HERALD

OF THE

FUTURE AGE:

A NON-SECTARIAN PERIODICAL,

DEVOTED TO

ANCIENT CHRISTIANITY,

AND TO THE ILLUSTRATION OF THE

New Constitution of the Kingdom of Israel,

AND OF

THE WORLD.

IN THE

FUTURE DISPENSATION;

WITH OTHER MISCELLANEOUS MATTER.

VOLUME I.

BY JOHN THOMAS, M. D.

"The Heaven must retain Jesus Christ UNTIL the times of the restoration of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his Holy Prophets (*ap' aioonos*) since the giving of the Law."—PETER.

"To the Angels he hath not subordinated (*teen oikoumeneen teen mellousan*) the Inhabited Earth of the FUTURE AGE concerning which we speak;" but to Jesus."—PAUL.

Richmond Virginia.

MDCCCXLV.

BR
1
H5
v.1
Rare Book (Va.)
178297
1000510408

INDEX TO VOLUME 1.

	No.
Prospectus	1
Address to the Citizens of the U. S.	3
Letters to a Friend in the Far West 7, 43, 62 106, 138, 164, 181,	226
Letter from Dr. May to Mr. Campbell	10
" " to "	110
Dr. May to the readers of the Harb.	193
Reformation in Louisville 12,	70
Review of the Charlottesville Intelligencer	18
Specimen Number	21
Progress of Reform	23
'Silas' and 'the Crisis'	23
Propositions	24
The World's Age 25,	49
The Two Visions 27, 52, 73, 91, 121,	145
The Occident and Amer. Jew. Adv.	32
Prophetic or Symbolic Time	35
Party the bane of Liberty and truth	36
Letter to the Editor of the Western Midnight Cry	37
" from John T. Walsh	39
Letter from Dr Bodenhamer	40
" " " on the Crisis, 188,	209
'Theological Tournament'	41
Campbell and Rice's Debate on the Salvation of Infants, Idiots, and Pagans 45,	57
Remarks by the Editor	77
Bishops	71
Letters from A. B. Magruder, 65, 197,	221
June 59. 1844, a Great Chronological Crisis	
" " " " " 66,	96
Notice	69
Dr. Dejernette	73
Re-immersion, Murdock, on	81
" Correspondence on, between Murdock and Wallis of England 111,	131
Remarks by the Editor	137
" by the Editor	157
Correspondence with R. F. Ferguson on Peace	84
Signs of the Times	93
Sore and Afflicting Incident	95
Letter from W. Haigh of Huddersfield	105
Read this and Act upon it	117
Salvation among the Heathens	118
Franklin College	119
Immortality only to the Righteous	141

	No.
" " dependont on the Resurrection	197
The Ottoman Power	143
Russia and Turkey	144
Future Destiny of Man unrevealed says Mr. Campbell	144
Obedience to the Faith of the Gospel for Remission	157
The Christian Journal and B. F. Hall	167
Epitome of Reform	171
'Soul Damning Doctrine'	173
Pencillings by the Way	173
Letter to the Editor of the Christian Review	174
A Good Hit	180
Great Tent Meeting in Louisville	183
Voice from Philadelphia	184
All Antiquity testifies to the Heresy of our Opponents	185
Peace based upon Obedience to the Gospel	191
Campbell and Co. the Heretics and Schismatics not we Mr. C. being Judge	198
Overture of Peace to Reformed Baptist Divines by the Editor	199
Apology	199
Ecclesiastical Amputations	200
'The Things of the Spirit of God,'	201
" " " "	219
Sublime Nonsense	207
The Prophetic Style a speaking Hieroglyphic	207
The Great Defects in Modern Christianity	208
Epistle Ecclesiastical commendatory of the Editor	214
'Campbellite Troubles'	215
Human Magnetism	217
'The Fear of the Lord' by J. T. Walsh	
" " "	218
Truth Dreads Nothing	"
T. J. Walsh's strictures on A. C.'s last Extra	225
Albert Anderson's position defined	239
Suit against Mr. Campbell for libel	232
May a Christian appeal to Cæsar	231
Visit to New Jersey	233
Christian Morality Illustrated	238
Conclusion	245

competencey, and of our removal from Louisville to Richmond will sufficiently account for its varied appearance, and the irregularity of its issue; though the volume has appeared within the period, it would have occupied, for the publication of fifteen numbers.

But concerning the future. We are not a person of many words and promises. We prefer to promise little and do much. We shall do the best we can under the circumstances which may come upon us. The mechanical execution will be uniform; and we shall do the best our means will afford to perfect it in this department, knowing, that matter well printed and illustrated, though as distasteful as truth generally is to ordinary minds, will be more readily entertained than when deformed by 'monks' and 'friars,' bites' and pages badly 'registered'.

As to the things destined to give spirit to the Herald during the second period of its existence, we cannot speak with certainty. The following list affords a specimen of documents on hand, which will appear as opportunity may serve. 'Knowledge the True Basis of Reform;' 'Critique on Josephus' Testimony to Jesus of Nazareth;' 'Unity of Christ's Church;' 'The Resurrection of Jesus;' 'The Bride of Aaron,' 'Restoration of the Jews;' 'Prophetic Works of Millerite Second Adventists;' 'Sure Word of Prophecy;' 'Jewish interpretation of Prophecy;' 'Shiloh, and Judah's Sceptre;' 'Jewish tradition concerning a suffering Messiah;' 'Unfulfilled Prophecy;' 'Non Perpetuity of the Law of Moses;' 'Origin of the notion that the Jews mingle Human Blood with their Passover;' etc. These are all interesting articles from the pen of a learned Christian Jew in England & never before published in this country. We have also an exposition of Matthew xxiv, etc, from our own pen, which like that of Daniel, differs from any other extant. Likewise articles on the 'Last Days' and 'the Latter Days;' 'the Witnesses;' etc; etc. What our friends may contribute to the Herald remains to be seen. We shall be glad to publish any thing tending to enlarge our views of divine truth, and to improve our readers in the conceptions and practice of Ancient Christianity. We shall not lose sight 'of the Future Age;' but shall endeavor to set forth its origination, political, ecclesiastical, and social, as developed in the Oracles of God.

From the position in which we find ourselves, we shall still be obliged to bestow some attention upon the Ecclesiastical Politics of the Present, or Living Age. Politicians of this order will doubtles afford us some matter for this department. We hope however, they will illustrate the proverb, that 'still tongue makes a wise head:' should they surprise us upon this point, we shall have cause to felicitate them upon their growth in the wisdom of this world at least, which if it will not save them, will shield them from many a rebuke, which hitherto they have not had the sagacity to avoid.

Upon the whole we are gratified with the position, things in general have assumed in this crisis. Bigotry and entolerance have struggled to gain the ascendancy, but have been signally check mated. They may open another campaign, but their overthrow is as certain, as that 'truth is powerful and will prevail.' The old apostolic gospel has entrenched itself in the hearts of some; who will suffer ruin of all, their worldly prospects rather than forego its defence against the treachery of pretended friends. Intellectual freedom has been maintained in the face of the insensate clamor of ignorance, stolidity and presumption, hypocrisy, has been unmasked; knavery unveiled, character vindicated, and the truth maintained. When we visited Virginia in 1843, swellings, and tumult assailed us on every side; but now we have cast anchor under the very guns of the enemy's fortress, and scarce the crack of a percussion cap vibrates upon the ear! Not because their hostility is assuaged, but because their caissons are emptied, and their ammunition spoiled and of none effect. What then remains for us, but to 'gird up the loins of our mind,' & panoplied in the armour of God, to do battle for the truth unto victory or death. This is our resolve: and while we have the means afforded us, we shall contribute our energies to the consumption of that Wicked One, 'whom the Lord shall destroy with the brightness of his coming;' and to the re-establishment of the unadulterated gospel and faith, hope, spirit, obedience, and life. May our Eternal Father crown our labors and to his glorious and holy name be the honor and praise henceforth now and forever, amen!

EDITOR.

HERALD OF THE FUTURE AGE.

PROSPECTUS.

"Unto the Angels hath he not put in subjection the World to come of which we speak; but to the Son."—Paul.

At this present we are saluted on every side by voices of strange and ominous signification. "The Midnight Cry;" the dying groans of the Orientals; contentions at home for religious rights; and the "*still small voice*" of prophecy, all proclaim that a "*crisis*" has arrived; that "*the Times of the Gentiles*" are fulfilled; and that the Messianic age of Glory, Honor, and Peace is about to be ushered in. While we believe that the cry "*Behold the Bridegroom cometh!*" which has resounded through the world, is that cry" which was to be "*made at midnight,*" we are far from conceiving, that the abstract belief of this fact, and the consequent looking for Messiah, constitute that preparation, which will entitle an individual to admission to the "*marriage supper of the Lamb.*" Furthermore, while we believe, that the 2300 days of Daniel, terminated in March, 1843; and that the period for the Ottomans "*to slay the third part of men*" is exhausted June 29, 1844; we do not admit, that Messiah will therefore come this year; but we maintain, that the next event is *the cleansing of the sanctuary*. By "*sanctuary*" we do not mean the "*whole earth,*" but simply the HOLY; which, in common with *the Host*, has been "*trodden under foot*" by the Gentiles for 1800 years We look to prophecy and to facts in relation to this subject. John, as well as Daniel, has indicated a cleansing of the Holy. He heard a voice proclaim, saying,

THE LAMB'S WIFE HATH MADE HERSELF READY.

This is the consummation of that agitation, which now convulses the ecclesiastical organizations of this expiring age, throughout the world. It is an agitation, contemporary with the convulsions in Syria, and it has for its end, the spiritual purification of the Body of Christ; while events in Palestine will culminate in the subversion of that power, which perpetuates its desolation, and prevents its immediate re-occupation by the Host of Israel.

A close observer of the times may discern these processes advancing collaterally, soundly, and with a prophetic certainty in their results. Combined, they will eventuate in the universal abolition, and utter dissolution of the existing framework, or constitution, of society, in all its political, ecclesiastical, and domestic combinations; and in the introduction of a *New Social Order*, under the glorious, omnipotent, and *personal* supervision of Jesus Christ, which, in the scriptures of truth

is styled *the* WORLD, or AGE, TO COME—"*the Rest*," or Sabbatism, which remains for the people of God.

With these views, I am constrained to occupy a position, in which I find myself alone. My friends, however, who are of that class who are determined at all hazards, to "*prove all things*," and to hold fast what appears to them, and not to other people, to be good and true, are not willing that, though solitary among the writers of the day, I should remain unheard. I am urged by them, therefore, to continue my editorial functions; and to teach and maintain whatever I believe the Scriptures reveal upon any and every subject, and leave the event to God. This being in harmony with my own judgment, I have concluded to publish the HERALD OF THE FUTURE AGE, as soon as sufficient money is received, to guarantee its continuance.

Among the topics that will be descanted on, are,

a. The introduction of the Future Age during the life time of the present generation;
b. The overthrow of all existing governments, but not the total destruction of the nations;
c. The kind of government that will be set up, and under which men will live during the Future Age;
d. The restoration of Sacrifice, and Jesus, our Lord, the High Priest, as well as Monarch, of the Future Age;
e. Those who are accounted worthy to attain to the resurrection of the Just, the subaltern Kings and Priests of the Future Age;
f. The constitution of man, his state by nature; sin and death; his state by favor: how the animal is converted into the spiritual; obedience, life.
g. The scripture doctrine of immortality, as opposed to the speculations of the Old and New Platonists; the intermediate state of the dead—Sheol, Hades, Heaven, Hell;
h. The promise of Eternal Life made to Abraham; the Animal Israel; their destiny; the Spiritual Israel; their destiny;
i. Obedience to the Ancient Gospel the only means by which a right and title can be obtained to Eternal Life and the honor, glory, and privileges of the Future Age;
k. God's ultimate design in the creation the Animal World;
l. The duration of the Future Age, or M lenial Dispensation; the events which company its abolition; the surrender of Kingdom to the Father;
m. The Apostolic Constitution of the Ki dom of Heaven, and administration of affairs, in letter and spirit, illustrated no organization extant;
n. The application of History to Prophe illustrations of the Apocalypse;
o. Ecclesiastical Politics; Miscellaneous ters; and so forth.

The pages of The Herald will be open correspondents of all denominations, write with candor and a regard for truth brevity; liberty of speech and pen be claimed as his inalienable right, both christian, and a citizen, the Editor make a point of honor to concede to others what demands for himself, even though this ri may be denied him by the jealousy and inj tice of his opponents.

The Herald will be published in 8 pamphlet form of 16 pages at least, wit neat cover, at $1 50 per volume, *payable advance*. We hope our friends will do th best to secure to the Herald an efficient respectable support; more especially as s powerful efforts are making to stay the p gress of our views, particularly in the Dominion.

All letters to be directed to the Editor, *Paid*, care of Dr. Bodenhamer, Louisvil Ky., *until further notice*.

All subscribers to the Investigator, unl we are notified to the contrary, will be c sidered as such to the Herald; only they requested to be prompt in forwarding subscriptions through the Postmasters; otherwise, *Post Paid*. The 11th and 12 numbers of the Investigator have been cently mailed from this city.

JOHN THOMAS.

LOUISVILLE, KY., March, 1844.

☞ I have ordered two thousand of t above to be mailed from Illinois; there some errors in them, which will be excuse as I am too remote to correct the proof.

J. T.

ADDRESS TO THE CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES.

FELLOW CITIZENS:—The time is short, and he days are few and evil. A voice has re-ounded through the world, calling your at-ention to the fact, that the Dispensation of he Times under which we Gentiles live, is ulfilled. Whether it be consummated im-ediately, or within the life-time, at most, of he generation now existing, is a question, hich, at present, we intend neither to dis-uss, nor determine; but, from the events, hich we see transpiring in relation to the ecclesiastical and secular affairs of men, col-ated with the things noted in the scriptures of truth, we are satisfied that the time which remains is brief, and that our eternal well-be-ng demands that we not only believe that He will come, but that we PREPARE *to meet the Lord*.

FELLOW CITIZENS:—Eighteen centuries have rolled away like a vapor since the anks of the Jordan resounded with the pro-lamation, "PREPARE *ye the way of the Lord, nd make his paths straight!*" This was "*the oice*" of the Elijah, whose appearance was predicted by Malachi, "*crying in the wilder-ess*" of Judea; whose mission was of God, who sent him to revive the fathers' disposi-ions in their descendants, (*epistrepsai kardias aterοon epi tekna*; Luke i: 17.) and to bring back the disobedient to the wisdom of just persons; and thus, "*to* MAKE READY *a people* PREPARED *for the Lord.*". To carry this into effect, John, the son of Zacharias, commonly called *the Baptist*, and by the Prophets "*Eli-jah*," because he came "*in the spirit and pow-er of Elias*," made his appearance in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Cæ-sar. The grand purpose of his mission was "to make ready a people prepared" for the reception of the Lord Messiah *at his first coming*. This he accomplished by travers-ing "all the country about Jordan, announc-ing the baptism of repentance for the remis-sion of sins," in consequence of which, mul-titudes flocked to him from Jerusalem and other cities, "and were all baptized by him IN *the river Jordan*, confessing their sins;" Mark i: 5.

FELLOW CITIZENS:—This is the manner in which that "Burning and Shining Light" prepared Messiah's way; and "made ready a people" to receive him, giving them "*the* KNOWLEDGE *of salvation, by the remission of their sins.*" Now, ponder well, we pray you, this question; if *such a preparation were necessary "to make ready a people prepared" to receive Messiah at his first coming; is not a preparation now equally demanded, by which "to make ready a people prepared" to receive Him at his second appearing?* This is our firm conviction, and, believing assuredly that "the day of Christ" is at hand, we address you all, without distinction of name, party, or denomination, in the words of the sacred text:

"Come out of Babylon my people,
That ye be not partakers of her sins,
And that ye receive not of her plagues.
For her sins have reached unto heaven,
And God hath remembered her iniquities."

Say not to yourselves, we are Protestants, and therefore not in Babylon. Fellow Citizens! Babylon is a system of things, made up of every departure from the positive institutions and practices of the New Testament. Original Christianity, which is as pure in the sacred writings as when first delivered to the Jewish nation by the Apostles, recognizes only "one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one Body, one Spirit, one Hope, and one God and Father of all," but, if you lift up your eyes, and contemplate the aspect of the Ecclesiastical World, you will behold, Lords many; Faiths, or Gospels, without number; Baptisms seven; as many Bodies as there are sects; Spirits of all kinds, but "the Spirit of Christ;" and more Fears than Hopes. The present religious system of "Christendom," in whole or in part, can nowhere be found in the Scriptures, except as "THE APOSTACY," which they declare would arise, and cover the face of the nations as with a veil of "strong delusion." The morality of the social system is vicious, giving countenance to all unrighteousness, vicious-

ness, and malice; and, judging from what comes out of their mouths, the hearts of all kinds of religionists are full of envy, deceit and malignity; being whisperers, backbiters, slanderers, haters of truly good men, despiteful, proud, boasters, volatile, and so forth; being lovers of trifling more than lovers of God. Upon such, his law pronounces the sentence of Eternal Death.

This being the obvious condition of the world, *is it prepared to receive Messiah?* The Scriptures say, that "the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Now, when He appears, it is to introduce that kingdom in all its glory; therefore, "the unwashed, unsanctified, and unjustified" will have no share in his dominion, for it is such only, whose characters are defined in the Book of Eternal Life, who will partake in the honors of the Future Age.

FELLOW CITIZENS:—Do you inquire what you must do, that you may inherit Eternal Life? That you may be prepared for Him at his coming? We answer, that the Scriptures teach, that we must *return to first principles:* to those Institutions which are sanctioned by the Apostolic writings. We must obtain "the knowledge of salvation by the remission of sins. This is the first step; for having before proved, that by practice, as well as nature, all are under sentence of death; it behoves us first, to be released from sin, that, in the act of release, we may pass from the sentence of death to that of life. The instant therefore, that a man obtains the remission of his sins, he acquires, in that act, *a right and title* to Eternal Life.

FELLOW CITIZENS:—Do you inquire what you must do to obtain his right and title to Eternal Life in the remission of sins? Permit us to quote a few passages from the New Testament in reply to this question. First then, it is written in Mark xvi: 15, 16, "*He that believeth* (the Gospel,) *and is baptised, shall be saved;*" (from his sins;) again, in Acts ii: 38, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins;" verse 40, "then they that gladly received his word were baptized;" again, in chapter iii: 19, "Repent and be converted that your sins may be blotted out;" again, chapter viii: 12, "When the Samaritans believed Philip, preaching the things concerning *the kindgom* of God, and *the name* of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women;" again, chapter viii: 38, "And Philip and the Ethiopian went down both *into the water*, and he, Philip, baptized him;" again, in chapter x: 43, "to Jesus give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." And Peter said, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized?" None objecting, "he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord;" again, in chapter xiii: 38, "Through this man, is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses;" again, in chapter xviii: 8, "Many of the Corinthians, hearing, believed, and were baptized;" and again, lastly, in chapter xxii: 16, "Arise, Saul, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." Why should we darken counsel by appending comments to these simple and emphatic replications; we will only add the reply of Jesus to the young rich man, who demanded of him, "Good master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have Eternal Life?" Jesus said, "*if thou wilt enter into Life, keep the Commandments;*" these are contained in the passages we have quoted, and in the "all things" which Jesus commanded his Apostles to teach those who were "baptized in his name."

FELLOW CITIZENS:—If you inquire, is this all that is to be done to acquire a right and title to Eternal Life? We answer, *it is.* But you will observe, that to obtain a right and title to an estate is not the same thing as to obtain possession of it; a right and title may be acquired, but, under certain conditions, *it may be forfeited.* No one can enter the Kingdom of God, or possess Life Eternal without first obtaining a right and title; though vast numbers, it is to be feared, who have acquired a right and title, will forfeit them; and consequently, never realize any share in the glory and renown of the Future Age. You will perceive, therefore, that in order to enjoy or possess the things to which we obtain a title by obeying the Gospel, we must also "PATIENTLY CONTINUE IN WELL DOING" *till the Lord comes*, be that event sooner or later; in other words, the interval between believing the Gospel and being baptized, and our departure hence, must be occupied in forming our characters after the model of

Jesus; "who is the exact representation of the character of God," and therefore, the very best after which we can aspire. CHARACTER, *and not opinions*, will be the test of our admission into the Kingdom of God; let us form, then, such a character as we find delineated in the Lamb's Book of Life—the New Testament; and be assured, whether our names be repudiated by our contemporaries, or ourselves persecuted to the deprivation of the means of subsistence, we shall be invested with incorruptible life, and crowned with glory and honor in the Future Age.

FELLOW CITIZENS:—The character we are required to form, that we may realize the "*one Hope of our calling*," must be inspirited by THE TRUTH; that is, the Law of the Lord must dwell in us, with the courageous determination to obey it, or live in conformity to it, and to contend earnestly for it, at all hazards. God must be in all our thoughts; and our actions must be shaped with a view to his approbation alone. How will this or that be approved by our Father in Heaven, and not what will the people or their leaders say, should be the only question permitted to stand up between our conceptions and the practice of them. In short, "the grace of God that bringeth salvation," teaches us, "that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in the present world; looking for that blessed hope, even the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works:"—it charges "*them that* are rich in this world, that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate, laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, *that they may lay hold on Eternal Life.*" Such are the things which constitute the character of the man, whose religion is "pure and undefiled," and who will be accepted when "the Day Star" shall illume the world.

FELLOW CITIZENS:—When the Ancients had obeyed the Gospel, they did not insulate themselves; on the contrary, attracted to a common centre by the love of the truth, they associated themselves together into communities, that they might continue in all the things enjoined upon them by the Apostles. They met together every first day of the week, termed the Lord's day, because he rose from the dead upon that day. Being assembled, they sang his praise, celebrated his death, supplicated his favor, exhorted one another to love, good works, and a patient continuance in well-doing; they searched the Scriptures, and, in proportion to the strength of their affection for the common truth, so they were knit and compacted together in the bonds of love and brotherhood in Christ. Their Hope was one. They earnestly desired the appearing of Jesus Christ, because they expected then to be raised from the dead; or, if alive at his coming, to be transformed into the similitude of his glory.—Their love was perfect; and they loved one another in the ratio of their love to God, who first loved them; there was no fear in their love, for "perfect love casteth out fear;" and, unlike the worldly-minded and false-hearted religionists of this Laodicean Age, as they conceived in their hearts, so with their tongues did they the truth express. In those days of primitive simplicity in the faith, they did not worship God by a proxy, whom they hired at so much per annum to preach the traditions of men; nor did they masquerade, or "trip it on the light fantastic toe," like an opera danseuse; but they "walked as becometh saints," ennobled by the truth, and destined for the "good society" of the Future Age.

FELLOW CITIZENS:—In the Scriptures of truth, God has set our destiny before us in the most intelligible terms. He pronounces us *sinners by nature and practice;* and because sinners, corruptible and mortal "in body, soul, and spirit, the whole person;" as it is written, "*the wages of sin is* DEATH." This life is probationary. We are placed here to prove ourselves worthy of the destiny we may choose. "*The gracious gift of God is* ETERNAL LIFE *through Jesus Christ the Lord.*" Which will you? *Life* and *Death* are set before you; will you strike for freedom from the law of sin; or choose ye rather to fret out the "few and evil days," which may remain to you as the bond slaves of this perishing state, and "*die accursed?*" God invites you to reconciliation; "come unto me," says Jesus, "all ye that are weary and heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Have you no am-

bition beyond the mean and groveling aspirations of this animal life? Are the glories of personal decoration with silks, and velvets, and gold, and precious stones, &c., the choicest brilliants after which you sigh? Is the honor which comes from vain and foolish man, corruptible and defiled in all his parts, your highest aspiration? Is the immortality of fame with future generations, the most renowned for which you long?—Fellow mortals! Of what value are baubles, such as these, to tenants of the tomb? Are the particles of dust which once rejoiced in the glory and renown of a Nebuchadnezzar, a Cyrus, an Alexander, a Cæsar, or a Napoleon more happy or estimable than those of a Lazarus? All these things perished in the using, and now are equally valueless to all, both of high and low degree.

Fellow Citizens:—Being destitute of all true riches, and good things by nature, our Benevolent Creator has offered us "glory, honor, incorruptibility, and Eternal Life," with an "inheritance, which is incorruptible, undefiled, and that shall never fade away." He invites us in the Gospel, to become *heirs* of these things; and, by our future conduct, to prove ourselves worthy to possess them. Would you not be arrayed in splendor which will excel the glory of the Sun? Would you not be exalted to the dignity of "associate Kings," with the glorious Monarch of the Future Age? Would you not be invested with an incorruptible life, that you may eternally enjoy "the inheritance in the light" which is to be revealed at the appearing of the "Bright and Morning Star?" Let, then, the dispositions of the Ancient Christians be revived in us, their descendants; and let us forsake our disobedience, and return to the wisdom of just persons; and thus the Truth will make of us "a people prepared for the Lord."

Fellow Citizens:—Forget the things which are behind, and press forward to the things which are before. Though you may belong to "*the straitest sect*" of popular religion, and in all good fame with its officials; "*come out from it*" and obey the Gospel for remission of sins. Romanism, Protestantism, or Sectarianism are forms only of "the Apostacy" from original Christianity. There is but one true and genuine Religion; all others are counterfeits. You can only be "accounted worthy" to attain to the Resurrection of the Just, by a right and title derived from that Religion. The New Testament is the only document in which it is found "pure and undefiled" by the traditions of men. If you would become Mohammedans, you would study the Koran, that you might learn in what Mohammedanism consisted; even so, if you would become Christians, you must study the Religion of the Christian Scriptures in these oracles, which alone contain it. The motive, then, presented to you, by which you may be induced to "count all things but loss," is the excellency of the things to be brought to you at the coming of the Lord. If you invest yourselves with the wedding garment, in the way the Scriptures direct, and we have endeavored to point it out in this well-intentioned address, you will be honored to "sit down with Abraham," the Prophets, Jesus and his Apostles, "in the Kingdom of God;" but, if "the cares of this world and the deceitfulness of riches" should unhappily lead you to put away these things from you, and to "*judge yourselves unworthy of Eternal Life*," there is but one thing for you; as it is written, "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; who shall be punished with Everlasting Destruction, from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power, when He shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired by all them that believe;" 2 Thess. i: 8. But, that it may be your part to eschew the evil coming upon the world, and to "lay hold on the Hope set before you in the Gospel," is the sincere and humble prayer of yours, in all philanthropy and benevolence.

The Editor.

"The Fear of the Lord is the beginning of Wisdom."

FACTS AND OBSERVATIONS CONNECTED WITH A VISIT TO EASTERN VIRGINIA.

LETTERS TO A FRIEND IN THE FAR WEST.

LETTER I.

Fredericksburg, Va. Aug. 8, 1843.

Much Esteemed Friend:—How little do we know what a day or an hour may bring forth. We devise projects, and propose to ourselves future plans, when behold some incident arises to "shape our ends" into a fashion, of which we had no original conception; and thus is verified the adage, applied to his defeat in Poland, by Diebitch, *l' homme propose mais Dieu dispose!* I had sold my farm in Illinois, as I supposed, and was congratulating myself, that I should thus be able to pay off the few debts I had contracted in consequence of the fire which had destroyed my printing office, &c.; have a surplus in hand; have condensed my affairs into a small compass; should now be permanently settled, with a sufficient support derived from my own efforts; and have nothing to draw off my attention from the free investigation of the things noted in the scriptures of truth. But, it appears, I was not to be permitted thus to settle myself quietly down in the development of things spiritual, leaving "this reformation" to run its own downward career; and its sun and solar satelites to scorch the brethren, as yet unwilling to sell their liberty in Christ to a rising order of "Evangelical" aspirants.

As you are aware, my *otium cum dignitate* was first invaded by one, of whom I once hoped better things, but who must be, and I regret to say it, *aut Cæsar aut nullus;* by one, who has placed himself at the head of a religious movement, from whence he seems prepared to hurl the thunders of indignation against every one who is not servile enough to call him supervisor; and to receive, with all due subserviency and docility, the traditions of such as he may condescend to recognize as co-laborers with him! I had concluded, as you know, to let him alone, and to yield him an unobstructed career, without joining issue with him any more; because, from past experience, I was well apprised that persons abound in "this reformation," who would have perverted my motives, and have misconstrued them into those of "pride and unhallowed ambition," which would "not suffer me to rest, but in the chair of dictation." Now, if I know any thing of myself, I am actuated by no other considerations than such as flow from a desire to see once more established among men, the New Institution in letter, spirit, and application as delineated in the Book of Eternal Life, those circumstantial relations alone excepted, which were peculiar to the Apostolic administration of spiritual affairs. We need no head or supervisor but Jesus; no privileged or superior order of salaried persons, styled preachers, but the Apostles and Evangelists; no professors of theology, or by what ever name it may be known, but the unction of the Holy One, which teaches us all things, and by which we know all things, and which is the Truth, written and transmitted to us, by the good Providence of our heavenly Father; we need no college bred youths to "Evangelize," and to take the oversight of churches at from $500 to $1000 a year; we require no schools of preachers, but the school of Christ; nor any college for their preparation, but the college of his Apostles. In fine, however much these inventions may tend to the glorification of "this" or that "reformation," or of "a New Denomination," I feel confident on my part, that the Body of Christ needs not such excrescences, which in the end, if grafted upon it, will "slay it with death," and cause to perish, the liberty of the sons of God.

The next circumstance which started me from my retirement, was the announcement of the purchaser of my farm on his return from England, that he had no money for me, hav-

ing been foiled in his speculations, &c.—This disappointment made it necessary for me to visit Eastern Virginia without delay, *in order to collect certain money still due to me, as I supposed, on the farm I sold when I left this State four years ago.* I mention this fact to you, because there is a paper published at Charlottesville, in this State, which, having announced my arrival in Eastern Virginia, states substantially, that I have come here to institute certain "*operations*" which I have already "*commenced;*" and which "operations" are, as its Editor says he "*has reason to believe,*" designed to "*endeavor to draw away disciples after me.*" He therefore wishes his brethren "*to be upon their guard, and not suffer me to deceive them with reference to my position and character.*" Now, the truth of the matter is as I have stated, and, I know not that any one has a better opportunity of knowing the truth, than I have. If any of my old friends wish to hear me expound the Scriptures, I shall gratify them, time and opportunity fitting, without regard to here and there a straggler, or his opinions. Therefore let them cease to trouble me, for I regard neither their warnings, nor their authority, whatever it may be, real or imaginary.

When I arrived at Baltimore, I found myself in rather an awkward predicament. On applying at the Rail Road office, between one and two in the morning, for a ticket to Washington, I tendered a three dollar bill of the State of Ohio, which was immediately returned as of no use; I produced another, which was also refused. I told their clerk that I had no other than Ohio bills, and after some difficulty persuaded him to take one at a discount; but on the steamer from Washington to the Potomac Creek, I could neither persuade the captain to take a bill nor to discount it, being averse to "shaving, lest it should be said, that his boat was a —— broker's shop." As you may suppose, I felt considerably perplexed, until relieved by his suggestion, that I could leave my baggage in the custody of the agent at Fredericksburg, who would surrender it to me when I should pay him the fare in money current in Virginia, or the District of Columbia; which I did the next day, by the aid of a friend; for, to my surprise, I found no broker's establishment in Fredericksburg!

I arrived at Fredericksburg by the cars, about eleven and a half o'clock, A. M., on Sunday, July 30. Having left my baggage with the agent, I directed my steps to "th Disciples' Meeting House," where, in forme times, I had been in the custom of worshi ping with the brethren, and of speaking o divers topics connected with the faith an knowledge of the Son of God. It is abou five years since I was in this town. If I am not, mistaken, it was in the fall of 1838; an not long before my debate with Mr. Camp bell on the Immortality of the Soul; a spec ulation he contended for, (not very succes fully, it is believed,) with all the confidenc he has in demons, ghosts, and witches. A that visit, I was received by all the brethre with great cordiality and kindness. I par took of this hospitality freely offered, and a sociated with them as brethren, as well friends. But, I have since learned that t good feeling they developed towards me, ve nearly cost them the loss of all things priz by those, who value the applause and ben diction of our friend, The Supervisor of th Reformation. For, not long after I left, "commenced operations in Eastern Virgi ia," by certain demonstrations in the tow where I now write. He arrived here Thursday or Friday, rather late, and ther fore put up at the tavern till next day, whe he was escorted to other quarters. The re port he had heard, of my reception by th brethren, seemed to have disturbed his equ nimity considerably. He appears to hav proposed to himself the alternative, that if was regarded as worthy of fellowship, h would not fellowship them! What a mer that He of Bethany is not He of Bethlehem *He* would not fellowship them! What wi not poor human nature yet do! He, M Alexander Campbell, would not fellowsh the brethren in Fredericksburg, unless som atonement, apology, or something else, we offered to propitiate his offended dignity. The meeting house was filled with brethre and citizens, expectant of his appearing. partake with them in the bread and win about to be administered to them by a worth old brother, since dead, from a church i Baltimore; and to listen to the things whic he might have to deliver to them under th special circumstances of the case. Servic was to have commenced at half past te o'clock, but the hour of eleven had elapse before he appeared among them. The caus of this delay, as was afterwards ascertained was the settlement of the very important que tion concerning my reception by the brethre

in Fredericksburg. If *they* fellowshipped me, *He* would not fellowship them. His sa cerdotal indignation, however, was at length appeased by one of the brethren, who assur ed him, that I had "*imposed myself upon the congregation!*" This was a fortunate as sumpsit of M——'s! The dark cloud hith erto lowering upon the brow of our lofty friend, began to lift its threatening masses; the sun of his benignity began to shine forth; the tempest passed away, and tranquility was again restored. He entered the meeting house, and *condescended* to "sit in heavenly places in Christ Jesus" with the congregation upon whom he had been made to believe I had imposed myself. I would not have you believe, however, that I was really so rude as to practice such an imposition as that imputed to me. My self esteem is too active to permit me to humble myself so unscripturally. I did not impose myself upon the congregation, as all, I believe, are prepared to testify; Mr. M—— and his family alone excepted, as he alleges; who may, perhaps, behold in himself, a body corporate of such magnitude as to conceal from view any other body than his own individuality!

Since these events, I have had no personal intercourse with the brethren in Fredericksburg, further than to receive orders for the Investigator. Being ignorant of this fabrication about my imposition upon their good fellowship, I expected nothing less than a cordial reception among them. Under this impression, I entered their meeting house on Sunday week. It was late; for a young gentleman, whom I do not recollect to have seen before, was occupying the time in exhorting them from the first Psalm. I was quite favorably impressed with his effort, concluding that if the rest of the brethren could make as fair a show, there was certainly a congregation here, that had the ability to establish their independence of college bred divines, or co-laborers from the West, or any other point of the compass. I could not help revolving the scenes through which I had passed, in connexion with different congregations, in Eastern Virginia. Surely, thought I, all bitterness of feeling has subsided among the brethren, if not among those who aspire to be their leaders, and spiritual guides. I felt as if I could shake them all cordially by the hand, as well for the sake of old acquaintance; as well as for the [illegible]hs common to us all. The discourse being ended, a member, seemingly in doubt of my identity, came to me, and inquired if it was not Dr. Thomas, &c.; to which I replied in the affirmative. Brother Gabriel Johnstone, who had also come up, then asked me if I would not walk forward and sit among them. Upon this, I accompanied him towards the desk, near which I sat down, with other brethren.—Several of them shook hands with me, as if glad to see me. The first salutation being over, a brother invited me to speak there in the evening. I replied, "*that when invited, I never refused, but that it was a rule with me, to force myself nowhere.*" My assent was signified to Brother Bruce, who, though not an elder, is generally looked to, to take the lead. He announced that Dr. Thomas would speak there, at early candle lighting. Not dreaming of any disturbance, I was conversing with a brother, when my attention was arrested, by some person enunciating my name, on the other side of the house, under considerable excitement. What is to do now, thought I. It is quite unnecessary to go into the details of the remarks which fell from the speaker's lips; suffice it to say, that he protested, with great agony, as it were, against my admission into that house to speak; he did not object to me, solely, on account of my opinions, but for the peace of Zion, and to prevent the body of Christ from being rent asunder. Another brother arose, both "mortified and vexed" at the exhibition he had just witnessed. He deprecated, with some warmth of feeling, the sentiments that had been advanced; and concluded, that, if they excluded me, they might also exclude him, for he not only agreed with me in some things, but went "a bow shot beyond." The peaceable gentleman then rose again, and declared he was "neither for John Thomas, nor *against him*, (but this no one could believe, who beheld him,) but for Christ, and, being for Christ, he pleaded for the peace of Zion," in rudely withstanding me; and added, that there were those present, who, if they had moral courage enough to speak out, would say the same things as he. Upon this, my friend R. W., (and I cannot but style him "my friend," for, both he and his family very kindly entertained me a day or two after this Parochial exhibition, at their residence,) rose and said that he did not "consider Dr. Thomas *as one of us*, and, therefore,

the appointment in the evening, had better be filled up as usual." Thus far, I had said nothing. My merits and demerits were being discussed, with as much freedom, as though I were about to become *sur le champ*, a subject of the judgment. I was both grieved and amused; grieved to see such a proscriptive spirit among those who formerly prided themselves upon their liberality, and readiness to hear and prove all things, and to hold fast that which was good; *amused* at the impotence of the wrath pouring out upon me.

I then arose, and requested to be allowed to say a word or so, explanatory of the position in which I now found myself. Having accounted for my presence among them, on that occasion, and stated how the appointment came to be proposed, I proceeded to call them all to witness, that if any thing unpleasant grew out of the present circumstances, it ought to be attributed to Mr. Parish, and not to me. I had come into their meeting house as any other of the public had a right to do, expecting to find here, many of my old friends and acquaintances. That I had said nothing, nor had I done anything, as yet; but some of them had wished to hear me speak, and therefore invited me. The law guaranteed to me this liberty, and I must be excused if I exercised my right to use it, where time and opportunity served. As to my being *of us*, or "*not one of us*," as my friend had said, it signified nothing, at least to me. I had believed *the* Gospel, I had obeyed it, and I could adduce proof to show, that, in the estimation of brethren acquainted with me, I walked worthy of it, therefore, I was "in Christ," and should be accepted of him whether accounted as one of "this reformation" or not. I was prepared to fraternize with all "in Christ," by whatever name they were styled; all who had believed the Gospel and obeyed it; and demeaned themselves as the Scriptures of truth required. As far as Mr. Parish's protest was concerned, I should not fall out with him on that account, for I had much rather a man would denounce me when present, than slander me, as was the custom, when absent, and deprived of the means of self defence. Some more words having passed on the other side, Mr. Parish, at another, though earnestly requested to stay as one of his brethren, hurried out of the house greatly excited, having earned, most meritoriously, the highest commendations, both from the Bishop and Arch-Bishop of "the Reformation," in Virginia:—He of Charlottesville, and He of Bethany—for having so valiantly and piously withstood the man 'whose influence is evil, and that continually!"

