, inasmuch as Animal Men are Living Souls, they are the ultimate constituents of Living Souls, in the sense of Genesis 2, 7: The pneuma, or breath of life, inspired by these souls is not composed of the "invisible spirits" enumerated by brother C.; but of the constituents of the "breath of God," as the scriptures term the atmosphere. Job says "the breath of the Almighty hath given me life:" and in another place, "by the

breath of God (the air) frost is given;" hence the "breath of the Almighty" is "the breath of life," and the breath of life is "the breath of God" or frost generating-air.

The residence of a Living Soul varies according to circumstances; but assuredly it resides not where brother C., has put it; in the vesicles of its own lungs.

"The thinking is indeed performed by the brain; for thought is but a "secretion of the brain," as bile is of the liver, or gastric juice of the stomach."

Here again our meaning is misconstrued. Our positions are these. The Animal Man is a whole made up of many parts or organs; such as the brain, the heart, the lungs, the liver, the stomach, the senses, and so forth. Each organ has its own peculiar function or office; thus it is the function of the five senses to see, to hear, to feel, to taste, and to smell; of the stomach to chymify the food, of the liver to secrete bile, of the lungs to arterialize the blood, of the heart to circulate it, of the brain to perceive, reflect, &c. That "mind" is composed of the manifestations which result from the operation of the brain upon ideas derived from the external world, through the senses. Thus "man is ignorant of every thing antecedent to observation." In order to the existence of "mind" in an individual, he must have the exercise of his senses, and something for these organs to act upon. In other words the order of mental manifestation is this—first, the external world; secondly, senses to discern it; thirdly, a brain to receive the impressions they transmit; fourthly, it must perceive them; fifthly, it must compare them, reflect upon them, &c; and sixthly, it must manifest its conclusions by overt acts, before its owner can be said to have mind or not.—This is what we mean by the figurative expression, that thought is a secretion of the brain. As it is the function of the liver to secrete bile, so it is the function of the brain to produce thought; and never has such a phenomenon been seen of men as a Brainless Thinker.

"The marrow thinks.—The marrow in the leg, the marrow in the spine, and the marrow in the brain secrete different sorts of thought—spiritual, animal, sensual, &c."

One would scarcely have expected so trifling a sally from such a source. But we live to learn.

"Other Materialists have in the present century gravely taught as corollaries from the new doctrine of atmospheric action that a general "resurrection of the just and unjust," and a judgment of the world, or a general judgment, are parts and parcels of the metaphysics of Scotch theology."

When Paul stood before Felix he said that he expected resurrection of the dead; both of the just and of the unjust; but said nothing about a "general resurrection," as in the above passage. I believe with Paul, Paul was not to be written in the law, and in the prophets, and in the books of the

the Apostles, but I cannot receive brother C's interpretations until he supplies us with more scripture testimony and fewer appeals to the passions or prejudices of the vulgar. His views of truth will never do, and cannot possibly be received for the truth itself. He must therefore condescend to reason with us as will rational, though juvenile, men. For if wrong, we desire to be enlightened, and not scoffed at; for if our souls be the "immortal souls" of Metaphysicians, which Theologians say are too precious to be valued, we pray him, to make an intellectual effort to open the eyes of our understandings and to rescue them from these material errors into which, it is alleged, we have so lamentably fallen. Permit us to say, that such passages as the following will tend rather to perpetuate than unshackle our bonds.—

"It is said, that when God made the body of man out of the dust, he gave him a soul, or made him "a living body" by causing the wind to blow in his face. "He breathed into his nostrils the breath of life," i. e. "the vital air," the atmosphere composed of two spirits, oxygen, and azote or nitrogen, and then he became a living soul. So that he received his "living soul from the vital air; or rather his spirit is so much of the vital air as he can at any one inspiration inhale. Thus was man made in the image of God!"

This passage is full of sophistry. "He gave him a soul."—By this phrase, Metaphysical Theologians mean that a soul previously existing was infused into the first man. We have used no such unscriptural phrase. Man was a creature before he breathed; he became an Animal or living creature, not God "giving him a soul" in the clerical sense, but by "breathing into his nostrils the breath of life," which brother Campbell styles in a singularly grave and characteristic manner,—"*causing the wind to blow in his face.*" An Animal, a living creature, a living soul, are all synonymous, as we shall show from scripture most abundantly at a more convenient season.

Never have we said, nor has it ever entered into our heads to conceive, that the resemblance between man and the image and likeness of God consisted in the manner of his formation, or in the way which his animal life is sustained. I believe that the resemblance between man and the image of God consists in his having been created a spotless being possessed of intellectual and moral faculties, by which he is capable of high degrees of knowledge and happiness. Having created him, he inspired him with speech and knowledge of much good. How he inspired him, is not said; nor is it essential to the matter in hand.

"Did not God breathe into the nostrils of the goats and swine a breath of life, and make them living souls too !!! Here then I am fairly conquered—unable to reply." Is this argument in this; or is it an exclamation for effect?

If brother C. cannot answer, Moses will. *Gen. i. v. 24. Let the earth bring forth the living creature; in Hebrew, the living soul:—verse 30, to every thing that creepeth on the earth, wherein there is life, in Hebrew, wherein there is soul. But more of this hereafter.*

It may be asked, wherein consists the difference between Man and the inferior animals?—Metaphysicians, Theologians, and Spiritualists, or rather Mystics of every denomination, have been much puzzled to answer this question. They have been accustomed to cut the knot instead of untying it. They are quite at a loss to tell us "where reason begins and instinct ends;" nor have they yet satisfactorily defined what constitutes the difference between reason and instinct. Phrenology, I conceive, has thrown the true light upon the matter. It shows that Man and the Inferior Animals have certain "Feelings" and "Sentiments" in common; but that Man has also Sentiments and Faculties which they have not. Now the difference—what I would term, the organic difference—between them consists in the cerebral organs which Man has and they have not. These organs then being peculiar to Man, he is capable of manifestations, and he has capacity for a destiny on terms which they are physically unqualified to observe. For instance there is no Veneration, Conscientiousness, or Hope in the lower animals; they are destitute of faculties for the development of these sentiments; hence it would be useless to propose an object of adoration, the hope of a reward, &c. to them. It would be like holding a light to the eyes of the blind. No impressions would be made, because they have no capacities to receive them. But man is not so. He can adore, be can hope, &c. Hence he is a being capable of worship, and capable of being operated upon by inducements of various kinds.

By republishing the article from *The Harbinger* we have proved, at least, in our own case, "that our lore is not blind;" and that we are not under the influence of that "peculiar love which is the blindest of all blind affections." We have reprinted our brother's remarks, under the conviction, that if they are true they can do no harm, as truth must ultimately work for the good of us all. If they are erroneous, men of discernment will easily detect their sophistry, though some may be misled. We conclude, however, that whether right or wrong, it may be gratifying to those of our readers who may not see *The Harbinger*, to peruse the *pro et con*, and the *modus in quo* of the points at issue as set forth.

Edwards.

PROTESTANTISM.

I regret, that in justice to myself, I am again compelled to offer a few strictures on another article in the *Millennial Harbinger* for July. I would much rather speak myself

Brother Campbell's efforts than otherwise. Even his peculiarity of style should be no obstacle to my rendering to him whatever is justly due. He will find me ever ready to be the humble echo of his sentiments, provided only they be founded upon, and sustained by the truth. This is the friend we are bound to honor above all others—*Amicus Socrates, Amicus Plato, Amicus Campbell, Amici Omnes, sed magis Amici Veritas*, which being translated, signifies, *Friend Socrates, Friend Plato, Friend Campbell, Friends All, but rather Friend Truth.*

"I am censured, reproved, and admonished," says he, "by a very sagacious gentleman in the east of this commonwealth, whose 'candid opinions' are not to be questioned, for having so far apostatized from him and myself, as to undertake to defend Protestantism. With him Protestantism is clearly and infallibly one of the Horns of the Beast. Not having read the discussion, the gentleman of course, volunteers his censures in anticipation of public opinion, in order to strengthen his opposition to me on other grounds more obnoxious than even Protestantism."

"But that he, or any one laboring under the same distemper may understand something of Protestantism, as it has been defended by me, I shall give a mere sample of the principles as expressed centuries ago."—The list can be consulted at leisure on p. 306, of the Mill. Harb.

"I would only add, that in my latitude Protestantism is not identified with Episcopalianism, Presbyterianism, Methodism, Congregationalism, nor Baptistism; but every thing in each and every one of these opposed to Romanism."

Such, then, is the definition of Brother Campbell's Protestantism. It certainly is an Ism of great latitude. If "the gentleman," as he facetiously terms me, mistook the kind of Protestantism, of which he announced himself "the defendant," Brother C., is certainly alone to blame: for assuredly, after his declaration to Mr. Hammond, every reader would conclude, that by Protestantism, he meant what is commonly understood by that term—"I have," says he, "for many years been seeking to unite all Protestant Christians in one great bond of union as Catholic as Protestant Christendom."—Here are "Protestant Christians" and "Protestant Christendom," which certainly, one would think, constitute the soul and body of Protestantism.—Brother Campbell, if I mistake not, is indignant, at the idea of "Protestant Christians" not being saved as such: if they are salvable, it must be by Protestant Institutions, which, I presume, make up Protestantism in the common and received acceptation of the word. This embraces all the Isms, and more besides, enumerated by Brother Campbell; which, as he very well knows, is "as Catholic as Protestant Christendom." I was surprised, that he should stand up as the defendant of

such an Ism; and am rejoiced to find that he rejects the identity of his Protestantism with that of the Protestantism of Christendom which it claims as peculiarly its own. I cannot but remark that it would be well if he would be more precise in his use of terms. It would prevent a misinterpretation of his sentiments. It appears to me, that the only tenable ground in opposition to Protestantism and Romanism is the Christian Religion. Had he proclaimed himself the defendant of Christianity instead of Protestantism, there would have been no danger of his being misunderstood.

With me, the Protestantism of "Protestant Christendom" is indeed one of the Horns of the Beast. I cannot say, that the Protestantism of brother Campbell is a Horn of any thing. I can compare it only to a ghost; for I know of no sect belonging to "Protestant Christendom" that holds a system which in theory or practice or both, is not more or less imbued with the dogmas of the Church of Rome. Even his third principle recognizes a distinction of laity and clergy, which is entirely popish. His eleventh justifies me in styling Protestantism a Horn of the Beast; for it says, "so many orders of the clergy so many marks of the Beast." And surely, it cannot be denied that Protestantism as well as Romanism abounds in these bestial indications.

As it seems to me Brother Campbell is at variance with his own Protestantism, for his fifth principle says "Purgatory is the invention of man; they who believe go into eternal life; they who believe not into eternal damnation." But he has states of being between the now and the future life and the future damnation; so that his fifth ought to read—"they who believe go to an intermediate heaven of temporal felicity and return to earth that they may be united to bodies to be judged, and so passed into eternal life; and they who believe not go to an intermediate hell (purgatory one would think) of temporal punishment, and return to earth, that they may be united to bodies and judged, and so passed into eternal damnation."—These appear to me inconsistencies of so great a magnitude, as to nullify "the truth as it is in Jesus;" they may be consistent with Brother Campbell's views of Protestantism; but they are certainly at variance with the doctrine of Christ.

I am said to be laboring under "a distemper." This I do not exactly understand: for, in the beginning of the article, Brother C. terms me, "a very sagacious gentleman." Well, well, be it so. Brother C. says I am a gentleman, therefore I must be so. Let no one after this say that I am not a gentleman. He says, I am "a very sagacious" one. Perhaps I am "a very sagacious" one. Quick of thought, quick of making a quick of scent; for these are the significations of "a very sagacious" one. But am I to blame for this. I am indebted to Brother Campbell for some of my sagacity *alias* distemper. I finished

of the infection from his writings, which insist upon our learning the truth from the writings of Prophets and Apostles, &c. I am doing so with all my might, according to the humble ability bestowed upon me. The truth makes a man both sagacious and a gentleman. Some call my distemper a mania; others, his "balderdash." Good! "Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and on my account, accuse you falsely of every evil thing."—"He hath a devil, and is mad, why hear ye him?"—"If they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more his servants?"—"Yea, I am content to bear all with-out repining, in the defence of what I believe to be the truth.

EDITOR.

DEBATE.

PRESBYTERIANISM versus THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

The discussion announced on the cover of our last number under this caption commenced on the first of August, and continued until the fifth. The assembly was constituted at upwards of a thousand people, chiefly from the neighboring country.—This number diminished during the last three days in consequence of rainy weather; though even under this unfavorable circumstance, the congregations were always good and singularly attentive. It is the judgment of the brethren who heard it, that the debate will do good; and that the truth has suffered nothing at our hands. It is our opinion that Protestant Sec-tarianism has received a blow in the course of the Meherrias from which it will not speedily recover. We believe that it cannot be extended; nor do we think that Presbyterianism and its Allies can maintain their ground. We have assurances from many hearers, that numerous prejudices have been removed, and that the sufficiency of the Scriptures to make wise to eternal salvation has been amply sustained.

Among the subjects treated of were the demerits of Presby-terianism; the ability or inability of men to obey God; the work of the Holy Spirit; the Platonic doctrine of an immortal soul; the Fall of Man; the Conditionality of Eternal Life;—Phrenology the true philosophy of Mind, &c.

We have been requested to publish the debate by several brethren and friends who were present. To this we have acceded provided sufficient subscribers be obtained to defray the expense. We committed the substance of our opponents speeches to writing; but that he might have no cause of complaint, we forwarded to him the proposition contained in the following note:—

"Mr. Thomas' compliments to Mr. Watt, and will thank him to forward the manuscript of his speeches to him through Mr. Watts of Watsborough, who will convey them to Mr. T. when they meet on the Saturday before the fourth Sunday of

this month. If Mr. W. decline, Mr. T. will then feel himself at liberty to proceed with the publication of the debate, giving the substance of Mr. W's speeches."

August 7th, 1837.

We extract the following from a letter just come to hand from a much esteemed correspondent in the South, in relation to some of the topics before mentioned:—"I now beg that you collect and collate all your defence on this subject, as materials for your next Extra. It is desired by more than myself. I will take 50 additional copies. Do comply. Let us show the world that we are not to be abashed on any ecclesiastical dogma when God speaks for us."

In reply to this, we would say, that the Debate which we are now proposing to publish, will contain the pith and marrow of the whole matter.

To the debate will be annexed, the address delivered on the Lord's Day immediately after the discussion. The entire volume will not exceed *One Dollar*. The following gentlemen are respectfully requested to receive the names of responsible subscribers in their immediate circles. Mr. J. Ragsdale, Mr. J. Boswell, Col. Richardson; Brethren Stone, Lester, and Watts. They can give in their lists to Mr. Gil W. Watts of Watsborough, who will forward them to me. Our agents and friends generally, will perhaps act for us in this particular for the accommodation of our readers at large.

As less than *five dollars* cannot be transmitted by mail, *five copies* at least should be the subject of one order. Postage at the expense of the subscriber.

EDITOR.

"The Apostolical Fathers."

The Church of England Reformation Society thus speaks of these pillars of the Apostacy.—"Every one must deplore that at this day, when the Bible was so extensively circulated and known, there should still be a tendency to desert The Word of God for the words of men. Under these circumstances the value of FIRST PRINCIPLES became of the most vital importance against error in the Christian world. This society in the object which it sought, had thrown the Fathers over-board. There was not a Roman Catholic error in condemnation of which many passages from the Fathers could not be produced, and also in support of which an equal number of passages could not be cited from them. Therefore, if they were hot and cold, and continued a mixture of light and darkness, how could the society be censured, if it refused to surrender the word of God and substitute in its place the authority

...ceded one half of the works of the ...
 we open to dispute. Basil was one of the most distinguished
 of the fathers, and yet there was great doubt whether many of
 the works that went under his name were written by him. All
 condemn the doctrine of persecution. Now, in reference to
 the decretals of Gratian, as set forth under the authority of
 Gregory XIII, persecution of heretics was recommended under
 several heads. Indeed under no less than 16 of these heads,
 the persecution of heretics is sanctioned; and the chief author-
 ity produced for this is, St. Augustine, Jerome, Cyprian, Leo,
 the Great, and Isidore. There could not therefore, be any
 member of the Reformation Society who would not say that
 they had done right in giving up the fathers."

TO CORRESPONDENTS AND READERS.

Several letters have been received and shall appear in order
 as we can find room.

Certain queries are under consideration and shall be answered
 as opportunity offers.

The query put through Brother P. B. P. is suspected by many
 brethren to whom we have submitted it to be a gin to catch
 us in our words. We do not believe that he is wilfully access-
 sory to the fact: we have higher thoughts of his attributes than
 to charge this upon him; yet, such is the false-heartedness of
 the times in which we live, that we do not think it at all un-
 likely. We hope that this view of the matter is entirely erro-
 neous. The query shall nevertheless be fairly met in due time
 come what will

The Advocate is not issued as early as we could wish. It is
 not our private affairs which cause this delay. We have de-
 voted ourselves for life, at least as long as we possess health and
 means, to the dissemination of what we believe the Scriptures
 teach. We consider this the business of our life; our domestic
 affairs merely subordinate to it. Absence from home on the
 things of the Kingdom and a fracture of the rod by which the
 platen or impression plate of our press is suspended, are the
 cause of the late issue of our paper. Another cause of its late
 arrival at its destination is owing to the irregularity and tardiness
 of the mails. The Advocate lays about a fortnight in the
 post office here before it can get a fair start on its journey
 onwards. Ours being only a one horse mail, it requires several
 loadings before its monthly editions can get into their several
 routes.

Letters from divers esteemed correspondents have not been
 replied to, owing to want of time from the pressure of other
 matters which cannot be set aside.

ERRATA.

THE ADVOCATE

Vol. 4. Amelia County, Va.; September, 1837. No. 2

HISTORY OF PRIESTCRAFT.

BY WILLIAM ROWITT.

NO. 5.

POPERY.

Pernicious Doctrines of the Jesuits—Hulliver's Exposition of such Doc-
 trines—Loyola, their Founder, sets up, under the name of General, ano-
 ther sort of Pope—The success of his plans—General character and pro-
 gress of the Jesuits: their Mercantile Concerns: their Conduct in China;
 in Paraguay; in the European Countries—Attempts on the lives of Queen
 Elizabeth and James I.; their Murder of Henry III. and Henry IV. of
 France.

The land in which I lived by a fall bene
 Was withered up. Tyrants dwelt sick by side,
 And stabled in our homes—until the chain
 Stuffed the captive's cry and to abide
 That blasting curse, men had no shame—all wild
 In evil, slave and despot; fear with lust.
 Strange fellowship through mutual hate had tied,
 Like two dark serpents tangled in the dust,
 Which on the paths of men their mingling poison thrust.
 REVOLT OF ISLAM.

But onward moved the mad, unholly train
 In their false roads, in fiery ponies to die.

This was the solemn sacrifice of Spain—
 Heaven's offering from the land of chivalry!

THE FOREST SACRIFICE.

We have surveyed strange scenes of priestly wickedness
 and bloodshed,—but of all the agents of the devil which were
 ever spawned in the black dens of that earthly pandemonium,
 the papal church, none can compare with the Jesuits and In-
 quisitors.

The Jesuits arose in the latter days of popery. Their doc-
 trines were those of popery grown to thorough ripeness. They
 seemed created to show to what lengths that system could be
 carried, and to crown it, in conjunction with their fellow-
 demons of the Inquisition, with that full measure of popery and
 indignation which should basten its great "immedicable wound"
 from the hand of Luther. The Jesuits took by the hand the
 dogmas of the papal church: that the end sanctified the means
 —that evil may be done that good may come of it—
 —that to that degree which banished the good, and
 stand in astonishment at the daring acts, and
 of "wild mad men." All other obligations
 religion, according to their creed, were for

side, just as it suited the object they had in view. They might cheat and lie, steal and kill, all for righteousness' sake. They embodied in practice the pithy maxims of Hudibras.

That saints may claim a dispensation
To swear and forswear on occasion,
I doubt not but it will appear
With pregnant light; the point is clear.
Oaths are but words, and words but wind;
Too feeble instruments to bind.
But saints whom oaths and vows oblige,
Know little of their privilege.
For if the devil, to serve his turn,
Can tell the truth, why the saints should scorn
When it serves theirs to swear and lie,
I think there's little reason why.
Else he has a greater power than they,
Which 'twere impiety to say.

They thought with him,

The Public Faith, which every one
Is bound to observe, is kept by none.
And if that go for nothing, why
Should Private Faith have such a tie?
Oaths were not purposed more than law,
To keep the good and just in awe,
But to confine the bad and sinful,
Like mortal cattle in a penfold.
Then why should we ourselves abridge
And curtail our own privilege?
And curl our own lanterns bear
Quakers that, like dark lanterns bear
Their light within them, will not swear.
Their gospel is an accidence
By which they construe conscience.

These were their precious tenets—the quintessence of the wisdom of this world, to which that of the children of light is unprofitable foolishness. Their founder, Ignatius Loyola, a Spaniard—an ominous name when connected with religion,—was a most acute and happy genius in his way. He saw the advantages which the popes had derived from their accommodating ecclesiastical logic, and he conceived the felicitous idea of creating a sort of second series of popes, taught and enlightened by the old series. He adopted their facile code of morals, and he even outwent them in the exquisite finesse of his policy. The head of this system was to take the name of General of the Order; his emissaries were to go forth into all kingdoms; to insinuate themselves into all cities, houses, and secret hearts of the people. They were to adopt all shapes, to follow all circumstances; to wear an outside of peculiar mildness, and an insinuation of subtle observance; to have the exterior of the dove in the interior of the serpent. With all this sequacity, flexibility, and disguise they succeeded wonderfully. What, indeed,

could resist them, when they came in all shapes, and with all pretences; at the first glimmer of discovery of their real designs, or of popular indignation, ready to set up their own words, and swear that they were anything but what they really were?—But when they found themselves in any degree of strength,—when they were desirous of carrying some point that compliance and duplicity could not carry,—who so dogged and insolent as they? They bearded people, magistrates, kings,—the pope himself with the most immovable assurance. The popes who regarded them as active maintainers of ignorance and obedience, were desirous to tolerate them as much as possible. But they often found it a severe task for their patience. They were in the condition of a man who has tamed a serpent or a lion; they might sooth the beast by coaxing, perhaps, but were every moment in danger of rousing its ferocity, and even of falling before its rage. When struck at, they stood and hissed, and fought with true snaky pertinacity; but if they saw actual destruction coming, they suddenly disappeared, only to raise their hydra heads in a thousand other places. Expelled from States in their own character as Jesuits, they came back in all sorts of disguises; and, instead of open enemies, the people and their governors had to encounter the secret influence of their poison, and their stings which struck in the dark. They insinuated themselves into colleges and schools under false colors, till they could seize upon them and convert them into engines of their designs. They became confessors, especially of women, that they might learn all the secrets of their husbands; of kings and ministers, to learn those of states; all the intelligence thus gathered was regularly transmitted to the general from every kingdom, so that he and his counsellors knew the condition and intentions of all nations; and, at a moment's notice, his creatures were ready to seize upon universities, churches, governments, or whatever they desired.—They entered into trade, and were scattered all over the world, wearing no outward appearance but that of merchants; yet keeping up a secret correspondence with one another, and with their general, and transmitting intelligence and wealth from all quarters of the globe. They were not satisfied with exercising their arts over the Christian world; they proceeded into all pagan countries as missionaries, and sought to bring the savages of Asia, Africa, and America, under their dominion. They evidently had formed the bold design of acquiring the spiritual and political sovereignty of the world; and, by their subtlety—their ambition and their impudence—were at power so alarmed and disgusted all people, that there is a continual alternation of their growing into strength, and of their expulsion from almost every part that can be named. England, France, Spain, Portugal, Poland, Bohemia, Italy, the East and the West.

North and South, in all these countries their arts were tearfully tried, and they were as repeatedly expelled with ignominy and vengeance.

The popularity with which they spread themselves is shown by the following statement from the memorial presented by the university of Paris to the king in 1724:—"In 1540, when they presented their petitions to Paul III., they only appeared in the number of ten. In 1543 they were not more than twenty-four. In 1545 they had only ten houses; but in 1549 they had two provinces; one in Spain, and the other in Portugal, and twenty-two houses; and at the death of Ignatius, in 1556, they had twelve large provinces. In 1608, Ribadeneyra reckoned twenty-nine provinces, and two vice-provinces; twenty-nine houses of profession; two hundred and ninety-three colleges; thirty-three houses of probation; ninety-three other residences, and ten thousand five hundred and eighty-one Jesuits. In the catalogue printed at Rome in 1629 are found thirty-five provinces, two vice-provinces, thirty-three houses of profession, five hundred and seventy-eight colleges, forty-eight houses of probation, eighty-eight seminaries, one hundred and sixty residences, one hundred and six missions, and in all seventeen thousand six hundred and fifty-five Jesuits, of whom seven thousand eight hundred and seventy were priests. At last, according to the calculation of Father Jouvenoy, they had in 1710, twenty-four houses of profession, fifty-nine houses of probation, three hundred and forty residences, six hundred and twelve colleges, of which above eighty were in France, two hundred missions, one hundred and fifty-seven seminaries and boarding houses, and nineteen thousand nine hundred and ninety-eight Jesuits.

On their mercantile concerns, M. Martin, governor of Pondicherry, observes, "It is certain that next to the Dutch, the Jesuits carry on the greatest and most productive commerce in India. Their trade surpasses even that of the English, as well as that of the Portuguese, who established them in India.—There may, possibly, indeed, be some Jesuits who go there from pure religious motives; but they are very few, and it is not such as those who know the grand secret of the company. Some among them are Jesuits secularized, who do not appear to be such, because they never wear the habit; which is the reason why at Surat, Agra, Goa, and every where else, they are taken for real merchants of the countries whose names they bear; for it is certain there are some of all nations, even of America and Turkey, and of every other which can be useful and necessary to the society. These disguised Jesuits are intriguing every where. The secret intercourse which is preserved among them instructs them mutually in the merchandise which they ought to buy and sell, and with what nation they can most advantageously trade; so that these masked Jesuits make an immense profit of the society to which they are alone re-

sponsible, through the medium of those Jesuits who traverse the world in the habit of St. Ignatius, and enjoy the confidence, know the secrets, and act under the orders of the heads of Europe. These Jesuits, disguised and dispersed over the whole earth, and who know each other by signs, like the Freemasons, invariably act upon one system. They send merchandise to other disguised Jesuits, who having it thus at first hand, make a considerable profit of it for the society. This traffic is however very injurious to France. I have often written respecting it to the East India Company trading here; and I have received express orders from it (under Louis XIV.) to concede and advance to these fathers whatever they might require of me. The Jesuit Tachard alone owes that company, at this moment, above four hundred and fifty thousand livres. These Jesuits who, like Tachard, pass and repass between this quarter and Europe, are ambulatory directors and receivers of the bank and of the trade."

"In the Antilles," says Coudrette, "LaVallette, the Jesuit, has half the worth of the property for whose conveyance to France he undertakes. In Portugal the Jesuits had vessels employed exclusively in their service, which facts are established by the process of Cardinal Saldanha. All the accounts of travellers in the East Indies speak in the same way, with astonishment, of the extent of their commerce. In Europe, and even in France, they have banks in the most commercial cities, such as Marseilles, Paris, Genoa, and Rome. In addition to this, they publicly sell drugs in their houses; and, in order to their sanction to this, they procured from Pope Gregory XIII. the privilege of exercising the art of medicine. Even in Rome, in spite of the opposition of the tradesmen, and the prohibitions of the pope, they carry on trade in baking, grocery, &c. Let us imagine twenty thousand traders, dispersed over the world, from Japan to Brazil, from the Cape of Good Hope to the north, all correspondents of each other, all blindly subjected to one individual, and working for him alone; conducting two hundred missions, which are so many factories; six hundred and twelve colleges, and four hundred and twenty-three houses of professors, novitiate, and residents, which are so many entrepôts; and then let us form an idea, if we can, of the produce of so vast an extent."

There have not been wanting advocates for these penetrating intriguing priests; who have represented them as merely laboring to promote religion among the civilized, and civilization among the savage nations. But what says all history? What says the indignation of every realm which has wronged and abused them? That wherever they were, wherever they were not, they took, whether the education of youth in Europe, or the conversion of natives in savage lands, all their plans turned to the purpose of absolute dominion over the minds and bodies of their

They seem to have taken a particular pleasure in breaking in upon the labors and in persecuting all other missionaries; and by their detestable and ambitious acts, Christianity has been expelled from various regions where it was taking root. This was the case in Japan and China. Here they first thwarted the measures of other missionaries, then got all power into their hands, and finally were driven out with wrath by the natives. In China their suppression was connected with circumstances of peculiar aggravation. The Bishop of Nankin names two to the pope, whose vices had become public. "But the crime of Father Anthony Joseph, the superior of the mission, is yet more scandalous. This man has remained there eight years past continually plunged in the abominable practice of sinning with women at the time they come to confess, and even in the place where he confessed them: after which he gave them absolution, and administered the sacrament to them! He told them that these actions need not give them any concern, since all their fathers, the bishops, and the pope himself observed the same practice!"

"All this was known to Christians and to heathens. Some persons represented these crimes to the superiors of the Jesuits; but the commissary whom they sent for the purpose declared him innocent—I know not upon what pretence. While I was considering the best means of punishing this man, the mandarins caused him to be arrested, suddenly, with two of his brethren, and about one hundred Christians. What occasioned still greater scandal, the mandarins, who had been some time acquainted with part of the facts, collected correct depositions to establish his crimes, and announced them at full length in their sentence, which they made public. He was condemned to death with the other Jesuit, on the 22d of September, 1748, and they were both strangled in prison. Of the hundred persons who were arrested with him, there was not one who did not renounce Christianity, and the Chinese missionary was the first to do so."

For more than two hundred years they maintained a system of opposition and vexation to the bishops and missionaries of India, in the very face of the popes commands to the contrary. Of their attempt to establish an independent kingdom in Paraguay, every one has heard. Under a pretence of preserving the Indians free from the vices of the European, they forbade them to learn their language; under pretence of protecting them from the oppressions of the Europeans, they regularly disciplined large bodies of them in arms. For them these simple creatures toiled, and their minds they moulded entirely to subserviency to them. They refused all Europeans, except their own confederates, entrance to the province; and actually on the authorities marching into it in the name of the Kings of Portugal and Spain, rose against them, and attempted to expel

them by force of arms. They hesitated not to send emissaries over to Europe to blow the flames of sedition there, and even attempted the life of the King of Portugal, in order to divert the efforts of their rightful monarchs from them; but finally they were themselves subdued, and driven out of the country to the total dissipation of their grand scheme of rebellion and empire. For those who have patience to read the scandalous and bloody squabbles of priests, there are copious details of these matters in the second volume of Southey's History of Brazil; and especially of their contests with Cardenas the bishop.

In Europe they signaled themselves by perpetual attempts against the peace of states and the lives of monarchs. In Venice, in 1560, they excited great commotion, and were very near being driven away. They showed great anxiety to confess the wires of the senators, for the purpose, it was believed, of acquiring the secrets of the republic. Trevisani, the Patriarch of Venice, says Sacchini, satisfied himself of the charge, and made other discoveries of still greater importance. In the Netherlands, in Portugal and Spain they were busy in similar schemes, and with similar results. In Poland they had the fortune to get a man of their order, Sigismund upon the throne. He desired to introduce them into Sweden, where his uncle Duke Charles, was his lieutenant. Charles remonstrated in vain, that the people of Sweden would not endure the Jesuits; the king persisted, and the people took arms against him. He was beaten both by sea and land; taken prisoner; and only released on condition that he would assemble his states, and act in conjunction with them. He then escaped from Sweden, and strove to arm the Peles against the Swedes; but they refused the alliance, and in the mean time his uncle seized upon his towns.

With the continual attempts of these pertinacious wretches against the liberties of England, and the lives of Elizabeth and James I., every English reader is familiar: the names of Crichton, Garnet, Parry, Cullen, Gerard and Teasmond, successively engaged in the design of assassinating the Protestant Queen, or in the attempt to blow up our English Solomon and all his parliament, will forever perpetuate their abhorrence in England; and in Ireland the general massacre of the Protestants in 1641, which they were principally concerned in exciting, and similar proceedings in that country, will keep alive their remembrance there. But of all their atrocities there are none which more affect one with indignation than their persecutions and murders of Henry III. and Henry IV. of France. In 1563, according to Mezerai, the famous Catholic league took its rise, whose object was to extirpate the Protestants in France. The Jesuits became the soul of this infamous federation. Henry III. besieged the states at Blois in 1579, for the purpose of dissolving

this conspiracy; and from that time was marked for destruction. Summier, a Jesuit, traversed Germany, Italy and Spain, to excite the princes of those countries against him. Mattheis, another, styled the courier of the league, made several journeys to the pope, to obtain a bull against him; and though the pope hesitated at this, he delivered his opinion, that the person of Henry should be secured, and his cities seized. Commolet and Rouillet were the trumpets of sedition. In the college of the Rue St. Jacques, the Jesuits met and conspired the murder of the king. It was there Banieres came to be stirred up by the doctrines of Varade, and that Guinard composed the writings for which he was hung. It was there that the sixteen signed an absolute cession of the kingdom to Philip of Spain; and that Chastel acquired the lesson of parricide he afterward acted upon. There Clement, animated by such horrible instructions, formed the resolve which he fulfilled on the 1st of August, 1589, the assassination of Henry III.

Henry IV., was a generous, spirited, and noble monarch,—was educated in Protestantism;—this was enough to arouse their murderous and unpassable hatred. It was almost by miracle that he escaped, then a youth, from the massacre of St. Bartholomew. On his coming to the throne he was pursued by them with such continual animosity that he had to allay their fury, he consented to embrace Catholicism. This produced no effect—he was a man of liberal opinions; and he would not tolerate. They made his life miserable, and at length nearly effected his murder by the knife of a fanatic, at Melun, in August, 1593. On the 27th of December, 1610, his life was again attempted by Chastel, another Jesuit, who struck at him with a knife, but missed his aim, and was obliged to stop of killing him, only cut his lip, and struck out a tooth. This circumstance, and the ferment of infernal fanaticism, which it produced, induced the passion of the king, and he ordered the banishment of the Jesuits, and caused the banishment of the whole order. This, however, did not mend the matter, as it regarded the same enemies in disguise, and if possible, ten times more embittered. With that good nature which characterized him, he at length consented to allow them to remain in France. It was in vain that Sully, his minister, represented to him that no kindness could soften such foes; he recalled the memory of a victim to their insatiable thirst, being stabbed by them on May 14th, 1610.

Many books had been written of late in vindication of the Jesuits, particularly the work of Mariana,—*De Rege et Regis Instauracione*,—in which the killing of a king was termed a "laudable, pious, and heroic action." It was by such writings that the assassin was spurred on to his diabolical act. Aubigny, a Jesuit professor, a Jesuit, when confronted with the murderer, was charged with being

pry to the design, at first denied knowing the man at all; but when driven from that assertion, he declared that "God had given to some the gift of tongues, to others the gift of prophecy, and to him the gift of forgetting confessions."

Such were the abominable principles which led them to these abominable actions. For a full account of this assassination, the reader may consult the fourth volume of Sully's *Memoirs*. So generally was the conspiracy known among the Catholic subjects of this unfortunate monarch, that many people declared, on the day when the murder took place, that the king was then dying, though they were in distant places. An astrologer had foretold the very day and hour to the king, the manner of the act, and that it would take place in a coach. So much impressed was the king with his approaching fate, that he was frequently in great agony of mind, and would fain have put off the Queen's coronation which was about to take place at the time predicted. He had terrible dreams, and so also had the queen, waking in horror, and crying out the king was stabbed. All these things the common mind looks to believe supernatural intimations, only show to the more reflecting one, the audacity of these bloody wretches, who were so confident in their power of doing evil, that they spoke of it till it became a universal impression.

LECTURES ON CAMPBELLISM;

Reprinted from the Appendix to W. Jones's Sermons.

Continued from page 118.

I have often admired the remark of the learned WYRAM, in his work on "The Economy of the Covenants," when treating on the subject of Justification, Book iii. chap. viii; and it is worthy of the reader's attention. "The doctrine of Justification," says he, "diffuses itself through the whole body of divinity; and according as the foundation is either solidly established, or superficially touched, so the whole superstructure either rises graceful and majestic, beyond the power of assault, or threatens an opprobrious fall." The learned professor then goes on to speak of the high importance that was attached to this article of the Christian faith by the WALSBERGERS, in the middle ages. "The pious Picardians," says he, "as they were called in Bohemia and Moravia, (the country of John Huss and Jerome of Prague,) valued this article at its true price, when in their Confession of Faith, Art. vii. speaking of Justification they thus write:—this sixth article is accounted with us the most important of all, as being the sum of all Christianity and piety. Wherefore, our divines teach and handle with the utmost diligence and application, endeavoring to press still it into all." And in this they acted wisely. LUTHER

great Reformer, pronounced it "*Articulus stantis vel cadentis ecclesie*,"—that article of the Christian faith by which the church stands or falls,—and declared that it "*actuated in his heart*." This doctrine, as Dr. Robertson well observes, in his Introduction to the History of the Reign of Charles the Fifth, was the lever with which Luther effected the Reformation from Popery; and I do not hesitate to affirm, that it is the pivot on which all scriptural Christianity turns. With these views of the paramount importance of the subject, I have searched the writings of Mr. Campbell with no little anxiety, to ascertain, if possible, what are his views on this subject; but great has been my disappointment. The most particular account of the matter that I have met with, is in the last of his works, viz. his "*Christianity Restored*;" and, therefore, it may be considered as presenting us with his most matured thoughts. As such, I shall here extract them.

"JUSTIFICATION ASCRIBED TO SEVEN CAUSES."

"In examining the New Testament, we find, that a man is said to be justified by faith,—Rom. v. 1; Gal. ii. 16, and iii. 24. 'Justified freely by his grace,'—Rom. iii. 24; Titus iii. 7. 'Justified by his blood,'—Rom. v. 9. 'Justified by works,'—James ii. 24, 25.—'Justified in, or by, the name of the Lord Jesus,'—1 Cor. vi. 11.—'Justified by Christ,'—Gal. ii. 16.—'Justified by knowledge,'—1sa. lvi. 1. It is God that justifies by these seven means—by Christ, his name, his blood; by knowledge, grace, faith, and by works."

Now, reader, think you of this, as coming from a "Master in Israel," one who has been diligently studying his Bible for more than twenty years, and now sets up for a Restorer of genuine Christianity—"the Original Gospel and Order of things?" Can the ingenuity of man devise anything more calculated to perplex, confuse, and distress the mind of an inquirer after truth, than the extract just made? The subject relates to the way of a sinner's acceptance with God; than which any thing more deeply interesting to all the human race cannot be conceived—"How shall sinful men be just with God—have his sins forgiven, and stand accepted in his sight?" Let such a one have recourse to Mr. Campbell's "*Christianity Restored*," for a satisfactory solution; and what does he learn from it? He finds he has seven points to adjust, before he can arrive at any certainty about the matter. He is justified by faith, and he is also justified by works—he is justified by grace, and he is justified by blood—he is justified by Christ, and he is justified by knowledge! And the more he endeavors to reconcile these various claims upon him, the more he is bewildered and confounded! Such is the teaching of his spirit:

of error, so much condemned in Scripture. And even philosophers tell us, that to embarrass, perplex, entangle, and confound are the inseparable characteristics of error, while truth is good and indivisible, simple, and ever consistent with itself, like the laws of nature. The apostle Paul tells us, that "God justifieth the ungodly"—and that freely, by his grace—not works; but believing—He is "the justifier of the ungodly." Thus that expression, as Dr. Owen remarks, which hath stirred up so much wrath among many, and on account of which, some seem to be much displeas'd with the apostle himself. Yet after all, this is the prerogative of God; as such, he will be believed on and worshipp'd, which add weight and emphasis to the expression; nor must we forego this testimony of the Holy Spirit, let men be as angry as they please.

But it is high time that I put an end to these strictures. Mr. Campbell is a very clever man, and has displayed great talent in his writings; but he has yet to learn the doctrine of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, touching the justification of the ungodly by faith, without the deeds of the law; and until he learns that, and lays it as the foundation of the Christian system, whatever superstructure he may raise, will only be as "a bowing wall, or a tottering fence." He may make his boast, and glory in his hundred and fifty thousand followers; but he is only building "wood, hay, and stubble"—which the fire shall destroy—for "every plant which our heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up."

Mr. Campbell takes no little credit to himself, for his emancipation from all human creeds and opinions; but while we cheerfully award him all the measure of praise to which he is entitled on this score, it is very desirable, that he should propound to us the true faith, and give us an explicit statement of what he has himself gathered from a twenty years' study of the Scriptures. After all the volumes he has issued from the press, I frankly confess, that I find it a much easier task to say what he does not hold than what he does! For instance, he does not hold the doctrine of Original Sin; or the "total depravity" of mankind, in consequence of the fall of their federal head and representative. He does not hold the necessity of the operations of the Holy Spirit, in order to give the Gospel its saving effect in regeneration, or conversion. He does not hold that "ungodly sinners are justified freely by divine grace, not working, but believing." He does not hold the doctrine of the Sovereignty of divine grace, preceding the exercise of the will of man; on the contrary, he tells us that we must solve individual salvation into a mere act of benevolence, to arm the Gospel of all its powers, make its promises, and its arguments deceitful, as well as its promises and double meanings, a parade of empty appearances; and worse than aliback on

realize our feelings.* He, himself, probably, expects to be saved by some other grace than that which rescued the dying malefactor from sinking into the jaws of hell! He does not hold the Moral Law to be a rule of life to the people of the New Covenant, though Christ himself has, indisputably, adopted it himself as such,—Matt. v. 17, &c. I might thus go on in the same denying course, and we should find the catalogue of *negatives* sufficiently copious. But who shall furnish us with his catalogue of *credentials*—the articles of his creed? Does he believe in the Deity, and distinct personality, of the Holy Spirit? If so, why infuse doubts into the minds of his readers, by recommending as he has done, in his *Millennial Harbinger*, vol. iii. p. 233, a treatise, in which both the distinct personality and the worship of the Holy Spirit, are impugned, as both unscriptural and contrary to reason; and why has he had recourse to such labored criticism, to set aside the plain meaning of Rom. viii. 26; and to shew the absurdity of believing, that the Holy Spirit helps the infirmities of the children of God, and maketh intercession for them with groanings which cannot be uttered.† All this is highly *ominous*, to say the least of it. But Mr. Campbell is still on the wing, and, in the rapidity of his flight, who shall assure us where he will alight and take his standing? He ridicules the practice of preaching from a single text; and to teach us the way more perfectly, he has set us a pattern for our imitation, in a new monthly periodical, called “The Christian Preacher;” the first sermon of which, is one of his own production; and the glory of it consists in stringing together some six or eight passages of Scripture, as a motto, and following it up by a rambling rhapsody, *de omnibus rebus et quibusdam aliis!* His “Christianity Restored,” which is to put the world in possession of “the Original Gospel and Order of things,” appears to me a very strange, and even whimsical performance. Who, for instance, would have expected in a book of such high pretensions, to meet with a system of Rhetoric—an explanation of tropes and figures, metaphors, beautiful, bold, and rude; allegory, metonymy, synecdoche, irony, hyperbole, catachresis, &c. &c.—Why not include it in a system of Natural History, birds, beasts, fishes, reptiles, &c.; also of Astronomy, in which he might have favored his readers with a learned dissertation on “the sweet influences of Pleiades, the bands of Orion, the orbit of Arcturus and his sons, and the coming forth of Mazzaroth in his season? His “Christianity Restored,” when com-

* See his *Millennial Harbinger*, vol. i. p. 237. Who would expect such language as that now quoted from the pen of Alexander Campbell?

† See his *Millennial Harbinger*, vol. i. p. 111, where, also, at p. 217, we have a very antiseptical refutation of Mr. Campbell's gloss, written by Mr. Andrew Broedha.

pared with Archibald McLean's illustration of our Lord's Commission to his Apostles, is as tinseal to sterling gold.

And what can we think of the bond of union recommended and adopted among the churches in Mr. Campbell's connexion? When I look into the New Testament, I find the Apostle Paul thus addressing one of the primitive churches: “Now, I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind, and in the same judgment;”—1 Cor. i. 10. The grounds and reasonableness of this, it is not difficult to make out. The Holy Scriptures comprise a system of divine truth perfectly harmonious in all its parts; and this is the only standard of our faith and practice, nor can there be any visible Christianity but what corresponds with it. The apostolic churches recognized one Lord, one Faith, and one Baptism, one hope of their calling, one God and Father of all,—one Holy Spirit, which actuated every member of the body, uniting them one to another, and all to Christ their living head. Is any thing of this kind aimed at, or pressed after, among Mr. Campbell and his friends? I find one of their leading men, both as an author and elder, denying the existence of the human soul, insisting that man is wholly *material*—that he consists of body, breath, and blood, and that *the blood is the soul*; and that to contend that there is any distinct, intelligent principle in man, any thing which survives the dissolution of the body, is the shrewdest nonsense imaginable; for that he, being a physician, has put the fact to a *chemical test*, and therefore can assure them, that the common opinion is a vulgar error! And this doctrine he is propagating by means of his “Apostle Advocate,” through the length and breadth of the United States, out of which it has made its way into our own country. Yet such is Mr. Campbell's extensive charity, that this same man is his “dear brother,”—yea, and more, “he is a chosen vessel!” See *London Millennial Harbinger*, vol. i. p. 443, note.

Take another instance. There is a Mr. Henry Grew, pastor of a church in Hartford, U. S., an open and avowed Sabellian, denying that there is any distinction of persons in the Godhead, a sentiment which is demonstrably subversive of the whole Gospel. This person commenced a correspondence with Mr. Campbell, in the first volume of his *Millennial Harbinger*, and honestly avowed his *Aceazy* from the very outset, impugning the doctrine of the Trinity in rather coarse terms. This correspondence has been continued, at intervals, ever since, and has elicited from Grew, what I must regard as no inconsiderable portion of bold blasphemy! But, notwithstanding this, Mr. Campbell's “dear brother Grew,” in 1832 this year, published a tract of sixty-nine pages, 12mo., entitled, “A

the Memory of the Apostles;" and in the following year, (see Mr. C's Millennial Harbinger, vol. iii. p. 239.) Mr. Campbell, without the smallest qualification whatever, recommends it to his readers, "as well deserving the attention of the Christian communities, and worthy to be entitled, 'A Tribute to the Memory of the Apostles.'" Yet who that has not had an opportunity of seeing it, could believe, that this pamphlet contains a direct attack on the doctrine of the Trinity, and the personality of the Holy Spirit.—"The worship of the Spirit of God, in distinction from the Father," says Mr. Grew, "is authorised by no divine precept, or recorded practice, of any prophet, or apostle, or saint, or angel, in the holy book. There is not a single address to the Holy Spirit, either of prayer or praise, in all the Bible." Indeed! What then are we to understand by the following prayer of the apostle Paul:—"The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all: Amen."—2 Cor. xiii. 14. If the Holy Spirit be not a distinct person from the Father and the Son, why are believers to be baptized into his name?—Matt. xxviii. 19. And how could Ananias and Sapphira, in lying unto the Holy Ghost, be unto God,—Act. v. 3, 4. And what shall we make of the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost: It is an unpardonable sin; yet it is not committed against either the Father or the Son?—Matt. xii. 31, 32.

But it is time for me to desist. Who that knows and loves the Truth can help grieving, that such *patron*, as this pamphlet contains, should be imported from America, and industriously circulated among the churches of this country; and that by one, who tells us that he does it under "some solemn consciousness of accountability at that tribunal whither we are all tending!" Holy Spirit! Mercifully remove the obscuring film from his mental vision, and ere it be too late, give him to see the error of his way, and to turn from it; so that the things which belong unto his peace may be known unto him, at least in this his day, before they are hid forever from his eyes. AMEN.

On a general review of the productions of Mr. Campbell's pen, I should be disposed to allot him a pretty high station, merely as a writer. He is blessed with a prolific mind, exuberant fancy, and quick perception; and expresses his meaning with great spirit and energy, but not without much incorrectness and many provincialisms. He also often terminates his subjects abruptly, and leaves his writings incomplete. As an advocate of what he calls the "Ancient Order of things,"—"the simplicity of Gospel worship,"—"I know not his equal; and in beating down the traditions of men, which the apostle Paul tells us, "always turn from the truth,"—Titus i. 14, it must be acknowledged, that he has done good service to the

cause of Christ. But,—as too frequently happens with men of talent, in their zeal for Reform,—he knows not where to stop. To say nothing of "the ancient Gospel,"—which I grieve to say he has garbled and mutilated, so as to render it no Gospel at all,—I think he has acted very injudiciously, in changing many scripture terms, such as putting favour for Grace—reform for Repent,—loaf for Bread,—reign of heaven, for Kingdom of heaven, &c. &c. The consequence of this has been, to introduce a new vocabulary of Scripture names not at all for the better, and often much for the worse, as it would be very easy to shew, where this the place for doing it. But I close these remarks. I have now submitted my reasons for declining to adopt Campbellism, and for abiding by the maxim that I find upon record, coming recommended—as it does—by the highest authority; "No man having drunk old wine straightway desireth new; for he saith, The old is better."—Luke v. 39.

A FEW STRICTURES ON MR. JONES' STRICTURES ON CAMPBELLISM;

Two considerations prompt me to offer a few remarks on Mr. Jones' Pamphlet: first, that "Friend Truth," may be defended against his well-intentioned, but unenlightened efforts; and second, because being a party concerned, I feel it my duty to stand forth in the breach, and to assist in maintaining the integrity of her works in the face of "Church" and "World." We hold nothing which we are ashamed to defend. We court inquiry. We know there is no permanent or real good to be derived from holding or propagating what is untrue. Error can benefit no one. If we be errorists, we would rejoice to be converted from the error of our way; and not only to believe, but to do the truth. Mr. Jones, or Mister anybody, will be entitled to abundant gratitude, if by any means he can reclaim us from what is wrong to that which is right. We are not, however, of the number of those who succumb to age, talents, or authority, unless these be manifestly sustained by, and are indeed on the side of truth.

I know that many will think this a bold, and perhaps daring proposition. I hold it nevertheless, in the sense in which I affirm it. My position is this, that in matters pertaining to The Faith, the age, talents, authority or reputation of unenlightened men, especially in this unenlightened age, ought not to weigh one feather; as far as we are acquainted with the manner of living and dead, we know of none of the so-called "wise and wise" whose judgment of what the scriptures teach, is to be confided in. As helps, some of their labors may be beneficial; but as guides, they are none of them. The only authority in matters pertaining to The Faith is Scripture. There are no men in existence, nor are there

writings of any extent, whose interpretation of scripture should be received as authority. The meaning of Scripture, as it is apparent to an un-sophisticated mind, is alone authority with such a man. This man may be young, or he may be old, he may be literary or not, his youth or seniority, add nothing to the meaning, neither can they detract from it. It is the meaning of scripture, as it appears to a believing reader, which ought to be authority with him; nothing else can be received, as authority by one who would please God. The aged men of Christendom during the last 1600 years, have for the most part grown old in error, and gone down with gray hairs to the grave in ignorance of The Faith. It is not the being the subject of some 60 or 70 annual revolutions of the earth, that makes a man wise or more competent to understand the truth. The fact is, if men's youthful minds have been the sponge, as it were, of human tradition, and well saturated with the doctrines of men they are more likely to be confirmed in them by age than emancipated therefrom. I am always inclined to suspect the validity of a man's positions when I find him appealing to the accumulation of the years of his annual life in recommendation or support of his arguments. As to a man's talents, of what weight ought they to be in the question of what the scriptures teach? Talents are but too often the handmaid of error. Reputation too. This can add no weight to truth, at least it ought not. *Let truth stand upon her own merits.* She asks not the fallacious patronage of human attributes, however esteemed of men, to enable her to prove, that she is worthy of all reception, veneration, and worship. I revere the aged believer as a father or mother in Christ, provided they have put him on according to truth. In short, I would at all times, "render to all their dues;" and, it appears to me, that this is quite compatible with the sentiments we have expressed; but when we come to enquire, *what do the scriptures teach* we conceive that it is God speaking by and through the Sacred Word alone, who can unfold their meaning in their several parts.

As for the experience of those called Christians in this day we think, that so far from their urging this as authority upon their contemporaries, they have more reason to repent in dust and ashes on its account. Their experience, which is essentially composed of doubts and fears, and of expedients and devices by which to satisfy themselves in some slight degree of their adoption into the family of God,—can add nothing, by contrariwise, detracts from, the sublime assurances of the word of God. He that walks by the light of the experience of the aged "Christians" of the 19th century, will certainly have little cause to felicitate himself on the agreeableness of his way. No reader, if you would be safe:—if you would walk in the light of truth; if you would be benefited by the experience of

Christians:—if you would be filled with peace, wisdom, and joy in believing; if you would yourself experience the assurance, the hopes, and the delights of the Christian life—fly you for refuge to the word of God—to the "sacred scriptures" which are able to make you wise to eternal salvation by the faith which is in Christ Jesus;" they alone are able to "make you perfect"—to "completely fit you for every good work."

These reflections have been suggested to my mind by the "Strictures on Campbellism" on the desk before me. I see there the last effort of an accomplished writer and of a very aged man. If age, talents, reputation, learning are to speak authoritatively; and, according to their views of what the scriptures teach, to judge and pronounce sentence—then are Alexander Campbell, Walter Scott, John Thomas, and Henry Grew cast out of the pale of the Church by the aged, talented, and learned Mr. Jones. For concerning Bro. Campbell he decides, that "he is no longer the enquirer after truth; he has changed that character for the bold dogmatist—the champion of a party." He considers that "he is subverted from the faith of the Gospel"—and departed from the "form of sound words" "the faith once delivered to the saints." "He exhibits a melancholy instance of human versatility." Mr. Jones quotes from his writings to evince "the profaneness" of his style. Charges him with caricaturing the operations of the Holy Spirit; rejects him as no longer one of his friends; says that "he has yet to learn the doctrine of the Great Apostle of the Gentiles touching the justification of the ungodly;" "pronounces the superstructure he has been raising for the last years of his life, as "a bowing wall, or a tottering fence"—"wood, hay, and stubble"—which the fire shall destroy." As to his faith, he says, it is more easy to tell what he does not than what he does believe. That he condemns text preaching, while in "The Christian Preacher" he has preached a rambling rhapsody, *de omnibus rebus et quibusdam aliis* "called a sermon;" "the glory of which consists in stringing together some six or eight passages of scripture, as a motto." Terms his doctrine "poison;" and concludes by shearing him of all merit, but that very poor one of being a pretty good writer; an accomplishment which he has prostituted to garbling and mutilating "the ancient gospel" so as to render it no gospel at all.

Here is certainly a catalogue of heinous sins. If God were to appoint Mr. Jones as Brother Alexander's judge, I fear he would stand but a poor chance of eternal life; for surely Mr. Jones could not be so inconsistent as to admit into the heavenly where he hopes to be, one whom on earth he can no longer call his friend; a man, whom he charges with being "an enemy of God's justification, and with having departed from the faith once delivered to the saints;" and therefore, worse than an infidel. What a pity Mr. Jones cannot see the more of his

eye. Why does he judge anything before the time? Let him look at home, and see if he be himself sound in the faith. We would say with all respect due to the length of his animal life, to his talents, and reputation—"Physician heal thyself."

There is much in Bro. C.'s writings. I do not approve; and I believe I have never hesitated to express my dissent. As to his views of the Holy Spirit, they do appear to me not so definite as they might be. There is a "yea and nay" in relation to a collateral influence, which tends to the position, that there is a something operating with the world. But as to the charge of "caricaturing the operations of the Holy Spirit" it is absurd and untrue. Mr. Jones, like Bro. C., upon another occasion, makes no distinction between a caricaturing *the opinions of men* concerning the operations, and a caricaturing *the doctrine of the scriptures* respecting His work. Mr. Jones has fallen into the same error respecting Bro. C., that Bro. C. did concerning me, when I satirized *the opinions of men* in regard to the Christian Hope. I have been much amused in reading Mr. Jones' "Strictures on Campbellism." The very thing that Bro. C. has been condemning in me, his once beloved brother Jones most unmercifully castigates in him! "What a remarkable illustration of the Master's warning—"judge not, that you be not judged: for as you judge, you shall be judged and the measure which you give, the same you shall receive."

There is an inconsistency in Mr. Jones' Bill of Indictment. He says that Brother Campbell has yet to learn the doctrine of Paul concerning the justification of the ungodly; and yet, he has departed from the faith once delivered to the saints. If he has yet to learn the doctrine, he can never have known it; consequently has not believed it; and is therefore an infidel; and, though as diligent a student of the scriptures perhaps as his late friend, these are inadequate to enlighten him as to the justification of the ungodly; and he must therefore, yet sit at the feet of Mr. Jones, that he may be taught the truth! Now, if it be true, as Mr. Jones states, that Bro. C. is ignorant of the true doctrine of justification, how can he have departed from the faith? Can a man depart from the belief of a thing, of which, it is affirmed, he is still ignorant? Paul's doctrine of justification is a part of the faith. If then Bro. C. can be proved ignorant of that, he can never have obeyed the faith; unless it can be shown, that a man can obey ignorantly. He must be in a woful plight indeed, unless he repent and embrace the "particular redemptionism" and "hyper-calvinism" of Mr. William Jones; which is the only true doctrine of Paul concerning the justification of the ungodly!!

No! we would speak the truth to Mr. Jones in love, and yet without disguise. The foundation which Bro. Campbell has been building upon is, that *Jesus is The Christ*. Paul "as a skilful architect," says that "he laid this foundation." Let

every one, whether John Calvin, William Jones, or their contemporaries, take heed how they build upon it. "For other foundation to one can lay, except what is laid, which is Jesus Christ." Mr. Jones' great authority Calvin attempted to build, but his building was made up of rubbish—"wood, hay, stubble, indeed! His crazy work has long been manifest, and to say nothing of England and Scotland, where his rival Aiminus presides over the ruins of his architecture, here in America, Calvinistic Presbyterianism is being devoured by Unitarian and Arminian Cormorants. The "wood, hay, and stubble" of his gloomy fanes, are crackling in the fire like thorns under a pot; and the enemies of Calvinistic decrees are avenging the murder of Serretus by destroying his tormentor's work. Had Mr. Jones addressed his strictures against John Calvin as a corrupter of the Faith they would have contained more truth than they do in their denunciation of Bro. C. on that score. I would by no means say that all Bro. C.'s building or superstructure is constructed of precious stones. We have to regret, that there are but too many who have the name of Reformers without the thing. These are they who are Campbellites indeed; persons who have been permitted too easily to incorporate themselves among the brethren. But there are many on the other hand, who can bear witness to the injustice of Mr. Jones' "Strictures" as to his ignorance of Paul's doctrine of the justification of the ungodly, which constitutes a part of what he terms his building of "wood, hay, and stubble." Paul delivered to the Corinthians what also he had received concerning the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus; who was "delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification." These things Bro. C. teaches and prescribes to such as believe, that they repent and be baptized, according to the ancient rules for the remission of sins. This is the gospel, which Paul himself preached; and this is the gospel which is THE POWER or GOD for salvation to every one that believes—a gospel which John Calvin, Mr. Jones' oracle was never the subject of, and which Mr. J. contemns as "a Baptismal Regeneration" with which he imagines the Holy Spirit has nothing to do.

As to his critique upon Bro. C.'s sermon in "The Christian Preacher" I shall leave Bro. C. to get out of that scrape as he best can. I can offer no apology for such an effusion. My opinion of it has been before the reader long ago. It is indeed a rambling *hapsody de omnibus rebus*; and had it been anonymously set forth, we could not have believed him to be its author. But he is its father, and the sooner the relation is forgotten the better.

As to our much esteemed friend Bro. Scott, Mr. Jones does not seem to have told Scotland a very "flattering" thing concerning this "one of her sons."—Bro. S. repudiates the Atonement doctrine of "total depravity," which in the opinion

per calvinist is a mortal sin. This sin has brought him also into condemnation; and Mr. Jones has pronounced sentence upon him as "a very unfit man to preach the gospel," because he does not care about (calvinistic) "human depravity;" and affirms that, "at any rate, his gospel cannot be identical with the original gospel, which the first heralds of salvation proclaimed." If Bro. S. were a Serretus and Mr. Jones an ecclesiastic of Geneva we fear that his lot would be unenvied by all who had not imbibed a taste for martyrdom!—Can Bro. Scott show cause why the sentence of death should not be executed upon him?

The next poor delinquent whom the worthy and learned judge arraigns at the bar of public opinion is my humble self. "This same man," John Thomas, is accused of "denying the existence of the human soul." It is urged that he insists "that the blood is the soul," and that he has proved by "a chemical test" that there is no distinct, intelligent principle in man.

What is to be done with "this same man?"—Is there no law by which he may be punished?—No means by which he may be neutralized, and incur contempt? Oh! yes, there is. The many of mankind are not afflicted with too much reflection—they are the creatures of passion, prejudice, and zeal, but not according to knowledge. Heap ridicule upon him, and appeal to prejudice; give him some ugly names, and the thing is done. Accordingly Mr. Jones has thought to place him in a ridiculous light, and therefore penned, and printed, and published, to the world, that supposititious paragraph in the "Structures" concerning me.

But misrepresentation is rarely consistent with itself. He says I deny the *existence of the soul*; and almost immediately tells the reader, that I insist that *the blood is the soul*. How then can he say that I deny to man a soul, when, he affirms, that I say, that he has a soul, and that this soul is the blood?

Mr. Jones knows that his representation of my views without qualification or explanation is well calculated to arouse all the prejudices of orthodoxy: which when, under the tuition of priestcraft, identifies such views with infidelity and atheism. This was done manifestly, with the intent of making Bro. C. as obnoxious as possible; for if he could fraternize with "this same man," and publish him to the world as "a chosen vessel," it would certainly be concluded, that he was as much of an infidel as his "dear brother."

Had Mr. Jones read my writings upon this subject, instead of the Harbinger, he would certainly, as an honest man, have come to different conclusions: or at least have stated them in less exceptionable terms.

The fourth and last offender on this side the water is Mr. Henry Grew—"an open and avowed Sabellian; an Anti-Trinitarian; an utterer of "bold blasphemy." "This Grew" is

another of Bro. Campbell's dear Brothers. What a quartet have we here! "A bold dogmatist," "a very unfit man," "a materialist," "a bold blasphemer!" Verily our cases are desperate, our accuser being our judge!

But all this is nothing more than was to be expected. Mr. Jones has long been pulling down the Apostacy with one hand, and building it up with the other. The epistolary correspondence between him and Brother Campbell, we always considered as a species of editorial coquetry. We were convinced, and have often said as much, that they would split on the question of the operations of the Holy Spirit. A Hypercalvinist and a Reformer can never get together so long as the calvinism is retained and enforced. It is subversive of the gospel of Jesus Christ. It misrepresents the Divine Attributes: it makes God partial, cruel, and unjust; and strips faith of the obedience in which God delights more than in whole burnt offerings or the fat of rams. Nor is this to be wondered at. For, who could expect from a barbarian, the murderer of a better man, any other representation of God, than is to be found in the theory of religion set forth in the Geneva Institutes.

From Calvinism, Arminianism, Campbellism, and Joneism, with all their contemporary systems, may the disciple of the Lord Jesus Christ be preserved; and may all who have put on Christ put on bowels of compassion and good feeling towards each other, and abound more and more in every good word and work, for his name sake, Amen!

EDDRA.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

No. 2.

To Sir Culling Eardley Smith, the Honorable "and Reverend" Baptist Noel, and "the Reverend" James Sherman.

Excellent Sirs,*

In the epistle I had the honor of addressing to you in my last, the following things appeared to my mind as unexceptionable; namely, that the Holy Scriptures are the acknowledged standard of all religious truth; that the Kingdom or Church of Christ is not of this world, and therefore, no National Church can be his;—that your new Queen, and Lady Patroness of Religion, Victoria I, although a pretty good sort of a young lady for the sphere in which she moves

* We address these gentlemen as 'Excellent Sirs' because they are considered as Sirs by excellence. Mr. Culling constituted Sir Culling according to the laws of England, before not a common Sir but a Sir by excellence or superiority. "Render to all their dues."

yet being the life and spirit of the fashionable world, which the Scriptures declare to be at enmity against God and not subject to his laws, though quite competent to be the Head and Defender of the National Faith, cannot be and is not the visible head of the Church of Christ;—that there may be many moral and pious Eucenes ("pious Eucenes")—many very decent and well behaved people of the National Faith, but that because of this morality, piety, decency, and good behaviour, they are not therefore necessary Christians;—that the Scripture definition of church is an assembly, congregation, or collection of people of any kind;—that a church of Christ is a peculiar assembly, founded upon Apostles, Prophets, and Jesus Christ, as the chief corner-stone; and consists of men and women, who are believers and have been baptized into the likeness of the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ; or in other words, have died to sin, been buried in water on account of their sins, and have risen from the water again to live a life to righteousness, the end of which is eternal life in full enjoyment;—or in fewer words, who have been baptized for the Remission of Sins;—that neither force nor passion, but that reason is the ground of action, with true believers in all matters of the Christian Religion; but that the members of National Churches are forced to profess a *some thing* called the religion of Jesus, when lakes and therefore without their knowledge and consent;—that in relation to National Churches there is no world, and therefore their communion is a fellowship of iniquity and deeds of darkness, mixed up with a few scintillae, not of the light of truth;—that the churches of Christ are essentially, not of the world, but are assemblies of men and women, who in the words of your EXCELLENT MISS BOOK, "have renounced the Devil and all his works, with the pomps and vanities of this wicked world," and who imitate the Great Archetype of the Faith, who is described in Scripture, as holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners; that the gates of Hades shall not prevail against his Church, that is, it shall never become extinct; that it is built upon the truth that Jesus is the Christ and no one else;—that this Institution, which is New compared with the Mosaic, which is Old and vanished away, has in it the efficacy, the sole efficacy, of cleansing from sin, and conducting to eternal life;—that the power of God for salvation is depos-

* James I. that mirror of Episcopal orthodoxy, whose favorite maxim it was, "No Bishop, no King," is said to have made the following public declaration when Pope of the Scottish Faith, and before he became the visible head of the Religion of England and Ireland:—"As for our neighbor Kirk of England, that service is an evil and mass in English, they want nothing of The Mass but the liftings (i. e. the elevation of the host). But Elizabeth left him the crown of England, which having greater charms than a crown of glory, with a royal conscience, he could transfer his affections from "the success (i. e. pursuit) Kirk in the world" to the Reformed Popery of England and Ireland.

ted there and no where else, and that this power to save is limited to believers, so that it is BELIEF ONLY THAT CAN BE BENEFITED BY THE DEATH, BURIAL, AND RESURRECTION OF JESUS; for without faith it is impossible to please God: faith, therefore is the ground upon which alone the benefits of the New Institution can be received—according to your faith be it unto you;—that a believer, in the Scripture sense, is a believer on evidence credibly testified and not credulous from hearsay or general report; and lastly, that such believers, who have been cured with Christ in a bath of water, and have so put him on in the only way which he can be put on, are by inspiration addressed as justified, regenerated, adopted, sanctified, saved, made alive having been previously dead in trespasses and sins, children of God, sons of God, saints, citizens of heaven, circumcised, the seed of Abraham, Christ's living stones, washed &c. as kings, priests, a holy priesthood, a royal priesthood, an elect race, a holy nation, a peculiar people, &c. &c. &c.

But, to proceed. The Church of Christ has no visible head at present; not has it had since the Assumption Day. People on your side of the question have assumed what they have never yet been able to prove; namely, that Jesus delegated his authority on earth *in perpetuo* to a succession of which one man was to constitute the Head. Your Church, Excellent Sirs, has derived this unscriptural tradition from the Mother of Churches, Mistress Balaam the Great. She has her Visible Head, whom she terms H. Hisness; and you have your Visible Heads in the persons of your Kings and Queens. Allow me to say, that I can see no difference in effect between Pope Joan, Pope Leo, or Pope Gregory, and Pope Henry VIII, Pope Elizabeth, or Pope Victor. Mystically considered they are the same under different circumstances, Pope Gregory being

The Earl of Chatham, a member of your Church, in his reply to the Archbishop of York, who in a speech had strongly inveighed against the Dissenters, said "the dissenting ministers are represented as men of close ambition—they are so, my Lord; and their ambition is to keep close to the College of fishermen, not to the Palace of Kings; and to the doctrine of inspired apostles, not the decrees of unlearned bishops. They contend for a spiritual creed, and spiritual worship, and have a Calvinistic creed, a Roman Liturgy, and an Arminian clergy. The information has laid upon the scriptures to all; let not the bishops shut them out again. Laws, in support of ecclesiastical power, are pressed, which would shock humanity to execute. It is said that religious sects have done much mischief, when they are not kept under restraint; but history affords no proof that sects have ever been mischievous, but when they have been suppressed by the RULING COUNCIL—then, gentlemen (though I do not mean approve your politico-ecclesiastical antagonists the dissenting brethren) is one of your own church rebuking a "Father in God" for his intolerance, and impudently abusing the popishness, interestiness, and persecuting disposition of your Kings, as well as the Romishness of your prayer Book. You will not therefore deem me disrespectful in styling it, as, in the text, your English Church.

the Visible Head of the Church in Italy &c., and Pope Victoria the Visible Head of the Church in England, Scotland and Ireland, with their dependencies. A Romish Pope and a Protestant Pope are Popes still; from whose jurisdiction and supremacy the lovers of gospel liberty will ever seek to be delivered.

You in common with your Catholic Brethren found your notions of a Visible Headship, upon the declaration of Jesus to Peter—"I will give you the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven." Now you suppose, that, if the Keys were given to Peter; and and if Jesus was to be with his Apostles "to the end of the world"—seeing that many ages have elapsed since their days, Jesus must have meant, that, when Peter had done with them they were to be left in the custody of successors—Romanists say in the keeping of his Successor the Pope; you, in that of the Chief Magistrate, or King of the nation, who is supreme over all things by a Divine and not by a popular right; for "kings," say you, that is the mortal kings of Europe, shall be the foster-fathers of the Church; and "their queens her nursing mothers." There is something like this in Sarah, but certainly not applicable to the National Churches of Christendom nor to the zeddy, concious, vain, levitical, and despotic Kings and Queens of the Eastern Hemisphere and the Globe.

If we ascertain what Jesus meant by giving the Keys to Peter; and by being with his Apostles *to the end of the world* methinks, Gentleman, you are at last prepared, that neither to popes, kings, nor priests did he design them to be transmitted, nor did he ever promise to keep such ungodly company as theirs to the end of the world.

Scripture is the best interpreter of scripture. I presume we shall not disagree as to this rule of interpretation. To understand, therefore, what Jesus meant by giving the Keys of the Kingdom of heaven to Peter, we ought to familiarize ourselves with the events of his subsequent and public life. Before you can establish the position that the Keys were transmitted to magistrates, ecclesiastical or secular, you have to prove, that they preside over the Kingdom of Heaven, in other words, that National Churches, which are composed of the world, the flesh, and the Devil—*tria juncta in uno*, are the kingdom of Heaven; for if they should happen not to be identical with the Church of Christ, it is impossible that Popes, Priests, or Kings can lock or unlock—open or shut, the gates of the Kingdom of Jesus, whatever else the Keys they hold may unfold, unbind or loose.

It is obvious from the context, that the giving of the Keys to Peter, is an expression symbolical of the authority entrusted to him, to remit and retain the sins of men; for it says, "whatever you shall bind on the earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatever you shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven."

The power or authority to remit and retain sins, in an *apostolic* way, was bestowed on all the apostles; for, Jesus said to them after his resurrection,—"As the Father has sent me, so do I send you. After these words,—"As the Father has sent me," he said to them, Receive the Holy Spirit. Whose sins ye remit, are remitted to them; and whose sins ye retain, are retained."—Here then they all had the power in common; but, in what respect had Peter the power in particular?

Excellent Sirs, you are well aware that to possess the Key to anything generally unknown, is to have the sole power of revealing the secret. A dozen persons may have the exclusive knowledge of certain important affairs, and yet one only of these individuals have the right, power, or authority to open the commission, to unlock the door of knowledge—with which they are entrusted. Twelve jurymen may be all acquainted with the verdict agreed upon, yet one only, and that the foreman, has the authority to make it known to the Court. How significant and familiar is the phrase "the Key of Knowledge." Under the Old Mosaic, "the priest's lips kept knowledge;" to disclose this knowledge then was to speak it; "Alas! for you lawyers because you have carried off the Key of Knowledge; you have not entered yourselves, and those who were entering you hindered." Here the carrying off the Key of Knowledge is to prevent persons from entering the Kingdom; hence to enable men to enter is to restore it.—"Alas, for you Scribes and Pharisees! Hypocrites! Because you shut the Kingdom of heaven against men; and will neither enter yourselves, nor permit others who would to enter."

From these premises we observe, that The Key of Knowledge is the power which one possesses of disclosing anything not generally known;—that the act of disclosure is in speaking the secret in a known tongue;—that to take away the Key is to blind the mind by fiction so that the truth is either corrupted or lost;—that to corrupt the truth is to shut the Kingdom of Heaven against men; for it is written, "in vain do ye worship me teaching for doctrine the commandments of men;"—and lastly, that, by the traditions of the Scribes, Pharisees and Lawyers, the Kingdom of heaven had been shut in the days of Jesus.

Hence, when Jesus gave Peter the Keys, in connection with the remitting and retaining sins, I understand, that he constituted him the Foreman, or Speaker of The Twelve, and authorized him to make known, in the first instance, by which Jesus had appointed the sins of men to be remitted, or otherwise retained. "Let all things be done in my name, in order." Here was the order laid down, that the secret was to be made known concerning the Kingdom of Heaven, or the salvation of the world. All the Apostles were to be

ered to remit sins to the Jews and Gentiles; but Peter was to be the one who was first to make the Way of Remission known.—In other words, he was appointed by the Great King to open the Kingdom of Heaven, which the Scribes, Pharisees, and Lawyers, by their traditions had effectually shut against men.

But you will observe, that Jesus entrusted Peter with more Keys than one. "I give to you the Keys," said he. Now you will remark, that the Kingdom of heaven in their days, was shut against two classes of men, *the Jews and the Gentiles*. He would, therefore, have to open its gates to both these. And this is precisely what he did, and in exact conformity with the Apostolic Commission; which directed them to begin at Jerusalem then proceed through all Judea, then go to Samaria, and lastly to the remotest parts of the earth: for it is elsewhere said "the Gospel is the power of God for salvation to every one who believes: to the Jew first and also to the Greek."

This giving of the Keys of the Kingdom to Peter is spoken of by Paul in the following words—"I was entrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision, just as Peter was with that of the circumcision; for he who wrought effectually in Peter for the apostleship of the circumcision, also wrought effectually in me for the Gentiles."—Peter then was, by commission, constituted the apostle to all the family of Israel; and Paul the apostle to the uncircumcised or chiefly to the Pagans of the Roman World.

I have often thought how singularly appropriate was the selection of Peter for the Speakership of the Twelve. He was ever prompt, and of ready utterance upon all occasions. But besides this there were other considerations calculated to make him most eligible for the office. It seems that the Apostles during their pupillage sometimes strove or contended among themselves as to which of them should be the greatest. The same spirit seems occasionally to have seized them, that has so long taken possession of all rectors, vicars, and curates; who are continually looking upwards to the luminaries of the ecclesiastical and political heavens, for promotion to the highest dignities of the National Church. It is with them permanently, as it was with the Apostles in their spiritual minority occasionally, who shall be Lord over his brethren—his Grace, the Archbishop, or Primate of all the rest.—"There had been a contention among them, which of them should be accounted the greatest. And Jesus said to them, the Kings of the Nations exercise dominion over them; and they, who oppress them, are styled benefactors. But with you it must be otherwise: nay, let the greatest among you be as the least; and he who governs as he who serves."—In connexion with this, he taught them humility by washing the feet of his servants; and said, "if I, the master and the teacher have washed your feet;

you also ought to wash one another's feet."—Peter was doubtless involved in the contention for pre-eminence: for Jesus was very pointed in his remark to him upon this occasion, "Simon, Simon," said he, "Satan has desired to sift you as wheat."—He did sift him indeed; for he made him deny his Master with oaths and curses. Peter was stung to the quick under the withering and heart-searching scrutiny of Jesus. He repented, and was pardoned. Could Peter after so humiliating a trial, so culpable a deed, have the face to Lord it over his brethren? could he under such circumstances aspire to be "the Prince of the Apostles"—the Archbishop of the Bishops or overseers of the church in Jerusalem—the Primate of Christendom?—Had he subsequently contended for the ascendancy, might not his brethren have said, what right have you to rule over us? Did you manifest more devotion to the master than we? Did he not say to you, Get behind me Adversary, you are an obstacle in my way: for you relish not the things of God, but the things of men; did you not with execrations and oaths assert that you knew him not; did not Paul withstand you to your face for your dissimulation? The master, it is true, made you our mouthpiece under certain circumstances; but may we not say, that he selected you for our organ, because you had least cause of any of us, save Judas, to pride yourself on your singular virtue?—I conclude that Jesus chose Peter in preference to the rest as the Keeper of the Keys, because he would have least plausible occasion to assume consequence over the rest on account thereof.