JOHN THOMAS.

DOCTOR CHARLES MAY'S LETTER.

LUNENBURG, VA., June 26, 1843.

Dear Brother:—I have deferred writing you, from time to time, being induced to delay from the want of something interesting or important to communicate. I am, however, impelled to write now by Brother Campbell's "Narrative of my last interview with Doctor John Thomas." That "Narrative" is couched in language calculated to make a false impression concerning the occurrences at Paineville, and I think that justice requires that the members of the Paineville committee should speak out on this occasion. I have written to Brother Campbell on the subject, requesting him to give publicity to my letter. This I think he will do—for I endeavored to write with christian spirit. I subjoin a copy of that letter; and should Brother Campbell, from any cause, refuse to publish it, I request its insertion in the "Investigator."

LUNENBURG, VA., June 19, 1843.

Brother Campbell—Dear Sir:—I saw, a few days since, in the "Millennial Harbinger," your "Narrative of my last interview with Doctor John Thomas," in which you state your understanding of certain things that transpired in Amelia. Now, as a member of the committee referred to in the piece, I may presume to know something of that matter; and being, to say the least, as disinterested an observer as yourself, I hope you will, in justice to "the Doctor and his friends," [illegible] equal publicity to my version as to your own.

You say: "On perusing it, ("the large pamphlet from the pen of Doctor Thomas,") I immediately visited Paineville, Amelia, for the purpose of exposing its sophistry in the presence of the Doctor and his friends. I left it to them to choose the way. They preferred a public discussion. We met in their meeting-house, and occupied some ten hours in examining some of its representations. Before we commenced, I distinctly stated my objection to any publication of the conference, on account of the scandal to the cause of Reformation, which I apprehended from the publication of the Doctor's views and arguments. The brethren, desirous of saving the Doctor, (as I understood the matter) and being fully satisfied with the discussion, interposed, and proposed to settle the difference some other way. They proposed reconciliation on the broad principles of christian forbearance and forgiveness. Believing, as I most certainly did, that they were fully satisfied with the development made, and that Doctor Thomas was truly humbled, and desirous of a restoration of christian harmony and co-operation, I responded to the brethren that I was ready to hear such proposition as they might deem expedient to offer," &c., &c.

Now, I would ask, what idea is conveyed in this language, and indeed throughout the "Narrative"? Why, that the "Doctor" acknowledged himself beaten, that the Doctor's "friends" acknowledged him beaten, and that the "Doctor and his friends" had given in their adherence to the popular dogma of "The Immortality of the Soul," and that these admissions constituted the basis of the "reconciliation." This I conscientiously believe to be a just inference from your language in the above extract, and, indeed, throughout the narrative.

If this be indeed the impression on your mind, I must, with all due deference to your talents and age, say that I am extremely surprised that a man of Alexander Campbell's acuteness of intellect should be so much at fault.

I mixed with the "Doctor and his friends" freely at Paineville, both in public and private, and can testify (to a negative, it is true,) that I never heard any one of them express any wavering in his belief in the main point at issue—the mortality of man, and the consequent doctrine, the conditionality of Eternal Life.

To the best of my knowledge—and I am personally acquainted with all the members of that committee, with many of them intimately—about sixteen out of the twenty-three have rejected the "Immortality of the Soul," as a doctrine diametrically opposed to the teaching of the Holy Spirit.

So the "reconciliation" was not effected in consequence of Brother Campbell's convincing "the Doctor and his friends" of holding erroneous views.

Besides, what says the "Resolution"? It states that to remove the cause of "offence to many brethren," and to avoid "a division amongst us," we recommend to Brother Thomas "to discontinue the discussion of the same, unless in his defence when misrepresented."

Here we see with what christian forbearance "the Doctor and his friends" acted, in order to remove every cause of "offence," and to avoid schism in the body of Christ, and this, too, after Brother Thomas had, in their estimation, ably and successfully defended what they esteem scriptural doctrine, against the attack of the renowned polemic, A. Campbell.

You speak of the Doctor's being "duly tamed and humbled," "much dejected and humbled"; but, if we were to judge from the circumstances of the case, we should be compelled to fasten, if any where, the being duly tamed and humbled on another person, seeing that you, unless I greatly mistake, non-fellowshipped Brother Thomas, for holding sentiments which, after the discussion, as the "Resolution" shows, you allowed him to hold, giving him the right hand of fellowship simply on the understanding that he should discontinue the discussion of the same.

How the "covenant" could be "broken in the very annunciation of it, by Brother Thomas re-affirming his unshaken confidence of the truth of his own views of those litigat-

ted opinions," is, I must freely confess, beyond the reach of my mental vision.

We, in this part of the country, can appreciate the charges issued, at your instance, from Philadelphia and Richmond—for they and their refutation have been before us; and moreover, the fact that you received Brother Thomas into fellowship, after the accusations referred to were made, and without, at least so far as I know, any expression of contrition on his part, plainly evinces what estimate you yourself placed on them.

If you know any think against the Doctor's moral or religious character, whilst in Amelia, I have no doubt "the Doctor and his friends" would prefer to know the charges, to hearing insinuations. As to Dr. Thomas' moral deportment, whilst in Amelia, allow me to say, that I never heard any thing against it, even as coming from his enemies, the sectaries; and I resided in that county ten months of the year subsequent to that in which you visited Paineville. And, as regards his religious character, he was, at the time of his removal, as he ever had been, in fellowship with all the congregations.

His standing cannot, I presume, be quite so low in Illinois as your anonymous correspondence would imply, since his fellow citizens, clergymen too, among the number, have unanimously elected him President of Franklin College.

I have given the Paineville matter as I understood it, and as I have no doubt the majority of the council understood it, and, as it appears to me, every one must understand it, who will consult the resolution, as it is on page 226, Mill. Harb., for May, 1843.

Fiat Justitia, ruat calum,

Yours truly,

CHARLES MAY.

Brother Thomas—Have you decided to go to England, and to visit us by the [illegible]?

Many of us would be most happy to see you. Some, however, think that your presence would be productive of a split. I say, however, and many will join me, come, Brother Thomas, and welcome. Let us not fear the consequences of the Truth. Evil (at least, lasting evil,) cannot result from good. Be assured that absence and distance have not cooled the love of all towards you. Many love you dearly for the truth's sake, and will continue to love, notwithstanding underhand influence, insinuations against character, and every species of slander.

Some of the brethren are endeavoring to obtain new subscribers to the Investigator, and will send you in a list ere long.

It shall not be long before I write again. I anticipate, however, the pleasure of seeing you here this summer or fall. In the mean time, believe me, your affectionate son, in the Gospel.

CHARLES MAY.

P. S. You have much to contend with having taken such high ground, in support of the truth; but "*Sperat infestis, metuit secundis Alteram sortem bene preparatum Pectus.*"

Magna est veritas, et prevalebit eventually.

REFORMATION IN LOUISVILLE.

There is a church in this city which meets in what is styled "The Christian Chapel." There are several very excellent citizens in it, as there are in all the churches of this community. It is said to number 300. I have seen a goodly number of them assemble on Lord's day; and on fine moonlight Wednesday nights I have seen as many as 8 or 9. It may be styled "a New Testament church," but I know of no congregations in the New Testament, to which I can liken it, save Sardis and Laodicea: it is like Sardis, because it is "dead," and because there are "a few names even in it;" and it is like Laodicea, because it is ready to be "spued out of the Lord's mouth." The time is come, when the truth must be told to all parties; and in telling it, I will endeavor not to "extenuate, nor to set down aught in malice." My aim is to apply such a stimulus to their ears as will awake the Sardian "dead" and kindle their Laodicean lukewarmness into the fervor of a zeal according to the knowledge of God: for the Lord is at hand, and this is a proclamation, which they hate to hear: and, unless something convulse their hearts, they will ere long sink into the perdition of Eternal Death!

Reformation in Louisville is a very *fashionable* affair. I need not expatiate upon fashion; its frippery and levity are too notorious to require any touches from my pen. It is easy to tell what abounds in the heart by what flows from the mouth; and when, therefore, you find religionists more studious and loquacious of the "Mysteries of Paris" than conversable with the "Mysteries of the Gospel," you will always find more levity on the lip, and more frivolity of the life than of a "conversation in heaven," or a denial of all ungodliness and worldly desires. I cannot testify, that the Mysteries of the Gospel are more popular among Louisville Reformers than *Les Mysteres de Paris;* nor can I aver, that their hearts are more interested in Jerusalem than in the Emporium of Debauchery and Fashion in the Kingdom of France! But I can *see* this, that the religion of the greater number, is a mere holiday dress, of a very flimsy texture.

In November last, they had over them three Elders. Two of these were old subscribers to the Advocate; the third, as ignorant of my person, writings, character, and views, as a "dead" man. The two invited me to speak in "the Christian Chapel." I did so, no voice disputing. Another appointment was made. In the interval, the Evil Spirit began to work. He entered into the third Elder, who began to agonize. His brother Elders wished him to have an interview with me, but although he was standing at the door of the house where I then was, he refused to see me. He reminds me of the man who persecuted Galileo for his views of astonomy. 'Come,' said the philosopher, 'look through this telescope, and see if I do not tell the truth.' No, replied he, I will not do that, for then, if I find it as you say, how could I maintain my opinions? From this time, this very little person, who, I am told, has been *a* troubler of the congregation for years, gave himself many foolish airs, which have resulted in his finding his proper level at last.

A little clique, in concert with him, either as head or tail of the compact, it matters not which, made themselves very busy to effect the closure of the doors against me, if possible. The two Elders had granted the citizens the use of the Meeting House to hear a discussion between me and a Universalist clergyman of this city. The faction were determined, if possible, to break up the arrangement. As the best means they could devise, they got up a petition to the two Elders to get them to resign; assuredly gathering that if they could instruct them out of office, they could carry out their designs against me. The petition was signed by about 45 persons, several of whom say they were induced to sign it by misrepresentation. The Elders put the document in their pockets. Shortly before this, friend Burnet was engaged to preach for them, at $1,000 per annum, *payable monthly.* This was a very wise stipulation on his part; for they had, it is said, on a former occasion, engaged one to preach at so much for so long a time. He crossed the Ohio punctually to his appointment, and ministered to them several months. Did they pay him according to promise? They did not pay him at all; and, had not Brethren Redd and Craig turned out and collected $20, he would have been out of pocket to the amount of his ferriage across the river. This beloved Brother is not one of those reformers who has made money by "reformation." He cannot boast of having got rich by religion, or having fared sumptuously upon stipends of hundreds per annum! No, he has done what he could, to the best of his knowledge and ability, and during fourteen years has received the enormous sum of about $100! But why did the church here *break its covenant* with him? Because, I am informed, he preached to them, that the Lord was at hand! This doctrine they despised, so they appear to have punished him by withholding his due.

I say, then, friend Burnett has done well to stipulate upon the principle of "no pay, no preach." He has experienced some anxiety already from a want of punctuality in the monthly pay; what would be the chances for a longer term? Upon this query Dr. B. F. H. can throw some light.

Well, B. went to the Debate at Lexington. During his absence, the pulpit was guarded by the third Elder and his faction, at a cost of about $10. Before B. returned, the appointment was made for the Debate on Universalism. The wires now began to work. He was opposed to the Debate in toto; doubtless, for many reasons that might be named. The two Elders would not disappoint the citizens by revoking permission to use the house. What was to be done? A committee of two was appointed to wait on me and Mr. Pingree

to get us to give up our right! One of that committee, I suspect, could not be persuaded to come on such a business again. Who appointed them? Did the church? No. The Faction? One of the committee declared not. Did they appoint themselves? No. Did friend Burnet? Had he any right to do so; he was not even a member of the church! But did he appoint them? Will *he* say "no!" As a matter of course, I paid no regard to the message they conveyed, for it came from no one in authority. I treated them politely; but I cut short the communication, stating that I had to do with none in this affair save the Elders. I afterwards heard, that one of the deputation acknowledged that I had treated them just right. Mr. Pingree was absent from Louisville, so that the manœuvre evaporated into "air, thin air!"

The wires still worked. Seeing the Debate could not be suppressed, the next move was to announce to the public that Dr. Thomas was not the champion of the "Reformed Church" of this city in the ensuing discussion. A notification to this effect was published in The Dime. I replied to it. There happened to be a certain influence at the head of affairs in that office. It was accepted for publication, but when this influence was brought to bear, the reply was returned to me. It was then inserted in the Journal as an advertisement. All this helped to create a great interest in the Debate. Disconcerted, but not yet exorcised of the Evil Spirit, nothing would satsatisfy them, but I must "*define my position.*" To this I most readily consented, glad of the opportunity to do so. The evening of Christmas day arrived: "The Christian Chapel," a large house, was crowded to excess. The hour having arrived, I stood up, and read off the following:

DEFINITION OF MY POSITION.

Gentlemen and Ladies:—By the liberality of certain of the congregation which worships in this edifice, expressed to us by their elders, Dr. Bodenhamer and Mr. Craig, you are accommodated for the hearing of the Discussion, soon to commence before you. They are willing, as freemen, released from bondage by obedience to the "*perfect law of liberty,*" to hear all things; "*prove all things;*" and to "*hold fast*" what appears to be "*good,*" either in faith, in practice, or in both. They are convinced, that Truth, "in a fair and open encounter," has never finally been put to the worst; and not this only, but that whatever the Great God has condescended, in his wisdom, to reveal in the Scriptures of truth are legitimate and wholesome topics of investigation. As far as I am personally concerned, they have *read* much to my dishonor in what are termed the "*Periodicals of the Reformation;*" and they have heard "*voices in the heavens*" against me, from tongues "*on fire*" from below; whose untamed emissions of "*deadly poison*" have wafted over the land, from the rocks of New England to the hill country of Virginia, and the plains of Illinois. But some of them have been acquainted with me for years, and, like men of honesty, candor, and independence, have read my writings also; and, are therefore prepared to testify that *passion* more than truth, and the *spirit of Satan* than that of Christ, have to do with the intrigues to destroy my reputation and standing in society. They have invited me, on former occasions, to speak in this house; and many of you who have heard me with attention, can testify, that my efforts have tended to the improvement of the understanding; the enlargement of men's conceptions of divine truth, and to the chastening of the affections of my audience, in relation to the things taught in the Oracles of God. They know that the voices against me are malevolent and mendacious; and while, I grant, that the evil speakers may really think they are uttering truths, against a corrupt and dangerous character; and that, in their opposition to me they are "doing God service, I would have them remember, that they are not the less criminal, inasmuch as *they neglect to use the means of being correctly informed.*

Of these evil-speakers, there are some in this city. They were, until my visit to this place, ignorant, *in toto*, of my person and views, excepting so far as they have been distorted, misrepresented, burlesqued, and lampooned in the Periodicals; and still more recently, as I am informed, in the debate between Messrs. Campbell and Rice, at Lexington, in this State; and this is not all, but they have sedulously abstracted themselves from such meetings, in which I might be supposed to participate. There are none so blind as those who will not see: hence their condemnation is just; for light having been brought to them, they have closed their eyes against it; thus demonstrating, that they are men who "love darkness rather than light," either

because their deeds are evil," or because they are afraid that their ignorance may be made manifest.

These persons, who pass current for "reformers," and seem prepared to endorse for whatever emanates from the Western Hills of the Old Dominion, are, as I am informed, exceedingly anxious that I should *define my position*, in relation to *them*, as "reformers," in this debate. They wish it to be distinctly understood, that I do not advocate their views; which, I suppose, are identical with Mr. Campbell's; and his, are the same as theirs; and both theirs and his, "agree in one!" If this be not correctly stated, I am at a loss to know what their views are; for, although a principal agitator among them, was urged to be introduced to me, that we might exchange views upon matters and things, he positively refused. In this uncertainty, as to their theology, though well acquainted with their spirit, which is essentially that of the man of sin, you will perceive, that there is but little cause for apprehension on their part, that I shall defile their opinions, by presenting them as my own. Furthermore, Gentlemen and Ladies, you are not to suppose, that the things which I shall defend in this discussion, are believed by them. No, they are things which have never entered into their philosophy, *if they have any;* they are as remote from their conceptions, as the "*mind of the spirit*" is from the "*mind of the flesh;*" and while, therefore, they repudiate my views, without knowing what they are, I protest against their bigotry, prejudice, unscriptural and antichristian practice.

Having these views of their practice as "Reformers," you will doubtless comprehend *my position*, in relation to such a Reformation as that, of which they may be the recognized types or models. I advocate *the purification* of such "Reformers," and an IMMEDIATE PREPARATION TO MEET THE SON OF MAN IN HIS GLORY, *by investing themselves with the robe of truth and righteousness.* Let them awake, then, out of their fleshly dreamings, and put on the whole armor of God; that they may be safe from the arts and wiles of the Evil One.

They denounce me as not identified with the "Reformed Church;" and are very much afraid, that you should imagine, that I stand here as its "champion," in this debate. It is true, that I am not a member of a "*Reformed* Church," while I frequently worship with churches, which pass under that name. When I was immersed by Mr. Walter Scott, I was baptized into Jesus Christ; and thus became of the "seed of Abraham," and an "Heir" of Eternal Life. By this act, I became a member of the "ONE BODY;" and have endeavored to walk as becomes the Gospel of Christ, to this day. Drawn out into public life, by a combination of circumstances, I have investigated the Word of Life for myself; and as I have been able to discover its true import, I have published it in speech, and by the press, without consultation with, or regard to, *the interpretations of other men.* This is my unpardonable sin. I never did propose to advocate any other system of Christianity, than that which presents itself to me, and not to you, to them, or Mr. Campbell, in the Oracles of God. This truth, as I am able to apprehend it, and not the opinions of this, or that "church," "reformed," or unreformed; or the dogmata of Messrs. A., B., or C. — is the client for whom I appear as Advocate to-night. About ten years ago, I formed a co-partnership with Truth; she is old as the everlasting hills, still in her vigor, but unpopular as she is ancient. With her, I expect to share in the adversity of her career; that, when the day of her supremacy shall arrive, I may be crowned with a diadem of glory, incorruptibility, and Life.

In conclusion, then, Gentlemen and Ladies, you are to hold no one responsible for the views that may be advanced in this discussion, upon my part, but myself; and, on the other hand, bear in mind, that I hold myself accountable to no tribunal, for them, other than that of the Judge of the living and the dead. What I may advance, I shall endeavor to prove by the law and the testimony. Sophistry, and all appeals to prejudice, I despise, as beneath contempt. And, may I exhort you, to open both your ears, that you may hear and understand both sides of the question before us; and, without bias, favor, or affection, judge ye what we say.

This discussion continued during six evenings; and the interest seemed to increase as the discussion continued; for on the last evening, the audience was completely packed. I

shall say no more about the debate at present, than that there was some account of it in the Catholic Advocate of this city, which I have not been able to obtain a copy of. Should I be more fortunate hereafter, I will give publicity to it; and lastly, having been requested, I shall publish in our next number my closing speech, which contains a recapitulation and review of our previous arguments, *pro and con.*

After this, things relapsed into their former Sardian condition. The eldership still consisted of three, over whom one may be said to have "exalted himself" as a Presbyterial overseer; for though neither a member, nor Elder of that church, he had "a letter in his pocket," which recommended him as Elder and brother. The wires still worked. The Presbyter Bishop appeared to be aiming at the *Factotumship;* for while the two Elders, Bodenhamer and Craig, remained, there was danger of a liberal policy being the order of things; and the mahogany stand and scarlet cushion might again be defiled by "the Arch-Factionist," or some one else. This was a possibility not to be contemplated without a shivering fit; in order, therefore, to prevent the recurrence of such a paroxysm, the little man of the Presbytery must be worked out of the eldership, for the purpose of ousting Messrs. Bodenhamer and Craig, who were too liberal for the Presbytery of the "Christian Chapel" Church! The latter brethren were the subject of perpetual annoyance from certain of the petitioners; who, not content with surly looks and inuendoes, as the last resort in such cases, began to *attack their character!* Oh! what a reformation is this! Surely it needs to be exorcised of the spirit of the Man of Sin! The result was, that Dr. Bodenhamer resigned, and Brother Craig withdrew from the church.

But the little man still remained! And there were several who declared that they would not live under his administration. But he had consulted the Oracle, not of God, but of his own little Utica! The priestesses had counseled him to hold on to his office. He was true and faithful to the decree for he held to it awhile with the grip of death. But it would not do, and he was literally clamored into a resignation. Thus far, then, the wires had worked capitally. The eldership was virtually abolished, and the church at the feet of a stranger!

But the Presbyter Bishop was still no more a member of the church than "the Arch-Factionist" who broke bread under the same roof. It was as yet inexpedient. There was a correspondence between Louisville and Lexington, and it was not yet decided which church should be married! But Brother Chesney, with whom I dined the other day, has since gone to Lexington; and he has given much satisfaction to the brethren, and I hear that they intend, or have already called him to preach to them. It is now *aut* Louisville *aut* none! Providence has decided the case, and the Presbyter Bishop has joined the church at last.

Reformation in Louisville! Behold it! The Presbyter Bishop has worked himself into the Factotumship at $1000 per annum, and the three Elders have been worked out. These are the facts, notorious to the whole community. Did I slander, or misrepresent him, when I said he "appeared to be aiming at the Factotumship?" Behold the fact. He is now the eldership; and every thing is made snug. Perhaps this article, when it appears, may originate a move to re-establish the eldership, to take away the reproach well, if they are chosen according to Paul's instructions, it will do good. Such an Eldership will dethrone the Presbyter Bishop, open the doors, and resolve that men of honor and integrity shall not be excluded, because they teach what they honestly believe is God's truth, on all things they believe God has revealed. But the Eldership is unique; it is perfectly harmonious; not a dissentient voice, and as orthodox as Bethany College. Every thing is made snug. Yes, reader, it is a perfect snuggery! No doctrine is permitted to reach the ears of the flock, which is not approved by *all* the Eldership.

The Diaconate consists of five deacons. Paul made a mistake, surely, when he defined the qualifications necessary in a candidate for this office. He says, they must "*rule their children and their houses well.*" Does not the "ruling of children well" consist in bringing them up in the "*nurture and admonition of the Lord?*" Will any one deny this? Is it a part of the Lord's nurture and admonition, that dances, or balls, with music hired at several dollars per night, to accompany them, should be introduced into the family some two or three times in a season? If it is, then Paul should have told us so, that all deacons might institute this divine ap-

pointment in their families, for their right culture in the ways of the Lord! Paul says "the Deacons and their wives must be grave." "Ah! Paul, you are an old fashioned man; and your notions are perfectly antiquated. You have never read Chesterfield, and know nothing of the Mysteries of Paris!" "Yes, but I understand the Mysteries of the Gospel; and I say, that they *must be grave;* my Lord requires it, and commands that all men live *soberly* in this present world!" Very well; but "reformers in Louisville" do n't think so: or else they believe, that, "when they trip it as they go, on the light fantastic toe," they are practising a part of the gravity you prescribe!" Be that as it may, we go in for dancing deacons, or deacons with dancing families; and we do n't think there is any harm in shuffling the feet. David danced before the Ark, why should n't we dance before the fiddler! It is the practice of "good society;" besides *our wives have been brought up fashionably;* and our Eldership do n't think it any harm! Such is the gravity of a part of the Diaconate of the Church meeting in the "Christian Chapel" in Louisville. This Deacon was very zealous against Dr. Thomas being allowed to preach in their house! Was it because Dr. Thomas brought up his family in a worldly, fashionable manner! Because he imbued their minds, more with the Mysteries of Paris, the Diabolism of the World, than with the Mystery of Godliness? Who dare affirm it? Yet Dr. Thomas is "*a wolf,*" (as A. C. wrote to a friend of his,) an abominable wicked character, and nobody knows what else beside; and not entitled even to the civilities of common life: but Deacon T—— is a dear brother, "who has purchased for himself, a good degree, and great boldness in the faith which is in Jesus Christ!" Well might Jesus exclaim, to men of this class, "Woe unto you, Pharisees! Hypocrites!" I esteem the curse of such deacons better than their praise. This sort of trifling, by deacons and others, is so notorious here, that worldly men advise that the benches be pulled up, and that the church finish off its career with a ball!

After this exposition of Reformation in Louisville, who will deny the truth of the remark, that reform is *a mere name in this city?* Mr. Goss, with as much sagacity as he seems to be capable of, after announcing to the public that I am in Louisville, Ky., says, "*that the cause in that city will suffer the consequences that have followed his whole history, we do not doubt.*" "The cause!" Who will recognize such a "cause" as I have here illustrated? Will Mr. Campbell? I can hardly believe it. Who would pray for the continuance of such a "cause?" Nay; would it not be commendable in any, to break up such a "cause?" Would it be factious? Rather, will not the Lord say to the man that can abolish it, and set up in the place thereof, a body of purified believers, walking in all the ordinances of the Lord, blameless, and waiting in the hope of His glorious appearing — "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord!"

Convinced of this, application was made for the use of a school room, where the public might be addressed on the things of the Future Age. The Presbyter Bishop of the Chapel preaches there on one night in the week. The teacher gave permission. In about two hours after, the following note was addressed to Brother Craig: "*Dear Sir:*— I will merely inform you, since you called on me, that several objections have been made, to having any other preacher than Mr. Burnett to preach in the school room: that if certain unpopular doctrines are preached, Mr. Burnett will not preach any more in the same house. I am, therefore, requested to inform you of these objections, that you may find another house. Yours, very respectfully, *R. Morecraft,* February 21, 1841." So this public building continues closed on Sunday, because of the possibility of the doctrine preached being unpopular! O Paul! what have we come to now!

Though, since the debate, my lips have been sealed in Louisville, I have been very diligently employed, in writing illustrations of the Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh Trumpets of the Apocalypse; the rise, progress, and destiny of the Mohammedan Power; the cleansing of the Sanctuary; and of the Book of Daniel. I have been rubbing up my recollection of the Hebrew and Greek, &c., all of which, besides my correspondence, has left me no time for matters of trivial import. I have, for the last two days, bestowed more attention upon my assailants, than I thought I should ever bestow again. But the mouths of foolish talkers must occasionally be stopped; to subdue their garrulity, altogether, is more than can be expected. I have, there-

fore, bestowed upon them, in this number, a castigation, which I hope will prove salutary, and I trust, render unnecessary, a very early repetition of the dose.

EDITOR.

☞ The reader will see the propriety of the foregoing exposition; because, a hint has already been given, and sent on to this city, which might possibly give birth to a communication for the Charlottesville Intelligencer, concerning the "cause suffering the consequences that have followed my whole history," since my residence here! I have thought it proper and just, therefore, that the religious public should know what sort of "cause" might possibly presume to attack my reputation. "People who live in glass houses, must not throw stones!"

EDITOR.

Review.

"CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER."

A friend in Richmond has sent us a paper of this name. THE SLANDERER, I opine, would be more appropriate to its contents. Three columns on the first page are occupied by Dr. Duval, whose communication, though it covers much surface, leaves no impression on the mind when read. After something more than a column on "Prayer," comes an article signed "John T. Walsh," defining his "position," which is a very curious one! He signed certain decrees passed by the Henley Faction in Richmond, in relation to which, he says, "I *was* and *am* opposed to all resolutions of the kind, whether they be *good* or *evil* in their nature." *Yet he signed them!* Would he have signed them if he had not been one of Henley's Evangelists, appointed and *tested* at the Jerusalem meeting? This comes of being paid by a faction to preach so much truth and no more than quadrates with its Archon—Mr. Henley's enlarged conceptions thereof! He signed it with his right hand, under the influence of his paymasters; he repudiates his act (like Cranmer at the stake, who burned his "unworthy right hand" because it had signed a recantation he condemned) under the influence of the inconvenient questions which encounter him beyond the pale of Henley's Duodecimal Inquisition. So difficult is it for a man to serve two masters! The second outside page is filled with an article by F. Fanning of Tennessee, an anecdote about "Irritable Christians," which applies very well to friend Henley; and advertisements. We now turn to the inside form to see what is there!

The first article is on "*Dead Souls*," by Brother Scott. We will let it pass, with this remark, that from conversation with Brother Scott, (and we have dined with him two or three times since we have been here) we know that he disapproves the course of the Henley faction in Virginia and elsewhere. He is an honest man, (though, *I* think, mistaken in

some of his views, as *he* regards me,) and that is more than I can say for the persons who figure in this Intelligencer. As to "Dead Souls," a *query* for a reasonable man, *when the* "soul" *of Messiah was* "in hell," *was it dead or alive?*

Then comes a selection from the Harbinger signed E. A. Smith; and one from Mosheim; then an extract from the Bible Advocate on "Young Evangelists," signed Henry T. Anderson, which is excellent, and the best article in the paper. Then we have over two columns from the Harbinger, which complete the page. We turn over now to page second of the inner form. The first column is filled, save three lines and and a half, with an article illuminated with a flaming caption, from the pen of one of the most hot-headed spirits of Virginia:—I mean my curious old friend, Thomas M. Henley. It is addressed to "*Brother* Goss," who is alleged to have testified for the Church in Charlottesville, though 'personally ignorant of almost every single transaction in reference to which he testified;' and it appears to have been proved also, that *he testified falsely*. Such is the "Brother" to whom Henley writes, and who edits this semi-monthly. The public may judge of themselves of such a brotherhood; and of how much their attacks upon my character are to be regarded. Henley styles me "our licentious opponent;" yes, so "*licentious* (reader, this word signifies "unrestrained by law or morality; loose; dissolute") that I urge upon them to repent, to obey "the *Law* of Liberty," and to begin to do well, that, being thus prepared, they may be found ready when the Lord comes! For if he should suddenly appear and find them lying, and persecuting his disciples as they are doing, he will drive them, as with a whip of scorpions, from his presence!

The first paragraph of his letter contains a downright falsehood. I never applied to the Church in Paineville for a letter; but one was offered to me, written for me, and delivered to me, before I left for Illinois, recommending me to all to whom I might come. Turn, old friend, to page 300 of the Advocate, Vol. iv., and read the letter of the Paineville Church, signed by its elders, Messrs. Walthall and Smith, and learn from it the character I sustained while in Amelia; and then cease your vain and foolish talking.

He says I never lived in peace with any church for any length of time! Here again is a pure fiction. I was in Philadelphia eleven months, and lived in peace with the church the whole time. When about to leave, I was urged to remain. I think I was in Richmond about two years; during which I had no war with "*the church*," but I had with some of its disorderly members, who had the name of Reformers, like Henley, without the thing. I think I was member at Paineville three years. They would have made me elder, but I would not. I lived with them in peace the whole time, as their present elders can testify; of whom, one invited me to preach last fall, and at the house of the other I staid on my return to Richmond from Lunenburg. As to my "*undefiled puritans* in Illinois," I regard this intended reproach as the greatest compliment my censorious friend can bestow upon me. Yes, I go in for such "*puritans*," and I want to see "this Reformation" constituted of "*undefiled puritans;*" yes, indeed, there is the rub! In contending for this in a scriptural sense, the Duodecimals feel self-condemned, and hence their malignity against me!

As to my opinion of the Christian Baptist, I still hold the same I formerly expressed; modified, however, by my own increase of knowledge in the word of God. It is the best of A. C.'s productions, and had he adhered to the principles he then advocated, there would be now no difference of *action*, though there might be of *opinion*, between us. I do not "denounce the disciples as Campbellites"; but I consider the Henley faction in Virginia, "who say, but do not," and who do the bidding of A. C. more than of Jesus Christ, as A. C.'s disciples, and not Christ's. If ye were Christ's, my friends, ye would tell the truth; for no false witnesses have his spirit abiding in them; and if ye be destitute of this, ye are none of his.

As to what I said some six or seven years ago about A. C. and the living ministry, I repeat. Since that time, he has gained their "praise" by compromising his principles as recorded in the Christian Baptist; and therefore, I *now* say, "*What evil hath he done?*" I answer, he has *sectarianized*—that is a summary of the evil! "Their approbation" has "withered him like the Simoon of Sahara."

As to the "means" of defending the disciples of Christ and his truth, I have faithfully wielded them in their defence, as at this day, against the slanders of this Intelligencer. I have not changed; I still occupy the same

ground; it is you that have faced about; Providence, however, by your aid among others, placed the "means" at my disposal, to save "this Reformation" from a general apostacy and ruin. You may yet bless me, on this account, if you reform from your depravity, before you "go hence to be no more."

The quotation as to my views of "the brethren" and of A. C. and his sectarian leadership, were precisely those stated *at the time I wrote them*. But the times are changed, and I confess that I was deceived. This was my misfortune, not my crime. He had not then *secturianized*. He had not then averred that he was "called of God to take the supervision of this Reformation!" Nor had he then been *apotheosized* by those who are willing to submit to his supervision! A preacher, whom I could name, and who stands high at Bethany, declared to a deacon in this city, that if A. C. were to die, he should "be off from this Reformation," which would then go all to pieces. This man still lives in Kentucky, and was one of the first to denounce me as "a factionist." "A disciple" from Cincinnati, yesterday, declared that A. C. was "*as great a man as Peter!*" I could name the person. Perhaps he is greater; for all the Hebrew, Greek, Latin and Logic he knows, he has acquired by his own labor; whereas the Holy Spirit inspired Peter with them all, without previous plodding by the midnight oil! Surely, I ought not to be indicted, because I do not still entertain the high opinion I had of Campbell, six or seven years ago, if this is criminal in me, it must be equally so in him; for he once styled me, "*a chosen vessel.*" Would he term me such now? *Query.* If he affirmed the truth when he styled me that, how does he know, but that, *in proclaiming a preparation*, such as I have set forth in my address to the citizens of the United States; and which carries out the principles he first started upon, but has now abandoned—I am performing the very work my "*vessel*" was originally "*chosen*" to execute? Let the Duodecimal Inquisition, which held its *auto da fe* in Richmond, recently, reflect upon this, and have a care to what extent they commit themselves against me! I tell you, fellow citizens, you are driving your heads against a stone wall; for you are utterly and unqualifiedly ignorant of the very first principles, or elements of the "heresies" you so bitterly denounce?

We next find two columns on the "Ge... Meeting in Richmond." The vera... "Brother Goss" tells his readers that "... *well known that the Congregation of D... ples in Fredericksburgh, has been divided ... the schismatic course of Dr. Thomas.*" ... well known that you and your familiar... *so*; but, it is equally well known by resp... ble citizens on the spot, that there is no t... in the assertion. The reader can refer to... letter from that place to a friend in the W... for the true version of the facts; I say ... for I read it to certain brethren, while th... that, if I had made any misstatement ... might be corrected; and I took this pre... tion, because I knew how my oppon... would gloat over it, if they could find a ... erepancy, which they could transmute ... an intentional misstatement, vulgarly ter... "a lie." The Henley faction, it appe... passed several resolutions. By the first, ... "resolved" the Parochial Hexarchy of F... ericksburg, into a Church of Christ! Wo... it not be in order, *first*, to resolve whe... they themselves belong to His Church? A... *secondly*, whether there is power in their ... solve" to convert a faction—several of wh... it is exceedingly questionable, if they e... put on Christ—into His body? They n... resolved that the Meeting House belon... to them, whom they resolved into the Chur... and then, that the present occupiers were ... worthy of their fellowship! Why did th... not at once boldly resolve, that they w... "heathen men and publicans?" They th... resolved, lastly, on this case, that the "Eld... and Evangelists" present, sign these reso... tions." This was the unkindest cut of a... It was known by the mover, whoever he w... that the Evangelists were "bought and sold... and that if they refused to sign, they co... cut off the stipend! Poor Walsh! It w... this resolution that entrapped thee! Af... thou hast had a little more experience wi... thy paymasters, thou wilt find that "hones... is the best policy," if not for the wallet, f... that, at least, which is dearer to an honorab... man, than riches, a spotless character befo... God.

Next, they resolved censure upon th... brethren at Free Union; and, having dispo... ed of that, they fired a shot at Brother A... derson, I suspect, and at me. The scope ... this unique "Christian Intelligencer," show... that I am comprehended among the "unwo...

itinerants," and "wandering stars!"—hen a man journeys from Richmond to w York, on business, is he to be insulted, being styled an itinerant or wandering ar! Would he not, either treat his stigmaers with dignified contempt, or tweak the oboscis of the first curmudgeon he met, that d dared to bespatter him with his vulgari I went to Virginia on business; I interred with no man; I demeaned myself reectfully towards all, even towards them, ho, I knew, were abusing and injuring me, every conceivable way. I demand, therere, by what rule of civilized society, (for hristian is out of the question,) I am to be eated thus? Doth religion, O men, disharge you from the decorum and decency of ocial life? Oh! may I never fall under the withering contempt due to such "Christians" or "Disciples" as ye appear to be! I pray hat in this, appearances may deceive me!

Lastly, we have nearly a column more, under "Dead Souls," by "Brother" Goss. It eems as though this "Brother" could not pen his mouth in relation to me, without estifying *falsely*, according to his old habit, n the case of Coleman, (miscalled the Church,) *versus* Magruder! He says, that having failed to get the brethren in Virginia to pay for my "withering and annihilating speculations," I have furnished many of them gratuitously. Now, *false witness* is generally dangerous, in proportion to its appearance of truth. It is true, that I "furnished many gratuitously," perhaps a hundred, for which I expect no pay: and I would add further, that I have about one hundred *sets* of the Investigator on hand; and that I have sent orders to have them mailed, leaving the persons who receive them, to pay me, or not, as they please. Is this liberality a sin? I feel it my duty to circulate, far and wide, what I believe to be true, on all scripture subjects, according to my ability. I only regret that it is not greater. If I had the wealth that some of you have, corrupting and perishing, and doing nobody any good, no, not even yourselves, I would flood your country with documents, without fee or reward. But the false witness consists in saying, that the little I have been able to do in this way, was because I could not get the brethren "to pay" for these things. This is all pure fiction; for, I do not remember to have ever asked a man to subscribe to the Advocate or Investigator.—There is no truth at all in the assertion. O! that you would speak truth. You might then say what you please, and thank you for it!

"*Return to the Word of God.*" Doth not this Word teach the destiny of the wicked as well as the righteous? Does it teach *your views* of these doctrines? You cannot show that it doth; and because you cannot, you think to cut the knot you cannot untie, by empty declamation. Why can you not have patience, to wait till the Lord comes, (and he will be upon you like a thief,) and let him pronounce upon what is useful, or idle, or purely speculative, or untaught; or on what will do good, or harm? Who made you a judge in these matters? Can you not leave them to Him that doeth all things well? You had better learn to tell the truth, and trouble yourself less with the views of other men! When, therefore, "Brother Goss," you have attained to this item of reform, I may condescend to notice your sayings and doings more extendedly. So, my most slanderous assailant, I bid you, in all commiseration for your obliquity, adieu!

EDITOR.

OUR SPECIMEN NUMBER.

The *typography* is before our readers, and is a specimen of the style in which we propose to publish THE HERALD OF THE FUTURE AGE. Our opinion is, that it is excellent, and would not disgrace the round table of the drawing room. As to the *matter*, opinions will of course be very diversified. The articles have nearly all been written, under a most provocative sense of injustice and oppression; but I have endeavored to convert it all into the earnest of that blessing, which, the Master says, shall come upon all, whom men shall revile and persecute, and say all manner of evil of falsely for his sake. I

know, and I am the the only one who can know it, others may believe it; I say, I know that they speak falsely of my motives and my actions; and, in this number, I have devoted some space to the revelation of their iniquity. I have characterized them with all the mildness their malevolence would possibly admit of; and I have done it, impartial reader, in the best possible humor and tranquility of mind. I feel as if I stood upon a rock, the rock of truth—and positively, I do read, as many can testify, their scurrilous anathemata, even with facetiousness. Doubtless, some will think me severe. This may be true; I intend to be severe; but I aim always to let the severity of my writings consist in their palpable truth. If the severity causes the reader to exclaim, let his censure fall not upon me, but upon him, who is proved to have acted reprehensibly.

The principles of this Reformation, are many of them good; and very many, styled "Reformers," are the excellent of the earth. I do not confine this remark to my particular friends; but to many, who at present are opposed to me, perhaps even hate and despise me. Indeed, if I knew no more of John Thomas, than I read about him in the Periodicals, I should despise him too; but, I happen to know something more than their Editors; hence my opinion of him differs considerably from theirs. While I admit all this, there is much, very much, that needs to be corrected, both in principle, in theory, and in practice. It is the Leaders of this Reformation, who are causing it to err; and these leaders, in Virginia, are chiefly Baptist clergymen, who can shine only in opposition to their quondam brethren. As long a brethren look to them, they will cer retrograde; for, in these matters, it is i sible to stand still. Do not, then, permit gentlemen to put a yoke upon your neck passing laws, restricting your rights an erties, in their General Assemblies. despotisms arise out of trivial circumst They profess to preach to you the Gosp them also obey it, and strive to behave selves like freemen in Christ Jesus. Re Give your support to the Herald of the ture Age, as though you were in earnes I pledge you, it shall watch over your s ual interests; and, by the magic wan truth, break the fetters they are forgi bind you in their toils. I have become ed to wrath; I smile upon the storm!

Our next number will contain my speech on Universalism; and a second from the Old Dominion to the Far West Indeed, one Letter will appear in every ber, till the tenth. I do not pledge myse give you more than sixteen pages at a but if you aid me with a spirited co-opera I shall oftener exceed them. I have promise of documents from Scotland, w will enable me to let you know the prog which is making, in the political cleansi the Holy. The subjects I shall treat of little understood; hence, I think, you wi repaid for the time and cost you may exp upon the work.

The second number will be issued, w sufficient money has been received, to g antee the continuance of the Herald, twelve numbers.

EDITOR.

PROGRESS OF REFORM!

When I visited the Rappahannock in Essex county, Virginia, it became a matter of grave deliberation, for upwards of an hour, whether I should be permitted to "break bread" with the congregation; although I had made no application to be permitted to do so! Two of the Elders were especially opposed to me; one, being the son of my former friend, T. M. Henley, could hardly be expected to favor me; the other, G. W. P kins, I think his name is, coincided with though I did not learn why. I shall gi particular account of my visit to this pl hereafter. With these Elders, some als the congregation were very much opposed me, indeed. Who they were, I did not tro myself to inquire. I presume they were those who rally around the standard of suc

formation, as old friend Henley advocates, en he visits them, to preach against Old ptists, from a pocket full of religious wspapers! Be this as it may, the crop harnizes very well, with the seed sown from h a wallet! I have heard nothing, direct- from Essex, since August last. Whether mes Henshall sent them all to sleep there, his doctrine concerning a new way into Kingdom, I cannot tell; but I hope not. he did, I pray them to awake; for, if the d come and find them asleep, woe, woe be o them!

The other day, however, Mr. Sands sent the Religious Herald; for which I thank m. But, what was my astonishment, when earned that a letter had been sent from G. . Perkins, in the name of the congregation, invite Rev. Mr. W. Southwood, a Baptist rgyman, to preach for them once a month; this hankering after preachers! Brethren the congregation who are in Christ! have not the Apostles and Prophets; can ye not ify, or build one another up with them? hat do you expect to get from W. Southood, that you cannot derive from them? I ant, his sermons will do you as much good friend Henley's battlings of the sects out religious newspapers; but what want you ith either the sermons or the battlings? O you did but know "the riches, both of the isdom and the knowledge of God," contain- in the Living Oracles, you would have no ear for "the spiritual things" of Mr. W. Southwood. But really, and I speak to those among you who called him, he has served you as you deserve. He is consistent; but alas! where is yours? He says he will preach for you, if you will pay him for his "spiritual things" or wares, and what is the schedule of his merchandize? Listen, while he enumerates them. Of course, they are offered to you in the sectarian sense: "the divinity and operations of the Holy Spirit,—the regeneration of the heart by the Holy Spirit—justification in the righteousness of Christ, *by faith only*, &c! Will you buy?

But the beauty of the thing is, he will sing, pray, and preach for you, provided you pay! but he will not eat bread with you! Do n't you remember, how you were willing to hear me preach, but refused to eat with me, last fall, though there was no question of pay between us? Do you not think, that Mr. Southwood is paying you off in your own coin? Do you not feel mortified, to be thus bargained with by the hireling? Oh! my beloved brethren, if you feel not for yourselves, I am mortified! mortified to the core on your behalf! Does not "this Reformation" want a new spirit infused into it? Who will say it does not, save those who are yearning after the leeks, the onions, and the flesh pots of Egypt!

EDITOR.

"SILAS" AND "THE CRISIS."

There is an article on "*the Crisis, No. II,*" in the February Millenial Harbinger, over the signature of "*Silas.*" It is, as much as possible, deprived of all marks, supposed likely to reveal the author; though he has not been entirely successful in suppressing them. He tells us, that he was at Campbell and Rice's Debate, in Lexington, Ky., and then speaks of "this State." We infer then, that the article was written in Kentucky. He incidentally remarks, also, that he was brought up a Presbyterian. *A Reformer, once a Presbyterian, and resident in Kentucky,* is this same "Silas." He is no friend of Messrs. Stone, Scott, Field, or Thomas.—Perhaps he considers all these as a part of "*the bilge water*" in the hold of "the ship Reform!" Hence, from his insinuations against them, I conclude, that he is a Trinitarian, a mystical Millenarian, an Anti-Millerite, and a Gospel Nullifier, who teaches that the "great and good men of the Apostacy," who never obeyed the Gospel, are now in Heaven! He is plainly the mere echo of the editor to whom he writes; hence, we may extend our description of him, as a Camp-

bellite Reformer, formerly a Presbyterian, resident in Kentucky, and the denunciator of all who are unpopular at Bethany.

But it is believed, that he is not only a resident in Kentucky, but also, somewhere in these parts. He appears to be familiar with reports in circulation here, about Dr. Field's forcing Dr. Thomas upon the church in Jeffersonville; in which there is not a word of truth, though this "Silas" gives currency to them; and, seeing that they have been contradicted by Dr. Field, in the most public manner, he is responsible for their mendacity, unless he forthwith repudiates them. He thinks my views "more *whimsical* than philosophical," more "*animal* than spiritual," &c.; and declares my *breath* to be "cold as death!" Will he, like an honorable man, courageously reveal himself to the light—come forth from the darkness in which he secrets himself—and prove my views to be whimsical, and carnal? Dare he do it? Let him try! How can he pronounce upon the "*cold*" or the heat of my "breath?" Has he listened to the things I speak? I admit that my "breath is cold as death" to Gospel nullification, hereditary immortality, the hireling-one-man-system, and to preaching which countenances *usury*, and the practice of [illegible] cing by the members of the church! breath is cold as death to such christianity this; but then *how does he know it?* Will adduce the proof?

The style, and use of certain words, likewise marks by which "*Silas*" is susp ed. The style is like a feather floating in air; the thought is like the ripple of a bro and the metaphors like stale jokes. whoever "Silas" may be, he is a cowar person of mean disposition; for none, such a character, would assail his betters der the cloak of a fictitious name. Suc the opinion of several concerning "*Sila* whose mendacious and scurrilous attacks on Messrs. Stone, Scott, Field and Tho we hold friend Campbell responsible for, til he reveals the unprincipled writer slanders "his brethren" under the name more noble-minded and honorable man.

EDITO

Our friend Burnet, of this city, has personally charged as "Silas"; but he positively denied having penned it, or connected with it in any way. We are to hear it.

E

PROPOSITIONS.

The following propositions, we consider, as involving principles, which are in strict harmony with the inspired teachings of the Prophets and Apostles. We present them to our readers, in the hope, that if they have any thing more scriptural to offer, they will favor us with it. For our own part, we regard them as impregnable to the assaults of the most rigid and subtle Logician extant; if any one, be he President, Editor, Elder, "Pastor," or "Evangelist," think he can prove them either sophistical, or fallacious, why then, in the name of truth and reason, let him do it. Testimony and argument are more respectable than slander; and the only weapons worthy of honorable and courageous men.

1. Man was modelled from the dust, a living creature, "*very good*," "*upright*" or *innocent*, BUT neither mortal nor immortal.

2. Men, by nature and practice, are "*sinners*," and therefore, destitute of *inherent*, or congenital *immortality*, and *unending l*

3. Glory, Honor, Immortality, and L which constitute *the Eternal Life of Man matters of promise, and therefore of* HOPE.

4. The Eternal Life of Man, or of World, is *deposited in Jesus Christ*, as SEED of Abraham.

5. Eternal Life is the Free Gift of God

6. Eternal Life, though the Free and cious gift of God through Jesus Christ, to World, *is nevertheless* CONDITIONAL.

7. Men are put in possession of Eter Life, not by the reunion of an "IMMOR SOUL" with a mortal body, but by the mo body itself, being re-animated by the Spir God at the Resurrection from among Dead.

8. Those who do not attain to Eternal L either perish without law, or are judged law, in the day when God shall try the sec of men by Jesus Christ.

THE WORLD'S AGE.

BY THE EDITOR.

"Two things are generally impressed on the public mind," says Mr. J. V. Himes in the Midnight Cry, No. 5, Vol. 1. "First, that the world is but 5846 years old; and second, that it must continue about 6000 years in its present state. When this subject was suggested to Mr. Miller, in 1840, he felt that it was an argument against his view of the prophetic periods. He thought the matter over, and at length resolved to appeal from Archbishop Usher (the great standard in Chronology) to the Bible. He spent three days in tracing the times of the Old Testament, and to his surprise, found 4157 years, clearly proved from the creation to Christ, leaving but 1843 to complete the 6000 years!" Soon after this, he says that learned commentators on the Book of Judges "labored to make the period shorter than the Bible seems to represent it. This they have done by *lapping* the periods on to each other; they have thus reduced 448 years to 295 years—mainly on the authority of a text in 1st Kings vi: 1, which Jahn, in his Hebrew Commonwealth, shows to be at least *doubtful*, as it now reads."

This is a very interesting discovery, *if* the position can be successfully maintained. I have examined the "*Bible Chronology from Adam to Christ, by William Miller;*" that is, I have compared his data with the Scripture—as every one else ought to do before he assents to it—and I find that with a few exceptions, they correspond with the citations.—The Periods stand thus, according to the most obvious arrangement:

From the creation to the birth of Seth was the 130th year of Adam's age; in this way Mr. M. obtains a starting point. His

	No. of years.
First Period, then, dates from 130 years before the birth of Seth to the 600th year of Noah, which was the year of the Flood, and comprises	1656
Second Period. From the year of Noah 601 to the Exodus of Israel out of Egypt	858
Third Period. From the Exodus to the fourth year of Solomon	621
Fourth Period. From fourth of Solomon to the decree of Artaxerxes	556
Fifth Period. From the decree to the birth of Jesus Christ	457
Age of the World from creation to the birth of Christ	4157
Sixth Period. From birth of Christ to A. D. 1843,	1843
Age of the World from the creation, according to Mr. Miller,	6000

This calculation of Mr. Miller's turns chiefly upon the period allotted to the Judges; by Paul, in his speech before the synagogue at Antioch, and the several times indisputably alloted to the jurisdiction of the persons who presided over the Commonwealth of Israel, by the author of the Book of Judges. Commentators allow to the times of these Presidents, 295 years; whereas, Paul notes the period as "about the space of 450 years, until Samuel the Prophet;" and the sum of the years stated in Judges, amounts to 448 years. Now, to which of these are we to give place as authority? Unquestionably to Paul; and we are much obliged to Mr. Miller for putting us in the way of truth so far.

But we have a few objections, and only a few, to the conclusion of the whole matter. We hope we may be permitted to say, without giving offence, that Mr. Miller's calculation is inaccurate; and that the World, so far from being 6000 years old in A. D. 1844, is not more than 5934 years.

The *first* exception I take is to his dating the beginning of the "430 years before the Law was given," at the *end* of "Terah's Life." His premises are deduced from Exodus xii: 40, 41. "Now the *sojourning* of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, *was* 430 *years*. And it came to pass at the end of the 430 years, even the self same day, it came to pass, that all the hosts—armies—of the Lord went out from the land of Egypt. It is a *night* to be much observed, &c.;" also, from Acts vii: 4, "Then came he—Abram—out of the land—Ur—of the Chaldeans, and dwelt in Charran—of Mesopotamia. And from thence, when his Father—Terah—was dead, he removed into the Land—Canaan—in which ye now dwell." And lastly,

Genesis xi: 32, "And the days of Terah were 205 years: and Terah died in Haran."

In the first place, the 430 years is the period of "sojourning," or rather of "*returning;*" for the words are *u-mu-sh*, which signify *now the returning itself* of the children of Israel, was 430 years. That is, God had made a promise to Abraham, that after the end of 400 years, (thirty years after,) his posterity in the fourth generation should *return* from the midst of a nation that would oppress them, "*hither again;*" that is, into the land of Canaan, in which he, Abram, then was. The fourteenth day of Abib, the first month of the first year of Israel's calender, these 430 years had an end; and this epoch of a new era was memorialized by the institution of the Passover. It was the day, or night rather, of the *returning* to the Land which God gave to Abraham, by a *confirmed deed of gift*, 430 years before. The *confirmation* of the deed, and not the death of Terah, is the date upon which Paul (who would be better authority than Stephen, if we were obliged to choose between them, which, however, we are not) fixes for the beginning of the 430 years; as he writes in Gallatians iii: 17, "The covenant that was *confirmed*, or ratified, before — *hupo* — by God — *eis* — concerning Christ, the Law, (of Moses,) which was 430 years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise (involved in the covenant) of none effect." From these data then, it was 430 years from the events recorded in Genesis xv: 7-21, to the Exodus from Egypt on the night of the first Passover; but, if calculated from the death of Terah, it was only about 370 years.

Again, Terah died forty years before Abraham. To establish Mr. Miller's data, it must be shown that the covenant was confirmed between the death of Terah and Abraham, that is, somewhere in the forty years. But the confirmation of the covenant took place *before the birth of Ishmael*, and therefore could not happen after Terah's death; for Abram was 86 years old when Hagar bare Ishmael, and Terah was then only 156. Because, Terah was 70 years old when Abram was born, and 86 added to 70 will make 156 of the life of Terah. And furthermore, Abram lived 175 years, which, added to 70, Terah's age at Abram's birth, gives 245 for their conjoined lives; but Terah lived 205 years, this therefore must be subtracted from 245, which leaves 40 years, the period that Abram outlived his father Terah.

We must, therefore, reject Mr. Mill chronology, which makes the 430 years be with the death of Terah. But there is n ing more easy than to reject a theory. we substitute anything more accurate t Mr. M.'s? For to prove his inaccurate is to enlighten, but to leave the reader, perh in greater difficulty and doubt, than be Mr. M. undertook to put him into the wa truth. We submit the following, then, as best conclusion we can arrive at from things noted in the Scripture:

From the confirmation of the covenant to the birth of Isaac, in the year of Terah's life 170, and of Abram's ye 100,

From birth of Isaac to that of Jacob, 25 years after death of Terah, and in life of Abram 160,

From birth of Jacob to that of his third son, Levi,

From the birth of Levi to that of Amram,

From that of Amram to the birth of Moses,

From the birth of Moses to the 14th day of the 1st month Ab b,

From the confirmation of the promise of Eternal Life to the institution of the Passover,

We have now to reconcile Stephen Moses. In the first place, Mr. Miller se to have misunderstood Moses, being misl by what has been to him an anachronism Stephen's speech. Stephen appears to h made a correct statement, if we unders him to signify, that at the time of Ter death, he was not in the land of Canaan; that when he died he did remove thither. T seems to harmonize with the Mosaic narrati But the word *kakaithen*, which, in the c mon version, is rendered *And from then* as correctly translated, "*Afterwards*, after his father died, he — God — caused hi Abram — to remove into this land, whe ye now dwell." Not that Terah died bef Abram left Charran; for this is not the f Moses says, indeed, that "Terah's days w 205 years; and Terah died in Haran;" the reason why he speaks of Terah's d in this place is, that his future narrative not be interrupted by further allusions to h We are not to suppose, that, because death is mentioned in the last verse of ch ter xi, the events of chapter xii are subseq

reto. In the beginning of chapter xii, oses reverts to what Jehovah *had* said to bram on a previous occasion, "*Now* the ord *had* said unto Abram, Get thee out, &c., om thy father's house, &c." Abram did so; nd Moses says, that when he emigrated ence, he was "*seventy-five years old.*" Now erah was 70 years of age when Abram was rn, which would make Terah 145 years, d not 205, when Abram left him in Charn; which demonstrates that Terah lived in harran 60 years after Abram left him; for 60 dded to 145 make 205, the days of Terah's life. But the truth is, Stephen's object was to fix e attention of the High Priest and Council pon a very interesting incident in the life of braham, which was a most striking living llegory, which represented the sacrifice of e only begotten Son of God. Now, when erah died, Abraham was living in the land f the Philistines; as it is written in Genesis xi: 32, "And Abraham sojourned in the hilistines' land many days." While in this ountry the Lord appeared to him, and told im to take Isaac and "get into the land of oriah, to one of the mountains he would ow him." After Abraham had traveled *ree days*, he saw the mountain "afar off." Having proved his obedience, he departed rom "the mount of the Lord" to Beersheba, here he took up his abode.

"And it came to pass, after these things, that it was told Abraham, &c." and in chapter xxiii, it goes on to state, "and Sarah was 127 years old; these were the years of the life of Sarah," verse one. When Isaac was born, Sarah was 90 years old, being ten years younger than Abraham. Hence, when Sarah was 90, Terah was 170, and therefore, when Sarah died Terah must have been dead *two* years; for 37, the remainder of the life of Sarah, added to 170, Terah's age at that time, will make 207 years, which is *two* more than Terah lived. As then the events of "the mount of the Lord" occurred between Abraham's sojourning in the Philistines' land and Sarah's death, at Kirjath-Arba, they must have taken place sometime in the two years subsequent to the death of Terah. I should therefore, interpret the passage in Stephen's speech, thus: "Afterwards, even 60 years after he left Charran, after that his father Terah died, God caused Abraham to remove from the Philistines' land into the land of Moriah, even into this land wherein ye now dwell." Thus we harmonize Stephen, Moses, and Paul, who all spoke by the same spirit, and all supply us with testimony, which inevitably subverts the chronology of our respected contemporary, in relation to "Terah's Life," and the 430 years.

(*To be Continued.*)

THE TWO VISIONS.

In the reign of Belshazzar, the last of the Assyrian dynasty of kings, which reigned in Babylon, Daniel the prophet had *two visions.* The one was displayed to him in the *first*, and the other, in the *third* year of Belshazzar's reign. The former vision relates to the *introduction of the Son of Man to his Kingdom, coevally with the subversion of the dominion of the Kingdoms of the West; and the utter destruction of the Papal Roman Empire.* This first vision, then, may be styled, THE VISION OF THE WEST; because it outlives the Roman Monarchy, divided into Ten Kingdoms, with which was to flourish cotemporarily an Eleventh Kingdom, before which three of the Ten were to fall: and because it depicts this as a blasphemous power, overseeing or episcopal, and a persecutor of "the *people* of the saints," &c. All which is known to apply literally to the Western Roman Empire alone; and to be without the shadow of a relation to the events, which have been developed in its EASTERN LIMB.

The First Vision is described in the seventh chapter of the Book of Daniel, from the third to the fourteenth verse inclusive. The 17th and 18th verse give a summary of the whole matter, as, "*these great beasts, which are four, represent four kings, or kingdoms which shall arise out of the earth. But the Saints of the Most High shall take the Kingdom, and possess the Kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever.*"

In verse 20, the prophet in desiring an explanation of the meaning of the Fourth Beast, interjects an item or two not expressed in the general description; for he adds, that the Little Horn not only "*spake very great things*," but that his "*look was more stout than his fellows*," and that he "*made war with the Saints and prevailed against them till the Ancient of Days came, and judgment was given to the Saints of the Most High; and the time came that the Saints possessed the Kingdom.*" In compliance with Daniel's wish, the interpretation of the vision as far as relates to the fourth Beast, is given, and may be found from verse 23 to 27 inclusive. From this we learn especially, that "*the judgment*," which sits upon the Little Horn, *is progressive*; it is "to *consume* and to destroy unto the end:" it begins then, when the consumption begins, and ends when its destruction is complete. And lastly, "*the* PEOPLE," that is, "Abraham's Seed," constituted such by being "Christ's;" these individuals "*of the Saints*," or politically holy ones "*of the Most High*," are to receive from him the Kingdom and dominion under the whole heaven.

And here I would remark, that many mistakes have arisen in the exegesis of these visions by confounding "the saints," and "the *people* of the saints;" in the vision, the former expression is used; in the interpretation of the vision, the latter. "The Saints" in this prophecy where used in connection with symbols stands metonimically for "the people of the saints;" for "the saints," or "holy people," are the nation, in which "the people," whether native Jews or Gentiles, are found, who in Messiah's Age, are with him to rule the world. This VISION OF THE WEST, then, in its consummation, especially refers to the relation of the Kingdom, or of Paradise, which they are to possess or rule with him, who come from the West, North, and South, as well as from the East, to sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; and not to the "Holy people," who are the subject of other prophecies.

The *Second Vision* may as emphatically be styled THE VISION OF THE EAST. The events, which it shadows forth all belong to the Asiatic page of history. If Macedon, Egypt, Rome, Greece, Ethiopia, Lybia, or Gog be alluded to, *it is only so far as the events they are connected with belong to the affairs of the East; and especially of the Holy People—the Jews and their country.* This second v appeared to Daniel in the third year of reign of Belshazzar. At the time he saw was at Shusan, the winter palace, in the vince of Elam, and by the river Ulai, w runs below.

You will find the description of the v in the 8th chapter, from the 3rd to the verse inclusive. The first thing he saw *a Ram with two horns of unequal altitude ting Westward, Northward, and South* Daniel next saw *a He-Goat with a notable between his eyes coming from the West ag the Ram with great impetuosity.* The r of their concussion was that the Horns o Ram were broken, and the Ram itself down and trampled upon. After this the Goat waxed very great, but when at the he of his power, his notable horn was bro He then saw four other horns, which he s "notable ones," sprout out from its roots, pointing towards the East, West, North, South. Out of one of these (the Nort Little Horn made its appearance; so that beheld the head of the Goat encumbered Five Horns. Now this fifth, or Little H became exceedingly great toward the So the East, and the Holy Land, where it ga the ascendency, and put to death some o Princes of Israel; yes, he even magni himself against the Prince of the Host Heaven (Messiah,) and by this little Horn Daily was taken away, and the Place of Sanctuary, (the City and Temple) was down. "*And the Host was given over on count of transgression against the Dail* and the Little Horn cast down the Law t ground; and it practised and prospered.

Such was the Vision; and in relation the things of which it was constituted, Da heard the following questions propound They are contained in verse 13:

1. *How long is it to be to the end of the Vi*
2. *How long before the Little Horn t away the Daily?*
3. *How long are the Sanctuary and the H of Israel to be trodden under foot of the Gen before the restoration begins?*

The answer is contained in verse 14, wh gives the time in which all these events included: namely,

"UNTO TWO THOUSAND AND THREE HUND DAYS."

And what is to take place after the exp tion of this period."

"THEN SHALL THE SANCTUARY BE CLEANS ;" in other words, Jerusalem, the Pleasant and, and the Host of Israel shall begin to e restored from subjection, under foot of the esolator—which restoration shall be per-ected in the cleansing of the Sanctuary as ecreed in Ezekiel, xlv: 18, when "recon-iliation" will be made "for the House of srael!" v. 17.

You will observe that the answer was only eneral; it gave the simple duration of the ision as a whole, without defining the sev-al periods into which it might be divided: hat is, it did not state when the Daily should e taken away, nor when "the Place of his anctuary" should be cast down; but only ow long the Little Horn, or Desolator, should practise and prosper against the Holy.

After hearing and seeing all these things, Daniel was very desirous of being informed the meaning, or signification of them. Accordingly Gabriel, was sent to "*make him understand the vision.*" And the Angel said to him, "Understand, O son of man, ki loth notz hechatzun *for to the time of the end the ision* (extends.) Behold! I will make thee know what shall be *bacherith hetzom, ki lam-oed-quotz* in the latter end of the indignation, for at the very time (2300 day's) the end ("the time of the end shall be.") He then proceeded to tell him the meaning of the Ram and the rough Goat; of the "notable horn between his eyes," and of the Four Horns which stood up after it was broken. How that these Horns represented Four Notable Kingdoms into which the Macedonian was divided; but that their Kings were not of the posterity of the Unicorn, which stood between the eyes of the Goat. In the 23rd verse, Gabriel told the prophet when the Fifth or Little Horn, was to make its appearance, namely, "*in the Latter time of their Kingdom*" when the transgressions of the violators of the Law of Moses "*had come to the full.*" He then described the Little Horn as "*a King of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences;*" which, in the words of Moses imports "a nation whose tongue Israel should not understand; a nation of fierce countenance, which shall not regard the person of the old, nor show favor to the young"—Deuteronomy 48: 50, "His power shall be mighty, *but not by his own power*:" that is, their Prince would not be hereditary like the Kings of other nations; even as the kings of the Four Horns, though of the same nation, did not derive their sovereignty from the power of Alexander, the Unicorn of the Goat—they were "not of his power." This Elective King was to be a great Destroyer; for he was to "destroy wonderfully, to prosper, and practice, and to destroy the mighty and the people of the saints, or holy ones" (*om quodashim.*) And he winds up his description of the Little Horn by saying, "uol *and through* shikalu *his policy* uhetzalih *he shall also bring to maturity* mersmee *mischievous fraud* bidu *by means of his power*; ubellebbu *and in his heart* igidil *he shall grow proud*, ubesheluee *and by false peace* ishichith *he shall destroy* rebim *multitudes*; uol *and against* shir shirim *the Prince of princes* iomed *he shall stand up*; ubaphes *but without* id *hand* ishiber *he shall be shivered to pieces*" verse 25. Thus ended the interpretation.

This VISION OF THE EAST is styled "*the evening and morning vision*;" because it was to continue a great many "evenings and mornings," which is a Hebraism, for days; as it is writen in Genesis orebuiei bequer ium ahed *the evening and the morning was one day.* Now Daniel was commanded "*to shut up the vision*," in other words, it was incomprehensible, inasmuch as no precise date was given, and an intricate series of events was foretold, to the unravelling of which, there existed at that time no clue. The vision was therefore, from the nature of the case, closed; for its continuance was decreed "*for many*," that is "*Two thousand three hundred days.*"

The enterprise of Gabriel to "make Daniel understand the vision" was not attended with success. The only effect the interpretation had upon his mind was to fill him with amazement; "*I was*," says he, "*astonished at the Vision, but none understood it.*"

You will perceive, that Gabriel has said nothing in his interpretation about *the time when* the Daily was to be taken away, *or in other words*, "*sin offerings were to be made an end of*;" or when the transgressions of the violators of the Laws should come to the full,—that is, when "transgression should be finished;" or when the Prince of princes against whom the Little Horn should stand up, should appear; or when the City, the Temple and the Law should be cast down; or when the Little Horn should "destroy the mighty, and the people of the holy ones;" or when finally, the Litle Horn should him-

self be broken to shivers without hand. From the nature of the case you will discover, that it would have been impossible at that visit for Gabriel to have told Daniel all these things, without greatly complicating the vision; because, in the first place the Daily, or "sin offerings," did not continue to be offered, Jerusalem, the Holy City, and the Temple, or Sactuary of the Daily, were not in existence, having laid desolate nearly 70 years, and the Law or "*truth*" and interrupted constitution which could not be kept; for it was already "cast down to the ground."

For Gabriel to tell Daniel, that the Daily should be taken away by the Little Horn when it had already been taken away by Nebuchadnezzar; or that the city and temple, and his fellow-countrymen should be destroyed when this was the very condition to which they were all then subject—implied, that a RESTORATION OF THE STATE and nation would first ensue; and that, after this revolution in favor of Israel, all these things spoken of by Gabriel would befal them. The non-existence of the Daily, the Sanctuary, and the Truth or Law, at the time Daniel saw the Vision of the East, is the very reason why Gabriel said nothing about the time concerning them, when he gave the exegesis; and therefore it was all a hidden mystery to Daniel:—he was amazed at the vision and interpretation thereof, but he could not understand it.

Fifteen years elapsed from the time Daniel saw this Second Vision until he received another visit from Gabriel. As we have seen, he saw the Vision of the East in the third year of Belshazzar's reign, which is 553 years before the birth of Messiah. Now we are told in the first verse of the ninth chapter that "the first year of Darius (Cyaxares) the son of Ahasuerus (Astyages) of the seed of the Medes, in which he was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans," had arrived. This was 538 years before the Birth of Christ; so that there is a well defined interval established between the revelation of the contents of the 8th and 9th Chapters, of exactly fifteen years.

It appears that Daniel was a great student of the prophet Jeremiah; and that the result of his investigations was, that he "*understood by books the number of the years,*" during which Jerusalem was to lay desolate. He had access to the archives of the realm, from which he learned accurately the year, when "Z... was plowed as a field, and Jerusalem bec... heaps;" and by calculating the 70 years desolation foretold by Jeremiah, from epoch, he found that in the first year of ... rius the Mede they had almost ran out; that the time was at hand when the L... would Restore the Jewish State. Daniel, though a prophet, arrived at this conclus... by the exercise of his understanding, ai... by such means as were within his re... He understood "by books," and not by ... extraordinary, or unusual revelation, that time of Restoration was at hand. This ... ought greatly to encourage us to follow ... example, with the reasonable expectation ... we also may understand by the prophetic ... Apostolic books, and standard historical w... ings, "the number of the years, whereof ... word of the Lord came to Daniel the proph... that he would accomplish to scatter the po... of the holy people, and finish all these thing...

Though Daniel had been loaded with h... ors, and had been prime Minister of the S... under many Kings, he loved his native co... try, groaned under its afflictions, and sig... for the return of better days to Israel; tho... in the nature of things, he could not exp... otherwise than to die in gorgeous exile f... "the glorious and pleasant land." Accor... ingly he "prayed earnestly to the Lord G... confessing his sin, and the sin of his peo... Israel, and presenting his suplication ... fore the Lord his God," for the City, the Sa... tuary, the Mountain and the People, who ... called by his holy name.

While he was speaking in prayer, ... man Gabriel was sent forth to "make h... skillful of understanding" in "*the matter*" ... his supplication, and "*the Vision*" he h... seen fifteen years before.

The first thing was "*the matter*" of ... supplication. This related to the restorati... of Daniel's "people Israel;" the Holy City, ... Sanctuary, the Mountain and country, fr... Chaldean desolation—verse 16-20; and the ... was as to "*the Vision.*" This referred to ... finishing the transgression, the making ... end of sin offerings by taking away the D... ly, the casting down the Sanctuary, the d... truction of the nation, the standing up again... the Prince of princes, and the casting of ... truth or Law of Moses to the ground by "... people of the prince," or Little Horn, ... should come. You may compare the ...

...our verses with those from verse 16 to 20 of ...his ninth chapter inclusive; and both passa... ...es with the 10, 11, 12, and 23 to 25th inclu... ...ive of the eighth; and you find this arrange... ...ment of Gabriel's present revelation at once ...imple and correct.

The Restoration from Chaldean captivity, ...nd the Desolation &c. by the Little Horn, or ...King of a fierce countenance" is set forth ...in the prophecy of the Seventy Weeks, which ...ccupies from the 24th to the 27th verse of ...his chapter inclusive.

To consummate the things referred to in "*the matter*" of Daniel's prayer, and in "*the Vision,*" seventy weeks of the 2300 days were determined, or decided upon. In these Seventy Weeks of Prophetic Days, the following events were to transpire:

1. To finish the transgression of the Law;
2. To make an end of sin offerings;
3. To make Reconciliation for iniquity;
4. To bring in Everlasting Righteousness;
5. To seal up the Vision and Prophet; and
6. To Annoint the Most Holy.

To "*finish the transgression*" was equivalent to taking away the obligation to obey the Law; "*to make an end of sin offerings,*" was to supersede them by "one offering for sin," which should be effectual to the taking away of "the sin of the world;" and by thus rendering them useless as types, &c. to prepare the nation for the forcible abolition of the Daily by the Little Horn, To *make Reconciliation for iniquity* was aquivalent to the cutting off of Messiah the Prince, "not for himself," but for the sins of the people; to "*bring in Everlasting Righteousness*" was to raise him from the dead and deliver the proclamation thereof to his Heralds; "*to seal up the Vision and Prophet*" was to confirm by miricles these things of the Vision, and to put an end to all the prophecies concerning Messiah (the prophet, whom "God the Father would seal," or set his mark upon—John vi: 27,) in his first appearance by the accomplishment of them on himself. This was to "confirm the covenant with many." And lastly, "*to annoint the Most Holy*" was equivalent to the pouring out upon him of the Holy Spirit, which in the New Testament is termed his annointing.

These Seventy Weeks of the 2300 days are divided by Gabriel into lesser periods of "Seven Weeks," "Threescore and two weeks," and "one week," which is sub-divided into (chatze) halves, or parts. The seven weeks are equal to 49 years; the threescore and two weeks to 434 years; and the one week to 7 years, which added together make 490 years or Seventy Weeks of years. This period was to commence with the going forth of a decree to *Restore the Law of Moses* as the foundation of the State, both political and religious. This decree was given to Ezra on the *first day of the first month* (part of March and April) *of the seventh year of the reign of Artaxerxes* King of Persia; a copy of which may be found in Ezra vii: 12-26. This is the commencement of the first Seventy Weeks of the 2300 days, which number of weeks terminated in the first month or Nisan (part of March and April) of the year of our Lord 33; and the whole period of 2300 will therefore end in the first month or Nisan of A. D. 1843-4.

After this era, 483 years were to elapse to Messiah the Prince; that is, until the commencement of the confirmation of the Covenant, which was to occupy seven years more. These 483 years were accomplished in the A. D. 26, which Mark terms, "*the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God,*" chapter i: 1, by the ministry of John the Baptist; which led to the manifestation of Messiah, who entered upon his part of the confirmation in A. D. 30, after John was cast into prison: as it is written, "now after that John was put into prison, Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the Kingdom of God, and saying, THE TIME *is fulfilled,* and the Kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye, and believe the gospel," verse 14, 15.

After the threescore and two weeks, which were to succeed the seven weeks, in other words, after the expiration of the 483 years, these events were to take place; namely, "Messiah was to be cut off, but not for himself," by the Little Horn or Roman power, standing up against him; then "the people of the prince," or Romans "that should come should destroy the City and the Sanctuary," or Temple, in other words, the Little Horn should "cast down the Place of the Daily's Sanctuary"—chapter viii: 11; and the consummation of which would be "a flood" of war spreading desolation to the end thereof.

But it is not to be supposed, that these things were to take place in the last year of the 483 years; but only that, at the expiration of this period, in the general, these things would sooner or later be developed.

(*To be Continued.*)

REVIEW.

"THE OCCIDENT AND AMERICAN JEWISH ADVOCATE."

This is a monthly periodical, devoted to the diffusion of knowledge in Jewish Literature and Religion; under the editorial supervision of Isaac Leeser. This gentleman, if we mistake not, is Flazan or reader to the Portuguese Synagogue in Philadelphia; and author of a volume published in Richmond, Va., styled "The Jews and the Mosaic Law." The Occident before us is the 12th number of Volume one. It is neatly gotten up, and appears to be ably conducted, and its articles devoutly and candidly written. We have perused its contents with great and absorbing interest, Though a Gentile by birth, yet, being an Israelite by adoption, we cannot but feel deeply interested in whatever relates to the well being and destiny of the mighty, and the Holy People. We rejoice, therefore, to see that there is a shaking among the dry bones of the House of Israel, and the House of Judah, as the Occident demonstrates in many particulars.