Let me then, Excellent Sirs, for this month content myself with remarking in conclusion, that *Two Keys* were committed to the Custody of Peter; the one to open the Kingdom of heaven to the Jews, the other to open it to the Gentiles;—that this act of giving the Keys to Peter, constituted him *The Apostle of the Circumcision*, that is, that he was especially entrusted with the first announcement of "Repentance and the Remission of Sins" to the animal descendants of Abraham, and to those Gentiles, who, having renounced paganism gave in their adhesion to the Law; and that to Paul was intrusted the Key of the Kingdom of Heaven to the Pagans; in other words, he was constituted by the same authority as Peter *The Apostle of the Uncircumcision*. That the eyes of your understanding may be duly enlightened by these truths is the devout and warmest aspiration of

Excellent Sirs,

Your

"PUBLIC DISCUSSION."

During a recent visit to Henry County in this State the "Virginia and North Carolina Conference Journal" for August 18th 1837 was put into our hands by a friend and brother. It contains an article under the above title from the pen of a Methodist Local Preacher we think named Jas. W. Hunnicut. It professes to be a report of the Debate between the Editor and the Rev. Mr. Watt; but like many other professions it is spurious and absurd. When in Halifax we heard that there was something about us in a Methodist paper; but, knowing how little of truth and justice is to be met with at the hands of sectarian Editors we paid little or no attention to it. Our brethren in Henry, however, being somewhat more sensitive than ourselves, we were induced to accede to their request, and to give a brief account of the truth in refutation of the absurdities palmed upon us by "the Rev. Jas. W. Hunnicut." Accordingly, having been politely favored with the Conference Journal by a Mr. Traylor, we read the article to a very respectable and seemingly intelligent audience at Henry Court House; and commented upon its several parts where comment seemed to be necessary. We doubt not, but that in that neighborhood, Mr. Hunnicut's labors have ultimated in more good for the truth and us than evil in the estimation of the unprejudiced and candid portion of the community.

Dear Brother Smith—You will confer a favor by inserting the following in the columns of your valuable journal. A public discussion commenced the first day of this month, and terminated on the fifth day. The debate was held at the Fork Church, in Lunenburg, Va. The disputants were Mr. Watt, a minister of the Presbyterian denomination, on the one part, and Dr. John Thomas, formerly a follower of Mr. A. Campbell, on the other part. Subject discussed—Has man an immortal soul, which can or does exist separate, distinct, and independently of the body. The affirmative of this question was assumed, and logically and scripturally defended by the Rev. Mr. Watt. Dr. Thomas made an effort to prove and demonstrate from the Holy Scriptures that man has no immortal soul within him; whether he demonstrated as clearly as a sunbeam that man has no immortal soul, I leave the candid and intelligent hearer to decide. The discussion was opened by the Rev. Mr. Watt, by offering up a concise prayer in the presence of all the people. It is due to Dr. Thomas to state that he observed that if Mr. Watt or his friends wished to sing or pray, they could do so, but he should take no part in it. It was thought antecedent to the discussion, that several of the cardinal doctrines of our Holy Religion would have been discussed, but they were, for the most part, passed over. The immortality,

or immortality of the soul was the principal topic of debate. Mr. Watt preached an hour in the commencement, in answer to a lecture which he had heard Dr. Thomas deliver some time previous to the discussion. Dr. Thomas thought that Mr. Watt did not do justice to his text; and after offering an apology to the audience for preaching, he observed, that he would preach Mr. Watt's sermon for him; and from the attempt, I should say, that I thought it must have been amongst his first efforts. But as he has such a natural aversion to text taking and sermonizing, I think he performed right down well. They continued speaking alternately for four or five days, at which time the debate closed. I might name many things, but as Dr. T. says he is going to publish the debate, I think it unbecoming to particularize at full length. It might not be out of the way, however, to observe, that Dr. Thomas does not think the thief who expired on the cross with Christ is either alive or in heaven. Paradise, says he, is a Persian word, which means a garden of delights. Abraham is not in heaven, Moses is not in heaven, but he confesses that there is some little mysticism involved in the case of Moses; for although Moses died and was buried, we are informed that he was one of those who held a colloquial intercourse with our blessed Redeemer at his transfiguration. Mysteries they pass over, when they casually blockade their luminous path, for it is a notorious fact, that mysteries, with the adherents of this system, are almost as rare occurrences as living men destitute of immortal souls. Dr. T. was very careful to inform us, that he was baptizing a Methodist when he received the intelligence of the anticipated discussion. And is it a fact that Dr. Thomas convinced a Methodist that he has no immortal soul within him? This champion of the non-immortality of the soul, may succeed in getting other Methodists, and I hope he will winnow all from amongst us who have no souls: for he must remember that we have no employment for men in our church who have no souls. All that we can do, is to shroud and inter them; this we consider our duty, according to the established law of nature. If Dr. T. can retain them in his church destitute of souls, we have not the least objection, he saves us the trouble of burying them; that is all. Dr. T. observed in his last speech that he had been listening during the debate to hear some arguments from his opponent, but he had not heard one single argument from him. If the Rev. Mr. Watt did not succeed in producing an impression upon the mind of Dr. Thomas, by logical arguments, that he has an immortal soul within him, we think that he would be very happy in proving to Dr. Thomas, from the Hebrew word *nephesh* (soul) cannot mean a "smelling bottle," (as the Rev. Mr. Thomas and the community generally, to state in a plain manner, some of the peculiar views of this man.

1st. If Adam had eaten of the fruit of the tree of life, after his expulsion from paradise, he would have lived for ever in a state of mortality, which state of existence would have been infinitely worse than eternal destruction or annihilation.

2d. All infants, idiots, and heathens will sleep through endless duration—they never can rise.

3d. All Methodists, old side Baptists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians and sinners, will be raised to the damnation of annihilation.

4th. False religions, or the orthodox systems of the day, cannot exist independently of infants, their priests must have infants, by which they excite the sympathies of the ladies—through them they gain the influence of their husbands—the purse next in order, and thus it is that the credulous are imposed upon, and the people priest ridden.

5th. Adults believe that their infant or baby baptism will save them from hell, (by which I understand the protestant or orthodox place of punishment.)

6th. What glory can redound to God, from the simple fact or circumstance of heaven being filled with babies or infants, *tolens vel nolens*.

7th. Eternal life or existence conditional, the condition being faith in the resurrection of Christ from the dead, reformation and baptism, (according to and baptism, I suppose.) This proven from 15 1 Cor. 3 Acts.

8th. Man has no soul nor existence separate, distinct, and independently of the body. Dr. Thomas observed that he felt encouraged to go onward in the way of truth, because, he remarked, I have succeeded in convincing many in this congregation from scripture and reason, that they have no immortal souls within them.

9th. That the spirit of God does not operate on any person apart from the word written.

10th. It is sinful for unconverted persons to pray to God.

11th. Christ will reign in person upon the earth a thousand years, the seat of government being at Jerusalem.

The above are a few of the many heterodox, anti-scriptural, and infidel peculiarities and illogical absurdities of Dr. Thomas. And the paradox of paradoxes, and the enigma of enigmas is, that this man, after all these absurdities, should profess to be an implicit believer in the scriptures of divine truth. This is indeed something new under the sun, at least to me. If the visionary speculations of Dr. Thomas be correct, then all others are wrong; for things absolutely different in their nature cannot be the same. If he is right, the Bible must be wrong; if he be right, the Bible is a false production, which can be proven. It is a subversion of our holy religion takes place, and man at once becomes the pitiful dupe of all the chimerical speculations of the ambitious designing sophist. The scriptures of divine

truth which have come to us from the hands of a wise and erring God, professing to have been written by the plenary inspiration of the Holy Spirit, do not, nay, cannot teach doctrines so diametrically opposite in their nature. I am aware that many ontologists have ransacked the mystical depths of metaphysics in search of arguments to establish the sceptical and atheistical hypothesis that man is "but organized dust," but never, until last week, did I believe that any man, possessing the slightest faith in God's revelation to man, would stand up in the presence of listening hundreds, and attempt to prove from the scriptures that man is but a polished ape. My advice to all is to shun infidels, and read the Bible. In the above, I have done no injustice to the views of Dr. Thomas.

JAS. W. HUNNICUTT.

Richmond, August 10, 1837.

REMARKS.

In reporting the attributes of the disputants Mr. Hunnicutt says, that we were "formerly a follower of A. Campbell."—This assertion is untrue. We are as much "a follower of A. Campbell" as ever; and that is not at all. We have no objection to fraternize with him in the "One Lord, one Faith, and one Baptism;" but never did we, nor will we, so long as we remain *conspicuous*, follow him, or any other uninspired man. The reporter is a follower of John Wesley, who in the great Rabbi of Methodism. Being under the "strong delusion," spoken of by Paul, he imagines, simply enough, that men cannot agree in faith and practice with another who has attained celebrity in defence of truth, without being his followers and disciples. Be it known, however, to all "Local Preachers" and Presbyterian clergy, that if they are averse to receive laws from uninspired Leaders and Assemblies, we are too well informed of our rights, privileges, and immunities, to yield faith or obedience to any spiritual authority than that of Jesus Christ and his Apostles.

The reporter affirms, that we said that "Moses is not in heaven." This assertion is also untrue. We said no such thing. The scriptures do not say where he is; and as they are silent on the place of his abode; all we affirm with certainty is, that he is alive somewhere; "looking forward to the resurrection."

The reporter would make the readers of the Congregational Journal believe, that a Methodist baptized by us, is, the same with a Methodist convinced "that he has no immortal soul within him."—This is the kind of sophistry made use of by priests to keep from their votaries the light of truth. It is not immerse men upon any such conviction. If we were to immerse people in baptism, it is into the likeness of the crucifixion of Jesus that they may be released from sin.

bars of an immortality, which can be attained in no other way, than by obedience to the laws of God. We baptize persons, whether Methodists, Presbyterians, or others "into Christ" not into a faction—upon the belief of testimony concerning Jesus, and not upon dreams, visions, experiences, opinions, human traditions, or implicit faith. The Methodist we were baptizing had been a student of the scriptures for a year previously. I am not aware that he heard any of our brethren more than twice or thrice before his immersion. He was, like most Methodists who surrender the right of private judgment to their "Circuit Riders" and "Local Preachers" exceedingly prejudiced against us. He stood high in the estimation of his brother Methodists, who have said, if ever there was a Christian among them it was _____, or to that effect. But, when he resumed the right of private judgment, and interpreted the Scriptures for himself, his prejudices gave way. He saw the fallacy of Methodism, like to which he could find nothing on the sacred page. He determined to renounce it, and to be born into the Kingdom of God, by being buried in water into the likeness of the death and burial of Jesus, and so rising from the watery grave, in the likeness of his resurrection.

The reader will please refer to this sentence and its context in the report—"Mr. Watt succeeded very happily in proving to Dr. Thomas, from an English Hebrew Lexicon, that the word *nephesh*, (which signifies soul) cannot mean a "Smelling bottle."

The impression designed to be made by the reporter upon the mind of the reader, as my opponent in the discussion labored much and long, though unsuccessfully to do on the minds of our audience—is this, that we said that *nephesh* signified "a smelling bottle."—Those who attended the debate consisted of two principal classes, namely, of those, who before a word was said by either disputant, had made up their minds, that we were to be discomfited at all events; and, of those who were inclined to withhold their verdict till they had heard the evidence. The former class of whom the reporter seems to be one, will have it that we said *nephesh* means "a smelling bottle." Well, it gratifies their little minds, and subserves the purposes of their evil-mindedness to have it so. We explained ourselves at the debate; but so delighted was our opponent and his adherents at the notion, that it became his text for many speeches. In reiterating the substance of our explanation here, we do it for the information of all unbiased persons.

We observed that in discussing questions of any kind it was necessary to define the terms employed. Hence in speaking of what is termed "the immortal soul," we ought to explain the meaning of the terms *immortal* and *soul*. In doing this, we should endeavor to find out the signification of the word used by the Hebrew people, as it was in their language that the doc-

trine concerning the soul was first recorded. A Hebrew Lexicon belonging to Bro. Albert Anderson being at hand (not we do not possess one of our own having lent it to a student when in England, who forgot to return it; it was Buxtorf's)—we turned to the word, *nephesh*, having a pronunciation according as it may be read with or without the Mnemonic points. We there found many meanings attached to it, all depending upon the several contexts in which it is found in the Hebrew Scriptures. Hence it has no absolute signification; that is, there is no one meaning or definition of the word which can be used in all passages without modification by the context. Consequently no doctrine can be deduced from *nephesh* as determinative of "immortality of the soul;" but, on the contrary, if any doctrine may be inferred from its numerous definitions, it is that of "the soul's" mortality; for one of the significations of the word is a *dead body*, see Numbers vi, 6.—Among the contextual definitions we found it used in Isaiah iii, 20 *parabolically* for "smelling bottles," or as Dr. Lowth, translates the phrase in which it occurs, "perfume boxes."—We read from Robinson's Gesenius' Lexicon as follows, "1. Breath, Job, 41, 13.—Breath of life, Gen. i, 20, 30. Also odour, perfume, which any thing breathes or exhales Prov. 27, 9; and would you believe it, my friends, but this word, upon which it is sought to establish the immortality of something in man, is used in Isaiah 3, 20 where the passage is rendered "smelling bottles."—Here then, Isaiah 3, 30 is quoted as an *example* that the word *nephesh* is sometimes used for odour, perfume, or the smell which any thing exhales. An idea which in substance, we intended to convey. But such was the inattention and perverseness of our opponent, that he continued to waste the time of the audience and to spin out his own, by talking a great deal of nothing about *nephesh*, insisting that we said it meant smelling bottle, though we read from Gesenius as quoted above in the plural number! This egregious trifling he carried so far, as actually to produce a smelling bottle before the audience as an illustration of my definition of the word *nephesh*. The reader may judge by this to what a miserable shift he was reduced for arguments to sustain his side of the question.

But to return to our venacious reporter. He sums up some of our peculiar views, as he terms them, under *seven heads*. Let the reader turn to the first and read it. He makes us say that "if Adam had eaten of the fruit of the tree of *Life* (sic) his expulsion from Paradise he would have lived *forever* in a state of *mortality*!" We never said, nor intended to say such thing. Is this part of his report to be attributed to carelessness or ignorance? Priestcraft is a compound of both. "Live for ever: a state of *mortality*!" Who ever said a thing as *living forever in a state of death*?

plies death; and this learned acion of Randolph Macon thus expresses himself! He never heard us say any such thing; he must therefore impute this saying to us knowing that we never spoke it; or use the phrase, the meaning of which he is ignorant, to express a something which he does not understand. The "Rev. Gentleman" from the construction of this sentence knows very little, we suspect, about the Tree of Life. Must we enlighten his darkness by telling him, that the Tree of Life was in Paradise. When the Man was expelled from Eden, Cherubim and a sword of flame were placed between him and that Immortality—imparting Tree. So that, if man had been ever so desirous "after his expulsion" to have eaten of its fruit he could not. Let him search the Mosaic record, and see, if a period of time did not elapse between the transgression and the expulsion. He will find if he have discernment enough, that there was such an interval. Now, if man had eaten of the Tree of Life *during this interval*, not after his expulsion, for that was impossible, he would have lived for ever &c. Let it be remembered by the reader, that the specific purpose for which the Man was expelled from Eden was, that he might not eat of the Tree of Life, and so live for ever.

This is what we said—That man is wholly and absolutely mortal in himself appears from this,—“the Lord God said, Behold the man has become as one of us to know good and evil: and now Lest he put forth his hand an take also of the Tree of Life and eat, and live for ever; therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden to till the ground from whence he was taken.”—Now the consequence of the man having partaken of the Tree of Knowledge was that he had become the subject of evil as well as good. By having thus disobeyed God, he had entered into a *mixed state*, neither wholly good nor altogether evil, but partaking of both. In this mixed state he lived a short time in Eden. In the garden there was the Tree of Life, the fruit of which had the property of imparting immortality or eternal life to the eater. While therefore this tree was accessible to Adam he was in great peril; for had he eaten of its fruit he would have eternalized his existence in a state of good and evil—not of mortality, but of mixed evil. But here the mercy of God shone forth conspicuous. He did not want man to live for ever in misery, therefore he removed him from all possibility of inflicting this dreadful calamity upon himself, by expelling him from the Garden, and placing a guard “to keep the way of (or leading to) the Tree of Life.”—Had God, then, interposed no further in human affairs after he had driven out the man, our race, would have been as the beasts that perish; for out of the ground were they all taken, both brutes and men; for *deceit* they are, and unto dust they all return; and, but for the forbearance and compassion of our Creator, in the dust should we all remain for ever and ever.

We did not say, that “all heathens will sleep through endless duration—they never can rise.”—To myriads of heathens the proclamation of repentance, remittance of sins, and eternal life was made by the Apostles and their contemporaries; it was confirmed so powerfully by miracle—attested so satisfactorily by Divine co-operation, that to reject it was to reject the manifest counsel of God. Tens of thousands did reject it, and chose rather to die in their Paganism than to live for ever according to the conditions of the glad tidings of God. Such heathens will not sleep “through endless duration.” They fell asleep when they were numbered with the dead; but they will be awake out of their sleep at the “second resurrection,” that they may be judged by Him whom they rejected according to their works. They can rise; they will rise, that God’s truth may be vindicated by the final destruction of their souls and bodies in hell.

In the third summary, the reporter has again erred. Our position is this, unless men believe and obey The Gospel preached by the Apostles they cannot attain to Eternal Life, call them by what name you will. We leave Mr. Hunnicut to settle this matter with the Scriptures of truth.

In his 7th, he has not correctly reported the conditions of Eternal Life as we stated them. The summary of the terms is contained in the reply of Jesus to the young man who said to him “Good master, what must I do that I may inherit eternal life?”—Jesus said “If you will enter into that life, keep the commandments.”—Now, it being premised, that a man is convinced of sin, and that if he die in his sins, where God is he cannot go—to such a man, who, under this dispensation, should inquire, what he should do that he might attain to eternal life with all its blessings,—the word of God directs that he should believe The Gospel and be baptized for the Remission of his sins. Having done this, he has but just set out on the road to immortality;—he has but taken the first step. He has been released from sin indeed, but he has now to walk worthy of his high calling during the rest of his days. For say the scriptures to those who have obeyed the truth, “God will render to every one according to his works. Eternal life, indeed, to them who, by PERSISTENCE IN WELL DOING, seek glory, honor, and immortality.” Here then the conditions are *first* belief of the gospel; *second*, obedience to it; *thirdly*, perseverance in well doing from baptism to the end of our natural life. Immortality is one of the things to be sought for, and will be obtained only by those who seek for it in the right way. The way is straight and narrow, and we regret to say it is traveled by very few. “Many are called but few are chosen.”

Let us strive to be of that few at all events.

The attacks of Sectarian Editors, and their various organs, we regard as matters of small importance;—we do not value greater length than the reputation of their writers.

plies death; and this learned scion of Randolph Macon thus expresses himself! He never heard us say any such thing; he must therefore impute this saying to us knowing that we never spoke it; or use the phrase, the meaning of which he is ignorant, to express a something which he does not understand. The "Rev. Gentleman" from the construction of this sentence knows very little, we suspect, about the Tree of Life. Must we enlighten his darkness by telling him, that the Tree of Life was in Paradise. When the Man was expelled from Eden, Cherubim and a sword of flame were placed between him and that Immortality—imparting Tree. So that, if man had been ever so desirous "after his expulsion" to have eaten of its fruit he could not. Let him search the Mosaic record, and see, if a period of time did not elapse between the transgression and the expulsion. He will find if he have discernment enough, that there was such an interval. Now, if man had eaten of the Tree of Life *during this interval*, not after his expulsion, for that was impossible, he would have lived for ever &c. Let it be remembered by the reader, that the specific purpose for which the Man was expelled from Eden was, that he might not eat of the Tree of Life, and so live for ever.

This is what we said—That man is wholly and absolutely mortal in himself appears from this.—"the Lord God said, Behold the man has become as one of us to know good and evil: and now Lest be put forth his hand and take also of the Tree of Life and eat, and live for ever; therefore the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden to till the ground *from whence he was taken*."—Now the consequence of the man having partaken of the Tree of Knowledge was that he had become the subject of evil as well as good. By having thus disobeyed God, he had entered into a *mixed state*, neither wholly good nor altogether evil, but partaking of both. In this mixed state he lived a short time in Eden. In the garden there was the Tree of Life, the fruit of which had the property of imparting immortality or eternal life to the eater. While therefore this tree was accessible to Adam he was in great peril; for had he eaten of its fruit he would have eternalized his existence in a state of good and evil—not of mortality, but of mixed evil. But here the mercy of God shone forth conspicuous. He did not want man to live for ever in misery, therefore he removed him from all possibility of inflicting this dreadful calamity upon himself, by expelling him from the Garden, and placing a guard "to keep the way of (or leading to) the Tree of Life."—Had God, then, interposed no further in human affairs after he had driven out the man, our race would have been as the beasts that perish; for out of the ground were they all taken, both brutes and men; and just they are, and unto dust they all return; and, but for the Providence and compassion of our Creator, in the dust should we all remain for ever and ever.

We did not say, that "all heathens will sleep through" the less duration—they never can rise."—To myriads of heathens the proclamation of repentance, remittance of sins, and eternal life was made by the Apostles and their contemporaries; it was confirmed so powerfully by miracle—attested so satisfactorily by Divine co-operation, that to reject it was to reject the most rest counsel of God. Tens of thousands did reject it, and chose rather to die in their Paganism than to live for ever according to the conditions of the glad tidings of God. Such heathens will not sleep "through endless duration." They fell asleep when they were numbered with the dead; but they will be awake out of their sleep at the "second resurrection," that they may be judged by Him whom they rejected according to their works. They can rise; they will rise, that God's truth may be vindicated by the final destruction of their souls and bodies in hell.

In the third summary, the reporter has again erred. Our position is this, unless men believe and obey The Gospel preached by the Apostles they cannot attain to Eternal Life, call them by what name you will. We leave Mr. Hunnicut to settle this matter with the Scriptures of truth.

In his 7th, he has not correctly reported the conditions of Eternal Life as we stated them. The summary of the terms is contained in the reply of Jesus to the young man who said to him "Good master, what must I do that I may inherit eternal life?"—Jesus said "If you will enter into that life, keep the commandments."—Now, it being proved, that a man is convinced of sin, and that if he die in his sins, where God is he cannot go—to such a man, who, under this dispensation, should inquire, what he should do that he might attain to eternal life with all its blessings,—the word of God directs that he should believe The Gospel and be baptized for the Remission of his sins. Having done this, he has but just set out on the road to immortality;—he has but taken the first step. He has been released from sin indeed, but he has now to walk worthy of his high calling during the rest of his days. For say the scriptures to those who have obeyed the truth, "God will render to every one according to his works. Eternal life, indeed, to them who, BY PERSISTENCE IN WELL DOING, seek glory, honor, and immortality." Here then the conditions are first belief of the gospel; second, obedience to it; thirdly, perseverance in well doing from baptism to the end of our natural life. Immortality is one of the things to be sought for, and will be obtained only by those who seek for it in the right way. This way is straight and narrow, and we regret to say it is traveled by very few. "Many are called but few chosen." Let us strive to be of that few at all events.

The attacks of Sectarian Editors and their organs, we regard as matters of small importance. We have no greater length than the reputation of their writers.

not that we expect to "turn them from darkness to light;" but that the public may be enlightened as to the questionable honesty &c. of their ghostly guides, and be disabused of the impositions practised upon them for the furtherance of the by-ends and ambitious purposes of the craft. We find, that the manuscript yet remaining to be set up, will over-run a page of print which is all that remains to complete this number. We are therefore, under the necessity of concluding these strictures upon Mr. Hunnicut's report in our next paper.

EDITOR.

PSALM L—C. M.

On the blessedness of the man who consorts not with the unrighteous, but delights in the daily meditation of the Word of God. He is like a fruitful evergreen, planted by streams of water; all he undertakes shall prosper. The destiny of the wicked contrasted with that of the righteous. They are like chaff driven before the wind. They shall not stand in the assembly of the just; for the road they travel leads to ruin.

Bless'd is the man that walketh not
In th' paths of the unjust,
Nor in the way of sinners stands,
Nor sits in th' scoffe.'s seat;

But whose delight is in the law
Of God, the Lord, Most High,
And on his precepts meditates
By day and night alike.

He's like a tree by rivers set,
Which timely fruit doth yield,
With leaves of evergreen;—all things
Shall thrive which he attempts.

Th' unrighteous are not so; they are
Like chaff which blows away.
The wicked therefore shall not stand
In judgment on that day;

Nor shall transgressors stand their ground
In th' concourse of the just;
For God the just man's way doth know,
But theirs to woe conducts.

THE ADVOCATE

Vol. 4. Amelia County, Va.; October, 1837.

CHRISTIANITY THE RELIGION OF CIVILIZED MAN

If we study the history of the Christian Religion we shall find, that, civilization in all parts of the world, proceeds in proclamation of the Gospel. Jesus was born of Mary in the Augustan age" of the Roman Dominion, which was acknowledged by the Nations of the East and West. This Age was the golden age of the Ancient World. It was an age of peace in which the arts, which embellish life, prevailed to a great extent. Multitudes could read with interest the writings of their poets and historians, and enjoy the intellectual repasts of the Forum, the Senate, and the Assemblies of the People. They were ravished by "the persuasive words of man's wisdom;" for eloquence and the art of reasoning were their glory and delight. These things sufficiently indicate the high intelligence, and civilization of the Ancient World.

Such was the character of the multitude. It was a mass capable of reasoning, or of examining and comparing the testimony, or the for and the against, of any propositions that might be submitted to their consideration. This is a qualification which distinguishes the civilized from the savage man. Man in the savage state is but a degree or so superior to the brutes; nay, in some regions of the earth he is decidedly their inferior, not indeed as to his organization, but with respect to his manifestations. Although he possesses intellectual and moral faculties as well as physical, their exercise is suspended for want of appropriate excitement, or proper education; and he is presented to the eye of the observer as a "natural irrational animal."

An animal of this description is inferior, cruel, and unreflecting. He is the creature of habit, who can be governed only by violence and fear. His gratitude from a principle of gratitude, is a stranger with him, than in his stomach. The subject of fear and the alms of life, his hand is against every man, and every man's hand against him. The equality and Comparison are inoperative; he is unable to discover dependencies of causation, or to compare great with small; in other words, he has no conception of cause and effect; nor can he discover the relation between things, and the things compared, or testimony and fact, established.

To publish to such an animal, testimony would be as irrational

under a paralysis of his extremities. The fact that God has never made proclamation to the uncivilized, is sufficient proof to my mind, that it would be useless. Hence, in reviewing the history of the world, I perceive, that God has always prepared the way for his proclamations before he has made them known. Take the Assyrian, Persian, Macedonian, and Roman Empires as an illustration of this. The wandering tribes of these countries were first subdued by war, which imposed upon them the necessity of a settled and regular life: in which, they devoted themselves to the cultivation of the soil and of the useful arts, in order to supply their immediate wants.— These being supplied they sought the luxuries of other climes, by commercial enterprise. Wealth and leisure followed in the train of commerce. As the necessities, real or imaginary, of men increased, new interests arose, which required to be defended and secured. Hence to conduct the affairs of a people rising into importance, talents, natural and acquired, were brought into play: and we find, that the Forum, the Senate, and Municipal Institutions, become the centres of new development. The progress of a people, then, from the savage to the civilized state, may be divided into periods, namely, the war period, the agricultural period, the commercial period, and the educational or civilized period. These appear to me to have been the periods through which every nation passed before God caused his proclamation to be announced.

To have published the gospel of peace amidst the din of war would have been useless. A nation of warriors in a state of war, will receive no message from earth or heaven tending to cool the tumult of their passions by an appeal to their benevolence. Hence God composed, and hushed to silence the discord of men, before he published to them his love. Upon the whole, I am convinced, that *God has caused the gospel to be proclaimed to all who have been hitherto able and willing to obey it; and that had it been announced to the tribes beyond the limits of the Roman World it would not have been received; and therefore, the proclamation was not made to them: so that God cannot be charged with partiality in publishing to the world within, and not to the world without, the limits of civilization.*

The gospel has never been authoritatively proclaimed to the Modern Nations of Europe, Asia, and America. In making this assertion, I am quite aware of what may be urged in regard to the scriptures. When I say authoritatively, I mean it has not been announced to them with the same attestations as to the Ancient Nations which occupied the same countries.

The gospel of their deliverance from Egyptian bondage was sustained by signs from heaven, wrought in the presence of Israel; the gospel of their deliverance from sin and the grave was attested by miracles, to the Jew first, and to the Greek,

effected by the power of the Spirit before their eyes; and the Gospel of the Everlasting Ago will be proclaimed to the existing Nations of the whole earth, by co-operation as authoritative and unquestionable; but though this will surely be, history bears us out in the assertion, that no gospel has been proclaimed to them sanctioned by the authority of heaven.

Look to facts. Take England, the most enlightened of her age as an example. The Ancient Gospel was promulgated in Britannia, then a province of Rome, in the first century; for Paul says, that in his day it was prevailing throughout all the world; and that it had been published to every creature under (the Roman) heaven. In process of time, it was corrupted so completely as to lose its original characteristics. The Christians of that Island "took pleasure in iniquity;" God therefore sent upon them a just punishment. The Romans drew off their legions for the defence of Italy, and in so doing marched away the flower of their youth, and left the Britons, become unwieldy and luxurious under the Roman rule, a prey to the invasions of the Picts and Scots. Against these contemptible enemies they were unable to defend themselves. They therefore, sent petitions to Rome, styled "The groans of the Britons," praying the Romans to come over and help them. But these masters of the world, were themselves the subjects of the indignation of God; who was pouring in the barbarous hordes upon their fairest provinces. They could afford them no succour. The disconsolate Britons next applied to the Saxons, a warlike people of Germany. They hastened to their assistance, glad of the opportunity of gaining a settlement in that beautiful country. They soon subdued the Picts and Scots; and finding how easily they were conquered, they judged, that the Britons might be as easily overcome. Having received reinforcements from Germany, they made war upon them, and succeeded after many years of war, in cooping up the unsubdued part of the nation in a corner of the Island, now known by the name of Wales. There in the fastnesses of this mountainous country they maintained their independencies for ages; till partly by stratagem and partly by war, they fell under the power of the English in the reign of Edward.

The Ancient British, Anglo-Romans or Welch, till their subjection by the English, maintained a religion which was a corruption of that received by their forefathers from the first teachers of Christianity. It was a part of the genuine apostasy on account of which God wrested from them their country, slew their thousands in battle, and blemished them in among the mountains of Wales. I say God did all this; for the Saxons were nothing more than his agents in the matter. I would fix the mind of the reader upon these things; for Episcopacy, the get quit of her Romish maternity, has sometimes claimed

sent from the religion of Wales; as if this were not equally apostate with Rome!

On the establishment of the Saxon barbarians in Britain, the Island was divided into seven kingdoms, termed the Heptarchy. "The Apostacy" had been destroyed; but the worship of Thior and Woden, gods of the Pagan conquerors, was set up in its place. How long England continued the dark abode of Paganism matters not; the conversion of her inhabitants to a new religion commenced with the labors of Austin an abbot at the head of 40 monks of the Benedictine Order, in the year 597. This Austin and his companions, landed in Kent, which was then a Saxon Kingdom. He preached the gospel of Romanism before the king, who soon after embraced it with great numbers of his people. Historics say, that Austin in one day immersed 10,000 in the river Swale, which runs into the Thames.

In process of time all England became Catholic; and the country which before had been politically subject to the Caesars now became spiritually subordinate to the Pope, the usurper of the Imperial purple. Reader! mark this well. The Saxon English were converted by the Apostles of Antichrist to Popery, and not to the Christian Religion. After a lapse of one thousand years, the English Papists rebelled against the Pope. They refused any longer to obey the Roman Impostor, and therefore, set up an hereditary succession of Popes in the persons of their Kings and Queens. This Anti-Popery of the English is known by the familiar name of Protestantism: which being a reformation of Popery, is but Popery still. Protestantism in England is English Popery modified; in Scotland, it is Scotch Popery modified, and so forth. The Greeks are Protestants of the most genuine kind: for they never submitted to the Roman Antichrist, but always *pro-tes-ted* against him and his Church. But it is obvious, that *Protestantism is not Christianity*.

Almost coeval with the rise of Protestantism in England is the rise of those numerous sects, which have all been transplanted to this country. These sects in that Island were summed up under the title of Dissenters. They are Protestors against Protestantism, which also protests against them. Dissenterism is neither more nor less than Popery somewhat more distilled than Protestantism or Church of Englandism. As Protestantism is the antagonist of Popery so Dissenterism is the enemy of both. In short the whole system from P to D, is a mere exhibition of a "Kingdom divided against itself." One step more and the climax is complete. As Popery begat Protestantism, and Protestantism begat Dissenterism, so Ignorance and Superstition have begot Infidelity which bids fair to destroy them all. And what next?—Why, "the Nations shall wait for his law."

From history it is apparent, that England has been the subject of the war, agricultural, and commercial periods, which have carried her onwards to that of her present state of civilization; in which she flourishes as in an Augustan Age of the Arts, Literature, and Sciences. Many things combined in the several ages of her existence, to exalt her to her present standing among the Nations of the World, which have always acted and re-acted upon each other. She is as a whole a noble structure, but neither permanent nor perfect. Ecclesiastical England, Political England, Philosophical England, and Domestic England are departments of the English System which excite in the student, feelings of a very different character. A mind enlightened by the Scriptures of truth, beholds no glory in the first, no beauty, symmetry, or consistency to make it desirable. Events now transpiring in her dominions show, that *her religious polity is not adapted to the wants and views of a civilized people*. It is notorious, that her ablest and most enlightened citizens have no faith in the institution of Protestantism or of Dissenterism. Multitudes, it is true, patronize these things; this patronage, however, has sobered down to the formal adhesion of a people, who prefer a defective system of religion to none at all. Romanism, Protestantism, and Dissenterism are but little else than Ecclesiastical Toryism, Conservatism, and Radicalism. God has but little to do with their counsels, and in that little, his aid is sought to prosper the designs of a party. The great body of the people are weary of the existing order of things; and are continually looking for and wishing a change.

The Ecclesiastical System of England is adapted only to a people, such as the English were in the days of William III. The Nation has outgrown its institutions. They are not adapted to an Enlightened race. The Scriptures have been too extensively circulated and read, to allow them much longer to tolerate them. They see, that Protestantism and Dissenterism have no counterpart in the New Testament; and hence, they are advancing rapidly upon the position, that *all sects should be placed upon an equal footing, to be patronized or rejected as the people please*. No chartered sect, no privileged religion, no national religious establishments, is the sentiment of the friends of civil and religious liberty there.

The Christian Religion, however, is not suited to the wants of the Nations, as Independent Bodies of Self Governing People. It never was designed for an alliance with Human Governments. The principles upon which these governments are essentially incompatible with the New Institutions. Nations must surrender their governments into the hands of Jesus, whose right it is to reign, before His religion can be a State Religion. It has almost accomplished its purpose in this Dispensation, which was, that by its means,

among the Gentiles might be taken for his name: this purpose will have been fulfilled when the times of the Gentiles shall have been completed. Then will "the kingdoms of this world have become the Kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ."

Though most highly civilized of all the Nations, England has not yet attained to the refinement necessary for a new order of things in which dwells righteousness and peace. It is true of England it is undoubtedly true of her sister monarchies. This refinement must be preceded by a period of war; a war, in which the preservation or destruction of existing Institutions will be involved. This position is illustrated by Spain &c. Things as they are, are incompatible with the New Age, which is to be everlasting or permanent; that is, undisturbed by revolution or Change, as all other ages have been before it. It is as necessary that a period of war should precede the Establishment of the thousand years of Messiah's reign, as that it should precede that of Antichrist over the Nations of Western Europe. There must be a break up of the existing order of things; and nothing but war can do it. The old world is but a slumbering volcano, ready to emit its fires, floods, and thunders at the voice of God. The Nations must be refined as in a refiners' fire; Messiah is that Refiner, and war is the blast of his furnace.

As the Age of Antichrist arose out of the ruins of the Old Roman World; so will the Age of Christ arise out of the ruins of "the times of the Gentiles" which now exist. Or, as the Roman Heavens passed away with a tumult of nations, so must the Heavens of Modern Times be rolled up with the fury and tempest of war.

Jehovah, says David, said to my Lord.

"Sit thou at my right hand,

"Until I make thy foes thy footstool."

Jehovah will extend the sceptre of thy power (O Messiah) from Zion;

Thou shalt rule in the midst of thine enemies!

Thy princely nation, shall be ready when thou musterest thy forces, in the splendid garment of holiness;

Thine associate Kings shall come forth like dew from the womb of the morning.

"Thou art a priest through all time,

After the order of Melchizedek!"

The Lord (Messiah) at thy right hand (O Jehovah)

Shall, in the day of his wrath, crush the heads of Kings.

He shall execute justice amongst the Nations;

He shall fill them with dead bodies,

He shall crush the Prince of his enemies over extensive countries.

He shall drink of the brook (be afflicted) in the way;
Therefore shall he lift up the head (or be exalted.)

Psalms, C.X.

In reading history, the truth of scripture should ever be present to our minds. We should never forget, that scripture history is an inspired narrative, containing the reflections of an unerring pen; while common history is an account, written by historians, whose minds were unenlightened by the truth.—Their phraseology, therefore, and that of Scripture must not be confounded. When they use the terms Christian, Gospel, Religion, &c., they do not attach the ideas to them, which these words stand for in the sacred writings. With them, the proclamation of the Benedictine monks to Ethelbert, King of Kent, was the Gospel; and his immersion is described as a conversion to the Christian Religion. In speaking of "the Church of Kent," Rapin says, "Ethelbert by his alliance with Bertha of France was induced to favor Christianity;"—he should have said—*Romanism*; "and in this favorable juncture it was that Pope Gregory I. sent missionaries into England to instruct the English in the knowledge of the gospel," or more correctly, in the knowledge of the *Italian Apostasy*. Hence, as soon as this system of Antichrist was adopted, by the immersion of the King and his people into Austin's proclamation, we see the Heathen Temples turned into Catholic Churches, and dedicated to all the saints in the Roman Calendar. The first monastery ever built in Savon England, was founded by Austin, the Italian Apostle of Romanism to the

Notes.—"From Zion;" where the *Throne of David his Father* "was. "Thy princely nation;"—Israel, the "nation of Kings."—"Forces;" his holy Angels—"Associate Kings;"—"Messiah's" brethren, who are "made kings and priests to God" by having been "washed in his blood."—"Come forth;" that is, from the womb of death as dew from the womb of the morning. A beautiful illustration of "the resurrection of the just." The womb of the morning is darkness, of which the light of morning appears to be born. As the Sun rises, his rays fall obliquely upon the dew, whose drops reflect his beams, and thus they become visible to the eye of the observer in all the brilliancy of prismatic colors. So the dark grave is the womb of death, of which "the Sons of light" are to be born. When the Sun of Righteousness shall arise, his healing beams will dissipate the darkness with which they are enshrouded, and manifest them in all the splendour of immortal youth.—"Priest through all time;" the priestly office will cease with sin; when death and hales, or the womb of death, cease no more, sin will have been thoroughly eradicated from among men. In the Eternal Age, which begins after the second resurrection, as the Expanding Age does after the first, every curse will have ceased; the offering of gifts and sacrifices for sins of the ignorant and erring, which is the purpose for which a High Priest is appointed, will therefore be done away. The Messiah is to be a High Priest through all time, but not through sin. He is to deliver up the priestly Kingdom to the Father, who will be removed, that God may be all and in all. Nevertheless, he will pre-eminence eternally.

Pagan English. He did not live to see it finished; some time however, before his death, he received The Pall, as a mark of distinction and honor; by which his metropolitan authority and dignity were greatly augmented in the estimation of his ignorant proselytes. On his tomb is the following inscription; which will go to show the kind of Gospel he preached, and the arts of conjuration he had recourse to, to assist him in imposing it upon the uncivilized English.

"Here lies Augustin, the first Archbishop of Doroborn (Canterbury) who having been sent hither by Gregory, Pontiff of Rome, and supported by the co operation of God with miracles, converted King Ethelbert and his nation to the faith; and having accomplished the days of his ministry, departed this life the 7th of the Kalends of June, in the reign of the said King."

We are not to suppose that during the twelve hundred and odd years which have elapsed since the days of Austin, there have been none of the true faith in England. There has been a remnant; bearing about the same proportion to the nation, that the 7000 did in the days of Elijah to the Kingdom of Israel. But they arose neither out of the ranks of Popery, Protestantism, nor Dissentism. They derived their origin from the Christians of Piedmont, Savoy, South of France, and the Pyrenees; who, when they were persecuted, fled for refuge to the British Isles, and there kept alive, though but feebly, the faith, for which, in the woods of America, we have the honor earnestly to contend.

Since Austin's day, there have been no missionaries sent to England from earth or heaven. If then, his proclamation was not that of the true gospel, the Gospel of Jesus Christ has not been authoritatively preached to the English. And, if this be true, the Religion of America falls under the same conclusion; for the Religions of this country are nothing more than those of Britain transplanted here; and considerably degenerated by the change of soil.

If the Popery, Protestantism, and Dissentism of England be adapted only to the ruder times of William III., the same Isms in America are certainly fit only for the days of barbarism; for they are infinitely less intellectual. The Sectarianism of this country is degrading to a people having the least pretension to rationality; the consequences therefore were necessary, and the end thereof is sure. It has begotten infidelity, positive and negative; which, being generated rapidly throughout the country, is charging the clouds of the social heavens with an electricity which will strike them with an impetuosity that will prostrate them in the dust.

If we contemplate the things now enacting, under the proscribed name of Religion in Society around us, we hear and see deeds of darkness and abomination, which fill the soul with horror and disgust to think upon. The moral and intellectual

faculties of the people are debased by the draughts of intoxication they imbibe from the pretended ministers of Christ. In Prince Edward county, while I am now writing, the Orgies of Sectarianism are driving their devotees to madness. A physician of that county writes me—"we are grieved to say, that the Leaders of Mystic Babylon are making sad havoc among us. Carefully laying aside all party ensigns, and uniting under the common banner of "spirit-baptism;"—that inveterate ghost and arch-demon of the Apostacy;—and, impelled to all appearance by some new and simultaneous feeling of common and imminent danger; this desperate coalition of hostile "brothers," like a mountain torrent is bearing down all before it;—triumphing in its desolating career, exulting in its trophies, and shaking, as it were, even the very "sons of light."—Drunk with the wine of their fornication, they forget both reason and scripture; and in the riot of feeling and passion, rival in many things even the rage of the prophets of Baal!"—An eye and ear-witness, and a non-professor, writes, "I have just returned from a "Great Revival of Religion," lately got up at Sandy River Church, Prince Edward. I there witnessed, what I should call a degradation of the Christian Religion. They substituted, for the means of salvation which is offered by it, a spiritual baptism; which they would feign have persuaded us came from God! This spiritual baptism was the dogma preached, as the means by which they might become instantaneously converted from a state of sin and misery into a state of inconceivable happiness; and they would have had us to believe, that this spirit descending immediately upon us, would instantly make us Christians. There is then required but one rite or ceremony, and that is "water-baptism," by which they are to become members of the temporal church. Having been baptized first of the Spirit they are members of the Kingdom of Church above; hence, they make baptism merely a means of entrance into the Church below. There were present about five "ministers." After singing and "praying," as they call it, their chief aim seemed to be to persuade the people to come up to "the altar" to be prayed over;—and this they do with a vengeance!—They then set before their hearers the terrors of hell and damnation, telling them the state of a sinner is like that of a man who is in "a horrible pit in which is miry clay; the greater efforts he makes to get out the deeper he gets in."—a poor prospect this for us poor sinners! They say we must throw ourselves-upon the mercy of Jesus Christ, and that we can do nothing; that we are poor, helpless, miserable, and lost; unless Jesus Christ have mercy upon us: and that, unless we come forward and be prayed over, and mourn, Jesus Christ shall be lost! So that unless we go up to their altar, we shall be the subjects of their prayers, and mourn, Jesus Christ will not have mercy upon us, and baptize us with

baptism." This appears to me to make these "ministers" of more importance than their pretended master; whose name they invoke, but do not obey.—"For our souls," say they, "we dare not tell you to put it off a day or an hour. You must instantly, at the very moment, come up to the anxious benches, or the next hour and you may be lost."—Having thus worked upon the passions of their hearers, who believing what they say, and knowing no other way of escape from the horrors set before them;—they succeed in bringing them to "the altar" and "anxious benches."—A strange scene then ensued, passing strange for "the House of God," as they call it. Men, women, and children, all jumbled together in one mass of confusion, clapping their hands, and shouting "glory!" Some of them down on their knees in moody weep; young females rolling on the floor, and throwing their heads about as if they were possessed. The preachers exulting in their work, walk about, not whispering consolation to soothe the anguish they have produced, but increasing it, by telling them, that of themselves they can do nothing—they must put their trust in Jesus, who is able to save them, &c. All they can do for them is to pray and sing over them; which greatly heightens their misery, feeling unable to join in their "devotions." Now, it seems to me, the most distressing thing of all, is that these preachers tell them of no means by which to escape this dreadful state, other than by a special outpouring of the "Holy Ghost;"—which they had the assurance to say, they could see coming; exhorting them to take hold of it before it is too late. When they did take hold of it, or it takes hold of them, they cut more capers than a Harlequin."

Such was this "Great Revival of Religion," which resulted in the addition of numerous converts to the Baptist Religion in Prince Edward. From one the reader may judge of all similar assemblies. Now, we put it to every intelligent man, whether, with the light of scripture shining into his mind, he can honestly affirm that such a system of things forms any part of the Religion of Jesus Christ. If the people knew the scriptures, such Babelish proceedings would be frowned out of society. For my own part, I believe there was as much of the gospel in the proclamation of Austin and his monks, as in the exhibitions of Messrs. Witts, Tinsley, &c., who seized so tragico-comically at Sa. dy River Church. Such a Religion may do for the half-civilized Sectarian, or savage people;—the mere creatures of passion or animal impulse; but it assuredly would not be named among enlightened and civilized society, only as one of the forms of delusion that once prostrated the minds of men.

The Christian Religion is so constituted as to suit the faculties of a moral, intellectual, and animal being; hence the faith and obedience of which it is the sum, require the exercise

of all these powers in man. It proposes to him certain things to be believed. Before he can rationally receive or reject them, they must be calmly and dispassionately examined according to the light or evidence adduced in support of them. He can believe nothing, unless there be evidence to prove the proposition submitted to him. Before prophecy can have any weight with him, he must become acquainted with the history of human affairs. They who are ignorant of these, as those nations are, which now sit in the darkness of Paganism, the scriptures come with no force; for the prophetic attestations of scripture lie in countries with the existence of which they are altogether uninformed. Nothing short of a new manifestation of divine power can bring the nations of the Pagan world over to Jesus. A new dispensation must be introduced. The New Institution as it is, cannot be received by the uncivilized. They cannot comprehend the notion of loving God, whom they know not, because he first loved them; a love of which they are unconscious. Nothing but fear is sufficiently potent with them to exact obedience; and, were it not, for the terrors of hell which I are got hold of the people of this country, even they would cease to yield that apology for obedience which now sullies them; for they are "strangers to the love of God," and therefore see nothing in him worthy of admiration.

"I have conversed," says a certain writer, "with many travellers that have been over the Stony mountains into the great Missionary settlements of St. Peter and St. Paul. These travellers, and some of them were professed Catholics, unite in affirming, that the converts will escape from the mission, whenever it is in their power, fly into their native deserts and resume at once their old modes of life. The vast empire of the Jesuits in Paraguay has all passed away, and we are told the descendants of their convert Indians are no way distinguished from other savages. It strikes me that Christianity is the religion of civilized man, that the savages must first be civilized; and as there is little hope that the present generation of savages can be well civilized, there is but little more that they will be Christianized."

This article, which I shall now conclude, was suggested to my mind by this conviction, that "Christianity is the religion of civilized man," and by the perusal of a notice in the Religious Herald to the effect, that, "Elder James B. Taylor, baptized 11 persons—seven of whom were colored. On the same day, Elder J. B. Jeter baptized 123 all of whom were colored." Here were 134 persons immersed or baptized as it is termed, of whom only four were white people.—Now this speaks volumes as to the Baptist Religion in Richmond. It is painful to find that in that city, that the conduct or morals of the colored members are deteriorated rather than improved after they become members of the Baptist Church. How can it be otherwise?

"pastor's" exhibitions are the barren generalities and dry details of the textuary: very little of the scriptures is read in their assemblies; the colored members cannot read: besides which both whites and blacks agree, that the word of God is a dead letter, and that without the spirit (which by the bye, they never receive; for he takes not up his abode in the hearts of the unclean) it cannot be understood. Instead then of feeding upon the rich repasts of the divine word they stare upon the dry husks of a miserable school divinity; which develops its fruits in the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life, in which the professors of Richmond Baptist-in luxuriance and abound. Let them take a hint from one who wishes them well though he thus speak—de throne the pulpit lords of your communion: select some good readers from your ranks: let them read to you without note or comment, the instructions of the Prophets and Apostles as contained in the Scriptures; accompany this public reading with a private and diligent study of the Word: after six months, if you believe the teaching you have heard read, then let every such man and woman obey the voice of the Holy Spirit by Peter—amend your lives and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the Remission of your sins; being thus sanctified and cleansed by a bath of water and the word" continue thereafter to walk before the Lord to all well pleasing, and you will be safe for the life which is to come. But go on in your present course and you will find that the time will come upon you, if indeed it have not arrived already, when your institution will be deemed fit only for the untutored barbarian; instead of the heaven-born religion of a civilized man.

EDITOR.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST

No. 3.

To Sir Culling Eardley Smith, the Honourable and Reverend Baptist Noel, and "the Reverend" James Sherman.

Excellent Sirs,

The renowned Apostle to the Nations of the Old World has somewhere said, that the time would come, when God would send upon them "strong delusion, that they might believe a lie." This is the most awful misap that can befall a people. But the curse causeless shall not come.—There must, therefore, be a reason why England and her American offspring, as well as France, Spain, Portugal, &c. with their transatlantic progeny, are now suffering under this deplorable visitation. These European Nations, you are aware, are the successors of those to whom the true gospel was originally proclaimed and attested by heaven. Now it must be ob-

vious to your sagacity, that a marvellous discrepancy exists between the faith and practice—the religion and morals—of those who bear the name of Christian now, and of those who bore it in the Apostles' days, as evinced by the Sacred Writings. For this discrepancy there must be a cause. Is it no because there has been a grievous apostasy from the truth both in theory and in practice? Would the Angels of the Apocalypse have sounded their loud blasts over the earth, the sea, the rivers, and the mountains of water?—Would they have poured out the vials of Almighty God upon the earth, the sea, the rivers, and the fountains of water; upon the sun, the throne of the Beast, the Euphrates, and the air—had not these Nations altogether corrupted His way?—Yes, you Islanders of the Sea, and you neighbors, the inhabitants of the earth with the borders on its streams and fountains have followed after a grievous departure from the truth! Britain, Excellent Sir, is a part of that grand apostasy, which the Scripture foretold would appear as the consummation of that Mystery of Iniquity which was working secretly in the Apostles' days. Look around you and contemplate before the light of truth the delinquency of your times. Behold the devotees of your own faith. Is it possible that with a good conscience, you could copy after your spiritual Lords, the Bishop, observing carefully the issue of their conduct, that you may imitate their faith? Do they watch for your souls as a father who must give an account? Are they such as you would honestly propose to your people "as patterns to the flock"? Are they not rather personifications of ambition, hypocrisy and lust? Look at your worship! Listen to those "common prayers;" mark those vain repetitions; those dry, insipid formalities you observe in obedience, not to God, but to Act of Parliament. Give ear to those "under shepherd;"—attend to their jejune and vaporing generalities, and say if in all these things you can find the image of that substance which formerly obtained in the spiritual sacrifices of the Kings and Priests of God. No, Sirs; you cannot find it. They are not identical. They stand related to one another as Belial to Christ. They are a part of that "lie," which the Gentiles, who have not continued in the goodness of God, have given themselves up to believe. You talk much of "Original Sin." The belief of a lie led to that sin. Truly, then, in this sense, the Europeans are buried in this sin; for they do not believe the truth, but take pleasure in their own ways, which are iniquitous in the sight of God. For this cause, then, because they have not embraced the *love* of the truth that they have named, God has sent them strong delusion that they might believe a lie: that all may be condemned who have not the truth.

You see then, Excellent Sirs, how important it is that we should believe THE TRUTH. If you do not believe the truth

will be condemned. Your sincerity in your present faith, if it should prove to be wrong, can by no means save you. An error is a lie; and all the sincerity in the world can never convert it into truth. If you die in the sincere belief of error, as opposed to the truth, you are lost; but if you embrace the truth in the love of it you will be safe. Impressed with these views, I am the more earnest with you; because from the little acquaintance I have with your fame, I think you are sincere; and if I did not, I should despise you from the bottom of my heart.

If what I have already submitted to your consideration be true, then whatever is opposed to it must be false. There is, there can be, no middle ground between us. Either you are right and I am wrong, or I am right and you are wrong. We cannot both be right; for things different cannot be the same. I am willing to abide this issue for life or death eternal.

Well then, the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven were entrusted to Peter. They were committed to him that he might open its doors—"the doors of faith"—to the people of God, against whom they had been closed by the Scribes, Pharisees, and Lawyers. In opening the Kingdom, Peter acted only as the agent of Messiah, "who opens and no man shuts; and shuts, and no man opens." You will observe, then, that when the Kingdom had once been opened, no man could again shut it unless duly authorized of Jesus. Now, if you search the Scriptures, you will find that he has not given authority to any to shut it; if therefore it has been shut and do yet remain shut it is not by his authority, further than this, that because the Jews and Gentiles did not continue in his favor, but apostatized from the truth, he has shut them out by sending upon them the strong delusion of which we have been speaking above; so that if any enter now, it is by invading the Kingdom, and taking it by force. The Kingdom of Heaven is invaded, and the violent take it by force. Antichrist has seized the gates, and having taken away the Keys, has suspended them to his girdle. He has encamped against the Citadel and surrounded it with his hostile bands. Many have been the sales of its citizen-troops, and though they have suffered much slaughter, they have made some prisoners from the foe. The time has at length arrived when their patient endurance, and arduous conflicts have been crowned with partial success; for they have with the sword of the Spirit opened a way into the city through the ranks of the enemy; and are still fighting the battle of the Lord against the mighty in doing their best to clear away the rubbish, and to expel from their lanes and streets every thing calculated to offend. Thus a communication has been established between the garrison and those without, who would have entered but had not been able. This re-opened way is narrow, and still beset by many difficulties; yet some

have the courage to force their way and victoriously to enter in. But figure aside.

In England the Kingdom of Heaven is to a great extent shut against men; and to be faithful with you, Gentlemen, your order has contrived to shut it by Act of Parliament. Your Church has cajoled "the Laity" into the belief that it is the Church of Christ or Kingdom of Heaven. They, therefore, in their piety, have placed it under the patronage of the crown, and allied it to the State. They pay enormous sums to your order to perpetuate the delusion—the strong delusion which binds them fast in the chains of superstition. Who that believes "the lie," that your Church is the Church or pure spouse of Christ, would strive to enter into a poor, powerless, and un-influential community of believers, whose only outward recommendation was to be found in a holy life, and a tenacious adherence to the Scriptures, and to the ordinances found therein, in opposition to all human standards and institutions? The belief of this lie it is which alienates multitudes from the truth and leads them off to fables.

As we have said, Peter had a plurality of Keys committed to his care. That is, he was empowered to open heaven on two several occasions to as many classes of men.

In the days of the Apostles, the Roman Empire, which was then styled The World, was divided into three classes. These were Jews, Proselytes, and Pagans. The Jews and Proselytes were the people of God; the rest of the world was not his people; the former were clean, the latter unclean. Of the proselytes there were two kinds; "the proselytes of justice" and "the proselytes of the gate." They were both worshippers of the true God. The former however, were circumcised, the latter not: yet they were not permitted to dwell within the gates of Israel, and to worship in the Court of the Gentiles—"The Proselytes of justice" were admitted to all the rights, privileges, and immunities of the natural Jew. These were clean; though in the same sense, this cannot be affirmed of "the Proselytes of the gate."—The proselytes mentioned in the 2d of Acts were those "of justice," while those named in the 10th chapter, appear to have been "Proselytes of the gate" "uncircumcised" and therefore "common or unclean."

To the Jews and "Proselytes of Justice," then, Peter addressed himself on the Day of Pentecost; and some few years afterwards, to the "Proselytes of the gate" in the house of Cornelius.

Let us pause here, and consider a few preliminary and important events. Jesus commanded Peter and the other Apostles to open the Kingdom to all Nations, by their repentance and the remission of sins, in his name.

*See Prid. Con. Vol. 2, p. 203. American Edition.

at Jerusalem. Now observe, these Apostles were Galileans and understood no other language than their own: how were they, then, to speak in the languages of these several nations the wonderful works of God? In reply to his command they might have said, Master, we are willing to obey you, but we have not the power, seeing that we know no other tongue but our own! But what did Jesus say to them? He charged them not to depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father. You shall be baptized or filled with the Holy Spirit, within a few days. You shall receive power by the Holy Spirit coming upon you. Acts i.—Now mark! They were to be endued with this power at Jerusalem within a few days after the Ascension. Then to Jerusalem let us go; and not to London or to Rome.

Jesus ascended to the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens, on the forty-third day after his crucifixion. Seven days after we find the Apostles unanimously assembled in the same place. Suddenly their attention was arrested by a sound as of a rushing tempest, accompanied by luminous appearances, resembling tongues of fire distinctly separated and even. These were so distributed as for due to rest upon each of them. Here was a symbol; of what was it the sign? A symbol of the power with which they were supernaturally endowed to speak a plurality of languages. The sign upon each of them was a tongue of light split or cleft into two; showing that each of them was gifted with the gift of tongues. Here then they were instantaneously qualified to do the work which Jesus had commanded them to do—namely to preach the Gospel in all the languages of the Roman World; for they spoke in other languages as the Spirit gave them utterance.

But on this occasion, the power which the Apostles possessed of speaking divers languages, answered for a sign to the spectators that they were speaking under the sanction of Him who conferred on men the power of speech.—“In the law it is written, ‘Surely, with other tongues, and with other lips, I will speak to this people; yet not even then will they hearken to me, says the Lord.’” So that foreign languages are for a sign; not to believers, but to unbelievers—as were the multitude assembled on Pentecost. 1 Cor. xiv.

Now when the report of this astonishing event was rumored abroad, a great concourse of Jews and Proselytes assembled.—These were sojourners in Jerusalem from every nation under the Roman heaven or government. You will please to note their characters. They were unbelievers, and fifty days before had caused Jesus to be apprehended, and, by the hands of the Romans, crucified and slain. They were, therefore, guilty of a great offence. They had put to death their own Messiah, the Apostle of God. This was their crime which constituted their iniquity.

“The promise of the Father,” the Holy Spirit, had come down. It had come to the Apostles, and had taken up its abode in them. The old Christians had “this treasure” the Holy Spirit “in earthen vessels.” Jesus had said to them, “If I go away, I will send the Advocate to you. And when he is come, he shall convince the world of sin, because they believe not in me.” On another occasion, he said to his Apostles, “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 will speak by you.”—Hence, when Peter stood up with the eleven, and spake to the assembled Jews, it was the Father, by his Spirit, through Peter convincing them of sin, because they had not believed on his Son Jesus.

He showed, that what they saw with their eyes, and heard with their ears, was a fulfilment of what God had said by his prophet Joel; and which he quoted. This prediction divides itself into three parts.—First, a promise of the Spirit; second, a threatened judgment upon the Sinite and people; and third, a promise of escape from this judgment to every one who should invoke the name of the Lord. He demonstrated further that what they saw and heard was a proof of the resurrection and consequent exaltation of Jesus to be Lord as well as Christ. “Being exalted therefore, to the right hand of God, and having received the promise of the Holy Spirit from the Father, he hath shed forth this which you see (resting on us) and hear” (in the numerous languages we speak.)

He quoted from the Psalms to convince them, that the Messiah whom God had promised them, was to be put to death, to rise again, and to ascend to the right hand of God: and that this Jesus, whom they had slain was that sufferer, and that risen and exalted One. Read his reasoning in detail as recorded Act. ii., at your leisure: and so, as I have often heard the priests of your religion pray, that they might be enabled to do, *mark, learn, and inwardly digest it.*”

Now, what was the effect of this discourse of the Holy Spirit upon the minds of those who heard it? Was it not to convince them of sin, because they had not believed on Jesus; and so judgment, because the Prince of their world was to be judged; a judgment which was consummated upon the Christ of their nation at the destruction of their city? Certainly, these unbelievers were changed into believers; by the power of the Holy Spirit laid before them. They were convinced that Jesus was the true Christ; and as an evidence of their conviction, they were commanded of Peter and the rest of the Apostles to be baptized.

WHAT SHALL WE DO?

—We have now arrived at the interesting point, where Jesus was upon the eve of opening the Kingdom of Heaven to the inquiring Jews and Proselytes. The Kingdom of Heaven

elsewhere termed **THE NEW INSTITUTION** in opposition to the **Mosaic**, which was **Old**, and about to vanish away. Concerning this new Institution the Scriptures teach, that its laws were not to be exhibited upon tables of stone as were the Mosaic, but on the minds and hearts of its subjects, whose sins and iniquities God would remember no more." Heb. viii.—Hence the citizens of the Kingdom of Heaven, before they could be admitted into so spiritual an institution, were to be cleansed or purified from sin. As the Mosaic was about to pass away, with its sacrifices and means of remission, it was then as yet a secret, what new means would be appointed by which to become just with God. The nation of Israel were ignorant of this secret; if their religion was to be set aside, they knew not how admission was to be gained into the Kingdom of Heaven. But the Apostles knew.

This ignorance on the one hand, and knowledge upon the other is obvious from what follows.— "What shall we do?"—How shall we obtain pardon of God for this greatest of sins? The answer of Peter is the way to obtain pardon of God and a consequent admission into the Kingdom of Heaven.

Answer.—**AMEND YOUR LIVES AND BE EACH OF YOU BAPTIZED IN THE NAME OF JESUS CHRIST FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS.**

Thus was the door of Heaven opened "to the Jew first."—Three thousand souls received his word with readiness, and were baptized for the remission of sins; and were that very day added to the disciples. In this way, by being baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for remission of sins, they became Christians. Before their baptism they were first unbelievers dead in trespasses and in sins; they were then begotten of the Father by the Spirit to the belief of the truth and thus became changed in their disposition, views, and feelings; they were believing Jews and Proselytes convinced of sin; they were "convinced of righteousness;" that is, they were convinced, that to become righteous with God they must be baptized into his Son; by baptism their state was changed—by a submission to that institution they were translated from a state of sin into a state of righteousness, or favor with God. Read for yourselves, Excellent Sirs, and see if this be not the true unvarnished, unsophisticated matter of fact. Compare this way of entering into the Kingdom of Heaven, and of becoming Christians, with the practice of your Church, and then say, if you can with a good conscience, that you and your brethren of the National Establishment can possibly be Christians.

The Scripture saith, that, "without faith it is impossible to please God." Mark I Sirs, the awful attitude in which your souls stand before God. *Practically* you say that this is not so; but if actually you contend that faith is not necessary to become Christians. How much faith, Goodlemen, must your consciences have you sprinkle with Holy Water and

sign with the sign of the cross when you rhanize them into the Queen of England's Church. By this process it is that you cleanse them of "original sin;" regenerate them; make them Christians, and fit them for sepulture in "consecrated ground?" This is what you call baptism into Christ, and yet no faith in Christ is needed! Say not dear friends, that the faith is in the sponsors. The godfathers and godmothers are for the most part liars in all sincerity. Did not the sponsors of George IV promise in his behalf to renounce the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same, and the carnal desires of the flesh, so that he should not follow them, nor be led by them?" Did not your late king's sponsors do the same, and Miss Victoria's also? And have these personages, the Popes of Protestantism done the things by *praxy* they were bound to do? Did not "the Right Rev. Father in God" who rhanitized or christened them, pronounce them regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ's Church? Did he not with his deceitful lips yield "heartly thanks" to God for this, and declare that they were dead to sin, and living to righteousness, and had been buried with Christ in his death? Yes, Good-men, these are the lying mysteries of your English Mass Book;—mysteries indeed, which shock our senses, and almost persuade us, that reason has fled from man to brutish beasts.

We shall resume this subject in our next: till then I subscribe myself

Your well wisher,

THE EDITOR.

AN "EXPERIENCE"

Illustrative of the Gospels according to Antichrist being essentially different from the Gospel of Jesus Christ; and respectfully submitted, by request to all of the like "faith" and practice with the writer.

Brother Thomas,

Some twenty moons ago I undertook to write out my (so called) "Christian Experience," and in doing so, I was so irresistibly brought to the conclusion that I had not obeyed the Gospel, that I determined to obey, in baptism, what I did not know or believe at my first immersion. As my Experience will, I presume, agree, in all its essential parts, with that of most other Baptists, and perhaps of all the Pædobaptists; if it shall be shown that when I became a Baptist, I held a Gospel essentially different from the Gospel of Christ, and that those whose experiences essentially agree with mine must also have believed something essentially different from the Gospel. What then, let us inquire, is the

Gospel? It is this: That complete atonement *has been made*—that God is satisfied with the sacrifice which *has been offered*—that he is therefore reconciled to the world, and is now by his Ambassadors, the Apostles, beseeching the world to be reconciled to him. And what, let me ask, is the essence of that which is believed, taught, and obeyed for the Gospel, by the Baptists, as well as the Pædobaptists, "of this degenerate age?" It is (I mean the practical result, for whatever the theory may be, the result is, practice is) that the atonement made for sin is *not* complete, that God is *not* satisfied with the sacrifice of the *spotless* Lamb that *has been offered*; and that he is *not* reconciled with the world; but that, in order to appease the wrath of God, and render him propitious, each sinner is required to offer up his own prayers, tears, cries, penance, &c., as a sacrifice for his own sins; thereby *practically* setting aside the sacrifice of Christ as of no use or effect.

Now I beseech the reader to compare his experience with mine, and see if they are *not essentially the same*, and then compare both his and mine together with the Gospel, and see if they are *not essentially different*—if so let him reject both his experience and mine as anti-scriptural, and cleave to the Gospel which *alone* is the power of God to salvation.

Well, then, about twenty-one years ago having been previously taught by Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians, that, in order to get religion (as they call it) one must pray, read books, sing songs, attend meetings, &c. in order to bring on what they call conviction; then the convict must weep, mourn, pray, and afflict himself with bitter anguish and deep distress, for an indefinite period of time, till God shall be satisfied with his sacrifice of penance; then the Holy Spirit would be despatched from heaven into the heart of the penitent convict, and take away his burden, shine away his darkness, give him a new heart; and in short make him a new creature—I say, having been taught these things, and having for years labored accordingly—about twenty-one years ago just as I was on the eve of setting out for a Methodist Camp meeting some twenty miles off, I had a dream of rather an uncommon kind, which I interpreted to mean, that though I was not converted, yet that I might be at the Camp-meeting, for which I was on the morrow to set out. Under this impression, I went to the Camp-ground, where many of my conscientious but deluded friends and relatives had assembled to make an attack, as they supposed upon the troops of his Satanic Majesty. Soon after my arrival, I was warmly invited into the altar, and directed to kneel, or rather to prostrate myself on the ground, and to pray to God to have mercy on me—to pardon my sins—to accept of my penance as a sacrifice for sin, &c. This I did for several days, without success, and when I was just about to sink in despair, I was told by way of encouragement, that the darkest

time of night is just before day, so I pressed on in great pain and distress, until some of my good kinsfolks, with good intentions, no doubt, but with mistaken views, came around, and took me by the hand, with great remonstrances for awhile, then cooling down, said I had *suffered enough*, and urged me to rise and shout; and thus by the high degree of excitement and subsequent re-action of the mind, I "got through," or to speak more truly I was *pulled through* by those who thus held me by the hands and raised me from the ground. And so I was induced to think that I was regenerated and born again by an infusion of the "Holy Ghost" into my heart; and being thus *cleansed* and made *alive*, I was told by the Methodists that I must then be *cleansed* (again) by having water poured or sprinkled on me, and by the Baptists, that I must be buried (alive of course) in order to be admitted into their respective communities; and accordingly 10 or 12 months afterwards, I was buried in water by a Baptist Parson and so added to that sect. Now in all this affair the blood of Christ had no agency nor is there any need or place in the system for it—it is manifest from my conduct and from that of my teachers, that neither I nor they believed, that the blood of Christ cleanses from *all* sin; but that they taught, and I believed that my praying, weeping, suffering, &c. cleansed me from sin, and that just at the instant when my sins were thus atoned for, God gave me his spirit to regenerate my heart, and so I was made a new creature without the water or the blood, two of the witnesses that testify in behalf of God on earth. It is true I was told that Christ suffered, bled and died on the cross; and that was only to excite my sympathies—to cause me to weep and mourn, to agonize and pray, as a sacrifice for my own sins. The sects *all* teach, practically, if not theoretically as far as I know, that sometimes the *judgments*, at other times the *Spirit* of God produces *conviction* in the heart of the sinner; and the sufferings, prayers, and penance of the convict *atones* for his sins, and just at the moment when his sufferings, as a sacrifice, have become *equal* to his sins, the Spirit is infused into the heart and works faith, conversion or remission of sins, and thus makes him a new creature. Hence then is no place in their system for the blood of Christ; for the Spirit convicts, the sinner's sufferings &c. atone, and the Spirit finishes the work, by cleansing from sin; of course the system is *not* the Gospel which the Apostles preached, but something *essentially* different from it. For according to the Gospel of Christ, as preached by the Apostles it is the *Word* or *Truth* of God (which is the sword of the Spirit,) and *not* the sinner's sufferings, acting physically, *nor* the judgments of God, that convicts the sinner's heart and produces conviction; and it is the sacrifice of the *spotless* Lamb of God, and *not* the sufferings, tears, cries, penance, &c. of the convict, that atones for his sins.

it is submission, through faith, to the sin-remitting institution of the Gospel, and not any physical infusion or personal visit of the Spirit, that can wash away the sins or purify the conscience of the penitent believer. For out of Christ Jesus there can be no new creature; and there is no being in Christ Jesus till we have put on Christ—there is no way to put on Christ but in baptism—hence there is no new creature before baptism. "For as many of you as have been baptised in Christ, have put on Christ" Gal. iii. 27. "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision avails any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature" Gal. vi. 15.—"Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life" Rom. vi. 4. So that before we can enter upon this new life, the old man of sin must be put to death by the sword of the Spirit, (which is the word of God Eph. vi. 17) and then this slain or dead old man must be put off and buried, in order that the new creature in Christ Jesus may arise to walk in newness of life. Now the sects (Baptists as well as others) believe and teach that this new life begins before the death and burial of the old man and resurrection of the new man into newness of life; but the Scriptures teach that it is as necessary to pass through the grave of water in order to enter upon that new life, which the Christian enjoys in this mortal body, as it is to pass through the grave of earth in order to enter upon that life eternal, which the resurrected saints shall enjoy in their immortal and glorified bodies.

As ever yours &c,
A. B. WALTHALL.

THE GOSPEL IN BUCKINGHAM.

On the fourth Lord's day in September, we visited, by request, Buckingham County. Brother A. B. Walthall accompanied me. Our appointment was at Buckingham Church, which is an old Episcopal Church of the days before the Revolution, and distant about three miles from "The Collegiate Institute;" of which our quondam opponent, Mr. Huestis, late of Farmville, Prince-Edward, is "the President." "The Church" is chiefly in the occupancy of the Baptists, under the incubus of "the Rev." P. Smith; who is the "Sir Oracle," as our friend styles him of the parish. Upon our arrival in the neighborhood, or the day before, we were informed, that Messrs. Smith and Huestis had taken great pains to blind the eyes of the people, and to stop their ears, that seeing they should not perceive, and hearing they should not understand, and be converted, and healed of that morbidity inflicted upon them by their priestly efforts.—They were very busy in prejudicing the minds of the citizens against us. Parson Smith read Parson Hunicutt's report of our debate with Parson Watt; he

echoed the old slander of our infidelity, and so forth, and advised his disciples not to hear us, but to go to the Methodist quarterly meeting to be held at Rocky Mount on the same day. Parson Huestis, (he who told his dear Brother Parson Drake that we carried a sword cane, &c)—on the other hand, gave similar advice. Upon being asked "why he dreaded Dr. Thomas' coming?"—He replied, as we are informed, "that the reason was he dreaded a split in the Baptist Church? Sympathizing soul! Affectionate creature! A baby sprinkler dreads a split in a Church which refused to fellowship his whole community because it is not immersed! Who but parsons and parsons' tools will give credit to the honesty of such a dread?"

But the coalition of parsons notwithstanding, some had the independence to exercise their own judgment in this case. We had, it is true, but few ladies; say a dozen or two; while we were honored by the attendance of a goodly number of their lords. All things considered we had a very good congregation, and certainly one of the most attentive we ever addressed.—Bro. Walthall made a few introductory remarks explanatory of our deviating from popular custom, in not calling upon them to join us in prayer and singing; which are spiritual sacrifice to be offered only by the kings and priests of God, on all appropriate occasions. We had come to them as strangers, to reason with them out of the scriptures "concerning the things belonging to their eternal weal. This, and not the worship of God was the purpose for which we had come together. He showed what the worship of God consisted in. That if we had assembled as a body of baptized believers of the Gospel, in other words, as Christians, we should, then, attend to "the fellowship, the breaking of the loaf, prayers, and singing, in addition to "the teaching of the Apostles." He showed what these things were; that they made up the worship of God in spirit and in truth, as preached by the Ancients; and that for this reason, we of the moderns contended for them as worthy of all reception and observance now.

Having sat down, I stood up, and after offering some remarks on the report of Parson Hunicutt, proceeded to reason with them out of the Scriptures concerning sin, righteousness, and judgment to come. The effect upon the hearers was as described by our correspondent below. I addressed them for three hours without intermission, during which their attention was profound. I believe I may thank the "Ghostly Fathers" for this. They had libelled me so grossly, that the citizens must have expected to hear an utterer of blasphemies and vain conceits; but what must have been their amazement, when they found that we spoke forth the words of truth and soberness. We had been described as the worst kind of infidel; for one of the parsons, "he tries to prove his infidelity from the scriptures."—A singular kind of infidelity this!—But let the

plemen beware, lest in judging us they be condemned themselves. The citizens have believed them once, but we suspect they will take care how they believe them again.

Entron.

Buckingham, Oct. 3th, 1837.

To the Editor of the "Advocate."

When I requested your address at Buckingham Church on the 23d Sabbath in September, it was with the full intention of reading on my subscription to your paper early in the then ensuing week. But on my way home from that place, concluded that I would first see several of my acquaintances by or hears on that day) and had out their estimation of your discourse, and the probability of their becoming regular readers of the "Advocate" with myself. I did so; found to my well pleased that what they had heard, particularly at that part which was your reply to the notorious slanders, which were read from that pulpit, on the Sabbath before, by the "Sir Oracle" of that neighborhood, and that part of the County.

With your religious tenets, so far as they could be gathered from that discourse, all (with one exception) were enthusiastically pleased. They highly extolled your simplicity, free liberality, and their unobscured, as they called it, non-contradiction from that narrow, contracted, sensual and bigoted principle which characterizes the doctrine usually emanating from that desk.

Before becoming a subscriber to your work, I, at their instance, and for their and my own information, desire that you will send, directed to "Diana Mills P. O. Buckingham," that No. of your periodical which contain your reply to that extract which was read by the Rev. Smith (P. P.) to his flock, the week before you were among us, and your objections upon the object with which it was then read; and all the articles of your Faith, if the same No. will contain both; if not, inform us of the latter, by note, or by sending such other No. as does contain them.

There are many valuable citizens, intelligent, influential, and liberal in the vicinity of Buckingham Church, who are not so indissolubly attached to the popular dogmas of the day that they cannot be made sensible of the errors of those dogmas. Of this consoling fact, I have lately had two clear proofs; one of which was the anxiety to hear, and the enthusiasm (the only word sufficiently descriptive of their feelings on that day) with which they received the doctrines of your discourse on that occasion; and the other consists in the open repudiation of the object which induced the propagation of that infamous libel.

Very many persons, I, one of them, had heard you called the "no soul Preacher," "the Devil," "the Unbeliever" &c. &c.

they chose to "hear all" and decide for themselves. That was the sign characteristic incident has had a very happy result in this remarkable case. I do conscientiously believe that to see so fair and so good discourses would be attended with such consequences, and they would be able without violence, to study the status of the popular fabric of Christianity that they would, with many, lay their centre of gravity and topple down.

Free from religious as well as political,
most respectfully,
ALFRED SWANEY TAYLOR

REMARKS ON MR. HUNNIGUT'S REPORT CONCLUDED.