The Editor, like those of all other periodicals, finds, that with the best intentions, it is impossible to give satisfaction to all his readers, "approbation and reproof" being meted out to him "for the very same articles." The following extract of a letter from an agent of the Occident, will show the topics in demand, on the part of some of the Israelites in America:—"In proceeding among our brethren for the purpose of procuring subscribers, I found much dissatisfaction with your work; * * * they expected that you would produce controversial articles, that would excite in them enthusiasm for our Holy Religion, and would assist them in defending the correctness of its Institutions, and the fulfilment of the prophecies of its eternal duration; that you would have proved from Holy Writ, the *downfall of the erroneous religions of the World*, the *glorious reign of the Messiah*, the *Ressurrection of the Dead*, the reward of the righteous, and the *Destruction of the Wicked;* that you would have called on our brethren continually to awake from their slumbers and lukewarmness, to *prepare for the Latter Days*, &c." We hope Mr. Leeser will devote a part of his per
cal to a scriptural exhibition of these to
for the benefit of his brethren; som
whom, we rejoice to find, are hungering
thirsting after these things. Yes, e
them "*to* PREPARE," for, if you will
and see, O Israel, you will find that "the
ter Days" *are come* upon the World.

The first article of this number is on "
Demands of the Times." It begins by a
ing to former essays, in which "cogen
sons" were presented for "*a union of ac*
among all Israelites. At present, differ
exist between them, but not in the sen
which *sectarianism* obtains among G
Religionists. This idea is repudiated.
divisions in Modern Judaism are not in
tion to the question, *what is the Religion*
Jews? as among the Gentiles, what is th
ligion of Jesus? but simply, as to certain
ditions of the Reformers, who have a
among them, introducing things which
Israelites do not consider as expedient.
are informed, by Mr. L., that "there
difference in doctrine and discipline be
them;" and observes, that "*Judaism*
uniform system based upon the words of S
ture, illustrated by the traditions and cu
of the fathers." This is Modern Juda
though Mr. L. has forgotten to inform
what that Judaism is, when stripped of
traditions and customs of the fathers: fo
own part, we have a suspicions eye
these; for a Jew, "greater than Solom
and "Ancient of Days," once declare
these "*fathers*," that *they made the law of*
of none effect, by their traditions.

It appears, that the events of the Fr
Revolution have produced a great chang
the mental habitude of the Jewish Na
It has not escaped the action of the new
ories of French Philosophy, which "sur
dered every thing to doubt and examina
and opinions, the most sacred and vital,
discussed with the freedom of a mathe
cal problem, and rejected not rarely,
they could be supported with mathem
accuracy and philosophical deduction."

fore the wars of the Republic, the Hebrew youths were excluded from the armies of the Catholic and Protestant powers; and all the avenues to honor and profit were closed against them. But, with the commencement of the revolutionary period, "a new life," says the writer, "was, so to say, breathed into the long oppressed race; the men of blood, who rode the storm at the outbreak of the Gallic Revolution, did one thing, at least, which should shield their memory from entire abhorance; they declared all the citizens of the State upon an equality, and whoever was willing to serve the land of his birth could do so, no matter what were his professions, or the lowness or degradation of his origin. Under these circumstances, not French Jews alone, but foreigners (Jews of other nations—*Ed.*) likewise joined the victorious armies of the Republic, and as the ranks of self-educated generals and new raised recruits carried the war into foreign lands, and proclaimed there too the principles of the Revolution, more Israelites became incorporated with the military or civil administration. It was a time of agitation, of rapid changes, of annihilation of states and systems; and many Jews, seeing the freedom with which Christians transgressed their received duties, the daringness with which the church systems and their doctrines were canvassed, and not rarely radiculed, by degrees learned too *to question many of the duties* they had hitherto religiously observed, not rarely excusing themselves by the necessity of their public employments.

Now, we hope our fellow citizens of the House of Israel will take it in good part, when we urge upon them the consideration of their national condition in the Latter Days, under the metaphor of "*very dry bones* in the open valley," Ezekiel xxxvii: 2. From this prophet we learn, that you are likened to "dry bones," because, before the breath of political and intellectual life breathes into you, you exclaim, "*our bones are dried;*" why? because "*our Hope is lost:* we are cut off for our parts." This was most truly your condition before the outbreak of the Gallic Revolution: you had no rights; you were without country; without honor, profit, or reward among the nations. Edom, as you term the Roman Power, had "scattered your power," abased you to the dust, and compelled you to bow down your backs continually. But the time came, and, as Mr. Leeser well observes, "*a new life was breathed into the long oppressed race.*" As he has shown, you ascended to the political heaven in a cloud, and a new era began in your history, which will, ere long, restore you to independence, and your native land. Compare your relations to society in England, France, Germany, and the Occident, with what they were before the earthquake, which shook the foundations of the political world, and is it not manifest, that you are now in *a transition state*—passing from the gloomy past to the bright and glorious future! The hand of God is in all this. More than 2500 years ago, he declared by Ezekiel, that he would "*cause breath to enter into you, and ye shall live.*" It is true! Yes, he is breathing into you political and intellectual life. It is this intellectual inspiration which is now agitating your congregrations, and causing you to break those bonds imposed upon you by your fathers—causing you "to question many of the duties you have hitherto religiously observed;" to bestir yourselves in the vital questions of domestic education; in supplying yourselves with the pure word of God, by a new translation of the Scriptures; and by establishing, both at home and abroad, a national periodical literature. Go on, and may God speed thee, O Israel, for thy regeneration will be the abounding riches of the world! But to return to the "Demands of the Times."

The Jewish soldiers of the revolution, like the French auxiliaries of the American Colonies, on the return of peace, spread by their example among the civilians of their faith, the liberalism they had imbibed, in the French armies. An entire want of veneration for "ancient customs and ceremonies" began to prevail; Jews learned to look upon their own faith "with diminished hope and with impaired sincerity;" and a state of indifference was exhibited by young men, "truly revolting" to a religious mind, which had been trained under the "old-fashioned teachers" of Judaism. Under these circumstances, the REFORMERS as they are styled, sprung into being. "They averred that there was transgression in Israel, that something must be done to prevent the sacred edifice from altogether falling into decay; yet, instead of illustrating the old (rabbinical—*Ed.*) methods

of worship and making them lovely to the multitude, they, in an evil moment, (as the writer thinks,) came upon the idea of rendering the divine service agreeable by introducing changes and modifications *unknown to and unauthorized by the teachers and wise men in Israel.* In place of discountenancing the errors of transgressors, they endeavored measurably to justify them by confessing *defects in our observances.* From one thing they proceeded to another, till innovations, both startling and unlawful, were proposed and sanctioned. The impulse was also farther assisted by the indecisive answers of the so-called Sanhedrim of Napoleon; and every year since then has seen some new cause of contention brought forward by those, who, we will admit, sincerely, but still unwisely, insist that our faith too requires a reform on the principle of the Lutheran Reformation of the Papal system."

It is a coincidence worthy of note, namely, *the contemporary appearance of* REFORMERS *among the natural and spirual Israelites.* By the *natural*, I mean, Israelites by birth; and by *spiritual*, those among the baptised, who were they truly in Christ, would, though Gentiles by birth, be Israelites indeed by adoption. The Jewish and Gentile Reformers are both aiming at an emancipation from the thraldom, to which they have been subjected by "the teachers and wise men" in Babylon; and profess a desire to return to the simple unadulterated word of the Lord. This is certainly a very remarkable sign of the times. We wish both parties abundant success, so far at least as they are aiming at a return to righteousness and truth.

The Editor of the Occident, does not appear to sympathize with these efforts at reform. He stands up (though with a mildness which would lead one to suppose, that he was not very hearty in his opposition to the Reformers in Israel,) for "the ancient customs and ceremonies" of the rabbinical fathers, of whose wisdom he speaks uniformly in praise.

"At their first appearance the Reformers did not number among their advocates any of the religious leaders of Israel. But with the departure from the field of action of the aged servants of the Lord, who had faithfully taught to others the knowledge which fitted their souls, a New Race, educated in the learning of the Gentiles, and not a few of them tinctured with the dogmas of mo philosophy, took their place, frequentl pointed, not as of old by the popular will, by governmental interference; and tea of this class have now given consisten the former vague hankering after cha though no two of them hardly agree what they desire, and where they will Such appears to be the description of state of the Jewish Congregations in the world before the contagion of reform bec epidemical in these United States. "R as far as the American Israelites are cerned, it was a long time before they fel contagion. Separated from the Old W by the Atlantic, they pursued for a long a course of godliness according to the light accessible to them; they were not le ed, it is true, neither in Hebrew nor in o knowledge, but their heart was true with and they strove to do all in their power the glorification of the Holy Name. with an increase of emmigration from rope, *persons tinctured with the modern sies* have mingled among us, and we d see the effects of their working in our mi *They often decry the ancient usuages,* and irreligious conduct is an ample evidenc the spirit within. The profanation of the bath (our Saturday) the eating of forbid things, the unjewish household, the omis of the covenent of circumscision, and the in marriages with gentile families, have b chargable to European emmigrants to as a degree as to native Americans. * * * form notions of the ultra kind have b brought over to this country from abroad, have been excited by foreign example. T who profess to be reformers, allege that th object is *the restoration of ancient usuag* STRIPPED OF ALL HUMAN ADDITION."

This would be to re-establish the Law Moses, which, it is not to be doubted, is fact the object of the Reformers. We judg therefore, that their ulterior views conte plate "the restoration of ancient usuage in the Holy City, Jerusalem; for it is only that city that the "ancient asuages" can lawfully observed. We would advise Occident not to oppose the Reformers; for carrying out of "their object" will assure lead them to National Restoration. A spi of enterprise has seized upon them, and th appear to brook no opposition that stands tween them and the accomplishment of th

design. Mr. R. Leeser complains of this in the following words: —

"We will not dispute their sincerity; but why do they urge their views with so much pertinacity, exclusiveness, illiberality? Who is the aggressor? Surely not those who wish to uphold the customs of their fathers. Why will they therefore, who wish for modifications, not tolerate the conservative views of their brethren? No one, we speak advisedly, wishes to preserve abuses which are clearly so; no one will oppose any wholesome regulations in the public service of the Synagogue, or object to any legal means which will make the practice of religion more loved and generally acquiesed in. * * * The system we have so long lived under (we speak of the *ceremonies*, not of the *religion*, for of this there is no question) is surely one which has the sanction of wise and eminent men, and we cannot surrender it blindly to the tender mercies of those who ask of us to help them to pull down, before they have shown us a fair specimen of what they mean to build up in its stead."

PROPHETIC OR SYMBOLIC TIME.

"And the Four Angels were loosed, which were prepared for an hour, and a day, and a month, and a year, for to slay the third part of men."

	years.	*days.*
An hour, or the twelfth part of a symbolical day, is equal to	0	30
A day,	1	00
A month,	30	00
A year,	360	00
	391	30
The Eastern Roman Empire, in its Greek form, was extinguished by the capture of New Rome, or Constantinople, the seat of Government, and styled, in Scripture, the throne of the Dragon,	May 29	1453
The Eastern Roman Empire, in its Turkish form, to prevail with power to slay,	*days.* 30	391
Expiration of the Tusco-Roman power to slay,	June 29	1844

TABLE OF SYMBOLIC TIME.

1 Symbolic day is equal to	1 Literal year;
30 Literal years or days,	1 Symbolic hour;
1 Symbolic hour,	1 Lit. month, or Lunar day and night;
1 Symbolic month, or Sym. Lunar day,	30 Literal years;
12 Symbolic months,	1 Sym. "*Time;*"
1 Symbolic Time,	360 Lit. years;
Symbolic "*Times*,"	720 Lit. years;
"A Season" or set Time,	280 Lit. years;
"A Season and Time,"	1000 Lit. years;
1000 Literal years,	The Symb. "*for ever and ever.*

EDITOR.

ANECDOTE OF BONAPARTE.

"Bonaparte was a very awkward dancer, and at the close of a dance said to his partner, 'I am sensible, my charming countess, that I have acquitted myself indifferently, but the fact is, my *forte* lies not so much in dancing myself, as making others dance.'"

And *Deacon* ——, might have added, had he been master of the ceremonies, "*And mine, sire, in paying the Fiddler!*"—*Ed.*

ECCLESIASTICAL POLITICS.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

Party is the Bane of Liberty and Truth.

Under this head we propose to chronicle divers illustrations, in the form of correspondence, &c. of the politics peculiar to the Ecclesiastical Bodies of the Present Age. It is true our periodical is the Herald of the Future Age, yet inasmuch as we are part and parcel of the present crooked and perverse generation, it would be impossible wholly to abstract ourselves from the things by which we are surrounded. Incidents will occur in our pilgrimage through life of a more or less interesting character; and which, though of little magnitude in themselves, are calculated to illustrate the springs of action in communities as well as in those who lead them. Many of our readers, if not all, we are advised are interested in the details; hence, as we aim to please all, if possible, we shall from time to time, briefly narrate such items of news as will keep them informed of the Ecclesiastical Politics of the Present Age. They are part of the Signs of the Times, and serve as landmarks to guide us in the way of consistency, by the contrast, which they present to the philosophical beholder to the genuine principle of integrity, honor aud independence.

In our first we devoted more space to these matters, than in any one number we intend to do again. We have in fact neither time nor space, nor disposition to devote so much attention to the croaking of unclean spirits. Life is short, and the evil of mens' intrigues voluminous; it would be bootless therefore, to analyze it in detail, for after all that should be accomplished, they would still be a stiff-necked and perverse race, still prepared to add evil upon evil to their inequity.

It is well known, that the Editors of the Periodicals of that section of the Ecclesiastical community styled "Millerite" (I use this term not as a reproach, but to distinguish the party from other religious denominations,) have very boldly chalanged investigation into their premises and conclusions; no doubt, feeling that they were based upon the rock eternal truth; for it is a consciousness of r which inspires a man with a courage whi knows no fear, and cannot be subdued. T ing for granted in the present instance, t a sect had sprung up whose principle of tion was to prove all things and to hold f only what was good, because proved to true, we could not find it in our heart to pose them; although in much we believ them to be mistaken: we therefore, coincid with them where we could agree, and cl cluded to await the arrival of the Ides March 1844, as an epoch which in the dis pointment of their expectations would do mo to open their eyes, than the most labored gument we could elaborate against their h pothesis: Nevertheless we were in hop that before the time expired as the end of t dispensation as Mr. Miller had expounded i we might succeed in speaking to the unde standings of his fellow believers. We we glad to see them take so much interest in t Second Advent of Jesus Christ, in the b lief of whose near approach we fully coi cide with them, though not so instantaneous as they imagine. But, we believe, we con discern a very radical oversight in their pol cy with respect to the Future Age. It is w to believe in the approaching manifestati of Messiah, *but it is better* to believe that, m to be *prepared for him too.* We perceive that a belief that He will soon appear accom panied by a moral (termed by some "a pie life," if the morality be mixed up with an a tendance on preaching, prayers, &c.) depor ment, made up the preparation for his com ing; which however, by no means reach the standard of a scriptural preparation. W determined therefore, to open a correspon ence with the "Western Midnight Cry" pu lished in Cincinnati. Accordingly, we fo warded the subjoined epistle in hope, that would prepare the way for others, in whi we should have directed the attention of

renders to the purification which can be de-rived only from a belief and obedience of the Gospel preached by the Apostles, and without which, the belief of the coming of Jesus instanter, however confident that belief may be, will be of no avail as a ground of acceptance with him: for "every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself ("by obeying the truth") even as He (the Lord) is pure."—1 John iii: 3.

We mailed it to the Editor, and waited patiently for two or three weeks expecting its appearance. But it was never permitted to see the light. The reader will perceive that it calls in question the correctness of Mr. Litch's interpretation in relation to the Ottoman Power. Now Mr. L.'s exposition has been an occasion of much glorying among the writers of Mr. Miller's Denomination; and to permit this to be confuted would be to convulse the system built upon Mr. Miller's premises with too rude a shock. The cussons of the Corps Editorial, therefore, were set aside, and a new rule, suitable to the present emergency, introduced. I was notified that the letter should be inserted, if I would consent to the document being first transmitted to Mr Litch for his examination and review! I believe Mr. Litch resides at New York, or Boston. Had Mr. Litch been Editor of the Midnight Cry this would have been regular enough, though a slow process; but he is not, and therefore stands in the same relation to that paper as myself, namely, *as a correspondent.* Here then, is a new rule-*if a correspondent to a paper publish an interpretation of a passage and another person undertake to show its fallacy, the critique of the latter individual must be sent to the exponent although he may reside in Boston, London, or Hong Kong!* This rule which was acted upon in my case, is very well calculated to discourage investigation, and to impede the progress of truth. In ordinary cases, the rule is to insert articles, and leave them open to criticism from whatever source it may originate. If a critique be received the Editor inserts it, and leaves the first correspondent to do the best he can with it, or at most accompanies it with some remarks from his own pen. In reply to the notification, we expressed our astonishment at the course indicated, but consented that the criticism upon Mr. Litch's views might be copied off and forwarded to him; at the same time, we stated that we wrote for truth without regard to party, which we thought we could perceive was not the motive which caused this new regulation to be enforced against us. This seemed to end the matter, and the letter was handed over to a friend by Mr. Jacobs with this saying, 'that he was pleased with its spirit but would prefer Brother Litch seeing it first.' Rather strange! But reader nothing need astonish us under the sun: *party* is the bane of liberty and truth.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE WESTERN MIDNIGHT CRY.

For the Western Midnight Cry.

LOUISVILLE, Ky., Feb. 13, 1844.

Mr. Editor:—Your "Midnight Cry" of February 10th, is before me. From it I perceive, you profess to be acting under a "commission" to cry with a loud voice; "Fear God, and give glory to him, &c." This is a good work; obey the exhortation of the prophet, "*cry aloud and spare not.*" but, first "be sure you are right," and then "go ahead," courting neither the smiles, nor eschewing the frowns of this faithless and *disobedient* generation.

Allow me, though not "*a Millerite,*" to say, that the great truth, to the propagation of which your paper professes to be devoted, is the grandest, most comforting, animating, and soul stirring in the whole scriptures of truth. The cry "Behold! He cometh!" when believed is truly terific; but to whom? To them, who are unprepared; to them, whose treasure, instead of being in heaven, is vested in stocks, merchandise lands, houses, colleges, &c. &c. and whose hearts are where their treasure is; to them, "who receive honor one of another," and who love to be called

Rabbi; to such worldly minded professors as these, slaves as they are to "the world, the flesh and the Devil," to them, I say, the Cry, "Behold he cometh!" falls upon their ears as the death-knell of all they esteem great and good! But to him, who has obtained "*a right and title*" to Eternal Life, the cry is as "life from the dead." *And why?* Because, he knows that his "*life is hid* with Christ in God; and that WHEN He who is our life shall appear, THEN shall we appear with him in glory;" because, he knows that "WHEN he shall appear, *we shall be like him*;" because he knows that an unfading crown of righteousness will be given to him at his appearing. Yes, the cry, Behold he cometh! is as life from the dead to the believers, because the day of His coming, is the day of the world's redemption from the tyranny of unrighteousness in church and world; and the grand era when all the obedient "in Christ" will put on incorruptibility and life; when they will be "crowned with glory and honor" as the reward of a "patient continuance in well doing."

Though I differ with Mr. Miller in some of his conclusions, I sympathize with him, because he is traduced and misrepresented. I believe he is both candid and honest, which is more I think than can be said of some of his opponents with whom I am acquainted. If ever so much mistaken, he deserves much credit for having aroused the attention of so many of this truly infidel generation of religionists, to the study of the Holy Prophets. I have read both sides to a sufficient extent to be enabled to judge without prejudice; and I am perfectly satisfied, that his main arguments are untouched *by his opponents*. No man who has any regard for his reputation for rationality and intelligence, ought to deny that the Seventy Weeks are a part of the Vision of 2300 days; this can be proved beyond a doubt independently of all Greek and Hebrew. They must therefore, have a common origin; and therefore, the 2300 days must end 1843; though, it can be by no means proved, that because they end in that year, the world will therefore come to an end with them. This, however, by the way.

I would call your attention, further, to this; namely, that the data of Mr. Josiah Litch's calculations are fallacious with respect to the Ottoman Power. He argues that "*the hour, the day, the month, and the* for which they were prepared "*to sla* *third part of men*" were expended Augu 1840. But the massacre of the Nestoria the number of 50,000 in 1843, sufficient futes this. The 391 years and *thirty* ought certainly to be calculated from th *litical death of the Greco-Roman E* which took place as signally by the ca of Constantinople, the Capital and the of Constantine XV, the last of the Emp as did that of the Mosaic Kingdom by the truction of Jerusalem; or that of the tern Roman Empire by the dethroneme Augustalus and the capture of Old Rom the Goths. I contend, therefore, that 391 years and *thirty* days should be cal ted from May 29th A. D. 1453, which cause them to end June 29th 1844, whic only *three months and eight days* after the posed termination of the 2300 years in Ma though some say June. The time is near that you will soon be able to verify, or co this calculation by the facts in the case. I affirm, that *after June next, you may e to hear of political movements on the part o Great Powers in connection with the P and its sovereignty over the Sanctuary or ly.* This in the Journals of Europe is st THE EASTERN QUESTION; and by Sir R Peel, "*the Question of questions*;" and he may say so; for upon the turn this take, rests the destiny of the British P in India, and consequently the fate of Jews and of the World at large.

On the first column of page 66, you h given us a new translation and paraphras Dr. Hales of Daniel ix: 27. How can abomination of desolation be said to stand u the pinnacle or battlement of the temple, the consummation of the 2300 days, seeing t the Temple has abeen non-existent for the 1774 years of that period? This translat is condemned when tried in the court of c mon sense by the facts in the case. The ginal without the points is, *uol caneph, shi zim meshimem uod cale; unecharetze tatha sukmem*, which is literally rendered—*and u the extremity, abominations of desolation e until the accomplishment; and then the dec shall be poured out upon the Desolator.* T word *caneph*, which Dr. Hales has rende "*pinnacle*," "denotes" says Parkhurst, " tremity, outermost, or *farthest from the m dle*," now the prophecy is speaking of

vasion of the Holy Land and destruction of Holy City and Sanctuary or temple: nce the context sustains the version I have ven that the desolation would spread over e Land *to the extremely*, or "farthest from e middle" or metropolis, which is the other City, and generally situated as near the iddle of the country, as circumstances will low. Again, *shi kulzim* which he has made gular, is plural; and should be rendered *minations*. Hence, you will perceive that was not one abomination of desolation that s to pervade the Holy Land to the end of e vision of 2300 days; but a plurality, which cords with the history of the case. Thus, ere were the Pago-Roman Abomination of solation; the Greco-Catholic Abomina- on; the Saracenic Abomination; the Latin atholic, or Papal, Abomination during the rusades and Kingdom of Jerusalem; the amlouk Abomination; the Mogul Tartar Abomination; and the Ottoman Abomination of Desolation, which is still "the Desolator" of "*the glorious holy mountain*" (Daniel xi: 45,) upon whom the Sixth Vial has been dripping and now pouring out abundantly for the last *thirty six* years, as the facts of history plainly show. "*And then*," the end of the Vision having come, *the pouring out of the Vial*, which contains the things "decreed," will be rapidly exhausted in the consummation; when the Great Battle of Armagaddon shall be fought between the Almighty and the Kings of the world.

If you think it will tend to the illustration of the truth, or assist in confirming the faith of the genuine disciple of the Lord Jesus, you will perhaps insert this in your next; if not you can return itto my friend Major Gano, who will put it in my hand at some convenient season.

Yours truly,

JOHN THOMAS.

LETTER FROM JOHN T. WALSH.

For the Herald of the Future Age.

Dr. Thomas — Dear Sir: — In the first umber of "The Herald of the Future Age," your "review" of matters and things in The Christian Intelligencer," you were leased to introduce to your readers a person, hose name is signed "John T. Walsh;" nd, as I answer to this name, I have con- luded that you must have referred to me. In our remaks then, you speak of "my posi- ion" as being "a curious one!" This may e true! But I am not alone in this "posi- ion," for, unless I am much mistaken, the orthy Editor of "The Herald," &c., is, lso, in "a curious" position.* But then, I o not like *him* the less for that, for, though curious," it may be the *true position!* But e people do not *think* it the *true* one! Does follow from this that it is not the true one? y no means! And because you think my osition "a curious" one, is it an improper ne? We are prone to *extremes*, and the man ho maintains his *central* position in the face all the prejudice, animosity, and raging elements of the present age, must be in a very "curious" predicament, at least in the estimation of the majority. It is probable that you had not seen my reply to the Editor of the Intelligencer, when you penned your strictures. I should not, however, have noticed your remarks at all, but for the *motives* which you think actuated me in signing those "resolutions." It was not *money*, as you suppose! No, sir, this consideration never entered my head, nor heart! And, I am sure, if you had known me as well as I am known by some others, and by myself, you would never have attributed such unworthy, and unchristian motives to me. *I will not sacrifice my conscience upon any altar, for the sake of pleasing any man, or set of men*, much less for the sake of "filthy lucre."† I ask you, then, in justice to me, to give this note an insertion in your paper, and to correct the impression you have made upon the minds of the people, particularly your readers, in reference to the matter before us.

Yours, in defence of the Truth,

JOHN T. WALSH.

* This is true; but though "curious," it is onsistent. We await, with calmness, the oming of our Lord, that he may pronounce pon its verity.—*Ed. Her. F. A.*

† We are not opposed to men living by the Gospel, *who preach the Gospel*; but, we do set our face, like a flint, against men making a

LETTER FROM DOCTOR BODENHAMER.

LOUISVILLE, April 25th, 1844.

DOCTOR THOMAS:

Dear Brother. We were truly gratified to hear of your safe arrival and kind reception at Cincinnati. The elders of the sixth street church, in inviting you to speak, have manifested towards you a spirit of christian courtesy and liberality, which is highly commendable, under present circumstances; in as much as these are the days, in which an *overgrown influence* is exerted, against all those who thus openly rebel against the *supervisual powers that be.* Who, my dear sir, would have thought, at the commencement of this reformation or restoration which began in theory and in practice and which was expected to continue to be carried out in both, until the Lord himself should come:—who would have thought I say, that at so early a period of its existence, a race of Goths and Vandals should arise who would arrest its progress and endeavor to *blot out* the rays of its sun, (as is now being done especially in Virginia!) But it cannot finally be accomplished. Ingenious fallacies may for a season mislead, but by stimulating enquiry and eliciting facts, truth will ultimately be generated from among the very seeds of error and falsehood. Who would have thought, in the days of the "*Christian Baptist*," that the advancing *tide* of this genuine reforming principle would at no for distant day, have its CANUTE, who would place his feet upon the *sand* and say, *Thus far shalt thou come, but no farther.* But this tide is destined to roll on over all opposition until a voice will be heard proclaiming THE LAMB'S WIFE HATH MADE HERSELF READY.

The *Herald* has gone forth, and so far as I have heard has been received by your friends with great interest. They are much pleased with the title, the typography and the matter. Some few, however, think that two much space has been allotted in the first number to what they term "*Campbellite troubles*," which might have been much better occupi *something of a more solid nature*, and il tive of the *Future Age.* We hope i respect, you will in future, amend your But they, one and all, say, that it sha be stopped for want of their co-efficien We have heard too, of others who are all pleased with the Herald! Of course! cannot, through their distorted visio any thing in it but *Snakes, Hobgoblins* an *nebed things.* Nothing but *covenant bre arch-factionism, disappointed ambition fidelity, distructionism, no-soulism, dea ism, non-resurrectionism, annihilationis terialism,* &c. &c. &c. Of such c ters it is useless to say any thing, is scarcely any hope for them. Let alone, they are joined to their *Idols.* have heard also from a few others wh to be considered neutrals. They say y entirely too imprudent, that you spe some of the doctrines and practices of *reformation*" with too much plainness freedom; with undue license and unnec ry severity. They do not consider, how that the severity and pungency may en consist in the *truth* and *justice* of your t tions; or that the *actual cautery* is some the very best remedy in speedily arr some *desperate diseases.* We are the a cates for free discussion, in its best and est sense; but we freely admit, that n cussion can be truly free, which is not courteous in manner, and as kind in spi the nature of the case will admit. G then, persuing the even tenor of your wa heralding forth the development of the g ons Hope, set before us in the gospel o blessed Saviour and Redeemer.

Yours in the Hope of the Future Age.

W. BODENHAM

P. S. The *Harbinger*, the *Messenger* an *Intelligencer* are at hand. From rea them one would naturally come to the co sion that "*this reformation*" is in a "cr

trade of preaching for a living. Preachers of this class pervert the minds of the people; excite their prejudices; close the doors of the meeting houses, and cause men to cry out "heresy," if they suspect others of being in advance of themselves. They are ever on the watch, lest the people should outstrip them in intelligence. The preacher of the Gospel is candid, open, liberal, independent; he joices in the truth, and will deal honestly all who are its friends, though they ca see eye to eye with him in every thing. are glad Brother Walsh disclaims preac as the *means* instead of the *end* of *his* lif EDITOR

ition;" and that it is high time that it *de- its position.* The Harbinger as usual un- the caption "*Tyranny of Opinionism*" is very ingenious way *speculating down* CULATION with a *forty-horse* power. He ll in this manner deliver himself of all his culations on these subjects without being at suspected. *Timothy* in the Messenger is on *Silas.* I am sorry he did not come out ve his own name. The cause certainly demanded it. But my dear sir, he is no friend of yours, and would no more defend you against the slanders of your enemies, than did Brother Campbell by a single word defend old Father Stone at the "*Grand Debate.*" Elder J. T. Jones of Illinois, has returned by the hands of Elder Brown your *prospectus,— without a name!* All right I suppose!!!

W. B.

"THEOLOGICAL TOURNAMENT."

A friend has succeeded in procuring for us notice of the Debate between Mr. Pin- and myself as published in the "Catho- Advocate," the Romanist paper in Louis- ille. Our disputation is styled a "Theo- ical Tournament" the description of which humorous illustration of the Protestant inciple, that every man has a right to judge himself in religious matters. Romanists ny this right to every man, unless he will nsent to judge in harmony with the decis- ns of the Church, whatever that papal will wisp may chance to be! The Catholic Ad- cate would doubtless interdict all "theolo- ical tournaments," if it had the power; for the Mother of Harlots," of which it is the gan in Louisville, is no patroness of Bibles, religious disputation. The stillness of th pervades her temple, and the light of th is not permitted to penetrate the dark cess of her "unclean and hateful" abode. t, rather than be reserved under chains of rkness such as those with which she binds r victims, we would prefer, that every man hould have an interpretation of his own; r, excess of liberty is certainly less prejudi- al to the eternal destiny of our race, then e odious tyranny and restriction, which the unclean spirits" of her communion would impose upon the world.

It would be loss of time to enter upon a se- ious and formal examination of the Priestly ditor's remarks; when we publish our notes f the Debate the reader can exercise the rotestant right of judging for himself. We do not expect candor and impartiality from an dvocate of the Jesuitical principle, that, the end sanctifies the means;" those quali- ties belong not to "the Mystery of Iniquity" from which flow "all the Abominations of the Earth." We are not, therefore, disappointed at the manner in which our views have been distorted. It would have been marvelous could a Roman Priest have comprehended the possibility of examining scripture truth independently of the "*isms*," which have sprung up like mushrooms from the stercoraceous accumulations of his own "GREAT CITY." One thing we cannot forbear to remark upon, however, namely, that we do most formally and positively repudiate the title of "Reverend" bestowed upon us by the Catholic Advocate. Were we ever so much in favor of the title we would certainly reject it coming from such a quarter; for we can conceive of no degradation more complete than to receive a title of honor, or distinction, from an official in the service of "*the Women drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the Witnesses of Jesus.*" We have nothing more "*reverend*" about us than other men of our class, which is essentially opposed to every thing clerical, from His Unholiness the Pope to an ordinary class-leader. No worm of the dust has any right to the title of "reverend:" it is the style of the Divinity for "holy and reverend is his name" alone of all intelligences.

The following is the article, which we republish, if not for the edification, at least for the amusement of our readers; as an additional illustration of the Ecclesiastical Politics of an organization which is destined to a "tetotal annihilation" before the establishment of the Future Age:

"There was, last week, a pass at arms, in

this city, between two teachers in Protestant Israel, Rev. Messrs. Pingree and Thomas.

Mr. Pingree believes that there is no hell, and that all men will be saved. He is a Universalist.

Mr. Thomas renounces all the *isms*, Campbellism, Universalism, Popularism and Protestantism, except so far as it may be found, in the *ism* which he will establish himself, and which his antagonist styles *Thomasism*.

Now, *Thomasism* divides mankind into three classes:

1st. The just, who will go to heaven to be happy for all eternity.

2dly. The unjust, who have had the Gospel preached to them, and who will go to Hell for all eternity.

3dly. The Pagans and infidels who never had the Gospel preached to them, and these shall be *tetotally annihilated*.

Mr. Pingree, whose ideas of the justice of God will not allow a hell to exist, or a devil either, except the devil of human passions, takes the Bible as his key, and opens heaven to all mankind—to the thief on the left hand of Christ, as well as to the thief on his right, to whom it was particularly said, "this day thou shalt be with me in paradise," to Cain as well as to Abel;—To the wretch whose sins are as "black as the Ethiop or red as scarlet," as well as to the patient Job;—to Dives as well as to Lazarus;—to the rich man whose "soul was buried in hell," as well as to the repentant Magdalen; to Judas, as well as to Paul; to the adulterer, fornicator, drunkard, and all the rest whom St. Paul would exclude, as well as to the virtuous, chaste, and mortified. A fine thing for presevering sinners to learn in these good Protestant times, that the devil is dead, and that after a long, faithful and prayerful investigation of the Bible, it appears to Rev. Mr. Pingree that hell has disappeared altogether, that it is, at best, a pagan *mythos*, unaccountably engrafted on Christian faith, though for ages supposed *a Bible truth*, even by Protestant Bible readers. Rev. Mr. Pingree is a Protestant, and has a bible, and reads it, and cannot find in it the doctrine of an eternal hell.

Rev. Mr. Thomas is a Protestant, has a bible, and reads it, and sees an eternal hell in the bible, as plain as the nose on Mr. Pingree's face.

Mr. Pingree uses the bible to ann
Hell and the Devil.

Mr. Thomas uses the bible to open h
the wicked, who have the gospel prea
them, that is, no doubt, for all those ob
sinners, who shall not be converted to T
ASISM, which is the latest and most cor
terpretation of God's word, or gospel;
test edition of "true religion." Bu
Thomas can also use the bible for the
work of annihilation. If he cannot a
late "Hell and the Devil," as Mr. P
does, he can annihilate all those who
not have the gospel preached to them, t
all whose misfortune it may be to hear
ing of THOMASISM. Those happy soul
shall believe in Thomasism, will "be the
and go to heaven, as sure as Rev.
Thomas understands the bible right,
he says he does, though Mr. Pingree t
he knows nothing about it.

Mr. Pingree, understanding the bible
than all self styled orthodox protestant
may be said to have taken the golden loc
the gates of heaven, and told the cher
with the flaming sword to stand aside, a
every soul in that comes. The keys
have been given to Peter, and left by Pe
his successors in Christ's Church, but
does Mr. Pingree care for the keys, wh
has got the lock off. Besides, having
away with the devil and his domain,
else can the wicked go if not to heaven!

Mr. Thomas thinks it entirely unscrip
to annihilate the devil and his habitation
protests against it in the name of the bi

Mr. Pingree talks louder and louder,
Mr. Thomas comes very near talking as
as he does. Mr. Pingree hits the bible
rible whack, as much as to say, "why d
not cry out in testimony of this truth?"
Mr. Thomas looks at the bible, as much
say, "you had better be silent till I ge
and then testify."

Mr. Pingree discussed, and Mr. Tho
discussed, and the bible said nothing, at
while we were present, and they tugged
and twisted it about, and pretended th
said this, and said that, much to the ed
tion of a large assembly of bible rea
who must have felt that the bible is an ex
lent book for a discussion, and leaves a
opportunity for learned and ingenious i
pretation.

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR TO A FRIEND IN THE FAR WEST.

LETTER II.

APPAHANNOCK, ESSEX, VA., Aug. 13, 1843.

Much Esteemed Friend:—In my former
tle I informed you of the extraordinary
ceedings of certain individuals, filled with
re zeal for the traditions of their Scribes,
knowledge of christian propriety, or of
requirements of civility and polished life.
sheet being filled, I had not room to in-
you of one or two incidents, which oc-
red, as striking illustrations of the intem-
ate conduct of the principal actors in that
ne of bigotry and intolerance, enacted in
edericksburg. I will mention them now.
hen the young gentleman's protestations
ainst my being permitted to use the meet-
-house were at fever heat, a voice pro-
ded from an individual, whether inside or
hout the house I know not, exclaiming,
will head a party to turn him out!" He
afterwards met in the foreyard by one,
, desiring to assure himself, inquired what
had said?—whereupon he repeated it, and
ded, in effect, as I am informed by an ear
ness, that "if Dr. Thomas preached in
house that evening he would have to
lk over his body;" upon which my friend
uired what he had to do with it, (for he had
excommunicated from the church):—
said he had to do with it, for he had $75
that meeting-house! Upon which A. B.,
effect, replied, that if that was his conclu-
in the case, he would have to walk over
body likewise, before a hair of my head
uld be endangered.

The other incident was an oracle delivered
m the lips of Mr. Parish to one who was
ting near him. As soon as it was ascer-
ined that I was present, he predicted to this
other, in expectation of an appointment be-
made for me to speak, that he would "*see*
fuss." He advised that nothing should be
id, but he was positive, and accordingly
rified his prophetic character by making "a
ss" "*for the peace of Zion;*" the details of
hich are already before you.

I remained in Fredericksburg until Fri-
y, 11th instant, a period of about twelve
ys. I enjoyed myself there very much in
the company of my excellent friends Ferneyhough, Johnston, Campbell, Timberlake, Pritchard, Wooster Bray, and others, whose names do not now readily recur to my recollection. Even my friend Walker, who summoned up "moral courage" enough, at the instance of the morally courageous Mr. Parish, to pronounce me "*not one of us*," and therefore ineligible to speak in their house, very politely invited me to come over and dine with them. I thanked him for his courteousness, and observed, that I should have pleasure in doing so, although he had cut me off as "not one of us!" I spent a very pleasant afternoon there, and really felt as much at home as though I were among my brethren and sisters in very deed; so great a charm does good breeding diffuse over the rough hewings of a fervid or misdirected zeal.