His report is correct inasmuch as it is not a fair statement. My objection was for a time to the complaining that we did not come to the point. By this, we suppose, he intended to point. We showed at length that we all long to do at the point that he had a prejudice. As a proof of this, we had received a surprise when we had a vocal many of our hearers, that the orthodox notions of an "immortal soul" were not sustained by the scriptures of truth; and which condemn us to go on in the same course we were pursuing.

His statement with this allusion that the Spirit of God does not now operate on any persons at from the written word.

His 10th statement. We did not say that it was sinful for unconverted persons to pray to God. Our sentiment is that they might pray as much as they pleased; but that their prayers would be answered will. Without faith it is impossible to please God; and we know that God hears not sinners; but if any man be faithful and obey him that man he hears. With these we entirely agree, though it might be shown from scriptures that "the sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination" in his sight.

In the same style of a Semian opponent this reporter brandishes with the name of "infallible" &c. A. we stated in debate, as we are given that with respect to *Servant's exhibitions of God and the prophet's religious or rather ecclesiastical of the day* we are not an infallible and infallible. We do not believe in the infallibility or the inerrancy of the character of God. Every representation of his character which is not scriptural is false; and every one that allows God under a false character is worshiping an idol, but a false God. Every man that has his own God. Some worship their own ideas of God, upon which a man may pray; and these by their repetitions, petitions, &c. &c. But the scriptures are not to be repudiated, it is a very liberal and useful view of the scriptures, that we are to be guided by the scriptures, and not by the opinions of men. The scriptures are to be our guide, and not the opinions of men.

and in truth. In this spirit and truthful worship we believe. We are not atheists in regard to the God of Nature and of Revelation; neither are we infidels in that New Institution set forth on the sacred page. To the one we yield adoring and obedient homage; and to the other, for they are we believe, but Him of his glory. Learn, consistency, and truth.

Mr. Hunnicut first misrepresents us as we have shown, and then claims his misrepresentation on the records of the Conference Journal, as a few of the many heresies, unscriptural, and infidel peculiarities, and logical intricacies of Dr. Thomas. This is truly ridiculous, &c. It does not, however, surprise us; for such a course is in strict conformity with the tactics of the Advocate through all ages past. It is not unlike our how we can believe the things we see, and yet venerate the Scriptures as we profess. No doubt it is an indignity to one, who has not industry enough to perceive that all religions, his own among the ranker, but that in the scriptures, can be proved to the satisfaction of man. Of course, if we have stated the true doctrine of eternal life, all that differs from it must be wrong; but, if any religion follows, that it will be right, the Bible will be a false prophetess. If we thought, it is certainly the logical consequence of the things we teach. Mr. Tarrant who writes so much about logic, seems not to know how to draw conclusions. We saw clearly, before we had finished the seventh page of his report, that he knew little or nothing about logic or scripture; or he certainly never would have committed our opponent's "logical" or "scriptural" prohibitions. Had he been a judge in this matter he would have charitably drawn a veil over his brother deacon's attentions to the a text concerning them scripture; and not have pressed him off to the conclusion of his singular mode of view. He ought to have studied Dr. Thomas's right, error, &c. (that is the views of religions) of the Bible must be wrong. — To this we could not see do. Yes, and more, we agree with him, that if we do desire we were dead, he right, when we believe in Christ (that is, of technical) holy religion when there. And this is necessary by the working of the whole system. For every one that believes, that immortality is to be obtained by believing and obeying the Gospel as explained above, comes into among the tribes of Christendom; and so they then self-styled "Fidel Religion" which is called "Religion" as "his Beliefs as the Page," and sets on the God Jesus Christ in a knowledge stands everywhere. Who are "the pillars" of eternal speculation of immortality designing "religion" will they be seen in the day when Jesus shall be the hidden things of men, he shall be "Paul's teacher" and "the Lord" who shall be the "Lord" that we lived and died for. We would not have said, that we lived and died for the sake of pleasing the Lord, but for lives.

Our reporter says, that to say that man is "just" is a sceptical and atheistical hypothesis. We have here made it enough to have added in his opinion, "scriptures say, that God formed man in his own image," and again, concerning his return thither, "His breath goes forth, he returneth to his earth; his thoughts perish." — Thus is something like the doubt, the testimony of prophets when it conflicts with "sceptical" opinions, is "sceptical and atheistical," at least in the reporter's opinion.

As to man's being but a "polished ape," we extend to such sentiments; though indeed there are many men not so polished as that amusing animal. We never heard of an ape who sat down and deliberately penned for a New-paper a representation of the sayings of a fly of his species, however angry he may have been with them. We wish the reporter's representation of our sayings would be as conscientious even as an unpolished ape. For our own part we prefer the conscientiousness of the ape, to the honesty of certain men; who make themselves a passport upon men for righteous, but God knows their hearts.

Let the Rev. Jas. W. Hunnicut be cautious how he reports discussion in future. We report his advice upon himself. Let him not only read the Bible but practice its precepts. We will then learn under the mark of candor not to do "injustice" to the views of his opponents by they who they may.

Ever

CORRESPONDENCE.

We have received letters containing many questions to answer, as well as others of an encouraging nature. To answer all the queries will take many numbers; and perhaps several volumes of The Advocate than one. We have thought to put some of them on record, from time to time, for the consideration of the reader, as well as by way of keeping them before our own mind. The letters of encouragement are particularly refreshing in these times; for by them we find, that our labors are appreciated and approved by brethren of acknowledged intelligence and discernment. We have been glad to give extracts from these by brethren to whom we had read them. We have concluded to do so, especially of the sentiments are of the most noble and independent character; and are well worthy of being adopted by all inquirers after truth.

LETTER FROM ENGLAND.

Brother Thomas,
Advocate for May, from

know not. If it was sent direct from you, please accept my best thanks for it. I conclude from what I have learned from other quarters, that you and others in Annapolis have seen my name in A. Campbell's M. Harbinger, in this last the cause of my receiving several communications from dissenting brethren living in the United States; all of which have proved encouraging to me, who because of circumstances have proved very much opposed in this piece. I expect we have seen mention of all their past sins; our neighbors consider us heretical and mad. Since the 25th of last December I have had the pleasure of immersing 33 persons, all of whom have joined the body to which I belong and are happy in the Lord.

I regret to learn—(that is, if you be in error)—that you have felt it to be your duty to sign a paper with Erster Campbell. Your letter appears to me very bold, and at the same time independent and unbecomingly. I hope you will not advocate any thing that will be found to be wrong at last; so would I hope of all who sincerely desire to understand and practice the whole of Primitive Christianity.

That the Gospel is a whole and not to be taken in the concrete is what I very much admire. What you mean by all who will not and all who cannot, in reference to the resurrection I know not. I cannot understand you in this.

That Protestantism is a *form of Antichrist* is very much displeas'd to think; and tremble at the idea of being found a component part of such a system.

You seem to have a different opinion of the present office of *Dracons*. Query.—In law many other cities and different parts of the word of God do we find that "circumstances alter cases" (p. 7.) are there any which are applicable to us Gentiles?

The union of all sects upon the one Lord, one Faith, one Immerison &c. however desirable, seems to me, as it respects this country utterly impossible for some generations to come. The established systems are so tenaciously adhered to, and the almost universal idea, that so many things are revealed in the New Testament, which are altogether unnecessary; must so long as it exist, prevent such an union. Besides Antichrist is to be destroyed. The Gentiles have not continued in his shadow: they must be cut off, if there be any truth in God's word.—Eph. xi. 22.

What is really meant by the brightness of his coming?—2 Th. ii. 8. O that I knew!—To come into the Spirit of the Father, to be united to him, His Word; but the latter part to concern with other things, I cannot understand.—I can only teach the meaning of the first words, because of the being hindered by human traditions, and their taking

them in their literal sense. They did not understand the Kingdom of Heaven, the God of Heaven, the Kingdom of spiritual in its nature and government, but they were expecting something which is not intended, but the same Kingdom? I feel anxious to convince you that Jesus is the Christ, and that if they wish to have remission of sins, peace of mind, and the gift of the Holy Spirit, they must be immersed into him, and in all things obey his commandments.

I remain yours affectionately, for the Truth's sake, sincere inquirer after a perfect knowledge of the mind of the Spirit.

JAN. 17. 1821

REPLY.

Dear Brother Wallis,

In the few remarks I shall offer in this place and on the present occasion, I shall confine myself to some brief observations on "The Brightness of his Coming" concerning which you express yourself as somewhat anxious.

I agree with you, that the consuming of the Law and the spirit of the Lord's mouth, means by His Word. I would go further, and observe, that by "His Word" I do understand by the force of truth alone. In order to have a correct perception of the true meaning we must consult the history of Christendom for the last 400 years. For it is chiefly during this period that the Lawless One's Dominion has been assuming. It was the putting of the Word of God into the mouths of the people that originated the religious wars, between the Protestant and Papal horns of the Bihorned Beast. If the Kingdom were torn by faction, that Kingdom cannot subsist. It necessarily be consumed. Civil war is a fever preying upon the vitals of a state. Now the Kingdom of Satan or the Lawless One manifested in the Antichrist, has been torn by factions for jubilees of years together. The Kingdom of Antichrist has been split into two grand factions which have perished at the destruction of each other by fire and sword, the one of which has been that they have by their wars been destroying the power of their sovereign Antichrist, but they have destroyed him. Spain and Portugal are existing in the consuming of the Lawless One by the Spirit of the Lord's mouth. Concentrate your mind upon the revolution of the City during the last 40 years, and you will see the illustration of the consuming which has been the old prophetic words. You may see the illustration of the old prophetic words. You may see the illustration of the old prophetic words. You may see the illustration of the old prophetic words.

Paris made every throne in Europe tremble to its foundation: and is now pouring (collaterally with the sixth) into the air. This will give you some idea of where you stand in Europe. The political air of England is feeling the effects of this violent political air or constitution of Spain is the enlittered rib-
 ject of it like wis; so are Portugal, France, &c. "The spirit of demons"—spirits unclean as in g—are working in Tories, Whigs, Conservatives, Radicals, Lictinines, Exaltados, &c. and the World. These conflicting factions are consuming by their intestine broils and divisions "the air" or political constitution of states and empires. They are breaking up the constitutions of the Lawless One. They are breaking up the constitutions of thrones and autocracies; and will absolutely dissolve the meretricious alliance of Church and State in every nation.

But the consuming of the Lawless One in every nation. grand climax of his UTTER DESTRUCTION.—Who shall have the honor, or who of men has the power to perpetrate a consummation like this?—We look over the wide earth and sea, but we look in vain!—we behold, and there it is not! Firmly whence then shall the mighty come?—In truth, it is, where else but from heaven? It is on Jesus we Gentiles place our hope. It is to him we look as the Destroyer of the Lawless One. At his coming to do this, he will come with "brightness," "in flaming fire," with thunders and lightnings, and an earthquake, and great hail. This will occur under the seventh, last, and existing vial, and will be concurrent with the great voice from the throne saying, "It is done."—Then will the dominion of the Lawless One be dissolved, his empire dissolved, and his "Seat" of government be dashed down with violence, like a great mill stone cast into the sea, never to be found again.

"When Jesus comes to do this, every eye shall see him."—He will be as visibly and personally present upon the earth, which is his inheritance, as you are visible and personally present in Nottingham. There is but one true name of Scripture; what then, but the most obvious?—"By name."—This Jesus, O Galileans, who is taken up from you into heaven, shall also come, in the same manner as you have seen him going to heaven. The brightness of his coming is attendant glory; which is not like the pageant of an earthly potentate; it is the glory, the splendor of an earthly Omnipotent displayed in the flashing fires, the roaring thunders, and the yelling storm by which his foes shall be sub-
 In that day will be fulfilled the saying of the prophet,

Isaiah, 26-28.

The foundations of the mountains rock-
 ed and were shaken.

Psalm, 6, 9, 18. A smoke went up from his nostrils;

Ch. xii. 3.

Rev. xviii. 7.

Zech. xiv. 4.

Rev. xix. 11.

Rev. x. 17.

Rev. xi. 19, xvi. 21.

Rev. xvi. 17.

Ezek. xxxix.

Rev. xix 17-21.

Zech. xiv. 4.

And fire from his mouth
 Burning coals shot forth from
 He bowed in heavens, and came
 And darkness was under his feet
 And he rode upon a cherub and did
 Yea, he came flying upon the wings
 the wind.

And he made his knees
 His pavilion round about him was
 water; and thick clouds of the sky
 At the brightness before him, his thick
 clouds passed away;

Then came hail stones, and coals of fire
 Jehovah also descended from heaven,
 And the Most High uttered his voice,
 Amid hail stones, and coals of fire.
 He sent forth his arrows and scattered
 them;

Incessant lightnings, and discomfited
 them.

Then the channels of the deep were seen,
 And the foundations of the earth were
 revealed,

At the rebuke of Jehovah,
 At the blast of the breath of thy nostrils!
 Psal. xviii. 7-15.

Many more quotations from the prophetic word might be quoted illustrative of "the Brightness of his Coming;" but this must suffice for the present. That your praiseworthy efforts to acquire "a perfect knowledge of the mind of the Spirit" may be crowned with abundant success, is the unfeigned hope of yours affectionately for the truth's sake also

JOHN THOMAS

Sept. 25th, 1837.

LETTER FROM TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

Tuscaloosa, Alabama, July, 25th, 1837.

"As to your views, you are leaving the whole matter far as I am acquainted.—The Advocate is a little like a chestnut burr; though it is somewhat prickly; yet I am glad to find to admit, that it is full of rich kernel. I am glad, though some are of so fine a sensibility, who are startled at the mention of *J. T.*—I think that you are more than formerly. I have seen all the same old views as a burr. Instead of stopping at the first preferred No. 1, and carrying it out, I think, that you now, occasionally make

there is an evident improvement. I have at least concluded to patronise you, if you do occasionally make me wince. Figure aside. As to your verdict on the grave, body, and soul question, it is not more strange than was baptised for the remission of sins ten years gone. And if you can guard it with the same heavenly armour, the pugnacity of those imaginary foes will always prove pointless. I say, imaginary; for I am convinced that those brethren who have been engaged in the controversy with you love you. And as to be, who is most deserving of the box for Christian charity and forbearance, I shall calmly pause, until "the graves are opened" and then let the decision of Jehovah. If for Bro. Thomas, Amen; and if for the others, Amen. And if both are accused of a want of Christian forbearance—what?—yes, Amen!—But I am not for muzzling the corn-reeder.—Speak out! I hate, Voltaire, Voltair, &c, all spoke; and we but them defiance, because God also spoke. And as long as "I the Lord has spoken it," I care not who may speak.—And, Sir, the fundamental principles of this reformation rest upon speak out.

If you can convince the religious world, that when the breath passes from the nostrils of the living man in its vicissitude it commingles with the zephyrs, &c, and the body with the dust passive and tranquil, until the *fat of God* bids it come forth.—then, Sir, all must acknowledge their just *idixia* condition in this matter. As for my self, in relation to your views, here, I dare not, cannot say *heretic*, until I examine the law and testimony. I know the pain of premature decision. In 1828 I cried out "*heresy*" against the very things, I am now repeated before any assembly, in this wide and read universe to prove are true.

I now beg that you collect and collate all your defence on this subject, as materials for your next. It is desired by more than myself. I will take 20 additional copies. Do comply. Let us show the world that we are not to be ashamed on any ecclesiastical dogma, when God for us speaks. But henceforth let us decline the use of all terms not found in the nomenclature of God. It is bad enough for catechumens thus to indulge, but much worse for European Graduates.

Lord forgive us!

Yours in the hope of heaven, if not before, at the resurrection day,

J. A. BOTLER.

LETTER FROM KING WILLIAM, VIRGINIA.

August 24th, 1837.

Dear Brother Thomas,

I am glad to learn that The Advocate is likely to live a little longer, notwithstanding the efforts of the popular and influential to prevent its circulation. Thoug

I do not agree with you in all you have written, yet in proportion to what I have seen of your writings, I am confident I have received more instruction in this scripture, than from the writings of any other man.

One of your old friends found it necessary in opposing what you had written upon the state of the dead, to affirm that it was materialism, and could not with propriety be called any thing else, and that it was in opposition to the truth as contained in the scriptures, for they prove that *the component parts of man are immortal*. For continued he, God made man out of the dust of the earth, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and he became a living soul; but upon his transgressing the commandment of God, he was told that from dust he had begun man, and to dust he should return; and *dust not being annihilable, man was therefore immortal*. And also, that the inanimate dust which once formed the body, contained a principle or ingredient, which had been imparted to it by God (I think when he breathed into his nostrils the breath of life):—upon which God's spirit operates in resurrecting the body and without which there could, or would be no resurrection, for there would be nothing upon which the spirit of God could or would operate.

Now, my brother, what think you of the competency of this brother to instruct the disciples in the Holy Word. Yet he is a teacher, and contributes largely to one of the popular periodicals of our day.

There being some among us, who seem not to understand you as to the *duration* of the punishment of the unjust, and what the Second Death is, I have thought it might be of some service to propose some two or three questions upon these topics for their special information. To myself and many of your readers, it would be supererogation. Should I not succeed in putting the questions correctly, you will do me a favor by supplying the deficiency, and adapt your answers to the weakest capacity.

Query 1.—Is not the "Second Death" a state of eternal and never-ending punishment?

Query 2.—Will not the unjust at the judgment be consigned to the "Second Death," and will not their punishment be eternal or perpetual?

Though these questions may appear useless, if not fully answered in your writings on this subject, you must recollect that some of your brethren, who read these, you must consider that there is some chance of seeing you in such measure.

Your brother in the hope

REMARKS.

"Dust not being annihilable, man is therefore immortal," says an old friend! If we carry this out a little further it also proves, that not only men, but all other animals are immortal; for Mo-e informs us that the earth was the mother of them all! We shall leave this reasoning to stand or fall by its own gravity. If there be weight in the foundation it will stand; but should it happen to be top-heavy it will fall. He adds, that if a principle or ingredient had not been imparted to the dust by God, which, when it becomes dust again, it retains, there could be no resurrection: for there would be nothing upon which the spirit of God could operate! Our old friend, whoever he be, forgets that John said to the Pharisees, that God would raise up children to Abraham out of the stones. Query, what principle or ingredient is there in stones, upon which the Spirit of God may operate to make living descendants of Abraham.—But it is not correct, that God cannot operate upon the dust, unless the dust contain a something previously imparted. All things are possible to him; and, if he could make the earth bring forth "every plant of the field before it was in the earth," he can just as easily raise the body, from the dust though destitute of every conceivable imparted principle or ingredient.

As to the *duration* of punishment, there can be no doubt but that it will be *eternal* in the most extended signification of the word. There will be no redemption from it; for redemption from sin and the grave is set forth in the scripture as all on this side "the Second Death." Beyond that tremendous crisis all is darkness, silence, and despair—there being no hope; nor the smallest gleam that the chains of darkness will ever be knocked off the suicidal victims of folly and sin!—"And these shall go into eternal punishment, but the righteous into eternal life"—Matt. xxv. 46.—Hence the punishment is eternal and the unjust are the subjects of it.—Is it possible to express ourselves more intelligibly?

EPILOGUE.

"The Advocate is working its way, and will increase before long provided it is kept up to its present condition. I learned some little time since, that its fruits are made manifest, at least in some of the lower sections of the state, by an acknowledgment from some, that its readers are becoming much more intelligent, having been stimulated by its means to read the scriptures for themselves; thus emancipating some from the galling yoke of Babylon, and delivering others from the power of Satan, who, having been bound for many years, did not know how to get release on account of the influence of clerical institutions and traditions which have rendered the word of God of no effect. Sir, I feel happy in being associated with the few who prefer to obey God rather than man—poor man, whose

wealth is in his nostrils, and whose authority in the estimation of the Most High is of so little account." Rich mond, Henrico, Va. Sept. 10, 1837.

THE QUEEN OF ENGLAND AND THE BISHOPS.

We have just received from England a very amusing early volume entitled "The Head of the Church giving the Bishops a rap on the Knuckles."—A rather blowing in the air will indicate the direction of the wind, so little men—in the ways of life will mark the tendency of a people's mind. In the last session of Parliament a motion was introduced for the expulsion of The Bishops from the House of Lords. Through a very desirable thing, the time was not yet quite arrived for such an alteration in the constituents of the political "air." A cry for "organic change" in the British "heaven," has been raised by the Democratic party; and we doubt not, but that in a very few years they will be effected. Judging from the "Ferry Journal," the power of this party is very great; for they are continually sounding the alarm, that "the Church is in danger." "The Church" is the rallying cry of those who would uphold the institution of Clergy and State in all its antiquated and absurd relations. On the other hand, "The Queen" is the watchword of the republicans, who would dissolve so unnatural and papistical an alliance.

The caricature is published in a democratic paper termed "The Penny Satirist." It represents Miss Victoria, the Queen, with a mitre upon her head and a pastoral crook resting upon her right shoulder. These are her insignia of office as "the Head of the Church" or Chief Pope of England. She is represented as standing with her left hand extended as if haranguing her spiritual lords, the Bishops; the *ere* of whom are standing with grim, blasted, and a-tortured countenances, misty, wizened, and habited in the ludicrous and emaculate costumes of their order.—The following dialogue is appended to the caricature.

Queen.—Ministers of the Gospel you call yourselves?

Bishops.—Peace your Majesty, we are.

Queen.—What do you mean by gospel?

Bishops.—It means good news, or glad tidings, your Majesty.

Queen.—Good news or glad tidings? right, I know

so.—Have you made it so, so those it was intended

happens it that the poor, to whom the gospel

turns them the greatest opponents of the Church

for something wrong has been done

Bishops.—It is owing to the

fall of man, and original sin, your Majesty.

always been depraved, always enemies of God, and haters of righteousness. It is a melancholy truth to confess.

Queen.— Alas, woe enough! But I subject the depravity is all in the shepherds of the flock, who have suffered the rot to come upon the sheep by feeding them with prayers or wishes instead of good pasture. I shall never believe you are true ministers of the gospel till the people love you and regard you as their great friends; that is the test for me. Go then and reform your ways for until you do so, I shall always consider you as the Ministers of Antichrist. You must either make the Church what Christ made it to be, or make a public avowal of infidelity!

Bishops.— You do not mean to plunder the Church, your majesty?

Queen.— I No; you must plunder yourselves. When the Apostles entered upon their ministry, it is said they *left all*, and followed Christ; but your Apostolicship is begun by keeping and catching; all, and pretending to follow Christ. I would advise you to eat and drink a little less and labor a little more in Christ's vineyard, or your services may be dispensed with.

LACONICS.

It is almost as difficult to know a man unlearn his errors, as his knowledge. Malinformation is more hopeless than confirmation: for error is always a cloudy day, and ignorance is a blank sheet upon which we may write; but error is a scribbled one, from which we must first erase. Ignorance is contented to stand still with her back to the truth; but error is more presumptuous, and proceeds in the same direction. Ignorance has no light, but error follows a false one. The consequence is that error, when she retraces her footsteps, has farther to go, before she can arrive at the truth, than ignorance.

The greatest friend of Truth is Time, her greatest enemy is Prejudice, and constant companion is Humility.

When you have nothing to say, say nothing: as a weak defence strengthens your opponent, and silence is less injurious than a bad reply.

Great men, like great cities, have many crooked arts and dark alleys in their heart, whereby he that knows them may save himself much time and trouble.

TO READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

The Editor being absent from home on a visit to the lower counties: the proof sheets of the present number have been corrected by others; to whom must be attributed the errors of the press.

Farmers, and others shall appear in due time. History of Priestcraft will be resumed. Receipts in our next.

THE ADVOCATE

Vol. 4. Amelia County, Va.: November, 1837. No. 1

REMARKS ON PROPHECY.

There are certain portions of Revelation, necessary, "to make the man of God perfect," the study of which requires the exertion of all our faculties, and the application of every branch of human knowledge we can possibly acquire. This arises from the very nature of the subject treated of, and from the limited faculties of the human mind.

A considerable portion of scripture is occupied with *prophetic declarations*,—in reference to events which have long since taken place, to those which are now happening, and to those that will hereafter happen in the future ages of the world. It contains a series of predictions which embrace *the leading outlines of the history of the world, from its commencement to its final consummation*. Now in order to trace the accomplishment of these predictions, and to perceive clearly the events to which they refer, a minute acquaintance with *ancient and modern history* is indispensably requisite; for it is in history either sacred or civil, that their accomplishment is recorded. And could we, with one comprehensive glance, take a survey of all the leading events which the history of the world records, we should be enabled, when reading the prophetic writings to perceive at every step the ideas and purposes of that All-comprehensive Mind that "knows the end from the beginning," and his faithfulness in accomplishing the promises, and executing the threatenings, of his word. A knowledge of *chronology* is also requisite, in order to ascertain the time in which predictions were uttered, and the periods to which they refer—and, of *ancient geography*, to determine the locality of those tribes and nations to which the prophecies have a reference, and their relative positions with regard to each other. In particular, it is necessary to be acquainted with the *figurative style* in which prophecy is conveyed, in order to understand the writings of the ancient prophets. These writings are common with those of most of the Eastern nations, are highly poetical, and abound in allegories, parables and metaphors. The *allegory* is that mode of speech in which the writer or speaker means to convey a different idea from what the words in their primary signification bear. Thus "break up your fallow ground, and sow not among thorns," (Jer. iv. 3) is understood, not of tillage, but of repentance; and "thy rowers have brought thee unto great waters," (Ezek. xlvi. 3) allude not to the fate of a ship, but to the ruin of a nation. Of all the figures used by the prophets the most

metaphor, by which words are transferred from their plain and primary to their figurative and secondary meaning. One of the most copious sources of these metaphors to which the sacred writers resort is *the scenery of nature*. The sun, moon, and stars, the highest and most splendid objects in the natural world, metaphorically represent kings, princes, or rulers, &c., the highest in the political world, as in the following passages, "The moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed" Is. xxiv. 23.—"I will cover the heavens, and make the stars thereof dark; I will cover the sun with a cloud, and the moon shall not give her light"—Ezek. xxxii. 7. *Light and darkness* are used figuratively for joy and sorrow, prosperity and adversity; as "we wait for light, but behold obscurity; for brightness, but we walk in darkness"—Is. lix. 9.—and likewise for knowledge and ignorance.—"The people that walked in darkness saw a great light," &c. Immoderate rains, hail, floods, torrents, inundations, fire, and storms denote judgement and destruction. Lebanon, remarkable for its height and its stately cedars, is used as an image of majesty and strength; Carmel which abounded in vines and olives, as an image of fertility and beauty; and bullocks of Bashan, rams, lions, eagles, and sea-monsters, as images of cruel and oppressive conquerors and tyrants. Metaphors are likewise borrowed from history, from the scenery of the temple, and its various utensils and services and from the ordinary customs and occupations of life—the meaning and application of which require to be distinctly understood, in order to perceive the spirit and references of ancient prophecy.

Dick's Improvement of Society, p. 240-21.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE APOCALYPSE.

Rev. xiii: 1-10.

The rise of the Kingdom of Antichrist in Europe. Its impious attributes. It derives its power, throne, and jurisdiction from the Imperial Majesty of Anti-Christian Rome. The subserviency of men to its rule. The Blasphemy of its King, who is "a King of Kings." The duration of his Kingdom. Its warlike character; its conquests, and extent of its jurisdiction. Its end, captivity, and destruction.

Prediction.

1. And I stood upon the sand of the sea, and I saw ascending out of the Sea a Ferocious Beast, having Seven Heads and Ten Horns; and upon its horns Ten Diadems, and upon its heads Titles of Impiety. 2. And the Beast which I saw resembled a Leopard, and its feet, as it were of a Bear, and its mouth like the mouth of a Lion; and the Dragon surrendered to it his power, and his throne, and an extensive jurisdiction. 3. And I beheld one of its heads as it were smitten by death, and its wound of death was healed, and all the Earth followed

with servility after the Ferocious Beast. 4. And they did homage to the Dragon who surrendered jurisdiction to the Beast, and they prostrated themselves to the Beast saying, "Who is like to the Beast? Who is able to make war with it?" 5. And there was appointed to it a Mouth speaking great things, and calumnies, and there was given to it power to wage war *forty-two months*. 6. And it opened its mouth in blasphemy towards God, to have calumniated his character, and his dwelling-place, and the sojourners in the heaven. 7. And it was permitted to wage war against the saints, and to overcome them; and there was surrendered to it jurisdiction over every tribe, language, and nation. 8. And all the inhabitants upon the earth shall do homage to it, whose character has not been described in the Book of the Life of the Lamb, who was sacrificed from the casting down of the world. 9. If any one have an ear, let him understand. 10. If any one take into captivity in captivity he dies; if any one slay with the sword, with the sword he must himself be slain. This is the patient-enduring and confidence of the Saints.

Signification of Symbols and Phrases.

THE SAND OF THE SEA.

Patmos, an island of the *Ægean Sea*, in which John was when he beheld the vision of the Apocalypse. The *Ægean* is full of little islands, which upon the map, in comparison to the adjacent continent, are as grains of sand to the sea. The *Ægean Group* is as it were a shoal of the European coast; and may, therefore, be regarded as the shore of the countries over which the power of the Ferocious Beast was to extend. In this light we view Patmos as of "the sand of the Sea." Standing on this Island, then, with his back to the southeast, John would have before him Italy and her Islands, Roman Africa, Spain, including Portugal, France, the British Islands, and the countries of the old German Empire. These may all be said to be countries of the sea, especially of the Mediterranean.—Those of the Old German Nation about southward upon the Gulf of Venice,—northward on the Baltic, and west of north upon the North Sea. The British Islands are sea-girt. France is washed by the English Channel, the Bay of Biscay, and the Mediterranean, the peninsula of Spain is almost enclosed by the Atlantic and Mediterranean; Roman Africa is washed by the same waters; and Italy with its Islands by the Mediterranean and the Gulf of Venice, which is but an arm of the sea. So that, with the exception of Britain, the whole may be said to be countries of the Mediterranean Sea. The British Isles scarcely forms an exception, for she has a sea on her western side as well. Out of these countries, John beheld the Beast ascending. He does not inform us in this passage whether the sea was stormy, or tranquil; that is, whether the countries of the sea were in a state of war or peace; though, we learn

from other sources, that they were in a state of tremendous uproar and commotion. The seas which surround these regions are always foaming and dashing upon their shores. They are never still; it is therefore, a fit and proper emblem of their inhabitants; who have more or less been involved in the tumult of war from the beginning of their nationality. It was out of this restless sea, that the Beast was seen ascending.

In chapter xi. 7, John says, that it ascends, *ek teos abyssou* out of the abyss; in chapter xvii. 8 the same phrase is used in the Greek, and is rendered, *out of the bottomless pit*; and here ch. xiii. he is said to ascend, *ek teos thalassas*, out of the sea; so that the sea, the abyss, and the bottomless pit, all referring to the same thing, are in these passages the same. *Abyssos* when applied to a large body of water indicates *depth*; and *thalassa*, agitation. The use of these two words, then, by John, when speaking of the rise of the Beast, indicates, that the sea out of which he ascended was a *tumultuous deep*.

A FEROCIOUS BEAST.

A monstrous beast is the symbol of a Despotism. The Kingdom of God and of his Christ is never represented under such an emblem. The Beast John saw was a monster in every sense of the word; he was impious, cruel, and the murderer of holy ones. "No doubt is to be made," says a writer on this passage, "that this Beast was designed to represent the Roman Empire; for thus far both Ancients and Moderns, Papists and Protestants are agreed; the only doubt and controversy is whether it was Rome Pagan, or Christian, Imperial or Papal."—It cannot signify the Roman Empire under a Pagan Constitution, because this had its numerous centuries before John saw this vision. In his day it had risen to maturity and was soon after to be revolutionized under the MAN OF SIN,—Constantine, who imposed upon it a Catholic Constitution, which he sealed with the blood of thousands; as foreshown in chap. xii. It was Daniel who saw the rise of Pagan Rome out of a stormy sea; it remained for John to see his prediction of the Little Horn amplified under the symbols of the chapter before us.

The monster had Seven Heads. In chap. xvii. it is said "the Seven Heads are seven mountains, on which the Great City that rules over the Kings of the Earth, sits," *va. 9, 18.* "And these are seven Kings" or forms of government, which have prevailed in the Seven Hilled City. Tacitus in his Annals says, "Rome was first governed by Kings, then by Consuls, by Dictators, by Decemvirs, by Military Tribunes with Consular authority." Since that time there have been Emperors, and Gothic Kings. These are the Seven Heads or forms of government, which were established on the Palatine, Caelian, Capitoline, Aventine, Quirinal, Viminal, and Esquiline mountains—the Seven Hills of Rome. On these mountains

they arose one after the other, until at last they all ran away and gave place to the Papal Form, which combined in the Imperial and Pontifical authority; and concerning which John says, "he is *RUZ MORRU*, and is of the Seven, but *RUZ MORRU* to destruction."

He had Ten Horns. The Angel told John, that, "the ten horns are (or signify) ten Kings, which have not yet (in his day) received their Kingdom, but they shall receive authority with the Beast, as Kings at the same time. These are unanimous, and shall deliver their own power and authority to the Beast."

The Body of the Beast is spotted like a Leopard. It is made up of various "tribes, languages and nations." Its feet are like those of a Bear, the instruments of cruelty and rapine. Its mouth is as the mouth of a Lion; very terrible when it utters its voice. In Daniel's vision, the Leopard is the symbol of the Macedonian Empire; the Bear of the Medo Persian; and the Lion of the Babylonian. The Ferocious Beast, therefore, having a mouth derived from the symbol of Babylon, identifies it as the anti-type of Babylon the Great, which fell before Cyrus; and which comprehended within its realm, Sodom and Egypt, the types of its spiritual attributes, even of its immorality, iniquity, and flagitious crimes.

TITLES OF IMPIETY.

These are upon its Heads. They are the Titles of the Roman Majesty under whatever form of government prevailing. Rome was called 'the Eternal City,' 'the Heavenly City,' 'the Goddess of the Earth,' 'the Goddess'; and had her temples and altars with incense and sacrifice offered up to her.—The Emperors pretended to divine power, to be gods upon Earth—*Lords of the World*—Augustus or Sebastos, (to be worshipped) and Autocrat or Self-powerful. In their decrees they assumed the language of gods, "Our Divinity orders so and so;" or "it is our divine will;" as if each Imperial Decree were a command from Heaven. This is but a faint idea of the Titles of Impiety assumed by the Sixth Head of the Beast.—The Eighth is the heir of these, and since he has come into possession of the estate, he has appropriated them in all their impiety. He calls himself *Pontifex Maximus*, or Supreme Pontiff, *Rector Orbis* or Ruler of the World:—"Sanctissimus et Beatissimus Pater" or Most Holy and Blessed Father; "Sanctissimus Dominus, or Most Holy Lord"; the Bridegroom, or Husband of the Universal Church. On that day, he is declared the Vicar of Christ, he is addressed by the Cardinals, who when they kiss his toe, say, "In the name of the Council of Lateran, in the name of the Holy Roman Church, we salute you, *Dominus Deus noster Papa, idem est Dominus Deus Cæli, nam habet potentiam ligandi et solvendi*"

Lord our God the Pope, is the same on earth as the Lord God of Heaven, for he hath the power of binding. When the triple Crown is placed on his head for the first time it is done with these words 'Receive the Tiara adorned with three crowns, and know that thou art the Father of Princes and Kings, Ruler of the World, on earth, the Vicar of our Saviour Jesus Christ, to whom be honor and glory for ever and ever. Amen.'

THE DRAGON.

This monster is mentioned for the first time in chapter xii. He is there termed a "great fiery dragon, having seven heads and ten horns."—"The great difference between the Dragon and the Ferocious Beast is, that the Dragon's Seven Heads were crowned and not his ten horns, as in the case of the Beast.—"And upon his heads" says John, there were "Seven Crowns." Remove these crowns from the heads, and place ten crowns upon his horns, and the Dragon is transformed into the Beast. This removal indicates that "the power, throne, and jurisdiction" of the Dragon had passed from him to his successor the Beast: and that the Majesty of the first symbol, which was undivided had been distributed, or shared among several.—The Dragon is the symbol of the Roman Empire, both under the Pagan Constitution, and under that which obtained from Constantine to the breaking up of the empire into Ten Kingdoms. This latter Constitution of the Empire some term Christian. But this is incorrect. The Roman Empire never had a Christian Constitution. From the time of Augustus, the first Emperor, till Constantine it was *Pagan*; from Constantine till the subversion of the Imperial Jurisdiction over the West it was *Catholic*; and from that period till now it has been *Papal*.—That the Dragon is the symbol of the Empire under the Imperial Pagan-Catholic Headship will be seen from this—John, surnamed Chrysostom, who lived in the 4th century, says, that "the Emperors wore among other things to distinguish them, silken robes, embroidered with gold, in which Dragons were represented." Gibbon says, speaking of the procession of Constantine from Milan to Rome, "he was encompassed by the glittering arms of the numerous squadrons of his guards and cuirassiers. Their streaming banners of silk, embroidered with gold, and shaped in the form of Dragons, waved round the person of the Emperor."

HIS POWER.

The Dragon or Imperial Pagan-Catholic Rome, surrendered his power, throne, and an extensive jurisdiction to the Ten Horned Beast. The power attached to the Imperial Supremacy consisted in the levying of armies, the raising of money, the waging of wars, the making of peace, the commanding of all the forces of the state, the having the power of life and death, the distributing of rewards and punishments, and the

enacting of all kind of laws. The Emperors, both before and after Constantine, were the *supreme judges and arbiters in all religious matters*. They took care that the rites of the prevailing superstition were properly performed, and for that purpose all priests were subject to them. The presence of the Imperial Pontiffs was requisite in public and solemn religious acts. They made prayer, dedicated temples, inaugurated priests, regulated the year, and the public Calendar, and so forth. The title of Pontifex Maximus or Supreme Pontiff or High Priest, although a Pagan appellation, was retained by the Catholic Emperors to the time of Gratian A. D. 378.—"The Christian Emperors" says Gibbon, "condescended to accept the robe and ensigns which were appropriated to the office of Supreme Pontiff. But when Gratian ascended the throne, more scrupulous or more enlightened, he sternly rejected those profane symbols."—Although the Catholic Superstition became the religion of the Emperors, yet the majority of the Roman Senate was avowedly Pagan until, by the influence of Theodosius, the Constitutional Religion of Rome was formally outrooted by the servile Assembly, A. D. 383. Thus, it will be manifest, that the Imperial Majesty of the Empire was both Pagan and Catholic at the same time, being The Bishop of Bishops, and the Pontifex Maximus of the College of Priests; hence the propriety of the term Imperial Pagan-Catholic Rome.

HIS THRONE.

A throne is a royal or judicial seat. The throne of the Dragon was the seat of the Roman Government. The Senate of the Roman People was instituted by the Founder of Rome to be the perpetual council of the Republic. After the expulsion of Tarquin the Proud, the power of the Senate was raised to the highest. Every thing was done by its authority. The magistrates were in a manner only its ministers. No law could be passed, nor assembly of the people held, without their consent. Although the supreme power at Rome belonged to the people, yet they seldom enacted anything in their Comitia Tributa without the authority of the Senate. The fortunes of the Senate were various, still before the re-establishment of Monarchy, its authority continued very great; for as *power and majesty* properly belonged to the people, so did *authority, splendor and dignity* to the Senate. When Augustus became master of the empire, the Senate still continued its functions, though shorn of much authority. His successors, having situated the Romans to slavery gradually began to order what they pleased, without consulting the Senate. Till the time of Constantine, the Emperors and the Senate were equal in Rome; but when Constantine became the Ruler of the World, a separation ensued; the Emperors removed the seat of their power, while the Senate remained at Rome. The power of the

City continued the throne or seat of the *oldest body in the State*; and, though Constantine could rear another wonder of the world, the people of the West still retained their veneration for "Rome, the Goddess of the Earth and of the Nations, to whom" as they supposed "there is nothing equal, and nothing second."—Rome, then, was the *throne of the Dragon*, as it afterwards became of his successor The Beast.

AN EXTENSIVE JURISDICTION.

In the second century of the Christian Era, the Empire of Rome comprehended the fairest part of the earth, and the most civilized portion of mankind. At the death of Augustus the Roman jurisdiction extended westward to the Atlantic Ocean, and eastward to the Euphrates; on the north it reached the Danube and the Rhine; and on the south, the straits of the Nile, and the deserts of Africa and Mount Atlas; including the whole Mediterranean Sea: "so that," says an Antiquarian, "the Romans were not without towns and cities, and the Lords of things," and Rome, "the Light of the world, the North, and the Metropolis of all Nations."—Few additions were made after Augustus. Dacia was added on the north of the Danube, and Mesopotamia and Armenia east of the Euphrates. The South of Britain was reduced, and the empire of the East extended to the Frith of Forth and the Clyde.

This jurisdiction the Dragon did not surrender to the Beast; he surrendered to him only a part of it, which was, however, very extensive. The part which he was obliged to surrender, ultimately fell a prey to the followers of Materialism, who still retain a considerable share. The extensive part which he surrendered to the Beast comprehends the empire of the East, which we have already delineated, and of which the Editor can refer.

(To be continued.)

"MATERIALISM AND ANTI-MATERIALISM."

We have just received the Primitive Christian for October. It is a paper edited by Bro. S. E. Shepard at Auburn, N. Y. We would take this opportunity of recommending it to the patronage of our subscribers, as a consistent, independent, impartial and fearless advocate for truth. We are personally unacquainted with Bro. Shepard; but from his writings, he appears to be a "Christian" of the "Primitive" order, and second to none as a writer "in its form." His paper is of the same form as the Advocate, and few pages by one third. The price of a year's paper is one dollar. One good turn deserves another. While the subject is so very such Christian ought to be, was impartial. He published to his readers both sides, that they might be able to form an independent

judgment for themselves. The Harbinger and The Advocate have both spoken in the Primitive Christian; and must therefore both applaud him. Such "Defenders of the Faith" are much wanting in this age, and ought to be encouraged by the free born sons of light.—We make the following quotations as a specimen of Bro. Shepard's style; with the matter we almost altogether agree. But of this the reader must judge for himself.

Ed. Adv.

"There are those that contend that the soul of man is material, and there are those also who contend that it is not material. The doctrine of the materiality of the soul is called Materialism, and the opposite should be denominated Anti-Materialism. Those persons who believe the former are Materialists, and those who believe the latter, Anti-Materialists.

The discussion of this question of materiality has been long, foggy, and warm; and every person knows that a long spell of storm, foggy weather a little better harvest, is very likely to result in rust, and the injury of wheat crops. Such weather is much to be dreaded by the agricultural portion of the community, and such discussions by those who would reap a harvest of truth.

Generally speaking, if significant and unambiguous propositions were submitted, and the leading or most important words in such propositions clearly defined, so that each disputant would have the same conception of the import of such words, the question would be settled without any further trouble. We should, in this way, save much time, and avoid much perplexity which we must, otherwise, continue to experience. It is out of unambiguous propositions and undefined words, that most, if not all our India-rubber discussions grow. One disputant takes hold of one end of the question, and the other seizes the opposite. They then turn back and commence the march of investigation, and the farther asunder the disputants, until, at last, by violence and rage, the proposition is sundered, and each party goes off in triumph, proclaiming himself victor.—Neither is the wisest for the discussion; and, as to the readers, they are willing solemnly to testify that they have nearly, not altogether, forgotten the original matter in controversy.

There is another question frequently, if not always, connected with that of materiality, namely: Is there a consciousness of existence for man between death and a resurrection? Now, if such questions have no necessary connexion with each other, because it is as possible for matter to be conscious in the present state. There is a question of consciousness, however, which must necessarily be connected with bearing on that of materiality. That question is, Is consciousness an attribute of matter in any of its forms?

affirmative of this question can be proved, then there may be a conscious state of existence after death, allowing the soul to be material. But if consciousness belongs not to matter, under any circumstances, then it is clear that the soul is not material, from the fact that it is conscious. But it is wrong to discuss these questions interchangeably. If the question under discussion be, Is the soul material? That question should be discussed. And the person who affirms should adduce his proof of its materiality. It is logically the business of the respondent to show that his proof does not sustain his position. And this is all he is bound, by the laws of logic, to do. But if he endeavor to prove the negative, by alleging that matter is not, and cannot be conscious under any circumstances, he then introduces an argument which has a direct tendency to change the question of discussion. The former question should, therefore, be laid aside for the time being, and the latter discussed. And the respondent is logically bound to prove the negative of the last question before he can insist on it as a proof against the affirmative of the first. If he be not able to do this, he should not introduce it as proof against the first affirmative.—But in case he succeed in establishing this negative, it will be conclusive against the affirmative of the first question, since it is admitted by both parties that the soul is conscious. But it should always be remembered that when the respondent of the first question shall introduce the negative of a second as proof against the affirmative of the first, the affirmant of the first has nothing to do in the second but simply to affirm. He is not bound to prove any thing on this question. If the original question had been, Is matter conscious? Then the case would have been different. But if the respondent of the first question be disposed to use the negative of the second as proof in his favor, he must in that case, make his proof good by establishing the negative of the second.

The question of the soul's materiality or immateriality is not decided in the Scriptures: nay, it was never discussed by any inspired writer. The heathen philosophers were the first who advocated the doctrine of immateriality; and I remember not an instance in which that doctrine was contended for among professed christians until after some of the philosophers adopted the christian religion, or rather, what was so considered at the time they professed faith in the Messiah. The origin of the doctrine, whether true or false, was purely pagan.

From the variety of opinion* concerning the nature of the soul among the sages of antiquity, and a correspondent variety among the modern *literati*, it would appear almost if not wholly impossible to determine the matter from any of the lights of

* These opinions, as given by Bro. S. we leave out, as a similar article has already appeared in our paper, p. 24 of present volume.—Ed. Adv.

our present sciences. There is a notion abroad that *spirits* are not material, but whence it originated, unless it was among the pagans, the disciples of Plato, who ascribed "invincible malignity and corruption to matter," is difficult to tell. It appears to me that it is from this notion of the malignity and corruption of matter, that the idea of an immortal soul has arisen. For this same Plato, who ascribes such attributes to matter, was of opinion that the soul was "an emanat' on from God." Whether spirits are material or not may be better decided after we shall have considered the properties which are common to matter; namely, impenetrability, extension, figure, divisibility, inertia, and attraction. Any thing which is destitute of these attributes, is undoubtedly immaterial, and it is very questionable whether it is an entity. The Bible gives us no revelation of such a being.

EDDORS.

NOTES ON MATERIALISM AND ANTI-MATERIALISM

BY THE EDITOR OF THE ADVOCATE.

1. "Those persons who believe that the soul of man is material are Materialists; and those who believe the contrary are Anti-Materialists."—Now to this definition of a Materialist I cannot altogether agree. A genuine Materialist is one who believes that the soul of man is material and mortal, and that when it dies there is an end of it forever. The climax of this doctrine, it will be seen, destroys the Word of God in toto, and reduces it to an ingenious lie. For, if there is an end of man for ever at death, then all that the Bible says of Eternal life, Heaven, Hell, the Judgment, Virtue and vice, and so forth, is false, unnecessary, absurd, and the Institutions of Religion are manifestly useless.—This being the idea attached by the world, which is influenced by names and fictions rather than by things, I must dissent from my excellent brother Editor's definition of a Materialist. I agree with the Materialists in *some things*; I also agree with the Antis in others: but, am I, therefore, to be saddled with all the absurdities of either or of both? The Anti-materialists or Spiritualist believe, that there is not an end of man for ever after his natural death; I believe so too; but, I reject their speculations upon this position.—The New Testament has been in the world some 1700 years and upwards. It has been read, from various and opposite motives, by men of every shade of belief; it would be strange, therefore, if we did not find some truth in all their systems.—Hence a Christian, in whom the word of truth dwells richly, will necessarily believe truths in common with them all;—it is therefore, to be nicknamed by all, or any of them, is no name? His faith and practice being obvious to all, he may expect that they will give him the most appropriate title. He need not regard this, however; let them

what they please, only let him not adopt one of them. His name is Christian; and he should respond to no other. The doctrine that the "living soul" is material, or living organized dust, is the doctrine of the Bible from Genesis to Revelation; but it also teaches, that when it has returned to the dust of which it was formed, at an appointed time it will be re-organized and reanimated, and either live for ever, or, having been tried and sentenced, become the subject of The Second Death. This is what I believe: and it was the doctrine of the Ancient or Apostolic Believers, until their faith was polluted by the breath of Pagan Philosophy. In the appropriated sense of materialist I am not a Materialist; but a Believer in the material or substantial hope as set forth in "the word of the truth of the gospel."

2. "Is consciousness an attribute of matter in any of its forms?"—When living and organized it is; but when dead and decomposed it is not; for it is written, in Psalm 116th,—"While I live will I praise the Lord; I will sing praises unto my God while I have any being. Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth: is that very day his thoughts perish."—Here life in the unsophisticated sense of the term, is equivalent to *having a being* or an existence; which is necessary to enable any one to praise the Lord. Nonentity or not being, destroys all idea of consciousness; unless the notion of a non-existent-conscious-being can be rationally conceived. I believe that the subject of this passage is the Messiah. If so, the not having a being is defined by the fact of his death. To be deprived of animal life is not to be until the spiritual or resurrection life is imparted. A conscious non-entity is a living nothing which cannot be conceived; a dead body in relation to consciousness is as nothing: "a living dog is better than a dead lion."—That natural death is the not being referred to by the Holy Spirit is obvious from other passages in the Psalms.—"In death," says he in the Sixth, "no praise ascend to thee; in the grave who can give thee thanks?" To this question we reply, no one. Death is compared to sleep of the soundest kind; and if in a profound natural sleep we are unconscious, as every one knows who has ever slept soundly; how shall we say that in the still sounder sleep of death, the Brain, the material instrument of thought, and which in death, being dissolved, ceases to be, is yet conscious?—Conscious of what? Of seeing, hearing, smelling, tasting, feeling? Of these, when the senses are all resolved into dust, and their connexion with the Brain, the center of all sensation entirely cut off?—"Enlighten mine eyes," says the Messiah in prophecy, "lest I sleep the sleep of death! Lest mine enemy say, 'I have prevailed against Him.'"—There is a sense in which being "kept alive" obtains without consciousness.—In Psalm 131.

The Christ says, "Thou hast kept me alive, that I should not go down to the pit." The signification of this is,—thou hast not permitted me to see corruption; as explained in the context, "O Lord, thou hast raised me up from the grave."—To have preserved Jesus, when dead, from running into decomposition, or from becoming disorganized dust, was "to keep him alive from going down into the pit; the Christ knowing that this would be the case, says in the sixteenth psalm, "therefore, my flesh also dwelleth in security; for thou wilt not give me up to the grave; nor wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption."—And in the thirtieth psalm he saith—"To Jehovah I made supplication;" which was this,—"what will my blood profit thee, that I should go down to corruption? Can dust praise thee? Can it (dust) declare thy faithfulness?"—Reason answers "No!"

The passage quoted from the 146th psalm teaches us that consciousness depends upon a living organization. The Holy Spirit there says, that "in the very day" when man ceases to breathe the breath of life "his thoughts perish."—Can consciousness exist in man without thought? Can I be conscious of seeing, hearing, feeling, &c. unless I think I see, hear, or feel? I think I am the subject of these impressions while dreaming, though in reality it is all ideal. Now if my thoughts perish in the day of my death, my ideality &c. is destroyed, and I am conscious of no impressions either fictitious or real. We are taught, therefore, that before matter ever living and organized, but now decomposed, can be conscious again either of pleasure or pain, it must be re-organized and re-animated; in other words, it must be raised from the dead; which is the doctrine of scripture throughout.

From these premises I conclude, that "consciousness is an attribute of" living "matter in the form" of organized Brain; and that though this be admitted to the fullest extent, it does not necessarily follow, that there may be, or is, a consciousness of existence in death. This conclusion involves another which is deducible from the same premises, that the materiality of souls is decided by the Scriptures; for if consciousness depend upon living organized matter, and admitting freely that consciousness is an attribute of soul, and the scriptures teaching that dead matter is unconscious, it follows that the soul is material; which is the doctrine according to Moses and to Paul! See Genesis ii. 7; 1 Cor. xv. 44, 45.

JESUS AND THE SADDUCEES.

Dear Brother Thomas, "It seems to me that Brother
Brother Wood, who wrote for the Primitive Christian, of Auburn N. Y. has lately assumed the position of an argument used by Christ to prove the doctrine of the Sadducees, as recorded in Luke xx, 27-28 inclusive; and through

also the misapprehension of that passage by Bro. Campbell; yet I think it may be put in rather a stronger point of view than even you have placed the argument of Christ. The Sadducees deny the Resurrection, and put the case of seven men having one wife as an objection to the doctrine of the Resurrection. Christ informs them, as recorded by Matthew and Mark in the parallel passages, that they "greatly err, not knowing the scriptures nor the power of God," as displayed in raising the dead; for the Resurrection is often called the power of God by way of emphasis. Let us now correct the argument of Christ as applied to this subject in three different ways:—

1. Suppose man dies and there is no future existence;
2. Suppose man dies and lives not again till the Resurrection;
3. Suppose man dies and lives in an intermediate state till the Resurrection and then soul and body are again united.

Under the first supposition that man dies and lives not again at all, the Resurrection is excluded; but Christ affirms the Resurrection to be true therefore the first supposition is false.

Again, under the second supposition that man dies or sleeps from death till the Resurrection and is then made to live again; the argument of Christ is most appropriate; for says he to those who denied that man would be made to live again after death, that is, at the Resurrection, Moses shews that there must be a Resurrection; for this: that he calls the Lord the God of Abraham of Isaac and of Jacob who were all dead long before Moses arose; now, says Christ, God is not the God of the dead but of the living; but Abraham Isaac and Jacob are dead; then, for God is not now their God; hence Abraham Isaac and Jacob must rise from the dead, and thus become the children of God by the Resurrection, that God must be their God, according to the declaration to Moses at the bush; for if they are now alive in heaven or elsewhere God is now their God; and the argument of Christ to prove the necessity of the Resurrection falls to the ground.

Again, under the third supposition, that though men die yet he continues to live in an intermediate state from the death of the body till the Resurrection of the same, the argument of Christ might have been easily refuted; for the point to be proved is the Resurrection, and the argument is, that Moses proves it by calling God the God of those who were then dead and that the dead must live again by being raised to life in order that the declaration to Moses at the bush may be true which is that God, who is not the God of the dead may be their God at the Resurrection.

Now, if it be true, that man does live immediately after death in a separate state, God can with propriety be called the God of such; because, though the body is dead, yet the soul is alleged to be alive, and can be the God of a living soul, though he is not the God of the dead, and if the soul be the thinking, only therefore the most important part of man, and that part is alive, there is no objection for God to wait till the Resurrection to be God of such a being; hence the argument of Christ, under this supposition would not prove the point in view, that is, the necessity of the Resurrection.

We are informed by the Scripture, that Abraham Isaac and Jacob are dead and Christ affirms that God is not the God of the dead; consequently not of Abraham &c. while dead, therefore they must be made to live again at the Resurrection, and then he will be their God and their children, being the Children of the Resurrection.

The last clause in the 20th verse of the 20th chapter of Luke has, I think, caused most of the difficulties in understanding this passage; the verse reads "For he is not a God of the dead but of the living; for all live to Him;" now if we make make the present tense "live" refer, as it often does to future time, and read "for all shall live unto him;" then the whole difficulty would vanish and the whole passage would be very clear and consistent; it would then read "for he is not a God of the dead, but of the living; for all shall live to him." And then he will be the God of those who are now dead, consequently of Abraham Isaac and Jacob who are all now dead.

So that under any supposition, except that man sleeps in the grave till the Resurrection, the argument of Christ founded on the declaration to Moses at the bush, can be easily refuted; but under this supposition it cannot be refuted; therefore the second supposition is true and the first and third are false.

And this doctrine harmonizes with the whole tenor of the Scriptures; the Apostles in their letters always point the disciples to whom they write, to the day of Christ, and not to any intermediate state, as the time of their reward. They always speak of death as a sleep, after the example of Christ who said of Lazarus, "he sleeps." And indeed, Paul in his letters to the Corinthians, argues with those who deny the Resurrection, that, if the dead rise not then are those who have fallen asleep in Christ perished; if the dead rise not then is the hope of the Christian confined to this life; for says the Apostle "if in this life only we have hope we are of all men most miserable;" and if the dead rise not, then have we hope only in this life. But if the soul is alive in heaven or elsewhere, or is conscious of happiness in a separate state between death and the Resurrection, then those who have died (fallen asleep) in Christ are not perished and the hope of the Christian is not confined or limited to this life. Hence those who say that the soul is alive in the enjoyment of happiness, while the body is dead, contradict the whole of Paul's argument in ch. xv. 1st Ep. to Cor. The apostle coincides the argument by insisting, that if the dead rise not, then all the sufferings, persecutions, perils, and bereavements, which Christians are called on to endure, are all unnecessary and declares, that we should rather eat and drink than endure these things, for tomorrow we die, and what advantage will it be to any one thus to suffer, if the dead rise not? If in this life only we have hope let us not deny ourselves but let us eat and drink for tomorrow we die, or perish forever; for if there be no Resurrection, we have nothing to apprehend or hope beyond the grave.

A. B. WALTHALL.

TO MR. ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

LETTER II.

Dear Brother,

On the desk before me is the eleventh number of your periodical. It contains three documents which have an intimate connexion with myself. The first is a replication of the prospectus of a Debate held in Lunenburg between me and a "Protestant clergyman" of the Presbyterian Secq; the second, a report of said discussion by another "Protestant Divine" of the Episcopal Methodist Communion; and the third some "remarks," purporting to be on the two preceding articles from your own pen: for the re issue of the first, I return you my sincere acknowledgments; because, it has given my prospectus a wider circulation than I could have flattered myself it would obtain under existing circumstances; and thus it may be the means, by increasing my subscription list, of expediting the publication of the Debate: a consummation as it will tend to correct the very monstrous absurdities, which have found a circulation to my prejudice, among both the friends and foes to truth. As for document number two, I can have no objection to its appearance in the Harbinger, for I have al-

ready published in my own periodical. By a reference to the September number it will be found with my remarks appended to it. These occupy five pages of No. 5, and over two of No. 6. They would have been more extended, but for the conclusion that, as the whole matter was to appear in another form it would not be necessary to enlarge on the present occasion. On good authority, I learn, that my strictures have been duly appreciated by the most intimate friends of the reporter; of whom, one declares that he will not acknowledge him as a brother if he does not give me a sound censing! These "good" folks evidently belong to the "Church militant" which for valour and pugnacity stands high in "the Protestant World!"—But, my good Brother Campbell, I am afraid, that you will in the end gain no applause either from the brethren, the "divine" or yourself, when you recur to the circumstances of the appearance of this report in your paper.—Consider who Mr. Hunnicutt is. It is true he is a Protestant, but he is not a Christian; unless it can be shown, that men become Christians without believing and obeying the Gospel. I am a Christian; and glory in the name, and am jealous of the honors and privileges, and immunities attached to it; so much so, that I cannot, I will not consent to share them with the innumerable pretenders to the title in the Protestant and Papal sections of the Kingdom of Antichrist. Bro. Walter Scott can testify that I believed the gospel and obeyed it before witnesses, of whom our esteemed Bro. Daniel Gano of Cincinnati was one. These brethren then, can testify, from the developments of a three hours conversation upon the truth, that I heard it, had read it, believed it, and obeyed it; they therefore, are my witnesses that I put on Christ understandingly and honestly (for my interest seemed to be on the side of Protestantism)—and am therefore a Christian. When I left Cincinnati, Bro. Challen, unsolicited by me, (for it was his own suggestion) presented me with a letter of introduction from the Sycamore Church to any other of the like faith and order I might sojourn with. The Church being witness, then, I left that city honorably. I have since resided in Philadelphia and Richmond. In neither of those places can a single flaw be justly detected in my moral conduct. In both places, to the neglect of my own interests, I pleaded for what I firmly and honestly believed, and do believe to be true. I would not wink at what I believed the scriptures condemned in practice. I gained the ill-will, and I fear the hatred of many, who have a name to live but are dead. With this I laid my account. My reputation may be clouded for a while; but there is a righteous God in heaven, and an impartial judge of his appointing, before whom we shall all stand; and having lived in all good conscience to this day, I appeal to Him, fearing nothing from His decision.

I say, then, that I am a Christian of good repute before God.

Now you know, that the Sect of the Nazarenes, has been every where spoken against, in all ages, by Jews, Greeks, Romanists, Infidels, and Protestants of all ranks and degrees. Was it, then, to be expected, that if I maintained the truth, and what I maintained were reported by an enemy to the faith, that that report would do honor either to me or my defence? For my own part, I expected no more justice at the hands of a priest than I have received at those of Mr. Hunnicutt. But what I most regret is, and that, too, more for your sake than my own, that you should seize with such avidity upon the report of a Sectarian, upon which to found that "Bull of Excommunication" which you have thundered against me in the form of "remarks."—What would the brethren have thought of me, or how would you have liked it, had some popish priest published a report of your Debate with Purcell, attributing to you blasphemies against God, if I had grounded an edict upon it, turning you over to Satan, or proclaiming you to the world as every thing that was heretical and diabolical? What an outcry would have resounded against me, for my barefaced assurance, my antichristian arrogance, or my Supreme-Pontifical presumption! And very justly. For who could have conferred the power and authority upon me, to sit on the throne of God, and thus *ex cathedra* to have hurled my ecclesiastical thunderbolt at you? If your views had been ever so heretical in my judgment, my duty would have been to reason with you and not anathematize you. If you had been subverted, it would have been for me first to have expostulated with you according to our Lord's commands; if all proper means failed, I would then have had to charge you before the church to which you belong, and if they condemned you, and they requested me to notify to the world the premises, the conclusions, and the sentence they had decreed against you, it would then have remained for me to have recorded it as *their* act, and not mine. But even if your church, should have condemned you as a heretic, it would depend very much upon the constitution of that Body, whether the public should ratify their decision. By the public I mean, the brethren at large. If your church were endowed with spiritual gifts, and so could judge infallibly as the churches of the Apostolic Age did, then, indeed, the public would be bound to ratify their decree; but inasmuch as these gifts are not now in congregations; and owing to the utter perdition of the faith by the Apostacy, with the spirit of which the "heresies" of nearly all "Reformation Churches" are embued, together with the notorious apathy and want of zeal among great numbers,—it is manifest, that if you were deemed heretical by your church, other churches would be bound in honor and justice to you and themselves, to withhold their decree until they had examined you in the presence of the public.

We ought to be very cautious in this matter.

nication; and especially ought we to beware of jumping to conclusions upon the reports of enemies to the faith. I know we agree in this, if we differ in every thing else beside, which, however, we do not,—that *there is no infallible judge of controversy upon earth*. If this be true, then my judgment of you, or yours of me, or ours of the church, or the church of us is not, and cannot, under existing circumstances be infallible. If you say there is no resurrection of the dead, then, inasmuch as the scriptures plainly say there is, the scriptures pronounce you perverted; but even then not lost; but in a state to be reasoned with, and so reclaimed to the true doctrine. If you deny the remission of sins by faith in the blood of Christ and obedience, then, you would manifestly have apostatized, and trampled under foot the blood of the Son of God: but is there no difference between this and contending for what one honestly believes to be the scripture doctrine of the resurrection, the gospel, its obedience, and so forth? If at this time, just as some are beginning to emerge from the smoke of the Great City, they are to "elevate" themselves as arbitrators in religious matters, and with an air of infallibility, to fulminate decrees against their brethren, I certainly think, they are overstepping the bounds of modesty, decorum, discretion, and propriety. It appears to me, from all the consideration I have been able to bestow upon the subject, that brethren ought not to excommunicate one another, *unless for well established dereliction of Christian conduct, or a plain and positive, (NOT A CONJECTIVE) denial of the truth, founded upon their own confession and not upon the report of others, who may be either personally or ecclesiastically opposed to them.*

I regard Mr. Hunnicutt's report as a species of revenge. He is not an impartial witness in this case, as I will show you.—In the month of August 1836, I attended, by request, the annual meeting of the brethren at the Fork Meeting House in Lunenburg.—After my speech on the second day, an invitation having been given for any who were dissatisfied at what they had heard to state their objections, Mr. Hunnicutt rose, and in his remarks upon what I had written in the Advocate concerning "Methodistic Sanctification," said *it was as false as I was infamous*. In the September number I reported proceedings, and in doing so gave him some salutary discipline. He had been smarting under this, from that time till the Debate, he has so ignorantly reported. In writing of him I played upon his name, and spelled it Honistrutt instead of Hunnicutt. He sent me a message when I was in Lunenburg for the purpose of debating, by Bro. A. Anderson, wanting to know if I knew his right name when I wrote it Honistrutt. I replied through Bro. A., that when he explained why he called me, in effect, an *infamous liar*, we would then talk about his inquiry. We afterwards met on civil terms; but he made no allusion to my,

reply. Since that, he has volunteered his services as reporter, the rest you know. See Adv. p. 112. vol. 3.—Now, I would just observe, that with the knowledge of these circumstances, were Mr. Hunnicutt a jurymen on any case, in which I was concerned, I should strongly object to his services in that capacity.

But my dear Brother, the more I reflect upon the documents before me the greater is my astonishment at seeing them where I do. *What can have been the cause of their appearance at this "crisis"?*—You say, in effect, my report or prospecta, and Hunnicutt's articles; for it is written, p. 214, in italics thus, "*The Rubicon is passed* in the late discussion, as is evident from the report of Dr. Thomas, and the Methodist Journal above quoted." Upon my having passed the Rubicon, carrying out the idea, am I to conclude, that, you consider me as marching upon Rome, to besiege your capital, and to overthrow the Senate! There is some little resemblance here, for the thunders of excommunication usually emanate from that city to burst upon the heads of the untried condemned! But fear not, my Brother; I have indeed passed the Rubicon, the boundary of Cæsar's province, and am marching onwards, as expeditiously as, time will serve; but it is towards Jerusalem, and not to Rome, that I urge my way. The Rubicon which I have passed, was Baptism into Christ, when I renounced the faith of Cæsar and of Cæsar's god.

But permit me to say, that I cannot attribute the cause to these articles. I will give you my reasons. I have a letter from you in your own hand writing, dated Bethany, Dec. 20th, 1836, about eleven months ago. It is a friendly epistle, and the last I have received from you. In this you subscribe yourself, "*in all benevolence, yours in the Hope, A. Campbell*." This was, and is, reciprocated by me to this day; but, I perceive, that some secret influence is working upon your too easy faith, which prevents you giving me credit for truth. Time however, who is one of the best friends to truth, may yet clear up all to our mutual satisfaction; at all events, I will indulge the pleasing, if but delusive, hope. Well then, eleven months ago, and mark, two months subsequently to my leaving Richmond, you considered me "*in the Hope*" and also, "*yours*," or your Brother. Now I would here observe, that all that I believe now, I believed then, and practiced, and if you consult my periodical, and unprejudiced persons, they will say, "*he tells the truth*."—But I have also, the copy of a letter in my possession, written to a brother in whom you therein say, "*that you have the fullest confidence*." Now, this brother has as much confidence in me, as you profess to have in him; and we are very intimate together for the truth's sake; and with but little exception, we believe the same things. This letter is dated *Nov. 11, 1837*, not quite four months after the former,

three months and twenty days before the Debate. In that letter, you speak of me in the most opprobrious terms, reduce me to a level with Dr. Sleight, and declare that you have "lost all confidence" in me. I saw this letter soon after its arrival, and as it was almost altogether about me, I was permitted to take a copy of it. You know, that you received a letter from Lunenburg, signed by about fifteen brethren concerning your sentiments respecting me, which they testified I did not deserve. I had no hand in that letter, it was written and sent spontaneously by them. I myself read your letter of April in the audience of nearly 20 brethren, who with one voice condemned it; I observed, in effect, that I had never expressed myself of an enemy in such terms; it was rejoined, that it was to be hoped I never would. How have I addressed you, since that letter? I refer you to my letter to you in the May Advocate; and to the manner in which I have written of you since. I have rigidly guarded myself in referring to you, lest I might give colour to the charge of a revengeful spirit. *Scripta manent*, refer to them.

But what was the cause of the difference between your letter to me, and that to our brother only about four months after? As there have been no private communications between you and me, the cause must be sought for in the Advocates of January, February, and March; for the December was published and the April not. On referring to these, I find the articles on Materialism, Nos. 2, 3, 4, and a prefatory notice to Epistolary Extracts. These, then, have caused you to lose all confidence in me. Had I to re-write No. 2, I think I should express myself in somewhat milder terms; I did not, however, call you the Pope or Man of Sin. This is a construction put upon my words which was not intended. In No. 3, I consider, I made sufficient admissions to have satisfied any reasonable person; and in No. 4, I see nothing, that you can take exception to, unless it be the complete refutation of your positions.

Now, your judgment concerning me it appears has been made up ever since April 11.—It is obvious, then, that you have only been waiting a favorable opportunity to "come down upon me like a thunderstorm," as a brother in Richmond informed me you intended to do, before the Harbinger had arrived. But, my Brother, it is a cloud without a bolt; for it comes at a time when I have ceased to be electric; it may be a storm of thunder, but for myself, I regard it as *vox et praterea nihil*.

But what makes this crisis so favorable an opportunity to discharge "the great gun of excommunication" against me? Let us see. I perceive in the ninth number of the Harbinger, three extracts from the letter of a sister in Lunenburg. That letter has been charged upon me, either as the prompter or writer.—But the sister who wrote it, can testify, that it was all written and sealed for the mail before I knew of its existence. I have

known the whole epistle read, and a most excellent one it is;—and it would have been well had you laid it before your readers entire, that they might themselves have been permitted the privilege of reading and judging independently of your views of expediency. My good brother, the remarks which you have appended to the extracts, goes to the utter subversion of the gospel of Jesus Christ. This is not my individual opinion. I am sustained in it by the loud and stern decision of brethren in whom you do confide, and others, who, if you knew them in their Christian character, you could not but respect. I have not long returned from a tour through Caroline, Spottsylvania, Essex, King and Queen, and King William. I have had an opportunity of acquainting myself with the sentiments of Protestants and Brethren. The Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, and Baptists of the day, congratulate themselves, that you have at length come over to them, and that "the Campbellites" will have to follow! This is natural enough; he who stands before the world as "the Champion of Protestantism" (I have read the Debate,) the next step is, to plead in their behalf, that there are Christians in all sects. How have the Brethren received this avowal? Some others go so far as to say that if you were to come among them they would not fellowship you. But for myself, I consider this as going too far. I was at Smyrna, King and Queen. I spoke there. When I had done, Bro. T. M. Henley rose and gave notice, requiring a full attendance of the church on the ensuing Lord's Day to take into consideration certain opinions that were being introduced into this Reformation. I turned to a brother, inquiring what next? supposing that I was about to come under trial.—But I was informed, that it was not I this time, but Brother Alexander Campbell. Tempora mutantur, thought I, *thesiſes are changed et nos mutamur ab illis!*—I next visited the Acquinton in King William. There I learned that a remonstrance had been signed by a full meeting against your perversion of scripture in the remarks on the Lunenburg sister's letter.

I know a place, not 40 miles from this, where I learned, that my detractors were scheming to get up a charge against me, in order to divert my attention from your gospel nullifying sentiments. My dear Brother I do not charge you with the same intention, but this I say, that your "coming down like a thunderstorm" upon me at this "crisis," culminating your Bull of Excommunication against me upon the flimsy and revengeful report of an enemy, which you seem to have seized upon with a morbid avidity, does appear remarkably coincident. But assure you, the day is past, and I trust gone forever; the great ecclesiastical personages, can make their "inferior" scape goat of their offences. May I not retort upon you, as you are yourself as much a subject of discipline as you

me. May I not advise you, to clear your own skirts before you set about purifying the brethren of mine?

I should not have named the things which now see the light in this letter; but you have put me upon the defensive. My cause is too just to permit me to indulge inectively as some may term a warmth and energy of style. My Brother, you have done me no real harm. I do not think you can now separate from me twenty patrons. Your *deceit* from Bethany has arrived about one month too late. The September Advocate is in the hands of its subscribers, and they know from that, that your manifesto is the baseless fabric of a vision. I need not therefore, offer any further remarks in refutation of Mr. Hunicutt's fictions: for fictions they are, as brethren who heard both sides can abundantly testify.

But if his are fictions, your allegations being founded upon these, are fictitious too. You have become my public accuser. In the discharge of your official attributes, you accuse me of *denying the resurrection of the dead*. Permit me to say, that the fervor of your imagination has obscured your judgment.—Did I not see the charge before me, I could not believe you would make so reckless an assertion. *I believe with all my heart, and without the shadow of a reservation, that there will be a resurrection of the just and unjust.* Mr. Jones of London, in his Lectures on the Apocalypse says, that the First Resurrection is but *metaphorical*, yet you can fellowship him, though he has unfellowshipped you. You are not so sensitive therefore, upon this doctrine in relation to me. Now, "do justice though the heavens fall." I believe that there will be *two literal resurrections of dead bodies*; you know I believe this, provided only you read what I write. I believe in a resurrection of the dead saints at the Second Coming of Christ; and in a second resurrection of saints and sinners, the subjects of the personal reign of Jesus on earth for one thousand years. I believe in the judgment which sits upon the subjects of the Second resurrection at the end of the Millennium—a Judgment of all both *small and great, who have done good or evil according as it shall be determined by the things written in the Books.*

As to the accusation about "all Adam's race who die in infamy," and which you have printed in capitals, it is nothing more than an appeal, which a man of sense ought not to condescend to. I regard it as an appeal to animal passion; the fervent hope of weak, defeated partisans. My opponent in the Debate swelled amazingly upon this topic, knowing how calculated it was to alarm the *parentalism* of his hearers. For my own part, I scarcely ever mention it on this account; for it is the most difficult thing in the world to elevate the intellect of an audience above their passions. Nevertheless, when questions are put to me, I answer as readily as I can, come

what will. You say, my Brother, that the contrary doctrine is taught in the scriptures; prove it if you can. I know you cannot. *Show that Eternal Life is unconditional and that I will give up the point.*

"Doleful gospel" is a singular phrase. Who ever heard of *glad tidings full of grief*? The gospel I am accustomed to teach is *full of joy* to all people who will obey it. It is, that, though under sentence of death, God offers them *Eternal life on condition of believing and obeying the truth concerning Jesus*. But you know what I maintain, as well as I do myself; for it is plainly laid down in my former letters to you. Though you say I am mutable, I still adhere to that.

You have brought many railing accusations against me.—May the Lord forgive you; I do. You term me "the chosen vessel" of former years,—"the person" an "incorrigible factionist," "a bold speculator," "a schismatic," &c. This may be all very polite in your estimation; but I really think that it is both "vulgar" and "abusive."—You say, that you "do most sincerely regard me as a mere sophist, too weak and bazardeous, too glaring and mutable ever to form and cement a party." How is it Bro. C., that your giant-strength has failed to crush so "weak" so "hazardous," so "mutable" a thing as I?—Look at the "party" you have been "forming" and "cementing" for the last years of your life; look at certain churches I could name, and then say, if you have succeeded in forming and cementing parties against which the gates of hades shall not prevail. What is the cause of that *splitting and apathy*, and that worldly-mindedness under which they suffer? These are things in which I have had no hand. I will tell you what it is; it is attributable to the *unsound principles* upon which these churches are constituted. There is too much of the leaven of Antichrist, which they must purge out from among them before they will be prepared to meet the King.

But your Decree takes an amazing sweep. My poor, weak, hazardous, glaring, and mutable self is not enough to satiate its appetite; ecclesiastical proscription must have more victims than one to gratify its inordinate desires! All "*who believe*" as well as teach what I maintain must go by the board with me! Well, I congratulate myself, that I am not alone. But whose fault is it, that I have company? It is the fault of him who cuts us off. It is he that *makes a party*, and not the proscribed. You will perceive from this Advocate, that I have a companion in heresy in the Editor of a northern periodical, of unimpeachable integrity. I could name Evangelists and Elders of churches, besides numerous brethren who believe with me. I have brethren who adorn the gospel of God. But with these you claim that you have "no more fellowship than with formalism and those who teach it." What a declaration! "sincerity," that darling substitute for the obedience

del, will avail us nothing! We are "subverted" and to destruction we must go; for our doctrines are declared to be "positively subversive of the Christian faith." But this we deny. We know they are subversive of Protestantism, but certainly not of Christianity.

As to my "speculation" and "opinionism," permit me to say, that you are the last man in America, that ought to reproach me in reference to these. What is your controversy with Mr. Skinner but speculation? To one, who reads the scriptures attentively, and understands them according to their most obvious signification, there is no difficulty in coming to the conclusion, that the theories neither of yourself nor of your opponent can possibly be sustained. And as to *opinionism*, have you not, my brother, in your tenth number decreed, that the propagation of opinions shall be quashed? But how have you obeyed your own laws? Look at the eleventh number, under the caption "Christians among the Sects." There, you confess, that in the ninth number under the same head you had been propagating opinionism through the length and breadth of the land; at least wherever the Harbinger circulates: for you say "we gave it as our *opinion* that there were Christians among the Protestant Sects."—Your *opinion*, as we have seen, has been extolled by those Sects; and, however, you may modify your *opinion*, they understand you as recognizing them as Christians; and with this they are content. If any thing makes a party in "this reformation" it will be your Championship of Protestantism and your proclamation of that *opinion*. You have not the shadow of a shade for that *opinion* in the Bible. You speculate upon Jews, Turks, Pagans, Romanists, Protestants, perfect and imperfect Christians, a non-descript obedience which falls short of *gospel* obedience, on the Newtons, and the Bunyans, inward and outward Christians, inward and outward Baptism, Essentials and Non-Essentials, and so forth; from all of which, you distil an *opinion*, that there are "Christians among Protestant Parties!"

But has it not entered into your conceptions, that a *propagation may, at one and the same time, be both a matter of faith and a matter of opinion*?—A few years ago, the proposition was advanced by you, in your debate with Macalla, I believe, that *Baptism was for remission of sins*.—This to you was a matter of faith; and why? Because, there was testimony sufficient before your mind to make it so. Not more, perhaps, than three or four persons believed it. You propounded it.—But how was it received by the public? As an *opinion*; and why? Because, there was not sufficient testimony before their minds to make it a matter of faith. Now, suppose, the public had said to you on that occasion, "Mr. Alexander Campbell, Sir, the world has hitherto been sufficiently harassed by the *opinions* of men, we have therefore, determined to be distinctly

understood upon this topic; we now consequently, make known to you, that we are resolved to quash the liberty of propagating *opinions*; we command you, therefore, "explicitly to renounce, and to be for ever silent respecting your opinion, that baptism is for remission of sins, which in our judgment is speculative and untaught. Suppose they had dictated thus to you as, indeed, you have to those who dissent from you, pray, my good brother, where would now be the doctrine of baptism for remission of sins. The Baptists, I trow, would have been spared much distress, and even you might have missed the renown of having *schematised* a portion of their communion.

—Allow me to observe, that Editors and Periodicals are not the bond of union in a church of Christ. Under existing circumstances they are indispensable to the dissemination of truth and to the subversion of error. But, a congregation of Christian Philosophers will contemplate an editorial war as a mere "battle of books." They will believe those propositions which have the most evidence to sustain them. It is the truth which unites them in the bonds of peace and affection. They will not declare for this champion or for that; though both may be slain, the word of the Lord abides for ever. They regret the fury of the combatants, while they smile at the impotency of their rage. They have no partialities: they sigh only for the victory of truth.

Before you proceed again to reclaim me from "opinionism" permit me to suggest, that my worthy physician would heal himself. "First take the splinter out of your own eye; then you will see to take the mote out of thy brother's."—The insuperable facts to my theory, which you say you laid before my face, and which it is alleged I did not profess to meet or obviate, were, if passed over at all, omitted as your weakest points for the saving of time. Your strongest position, as you supposed, was your "17th Argument." This you termed a "most triumphant refutation of Materialism and Sadduceanism."—How easily I demolished your whole fabric based upon this, will appear from p. 21, vol. iv. But if you are not satisfied with my reasoning upon the subject, allow me to recommend to your notice an article in the present number over the signature of A. B. Walthall. It has already appeared in the Primitive Christian; and would perhaps, enlighten not a little, the exclusive readers even of the Millennial Harbinger.

But I am glad that I am too weak "to form and cement a party."—The party that will be approved by God, is that which is *formed and cemented by the truth*. I belong to that party; and having volunteered under its banner, I will not enter into no compromise with any other. You may do as please about persisting in or spreading your *opinion*; but matters not. You may cast us out of your Kingdom, but to be to the King, you cannot deprive us of the right to be

ship or expel us from his Kingdom. You have excommunicated us, it is true; but we are still "kings and priests to God," constituted such by being washed in the blood of a Royal victim; we have still the right though denounced by the whole world, if unjustly condemned, to commune in spirit with the Father who has begotten us to himself by a belief of the truth.

We are commanded to return good for evil. Being yet "in the hope" as you profess to be, I expect to meet you in the Kingdom of the Everlasting Age. I shall therefore treat you as a brother, and regard you as such, though somewhat more dictatorial than you have a right to be. I shall still continue to plead for what I believe to be true, though it should cross you at every step. I shall not seek to encounter you unnecessarily; but, if you continue to plead for an UNBAPTIZED CHRISTIANITY, I shall oppose you with all my powers contemptible as you may deem them to be.

My case I willingly submit to the jurisdiction of the Church to which I belong. It is composed of honorable and intelligent men, who have learned how to rise superior to vulgar prejudice. I will not anticipate their decision; but, as they are friends to us both, and no doubt will require that justice be done to each: it is possible they may respectfully call upon you to retract your decree, and to republish my remarks upon Linnicent, and this letter to you, as a part of the *amende honorable* to which I as the injured party may be entitled. But I shall not seek to bias their decision; for I am armed too strong in the justice of my cause, to have recourse to any sinister means of defence.

With the most unfeigned wishes for your well being in all things

I subscribe myself, Dear Brother,
Yours in all Christian Benevolence

JOHN THOMAS.

Amelia, Virginia,
Nov. 20th, 1837.

P. S.—If the brethren can tolerate such a Dictatorship as that developed in the last numbers of the Harbinger they deserve the name of "Campbellites" forever. There is none of our Editorial brethren, who may venture to dissent from Bethany; or any church, that may believe with them, whose Christian standing is not jeopardized by the precedent, of which we and others are now the victims.

CORRESPONDENCE—[continued.]

Fredericksburg, Sept. 14th, 1837.

Brother Thomas,

I saw a letter from you to Bro. Ferneyhough sometime since, informing him you would visit us this season, we are anxious to see you, can you do so soon, please write me

and let me know when. The brethren are all well and to be remembered to you; I have the happy privilege of informing you that, we have been made to rejoice exceedingly within the past week, by seeing and feeling the effect of the power of the Gospel of Christ; from 12 to 15 have been baptized into the death of Christ. We have had with us Brethren Colman, Moore, Day, Ferguson, and Henshall, the most of them are with us to this present, but some have left—besides the speaking brethren that have favored us with a visit, several disciples from the surrounding country have been with us and united in blessing God and rejoicing with all of us for the favor of God that brings salvation.

We yesterday received the 9th number of the Harbinger. I was astonished on looking into it at Bro. Campbell's answer to some Lunenburg sister. And is it true that he that believeth shall be saved provided he acts as he thinks right! Every lover of Apostolic doctrine will grieve at the thought of such disregard of Jesus and his institutions. Brother Thomas I have no doubt that there are many Campbellites and Thomasites in our land, but those who love the Lord more than man will not be moved from the simplicity of the truth by the reasonings of A. Campbell nor John Thomas. I love them both, but I love Christ more.

Yours in hope of Eternal Life,

THOMAS P. MILLS.

REMARKS.

It gives us much pain, that the momentous truths of revelation cannot be discussed without reference to persons. The main question, which every reader of periodicals should propound to himself is this,—what do the scriptures teach upon this or that topic?—As things exist in Christendom, periodicals are necessary and indispensable. It is to the press, as a part and a very important part, of a grand system of means, that we are indebted for the liberty, civil and religious, which we enjoy. It is by a free discussion and unfettered examination of—"what is truth?"—it is by a free and unrestrained circulation of the for and against, that we are enabled to arrive at what is and what is not. In the discussing and the examining of these things, what does it signify whether the things written are the opinions of Alexander this, or John that? Why will not our readers pay more attention to what is said than to the persons who say it! Be the truth spoken by whom it may, great or little, high or low, rich or poor, saint or sinner, the truth still; and therefore, we ought to receive it from the mouth of him who sets it forth, but for its own sake. Let the banner be the badge and banner of our enterprise; and let the name of an undivided Christ, be our Sovereign Lord and our King.

Without reference then, direct or indirect, to the who has spoken it, we freely express our sentiments, that there is no such thing taught in the scriptures from Genesis to the Apocalypse included.—“He that believeth shall be saved provided he acts as he thinks right.”—The Romanist believes that Jesus is the Christ the Son of the living God; he believes, that the blood of Jesus was shed for the remission of sins; he believes in baptism for the remission of sins; in the resurrection, assumption, &c. “He thinks that he acts right” in kneeling at the feet of a priest and in receiving absolution at his hands; “he thinks he acts right” in prostrating himself before the Image of the Virgin, whom he styles “the Mother of God,” and in supplicating her intercession with her son on his behalf; “he thinks he acts right” in worshipping a piece of paste called “the Host” as a real and substantial Christ; &c. The Protestant believes with the Romanist the things aforesaid; and “he thinks he acts right” in receiving absolution after the formula of Episcopacy: “he thinks he acts right” in maintaining an adulterous alliance between Church and State; “he thinks he acts right” in aiding and abetting wars for the defence of his religion: “he thinks he acts right” in refusing to be buried in water into the death of Christ; “he thinks he acts right” in upholding the principle that *without faith it is impossible to please God*; “he thinks he acts right” in praying, and weeping, and mourning; in perpetuating the absurdities of the Campmeeting, and altars of Sectarianism—that he may make God witness to save his soul. He believes these things, and he practices them in sincerity of heart; and thus he is constituted a fit subject to sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the Kingdom of God!—And this can be believed in this “luminous age,” yea, and taught, as the truth of Him in whom there is no darkness at all!

And is it come to this, that *he that acts sincerely shall be saved, and he that is not sincere shall be condemned!* Let us compare this to the unsophisticated testimony of Mark—

“Go ye into all the world, and preach THE GOSPEL to every creature. He that believeth (the gospel) and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not (the gospel) shall be damned.”—*Jesus to his Apostles.*

Hear, O Inquirer after the Truth, the testimony of Paul—
“I am not ashamed of THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST; for it is THE POWER OF GOD unto salvation to EVERY ONE THAT BELIEVETH. . . . FOR THEREIN is the righteousness of God revealed, &c.

And to them who have obeyed the Gospel of Christ, he says in the same epistle—

“God will render to every one according to his works:—ETERNAL LIFE, indeed to them who, by perseverance in well-doing, SEEK glory, honor, and immortality; but anger and

wrath to them, who are contentious, and obey not THE TRUTH, but obey unrighteousness.”

And again,
“Not those who hear the law, are just before God; but, those who obey the law shall be justified, in the day when God will judge the hidden things of men by Jesus Christ according to MY GOSPEL.”—Rom. chs. i. ii.

And to the Thessalonians, he says
“The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire; taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.”—Ch. i. ep. 2.

Here are declarations intelligible to the meanest capacity.—Here are no sophistical caveats and provisos: but plain straightforward announcements. In a certain sense, the Law has gone forth from Zion; THE POWER OF GOD has been deposited in a known place: HIS NAME is placed in the New Institution for the Remission of Sins. He will make his laws victorious; He will not nullify his own power; He will not lend his name to Antichrist, nor his glory will he give to another.

Shall we say, that God caused the Apostles at the hazard of their lives, to proclaim to the nations that *His power to save was in the Gospel*; and then, after all to disperse his power into other gospels, then when but now rampant among the worshippers of Six-winged *the great foolishness of the Gentiles!* Hear, O ye who prostrate yourselves at the shrine of this seductive deity, the words of Paul concerning these gospels and the gospel in which God has deposited the power to save, and of which the Apostle to the Nations was not ashamed—

To declare some who trample you, and wish to pervert the gospel of Jesus. But if even we, or an angel from heaven declare a gospel to you, different from what we have declared unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so now I say again, if any one declare a gospel to you, different from what you have received, let him be accursed.”

See then, how jealous the Apostle was of that gospel which he proclaimed. No mincing of the matter here, to meet the squeamishness of sincere errorists. Has any new revelation been given since the Apostolic day? Have we to do with a changeable God? Are his ways like our ways, and his thoughts like ours! No! He is “the Father of lights in whom is no variableness nor shadow of turning.”—That which was necessary to save men formerly is necessary to save them now; they would indeed be saved.

Protestantism is a faction in the Kingdom of Antichrist; it is made up of spurious gospels and spurious institutions. The Power of God for Salvation cannot be found in any of them. Upon all their ordinances is impressed “In vain.” It is not by their teaching for doctrine the commandments.

As there is but one road to Eternal Life, and that a narrow one, so there is but one way of becoming a Christian; and few there are who can rightfully claim it. Out of Christ, there is no salvation. In Christ is the only safety. There is but one way of entering "into Christ" or of putting him on.—"As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ;" consequently, as many as have not been baptized into Christ, have not put him on; and therefore, be they Romanists or Protestants, be they ever so sincere, and all that sort of thing so extolled by the world, unless they obey the one only true and undivided gospel of God, they are neither in Christ nor Christian.

A good Christian is one who has "put on Christ" intelligently, and continues to walk in him before God to all well pleasing. None else we conceive are entitled to the name.

EDITOR.

P. S.—Since writing the above we have visited the brethren in Fredericksburg. We were much gratified with their society. The church seems to be healthy, and to have been built up on the right foundation. The brethren and sisters are intelligent and appear to know what they are about. A love of the truth which they have confessed, and not the spirit of a party, unites them together in the unity of peace. They are quite alive to the necessity of knowledge and understanding of the Gospel previous to immersion, if unity, life, and peace are to be maintained among them. That they may contend earnestly and unflinchingly for the faith originally delivered to the saints by the Apostles of Christ; and that no root of bitterness may spring up among them, is the genuine hope of their friend, brother and servant for the truth's sake.

From Fredericksburg, we proceeded to Rappahannock, Smyrna, and Aquinnton. We found things in the lower counties as far as relates to ourselves, in a very gratifying condition. Many evil reports had been circulated there as elsewhere; but we found them received only as the voices of malevolence or of a misapprehension of the truth. Time will cure all things; and we are convinced from the observations we were enabled to make, that it will bear us harmless in the end.

EDITOR.

Lansburg, Va. Oct. 23, 1837.

Dear Sir,

Does the figurative representation contained in Luke xvi. 19-31, picture to us the punishment of man after the death of the body until the resurrection; or does it represent the punishment after the resurrection of the body? You will give me a plain answer, and by so doing you will oblige your friend.

J. B. HARDY.

ANSWERS.

The parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus was designed to represent neither. It was constructed in conformity with the popular notions of the Jews on the subject; and which may be found at large in Josephus' discourse to the Greeks concerning Hades. The design of the parable was to show, that the destiny of men is determined on this side of Hades or the Grave; and that if they will not hear or believe the testimony of God by Moses, and the Prophets, (and since Messiah's day we may add) and by the Apostles their case is hopeless, and that if they believe not these, neither will they be persuaded though one should rise from the dead.

As the query does not come within the scope of the Parable it is unanswerable. I have given the only answer of which I believe it is susceptible; and beyond this we must not go. One very important truth is inculcated in connexion with the application; and it is this,—if men do not obey God here, it matters not how sincere they may be, there is no reward for them either at death or at the resurrection.

EDITOR.

PSALM CX.—L. M.

The Apostle shows, that this psalm refers to the Messiah: Heb. I 12.—In the first verse, Jehovah declares to David's Lord, that HE, the Son of David, shall sit at his right hand until his foes are subjected to him;—v. 2 he continues to address Him and avers, that Mount Zion, the place of David's throne, should be the seat of his government, and the centre from which his power should extend. V. 3 & 4, foretell THE PREPARATION, the Gathering, and the Resurrection; and that He shall be a High Priest through all time. The prophet then addresses Jehovah concerning the Lord at his right hand, and predicts, that, in the day of his displeasure, He will crush the heads of kings, judge the nations, fill them with death, and overthrow the Antichrist or Prince of his enemies. And lastly, that this signal establishment over his foes was the reward of his sufferings.

Jehovah to my Lord declar'd,
"Be seated thou at my right hand,
"Until thine enemies I make
"The footstool of thy trampling feet."

Jehovah will from Zion's Hill
The sceptre of thy pow'r extend;
And thou shalt govern in the midst
Of those who are thine enemies!

Prepar'd shall be thy people, when,
In splendid robes of holiness,
Thy throne, Lord Messiah, thou;
In concourse, each next unto thee!

Thy kings as yet shall come forth;
Like dew-drops from the morning's dew,
Jehovah, he hath newly created,
And his oath will not repent.

"A priest thou art forever made
Of th' order of Melchisedec."
The Lord at thy right hand, O God,
In th' day of his displeasure shall

The heads of mighty monarchs crush.
He shall among the Nations judge;
And fill them with the shame; and crush
The hostile Prince o'er wide dominences.

He in the way shall deeply drink
Of sorrow affliction's brook; so that
He shall his head hit up, and be
Exalted as the Lord supreme.

"The sure mercies of David" are the gracious promises made to David. These promises are contained in the discourse of Nathan the prophet when God sent him to tell David that he should not build a house for Him. Upon this occasion, He pronounced to David, that He, the Lord, would make him David's house. That when he should be sleeping with his father, he would set up his Seed after him. That He should build a house for his name, and that he would establish the throne of his Kingdom for ever. He promised that he would be his Father, and be the Seed, and be his Son. He continued, "even in suffering for iniquity, I was made thine with the rod due to men; and with the stripes due to the children of Adam. And thine house and thy Kingdom shall be established for ever before me; thy throne shall be established for ever." Upon receiving these promises, David went in and sat before the Lord, and in his prayer said, "Who am I, O Lord God?—And what is my house, that thou hast brought me hither to?—And this (bringing of him hitherto) was yet a small thing in thy sight, O Lord God; but thou hast spoken also of thy servant's house for a great while to come. And this must be the LAW OF THE ADAM, O LORD GOD?"—or concerning the man who is from above.

This seed promised through Nathan is David's Lord, who is the subject of the 110th psalm. Concerning him all the prophets testify. Isaiah foretells that, "the government shall be on his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Father of the Everlasting Age, the Prince of Peace." Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, UPON THE THRONE OF DAVID, and upon his kingdom to order and establish it with judgment, and with justice henceforth even for ever." And Gabriel a messenger sent direct from God to Mary of Nazareth, quotes this prediction concerning the Seed, or David's Lord, and applies it to one who was to be born of her, "whom" says he, "you

shall name Jesus. He shall be great and shall be called, the Son of the Highest. And the Lord God will give Him the Throne of David his Father. And he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; his reign shall never end."

It is manifest, therefore, that the Messiah was to be born a King, and that he was to live forever. This kind of Messiah was the National Hope of Israel. They could not make out, therefore how he was to suffer death. "Jesus said this, alluding to the death, which he was to suffer. The people answered we have learned from the law, that the Messiah will live for ever. How do you say then that the Son of Man must be lifted up? Who is this son of Man?"

But let it be observed that Jesus or the Messiah, has never yet sat upon "the throne of David," nor reigned over the house of Jacob. When on the earth, they would not have him for a King. Have the gracious promises, then, which God made to David been falsified?—In the Acts, Paul says, that God promised to give to Jesus "the sure mercies of David." But Jesus has not obtained them; unless it can be shown, that David's Throne and Kingdom were not of earth, but in heaven where Jesus is, which none we presume will be absurd enough to say. Then what follows? But that in order to sit upon the throne of David his Father, and to reign over the house of Israel for ever Jesus must descend from heaven to Judea.—He must descend that he may occupy the Throne of David, and so that he may reign over the world. To this the prophet gives witness in the psalm before us; which says, that Mount Zion is to be the centre of his dominion.

That Antichrist, the hostile prince and rival of Messiah should sit upon the throne of the Roman Majesty, that he would rule over the mightiest realms for 1260 years, that Rome "the Eternal City" should be his seat, that the sceptre of his power should extend from a city which was once the Mistress of the world—excites no astonishment in the minds of men; but that his superior and destroyer, Christ, should sit upon the throne of his father David, that He should in his turn rule over the universal globe for 1000 years, that Jerusalem, the city of Peace should be his seat, and that the sceptre of his power should extend from a metropolis once possessed by his enemies, and without whose walls he died, the sacrifice for the world—excites the scorn and ridicule of those who dream of an inviolable reign of Christ.

Jerusalem for Christ, and Rome for Antichrist; Rome will never fit for any thing else but to be the throne of Satan; he never placed his name there; it is in Jerusalem that the peace, and which he has promised to make "the peace of the whole earth," that He delights to dwell.—"The Gentiles shall forever, the gentiles shall perish out of his land.—The righteous shall inherit the Land, and dwell therein."

eter.—“Trust in Jehovah and keep his way, and he will raise thee to the possession of the Land.”—“Great is Jehovah, and greatly to be praised in the city of our God (Jerusalem) upon his holy mountain (Moriah.) Beautiful in its elevation is Mount Zion, the joy of the whole earth; on the northern side is the city of the great King; in her palaces God is known as a refuge.”—“God will establish it forever.”—“Why frown ye at the hill (Mount Zion) in which God is pleased to dwell, in which Jehovah will dwell for ever?”—“In Jerusalem is his tabernacle, and his dwelling-place in Zion.”—He rejected the tents of Joseph and would not dwell in the tribe of Ephraim; but chose the tribe of Judah, The Mount Zion, which he loved. Where he built, like the heavens, his sanctuary: like the earth which he hath established for ever.”—“They who trust in the Lord shall be as Mount Zion, which cannot be moved; which standeth forever.”—“Jehovah hath chosen Zion: he hath desired it as his dwelling-place. This is my rest for ever: here will I dwell, for I have chosen it. There will I exalt the power of David: I will prepare a light for mine anointed. His enemies will be like the walls of smoke, and the crown shall glitter upon his head.”

Such is the testimony of the Psalms, in which “the word of Christ,” dwells richly, concerning the Throne of Jehovah’s Anointed King upon the earth.

The PART VOTERS foretold in this psalm is also predicted by John in these words: “We rejoice, and exult, and give glory to him, because the marriage of the Lamb is come, and His wife has prepared herself.”—The “wife” spoken of here is the same with the Lord’s people in verse 9. The wife of the Apocalypse, is to be “clothed with fine linen, pure and resplendent; and the fine linen is the righteous acts of the saints;”—and the “people” of the psalm, are prepared “in the splendid garment of holiness.”—In psalm 45, the wife of the Lamb is thus described as to her apparel: “on the right hand stands the queen in gold of Ophir. All glorious 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. With gladness and rejoicing shall they be brought; they shall enter the King’s palace.”

“This Reformation” rightly understood is the beginning only of the PREPARATION of THE LAMB’S WIFE of Church of the Lord, spoken of in the prophets of both Testaments, to receive the King at his coming in glory. It will not be consummated till the Church be clothed with righteousness as the Sun with light, pure and resplendent. Though the prospect be at present dim, let us not despond; the day will yet dawn, and the Day Star arise upon us. “At even tide it shall be light.”

The gathering, spoken of in verse 3 is mentioned by Paul 2;

Thess. ii. 1. “Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him.” The “forces” are “the armies which are in heaven following him” spoken of in the Apocalypse; the “mighty messengers” of Paul, the “ten thousands of his saints” of Jude; and the coming of the Son of Man in his glory accompanied by all the angels,” of Matthew.

Concerning the “sceptre of his power,” his “Associate kings” and his Throne, it is written also in psalm 45, “Thy throne, O God (or King) shall stand for ever; the sceptre of thy kingdom is a sceptre of equity! Thou lovest righteousness, and hatest iniquity; therefore, O King, thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness (the Holy Spirit) above thine associates.” In verse 1 of the CXXth these kings, the fellows or associates of the great King, are spoken of as rising from the dead as dew from the womb of the morning. They are the saints; the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and thy righteous contemporaries, who are to share Messiah’s power over the nations for 1000 years. “As for the conqueror, I will give him to sit down with me upon my throne; as I also have conquered, and have sat down with my Father upon his throne.”

“The day of his displeasure” verse 5. This corresponds to the “brightness of his coming;” “the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven” inflicting a just retribution; “the dashing down with violence the Great City of Babylon;” “The plague of hail;” “the indignation and wrath of Almighty God;” “the battle of Armageddon;” “the great supper of God;” and so forth.—In this day of dashing in pieces the nations like a potter’s vessel, “the kings of the earth” “the Beast,” “the false prophet;” “the Prince of his enemies over extensive countries,” will all be whelmed in one common overthrow, and the Lord at Jehovah’s right hand, whose title is, “KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS” will reign over all supreme.

EDITOR.

The Christian and his Persecutors.

It was an excellent rule of an ancient philosopher, when an enemy accused him wrongfully, wholly to disregard the slander; but if justly, quietly to amend his fault. All, says the Apostle, who will live godly in Christ Jesus, shall be persecuted; but wicked men and imposters will grow worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived. The man who is determined to live ‘godly in Christ Jesus,’ deems it a part of that living to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints. In doing this, a contention inevitably ensues between him and the wicked men and imposters spoken of by Paul. In contending for the truth he condemns them by implication. They hear this, and feel it too. They retaliate, and having no arguments, they persecute him as far as they dare. In

days, their instruments of torture were the axe, the fire, the sword, &c. but in these times, it is 'a little member' called the tongue. Concerning this instrument of torture, James says, it is a fire, a world of iniquity; it defiles the whole body, and sets the wheel of nature on a blaze, and is set on fire from hell. The tongue of men, no one can subdue, it is an untruly evil thing, full of deadly poison.—But to the man living godly in Christ Jesus, the tongue of evil minded men can do no real harm. He seeks not the applause or lucre of the world but the approbation of God; who saith,—Fear not them who can deprive you of animal life, but cannot affect your eternal existence; rather fear Him, who can deprive you of both in the destruction of Hell.—The wicked may slander the righteous, which they take care to do in their absence, and their reports may operate to their prejudice in the estimation of other good men, whose weakness may be credulity; but 'Time is the best friend to Truth,' and will effectually counteract the envy, hatred, and malignity of ungodly men. Hence, a man who contends for godliness in theory and practice must lay his account with persecution of some kind or other. His persecutors will be of two classes; of those who persecute him unwittingly; and of those who do it from a bad heart. The former may be good men acting under a false impression; the latter, are 'wicked men and imposters.' These then, are separable into those who are radically wicked and without disguise; and 'imposters' who however beautiful their sepulchres may appear without, are not only bad themselves, or 'deceived,' but imposing on others; or 'deceiving and being deceived.' Of these there is but little hope; for instead of reforming 'they grow worse and worse.' The tongue of these men no one can subdue; for they are imperious to truth. It is therefore useless to be troubled about what they say; the best way to treat them is after the fashion of the ancient philosopher, 'wholly to disregard their slander.' For after all, if we bear it patiently, and with a good conscience before God, we are blessed; for Happy shall you be, says the Rewarder of them who diligently seek him, when men shall revile and persecute you; and on my account accuse you falsely of every evil thing! Rejoice and exult, for great is your reward in heaven; for thus the Prophets were persecuted who were before you.' What then must be done with these our persecutors, must they go on unrestrained; must no effort be made to check them?—None; only give them rope enough and they will destroy themselves. They will slander on until their slanders will become too gross to be believed. They are the greatest enemies to themselves. "Father forgive them for they know not what they do" is the prayer best suited to their case.

EDITOR.

If it be well weighed, to say that a man leith, is as much as to say, that he is brave towards God, and a coward towards man: for a be faces God, and shrinks from man.

THE ADVOCATE

&c.

Vol. 1. Amelia County, Va.; December, 1837. No. 6

From the Primitive Christian.

IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

The question of the soul's mortality or immortality has excited much attention as well as its materiality or immateriality. Socrates believed it to be immortal because immaterial. Plato believed it to be an emanation from God and therefore immortal. One believed in its immortality on the ground of its immateriality, and the other on the ground of its divinity. Josephus, the Jewish historian, in his address to the Grecians on *Antiquities*, speaks on the Platonic sentiment of the soul's immortality, and draws from it an argument in favor of the resurrection of the body, alleging that God was as able to resuscitate the body as to create and immortalize the soul.

But with all the opinions of Socrates, Plato, Josephus and every other unspirited man, on this subject are of no authority. *There are no means existing by which any human being can prove his soul to be mortal or immortal, or at least, there is none if we do not know any thing.* The notion that physicians have any better opportunity of determining this matter than other people, owing to their knowledge of anatomy, by means of dissection, is perfectly erroneous. There are, we know, some gentlemen of this profession who speak with all the positiveness of conscious infallibility on this subject, but whose opinions are the less deserving respect on the account of their very great confidence in their ability to decide on the nature of the soul by anatomical dissection. These gentlemen, however, never dissected a soul, and how they can be able to determine its nature in respect to immortality from the nature of the element which it once inhabited, is a question of so much obscurity that they have never been able to answer it. They do not decide among themselves what life is. They do not know of life in the living body, and in it, also, they give no manifestations of intellect. There are cases, however, where life is as obvious as in any other case, where the least manifestations of intellect, observable to the eye, are thousands may examine. It will not, therefore,

life with the knowing faculty; because, moreover, idiots live as really as sages.

But with us the question is, *What say the Scriptures? We are thoroughly convinced that they contain a revelation from God on the subject of immortality, and us far as they instruct us so far we believe and no farther.*

"I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Christ Jesus, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession, That thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukeable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ. Which in his time he shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of kings, and Lord of lords; Who only hath immortality, dwelling 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. (1 Tim. 6: 13, 14, 15, 16.)

"Who only has immortality." Now the question is, if every angel in heaven be immortal, and every man, woman, and child on earth has an "immortal soul," can it be said, in truth, that only one being in this universe "has immortality?" We therefore say that, although the Scripture says nothing concerning the materiality or immateriality of the soul, yet it does take the negative of the question, Has man an "immortal soul?"

"Who will render to every man according to his works; eternal life, indeed, to them who, by perseverance in well-doing seek for glory, honor and immortality." (Rom. 2: 7.) Here the well-doers are said to seek for immortality. Put does any rational man seek for that which he does not hope to obtain? "Now hope obtained is not hope. For who can hope for that which he enjoys?" (Rom. 8: 24.) Now if a man is in actual possession of immortality why should he be seeking it?—This would indeed be like the lady who sought an hour for the tumbler which was the whole time on the very finger on which she wished to use it. In what does immortality consist, but in "eternal life?" Well, this "eternal life is the gift of God through Jesus Christ our Lord," and is to be conferred on none only those who "persevere in well-doing." This is the condition on which the gift is to be bestowed. The notion that man has an "immortal soul," appears to us to be pagan, and not Christian. If, indeed, it was Jewish, it appears not to have been adopted from any of their inspired writers, but from Socrates or Plato. It is by virtue of the laws of the physical universe that we receive and enjoy physical life, and it is matter of superlative joy to the intelligent christian that through the laws of the moral universe he will assuredly be immortalized by the power of Jehovah. Let all, then, who have commenced doing well "persevere in well-doing," that God may render to them eternal life. Animal life is not to be enjoyed by our species without effort and constant care. God has also given us

clearly to understand that our best efforts, and our constant cares are requisite to the enjoyment of eternal life. "Enter through the straight gate; for wide is the gate of perdition, broad is the way leading thither; and many are they who enter by it. But how straight is the gate of life; how narrow the way leading thither; and how few are they who find it!"

"Many will seek to enter in but will not be able." There are many who seek to continue to enjoy animal life, but, notwithstanding, fail to secure their object, because they seek not in accordance with the laws by which this life is to be perpetuated.—And many, very many, it is to be feared, will fail to receive eternal life because of their carelessness, or inattention to the word of life. How shocking is the biblical ignorance of the community at large! What criminal inattention to the word of God prevails! What stupidity and apathy prevail!—The time is rolling on, however, when this stupidity will be aroused, and this apathy dispelled—when every mind will be attention, and every heart beat high with feeling; and God's eternal truth will be demonstrated in the eternal life of the righteous and the eternal destruction of those "who know not God and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." Those who now flutter in silks, and wallow in luxurious wealth, will then forget their extravagant self-esteem, and their superlative love of human approbation. Their vain hopes will then be succeeded by despair—their pride by involuntary abasement, and their vain and trifling joy by wailing and gnashing of teeth. Beware you who fear not God. The time is coming when he will plead his own cause, not in all the pathetic eloquence of the gospel, but in a voice which will shake earth and heaven—a voice compared with which, the seven thunders of the Apocalypse will be as the whisper of the mildest zephyr.

"Sinners, awake betimes, ye fools be wise,
Awake before the dreadful storm arise."

EDITH.

ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE APOCALYPSE.

(Continued from p. 218.)

IMMORTALITY.

The vision in which the Dragon was first seen (ch. xii.) belongs to the beginning of the fourth century. In the fourth verse he is said to have abased the third of the stars of heaven casting them down to earth. The events which ultimately led to the overthrow of these politico-celestial bodies, are set forth in the sublime imagery of the Sixth Seal; where, it is said, "the stars fell from heaven, on the earth, as a fig tree casteth untimely figs, being shaken by a mighty wind." The

stances of the fall of these luminaries of the political heavens, have been set forth in the first volume of this work. The Dragon, was composed of a Body, Seven Heads, and Ten Uncrowned Horns. These, namely, his body, heads, and horns, compose the whole extent of his jurisdiction: to wit, from Caledonia to the Euphrates; and from the Danube to the Cataracts of the Nile, and the deserts of Africa and Mount Atlas.

In the description of the Fourth Seal, mention is made of "The Fourth part of the Earth;" and in that of the first, second, third, fourth, and sixth trumpets, John speaks of "a third part of the trees," "a third part of the sea," "a third part of the ships," "a third part of the rivers," "a third part of the waters," "a third part of the stars," "a third part of the day, and night" and "a third part of men."

The Third parts of the Trumpets, and *The Fourth part* of the fourth seal, have reference to two periods of the Roman History. That of the *Fourth part* relates to the Dioclesian Constitution of the Empire; while the period of the *thirds* is subsequent to the triple division of the world between the three sons of Constantine, A. D. 337.

I have no doubt in my own mind, but that the "third parts" have reference to a three-fold division of the jurisdiction of the Dragon; and that the "fourth part" has relation to the four-fold distribution which preceded, and was afterwards collateral with it. This we shall proceed to illustrate.

Originally there were two *prefecti prætorio* (or Lieutenant Generals of the Empire) but according to the plan of government instituted by Dioclesian, the four princes had each their *Prætorian Prefect*; and, after the monarchy was once more united in the person of Constantine, he still continued to create the same number of four prefects, and intrusted to their care the same provinces which they had already administered. By this institution the whole Imperial Jurisdiction was divided into *Four Parts*, or *Prefectures* (*Licentianeries*); namely the East, of Illyricum, of Italy, and of Gaul. "The Prefects were the first officers of the Empire, and generally looked upon as Emperors of an inferior rank; or, as Gibbon expresses it, "as the immediate representatives of the Imperial Majesty." "The Prefect of the East," he observes, "stretched his ample jurisdiction into the three parts of the globe which were subject to the Romans, from the Cataracts of the Nile to the banks of the Phasis, and from the mountains of Thrace to the frontiers of Persia. 2. The important provinces of Pannonia, Dacia, Macedonia, and Greece, once acknowledged the authority of the Prefect of Illyricum. 3. The power of the Prefect of Italy was not confined to the country from whence he derived his title: it extended over the additional territory of Rætia as far as the banks of the Danube, over the dependent islands of the Mediterranean, and over that part of the Continent of Afric-

ea which lies between the confines of Cyrene and those of Tingitania. 4. The Prefect of the Gauls comprehended under that plural denomination the kindred provinces of Britain and Spain, and his authority was obeyed from the wall of Antoninus to the foot of Mount Atlas."

"The massacre of the Flavian race," says Gibbon, "was succeeded by a new division of the provinces; which was ratified in a personal interview of the three brothers. Constantine, the eldest of the Cæsars obtained with a certain pre-eminence of rank, the possession of the new capital (Constantinople,) which bore his own name, and that of his father. Thrace and the countries of the East, were allotted for the patrimony of Constantine; and Constans was acknowledged as the lawful sovereign of Italy, Africa, and the Western Illyricum."

Thus, then, there were Prefectural Fourths and Imperial Thirds into which the jurisdiction of the Dragon was divided. Under the threefold constitution, the Prefectures of Italy and Illyricum, acknowledged the sovereignty of Constans, and afterwards, were sometimes confounded together, when the whole Empire was united under one Emperor. This appears to have been done in the days of Julian, when Maximian governed Italy, Africa, and Illyricum as the Prefect of the whole; which shows, that till after the time of Julian, at least, the only constant division of the Empire among the Prefects, was that of the three divisions of the empire, by Constantine, among his sons, at his death—and after the division of the empire, into eastern and western, the Prefect of Italy had all the western share of Illyricum.

But after the aforesaid division of the empire, and the cession of the greater part of the Prefecture of Illyricum to the Byzantine emperors, the western Illyricum was added to the jurisdiction of the prefect of Italy; so that his power now stretched itself not only over the provinces of Africa, the peninsula of Italy, and the dependent isles, but over all the upper and lower Lombardy; and from thence, we trace its boundaries from the top of the Adriatic Sea, along its eastern shores, to the modern Alessio, from whence we cross the mountains of Argemont to the source of the Drino, pursuing its stream to its confluence with the Save, and from thence to Belgrade, and along the shores of the Danube to its source, at the distance of thirty miles from the Rhine; crossing to Basle, to traverse the banks of the Rhine to its source; and leaving Gaul (France) on the right we reach the Mediterranean Sea.

The Ten Horns of the Dragon were the ten Prefectures of his jurisdiction, which were comprehended in the provinces of Gaul and Italy, as just defined; and saw their origin in Spain, Gaul, Britain, Italy, Rhætia, Noricum, Pannonia (forming but one) Dalmatia, Dacia, Mesopotamia, and extensive jurisdiction, which the Beast visited.

was acquired from the Præfectures of Gaul, Italy and Illyricum, and not at all from the Præfecture of the East, which afterwards fell under the Mohammedan Dominion. The Jurisdiction of the Body, Heads, and Horns of the Dragon, was finally divided in the year 364 into the Eastern and Western Empires. The Body, or Eastern, comprehended the Præfecture of the East and part of Illyricum, which was made up of fifty provinces; while the Heads and Horns, or the Western, included those of Italy, Gaul, and the rest of the Illyrian government, with their ten provinces. In the year 476-8, the jurisdiction of the Dragon over the West was extinguished for 70 years. This is termed, *one of its heads being smitten by death*; at the expiration of that period, it was restored, which is signified by *the healing of its wound*. Though this is affirmed of the Beast, yet it is true of the Dragon; for the heads are common to them both; but in the year 827, the Ten Heads succeeded in finally wresting from the Dragonic Heads, the crowns of jurisdiction over "every tribe, language, and nation" of the Western World."

THE EARTH.

Astronomically, the earth signifies the planet inhabited by the human race. This is the most extended signification of the word. It is also used, in a limited sense, to denote a part or parts of the globe. In scripture it can extend to the Land of Promise, sometimes an Empire or its inhabitants, and so forth. In the passage of the Apocalypse before us, the extent of its meaning is determined by the context. "The answer to the question, 'who allegorically submitted to the authority of the Beast?' will be the Earth system of Ty John. It was not the Chinese, the Hindus, the Burmese, the Israelites, the Persians, the Greeks, &c.; these, therefore, are not included in the Apocalyptic Earth of chap. xiii.—It was, and is, the inhabitants of the countries over whom the kings of Europe wield their sceptres, who do homage to the Beast; the subjects then, of the Ecclesiastical Kingdom of the West, constitute the Earth in relation to the Beast; as the citizens of the Roman Empire at large do the earth in relation to the Dragon.

That the Pagan contemporaries of the Apostle, regarded the Roman Empire as the Earth, is obvious from the style in which the Romans spoke of their city. Livy terms it the *Head of the Earth*; and Cicero denominated it the *Light of the Earth and the Metropolis of all the Nations*.—Concerning the vanity of the ancients in this particular, Gibbon observes, "this long enumeration of provinces, whose broken fragments have formed so many powerful kingdoms, might almost induce us to forgive the vanity, or ignorance of the ancients. Dazzled with the extensive sway, the irresistible strength, and the real or affected moderation of the emperors, they permitted them-

selves to despise, and sometimes to forget the outlying countries which had been left in the enjoyment of a barbarous independence; and they gradually usurped the license of confounding the Roman Monarchy with the Globe of the Earth." In another place he says, "the empire of the Romans filled the world, and when that empire fell into the hands of a single person, the world became a safe and dreary prison for his enemies. The slave of Imperial Despotism, whether he was condemned to drag his gilded chain in Rome and the Senate, or to wear out a life of exile on the barren rock of Seryphus, or the frozen banks of the Danube, expected his fate in silent despair. To resist was fatal, and it was impossible to fly. On every side he was encompassed by a vast extent of sea and land, which he could never hope to traverse without being discovered, seized and restored to the tyrannical master. Beyond the frontiers, his anxious view could discover nothing except the ocean, inhospitable deserts, the tribes of Barbarians, of loose manners and unknown language, or dependent kings, who would gladly purchase the complete protection by the sacrifice of an obnoxious fugitive. "Whoever you are," said Cicero to the exiled Marcellus, "inasmuch as you are equally within the power of the conqueror."

The extent of this world, or Roman Earth is thus defined by Gibbon. The empire was about 2000 miles in breadth, from the wall of Antioch and the northern limit of Dacia, to Mount Atlas and the Tropics of Cancer; it extended in length more than 3000 miles from the Western Ocean to the Euphrates;—it was situated in the finest part of the Temperate Zone, between the 24th and 56th degrees of northern latitude; and was supposed to contain above 16,000,000 square miles, for the most part of fertile and well cultivated land.—"All the inhabitants of the Earth, then, does not denote the population of the Globe, but the citizens and subjects of the Roman World. If they do homage to the Dragon, it signifies the inhabitants of the whole empire before he surrendered a part of his jurisdiction to the Beast; but, if they worship the Ten Horned-Monster, it represents the population of those countries, which have acknowledged the sovereignty of the European-Kings and His Holiness the Pope. The modern empire of the Russians is not included among the Ten Kingdoms; for in the days of the old Roman Dominion, that country was beyond the limit of the Roman World, and inhabited by wild and savage tribes, known to the Ancients as the Sarmatians. The Russians, though Catholic, never did homage to the Pope.

A MOUTH.

This is the symbol of speech. To give a mouth to a man is to appoint spokesman, or speaker for him. Peter, on the Day of Pentecost, was a mouth to the Twelve.

sent Moses to the enslaved Israelites, he said to the Lord, "I am not eloquent; but slow of speech, and of a slow tongue."—And Jehovah replied, "I know that Aaron can speak well.—And he shall be thy spokesman unto the people; and he shall be to thee instead of a mouth."—The giving of a mouth to any one, or to any body of men, is necessary only, when they cannot speak themselves to the purpose. Although the Ten-Horned-Beast had seven heads, it had *but one mouth*; and that like the mouth of a Lion. Had there been seven mouths, the commands of the Beast would have been continually clashing;—and the inhabitants of the earth would have succumbed to seven different politico-ecclesiastical systems. But as there was but *one* mouth, and as the Horns or Kings had but "*one mind*" and delivered their own power and authority to the Beast"—(Rev. xvii. 13.) *the speech was one*, and all the people bowed subserviently to its laws.

But it was *Lion-mouthed*—As the roar of a Lion makes the Beasts of the forest tremble, so when the Ten-Horned-Monster spoke by its LION-MOUTH, it struck terror into all that roused it from its lair. It roared out great and terrible things, which convulsed the Nations of the Earth. Blasphemy, or Impiety, was on its Heads; and blasphemies against God, his earthly dwelling place, and his people, issued from its Mouth. By its Mouth the Beast proclaimed war against the saints, which was executed with fury by the willing kings, who *gored* its victims to death.

Daniel saw the mouth in "a Little Horn," which rose upon one of the Heads of the Beast after the other Ten. It was an Eleventh Horn; and corresponds to the Two-Horned-Beast and Image spoken of in this chapter. He says that "it spake very great things;"—"great words against the Most High;—and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws."—Christians, then, are the subjects of its tyranny, as well as all, who are not saints, who would stand in the breach between Him and them. Christians not being permitted to shed blood, "the earth helps the woman;" hence the long and bloody wars fought by the Protestant and Papal Factions against the tyranny of Rome, avowedly for liberty, civil and religious, and "for the cause of Christ."

The thousands of excommunication are among the "great things" which issue from this Mouth. It cuts off from its fellowship, individuals, cities, provinces, and kingdoms. It forbids to marry; it commands to abstain from meats; it proclaims its own exaltation above every thing on earth; it pronounces absolution, or forgiveness of sins, to all who obey it; it interdicts; it absolves subjects and citizens from their allegiance to all States that renounce it; it forbids the rites of baptism, matrimony, and sepulture, under certain conditions; in short, there is no pretension however arrogant; no aspiration however im-

pious; and no tyranny however cruel, which the voice of this Mouth does not sanction or proclaim.

FORTY-TWO MONTHS.

This is the symbolic time allotted for the Lion-Mouthed Beast—*potestatem potestati*—to wage war. Forty-two months are equal to forty-two hours, or forty two twelfth parts of any given number. Daniel who speaks of the same Beast says, that the Saints against whom war was to be waged, were to be given into his hand until a *time, times, and the dividing of time*. This is the whole period. A time is 360 days, or the time of one Jewish year. Nebuchadnezzar lost his reason during "seven times," or years. Daniel's number, then, is *three years and a half*. By reference to Numbers, xii. 33, 34; and Ezekiel iv. 6, it will be found that in prophetic style, a day denotes a year. Now three years and a half contain 1260 days which is the sum of 42 multiplied by 30 which is the *twelfth* of a time of 360 days; so that, forty-two months of 30 days each is equal to 1260 years.

The power of the Beast continues during a millennium two hundred and sixty years. If we could discover positively the date when he began to exercise this power, we could tell with certainty when it would terminate. It is not probable that he still remains. The time is very long; but we must await the great final consummation of all things.

The time of the giving of forty-two months occurs in other places. It is mentioned in the Holy Spirit, says, that the Woman and Child of the 12th chapter was to be nourished in a place prepared by the 12th chapter for 42 months. This period commenced with her birth in the reign of Constantine and must therefore have expired long since. In the eleventh chapter, it says, that the Two Witnesses, by which I understand the Woman and the Earth that helped her, were to prophesy in sackcloth 1260 years. These two passages are parallel with the giving of the Saints into the hands of the Beast for a time, times and the dividing of time.

The 1260 years or forty-two months' of the Lion Mouth's power is not parallel with the trampling of the Holy City for the same period by the Gentiles (chap. vi. 2). We must not confound the Beast's wearing out the saints, with the duration of his power. The Beast began to wear them out on the flight of the Woman;—but the power of the Lion-Mouth to levy war did not begin for a considerable time after. The Bishop of Rome had no power to make war on saint or sinner until he became a Temporal Prince; yet the saints were murdered by the Papal-Catholic-Imperial Power before that time.

Character—Dwelling-Place—Sojourners in the

Thus have we rendered—"his name, and those that dwell in heaven"—as we find it

were induced to re-translate the whole of the ten first verses of the thirteenth chapter, because of a difficulty we had to encounter in verse 4. We could not understand how the whole earth could worship the Dragon by magnifying the Beast, who had violently deprived him of an extensive part of his jurisdiction. Upon referring to Wetstein's edition of the Original, we found that a portion of the text had been omitted; which when supplied removed the difficulty. Instead of reading, "and they worshipped the Dragon, who gave authority to the wild beast, saying: Who is like to the Beast?"—it ought to read, "and they worshipped the Dragon, who gave authority to the Beast; and they worshipped the Beast, saying: Who is like to the Beast?"—The words in italics are the words omitted, in the New Version; which in this rare instance is less accurate than the Old. It may have been a typographical error; its correction assists the interpretation considerably.

Onoma, in the original, signifies *character* as well as *name*. In Mark xiii. 6, Dr. George Campbell has translated it *character*; which we have preferred as the more easily understood. *Skeenecen* signifies a tent, tabernacle, or temporary dwelling place; and *skeemountas* refers to those who sojourn in it. As the abode is temporary the residence of the tenants is not permanent, as the term *sojourners* indicates. When, therefore, *skeemountas* is used in connexion with *en too ouranos*, it denotes, that the heaven in which they sojourn is *provisional*—God's dwelling-place on earth under the Times of the Gentiles, is "the Holy City" (ch. xi. 2) of Church of Christ.—He dwells there temporarily, as the Christian Tabernacle is to be superseded, at the Second Coming, by the Most Holy of the Everlasting Age. The place on earth where he dwells is *the heaven* which is an elliptical expression, denoting "the Kingdom of Heaven," or Church of Christ; which is also the Holy Place or Ante-chamber of the true Tabernacle, which the Lord pitched and not man (Heb. viii. 2).—The *sojourners* in the Heaven are "the citizens of Heaven," or "the saints who are in Christ Jesus," that is, the true Christians, whom the Beast made war upon, and overcame in 1685. These abide but temporarily in the Kingdom, as it is now constituted. They are "pilgrims and strangers" here; earnestly longing after an entrance through the veil into the Most Holy, by the new and living way, which is the resurrection from the dead. Or if they be so favored as to remain till the coming of the Lord, by being transformed when the trumpet shall sound to awake the dead. Then will they enter gloriously their Eternal Home!

The blasphemy of the Beast's Mouth, therefore, consists in usurping the character of God, by assuming the titles and attributes which belong to Him; speaking words against the Most High; changing his times and laws; in calumniating the true Body of Christ in every possible way, and in vilifying the

Citizens of the Kingdom. All who, have imbibed the spirit of the Beast, practise the same things; while they condemn it in as far as it may affect themselves. This is abundantly exemplified in all the Sects of the Antichristian Kingdom. This impiety towards God, under the specious pretext of doing Him service, and of vindicating the honor of his character and his cause; and this calumny against his church and people,—is indulged in by Romanists and Protestants of every shade.

To overcome them.

The Beast was to make war upon the sojourners in the heaven, and he was to overcome, and kill them (ch. xi. 7.) This is affirmed also of the Two Witnesses. But it is said concerning the Church, that the *gates of Hades shall not prevail against it*. If the Church be a *constituted* of the symbols termed Witnesses, it may be objected, that the gates of Hades did prevail against it. In reply to this we would observe, that, if every Christian on the earth were massacred, it would be no proof that the Gates of Hades had prevailed. They are all to be raised from the dead; the Gates of Hades, therefore, could not be said to have prevailed, unless it could prevent their resurrection.—The Holy Spirit predicts, concerning the figurative Body of Christ—the Church—that the same fortune was to happen to it that happened to Jesus. His enemies made war upon him, overcame him, and killed him; but, on the third day the breath of life from God entered into him, and he stood up, and great fear fell upon those who looked upon him:—so, the Beast made war upon the saints, overcame and killed them;—but they rose again, and struck terror into their enemies. Death, therefore, did not prevail; his victory was transient and incomplete. Hence a *succession always living* is not necessary to the fulfilment of Christ's saying, that the Gates of Hades should not prevail against the Church.

Every Tribe, and language, and Nation.

These are the tribes, languages, and nations of the Ten Papal and Protestant Kingdoms of the Beast; whose jurisdiction though based upon the ten provinces of the Western Empire, has been extended over tribes never subject to Rome. Though spoken of the Europeans, it comprehends the people of this Continent; who are all emigrant, and the descendants of emigrants from those kingdoms; and of which until about sixty years ago, they were all the subjects. The French, Spanish, and British, Horns compelled the people to do homage to the Papal and Protestant Horns of the Two-Horned-Beast. But the jurisdiction of these Kings has been for the most part subverted; their sceptres have been broken, and the power by which they sustained the ecclesiastical tyranny of the Dragon-Lamb, overthrown. The northern colonies remain; but we doubt not, the days of the British Lion are numbered in the Calendar.

is the patron of an ecclesiastical tyranny in those provinces which must be put down. The political foundation must be destroyed, that the superstition of Antichrist may be abased. We look earnestly and anxiously for the speedy accomplishment of what must ultimately ensue.

This Character has not been described.

This refers to the vassals of the Beast, "both small and great, rich and poor, freemen and slaves," who have received his mark on their right hand, or on their foreheads, or the denomination of the Beast, or the number of his name. This phrase is ordinarily rendered, "Whose names are not written."—In the original, it reads, *homo on gegraptoi ta onomata*. This is grammatically correct; though Wetstein has a note upon *ta onomata*, which indicates, that in some MSS. it reads *to onomata*. It can be rendered *whose characters or characters &c.*: the sense however, is not affected either way. The phrase of description is framed *in the mode or manner or mannerism*. The Book (i. e. *Zeus*) of the Lamb denoting some particular life. The Life of the Lamb, is "the life and immortality" of the Eternal life, which He brought to light. Now, the question is, where is the development of this life to be found? The only and the final answer is—in the New Testament of Jesus Christ. This is the Book of Eternal Life, which will abide it makes us not subject to death, but to life by Christ Jesus, who is "the life of the world." In the Book is written, delineated, and described the character, which every creature sustains, who is to inhabit the world here. The man whose character does not answer to this description of the Book of Life, will perish in the Fall, and be cast down into the Fall. The character described in the Book is *an abel*. The man who is the subject of the description, is one who has understood the gospel, believed in it, and obeyed it, by being baptized into the death of Christ; and who, having thus begun, perseveres in well-doing to the end. He that answers to this description, and not a soul beside, is the man who will be crowned with "glory, honor, and immortality."

Sacrificed from the casting down of the World.

In the common version it reads, "slain from the foundation of the World." The phrase refers to "the Lamb," or Christ Jesus, who is to mediate the Lamb of God which takes away the sin of the World. Concerning this expression, Jones, in his Lectures, says, "the latter clause of this verse, seems to suffer from an incorrect punctuation, or arrangement, as hath been remarked by many. 'Tis certain, that the Lamb of God was not actually slain "from the foundation of the World," though he was in the divine decree or purpose." He then gives Gilbert Wakefield's translation as follows,—"and all the inhabitants of the earth will worship him, whose names are not writ-

ten, from the foundation of the world in the book of life of the Lamb that was slaughtered." This rendering Mr. Wakefield prefers, because it accords with Rev. xvii. 8, which reads, "And they that dwell on the earth shall wonder, whose names were not written in the book of life from the foundation of the world."

The passage of the 17th chapter I regard rather as elliptical of that before us. In a certain sense, the Lamb may be said to have been slaughtered, and the character of the heir of eternal life described almost at the same time. "If thou dost well shalt thou not be accepted?" said the Lord God to Cain. Whether a man be an antediluvian, a patriarch, a Jew, or a Gentile of modern times, if he would attain to the life of the Lamb it can only be by "well-doing." God being the judge according to what is written. But the description of the character of the just, has reference to the contemporaries of the Beast; the signification of the phrase "foundation of the world" still remains obscure.

The common idea attached to it, is 'from the creation' and with some 'from all eternity.'—The original is *esphagmenon apokatabolēs kosmou*. The radical meaning of *katabolēs* is to cast or throw down. Paul uses the term 2 Cor. iv. 9—*kataballo* usot all' ouk apollumenot, *cast down but not destroyed*. *Katabolēs*, a casting down, or djection, as of seed. Heb. xi. 11.—Now, applying this definition to the *Kosmos*—"the order and beautiful arrangement of the terrestrial universe,"—this question is suggested, namely—*when was the world cast down?*—The answer is *at the Fall*. And with singular propriety we may apply the phrase which Paul appropriates to himself and companion—it *was cast down but not destroyed*. We are now met by another inquiry—*Was the Lamb sacrificed from the Fall to the sacrifice of Jesus?* He certainly was in type: for the institution of sacrifice was consequent and dependent upon the casting down of the world by that fatal event. The Lamb of God then, who takes away sin, was typically sacrificed from the Fall, and really on the cross; hence the propriety of the translation we have substituted for the ordinary rendering of the passage.

If any one have an ear, let him understand.

Akousetoo signifies to hear so as to understand. The use of the ear is to hear understandingly. If the ear but know not what they denote, it might as well hear any good it does the owner. To hear the Spirit in any other part of scripture read, is useless, unless we understand what we hear. "Happy, says the Spirit, are they who hear his voice, and observe the things which he saith in the scriptures, and him understand what the Spirit saith to the church."

'Seal not up the words of the prophecy of this book.' A sealed book is a book which cannot be understood; but the Apocalypse is declared by the angel of God not to be sealed; it is therefore, intelligible to the wise in the things of God; 'none of the wicked' says the prophecy of Daniel, 'shall understand, but the wise shall understand.'

If any one slay with the sword, he shall himself be slain.

Slaughter is the woe of Antichrist. The political and ecclesiastical tyrannies which constitute his Kingdom are doomed to perish by the sword. His Thrones are to be cast down, and his *Body* destroyed, and given to the burning flame. 'The judgment shall sit,' say, rather is *sitting*, 'and THEY' who once servilely worshipped him, 'shall take,' or rather, *are taking* 'away his dominion, to consume and destroy it to the end.' Dan. vii. To say nothing of the times of Napoleon, the events of our own day, since the Vial began, in 1830, to pour out upon the Air, or Constitution of the Kingdom of the Beast, are sufficient to illustrate the fate of the Governments, Thrones and Hierarchies of Europe as foretold above. If we turn to Portugal, we see a people, once glorying in the Beast, resolving themselves into clubs and striking terror into their priests, nobles and princes. They have completely annihilated the monkish orders. The convents are now either for the most part in ruins, or appropriated to objects of public utility. In fact a complete revolution, or rather extinction of the monastic system has taken place, 'never' says the writer, 'I hope, to be re-established.' Turn we to Spain, the Nursery of the Inquisition, there we behold them hating the Harlot and waging war against her priests with the king and nobles who sustain them. We see them plunge the poignard into the breasts of their papal tyrants, despoiling them of their wealth, suppressing their conventual seraglios, 'and destroying them to the end' with fire and sword. Nor are we confined to these Horns for an illustration of the consumption and taking away of the dominion of the Beast. Time fails us now to tell of Italy, Ireland, England, and so forth; countries in which, the hoodwinked and besotted worshippers of Antichrist are bestirring themselves to the overthrow of his hated rule.—(To be continued.)

EDITOR.

THE MANY AGAINST THE FEW.

"The few have had a conflict with the many in every attempt towards Reformation since error got the better of the truth. This for a long time must uniformly be the case. Therefore, none ought to be discouraged because of the numbers or influence of those leagued in support of any error."

The history of the world is replete with information and encouragement on this subject. Truth, fairly presented, and enforced by the good example of its advocates, has ever triumphed, and will continue to triumph till the victory is complete. "To the law, then, and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."—Isa. viii. 20.

PSALM XV.—C. M.

The qualifications of an acceptable worshipper. God is Spirit and they that worship him, must worship him in spirit and in truth.—*John.*

Within thy tabernacle, Lord,
Who shall abide with thee?
On th' mountain of thy holiness
Who shall a dweller be?

The man that walketh strictly right
And righteousness performs,
And from his heart with honest mind
The simple truth affirms;

Who doth not slander with his tongue;
Nor yet his neighbour wrong;
And who against his brother's fame
Dull utter no reproach.

He, in whose eyes the worthless are
Contemptible esteem'd;
But, honors them who fear the Lord:
And promises fulfill.

Nor money lends for interest,
Nor 'gainst the innocent
A gift accepts; he never shall fail
Who to these things attends.

The following from the Christian Baptist so exactly suits our case at this "crisis" that we have deemed it expedient to present it to the consideration of those, who condemn us because of the "matter exhibited" in The Advocate during the last two years.

"I have acted very imprudently, say many, in the exhibition of the matter contained in this volume. If I had not been so plain and so full in opposing many popular plans, just in the commencement, I might have, say they, obtained a more extensive circulation for this paper. I confess I used none of this sort of policy. My great object was to please myself. And as to policy, I acted under the impression of the truth of that adage which says, "Honesty is the best policy." Whenever I cannot obtain a circulation for what I believe to be the truth, I will cease to be an editor; and while this paper will quit cost, I shall bestow all my labor rather than be a silent spectator of the proceedings and events of the times."—page 78.

It is an easy and a vulgar thing to please the mob, and not a very arduous task to astonish them; but essentially to benefit and to improve them, is a work fraught with difficulty and teeming with danger.—*Lactantius.*

Let those who would affect singularity
determine to be very virtuous, and they will be
singular.—*Isa.*

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EARTHLY AND HEAVENLY LOVE

After the Queen's sermon, which we gave last week, the Bishop took her to task in the closet, and rebuked her severely. In the first place, he said, that being a woman, she had no right to give her opinion upon religious subjects. In the second place, although she was the Head of the Church she was not a speaking head; her business was to be retired in point to livings; and, as the Clergy had already, by the aid of the Holy Ghost, who cannot err, settled what was true and genuine, and unadorned Christianity, it was not becoming in her Majesty to give the law to the sacred profession. And, in the third place, he said, that the people had been so long accustomed to look at Christianity in the light in which the Parsons represented it, that they would never believe that a sort of casuist could discover any virtue in it which had been overlooked by so many eminent and learned Divines in all ages. Her Majesty being exhausted by her flight, and disposed to thoughtfulness and reflection, on the effect of it was likely to produce upon the nation, did not reply. The Bishop interpreted this silence favorably and proceeded to expound the gospel as follows.

"You are very right," said his Lordship, "in supposing that our master compels all us to exercise mercy. Thus is the main and substance of religion. But includes your Majesty carries a truer bottom, and makes it too earthly. There is no earthly love, and no heavenly love. The earthly love is necessarily confined to ourselves and our relatives, and it induces us to show our property with them. But the heavenly love is contrary to that order; it is directed by the noblest man, and takes us not to love our spiritual condition. The heavenly love is so situated that it is not of sense, or of worldly wisdom, or what you might think, or what you would be clothed in looks solely by the state of the mind, and is not confined to the souls in heaven, but it is the love in the most perfect communion. Now, the contrary your Majesty has done is very much against you, especially the heavenly love. You are necessarily making a distinction in the communion of the love, between the spiritual and the carnal, and the pointing of the earthly affections which was not intended. This is a sad and a trifling mistake, and I am glad to see that you are so sensible of it. May your Majesty be so good as to direct the mind of the Church to the heavenly love, that it may be able to distinguish between the heavenly and the earthly love that the Church is bound to exercise."

Her Majesty was so moved by the Bishop's words, that she was last week taking, and that he was making a private confession to me, I went on to demonstrate to her Majesty that the people are false, and the false is the true.

"You see, therefore, my dear Sovereign and Royal Mistress," said his Lordship, "that this is not a party, but that this spiritual love, being the very essence of the gospel of Christ, must be carefully distinguished from the earthly love of children and relatives, and in order that the earthly love may have as small a field of action as possible, the wisdom of the Church has thought proper to encourage the small family system. When the Church first arose, it made all families one by distribution of wealth; but this was found to produce very carnal consequences. The faithful consulted too much the bodily comforts of one another; they were more attentive to the cravings of the stomach than the aspirations of the Spirit. This begot secularism, banqueting, and jollity, which the Apostle calls chambering and wantonness. In order to remove this evil, the godly perceived that pauperism must be revived." [Here the Bishop spoke in a whisper, and repeated, "pauperism must be revived."] The earthly love was afterwards confined to one's own family; and the poor, who had formerly been tended and nourished by earthly love, were then confined to the charge of heavenly love alone. This is the present state of things, and any attempt to alter

this state would be high treason against the love of Christ, which passes all understanding. Don't you know that it is only the infidels who oppose this spiritual love? Your Majesty will get a bad name, if you attempt to innovate upon that which has been universally established for eighteen centuries as the true gospel of glad tidings to the poor."

"And do you consider this earthly love," said her Majesty, "as virtuous or vicious?"

"It hath more of the nature of vice than virtue," said the Bishop, "being of a fleshly nature; nevertheless when exercised towards the souls of men, in subordination to the heavenly, it is not altogether inconsistent with virtue."

"What do you call subordination to the heavenly?" said the Queen.

"I mean," said the Bishop, "that the interest we take in the worldly prosperity of our relatives ought to be subject to an interest of a higher nature; and, if a man should think it requisite for his son's salvation, that he should be disinherited, he is justified in disinheriting him."

"And do you think it is ever necessary to disinherit a son for the salvation of his soul? I never hear of such a thing being done. I am afraid, Bishop, that what you call the earthly love is uppermost, and that what you call the heavenly love is only a hypocritical apology for selfishness. But according to your own doctrine, my Lord, I think it clear enough that the law has a right to disinherit the nobility and gentry of their property should it be deemed necessary for the salvation of their souls."

This was a thin herb to the Bishop, he stared and summoned all the sophistry of Oxford to his aid to rebut the arguments of her Majesty. He stammered and stammered. The Queen perceived his confusion, and said—

"My Lord, I see what you mean, you are confounded by the simplicity of an unspiced god. I fear there is something wrong in this theology of yours; it is too artificial. Nature is too strong for it."

"My liege," said the Bishop, "I am not confounded, I was only taken by surprise at the new light in which your Majesty has presented the subject. I do allow the truth of your Majesty's observation, that the law has the right; but it is only the law of the Church, for the Church alone can determine what is indispensable for the soul's salvation, and the Church never will consent to such an act of plunder."

"But what Majesty," said her Majesty, "rather than consent to such an act of plunder, the Church would sell the souls of all the nobility of England?" [Her Majesty said with considerable emphasis on the latter d.]

"But what do you call the Church?" said her Majesty. "I think it very clear that the Church means the members of the Church, but you have made a class for itself, and have confined its name to a self-elected body, educated at Oxford and Cambridge. What right have you to exclude the people from the Church? Why should they not give an opinion upon Church doctrines as well as the clergy? Methinks you assume too much. I cannot see whence you derive your rights. But I suppose you mean to reply that the opinions of the Church are fixed by act of Parliament, and unalterable; consequently, they are not opinions of all, but articles or protocols, which you must upon when it suits your convenience, and dispose with, or break altogether, when you think your earthly interests will profit thereby? You have invented a gospel of your own, and in order to expose the state, you have made it a rich man's gospel, and what really is a gospel to the poor, you call plunder, and I thus propose the minds of the public against the fulfillment of your master's law of love. You are a great deal to answer for, my Lord; if there be such a place as hell, I think my soul's salvation on the assertion, that there is a larger number of priests than thieves in it."

"I am exceedingly sorry," said the Bishop, "to find that the Church has imbibed these false and profane opinions, but I am glad that the people are young and inexperienced, and I am glad

tribute them to youthful enthusiasm than to an unchristian spirit; but time will blunt these Utopian feelings, and the grace of God will restore your Majesty to the bosom of the Church."

"It will be something else than the grace of God, I believe; it will be the *earthly* love of my bishops and nobles, who have already exhibited symptoms of rebellion, and declared that, rather than have such a gospel law as that which I proposed; they will drive me from the throne of England, and replace me with my uncle, the King of Hanover, who has what you call the grace of God in greater perfection than any sovereign of Europe, Louis Philippe excepted."

"May God forbid!" said the Bishop, "but such a spirit of opposition should quell the ardour of your Majesty's mind, and teach you the necessity of conceding somewhat of your own opinion to the judgment of your people."

"Of my keepers you mean, but I know it must be so. You will beat me by physical power and the aid of earthly lore, my lord, but truth, and justice, and *heavenly* lore, my lord, are on my side, and if they do not conquer in my reign and person, they are sure to conquer at last, and history, I hope, will record my name in the list of those who attempted to give the poor a genuine gospel, but were prevented by the earthly love of the ministers of — What my Lord, what do you call your religion?"

The Bishop was horrified by this question, but did not reply to it; he seemed to be putting up an inward prayer to heaven on behalf of her Majesty, who appeared in his eyes to be in an awful state of apostasy.

Her Majesty's feelings were at last overcome; she sat down and cried bitterly for about a minute, then rose up, wiped her eyes, and fanned her pretty cheeks, and became more composed and cheerful than before. She now resolved to cajole the Bishop. Perceiving that rationality had no effect upon a secret conscience, she applied the test of ridicule so smartly to the Bishop's pure Christianity, quoted Scripture so fluently, and reasoned so purely and so easily with the truth she wielded, that the Bishop was evidently shaken in his Christian steadfastness, but resolved to abide by the old rotten timbers of his spiritual ark as long as the tithes and the offerings came into her.

We can only observe, that the resistance her Majesty's piety has encountered from the corruption of her body-guard has postponed her resolution for a season.

In the book of Religious Rates, registered in the court of France, in the year 1699, are the following items: Absolution for apostasy, 80 livres; for bigamy, 10,050; ditto for homicide, 95; dispensation for a great irregularity, 50 livres; dispensation from vows of chastity, 15.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

No. 4.

To Sir Culling Eardley Smith, the Honorable "and Reverend" Baptist Noel, and "the Reverend" James Sherman.

Excellent Sirs,

In my last we brought to view the opening of the door of the Kingdom of Heaven by the Apostle Peter to three thousand Israelites. Concerning these persons you will observe, that by the *testimony of prophets and apostles, and by obedience to the word spoken by Peter, their views, dispositions, feelings, and state were changed. They saw that Jesus was indeed the Messiah of God; they were disposed no longer to reject him but to receive him as such; they felt contrition for their sin; and evinced this change by being baptized in his name, or buried in water into his death and burial for the Remission of sins. The state of these converts was now dissimilar to that of all the house of Israel besides. By submitting to the government of Jesus they were adopted into the family of God. Thus they became his sons. They were in Christ, and stood "complete in him." They had put on Christ; for, it is written, "as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ."—Being complete in him, and clothed with him as with a garment; they partook of all his attributes in a degree. They partook of his circumcision, his sonship, his prophetic, priestly, kingly, and judicial offices; of his heirship, his anointing and so forth. And the reason of this is obvious, when we reflect, that they had been sprinkled with the blood of sprinkling, which speaks better things than the blood of Abel; they had been sprinkled, not with water indeed, but with the blood of a royal and a priestly victim.— Thus it is written, concerning the baptized believers of the Gospel, "you are all the sons of God through the faith (or gospel) by Christ Jesus;"—"by whom also you have been circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in the putting off the body of the (sin of) the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ; having been buried with him in baptism;"—"in whom who has loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and has made us kings and priests to his God and Father;"—"do you not know that the saints are of the world?"—"if you are Christ's certainly you are his seed, and heirs according to the promise;"—"and ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit;"—"ye also (as well as Christ's saints) are built up a spiritual temple, a holy temple."*

for spiritual sacrifices, most acceptable to God, through Jesus Christ;—you are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people; that you should declare the perfections of Him, who has called you from darkness into his marvellous light."

From these testimonies you will perceive that all *immersed believers of the gospel* are regarded as equal in every respect before God. If any one of them be called by his brother kings and priests to any office, or be sent upon any mission the "royal priest" so appointed differs in nothing from the rest as to *dignity*; for he is in truth only the *servant of the rest*, and any consideration he may acquire amounts to no more than a *high esteem for his work's sake*; and you know, that every diligent and faithful servant deserves to be rewarded by those who employ him. The servant cannot be more than a king or priest; if he aspire to greater dignity than this he aims at being a king of kings and a lord of lords, which no one but "the Ruler of the Kings of the Earth" has a right to be. Hence, Gentlemen, if we granted the pretensions of your Church to be that of Christ, your whole Hierarchy from Victoria to the humble pew-opener is as barefaced an usurpation of the rights of Christians, as that of Gregory XVI to be Vicergerent of God upon earth.

The three thousand one hundred and twenty Israelites congregated in Jerusalem for the first time in the name of Jesus Christ constituted for a season the only Church of Christ in the World. It was the first Christian assembly the world ever saw since the Pentecost. We have seen how these Israelites became Christians. It was, we repeat, *by believing and obeying the gospel*. This was the only way in which men became Christians in the days of the Apostles. There was no middle ground. Men were either in Christ or not in Christ; and the only way to get into Christ was by being baptized into him; and gentlemen, he of you, or of your order who affirms the contrary is a perverter of "the right ways of the Lord." You may be learned, very moral, very eloquent in your pulpit addresses; you may confound the Romanists in Exeter Hall; you may convert Dissenters of schism in separating from your Church; your piety may comport very strikingly with *men's* views thereof as expressed in theological theories; you may stand high as "evangelical clergymen," and champions of the *faith* as it is in Protestantism—but if you destroy the foundations you cancel every thing; and become as sounding brass and a noisy cymbal.—"If the foundations be destroyed what can the righteous do?"

Gentlemen, can you conceive of a more noble and dignified assembly upon earth than an Institution all of whose members are kings and priests to God? You see with the natural eye a poor man with all the externals of poverty, who has believed

the gospel and obeyed it in the sense in which I have been preaching; and on the other hand, you look upwards to the heavens, and there you see the Kings or Queens of the earth, sitting as gods in the alleged temple of God, with all the paraphernalia of royalty and ecclesiastical headship. The poor man walks correctly in the light of the Holy Spirit as it shines into his mind from the sacred page. You affect to look down upon him; and if you hold a conference with him, it is as "the Ambassadors of God" with one of the multitude. But you know him not. He is in truth (and the truth of it will appear at the revelation) more noble, he has more dignity and genuine majesty, than the whole line of the Defenders of the Faith of Protestantism from Henry VIII. to Victoria I. The Ennobler of men, though he was rich, for their sakes became poor that they through his poverty might become rich. It was to the poor that the gospel came; and by them for the most part it was received. The patent of true nobility comes from Christ; and his power to ennoble resides in the Gospel. He regards not the wealth or poverty of man; for he is no respecter of persons. He bestows his patents with an equal hand. A poor man will take as readily a king and priest as a rich one in his esteem; and seek as eagerly to be a king and priest as a rich one in his esteem. The external circumstances of men, reign not a feather in his distribution of titles or rewards.—Hence we had him to whom all authority in heaven and on earth is given selecting his Ambassadors from the lower ranks of men and making fishermen, publicans, and so forth the companions of his public and private walks. In view of these things, gentlemen, do you ever look down upon the poor sectaries as you may regard such of us who renounce your Church as a part of Antichrist's dominions; the poor sectaries (Nazareth—the Seat of the Nazarene—the origin of mankind when in the Coming Age will judge the world, and share with the King of kings his universal rule). The Pentecostian sectaries constituted this sect. Look not to them; gaze with intense earnestness on them; view them by the beams of that blazing light which shines among them from the apostolic lamps. When your eyes shall have been satisfied with seeing, and your ears with hearing the harmonious doctrine which distilled as the dew from the lips of the Twelve; then turn to the Churches of Protestant and Roman Christendom; look down upon them in the abyss of human folly, benighted, and say if you can discover ought but gloom, hypocrisy, and crime. You see the Church of Christ "sanctified and cleansed by a bath of water and the word; glorious, having no wrinkle, nor any such thing; holy and without blemish; but below, you behold the Church of Antichrist, the deceived inhabitants of the earth, and the nations, pollution, and blood!"

After the three thousand had entered into the

or Kingdom by the door of baptism in the name of Jesus Christ, *what was next to be done with them?*—For the answer to this question you must revert to the commission. There you will find, that after the Apostles had baptized the nations, they were to teach them to observe all the things Jesus had commanded them to teach. *First* convince of sin, righteousness, and judgment; *then* baptize the convinced; and *afterwards*, teach them to observe all things that baptized believers of the gospel ought to observe. Now it must be clear to your Excellencies, that whatever these baptized Israelites did in relation to the Kingdom of Heaven must have been done in conformity to the commands or teaching of the Apostles. For this reason. At that time, the Apostles alone understood the Christian Institution; they therefore could alone teach it. All knowledge then must have flowed through them; consequently when we read in the New Testament of the Christians observing certain practices or customs, we regard them as equal to expressly recorded precepts; upon the principle that Apostolic teaching must have preceded Christian practices. When, then, we read concerning the Pentecostians in Acts ii. 42, that "they continued stedfastly in the teaching, in the fellowship, in the breaking of the loaf, and in prayers of the Apostles," we know assuredly, that they observe these Institutions of the Kingdom of Heaven in obedience to the instructions of the Twelve. These institutions in the aggregate compose "the worship of God in spirit and in truth." It was *spiritual* worship, because appointed by the Spirit; who also qualified the saints of other churches in fellowship with that in Jerusalem for the performance of its "spiritual sacrifices" in truth. The time had now arrived when men and women were required neither to go to Gerizim, nor to Jerusalem, to worship the Father. The time had come, when the true worshippers, the Pentecostian believers from all nations, worshipped the Father in spirit and in truth; and such are the worshippers, whom the Father requires.

Gentlemen, I would that you would institute a comparison between the worship of the true worshippers as recorded Acts ii. 42, and that of your Church as set forth in the "Book of Common Prayer."—The Holy Spirit has left "a formulary" on record to which you would do well to take heed, as to a light shining in a dark place. I have no more faith in "the random outpourings of the conventicle" than I have in the dry formalities of your Mass Book. You think your system of Will-Worship set forth by act of Parliament, or Order in Council, as necessary for uniformity! What a lamentable ignorance does this notion display of the Apostolic teaching! If men would study the Scriptures, and follow them, they would be all-sufficient for faith, worship, and discipline. You can find no resemblance between your will-worship, which may be said to

be no resemblance then, certainly they are not the same. Now, who gave your Church or any other Church authority to alter or modify the Institutions of God to suit time and circumstances? This comes not from Him who founded them. It is an enemy that has done this. It is the Antichrist who has changed times, and seasons, and laws; and made all Christendom, both Protestant and Papal, to drink of the wine of harlotry with which clergy and people are besotted.