On Sunday week after my arrival, we assembled in the customary manner. Not desiring to give offence, I took my seat at a respectful distance from the table but the few dissentients were absentees upon this occasion, so that my precaution was unnecessary: of this, however, I was uninformed till our meeting was dissolved. We all seemed to harmonize or rather fraternize very well, as nothing occurred to disturb our tranquility, the fuss-makers having all voluntarily withdrawn. Though no appointment was made for me, when the congregation met in the evening, I was called upon to address them.

And here let me observe to you, that since my arrival in Eastern Virginia, I perceive a great readiness on the part of some of my opponents to convert any mistakes I may make, from whatever cause they may arise, into "a lie." There seems to be a feverish anxiety to affix some stigma to my character, by which I may be made odious to all who esteem reputation better than riches. I find, therefore, that it is necessary to be more punctiliously accurate in word and deed than all other men, except those who are my friends, and they are as marked as I myself. I have, therefore, submitted these letters to the perusal of those who were actors in the

scenes, that my communications to you may be corrected by their reminiscences; and as far as our recollections serve we hesitate not to say, that you are by these epistles put in possession of the facts in the case: and as far as I am concerned, I can assure you, that I have nothing extenuated, nor set down aught in malice!

On Friday morning, having bid a temporary adieu to our friends, a company of us took our departure from Sligo, the hospitable residence and well cultivated farm of our Brother Fernyhough, to La Grange, a very beautiful homestead belonging to Brother Winter Bray, in Essex county. The carriage being full, I mounted a horse, which proved to be one of the roughest travelers it had ever been my lot to ride. We journeyed 36 miles that day, much to the weariness of my jolted and pummeled frame. Much fatigued from heat and horsemanship, we arrived at Mr. Spindle's, in Essex, where we experienced a truly friendly Virginia welcome. Only think of a carriage load of unexpected visitors, with two out-riders, and their horses, in all four gentlemen and ladies, two servants, and four horses, coming in upon a family after sun down! Yet this is a common thing in Virginia, which is indeed famed, and just, by for its ungrudging hospitality. How great the contrast between the manners, customs, habits, and politeness of those, who give tone to the society of the South, and the parsimonious, picayune, and narrow-hearted developments of certain regions I could name. Here we have a degree of civilization and refinement, which makes the intercourse of life pleasant and agreeable; and were it not for certain considerations, I know of no country on this continent where I would sooner run out the current of my days, than

In the morning we proceeded on to La Grange. The country is interesting divers points of view. In the general sents the surface of what might have der a judicious system of cultivation fine country. The extensive growth field pines demonstrates the extent land butchery was carried by the old convivialists of former times; and the spots, "old fields" scantily clothed with sickly looking grass, and scarcely nubbing corn-fields, but too abundantly strate how faithfully their descendants trod in the footsteps of the evil practices their fathers. But there is hope for the out regions yet. Immense strata of rich in shells and animal matter, have discovered in great abundance. By application of this to the worn out their fertility may be restored. Several are presenting the good effects of the tem; and there can be no doubt but that days are in store for the agriculture old domain. Having taken some refreshment at La Grange, we departed, and ing at Brother E. Ferneyhough's, we ciled ourselves with him until the next for my own part, much gratified at got into quarters, independent of such as yesterday's. And as we have arrived the end of the week, we will, if you please bring this letter to a conclusion at this and for the present wish each other adieu.

That this may find you in good health undisturbed equanimity, and buoyant in of a glorious and honorable immortality leaves me, is the sincere and affectionate desire of yours,

JOHN THOM

THE "CHARLOTTESVILLE INTELLIGENCER."

A friend in Richmond, Va., has sent us the Charlottesville Intelligencer, No. 3. Friend Henley still continues his work of mis-construction and misrepresentation. We have looked over it; but find nothing in it of note. Yea verily; it is good advice them alone, for they are joined to This we will endeavor to do.—EDITOR.

DEBATE ON THE SALVATION OF INFANTS, IDIOTS, AND PAGANS,

BETWEEN "REV. A. CAMPBELL AND REV. N. L. RICE."

Selected from the Report of the Discussion held at Lexington Ky.

make the Word of God (the gospel) of none effect, through your traditions which ye have delivered.—Mark vii. 13.

Campbell.—Mr. President.—The proposition to be discussed to-day, is expressed in the following words:—"*In conversion and sanctification, the spirit of God operates on persons only through the Word.*" To sustain this he adduced seven arguments. In fourteen closely printed octavo pages, Mr. C. adduces the following mass of texts which are these:—"How shall they call upon him in whom they have not believed?" "How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard?"—"And how shall they hear without a preacher?"—"And how shall they preach unless they be sent?"—"The Living and Effectual word;"—"My Father worketh hitherto and I work"—"I and my Father are one;" "Whatsoever the Father doeth, the Son doeth likewise;" "Holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy spirit;" "By faith;" "Faith comes by hearing;" "Making the word of God of none effect by their traditions;" "Begotten of God;" "Incorruptible seed;" "Living Word;" "You are enriched by him in all knowledge, and in all utterance;" "No one can say that Jesus is Lord, but by the Holy spirit;" "The world by wisdom knew not God;" "By faith we know (understand) the worlds were framed by the Word of God;" "So that things now seen existing did not formerly exist;" "We speak spiritual things in spiritual words;" "it is God that teacheth man knowledge, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding;" and lastly, "The entrance of thy word giveth light; it giveth understanding to the simple."

The style and composition of the fourteen pages of philosophy through which these quotations were dispersed was considered beautiful. Our space will not permit us to do more than to quote the following:

"Faith is impossible without language, and consequently, without the knowledge of language, and that language understood. An infant cannot have faith; but it needs neither faith, nor regeneration, nor baptism. It was a figment of St. Augustine, adopted by Calvin, propogated in his Institutes, and adopted by his children."

"These infant regenerators are lame in both limbs: in the right limb of faith, and in the left limb of philosophy. They move on crutches, and broken crutches too. They have no philosophy of mind, or else they abandon it in all their theological embarrassments. They will have infants regenerated, and souls morally dead quickened by a direct impulse."

"My fourth argument is derived from another fact, to wit, *whatever is essential to regeneration in any case, is essential to it in all cases.* * * Now this being admitted, follows it not then, that neither the word of God, nor the gospel of Christ, neither preaching nor teaching, neither hearing nor believing, is necessary to regeneration, according to the doctrine of the Presbyterian Church? Inasmuch as that church believes and teaches that *infants and pagans are regenerated, in some cases, without any instumentality at all,* but by the direct, naked, and abstract influence of the Spirit of God operating immediately upon their souls." He then quoted the following from the creed:—"Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ through the spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how he pleases; so also are all other elect persons, who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word."

"Surely faith, and preaching, and the gospel ministry are all vain and useless in making man a new creature, if dying infants and untaught pagans may be regenerated by the Spirit alone. Nay indeed, if my position be true, that whatever is essential to regeneration in any case, is essential in all cases, then although we have three classes of subjects, to wit; elect infants, elect pagans, and elect gospel hearers, we have for them all one and the same species of regeneration." If regeneration is not regarded as another name for conversion and sanctification, but a previous work, then we would be enlightened on the

question, continues Mr. C., "how long the interval between regeneration and conversion, between regeneration and faith, and between regeneration and the dying infant's or pagan's exit? For if the interval should be such as to preclude the possibility of conversion and sanctification, we should have the startling fact promulged, that infants and pagans too, dying regenerate, enter heaven without being converted! Another curious question will certainly arise here. Of what use is infant baptism, according to such a theory of regeneration? For if elect infants are regenerated without knowledge, faith, repentance, or baptism, and if non-elect infants, though baptized, are not regenerated, why have such a war of words about a matter virtually worth nothing to the living or to the dead?"

Mr. Rice.—Mr. President.—"In this, as in his other introductory addresses, my friend, Mr. C., seems to have directed his efforts more to beauty of style and composition, than to the clear statement and defence of his faith. I venture the opinion, that no one individual in this large and intelligent audience, has been able to gather from the address he has just read to us, wherein we differ, or what is the point to be debated."

"The difference between us, so far as this subject is concerned, is, in general terms, this:—"Mr. Campbell contends, that in conversion and sanctification the spirit never operates without the truth, as the means of influencing the mind. I maintain that in *the case of those dying in infancy and idiocy, the Spirit operates without the truth.*"

"As God created man holy, so can he new create him. As he created Adam in his own image without words, so can he renew the infant mind, and prepare it for heaven, though it cannot receive the truth."

"*Mr. Campbell's doctrine necessarily involves the damnation of all infants and idiots.* I do not say, that he holds the doctrine of Infant Damnation; but I do say, that to be consistent, he must hold it—for it follows, as a necessary consequence, if his doctrine concerning divine influence is true."

"The gentleman is yet in trouble on the subject of infant baptism. He has brought it up again. If I understand his remarks correctly, he said, that *all infants*, baptized or not, *are saved.* Is he not aware, that no Presbyterian, Methodist, or evangelical Pedobaptist baptizes infants for the purpose of saving them from Hell, should they die in infancy? Many things in the plan of salvation we regard as useful, that are not absolutely essential to the saving of the soul."

"But to return. The gentleman's doctrine I have said, necessarily involves the damnation of infants and idiots. This is an important argument; for more than one-half of the human race die in infancy. Although I do not suppose that his views affect the safety of infants; still it is a point which very deeply interests the feelings of every affectionate parent. It would be difficult to induce them to believe, that infants, incapable of knowing right or wrong, are sent to hell.

"It is a truth, clearly taught in scripture and admitted by Mr. C., that infants and idiots are by nature depraved. Our Saviour said "that which is born of the flesh is flesh." By the natural birth all are depraved. This I say Mr. Campbell admits." Mr. Rice then read from the *Christian System* to prove it. He then proceeded.

"This system is indeed quite orthodox, and since this is the gentleman's second confession of faith, we may hope that his third will bring him nearly right! There is hope. He acknowledges "a sin of our nature, as well as personal transgression;" there is a "disease in the moral constitution of men;" and we are "greatly fallen and depraved in his whole moral constitution." Now the question arises, How are Infants, thus fallen and depraved, to be saved? The gentleman with singular inconsistency, denies any divine influence by which they can be sanctified, and still expresses the opinion, that they may be saved!

"Infant's, it is admitted, are depraved. Then, concerning all that die in infancy, one of three things is necessarily true, viz: either they go to hell, or they go to heaven *in their depravity;* or they are sanctified by the Spirit *without the truth.* But we know they cannot go to heaven in their depravity; we know that they cannot be sanctified *through the truth* which they cannot comprehend; but Mr. C. denies, that they can be sanctified *without the truth.* We are therefore, forced to the horrible conclusion, *if his doctrine be true*, that *they die in depravity and are forever lost!* With his *opinions* upon this subject we have nothing to do. They directly contradict his *doctrine*; and therefore the one or

the other is false. But here I will for the present close my argument."

Mr. Campbell.—"Mr. President—If there be any other moral or spiritual influence in the new creation of man, we call for the testimony and the definition of it. If the Spirit converts, sanctifies, and saves an infant without the word, the gospel of Christ—sanctification conversion, then, is independent of the Word; and seeing it is so, the Word ceases to be *the means* of grace and of conversion. The fact, that whatever is essential to one subject, whether animal, vegetable, intellectual, moral or spiritual, is essential to every other result of the same kind, will one day explode this mystic, unintelligible, unscriptural jargon, which makes void and of none effect the Word of the Living God."

Mr. Rice.—Mr. President—"The gentleman has at lenght, put forth his high decree, and Mr. Rice *must* follow him, or confess that he cannot. And it is now time for me to say to Mr. Campbell distinctly, that we have moderators, to whose decision, I shall cheerfully submit; but that Mr. Campbell *cannot moderate for me.* To his dictation I most assuredly will not submit.

"When infants are called from earth, because they can be sanctified through the truth, they are sanctified without it. Surely if God would feed the bodies of his people without the ordinary means, he would not refuse to the soul of an infant the bread of life.

Mr. Campbell.—"Infants and adults are sanctified holy by the same direct and positive act, the same specific miracle that made Adam holy"—by creation, when he thinks he made him "perfectly holy." "Avant then all secondary causes, all ministerial means, all Bible preaching and moral argumentations! God makes infants, adults and pagans holy, by the same means that he made Adam holy; that is by a miracle," this is positively affirmed; where is the "thus saith the Lord" for it?—a voice from Louisville.)

"Now I insist, that if one infant be regenerated, *without moral instrumentality*, all can. But Sir, in my humble opinion this metaphysical abstraction, this theological speculation, this electric, immedial operation, that makes an infant or apagan holy in a moment, has been the most soul ruining dogma ever invented, preached or propagated. It has slain its tens of thousands. It has made skeptics, fanatics, despondents, and visionaries without number, and without limit.

"These elect infants, elect pagans, elect idiots on whom God acts when, where, and how he pleases, but makes them *holy* in a moment, without light, knowledge, faith or love, are fragments of distempered brains, the creatures of religious romance, the offspring of a metaphysical delusion, for which there is no cure, but in the rational reading and study of the Book of God.

"Mr. Rice seems, if I understand him, to have drunk deep into these muddy waters, and to have adopted the fable of infant regeneration as a choice of evils. His dilemma is—*infants are saved or lost.* Not lost truly!—well then they are saved. With or without regeneration! Without regeneration is to him inadmissible, because then they would be saved in a state of wickedness. His theory is therefore, adopted to get rid of a metaphysical difficulty. It owes its origin to a mystic knot which he cannot untie, and which he dares not cut. The regeneration of these infants then, is not *moral* but *physical.* Well perhaps we may yet agree in their *physical regeneration.* I *believe* those dying infants, and with me they are all elect, *are fitted for heaven by a physical regeneration*, of which we shall hereafter speak." Mr. C. then repudiated in toto infant moral regeneration "as a mere phantasy, an idol, or chimera of the brain, and the whole doctrine growing out of it a miserable delusion."

"But now, with regard to our physical regeneration of infants, my faith is in the Lamb of God, who hath taken away the sin of the world,"—(*ho airoon*, taking away, or who taketh away, *not* "hath taken," as Mr. C. quotes it.) The atonement of Messiah has made it compatible with God, with the honor of his throne and government, to save all those infants who die in Adam. He has made an ample provision for extending salvation from all the consequences of Adam's sin to whomsoever he will. Ever blessed be his adorable name. The Lamb of God *has borne away* the sin of *the world.*" (Preposterous for a man with his eyes open to affirm this!—a voice from Louisville.) "Infants then, need that same kind of regeneration that Paul, and Peter, James and John, and and all saints need—the entire destruction of this body of sin and death. The most perfect Christian that I have seen, needs a regenera-

tion to fit him for the immediate presence of God. The infant that falls asleep in its mother's bosom, and after a few short days breathes out its spirit gently there, needs no more change to fit it for Abraham's bosom, than that which the spirit of God will effect in the resurrection of the dead, or in the transformation of the living saints at the time of his coming. Philosophy, reason, and faith, are alike silent on the subject of any infant regeneration before death. It is all theory—idle, empty, suicidal theory. Experience lifts her ten thousand voices against it. Who ever saw a child regenerated, growing up from birth a pure and exemplary christian? Persons have been sanctified, that is, set apart to the Lord from their birth; but that any one was in our sense of regeneration, changed in heart from birth, reason, revelation, experience, observation, depose not; on this subject they are all as silent as death. While then, I *believe* (where is the testimony?) in the physical regeneration of infants after death, I repudiate their spiritual or moral regeneration in life, because unscriptural, irrational, and absurd."

Mr. Rice.—Mr. President.—"Mr. Campbell asks, how can an infant be born of God, before it has any knowledge of God? There can be no disposition, he says, where there is no knowledge. I thought he had repudiated metaphysics; but really, he appears to rely upon his speculations more than upon the Bible. But his philosophy is most unphilosophical and unscriptural.

"But he is not willing to give up the salvation of infants; and he complains of me, for urging the argument against his doctrine, that it necessarily involves the damnation of infants. He does not find fault with me for maintaining that they are depraved; for, although he now denies that there can be moral disposition where there is no knowledge, he admits and teaches, that infants are by nature depraved! that they have a proneness, a disposition to sin!! This being admitted, my argument against his doctrine is most certainly legitimate and conclusive. It is what [illegible] call the *reductio ad absurdum*, that it leads necessarily to results [illegible] admits to be false and absurd. I was surprised, that he thought it necessary to appeal to the Moderators, to protect him against the force of this argument.

"He attempts, however, to escape the difficulty by saying, that nothing more than the atonement of Christ is necessary to salvation of infants. Does the blood of Christ purify the *heart?* The atonement secures remission of sins; but does the Bible say that it takes away depravity? Why this idea is absurd. There is not a word in the Bible to countenance such a notion. The difficulty still remains. Infants, as the gentleman admits, are depraved. How then shall they be sanctified and prepared for the enjoyment of a holy heaven? They cannot be sanctified through the truth; and he asserts, that they cannot be sanctified without it; therefore, *they must die in sin, and be for ever lost!* Such are the results to which this doctrine necessarily leads, whether the gentleman, consistently, to carry it out or not.

"There is nothing in the Bible, he says, that favors the idea of infant regeneration. He takes care, however, not to reply to the argument founded on John iii. 6, "for that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit." Infants are born of the flesh; and therefore, they must be born of the spirit; and if not born of the spirit, they cannot enter the kingdom of God—they must be lost. They cannot go to Heaven in their depravity.

"But, says the gentleman, adult believers must, at death, undergo as great a change in order to enter Heaven, as infants need to experience. For this assertion he can find no authority in the Bible; and it is vain for him, on a subject such as we are now discussing, to give us either his opinions or his assertions. *Death will produce on the mind no such change*, such as infants must experience before they can enter Heaven."

(*To be Continued.*)

THE WORLD'S AGE.

(*Concluded from page 27.*)

The exception, which constitutes the second anachronism, is that in which Mr. Miller assigns twenty-five years for the captain-generalship of Joshua. This calculation is based upon facts in the life of Caleb, and the single fact that Joshua died when 110 years old. "Forty years old was I," says Caleb, "when Moses sent me from Kadesh-Barnea to espy out the land; • • • and now, behold, the Lord hath kept me alive, as he said, these *forty-five years*; • • • and now, lo, I am this day *four score and five* years old;" and in chapter xxiv. 29: "Joshua died, being 110 years old." Now these are all the premises that appear to have been before Mr. Miller in the case; no wonder then, that he should be reduced to the necessity of guessing: for no one could tell for certain how old Joshua was when Caleb was forty years old, because Caleb declares this of himself. Joshua might have been either older or younger than Caleb; but of this the record says nothing. Because in Exodus xxxiii. 11, he is styled "a young man," Mr. M. thinks "Joshua could not have been more than 45 years old then; and 85 when he entered Canaan." But I shall not pretend to fix the age of Joshua. He was certainly 40 years in the wilderness, and he lived till he was 110; he may have been 85, or 90 more probably, when he entered Canaan. But our anxiety is not so much to know the precise duration of his administration, as the interval between the 430 years and the period of the Judges. But to ascertain this, we must examine the "*doubtful*" passage in 1 Kings vi. 4.

Turn, then, reader, to this passage, which you will find to read thus: "*And it came to pass in the 480th year, after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt, in the fourth year of Solomon's reign over Israel, in the month Zif, which is the second month, that he began to build the temple of the Lord.*" Now Mr. Miller and Mr. Himes regard this "at least doubtful;" first, because according to Mr. Miller's computation, it was 621 years from the fourth of Solomon's reign to the Exodus from Egypt; and secondly, because Jahn, in his Hebrew Commonwealth, "shows it to be so, as it now reads." But let our respected contemporaries reconsider the text, and I think they will find with me, that there is no need of doubt at all, as to the accuracy of it, as it now stands.

In the first place, they regard it as doubtful upon the assumption, that the historiographer calculated the 480 years from the Exodus from Egypt. This does not appear from the text. He says "480th year after the children of Israel *were come out*," and not 480th year from their coming out of Egypt. But query here: *how long were they come out of Egypt before the 480 years commenced?* The sacred writer has already informed us, in Joshua, that they "were come out of Egypt" *forty years* before they entered Canaan. It would have been a superfluous calculation, an unnecessary "*lapping* of periods," as Mr. Himes would say, to have computed again from the Egyptian Exodus. It would have been like Mr. Miller saying 205 years to the death of Terah, and 635 years from the birth of Terah to the Exodus of Egypt. Mr. Miller would not express himself thus; on the contrary, he would follow the example of Solomon's Historiographer, as he has done in fact, and say to the death of Terah 205, and to the Exodus 430 years.

I proceed in the next place, to observe that the Chronographer in Kings has accurately recorded the time. Now, I understand the indication of the time in the text, thus: First, he affirms that there was a period of 480 years after the Exodus, but he does not say when they began, nor when they terminated; if he had said "and it came to pass from the departure from Egypt to the fourth year of Solomon, which was the 480th year," there would have been no room for difference of opinion; but he does not do this. Secondly, he indicates another epoch, namely, *the fourth year of Solomon;* but how long a time elapsed between the end of 480 years and the fourth year, he does not say in this place. The truth is, he does not calculate the period from the *first* of Saul to the *fourth* of Solomon any more than he does from the departure out of Egypt to the invasion of Canaan, which was

40 years. This appears to be the Chronographer's style, to wit: *a calculation by periods*, thus:

First period, from the 14th day of the first month Abib, to the passage of the Jordan, which covers the sojourning in the *yrs*· Wilderness,	40
Second period, from the passage of the Jordan to the first year of the Kings,	480
Third period, from the first year of Saul to the fourth of Solomon,	84
Whole number of years from the beginning of Israel's calendar to fourth of Solomon, the first year of the building of the Temple,	604

Thus then, from the passage as it stands, we have first the "480 years;" then the "*were come out*;" and lastly, "*the fourth year of Solomon's reign*;" which serve as the basis of the computation of the time of the building of the House of the Lord. But, there is less difficulty in the Hebrew text than in the King's version. Thus it reads: *u iei* (the Vau converts the future into the past tense)—and it was—*b*—in—*shmunim*—eighty—*shne*—year—*u*—and—*arbo*—four—*mauth shne*—hundred year—*l*—after—*tzaath*—the coming out of—*bni*—the children of—*Ishral*—Israel—*m*—from—*artz*—the land of—*mtzrim*—Egypt; *it was in eighty years and four hundred years after the coming out of the children of Israel from the land of Egypt.* This is the middle period of the computation. The end of the last period is then given. He goes on to say, *and it was* (understood) "*in the fourth year*," &c., in the 84th of the Kings of Israel, the Temple began to be built.

But, in the computation of the 480 years, we have to correct some of Mr. Miller's numbers in his estimate of the continuance of the Republican Government of Israel, which preceeded the Kingly. He has appropriated 18 years to "*Elders and Anarchy*," on the authority of Josephus. I would observe, that Josephus is no authority in the case before us. I would as soon take Mr. Miller's own opinion upon this interval as Josephus'; this affair of the World's Age is a *quod erat demonstrandum* business, which must be established by Bible facts and data. The discourse in Judges to chapter iii. 8, appears to be *principally* recapitulatory and prefaratory to the subsequent history; (compare Joshua xv. 14, with Judges i. 12; and Joshua xxiv. 29, with Judges ii. 9;) and would seem to be collateral w
conclusion of the book of Joshua. I co
therefore, that the history contained
Joshua down to Judges iii. 8, is comp
sive of 30 years; and that the eight y
verse eight, are the last eight of the 3
elapsing between the passage of the J
and the first year of the 40, during wh
land had rest, in consequence of the
of Othniel, Caleb's younger brother,
Chusan-rishathaim.

The next error which appears in Mr
computation of the Judges is in the 24
of Samuel. In the first place, 24 years
appear to be enough from the death of
the first year of Saul, which covers t
ministration of Samuel and his sons.
20 years and 7 months from the death
to the time when Samuel judged Isra
Mizpah. From this event "Samuel ju
Israel all the days of his life," and dur
part of his administration, in conjun
with his sons, 1 Samuel vii. 15, 17.
Samuel lived almost to the end of S
reign; it is manifest therefore, that the
ship of the Republic did not end with th
stitution of Kingly authority, for Saul
Samuel shared in the government, in a
lar relation to that of the President and
ciary of the Supreme Court of the Un
States. It appears then, from the events
sequent to the convention at Mizpah,
seven years and five months is short
enough to allot to the period between this
the anointing of Saul. This will give
years from the death of Eli to the first yea
Kingly government.

But Mr. Miller casts the Judgeship of Sa
uel and his sons out of his computation of t
times of the Republic of Israel. He d
this from what I conceive to be an errone
construction of Acts xiii. 21, where Luke
ports Paul's speech before the Synagogue
Antioch, in Pisidia. Thus he says, "*He g
unto them Judges about the space of* 450 *y
until Samuel the Prophet.*" From this Mr.
supposes that the 450 years ended at the
ginning of Samuel's administration; and co
sequently, that the time of Samuel's Judg
ship must be added to the 450 years. But
do not understand it so. In his speech, Pa
chronologizes the *periods* of Jewish histor
His first period is *forty years* from the
Egyptian Exodus; his *second*, the period

quest and division of the land of Canaan; his *third*, the time of the Judges; and his *fourth period*, the time of the Kings. To the second, he allots no time; to the third, 450 years; and of the fourth, he names only the reign of Saul, and the exaltation of David in his place. But when he says, "*until* Samuel the prophet," he manifestly means "until Samuel the prophet," *inclusive*; for Samuel was as much a Judge as any who preceded him, and, if Paul did not include him, then he has left an hiatus in his chronology between Eli and Saul. The 450 years, then, of the Judges begins with the first of Othniel, the younger brother of Caleb, and ends with the anointing of Saul, the son of Kish. The following is the distribution of the years:

Othniel,	40
Eglon,	18
Ehud, Shamgar,	80
Subjection to Jabin,	20
Barak,	40
Subjection to Midianites,	7
Gideon,	40
Abimelech,	3
Tola,	23
Jair,	22
Subjection to Philistines,	18
Jepthah,	6
Ibzan,	7
Elon,	10
Abdon,	8
Philistines,	40
Eli,	40
Samuel,	28
Continuance of the Judges,	450

Having ascertained precisely the commencement of the 450 years of the Judges, we are at no loss to determine the duration of the period of the conquest, and allotment of Canaan among the tribes of Israel, &c. It was 450 from the first year of Saul to the commencement of Othniel's administration, or rather victory over Chushan, for, after the deliverance, the land had rest for forty years; there remains then, to the coming out of the Wilderness, 30 years, which, added to the 450, make the 480 years of 1 Kings vi. 4.

With these errata of the scheme of our worthy chronographer, Mr. Miller, the account of the World's Age will stand according to the arrangement of the following table:

From the Creation to the 600th year of of Noah,	1656
From the Flood to the promise made to Abraham, 430 years before the giving of the Law of Moses, and in the year of Terah's life 155,	378
From the confirmation of the promise of Eternal Life to the institution of the Passover, coeval with the Exode,	430
Sojourn in the Wilderness,	40
Subjugation of Canaan, &c., &c.,	30
Times of the Judges,	450
Times of the Kings from the anointing of Saul to the captivity,	510
Babylonish captivity,	70
From end of captivity to 7th year of Artaxerxes,	70
To the birth of Jesus Christ,	456
World's Age at Birth of Christ,	4090
From this epoch to present time,	1844
Age of the World,	5934

Thus, after a very careful examination of the Scriptures, we have reduced its data to a demonstration of the true age of the world. If any of our contemporaries can present a more correct computation, we shall feel ourselves under equal obligations to him with the rest of the public. We have devoted more attention to Mr. Miller's Chronology than we shall, perhaps, to any other writer on the subject, because he has entered largely into prophetic calculations, (some of which, hereafter, I shall have to point out the inaccuracy of,) and he has candidly avowed, through Mr. J. V. Himes, that the fact of the world not having attained to the age of 6000 years, would be an argument against his view of the prophetic periods. We would remark, however, that there is nothing in the Bible demonstrative of the proposition, that the 1335 days of Daniel are to terminate either with "the 2300 days," or with the year of the world 6000. It is a plausible theory, and may be true, that, as the animal world was six days in its fabrication; and as the Aleim rested on the seventh day, and that as "a day with the Lord is as a 1000 years, and 1000 years as one day," therefore, the development of the spiritual economy will occupy 6000 years, and that the last thousand of the whole period of seven will be the Millenial Sabbatism of the World. It may be the fact—I will neither affirm nor deny it. It would greatly facilitate our computation of the prophetic periods,

if we could know it. I do not think that the most rigid scrutiny can vary my computation of the world's age 20 years. I wish it could be *proved* that the world is older than I have made it. I will furnish any one with the Herald as long as published, without c... who can demonstrate that the world is ... years old now, or within the next 45 ... Who will try?

Edit...

THE TWO VISIONS.

(*Continued from page* 31.)

For in the 483d year Messiah did not make his appearance, but was only at hand to come. It was three years after, that he was "manifested to Israel," and seven full years before he was cut off; and lastly, the Place of the Daily Sanctuary was not cast down till 44 years had elapsed from the end of the 62 weeks. So that, as we have said, the 483 years to Messiah, the Prince, must be understood as extending to the "*one week*," during which the confirmation was to be displayed.

We have in these things appropriate illustrations of the use of the word "*after*" in prophecy; and we might add, of "*then*," "*afterwards*," and so forth. In verse 14 chap viii. "*then*" follows the same rule. It does not mean that the Holy, or Sanctuary, should be cleansed in the 2300th or 2301st year; but that the cleansing of the Holy should succeed the expiration of the 2300 days. In Matt. xxiv. 30, "*then*" is used after the same manner, indicating simply *order of events*, and not the precise time. Thus, in verse 27, "*immediately after*" denotes that as soon as "the City and Sanctuary" were cast down, "the truth," or Law, by which the sun, moon, stars, and powers "of the Jewish "heavens," or government were constituted, should also "be cast down to the ground." But the phrase, "and *then* shall appear," &c. does not signify that *immediately after* the destruction of THE STATE should be seen "the sign of the Son of Man in heaven;" but at the time when "the King of the North," "Gog, of the land of Magog, even Rossi, prince of Meshech and Tubal," "shall plant the tabernacles of his palace, (or tents of his camp) between the seas in the goodly mountain of delight of holiness." Dan. xi. 45, when "Michael, the great Prince, shall stand up for the children (posterity) of Daniel's people," *then* shall "the sign of the Son of Man appear." "And then shall all ... Tribes of the Land (of Israel) mourn," ... they shall "look upon Him whom they ... pierced;" (Zech. xii. 10—14;) "in a ti... trouble such as never was since there ... nation to that same time." Dan. xii. 1. ... that between the "*immediately after*" an... two "*thens*" of Matt. xxiv. 29, 30, other... sages show that there is an interval of ... centuries of years.

The last week of the Seventy is the ... of the confirmation of the New Cove... which God, by the mouth of Jeremiah, de... ed he would "make with the House of I... and with the House of Judah." But the ... verse of Daniel ix. is susceptible of a re... ing which will make it more intelligible, ... "And he shall confirm the Purifier be... multitudes for one week; and in a half ... of the week he shall cause the sacrifice ... offering to cease; and unto the extremity ... the land) abominations which cause to be ... solate (shall prevail) even until the end, ... (until) that which has been determined ... be poured out upon the desolator."

The translation, "confirm the Purifier, ... sustained by the use of the word Berith, ... Isaiah xlii. 6, thus: "I will give thee f... Berith—Purifier, or covenant for the pe... (Israel,) for a light of the Gentiles; to ... the blind eyes," &c.; and again in chap. ... 8: "I will give thee for a Covenant—Be... —of the People, to raise up the Land, to c... to inherit the desolate heritages," &c. ... Purifier, or purification sacrifice, as Be... also signifies, was attested by the Father ... fore multitudes of the people, when he "se... the Prophet," or set a mark upon Jesus in ... descending of the Dove upon him at his ... ointing as the Most Holy;" as well as by ... miracles he enabled him to perform.

It was in the latter half part of the week ... Jehovah caused "*the sacrifice and offering ... cease*;" not by taking away the Daily, but ... abolishing their acceptability by "bring... in a reconciliation for iniquity, and an ... erlasting righteousness," by the death and ... surrection of Messiah the Prince, whose ... sacrifice of himself in the end of the world," ... Jewish Age, rendered, "any more offering ... sin unnecessary."

Thus in the month Nisan, of the year of our ... rd, 34, the first Seventy Weeks of the 2300 ... ys, or 490 years, were accomplished. Fifty ... ys after, the Word of Reconciliation was ... oclaimed, offering a perfect and complete ... mission of sins to all who would accept it, ... dependent of "the sacrifice and oblation" ... the Law. "This Gospel of the Kingdom ... as not only announced to Israel, but in "*all ... world*," or dominion of the Little Horn, "*for a witness unto all nations;*" and then the ... of the world, or age, came—Matt. xxiv; ... This consummation took place 37 years ... er the proclamation of the gospel; when ... e Little Horn, or "*Abomination of Desola... om, spoken of by Daniel the Prophet, stood in ... Holy Place*," or Sanctuary, A. D. 70; and ... ok away the Daily, and abolished the Jew... State: and from that time until the pres... nt, desolations have pervaded the Land, and ... ill continue so to do until "*that which has ... en determined shall be poured out upon the ... solator.*"

The Little Horn, in the Vision of the East, ... presents the Roman power, which first es... blished itself beyond Mount Taurus, in the ... minions of the King of the North, or Syria. ... llin, and after him, all Romanists and ma... y Protestants, consider Antiochus Epiphanes ... the Little Horn. But this needs only to be ... amed to be instantly repudiated by all who ... not themselves, or the ecclesiastical or... nizations to which they belong, make a ... rt thereof; for there was a period when the ... ittle Horn was Catholic in this Vision, as ... ell as in the Vision of the West. But An... chus cannot be the Little Horn, because he ... as to tread the Sanctuary and the Host un... r foot, until the time should arrive for the ... ansing of the Sanctuary at the end of the ... 00 years. There is no power that will an... wer to the description of the Little Horn, but ... Roman. But we must not confine our ... derstanding of this symbol to Rome Pagan, ... even Catholic; this would be to leave an ... tus in the prophecy, which would completely insulate it from the Latter Days. No; the little Horn in the Vision of the East, represents *every form of Desolating Abomination which has possessed the Holy Land since the taking away of the Daily by the Romans.* The "*Little Horn*" and "*the Desolator*," though a different people, possess the same territory in the East, namely, the territory of the Eastern Roman Empire, and therefore entitled, in this case to be regarded as one and the same Horn.

From this view of the matter, we behold under the symbol of the Little Horn, which came up behind the Horn of the King of the North in this Vision, not one Abomination of Desolation only, but many. And this the original text would lead us to expect; for the phrase *shikutzim meshimem* is Abominations which cause to be desolate. Besides the Little Horn which cast down the Law to the ground, and has continued to tread the Holy under foot is to be "broken to pieces, without hand," which cannot be said of any Desolator, which has overspread the Land with his violence from A. D. 70 until now. The Desolating Horn, or Power, still treads Jerusalem under foot; and it is only necessary to ascertain what that Power is, to be convinced that the Little Horn, in the Vision af the East represents something more than Rome, Pagan or Catholic; after this I need hardly say that it includes the Ottoman as well.

A plurality of Abominations causing to be desolate exactly harmonizes with the history of the glorious and pleasant Land; and our interpretations ought to go hand in hand with history. I speak only of those Abominations which by conquest have obtained a right to the country. First, then, there was the Pago-Roman Abomination under Titus and Vespasian. This continued until it merged into the Greco Catholic constitution of the Eastern Limb of the Roman Empire. This Greco-Catholic Idolatry or Abomination trod the Sanctuary and Host under foot till A. D. 636, when the Saracens, under the Caliph Omar, wrested them from the Grecks. The Saracenic Abomination oppressed the Land, until the Crusaders established themselves in Jerusalem, A. D. 1099. This city was then declared the capital of a new kingdom, which extended from the confines of Egypt to the Euphrates on the East, and to the acclivities of Mount Taurus on the North; and several of their principalities lasted nearly 200 years. The Papal Kingdom of Jerusalem was destroyed

by Saladin, A. D. 1187. In the year 1290, Acre was the only city that remained to the Latins; in April, 1291, an immense army of Mamlouks issued from Egypt against the city, estimated at 200,000 men; they carried it by assault, and planted the crescent upon its walls, where it has continued ever since. Palestine after this event, remained subject to the Mameluke Sultans of Egypt, till the year 1382, when they were dispossessed by the Circassians. Upon the expulsion of these it reverted to the Mamelukes, who, except during the formidable irruption of Tamerlane, retained it until A. D. 1516, in which year Selim IX., Emperor of the Othman Turks, carried his victorious desolations from the Euphrates to the Lybian Desert, involving in one general subjugation all the intervening states. During 328 years has the Ottoman Abomination of Desolation exercised a dominion over the Land of Judea, varied only, or rather chiefly, by intervals of rebellion on the part of governors who wished to assert their independence, or by wars among the different pashas, who, in defiance of supreme authority, have from time to time quarrelled about the spoils of "the Land" which the Desolator divides for gain:" Dan. xi. 39.

The Land thus divided for gain is to continue prostrate "until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled," and "*that which has been decreed shall be poured out upon the Desolator.*"

The 2300 years of the Vision of the East elapse this year; and "*the hour, the day, the month, and the year*"—391 years 30 days—for which this Abomination was "prepared to slay the third part of men" expires precisely on the 29th of June, 1844. Seeing then we are arrived at this interesting crisis what more remains to be accomplished? We answer, THE CLEANSING OF THE SANCTUARY, in the manner indicated by the prophecy itself; namely, by "*pouring out upon the Desolator the things decreed,*" and shadowed forth from verse 40 of chapter xi. to verse 1, chapter xii. of Daniel's prophecy, and elsewhere.

About four years after Gabriel's second visit, when he explained to Daniel the things which were to happen during the first 490 years of the 2300, "*a thing or word was revealed to him*" by a man of a very extraordinary appearance. It was in the third year of Cyrus, king of Persia, which synchronizes with B. C. 534; and forms the subject of the tenth chapter of his prophecy; so that between the ninth and tenth chapters there interval of four years.

Daniel declares that the *daber*, or "w which was revealed to him was "*truth,*" (*tzaba*) *the warfare continued, and he stood the substance of the word, and had standing assuredly of the appearance;*" ch.

On the 24th day of Nisan, he beheld a who had the appearance of Messiah the P when he appeared to John in Patmos, midst of the Seven Candlesticks; Rev. i. 16; Dan. x. 5–6. The effect on Daniel John at the sight of this great personage similar. They both fell prostrate at his as dead. He touched them both with hand, and told them not to fear; whi John he said, "*I am the first and the las that liveth, and was dead; and behold, I am for ever more.*" To Daniel he said, ver "Now I am come to make thee under what shall befal thy people in the latter for the Vision (*chazun*) is still for days."

This, then, was the object the *Merae*, o pearance, had in view in coming to Dan this time; namely, to explain to him wha remained of the chazun over and abov 490 years, which would comprehend a p of 1810 years. I speak of the *Merae* and *Chazun*, because in chapter x. they are dered *Vision*, which is not precise enough calculated therefore to mislead. *Merae*, the root *Rae*, signifies an aspect, look countenance.

Chazun is a word of different deriva as from *chaze*, "to see, behold, i. e., to f fasten the eyes, either of the body or min an object. Hence, perhaps the English The Vision of the East is *chazun*, and it to reveal to Daniel an outline of "*the warfare*" which would prevail in the and by which Judea would suffer seve from the time of Xerxes "until that dec should be poured out upon the Desola that the Angel appeared under the simil of the Anointed King of Jehovah.

But it may be inquired, why is the ve revelation of the Vision of the East (by t in a special sense, I mean, without addit symbols) communicated to Daniel by the s ilitude? I would reply, because, in gi the prophet information of what shall b his countrymen in the latter days, the m festation of their Most Holy and glor King in all his power and great glory w necessarily be declared; therefore, Jeho designed to herald forth so magnificent a

mation, by a messenger under the simili- de of that very King, in the dazzling blaze light and burnished gold; that Daniel also, cause greatly beloved, might behold the rince of his People, who was to impart to m eternal glory, and to establish him "in is lot at the end of the days."

The tenth chapter is the exordium, as it ere, to the discourse (daber) contained in e eleventh and twelfth chapters. As the reat interest of this verbal revelation was herent in the things made known concern- g the latter days, it was necessary that the doni or Lord should commence his details ith a reference to one or two particulars nnected with the Medo-Persian Ram, *before* e Rough Goat with the notable horn came ainst him from the West. This, I say, was ecessary, in order to develope that concate- ation of leading events, which, as with a hain, connected the times of the Persian ings with the times of Merae, who should and up for the Host of Israel in "*the time of e end.*" Thus, by noting a fact, which had curred four years previous, he calls our at- ation to that epoch, as the period from which e Vision of the East is to be unfolded with- t the intervention of hieroglyphics, as in apter viii. This fact is thus expressed in apter xi. 1. "*Also I in the first year of Da us the Mede, even I stood to confirm and to engthen him.*"

There is something very peculiar in some the sayings of this tenth chapter, in con- ction with verse one of this. First, "*a and*" touched Daniel, the effect of which as as invigorating as the touch of Jesus, hen he healed the sick. The Merae (for I ow not a word better suited to the person- e of the appearance which addressed him) en informed him, that he had come to him cause of his words; "but," continued he, *the Prince of the Kingdom of Persia with- od me one and twenty days: but lo, Michael e first of the chief princes came to help me; and remained there with the Kings of Persia,*" erse 13. In the 20th verse the Merae, whom, the 17th and 19th verses, Daniel styles doni, says, "knowest thou wherefore I come nto thee? And now I will return *to fight ith the Prince of Persia;* and when I am ne forth, lo, the Prince of Grecia shall me. But I shall show thee that which *is* ed in the scripture of truth; and there is ne that holdeth with me in these things, but Michael, *your Prince:*" and then follows chapter x. 1, as already quoted.

From this it would seem, that Angel Princes, though unseen to mortal eyes, were placed at the head of the governments of the world, to direct their movements according to the declared will of God. There are certain Angelic Princes named, who appear to be opposed, or rather, to assume positions, which place the government over which they are appointed, in hostility with each other. In chapter x. 2, 3, Daniel says he was mourning and fasting during "*three whole weeks;*" and in verse 12, we learn that his words of mourning had relation to something which he desired to understand, but could not. This thing which he was so anxious to know was, *what should befal his nation in the latter days;* for, said the Merae, "I am come because of thy words, to make thee understand what shall befal thy people in the latter days," verse 12, 14. Daniel could not understand their destiny from the hieroglyphics of the Vision of the East; because it had been dismissed with the very general summary, that the Little Horn should practice and prosper; that he should stand up against the Prince of Princes; and that he should tread both the sanctuary and the host under foot for 2300 years; but, that the sanctuary should be cleansed after the expiration of those days, and the Little Horn of desolation shivered to pieces without hands These were very general declarations which could not satisfy Daniel as to the destiny of Israel at the time of these events; hence his perplexity, and chastening of himself before God, that he might be pleased to give him information upon the matter.

But the Angel of Jehovah was "three whole weeks" before he brought the answer to Daniel's supplication. His prayer was heard upon the third day of the month Nisan; but it was not until the twenty fourth that the Merae appeared; "Fear not," said he, "Daniel: for from the first day thy words were heard,"—12: but why were they not answered forthwith? Because the Prince of the Kingdom of Persia withstood him one and twenty days. And it would seem, that the answer might never have arrived, had not assistance been sent to him to enable him to overcome the obstacles thrown in his way by the Prince of the Kingdom of Persia: as it is written, "but lo, Michael, the first of the chief Princes, *came to help me.*" Now, from

what follows, it would appear that the Prince of the Kingdom of Persia was hostile to the Kings of Persia, and aimed at weakening their power; for after Michael had come to his aid, he remained at the court of Persia, and confirmed and strengthened them: for thus it is written, "*and I remained there with the Kings of Persia*," namely, Darius the Mede and Cyrus, who reigned conjointly in Babylon for two years. And what did he, while sojourning at the Court of Persia? The answer to this question is contained in chapter x. 1, "in the first year of Darius the Mede, I, even I, stood *to confirm and to strengthen him*."

It would appear, also, from this, that there were good and evil Angel Princes; and were I to give a reason why the Prince of Persia withstood the Merae from appearing to Daniel in the Kingdom of Persia, I should say, because he was opposed to the interests of the House of Israel, then in bondage at Babylon, and shortly after the Merae's visit, liberated from captivity by the proclamation of Cyrus, "whose spirit," Ezra declares, "the Lord (the Adoni or Merae) stirred up." How was Cyrus' spirit stirred up? By words delivered to him by some one; for he says in his proclamation, "thus saith Cyrus, King of Persia, the Lord God of Heaven *hath charged me* to build him a house at Jerusalem, which is in Judah,—chapter i. 2. After the visit of the Adoni to Daniel, he returned to fight with the hostile Prince of the Kingdom of Persia, who appears to have been beaten off; while he himself remained at Court, to superintend affairs, in relation to the Jews, especially to the things decreed concerning their restoration in the prophecy of the seventy weeks,—until the time should arrive when the Horns of the Ram should be broken by the Unicorn of the rough Goat. "Knowest thou wherefore I have come to thee, O Daniel? And now will I return to fight with the Prince of Persia; and when I am gone forth, lo, the Prince of Græcia shall come," verse 20.—Thus, the Kings of Persia were strengthened and established so long as this Angel Prince continued with them; but when he went forth, or abandoned them, they became weak, and lost their Kingdom, as in the reign of Darius Codomannus, whose power was broken by Alexander, the mortal leader (as was Joshua of the Prince of Israel) of the army of the Angel Prince of Græcia.

From other parts of the Scripture it would appear that the affairs of Israel were administered under the guidance of Angel Princes. Moses is styled "a ruler and deliverer *by the hand* of the Angel which appeared to him in the bush;" and again, "This Moses is he, who was in the congregation in the wilderness *with the Angel*, who spake to him in the Mount Sinai."—*Stephen's Speech*. And again it is written, "Behold, O Israel, I send an *Angel before thee*, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place, or country, I have prepared. Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgressions: for my name is in him. But if thou shalt indeed obey his voice, and do all that I speak, then I will be an enemy to thine enemies, and an adversary to thine adversaries. For mine Angel shall go before thee, and bring thee in unto the Amorites, and the Hittites, Canaanites, &c., Exodus xxiii. 20. Was not this Angel Prince of the House of Israel, Michael; concerning whom, Jude says, that he contended with Satan for the body of this same Moses? Indeed, in Daniel x. 21, this is plainly affirmed, where the Adoni Merae says to the Prophet, "and there is none that holdeth with me in these things but *Michael your Prince*." When Joshua was encamped by Jericho, the Prince of Israel stood over against him with a drawn sword in his hand. And Joshua said to him, Art thou for us, or for our adversaries? And he said, Nay; but as Captain of the Host of the Lord am I now come. And Joshua fell upon his face to the earth, and did homage, and said unto him, What saith my Lord unto his servant? And the Captain of the Lord's Host said unto Joshua, Loose thy shoe from off thy foot; for the place whereon thou standest is holy. And Joshua did so;" chapter v. 13. Thus they "minister to them who shall be the inheritors of salvation;" beholding always the face of our Father in Heaven.

"Unto the Angels," saith Paul, "he hath not put in subjection the world to come;" as it appears he had subjected the Economy constituted by the Law. No; he hath subjected it to Him, who was made a little lower than the Angels, even to Jesus, who, for the suffering of death, was crowned with glory and honor; and has now become the Prince, "the first of the chief (Angel) Princes," the true Michael, who is, as the Adoni Merae, to stand up for his people Israel. To Him and to the saints, become the Peers of Angel Princes, having been accounted worthy to attain to the resurrection of the just; to these, and not to Angels, has the Great God subjected the Nations of the Future Age.

Angels still minister in human affairs, under the direction of Messiah, the "Prince of princes," to whom are subjected all principalities and powers; all authority in Heaven and earth being surrendered into his hands. But our plan will not permit us to pursue these thoughts further; I will, therefore, recall your attention to the eleventh chapter of Daniel.

To be Continued.

DEBATE ON THE SALVATION OF INFANTS, IDIOTS, AND PAGANS,

BETWEEN "REV. A. CAMPBELL AND REV. N. L. RICE."

Selected from the Report of the Discussion held at Lexington, Ky.

"*Ye make the Word of God (the gospel) of none effect, through your traditions which ye have delivered.*—Mark vii. 13.

Mr. Campbell.—Mr. President:—Mr. Rice says that "my doctrine leads to infant damnation." That is, if the Spirit operates only through the Word, then infants cannot be saved, because they cannot understand, or believe the Word. Now, if his views of faith and spiritual influence were correct, then the objection would lie against my affirmation, "only through the Word." But his views, being erroneous on these points, the objection is idle and impotent. These words, "infant damnation," are ugly words; and they come not so consistently from one who believes and teaches the confession. His creed divides infants into two classes—the *elect* and the "*non-elect*." Of course, then, infant damnation is inevitable, if the confession be true. Now, if we were to proportion the number of "*elect infants*" by the number of elect men, according to appearances, there would be a hundred non-elect for one. And yet this gentleman upbraids my doctrine as objectionable, because it might perchance involve the possibility of infant damnation, when his own confession consigns an awful overwhelming majority of all infants to eternal perdition.—Think not that I exaggerate the relative proportions. Look at the whole world! Pagans of all casts; Greek and Roman parties; Jews, Turks, Atheists," (query, Materialists?) "and all the reprobate Protestants! What disproportion between the good and bad! It is as one to the hundred!

"There is nothing more repulsive to the human mind than the doctrine of infant damnation. It was the first item of Calvinistic faith at which my infant soul revolted. I still remember my boyish reasons on that tenet of elect and non-elect infants. I dared not to say that it was absolutely false, seeing my creed and my ancestors recognized it. But, thought I, can it be true? How can it be true? An infant is born, yet could not help it—it opened its eyes but once, and shut them forever, and went to everlasting anguish!!! That millions should be forced into existence, and forced out of it in a day, a month, a year, or some six or seven, and go down to everlasting agonies! My soul sickened at the thought! and yet I had lived full fourteen years before I presumed to utter to any mortal what my heart felt. I thank God, that this doctrine of reprobate infants is not found any where" (nor saved infants either—*Voice from Louisville*) but in the creeds; and there they are found only in a minced form, by implication, in the words, "elect infants."

Mr. Rice.—Mr. President:—"I am truly gratified that the gentleman has brought forward the charge against us, of holding the doctrine of the damnation of infants; because it is believed by many who are unacquainted with our views. He says, our confession of faith teaches this doctrine. This is not true. It is true that it speaks of elect infants: "Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regene-

rated and saved by Christ, through the Spirit." Are all infants, dying in infancy, elect? All Presbyterians, who express an opinion on the subject, so believe. The expression, "elect infants," the gentleman seems to think, implies non-elect infants; but I call on him to produce one respectable Presbyterian author, who ever interpreted the confession of faith as he has done. I never heard a Presbyterian minister, nor read a Presbyterian author who expressed the opinion, that infants dying in infancy are lost. Mr. Campbell boasts of his familiarity with the doctrines of our church. He, then, is the very man to make good this oft repeated charge. I call for the proof.

"So far as I know the sentiments of Presbyterians, on this subject, they believe that all that die in infancy are of the elect, *are chosen of God to eternal life*, and are sanctified by the Holy Spirit, and saved according to his eternal purpose. Infants do not die by accident. He, whose providence extends to the falling of a sparrow, takes care of every human being; and we believe that his purpose is to save those whom he calls from time before they are capable of knowing the truth.

"But the gentleman has made the charge, that the Presbyterian church holds the doctrine of the damnation of infants; and now I demand the proof. What proportion of the human family are chosen to Eternal Life, our confession of faith does not profess to determine. The calculations of Mr. C., therefore, is an affair of his own, for which we are not responsible. The very worst that any candid man can say of our confession, so far as this subject is concerned, is, that it does not profess to determine whether all infants are saved. It gives not the least intimation that any are lost.

"But the gentleman tells us that when quite young, his mind was shocked at this doctrine. Is it not then, most marvellous, that whilst his mind revolted at the imagined doctrine that *some* infants may be lost, he should have embraced a doctrine that makes it utterly impossible that any of those dying in infancy can be saved? It was certainly a most singular effect of his early dislike of what he imagined to be the doctrine of our church!

Mr. Campbell.—Mr. President:—I would inquire "whence came this new designation, 'elect infants?" It is not elect persons, nor elect men, but elect *infants*. There certainly were non-elect infants—not only non-elect men, but non-elect *infants*. Who taught the language? The creed, and not the Bible. But we have been just now informed, by a revelation made from the upper world, through Mr. Rice, that all infants that die are 'elect infants.' If we had only a miracle we might believe in this new revelation. But what comes of the non-elect infants? They become non-elect men. Why then call them non-elect infants, as none of that kind can die. All non-elect infants are immortal infants. As infants they cannot die!! It is only about a year ago that this new revelation of elect infants, being all dying infants, first reached my ears. The Scotch Presbyterians never have been favored with this new revelation. I must again read this remarkable passage:

"3. Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ, through the Spirit, who worketh when, and where, and how he pleaseth. So also are all other elect persons," (idiots and pagans,) "who are incapable of being outwardly called by the ministry of the word."

"The Westminster Divines must have got into Mr. Rice's dilemma, when they conceived this doctrine. They supposed but three conditions of the question. Infants dying were lost, or infants dying were saved, and if saved, they must be regenerated, because none can enter Heaven but regenerated persons. They assumed the last, and made the doctrine to escape from the folly of the assumption! There are, then, three classes of elect persons, to be regenerated by the Spirit without the word. These are elect infants, elect pagans, and elect idiots. Of four classes of mankind, but one was regenerated by the word. My friend will have three subjects of physical regeneration for my one.—Will the gentleman say, that all these elect pagans are, like infants, in a state of irresponsibility? And, if they are not, in what consists the parallelism? I heard of a lady who drank pretty deep into this new revelation. She became a monomaniac. She had a small family of infant children; and weary of the world herself, she thought it was best to make her own mind easy about her offspring, and to make their happiness secure. She accordingly rose up in the night and strangled them all. She gave this, on trial, as the only reason of her conduct. Of course she was sent to the Lunatic Asylum.

"I regret that my friend, Mr. Rice, could

find so much time to discuss this matter, rather than the question. I shall dismiss it with a single remark, viz: that it is but a flimsy and superficial covering for a very incredible and unchristian dogma. I would then advise its being expunged from the book altogether. Because, among other reasons, it had been more rational to make the non-elect infants die; for then there would have been much more mercy than in this scheme. The elect would have lost nothing by living seventy years, but rather gained much by their good works; and the non-elect would have gained much too, in having no punishment to endure for actual transgressions; their only cause of regret would then be, merely that they had been born. Thus dispose we of this branch of the philosophy of infant regeneration *without* the Word."

Mr. Rice rises.—Mr. President:—"I proved that the gentleman's doctrine necessarily involves the damnation of infants, because they are depraved, and he denies that they can be sanctified without the truth. I then understood him to say, that depravity is in the body, and therefore, their souls might be saved. But now he has got the depravity back into the soul, and is involved in the old difficulty. The minds of infants, he admits, are depraved. How then, can they be sanctified? Certainly not through the truth, and he denies that they can be sanctified by the Spirit, without the truth. Consequently, according to his doctrine, they die in their depravity and are lost! There is no escape from the difficulty.

"Does the Bible say, the Spirit operates *only* through the truth? It does not. But it does plainly teach, that infants must be regenerated, or born again. "For," said our Saviour, "that which is born of the flesh, is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit, is Spirit." This is the reason why the new birth is absolutely necessary. But infants are born of the flesh; therefore, they must be born of the Spirit. They cannot be regenerated through the truth; consequently they must be regenerated without it. This passage, therefore, teaches clearly the doctrine that regeneration may be, and is effected by the Spirit without the truth.

"When Mr. Campbell charges our church with holding the doctrine of infant damnation, we have the right to expect him to produce at least one Presbyterian author who has taught it. I have challenged him to produce even one, and he has not done it; nor has he been able to prove that it is countenanced by our confession of faith. I deny that our church holds the doctrine. He has made the charge, and *once more I demand the proof*. I had supposed him to be a man of so much experience in public discussions, that he would be prepared at once, when he stated facts, to prove them. But it is not so. Very far otherwise.

"The gentleman has repeatedly contradicted himself since this subject has been before us. He told us that nothing more is necessary to secure the salvation of infants, than the atonement of Christ. I replied that the atonement cannot change the heart. On yesterday he told us that depravity was seated in the body, not in the mind, and therefore, infants need no change to fit them for Heaven, but the separation of the soul from the body.—Now he seems to have it in the mind. So he is still involved in the old difficulty, and has left infants and idicts without the possibility of being saved!

Mr. Campbell rises.—Mr. President, "all infants that die are elect infants! A happy conception truly! But a fair construction of the confession will not authorize it. I first heard the gloss last year. But neither the founders of Calvinism on the continent, nor the Westminster divines so understood this matter, as my reading and recollection fully justify. I shall read a few passages on this subject, and first one from Calvin's Institutes. I wonder not that Calvin, to quote his own words, calls it, Decretum quidem horribile, fateor; which Professor Norton renders as follows: "I ask again how it has come to pass, that the fall of Adam has involved so many nations with their infant children in eternal death, and this without remedy, but because such was the will of God? It is a dreadful decree, I confess."

"But Calvin, besides this passage quoted from his Institutes, (lib. 3, c. 23 § 7.) in speaking of the errors of Servetus, says: "In the mean time, certain salvation is said (by Servetus) to await all at the final judgment, except those who have brought upon themselves the punishment of Eternal Death, by their personal sins: (*propriis sceleribus*,) from which it is also inferred that all who are taken from life while *infants and young children* are exempt from Eternal Death, although they are else-

where called accursed," Trac. Theo. Refut. Error Mich. Serveti. This was one of Servetus' errors, according to Calvin. Servetus, (like Mr. Campbell) would have all infants saved that died; but Calvin thought this a great error, because there were of these same infants called accursed. Augustine, in condemning the doctrine of Pelagius, says: "We affirm that they (infants) will not be saved, and have Eternal Life, except they be baptized in Christ;" and much more to the same effect.

Turretin, the chief of Calvinistic writers, teaches the same doctrine in the clearest manner. He is of high authority at Princeton, and has stood on my shelf for more than thirty years. He says:

"The Remonstrants, in their apology, pronounced certain that God will appoint, and that he, on account of *original sin*, with justice can appoint *no eternal torments to infants*, of whatever lot or descent, dying without actual or personal sins; holding that their opinion, viz: that any infants will be appointed to *eternal torments* is opposed to the Divine goodness and right reason; nay, that it is uncertain whether the preponderance is in favor of the absurdity or its cruelty."

"Here, then, is an explicit declaration from a Calvinist of the highest authority that God can, in justice, appoint infants to Eternal Torments. Indeed, I can quote distinguished Calvinists in considerable numbers, in proof than infant damnation on account of original sin, was the doctrine of a portion of the Protestant Reformation, of the Synod of Dort, and of the Westminster Assembly.

Mr. Rice rises. — Mr. President: — Mr. Campbell seems to regret the necessity that is laid upon him to speak of the doctrine of infant damnation, as held by Presbyterians! I am truly glad that the subject has been brought up on this occasion; for Mr. C. is the very man to prove upon us this stale charge, if it can be proved. On yesterday he professed to find it in our confession of faith. He now acknowledges it is not there; but he says Calvin taught it. I deny that Calvin ever taught it. If he did, I have failed to find it in his writings.

"Now, what is the doctrine taught by Calvin in the passage quoted? Does he teach that infants are actually lost? He does not. He contends that in consequence of the Fall of Adam, all his posterity, infants and adults, are in a state of condemnation, and are exposed to the wrath of God; and that, had no remedy been provided, all must have perished. He does not say that any infant actually perishes, but that all are exposed to ruin in consequence of the fall, and must have perished had no remedy been provided. The gentleman might have proved, with equal conclusiveness, that according to Calvin, all nations, adults as well as infants, do actually perish for ever; for he speaks not of infants only, but of both adults and infants — of the whole race.

"Is it true that the gentleman's Reformation cannot sustain itself without such caricatures and gross misrepresentations of the doctrines of others? No man has more frequently complained of being misrepresented than Mr. C., and no man living has done greater injustice to others, living and dead." (We can speak experimentally, that this is too true to be gainsayed.—*Ed.*)

"Calvin did not teach the doctrine he has charged upon him. But he quotes Augustine as teaching it. Was Augustine a Presbyterian? The gentleman is attempting to prove that the Presbyterian church holds the doctrine of infant damnation, and to establish the charge, he quotes Augustine!!! But he quotes Turretin too. Was Turretin a member of the Presbyterian church? But I will subscribe to the doctrine of Turretin. He opposes the sentiments of those who say, that it would be unjust in God to exclude infants from heaven — that he is bound in justice to save them. He holds, not that infants are actually lost, but that their salvation is of *grace*, not of justice. Zanchius was also quoted. Was he a Presbyterian? This author, in speaking of infants, uses the Latin word *damno;* but Mr. C. certainly knows that this word means simply to *condemn*. The doctrine of Zanchius, as that of Calvin and Turretin, seems clearly to be, that all the human race, in consequence of the sin of Adam, are involved in a common condemnation, from which they can be saved only by the grace of God in Christ.

"The gentleman has frequently boasted his thorough acquaintance with Presbyterianism. I will not charge him with wilful misrepresentation of the doctrines of the Presbyterian church; but I will say that you can scarcely find an old Presbyterian lady who does not know that our church never did teach or hold the doctrine he has charged upon her. Charity, then, requires us to suppose that his knowledge of Presbyterianism is very limited. He is certainly not half so well informed concerning these matters, as he professes to be.

Mr. Campbell rises. — Mr. President: — "I am sorry to see Mr. Rice so positive in his assertions and contradictions respecting the readings and comments on Calvin. He has not given a correct translations of it besides my own, and I have also read Calvin's own French translation of the passage in dispute. I will read an interpretation of it by Jeremy Taylor:

"If we are guilty of Adam's sin by the decree of God, by his choice and constitution that it should be so, as Mr. Calvin and Dr. Twiss do expressly teach, it follows that God is the author of our sin, so that I may use Mr. Calvin's words — "How is it that so many nations with their children should be involved in the fall without remedy, but because God would have it so; and if that be the matter, then to God, as the cause, must that sin and *that condemnation* be ascribed." Jer. Taylor's works, Hab. ed. Vol. ix. p. 322; quoted by Christ. Ex., Boston, 1838.

Mr. Rice rises. — Mr. President: — "I see not what advantage the gentleman expects to gain by attempting to blacken the character Calvin — a man who was a blessing to the world, (would Servetus confirm this saying? *Editor.*) and who has long since gone to his rest. He says I have not a correct translation of Calvin's Institutes. I have one of the very best that has been made. But there are present in this large audience many scholars, who understand the Latin language. I was waiting to hear him read to us the original. He certainly cannot expect us to take his bare assertion in matters of this kind.

"He emphasized the expression, *horrible decree*; yet I presume he knows perfectly well that the Latin word *horribilis* is not precisely synonymous with the English word *horrible* derived from it. Calvin used it in the sense, of *awful*.

"Suppose I should admit, that the Spirit operates on adults only through the truth; would it follow that the same is true of infants? I can easily prove that adults are saved by faith, never without it; but does it follow that infants must believe, or be damned? According to the gentleman's logic it would; for he contends that whatever is essential in one case, is essential in all cases. Neither reason nor scripture will permit us to assume the principle that what is said of adults is applicable to infants. Mr. C. denies that infants are regenerated by the Spirit. So he leaves them to die in sin and be lost.

I will recapitulate my argument. The doctrine of Mr. C. necessarily involves the damnation of infants and idiots. He admits that they are depraved, that they "inherit a *sinful* nature," that they "are greatly fallen and depraved in their whole moral constitution." This being true, one of three consequences must follow, viz: 1. They go to hell; or 2, they go to heaven in their depravity; or 3, they are sanctified by the Spirit without the Word. He will not say they go to hell; nor will he pretend that they go to heaven in their depravity. The conclusion is, therefore, inevitable, that they are sanctified by the Spirit without the Word. This is our doctrine; and it is the doctrine of the Bible. Our Saviour taught that all must be born again, because that which is born of the flesh is flesh" — is carnal: and therefore, it must be born of the Spirit. You have seen how the gentleman writhed under this argument, and to what absurdities and contradictions he has been driven to evade its force. I leave you, my friends, to determine whether it is more accordant with reason and Scripture, that infants should be sanctified by the Spirit without the truth, or that they should be forever lost.

To be continued.

BISHOPS.

"Let no one, however, confound the Bishops of this primitive and golden period of the church, with those of whom we read in the following ages. For, though distinguished by the same name, yet they differed extremely, and that in many respects. A Bishop, during the 1st and 2d 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."—*Mosheim.*

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR TO A FRIEND IN THE FAR WEST.

LETTER III.

BEN LOMOND, near the Rappahannock River, August 15, 1843.

MUCH ESTEEMED FRIEND:—We spent Saturday evening very pleasantly, after our ride. And here we are, just where I was about five years ago, and in the same company. Few changes appear to have occurred in the neighborhood. The meeting house into which I used to be received unanimously and with open arms, is still here; and the same old faces still recognizable, as the countenances which used to greet me with the most friendly expression. I staid at the house of my open faced and warm hearted friend, E—— F—— until Sunday evening, the time of meeting alone excepted. As soon as we had descended into the yard, he recognized me, and shaking me heartily by the hand, made me welcome to his home. This was a good beginning, but if the adage be true, it presaged only an unfortunate issue. But why should I apprehend aught else than a good reception from my old friends of the Rappahannock? I had offered none of them any personal offence, nor was I aware that they had any thing whereof to accuse me. The members of this congregation had hitherto sustained a reputation for candor and consistency; and had feared not to treat with politeness and christian benevolence all who were of good report in the congregation to which they belonged, be their views or opinions heretical or orthodox in the estimation of the scribes and principal men. But I have since verified, and certainly not to the honorable renown of those concerned, that the times being changed, some of them have changed with them.

Between nine and ten on Sunday morning my worthy old friends, brethren M—— G——, Col. T—— and P—— D——, called. I felt very glad to see them. The latter is one of the elders of the congregation. There are three of them; with the other two I am not personally acquainted, and indeed, until today, I do not remember having seen them. I exchanged a few ideas with brother D—— during the short time we were together. He fraternized with me as a brother, stating that he would not permit himself to be dictated to in this matter; that he would fellowship any one who confessed the one Lord, the one faith, and the one baptism, and who maintained a good character, which he had no reason to believe I did not.

The time of meeting was at 10 o'clock, when we adjourned to the house, where as yet but few had assembled. Having been introduced to several, I took my seat in-doors, as any other stranger or private brother would do, and near to one with whom I was acquainted. Vehicle after vehicle arrived and discharged their company at the door. The congregation had met, and the hour of eleven had fully passed away, yet no movement was made towards opening the exercises of the day. I heard considerable talking in an earnest, but under tone, between individuals near the desk; but curiosity was not strong enough to induce me to lift my eyes from the scripture I was reading, to see who they were or what was going on. About half past eleven, however, the talking ceased and brother D.—— placed himself by my side. He stated the the subject matter of this discussion to be the question of breaking bread with me. That some were for it and some against it; and that as he was one of the elders, it had devolved upon him to inform me of it, that I might act as I thought proper, in the case. I received this communication, not as expressing his determination not to eat with me; for after what had passed between us before meeting, I could not so construe it; but simply as a report communicated by him of the determination of certain among them *not to eat with me, because they did not think with me!* This was the construction I put upon his report, for it seemed capable of no other; accordingly, I observed in effect, that they need not trouble themselves on my account, for the bread and wine would not be arrested in their course by me. Brother D—— afterwards stated to the congregation what he had communicated to "brother, Doctor Thomas," (the word "brother" was spoken in harmony with the feeling of our private meeting, but was changed to "Doctor" to accord with the new position he was now assuming.) Having ended his report, Col. T—— arose, and inquired if I would answer him one question? He then asked me if I did not formerly belong to a congregation of disciples in Amelia county? I did. "Were you," he continued, "ever cut off from that congregation?" I replied that I was not only not cut off, but received a letter of introduction and commendation to any church of Christ I might fall in with, in the country to which I was removing." He was satisfied, and then sat down.

About half past eleven, or between that and twelve the worship commenced. The usual hour of beginning is ten; but the discussion of my merits, or rather demerits, had brought all things to a stand still until nearly noon. Worship being ended, brother D.—— arose and invited me to address the congregation! As you may suppose, I was surprised at this, after what had occurred; and of course, regarding the invitation as a simple expression of his own disposition, I did not comply, until, at the suggestion of my friends, I was formally invited by the congregation. It was put to the vote, when, with the dissent of a small minority, I was generally invited.

I addressed them from the letter to the Galatians. In the course of my exposition upon that part of it, where it reads, "if there had been a law given, which could have given life, then righteousness would have been by the law," bro. D—— thinking, I suppose, that he saw the conclusion to which my premises would lead, put a question to me touching the resurrection of the unjust, and some other brother inquired also concerning the subject of the first resurrection, &c. Thus they involved me in digression, which caused me to make developements of my views, which are deemed very heretical by certain scribes and elders, and their admirers of this expediency-loving generation. Some one objected to these interruptions as breaking in upon the continuity of my discourse; but, I was the rather gratified because it gave me the opportunity of making explanations which I should not otherwise have done. Having ended, notice was given that I would speak there on Tuesday following at 11 o'clock.

Monday was King and Queen Court.—Notice was given there of the meeting, as well as at a Methodist gathering in the neighborhood. I forbear to place on record the various deprecations and maledictions enunciated against me by some I could name. Suffice it to say, that their pious indignation may very well become them as carnal, but certainly not very commendable as spiritual; to which, I fear, if that which is born of the Spirit is spiritual, they have few pretensions. I would remind them that the wrath of man works not the righteousness of God;" let them spare their indignation, then, for a more effective purpose, and for one who deprecates it, and would propitiate it more than I.

I need not remind you of the inconsistency of human nature, I will therefore merely supply you with an illustration thereof. During worship on Sunday, I sat as a mere spectator, not partaking in any of the usual exercises. Complaint was afterwards made of this, in conversation with one of my friends. But, I need not tell you, for you are well instructed in these things, that prayer, praise, and thanksgiving, are as much acts of communion, as eating of the bread and drinking of the wine. Here then, were a certain few of this church, who cut me off, by saying, if you partake of the bread, we will not. That I might not be charged with breaking their peace, I agree to abstain; and then, they reflect upon me, because I did not join them in giving thanks for the loaf, of which they had, in effect, said, thou shalt not eat thereof, neither shalt thou touch it! How long will it be before men learn that prayer and thanksgiving are as much acts of fellowship as showing forth the death of Christ, by breaking the loaf! And are they without sin, when they refuse to conform to his institutions, because a member of the "one Body" does not harmonize with them in their speculations? No! I remained a mere spectator, not caring to stultify myself by joining in thanksgiving for what I was interdicted from receiving.

On Tuesday forenoon, we met, according to appointment. I was agreeably disappointed in meeting quite a numerous assembly. As the character of every man, who stands before the public to hold forth to them "the Word of Life," ought to be "of good report," (of course this is not expected from the lips of enemies and defamers) I prefaced my address by certain explanations. On Sunday morning the attention of the public had been turned to certain statements in "The Christian Publisher," against me; when a brother present charged the writer thereof with slander, and gave notice, that, after what had occurred

that morning, should said individual visit the Rappahannock, he should object to his being received to communion with them, until he had cleared himself of what he believed could be proved to be a slander upon me. Accordingly, I read an extract from the Publisher, and, having commented upon it, also read the following letter, which I happened to have with me. It is from the church in Dundee, Kane county, Illinois. It was written, not as a letter of introduction, but for publication in the Investigator, when I should reply to the President's second attack upon me:

"Whereas, in the fifth number of the Millennial Harbinger, page 230, it is written by the Editor, that, 'if he is not greatly mistaken, the Doctor has set out for a new party, founded on the annihilation of the wicked, infants, idiots, pagans, and Jews. Infants, idiots, and pagans will never rise from the dead; and the unjust hearers of the gospel, when raised, shall be judged and literally destroyed, or reduced to everlasting insensibility. To this gospel, the Doctor is now devoted, and, of course, will regularly assail us, and all who will not succumb to his speculations.'

"Now, this is to certify, that, in consequence of misrepresentations, which, we believe, originally emanated from Bethany, we formerly regarded the said Dr. Thomas as a 'thorn in the flesh,' 'a factionist,' a disturber of the peace of the churches, and a setter forth of strange and heretical doctrines; and consequently, when he removed to this state from the Old Dominion, and it was proposed by one or two of our brethren, to invite him to come among us, we were afraid to comply with the suggestion, not doubting but he would do more to retard the progress of the truth, than "a dozen good men could do to carry it ahead."

"But we were deceived, and freely confess that we did him injustice, in arriving at such a conclusion, upon no other testimony than upon the interested and garbled report of his opponents. We have now been acquainted with him a considerable time, and, having conversed with him abundantly, heard him discourse often, and read his writings attentively, we feel ourselves qualified to testify to the uprightness of his character, and to the things he inculcates for faith and obedience.

"We, therefore, without hesitation, pronounce that there is not a vestige of truth in the above extract, which we cannot but regard as a gratuitous calumny upon him. He is devoted to no such gospel, and but rarely even converses upon the destiny of infants, &c., unless the question is broached by another. The Gospel to which he is devoted, is the Gospel preached by the Apostles, Peter and Paul. He maintains the necessity of that Gospel being *understood, and believed as a prerequisite to the reception of remission of sins by baptism.* This is the principle which characterizes his teaching from that of those who denounce him; a principle, which, if acted upon in the beginning, would have caused "this reformation" now to present a more scriptural aspect than it does.

"As to the Doctor's assailing the Editor of the Harbinger, "and all who will not succumb to his speculations," we can testify, that our experience contradicts the truth of this intimation. He assails none but the assailants of the faith and hope of the Gospel. He pleads for the Word of Life, and lays no stress upon matter of doubtful disputation.

"In relation to the Doctor's character, we are happy in being able to rebut the falsehood which would hold it up to reprobation.—There is no man in Kane county, whose character stands fairer; for, while we admit that his religious principles are detested, we know that the breath of calumny has not yet affected the reputability of his standing in the estimation of the respectable portion of our fellow citizens."

Signed by Elder John Oatman, and fifteen others.

"Such was the letter I read in the hearing of the congregation. I then proceeded to open to them the Scripture, in exposition of the first chapter of James. I have but little occasion to complain of the inattention or sleepiness of my hearers, in general; and certainly none of the assembly at the Rappahannock. The secret of keeping the people awake is to present them with the burning truths of revelation, in a simple and intelligible manner; there are some, however, that cannot be awaked to the importance and majesty of these things but by the dead reviving blast of the trump of God. These would sleep under the teachings of our Lord himself; our congregations, however, are not of the sleepy kind: they come rather to hear than enjoy a snooze; they can avail themselves of a *siesta* on any other first day of the week, at the several places of fashionable religious resort. For three hours they listened with great attention, while I laid before them the first principles of the Religion of God; and I am gratified in knowing that the speculations of the Platonists fell to zero, in the minds of several in high standing and respectability in society.

I spent the evening with Captain Covington, who entertained me with much politeness, hospitality, and brotherly kindness. As I had to push on for Richmond the next day, by public conveyance, my stay with him was but short. Our interview was pleasant, and indeed, gratifying to me; because, I learned that my morning's labor had not been in vain. Colonel ——, of the Virginia Legislature, expressed to me his satisfaction at the things he had heard, inasmuch as I had made a deep impression on his mind, and had removed many difficulties out of his way, which he had never been able to master before.

You will remember that this is Tuesday night, and that to-morrow I must be up very early. It is expedient, therefore, that I retire betimes, to snatch from the fleeting hours what little rest they can afford me, after the varied excitations of the day. And as writing and sleeping are non-coetaneous processes, though preaching and sleeping often are, I shall close this epistle, that I may have leisure to close my eyes and lucubrations upon the world without. Wishing you, then, every blessing, I subscribe myself yours in the "One Hope."

JOHN THOMAS.

CORRESPONDENCE.

LETTER FROM A. B. MAGRUDER TO THE EDITOR.