Uniformity in faith, worship, and discipline can only be attained by minding the things written in the New Testament, which in all its testimony is one and the same. You Protestants all pretend to take the Bible as your rule of faith and practice; but, Gentlemen, who can be so silly as to believe you! If the Bible be the religion of Protestants, their religion is a strange medley. Do you not know that the Bible contains the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian systems. If then the Bible be your religion, it must be a religion compounded of all these and *something more*; for there is much in your religion that is not to be found in that sacred book. But Gentlemen, the Bible is not the rule of faith and practice among Protestants.—Your rule of faith is the 39 articles; the Presbyterian rule is, some what doubtful; for here they cannot agree upon the meaning of the Westminster Confession; the Methodist rule is, their "Book of Discipline" and so forth: now if the Bible were the rule of all these Protestants, their "Articles," "Confessions," and "Disciplines" would soon be consigned to merited oblivion. The truth is that no one book contains the religion of Protestants. There is no unity in their faith and practice; they are both dispersed hither and thither without order or precision. Yes, there is one sense in which the Bible is the religion of Protestants: it is the universal text book: if that be the idea, it is certainly their religion; for it consists chiefly of sermonizing from scripture texts.

The model Church in Jerusalem had a *presbytery* of twelve elders, who being called and sent of Jesus, and exercising the overseers office were *apostles* and *bishops*. For a time, they acted as the Deacons also; for it was not until the murmuring of the Hellenistic Brethren on account of the neglect of their widows in the daily ministrations, that the office of overseer and deacony been separate and distinct. On this occasion, all that appertained to the Fellowship was no longer attended to by the Apostles, but by seven Christian Kings of an attested character, full of spirit and wisdom. Because therefore, this dignified assembly in Jerusalem had a plurality of presbyters and deacons, all other churches of the like character had them too. The churches in Judea, were then, and are now, of the types of all communities professing to be Christian brethren," says Paul to the Thessalonians, "discussing the ministers of the Congregations of God, which are

Christ Jesus."—This imitation is commendable, and imperative on all churches professing to be in Christ Jesus.

In view of all these things I conclude, that the Church in England and Ireland, with all her Protestant Sisters are not the Church of Christ either in whole or in part; and therefore their members, whether Clergy or Laity, are not Christians.

1. Because they are built, not on the foundations of prophets and apostles, but upon the doctrines and commandments of men.

2. Because their members having no faith when "baptized" cannot therefore have had their hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience by faith in the blood of sprinkling.

3. Because Protestant "Baptism" is not Christian Baptism being dissimilar in all its parts. The subject, the mode, and the design are all different from what the scriptures require. The subject is an unconscious babe; the mode is a sprinkling and the design the washing away of original sin; whereas, the subjects of Christian Baptism are required by the scriptures to be men and women who believe the Gospel; their mode is burial or planting in water, and the design the Remission of Sins.

4. Because, their members not being baptized are in their sins, consequently polluted, unsanctified, unregenerate, unconciled, unadopted, unsaved; and therefore, having all the attributes of aliens, they belong to Antichrist and not to Jesus.

5. Because, never having put on Christ they are not in Christ and therefore not Christian.

6. Because they are unholiness; being full of the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life.

7. Because, they are Churches of this world, having been for the most part baptized in human blood.

8. Because, they have no resemblance to the Church in Jerusalem or to the churches in Judea.

9. Because they are born of spiritual fornication; having Mistress Babylon for their Mother and the Man of Sin for their Sire; for they all trace their descent from the Apostles through the Italian Apostacy.

From the whole, I conclude, that Schism from such churches is a virtue; and imperative on every one who would see the glory of God in peace. But we must pause, and resume our investigations hereafter. Till then I subscribe myself again,

Your well-wisher

THOMAS BARRON.

The keenest abuse of our enemies, will not hurt us so much in the estimation of the discerning, as the injudicious praise of our friends.—*Lactantius*.

Tout ce qui est en la main de Dieu
 All that glitters is not gold.

Our own experience of "this Reformation" has so long convinced us, that it needs to be itself reformed. Reform to be identified with this reformation it must be purified. It conveys the impulse of life-energizing principles which it conveys at present in a very limited degree. It is the conversion of eye-witnesses, that in the West; "they are imitating the East"—that is, they are crowding the Churches with converts without paying due attention to the churches themselves. Too much dependence is placed on the labor of individuals in the conversion of men and women, and too little on that of congregations themselves. In the Primitive Age, "the congregations walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the administration of the Holy Spirit, were multiplied;" but in these days, the multiplication of the churches is attributable to "big meetings" with their et cetera. A brother from West Tennessee informed us that the Church to which he belongs numbers about 70 and upwards; but that, unless "a preacher comes along" their meetings on the Lord's Day scarcely ever exceed 25. This is not a solitary instance, it is a disgraceful sectarian relic of which great numbers of "Reformers" are guilty. They are prompt enough in attending Court Houses, military musters, market, &c; but any trifling obstacle is sufficient to prevent them mustering with the forces of the Great King on his triumphant day.

The compassing of sea and land to make proselytes, while the churches are unhealthy and ready to die of excommunication, if it be not already, the besetting sin of "this Reformation." While the speaking brethren are shooting over their heads, the unconverted, the disciples are either at a stand still, or in a state of retrogradation. No church is walking worthy of its vocation unless it is found in the weekly practice of the commandments and ordinances of the Lord. And as for the persons described by our correspondent below, they may utter the ungodly of flattery to their souls, that because they have been immersed, yes, even for the Remission of Sins, they therefore go to heaven; but, we can assure them, that, if they are not from God's word, they are merely flattering their hearts for the day of slaughter. We counsel them to reform, and do their first works, if indeed they are worthy of repetition; for the time is coming, when the Lord will visit them with the sword that comes from the mouth of the Lord.

Danville, Kentucky.

Brother Thomas,

The cause of truth advances but slowly in the South. Indeed there are but few laborers and they are scattered over a large field. The pulpit of this world exercises a strong influence over the churches both of the East and of the West. Reformation is much needed amongst the so-called Reformers. They, like others are easily led by their teachers into that which seems popular. We may justly conclude that there is no safe ground unless it is described in the Scriptures of Truth. Yet we had many of our brethren urging loth from the pulpit and the press many things not to be found in the Living Oracles. This is a time for us to look narrowly into the perfect law of liberty. We have assumed high ground: let us hither to occupy it faithfully.

Truth is on the march and eventually must prevail: but we must be vigilant and take to ourselves a complete suit of the heavenly armour. We must fight the good fight of faith.— But O! let us remember that our weapons are not carnal, but mighty through God to the destruction of the strong holds of our wicked adversary.

Glory be to God in the highest!! In great haste, I conclude by subscribing myself your brother in the Kingdom of the blessed Jesus,

ERENNAH A. SMITH.

Holly Springs, Miss. Nov. 16th, 1837

Beloved Brother Thomas,

I was very much taken with your replication to brother Winans, Adv. No. 3, p. 16. It does certainly appear that you have the truth on your side; if so "go ahead."

If brother W's conclusion from the truth, that God has not spoken to infants be correct, I do not see why we may not come to the same conclusion in reference to brutes.

Whatever God has not spoken to will be saved;

God has not spoken to brutes.

Therefore brutes will be saved!!!

Perhaps you would be pleased to hear something respecting the "Reformation" of the West.

I travelled through several parts of West Tennessee and can only say that Religion is in a deplorable condition.

In the town of Paris, Henry Co. there is a church, which is going on very well, continuing in the "Apostles' doctrine and in fellowship and in breaking bread." The members are intelligent and devoted to Religion; except this, I know of no other church thus progressing;—I do not know one single "reformer," preacher, or what not either in this state or West Tennessee who is in the habit of having family worship. Many

of them will ask a preacher if he be a stranger to have worship when he visits the same. This I consider mere pretence.

I heard of two preachers in Hardeman Co. who have abandoned preaching for the more profitable business of selling whiskey on the road side, (keeping doggeries.) In the counties of Lawrence, Giles and Bedford, I heard of many, very many, who had laid aside their religion for the dancing-room and other places of amusement. It is indeed lamentable to think of the manner in which "Reformers" are acting in many parts of the West. Perhaps you will inquire the cause of this state of things? It proceeds, I believe from the camp-meetings. Heu! mirabile dictu! The "Reformers" can't keep their reformation alive without these antichristian meetings. You know what sort of things they are, therefore I say no more about the same. Would to God that the Editors of religious periodicals, would talk less about first principles and more about perfect works; less about the manner of receiving the Spirit, and more about the fruits thereof; for indeed, sir, I know but few who act as though the Holy Spirit had any thing to do with the same. But enough of this horrible picture, I only say Oh! that these "Reformers" could be reformed.

I shall be happy brother Thomas to receive a letter from you at any time should a few spare moments ever present themselves.

Please remember me to brother Anderson. With Christian affection for you and yours,

I remain your brother in the hope of immortality,

JOHN G. TOMPKINS.

Nelson Co. Va. August 29, 1837.

Dr. John Thomas,—Sir:

We would like to have the subject of re-immersion well explained; Baptism for Remission; the true intent of Baptism; Baptism in the room of circumcision; the manner in which the Holy Spirit convinces sinners, and operates on believers. When, or at what instant do they receive it; what evidence sufficient to produce faith in order to immersion. How a person may ascertain that his sins are forgiven. What constitutes sin against the Holy Spirit, which shall not be forgiven in this world nor in the next. The sin which is unto death, concerning which we should not ask.—The willful sin after receiving the knowledge of the truth (Hebrews.) If a person after Baptism have committed sins worthy of condemnation, how are they to be remitted. The spirits of the just are in just where do they remain until the resurrection.—How the Millennium is to be ushered in. Whether all will be raised at the coming of the Messiah. The General Judgment.—Satan's army besieging the City. Excuse the shortness of the questions for the time is short.

M. H. HARRIS.

Had we lived 300 years ago, and had our worthy interrogator been our contemporary, and called upon us then to answer this formidable list of questions, we suspect we should have had but a slight possibility in favor of our wading through them without a charge of "damnable heresy" being constructed on our replies to the imminent jeopardy of our outward man. The list is certainly formidable, both in length and quality, even for the times of this "enlightened age." Nevertheless, we shall take them up, time and opportunity fitting.

Editor.

London, 1837.

"We have an Irvingite Chapel directly opposite to us. They have twelve Apostles, one of which I heard one morning, inquired, who that was who was speaking? and I was told very gravely, that it was one of the Apostles, whether Peter Paul, or James, I was not informed. They have Prophets, Pillars, Evangelists, Heads of the Evangelists, and many more which they say constitute the visibility of the church, God is now building. I have never heard tongues in this place; but I once heard an utterance, which was by a woman who rose and in a singing tone repeated a passage of Scripture. They are in a mist, for they call all who have been sprinkled—"Baptized Christians."—If I had time, I would give you a detail of the Apostle's discourse. They speak as if it were revealed to them particularly."

Thus our correspondent writes from England. The "mist" alluded to, must be a very dense one; for we can bear testimony, that it broods over nearly the whole of the Continent of America as well as the sea-girt-isle of Britain.

Editor.

Greenville, Va.

Dear Brother,
"Mr. Hunnicutt's publication of misrepresentations has done seemingly much damage to the truth; but when the truth comes to light, all will come right. Those who will read your reply and are unprejudiced, will exculpate you from the false charges alleged against you in said publication. There have been considerable revivals around amongst the students a certain missionary by the name of Erice, has been here to see, just fresh from the Holy Land with one of the angels which helped to confine our Saviour to the cross, and that assertion he has converted hundreds—to what, I will say."

R. MALDEN

Query. Suppose such converts were immersed into Baptist Churches in Greenville, would they be Christians?

Or suppose, that hereafter some one or more of these converts become convinced of Baptism into the death of Jesus, and the remission of sins, ought they to be received into a Church of Christ unless again immersed, and that on the true basis?—Let Scripture, Reason, and Common Sense reply!

Editor.

LATEST NEWS FROM BETHANY.

There is a great analogy between tempests in the Natural and Symbolic Heavens. When the intensity of the bursting, rolling, and rattling thunder has worn away, the rumblings and inconstant flashings of the dispersing storm still continue.—The detonations of the electric clouds have scarcely died away ere our astonished ears are again saluted with voices from the high lands of Bethany! But thunder is often unaccompanied by any perceivable flash. We have heard the echoes from the hills, but the light of our own sunny sky has extinguished the fainter fires of the stormy West! The last was feebler than the first, and, as we conclude, the mere dying reverberation of the former peal!—A vox ex praterita nitit, a sound and nought beside!

The big clap was the Great Bull of Excommunication, which was hurled, with the furious impetuosity of a thunderbolt, at our devoted cranium in the eleventh number of the Millennial Harbinger; the dying echo of the peal is the Justification of the Bull; with which the Public has been complimented in the twelfth!—But a 'miss is as good as a mile; and we have to 'thank our stars,' as the phrase is, that the Bull failed to strike us having fallen dead at our feet!

The Bull occupied three pages, and the Justification about twelve! Who would have thought it! The Author of the Bull has written fifteen super-royal pages in only two numbers, besides page upon page in others, which collected together would make a respectable volume, 'and yet he never tried his hand seriously to disprove' the odious theory! Truly, then, he has made 'much ado about nothing,' and his efforts must have been after all a mere effort to amuse his readers with a long comic joke! And all done, too, out of great affection for the misled wanderer from the faith! 'Tis a pity! 'Love's labor's lost' should be lost! Another effort, and yet another man, I would commend to consummate the plot; and hence the ludicrousness of the Doctor's life by a thunderbolt!

But this Doctor Thomas is a very 'weak' and 'foolish' Physician a very wise man; yet he has been in the world his whole life for upwards of two years and has not yet! He has used 'astuteness' upon the 'common' No. 6, is not said to be a 'strong' man.

then subdued.—Steam-Fryperism being inadequate to the case, Doctor Harbinger next had recourse to Regalism! Hence blisters, blisters, and other antiphlogistics, but still without effect. Dr. Advocate would assuredly have sunk under such 'violent means,' but for the excellency of his Constitution, the dulness of his Operator's lancets, the scarcity of Cantharides in his Blisters, and the undepleting power of his anti-phlogistics! The Doctor being still alive, having survived the tortures of Quackery and Regularity, and being yet uncured, and his case being a very inconvenient one, having lacked the skill of so renowned a Doctor, it was upon a consultation of Physicians resolved to kill him as the only possible way of saving their credit and of terminating the case. But Doctor Advocate having almost as many lives as a mouse, which is said to have nine, yet lives, having escaped the effects of the fatal dose!

The disease of this Doctor is said to be 'delirium,' or madness. This is the opinion of his Physicians. But Doctors are not always correct in their diagnoses. There are many instances of their fallibility on record. Thus to quote a case. About 1700 years ago there was one Paul, who became the patient of a knot of Doctors, whose treatment was always one of 'violent means.' They examined Paul's case, and the result was that they declared that he was 'mad' or delirious. To bring him to reason, they gave him forty stripes save one, put a chain about him, as they often do about the delirious, or mad; and put him on low diet in solitary confinement. But all was ineffectual. At last considering him to be a 'pestilent fellow, a schismatic, and a turner of the world upside down, that is, a teacher of men that they should stand upon their heads instead of their feet, they cut off his head as the seat of an incurable disease! But Paul declared that he was not mad. Mankind have since re-examined his case, and have concluded that Paul was right; and that all the madness or delirium was in the heads of his Physicians!

It is the custom of some Practitioners of Medicine to mix many ingredients in the same prescription; and in doing so they often compound things which are chemically and mechanically incompatible. This is the case with the Justification of the Bull, as we have termed the last prescription of Doctor Harbinger. It is not only incompatible with itself, but exceedingly incompatible with the alleged 'delirium.' It most unskillfully professes to cure symptoms which have no existence in the Doctor's case, save in the "immortal soul" of the Doctor's doctor! It proposes to cure the delirious denial of the Resurrection and of the Judgment. The Doctor never saw this symptom in his patient; nevertheless, in the true spirit of Charlatanism, he prescribes upon the mere report of one who wants to kill his unfortunate patient! Doctor Harbinger well knows that there is no truth in the report; and he knows too, that the

remedy generally advised to cure such an indication, would jeopardize the life of the patient; yet finding the case obstinate and not caring if Dr. Advocate should die, he hazarded the prescription at all events.

We would advise the Public to put no faith in Dr. Harbinger's prescription. It is unsound in principle, and injurious to the health of all who would, if sick, be cured, or if in health, would preserve so inestimable a blessing. For our own part, we reject it as an imposition upon the faculty. If the Public will swallow the potion; let them. We have warned them, that though sweet to a no-bid palate it will be found a nauseating draught in the end to the strongest stomach.

In plain words, the Justification of the Bull is unjustifiable as the Bull itself. It contains but little that deserves anything more from me than a mere passing comment; and many of its parts not even that. Bro. Campbell may understand himself, but I am convinced he does not understand me. The reader who is really desirous of knowing my sentiments, will consult my writings, and not Bro. Campbell's version of them. The man whose conscientiousness or sense of justice is faint, will take it for granted that all he says of me is true; and will therefore search no further. I care nothing for the opinions of such persons; their judgment with me is worth not the value of a straw. I respect only the sentiments of those who read and examine both sides before they decide. I do not expect that the exclusive readers of Bro. C's paper will be permitted to bear me in my own behalf. It will be useless, therefore, for me to elaborate a formal refutation of the unjustifiable Justification of the Bull. The readers of the Advocate will know how far to credit the assertions it contains; a serious reply is, therefore, unnecessary to set us right with them. One thing we will offer a few words upon.

Brother C. says that "immortality" and "Eternal Life" are not used by him and his contemporaries as equivalents to endless being or perpetual existence. He says that in Biblical language, immortality and eternal life in hell is nonsense; but perpetual existence in hell or in any place, is quite another thought.—By this I understand him to mean, that "immortality and eternal life," are applicable only to the saved, while "endless being or perpetual existence" are applicable to the lost—if this be correctly apprehended by me, I should like to know, where the Scriptures teach such a distinction. If this distinction cannot be clearly shown, then the phraseology applicable to the lost is a part only of the spiritual doctrine. A school: I understand "immortality" in the same sense as we use to denote imperishability, as if the resurrection were immortality. This is necessary to show that the phraseology of perpetual existence in hell, is not a contradiction, but is substantially true.

very nucleus, or kernel, if I may so speak, of "Eternal Life." There is *fatal* life, *infantile* life, and *adult* life, animal, mental or intellectual or all combined. To any of these, imperishable ability is essential before it can be Eternal life. The Eternal Life of the Scripture is *Imperishable Intellectual, Moral and Corporal faculties in active exercise*. An imperishable *fatal*, or infantile life, though incongruous, is possible to Him with whom all things are possible; but it is not probable, and is nowhere taught in the sacred word. 'Perpetual existence in Hell' is imperishability in Hell, the place of perdition! And men and adults are the subjects of Hell, the perpetual existence in Hell of Adults, is nothing less than the exercise of *im*, *erish*, *able* intellectual, moral and corporal faculties in the same person in Hell; a doctrine for which we have searched in the Bible, but in vain.

To exist *perpetually in Hell* is one thing; and to be the subject of Eternal punishment is another, and quite a different thing. We believe in Eternal punishment, but we neither believe nor teach the dogma of *perpetual existence in Hell*. By existence in this connection, I understand, intellectual, moral and corporal consciousness. We will leave our brother to speculate upon this at his leisure. We would hint to him that to be eternally punished, and to be eternally punishing are very distinct ideas.—The reader can now turn to Bro. C's 1st example, p. 581, no. xii.—and when he has read what I have here written, and what is there printed, then, whether I be right or wrong in my conclusions, let him say candidly, if Bro. C. has not misunderstood, and consequently misinter-*reted* me upon this point?—From one instance learn a multitude!

☞ We refer our readers to the forth coming debate as an antidote to this Justification of the Bull. Our time is so much occupied in preparing this, that we cannot devote longer time to the document before us. We have no apprehension for the result. I shall not flinch from defending what I believe to be the truth, and the whole truth; though Bro. Campbell should excommunicate me 13 times per annum. He may justify as much as he pleases, but neither his Bulls nor Justifications will shake me. If he would subdue me, he must do it *by conviction*; and this must be, not only by, but by argument, and not by Bulls, Justifications, and Human Authority.—If the doctrine I plead be true, there is no man who can extinguish it; for the whole truth will be established sooner or later; if it be false it will infallibly come to nought. For peace or war, prosperity or adversity, life or death, I fearlessly abide the issue. Thus the Lord may give Bro. Campbell repentance, for having assailed himself on His Throne, and for having usurped his prerogative of Excommunication in relation to one in whose heart he hid neither guile, scepticism, infidelity, nor atheism, and

whose life is irreproachable; is the cordial and sincere friend of his friend and brother

Liberty, Amelia, Va.
Dec. 24, 1837.

THE EDITOR

ADVERTISEMENT

To the Friends of Truth and Free Inquiry.

At the pressing request of many Brethren, we are preparing for publication a Report of the Debate held between the Editor of the Advocate and a Clergyman, of the Presbyterian Order, in Lunenburg Co. Virginia. This Discussion having become a notch upon which to hitch a Decree of Excommunication against the Editor, has acquired an importance, as well as a notoriety, which the most sanguine anticipations could not have conferred upon it. On this account it is considered, that a true report of what the Editor pleaded for upon that occasion, should be recorded, and published to the Brethren and Public at large. Principles were developed in the Debate which the reader will find written in no other place save the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments; and if he be desirous of understanding the truth as taught in the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, we doubt not but he will consider himself as repaid by the purchase and perusal of the volume now offered to his patronage.

We will lay but little stress upon the duty incumbent on the Friends of Truth and Free Inquiry to aid in the publication of a work like this; because it must be as obvious as that justice should be done though the heavens fall. We use no arguments of a personal nature to induce them to patronize it; for, although our reputation as a disciple of Christ has been assailed, and denounced because of the counterfeit report of a sectarian, yet we prefer to recommend it to their regard upon the broad basis, that the Discussion was a contention between Revelation and Human Tradition, and therefore worthy of their support.

The Manuscript will be put into type so soon as we shall have received subscribers sufficient to bestow us a handsome publication. About 100 subscribers more than the amount of the cost will induce us to put it to the press. We do not desire to do *only* what we want the names of such as are willing to contribute, *swearing no man any thing but it is for the good of the work*, whose contributions we will receive with thanksgiving; let them make the amount of their subscription, and we will supply them at our utmost ability.

The Volume will be One Dollar.

containing orders to be post paid. Our agents and friends please give us their assistance in obtaining subscribers as their convenience will allow. The post office, County, and State should be distinctly specified.—Address: Office Tavern Amelia, Virginia.—New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland currency or United States Bills received in payment as well as Virginia Notes, both for the Advocate and Debate.

Entered

Liberty, Amelia, Va.
December 1837.

Burke's Opinion of Reformation.

"Reformation is one of those pieces which must be put at some distance in order to please, its greatest favorers love it better in the abstract than in the substance. When any one is prejudiced of their own, or any interest that they value, is touched, they become scrupulous, they become captious, and every man has his separate exception. Some pluck out the black hairs, some the grey; one point must be given up to one; and that point must be yielded to another; nothing is suffered to prevail upon its own principles; the whole is so frittered down and disjointed, that scarcely a trace of the original scheme remains! Thus, between the resistance of power, and the unsystematical process of popularity, the undersinker and the undertaker are both exposed, and the poor reformer is hissed off the stage, both by friends and foes."

DR. WATTS' TESTIMONY

In favor of the need of Reformation, and a more thorough knowledge of the Sacred Writings.

"Nor should a student of divinity imagine that our age is arrived at a full understanding of every thing which can be known by the scriptures. Every age since the Reformation has thrown some further light on difficult texts and paragraphs of the bible, which have been long obscured by the early rise of Antichrist; and since there are at present many difficulties and darknesses, hanging about certain truths of the Christian religion, and since several of those relate to important doctrines, such as the origin of sin, the fall of Adam, the perdition of Christ, the blessed Trinity, the descent of God; &c. which do still oppress the minds of the most eminent teachers, and who daily work for nothing but the glory of God, and the souls of mankind in the Bible, and who are not content with the plain sense; and it is certain that the only way to solve

difficulties, and to reconcile these seeming contradictions, is by why may not a sincere searcher of truth in the scriptures, by labour, diligence, study, and prayer; with the assistance of his reasoning powers, find out the proper solution of those doubts and perplexities which have hitherto been unsolved, and which have afforded matter for angry quarrelling? Happy is every man who shall be favored of Heaven to give a happy issue to the introduction of the blessed age of light and love."

Milton's Treatise on Christian Doctrine.

"If, then, the scriptures be in themselves so perspicuous, and sufficient of themselves to make men wise unto salvation through faith, and that the man of God may be perfect, though roughly furnished unto all good works, through what infatuation is it that even Protestant divines persist in darkening the most momentous truths of religion by intricate comments, on the plea that such an explanation is necessary: stringing together all the useless technicalities and empty distinctions of scholastic barbarism, for the purpose of elucidating those scriptures, which they are continually extolling as models of plainness, as if scripture, which possesses in itself the clearest light, and is sufficient for its own explanation, especially in matters of faith and holiness, required to have the simplicity of its divine truths more fully developed, and placed in a more distinct view, by illustrations drawn from the abstract of human sciences, falsely so called."

INFALLIBILITY.

[Extract from Dr. Chalmers' Sermon on "the Doctrine of Christian Charity applied to the case of Religious Differences.]

"It is said of the Papists that they ascribe an infallibility to the Pop; so that if he were to say one thing, and that another, his authority would carry it over the authority of God. And think you, brethren, that there is no such Popery in you? You all here, or ought to have, Bibles; and the Bible is it repeated there, "Hearken, diligently, ye men, ye women, ye obey this requirement, by making the word of God to be a distinct and earnest exercise. (1.) Do you obey your favorite minister to the utmost of your power, tremble at the presumptions of the man who is the hearing of the word; carried away by the heat of the word, than the reading of the Word, and who is the hearing of the word."

indolent acquiescence in his doctrine, is just calling man Master; it is putting the authority of man over the authority of God; it is throwing yourself into a prostrate attitude at the footstool of infallibility; it is not just kissing the toe of reverence, but it is the profound degradation of the mind, and of all its faculties; and without the name of Popery—that your bosoms, your souls may be infected with the deadly poison and your consciences be weighed down by the oppressive shackles of Popery. And all this in the noon-day effulgence of a Protestant country, where the Bible, in our mother tongue circulates among all your families; where it may be met with on almost every shelf, and is soliciting you to look to the wisdom that is inscribed on its pages.

The Christian does not pray to be delivered from glory, from *causa gloriae*. He also is ambitious of glory, and a candidate for honor; but glory, in whose estimation? honor, whose judgment? Not of those, whose censures can take nothing from his innocence; whose approbation can take nothing from his guilt; whose opinions are as futile as their actions; whose lives as transitory as their praise; who cannot see his heart, seeing that they are ignorant of their own. The Christian then seeks his glory in the estimation, and his honor in the judgment of Him alone, Who,

From the bright Empyrean where He sits,
High throned above all height, casts down his eye,
His own works, and man's works, at once to view.

We hate some persons because we do not know them; we will not know them, because we hate them. The friendships that succeed to such aversions are usually firm, for the qualities must be sterling, that could not only gain our hearts but conquer our prejudices. But the misfortune is, that we carry these prejudices into things far more serious than our friendships. Thus, there are *fratres*, which some men despise, because they have not examined, and which they will not examine, because they despise. There is one single illustrious record, where this kind of prejudice was overcome by a miracle;—but the age of miracles is past, while that of prejudices remains.—A.

THE ADVOCATE

&c.

Vol. 4. Amelia County, Va.; January, 1838. No. 9

ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE APOCALYPSE.

(Continued from p. 234.)

Rev. xiii. 1-10.

Historical Fragment.

Having interpreted, according to our ability, the Symbols and Phrases, we proceed now to exhibit the fulfilment of the Prediction as we find it detailed on the page of History. And before we proceed further we will just inform the reader of the rule by which we work the "Apocalyptic Illustrations."—We believe, that the Revelation of John is a Hieroglyphic Outline of the History of certain parts of the World, from about the period of his exile to Patmos to the final consummation of all things. This conclusion is founded on the first and nineteenth verses of the first chapter, and on the sixth and tenth of the twenty-second. "The revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show to his servants things which must shortly come to pass."—"Write the things which thou hast seen, and the things which are, and the things (or events) which shall be hereafter." "And the Lord God of his Holy Prophets sent his angel to show to his servants the things which must shortly be done."—"Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book; for the time is at hand."—If then, this conclusion be just, it follows that it is in history, either civil or ecclesiastical, that its accomplishment is recorded. Thus I believe, that the History of the last 1737 years is the true interpretation of the Apocalypse as far as it is fulfilled. When then is necessary a satisfactory illustration of this Book. First, to understand the language in which it is written; secondly, to ascertain the periods of the 1737 years; and thirdly, several parts refer; and finally, having ascertained the periods, to apply its history to the predictions. And I believe that the application is true inasmuch as the History of the Prophecy, namely, events, is a necessary consequence of the prediction. It is correct and true, and may be any thing.

the Interpreter has not succeeded in his explanation, and he must try again.

To attempt the explanation of the Apocalypse has been deemed by some as a trespass on forbidden ground. But as the Christian, no part of Scripture is forbidden ground. It is true, that many 'great and learned men' have failed to interpret correctly the Revelation of John. But this is no ground of discouragement to the 'small'; for 'great men are not always wise.' The Apocalypse was not addressed to the Great and Learned; but to the Seven Congregations of Asia Minor, composed of the humbler class of men. It was addressed to the Churches of Christ through all ages; and not to the Communion of the Antichristian World. 'The wise' who were to 'understand,' are not the Great, the Learned, or the Wise in the estimation of the World; but those who are 'wise to salvation through the faith which is by Christ Jesus:—' Prophecy is a sign to believers 'who have obeyed the Gospel; and in the Apocalypse we have a standing sign to the Church of Christ in all periods of its existence. The wise of this world are the foolish in the sight of God who will bring their wisdom to nought. If they prove themselves not wise enough to discern and obey the Gospel, how can they be expected to interpret truly the oracles which God has entrusted to the faithful. A Protestant or Papal interpreter will never see his own Communion in the Mirror of the Apocalypse;—'the wicked shall not understand;' but the Christian will see them both. Let not the sarcasm of the aged great, deter the disciple of Christ from the investigation of this prophecy; a blessing is pronounced upon every one who reads, understands, and keeps the things which it contains; it is a book not sealed, and therefore, intelligible; let him then, enter upon it deeply; and if he will, let him come out "full-orbed" on the wonders it reveals.

The period to which the commencement of this prophecy refers, is to the transfer of the 'power, throne, and jurisdiction of the Pagan-Catholic-Imperial Majesty of the Roman Empire over extensive countries, to the Ten Original Dynasties or Sovereignities of Europe. That there was to be such a transfer is obvious; for the Diadems or Crowns, which are the emblems of suzerainty, are found to have changed their locality from the Dragonic Heads to the Ferine Horns. Now the question is, Did such a transfer in reality occur—does the page of History record such an event? Of this there can be no doubt. The Modern History of all the Nations of Europe begins with the detail of their rise out of the Fall of the Roman Empire;—France, Spain, Britain, &c., as they exist, were all born of the remarkable Revolution. As we wish to be concise, we will cite the transition of one country from the Dragonic to the Ferine state as an example of that of the remainder. We will

take France, first, as a province of the Roman Empire; and secondly, as an independent kingdom.

This country may be contemplated with advantage at three several periods: first, as a comparatively tranquil province;—second, as in a state of transition; and thirdly, as an infant Monarchy. As a province it was termed Gaul. It was incorporated into the Roman Empire about fifty years previous to the birth of Christ; and so continued for the space of five centuries. In the period of its tranquillity, about 250 years it made rapid progress in improvement. It received the advantages of political union, of an enlightened system of justice, and of a long interval of peace; and wealth, industry, agriculture, and commerce soon followed as necessary consequences. The Gospel was preached by the Messengers of Heaven, and received by multitudes of the Provincials; who maintained the unity of the Spirit, in the bond of peace, until they merged into the shades of the Apostacy; when the calamities of the transition period harassed them with singular severity.

Of the natural and well-known boundaries of the province of Gaul, the Rhine was the most important. It was the Great barrier which defended the Roman Empire from the roving tribes and nations that swarmed beyond. Wealth and civilization were on one side of the stream; want and barbarism on the other. Betwixt such neighbors the natural state is war. The disciplined legions of Rome, however quelled the turbulence of the German tribes, penetrated far and at different intervals into their country, fully avenged one or two defeats, and long held their rude enemies in salutary awe.

But the Germans, though little versed in policy, began, in the transition period of Gaulish History, to perceive that their frequent defeats were in a great measure owing to their dissunion, to their dispersion in different tribes, and to the want of any solid or lasting bond of connexion,—whilst they were opposed by the united mind and forces of a large empire. The consciousness of this defect produced in the third century those confederacies in which many tribes united, not occasionally but lastingly, under one common name, and often under one monarch or chief. Some assumed the appellation of Allemanni, or All Men; others, the simpler distinction of Franks; that is, Brave or Free Men.

In about A. D. 280, the Franks made a warlike incursion into the hitherto peaceful province of Gaul; which was quelled by Probus, who drove them back into their mountains. A civil war betwixt Magnentius and Constantine followed, which ended and wasted the Roman forces in mutual slaughter. The Franks, both Franks and Allemanni, took advantage of the confusion, and established themselves in the province.—The Emperor Julian, who succeeded Constantine, drove the Allemanni across the Rhine, but did not

Franks or French, to settle permanently on the Roman side of that river.

The commencement of the fifth century is marked by the great and victorious irruptions of all the Barbarian hosts into Gaul. They poured like a long pent up and gathering tide, a thousand destructive torrents throughout the land, sweeping away and overwhelming in a mass, life, property and institutions. Years elapsed ere the agitation subsided and the brevity of conquest was over. When calm was restored, we find the transition complete. Gaul was no longer a Provincial Horn of Dragonic Rome, but a country of Ferice and independent Sovereignties. The Visigoths were in possession of Aquitaine and the lands southward of the Loire, with Toulouse for their capital; and the Burgundians held the district bordering on the Rhone, from the Lake of Geneva to the Mediterranean. And here it is worthy of remark, that these two Sovereigns of the Visigoths and Burgundians, comprehended Languedoc and Provence; afterwards so celebrated as the theatre of the cruelties of the Lion-Mouth aided by the sword of the French Horn, upon their simple-hearted yet noble-minded citizens. Britany, on the north of the Bay of Biscay, maintained a kind of independence. The Franks advanced their establishments over the present Kingdom of Belgium to the limits of Modern France; whilst the central parts, preserved Rome by the victories of Clovis, were, like Britain, gradually abandoned to themselves and came to obey, under Roman forms and titles, the wealthiest and most powerful of the native provincials. It was thus that Count Egidius, and after him his son Syagrius, governed, and were even said to have reigned at Soissons.

Thus did Gaul pass from the Provincial to the Monarchical State; and thus in the fifth century, did the Visigoths, Burgundians and Franks, or certain of the Horns of the Beast, wrest by the power of the sword, the sovereignty or supreme jurisdiction of the country from the Pagan Catholic Imperial Head of the Dragon. It remained for other Barbarians to wrest from them his Throne, and the rest of his power, and jurisdiction over the countries of Europe.

But the division of Gaul into these several independent parts was not to continue. A conflict, subsequently arising, and the Franks, who were the least civilized, eventually subdued the rest, and gave their name to the country and its mixed population. They began with the subjugation of the Soissons. This they effected under Clovis, who took possession of the territory and capital, A. D. 485, and thus became the Foundation of the French Monarchy. Like all the heroes and notable times of those times, Clovis paid great respect to the Catholic Church, and received considerable advantage from its aid. The Franks had been Pagans hitherto; but Clovis, having married

da, a Burgundian princess, became instructed in the Christian religion of the Catholics. In the heat of a battle against the Germans near Cologne, in a doubtful moment of action, he invoked the God of the Catholics. He gained the victory, and after; and was immersed, with the greater number of his warriors like Franks, in grateful acknowledgment of the supposed aid. His faith being Anti-Arian, he acquired the zealous support of the Gaulish Clergy, who conferred upon him the title of *Most Christian King*, which is worn by the Kings of France to this day. In conclusion, the sons of Clovis subdued Burgundy and Aquitaine, and extended their dominions, with the exception of a small province round Narbonne retained by the Visigoths, to the Pyrenees and the Mediterranean in the south, while Switzerland, Bavaria, Saxony, and the German nations as far as the Baltic and the Elbe, acknowledged this authority towards the north. This brings us to the age of Charlemagne, where we shall leave our subject for the present, and return.

The fate of the Roman Jurisdiction over Gaul was equally that of its authority over Spain, Britain, Italy, and the rest of the western provinces. In Spain, the Suevo, Alani, and Vandals exercised their indiscriminate cruelty on the forges of the Romans and Spaniards, and ravaged with equal fury the cities and open country. This invasion happened A. D. 409, and was consummated in the partition of its provinces between the invaders. In 414 it was again attacked by the Goths, who restored it to the Empire; but finally in 467, wrested it from Rome, and founded an independent sovereignty upon its provincial ruins. In 712, the kingdom of the Visigoths was subverted by the Saracens of Mauritania, who established their own power in its stead.

The Romans were compelled by the urgency of their affairs in Italy, finally to evacuate Britain in 418. The degenerate inhabitants of South Britain, being unable to defend themselves against the Picts and Scots called in the Saxons to their aid. The Picts, Scots and Saxons entered into an alliance, and having subdued the Anglo-Roman provincial, settled themselves in the subjugated province; and thus usurped a jurisdiction, which had belonged to the Roman Dragon for about 500 years.

With respect to Italy, a more particular notice is demanded in connection with the prophecy under consideration. In the country of the Dragon's Throne, which he was to give also to deliver to the Beast. But before this could take place; other events are indicated in relation to the Beast, or Dragon, whose image is to be in the City, or Rome. John beheld, one of the seven heads of the Beast, which were by Death, and its voice was as the voice of the Head, which was the Pagan Catholic Imperial Head, suspended, but not finally destroyed.

perial Authority over Rome and Italy suspended; and what was it healed or restored?—These are two inquiries which history is fully competent to answer.

In the fifth century the Ostrogoths were established in Pannonia. Under Orestes, A. D. 476, they dethroned Nepos, the Emperor of the West, and set up Augustulus in his stead. This person was a mere cipher in the affairs of state; and soon found that he had to choose whether he would be the slave, or the victim, of his mercenary Goths. The dangerous alliance of these strangers had oppressed and insulted the last remains of Roman freedom and dignity. At each revolution their pay and privileges were augmented; but their insolence increased in a still more extravagant degree; and they insisted on their presumptuous demand that a third part of the lands of Italy should be immediately divided among them. But the father of Augustulus chose rather to encounter the rage of an armed multitude, than to subscribe the ruin of the Italians. He rejected the audacious demand; and his refusal was favorable to the ambition of Odoacer, a bold barbarian, who assured his fellow-Goths that if they dared to associate under his command, they might soon extort the justice which had been denied to their petitioners. From all the camps and garrisons of Italy, the confederates flocked impatiently to his standard. Orestes took refuge in Pavia, which was besieged, stormed, and pillaged. Orestes was put to death, and his son Augustulus was obliged to implore the clemency of Odoacer; who was saluted with the title of *King of Italy* by the acclamations of his military followers.

Odoacer abolished the office of Emperor of the West, as useless and expensive; and the unfortunate Augustulus was made the instrument of his own disgrace. He signified his resignation to the Roman Senate; which immediately addressed an epistle to Zeno, the Eastern Emperor. They solemnly disclaimed the necessity, or even the wish, of continuing any longer the Imperial Succession or Headship in Italy; a use, in their opinion, the majesty of a sole monarch was sufficient to pervade and protect, at the same time, both the East and the West. In their own name, and in the name of the people, they consented that the seat of universal empire should be transferred from Rome to Constantinople; and they renounced the rights of choosing their Emperor, the only vestige that then remained of the Senatorial authority which had given laws to the world. The republic, they repeated, could safely confide in the civility and military virtues of Odoacer; and they humbly requested that the Emperor would invest him with the title of Patrician, and the administration of the Diocese of Italy. The Deposition of the Senate was received at Constantinople with some marks of displeasure and indignation. The Emperor Zeno, sternly reproached them with their treatment of the two Emperors, Anthemius and Nepos, whom the East had successively granted

ed to the prayers of Italy. "The first," continues he, "you have murdered; the second you have expelled; but the second is still alive, and whilst he lives he is still your lawful sovereign." But the prudent Zeno soon deserted the hopeless cause of his abdicated colleague. His vanity was gratified by the title of sole Emperor; he entertained a friendly, though an ambiguous correspondence with Odoacer the Patrician King; and he gratefully accepted the purple and diadem, the Imperial ensigns, the sacred ornaments of the Throne and palace, which the Barbarian was not unwilling to remove from the sight of the Italians.

Augustulus, a beautiful youth, was the ninth emperor who had sat upon the Throne of the West in the short space of twenty years. Of all these, his reign would be least entitled to the notice of posterity, were it not that it is marked by the extinction of the Roman Empire in the West, and thus left a memorable era in the history of mankind. The generous clemency of Odoacer spared his life; he dismissed him from the Imperial palace, fixed his annual stipend at 6000 pieces of gold, and assigned the castle of Lucullus, in Campania, for the place of his exile or retirement.

In this way, the Sixth or Imperial Head of the Beast was 'wounded' by the 'death'-dealing blow of Odoacer, the first chief of the Serpent or Kingly Head, A. D. 476. His policy was directed chiefly against the Imperial Office. He studied to obliterate it from the minds of the people. Though saluted King by acclamation after the pillage of Pavia, he abstained during his whole reign from the use of the Imperial Ornaments—the purple and the crown—which as we have seen, he sent to Constantinople. Odoacer was the first Barbarian who reigned in Italy, over a people who had once asserted their authority above the rest of mankind. He raised the Consulship, enforced the laws, protected the country, and caused its frontiers to be respected by the Barbarians of Gaul and Germany, who had so long insulted the feeble emperors of the West. But the price of his elevation necessarily inflicted great misery on the proprietors of lands in Italy. One third of those ample estates, to which the ruin of Italy is originally imputed, was extorted for the use of the conquerors. The least unfortunate were those who submitted without a murmur to the power which it was impossible to resist. Yet Odoacer mitigated the general distress by his humanity which was necessarily rewarded by Providence. He reigned fourteen years, when he was succeeded by the superior genius of Theodoric, King of the Ostrogoths, who fell by the hand of an assassin, the assassin being the conspirator of Ravenna. After his death he was succeeded by his son, who succeeded him as King of Italy, and was succeeded by his son, who was succeeded by his son, and so on, until the East. He reigned 33 years, and was succeeded by his son.

tha his daughter as the guardian of his grandson Athalaric and the Kingdom of Italy.

But the time was fast approaching, when 'the wound of death' was to be healed, by the Imperial Office being fully re-established in Rome. It was under the Regency of the Queen of Italy, that Belisarius threatened to deprive the Goths of their sovereignty.—"If you compel us to take up arms," said he, "we shall contend, not to regain possession of a single city, but to deprive you of all the provinces which you unjustly withhold from their lawful sovereigns."—Theodatus, a weak, avaricious, and timid tyrant, ascended the Gothic Throne, A. D. 534, and reigned two years. He was succeeded by Vitiges, who was elected King by the suffrages of his troops.

In 536, Belisarius, the renowned general of Justinian, the Emperor of the East, invaded Italy. Having subdued Naples to the Imperial Authority; he directed his march towards Rome whither he had been invited by the citizens. In the absence of the main Gothic army, a monastic enthusiasm of religion and patriotism had seized their minds. They furiously exclaimed that the Apostolic Throne should no longer be polluted by the triumph or toleration of Arianism; that the tombs of the Cæsars should no longer be trampled by the armies of the North: and without reflecting that Italy must sink into a province of Constantinople, they fondly hailed the restoration of a Roman Emperor as a new era of freedom and prosperity. Accordingly, Belisarius entered Rome in the name of Justinian, to whom he sent its keys, by Lauderis the captive lieutenant of the Goths. In 537, Belisarius was besieged in Rome by the Goths during one year and nine days; when having lost about one-third of their host of 150,000 men, they burned their tents, and retired precipitately to Ravenna. This impregnable city was surrendered by the Goths A. D. 539; their king was taken prisoner; their kingdom subdued, and Italy again numbered among the provinces of the Pagan-Catholic-Imperial Majesty after a separation of about sixty-three years.

But, the flattering prospects of Justinian were doomed to suffer a speedy reverse. In 540, the Goths revolted. Though they had lost much, they still retained Pavia with a garrison of 1000 soldiers. Vitiges being dead, they elected Totila for their king; who at the head of 5000 troops, undertook the restoration of the Kingdom of Italy. He defeated an army of 20,000 Roman mercenaries near Faenza; he reduced Naples and Cumæ with the provinces of Lucania, Apulia, and Calabria: and he has army to the gates of Rome, which he summoned to submit to the superior blessings of a Gothic over a Grecian reign. Belisarius was again sent to Italy, but without either men, horse, money or the implements of war. None of the Italians joined him: The siege of Rome still continued, Totila having resolved to starve the city rather than to carry it by assault.

To such distress were the citizens reduced, that it is recorded, that "a crowd of spectres, pale and emaciated, their bodies oppressed with disease, and their minds with despair, surrounded the palace of the Governor, urged, with unswerving truth, that it was the duty of a master to maintain his slaves, and humbly requested that he would provide for their subsistence, permit their flight, or command their immediate execution."—Belisarius replied, that it was impossible to feed, unsafe to disperse, and unlawful to kill, the subjects of the Emperor." An effort of Belisarius to relieve Rome having failed, it fell into the hands of the Goths, A. D. 546, after a siege of about eight months. Totila decreed, that this 'Metropolis of the Nations' should be changed into a pasture for cattle; but the firm and temperate remonstrance of Belisarius suspended the execution. Yet the king of the Goths in his march to Lucania and Apulia, carried off the Scythians with him in his train, and afterwards confined them in the fortresses of Campania; the citizens, with their wives and children, were dispersed in exile; and during forty days Rome was abandoned to desolate and dreary solitude.

After the departure of Totila, Belisarius took possession of the vacant space of the 'eternal city,' and a second time sent its keys to the Emperor. At the end of twenty-five days, Totila advanced by hasty marches to retrieve his loss. The Goths were thrice repulsed in three general assaults upon the Imperial troops, by whom the gateways were defended for want of gates. Belisarius was recalled from Italy. Rome was retaken by Totila, A. D. 549, and under his favorable regards began to recover from the calamities she had endured. He was successful on every side, and at every step of his victories repeated to the Emperor his desire of ending hostilities between them.—But Justinian was deaf to the voice of peace, though his indolent temper paralyzed the prosecution of the war. Pope Vigilius, however, aroused him from his lethargy, and adjured him in the name of God and the people, to resume the conquest and deliverance of Italy. Accordingly the Gothic war was rekindled from its ashes, and A. D. 552, Narses led a numerous and well-appointed army into Italy. The hostile forces met at Tagina. The Goths were routed; Totila was slain, and Narses advancing upon Rome marched through Tuscaney and accepted the submission of the Goths. Rome had been five times taken, and recovered in Justinian's reign. It was besieged and taken, and the keys a third time sent to the Byzantine Emperor, and the deliverance of Rome was the last calamity of the Gothic people. The flying Goths slew 300 youths of the nobility, who had been held as hostages by Totila before his death. He had exiled the Senate from Rome, and the banishment had been various but tragical. Their houses were razed to the ground, and the streets of Campania. Speaking of the Roman Empire, the

observes, 'after a period of thirteen centuries, the institution Romulus expired; and if the nobles of Rome still assumed the title of Senators, few subsequent traces can be discovered of public council or constitutional order. Ascend six hundred years, and contemplate the Kings of the Earth soliciting an audience, as the slaves or freedmen of the Roman Senate?—is worthy of remark, that the Seventh Head or Form of Government in Rome fell with the Senate, which had subsisted through all the revolutions of the City. It was instituted by the first King and perished with the last, A. D. 552.

The Gothic war was yet alive. Having retired beyond Teias, they elected Teias to succeed Totila. He solicited the aid of the Franks; and pitched his camp on the banks of the Drago, or Dragon. Sixty days were consumed in distant and fruitless combats. Teias maintained this important post, till he was deserted by his fleet and the hope of subsistence. Being determined to die in arms, the king and his chosen band marched to a close fight. Every hand was ambitious of the honor of piercing him with their javelins. After a combat of many hours his left arm was fatigued by the weight of twelve spears which hung from his shield. Still fighting, he called for a fresh bowler, but in the moment while his side was uncovered, it was pierced by a mortal dart. He fell: and his head, exalted on a spear, proclaimed to the nations that the Gothic Kingdom was no more. It is a remarkable coincidence that the Seventh Head which was common both to the Beast and the Dragon fell upon the banks of the Dragon, a river which flows from Neapolis into the Bay of Naples.

After the death of Teias, Narses separated his troops to reduce the cities of Italy. But before he had effected this, Italy was overwhelmed by a new deluge of Barbarians. Seventy-five thousand Oriental Franks descended in the autumn of 568 from the Rhetian Alps into the plain of Milan. The Goths flocked to their standard, and admitted them into the cities which still resisted the arms of the Roman General. They separated into two divisions, and wasted the country on every side, until they were themselves wasted by a change of climate, disease and intemperance; while the finishing stroke of their discomfiture was given by the sword of the Imperialists A. D. 554.

After a reign of 60 years, the throne of the Gothic Kings was filled by the Exarchs of Ravenna, the representatives in peace and war of the Emperor of the Romans. Their jurisdiction was soon reduced to the limits of a narrow province; but Narses himself who was the first and most powerful of the exarchs administered above 15 years the entire kingdom of Italy. He appointed Dukes for the defence and military command of each of the principal cities; and his eyes pervaded the ample prospect from Calabria to the Alps. Forgetful of the past, re-

less of the future, the Italian cities resounded with the riot of drinking and dancing. The civil State of Italy was fixed, after so long a tempest, by a pragmatic sanction; which the Emperor promulgated at the request of the Pope. Under the Exarchs of Ravenna, Rome was degraded to the second rank; and the twenty years of the Gothic war had consummated the distress and depopulation of Italy. As early as the fourth campaign under Belisarius 50,000 laborers died of hunger in the narrow region of Picenum; and a strict interpretation of the evidence of Procopius would swell the loss of Italy to fifteen or sixteen millions.

The avarice, and unpopular administration of Narses, excited the discontent of the people. The Deputies of Rome boldly declared before the throne of Justin, that their Gothic servitude had been more tolerable than the despotism of a Greek Eunuch; and that unless their tyrant were soon removed, they would consult their own happiness in the choice of a master. Narses was recalled after an administration of about 15 years. This period had scarcely elapsed, when A. D. 568, the Barbarians again deluged the plains of Italy; and in two years from the Trentine hills to the gates of Ravenna and Rome, the inland regions became without a battle or a siege, the lasting patrimony of the Lombards. Pavia alone arrested them before its walls. After a siege of three years it fell; and became the Capital during some ages, of the Lombard Kingdom of Italy.

During a period of two hundred years, Italy was unequally divided between the Lombards and the Exarchate of Ravenna. The Exarchs were appointed by the Byzantine Emperors and invested with the full remains of the civil, military, and even of ecclesiastical power. Their immediate jurisdiction, which was afterwards consecrated as the *patrimony of St. Peter*, extended over the modern Romagna, the marshes or valleys of Ferrara and Comacchio, five maritime cities from Rimini to Ancona, and a second inland Pentapolis, between the Adriatic coast and the hills of the Apennine.

Thus was the Sixth or Imperial Ferino-Dragonic Head "wounded as it were by Death;" and such was the terrible process by which "its wound of death was healed." We have seen the Seventh Head expire on the Draco; the Dragon surrendered his power, and an extensive jurisdiction to the Beast; his throne became the subordinate seat of a Duke; and Italy partitioned between the Lombards and the Greeks. "How minute the prophecy, how exact its fulfilment! Who that accurately examines 'the sure word' can forbear to magnify the unsearchable wisdom of the Almighty, to whom the events of endless duration are all known from the beginning. It is indeed a sure word of prophecy, like a light shining in a darkness, and to which it will be well that we all take heed."—*continued.*

THE CHURCH AT PAINEVILLE AND THE HARBINGER.

In the Decree issued from Bethany in this passage; namely, "it therefore belongs to the church of which he is a member to consider whether his (Dr. Thomas)' case is not of the same genus with that of H; meneus and Palletus (2 Tim. ii. 16, 17) and then for sister churches to act upon their approbation or disapprobation of her decision of this question." In consequence of this call made upon the Church of Christ in Paineville, Amelia, Virginia, She has responded in the following address, *remissive contradicente*, or none of her members contradicting. A copy of this document has been forwarded to Bethany for insertion in the Millennial Harbinger; and another has been put into my hands by my Rulers for publication in the Advocate. I have pleaded neither *pro* nor *con* before the church; but unreservedly surrendered my case into their hands to dispose of it as they should think fit. Convinced that they were righteous and impartial men, I feared not but that they would decide according to truth. For myself, I am satisfied with their decision; and whether "sister Churches" approve or disapprove it, I cannot but feel gratified at the straightforward independence and unbiased vindication of my reputation and character from the attacks of malicious or mistaken opponents as set forth in the Report.

I have been twice the object of which have been hurled anathemas of excommunication by Editious "Reformers." Plain Dealing and Bro. A. Campbell, both well acquainted with sceptical intricacies," consigned me to the infidel herd of men; a prophecy had gone before, "that I should become an avowed infidel in twelve months." But little more than this period had elapsed ere the Bethany Decree denounces me as subverted from the faith. Can the fulminator of this edict have been the prophet to whom Plain Dealing referred as "a brother of more than ordinary intelligence?" If so, is it possible, that in him "the wish could have been the father to the thought?" The Decree would have come with better grace, if grace it contain at all, from any other man than from him who refuses me the Communion of Christians. He has failed to sustain his position by the force of argument; and now he wheels about to prostrate me, *if he can*, by the argument of force! But it is an old *ruse de guerre*, which has invariably recoiled upon the strategist when manœuvred against the truth. Plain Dealing and the Decretist of Bethany have both signally failed. The Brethren refuse to ratify their edicts; they will not separate me from their fellowship; and they have too much candor and veracity constructively to metamorphose a true believer into an Apostate from the Faith.

But the denunciations of certain of my brethren, and of Sectarian Leaders, affect me no more than the lightning beam. If I contend for the truth, for which none of whom the world was

not worthy, lost their lives, I expect, and demand the same treatment. 'He that will live godly in Christ, shall be persecuted'; and it is 'through much tribulation, we shall enter the kingdom.' I rejoice that I am counted worthy to suffer infamy for Christ. He knows what is in man, and he knows that my object is the disenthralment of the faith and the gospel from the rubbish of sectarian legends and traditions; and that the recompense I seek is not from men, but from the rewarder of them who diligently seek him.'

We leave the Report with the reader; and respectfully request, not as a favor, but as an act of justice, that our Brethren of the Press will insert it, with or without these remarks as they please, in their several papers; and should they ever be placed in like circumstances we will do them the same favor.

EDITOR ADV.

THE CONGREGATION OF GOD AT PAINEVILLE, VA. TO THE BRETHREN IN CHRIST JESUS.

Dear! Beloved,

We deem it our duty, when any Brother presents a charge against any member of our body, to act upon that charge as though it had been made by a member of our own immediate congregation. And whereas Bro. A. Campbell has brought certain charges against Bro. John Thomas and requested us to take them under consideration, we having done so, and after much deliberation among ourselves have come to the following results in relation to the charges which our Bro. A. Campbell has felt himself bound to allege against one of our body (J. Thomas) who is esteemed by us as an excellent man and an exemplary Christian. We very much regret to see the breach between brethren C. and T., that instead of uniting their talents, their energies, and their efforts in dissipating the clouds of that darkness and ignorance which now broods over all the countries of Christendom, they should direct them, at least in part, against each other, and thus give occasion to the Prince of Darkness still to triumph. We did once fondly hope, that this reformation, like the body of Christ, founded upon the principles of forbearance and unity, would steadily move onward in its course, adding light to light and knowledge to knowledge until it would have stood forth, in the midst of an apostate world in all the beauty, simplicity, and purity of the ancient Apostolic Gospel; but alas! how grieved we are to behold it now so split asunder, and that too by those who ought to be the glory of our Mother and its conservators! For when we see the course pursued by the Advocate and the Harbinger, and how half towards each other, we are bound to inquire, whether one or both of these periodicals, by their mutual attacks, do not acquire who was first or last to blame.

one or both are at fault, let us direct our attention more immediately to the call that has been made upon us through the Harbinger. And what is that call?

It is to consider whether the case of Bro. Thomas is not of the same genus with that of Hymeneus and Philetus, recorded 2 Tim. ii. 16, 17, 18, viz. "Shun profane and vain babblings; for they will increase unto more ungodliness and their words will eat as doth a canker, of whom are Hymeneus and Philetus, who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the resurrection is past already; and overthrow the faith of some." The heresy of Hymeneus and Philetus here spoken of, was that the resurrection had passed already: consequently they denied that there was to be any resurrection hereafter. Now we understand Bro. Thomas to believe and teach that there will be a literal resurrection of the dead bodies of the saints at the coming of Messiah, and that there will also be a literal resurrection of the dead bodies of saints and sinners at the general judgment, we do not therefore see how the two cases can be identified; unless, indeed, it be contended that because Bro. Thomas believes that the Gospel is the power of God for salvation to every one that believes it, and that the secrets of salvation are to be judged according to the Gospel, and that therefore those to whom the Gospel has never been offered can neither believe it and be saved by it, nor reject it and be condemned by it; and hence they are not to be the subjects of that resurrection mentioned in it; and that therefore he denies the resurrection of those whom he considers wholly out of the purview of the Gospel. If this be speculative or untaught, is it such a heresy as merits such a sentence of condemnation as that which Bro. C. has pronounced, and which he asks us to confirm against Bro. T., and that upon the first, or rather before any admonition, at least from us, the proper tribunal?—Now we understand the scripture rule in this behalf, to be this: the congregation that has charge of the person accused must judge him to be a heretic, and then admonish him twice and then reject him after the second admonition has proved ineffectual. But why does Bro. C. call on us to take the case of Bro. T. under consideration, now that he has publicly condemned him? If we, too, condemn him, he will still hold the same relation to Bro. C. that he does now; if we acquit him his relative situation to Bro. C. will be still the same; that is, of one on our side for Christian Communion as a deluded Mormonite.—Again, why does Bro. C. wish to hold the rod of terror over our heads, while we are sitting in judgment upon Bro. T.'s case, by calling on sister churches to set upon our decision and to place us conditionally upon the same footing with Bro. T. by refusing to receive the fellowship of Bro. C. we have no more to say, and that is to renounce Bro. T. either without the formality of a trial. It will therefore be

perceived that Bro. C. has tied our hands, and put us in a dilemma in which we must either forfeit his fellowship, or renounce one of our congregations that we look upon as a lawful assembly of disciples of Christ. We therefore, conclude that Bro. C. has been premature in passing sentence on Bro. T., and all who believe and teach with him, before he and they had been dealt with according to the Laws in such cases. Again, the sentence which Bro. C. has thought proper to prescribe, to us, upon which Bro. T. can alone be retained among us, we think oppressive in their character, and immoral in their tendency. He says, page 514, Mill. Harb. vol. 1 new series, "I will only add, that in a case of this sort, an explicit renunciation of these (new) doctrines, not merely a promise to suppress them, or to hold them as private property, as though they were unoperative opinions, would be indispensable to Christian Communion." This rule is high-handed and oppressive, because it takes from one the right even of thinking for himself, it is immoral, because it tends to make one say he does not entertain certain opinions deemed heretical, lest he may thereby incur the censure of his brethren. No one ought to be induced to declare his disbelief in any opinion till he has first been convinced of the error of that opinion. We cannot, come what will, offer any inducement to Bro. T. by appealing to his hopes, or his fears, to disavow those sentiments, so long as he remains unconvinced of the error-ousness of them. For this would be to tempt him to declare falsely. We do not feel ourselves called on to answer all the questions separately which appeared in the article under consideration, they being addressed to the Brethren in general, and not to us in particular. It therefore remains for them to consider of those several matters, and adopt such conclusions as the premises may seem to them to warrant. And since they are called upon to adopt or reject our decision, and of course ourselves along with that decision, we would, in view of that glorious hope set before us in the Gospel, the hope of a resurrection from among the dead, and an entrance upon the enjoyment of that life which is hid with Christ in God, most devoutly pray, and ardently beseech them first to search well the scriptures to see whether these things are so, and then compare the scripture doctrine with what Bro. T. believes and teaches as contained in his own writings, and not in the reports of others; and especially his remarks upon McCutts report of the Debate and his letter to Bro. C. We can find it in their hearts and consciences to reason with us, and us, be it so, we should most sincerely regret that we should endeavor, by the help of the T. to force our Christian fortitude. And, although we do not desire to sever fellowship with many, yet we do not wish to sever from our communion

emphatic, and whose devotion to the truth is so ardent, as that of St. Thomas. We feel bound by the sacred scriptures to continue to treat him as a Christian, so long as he continues to walk in such, and we trust that the Brethren after maturely considering this important matter, will duly appreciate our motives and ratify our decision, and that Bro. Canby will in particular, whose influence is great, and whose responsibility is proportionally great, would reconsider the whole matter, and so act as to avoid that schism in this reformation which must otherwise result from the course which, no doubt, he has felt himself called on to pursue; for, although we have censured Bro. T's manner, in some respects, and, although some among us regard some of his views as speculative and untaught, yet as he has thus far manifested a disposition to amend, and has in fact amended his manners, and if convinced of error, would we think, change his matter too, we cannot consent to interdict him from proving, or attempting to prove what he may consider truth upon any subject of Revelation. We have too much confidence in the power of truth, and in the heads and pens engaged in this reformation, to fear that any error fatal to the cause of truth can be successfully propagated and sustained.

May favor, peace, and mercy, be multiplied to all the faithful in Christ Jesus. Amen.

Signed by Order of the Church,

Jesse Smith, }
A. E. Walthall, } Elders.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

No. 5.

To Sir Calling Eardley Smith, the Honorable "and Reverend" Baptist Noel, and "the Reverend" James Sherman.

Excellent Sir,

The Acts of Apostles has been divided, and very judiciously, I think, into three parts; each corresponding, as it appears to me, to the order appointed by Jesus, according to which the proclamation of Reformation and the Remission of Sins was to be made known. The Apostles were to be his witnesses first "in Jerusalem" and in all Judaea; secondly, in the territories of "Samaria" and thirdly, "to the utmost parts of the Earth," or Empire of Rome. The first division of these labors comprehends the opening of the Kingdom of Heaven; and the subsequent proclamation of the Gospel to the Gentiles, and the subsequent proclamation of the Gospel to the Gentiles, and the subsequent proclamation of the Gospel to the Gentiles. In this they were engaged from A. D. 33 to A. D. 41, as is proved from chapter 2, to 11; being a period of about seven years. 2. The second division is an account of the opening of the Kingdom, to the people of the Jews, or devout Gentiles, together with its further progress

among the Jews from A. D. 41 to A. D. 44 (Acts 13—28). 3. And the third division comprehends the diffusion of the Faith of Christ among the idolatrous Gentiles, together with its further progress among the two preceding divisions from A. D. 44 to A. D. 63 (Acts 18—28).

Under the first head we have considered the opening of Heaven, by the House of Israel by one of the Keys entrusted to the Apostle Peter, and the opening of the Kingdom of Heaven to the Gentiles also. This had been shut to them as well as to the Jews by the traditions of men; and such was the force with which its gates had been closed, that none could effect an entrance for our race, save a Manifestation of Heaven. A week of years had been completed since the first proclamation of the Gospel. We have already contemplated the surprising and preternatural occurrences which accompanied that extraordinary event. The confirmation of the Apostolic acts on that day were supernatural. A period had now arrived, and an occasion now presented itself, which required sanctions, as strong and indisputable, as those which had been previously given. It was a Septennial of Divine Interposition, which rendered

But before proceeding immediately to the events of this period, we shall consider a few preliminaries. And first, why have we no introduction in account of the martyrdom of Stephen? In my judgment it was so introduced as a notice of the reader; the great persecution in which he was concerned against the congregation in Jerusalem; and to show, how it was the means of extending the Gospel through the regions of Judaea and Samaria, while the Apostles remained stationary in the Metropolis.

And here, gentlemen, it is worthy of note, that the only prerequisites to the preaching of the gospel in those days, were, first, to believe, secondly, to obey it; and thirdly, to possess the powers of Confirmation. As this congregation was dispersed by the persecution, and all both men and women, who did not fall into the hands of Saul, went about declaring the glad tidings of the word. For a person to proclaim the word would be useless unless he was able to administer it. Hence they baptized those who believed it. The Ambassadors of Jesus Christ remained in Jerusalem; and the Apostles, the full power of confirmation was not necessary to the proclamation; for Philip, though he could work miracles, had to send for apostles to lay hands on his converts, that they might receive the Holy Spirit, God's lot, or clergy, in those days of truth and honesty, were made up of all the Disciples of Christ both men and women; and to each share was the term applied until your Order, gentlemen, usurped the rights, privileges, honors, and immunities of the Body at large. There were no "licences to preach;" then "to leave to buy and sell" was then thought of. It was had contemned by every Christian to propagate the truth but faith was rapidly diffused; but when "Clergymen" usurped the exclusive right of preaching and administering the blood gates of corruption, were thrown open, and a spiritual mortality soon protruded the souls of men.

Concerning Philip, Luke observes, "that going from Antioch, he preached the gospel in all the cities, till he came to Caesarea;" and then he mentions him, where his labors were suspended; for he was not sent to Samaria, but the Word to that City of Samaria. You will observe, that the Apostle God disposed all his arrangements. Heaven was opened to the Jews and Gentiles, for whom it was necessary an Apostle should be sent to the Gentiles. I say it was needed, the proof of which is, that the Jews were appointed; and God does nothing without a purpose. It is necessary, that important, the inquiries, and the inquiries, and the inquiries, and the inquiries, and converted from a savage, persecuted, and a faithful soldier of the Cross. One thing, I would call your

relation to his case; namely, though Jesus convinced him, that he had sinned from the deed by his personal appearance, yet the Lord did not preach the gospel to him, or tell him what he must do to be saved from the punishment he deserved. And why did he not?—For the plain reason, that he had committed the matter to human agents, and, therefore, did not choose to depart from the order he had laid down, by taking it out of their hands. It was necessary, therefore, that Saul should go to Damascus to learn what he was to do for salvation. When he arrived there, Jesus sent a Disciple, not a 'Clergyman,' for there were no such anomalies then,—but a certain Disciple, named Ananias, to tell him what he 'must do.' And, Excellent Sir, if you would be saved you *must do the same*—you must 'arise and be baptized and wash away your sins, invoking the name of the Lord.' Ananias commanded Saul to do this; and the future Apostle to the Gentiles of yore—if you believe the Gospel, go and do likewise. The hate of the Great Preceptor by an ignorant and lowly and an Apostle being provided, the pre-cession is made; 'the congregations had risen and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the annunciation of the Holy Spirit, were multiplied;' and the Apostle Peter again speaks upon the theatre of events.

He determined about this time to make a tour of the empire again. After making some progress, we find him at Lydda in Samaria; to distance he went to Joppa about ten miles; if that place he continued for ninety days in the house of Simon, a tanner, whose house was on the Mediterranean shore. Here we will have him for a little time, while we pay a short visit to Caesarea, a city of Samaria, distant from Joppa about thirty-eight miles.

In this city there lived an uncircumcised workman of the true God, named Cornelius. He was a devout Gentile, and one of those who had not the law, but did by nature, or in effect, the things of the law; and followed the work of the law, written on his heart; and was, as the learned Grotius also mentions in the First Discourse, a man of God's countenance. After instance, he was often a giver of alms to the poor, when he was surprised by the presence of a Messenger from heaven standing before him in bright raiment. By the mouth of this celestial visitor, he was commanded to send for Peter, who said he, 'shall speak words to you, by which you and all your family shall be saved; and having done so, I will tell you where Peter was to be found, and his part.'

Does not the inquiry, Gentiles are crowded upon your minds.—Why could not God have told Cornelius by the Messenger, that was to visit him, and his family should be saved, without adopting the more circuitous way of sending or words of ten miles to and fro for Peter, and then crossing a valley in a 'season of fast days'?—Some would object to this plan, that Cornelius or some of his family might have died, and then whose fault would it have been, that they were lost? But, let such learn from the transactions at Caesarea, that God is not going to depart from his appointments and arrangements for the sake of obviating every casualty that may happen. The reason why God did not preach the Gospel to Cornelius by the Celestial Messenger was, because, Jesus had already appointed Peter to do it, when he gave him the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. Why was not Cornelius commanded to send for James, John, or Matthew? For precisely the same reason; because the Keys of the Heaven were not committed to them. 'Brethren! said Peter on another occasion, to the Apostles and Elders at Jerusalem, 'you know that God from among us chose, that the Gentiles, by my mouth, should hear the word of the Gospel,

and believe!—God had brought him down to Joppa, by his journeys, that he might be in readiness to obey the command; he was about to send him by the servants of Cornelius, before they had arrived, the Lord proceeded to prepare Peter for the interview. Let us then retrace our steps to Joppa, where he still remained.

The prejudices between the Jews and the Uncircumcised were inveterate. The Gentiles regarded the Jews as the unclean dogs, common, and unclean; while the Jews regarded them as dogs, common, and unclean; with whom it was unlawful for a Jew to join, or even to enter their houses. 'It is no meet to dogs,' said Jesus to the Syro Phenician, 'to give the children's Seven years;' and in this sentiment all Jews concurred. For circumcised persons, the Christian Church was composed solely of them; but the time had now arrived when the door was to be opened to the uncircumcised in the flesh, that they might be circumcised with the circumcision of Christ. But the national and religious prejudices was himself a Jew, and not his countrymen in their antipathies to the Gentiles.—You will see, therefore, the necessity and the importance of the occurrence which happened to Peter on Simon's house-top.

He had retired thither to pray. He became very hungry, and was in refreshment was preparing, he fell into a deep sleep, or profound abstraction. He saw something like a great sheet full of unclean and noxious animals; at the same time he heard a voice compelling to his hunger, and calling upon him to arise, kill, and satisfy his appetite. But, though hunger is said to break through stone walls, it was not strong enough to break through Peter's prejudice.—'By no means, Lord,' he replied, 'for I have never eat any thing common or unclean.'—But, the voice said, 'those things which God has cleaned, do not you call common.'—The moral of this is obviously, that God was about to cleanse or purify the Gentiles by faith, and therefore, they were no longer to be regarded as common or unclean.—This was Peter's understanding of the matter; for, says he, 'God has shown me, that I am to call no man common or unclean.'

The messengers of Cornelius having delivered their message, the Spirit ordered Peter to go with them, 'for,' said he, 'I must send them.' Cornelius sending in obedience to the Messenger from God, is termed the sending of the Spirit; and the same way; it may serve to show, that when a Church is a member of its Body, or sends him out any how, done in conformity with Scripture, and not otherwise, it is called and sent of God; and not otherwise.

Peter accompanied them, together with

the day after entered Cesarea, and the house of Cornelius; who observed that he, his relations, intimate friends, and household, were all assembled before God, to hear," continued he, "all the things which God had given Peter in charge."

Gentlemen, you will please to notice, that Peter did not act upon this occasion, as the Clerical Order is accustomed to do when its members go to visit the convicted, or to preach what it very mistakenly terms the Gospel. Here was a company of worshippers of the true God, whose prayers were acceptable to him. But you do not find the Apostle preface his proclamation, on this singularly important occasion, by abstracting from his pocket a hymn-book, or a Book of Common Prayer;—he and his six brethren, did not commence by singing a hymn to the praise, and glory of God, or by offering up a prayer, either read or spoken extemporarily, that 'God would be present, in their midst and that to bless them,' or that he would 'bless his word,' and convert many souls that day! No, Gentlemen, there was none of this; these are the mere inventions of your Order grafted upon the simple proclamation of the truth. Surely, if ever the preaching of the gospel ought to be preface by singing and prayer, this was the occasion for it. But you no where find such a plan adopted by the primitive preachers, no matter how many Christians were present. The worship of the Church, and the preaching of the Gospel to the world, were always separate and distinct. There is a time for every thing. A time to worship God and edify one another as Christians; and a time to address sinners in behalf of the truth. But I do not wonder at so much singing and 'praying,' as it is absurdly called, in your vulgar religious assemblies; confine these to the 'Church members' on the first day of the week, and your abstract gospellings would soon cease for want of hearers. It is the singing and ranting of this country, and not the preaching of the gospel, which crowds its temples with the vain, the giddy, the thoughtless, and the proud.

Well, the company being assembled, Peter opened his mouth, and proceeded immediately to the delivery of 'the message' God had given him in charge. It was like what all messengers ought to be, full of matter, but spare of words. He referred them to a certain report concerning Jesus of Nazareth with which they were familiar. He spoke of the immersion of John: the Anointing of Jesus with the Holy Spirit and with power; his benevolence; and communion with God. Testified to their truth; for he and his companions were witnesses of them.—Thus they established the report as true. He then referred to his death, and the manner of it; to his resurrection and subsequent manifestations to himself and apostolic brethren, who ate and drank with Him after he rose from the dead. He then came to the thing which was especially given in charge to the Apostles; namely, that God had appointed him to be 'the Judge

of the living and dead.' That he was testified by all the prophets; and that 'the subject matter of a part of their testimony was—

And here, Gentlemen, the Apostle is about in the declaration which follows, to open the Kingdom of Heaven to the Gentiles for the first time. It is interesting; yes, it is important beyond expression both to you and to me. It is that part of the Commission of the Kingdom upon which our rights as Gentiles are founded.

To Him, said Peter, all the prophets bear witness, that EVERY ONE WHO BELIEVES ON HIS SHALL RECEIVE REMISSION OF HIS SIN.

The way of Remission was now open to 'every one'; and the announcement was ratified by the Holy Spirit, descending upon all who were hearing the word; the proof of which was that luminous and cloven tongues sat upon each of them, and they spoke in ancient tongues, glorifying God; 'for,' said Peter, 'the Holy Spirit fell upon them even as upon us at the beginning.'—This celestial attestation came most opportunely. Peter laid hold of it as an argument that they should not be prevented from receiving "forgiveness by his name."—"Can immersed, who have received the Holy Spirit as well as we? Now objecting, he ordered them to be "baptized in the name of the Lord."

And here, Gentlemen, you will observe, that to receive forgiveness by the name of Jesus, is the same thing as to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the Remission of Sins. This is obvious from the declaration of Peter, which he followed up by a command. The same gospel was preached to the Jews on Pentecost, as to the Gentiles at Cesarea, and the obedience yielded by each was the same. They were baptized for the forgiveness of sins, of actual transgression, which the law of Moses could not blot out effectually. And consider furthermore, that this forgiveness is promised to those only who believe on Jesus. Pray, Gentlemen, how many of the infants you are in the practice of sprinkling, believe on the name of Christ? And if baptism into his name be for remission of sins, how many sins or transgressions, have they committed, before you asperse them, for which they need to be forgiven? And how can any one be baptized into the name of Jesus, who is ignorant of the testimony of prophets and apostles, (did I not tell you of him?) But your Order says, that there were hundreds in Paul's household! And how can this be, seeing that the Scriptures concerning them, that 'God purified their hearts by the word of faith, do you think they had in their hearts any other faith? Suppose we grant that there were some in the household, do you think they had in their hearts any other faith for the salvation of Cornelius' household? And how can they among the ferrety one who believe,

then addressed by the Apostle? Verily, Sirs, if you are so credulous as to believe, or rather sincerely think, that the gospel for remission of sins has any thing to do with animal infants, you have superstition enough to receive the grossest absurdities for the truth! Every ordinance of the New Institution is predicated on faith that works by love. That is, no one, man, woman, or child, can receive any advantage temporal or eternal, by observing any Christian ordinance, unless they do it believingly; and that belief will benefit them nothing if it works by fear instead of love. In the faith of a Christian there is no fear; for 'perfect love casteth out fear,' and there is no fear in love.' He believes and loves God, because he has been convinced that God first loved him. Your Church is aware of the importance of this principle concerning the necessity of faith; hence she appoints sponsors, or proxy-believers, in the facial aspersion of infants! But even these have no faith. They are credulous and superstitious, but of love to God they are destitute. Gentlemen, your Church admits the indispensability of baptism to salvation; but, as I have shown, your infantile aspersion is not baptism; therefore, she is self-condemned as without the ark of safety. Her ordinances are popish, unholly, useless. Your Church is the colossal oppressor of the poor; the persecutor of the widow, the fatherless, and the orphan; the adulterous ally of the Monarchy; pregnant with every lust, a dead weight about the energies of an ingenuous nation: unscriptural; antichristian, and a plague spot on the body Politic. *Can Schism from such a Church be a sin?*—Let us hear what one of your own Order says in relation to this in his Illustrations of the Book of Common Prayer.