DEAR BROTHER THOMAS: I received and read with pleasure the 1st No. of the "Herald of the Future Age." I hope it will be what *a Millenial Harbinger ought to be*—that it will fearlessly advocate the *truth*, and free and candid investigation as the handmaid and ally of *truth*. "Disturb not that which is quiet" is a sound maxim for a rotten cause. There is a nobler one of higher coinage—"prove *all* things and hold fast that which is *good*." "How *long* has it been a favorite policy with the would-be-great-one of this reformation, that we should not boldly canvass *every position* come from what source it may, which involves the present position, or the future destiny *of man* in the universe of God? Was it under this timid, vacillating, and cowardly motto, that the Editor of the Christian Baptist and his allies attacked the sectarian "principalities and powers in heavenly places," and precipitated many of them to the earth? Or was it rather under that celestial watch word, which bid us without fear of consequences, "*contend earnestly* for the faith once delivered to the saints?" And why should we not freely canvass the question whether man *is* an immortal being by inherent nature, or whether he is tendered the boon of immortality through the gracious gift of God in reward for a life of holiness and obedience? Can we for a moment suppose that our heavenly father, who has caused it to be written for our instruction that we should "be *not unwise* but *understanding* what the *will* of the Lord is," would frown with displeasure on those whose greatest offence seems to be that they search the scriptures as for *hidden treasures*—who like the good scribe instructed in the kingdom of heaven bring forth out of their treasure, things both old and new? Can we be condemned by the author of the Bible for declaring in its very words, "*this is Eternal Life* to know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou has sent"—that whilst "the wages of sin is *death*, the gift of God is *eternal life* through Jesus Christ;"—that "he that hath the son, hath this (eternal) life; he that hath *not* the son of God, has *not* this life." I hope, sincerely Brother Thomas, that you will not be deterred from freely, and faithfully and *benevolently* discussing these great themes. It is of the highest importance to all men that they should know their real position, their responsibility and their destinies

exactly as they are revealed in the scriptures of truth. To dilute what may be the *whole truth* in order to render it palatable to a perverse and gainsaying generation is an invention of priestcraft; and it is doubtless in exactly this point of view that the Editor of the Harbinger correctly declares in his preface to the 1st vol. of that work, that "*clerical* oppression is the worst of all sorts of oppression," and that the "clergy themselves, however innocent in intention are the "*most relentless*" of all "tyrants." To any intelligent and candid spectator of the course of things in the so called "reformation" it must be plain that far from *advancing* under the guidance of the wholesome principles of scriptural truth and toleration which obtained amongst us some dozen years ago, there has been a lamentable *lapse* into the beggarly elements, whence we had fondly hoped we were rescued. The history of Reformations seems abundantly to demonstrate *one fact* of much importance. It is, that God in his providence never has committed to any *one* person the inception and *consummation* of the enterprise, or even to permit a very prominent instrumentality to be wielded by *any one* hand. Joshua not *Moses* led the Israelites across the Jordan. Elisha consummated some of the reforms which Elijah had begun. What Daniel foresaw and prepared for, Nehemiah accomplished. The late interesting history of the Protestant Reformation of Luther by D'Aubigne, discloses the fact, that the Saxon Reformer became in his latter days much more tolerant of Rome (apologizing for, and even advocating Image-worship, &c.) than his Swiss and French Colleagues, Zwingle and Faiel, who, *of course* as they ventured in some respects to differ from the Wittemberg Doctor, did not escape the imputation of being rash, and imprudent, and perhaps "*covenant-breakers*" also!

The paper here with some allies in Lunenburg are endeavoring to make you out a covenanter with *them*, not with Mr. C. It is only necessary to look to the *terms* of the "Covenant," to see that they were mediators to settle a quarrel between you and Mr. C., for they say, certain things being done "harmony &c. is agreed upon between *them*"—you and Mr. C.

I shall look with much interest for your next number. I have only space to subscribe myself very faithfully and sincerely

Your Brother in hope,
of the common salvation.
ALLAN B. MAGRUDER.

JUNE 29th, 1844, A GREAT CHRONOLOGICAL CRISIS.

According to Sir Isaac Newton, Jesus was crucified in the year 34; hence the decree of Artaxerxes, in the 7th year of his reign, must have issued B. C. 456, which was 490 years from the crucifixion. I am, therefore, inclined to conclude finally, that the 2300 years terminate in 1844. The respective dates, then, will stand thus:

B. C. 676 — 2,520 years, end A. D. 1844.
B. C. 456 — 2,300 years, end A. D. 1844.

As I have already announced, the Holy Spirit has given us another Chronological Prophecy which also terminates in the year 1844. Since the publication of this announcement, in our last number, (see letter to the Midnight Cry,) I have obtained a sight of Hebershon's Guide to the study of Chronological Prophecy," wherein is contained an article on the "Kingdom of Turkey." In this document he holds the following discourse:

"In the first place, the date from which it is to be reckoned is known even to a day, namely, May 29, 1453; the prophecy itself is given with unusual precision, namely, 'a day, an hour, a month, a year,' which signifies (360 + 30 + 1 = 391,) 391 years and a month; and of all the present signs of the times, the consumption of the Turkish Empire is the most distinct and unequivocal.

"The taking of Constantinople by the Turks was at the time above named, in 1453; and this, I conceive, is the only event in the Turkish history from which this period can be dated, and for the following reasons:

1. Because it is the only such event that bears the character of a prophetical era — namely, as being one of surpassing historical importance, one that has an especial respect to the affairs of the Church of Christ, one that produced a permanent change in the political aspect of the Roman world, and one of God's most severe judgments.

2. Because, all the Trumpets being intended as judgments upon the degenerate Christian Church, the Turks before this period fell upon that part of the Roman Empire not under such jurisdiction, and therefore were no more the subject of prophecy than were the great exploits of Hannibal or Tamerlane.

3. Because no preceding event in the Turkish history could be said to 'kill men,' that is to cause the political death of a part of the Roman Empire.

4. Because, in no preceding event was artillery used, yet such is mentioned in this prophecy; and it is a great historical fact that the use of this newly invented engine of destruction mainly contributed to the success of the Turks on this occasion.

5. Because, if reckoned from this event, it will end in the same year as the 2300 years, which has equally a reference to the Mohammedan apostacy, and are thereby required to have one common termination.

"I would merely add, that the very gradual extinction of Turkey, expressed in the prophecy, by the term, "drying up," appears to be for the express purpose of a general warning to the world, similar to what the building of the ark was to the antediluvian world; for there are none who do not observe it; the prophecy is in all respects clear and definite; and it exactly agrees with the actual condition of the nation to which it refers, the influence of Turkey being every where spoken of as at an end, and the empire itself having only a nominal existence. Let believers, then, be awake and alive to the all important times which are at hand; let them abandon every preconceived idea of the future, not founded on the word of God and the clear light of Divine prophecy; and with their lamps trimmed and their loins girt, let them, in humble resignation and joyful hope, be prepared both for that fierce persecution, as well as for that glorious exultation, which is appointed for them; and which are thus appointed to take place immediately preceding the final extinction of this universally acknowledged expiring empire,"—*pages* 50 and 51.

Thus, without any previous acquaintance with each other's views or writings, Mr Habershon of England and myself have come to the same conclusion, predicted, indeed, upon somewhat different premises, as to the termination of the day, hour, month, year, during which the Ottomans were to "slay the third part of men." We repeat it, that after the 29th June, 1844, *we may expect to hear of political movements on the part of the Great European Powers in relation to Turkey and its Sovereignty over the Eastern Roman Empire, and especially to that province of it which includes the Sanctuary or Holy Land.* Already "coming events cast their shadows before," as will be perceived from the following extract from a letter dated Constantinople, March 27, and which appeared in the London Times of April 16th. By this letter it would appear that England and France had demanded "that no Christian or Musselman should be decapitated on account of his religion," and that "their demands were granted on the 22nd" This looks like taking away their power to "slay the third part of men" for their religious opinions at least; a power which the Turks have exercised over the Greco-Romans for 391 years, on the 29th of this month of May: they have one month more, and then their time is out. The announcement that the Ottoman Government had granted the demands of England, spread consternation throughout the Mohammedan population.

But it had scarcely been published, when Russia, the Gog of Ezekiel, made still more serious and difficult demands upon the Sultan, which will be better understood by the extract itself.

". . . . . In consequence of the intelligence of the outrages committed by the Albanians on the Christians in the district of Iscupe, the Russian embassy have delivered a note to the Porte, demanding to be made acquainted with the means which the Porte intends to pursue to arrest the outrages which have been committed against its Christian subjects, and distinctly acquainting the Porte that, unless the reply is immediate and satisfactory, it is the intention of the Russian government to make an armed intervention. Russia has likewise mixed up other demands in the present instance in favor of the Christian population, to prove her adherence, as I presume, to the war of protection. The chief point is, that

the office of Œcumenical Patriarch of the Greeks at Constantinople be made for life, and not dependent for its continuance as at present, on the good will of the Porte.

"This manœuvre is easily accounted for here. It would, no doubt, prove highly important for Russian interests, and might make up for a good many other damages which she has suffered within the last two years, if she could put the Œcumenical Patriarch on the same footing as the Patriarch of Jerusalem, when, as a necessary consequence, it would become a like subservient tool to her designs. Such is the severe tone assumed by the Russian diplomatist at the present crisis, that orders were given last Friday to the Russian brig of war in attendance on the embassy, not to salute the Sultan, as usual, on his way to the Mosque: and, in consequence, although the Sultan passed close under the bows of the brig, in his state kaik on that day, the crew neither manned the yards nor fired any guns.

"We insert here a letter found in the same paper, showing the dreadful state of suffering to which the Christians are subjected in the province to which Russia has directed her attention. It would seem unavoidable that if Russia strikes the blow, the *world must be embroiled.*

"Translation of a letter from the Bishop Scopie (Iscupe) to the Patriarch of Constantinople, dated 3d of March, 1844, and by him presented to the Porte:

'Most Holy Prelate—I know not in what terms to describe to you the numerous horrors which the wicked and cruel Albanians have fearlessly committed, and which they still continue to commit to this very moment, in the country of Samacovan, as well as in the other districts of the diocese of Scopie. Behold, oh! Heaven and shudder! Pity, oh! pity on the Christians! Pity the young men and young girls! Can Heaven behold such wickedness and suffer it in silence? These monsters tie the men to posts, and then violate their wives and their daughters in their presence. They then hang the men up by their feet, and force their own wives to suffocate them with the smoke of burnt straw. Old women of 80 and girls of 10 years old are alike dishonored. They impale boys and roast them like their sheep, saying, "In Chivzi Pasha's time you did not prepare the Bairam sheep for us to eat. This is now rewarded: we eat you. Call Chivzi Pasha to your help." They tear the clothes off the girls, and oblige them to stay up all night in a state of nakedness to serve them with wine. Some of the husbands whose wives have been violated were constrained to bear torches meanwhile in their hands. Oh! heavens and earth! how can ye suffer such abominations? Alas! alas! the poor Christians run about the squares and streets half naked, not knowing where to seek refuge. They wail and cry, but nobody can help them. Such are the scenes which surround us. And I pass over in silence the exactions, the pillage, the murders, and the continual abjurations, of faith. Open the ears of your soul, holy prelate, and listen to what I write, for until the present this bishopric has existed, and Christianity could maintain itself, but now all is lost. In the country of Gehoca the inhabitants, old and young, of a village composed of 70 families, have abjured their faith, not being able to resist any longer the indescribable sufferings, tortures and murders inflicted by the savage, sanguinary and brutal Albanians. To-day 500 Christians of different villages presented themselves before me their Metropolitan. Some having previously been burnt over the fire, had been brought with difficulty in carts; others, who had been pitifully beaten, could hardly support themselves. In the deplorable state to which they had been reduced, they raised their mournful voices, asked remedy for their misfortunes, and saying, "We cannot again return to our villages; we would rather be burned alive than do so; for what should we find there? We have neither cattle, food, children, nor honor: and if no help be given us, we are ready to drown ourselves in the river Barden: yet we have always been faithful and obedient subjects, and have paid regularly the taxes." I saw them in this heart-rending condition, and shed many bitter tears. . . . . Most worthy prelate, expression fails me, my hand trembles, my spirit is troubled, and I must, despite my wish, be silent.

I am, with profound respect, &c.,
Sissius, Bishop of Scopie.

From the above we learn the interesting and important fact, that England, the Head of Protestantism, and France, the great Infidel power, have extorted from the Euphratean Head of Mohammedanism an agreement not to "*slay the third part of men*" any more for their religious opinions. The Ottomans still possess the power to "slay," though they have consented to forbear the application of that power to religious delinquency. The power to slay with political and spiritual death, they will possess till June 29th 1844, a date which will expire in a few days. We hope our friends abroad will forward to us all papers they can procure, which may contain any news in relation to Turkey, Russia, Egypt, Syria, and India; for, we regret to say, that the Editors of this City are so absorbed in the politics of their several factions and the prices of cotton, hemp, tobacco, &c., that Europe and Asia,—the old prophetic world—may be sunk for any thing we can learn from their report of their political relations. There has been considerable agitation in Turkey and the Ecclesiastical States, and information of these distubances has arrived in Cincinnati; but in Louisville, the only allusion to it we have been enabled to discover is contained in the following extract.

"TURKEY.—The firmness of the British and French Ambassadors has induced the Porte to make further slight concessions regarding Christians, who, having once embraced the Musselman religion, return again to their old faith. The submission of the Sultan in this matter is regarded as the most important diplomatic occurrence in the annals of Turkey, being in fact the death-blow to Ottoman fanaticism. It is, however, attended with considerable danger to the Government, having excited much discontent and rebellious feeling in the breasts of the Turcomans."

If the Ottoman yield to the demand of Russia, to make the Patriarchate of Constantinople independent of the will of the Porte, the Autocrat will have succeeded in planting a prince in Stamboul, in the very court itself of the Sultan, who, backed by the political influence of the Emperor, will be, in effect, the Muscovite Viceroy of the Turkish Empire. This is a move, which, combined with that of England and France, is calculated to bring about the consummation of Mohammedan desolations in the Eastern Limb of the Roman Empire. If Turkey resist the demand of Russia, war is inevitable; if she yield, her position will be little else than that of a Muscovite province: which will be sufficiently pregnant of evil, to develope the belligerent interference of the West. Indeed, we doubt not but Russia will yet possess herself of Asia Minor, and the countries, which formerly constituted the dominion of the ancient Syro-Macedonian Kings. England and France will doubtless, combine to prevent it, but they will not succeed; the decree has gone forth and been long since recorded by the Holy Prophets. Nothing will remain for them but to *re-establish the Commonwealth of Israel in Palestine as the out post and vanguard of European interests in Asia*; or "Rosi prince of Mesech and Tubal" will sweep its plains from the Euxine and Caspian to the shores of the Mediterranean, Red Sea, and Indian Ocean.—*Editor.*

NOTICE.

In a letter, dated, King William, Va., April 26, 1844, is this passage—"We hope you may be able to visit us during the summer. The brethren send you once and always a standing invitation to come whenever you can find it convenient." In another, of May 16, 1844, from Lunenburg, it is thus written—"Inform me whether or not, you can pay us a visit this summer; your expenses shall be paid, if you will come; only let us know, so as to make the necessary appointments in time, &c. To our friends in these two sections of Virginia, we would say, that we are under the necessity of revisiting Illinois to settle up our affairs in that region; and that, if we can despatch our business sufficiently soon, we will do ourselves the pleasure of a trip to the Old Dominion; first, to encourage and strengthen the hearts of all, who love truth, liberty, and justice; and secondly, to know, not the speech, but the power of those disciples of Plato, who denounce us in such set terms when forests, plains and rivers intervene between us and the public, whose ears they are laboring to turn aside from the truth to fables.—*Editor.*

ECCLESIASTICAL POLITICS.

REFORMATION IN LOUISVILLE.

SPIRITUAL COQUETRY.

In our first number of the Herald, under the caption of "Reformation in Louisville," is this saying, "I say, then, friend Burnet has done well to *stipulate* upon the principle of "no pay, no preach." Now, he has requested Dr. Bodenhamer, with whom he corresponded on the subject of "a call to preach" in Louisville, to say that this statement is incorrect, inasmuch as the $1000 per annum, payable monthly, was proposed *to* him through Dr. Bodenhamer, and not *stipulated by* himself as the condition of his ministrations at "the Christian Chapel."

But, notwithstanding this disclaimer, we cannot but regard Mr. B. as having *stipulated*. What is meant by the word *stipulate?* Let Webster reply. It signifies, "1st. To make an agreement or covenant with any person or company to do or forbear anything; to contract; to settle terms. 2d. To bargain."—Does not this definition show that in an affair of stipulation there are necessarily two parties? In the case before us, "the vacant church" was one party, and Mr. Burnet the other. They were both stipulators. The church said, through Doctor Bodenhamer, "come and preach to us, or for us, and we will give you $1000 per annum, payable monthly. Here was the "bid" or "call." If Mr. B. had thought the sum a *quid* of too much value for the *quo* he had to offer, he would doubtless, as a conscientious man, have replied "no, brethren! you *bid* too high for my humble service, or, your call is too loud, I cannot think of selling you my spiritual wares at so high a price. I will not come until you reduce the sum to an amount more commensurate with my merits." But he did not take this view of the matter. He considered it was just the thing, and without a word of disputation closed in with the proposition, *by sending on an appointment*, as the first of a series of ministrations. But he says, he did not propose that the church should give him $1000 *per annum, payable monthly.* Granted; but he first elicited this proposition, as a lady the question of her lover, and then agreed to preach for this sum; and he will recollect, as we hinted in No. I, that there was a want of punctuality in the monthly pay, and that he went to a certain elder of the church, and reminded him of the stipulation, and obtained his aid in stimulating the fundholders to pay up according to contract; which he very promptly agreed to do, and soon after, the monthly stipend was forthcoming with a balance due on the previous month! We cannot but consider Mr. Burnett a stipulator with the church of Louisville; for, if not, how came he to leave Mount Healthy for this city? We have published his disclaimer to gratify him, but he must excuse us if we still regard him as having stipulated for a stipend of a $1000 a year, payable monthly. The public can judge for themselves. If Mr. B. is not satisfied with these remarks, the correspondence can be produced which will place the question beyond all dispute.

After all, there is something highly amusing in the coquetting of divines with vacant churches. The reader must not imagine that stipulations between these parties are conducted after the fashion of a barter for pork or potatoes, where the one party bids against the other, and beats him down. This would be too gross. They are rather conducted after the manner of a courtship, in which the preacher woos the church, and the church, as ladies are privileged to do in leap year, "pops the question." We will suppose a case, by way of illustration. It is noised abroad, that the apocalyptic woman of a certain city has been divorced from her spiritual husband; and that she is ready to "pop the question" to the first eloquent divine, whose man-pleasing talent will fill her house with admirers. The report of this dissolution of spiritual partnership reaches the ears of some gentleman who is rusticating, and who desires to mingle more with this busy generation, and bear a part in the scenes which are formative of our final

destiny. He forthwith addresses a letter of friendship to some brother of the church, with whom he had formed an acquaintance when out upon his recent exploring expedition. He thanks him for some little attentions, and proceeds to detail the annoyances to which he is subject by the importunate bids he is constantly receiving from vacant churches; and observes, that, could he but arrange things to his mind, he would, for a time, give himself to preaching at ——, or elsewhere! Purely for the sake of getting rid of so many annoyances! He inquires how he can do this? And sighs for the power of ubiquity! This elicits a reply; to which a rejoinder soon appears. Have you heard it? he inquires; I am free. How are you doing at ——? Have you engaged a speaker? He then tells how he has been solicited to go here and there, but assures his spiritual lady love that he prefers her charms (the hundreds per annum) to any he has yet seen or heard of! He talks of the immense sacrifices he would have to make were he to marry her; nevertheless, for the love he bears her he is ready to throw himself away! Kind soul! The beloved church replies to him through her diplomatist in general terms. She has a fortune it is true; but she does not know whether she can bring her lover $600, $800, or $1000 per annum. She would like to have him; but can't tell exactly what she could do for him! This pecuniary incertitude is by no means gratifying to the divine gentleman. He discovers, in the church, a disposition to covetousness, a worldly mindedness, too much *nonchalance*, too little devotion, and less practical religion!! He concludes, therefore, that a spiritual jobation over the left shoulder will be in place here, and calculated to elicit something more definite as to the pay. He will not say how much he wants, but he will coquet, until the *ecclesia inamorata* can stand it no longer, and concludes to "pop the question" in the most unmistakeable phraseology. He exhorts her to rouse herself to an activity commensurate with her means and obligations, and the result of a sense of her individual and corporate responsibility. He pronounces shame upon her; and laments over the confusion which prevails everywhere: the little devotion, and the less practical religion! He tells her, if she will co-operate with him, with full purpose of heart, much may be done. Furthermore, he does not fail to let her know that he is being wooed by other ladies, but that he is more favorably disposed to the church at ——.

This exhortation has the desired effect. The church perceives, that he will not make the great sacrifices he refers to until they say what equivalent he may calculate upon. Hence a meeting is convened and the question is put, "How much will you give any how?" The inquiry circulates from one to another until it is ascertained what can be raised? The next question is, "How shall it be paid—monthly, quarterly, half yearly or annually?" This being settled by the vote of the majority, A. B. or C is deputed to inform the "dear man" what the Church will do. He receives the proposal and perhaps prays over it, or says he did, if it be desirable. If it does not meet his estimate of his own merits, he hears a louder call in the east, or west; but if it coincides with his views, he says no more, but writes a brief note, saying, that "the Lord willing" he will preach for them on such a day, and thank them to make an appointment accordingly. Thus the bargain is struck; and in this way the divine *stipulates* for his future pay.

Mr. Campbell has admirably displayed the intrigues of the priestly lovers of the Church, in the Christian Baptist, (pages 34, 42, &c. art. clergy,) edited by Mr. Burnett. We have no room for quotations at this time. We endorse for all he says upon the subject. It is well said, and worthy of an attentive perusal by all evangelists and pastors. His object was to "dethrone the clergy that the Apostles might be enthroned;" if he succeeded, we propose to do our best *to keep them on their thrones*, and to defend them from the usurpations of college bred youths, and half reformed immersionist divines.

We conclude what we have to say at this time, by informing all clerically disposed preachers, that the body meeting in the Christian Chapel in this city is divorced from her late incumbent. They have been paying at the rate of $10 or $11 a speech, which we consider vastly liberal all things considered. In reviewing the events of the last six months, we cannot report that much, if indeed, any good has been done. The church has been bereaved of its elders; all voices have been stilled, save that of the *de facto* Presbyter Bishop; the deacons are required by Paul to be grave and *no strikers*, nevertheless levity

and pugnaciousness are patronized by some of them. The church is now without a shepherd either *de facto* or *de jure;* the factotumship is vacant, and the flock left to the wolf, which some affect to believe is not very far off. This is what remains of the labors of the last six months! Is it not a disgrace to a congregation calling itself reformed, to be found in this predicament? Can they not edify themselves; and forgetting the past, emancipate themselves from their present thrall, and set about elaborating a radical reformation in deed and in truth? Less preaching and more investigation of the word of God is the first item we would prescribe for their spiritual ills. There are some among them, who understand and have obeyed the truth; will they not bestir themselves, and "be watchful, and strengthen the things which remain and are ready to die: for their works are not found perfect before God?"—*Editor.*

We understand "The Harbinger" of a Mystical Millenium is out upon us again. We have not seen the article, nor shall we, unless we happen to take a second thought, condescend to peruse it. We are told that a Dr. Dejernette is the correspondent! We have only to say, with respect to him, that we shall dispose of him hereafter. For the present, we simply remark, that when we were in Lunenburg, we were informed by good authority that he was emphatically a disorderly professor of religion; setting at defiance the authority of the Liberty congregation, in Prince Edward, of which he was formerly a troublesome member. Mr. Campbell is welcome to all such correspondents. We would remark further, that if this Dr. D. were as well known abroad as he is at home, where his name has become a bye-word with all lovers of Christian propriety, any attack upon us from him, so far from being regarded as discreditable, would be considered as the highest compliment that could be conferred upon us.

We also hear that another of our friends, to whom we are conscious of having given no offense, is also penning it to our disparagement. Towards this brother, we neither have, nor can have, any other than the best of feelings; and we are sure as men can be, to whom it has not been declared, that, but for priestly influence, which, since we left for the northwest, has married into his family, he would be our friend still. But the heartless intrigues of Priestism will stop at nothing for the promotion of its own byeends and selfishness. It invades the peace of the domestic hearth, sows the seeds of discord among neighbors, fans dissensions, and alienates bosom friends. It has done all this, yea, and more, in other countries than Lunenburg; and we presume, will continue to work out its unhallowed intrigues until the establishment of the Future Age,

As to the Harbinger itself we shall not peruse it, because it is difficult to resist temptation. We might find there something which would stir up the spirit of retaliation, and we do not wish to retaliate in the spirit with which we are ourselves pursued. The papistical treatment we receive from the Editor and his advisers, reminds us very much of the case of Saul and David: and had we David's lyre we might hope occasionally to avert the king's spear by the sweet strains of melody. But though somewhat musical, our art would fail us to charm away blue spirits from the king; all that remains therefore, to be done, is to keep out of Saul's way as David did. We must either do this, or lift our weap on against him, whom, he alleges, God has called to take the supervision of the church! Saul was certainly vanquished by the chivalry of David; so therefore, though we have his antitype in the strong hold of Engedi, we prefer to cut off the skirt of his robe to transfixing him with our trusty spear. We, like David, have the truth of God's word on our side. Of this we are assured, and no one yet has been able to overturn it, though defended only by "a stripling." We feel strong, courageous, and prepared to do. Who so tranquil as the man whose eye is single, and his faith assured! The king's cause is rotten, and can only be bolstered up by the intrigues of his serving men. Let it not be forgotten, that for every Saul there is a Gilboa, and for every David, a crown in Hebron and Jerusalem. *Narrative*, and not disputation, will wind up the drama of the first act of this reformation. Saul has taken his stand in resistance to the truth, and therefore, the spirit of the Lord has departed from him. To all personal encounter, then, with Mr. C. we bid adieu! The Editor of the Herard of the Future Age has themes of nobler import to discuss than the petty personalities of great or little men:—

To themes sublime, sublimer strains belong.
Editor.

THE TWO VISIONS.

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 67.)

"The discourse (dabar) is *truth*, and the warfare continued;" "and, now," said the Adonai, who strengthened Darius the Mede in the first year of his reign, "will I show thee, O Daniel, *the truth*."

"Behold, there shall stand up yet *three kings* in Persia," viz. *Cyrus*, *Cambyses* and *Darius Hystaspes*; "and the fourth" *Xerxes*, "shall be far richer than they all; and by his strength through his riches, he shall stir up all against the realm of Grecia." This is what is meant ch. viii. 4, by the "ram pushing westward" B. C. 481.

"And a mighty king shall stand up," even Alexander of Macedon, "that shall rule with great dominion, and do according to his will." This is parallel with ch. viii. 5, 6, 7, B. C. 334. Verse 8, "And the He-goat waxed great; and when he was strong the Great Horn was broken:" and in ch. xi. 4, "and when he shall stand up, his kingdom," answering to "the belly and thighs of brass," the "four-headed leopard," and "the notable Horn"—the Macedonian dominion of "the brazen-coated Greeks"—"shall be broken, and shall be divided to the four winds of heaven" B. C. 301. But the kingdoms into which Alexander's shall be broken, shall not be inherited by "his posterity, nor according to" the limits of "his dominion which he ruled."

Alexander seemed to have a presentiment of this result, deriving it perhaps from the prophecy of Daniel concerning himself; for it was shown to him when he visited Jerusalem. He would not upon his death-bed dispose of his dominions to any heir: declaring that his friends would celebrate his funeral with bloody battles.

Alexander and Roxana his mother were put to death by Cassander when the former was fourteen years old. The year after B. C. 309, Polysperchon, another of Alexander's generals, put Hercules, then seventeen years old, and his mother one of the wives of the king to death likewise for the purpose of securing to himself the sovereignty of Greece. In the year B. C. 308, Cleopatra, the sister of Alexander the Great, and the last of his race, was slain secretly by the command of Antigonus; and thus were exterminated all that remained of that "mighty Horn" according to the word of the Lord: "for his kingdom shall be plucked up even for other" rulers "besides those" of his posterity.

The Four Kingdoms into which the unwieldily empire was divided did not extend to the limits of "his dominion which he ruled". There were kingdoms set up in Cappadocia, Armenia, Bythinia, Heraclea, and the Bosphorus; and besides these, all India beyond the Indus, though allotted to the northern kingdom, revolted from the successor of Alexander the Great.

These Four Kingdoms were the Four Heads of the Leopard as well as the Four Horns of the Rough Goat. The Kingdom of the *Southern Horn* comprehended Egypt, Lybia, Arabia, Cœle-Syria and Palestine: that of the *Western Horn*, Macedonia and Greece; that of the *Northwestern Horn*, Thrace, Bythinia, &c.; and the kingdom of the *Northeastern Horn*, included within its limits the rest of Asia to the other side of the Euphrates, and as far as the river Indus. It will be proper to observe here, that the Medo-Persian out all the remaining part of this chapter, confines his discourse when speaking of these kingdoms, to those of Egypt and Syria; the former being styled "*the King of the South*," and the latter, "*the King of the North*," such being their relative situation to Judea; and because they were the only princes of the four who engaged in wars against the People of God.

"And the king of the South shall be strong and of his" Alexander's, "princes" chiefs or generals: "and he" of the South "shall be strong above him" Alexander, "and have dominion: his dominion shall be a great dominion"—for he shall be master of Egypt, Lybia, Cyrenaica, Arabia, Palestine, Cœle-Syria, and most of the maritime provinces of Asia Minor; with the Island of Cyprus; as also of several isles in the Ægean Sea; which is now called the Archipelago, and even some cities of Greece, as Cleyon and Corinth. Such was the extent of the "great dominion" of Ptolemy Soter, who was the first king that reigned in Egypt after Alexander's death. He was both a general and

successor of the Notable Horn. His reign commenced after the battle of Ipsus B. C. 301.

"And in the end of years" B. C. 249, "they shall associate themselves;" for Berenice "the daughter of" Ptolemy Philadelphus "the king of the South shall come, or be conducted to Antiochus Theos, "the king of the North to make" or enter into a marriage "agreement." There had been a long war between these two kings, till Antiochus made overtures of peace. Ptolemy consented on the conditions that Antiochus should divorce his sister Laodice, by whom he had two sons, and espouse Berenice; that he should also disinherit Laodice's children, and secure the crown of Syria to his children by the daughter of Ptolemy. The events resulting from this "agreement" were both calamitous and fatal.

"But she," Berenice, "shall not retain the power of the arm" of Antiochus Theos. Ptolemy Philadelphus died B. C. 247, only two years after her marriage. As soon as Antiochus received intelligence of this he divorced Berenice, and recalled Laodice and her children. "Neither shall he" Antiochus Theos "stand, nor his arm." For Laodice, knowing his mutability, resolved to improve the present opportunity to secure the crown of Syria for her son. She therefore, caused Antiochus to be poisoned, and by artifice got her eldest son Seleucus Callinicus appointed his successor.

"But she," Berenice, "shall be given up" or put to death, "and they" the Egyptians also "that brought her" to Syria; "and he" the son, "whom she brought forth, and he that strengthened her in these times" shall die; and thus leave her to the mercy of her rival, which will be treachery and death.

Laodice not believing herself safe as long as Berenice and her son lived, concerted measures with Seleucus to destroy themalso: but Berenice being informed of their design, escaped with her son to Daphne, where she shut herself up in the asylum built by Seleucus Nicator. But being at last betrayed by the perfidy of those who besieged her there by the order of Laodice, first her son and then herself, with all the Egyptians who had accompanied her to that retreat, were murdered in the blackest and most inhuman manner.

"But out of a" *fraternal* "branch of her" *parent* "roots shall" Ptolemy Euergetes, the son and successor of her parents, Ptolemy Philadelphus and Arsinoe "stand up in his estate," or kingdom, "and come with his army, and shall enter into the fortress of the king of the North" which was Antioch, "and shall deal" or make war "against them" Laodice and her son Seleucus, "and shall prevail" and" Euergetes "shall also carry captive into Egypt their gods, with their princes, and with their precious vessels of silver and gold; and he" Euergetes "shall continue" to reign nine "more years than the king of the North" who died a prisoner in Parthia five years before the king of Egypt.

"So the king of the South shall come into his kingdom, and shall return into his own land" of Egypt in the year B. C. 244.

Euergetes receiving intelligence of the treatment inflicted upon his sister Berenice, invaded Syria with a great army, in order to rescue her from death, but she, and her children with all the officers who conducted her from Egypt into Syria, and who were her strength and support while there, were destroyed as already related. Finding he could not arrive in time to save her, he entered Antioch, the capital or "fortress of the king of the North" and not only caused Laodice to be put to death, but made himself master of all Syria and Cilicia; after which he passed the Euphrates, and conquered all the country as far as Babylon and Tigris: and if the progress of his arms had not been interrupted by a sedition which caused him to return to Egypt, he would certainly have subdued all the provinces of the Syrian Empire. Upon this, Ptolemy marched back laden with spoils. He carried off about 40,000 talents of silver (£6,000,000, with a prodigious quantity of gold and silver vessels. He also "carried captive into Egypt" 2500 statues of "their gods" and heroes, part of which were those Egyptian idols that Cambyses, after his conquest of that kingdom had sent into Persia. Thus were developed in strict accordance with the Adoni's discourse, the events foretold in the first nine verses of this chapter. May we not with a distinguished historian exclaim, "Great God! How worthy are thy oracles to be believed and reverenced. *Testimonia tua credibilia facta sunt nimis!*"

Verse 10. "But his" Seleucus Callinicus's "sons shall be stirred up" to war; "and Seleucus Ceraunus and Antiochus "shall assemble a multitude of great forces;" "and one of them" Antiochus the Great "shall certainly come and overflow," or force his way "and pass through" the passes of Libanus, "and pass through" into Galilee; and having made himself master of it, he shall cross the Jordan, take Gilead, and possess himself of all that part of the country, which was formerly the inheritance of the tribes of Reuben and Gad and the half tribe of Manasseh. "Then," the season being too far advanced to prolong the campaign, "shall he return" to Ptolemais, where he shall put his forces into winter quarters. Rollin D. xviii, 8, 1, 1.

"But" early in the spring of A. C. 217, "Ptolemy Philopator shall raise an army of 70,000 infantry, 5,000 cavalry, and 73 elephants, at the head of which he shall march to Raphia, by which Antiochus, the king of the North, "shall be stirred up" again to war: for at this place the king of Syria shall meet him with 72,000 foot, 6000 horse, and 102 elephants. A great battle shall be fought at Raphia in which the king of the North shall be defeated with great slaughter. He shall therefore abandon all his conquests in Judea, and with the remains of his army retreat to Antioch, the "fortress" of his kingdom.

The victory of Ptolemy Philopator is clearly pointed out in verse 11. "And the king of the South shall be moved with choler" by his conquest of Judea; "and shall come forth and fight with the king of the North" at Raphia: "and he," Antiochus, "shall set forth a great multitude" of 72,000 foot and 6000 horse, "but the multitude shall be given into the hand" of the king of Egypt. "And when he had taken away the multitude," that is, defeated Antiochus, "his heart shall be lifted up." He shall visit the Sanctuary, and desire to enter the Most Holy. He shall force his way into the second court; and prepare to enter the temple itself, but he shall be stricken and carried off as dead. In his victory over Antiochus "he shall cast down ten thousands," according as it is recorded, that "Antiochus lost upwards of 10,000 foot and 300 horse, and 4000 of his men were taken prisoners. "But," though he might have dispossessed Antiochus of his dominions, had he taken proper advantage of his victory; he contented himself with recovering Cœle-Syria and Phœnicia, and again plunged into his former debaucheries, and therefore, "shall not be strengthened by" his victory.

Verse 13. "For" after certain years, that is 19 from the battle of Raphia, Antiochus "the king of the North shall return, and shall set forth a multitude," or army, "greater than the former, and shall certainly come with a great army and with much riches" B. C. 198. He shall defeat Scopas the general of the Egyptians, at Paneas, near the source of the Jordan, with great slaughter; and he shall compel him to fly to Sidon, where he shall besiege him. And though the Regency of Alexandria shall do its utmost to raise the siege; Antiochus the Great shall defeat all their efforts, and compel him to return to Egypt naked and disarmed. Thus having captured Sidon and Gaza, he shall subjugate all Palestine and Cœle-Syria. Rol. D. xix. c. 2.

Verse 14. "And in those times" when Ptolemy Epiphanes shall reign, "many shall stand up against" the infant "king of the South." The kings of Macedonia and Syria as soon as they learned the death of Ptolemy Philopator, entered into an alliance to take off his son Epiphanes, and divide his dominions between them. Scopas also conspired to dispossess him of his crown and life.

"But in those times "the robbers of thy people," O Daniel, "shall exalt themselves to establish the Vision." Much of the force of this passage is lost in the imperfection of the translation. It should read, "*But the deputies of the breakers of thy people shall interfere to establish the Vision.*" The word *Beni* is left out in our common version. It is a noun masc. plur. in regimine derived from *Ben* to divide; and is rendered by Montanus in the singular *vir intermedius* a middle man, one who comes between two contending parties, as a champion, to determine the dispute by single combat. *A middle man.* What kind of middle men these *Benim* were, may be determined by the import of *Nushia*, which the common version renders *exalt themselves*, but which I have translated *interfere*. Nsha, in its fourth definition by Parkhurst, signifies "to lift up, or lay on as a load upon a beast." As a noun it signifies no more than a *weighty important discourse.*" When, therefore, it says the *Beni phritzi omek inushau* we are to understand *such mediators as on the occasion confine their interference to a discourse of weighty and important words.* This suits the history in the case exactly, and therefore, I have styled the Benim, or middle men, deputies; because they were deputed to mediate by the Little Horn, which in after years established itself as the Breaker of Daniel's countrymen.