"Our Liturgy," says the author, "was first established by the Convocation, or provincial Synods of the realm, and there by became OBLIGATORY *in foro conscientiarum*, and was then confirmed and ratified by the supreme magistrate in Parliament, and so also became OBLIGATORY *in foro civili*. It has, therefore, all authority, both ecclesiastical and civil. As it is established by ecclesiastical authority, those who separate themselves, and set up another form of worship, are *schismatics*; and consequently guilty of a *damnable sin*, which no *toleration* granted by the civil magistrate, can authorize or justify. But as it is settled by act of Parliament, the separating from it is only an offence against the State, and as such, may be pardoned by the State. The Act of Toleration, therefore, as it is called, has freed the Dissenters from being offenders against the State, notwithstanding their separation from the worship prescribed by the liturgy; but it by no means excuses or can excuse them from the schism they have made in the Church; they are still guilty of that sin, and will be so long as they separate, notwithstanding any temporal authority to indemnify them."

So speaks one of your 'Divines.' From this it is obvious,

that if the state were to leave the Dissenters to the tender mercies of 'the United Church of England and Ireland!' she would make them smart for their sin, as she used to do when aided by the State. Schism from such a Harlot is pronounced by one of her Merchants to be a 'Damnable Sin.' He pronounces the Dissenters still guilty of it; and therefore, in a damnable state! No doubt can be entertained, but that *Schism from the Church of Christ* is a heinous offence; but, Gentlemen, schism from a corrupt and antichristian community is a virtue, and expressly commanded by God. Your Church is notoriously corrupt. It never was the Church of Christ, nor ever will be. It is a part of the Antichristian Kingdom which goes to destruction. The signs of the times in England and Ireland should convince you of this. Your Church is falling; and its death-cries have reached these shores. All that would become the people of God are commanded to come out and be separate, and touch no unclean thing; and he will receive them "and I will be to you a father; and you shall be to me sons and daughters, says the Lord Almighty."

I have now brought to a close my remarks. I have endeavored to write in a "Christian Spirit," and have derived my 'views of the nature of this sin exclusively from the scriptures.' I have been 'eminently candid and impartial,' and have endeavored to 'compel you to detect and condemn as mortal a sin in yourselves.' I cannot charge you with having separated from the Church of Christ; because, as I have shown, you never belonged to it. In these letters I have exhibited to you what the truth is; if you receive it, you cannot fail to condemn yourselves as aliens to the Commonwealth of Israel. As uncircumcised by the circumcision of Christ, then, I address you, Gentlemen, on the importance of your turning from these episcopal vanities, to serve the living and true God as set forth by precept and example in the scriptures. What are all the honors of this passing existence compared to the crown of eternal life. If you would attain to that state of glory, renounce your ecclesiastical Order; come out from Babylon; believe the Gospel as preached by Jesus to the Jews and Gentiles; be immersed in the name of Peter for the Remission of your sins; and having thus began to do well, persevere in well-doing for the rest of your days, and at the Resurrection of the just, you will attain to glory, honor, and immortality.

That this may be your happiness is the unfeigned aspiration of
Excellent Sirs,

Your Fellow-Countryman and well-wisher

T. B. B.

P. S. As to the prize of £100, I put in no claim; I have the means of leading you to the obedience of the faith; I am ready to confer upon me, not £100 only, but your prayers also. I shall therefore wait till then for my reward.

have to bestow. Should I succeed in turning you from your vanities to righteousness, you will be gems in my crown in the Kingdom of the Father; where his saints shine as the stars for ever. Amen.

From the Millennium Harbinger.

DR. THOMAS' SECOND LETTER.

The November No. of the *Advocate* is come to hand. As usual the Apocalypse, the organization of the brain, and the theory of Dr. Thomas' newly invented man, chiefly engross its 36 duodecimos. About the one-third of them are addressed to his "dear brother Campbell," whom he has now converted into a dictator, dogmatist, and persecutor. Every single point worthy of any notice, I believe is found fully anticipated in my late Extra, which he had not then seen. I should, perhaps, except the new titles he has bestowed on me; for really I was not prepared to expect that he should convert Bethany into Rome, myself into the Pope, and my declaration to the world that I had no fellowship with his new doctrines, into a bull of excommunication. I fear nothing from this abuse. If my past and public labors do not shield me from such maliciousness, I should not expect to do it by any defence I could offer. Every instance of church discipline will afford the same scope for the same language from such men, till the Lord comes.

I am happy to learn from numerous and authentic sources, that the Doctor's partizans are indeed very, very few—only one or two here and there out of his own immediate neighborhood. It is due to the brethren abroad that this should be known, because the Doctor has sought to make the impression that his new-ramped theory of human bodies and their earthly destinies is somewhat popular in Virginia. It is questionable, I learn, whether one dozen of persons in this commonwealth believe them. There may be a very few who regard them as innocent speculations: but, if I may believe a great variety of testimony, he has not made perhaps twelve converts as the fruit of his three years labor of tongue, pen, and press. But this, with him, may be proof of their truth and excellency. The morality of some of his representations, and of extracts from letters, and colorings, is to some minds as questionable as the truth of his new doctrines. For my own part, I now have as little fellowship for the one as for the other. The inuendoes about my letter to Albert Anderson, and some other matters of the same genus, have confirmed my former doubts. My letter to brother Anderson is his property. If he agrees to its publication, it would much rather see it all published in the *Advocate*, than these unjustified and unjustifiable allusions to it.

Other persons in Virginia, I learn, wish their whole letters to be published, rather than the extracts which have appeared; for their views are greatly misrepresented by the extracts given to the public. All this with me is as immoral as the *Advocate's* speculations are schismatical.

I think the allusion to brother Shepherd, Editor of the *Primitive Christian*, in his last letter to me, as if brother Shepherd was a Materialist of Dr. Thomas' school, is injurious to brother Shepherd and calculated falsely to prejudice the public mind. The puff he gives brother Shepherd's writing talents for liberty to use his name in this way, will not be deemed by the *Primitive Christian* as a sufficient price for the use of his name on the backside of the *Apostolic Advocate*. Brother Shepherd had better take an inventory of the estate before he risks any thing on the adventure. I know the *Primitive Christian* has *cautiousness* well developed.

There is a very pretty little criticism, indeed, on the Savior's exposition of Sadduceism, from the pen of our brother Walshall of Virginia, in a late *Primitive Christian*, copied into the *Advocate*, which I intend to present to my readers some of these days, with a full dissertation on that memorable refutation of Sadduceism, the meaning of which I am fully persuaded has never yet entered into the mind of some gentlemen. Independent of the value of the argument deduced therefrom against these speculations, it deserves a full investigation for the sake of the reputation of its author and the good sense of his whole audience in admitting its irresistible conviction. For as the matter now stands in our days, I do not think one in a thousand of the readers of the *New Testament* understands it; and I am morally certain it is as completely hid from the eyes of all those called Materialists as were the pretensions of the Messiah, from those who crucified him. A. C.

LETTER THIRD.

The Editor to Mr. Alexander Campbell

Greeting.

I am constrained thus to address you by a desire not to offend you by the phrase "dear brother." I would substitute "dear sir," were it not that I perceive, that the memory of "dear," when written by my obnoxious self, is unconsciously received. I could invite you by a simple *Sir*; but then I should be visited, perhaps, by the acrimonious reflections of those who are accustomed to make me an offender for a word. It would be said, that your notice of my last letter is as a vindictive, or perhaps, an angry notice, and that from me to return you evil for evil, or notice of notice, would give me credit for entertaining a malignant

feeling than existed in the breast of Paul when he withstood Peter to his face for his dissimulation, I can assure you, the notwithstanding all that has passed between us, I bear you no ill-will. There is no man living who can come forward and truly testify, that I have ever spoke a disrespectful word concerning you. The worst I have ever said is before the public. I cannot understand how it is, that you so uniformly misinterpret me. I am willing to take you as meaning what you say; why, then, can you not do me the same justice? You compel me to infer, either that you are blinded by prejudice against me, or that you are unhappily the victim of some disguised enemies unknown to me. If it were otherwise, how is it that all who read the Advocate do not coincide with you in your judgment of me? I could name men in these parts as intelligent, as faithful, as moral, as self-denying, and as influential in society as any in the country who acquit me of the things you lay to my charge, and who consider the course you have taken as exceedingly reprehensible. They are brethren of good standing in the several churches to which they belong. They are not of the number of those, who scarcely ever make their appearance at the worship of God, unless a preacher comes along; on the contrary, they are pillars in the churches, and honorable defenders of the doctrine of Christ in their several vicinities. From such it is, that I have received assurances that the Advocate shall be sustained. It is they who strengthen my hands, and will strengthen them so long as I plead faithfully for what I believe to be true. If you want a character of any man would you not inquire of those who know him best? Who are observers of his every day walk and conduct in society? It is such, then, that have testified to you, that I deserve better and more Christianlike, treatment than I have received at your hands.

Are you not a "dictator?"—Have you not dictated to the church to which I belong what they were to do with me; and to sister churches what they are to do in case I am not excised by the Painesville brethren? There can be no question as to your dogmatizing upon what you are pleased to term my dogmatism; and certainly, the spirit with which you bear down upon me is very like pursuing me to social reprobation.

You have not noticed "every single point worthy of my notice." I have yet seen no notice of that point which relates to the founding of your Decree upon the report of an enemy. I am just returned from Lunenburg, where I learned, that the writer of that report said, in effect, to one of our brethren, that he did not give it as a report of what I said at the Debate, but as his conclusions from what I spoke there and have written in the Advocate. So that you will discover that a deception has been practised upon your too easy faith. Why did you

seize upon this so greedily? Was it out of good will to me? Or from a more kindred feeling for a brother Methodist?

I have bestowed no "new title" upon you. I merely carried out an idea of your own suggestion. You should not be so free with the use of figures, if you are not prepared for their extension. You said, Dr. Thomas has passed the Rubicon. This suggested to me the passage in my last to which you refer. The Rubicon was the fluvial boundary of Julius Caesar's province. When he crossed it with his troops it was to make war upon the liberties of Rome towards which he marched. If then it were said, that I had passed the Rubicon, what more natural than to suppose, that I was marching in Caesar's steps, and upon another Rome? I did not convert you into the Pope;—though I confess, that to my mind, your course towards me has been exceedingly arbitrary, and such as no son of liberty would succumb to without a stern defence. If this be to call you the Pope, then be it so.

What follows is not a fair statement. You say, "I should convert my (A. C.'s) declaration, in the world that I had no fellowship for his new doctrines, into a Bull of Excommunication." It was not the doctrines only, but myself that you cut off from your communion or fellowship. You said p. 513, "I have no further object in these remarks than to give my reasons why I can no longer regard him" (this bold speculator Dr. Thomas, as you term me) "as a brother in the Lord." Thus you prejudged my case, and called upon my brethren here to ratify what you had done, in your elevation above all squeamishness. Is not this excommunicating me myself as well as my views, from your communion or fellowship? If it be not, I know not what it is.

And this carrying out of your own figure, and calling your separation of me from your fellowship by its right name, you term "abuse?" Your temperament, I suspect, is a very nervous one; its texture must be extremely sensitive; for, it is plain, that you are very easily abused. I once thought, from the roughness with which you handled your opponents, that it would take much rallying and long before you would acknowledge yourself "abused?" I have learned, however, from experience, that it takes much less to abuse a great man than one of small account.

"Maliciousness?" I am not actuated by malice, but the wrong side to be malicious. You have put me on the defensive. It is the plaintiff, and not the defendant, who is against whom such a crime should be imputed. I do not believe me, I have not a space of malice in my heart, I could not find it in my heart, to injure any man, or to tread upon any wheat, for totting up my wheat, much less so, as you do, when on the side of truth, is the noblest and most generous nature. You mistake, I am not a subject of "church

plise," unless, indeed, the church is embodied in the person of Alexander Campbell.

You are happy to learn from authentic sources that my "partizans are very, very few." I am glad that for once, even in this stage of our affairs, that I possess the power of augmenting this happiness, so authentically derived. My "partizans" as you term some of the brethren whom you fellowship, are not only "very, very few," but as far as I know, absolutely not-existing. There is not a single brother within the range of my personal acquaintance, that I could venture to call my "partizan." The brethren know, and can testify, that I have never made a single effort, or manifested the least disposition to make a partizan. Bro. A. Anderson, in whom, you say, you have the fullest confidence, once remarked to me, that he did not believe that such was my desire, because, if it were, I did not make the effort necessary to effect it. No; no; to head a party has no charms for me. I know too well the inconsistency of men's allegiance to their leaders; I am too well acquainted with the fickleness of humanity, to propose to myself any such bauble as an object of ambition.

But there is a party, and a growing one too, for the truth as it is in Jesus. This party, though not quite "150,000," acknowledge me as a brother and a fellow-partizan. We labor together for our leader, whose name is neither Campbell nor Thomas, but TRUTH. We do not seek to make the impression that this Leader is "popular," for he unquestionably is not; yet he can number in this commonwealth more followers in his train than "one dozen persons." Upon this point your informers do not agree in testimony. A one-eyed "Spectator" who writes in the Southern Religious Telegraph, says concerning me, "yet he has followers. Who in this enlightened land of ours cannot obtain followers? A Fanny Wright can have them; a Matthias can have them; and why not a Dr Thomas? In one section of this county (Lunenburg) his followers are numerous;" and he might have added powerful: for he continues, "they have ejected the old Baptists from one of their Churches, and instead of the pure christian morality inculcated by them, they have, under the cloak of religion, planted infidelity." So then, you perceive, that your informers testify that they are few; and "Spectator," an episcopalian brother (!) as it is said, declares that they are numerous in the county in which he lives, and where the Debate occurred! But, as I have said, they neither of them testify the truth, for I have no followers at all. For instance, if I were to venture to teach, that a man might attain to the Resurrection of the Just, without becoming a citizen of the Kingdom, as it is, in the only appointed way, my influence would take its evil wings and fly away. They would charge me, and very justly, with falsehood, and soon call me to order as a good many have done you

and it is because, they prefer to follow TRUTH rather than me, that you have been the subject of so much unavailing vexation of late.

I cannot tell exactly, whether I have made "twelve" or more than "converts" during the last "three years." Suppose one of the "150,000" reformers were to make twelve converts in three years, would it not be doing great things? There would then be no less than 1,800,000! Then if each of those were to do the same, we should have in six years from this time 21,600,000 converts, which would be about seven millions, six hundred thousand more than the population of the United States! And that too without any abatement for the infantile portion of the nation! So that, upon the whole, if I had made no more than your "great variety of testimony" testifies, I shall have done my duty, for three years at least. But suppose that I live 21 years longer, and that I convert during that period twelve persons every three years, at the end of that time I shall have converted eighty-four; which will be doing well, provided they are turned to righteousness. Further, if I were to make no more converts, but that each of my twelve were to convert twelve each, and these were to do the same thing, and so on, every three years, the aggregate of the whole in twenty-one years would be 129,931,696; but if I were to continue converting at the rate of twelve every three years in concert with them, by the same rule our converts would far exceed the population of the globe. Despair not therefore, the conversion of twelve persons in three years by one man. Its effects upon society would be incalculable, if every Christian were or could do, the same thing. But how many converts have each of your "great variety of testimony" made? I know for certain, that there are very few reformers east of the Blue Ridge, that have convinced and converted twelve adults within three years.

But, when I reflect, that at the end of three years and a half all the permanent converts of Jesus upon whom he chiefly relied, did not exceed twelve; and that of these, one was a traitor, another renounced him with oaths and curses, and all forsook him and fled, I am not distressed at the fewness of the converts I am alleged to have made. But I would observe, that I am not solicitous to make converts. I leave others to convert while I convince. I leave others to build upon the foundation I endeavor to lay. I rejoice to hear of the conversion or baptism into Christ, by other brethren, of the persons whose minds I have sowed the good seed. Paul converted more than Crispus and Gaius; and the household of Stephanas at Corinth: because he was sent not to baptize, but to preach the gospel, or to convince the hearers, and judgment to come. The more converts he gave to him, as it is to me; for of course, the more that it can be established, that I "baptize"

I will relate an incident to you which opened my eyes to the unsoundness of the proselyting system of "this Reformation." On my first tour in Virginia, I addressed a considerable audience in one of the lower counties. My subject was, on the first day, Peter's discourse on Pentecost; on the next, the Little Kingdom cut out of the Mountains. After I had closed the subject, I exhorted my hearers to enter into that Kingdom which exists now in principle; but my exhortations failed. Every countenance was composed; not a head bowed; no handkerchief concealed the face of the penitent; not an eye glistened with the tear of contrition or of joy. My exhortation finished; some hymns, or 'recruiting songs,' were struck up. They were animating by their exciting sounds. What a change then ensued! The feelings were wrought upon; and what the truth could not do of itself, the singing effected. Many sobbed and cried; but for what—I myself could scarcely repress my feelings: I could have cried too, but I struggled successfully to maintain my gravity. It was animal sympathy. These individuals cried copiously; still they hung back: and it was only by personal persuasive efforts that certain ventured up. Others then followed, and before the meeting closed, sixteen came forward to be immersed. Were their tears, of sorrow or of joy? If of sorrow, why did they not cry before the singing began? If of joy, why did they not immediately come forward and demand to be baptized in the name of Christ, without so much ado? If they were tears of sorrow, surely the speediest way of getting quit of their affliction, was to demand instant baptism for the Remission of Sins. But this is not the worst of the matter, for I have since learned that for the most part, these converts have failed to adorn the doctrine of God as become saints.—On another occasion, nearer the sea shore, I spoke about four hours and a half on the Resurrection of Christ and its connexion with the doctrine of Remission of Sins. My audience was deeply interested; I do not remember that one left his seat the whole time. At the conclusion not one came forward. But in two or three weeks after, a brother visited them, and immersed *thirteen* in whose minds I had sown the seed. I could mention similar instances; but these will suffice. I claim no applause; if any real good was done, to the Truth of God be all the glory.

My conviction is, that if they were not for so much singing, we should bear very little of the great proselytings of the West.—We are to judge of things by their fruits. What is the value of such proselyts as those described by Bro. Tompkins in our last. Do the majorities of these thirties, and hundreds live among their neighbors as 'shining lights': are they marked as 'a peculiar people, zealous of good works': are they careful not to forsake the assembling of themselves together; do they meditate in the word day and night; is it their meat and their

drink to do the will of their father who is in heaven? If these things be so, happy are they; and if such be their practices, why do we from time to time read such heavy complaints of their apathy and worldly-mindedness even in the Harbinger? The bane of this age is the old evil by which the Church of Christ was desolated in the third century. It flattered the vanity of the hishops and greatly augmented their influence and consideration among men, to crowd their churches with neophytes. In this way, the Church was soon confounded with the world: an amalgamation, which, unless a halt be sounded, bids fair to alloy and finally extinguish the virtue, purity, and excellence of "this Reformation." This proselyting through thick and thin, is but a version, somewhat revised and corrected, of those sectarian efforts which 'compass sea and land' to the same end. And we see the working of the system. The fruits of the Camp-meeting, the Revival, the Big and Protracted Meetings are inundating their communions, and will certainly ultimate in their desolation.

In reading the scriptures, I discover no such manner of proselyting as I have seen in the East and West. In the Day of Spiritual gifts, "the Lord added to the Church the saved."—How?—By confirming the word by the miracles and signs, by which it was accompanied. In that Day, those who possessed the Oracles of God, 'searched the scriptures,' and therefore they believed. And again, 'the congregations walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the admonition of the Holy Spirit, were multiplied.' There is not a single instance on record in which men were made Christians by singing; or by the mechanism of a big or protracted meeting. I am persuaded that the Lord has little or nothing to do in adding very many to this reformation; if he had we should certainly behold a very different state of things.

The Churches need improvement in faith, hope, and practice. The first thing to be attended to, is to enlarge their conceptions, to build them up in their most holy faith, and to discipline them, like a well trained and compactly organized regiment, in the practice of their spiritual exercises. This conviction is one cause why you receive such 'a great variety of testimony' about the fewness of the baptisms I administer. I am for christianizing men through the Congregations of God. If we can succeed in bringing them to 'walk in the fear of the Lord,' the admonitions of the Holy Spirit, they will be multiplied as a matter of course; but, if not, then they are nothing but stumbling blocks in the way of truth. Besides, I set a shining light, or as you would say, the darkness. Will be it so. According to your plan, the world is to be converted by the conversation of the World, which is a mere human plan, unless aided by miracles and the power of the Holy Spirit; but according to my darkness, I propose, that

the Church, or Lamb's wife, for the reception of the Lord at his Second Coming, which I believe to be near. In the pursuit of your object, the word does not sustain you; but in laboring to accomplish mine, I have 'the sure word of prophecy more firm'; which to me is 'as a light shining in a dark place' to which I labor to take heed. But convert as many as you can with all my heart, if your talent lie that way: only take care that you turn them to the Truth and not to Gospel Nulification. I am sure in such a work, I wish you heartily God speed.

When you have proved the "morality" of some of your own "representations, and extracts from letters, and colougings," it will be time enough for me to meet your new accusation of immorality. You say that you have now as little fellowship for the morality of my representations, &c. as for the truth of my new doctrines. You would make your readers suppose that this was a new thing. You mistake the word new, as if you had retained me in fellowship till 1838; when in fact you forestalled the decision of the church and cut me off in November, three months before. I refer you to the Address of the Church in Painesville for my defence.

If Bro. A. Anderson object not, I will publish the whole of your letter to him: of course you will publish it in the Harbinger. My allusions are neither "unjustified" nor "unjustifiable." As I have said, I read it myself in the audience of 15 or 20 brethren, who justified me and reprobated you. Let the persons whose views are greatly misrepresented by the extracts which I am alleged to have given to the public, explain to me, and, if I can, I will address their grievances. I suspect, you learn a great deal more about me and my affairs than I know myself; if guilty, which I deny, and it I love covers a multitude of sins, you evidently show that that love towards me has no place in your breast. We are exhorted to 'lay down our lives for the brethren'; nay, more, to love even our enemies; whether that disposition be in you, I leave others to say; I see not an inkling of it when my brethren and I happen to cross your path. But I suppose, that my being turned out of God's family or house by you, reduces me to the condition of one unbegotten and unborn; and that therefore you are not bound by such considerations towards me. Very well, if not before, we will settle this matter when the Lord comes.

All who know me, know very well, that I am not given to puffing. It would come with as bad a grace from me as flattery. But, if I did "puff" Bro. Sheperd's writing talents, did you not egregiously puff off the Christian Publisher; and in so doing puff off your own spirit and praise? See Mill. Harb. 668. This periodical was designed for the re-publication of much of the Christian Herald; which intimation it regularly fulfills. In speaking of its excellence, therefore, you commend your own writings; a commendation, indeed, they are entitled to; though

it would come better from another source. I wish well to Bro. Colman's paper so long as he pleads for the Gospel for Remission and a title to Eternal Life.

I believe Bro. Silas Sheperd to be an honest man and a Christian. He may have "cautiousness" well developed; but I am persuaded it has not yet degenerated into expediency. It is no compliment to Bro. S. to appeal to his fears. I doubt not, but he will follow out his convictions of the truth, though he should be found in company with myself; and discover, that to be found in such company, exposed him to the pains and penalties of an edict from Bethany. I have no inducements to offer him; on the contrary, if he would be popular let him stand aloof from me at present. This is my day of trial. God will defend the right. I can stand without his patronage or yours. If he or you are disposed to be friendly, I will reciprocate the disposition; if not, then stand to your arms. It will require a good battle to subdue me. I prefer peace; but am prepared for war; so weigh the matter well.

You have promised us some new light on Christ's refutation of Sadduceism: you have already given us your view in what you termed your "17th Argument," or most triumphant refutation of Sadduceism and Materialism." Bro. Walthall's article, which he requested me to insert, is to show that you had mistaken the whole matter; and now you are going to give us a *tertium quid* which has never yet entered into the mind of one in a thousand! What a pity you should leave the "materialists" in the dark upon the matter till "some of these days," a very indefinite period, should arrive. To me this looks very much like a put off. But we shall see!

A word or so about Bro. A. B. Walthall, and I have done for the present. You term him "our brother;" while me you refuse to fellowship. Now there is not a shade of difference between him and me on the points at issue in relation to Resurrection and Eternal Life. He accompanied me to the Debate, and approved my defence. You see his name as one of our Elders attached in the document which you have called forth. We esteem him highly, in these parts, as an intelligent, faithful, and orderly citizen, both of the Kingdom of Christ, and of the Commonwealth of Virginia. Now, how is it, with the evidence of his alleged "Sadduceism and Materialism" before your eyes, you can call him, so homely, "our brother Walthall;" while for me, the worse epithet appears to be the good? You are evidently partial. If I am no better than deluded Mormonite, neither is he; for things equal to us are equal to one another. I perceive that your generalists in procribing me, and in flattery all other generalists who sustain me. If they are vulnerable, they may succeed to a certain extent. But they know how to use them. They already

of your bearing towards me, and towards others, who believe the same things. "Divide and conquer" may do in some cases; but it cannot be practised in relation to those, who believe from their hearts, *the truth*. I cannot help concluding, therefore, from all the premises before me, that your alienation in reference to me, is *not doctrinal* but *personal*.

Liberty, Amelia, Va.

Jan. 27, 1833.

The Earth as it was, a Type of the World as it is.

Dear Brother Thomas,

In reading the description given by Jeremiah of the state of the world just before the Millennium (chap. iv. v. 23 &c.) I was struck with the similarity between the Prophet's description and that given by Moses of the creation—(Gen. ch. i. v. 2. &c.): Moses says, "The Earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep;" Jeremiah says, "I beheld the Earth, and lo, it was without form and void; and the heavens, and they had no light. And Isaiah in the li. chap. v. 3, in describing the state of the world after its renovation or during the Millennium, says,— 'For the Lord shall comfort Zion: he will comfort all her waste places; and he will make her wilderness like Eden, and her desert like the garden of the Lord; joy and gladness shall be found therein, thank-giving and the voice of melody.'" So that when we look at the world in a moral or religious point of view, we may in truth say it is without form and void—instead of Eden, the garden of the Lord in which Adam held sweet converse with God, we behold nothing but waste places and deserts—all is chaos and confusion; and as God by his word arranged and organized the elements of the physical world and caused the sea and the land to appear, and the light to exist; and thus created the physical world; so he will, by his word, arrange and organize the elements of the moral world, and thus create the new Heavens and new Earth wherein dwells righteousness.

A. B. WALTHALL.

Anecdote.

"It is said that about the time Paine published his *Age of Reason*, a certain Bishop in England offered two men a guinea each, to burn Paine's *Effigy*; they very readily engaged to do it, not out of any ill-will to Paine, or good-will to the Bishop; but for the sake of the money. Soon after this, a friend of Paine, told these same men he would give them two guineas more to

burn the *Bishop's Effigy*; they immediately agreed to do so, and received the money. While burning it, a stranger passed by, and asked them whose *Effigy* they were burning? they replied they could not tell, they were hired to do it, but said they believed it was some *Bishop's Effigy*.

Many things of this kind take place in the same way; one man sets one to defame the character of another; while the one who does it, has no more design of injuring the man, than the men had who burnt both of the Effigies for the sake of four guineas.

There are many professors of religion at the present day, who appear willing that honest, well-meaning men should suffer, if by the means they can live in ease, and be considered right, in things which abound with contradictions."

PSALM XVI.—C. M.

Messiah prays to God to preserve him in his distress, and declares, that his happiness is centered in Him, and 'his delight in the Holy Ones of Israel. In view of his own acceptable sacrifice, he predicts the calamities of those Jews who should reject Him; and avers that He would not present their offerings to Jehorah. In view of his exaltation, he expresses his confidence in God, that, though he should become the tenant of a tomb, yet He would not give him up to corruption; but would raise him from the dead, and place him at his own right hand in the fulness of joy.

O God, preserve me, for to thee
Do I for succor look;
I to Jehovah have declar'd,
Thou art my Lord in truth;

Without thee I've no happiness!
The holy in the Land,
And those whose lives in good excel,
In them is my delight.

Their sorrows shall be multiplied
Who to another haste;
Their bleeding offerings I'll not own
Nor yet their names express.

The Lord's my portion and my cup—
Thou wilt maintain my holiness;
My lines in pleasant places are
Yes, I've a good estate.

The Lord, who cares for me, I'll bless;
In th' night my heart instructs:
Yea, I before me always set
The Lord Jehovah God;

Because he at my right hand is
I shall not be confound'd:
My heart on this account is glad,
My mind rejoiceth too;

My flesh shall also dwell secure:
For thou'lt not give me up
To th' grave; nor yet the pit allow
Thine Holy One to see.

To me thou'lt show the path of life;
Of joy there's fulness is
Before thy face; at thy right hand
Are pleasures evermore.

The history of the Jews since the Destruction of Jerusalem is a striking illustration of the fulfilment of the prediction in the third verse. The rejection of Jesus as their Messiah was the cause of that dreadful calamity. Let the reader study the two last verses. Jesus though dead dwelt securely in the tomb; God did not yield him up to the grave, nor did He permit him to see the pit, that is, to go to corruption. The path from the tomb to life, which Jesus trod was that of the Resurrection by which he entered into the presence of Jehovah.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

A letter has been received from King and Queen which shall be attended to. We intended to have inserted Parmenas, and others in this number, but have been prevented by other matters. They shall soon appear and in due order. We thank others for the assurances they have given us of their stability in this day of thunder and lightning. Our electric rod has saved us thus far. We thank God and take courage.—We have forwarded Bro. J. T. Johnson the numbers he has written for.

We are requested to state for the information of some distant friends, that Susra, wife of Bro. Musco GARNET, fell asleep in Christ, at Laurel Grove, Essex, Va. on Dec. 19, 1837. She died much respected, and in the full assurance of faith. Levity is often less foolish, and gravity less wise than such of them appear.—LAWSON.

THE "A" DEVOTIONAL

Vol. 4. 4 Amos County, Va., February, 1838.

CHRISTIAN WORSHIP AND FRIENDSHIP.

"And they (the Apostles) followed (the Lord) in the teaching, in the fellowship, in the breaking of bread, in the prayers of the Apostles."—Acts 2, 42.

The true Christian worship is alone divine; and the honour of all worship: extant was divinely appointed. The word is used to signify these acts, either in general or in detail by which men draw near to God. Hence, there are many kinds of worship as there are sects among mankind; each sect has its own worship and order thereof. But worship is homage paid to the Supreme, with whom mankind is in terms of friendship. Man has offended God; reason, therefore, teaches that it is the prerogative of the Most High to dictate to men in what way they may approach his Majesty. The first Pair when shame and fear, the certain signs of guilt, invaded their consciences, thought to hide their own nakedness by raiment of their own contrivance. But the Lord rejected it. He clothed them according to his own mind, and appointed them the skins of sacrifices instead of the bloody foliage of the tree. When they entered his prepared clothing with their own device they were judged and condemned; but when wrapped in apparel of his appointment we find them walking in the favor of God; as in the case of Abel. Cain is an example of the light in which God views the worship of men, when not according to his appointment. "And he brought of the firings of his flock and of the fat thereof." And the Lord had respect unto Abel and to his offering. And it may be asked, why?—Because it was worship according to the Lord's appointment.—Cain brought of the fruit of the ground a (bloodless) offering to the Lord. But when Cain saw that his offering he had not respect. And why?—Because it was not according to appointment. God, and not man, is the Judge. He had respect to the offering of Abel, because it was a part of what he had appointed. What God appoints to do, man should do, and man should do it in the way that God appoints. And man should do it in the way that God appoints. And man should do it in the way that God appoints.

office of the wicked is an abomination to God."—"If thou dost worship, O Cain, shalt thou not be accepted? and if thou dost not, wilt thou perish as the doer?"

If a general invade a country and subdue its inhabitants, does he permit them to determine the homage or worship they will yield? Does he not rather appoint the homage himself, and exact it upon pain of his sore displeasure? If he were to require of them two million of dollars in specie per annum, would he be content, if they were to lay at his feet worn out notes to that nominal amount? They might urge, that they thought that these would do; but would the general admit their *thinkings* as an equivalent to an actual obedience to his edict?—Reason and history testify, that such a principle has no place in the affairs of victors and the vanquished. Neither will God admit it; as all his dealing: with men attest. His King is the mighty hero, whose laws will be made victorious. 'Tis he that will give laws to the Nations; it is they who must obey or be exterminated.

Cain and Abel are the types, as it were, of "the Sons of Men" and "the Sons of God." The Sons of Men are the genuine anti-types of Cain. Like Cain, they acknowledge that offerings should be made to God; and like him, they claim the right of choosing their own ways or worship. The Cainites are an erring, headstrong, disobedient, and presumptuous class of men. They pass under the names of Atheist, Deist, Infidel, Catholic, Protestant, Mohammedan, Jew, and Pagan. They all worship something they call God, according to their own appointments, and in their own order. They are a stiff-necked and perverse generation. They are willing to do any thing, but the right thing; and this they will excuse themselves from doing by every conceivable subterfuge or evasion. The Abellites, on the other hand, require only to know what God commands, and straightway to do it. This is the very essence of doing well.

There is this essential difference then, between the worship of the Sons of God, and the worship of the Cainites;—the former worship God according to his appointments; which is, therefore, a worship in spirit and truth, or divine; while the latter worship according to their own devices, which is therefore, "will-worship," or human. As to the Sons of God, it is written,—"the Father requires such to worship him," and to the Cainites the Scriptures saith, "in vain do ye worship me teaching for doctrine the traditions of men."

The homage or worship which God requires of men under this Dispensation is twofold; first, as regards sinners, and secondly, as respects the Saints. He does not look sinners in particular for the adoration of the Saints, and if of course he cannot. These two classes of men in the sight of God are so distinct or distinct, and as far removed as darkness and light, true and

truth, disobedience and obedience, rebels and worshippers, false and true worshippers. The worship which God requires of sinners is to obey the Gospel; and the worship which God requires of the Saints is an unreconciled state towards God. There is no way in which they can be reconciled. God is not reconciled to them, and has appointed the way by which they may become reconciled to him. He has provided the means of reconciliation. A belief of and obedience to the Gospel is the means. If they will not believe and obey the Gospel, the consequence will be fatal, and they will have only themselves to blame. The Gospel stands between them and God; if they would worship him acceptably they must obey the Gospel. Let them not deceive themselves. God is not to be mocked; he cannot deny himself. Their prayers, songs, alms-deeds, &c., are sacrifices in which as coming from them he takes no delight. The blind Jew, whom Jesus restored to sight, has stated this truth in fit and appropriate terms, to the confusion of all the hierarchies of Anti-christ who teach the contrary;—"we know," said he, "that God hears not sinners; but if any man worship God, and obey him, that man he hears." Transgression be no longer deceived by the pretended "Ministers of Christ" who invite among you like wolves in sheep's clothing. They tell you to go up to their altars, that they may pray for you. Their altars are no altars at all. Their prayers are of no virtue. They are sinners like yourselves, whose supplications are false and abominable in his sight. They are deceivers and deceived. They neither know the truth themselves, nor have they observed that they do know the truth, so much that they dare to lead if they obey it not. They are blind, leaders of the blind, and they know if the blind lead the blind both will fall into the ditch. They and you may be sincerely blind; but remember if you approach the edge of the ditch your sincerity cannot save you from falling in; nothing but sight can deliver you. So if you travel on to the grave in mental blindness you will fall into perdition; unless the truth give sight to your mental eyes before it be too late.

The Saints, under this dispensation, are those, and only those, who have obeyed the Gospel. A Saint is a baptized believer of the Gospel. The term signifies a holy one. The Holy One is Jesus; the holy ones are his genuine disciples. There are no such things as Saints, who believe that they are the Christ, repent, and fall short of perfect obedience to the Gospel. If there be in the world other persons who are true Saints, they must be spontaneous, for they are not mentioned in the New Testament. The only Saints mentioned in the New Testament are those who were baptized with water in the name of Jesus Christ, and who were obedient to his commands. They were not those who were baptized with water in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and who were obedient to his commands. They were not those who were baptized with water in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and who were obedient to his commands. They were not those who were baptized with water in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and who were obedient to his commands.

The Saints, then, or baptized believers of the Gospel, standing in a different relation to God than the unholy, have a different worship to observe suited to their state and character.—This worship is composed of the institutions enumerated in the passage prefixed to this article. The continuing steadfast in the teaching, fellowship, breaking of the loaf, and prayers of the Apostles, implies, that the disciples not only witnessed the performance of these acts, but did in very deed participate in them. They heard, believed, and practiced the teaching of the Apostles; they sold their estates and laid the produce at the Apostles' feet, that the Apostles might distribute to the necessities of all the Saints; they eat of the loaf which the Apostles broke; and they with heart and mind added their "Amen" to the Apostles' prayers. All these things were "of the Apostles," because, they taught the Saints to observe these, and themselves personally administered them.

But some may say it these be the sum and substance, the part and the whole, of the worship of the Saints; how is it that even we who contend only for what is written practice, exhortation, singing, giving of thanks, and drinking of wine? seeing that no mention is made of these things in Acts ii. 42.—To this we would reply;—that the four things mentioned in this verse are *four institutions*, which are themselves made up of component parts. The institution of Apostolic teaching comprehends *prophecy* or "the speaking to men for edification, and exhortation, and consolation" as well as teaching;—the institution of the Fellowship comprehends the providing of all things necessary for the wants of the Body of Christ;—the institution of the Breaking of the Loaf comprehends the giving of thanks for the true bread which came down from heaven, &c.; the pouring out of the Wine; the giving of thanks for what it represents; the partaking of the bread and wine by all the Saints; and the *hymning of the praises* as well as the breaking of the loaf;—and the institution of the Prayers comprehends "supplications, intercessions, and thanksgivings" as well as prayers; to all of which the Believers said "Amen."

As to the Order of this Divine Worship a few words may be added. It is one of the attributes of a good historian to narrate events in the order of their occurrence. Luke wrote under the guidance of one who was perfect in this respect as in all others. Luke's experience of the congregations was complete. He was well acquainted with their faith and practice in all their parts. What more probable, then, but that he would in writing an account of their acts of assembly record their transactions in the order in which they uniformly took place. Even supposing that the order as set down in historical Acts ii. 42, were only probable, in their view among us an order of worship amounting even to a probability?—The order observed in the Churches of "this reformation" as far as

I know, with one or two exceptions, has no countenance in the New Testament. The elders follow their own views. Hence in one Church, the worship begins with prayers, in another with singing, in a third with reading, and so forth; so that there is an entire want of uniformity. Some object to the order as exhibited in Acts ii. 42, and contend that the worship ought to commence with prayers; because, say they, Paul says "I exhort first of all that supplications, prayers, &c. be made;" and yet they are inconsistent enough to sing "first of all," so that we can but regard their objection as peculiar and wasteful. They cannot certainly believe that there is any force in their argument, or, if honest, they would assuredly follow out their convictions. Will these objectors prove that Paul's meaning is "I exhort, that when you come together on the Lord's Day, the first thing of all others you do is to pray?"—To me, it appears, that, when he said "I exhort, first of all, he meant I exhort especially, that when you pray, you make intercessional prayers, and supplications for kings, and all who are in authority, &c." if he meant first of all in order, why has he not said what is to be done, second or third, or fourth of all?—For my own part, I always prefer that which is more evident in that which is less so; now there is more evidence for the order of Acts ii. 42, than for the ever-varying course of the Churches called "Reformed." I prefer, therefore, to follow it, and whenever I have opportunity to recommend it as worthy of all reception.

A place for every thing, and for every thing a place. In the first place, then, THE TEACHING. The Holy Spirit being the Teacher of the Saints, and the Apostolic and prophetic writings containing all that can edify, console, and instruct, being the fruits of his inspiration, the Scriptures should be first examined by reading and collation as the opening of the service. The acquisition of knowledge, which is light, should always precede action of any kind, more especially that which relates to God. A congregation of worshippers in which the Scriptures have little or no place is a chamber of darkness. The prophetic word is the light which shines in a dark place, in which we do well to take heed. Without the light of the seven-branched-golden candlestick in the Holy Place, the Jews could not have performed the Divine Service under the Law, so without the light of the Holy Spirit shining from the throne, no page would the congregation of the kings and princes be unable acceptably to worship him. The first thing to be done, when they meet for the service, on the Sabbath, is to light up the brilliant by attending to the Scriptures, so that their beams may shine into the hearts of the worshippers.

In the second place THE PRAYERS. Let us meet every week let each of you lay aside all other business, as he may have prospered, putting in his time as follows:

well-ordered congregation of Christ has its Treasury.—Without a Treasury its widows and orphans will, if necessary, have to depend on the world for support. Without a Treasury, it cannot sound out the word of the truth of the Gospel, and so forth. Every Saint is bound, according to his means, to contribute to the Fellowship or Treasury of the Lord. No one ought to think of eating the bread and drinking the wine before he has paid his quota towards them. A Christian ought to have more independence and a greater sense of propriety, than to sit at the Lord's table at the expense of his associates. No one is so poor but that he can contribute a mite. The widow in the Scriptures is an example which puts to shame the parsimony of our money-getting and money-loving generation. She of her exiguity, gave all that she possessed. In this country, we have no widows whose whole living does not exceed two mites. The King's tax therefore, ought to be promptly cheerfully, and liberally paid. And as he leaves the amount in our own discretion, we have no cause to complain.

In the third place, *take the Loaf, give thanks, break it, and then give it to the disciples.*—The loaf, which we break, is the joint participation of the body of Christ. Because there is One Loaf, we the many (disciples not sects), are One Body; for we all partake of that one loaf.—*Then take the cup, give thanks again, and give it also to the disciples.*—The cup we bless is the joint participation of the blood of Christ. "Drink this all of you," said Jesus, "for this is (the sign of) my blood; the blood of the New Institution, shed for many, for the remission of sins."—Having drank this, *sing praises to God in Psalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs.* It is agreed that the Hymn sung by the Lord and his Apostles upon this occasion, consisted of the six Psalms which composed the *Great Hallel*, and which used to be sung at the Feast of the Passover, &c. There were the 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, and 118th.—Instead of interrupting the exercises by inappropriate singing, it ought, as it appears, to me, all to be reserved for this place. After having listened to the prophetic word, having paid in our contributions, and shown forth the death of the Lord, what more appropriate than for the whole Assembly of the Saints to sing his most worthy Praises, and in poetic strains to celebrate his sufferings, his resurrection, his exaltation, his glorious coming, his triumphant reign, and so forth, "Sing also with understanding."

In conclusion, *THE PRAYERS.*—"Keep thy foot when thou comest to the house of God, and be more ready to hear, than to give the mercies of fools. Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thy heart be hasty, to utter any thing before God: for God is in heaven, and thou art earth: therefore let thy words be few. A fool's voice is known by a multitude of words."—Therefore use not a multiplicity of words as the Pagans do,

who think that using many words will gain them grace, and imitate them not.—"If you forgive not others their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses."—"Do ye also with understanding."—"Having free access to the Holy Place by the blood of Jesus, and having a Great High Priest over the house of God, let us draw near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith."—"If we walk in the light, the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses us from all sin; if we confess our sins, he is Faithful and just to forgive our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness."—"If any one have sinned with the Father, Jesus Christ, the Just One."—"If we ask any thing according to his will, he hearkeneth to us. And if we know that he hearkeneth to us concerning whatever we ask, we know that we shall obtain the petitions, which we have asked from him."—Amen!

The order of divine worship, then is,

1. The ministry of the word in teaching and prophesying;
2. The Contribution to the Treasury;
3. Giving thanks for the Loaf, and eating it;
4. Giving thanks for the Wine, and drinking it;
5. Singing the Praises; and
6. The Prayers.

EDITOR.

MESSEURS CAMPBELL, HUNNICUTT, WATT, FLEPP, AND OTHERS.

In the February Number of the Harbinger, there is a series of documents intitled "Dr. T's case—Again." Sundry persons figure in these, much to the gratification of Mr. Campbell, and to the apparent annihilation of "Dr. Thomas." When we first perused them, our eyelids widened with astonishment, we proceeded. What an alliance, thought we, have we heard Mr. Campbell, with two Clergymen, the Ministers of a Church, for his supporters, and he himself heralding forth their praises upon no other recommendation than their own! And against whom does he wield their assertions? Against one, whom he used to call his beloved brother, and published in the world as "a chosen vessel!" We know that these clerical despise him in their hearts, for "out of the fulness of the heart the mouth speaketh;" and from the testimony of his brethren in Lunenburg, we are assured, that the Reverend Missionary Watt, makes it a very important part of his missionary labors to go from house to house to guard the people, and to convert others from the damnable heresies of Mr. Campbell and Dr. Thomas! As to the substance of the documents, informed, that since the publication of the first number of the Harbinger, the replies to the Lunenburg Association, and the Harbinger, of his new prison in the year 1808,

part; it also signifies 'to take breath' as after fatigue. The word *Naphash* has a great variety of meanings, all of which are connected by the connexion in which they are used. Gesenius, whose Lexicon is before me, has arranged them under five classes, with passages, selected from the Bible, illustrative of each definition. Under the first head, its contextual significations are 'breath; breath of life; alloodour, perfume, which any thing breathes or exhales; and would you believe it, my friends, but this word, which has been so arbitrarily defined to be 'an Independent and Immortal Spirit,' is here reduced to the connexion with the humble term 'smelling bottles'—*Ishlah* 3: 20.

Under the second head, we read as follows:—"The vital Spirit" in Greek '*πνευματι*,' in Latin, '*anima*,' through which the body lives, i. e. the principle of life manifested in the breath, (compare *spiritus*, Lat. *anima* collated with Gr. *anemos*) and whose seat was supposed to be in the blood. *Lev.* 17: 11. *Deut.* 12: 23. *Gen.* 9: 4, 5. Hence life, vital principle. *animal spirit*, *Gen.* 33: 18. "*as her spirit was departing*, that is, as she gave up the ghost" or her life." 1. *Kings* 17: 21. *let her Spirit of this child return to him again*, that is, let his life return. "*Exod* 31: 23. *life for life*." This life, Spirit, *anima* itself is said to live *Gen.* 12: 13. *Ps.* 119: 175." And, my friends, mark too, that this same *naphash*, or Soul, is also said "*to die*, *Judg.* 16: 39." Also "*to be killed*, *Nomb.* 31: 19. —so be asked for 1 *Kings* 3: 11. —to be poured out, as if along with the blood, *Lam.* 2: 12; *Is.* 53: 12. It is very frequent in phrases which have respect to the losing or preserving of life. Further also in many expressions which have respect to the sustenance of life by food and drink, and the contrary, where the English Version often renders *Naphash* by *Soul* but improperly. Thus the *Spirit*, *anima*, is said to be *satiated* with food and drink, *Prov.* 27: 7. *Is.* 55: 2; so to fill i. e. to satisfy one's Spirit, *Prov.* 6: 30. and hence *Naphash* is itself put for *aliment*, *Is.* 56: 10, if thou draw out thy soul to the hungry, and satisfy the afflicted Soul," or if thou give out thy food or aliment to the hungry that he may be filled. "So the opposite: my spirit's Avengers, *Prov.* 10: 3. 27: 7, *thirsts*, *Prov.* 25: 26. *fasts*, *Ps.* 68: 11, *abstains* from certain kinds of food *Lev.* 30: 3, *is polluted* by them, *Ex.* 4: 14. Also the spirit is *empty*, i. e. hungry *Is.* 29: 7; to open wide the life, spirit, i. e. tropically for the jaws, throat, *Is.* 6: 14. *Hab.* 2: 5."—And, says Gesenius, 'of the Spirit as separated from the body, *Job.* 14: 22.'—But on turning to this reference we find that he is not sustained in this definition. It reads 'His flesh upon him shall have pain, and his soul within him shall mourn.' *Job* was willing to be a sacrifice to which *aman* is subjected in this life, that *aman* which is to fill him with painful and joyful emotions. "Thou washest away, O God, the things which grow like the dust of the earth," which things are the hope of man who tills it; "thou destroyest" says he "the hope of man" by *aman* and so forth. Now what is the effect of these misadventures upon cultivators? The answer is in the mind of every planter that he is 'altogether pained; his hopes of abundant crops being dashed, he is pained and troubled in body, soul and spirit—the whole man.

Under the third head, *Naphash* is rendered "the rational soul, mind, animus, as the seat of the affections, feelings, emotions of various kinds;" in other words, it signifies the *Brahn*, which is demonstratively the seat of the feelings, affections, and emotions. "To it are attributed *love* (*Amaniveness*) *joy* (the pleasing emotions which flow from the gratifications of *Acquisitiveness*, *Love of Approbation*, *Hope &c.*) *fear* (*Cautiousness*) *piety* toward God (*Veneration*) *confidence* (*Hope*) *desires* (*Acquisitiveness*) *longing* or *appetite*, e. g. for food (*Alimentiveness*) *revenge* and *slaughter*, *hatred*, and *contempt*, *outrage* and *sorrow*, and as the seat of *warlike valour* (*Destructiveness*, *Combativeness* and *Self-Butsam*). It is spoken of the feelings in general, "*ye know the feelings of a stranger, or how a stranger or foreigner feels*"—a knowledge, which has been but little displayed towards me in this debate—1 *Sam.* 1: 15, I have poured out my Soul before Jehovah, i. e. have laid open to him my inmost feelings.

Words also which themselves express feelings of the mind or soul, are often used in connexion with *Naphash* in this sense; thus the soul is said to weep; to be poured out in tears; to cry for vengeance; and also to invoke blessings. More rarely things are attributed to the soul, which belong rather to the mode of feeling and acting, as pride, patience, and impatience, to the will or purpose; to the understanding or faculty of thinking.

Under the fourth head, concretely it signifies 'animal life,' which is the *Naphash* *anima*, or life. *Josh.* 10: 23, every animate or living creature. v. 30, 32, 35, 37. After *animal* or *life*, i. e. endued with life, *living animal*, or as more commonly in English, *living soul*, *living being*, *Gen.* 2: 7, and very often collectively for *living things*, *living creatures*, *Gen.* 1: 21. *Ps.* 9: 10, 12, 13; *Lev.* 11: 10. In *Gen.* 2: 19, and whatsoever we called them, the living creatures (or souls) that was there," *Deut.* 24: 7, to steal a soul, i. e. to steal a man; *Lev.* 24: 17, a soul (that is, if any one) shall smite. In a *company*, *pl.* seventy souls, i. e. persons. *Gen.* 14: 22, the souls they had acquired in Haran, *Lev.* 24: 17, to steal a man, *Num.* 6: 6, let him not come near to a *company*.

Under the 5th head, with a suffix, or particle attached, it is very frequently used for *I myself*. The German *selb*, *selber*, Swedish, *sjel*, English, *self*, are all from the same root with the German *Seele*, in English *Soul*.—Robinson's Gesenius under the word *Naphash*.

From all this, it is obvious, that no arbitrary, absolute, or unqualified definition, nor any consistent doctrine, can possibly be constructed upon the word used for soul in the Hebrew Bible. If one say, that the *Naphash*, in English *Soul*, is an immortal spirit, another would turn to Numb. 6: 6, and show that the word meant 'a dead body;' or if a third should affirm that soul, was 'a dead body,' a fourth might turn to Joshua 10: 25, and show, that it signified 'a living creature;' and so throughout, to the utter confusion of every hypothesis framed upon any one definition of the word. Hence if called upon to define the word *soul*, insulated, as it were, from every collateral phrase or word, it would be utterly impossible to do it; for the meaning of the word depends upon the context to which it stands related.—*End of the Speech.*

But suppose I had said, without qualification, that *naphash* signified "smelling bottle," what will Messrs. Campbell and Watt do, with Isaiah, 58: 10, where Gesenius says, that *Naphash* is itself put for *aliments* or food? Are these my friends, so ignorant of language as not to know that *metonymically* *naphash* life is put for *aliments* or that which sustains it? Mr. Watt rung the changes a good deal, for he could do little else, upon the phrase, "why art thou cast down, O my smelling bottle?" Now, if he had had sagacity enough, he would have discovered, that he was displaying his own ignorance and not Dr. Thomas'. Surely there is as much propriety in that as "why art thou cast down O my aliments!" But, I will not descend further to deprive him of what little consolation he may draw from his "spirited and powerful elaboration" of a smelling bottle.

After Mr. Watt comes my old friend Henley! Rapped on the knuckles first by one and then by another; now pouncing upon *Seyla*, and then upon *Charybdis*, it is as much as he can do to keep his barque from sinking. We believe he means well, though he has not the happiest way in the world of showing it. He has written a letter to Mr. Campbell, which bears upon it front the mark of haste and misconception. My friend says "we have passed no resolution." I do not know whom he means by "we;" but if the reader turn to p. 237 of this volume, he will find that I have no where said that a resolution had been passed. What I have written there, I declare to have come under my own observation; and I can give authority for it too. He goes on to say "We had no fears among ourselves that the opinion of any man on earth would be an article of faith among us." Why then all this agitation about the opinion of Dr. Thomas'?

and—He thinks I have treated a *dear* friend with "silent contempt."—This shows the *dear* old friend. Why should he surmise, that I entertain contempt towards him or his? I protest, that none is contemptible in my eyes except the worthless. I respect him fully as a man; though somewhat unstable withal. I am so much occupied in brightening up my defensive and offensive weapons, that I often put a letter aside intending to notice it at a more convenient season, when it entirely escapes my recollection until too old to be of interest. If in so doing I have offended my old friend, I ask him a thousand pardons.

He still harps upon "infants, idiots, and heathens," which at most I have but incidentally noticed. I refer him to the article "Things contended for" paragraphs, 17, 18, for a hint upon this matter. Does my friend understand the scriptures, making no difference between those who live under "degrees of ignorance" and times of knowledge; if he does not, I would advise him to search deeper before he judge.

It seems, that he was well nigh denouncing me at the suggestion of some he terms brethren, as well as Mr. Campbell. I doubt not but I shall be proscribed by all Churches, which regard a hint from Bethany as tantamount to a command; but let "Leaders of Churches" remember, that if they judge unrighteously they may wrap it up here with Mr. Campbell, but they will have to render a strict account to their Lord and ours.

The next document is signed by ten well-meaning, but mistaken, men. One name, I regret to see; because, I am persuaded he acts under the influence of others. But these things will be. They profess to act for the Church, which I believe amounts to about 70 or 80 members. It is dated from Philadelphia, in which City I resided about 11 months. While I was there, two parties existed in the Church. One party was made up by one to sustain me, if I would remain and endeavor to establish a Church upon more scriptural principles. But I refused, and preferred rather to leave than to be the leader of a party. The decision of this Church is an *ex parte* statement: For the last three volumes I have had but two members belonging to that Church. One a Sister, and the other dead. Let the reader judge then, how competent these people are to judge between me and Mr. Campbell. I will decide my case upon the testimony (such it is) of Dr. Thomas' and Harb! Here is a Church cuts me off from the communion, because of what is termed my *deformation*; for Dr. Thomas, "He went to Philadelphia, in December, 1833. The brethren there, who were acquainted with him a good character, said that he was a man of the Scriptures; but that he was not a man of the *cal*,"—all this of course is full of sense.

from Mr. Campbell; such as, 'an incorrigible factionist,' 'abominable and subversive speculations,' 'a dogmatic and vindictive spirit,' and so forth!

But these good people are some of the most inconsistent I ever knew. A brother visited them from these parts, and spoke much to the edification of them all. He tells me, that he taught the very same doctrine I am accustomed to do, and that it was received very well by all but one; who got up and opposed him. While this member was speaking, another closed up to brother —, and advised him to take no notice of what that man was saying, for he was cracked! Or words to that effect. And now we have, within about four months alter, ten men signing on the side of the cracked man, in condemnation of the very doctrine they approved when spoken by the mouth of another person! Surely, themselves being judges, the cracked man was the only wise man among them!

These ten have as fair names, and they sound as well; and with the public, carry as much weight as any other ten, that could be put in type; and of whom the world knows as little. With eight out of the list, we are more or less acquainted. Owen Flaagan, whose strength is but weakness, knows more about the Scriptures than the rest put together. I believe he was once employed as a reader of the Bible among the peasantry of Ireland. He used to meet with a few plain, but worthy people, before the Church at Bank Street, had a being; I think for two years. I have heard these good folks regret, that they ever joined Mr. Ballantyne's Church; which was constituted upon any but Apostolic principles. They informed me, when I went among them, that his company was made up of Messrs Heaslit, Hall, Harpham, and, I think, Brindley; with a few females of their families. Ballantyne was appointed Elder, Heaslit and Harpham Deacons, and Hall and the females the congregation. The Elder would leave his flock to minister for the Baptists, while the Church at home had to occupy their time as they best could, which, I was told, they did by singing, praying, and reading from a volume of printed Sermons, &c. As to Mr. Harpham, who, I believe, I once met in Cincinnati, and who, no doubt, is a very correct man, he was added to their Church by a letter from 'a sister Church' (Dagg's) in Philadelphia, of the Baptist sect) three months after he was made a deacon! These are some of the things of which I was informed soon after I went to Philadelphia—things, which speak volumes for the intelligence of Messrs. Heaslit, Hall, and Harpham, three of the signers of the document before me, in the doctrine of Christ! Owen Flaagan's party was engrained upon this stock, much to their regret, as they have expressed to me. John W. Hall, if he be the Senior, is a weak individual, and I am inclined to think, if the Junior, I think, if my collection serves me right, the subject of a reprimand from

the Church. I know but little of J. L. Brown, what I do know is no discredit to him. I believe he is an intelligent moral man. His opinion of Isaac Cole, a contemporary, as expressed to a brother in this County, I am convinced is very correct. Isaac Cole is Son-in-law to the late Mr. Lantyne; and when I left Philadelphia, a deacon of the Church in New Jersey, and at the same time a woman at Bank Street. He is devoted to making money, after he drives with his whole soul. He is a blustering, ill-natured sort of a man; but as his brother Rheas says, he is little or nothing about the Christian Religion, or of any effect. Of Rowzee and Davis, I know nothing. Andrews is the tenth; of him, I say, though he is a man, to kiss the hand of my destroyer. I love him for he has done me while in Philadelphia; and take this opportunity of expressing my gratitude for his goodness. James Hall, as far as I can be noticed. His integrity may be deduced from the following incident. When about to commence the Address, he was desired to take two copies. The first number was sent from Richmond, as I intended to remove thither. It is upon the presentation of No. 1, that I was about to leave Philadelphia, the following conversation ensued—*Hall*—Bro. Thomas, I find you are going to R.? You will get no more subscribers about here? I replied, very possibly. *Hall*—You will lose those you have in this City? I cannot help it, I rejoined, my engagements are made. *Hall*—If you go it will not suit me to subscribe? Very well, said I, do as you please; I want none but willing patrons. To Richmond I go!—This incident proves two things, first, that after 11 months acquaintance with my opinionatedness, he wished me to stay in Philadelphia; and secondly, that he makes promises without fulfilling them, and therefore, his signature goes for nothing in a question of truth or error. Such then, are these my judges, who publicly disclaim all connexion with me and those who hold fellowship with me in my pernicious views! I should not have searched them thus, had they not stirred me up in self-defence. I feel more honored by their rejection of me, than I should by their communion. They are intellectually and therefore morally incompetent, to sit as judges upon what I believe and teach. When they know all that God has revealed in the Bible, and then be time enough for them, when appealed to by local societies, to ascend the throne of Christ, and render by their signatures, according to our vows.

Then comes Albert R. Flippo, to vindicate his signature, saying his part or lot with me in my "sinful" views. He expresses great regret at my course, and says that he is but partially informed. He mentions the "noble cause" of New-Platonism, and the "noble cause" against the held opinions of the

"Infallibility." That is, in plain english, that it is a noble cause to undertake to show that a man can attain to "life and incorruptibility" without obeying the gospel! He has "charity enough" not to denounce me as "a deluded Mormonite." He thinks, too, that "the Advocate has nearly exhausted himself on his favorite topics." But in this his opinion he will permit himself to be mistaken. Bro Flippo should recollect that "the roads are not equal; and that if his has been long since empty, mine is yet full.

The result of this apology is that Mr. Campbell flatters me with the peculiar phrase of "our brother Flippo." It is "Flippo" if he be suspected of rejecting the nostrum of "disembodied spirits;" it is simple "brother" if a Christian man be thought to waver; but it is "our brother Walcott" or "our brother Flippo," if it be thought worth while to denigrate a brother from me, or if it be judged proper to reward another for a public condemnation of "the incorrigible factionist Dr. Thomas," for whom there is no grace!!!

In conclusion, Mr. Campbell proclaims, that "he will forestall his correspondents on this subject, by informing them, that, except from the Church of Richmond, of which Dr. Thomas is yet a member, we do not intend to publish any further communication concerning his case."—Eet, not to cast Mr. Campbell.

I am not a member of the Church in Richmond; nor have I been for the last sixteen months. I belong to the Church of Christ, and to that portion of it which meets at Paineville, Amelia, Va. This Church, as my readers know, has taken up my case, and has addressed the Brethren at large upon the subject. I demand, and the Paineville Church demands, and the brethren in these parts, and especially those in the neighborhood of the Debating ground, they all demand, that, that document be published in the Harbinger as soon as it is received. We are advised that, down to the present moment, Feb. 21, 1838, there has been no meeting in Richmond concerning me. My eye is upon their proceedings. I shall take care to be informed of whatever may occur there upon the subject. I shall ascertain the movers and the signers, and from that be quite prepared for any thing that may issue there.

I am calm and unruffled in the midst of all, because conscious of my guilt, and of being sustained by the testimony of God, I look down with commiseration, upon the impotency of my assailants. May the Lord have pity upon them all, and forgive the unrighteousness of their doings; for I believe assuredly that they know not what they do!

Wm. Flippo,
Amelia, Va. Feb. 21st, 1838.

MY INFIDELITY.

At the Debate, my clerical opponent said, that he had seen some tendency of Dr. Thomas' sentiments, formerly a Baptist Preacher, and having made an effort had expired, a gentleman, formerly a Baptist Preacher, and having communicated with others, because he followed his me, observed, that he was astonished any one should charge me with infidelity, or my principles with a tendency to it, inasmuch as I had conceived more passion of the truth of the Christian Religion in that county (Lunenburg) than any other man in it. Yes, Sir, rejoined Mr. —, one of the Moderators, if I had heard Dr. Thomas, I should have been an avowed infidel long ago.

This anecdote was reported to me by the brother alluded to about ten days since. According to our Lord's rule by *their fruits you shall know them*, this incident speaks more in favor of my principles than a thousand pages written in my own defence. Certain interested men would rejoice to succeed in metamorphosing me into a disciple of Paine, Volney, or Voltaire; were it for nothing else than to prove the subtlety of their own positions; but while I can adduce such *fruit* as the above, honest men will know that my doctrine is of Christ and his Apostles, to the utter confusion and disgrace of all liars.

EDITOR.

LETTER FROM KING & QUEEN.

January, 11th, 1838.

Brother Thomas:—Dear Sir; the present period, among the Disciples in Eastern Virginia, is marked by much distraction, not unfrequently attended with very unchristian feeling. Opposing parties, in any of the numerous states of civilized, social combinations, may be justly considered one of the most serious of evils. Such a state of things may be always expected to destroy the best consequences of union, unity, harmony, power, wisdom, virtue or religion, as the case may be. Hence, in the wisdom of the Saviour, *his followers were urged to the most rigid adherence to unity and harmony among themselves.* Many of us have considered the unity and harmony of the Disciples of the reformation, to be of the same character, and hoped that they would be productive of such effects as were exhibited by primitive christianity; that the word of the Lord would run, and be glorified in, and by us. Much has been accordingly accomplished; but we seem at length to have fallen into a sort of a "fery trial," which, at a time at least, must cast a deep shade over our (former) bright prospect. Parties have arisen more or less distinctly among us, and the worst effects of division and strife are apprehended. The world of mankind, must, under such a disorderly and unchristianian aberration, be benefited by any extensive christianian aberration.

We, who now take the liberty of addressing you, have been persuaded, that our more talented members, by their largely in bringing about this state of things, have been the conscientious means, we have

wish no disguise as to our course, and are determined, if it be possible to avoid it, not to become mere partizans, contrary to the known laws of Jesus our King. We do believe brother Campbell's and your course, constitute the foundation and cause of our present confusion. There is scuffling, perhaps many things, wrong among us. Whether you two are to be blamed alone, for going before, or the body of the Disciples too, for falling into the way of difficulty, may not be easily settled. As far as we can judge, all are honest, and truly sincere, but certainly, all are not right. We are all liable to err, but should still seek after truth. Some of the congregations and many individuals, have thought it proper to express their dissent from an important "opinion" of brother Campbell, touching the question of what constitutes a *christian*. In doing so, we did what we considered to be our duty towards him and ourselves, and will here stop, whether his explanation be satisfactory or not, rather than create strife.

Upon the same great question, in another form, we now address you. Your attention has been repeatedly called to this subject, in different ways, long ago. You need hardly be reminded of a proposed discussion, tendered by one of us, immediately after your introduction of the subject of re-immersion; nor of a query put by some three or four of us in this neighborhood, sometime about last May, through brother P. B. P. One of us, during last fall, addressed you again in reference to this query. You declined publishing, or answering these papers. We have determined therefore, jointly, to call up these matters once more. We do not mean to meddle with your opinions upon any subject whatever; but upon your language and course, do earnestly ask a declaration of your faith upon a single, specific point of teaching and practice. The Disciples in this quarter, are divided by your course, upon this question. "Are the Disciples among us, who have come out of the Baptist Churches, recognized by Dr. Thomas as Christians?" Many among us contend that you do recognize such as *christians*, both in word and deed; while many others are fully persuaded that both your language and practice justify an opposite conclusion; and not only so, but that you do teach that the Baptist denomination is not christian, and ought, as you say on page 192 of the current A. Advocate, (making the Richmond church as one instance of many) to "select some good readers from your ranks; let them read to you without note or comment, the instructions of the Prophets and Apostles as contained in the scriptures; accompanying this, public reading with a private and diligent study of the word, after six months (but the Word must be daily) if you believe the teaching you have heard read, shall let every such man and woman who is the voice of the Holy Spirit, by Peter—

and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins," &c.

Now Dear Sir, with this state of things before you, we do not your opinion as in exceptions among that people, but we wish you in many and christian candour to declare explicitly, whether you sustain, from all the testimony and evidence presented in word and deed by the mass of us who have come out from the Baptist ranks, that we are christians or not, without re-immersion? You have studied the subject well, and know many of us for several years. We desire a short, and unequivocal answer. If the question should not appear to your clearer mind, to cover the ground fairly, we trust that you will take and answer it in a more enlarged sense. It is high time for us to come to a satisfactory adjustment of this distracting subject. We urge the insertion of this address in the next No. of the Advocate. Should you determine not to let it appear please return it to one of us without delay.

Your's in pursuit of truth, and christian unity,
THOMAS M. HENLEY,
JOHN DU VAL.

To all "in the pursuit of Truth and Christian Unity"
Greeting.

In the spring of 1837, I received a query through my worthy and much esteemed friend and brother, Philip Baylor Pendleton of Smyrna, King & Queen, Virginia. It ran thus:—"On page 201 of the January Advocate, you speak again of the questionable state of hundreds or perhaps thousands of those who have left the Baptist Denomination, and seem to predicate your opinion upon the ground that they were born in Anti-christ. Now we are somewhat perplexed hereabout by your language; and must request you to state, whether you mean by the hundreds and thousands exceptions among the genuine Christians, who have left Anti-christ? And if so, further inform us how the genuine Christians can be so, while they were born under the like circumstances with the querrists? In other words, do you consider them to have been born of water and Spirit, who have come out of the Baptist Denomination? You see I have broken upon this letter to put in the Query."

Various circumstances, which I do not now remember, prevented the query from receiving that prompt attention which seems, the querists desired. Accordingly, brother Pendleton repeated it in a letter dated July 4th, 1837. The following is the following remark—some thing like the answer to the query at all, other than what I have given, is not desired; and I trust let us have peace, and that depends upon it."

This comment impressed my mind with the idea, that there was something working below the surface, which did not appear on the face of the query. I determined, therefore, before I took any notice of it, to carry it up with me to the Debate, where I expected to meet many brethren from divers parts, and to submit it to them for their consideration. The result of this occasioned our notice in the August Number under the Caption, "To Correspondents and Readers"—p. 144.—This elicited a note from brother Du-Val of King & Queen, dated Sept. 15th, 1837.

KING & QUEEN, Sept. 15th, 1837.

Brother Thomas:—In your August No. of the Advocate under the head of replies to "correspondents," you notice a query put, as you say, "through Brother P. B. P." and state your suspicion that it is "a gin to entrap" you in your words, suggested by some other person; bro. P. B. P. being ignorant of its design. Now as to this matter, you are partially right. If I am right in applying the initials, you are not altogether wrong in your conjectures. The query resulted from a discussion between four of the disciples in this neighborhood, at a late discussion of some point taught or asserted by you in some back No. of the Advocate. Some of us thought that you taught one thing, while bro. Pendleton (P. B. P.) thought differently. He had a letter in his pocket, ready to be mailed to you, by which, we all concluded to enquire of you as to the import of your language. We wish you to settle the matter yourself; seeing that we could not. As your words were of doubtful import, as proved by our controversy, we thought an explicit answer from you, should settle the question. But who dictated the query? which you think a "gin." If my memory serves me, I dictated it, and brother P. transcribed it over his name into his letter. He was equally interested with the rest of us, in the subject; we all sought the simple truth. Those of us, who objected to what we considered you to teach, wished you to speak in language which could not be mistaken, while bro. Pendleton, who warmly sided with you, or defended his understanding of your words, had no hesitation, in making further inquiry. It is strange indeed, that you should think that any thing *underhanded* was meant, while you had the ostensible enquirer before you without disguise. With brother P.'s permission, I would cheerfully have appended my name had it not been for the fact, that you and I, are not on what are called commonly "good terms." We have desired no success in this matter, nor have we employed disguise of any improper character. I humbly conceive that it was far more proper for bro. P. to put the query, under existing circumstances, than it would have been for me to have done it. Either brother

roy or Walker could have given their name with propriety.

Your insinuations having been quite pointed, both as to bro. P. as well as to some other, I hope that you will give this space of explanation, a place in the next Advocate.

Your truly,

J. DU VAL.

To the spirit and style of this letter, I have no objection, and am well satisfied with the explanation in relation to the query. I except, however, to this sentence of it—"You and I are not on what are called commonly, "good terms."—I do not recollect ever having exchanged an uncivil word with Brother Du Val. Save the letter quoted, I believe, I have received no communication from him since we met at the Acquinton, I think, in 1836. On that occasion I took brother Du Val to be quite on good terms with me. When last in the lower country, in the autumn, I made inquiry upon the subject, and all I could ascertain was that I had alighted some letter or other he had written. This brought to my recollection; that I had received an epistle in 1835 or 6, on the subject of re-immersion. I met Bro. Tompkins of King and Queen, now of Mississippi, at Lynchburg, on my return from Henry. He informed me, that there was a letter, from Dr. Du Val waiting for me in Richmond. When I arrived in that City, I found it there. It was quite lengthy. I read it of course, but being disposed to let the subject of Re-immersion rest a while, in conformity with the wishes of those, who deprecated the agitation of the subject, I put it aside for "a rainy day," or until "a more convenient season."—In conclusion, I would observe, that, if failing to notice all the letters sent me by my friends, is to place me on bad terms with them, I fear my enemies will be far more numerous than I have yet surmised. Once for all, let no one inscribe my name in his Black Book, because I fail in formally responding to his communications;—I thank my correspondents for their favors, and have, in many instances, been edified, encouraged, instructed, amused, and corrected; all of which comes home with double force, if their letters be post paid.

I do not recollect the contents of said letter at this time, but I suppose, this sentence, in the letter signed "Thomas M. Henley," and "John De-Val" has reference to something it contained;—"you need hardly be reminded of a proposed discussion, tendered by one of us, immediately after your introduction of the subject of re-immersion."—Now, let me observe here, that I did not introduce the subject of re-immersion. It flowed from the doctrine of "Baptism for the dead;" which was first taught in this Country by brother Walker, or Mr. Campbell; and appeared for the first time in the Millennial Harbinger. The Editor understood

to silence, but not in convincing all the readers of his writings and the Scriptures. I resumed his discussion, and was satisfied to contend with one opponent at a time, and he the greatest. This is my reply to that part of said letter.

My respected friends, add, alluding to this epistle and the query, and the Doctor's note, "you declined publishing or answering these papers." This is not correct. In my notice to "Correspondents" I said, "nevertheless the query shall be fairly met in due time come what will." The time being due, they are now (save the letter of 1835 or 6, which is I know not where) before the reader. It is strange, passing strange, that the agitation of this subject should be so much deprecated as being of a schismatical tendency, and yet I should be so 'repeatedly called upon' to take it up! But I can see!

I come now more particularly to the letter with the double signature. It is in the hand writing of brother Du Val. To him, therefore, I attribute the style and spirit of it. I have no fault to find with either; and, but for brother Healey's late epistle to Mr. Campbell, I would very readily concede to him a share in the excellencies it displays. But when I compare that document with the manuscript before me, I discern so marked a difference, that the vinegar of the one curdles his part of the milk of the other to some extent. There, he writes in a spirit, which dictates the title "Dr. Thomas," while here it is "Brother Thomas, Dear Sir;" there, I am accused, while here, I am reasoned with; there, he is a judge upon false premises, while here he is "in the pursuit of truth;" there, he threatens me and lets me into the true secret of the letter before me as far as he is concerned—"I have been requested," says he, "to unite with brethren to address him plainly, that they will not any longer countenance any man that writes as he does, before you disclaimed fellowship with him. I put them off until he answered the queries, or could learn clearly his views."—"The threat is this, if I answer this letter according to my conviction, which I shall do, he and some others will join with Mr. Campbell in unellowshipping me, and very soon send me vastly more than twenty discontinuances! I am glad that I have delayed till this time the answer of the query. As I write not for money, but for what I believe to be the truth, let me say to all terrorists, that is, to all who would frighten me into their way of thinking and acting, that the loss of the fellowship of all Christendom, reformed or unreformed, or the loss of every subscriber I have, will not weigh one feather with me in answering or pleading for what I believe the Scriptures teach. I concede to every man, the right of maintaining what he pleases, provided he injures not his neighbor in liberty, reputation, property, or life. If he teach error, the truth is stronger than error, and will ultimately overthrow it. The intelligence and faith of that Church is composed but of flimsy materials, which

are to be sapped, mined and overturned by the power of truth of men! What I concede to others, I claim for myself. As long as I have a pen to write, and a paper to transmit my convictions I shall publish them without regard to the appeals to my hopes or fears.—It is true I have rich friends, but I have also rich friends, to whom the support of my views would be a trifle. If therefore, I am to be put to flight, it must be by the power of truth, rationally and argumentatively sustained, and not by melaces or proscriptions.

Brother Healy put off his friends until, he could learn clearly my views. Now, my worthy friend, knowing my views very well. While I lived in Richmond he called upon me, and we conversed upon the subject. At the end of our conference he expressed himself satisfied, and that he understood me. Until Mr. Campbell appealed to the sympathies of the Eastern Virginians, brother Healy proved by actions his friendly disposition towards me; since that time all the world knows the rest. I met him at Smyrna, in the autumn of 1837, for the first time, after his "defence." I greeted him with the utmost cordiality of heart face and hand; though my salutation was met with the most frigid, and gloomy formality. I was amused, but not at all offended. In proof of this, I requested him to take part in the exercise of the morning; which he did. In his invocation he styled me "thy servant" that is, of God. When our meeting was dissolved, he invited me to go home with him; but, being previously engaged, I declined. At that visit, I saw nothing of brother Du Val; nor did brother Henry say one word to me about the topics in debate.

Bro. Healy thinks me inconsistent in calling him a brother, I think him much more so in calling me one after his "Blessed Brother Campbell" has told him, that I am no better than a deluded Mormonite, and that his brethren should not even fellowship those who fellowship me. Now if brother Healy's fellowship me, he is manifestly excommunicated by the Church in Philadelphia, which has echoed the sentiments uttered there by Mr. Campbell! This appears to me to be the previous condition—will Thomas M. Healy and John Du Val, who do fellowship with Alexander Campbell, fellowship John M. Healy, whom he has pronounced to be severed from the Church?—If they will, then, Alexander and his Philadelphia brethren cut them off; for the latter "publicly disclaim" all fellowship with him, and those who hold fellowship with him are cut off;—But if, they will not—then it is of no importance to Messrs Healy and Du Val, whether John M. Healy does or does not fellowship with Alexander Campbell; and you see also, how manifestly the principle there is in this affair.

But as to this matter of fellowship,

"Whom do you fellowship?"—I reply, that it is not a matter of choice, but of necessity with me, if I would stand myself in the fellowship of Jesus Christ. If I be myself in Christ, I am bound to fellowship all others in the same situation. If a man convinces me that he is in Christ and of correct deportment, it is at my peril, to refuse to fellowship him as a brother. On the other hand, I cannot in my conscience fellowship a man, who is not in Christ. I fellowship no man, because he is called a reformer or a Christian. In passing through life we are obliged to take much upon trust, but when we come to particulars, if I give the right hand of brotherhood to another, it is because, I believe, that he has obeyed the gospel of Jesus Christ. In this, however, I may be deceived; my belief may be credulity; but until I discover my error, I must fellowship him.

I regard no immersed man as Christian, who has not believed and obeyed the Gospel preached by the Apostles. I have nothing to do with names, parties, or denominations in this matter of fellowship. I can fellowship some, who are yet Baptists, some Reformers and some Dunkards; not, however, because they are Baptists, Reformers, or Dunkards, but because they shall have understood, believed, and obeyed the Gospel of Jesus Christ. As things are, there is no denomination that can scripturally be termed the Body of Christ. For myself, I am a member of no 'Denomination,' nor do I ever intend to be. I would no more endorse for all men called Reformers not previously Baptists being "in Christ," than I would for all Baptists the question with me would be, 'have you obeyed the gospel of Christ, and do you continue to walk worthy of that gospel, as taught in the New Testament?' After this was satisfactorily proposed, I would receive him into my house as a brother and 'bid him God speed.' Further than this, as an individual, I am not to go.

If asked my conviction in relation to the Baptist Denomination, as a denomination, I reply, that, from observation, and from the testimony of Baptists themselves, I am persuaded that it is exceedingly corrupt. Whatever the Body of the Immersed was before 1685, I am convinced, that from that day until the era of the French Revolution in 1790, they constituted a part of the two symbolic witnesses, whose dead bodies lay three days and a half unburied in the street of the great City, which is spiritually called Sodom and Egypt. When "the breath of life from God entered into them," the Testimony of the Immersed against Anti-christ and in behalf of the Gospel of Christ revived in the old world. From thence it has been propagated through the new, though amplified in various ways. This testimony has been rejected by the Baptist Denomination, which, as a Denomination, has identified itself with the sects of the Anti-christian Kingdom and thus become "part and parcel of the Symbolical Babylonish Empire."

It is impossible for me, were I appointed to the office, to justify

whether the mass of the people among reformers, who come out from the Baptist ranks are Christian or not, without re-immersion. Correct moral conduct is no proof, that the subject is a Christian; although correct moral conduct is essential to constitute a man a good Christian. There are good moral people, in the popular sense of the phrase, in all sects. I was a person of good moral conduct, but not a Christian, before I obeyed the gospel, my morality, however, would not have saved me without obedience. My faith upon the matter is, that I do not believe, that any one is a Christian who has not obeyed the gospel; and that fifty re-immersions would not make him such, unless the fiftieth was predicated upon an antecedent intelligent belief of the gospel. Now, if any man would know whether he be in the faith, let him examine himself, and compare his case with that of the primitive Christians: if his and theirs are identical, then, he is safe; but if they be not, all I can say is, I would not die in his state for a thousand worlds.

Brother Henly in his letter to Mr. Campbell asks where I found any Apostle advocating re-immersion. To this I answer, that Paul prescribed a re-immersion to twelve men called "disciples" at Ephesus, and that the reason why he did so was because their first immersion was predicated upon a wrong faith. This is precisely the ground I take. When "the gospels" Epistles, and Acts were penned, the doctrine of the Spiritual Babylon had not been published, therefore, the disobedient of that time were not identified with it; but when the Apocalypse was written, after times were informed, that certain termed God's people would belong to that mystical Empire, and that in order to escape punishment, they must come out of Babylon. Now, the question is, WHAT DOES COMING OUT OF BABYLON CONSIST IN?—Yes, my readers, that is the question!

Edison.

Liberty, Amelia, Va. Feb. 26th, 1833.

THINGS CONTENDED FOR.

At this "Crisis" some may wish to know what are the things contended for by our Advocate. For the information of such inquirers we observe.

1. That he requires liberty of speech, and the free discussion of all subjects which to any one or more persons in any country may appear to be revealed or treated of in the Scriptures. At the same time, he deprecates the magisterial or legislative interference of any man as a judge of controversy, or a "Commander in Chief" on earth in the Army of God. For, he contends, that, as the spiritual gifts of "wisdom" and "the word of knowledge" are given to the church, and, there lives not the man among men, who is

concerning questions in debate, that this or that is "speculative or untaught." He may of right say, that a question is speculative, or that it is untaught in the Bible in *his judgment*, but to do otherwise, that is, to affirm positively, is to assume that he knows all that is revealed, that he is infallible in judging, or inspired. An Apostle or other inspired Believer could infallibly pronounce certain questions to be untaught &c; but all that the uninspired of after times, especially of this day after so long a night of intellectual and moral darkness as that of ages past, can without presumption do, is to qualify their decision with *as it appears to them*. To do this would be to receive *one another without regard to doubtful dissertation*. Hence the subjects of the "One Lord, the One Faith, and the one baptism," if they did not see eye to eye in all things, would at least "agree to differ," harmoniously.

2. He aims at the organization of communities, all of whose members should have *understood, believed and obeyed* the GOSPEL.

3. He deprecates the *indiscriminate* amalgamation of all persons because they have been dipped and afterwards assented to a theory however true it may be. He contends, that it should be shown that the mind has been enlightened by "the word of the truth of the gospel!" previous to immersion, before an immersed person is recognized as a brother in Christ.

4. He deprecates a resort to violent measures with respect to the immersed already in the Churches called "reformation Churches," who have seceded from the Baptist Sect; yet he would not, that the truth should be withheld from them by those of their associates who are convinced of the necessity of an intelligent obedience to the gospel for Remission and a title to Eternal Life. He is convinced, that this will be adequate to accomplish a genuine reformation in *all sincere enquirers after the truth* who have come out of that corrupt denomination; and of whom he doubts not, there are many among "reformers." But should this fail, then he would leave them in the hands of the Righteous Judge of all; who will determine impartially, and without respect of persons.

5. As to the members of the Baptist Sect still identified with it, he would as an individual express his decided negative to their admission into a Church of Christ unless they could show, that they had *understood and believed the gospel before they were dipped, and had subsequently demeaned themselves uprightly, having a good report with those without*. If they could not establish this satisfactorily, yet did, on their applying for admission, then understand and believe the gospel, and desired to be identified as citizens of heaven, having determined to walk worthy of the gospel, he would suggest the propriety of treating them to be buried with Christ in baptism, though

they had been previously, yet indeed ignorantly, baptized. 6. He contends, that the indiscriminate admission of unconverted persons has filled many of the Churches with ignorance and corruption; and from experience, he knows, that such "reformers" have in certain places made "his reformation" temptible.

7. He pleads for an Eldership, whose plurality shall be proportioned to the bulk of the several Churches, and that, without respect to pecuniary considerations, the Presbytery be elected unanimously, or by an overwhelming majority, or by a bare approbation or acquiescence in certain persons names, yet by the nominated drawing lots; and he pleads for this as unscriptural in his judgment, and in order to guard the rights of the poor, and to secure an equal administration for all. He contends further, that the nomination be made in strict conformity with the description of what the man ought to be, who would exercise the office of a bishop; a description of character, which, he is persuaded, may be easily found in a Church of Jesus Christ. 1. Tim. iii. 2-7, Titus 1. 7-12.

8. He contends that the votes of majorities of the private congregation are unscriptural, and calculated to oppress virtue and to establish vice. That the majorities of old, voted Christ out of doors, and anti-christ in. In Corinth, the votes were three to one against Christ, who was at last voted out, and compelled to fly into the wilderness. He contends, that the discipline of the Church is scripturally in the hands of the eldership, which by a decided, and not a bare majority, or casting vote, he thinks ought in the presence of the Congregation to determine, not according to rules or bye-laws of their own, but by the written laws of Christ and his Apostles, the affairs of the body.

9. He contends, that no citizen of the kingdom ought to be separated from a Church of Christ for *constructive heresy*. So long as a brother maintain his adhesion to the faith, and continue to walk worthy of his vocation, it is arbitrary, oppressive, and exceedingly despotic to pronounce him a "heathen man and a publican" in relation to Christians, because he holds sentiments which all the world, and even numbers of his brethren have not received, for there ever will be controversy concerning things revealed until the appearing of Jesus Christ.

10. He contends for the order of Christian worship as set forth in the first article of this number of the Advocate.

11. He contends for an inspired Psalmody to the neglect of the rhymes now in use, because, of the immorality and licentiousness of much of their matter, together with the meanness and poorness of their style.

12. He protests against the use of the *Lord's Supper* for the conversion of men. He contends, that the only way to follow the practice of the Apostles, is to

this matter as well as in the worship of God, for if proselytes are to be made, who shall be an ornament and grace before men, it is by the power of the truth, and not by human expedients, that they must be brought over.

13. He contends that no religionist, or sect of religionists whatever, ought to be recognised as in Christ, or as Christian in the scriptural sense of the word, unless they have believed and obeyed the gospel as plainly recorded in the New Testament.

14. He protest most conscientiously and unqualifiedly against every sect or denomination of Christendom, the exception, No. 13, alone excepted, as so many sections of the kingdom of Anti-christ, and therefore, that no ecclesiastical fellowship, or communion, ought to be held with them by a Christian in thought, word, or deed.

15. He contends for the testimony of the Word, to the effect, that the time is close upon us, when Christ Jesus our Lord and King will be revealed from heaven with the suddenness and unexpectedness of lightning; and that when he comes he will raise the righteous dead, change the righteous living; and punish every soul of man in life, liberty or estate; without respect of persons, who either know not God, or who has not obeyed the *law* of salvation.

16. He contends, that the Scriptures teach, in effect, that men derive nothing from Adam but mortality, of body, soul, and spirit, the whole person. This is what he means, when he says, that man is absolutely and altogether mortal. He contends, that the grand difference between an animal and all other animals is, that God has constituted Man so, that he is susceptible of Immortality, that is, that he is capable of attaining to Eternal Life by an intelligent obedience to the commands and appointments of his Creator; which the inferior animals are not.

17. He contends, that if after Adam's Expulsion from Eden God had not interfered any further in human affairs, the race of man would ultimately have become extinct, like the races of the Mammoth, Ichthyosauria and other species. But that God did interfere, and that the result of that interference was, that he offered eternal life to ALL WHO WOULD OBEY HIM under the several dispensations that have obtained, and to none else.

18. Consequently, that in this age, if any of Adam's race would become immortal he must obey the Gospel and walk worthy of it afterwards. Immortality is a thing to be sought for, and can be attained only by those who are able to seek a blessing which must be in God's way, and not in man's. An intelligent man can discern all the consequences which flow from this position—consequences which it is not always well

to submit to the scornings of vulgar prejudice, upon the principle that we should not throw our pearls before swine.

19. That the unjustified are raised to life to be glorified, and executed, not by virtue of any inherent power of immortality, but by the recreating or reorganizing power of God.

20. That when men die, they return to dust, and so long as they continue under the power of death, dust they remain; but that when the periods of the Resurrection come, they will rise from their ashes to life; which life will either be continued to them endlessly, or terminated again violently, according as they shall be righteous or wicked during their animal lives.

21. He contends that there is no Remission of Sins without Obedience in the strict import of that term. Nothing short of obedience to God's will whether under this or other Dispensations, will obtain for a man forgiveness of sins or a title to Eternal Life. And this doctrine the Advocate considers enhances the value of the ANCIENT APOSTOLIC GOSPEL ten thousand fold.

22. He contends, that it is the Holy Spirit, who alone convinces the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment to come; that he is the Comforter of all true believers; and that he both convinces and comforts in the absence of spiritual gift, which were restricted to the Apostolic Age, by the Written Word alone; for, he contends, that if God were to speak with an audible voice from the heavens to convince men, or to comfort the faithful, he would add nothing to what is written in the Books of the Old and New Testament.

These things he submits to the candid and impartial consideration of all noble minded people. He leaves such to determine whether infidelity or atheism lurk beneath them. He is convinced, that these things are true. He fears not, therefore, to contend for them earnestly though an ecclesiastical tempest may rage on every side. In thee, O God, do I put my trust!

EDWARD

TESTIMONY

in re

MEDDERS CAMPBELL, HERRICUT, WATT AND

HERALD

versus

THE EDITOR OF

The completion of the present

been somewhat deferred in order that we might give insertion to certain documents from Lunenburg in relation to many libellous *et ceteras*, which had by various persons, been imposed for truths concerning us upon the public. We have not room in this number for the article of the R. Herald; we shall publish it in our next. Upon receiving it, we despatched a messenger to the vicinity where the Debate occurred, some forty or fifty miles from hence, that he might lay its contents before those who heard the Discussion, and obtain from them their judgment in the case. He has just returned after an absence of about twelve days, being the bearer of writings, which testify most satisfactorily in our behalf. Thus far, 'all things have worked together for good.' Mr. Campbell's decision in favor of Mr. Watt, upon no other testimony than Mr. Watt's recommendation of himself; and the Religious Herald's Sub-editor's co-adjutorship with that person in deceiving the Baptist Public—have had the effect of rousing certain of the Citizens of Lunenburg, to right the injured, and cheer up the heart of the courageous in the faith. They have subscribed upwards of three hundred dollars for the immediate publication of the Debate, and have abundantly testified their sense of our labors upon that occasion. One goes on to say, that the Advocate will be supported, and that he, if necessary, will subscribe fifty dollars per annum to sustain it. But, this extraordinary aid, we trust will not be needed. With these few remarks, for we have room for no more at present, we introduce to the notice of our readers the following address from the Church of Christ assembling in the Forks of Meherrin, Lunenburg, Va; where our testimony against the Apostacy was held forth.

Corroa.

Liberty, Amelia, Va. March, 10th, 1838.

We the Congregation of Christ, worshipping at the Fork Meeting House, in Lunenburg County; the place at which the debate between Mr. Jas. S. Watt and Dr. Jno. Thomas was held, which commenced on the 1st day of August, and continued during five days—to the brethren in Christ Jesus.—Whereas Bro. A. Campbell has called upon the Congregations generally, to act upon the decision of the Congregation of Painesville, to which Bro. Thomas belongs, which decision is published in the Advocate, and acquits Bro. Thomas of the charges brought against him by Bro. Campbell and others, or some of them at least; and in as much as many evil reports have been circulated concerning the debate, between Dr. Thomas and Mr. Watt, to the prejudice of Dr. Thomas, we in all due benevolence to Bro. Campbell and Bro. Thomas, submit the following report to the public; but before we proceed,

owing to the existing state of things, think it advisable to give a concise history of our Congregation. On the 29th of November, 1834, we were constituted, taking the word of God, as contained in the Old and New Testaments, for a rule of our Faith and Practice. Since our Constitution we have generally met on the first day of the week for worship, but have gone a way from us, not on account so much of some immo- sion as we believe, but because they were not agreed with us in the belief of Baptism for remission of sins, for so far as they have expressed themselves to us, they say that if Bap- tism be for the remission of sins, they have not been Bap- tized. Notwithstanding, many have left us, our number is not diminished, having been supplied by additions, and our strength is generally increased. Our present number being about forty-three white members who agree with Bro. Thomas, in the doctrine concerning life and incorruptibility; several remaining neutral, for whom we cannot answer. We regret to see the division which has or is likely to take place among a people, who profess to have taken the word of God for their faith and practice regardless of the opinions of men in relation to the christian religion; but being more zealous for the cause of truth, than for the opinions of men, and being determined to defend it at all hazards, do highly disapprove Bro. Campbell's course in relation to Bro. Thomas, and heartily approve the decision of the Painesville Congregation, as published in the Advocate.

The next thing which claims our attention, is the many evil reports gone abroad concerning the Debate above named. 1st. The report of Mr. Jas. W. Hunnicutt is correct concerning the principal subject debated, being "the immaterially or immor- tality of the Soul," and he has admitted to one of our Breth- ren, that the balance of his report was principally his conclu- sions or views drawn from the Debate and Advocate, many of which we say are not true, and call on Mr. Hunnicutt to prove his report if he can, which he says he can do, as pub- lished in the Harbinger, and we hereby state that nothing will be admitted as proof but Dr. Thomas' own words, that all men have the privilege of arriving at their own conclusions, and to prove to Bro. Campbell, that he is the intended victim of this designing Clergyman, we would say to him, that Hunnicutt has been heard to say, that he always entertained a respect- able opinion of him, and more so since his defence of Protestantism in his Debate with Bishop Parvell, and that Bro. Thomas was much more consistent than A. Campbell. As regards the report made by Mr. John S. Watt, published in the Religious Herald, we would not only disapprove, but obtain a circulation far beyond the bounds of our own coun- try. Mr. Watt would make the following statement in his mind, that Dr. Thomas was the intended victim of Bro. Campbell's

ality of the Soul, by his not taking up that subject until the evening of the second day of the Debate; which was not the case, for in Mr. Watt's first speech, he threw out many insinuations, or charges in relation to certain things believed by Dr. Thomas, and speaking in relation to the Presbyterians; asked if it was a "new thing for Presbyterians to be liberal?" which made it obligatory on Dr. Thomas to give a History of the Presbyterian Church, in which he shewed it was a new thing that they should be liberal, and called upon Mr. Watt to shew from the Scriptures if he could, whether Presbyterians preached the same Gospel that Paul preached; after having shown from the Scriptures, in connection with Mr. Watt's text, as recorded in Gal. 1st chap. 8 v., what that Gospel was. From the impatience of Mr. Watt and others, Dr. Thomas was requested to depart from his general order and discuss the subject of immortality, about which Mr. Watt had made so much ado, which he did, and so far from Mr. Watt's "taking the Dr. at one blow," as Bro. Campbell has said; he was entirely unable to answer Dr. Thomas; not occupying his full time in his speech which followed; thereby making the impression on the minds of many, that he would not be able to hold out much longer; but in this opinion they were mistaken; and it was said by a Dr. of Phisic, who is a member of the Methodist Society, and opposed to the doctrine maintained by Dr. Thomas; that all the credit he could give, Watt, was, that he could endure more than any man he ever saw, and that all he did, was to "use the Dr."

As to what Mr. Watt has said about the pronunciation of the Hebrew word Naph-sah, and Dr. Thomas' ignorance of the Hebrew, he acknowledged the explanation given by Dr. Thomas of the pronunciation.

Dr. Thomas did not condescend to notice his knowledge of Hebrew or any other language, but informed Mr. Watt, that he knew enough about the language to prevent being imposed upon by the criticisms of clergymen and others, and could fit his own words without the assistance of another, which it is presumable Mr. Watt was not able to do, as his friend searched out his Hebrew words for him, notwithstanding all his puffing with regard to his Hebrew criticisms.

As regards Mr. Watt's accusation, that Dr. Thomas would make the impression on the public mind, that he read from a Hebrew Bible instead of the Lexicon, is untrue, for Mr. Watt urged Dr. Thomas to define the word Soul, which he shewed from the Scriptures, had no absolute meaning, but was dependent on the context. Reading from a Hebrew Lexicon, whose author we do not recollect, showing therefore from the many definitions given that word, informing his audience before reading, that it was a Hebrew Lexicon.

Now, in conclusion of what we have to say, in relation to

the whole matter, is, that we believe, Bro. Thomas acted justly, and logically defended all the points discussed during the Debate, making at least 12 or 15 distinct points, which he held on Mr. Watt from day to day, to answer if he could, or to leave those who were present to say, whether Mr. Watt had these points or not, and do further say, that we believe Mr. Watt's object to have been in the communication as published in the Religious Herald, for the purpose of forestalling public opinion with regard to the Debate; and think it exceedingly strange that he should be able to give a correct account of that which he acknowledged himself unable to do, when called on by Dr. Thomas to write his speeches, in order that they might be published in the forthcoming Debate.

We think it a matter of common justice to all persons, when accused or falsely represented, that they be heard before they are condemned, and hope the Brethren and Friends will suspend their verdict until the evidence is fairly laid before them in the forthcoming Debate:

Signed by order of the Congregation,

WM. A. STONE, } Elders.
WM. S. WILSON. }

P. S. We respectfully request that Bro. A. Campbell, Scott, Shepard, Colman, Thomas, and all our editorial Brethren, will publish the above communication in their papers, and that the Editors of the Religious Herald, and Va. and N. C. Conference Journals, as they have given one side of the question, will give it a place in their papers, in order that the friends of Truth and Free Inquiry may have a better opportunity of arriving at correct conclusions concerning said Debate.

WM. A. STONE
WM. S. WILSON

CERTIFICATE OF COL. J. G. RICHARDSON.

Bro. Stone, one of the Elders of the Fork Congregation, has also forwarded to me the Certificate of Col. J. G. Richardson of Lunenburg. Before the Debate, the Colonel and myself had no acquaintance. My opponent's second, Deacon Smuth, had the appointing of all the Moderators, and Col. R. was one. His certification, therefore, is regarded as the result of an undue bias in my favor.

"I do hereby certify that I was called to the Moderator in the late Debate between Mr. Stone and Dr. Thomas, which took place at the Fork Congregation, in the county of Lunenburg, commencing the 1st of August, and lasted five days. I attended four days, and was present

Dr. Thomas conducted himself with ability and very much like a gentleman. I considered Dr. Thomas fully able to answer any point given him by his opponent, and being called on, I feel it my duty to state that Dr. Thomas complied more strictly with the rules laid down for them to be governed by than Mr. Watt. Given under my hand this 4th March, 1838.
JAMES G. RICHARDSON."

(Testimony to be continued.)

Dr. Thomas not a Schismatic, Mr. Campbell himself being Judge.

If divisions, then, are made, it is easy to see who causes them. He that excludes, and not he that is excluded, is the *schismatic* and the *heretic* in Paul's estimation. Offences will come: for truth is offensive to *errorists*. Telling the truth to them has caused rivers of human blood to flow. As well, however, might our opponents blame the martyrdom of Jesus, his Apostles, or the first Christians upon their lives, as any division now existing upon us.—*Millennial Harbinger*, p. 5, vol. iii.

Ambition is to the mind, what the cup is to the falcon; it blinds us first, and then compels us to *fall*, by reason of our blindness. But alas, when we are at the *summit* of a vain ambition, we are also at the *depth* of real misery. We are placed where time cannot improve, but must injure us; where chance and change cannot benefit, but may betray us; in short, by attaining all we wish, and gaining all we want, we have only reached a pinnacle, where we have nothing to hope, but every thing to fear.—*Lacon*.

Since our reply to the letter with a double signature, we have seen another from King and Queen, in which the writer says, that Dr. Thomas' answer to that epistle is to "*decide his fate*." It may decide our fate with those, who cry peace, *peace* when there is no peace, but sudden destruction at the door; they may cast us out as evil in obedience to the commandments of man: this honor, however, have all the faithful who prefer *light* with war to darkness with a *false peace*. But our "*fate*," be it known to all, is not in the hands of "*dust and ashes*," but in the high and righteous keeping of: an all-wise, just, and Almighty God.
 Errors.

THE ADVOCATE

&c.

Vol. 4. Amelia County, Va.; March, 1838. No. 1

ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE APOCALYPSE

(Continued from p. 298.)

Rev. xiii. 1-10.

Fulfilment.

In our last essay under this head, we contemplated the ascendance of the Dragon and the rise of the Savage Beast; in other words, the transfer of 'the power, throne, and jurisdiction' of the Romans or, to speak more precisely, of the Imperial Roman Senate, to the Sarazes of the North, the Emperor of Ravenna, and the Dukes of Rome. We have seen the Sixth or Imperial Head of the Empire 'wounded' by the Gothic Sword, and the Seventh, or Kings, fall on the banks of the Dragon; and we have beheld the violent means by which the wound that was inflicted upon it by the Goths was 'healed.' That it was a wound, and not a death of the Imperial Headship appears from this—that when Odoacer had compelled Augustulus to abdicate the purple and the crown, he still continued to accede, though, in fact, King of Italy, to supplicate the servile Senate, the title of Patrician, and the administration of the Diocese of Italy at the hands of Zeno, who sat on the throne of Constantine, and who was acknowledged as Sole Emperor of the World. In this Zeno prudently succeeded, leaving Odoacer, in tranquil possession of his kingdom, and accepting, with well dissembled gratitude, the Imperial Office of the West. Again, upon the death of Theodoric, the Conqueror of Odoacer, the throne was seated, though tardily, reluctantly, and ungraciously, upon the neck of the dastardly solicitation of the Emperor, and it was not till some time came when the Gothic power was again restored, that we have seen the Emperor Zeno, in the name of the Roman people, desired the Goths of their power.
 Had the Gothic usurpation been a death of the Imperial Headship, history would not have testified its restoration, or revived

...quisher) had its wound been mortal it would not have been incurable; it was, indeed, very severe, but not incurable. There are certain important matters brought to light in our last essay, which it is now our duty to bring to bear in mind. A. D. 476, the Imperial Senate formally transferred the Throne of universal empire from Rome to Constantinople.— This translation, though in truth nominal—for Rome, at that time, did not possess the universal dominion to transfer—was yet the Seal of her low estate, for, though the Imperial Office was restored in Italy, the Imperial Throne, the Seat of the Imperial Jurisdiction in Italy, was removed from Rome to Ravenna. After the expulsion of the Goths it was never even the Throne of the Italian territory, much less of the world; until it again became the Mistress of the West, by becoming the Throne of an Ecclesiastical Dominion, which was headed up in the Imperio—Pontifical Authority.

Rome became the Throne of the Seventh or Gothic, as it had been of the Sixth or Imperial, Head of the Dragon, A. D. 476. And so it continued until A. D. 528, when Belisarius recovered it. Upon this occasion, another Throne is brought into notice, by the declaration of the citizens, that the Apostolic Throne should no longer be polluted by the triumph or toleration of Arianism. This Throne was the Chair of St. Peter, the seat of an *imperium in imperio* or of an empire within an empire. The events of the period under consideration, A. D. 476—554, were all elaborative of the final ceremony of this said Apostolic, or Ecclesiastical Throne. They effectually removed the grand obstacle in the way of the manifestation of the Eighth Head, the Little Horn, or Papal Roman Monarchy. In 476, there was an Emperor in Rome; his office was set aside by the Gothic King, who still occupied the City; their Sovereignty was overthrown by Belisarius and Narses; of whom, the latter dragged Rome to a duchy, removed the government to Ravenna, 160 miles distant, and left only a feeble Duke to divide the authority of Rome with the Pope. When Belisarius expelled the Goths from the City, they retired to Ravenna. Upon their revolt, A. D. 540, Paria became the Throne of this Kingdom; till they re-established themselves in Rome, A. D. 549, after which they occupied it for three years. In 553, it was recovered by Narses, and they lost it forever.

There have been eight forms of government in Rome since its Foundation. John informs us, that in his day there had been six, and that he lived under the Sixth:—"five," says he, "are fallen," or have passed away, "and one is" or exists; but "the other" or the Seventh, he continues, "is not yet come; and when he comes he must continue a short space or time." And the Beast that was, but is not (in John's day,) he is the Eighth, and is of the Seventh, but goes to destruction." The first five continued during 790 years; the sixth, 443; the seventh, 77; and

the eighth, has obtained for upwards of 1000 years, and still exists. Hence compared with the rest, the seventh continues a short space." Gibbon estimates the duration of the Gothic Kingdom, at no more than 60 years; which makes it expire the Recovery of Rome by Belisarius A. D. 536. But the Gothic Kingdom was not subdued till 553, when Teias the Gothic King was slain, and the Goths submitted to Narses; three years after they were expelled from Rome. The downfall of the Seventh Head was the destruction of the Imperial Senate, a body which had been the contemporary of all the forms of government that had prevailed. In 516, it was exiled from the City by Totila; and in 551, it expired by the sword of the Goths, and thus, another impediment to the gratification of Episcopal lust was removed.

Upon the healing of the Imperial wound, the Emperor of the East delegated his power and authority over Italy to the Archbishop of Ravenna. The entire Kingdom acknowledged the Ecclesiastical authority for fifteen years. But when the Lombards established themselves in Italy, the Imperial Jurisdiction was restricted to what is now termed the Papal territory, or the States of the Church; besides two or three more detached cities not pertaining thereto. Over this district the Imperial authority continued for 200 years, when it was finally extinguished by the Conquests of the Lombards; and afterwards presented to the Bishop of Rome, A. D. 754, by Pepin, King of the Franks, and conqueror of the Lombards.

By the year 553, the date of the fall of the Seventh Head, the Dragon had assumed, or rather been superseded by the Beast. The Alemanni, Burgundians, Franks, Goths, Sævi, Alani, Vandals, Huns and Saxons, had wrested from Rome its dominion or jurisdiction, over Gaul, Spain, Britain, Dacia, Pannonia, Rhætia, Dalmatia, Media, and Thracæ, and in about 15 years after, the Lombards deprived her of the whole of Italy, with the exception of the Exarchate which the Greeks retained, of the Roman Dutchy, which extended from Viterbo to Terracino about 100 miles, and from Narni to Ostia about 100. The Crowns or Diadems had been wrested from her Seven Heads by these Barbarians, who, in setting up their own independent and Sovereign Decade over her extensive provinces, had crowded themselves; and thus presented upon the map of Europe, the Ferine in the place of the old Dragon;—the signal and profound the prostration of the Majesty of the world;—"the Goddess" as her citizens delighted to call her, "dominions once extended from the Danube to the Nile, and from Caladonia to the Euphrates; now she lies prostrate and fallen; once the Metropolis of the Nations, now she is the remote capital of an insignificant country."

But, why did Rome, down to this epoch, display the cup of bitterness?—Rome, the Throne and Patrimony

St. Peter! The favorite of heaven, and the dwelling-place of the Viceroy of Christ upon Earth? A Church of Christ composed of the meaner sort of people, had been planted there, not by Peter indeed, but most probably by those "Roman Strangers" mentioned by Luke, (Acts ii. 10,) who had heard from Peter's lips 'in their own tongue the wonderful works of God.' They were strangers in Jerusalem, but members of the circumcision, won from Rome had journeyed thither to keep the feast of Pentecost. They believed and obeyed the Gospel of Remission, which he proclaimed; and doubtless, according to the promise, became partakers of the gifts of the Holy Spirit. Thus qualified, what else should they do on their return to their homes, but make known in their families and in the Synagogues of Rome, the proclamation of the Apostle Peter, which they had obeyed, and which they were themselves able to confirm by the Spiritual powers with which they were endowed. By this simple process, then, would the New Institution be set up, and the reputation or renown, of the Apostle Peter be established in the Metropolis of the World. He had been the chief speaker among the Twelve; hence the report of what he said would be more conspicuous before the minds of the Roman Strangers than the acts of his companions. How natural then, for the untutored of a densely populated, and distant City, to magnify him into the Prince of the Apostles. That the Church in Rome was chiefly Jewish in its origin and infancy is apparent from Paul's letter; which is so largely occupied in pleading for the Gentile converts in opposition to Jewish prejudices; indeed, the Pagans regarded the new sect as a sect of the Mosaic Religion. But, in those days, their faith was pure, and its excellency published in all the world or empire. They were 'the called of Jesus Christ;' 'beloved of God, called Saints,' and upon whom, the Apostle pronounced the benediction of grace and peace. They worshipped not in splendid Churches, or in superb Cathedrals, but assembled themselves together in the house of Aquila and Priscilla, (Rom. xvi. 5.) little dreaming, that the Successor of the humble bishops of their flock would ever sit upon Caesar's Throne adorned with the Triple Crown!

But what were the fortunes, or the fate, of this humble, obscure, and unpretending society? How long it continued, pure and peaceable, cannot be exactly determined. It has been truly said, "there is no institution so pure and excellent which the corruption and folly of man will not in time alter for the worse, and load with additions foreign to its nature and original design." Such is a particular manner was the fate of Christianity in Rome. We have no authentic account of its purity and excellency after the years 57, and 64, which are the dates of Paul's letter to the Romans, and of the Acts of Apostles. It is probable, however, that it may have continued "the pillar and the support of the truth" in Rome till the wane of

the second century; after which it became the chief pillar of the faith. Nor need we be surprised at this early departure from the truth, when we recollect the fact, that the majority of Iniquity was working secretly under the very eyes of the Apostle Paul, A. D. 52.—3 Thess. ii. 7.—In the Second Century, Bishops had assumed the office of High Priests in the Congregations, leaving to the Presbyters and Deacons the subordinate ranks of Priests and Levites. They began a system of proselyting in order to extend their own influence with the multitude, rather than that of the truth. Hence they commenced the conversion of the Christian into the Catholic Religion, which is made up of absurd rites and ceremonies, which strike the senses of the vulgar and the savage, but fail to amend the life.

The Apostatising of the Church of Christ in Rome, is fully evinced by the following incident. Some time before the year 200, not a century after the death of the Apostle John, Victor, the chief bishop of the congregation, endeavoured to force the Asiatic Brethren by the pretended authority of his laws and decrees, to celebrate the paschal feast on the night that preceded the anniversary of Christ's resurrection; which was contrary to a practice which the Asiatics pretended they had received by tradition from the Apostle John. Having consulted some foreign bishops, he wrote an imperious letter to the Asiatic Pastors, commanding them to imitate the example of the Western Christians in their observance of Easter. To this Lordly requisition the Asiatics replied with great spirit and resolution, that they would by no means depart in this manner from the custom handed down to them by their ancestors. Upon this, says Mosheim, 'the thunder of excommunication began to roar.' Victor exasperated by this, broke communion with them, pronounced them unworthy of the name of his brethren, and excluded them from all fellowship with the Church at Rome. But here the progress of this violent dissension was stopped by the moderate counsels of Irenaeus, bishop of the Church at Lyons in Gaul, who urged the impudence and injustice of the step taken by the Roman Prelate.

From this time the Congregation in Rome rapidly advanced in its defection from the faith and morals of the New Institution. They postponed the baptism of believers to the festival of Easter and Whitsuntide; signed the Baptized with the Sign of the Cross; anointed them with oil laid hands upon them, and then concluded the administration; by giving them bread and honey: Its servants had assumed a despotic language of God, or the multitude of the believers, being examples of virtue to the flock, and their voluntary contributions, were used to support the ambition, powdered with a spirit of avarice, were addressed to many other vices.

proach upon the holy religion, of which they were the unworthy professors and ministers. "The bishops," says Mosheim, "assumed a princely authority, particularly those who had the greatest number of Churches under their inspection;" and who presided over the most opulent assemblies (which was pre-eminently the case with the Bishop in Rome). They appropriated to their evangelical function the splendid ensigns of temporal majesty; a throne of pulpit surrounded with ministers, exalted above his equals the servant of the meek and humble Jesus; and sumptuous garments dazzled the eyes and minds of the multitude into an ignovant veneration for this usurped authority. An example which ought not to have been followed, was ambitiously imitated by the Presbyters, who neglecting the sacred duties of their station, abandoned themselves to the idleness and delicacy of an effeminate and luxurious life.—The Deacon, thus beholding the Presbyters deserting their functions, boldly invaded their rights and privileges; and the effects of a corrupt ambition were spread through every rank of the sacred order! This usurpation of the Deacons originated a host of inferior orders to perform the duties they had become too proud to discharge; hence the titles of offices of *sub-deacons, acolyths, cantors, readers, chorists, and coadjutors*. A state of celibacy began, likewise, to be esteemed as adding to the reputation of the clergy, (as the deacons and deacons of the Churches were now called) for piety and virtue; and the *Austere subintroducta*, or holy concubines, supplied the place of wives, without gratifying the desires of the Holy Prelates!"

Such was the state of things to which the Church of Christ in Rome had attained in the third century. It was in this age of the world, that a separation existed between the members of this community. Two injurious subjects were agitated at this time among Christians; the first, whether the immersion practised by the philosophical sects were valid; and the second, whether those who had fallen into the commission of grievous transgressions; especially whether those who had apostatized from the faith under the Decian persecution, ought to be again received into the Church. Upon these topics the Christians were divided. Many Churches placed the Sectarians, who desired admission into their Society, on probation as Catechumens; and, when satisfied with their conduct as candidates, admitted them, by a *re-immersion*, into the communion of the faithful. The greater part of the European Churches acted differently. They own the baptism of Heretics as valid; and therefore used no other form in their reception than the imposition of hands, accompanied with prayer. This diversity prevailed a considerable time without exciting contentions or animosities. But at length it was kindled, and the fire of ecclesiastical discord burst into a flame. The Asiatics

decided in Council, that all Sectarians were to be received before their admission to the communion of the Church. To this resolve, Stephen, the bishop of the Church in Rome, offered a most violent and arrogant opposition. He broke communion with the Asiatics, and excluded them from the communion of the faithful. But the rage of a Roman Bishop was not yet ferocious enough to strike terror into the objects of its ire. Notwithstanding his intemperance, a Council was assembled upon the occasion, by which the practice of the Asiatics was adopted in Roman Africa; and notice thereof was given to the imperious Stephen. The fury of the Pope (for such the Bishop in Rome had become,) was redoubled at this notification, and produced many threatenings and invectives against Cyprian, the instigator of the Council, who replied with great force and resolution, and in a second council holden at Carthage, declared the immersion administered by Sectarians, void of all efficacy and validity. Upon this the wrath of Stephen was inflamed beyond measure; and by a decree full of invectives, which was received with contempt, he excommunicated the Bishops of the African Province, whose moderation on the one hand, and the detra of their imperious antagonist on the other, put an end to the violent contest.

This controversy may be regarded as preparatory to the separation which was about to ensue in the congregation in Rome. About the year 250, a party arose in this Church.—They were the advocates, in the midst of Catholic Apostasy, for purity of faith and morals; hence they were nicknamed *Cathari*, i. e. the pure. The abolition of the Bishop and Presbyters of the Society in Rome, together with the relaxation of primitive purity, had swelled the Church with a crowd of proselytes, 'having a form of godliness without the power.' During the persecution of the Church by the Emperor Decian, a multitude of these formalists apostatized from the faith, which, under the Pagan Government, consisted in executing Christ and burning incense on the affairs of the gods. When the persecution ceased, and there was no longer any danger in professing the faith of Christ, they applied for re-admission into the Church. The application being taken into consideration by the Eldership or Presbyters, Cornelius and the Majority were for their reception, which was opposed by Novatian and others of the Elders. Novatian is described as a man of uncommon learning and eloquence, but of an austere and rigid character; that is, I presume, in the exclusion of Heretics, and effeminacy of presbyters, and their princely habits. The highest encomium is pronounced upon Cornelius for his wisdom and influence upon the highest standing in the Church, and admission of the majority, which history has since retained to eminent correction in all ages.

readiness and determination to re-embody with themselves the Apostates.

This incident placed Cornelius at the head of the Catholics or majority of the Church; and Novatius at that of the Christians, who contended for purity of faith and morals. The election of a Successor to Bishop Fabianus deceased, was the trial of strength between the two parties, and to determine whether faith or superstition, virtue or vice, were to continue supreme in the Church in Rome. In the year 250, Cornelius put up for the Episcopate, but was opposed with the greatest activity and zeal by Novatius. His opposition however, was vain; for Cornelius was elected to "the Chair of Peter" and Catholicity gained the day in Rome.—Beholding the triumph of the Mystery of Iniquity in the Church, and being convinced that any further efforts to stem the torrent of impiety and superstition in the congregation would be useless, Novatius and his brethren separated themselves from the jurisdiction of the Bishop Cornelius; who, in his turn, having no more that he could do, called a Council at Rome, A. D. 250, and cut off the Novatians, (as they were called,) from the communion of the Church.

Those excommunicated by the Pope, they erected a New Society, or rather continued among themselves the Institution of Christ. On account of the severity of its discipline it was followed by many, and flourished until the fifth century, in the greater part of those provinces which had received the gospel. History testifies, that they cannot be charged with having corrupted the doctrine of Christ; their crime was that they made a schism in the Church. The subsequent career of the Novatians and Catholics, sufficiently testifies, that crime, tyranny, superstition, and blasphemy, were on the side of their antagonists, while the purity of faith and morals was maintained by themselves in the midst of an universal defection. Faithful to their principles, they refused to admit to their communion those who after baptism, had fallen into the commission of heinous crimes though they did not exclude them from the possibility of salvation. They very properly considered a Church of Christ as a Society where virtue and innocence reign over all, and none of whose members, from their entrance into it, had defiled themselves with any enormous crime. With the incestuous Corinthian before our minds, the Novatian rule, in the absence of superior authority, is safe, and well calculated to maintain the health and purity of the Church.—They would not associate with great offenders, but left them with the Judge to settle the account at his coming: They looked upon every Society, which re-admitted such to its communion, as unworthy of the title of a true Christian Church; this was severe, but perhaps necessary, and adapted to the delinquency of the times; and even now, we hesitate not to say, that any Society, which re-

admits heinous offenders, in its bosom is both unworthy and untrue. And lastly, they required all who came over to them from the Catholics, to submit to a second immersion, as a necessary preparation for entering their Society; for, as History testifies, they considered the baptism administered in the popular Churches, as absolutely divested of the power of imparting the remission of sins.

The virtue and excellency of the Church in Rome having succeeded, it soon lost all resemblance to a Christian Body.—So completely was it metamorphosed from a spiritual to a worldly institution, congenial to the views, feelings, and affections of the profane, that we find it in about 62 years after this event, enjoying the patronage of the Imperial Head of the great fiery Dragon. Constantine conferred on its Bishop a sort of pre-eminence over all other Bishops. The Church in Rome now became the Church of Rome; and its Episcopal honors became a most seducing object of sacerdotal ambition; and so earnestly were these contested, that, in the fourth Century, in the case of a double election, a civil war within the City of Rome, was carried on with the utmost barbarity and fury, and produced the most cruel massacres and desolations, before it could be decided whether Ursicinus or Damasus should be the Vicar of Christ!

ERRATA.

(To be continued.)

TESTIMONY IN VINDICATION OF THE EDITOR.

(Continued from page 351.)

In the Religious Herald of February 23, there is an article of about four columns of the most satanic effusion from the pen of Mr. John S. Watt, a Presbyterian clergyman of Lenoirburg County. As it will appear elsewhere, we shall not crowd our pages with it at this time. In the fourth column, however, is the following paragraph, which refers to Bro. A. B. Walthall of Paineville in this County whom the subsequent communication has condescended to notice what would otherwise have been unworthy of comment, were Mr. Watt as well known generally as he is particularly in one or two vicinities. For ourselves, had we expected to have found in Watt a second Macalla, we never should have consented to have met such a person in debate. We will take care the next discussion we are involved in, that it shall be with one, who has a good report with the world at least for possessing the attributes of a gentleman and a man of truth.

Extract.—"A gentleman present, who heard what had been said by Thomas and myself, about snakes, while remarking, during the course of the debate that took place in the middle of the day, on the subject of

dition that Dr. Thomas had given to it, was interrupted by one of his followers, as I heard, and said that Dr. Thomas did not say that the word *napier's* meant a smelling bottle. "Sir," said the gentleman, "if Dr. Thomas were to come to me and tell me so, I would tell him that he uttered a falsehood."—"How am I to take you, Sir?" said Dr. Thomas' follower.—"You may take me just as you please, Sir," said the gentleman. Dr. Thomas' follower then remarked, "that he was a prof. asserter of religion, and could not bear any small offence to him, and so probably retired."

Such was the gentlemanly spirit of this gentleman, who as Mr. Wallhall returned, when informed who he was, was heard by others to say, that he did not care a damn who he (Mr. Wallhall) was. This certainly was a very gentlemanly remark, and well calculated to confirm his reputation as a gentleman of truth!

EDITOR.

Painesville, Va, Mar. 3 1st, 1873.

Beloved Bro. Thomas:—The present crisis in that struggle for truth, in which you have so nobly and so uncompromisingly embarked, calls for all the circumspection and vigilance, as well as all the Christian fortitude and forbearance, which you as well as those who are identified with you in that struggle, can bring to bear in this time of need, this day of trial of our faith much more precious than gold that perishes.

It is the part of wisdom when, in the heat of battle to keep cool and self-possessed in order thereby to be able to guard against and ward off any sudden and unexpected attack, as well as to be ready, at all times, to profit by any neglect or improper maneuver on the part of the enemy. And in the Christian warfare, it is especially necessary to *endure* all things *patiently*; for it is by enduring hardness, as good soldiers that we are the more victorious—it is by a patient continuance in well doing, that we are to seek for glory, honor, and immortality,—in fine, it is through much *tribulation*, that we are to enter upon the promised inheritance. While then the clouds of persecution are gathering thick and dark around us, and while we hear the distant roar of the approaching storm, let us remember that the winds *may* blow, the rains *may* descend, and the floods *may* come and beat upon the christian edifice; but all in vain; for it is founded upon the rock of ages, against which even the gates of Hades shall not prevail. Yes, let all the powers of Earth and Hell combine, let all the forces of Anti-christ be concentrated into one grand phalanx, and march with all their force and fury to scale the walls of Zion's towers, yet the small christian band, having put on the whole armour of God, having their joints girt with truth, having on the breast plate of righteousness, their feet shod with the preparation of the Gospel of peace; above all, having taken the shield of faith, where with they are able to catch and extinguish all

the darts of the wicked; and having taken the helmet of salvation and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God; and praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching there unto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints; that small band I say, thus equipped, would be able, in the evil day, to stand not only against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, and against spiritual wickedness in high places. Let us then take courage and be firm, remembering that the Captain of our salvation has all power, both in Heaven and on Earth, that no good thing will be withheld from them who walk uprightly, that no weapon formed against the right one shall prosper, and indeed that all things shall work together for good to them that love God. So long then as we love God which is to keep his commandments, we need fear no evil; for though we enter through the gate of Hades, yet we shall not be ever detained in those darksome chambers; but like our great forerunner, who is the way, the truth and the life, we shall be waked up in the morning, being redeemed from the power of Hades, and shall be introduced into the enjoyment of that inheritance which is incurruptible, undimmed and which fades not away. Let us then ever keep in view the hope of glory set before us in the gospel and walk worthy of our high vocation, and then all the persecutions, maledictions and mis-representations that may be heaped upon us, will pass over our heads as harmless as the zephyr that softly blows over the verdant fields in the fragrant month of May; while they leave behind a sense of conscious rectitude more soothing and refreshing than even the aromatic breeze from the flowers covered field of enlivening Spring.

All such publications as that in the Religious Herald of the 23d Feb., in which Mr. Watt, while castigating you, (as he would have the public believe,) introduces me under the *odious* name of a follower of D. Thomas, will like a dart whose force had been entirely spent, fall harmless at our feet. For the information of the learned gentleman, I beg leave to say through your paper, that although he may be accustomed to follow in the wake of some great man, yet I acknowledge no man on earth as my leader; one is my leader even Christ. I am sorry that Mr. Watt was not more particular in regard to what he has published in the article alluded to; for he might have saved us the trouble, and himself the mortification of a corrected statement. He has certainly made false impressions on the minds, at least of Bro. Campbell and the Editor of the R. Herald, and I presume of some others also; for it is times when folks saw things in a Religious paper, published by a preacher, they need to believe them, and I reckon they do yet. Hence others besides Bro. C. and the Editor of the R. H. may have been convinced that you are a follower of D. T.

Hebrew alphabet, and Hebrew pronunciation of Mr. Watt has shown himself to be; for he followed you in your pronunciation all the balance of the day until his learned friend, (I suppose,) that night corrected him in his pronunciation; so the next day he came back and criticised on your pronunciation of *Nepheah*, and after he had for the want of argument rode that hobby for two days you thought it was time for the poor pony to rest.—So you gave a reason for your pronunciation without the points, which Mr. Watt publicly admitted to be sufficient, and thereupon put up his jaded pony to be fed and rubbed for another ride, when he should be hard pressed in his mental peregrination over the barren soil of his side of the question. So here he comes fat and slick from the stable of the R. H., kept by Mr. Sands in the City of Richmond, not without first having been well stuffed with a full hate of choice editorial remarks; and Mr. Watt booted and spurred, and dressed in a full suit of priestly livery, mounts, (as he supposes,) the rampant pony; but alas! alas! it is but the delusion of a dream; for soon he falters and sinks beneath his ponderous rider and upon examination the poor animal is found to have "One eye out and 't'other blind, fore leg broke and hune b'hind," and to be broken-winded, string laid and spavined, the effects of having been too severely rode when too young, by a fat and corpulent rider. But to speak without a figure; what if you did pronounce *Nepheah* wrong? does that prove any thing? The question here was: Is the Soul immortal? and the argument was: Dr. Thomas pronounces Hebrew wrong, therefore the Soul is immortal.—That's the amount of Mr. Watt's *Hebrew* argument. The truth is, you advanced arguments on that occasion, unanswered and unanswerable by Mr. Watt; hence his object was, and still is, to draw off the public attention from those arguments, and fix it upon the *trash* which is almost always lugged into all discussions for the want of arguments. If Mr. Watt wished the public to be benefited by his account of the debate, why did he not state some of your chief arguments and his *powerful* and *spirited* refutation of them? And sure! if you are so very *unlearned* and your views so very *abundant*, it would be a hard task for the educated Mr. Watt totally to upturn that whole system.

As to what relates to myself, I am persuaded that the gentleman alluded to in the article as holding a conversation with one of Dr. Thomas' followers, would if consulted, have given a more correct account of that conversation, than that published by Mr. Watt in the Herald. See foregoing extract.

The occasion of that conversation was as follows:

On the 2nd of August, I think it was, you were showing this no fixed and absolute sense can be attached to any word, but that the meaning of all words must be determined by the con-

text, and you referred to the word *Nepheah* in the Hebrew Bible, you prepared by Gesenius and translated by Robinson of *the* *Savior*, which bro. Anderson happened to have present, and after remarking that Mr. Watt was bound to admit it as authority, for that the author belonged to the orthodox side in Religion, you proceeded to read the different meanings given in English, by the author to the word '*Nepheah*,' and amongst others you said it meant "in connexion" a smelling bottle. So far from attempting to make the people believe you were reading from the Bible instead of the *Lexicon*, you told them what Book it was, who the author was, and where the book was compiled. You also read over the references to the various Scriptures without turning to other parts of the book, and I think the people of that section although they may not know Hebrew, would certainly know that Job, Moses and Isaiah, did not all write on one and the same page of the Bible; the more they had no reason to think you were reading from the Bible, because you did not turn over leaves as you read. Mr. Watt attempted to make the impression that the word *Nepheah* did not mean so insignificant and so material a thing as *perfume* or *smell*, and I suppose he succeeded with some; for while the people were taking a recess a certain Mr. H. bro (I think they call him,) was expatiating largely to a cluster of people about Mr. Watt's boasted triumph over you in this behalf, when I remarked that Mr. Watt had reduced the meaning of *Nepheah* to a less thing than Dr. Thomas, admitting that the Dr. said what Mr. Watt alleged, he did, that is that *Nepheah* meant a smelling bottle; for that Mr. Watt, by saying that it required the addition of another word to make it mean that, had reduced it still lower, even to the scent of a bottle. This Mr. Heber denied and contended further that *Nepheah* did not mean *smell*; I replied it did mean perfume! Mr. H. then said that Mr. Watt had proved that Dr. Thomas had told a lie, and that those who supported him in it, were no better than the Dr., and that I might take it as I pleased to which I replied "I shall take it as a Christian, and as a Christian I am convinced when I am reviled not to revile again!" Mr. H. replied that he did not mean to say that I had lied I rejoined, if you did not mean to include me in that remark I cannot complain. Here the conversation ended and as I walked off I heard some one inform, Mr. H. who I was to which he was marked, he did not care a damn who he was. This in the substance, and in many parts the very language of that interview; and I think when Mr. Heber sees this, however much he may dislike your views or my conduct on that occasion he will be bound to admit its correctness, and as a gentleman feel some obligation to have the matter right before the public, so he is concerned.

A. B. WALKER

the Lord," or a "Thus it is written," in affirmation of the question, and we say, amen; we have been taught by some of the prominent actors in this reformation, to call "Bible-things by Bible-names," and that as words represent ideas, if the words are not in the Book, neither are the ideas. The inspired Moses records the simple account above of man's legitimizing, the sentence pronounced upon him for his transgression,— "dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return," and its execution, 930 years from his creation,— "he died." Now where in Moses' history of Adam's creation and death, can we find a "Thus saith the Lord," which taught him that he had an immortal spirit within him, that would, when his body should return to the dust, exist for ages in a disembodied conscious state.

Neither in Genesis, nor to the end of Revelation, can we find such a "Thus it is written," or "Thus saith the Lord," as that man is composed of matter and spirit, the matter shall return to the dust of the ground, whence it was taken, but the spirit being immortal, immaterial and indestructible, shall necessarily live in a conscious state for ever. Can there be found in all the Book, a "Thus it is written, or saith the Lord," for the reunion of body and disembodied spirits?

In the absence of such authority, Bro. T. feels himself bound to hold the position he does, which is the negative, and from which it follows, as an inseparable consequence, that man without Jesus Christ, the resurrection and the life, perishes as the brute.

Though, what is all important, a "Thus saith the Lord, or it is written," it will be yielded, cannot be found, in affirmation of the question, yet, it is contended there are scattered throughout the writings of Prophets and Apostles, numerous passages which imply, that the doctrine of disembodied human spirits in a conscious state, imperishable and indestructible, "was always held and universally received and believed as true, by the holy men of God. But it may be well questioned whether God would leave us to find out such a truth from bewildering applications. It is so with the truth of the doctrine of a resurrection?

Since the appearance to man, of "the Way, the Truth and the Life," the writings and sayings of Evangelists and Apostles do, indeed, abound with numerous incidental allusions to a resurrection from among the dead," and these allusions do most clearly imply, that the Rerarglist and Apostles believed the doctrine of a resurrection of the body to be true. But unlike those in the preceding case; these incidental allusions and implication rest on the everlasting and immutable basis of a "Thus saith the Lord."

Now out of this parent question have arisen many and various others; many of which are—according to our judgment—of

a purely speculative character. A discussion of some of these has occupied prominent place in the Harbinger and Advertiser for some months past, and finally originated in the expulsion of Bro. T. from the fellowship of certain brethren.

Paul contemplates man as a being composed of "body, soul and spirit," but upon neither of these component parts does he pretend to theorise or to speculate—he pretends not to consider either abstractedly. We therefore, with our brethren in Philadelphia, 'disapprove and disallow' all Bro. T.'s speculations, and hold what he and Bro. Walball have written and said, to show that the 'blood of man was his soul, and his breath the Spirit,' as speculative, 'untaught' and unprofitable. And so we hold much that has been spoken and published by other brethren, upon the subject of abstract spirit. Yet we cannot, on this account, treat them as "pagans and publicans."

We understand Bro. Thomas, as maintaining the opinion, inferentially drawn from what he advocates as the truth of the fundamental question already stated, in connexion with his views of the Gospel of Christ; that none but those who hear the Gospel, believe and obey it, and by a perseverance in well doing, seek for glory, honor and immortality, can have eternal life; that Infants, Idiots and Pagans who die such, are not embraced within the salvation of the Gospel. For according to Paul, this "Gospel of Christ, is the power of God for salvation to all who believe." Now if there be a power of God for the salvation of those who cannot believe, it must be some other than the Gospel. It can be admitted, there may be some other power with infinite goodness, if it can be supposed the Scriptures do not contain a full revelation of the future and unalterable destiny of each one and all of Adam's race. But if they do contain such a revelation, and there be little else than silence in them in reference to the future destiny of idiots and infants, is there not a very strong inference forcing itself upon us, that as they are brought into existence unconscious, live unconscious and die unconscious, so they will continue unconscious forever? It may not be as clear to our minds as it is to that of Bro. T., therefore we do not agree with him in the opinion which he so strongly expresses, that "God has certainly revealed to us the future destiny of infants, to be his the way of eternal life." Yet for this difference of opinion, we cannot disclaim fellowship with him, for so we have seen, we do not seem to involve any principle of a practical tendency.

We invite the serious and unprejudiced attention of what Bro. Campbell has written in his *Examiner*, containing page 593, of the *M. Harbinger*, vol. 1, no. 12, new series. There sets forth "the evidences of Bro. T.'s doctrine of the cardinal articles of the Christian Faith, and the doctrinal tendency of" (what he alludes to) "the doctrine of man, and of the future state." If we should not

of what he has written under these heads, present ourselves before the subject in a servile, cringing, suppliant attitude, we trust Bro. C.'s known love of frankness, candour and independence will plead our cause successfully with him. To hear Bro. C. roundly assert that Bro. T. had denied the "resurrection of the dead," might well nigh make one, who had not examined for himself, think Bro. Thomas had denied that "hope and resurrection of the dead," which once died Paul with such majesty and power and strength before Kings and Councils.—But not so. Bro. C. charges him with denying the "resurrection and the judgment of the world."

What says Bro. Thomas! He contemns the human race under two great divisions—those who have the word of life and those who have it not. The latter division embraces pagans, infants and idiots; the former, comprehends those, who not only have the word of life but have purified their hearts by obeying it, denominated the "just," and those who will not obey it, these are the "unjust." The latter holds, that the "just and the unjust," will be the only persons raised from the dead; the former to enjoy eternal life, and the latter to suffer the "second death," and that all others, including idiots, pagans and infants, shall die and sink into a state of endless insensibility. Thus we find Bro. T. denying a resurrection in Bro. C.'s sense, but maintaining a resurrection, according to what he, Bro. T. conceives to be the Scriptural sense.

Bro. C. argues, as a denial of "the resurrection," implies a denial of a "judgment of the world," it would be needless to make more than one article of it, that is a denial of the resurrection, which charge he thinks, we suppose, he has proven upon him. If a denial of the resurrection implies a denial of the judgment of the world, then the abolition of the resurrection of all the dead, implies a judgment of all—not excluding infants and idiots.

Shall we reckon infants and idiots amongst those "at the last day," who shall be judged out of those things, which were written in the books, according to their works? In what sense shall we understand our Saviour when he shall say in a coming day to infants and idiots; will you do good and faithful servant,—I was hungry, naked, sick, and you fed, clothed and administered unto me?

Whether Bro. T.'s views, limiting the "unjust" to those who fear and will not receive the Gospel, be false or true, we are not prepared to give clear and decided opinion. But assuming them to be false, we do not think perversion and misrepresentation of them are necessary to their refutation. The truth, makes such auxiliaries, and indignantly frowns upon their insertion. We doubt not, that it was unintentional with Bro. C. of error or misapprehension in this matter, but think it arose from misapprehension on his part. But assigned as undesigned

the effect is the same on Bro. T. as far as Bro. C.'s language touches with those, who "think and think say themselves a little. Hear Bro. C. "He (Dr. T.) denies perpetual existence to any human being in virtue of his descent from Adam. He (Dr. T.) also teaches, the unjust shall be forever punished. Now the question is, whence this perpetual existence to the unjust writher from Adam nor Christ, say Dr. T." Thus Bro. C.'s misapprehension misrepresents Bro. T. and concludes by fixing on him this triumphant absurdity, "a belief gives them endless being."

Be it such an absurdity can be fixed on Bro. T. it must first be shown, that the ideas of an everlasting punishment necessarily implies the endless continued existence of its subject, and that a person can, at one and the same time, be the subject of the eternal or "second death" and of an endless conscious being. And before their last proposition can be shown to be true, it will be necessary, first to prove, that the "second death is a figurative expression, and not the antithesis of "eternal life" in point of being.

So much for that absurdity; in the noticing of which we have anticipated another perversion, growing out of the same misapprehension, where, in considering the practical tendency of the doctrine, he says, "it would be cruel to send such a Gospel to the heathen, and that it is more malicious than benevolent, because, forsooth, the greatest part of them would be made unjust by it, and thus made forever miserable, whereas without it, they would only have an eternal rest in the bosom of undisturbed unconsciousness." Bro. C. puts it to the understanding and conscience of every reader, to say if this is not cruel." But we would respectfully submit it to Bro. C. to say, if the cruelty, (if it be cruelty,) is not on the other side. For does not Bro. C. teach these his doctrine of future punishment, and that those, who hear the glad tidings of mercy and reject them, are more worthy of punishment, than those who have never heard them? And does he not admit, the number who hear and reject, greatly exceed that of those who hear and accept? Admitting so much, must he not allow, on his own principle of arguing, that it would be cruel to send the gospel to persons, when it will be the "occasion" of an aggravation of their misery forever?

The Gospel makes men unjust! We have thought the proper meaning would be better expressed, the mission of it makes them so—at any rate aggravate their guilt and condemnation. What did our Saviour mean when he said to the Jews, "If I had not spoken to you, you had no sin."—
ned."

We understand Bro. Thomas to hold as
"hope and resurrection of the dead," about which
simply, yet so eminently in 1 Cor. 15.

should ask, with that idle curiosity and speculative inquisitiveness, which prompted some at Corinth in the days of Paul—*How can the unjust dead be raised up, and with what kind of body do they come?*” Who would answer the question in Paul’s language?—*Simpleton*—it is sown in corruption—it is raised in glory &c.” No one; as the Scriptures give no answer, there is none to be found among men. If it be clear that Paul is here writing of the resurrection of the righteous, is it not, in some degree, evident that the *2d v.* must be taken in a limited sense?

Under the most enlarged view that we are capable of taking of this woeful matter, and after the most anxious and impartial investigation that we are able to bestow upon it, in reference to the “great end of morality and religion,” whether in this life or the future, we are brought to the conclusion, that there are not, in its practical tendencies, those dangers which seem to excite and alarm the apprehension of many.

Behold with us a little longer, while we advert to some things, which many of us have learned from Bro. C. He says,—“it is presumed, the momentous changes already accomplished in the British Society—are the legitimate consequence of a single maxim—namely nature is, and of right ought to be, a *thinking being*—he ought not only to think, but to *think for himself*.” “To those of the most enlarged conceptions of human affairs, and of the natural tendencies of things, we imagine it will appear most evident, that it is *safer and happier for society*, that the mind should be permitted to *rest with full assurance only upon its own investigation*, and that perfect freedom of inquiry should be guaranteed to every man to *reason, examine and judge for himself, on all subjects in the usual, involving his own present or future destiny, or that of society*. Happy is it for the general interest of all science and all society, that when men begin to think and reason and decide for themselves, on any one subject untrammelled by the restriction, and unawed by the authority of past ages, it is not within their own power, nor within the grasp of any extrinsic authority on earth, to restrain their speculations.”

Again,—“We have met with no author—who could make us understand what are the intellectual and moral powers—which constitute that *something*, called the human mind.” In addition we would invite your attention to the “*Dover decree*,” published in the *Harbinger*, by which certain persons were driven out from amongst the hospitals for their heretical love and zeal for truth, and to Bro. C.’s remarks upon that memorable occasion. All these things maturely weighed and properly applied, will keep us mightily in this trying crisis.

We have had personal intercourse with Bro. Thomas; we have seen him in private and in public, and we have seen nothing but the exemplary christian; his morals unexceptionable; his

life rigidly self-denying. As to his style and manner of advocating what he conceives to be the truth, we say there has been too much pugnacity—too much bluntness—too much roughness;—and a seeming disregard for the feelings of others, which a love and zeal for the Luth do not require, and we do not approve.

We moreover declare, that we differ from him in the interpretation, which he gives certain passages of the Scriptures, illustrative of his alleged obnoxious tenets.

Thus have we freely expressed ourselves about this brother and his principles,—having in our poor way and in as brief a manner as we could well set forth an exposition of the reasons, which have determined us in the course we have taken. After much anxious reflection, and we think, mature deliberation, we are constrained to give it as the candid and honest conviction of our minds, that the congregation in Philadelphia, have, in the rejection of Bro. T. from christian fellowship, put aside New Testament precedent and precept, and therefore have done wrong.

Have they proceeded according to the authority of the Bible?

Was the 18 c. of Matthew consulted and acted upon by them?

Does the parable of the wheat and darnel afford no practical instruction, by which a different decision might have been made?

Can a discrimination between Bro. T. and a christian be made with more accuracy and precision, than between the wheat and darnel? If there be not a greater dissimilarity between him and a christian, than there is between darnel and wheat, we ask why should the advice, given by our Saviour in that parable, be contemned?

We will even put his case upon the extreme ground, that he is darnel amongst the wheat (which, however, we deny) that the precipitancy, and unwarrantable procedure of the Philadelphia congregation may be most apparent to all. We cannot but learn from this parable, in what an exceedingly delicate and tender manner, our Saviour regarded the exclusion of members of the church. But all these teachings are thrown aside, and Bro. Thomas numbered amongst “*pagans and yob-cans*.” We do now by the weightiest considerations of brotherly love harmony, peace and unity of spirit, amicably and peacefully implore our brethren in Philadelyhia, to retract what they have done, resolve the consequences, and if they do not, we really think they have done wrong, retract their error. We solemnly and affectionately call upon all the members, which may not have gone so far, to pause and consider, whether deliberately, intentionally, or otherwise, they do the harsh things of the Philadelyhia

may you may be governed in what you do, by the wisdom which comes from God, our Saviour, to whom be glory and honor forever. Amen.

Let us not be alienated in our affections and driven asunder by man's vain speculations and unprofitable abstract questions, upon the essence of things. Let those, who will, investigate and pursue such vanities, till they are lost amid the murky logs of mysticism, but let us betake ourselves to the higher and nobler business of endeavoring to pursue the unity of the spirit by the bond of peace; let us rejoice with our Saviour's beloved disciple, in the assurance that "though it does not yet appear what we shall be, yet when he, (our Lord) appears, we shall be like him—we shall see him as he is." The Apostle John does not stop to contemplate an "intermediate state," nor to speak of the happiness of his "disembodied" spirit in that state—nor does he speculate upon what he should be—whether "flesh or bones," or any thing else, but his eyes are fixed in an enraptured gaze upon the glorious appearing of the Lord.

By order of the whole congregation at Bethel, with the exception of our member, whose objection is not against the matter of the letter, but arose from an opinion that its publication now would be premature.

THOMAS E. JETER, } Elders.
JOHN H. JACKSON. }

March 10th, 1839.

A few reflections suggested by the preceding Address.

In all the battles fought under the most skilful generals of which I have read in history, I find that in mar shall hang the order of the fight, they always place in the rear a strong corps *à la reserve*, which oftentimes never engages in the strife, that they may be able to confirm the waverings of the wings or centre, or, if need be, to give an overwhelming impetus to the grand assault by which the fortune of the day is so decided. This movement gained the battle of Marengo, and well nigh secured to the same Commander, victory on the plains of Waterloo.—But his glory was transient, and his immortality founded by the narrow limits of the passing age. He fought for glory, for honor, for a deathless fame; but alas! for the vanity of human ambition, he fought and missed the prize. His reserves worked wonders for his renown; but in the age to come, his genius, his generalship, his valour in the fight, his conquests, and his disengagement of kings will all have been thrown into the shade of oblivion by the incomparable tea's of the Mighty One, before whose august presence, thrones shall fall, and monarchs bite the dust. In that day, he will bring up his re-

serve of cavalry, (Rev. xix.) and upon his own white horse, he will smite his sword to the hilt in the blood of the slain. The day of terror to his foes will that be! But how joyful will be the day of triumph to those who have sought for glory, honor, and immortality by perseverance in well-doing!

Joyful in hope and patient in tribulation is the disposition of those, who before the grand crisis of the conflict, fight, the good fight of faith. The allied army under Wellington in the campaign in Belgium, the battle ground, of Europe, is a marvellous illustration of endurance in suffering for the hope of victory. Three hundred pieces of ordnance crowded down their ranks by hundreds. Deep and frightful chasms were made in their solid squares, yet did their courage and their ranks remain unbroken! They fought and conquered—but for what? For vanity! And shall it be said, that they endured hardness as good soldiers; that they imperilled limb and life—that they braved death in forms the most excruciating, not for fading crowns, but for the hire of a day;—and that the christian, their contemporary, has not the courage to face, in the cause of truth immutable, a frowning and persecuting world! May the thought perish! We will rather indulge the hope that there is even in this superficial age, a 7000 who will not bow the knee to Baal, and some Elijahs at least who fear not to discard him openly, though there may be many Ahabs who go about to kill them.

For myself, I would not only be patient in tribulation, but rejoice in suffering; it by that endurance, the truth might be advanced to its complete development. When I review the past, I am inclined to say with Milton, "best are all things as the will of God ordains them." I know from Scripture, that "all things shall work together, for good to them that love God and are the called according to his purpose." In my own experience I have verified the truth of this. For my own sake, I do not regret that I have been the subject of misrepresentation, slander, and ecclesiastical vengeance; I regret it for the sake of those, who have so far forgot themselves as gentlemen and christians as to have recourse to such unchristly proceedings to stop the mouth of one whose rights and privileges are equal to their own. It is a pity for them, that they should so far have miscalculated their own power and authority, as to suppose that they could veto the free discussion of any point whatever. They have brought up their reserves. They have struck the last, and therefore, their most potent blow; but how vainly! The temper of our breast plate, shield, and helmet, has been so effect. David's sling and stone was a fatal missile. The truth, though massive as a weaver's beam, has proved to be too strong for any man's arm. The Lord of Hosts, the Father of mercies, the God of Israel, is the author of our redemption. By this time, I suppose my readers

that they have been too precipitate in the steps they have taken against me. Crooked policy generally defeats itself. I have never had recourse to it, but have always been straight forward and above board, which, in the long run, will be found to be the best policy, for it is honest. I confess, I have not labored so elaborately as I might have done in sustaining the positions I have set forth. I have adapted my defence to the nature of the attack I have had to bear. This has been, as far as argument is concerned, so feeble and so pointed, that I have ranged much, that could have been advanced in the rear guard as a *corps de reserve* or body of reserve. We have thrown a few bombs, congraves, and hand grenades into our opponent's trenches which have done their works much damage; but as our garrison has been strengthened neither for water, provisions nor forage, we have contented ourselves with posting the watch for the look out, while we have reserved our main force for time of need. But from all appearances, we do not think, that our *reserve of defence* will be needed: we shall, therefore, at some future day convert it into a *reserve of offence*, and carry the war into the hostile territory.

If it were only the giving birth to the preceding Address, we should not regret the call made upon the congregation to which we belong to deal summarily with our alleged Heresy. It is an able, dignified, temperate, and impartial document; and does much credit to the head and heart of the physician who drew it up by order of the Church. The brethren, who compose this congregation know me well; for I go in and out before the every alternate Lord's day. They are well acquainted with my sentiments, which they hear from my own lips; and they know my actions, for they can observe them with their own eyes. This address was drawn up, submitted to the Church, and approved, before I knew that such a thing was in agitation.

Mr. Campbell ought to insert this address, as well as that of the Paisneville and Fork Churches, in the Harbinger. They are documents which would never have seen the light if he had not called them forth. Surely he will not destroy his own work, and say, they shall not appear on my pages! If he do, he may preach about independence, and honesty of purpose, about Christian morality and so forth; but it will all be like the preaching of the Pharisees; who said, but did not what they said. That this may not be laid to his charge with more truth than has yet appeared is the hope of the

Editor.

Liberty, Amelia, Va.
March 25th, 1838.

When the million applaud you, seriously ask yourself whether you have done; when they condemn you, what go.

"Responded to them, I have received a very well written, candid, and I have no doubt, a very correct view of the Hebrew part of said document, from the pen of the Presbyterian Clergyman, Mr. J. S. Watt with whom Doctor Thomas debated on Misralianism." . . . "This unfortunate blunder, completely killed the Doctor at one blow." . . . "Mr. Watt has elaborated this matter with great spirit and power." . . . "Besides those, I have received numerous other documents." . . . "I very thankfully acknowledge the receipt of these favors." . . . "The Author of 'Morality of Christians,' in the Millennial Harbinger."

Illustration by Mr. Albert Anderson.

Prince Edward, March 5th, 1838.

Brother Thomas,

Brother Wilson tells me that your bro. Robert has a letter from you to me, and bro. W. thinks it contains a request for me to give a certificate of the way in which you were brought into the Debate with Mr. Watt. I think I can give a correct statement in substance. In a conversation between Mr. Watt and brother L. Arvin, brother Arvin understood Mr. Watt to send an invitation to me for a Debate. A letter was written by myself to Mr. W., on account of said invitation; my letter proposed an interview for the purpose of making the necessary arrangements. Mr. W. however, in his answer to my letter, stated his regret, that such an impression had been made upon my mind as an invitation to debate; that he had been forced into a declaration of his willingness to debate, by questions put him, such as why do not some of your learned men undertake them &c. I give the substance from memory.

However, an interview took place. It was proposed on my part, that we should throw our views on some important points into plain, intelligible propositions; that on comparing said propositions, we should lay aside such as agreed, and discuss such as did not agree. This proposal was not agreed to by Mr. W. Nothing seemed to suit him, but an attack upon your celebrated Tussekuah address upon the subject of justification, enforced upon the attention of your audience at that place, by an interesting consideration, and expose of the Red heifer subject contained in the 19th of Numbers. (As we afterwards learned, it was not upon your whole address that he wished to make his attack, but upon a tenth of title of it. Truly, this was clergy like, to do with the title. He wanted me to put myself into 'your shoes,' that is to identify myself with you in reference to what he looked upon as your views. This was refused on my part. It was at length agreed that he should deliver his own one hour address, and that I should in the second hour say what I pleased about it. That afterwards we should spend the half an hour alternately, attacking and defending each other's plea. This was a singular arrangement; but it was to be either or none.

It was afterwards agreed, that we should

on my part, and that he should call some of his brethren on his part.

When it was ascertained that you would attend, and was understood that he had not prevailed on any of his brethren to aid him; it was suggested to him, that as he designed his attack upon Dr. T., the people would expect Dr. T. to defend himself. He seemed to agree to this as a reasonable suggestion. This is, (as well as I remember,) a statement in substance of the matter.

Bro. Campbell's commendation of Mr. Watt's criticism, as written with great spirit and power, has come very unexpectedly upon me; indeed I am almost amazed at bro. C.'s eulogy upon such a man as Mr. W., especially when contrasted with his 'belittling' expressions about John Thomas. Where were this spirit and power during the Debate? Were they in his elucidation of his excellent text; "Though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel, &c." When he went on with his appeals to sectarian prejudice, by giving a history of the Baptists before the Revolution, during the Revolution, and since that time, or to national prejudices, when he abused you for being an Englishman, and so grossly abused you as to be called to order, and to submit to that call with so bad a grace, as to cause one of the gentlemen moderators to rise from his seat, and threaten not to sit any longer, if Mr. W. did not desist? Or were they developed, when he exhibited noise instead of sense, about your using a Hebrew Lexicon, and when he obviously did this, because he was unable to return argument to arguments, and was obliged to fill his half hours with vociferations, or leave them unfulfilled? Brother Campbell's eulogy upon such a man, is to me incomprehensible! I am not a man given to personal prejudices, yet, when I endeavored to get hold of arguments from Mr. W. I continually caught bubbles which contained nothing tangible. One was almost tempted to think that Mr. W. was trying to break bones in his words, he pressed upon them so hard and so long! I write in haste having been waiting a while on account of rain. Believe me, your brother in the hope of a glorious resurrection.

ALBERT ANDERSON.

WINDS ON 'THE SALVATION OF INFANTS,'
&c.

Brother Thomas,

Certain indications, which have presented themselves in the course of this "trial," and of which you seem to have been the subject, have reminded me of this passage of Luke's testi-

mony:—"While he spake these things, the Scribes and Pharisees began vehemently to press him with questions on many points; laying snares for him, in order to draw from his own mouth matters of accusation against him." This was a mean artifice, yet perfectly consistent with the character of the Scribes and Pharisees of our Lord's age. There are Scribes now, who scribble many things, which it would show their wisdom to withhold. But, if they will gratify their *caecot Aes scribendi*, or itch of scribbling, by scribbling nonsense, 'tis a pity they will persist in thrusting upon you, as articles of your faith, their own superficial deductions from what you have written. This, however, is a grievance you will have to bear with patience. It is difficult to write upon any subject without being misintently rated by biased or prejudiced people. You must be content to bear the fate of all advocates for truth as opposed to error. All you can do, is to supply your readers with subjects for reflection; it is beyond your power to furnish them with intellects to comprehend or to digest them.

In the Harbinger for March, which has just come to hand, I see two letters from M. Winans. In the first, he says, that he had addressed you on the 'salvation of infants' Salvation of infants! Is this a Bible phrase for a Bible thing? Is there any such an expression in the whole book of God? We have been taught, that if the phrase is not in the Bible, the thing signified by the phrase is not there either. Believing this to be true, I conclude, that no such idea as the 'salvation of infants' ever entered the head of the holy men of God who wrote the Bible. If then it belongs not to the language of Canaan, it must certainly be sought for in the vocabulary of Ashdod alone. The salvation of infants from what? From the pains and penalties of Hell forever? Sectarian theology answers 'Yes.' Are infants, then, liable to 'the damnation of Hell' from the unfortunate circumstance of their being descended from the First Human Pair who disobeyed God? The theological world will have it so! But there is no such doctrine in the Bible as the damnation of infants to the flames of Hell; and if therefore, they are to be saved, their salvation must be from a deliverance from something else. And what is that thing, which is to deliver them from temporal death? It cannot be from this; because infants die; and no such event ever happened, as the salvation of an infant to heaven. If then, it be neither from this life, temporal death, nor the damnation of Hell, what can it be, but from an eternal sleep? And if it be from this death, where is this taught in the Bible? For I have searched for it, but searched in vain.

M. Winans goes on to say, that he saw a vision, in which he saw a man was a type of Heaven, and that he was saved from the faith; from which, his inference was, that we are saved from our father heaven unconditionally! Now

souling, and sure I am, it is not scriptural; because nothing which is absurd is sustained by Bible testimony.

His syllogism suggests the following to my mind:—Canaan is a type of Heaven; Philistines were to Canaan as thorns in the sides of Israel; Ergo, there will be Philistines as thorns in the sides of the Israel in Heaven! Again, he says,—"God did not speak to infants, but that I spoke of them," therefore, infants are taken to Heaven unconditionally! Let us try this also by the rule of *reductio ad absurdum*. All that God has not spoken to will be saved; God has not spoken to brutes; Ergo, brutes will be saved and that too unconditionally! He seems to lay much stress on the text, "as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." Really, I am astonished that "the usual good sense and point which characterise the Doctor," have forsaken him here. Let him turn to the context, and he will find that the "all does not apply to all of Adam's race or descendants; but is limited to all of Adam's posterity who are "in Christ;" for Paul is talking about the resurrection of those who had fallen asleep in Christ and not out of him. So easy is it to demolish such orthodox and flimsy 'anti-speculative' speculations!

By his second letter, I find, that the Advocate is "bous, for a new discovery." He gives in the form of a quotation a version of your doctrine, "all that have been immersed, not understanding at the time, that immersion was for remission of sins, must be re-immersed." Now I confess, that I have never understood this to be your view of the matter. As it stands in M. W.'s letter, I should suppose, that you taught 'Immersion for the Remission of Sins;' but I have never read any such doctrine as this in your Advocate. I have understood you to teach that God purifies the hearts of men by faith in the blood of Christ and that this faith to be of benefit to the subject, must be accompanied by a burial in water into his death. Am I right?

Do you teach, as M. W. says, that the punishment of the wicked in Hell will be perpetual; or in other words that nothing will be punished eternally?

As to James A. Butler, I know not what to say of him after comparing his letter to you in the Advocate, with that of A. Campbell in the present Harbinger! I will offer no comment on his case, further than to say that 'the end does not justify the means,' and that we have no right to do evil that an alleged good may come. Let the reader compare the two documents, and make his own conclusions. "Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help.—His breath goeth forth; he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish. Happy is he that hath the God of Jacob for his help, whose hope is in the Lord his God." Ye call that has this refuge is a strong fortress and secure from every danger.

OMICRON.

Reply to the Queries

do not teach 'Immersion for the Remission of Sins;' but of of "the Gospel concerning Jesus and the Resurrection," an obedience to it; which consists in being buried with him to his death and burial. I teach that without a burial, the efficacy of the gospel, immersion avails nothing. This is necessary for the Remission of Sins. How often will it be necessary to repeat it to disarm misrepresentation of its being

I believe that the Scriptures teach that the wicked will be punished as long as there is any thing of them to be punished with 'destruction'; and that this destruction will be 'perpetual,' 'perpetual,' 'eternal.' & Thesa. 1. 9. I never said, though never intended to say, that "nothing would be punished eternally." Bro. Winans will pardon me when I say that this is one of his own ingenious fictions.

Epaeon.

*Of the Veracity of 'the Rev. John S. Watt,
Lancaster County, March 6th, 1838.*

Dear Brother Thomas,

Robert arrived here about 12 o'clock, in a great hurry for home. I should have been glad to have had more time to write; I will however, say a few things. I have sent you the Address of the Church, which we wish you to publish; also Colonel Richardson's Certificate. I send you one hundred dollars to assist in the publication of the Debate, which is wished for as soon as possible. Let me say something to you about Watt, who is of such great moral worth! He came to my house one morning, and stayed perhaps three quarters of an hour; and in the time he palpably contradicted himself twice, Brethren Watts and Silas Wilson present, who will recollect his contradictions; and heard a member of the Presbyterian Church, belonging to the congregation for which Mr. Watt preaches, say, in the Court yard, in the presence of Bro. Watts, that Watt insulted him and his family in his own house, and told a lie; and that he showed him his fist. The gentleman to whom I allude, is a man of as much truth as any in the County; and when Watt could no longer defend himself from the falsehood he had been guilty of, he said he wished his tongue had been blackened.

I cannot obtain Mr. Ragsdale's certificate. He is in

"Mr. Joel Ragsdale was one of the Moderators who presided at the Debate; and was chosen as such by Dr. Anderson, and every opponent's Record. On my part, none were chosen, every possible advantage, save that of argument, being taken by Mr. Watt's side, we surrendered our right to choose our own Moderators. The next contention was, that the Debate was related by the Deaf, Bro. Watt's side, and that the Deaf, Bro. Watt's side, and many others, be satisfied.

State of Alabama. But I have seen Mr. Ragsdale several times since the Debate; and many others can testify of it; he says that before he ever heard you he was veering, and that he believes, that if he never had seen you, he should have been a confirmed infidel; and that he is thoroughly convinced of the doctrine for which you contend at the Debate. Mr. Ragsdale is a man of as high standing as any in the State of Virginia, and formerly the Representative of the County. I will get his certificate as soon as he returns.

'I see you are engaged in hot combat! Well, the hotter the war the sooner over. You have nothing to fear; don't injure yourself; your enemies cannot do it. I should like to have written more, but have not time. The Advocate will be supported. I will pay fifty dollars a year myself before it shall go down. Farewell.

Yours in the hope of the Resurrection,

WM. A. STONE

P.S. If you should make any extracts from this letter, (which you are at liberty to do,) if you do me injustice, I will make my own complaints, and not wait for A. C. to do it for me.

W. A. STONE

For the Advocate.

The Elders of the Congregation of Christ meeting in the Sycamore meeting house, Richmond, Va.

To all the Saints and faithful Brethren in Christ. Dearly Beloved,

Whereas the Congregation meeting at Painesville, Amelia County Va. has decreed in a paper to name a Circular to the Brethren; naming Dr. John Thomas as a member of their body, and sustaining him as a co-sponsor, Editor of the Advocate, and especially as "one whose work is extraordinary, and whose devotion to the truth is so ardent, that they so writing to "regard the love of fellowship with many," rather than "sever from their congregation;" and whereas the said Dr. Thomas, was for some time considered a member of our body, and was an Elder for some time in the Congregation, during which time he acquired a far different character, as was more fully developed after he left the City. We deem it our duty to notice them publicly, the Circular above alluded to, and make known to the community how we stand in relation to said Dr. Thomas. In order to which we state.

1st. We consider opinions as private property, and each individual entitled to hold and enjoy his own opinion, provided he does not attempt to force it upon others, and provided also his conduct is as becomes the Gospel of Christ.

2nd. That we disapprove and reject many of the opinions and speculations of Dr. Thomas.

3rd. That we have something more serious, than mere opinions and ungrounded speculations, against Dr. Thomas, of which he is aware. Since his removal from the City an A. Physician was made known to us, who has been furnished by some Christian Brethren, and an Elder of our congregation, in which light shall be obliged to clear him until he receives us of our errors and of his corrections. If he should fail to do that, we shall no longer

recognize him as a Christian brother, and consider ourselves in no communion with him whatever.

May favor and peace be to all the holy Brethren,

THOMAS J. GLENN,
J. B. BRAGG,
WM. M. CARTER.

Richmond, March 25th, 1832.

A copy of the foregoing, has been sent to the Millennial Harbinger, and one to the Christian Postmaster.

MY DEFENCE.

I have just received the document which is signed by the names of Messrs. Glenn, Bragg, and Carter. The third "form" of the Advocate was almost completed when it came to hand. That my readers, however, and the public might have it as soon as possible, I have thrown out other matter, which was already set up, to make room for it. Never shall it be said of the Editor of this paper, that he would give insertion only to what served his own purpose.

From a letter written to a brother in this neighborhood from King and Queen, I and others were convinced, that the designs of my enemies had been partially defeated by the answer to Mr. Campbell's call proceeding from Painesville instead of from Richmond. But it seems, that a malevolent determination to do his bidding in the spirit if not in the letter of his Decree, is still uppermost in their hearts. Doctor Thomas is to be put down at all hazards; if not as a heretic, there are not wanting those who will volunteer their services to blast his fair renown. Alas! for them, "dust and ashes" that they are. Do they not know that there exists a God in Heaven, who is the searcher of all hearts, and who can, yea and doth discern the bitterness and malignity of theirs? Do they think there are no men of honesty and intelligence, who can detect the malevolence and severity of their doings? But time will discover their deformity, and abundantly reveal the dishonesty of their proceedings, without much ado from me. I will add this, that their vengeance is without a sting; for my actions when scrutinized by a just and impartial God will be approved though condemned by every son of Adam.

In the first place, the above document is not a Letter to the Church in Richmond; but from three men styling themselves Elders of the said Church. It is neither a Letter to the Church nor 'by order of the Church' at all events. It is not so written. An incident is suggested, but it is not so written. The last time I was in the presence of the Lord's Day, the question of choosing Elders was on the occasion, and amidst the confusion of the occasion, a number of their individual names were mentioned, but I could not be indifferent to any of them. I then begged leave by instructions in the matter of choosing Elders, from Timothy and Titus. Having finished,

Brother Joseph Woodson. I appeal to this brother, whether he did not make every reasonable concession. I granted, that it was possible, that the bargain might have been made, but that it had entirely escaped me. I admitted, that on his part, he might have entirely forgot the conversation on the road to his house. And, further I offered, that as he felt himself aggrieved, to restore him the difference between the fees of the alleged bargain and the \$3 per visit charged. But he refused to take the money; I even proposed to deposit the alleged over-charge in the hands of trustees to be disposed of at their pleasure. But to this he would not agree. After a little more sparring, we again agreed to bury all in undisturbed oblivion. How Mr. Curtis Carter has fulfilled his *Covenant* on this matter, I leave the impartial reader to determine. In my judgment he has broken *Covenant* in this very thing. I appeal to Bro. Joseph Woodson for the truth of what I have here stated. In conclusion, I would affirm, that this matter never became a subject of Church Discipline between us. If what is right, therefore, does this triumvirate come forward and denounce me without trial in the manner they do! My conviction is, that it is to gratify *prejudice* and the *affectionality* of their Leader.

As to the second charge of being an Extortioner, they are unjust and dishonestly in bringing up such a charge against me which has already been investigated before the Church and decided in my favor. The circumstances were these. A young man, one of the apprentices of one Gorton Hanes, formerly a member of the Church, was brought to me with a dislocated shoulder, which I reduced in the presence of Bro. Wm. Bootwright, who can testify that it was done as the truth. At the usual time, I sent in the account, but before it was so, as I was unacquainted with the medical fees of the City I took the precaution to inquire of Mr. Hanes' family person the usual fee in such a case. He told me \$20. I thought I would be on the safe side and charge I paid \$15. Mr. Hanes paid it. Many sayings of his subsequently came to my ears, which induced me to call upon him for explanation in the presence of two witnesses. As he only aggravated the matter I brought it before the church. One charge brought against me was the crime of being an Englishman, and therefore by nature an enemy to the negro! A regular muster was made of disaffected and disorderly members to make up a majority by which to effect my expulsion from the church. Members were brought up to vote against me who had scarcely darkened the doors for the celebration of the death of Christ more than once in six months. This party which is now scattered, unless they have rallied since I left, were strenuous for ruling the church by votes of majorities. My case was tried, the vote was taken, and the

majority, of which brother Wm. M. Carter one of the three signers above was one, exculpated me of extortion. As Hanes has since said, as reported to me, 'the Doctor overgenerated them,' and seeing how the vote had resolved the case, they one and all took up their hats and marched out to the number of about ten men, who had ever been a millstone as it were about the neck of the Church. The Elders, beside myself, at this time, were T. J. Glenn, Wm. Bootwright, and — Redd. I will relate one incident illustrative of the iniquity of my enemies. One of the party, that was brought up to vote me out as an Extortioner, had not long before dislocated his own shoulder, and had actually been charged by Hanes' physician, who told me the usual fees in the case, \$20, which he paid, and which was \$5 more than the fee indicated by myself. So much then for my extortion.

Upon the subject of my medical charges in Richmond, I would observe, that if I charged any one too much it was an error in judgment and not a desire of gain. For I can appeal to many in that City, if I did not neglect my profession, and consequently the means of making money, in order to comply with invitations from various points of the compass to come over and help them. Had I devoted myself to my practice as other 'Christians' do to making bricks, measuring lumber, and other gainful trades, I could have filled my purse as deep as they. But it was not so with me, I attended to the affairs of the king first, and God has hitherto supplied my need.

If the document be that of the Church, and not merely that of the 'Elders,' I shall resume the subject hereafter.

I perceive it is also sent to the Harbinger. Dare Mr. Campbell insert it in his paper, and not permit this my defence to accompany it likewise? I pause until the consummation of the act. As to the Christian Publisher, I cannot for a moment doubt but its Editor will permit its readers to see my reply. I regard the whole affair as a conspiracy for my destruction; but the power of my enemies cannot effect it.

I shall not detain the reader longer. If he is an honest and impartial man, he will judge tightly according to the facts; but if he be neither the one nor the other, then his decision concerns me not.

Error.

Adden a. — I would just add, that William M. Carter is the best man that should have volunteered his services in securing me of extortion. I attended his family in sickness and obstinately. The fee in Richmond is \$30; and if the physician be called out of town, one dollar a mile extra. He called upon me to discharge his account. I made no charge in the case. I told him, that as he had been kind to me, I would leave him to name his own price, which he did; fixing it at \$100. He stated, that I had obtained no charge for certain services to his sick family. I told him, that they had escaped me, but he

them pass, and say so much for the whole. He expressed himself as perfectly satisfied; and in proof of it, as I was about to set off for Lunenburg and other places south of the James, offered me money towards defraying my expenses. I refused to accept it; stating, that it was for those who sent for me to be at charges with me, and not the brethren in Richmond. I am persuaded from what I know of Brother Wainian, that I should not have seen his name among my accusers, had he not been under the influence of others. As to Curtis Carter, he is a wealthy, quarrelsome, obstinate man. A warm friend, where he takes a liking; but a bitter enemy to such as incur his displeasure. As a member of the Church, he is moose, distant, and disorderly; and had he been a poor man, would have been either publicly reprov'd, or suspended. When in the congregation, he sits off to himself from his brethren, and leaves the house with scarcely an exchange of civilities with any.—It is, or used to be, the custom to invite members to exhortation. One brother, of whom I have heard him express the highest esteem, but to whom he has become hostile, was in the practice of responding to this; but as soon as he would begin to speak, as I am credibly informed, he would take his hat and walk out of the assembly in the rudest and most disturbing manner. On the subject of my extortions, I would add lastly, that it is only the rich men by whom I am accused. There are poor in the City who can testify that I have healed their diseases without fee.

Let it be observed that the Elders accuse me, *hypocritically*; and instead of proceeding towards me according to Matt. x viii, charge me before all the world when they make my tribunal, instead of the Church as Christ commands. Until I satisfy them of their error, an accusing me of the things alleged, they affirm that they will regard me as guilty! Impartial and just judges truly. And if I fail to do so, they will no longer recognize me as a Christian brother. So that they will regard me as guilty, although they admit the probability of their being in error! Right, say men!—And as to your fellowship, that is of you Thomas Jefferson Glenn and Joel B. Bragg, I have long been in doubt how I could conscientiously regard you as 'Christ's.' Your confessed ignorance of the Gospel, and Joel B. Bragg, your worldly-mindedness combined, has often mortified me as a member of the same Society with you! The document before me in the hand writing of T. J. Glenn, abundantly proves to my mind, that feeling or rather passion, and not principle in the spring of your actions, except in temporal affairs. Now permit me to say, that whether this defence satisfies you or not, (and what justice is there in passion!) I crave not your fellowship as brethren. If we meet hereafter let it be as citizens, respectfully. Farther than this we have no affinity, under existing circumstances.

Edwa.

Liberty, Amelia, Va.,
March 25th, 1828.

God made the Country, and Man the Cities, which are the
Seat of every species of hypocrisy and crime.

THE ADVOCATE

&c.

Vol. 4. Amelia County, Va.; April, 1828. No. 12

EGYPT.

(From *Blackwood's Magazine*.)

The present condition of Egypt is perhaps amongst the most remarkable of any existing territory of the world. The Jewish prophecies marked it from the earliest periods of history as lying under anathema, second only in sternness and extent to that of Judea itself. Its religious corruptions, which have been suffered, as if for the purpose of showing to what depths the human mind, in its natural state, can descend, brought down upon it the extraordinary malediction that the Egyptians should never be an independent people. No prophetic declaration has been ever more distinctly fulfilled. For nearly three thousand years the Egyptians have been the prey of adventurers, successfully ravaged by the Persians, tyrannised over by the Greek successors of Alexander, turned into a province by the Romans, ravaged by its Saracen Government, enslaved by its Mamluke robbers, conquered by the French, again in the hands of the Turks, and at this hour mastered by a Turkish slave.

Whether its long depression is now about to cease, or whether, as is much more probable, it is destined, on the death of Mahomed Ali and his son, to fall again into the hands of the Turks, and feel the pillage of a Turkish government, is only for the future to decide. But the not less extraordinary circumstance characterises Egypt, that it, of all the regions of the earth, is perhaps the most singular instance of a continuance of fertility, and of a perpetual provision of that fertility. In the midst of a desert, the narrow land of Lower Egypt presents to the eye a territory whose exuberance scarcely requires the aid of human labor, and has scarcely ever failed in the course of centuries. This is the well-known valley of the known Nile. But it is not to be overlooked, that the physical conditions of Egypt, exhibiting the most striking contrast to each other since the days of Pharaoh,

proof of the fact that the power and prosperity of a nation are dependent on higher sources than soil and situation. The position of Egypt is made for power! Inaccessible by land, with the desert for its rampart; inaccessible by sea, from the shallows of the Nile, if the people had the spirit to defend either frontier or their shore; standing on the central point between the east and west, and thus commanding the opulent commerce of both with the unexampled productiveness of a soil utterly inexhaustible,—why has Egypt been a prey or a province for nearly 3000 years? All probability is against it; Nature is against it; but fact is for it, and prophecy had prepared us to expect it. *Great designs of Providence may be in activity at this moment for the restoration of the East to its moral understanding, and for the extinction of those horrid, fierce, ignorant, and godless governments which tear it to pieces.*

THE THOUGHTS OF MEN, TOTALLY FREE FROM EXTRAVAGANCE, ARE TURNING UPON PALESTINE. The days of the Crusader will never come again; but it is impossible to doubt that a new influence is turned towards regions on which neither Jew nor Christian can look without a mingling at once of joy and pain, of the loftiest hope and deepest humiliation.

The ceremony of the opening of the Nile has lately taken place, and it is singularly characteristic.

At four in the afternoon of the 19th of August, the Nile having risen to the proper height for cutting the canal, through which the waters of the Nile are conveyed into Lower Egypt, a large boat, having scaffolding erected, dressed with flags, awnings, and carpets for the occasion, and crowded with people, was seen slowly ascending the stream; and presently another large dressed-out boat steered off to the former, both were lashed together; these were preceded by another boat, having a gun on her bow, which continued firing during their ascent up the river. These three were joined by various other boats.—Both sides of the Nile were crowded with lookers on. The Garden of Rhoda, which lies contiguous to the spot where the waters are let in, was also densely crowded. On the arrival of the vessels at this point they were received with a salute of artillery, stationed there for that purpose. Through the whole night boats had been constantly passing up and down, most of them with Arab music on board. In fact, for this one night in the year, the Nile may be said to resemble Venice in its summer serenading.

At frequent intervals, rockets, artillery, blue lights, and fireworks of various descriptions, were fired throughout the night. Close to the spot where the cut was to be made, stand the buildings which contained the machinery by which the waters of the Nile are conveyed to the citadel of Cairo. Those buildings seemed, when the fireworks were playing, like a huge fortification; for, as they occasionally lightened the atmosphere,

hundreds of people were seen on their summits. As the morning dawned, the boats with the harems began to appear with various suites from different points. First came the ex-*sheriff* of Mecca, with his splendid and pampered Arab horses, of the true Neghed breed, probably the finest in the world; then came the dervishes from Turkey; those wore their handkerchiefs and badges on this occasion. The consuls of European nations, as well as the subjects of those nations, all repaired to the spot.

Next came the military, civil, and other officers of the Egyptian Government; and last, not least, at eight o'clock, came Habib Effendi, the venerable and respected Governor of Cairo, to attend the opening of the waters. His barge began to throw copper money in handfuls for the poor into the canal. At sunrise the laborers stationed to cut the soil were at their work; and at a quarter past eight the waters rushed in, and in ten minutes after a boat passed through, and floated for two miles inland. Habib Effendi then presented the Cadi of Cairo with a caftan, or robe of honor, and his agent also gave other robes to the officers of the Cadi. The tents and two most beautiful flags of cloth of gold were now struck, and in a quarter of an hour the whole multitude had disappeared. All were dressed in their richest costumes, and all wore happy faces. The shouts of the multitude, and the roar of cannon at the first gush of waters was almost paralyzing, joined as it was with a prayer to Heaven from nearly every human being on the spot, whose numbers probably amounted to 250,000.

While the present extraordinary man at the head of Egypt lives, all will go well; but age is already pressing on him.—Ibrahim, his son, is sickly; and a few years will probably dissolve the whole fabric, restore the dominion of the savages and the sands, lay the power of the great Viceroys in the same historic dust, where the valor of Saladin and the ferocity of the Beys had been laid, and leave nothing but the foundation for a new thousand-and-one nightly dreams of Arab and African splendors, the rhapsodies of future Egyptian minstrels, and the theme of travellers looking for the spirit of the mighty Mahomed Ali among the fragments of his towers and tombs.

REMARKS.

In the mind of the student of Prophecy there is but little apprehension of such a catastrophe at this period of the world. The Lord declared by Isaiah that he would smite Egypt; he also said, that he would heal it. The Egyptians have been long the slaves of Turkish Tyranny, and a very important province of that Empire; but, first by Ali, who broke the power of the Mamelukes, and next by Mahomed Ali, who renounced the authority of the Sultans,

troops beyond the Mountains of Taurus, Egypt has been delivered from Ottoman oppression. This event, is a consequence of the pouring out of the sixth Vial upon the River Euphrates; the consummation of which will be the utter, and irrevocable, subversion of the Turkish Dominion. Egypt may pass into the hands of Russia or England upon the demise of its present sovereign; we presume rather into those of England, for the government of that country would never consent to the establishment of Russia in the Mediterranean Region; but the time is passed for its re-annexation to Turkey, which, of itself could not re-conquer Egypt; and should any other power offer to assist it, the jealousy of its Allies would interpose to prevent a conquest, which might ultimate in the vanquished being retained as a security for the expenses of the war, incurred by the confederate Power to its own aggrandisement, and the jeopardy of neighboring States.

At the same time that the separation of Egypt tends to the drying up of the Turkish Empire, it is very intimately connected with the political re-constitution of Israel, and the complete regeneration of the Egyptians themselves. Since the political Earthquake of 1790, the Human Mind has received an impulse, which no power on earth can check or control. Its career is onward; its march knows no retrograde. It may be kept in ignorance; but, when once enlightened to ignorance it cannot be recalled; the slavery of despotism may be perpetuated; but the happiness of even a less galling yoke will prompt a people to a self-defence, which may ultimate in complete deliverance. Light is dissipating even Egyptian darkness, and they are learning to prefer the rule of an Independent, though arbitrary, sovereign to the oppression of a Sultan's Viceroy. We do not believe, therefore, that Egypt is doomed to relapse into Turkish degradation. No, she is on her advance to that glorious consummation, when 'Israel shall be reckoned a third, together with Egypt and Assyria; a blessing in the midst of the earth; and when it shall be said 'Blessed be my people Egypt.'

The writer in Blackwood suggests that 'great designs of providence may be in activity at this moment for the restoration of the East to its moral understanding.' As a student of the 'prophetic word,' and an observer of the events now developing in Europe, and the East, I am convinced, as I have often said, that the East, the home of Man's nativity, and the theatre of his most interesting history, is about to be restored to more than its pristine ascendancy over the other sections of the Globe. Some may have deemed me visionary in my views of future oriental glory and magnificence, but, their judgement notwithstanding, it seems from the foregoing, that 'the thoughts of men, totally free from extraneousness, are turning upon Palestine.' My views of Eastern splendor are derived from two sources—*Revelation* and *contemporary History*. The former teaches, that the Great 'Re-

storer of the paths to dwell in, who will extinguish 'those horns fierce, ignorant, and godless governments, which tear the East to pieces,' will in the latter day, stand with his feet upon the Mount of Olives; from whence he will ascend 'the throne of David his father,' and wield the universal sceptre of a subject world. And the History of the Eastern Hemisphere, contemporary with ourselves, instructs us, that political, commercial, maritime, and scientific enterprises are all concurring to prepare the way for that grand crisis in human affairs.

We have no fear therefore, of a retrograde movement, of the probable dissolution of the existing fabric, or of the restoration of the dominion of the Savages and the sand, consequent upon the demise of Mahommed Ali, or of Ibrahim his Son. They are laboring, it is true, for the perpetuity of the Egyptian Throne in their own family; but this will prove the baseless fabric of a vision: a few years will place all Egypt at the disposal of that Sultan from heaven, whose right it is alone to reign. The rhapodies of the minstrels of Egypt of that glorious future will attune their harps, not to magnify the deeds of the mighty Ali, but to celebrate the praises of him, whose renown will fill the whole earth!

Edwin.

ADDRESS FROM THE CHURCH AT OAK GROVE.

Lunenburg, March 4th, 1838.

The congregation worshipping at Oak Grove, Va., to the brethren in Christ Jesus.

Dear Brethren, the most of us having just embraced the hope that is in Christ Jesus as set forth in the Gospel, (though some of our heads are gray with the decline of the present life,) do with regret view the hindrance of the progress of the truth which the present state of things has produced. But as we are commanded to mourn with them that mourn and rejoice with them that rejoice, we feel ourselves called on to communicate to the Brethren generally, and especially to the Brethren at Painville. Dearly beloved as we have constituted on the word of the Lord alone without regard to opinions, and consider every one righteous who does righteousness or lives in obedience to the precepts of the Gospel; we cannot discard Dr. Thomas as a Brother, but we do appropriate the decision of the Painville Church. We deem it unnecessary to say any thing about the better course that Bro. C. ought to have adopted towards Bro. Thomas, only we wish every Brother to see him so ready to seize the weapon of an enemy, as Bro. C. ought to have adopted towards Bro. Thomas, and we do hope that he has or will overcome his prejudice, and become truly convicted of this unchristian matter and become truly convicted of this unchristian matter towards a Brother in the one hope as revealed by the Holy Spirit.

not as imagined. There is one sentiment in the Harbinger to the Sister in Lunenburg, that we have arraigned at the tribunal of the sayings of the Apostles and without taking its age or its author into consideration, we have unanimously condemned on account of its not having a thus saith the Lord, to sustain it; but only the good and the great of the so called Christian world.

And whereas many misrepresentations have gone abroad about the Debate between Bro. Thomas and Mr. Watt; we think it necessary to state (being eye witnesses,) that Bro. Thomas did scripturally defend the cause of truth and shake the foundations of the sects in Lunenburg and convince some of the priest ridden citizens, and we believe the sects would have been driven almost to despair, had it not been for the scraps thrown them by some called reformers; whether it was to justify themselves or not, we shall not undertake to say. But we can safely affirm that the sects have more hope of putting down Dr. Thomas through Bro. Campbell than by any effort they can make; yet some of them are bold enough to say they will give him a shot presently from his own gun. Bro. Campbell need not think his enemies will not seize the prize whether contested or not; neither do we believe that any thing believed without Debate makes it true.

As it respects Mr. Watt's having debated logically, we believe if it had not been for Bro. Thomas being an English man, the Old Baptist, the smiling bottle, and the Old Brother Presbyterian's having killed many English men in the Revolution War, his thread would not have been half as long as it was; sometimes appeared very sick of his cause, and frequently spoke with glad when his hour was out, and sometimes would take great pains in asking the Doctor what he said, and publicly confessed he had not attended to what the Doctor had been saying; we therefore believe he had let the Debate almost entirely slip him before he put the late report in the Herald, and do sincerely hope neither the Brethren nor the public will be satisfied with the one-sided view of the subject which they have had.

There is one thing we wish to impress upon the minds of all, which is this, the cause in which we are engaged is one that cannot be enjoyed nor supported without or before being understood; our strength therefore does not consist in numbers, but in the knowledge of the truth as written in the book of Revelation; nor can it produce a rational and well grounded hope without obedience to all its precepts. We enjoy the good effect, and therefore would communicate with others, that we may not be easily shaken. We hope union and communion will continue to subsist among all the Brethren that contend for the Apostolic faith alone.

May the sustaining and comforting scriptural influences of the Holy Spirit be with you all. Amen.

Signed by order of the Church.

CHARLES GEE, Elder.

N. B. Those Editors who profess not to be one-sided, will please give insertion to this Address.

C. G.

Extract from a letter in reply to a correspondent in Nottingham, England.

"That God should create matter capable of thinking appears as incredible to some, as that He should raise the dead from their corruption, did to King Agrippa. The Sadducees erred in denying certain things for two reasons; first, they were ignorant of the Scriptures; and secondly, they were ignorant of the power of God: you err," said Jesus to them, "not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God." And these are the two grand causes of scepticism among professors of religion in the present day.— Now, he that knows most of Nature and Revelation, the things of which harmonize in all their parts, and whose belief in the power of God is boundless, will be found if he commit his reflections to paper, to entertain views of an uncommon and startling character. And why uncommon? Simply, because it is so very uncommon a thing, for men to study the Word of God independently of the prejudices of education. He that takes it for granted that every thing is known in society, that can be known from the Word of Wisdom, even if the study of that word should bring him to opposite conclusions, will be very apt to reject his own concepts in favor of the popular faith. Does it harmonize in all right reason to conclude that the truth has been perverted in all its parts, except in that concerning the immortality of Man? Had the world retained the true doctrine concerning eternal life the truth would have returned unaltered by the traditions of men. Now, I think, this deserves re-union—that the New Testament doctrine of Immortality teaches, not the continuance of Immortality to an incorruptible principle in man, but how that WHICH IS MORTAL, MAY BECOME IMMORTAL. "This mortal," says the word, "shall put on immortality," not this immortal spirit shall be continued in immortality; but this mortal or animal body.

I want to suggest a something to you which to me conveys a grandeur of conception far transcending all human imagination. I am often embarrassed in expressing my ideas, by the want of precision and feebleness of the English language; so difficult is it to speak of divine things in human speech. Well might Paul say he had heard and seen things unutterable. My difficulty in expressing myself as not to be misunderstood. Well; express to you, that the wisdom of God is singularly manifested in his having constituted a material or animal body, a simple principle. That idea is, the forming of

the ground a substance capable of mental combinations, by some termed reason and 'instinct.' This is the first principle, or radiote, of the animal world. And I would suggest first—that the reason why the individuals or citizens of this world, are not all of one form is, that they may be able to execute or develop the conceptions of the thinking substance in its several stages from incipience to its organization in man. Thus one modification of this substance conceives the idea of crushing the bones of the Buffalo, and afterwards of swallowing him whole, horns, hoofs, and every thing. Now if this modification of the thinking substance were placed, or incorporated in the human form, or in the form of a sheep or hare, it could not develop its conceptions for want of a system of organs capable of executing or of developing its purpose; but incorporate it in the form of a Boa Constrictor, and it can at once accomplish its desire. The most perfect thinking substance in the animal world is the Human Brain. The nucleus of this substance is discoverable in the polypus; and ascends from the zoophyte through many stages, corresponding to the several species of animals, until it arrives at Man, beyond which at present it does not go. But a time will come when it will advance beyond its development in the *Animal Man*. The thinking substance will be perfected in the *Spiritual or Immortal Man*; the type of which is the Anointed Jesus our Lord. The Immortal Thinking Substance will be incorporated in a body capable of developing all its conceptions; it will indeed be, 'a Sound Mind in a Sound Body;' as far superior to the *animal organ of thought*, which now is in Man, as incorruption is to that which is ever running to decay. I throw these things out as pegs for you to suspend some ideas of your own upon.

It is an axiom with me, that God adapted his Dispensations of Religion to Man and not Man to the Dispensation, hence, no theory of Religion derived from the Bible can be true, which does not harmonize with the organic constitution of Man *as he is*. If one God had made Man, and another God had made Religion, we might account for a want of harmony between Man and Religion; by supposing that the God of Religion did not entirely understand how the God of Nature had constituted him. But seeing that one God made them both, if any discrepancies do appear, they must be attributed to the interpreter and not to the Creator of the things professed to be interpreted."

J. T.

RULES FOR READING THE SCRIPTURES.

NEVER open the Word of God, without remembering that you must be tried by its rule at the judgment seat of Christ.

When you read the Scriptures, let not your attachment to the sys-

tems or the sentiments of men obscure their meaning, or induce you to pervert them.

When you discover any truth in the Bible, receive it with candour, maintain it with meekness, and avow it with courage.

When you discover any duty in the Bible, meet the discovery with a cheerful obedience.

In your daily perusal of the Sacred Volume, receive its doctrines with a lively faith, practice its duties with holiness and virtue; that these doctrines and these duties may become the fountain and the stream of genuine Christian discipleship.

This book contains the law of the most High God. It founds its claim to this divine origin on the harmony of its facts with the records of universal history; on the moral character of its inspired penmen; on the sublime yet simple majesty of style; on the excellency of its doctrines; on the purity of its morals; on the rapidity with which its truths were originally promulgated, under circumstances the most unpromising; and on the evidence of undisputable miracles.

To the Christian this volume supplies a surer guide than the Israelites enjoyed in the pillar of cloud by day, and the pillar of fire by night. It unfolds the consoling doctrine, and the directing precept; the warning threat, and the cheering promise; it exposes our guilt, proclaims our danger, and reveals our duty; it condemns us to justify, and justifies to condemn no more.

To the dead it speaks life, and to the living it unfolds immortality. It makes the weak strong, and to the strong it increaseth strength; it invites inquiry, and amply rewards the honest inquirer; it holds up a guiding star through the pilgrimage of life, and extends the horizon of our moral existence into the boundless ocean of a happy eternity.

THE DESIGN OF THE SCRIPTURES.

THE Scriptures are especially designed to make us wise unto salvation through faith in Jesus Christ.

- I. To reveal to us the mercy of the Lord in Him.
 - II. To form us after the likeness of God our Saviour.
 - III. To build us up in wisdom and faith, in love and holiness.
 - IV. To make us thoroughly furnished unto good works, enabling us to glorify God on earth; and
 - V. To lead us to an imperishable inheritance, among the just, and, finally, to be glorified with Christ in the heavenly kingdom.
- Oh, then! If such be the great design of the Holy Scriptures, necessary it must be for every one to pay a serious attention to what it reveals. The word of God invites and prayerful regards, in terms the most engaging.

It urges us to press forward eagerly to our high calling—to the hope set before us; and then closes its gracious appeals by proclaiming, "Whoever will, let him take the water of life freely."—Rev. xxii. 17. The infinite tenderness of the divine compassion to sinners flows in the language of the inspired writers with which they address the children of men, and the most gracious promises of the Lord of Glory accompany the divine invitations.

Neglecting the Bible, under the Christian dispensation, is despising the pity and tender mercy of God and the blessings of his gracious covenant. Then neglect not these precious truths for the Bible will be thy stay, and the guide of thy pathway—it is the sacred word of the Most High; and "How shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?"—Hebrews ii. 3.

It is to be feared, we are so much accustomed to the sight of a Bible, that we are in danger of looking upon it merely as a common book; but every time we cast our eyes upon the Sacred Volume, our minds should be impressed with its character, and that it is the inspired revelation of the Lord God Almighty!

THE EXCELLENCY OF THE SCRIPTURES.

More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold, sweeter also, than honey and the honeycomb.—Psalm xix. 10.

The Bible is the only book which teaches every thing that our Creator requires of us, either to know, or believe, or do; that we may escape his deserved displeasure, obtain his sovereign favour, and dwell for ever in the bliss of his immediate presence.

In the Scriptures we are taught the purest morality, perfectly accordant with the dictates of sound reason, and confirmed by the witness of enlightened conscience.

In the Scriptures we see described all the secret workings of the human mind, in a manner which demonstrates the inspiration of Him who is the searcher of hearts. They give us a particular account of all the spiritual maladies of man, with their various symptoms and the methods of their cure. From this source flow all the pure streams of spiritual and healing knowledge, to bless mankind with recovery from their fallen state—with salvation from sin and immortality.

Although many hundreds of thousands of books have been written in different ages by wise and learned men, even the best of them will bear no comparison with the Scriptures, in respect either of religion, morality, history, or purity and sublimity of composition.

The fairest productions of human wit, after a few perusals, like gathered flowers, wither in our hands and lose their fragrance;

but these unfading plants of paradise become, as we are accustomed to them, still more and more beautiful; their bloom appears to be daily heightened; fresh odours are emitted, and new sweets are extracted from them. He who hath once tasted their excellencies, will desire to taste them yet again; and he who tastes them oftenest, will relish them best.

AN UNANSWERABLE ARGUMENT.

The reader will remember that a letter was addressed to me conjointly by "T. M. Henley and J. Duval." This letter my old friend T. M. H., afterwards informed a brother, was to 'decide my fate;' for they were determined to put down such a factionist and schismatic as I am alleged to be, or words to that effect. I answered that letter according to my convictions; and as related to T. M. H. in perfect good disposition. On the 10th instant, I received the following convincing, conclusive, and unanswerable rejoinder!!

"The Apostolic Advocate, having become the Advocate of John Thomas, will no longer be read by Mrs. Hannah Harrison and Thomas M. Henley, nor Mary T. Billups after this volume has closed its abusive career.

THOMAS M. HENLEY."

April 1st., 1838.

Of course this is a genuine manifestation of the spirit of "biblical reformation!" This is doubtless fulfilling the commands, 'let all your matters be done with love,' to no one return evil for evil, 'be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good' and so forth! How true it is, that events develop persons! Some are full of profusion of love and affection in words of the most hoarse and dissonant description; but no sooner do you fall to any shibboleth, or differ with them in their theories and operations, than they set all law and gospel at defiance, and arraign you before the public as an enemy to Christ, religion, but above all to *themselves or their party*. Their affection, and loving speeches all vanish in an instant; and he who subscribed himself "Yours affectionately" yesterday, is by a word, converted into "your servant, &c." or "yours, &c." or perhaps nothing at all, as in the case before us, to-morrow. Now to such brethren as these we would say in the language of the Apostle, "My little children, let us not love in word, nor in tongue; but in deed, and in truth. For by their works shall we know that we are of the truth, and shall assure our hearts before him." Nothing has so shaken my confidence in the integrity of certain for whom I once conceived esteem, as their consideration,—as the 'rapidity with which their affections were morphosed into unrelenting hostility. Love is the only

long, to be kind, and never to fail; my experience for the last four years convinces me, that while there are numerous exceptions, there are more instances of its non-unity than otherwise in the sect, as it has become, of 'this reformation.' There is abundance of protestations of affection for party's sake; but an especial little of scriptural love for the truth's sake. Had love abounded, we should have heard nothing of Ex-communications; and of the passing of condemnation upon brethren before a fair trial for opinions; of misrepresenting and perverting their words for effect; and so forth. My own conclusion is, that if the manifestations of which I and other brethren have been the subjects be the genuine and recognized 'love' of 'this reformation,' the less there is of it in the religious world, the better. I never loved a man because he was a "reformer;" I have had too much experience of the walk and conduct of "reformers" to make me sceptical of the veritability of the principles which actuate many of them. I love truth and the truth; if, therefore, I meet with men who do the same, I cannot help conceiving an affection for them which can be shaken only by an indifference or departure from the truth in word and deed. As long as all love truth and the truth, they will love one another *ex-necessitate*. The strength of their affection for one another will be proportionate to the force with which they are united to the truth; but if, in a community, they love not truth, nor the truth, (and if they are ignorant of it they cannot love it, though in general terms truth may yet be loved by them,) they will have no confidence in themselves, or in one another. I have been said to be too credulous of the integrity of men. I believe there is truth in this. At first, I was too ready to believe that profession and principle went hand in hand in this reformation; but *experience* has proved to me, that this profession is not principle in the general, in what is called the Church of Christ any more than in the world at large. I speak now from my own experience; I leave the reader to consult his own.

The reason of my friend T. M. H.'s discontinuance is not the abstinence of the Advocate's career, but the alleged circumstance, that the Advocate has become the Advocate of John Thomas! Who have made it necessary that the Advocate should defend its Editor? They are my friend himself, his Philadelphian, Richmond, and Bethany brethren and their sectarian allies. If they did not want the Advocate to defend its Editor, they should not have named him; and they should have given him fair play, and a clear stage, though they granted no favor. Had they confined their attacks to the things written, and acted justly and uprightly towards John Thomas, the Advocate would have confined himself strictly to an investigation of the arguments adduced against the doctrine taught. But a worm will writh under the tread of its oppressor. I have evinced feeling too; but a great deal less than I have really felt. It would seem, that the only

way I could have given satisfaction to certain, would have been, to have cried 'pccavil' to have begged pardon for venturing to talk about things "untought" in Mr. Campbell's writings; and therefore 'speculative' in the opinion of himself and friends; and for the future, to have floated down the stream of the *populi* under the delusion that it was the *voice of God!* But no; I must be convinced that I have sinned against the truth before I repent, and supplicate forgiveness. It is a consummation from which I begged to be excused.

EDITOR.

LETTER FROM PARMENAS.

Cape Girardeau, Mo. Aug. 15th, 1837.

Dr. Thomas;

Dear Sir, a few days ago there fell into my hands the 1st No. of the 4th Vol. of your "Advocate." On pages 14 and 15, I find much to my wish, a summary of your religious faith comprised in 14 articles. I like to see explicitness in controversial writings, political, literary, or religious. Now I hope you will pardon me; dear sir, for the few remarks I thus intrude upon you. I am a well wisher to the truth, but have no desire to appear in name on the arena of religious controversy. If you please, I will address you a few epistles *incognito*, pledging my word to say nothing indecorous, and to furnish my name, should any find reason to demand it of you.

The phrase, "Second death"—*thanatos deuterios*—is peculiar to the Apocalypse of John, in which it occurs four times, viz: 2 c. 11 v. 20 c. 8 and 14 vs: 21 c. 8 v. It is defined to be "destruction in the lake of fire and brimstone." Into this lake the first death and *hades* will be cast, and all the "fearful, unbelieving, abominable, murderers, whoremongers, sorcerers, idolaters and liars." He of the Church of Smyrna, who overcame in all the trials of the ten days tribulations, and remained faithful until the first death, was not to be hurt by the second death; nor will those be, who shall have part in the first resurrection; for "over such the second death has no power."

The first resurrection is to be a thousand years before the second, or the rising of the rest of the dead; and of course a thousand years before the opening of the books and of the judgment of the small and great according to their works; but that there are some righteous who will not partake of the first resurrection, but will stand the test of the book, that is, the wicked, or that those who have rejected a share with Christ, will be brought to the bar by his resurrection.

But it is the dead whom the second resurrection will raise to the living, immortal children of the first resurrection; and on that day to stand before the throne and

will have their names written in the book of life, and some not. Those who shall be condemned in this judgment will compose the subjects of punishment in the lake of fire. Now none can be justly condemned by books or written law with which they never had any acquaintance?

Paul to the Cor. I Ep. xv. c. speaks of the resurrection of believers who had died, and the transformation of living believers at the sound of a trumpet. This he calls their victory or triumph over death and *hades*. If this takes place at the coming of Christ, or the commencement of the thousand years, then death and *hades* will still exist and reign over the rest of mankind after their triumph. Indeed death is the last enemy that is to be destroyed. It is after the termination of the thousand years, after the judgment of the small and great, after death on his pale horse with *Hades* in his train shall have accomplished all the purpose of God in punishing the disobedience in the first life, that he with his companion shall be cast into the lake of fire, and the second death shall commence his reign.

Again the new covenant is different from the old, both in its promises and threatenings. It is founded on better promises, and those who neglect it are certain of a sorer punishment than simply the death, prescribed by Moses' law. I need not refer to the text, supporting this idea, you know them. In what will this sorer punishment consist, if not in the second death? What is the condemnation to which the sinners against the Gospel will arise, if not the sentence of being cast into the lake of fire?

Once more, the promises and threatenings of any law refer to the subject of that law. The sanctions of the Jewish law affect none but Jews. If Gentiles before the coming of Christ suffer, it is because they slighted information received from another source. They are judged without law, that is, not by any written code from God. They cannot be among those who shall be judged when the books shall be opened; and of course, they cannot be sentenced by those books to be cast into the fiery lake. They cannot be punished with the second death. Greater privileges incur greater obligations and a neglect of them deserves severer punishment. A Jewish sinner, it seems to me, deserves something worse than Gentiles, his privileges being greater, *ceteris paribus*. The gospel dispensation places men under different circumstances from those of the Jews or Gentiles, previous to its commencement. The privileges are greater, the obligations weightier and the punishment sorer. Can any attain to the reward of the Christian institution who is not liable to its punishment? Will any suffer the punishment who never had an opportunity to obtain the reward?

I cannot understand your second article or discern its consisten-

cy with the 8th article. If the first death terminates all sensibility, and of course all suffering, and the second death is but a perpetuity of this insensibility, then what difference is made between not only the sinners among the Jews and the Gentiles, but the despiser of Moses' law and him who has done despite to the spirit of Grace? And is this eternal sleep equally the state of the innocent babe, like which are said to be the citizens of the kingdom of heaven, and the man who has grown grey in care and insult to God? What do you make of the second death, or of being raised to suffer the punishment of damnation? Will the sinners against the Christian law be raised in their mortal bodies capable of enduring the agonies of dying the second time? And will that death be induced by means similar to those which terminate the present life; such as sickness or direct injury, suffocation, decapitation, burning or crucifixion, or will they be thrown alive into the lake of fire and brimstone, literal bodies into literal fire, and there left to suffer the physical consequences of such a location? Will the second death terminate sensibility as does the first, and the first and second become identified as one eternal sleep? Is the only purpose of the resurrection of the wicked, to kill them again; and is this the only difference between the despisers of the old and of the new covenant?

Most respectfully,

PARMENAS.

Remarks on Parmenas.

We know not who Parmenas is; the things he writes, however, sufficiently demonstrate that he is an intelligent and unprejudiced person. To the inquiring of such, it always affords us pleasure to reply. "Is it implied," says he, "that there are some righteous who will not partake of the first resurrection, but will stand the test of the books together with the wicked; or that those who have reigned a thousand years with Christ will be brought to the bar to bear their doom?" In answer to this, I would observe, that the testimony does not teach this. The doctrine is that all the righteous dead from Abel to the First Resurrection will be raised at the coming of Christ. The subjects of this Resurrection whom John saw, were those who are to sit upon the Thrones of the World. These were first, those who worshipped not The Beast nor his image, and had not received his mark in their foreheads, and in their hands. All the righteous who answer to these qualifications will be raised then. Some think that it is only those who have been beheaded who will be raised at the First Resurrection. Paul teaches contrary to this. He tells us that the reward will be conferred on the dead in Christ at the

immediately on the points of difference between the Advocate and the Harbinger the promise has been, that the cause pleaded by the Advocate, I am convinced, is incontrovertible and self-evident truth—it cannot be overthrown by human reasoning or philosophy."

DANIEL WIERS.

Victory, Cayuga, New York.

Mr. Advocate,

The duties and privileges of females in the Christian Assemblies, are subject-matter on which the disciples in the North are not agreed, owing probably to previous education and habits. Please answer the following queries and confer a favour on many who wish to know and practice the truth.

1. What did Paul mean when he said 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35, let your women keep silence in the Churches, &c. and in the corresponding passages 1 Tim. ii. 11, 12.

2. If he is to be understood, literally have they any right to exhort and pray in the public assemblies.

3. If they have not, what did Paul mean, when he said there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus.

4. And what did the women mean to whom he alluded in Phil. iv. 2 regarding by him as fellow-labourers, &c.

J. T. KNAPP.

Answers.

1. Much confusion appears to have arisen in the Church at Conmith. They appear to have been very much divided in their proceedings, especially in the matter of speaking. It would seem, that they spoke more than one at a time; and that the sisters indulged in talking too. Paul did not approve of these things. He commanded the men, therefore, to speak one by one; and the women to keep silence altogether. This injunction which was from the Lord, Paul reiterates in his letter to Timothy; and there gives the reason, why the ladies are to hold their tongues, or rather to keep the peace; for says he, God is not the author of confusion, but of peace. He does not allow a woman to teach; because teaching implies authority, or rather superiority. "Let a woman learn in silence with all submission; for I do not allow a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be silent; for Adam was first formed, and then Eve."—Can command be plainer?

2. They have no right at all to exhort or pray in the public assemblies, unless they can be silent and yet speak, say nothing and yet talk; when they can do this they may exhort and pray in public, but not before.

3. Paul, when he said, there was neither male nor female; but all was one in Christ Jesus, had no reference to women speaking in public. The subject he was upon, was that of breaking down, by the gospel, and not by the law, to all nations, Jew or Gentile, bond or free, male or female; for the same privilege abate them all up, to be under sin, they were all sinners; the promise of pardon and the inheritance coming

by Christ, and men and women becoming the vessels of God through the gospel, by obedience to the law. They had introduction into the favor in which they stand, they were all one and all subjected to the same rule; therefore, there was no pre-eminence of the Jew over the Gentile, nor of the male over the bond, nor of the male over the female; for they were all one in Christ Jesus; the Lord and Saviour common to them all.

4. To labor with an Apostle in the gospel, did not require the fellow-laborer to speak publicly. We are certain, that the Sisters who labored with Paul did not reason with the public out of the scriptures as he did; because he positively enjoined silence upon them. When Paul was at Philippi, Lydia had a certain sense labored with him in the gospel inasmuch as she received him and his companions into her house, and supported them while they continued there, planting the Church in that City. A person that furnishes materials or means for the erection of any building, being a co-operator, is therefore a fellow-laborer; hence, although a man may not lay a brick, hew a single stone, or saw a piece of plank, yet if he furnish the supplies, he is said to have built the house. So every one, male or female, who in any way contributed to Paul's support while he was engaged in planting Churches, labored, or co-operated with him in the work. Hence there is no one, male or female, however rude of speech or unlearned, who may not do themselves the honor of promoting the gospel, by contributing according to their ability to the support of those who while engaged in the ministry of the word cannot support themselves.

Enron.

Throopville, Cayuga, New York.

Dear Bro. Thomas,

For myself, I am for truth, as the New Testament presents to us. I care not a pin for all the traditions of past ages, or sanctions of time, or the modern practice of the Churches; much less will I sanction knowingly a single Bible-society, or a system, which may have been brought up to Jerusalem, and turning captives, I am quite dissatisfied with the manner and method of singing. The reason of this is, that I cannot satisfy myself, from the Bible, that I am authorized. The result of my inquiries is, that I am authorized, by the Bible, to praise God in any other than the manner

ted by the inspiring Spirit, or at most only such other words as shall be necessary to arrange the Spirit's communications in metre, and so as not to leave the slightest doubt that we are singing the sentiments of inspiration. I am satisfied the time is not very distant when something further will be called for by the increasing intelligence of all honest and faithful followers of Messiah the King. I can go with no man or set of men further than my understanding can go. I was immersed at the age of 18, upon the common Baptist profession, and for nearly 20 years remained a Baptist as ignorant as at the commencement. Your remarks under the head of "knowledge, &c." I had like to have said, were the best I had seen from your pen. Perhaps I am selfish in this. The principles are such as I have in my feeble way, advocated for the last three years. I consider that the Baptist religion is not the religion of the Bible. But, my dear Sir, there are many professed disciples, who are not half converted to the pure gospel. Knowledge is greatly wanting; and courage to practice what they know."

D. D. W.

As our readers are well aware, we also have been long dissatisfied with the matter of the singing, as practised in public worship. A person whose mind is enlightened by the scriptures of truth, cannot conscientiously sing much that is put into our mouths by the uninspired porters of the day. While singing, we often have to make a sudden pause, until some passages are passed over, which are manifestly unscriptural. This would not happen, if the psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs were those of the Spirit, the Poet of the primitive Churches. The things sung would then correspond with the things read from the Prophetic word. "I will sing with the Spirit," says the Apostle; that is, *I will sing praises by inspiration; for the Apostle was then discoursing upon spiritual gifts; but I will also sing with understanding; that is, that I may understand myself, and be understood by those who hear, that the congregation may be edified or built up in the faith.* But this cannot be effected, unless the singing be according to the mind of Christ; which we are persuaded the popular singing is not, unless it be according to his mind, that the faithful should be amused by the traditions of men, instead of being instructed by the testimony concerning things past, present, and to come. There is no praise to God in singing feelings not felt; and we are persuaded, from the prevailing ignorance of great numbers, that they often about "Oh how beautiful is my soul," without any just grounds. This singing of unscriptural feelings, shakes up the soul and body of popular praise, and is a testimony composed of unscriptural theories of feelings, which however much they may be the feelings of the individual, is nearly applicable to congregations, unless indeed they be founded upon that theory. The body of Christ is the True

Israel of God, which is founded upon the Twelve Apostles; and the Twelve Apostles; those who are based upon the Father alone are natural or animal Israelites, but not True Israel for "all the descendants of Israel, (Jacob,) are not Israel." The Messiah was promised as The King of the True Israel; what more consistent then, but that we should praise Him as the goodness of God, in the sentiments of "the Sweet Psalm of Israel," as expressed in "the Songs of Zion," the Songs of our King. If the Animal Israel could in the worship of God, with propriety sing the prophetic word concerning Messiah's sufferings, death, propitiatory sacrifice, resurrection, ascension, spiritual gifts, his glorious reign, their restoration, which, to be, "the riches of the world," the conquest of his enemies, preparation of his Queen, the resurrection of the Saints, life everlasting, and so forth; may not the Spiritual Israel with equal propriety worship God in these Spiritual melodies likewise? When we reflect on the ennobling sentiments, and glorious predictions of "the word of Christ" by the Psalmist, and compare them with the popular religious rhymes, we are in amazement at the apathy of Christians. Can it be attributed to any thing else, but to a want of information, or acquaintance with the beauties and excellencies of these compositions? But we conclude with our Brother, that "the time is not very distant when something further will be called for by the increasing intelligence of all honest and faithful followers of Messiah the King."

EDITOR.

Greenville, March 4th, 1838

Dear Brother Thomas,

I see by your Advertisement you have not subscribers enough for the publication of the Debate, I herewith send you 20 dollars to aid you in executing the work; and rather than your mouth should be closed, I will send you the remaining hundred; so if no one else takes a part of it, you will inform me by letter. I am truly glad to see the able and just publication of your Christian character, by the Church of which you belong. May God bless and prosper her for the good she has taken in favor of truth.

I would be very glad to see you in this christian country, but I am sure you would be very welcome, if permitted.

Yours in the hope of

Formerly a member of the Church of

Remarks on certain things of general interest in reply to a
Correspondent.

LIBERTY, AMELIA, VA.

Dear Brother,

I have just received your pacific communication. You salute me with "Health and PEACE!" I thank you unfeignedly for your good wishes. Health is one of the greatest of blessings, and constitute a part of the Hope which is set forth "in the word of the truth of the gospel;" for, says the great Voice out of heaven, "death shall be no more, nor grief, nor crying; nor at all there be any more pain." In return, may you possess hereafter a full proportion of that health which is in reserve for all the faithful in the age of peace.

But in your salutation, I perceive, that you emphasize more on "PEACE" than "Health," in the proportion of three sub-linear dashes to one. Had I saluted you with this phrase, I should have reverend the emphasis for peace flows from a health of purity, and not purity or health from peace. This is physically and spiritually true. Hence the Apostle says, "now the end of the charge is love, from a pure heart and a good conscience, and unfeigned faith;"—"pursue righteousness, faith, love, and peace, with them who call on the Lord from a pure heart." Here the prerequisites to peace are righteousness, faith, and love; and not peace, love, faith, righteousness; and it is likewise taught in this passage, that the class with whom we are to pursue peace is composed of those who call on the Lord from a pure heart, and that consequently we cannot be on pacific terms with the impure. "The wisdom which is from above, is indeed just, pure, and thus peaceable," and so forth. Now, I am persuaded, that if two persons are to be at peace, they must be pure in heart; and this will be evinced by impartiality and an adhesion to truth.

There is a great cry for peace in these days, but 'a still: small voice,' only is heard on the side of purity. The mutters of the times are 'disturb not what is quiet,' and 'peace be still.' This reminds me of one of the signs of the times given by the Apostle when 'the Lord himself shall descend from Heaven.'—"They shall say peace and safety, then sudden destruction comes upon them." I am for peace; but it must be a peace founded upon impartiality, true-heartedness, intelligence, and 'the righteousness which God requires.'

There is a false and a true peace. A genuine peace is a disengagement from war upon honorable terms; a false peace, a compromise for the sake of ease. For the latter, I have no sympathy; and the former can alone be attained by concession; conquest. If two parties have engaged in the war, they can sacrifice every error of whatever kind upon the altar of peace with mutual honor and advantage: for myself I would

willingly confess my faults to the full extent of my conscience; but if peace could only be obtained by surrendering the decision of certain questions, which in my judgment, were fully taught in the book of wisdom and knowledge, I would not die fighting than come to terms upon any such conditions.

The Christian, like a Soldier's, life is one of labor and attention. The Christian has no more right to sue for peace before his Lord's return, than a soldier has to anticipate the overtures of his general to the belligerent power. The Christian must conquer peace; that is, he must die in his armor, sword in hand, if he would reign in peace in the age to come. The present dispensation is a period of war; the next will pre-eminently be that of peace. It is easier to keep the peace, than to restore it when broken. The Apostle offered peace to the world upon certain terms; but the world to a great extent rejected them: consequently from that day to this there has been war without, as says the Apostle, 'without are fightings.' These Holy Men were very solicitous that peace should be maintained within; but even their authority and presence could not preserve it. It was broken, and after their departure flared up into open and cruel war. Unrighteousness, partiality, faithlessness, hypocrisy, ambition, lust, and impurity of every kind, invaded the sanctuary of purity and truth. These as was fit, defended their temple with various success from time to time. The collision between truth and error, purity and impurity, has been, is now, and ever will be perpetual wherever they come in range. Hence when parties disagree, it is always attributable to the inherent repulsion in these opposites. Peace therefore, can only reign by one or other being subdued. If truth and purity conquer, the peace will be pure and honorable; if the contrary, it will be spurious and detestable.

If a community of professors be in peace, it is no proof that they are pure; for their peace is as likely to be false as true, if in a state of controversy, it is a presumption that some at least are alive to the purity of the faith. Light and darkness cannot dwell together in unity; they are essentially repulsive to their nature. One or other must succumb; and in a dark and besotted world like this, light is oftentimes extinguished.

You are anxious for peace? For myself, I am at peace with all who follow peace from a pure heart, I have no quarrel with any man who is 'without partiality.' I feel that I have suffered injustice at the hands of many; and I have not perhaps may have been betrayed into expressions of anger which might with advantage, have been suppressed. I can say no means say, that I have not set myself above an Apostle's example. But this I will say, that my heart has been true to the truth, and not to hypocrisy, to partiality, to

or improper motive; and had my opponents abstained from personalities and other unjustifiable reflexions they would have been subject to no strictures from me. I have ever endeavored to keep them to the question concerning *what is said*, not as to *who says it*. But I could not succeed.

The great object I have had in view has been, the purification of the body in faith, hope, and practice. This is still my enterprise, and one for which I am counted an enemy! In laboring to this end, I have not been unmindful (the libellous accusations of unprincipled men to the contrary notwithstanding,) to begin at home. And I hesitate not to affirm, that my efforts to bring about a radical reformation in the communities I have been attached to, are the primary cause of all that odium and injustice which have been heaped upon me by wicked men, and *those they have succeeded in making the victims of their deceptions*. Had I not aimed at this to their inexpressible annoyance, you would have heard nothing, perhaps of my 'unlearned' questions. The doctrine of re-immersion upon an intelligent belief of the gospel as the first step in the march of the returning Captives from the Spiritual Babylon has been and is, 'the head and front of my offending.' This stirred up the opposition of some, the enmity of others, and the willing practice of a third. The former are pursuing me with all their might to reprobation; and had I not been sustained by invincible truth and a straightforward honesty of purpose and practice, I must have sunk ere this a victim of their malevolence.

Concerning him of whom you speak, and with whom you suggest an interview face to face; from the April number of the Harbinger I am confirmed in my early impression, that he is the dupe of some unprincipled person or persons in these parts. If he knew as much as I could reveal, he would perhaps pause in his prescriptive career. Viewing his actions in connexion with this, I am still prompted to bear and forbear; with the hope that his eyes will yet be opened to the spell by which he is bound. Were it not for this consideration, I should be compelled to regard him as desperately wicked. But supposing that he is imposed upon by unrighteous men, whose charges he takes for granted to be true, and therefore, in proscribing me, 'thinks he is doing God service,' I am willing to leave a door open for a return to amity and peace. But time will cure all things. If he is not disposed for a mutual oblivion of the past, and a concession of equal rights and privileges for the future; I am quite willing and prepared to let our cause stand to be tried before the Judge whom God has appointed to sit on the throne of the earth. I must not forget, however to tell him past trespasses against me, I freely and entirely forgive, and will endeavor likewise to forget. With this I will endeavor to do, and I sincerely trust, that I shall joyfully abide the issue.

You inquire, 'can there not be an armistice?' I do not want the last word. For the future, I shall endeavor so to fortify myself, as not to permit any provocation to quarter to arouse me. I shall pursue the even way through evil and through good report, let him be as he will. I have sufficiently vindicated my character, at the judgment of impartial men, both aliens and brethren, as it is useless to be continually reiterating the same things, which shall in future pass the fog-banks of the west, as smoke evaporating more.

I thank you for your exhortation, and especially for the spirit of kindness in which it is conveyed: I cannot, therefore, but "suffer the word of exhortation you have written to me in brief;" nor can I forbear to reciprocate the assurance, that I am "ever your brother to serve in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ."

JOHN THOMAS.

To E. K. S. _____ of D. _____ Ky.
April 25th, 1838.

WINANS ON 'THE SALVATION OF INFANTS'

Painesville, March 30th, 1838.

Bro. Thomas,

I have just arrived from Richmond where I met the M. Harbinger on its journey from Bethany to Painesville; and among the usual topics; such as Christian morality, Mr. Lynn on the Holy Spirit, discussion of Universalism, etc; I saw several letters from Bro. M. Winans of Ohio, in one of which he states that he had written you two letters on the *salvation of infants* and that you had replied to but one of them. Bro. Winans seems to complain that his strong argument is not read, in case his letter has come to hand. That I should learn from the Harbinger is this, that as infants were not with the adults of Israel, unconditionally into the Red Sea; so infants will be admitted unconditionally into the Kingdom of Heaven. Will Bro. Winans tell us why the *infants* in the ark were not collected unconditionally into the ark, but were saved from the destruction by the flood? If the ark furnishes us with an unambiguous illustration of the *salvation and destruction of the human race*, it can be no mistake; that the *infants* who were saved shall be in the days of the flood. Will Bro. Winans tell us, how God came and swept them off the face of the earth? (Not one infant) who were saved? Will Bro. Winans tell us, where unto Baptism doth now save us? Will Bro. Winans tell us, that Canaan is a type of Heaven?

country promised to Abraham I presume he means—admit it and it follows that Israel, the natural seed of Abraham, was also a type of the Church, the spiritual seed by faith; and there were infants among the natural seed, so there are babes among the spiritual seed. So that infants in Israel beautifully correspond to "babes in Christ." Otherwise the infants, not only of Israel, but of all the nations of Canaan, should have been saved from that destruction which was visited upon those nations, and permitted to enjoy a portion of the Land of Canaan; but instead of that, they were all, infant and adult, driven out to make room for the chosen people of God.

Your's as ever,

A. B. WALTHALL.

LETTER FROM MR. A. ANDERSON.

Bro. Philip's, P. E., April 14th, 1838.

Dear Bro. Thomas,

It may be well to bear in mind and to speak often to one another, even the things we know. It appears from the sacred writings, that suffering, patient suffering, as a component part has a large place in the condition of the genuine disciple of Jesus, during his pilgrimage here. This appears to be illustrated in some very striking sayings of the Bible: "Happy shall you be, when men shall revile and persecute you, and on my account, accuse you falsely of every evil thing." Rejoice and exult, for great is your reward in heaven; for thus the Prophets were persecuted who were before you." "You have heard that it was said, 'eye for eye, and tooth for tooth.' But I say to you, contend not with the injurious; but if anyone smite you on the right cheek, turn to him also the left, &c." "You have heard that it was said, 'you shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy;' but I say to you, love your enemies; bless them who curse you; do good to them who hate you; and pray for them who arraign and persecute you, that you may be children of your Father in heaven, &c." See 5th and 6th Matthew. "Love suffers long and is kind"—and many more. Again, the position concerning christian long suffering, is illustrated and confirmed in the examples of Patriarchs, Prophets, and Apostles, and especially in the example of the Saviour. They certainly practiced what they taught. With such a cloud of holy ones as witnesses, placed before us, surely laying aside every encumbrance and sin besetting us; we ought to run with perseverance the race set before us, looking to Jesus, the Leader and perfecter of the faith, who for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross, despising the shame, and sat down at the right hand of the throne of God. Now let us

consider him, who endured such oppositions of sinners against himself." Dear brother, you and I could stand and look down from a rock, insensible rock, based at the sea sides—sitting as aaving borne and withstood the storms of winds and waves for ages. And can we not, admire him (in figure called the Rock,) who though not insensible, did bear and did sustain the opposition of a stormy world!! Mild, but firm, amidst all the tempest rage of his enemies, and willing to save even enemies themselves, not using against them as much violence, as might be necessary to break a brutised reed, or to quench a dialy burning taper. All-powerful, yet praying to his heavenly Father to forgive them, even when he suffered the torture of the cross. Though yielding for an hour, the hour of the power of darkness, yet conquering, he is an object for contemplation and admiration to the ends of the earth. How much more worthy of admiration, the glory of the firm, but mild Nazarene, the glory of the suffering, but conquering Messiah, than the glory of the man slaughtering Alexander the great!!

We together have seen the grandeur of mountains, and mountain summits, and mountain rocks; but never with you, or alone did I see the ocean storms, and tempest beaten rocks, built by ocean's side. May be this partly accounts for the difference in our present situations. Could I like you experience a dangerous Atlantic voyage, I might so fall in love with scenes sublime by storm and tempest, as even more than yourself, to provoke or to seem to provoke them.

Your's in the hope, of life eternal.

ALBERT ANDERSON.

LETTER FROM TENNESSEE.

Jefferson, Tenn., Jan. 4th, 1838.

Beloved Bro. Thomas,

Unknown as I am personally to you, yet there is such a perfect agreement (almost) between us on scripture, that I think if an old acquaintance had existed between us. I had intended to have written you long since, touching certain points which have drawn down on you some harsh epithets and business of my Profession (medicine,) has often hindered me. Your views (I say views, in accordance with a common opinion,) concerning the resurrection, hanging and burial, I daily receive. It always did seem to me that the doctrine in the world, that our Brethren, who are called Christians, their only rule of faith had proceeded from the scriptures, and that doctrine, that as soon as a man dies his spirit goes to a lasting fight to the climate of eternal life.

...pit of eternal perdition." What use they can find in a judgement afterwards, is past my ingenuity. I had frequently argued with some brethren on this subject, and received many views, but many did not. However, I firmly believe that the truth will yet prevail and men will determine to judge for themselves. No one pretends to say the *Body of man* is immediately to heaven or hell after death. No 'tis the *spirit* only. What is the *spirit*? Is spirit susceptible of either pleasure or pain divested of materiality? In other words; is that the material, organic, feeling, sensible portion of mankind that is to be punished, or blessed, or is it the immaterial, inorganic, unfeeling and insensible portion? Now I know nothing of spirit divested of organised matter. Will some spiritualist, (as they call themselves, though they are ignorant of the term,) define the operations, existence first, of spirit independent of its connection with matter? Well, but says one, ah sir, you are a materialist. Yes, and say I, so are you too sir. You believe man is an organized being, do you not sir? Oh yes! You believe that he holds his superiority on account of his superior organization, do you not? Oh yes! You believe God can make matter immortal as easily as spirit, do you not? Oh yes! You know nothing of spirit independent of matter, do you not? Oh no. Well sir, I neither, so you are as much of a materialist as I am. But what does Paul say about the *Body*? "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 a natural body, (natural Christianism,) it is raised a spiritual body, &c. &c." God then makes these bodies of ours (at the resurrection,) incorruptible, glorious, powerful and spiritual,—Glory to God for such inestimable gifts! Where is heresy then? It is excluded; yes, and excluded too by the Law of Christ. But says one, Lazarus died and went to Abraham's bosom; and Dives died and went to hell, before the resurrection. Granted; but I fear you don't understand the object of this remark. You say the *Body* lies in the grave until the resurrection? Certainly. Ah, but sir you are in a dilemma; for Dives had his *tongue* and *eyes* with him although he was in torment; and I think these belong to his *Body*!

Now, unless you believe that spirits have eyes and a tongue, and are susceptible of pain, you must believe they were his natural eyes and tongue, and consequently, his body was there also; so much for this.

Baptism for the remission of sins, preceded by faith and repentance, is certainly the Gospel plan. But whether any other than "the *faith* delivered to the Saints" will suffice, I am not warranted to say,—say verily, I honestly believe it will not. Bro. Campbell has written some "snaky" things in answer to a sister, so I am told. Though I have not seen them. Nevertheless, many Brethren are kicking up at them, and some

of the sects say that he has turned Methodist, Bro. ...
 ... Any how he has quit "writing ..."
 ... Glad of that; let's hope he will not write ...
 ... other ... only the truth as it is in the Book; he ...
 ... C. is a dear Bro., I love him heartily; I do think ...
 ... ted you badly. I fear he is like the lying Deacon ...
 ... who said "thou' people thay that I liphase, but for far ...
 ... can perthieve it!"
 ... I have some objections to some things which you teach ...
 ... but I cannot make them now.

Your's in the Hope of eternal life.
 JNO. W. RICHARDSON

"It is fallen! It is fallen! even Babylon the Great."
 "And a strong messenger took a stone, like a great millstone, and cast it into the Sea, saying, Thus shall Babylon the Great be dashed down with violence, and never be found again."
 Rev. 18. 21.

"The state of mankind is one of a mutation so wild that neither the profoundest cogitation of human philosophy can comprehend it, nor the most elaborate reasonings of the political economist account for it." Such is the sentiment of the Reviewer of Sir William Gell's "Topography of Rome and its Vicinity" in the Metropolitan of Dec. 1834. It is a sentiment most true. The course of human affairs is turbid, vexed, and fleeting; and the history of the past has proved, that human wisdom is inadequate to the task of defining the probable condition of man, even within the lapse of twenty years. So true is it, that the profoundest of our race, know not what a day or an hour may bring forth in the moral universe of God. This fact acknowledged, and what a powerful argument does it furnish us with in behalf of the Sacred Writings. For, if the wisdom of man be unable to comprehend his destiny but for a twenty years, those Scriptures which have outlined it for six thousand, must assuredly be the work of the Supreme.

These remarks were forced upon us by reading the analysis of Sir William's Topography in said Review. It contains some very interesting geological notices, among which are subjoined particularly arrested our attention. They are extract to my readers as one of great curiosity and interest, especially when contemplated in relation to Babylon, sinking into the abyss, like a millstone cast into the sea.

"Albatross ..."
 A subterraneous stream hot to the touch ...
 mentions in no being on the ...
 speaks of this mystery, ...

and says it was used either for bathing or drinking, and is good for many complaints. There are now three Lakes, one of which (called Solfatara, or Lago di Zolfo, of Brimstone,) is a strong current, generally accompanied by a long line of vapour; it runs in an artificial bed, in breadth nine, and in depth four feet, under the modern road at Tivoli, about a mile and a half from the Ponte Lucano. At the Lake near the Valerian Road, are the ruins of the Thermæ of Agrippa, and this with caution may be approached with a carriage, after passing the bridge. Sir Humphrey Davy made some curious experiments on the process by which this water continually adds to the rocks around by petrification and incrustation. He says that the water taken from the most tranquil part of the Lake (Lago di Zolfo or Lake of Brimstone,) even after being agitated and exposed to the air, contained in solution, more than its own volume of Carbonic acid gas, with a very small quantity of sulphuretted hydrogen. The temperature is 80° of Fahrenheit. It is particularly fitted to afford nourishment to vegetable life. Its banks of Travertino (a kind of white spongy stone,) are every where covered with reeds, lichens, conifers, and various kinds of aquatic vegetables: and at the same time that the process of vegetable life is going on crystallizations of calcareous matter, are every where formed, in consequence of the escape of the carbonic acid of the water.

The ancient Valerian, or Tiburine Way, ran to the Thermæ; and thence, not directly toward Tibur, but to certain ruins now called Colonicella, where it met another road at right angles, and turned directly right to Tivoli, or Tibur. It is here continued to the line pursued by the modern road was a more remote times passable; and that there was then another Lake, which has since been covered by another Coat of Travertino. Certain tombs called those of Plautus Lucanus, and Claudius Liberalis, which still exist, and are close to the bridge, seem, however, to show that in Imperial times a way did pass by the present carriage road; and it may be suspected, that as Cæcina and Medullæ were destroyed, the other might have led from the Thermæ, to the innumerable villas which the Patricians possessed in the neighborhood of the present Viciano and Marcellina. In the line between the bridge and the Solfatara, (Sulphur mine,) the rocky crust was broken in on the left near the stream, in the year 1625, and a portion of the water was lost; and another stream called Acqua Acetosa, (Acid Water,) falls into a hole on the right: these instances show that the crust is but thin in some places. It probably covers an unfathomable abyss; for a stone thrown into the Lake, occasions in its descent so violent a discharge of carbonic acid gas, and for so long a time, as to give the idea of an immense depth of water. The taste is acid, and the sulphureous

small so strong, that when the wind assails, it has sometimes been perceived in the higher parts of Rome.

The Lake called the Lago di Tartaro, (the Lake of Hell,) two miles nearer Rome, which once was deep, has now nearly filled with its own depositions, that in June 1825, it was perfectly dry, having formed a crust, which probably cut it off from the Subterraneous reservoir below. It is not unlikely that the same will happen in the course of time, to the Solfatara; for on the brink of this Lake, it is manifest that even now, the Spectator stands on a shelf like ice, over an abyss of unknown depth. In this way many Lakes have been either filled up, or have rapidly diminished. The Lake of the floating island at Cutiile is also bounded by a rocky margin, which, like that of Solfatara, overhangs an unfathomable abyss, and is alarmingly insecure."

The following are the remarks of the Metropolitan upon these geological facts. "Who must not shudder at the awful insecurity of the surface of such a country!—a country too, so often visited by shocks of earthquake! If this process of crusting over lakes, heated by volcanic fires, and lakes too, of an unfathomable depth, has been going on for ages, which is by no means improbable; a more than ordinary convulsion of the earth might precipitate a whole province into the bowels of the deep, leaving no vestige behind of the vast ruin, excepting the treacherous and calm face of a sulphurous Lake, (a Lake of Brimstone,) where formerly forests waved, man labored, and cities flourished. It is perhaps not far from the truth, that the whole length of Italy, from the very top to the heel of the boot, is honeycombed with furnaces of explosive fires, and collections of mephitic waters; and in this case, notwithstanding the dreadful catastrophes that Vesuvius has, from time to time, inflicted upon towns and cities that seem crouching at its feet for protection, and find destruction, its fires and its overflowing craters must be looked upon as blessings. Were it not for them, (volcanic craters acting as vents,) we fear that the eternal city, (Rome,) like all other human edifices, would speedily come to a terrific termination."

What this sagacious writer fears, is actually foretold, by the Apostle John, and will assuredly come to pass. "A more than ordinary convulsion of the earth," is indeed to happen—a convulsion which is to cleave the mountains asunder, overturn the cities of the nations, and among them Proud Rome—the Myrror Babylon—which is to sink down into "the unfathomable abyss,"—the Lake of Volcanic fire, which is the Lake of Brimstone. Sodom and Gomorrah are fit examples to illustrate that "crack of doom," that broods over the face of the Anti-Christian World. "Is our Metropolis to come—death, and mourning, and famine? Are plagues to come—death, and mourning, and famine? Are the last judgments in store for her inhabitants?"

(*She*) shall be burnt with fire; for strong is the Lord who judges her."—"In *our* mourn' will the crisis come. The best *Queen* of the earth will mourn and lament when they behold the ascending smoke of her conflagration—when they contemplate 'the vast ruin'—'the treacherous and calm face of a sulphurous lake.' As did the *Marble Pier* at Lisbon, with 3000 people upon it, in 1755, sink into an abyss, which has not yet been fathomed, so will Rome with all her Temples, Capitol, Palaces, Cathedral, magnificent ruins, houses, inhabitants and seven hills be engulfed, and 'thus will the *Great City* be dashed down with violence and never be found again.' The noise of the crashing and falling ruins, and the wild tumult of despair, will then yield to the awful silence of an entire desolation. The voice of musicians, the sound of the trumpet, the noise of the millstone, the light of a lamp, and the voice of merriment will no more be heard or seen in this region of death. But why this awful vengeance? O! it's because She has corrupted the earth with her abominations, and shed the blood of the *Disciples of Jesus*!—Therefore, 'Rejoice over her, thou heaven, and you *Saints*, and *Apostles*, and *Prophets*; for on your account God has pronounced sentence upon her.'—How retributively just is the Almighty God! Who, but the insane of men, would not kiss the Sun, lest his indignation be aroused, and they perish from the way, when his wrath is kindled but a little!—When it waxes fierce and hot, who then dare stand before them! Reader! *now* is the accepted time, *now* is the day of salvation. Be wise, then, *to-day*, for it is madness—utter madness to procrastinate; for procrastination is the thief of time, and you may be undone!

EDITOR.

Some well meaning Religionists, 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 souls will take the good seed, without being watered by tears, or fertilized up by affliction.—*Lacon*.

There are only two things in which the false professors of Christianity have agreed; to persecute all other sects, and to