These are the facts. As I have said already, the kings of Macedonia and Syria conspired to make away with the infant Ptolemy Epiphanes; and to divide his dominions between them; but Jehovah raised up the Romans for his protection, that the Vision of the East might be established. The king of the North had already wrested Cœle-Syria and Palestine from Epiphanes; and Philip of Macedon intended to seize on Caria, Lybia, Cyrenaica, and Egypt as soon as he could find leisure to accomplish it. The court of Egypt being so much endangered by this alliance of Philip and Antiochus against their infant king had recourse to the Romans for protection, and offered them the guardianship of the king of the South, and the regency of his dominions during his minority. For divers reasons they accepted the guardianship; and in consequence had appointed three deputies, "who were ordered to acquaint the two kings with their resolution, and to enjoin them not to infest the dominions of their royal pupil, for that otherwise they should be forced to declare war against them."

Emilius, one of these deputies waited on Philip, and acquainted him, that he was ordered, in the name of the Roman Senate to exhort him not to invade any part of Ptolemy's dominions; and that provided he acquiesced with these remonstrances, he would continue in peace; but that if he refused the Romans would declare war against him. Emilius then departed from Philip to Alexandria, where he assumed the guardianship of Ptolemy, in the name of the Romans, pursuant to the instructions he had received from the Senate at his setting out; and settled everything to as much advantage as the state of affairs in Egypt would then admit. Thus the Deputies of the Breakers of Daniel's fellow-countrymen interfered to establish the Vision of the East.

"But they shall fall;" *i. e.* the Romans who here begin to mix themselves up with the affairs of Egypt, Palestine and Syria; and in a few years establish themselves as lords paramount over the East, and thus assume the character of the Little Horn—"this shall fall" or "be shivered to pieces without hands," when the stone shall strike the Image on the feet.

Verse 15. "So the king of the North shall come" into Palestine, "and cast up a mount" against Sidon, where he shall besiege the forces of the Egyptians; "and he shall take the city of munitions" i. e. Jerusalem, from the castle of which he shall expel the garrison of Ptolemy by the aid of the inhabitants. "And the arms of the south shall not stand, neither his chosen people, neither shall there be any strength to withstand" against him.

"But he," Antiochus "that cometh against him," Ptolemy Epiphanes "shall do according to his own will" in Cœle-Syria and Palestine, "and none shall stand before him; and he shall stand in the glorious land" of Judea "which by his hand shall be consumed" from the long sojourn of his army in the reduction of the castle of Jerusalem.

The Romans having by proclamation restored to Greece its ancient liberty, Antiochus became desirous of incorporating it into the Syrian Empire. Accordingly "he set his face to enter" into that country "with the strength of his whole kingdom, and (Ishrim) Israelites with him."

"Thus shall he do" in order to bring the strength of his kingdom to bear upon the great object of his ambition. In carrying his purpose into effect he was aware that he should have to contend against the Romans; and seeing that they had undertaken the defence of young Ptolemy, he thought it would best suit his interest to lull the king asleep, by giving him his daughter in marriage; as it was foretold, "and he," Antiochus "shall give him" Epiphanes, Cleopatra "the daughter of women, corrupting," or bribing "her" to betray her husband to his purposes by resigning to that prince as her dowry, the provinces of Cœle-Syria and Palestine, but upon condition that he should receive half the revenues. Thus the "Ishrim" were "with him" in his strengthening himself to enter into Greece.

Our common version reads "*and upright ones with him.*" *Ishrim* is the Hebrew for "upright ones." It is a noun plural masc. from the root *Isher*, to be straight, even, smooth right. *Isherun*, or Jeshurun, upright, or *uprightness* in the abstract. This is the marginal reading of the Polyglott. It occurs as a name of Israel in four passages "and was given" says Vitringa, "to the people, first, with respect to the original institution of *their condition*, as being the only nation which had the *right* knowledge of God, and professed the *true religion*; *2ndly*, with respect to the *seed* of the true Israel, which was preserved in this people, among whom were some properly *Ishrim* or *Isherim* "upright," men of pure sentiments and sincere affection towards God, and true confessors of his name." Hence I render the passage "*and Israelites with him*," a fragment which seems to find its fulfilment in their country being given over as a bribe to corrupt the young wife of Ptolemy Epiphanes to betray his interests to her father Antiochus the Great. But the king of the North had forgotten nature's laws, that "a man should leave his father and mother and cleave unto his wife." His policy was defeated by this principle; for as soon as she was married to Ptolemy, she renounced her father's interests, and embraced those of her husband. It was on this account that we find her joined with him in the embassy which was sent from Egypt to Rome to congratulate the Romans on the victory which Acilius had gained over her father at Thermopylæ. Thus the prophecy was verified, "but she" Cleopatra "shall not stand" on her father's side, "neither be for him."

Verse 18. "After this shall he" Antiochus at the earnest solicitation of the Ætolians, "turn his face unto the Isles" of Greece "and shall take many; but (quotzin) a military commander" L. Scipio, the Roman Consul "shall cause his reproach by him (offered) to cease; without his own disgrace he shall cause it to turn upon him," by defeating him at Mount Sipylus, and repulsing him from every part of Asia Minor.

In the battle of Sipylus, Antiochus lost 50,000 foot and 4000 horse slain. He was required to pay 15,000 talents; 500 down, 2,500 when the Senate should have ratified the treaty; and the rest in 12 years, 1000 talents each year. To this he acceded. Having obtained peace upon these conditions "he shall then turn his face toward the fortress" or Capital "of his own land." He was now very much puzzled how to raise the sum he was to pay to the Romans. He set out from Antioch to levy the tribute due to him by the provinces of the East. Being arrived in the province of Elymais, he was informed of a considerable treasure in the temple of Jupiter Belus. This temptation was irresistible. Accordingly he entered the temple at dead of night and carried off all the riches which had been hoarded there for a long series of years. "But he shall stumble and fall, and not be found." The people of Elymais, exasperated by this sacrilege, rebelled against him, and murdered him with all his followers.

Thus ends the Vision, or rather the Merae's discourse concerning Antiochus, the Great King of the north-eastern Horn of the Goat; represented to Daniel in the Vision of the East. The time of the 19th verse synchronizes with the year B. C. 187.

To be continued.

DEBATE ON THE SALVATION OF INFANTS, IDIOTS & PAGANS,

BETWEEN "REV. A. CAMPBELL AND REV. N. L. RICE."

Selected from the Report of the Discussion held at Lexington Ky.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR.

The reader is aware, that a great clamor has been raised against us for writing, incidentally as it were, upon the question—*What is the destiny of those who are either physically or circumstantially incapable of obeying the gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.*—Now put all we have written on this question together and it would scarcely make one-third of the above debate; and when we have written, or spoken, on the subject it has generally been pressed upon us. One of these "debatants" was among the first to excite a prejudice against our doctrine because of its *tendency* in these cases; and because of the imaginary evil professed to be apprehended to "this reformation" on account of its opprobrium! Yet in the discussion before us, he was the very person to introduce the question of the destiny of infants, idiots, and pagans! I do not blame him for bringing it up, because I do not believe that there is any divinely interdicted subject in God's Word; and if he could destroy the dogma of infant salvation and damnation, he would succeed in remov-

ing the foundation corner stone of domestic priestcraft. If my recollection serve me, I believe that the first time I ever alluded to the subject was to show the absurdity of infant sprinkling which is almost the sole baptism of the western world. Orthodox denominations all believe baptism essential for something, or we presume they would not practice it; now if it can be shown, that infants are neither salvable nor damnable in the popular sense, it evaporates into "thin air" all "baptism" in relation to them, and leaves the sectarian community in their true condition,—*which is an unbaptized and therefore uncircumcized one.* Well, here we have two Divines before a large audience debating upon the subject of the salvation and damnation of infants, idiots, and pagans; and one of them the man who some few years since affected to believe, that it was highly obnoxious to the Disciples and of a very schismatical tendency, &c. We maintained a certain view of Eternal life, which left them in the dust of the earth where the earthy man came from. This was denounced as heresy, and we have been punished with the treatment of a stag at bay, the reverend gentleman hallooing on the hounds; but the times are changed, and we find him dogmatizing upon the same subject, and palming assertions on the public for truth, that are, to use his own language, "unscriptural, irrational, and absurd." Now, we conceive, that in this land of boasted liberty and equality of rights, we have as much right to denounce him, and to renounce him, unless he cease to teach his speculations, except in self-defence when misrepresented! Yes, we have as much right; but the fact is that neither he nor we, have any right to put restrictions on one another at all. He has the right to speculate as much as he pleases, and so have we; the public can do as it pleases also whether it chooses to adopt his views, or ours, or neither: we shall exercise the liberty with which the truth has freed us, and proceed to sum up the fallacies of the disputants, and to state what we believe to be the scripture doctrine in the case.

Mr. Campbell's theory is substantially this:—*Human nature is constitutionally depraved*, or corrupt, we suppose he means; and as "corruption cannot inherit incorruption," depraved human nature, whether in an infantile, idiotic, or pagan form, cannot enter heaven. So far good. God designs to save all infants, idiots and pagans who have not the means of grace, *but would obey if they had* (we are not certain if he makes even this limitation)—but their *constitutional* depravity, and the law of his kingdom, necessitates their regeneration; they cannot, however, be regenerated *through the Word*, hence their regeneration is not moral, and must therefore be physical. But the subjects of idiots and pagans who die in their sins as well as constitutionally depraved; all those, *then*, who enter paradise arrive there without previous moral regeneration; and if by *enter heaven*, he mean, enter by a resurrection, they are physically regenerated by a resurrection from the dead, which he regards as the *miraculous regeneration* of infants, idiots, and pagans.

Now reader, mark the principle upon which the reverend gentleman delivers two-thirds of the human race from the sentence of the Law of Sin; it is upon the principle namely, that *death is a purifier of souls from sin.* Elect pagans die constitutionally depraved and steeped to the eyes in idolatry with all its abominations; thus they die constitutionally and morally depraved, but they enter heaven by a physical miracle, having been purified by death, which is in itself the punishment of sin!! This is Mr. Campbell's dilemma and syllogism—infants, idiots, and pagans are regenerated or they are not; without regeneration they cannot be saved; but they cannot be regenerated by the truth; they must therefore be regenerated by death and a resurrection! These we say are his, emphatically and especially his; for the truth has no such dilemma; no such sophisms or syllogisms.

But the principle upon which Mr. C. saves two-thirds, or three fourths, of the world is the grand universalist dogma, that *Death is a purifier from depravity and sin:* it is by this tradition, that they extricate the whole family of man from sin. They are consistent.—They save *the whole;* Mr. Campbell saves only *three-fourths of the whole* upon the same principle: one fourth only, or the mere application of the principle, makes the difference between them! Mr. Rice, however, is truly scriptural upon this point; for, says he, "*death will produce on the mind no moral change;*" and every scribe well instructed in the kingdom of heaven knows, that *without a moral change previous to death* neither infant, idiot, pagan nor adult of any class can enter heaven.

We take Mr. Campbell on his own ground, and say in the language of his fourth argument "*whatever is essential to regeneration in any case, is essential to it in all cases.*" If it be necessary, that he believe the testimony of the Spirit, that is, the Gospel, and be born of water, or baptized, to constitute him a regenerated man, it is equally necessary that all infants, idiots, and pagans should also believe and obey the gospel to their regeneration; for scriptural regeneration is neither solely moral, nor solely physical, but *both intellectual, moral, and physical.* Neither Mr. C. nor Mr. Rice have a right to sever these items, which God has wisely joined together as parts of one stupendous whole.

If it be true, and no man on earth can successfully maintain the contrary, that scriptural regeneration is wholly and unfractionally an intellectual, moral, and physical process, then it follows, as Mr. Rice contends, that Mr. Campbell's proposition of the spirit operating through the Word, does inevitably lead to infant damnation—as inevitably as the dogma of the confession concerning "elect infants and pagans" does, according to Mr. C., to the same catastrophe; which, as both these gentlemen believe in eternal torments, is indeed a *horrible*, "a horrible decree!"—But reader, mark well, if regeneration as a whole, be intellectual, moral, and physical (and the scripture teaches no partial regeneration as a substitute for the whole)—then the truth concerning the destiny of three-fourths of mankind is neither with Mr. Campbell nor Mr. Rice, but somewhere else. The spirit neither regenerates them "through the Word," nor "without the Word;" and there exists not the man under the canopy of heaven that can prove them to be the subjects of regeneration at all.

These gentlemen both believe and teach the physical regeneration of infants, idiots and pagans: the only difference is that Mr. Rice has them regenerated before death; and Mr. C. after death upon the Universalist principle. Though they are both in the dark on the subject, Mr. Rice is more scriptural in this, that he sticks to the text, which Mr. C. passed by in silence though urged to take it up; namely; a man, be he infant, idiot or pagan, "must be born again or he cannot enter into the kingdom of God"—"for that which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the spirit is spirit." This is the eternal truth of God's word; no human being can enter the kingdom of God who is not regenerated in body, soul, and spirit, the whole man. Mr. C. contradicts Jesus and dogmatically affirms, that they can. He teaches that three-fourths of the world may die depraved and even actually transgressors, if pagans and enter the kingdom of God by a miracle; so that while one fourth of the world are "scarcely saved" by obedience to the gospel and a patient continuance in well doing, he teaches that three-fourths *enter heaven by a miracle* without knowledge, faith, repentance, baptism, or good works! Who can wonder at his pleading for "Christians among the Sects," or at his nullifying the gospel by admitting, or at his teaching that pious men have remission of sins, only they don't know it, and therefore cannot *enjoy* it, without immersion in the name of Christ, or if immersed without an intelligent conviction of the truth! These are truly gospel nullifying principles. If we have misconstrued his theory (and if we have it is undesigned) let him show wherein and we will give it a revision, and if we have mistaken it we will correct the error. But in the face of the words of Jesus to Nicodemus, we demand the proof of 600,000,000 or more dying in depravity and sins, every thirty years, entering heaven by a miracle either at death or the resurrection: we ask for the *unparalleled* testimony of prophets or apostles.

But says Mr. Campbell, "my faith is in the Lamb of God who has taken away the sin of the world;" hence, he argues, illogically enough, that because God has taken away the sin of the world, *therefore* infants, idiots, and pagans are purified from sin and depravity, and enter heaven by a miracle! I ask an unbiassed reader, if such a *quod erat demonstrandum* be involved in the premises? Here we have Universalism leaking out again—a genuine universalist argument to prove the final salvation of the whole; Mr. C. elaborates it in the same way, but to the salvation of three-fourths! The Universalists handle the text, or rather refine it in their theological crucible with the same heat so as to reflect the same dogma; Christ has taken away the sin of the world, therefore, all mankind will be saved; 'hold,' cries Mr. C., 'not *all* mankind; say three-fourths, and then I will agree with you!"

But there is no such scripture, as Mr. C. quotes it, in the Bible. John the Baptist did

not say "Behold the Lamb of God who *hath taken away* the sin of the world." It is carelessness in Mr. C. to quote scripture in this way; he has no right to put his construction on passages, and without explanation, cite them as if repeated literatim et verbatim: in this way an unlearned audience is often led into error. John said, "Behold the Lamb of God *ho airoon* the sin of the world!" Now, Mr. C. knows, that the common version is the correct rendering of *ho airoon*. It is the nominative masculine singular of the *present* participle, agreeing with the noun *ho amnos* the Lamb in gender, number, and case. Why then does he render it by the perfect tense *hath taken away?* Is it true, that Jesus hath taken away the depravity of human nature, or the actual transgressions of the world? If he have, why are infants, idiots, pagans, and adults of all classes still subject to disease, to death, to corruption; why does the gospel call upon men to obey it for the remission of sins; are the sins of the world indeed taken away in the past tense, and is it yet necessary to obtain forgiveness of sins in the future!? If the Lamb of God *hath taken away* the sin of the world, then there is no halting between three-fourths and the whole. Universalism must be true in theory at least, if not in fact; for the facts in the case, destroy the theory. But the truth is, the common reading of the text is the only true one, and it harmonizes with the facts in the case. Jesus is "the Lamb of God taking, or who *taketh* away, the sin of the world." He was the propitiatory sacrifice for "the sins of the whole world;" so that "*whosoever* (of the world) believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life:" no, says the universalist "he is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world so that all mankind may have everlasting life" without condition; 'not so fast,' says Mr. C's theory, not all mankind, but that three-fourths of the world may be regenerated by a miracle, and that the other fourth may, if they will, be converted and sanctified only through the word!"

The fact is the sin of the world will not be taken away until "the Son shall deliver up the kingdom to the Father." When "death shall be no more," there will then be no more sins for death is the penalty of sin. Jesus has indeed led captivity captive;" but the emprisoner of men is not yet destroyed. This is the great work the Lamb of God has to do —*to take away the sin of the world by intellectual, moral, and physical means.* This work he cannot accomplish by purely intellectual, moral or physical institutions: we say, he cannot in face of the law, that "except a man be born of water and of the spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God;"—*truth* and *testaments* are the instrumentality he employs. By this he will finally succeed; for it is written, that "he shall make his laws victorious."

Mr. C. *insists*, that "if one infant be regenerated *without moral instrumentality* all can." We suppose, he means, all mankind can. Granted; and it might be urged against his theory also, that if three-fourths of the whole be regenerated by a miracle, the whole can. Indeed, it would be better for us all to be either infants, idiots or pagans; for then we should be safe. We should be regenerated by a miracle. We might enjoy this animal life, or the pleasures of civilization, but what of that, the cup of our present life, to most of us, has more of the bitter than the sweet, we should after a period of expiatory suffering as it were, return to our mother earth, and by a miracle arise to a new life, regenerated in all our parts; but as ignorant of who brought us into the new world, as the man, who, believing in the transmigration of souls, was of his relations when the animating principle of a flea! We should certainly be well qualified to "sing the new song"—"thou hast redeemed us to God by thy blood!" What glory there would be to God in all this, the scripture saith not. God appeals to our natural sense of justice; for the principles of justice are eternal, whether expressed by God or man. There would be a positive injustice in Mr. C's theory, as well as cruelty; of which the Divine Being has given no illustration in any of his dealings with mankind. Take the prophets, Jesus, and the apostles for examples. They learned obedience by the things they suffered in their adhesion to his word; and Jesus was for the suffering of death crowned with glory and honor. A cloud of witnesses of whom the world was not worthy also suffered the loss of all things that they might "*win* Christ;" yet, here is the doctrine of old Servetus, new vamped by Mr. Campbell, which gives to three-fourths of the depravity and sin of the world in the organized forms of infants, idiots, and pagans—which confers upon them all—*without any previous probation*,

less hazard, or hindrance—"glory, honor, immortality and eternal life" in the Future Glorious Age. Surely men who teach such things cannot believe the Ancient Gospel, or believing it, are ashamed of it, as too proscription for the liberality and piety of a sceptical generation! "If *the righteous scarcely be saved*, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?" The righteous scarcely be saved, and three-fourths of the world's depravity and sin translated into heaven by a miracle! If this be not making of none effect the word of God, we know not what is!

It is plain, that the doctrine, or theories, of the two gentlemen do inevitably lead to the damnation of all infants, idiots, and pagans: though we must, do them the justice to say, that they do not believe it. Their *principles* and their *opinions* are at variance. Men ought, however, to throw away theories they do not believe; but, to do this requires great honesty and self-denial, hence it is seldom done. They are manifestly perplexed, puzzled; the infants, idiots, and pagans are in the way. They would rather not hear the subject mentioned; they endeavor, therefore, to suppress the agitation of the subject as much as they can. But, in the discussion at Lexington it leaked out, to the manifest discomfiture of both parties, who had immortal souls to dispose of, but the Bible would not tell them what was to become of them; because they persisted in reading it in the spectacle of their own conceits. Had they understood the truth, they would have understood one another better; but they are too wise to learn, and God takes the wise in their own craftiness; hence they were foiled in their disputation, so that it remains for us, briefly to lay the truth before the world.

To be continued.

MURDOCK ON RE-IMMERSION.

From Chr. (Eng.) Messenger.

Mr. Editor.—As you conduct a professedly liberal and independent journal, and as you have already inserted some articles opposing the re-immersion of those who were immersed into the opinions of men, and not for the remission of sins, it is expected you will insert a friendly communication in favor of the re-immersion of such. No one need be startled at the idea of re-immersion; for Paul caused the subjects of John's baptism to be re-immersed. Acts xix. We have apostolic example here; and if all the tongues and voices in the world were raised against us for advocating such a thing, we can with complacency, wait until their ire has subsided; and then resume our advocacy of the truth, in the spirit of our Master, Jesus.

What the baptism of Christ is may be briefly expressed thus:—A believer is to be immersed in water, for the remission of sins. We thus see four prominent features in this institution. The first is that, a believer is the subject; second, immersion is the action; third, water is the element in which that action is performed; and fourth, remission of sins is the design.

1st. Now, before proceeding any further, let me ask which of these shall or may we dispense with, and still call it the baptism of Christ? The first—the second—the third—the fourth? Of how many of them may we dispense with, and still retain the institution of Christ? One? two? or three? Some have dispensed with the design; some with the design and the subject; some with the design, the subject, and the action; and some have dispensed with them all, and each and all of these say that they have the baptism of Christ, and possess that gift which Christ promised to communicate to those who submitted to him—the remission of sins. But if we may lay aside one of these, why may not others lay aside another, or two or three other? In short, if we may alter it at all, why may not others dispense with it altogether? And if it still be the baptism of Christ without the design, is it not the baptism of Christ without the subject and so on? If we begin

to alter or modify we do not know where to stop. But God has joined those constituents of Christian baptism together; and let those take heed to themselves who separate them. Or let those take heed to themselves, who would, for the above baptism, substitute one having other constituents.

Now it is with such as have been the subjects of a baptism having only the first, the second, and third of the above features that we have to do: those who were immersed not for the remission of sins; and to them we would submit the preceding questions, requesting them to answer them to their own satisfaction. Let them think of the importance of the subject. Let them bear in mind that, if they be in the error, they are still in their sins; and if they find this to be the case, they must embrace the principle which we have enumerated. Also let them think of this: if they should even be right, we are safe; whereas, if we be right, they are in danger.

2nd. Christ, repeating the words of the prophet, says, "In vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrines, institutions merely human." And Paul tells the Galatians that the gospel, by having legal customs added to it, ceased to be the gospel. Now baptism has not only had a human design added to it, but it has had the divine design taken away, if we even admit that ever the modern institutions were of God, and so it has ceased to be the baptism of Christ. For if the perversion of the gospel renders it no gospel, so will the perversion of the baptism render it no baptism of Christ. What then is the condition of those who have only submitted to the modern rites of human invention, or perversion, if you like it? Theirs must be the condition of those who have not obeyed the truth. And we can also answer a question on p. 384, vol. V. of the *Christian Messenger*. "In what point of view are all their prayers and praises, and communion in the Lord's death, &c. to be regarded?" Christ answers in the above words, "In vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrines, institutions merely human." So that however triumphantly the question may be asked, Christ answers that *their worship is vain*.

To be able to answer the question in this way is no great triumph to us; we answer it in sorrow and affection for those whose interests are so much involved in it—in sorrow that they should be in such a condition, and that those who ought to know better should be helping them to delude themselves; and we manifest our affection in our endeavors to convince them of the truth.

3rd. Paul tells us that "whatsoever is not of faith is sin;" and that "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." Now seeing this to be the case, and that it is not of faith to be baptized for the purposes for which the moderns are frequently baptized, it must be sin. It is not of faith; therefore it is sin.

4th. The command is to be baptized for the remission of sins. But they only obey one half of the command, and the other they leave out. Now how can they mend this but by arising and being baptized, and washing away their sins, calling on the name of the Lord?

5th. The baptism of John was very similar to that of Christ; and notwithstanding this, the subjects of the former were required by an apostle to be immersed into the name of the Lord Jesus. And if this was the case, how much more ought they to be re-immersed, who have only submitted to an institution never sanctioned by God, or at best a perverted institution?

6th. Seeing that the right use of baptism is to put the penitent believer in possession of the remission of his sins, the other uses that are made of it are mere perversions. It hence follows that those who have been baptized, not for the remission, have perverted the institution, and never made the proper use of it. How then can they claim the privileges which can only belong to those who use the institution properly? Let them cease to pervert the institutions and the right ways of the Lord, and arise and be baptized, and wash away their sins. Taking this view of the subject, it would appear that the modern baptizers contend for the privileges, not because they have used the institution of God, but because they have perverted it.

It is clear from the preceding, that those who were immersed as aforesaid, required to be re-immersed; and of course, it follows that we should have no fellowship with them until they have obeyed the truth. There might be much more said to the same effect; but this may suffice for the present, with answers to some objections.

First objection. But although they did not, when they were immersed, believe that immersion was for the remission of sins, they believe it now; and, therefore, they do not need to be re-immersed. Answer first. So might a person reason who had been immersed in infancy. He did not believe or repent, but he does so now; and therefore he need not be re-immersed! If the one defect can be remedied without re-immersion, so may the other. 2. But Paul did not, reason as above with the disciples he met at Ephesus. He had them baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, although they had repented before their first immersion, and believed in the coming of Christ, and in the design. He did not teach them that their subsequent faith would mend the matter, unless they acted according to that faith. 3. And if our modern friends do believe now that baptism is for the remission of sins, let them shew their faith by their works. Let them be baptized for the remission of their sins. 4. And as we have seen they either perverted the baptism of Christ, or submitted to another; and that they may come to the enjoyment of the forgiveness of their sins, they must use it properly, and thus submit to the institution of Christ.

Second objection. You ought to allow them to be fully persuaded in their own minds. Answer 1. Very true; and we help them to be persuaded of the truth, by laying it before their minds; for we know that they cannot be persuaded of the truth of anything unless it be submitted to their minds. 2. But some use the above words as if the best way to enable a man to be persuaded in his mind, was to let him alone, and not assist him by furnishing him with evidence. There are many fully persuaded in their own minds that infant sprinkling is of God. Shall we leave them in that condition? Surely not. We must persuade them of the truth. So also of those who are persuaded of the truth of other things which are not true.

Third objection. The subject is entirely of a personal nature, and you should leave them to do as they think proper. Answer. It is of a personal nature certainly; but not only so we as well as they, must be convinced that they are forgiven, before we can hold fellowship with them. For if we fellowship with them without believing that they are forgiven we are sinning. For whatsoever is not of faith is sin; and we are conniving at their delusion.

Fourth objection. But you should bear with your weak brethren. Answer. When they become my brethren in Christ, I will treat them as such. But to call them my brethren now, is just to beg the very question in dispute. If it can be proved they are my brethren in Christ I will at once give up the point; but so long as I look upon them as unpardoned I cannot call them brethren. And further, I must withdraw from those who are disorderly as to fellowship with aliens, and help to delude them by countenancing their disobedience to, and perversion of, the truth.

Fifth objection. Then you must cut off all connexion with the churches and disciples in America, and many in this country! Answer 1. Well, what of that? If those churches consist of unpardoned and disorderly persons, it must be a relief to be cut off from having connexion with them; and it is our imperative duty to separate from them, in obedience to the command of God, whatever the consequences may be. 2. What is there so serious in being separated from those in America and here, who do not obey the truth, any more than there is in separating from the Papists, Episcopalians, and the like. If the objector have a desire to frighten us with numbers, he had better add all the sects in Europe and America together, and then say that we separate from them all; there will be something more formidable in it. 3. If the churches and individuals in America will compromise the truth for the sake of numbers or popularity, that is no reason why we should follow their example, or countenance their errors; it is rather a very good reason why we should the more boldly advocate and practice the truth in opposition to the error. Let the churches in America see to themselves that they are not building a sect, having in it some of the essential elements of the "falling away." And let us see to ourselves, as churches, and as individuals, that we do what is right, being unmoved from the truth by the numbers of other communities or by the authority of other individuals. Let us prove all things, and hold fast the truth. To our own master we stand or fall. The circumstance of things being imported from America does

not stamp the truth upon them, by whomsoever they may have been exported. We must examine for ourselves, act for ourselves, and give an account of ourselves. And may the Lord grant that we may all be able to do so, and ultimately enter into the possession of the incorruptible and undefiled inheritance which fadeth not away, which is now reserved for us in heaven.

I should be glad if you would state your objections to this letter, if you have any, or acknowledge in word and in deed your assent, regardless of the authority of any man or set of men.

Affectionately yours,
JOHN MURDOCH.

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

The following correspondence explains itself. It is interesting in various points of view. It throws light upon the Ecclesiastical Politics of the age, as well as upon certain important doctrinal questions. We invite the reader to peruse it dispassionately, and calmly to pronounce upon the topics of which it treats. Its publication has been superinduced by the considerations presented in the following note, which harmonize exactly with our wish, namely, that "those interested may know precisely what has passed between us." We have not room to offer further remarks at this time: we must therefore refer the reader to the correspondence which of itself will put him in possession of the facts in the case.

R. F. FERGUSON TO THE EDITOR.

Office Christian Journal,
Harrodsburgh, Ky., June 7, 1844.

Dear Doctor,

A report has got into circulation by some means, that I agree with you in your views of what *The Book* teaches. As I have no copy of letters addressed by me to you, you will confer a favor by sending me my original letters, or copies of them if you prefer it, that I may publish, at least my letters to you, if not your letters to me, in order to let those interested know precisely what has passed between us. Feeling assured that you will extend to me this courtesy *immediately*, I subscribe myself

Yours, Faithfully,
R. F. FERGUSON.

P. S. Fearing you may not be at Louisville a copy of this is sent to Cincinnati.

The above was indeed the last of Bro. F's letters; but we have inserted it as the first, by way of showing how the correspondence came to be published at this crisis. The following was introductory to the correspondence, and therefore

No. 1.

Overture for peace—Is the Editor "one of us?" What the terms of his fellowship?

Dr. Thomas,—Dear Sir:

I have been requested by two of the principal brethren in Virginia, to open a correspondence with you, for the purpose of ascertaining whether there exists a probability for the reconciliation of all past difficulties between you and the Virginia brethren. The proposition, *I know*, is made in *good faith*, and in view of all the disastrous results of schism, demands, in my opinion, your solemn and prayerful consideration. You are personally a stranger to me, and with your writings I am not familiar, though I have a general understanding of your teaching on the Christian System. I am equally strange to you. But so far from considering this a disadvantage in bringing our correspondence to that issue which all good men must desire—the consummation of peace and harmony between you and those with whom you differ—I esteem it favorable to the accomplishment of the object designed. We have no private griefs, no personal difficulties to impede our progress in the object of this correspondence. True, I could wish that some other individual had been chosen by the brethren in Virginia for this purpose; for doubtless my accidental position as Editor of the Journal has had too much weight with them in making their selection, whilst there are others in Kentucky better known and such as would doubtless be preferred by you as mediator in t[illegible] has

matters. But you must not consider that I alone am concerned in this negociation; President Shannon approves of the object of this communication and I beg you to consider him as connected with me in all that may pass between you and me on this subject.

Without farther preface I proceed to ask you a question or two, which you will doubtless have no objection to answering. Do you consider yourself one of *us*—as connected with the great reforming movement of this century, which has for its object the establishment of Christianity as it was in the beginning? Do you consider yourself one of this brotherhood?—a brotherhood united in the belief of the facts of the gospel, and not on opinions; or must the brotherhood embrace your opinions (or your *faith*, if you prefer that word)—those opinions which have created present difficulties between you and them—before you can recognize them as brethren?

As I do not know what your sentiments and feeling are towards those who differ with you, it is important as you will doubtless perceive, that I should have a definite answer to this question, ere I enter more fully into this mediation.

I will state for your satisfaction, that my father is one of the brethren who has requested me to ascertain if peace cannot be restored. He is a peace-maker—and I will further say that the proposition for peace comes from one with whom you have had serious difficulties—but who *for the sake of peace* is willing to bury the past.

You are a reader of the scriptures, Doctor; It is then wholly unnecessary for me to present the motive which should actuate us, or the sacrifices that we are called upon to make in restoring harmony where discord now holds her reign.

Please answer this at your earliest leisure.

Fraternally yours,
R. F. FERGUSON.

THE EDITOR'S REPLY.—No. 1.

Settlement of past difficulties—Causes of present ones—Real motive for peace—Proper foundation thereof—who fellowshipped by the Editor—Leading principles.

Cincinnati, Ohio, May 1, 1844.

Bro. Ferguson,

Dear Sir,—Dr. Field has transmitted to me a letter from you addressed to his care. It is written to me; and came to hand a day or two since. In the communication you say, "you are requested by two of the principal brethren in Virginia, to open a correspondence with me for the purpose of ascertaining whether there exists a probability of reconciliation of all past difficulties between me and the Virginia brethren?" You also add a very important item, namely, that you "*know* that the proposition is made in *good faith*."

After this you proceed to ask me "a question or two" as follows: "Do you consider yourself as one of us—as connected with the great reform movement of this century, which has for its object the establishment of christianity as it was in the beginning?—a brotherhood united in a belief of the facts of the gospel, and not in opinions; or must the brotherhood embrace your opinions (or your *faith* if you prefer that word)—those opinions which have created present difficulties between you and them—before you can recognize them as brethren?"—And lastly, you inform me, that your respected father (with whom I believe I had a slight acquaintance in Philadelphia, and who became subsequently a subscriber to the Advocate) is one of the two principal brethren, who have requested you to open the correspondence, and that the other, is one with whom I have had "serious difficulties"—"but who *for the sake of peace* is willing to bury the past." Such appear to be all the points of your letter to which a reply is requested.

Now, as to the other of the "two principal brethren," I *guess*, that it is friend Campbell, for there is no other principal brother in Virginia with whom I have had any "difficulties" which I consider deserve the name of "serious." Men are apt to magnify things in their own minds, which intrinsically are of no importance; and while there are several who regard themselves as chief among the brethren there, who have been diligently *manufacturing difficulties*, yet as to their personalities against me, I regard them as mere particles of dust raised by the general breeze. They sometimes get into the eyes and produce a little irritation; but after a while it subsides and the cause is forgotten.

As to "ALL *past difficulties*" this is a phrase, which may either signify all difficulties, great

and small, from my arrival in Richmond in 1834 to the present time; or, from the Painesville meeting in 1830 till now. All difficulties were *precisely* settled down to 1838; in relation to them, therefore, I have nothing to say. If any body else wishes to talk them all over again, they can have it all to themselves. Since 1838 it appears, that some styling themselves "*the* Virginia Brethren," have elaborated another catalogue of "difficulties," all arising out of an alleged infraction of some fictitious covenant, on my part, "in the very announciation of it." They should remember that in all covenants there are two parties, and that if good *faith* is not maintained on the one side, the other is certainly released. This want of good faith toward me I can prove. The 'resolution' was construed to mean what I would have suffered the loss of my right hand before I would have assented to; and my position at and subsequently to the debate with A. C. was '*misrepresented*.' I give you credit, brother F., for the ground you now occupy in this matter to the full extent of your wishes, and that your father and brother Shannon are actuated by the best of motives; but I do assure you from my experience of the past, and of the present down to this day, I am intensely sceptical as to the 'good faith' you speak of

Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes.*

For nearly three years after I left Virginia, I was so silent that many of my friends knew not whether I was dead or alive. From our debate until I left Amelia, Va., in Sept. 1839, there could be no new difficulties, for a letter of fellowship was presented to me unsolicited from the church, so that from Nov. 1838 till the commencement of the Investigator in May 1842, no Virginia brethren can pretend to have any thing against me. '*All past difficulties*' then must refer to the events of the last two years. Now concerning the 'reconciliation' of these, it will of course depend upon the nature of them.

The count in which is involved all big and little difficulties, is my *alleged* infraction of a covenant. It is not the place here to argue the matter. I simply deny it, and remark that the *majority* of the brethren who signed the resolution do not condemn me. I refer to Dr. May's letter in the Herald of the Future Age, and A. B. Magruder's protest in his last pamphlet. What then has originated the difficulties since 1842? *A spontaneous and unprovoked attack upon me by friend Campbell.*

If I have *guessed* right that he is disposed to bury the past *for the sake of peace*, I would remark that, however much disposed, *it is not in my* POWER *to make peace*. Peace upon Bible principles is very desirable; and that is the only peace I will be a party to. I have tried peace *based upon compromise*, and experience teaches me that no good comes of it. I am anxious and ready to promote peace based upon *truth, liberty, equal rights and justice*. If the 'principal brother' and 'Virginia Brethren' are prepared for this, then I, and the brethren who are my friends (and without them I make no treaty) will all doubtless be ready to bury the tomahawk and smoke the pipe of peace.

Allow me to remark that an overture for peace with such a character as 'the Virginia Brethren' are laboring in speech and print to make me, greatly astonishes me; and suggests the inquiry, can *I* without a profound suspicion of their want of 'good faith' and honesty, consent to peace with them? And should I not commit sin before God in being reconciled to them? Consider for a moment the crimes and heresies with which I am charged! They denounce me as an 'Arch-factionist,' 'a reviler of the brethren,' 'a splitter of every church with which I have had to do,' 'a hypocritical rascal'—[Coleman's saying,] 'a wolf' [A. Campbell's] a denier of the divinity of Jesus, a Materialist, a Sadducee, who denies the resurrection of all the dead; I am compared to an unclean beast; disinherited of the kingdom of God, and therefore not fit for any church; one whose principles subvert the foundation of all religion, a liar, &c., &c. Behold the use made of my name at Lexington, and in the Charlottesville Intelligencer, and the arbitrary proscription of the brethren who will not join in the proscription against me. These are not old, but current, denunciations just issued from the press; yes, brother F., some of them even *since the date of your letter*. Now, this is either my true character, or it is not. If I am what they represent me to be, then they would perpetrate a high crime and misdemeanor against high heaven in being at peace with me; *if they believe their own charges* for I am to day what I was three

* *I fear the Greeks bringing presents.*

months ago] *and in that faith they offer peace*, I would as soon be at peace with Satan, for it would be a fellowship of rank iniquity—such faith and fellowship will not suit me; and if they have been moved to this overture by the unfavorable attitude Mr. Rice has placed them in by their unholy course towards me, I cannot consent to *hush up the matter* to extricate them from a dilemma upon the horns of which they have suspended themselves. Did I believe a man to be such an one as they profess to regard me, I would wage war against him till death unless he reformed. This is their duty with respect to me, *if they believe the truth of their own charges*.

But if their representations are not the true version of my character, then they have sinned grievously against me, and have a very fearful account to settle with the judge. I know that they have one and all dealt falsely against me; and, if I am not now extinguished, no thanks to them; and I cannot but say to you, that I believe the present move is a mere matter of policy, and not a sincere desire of doing *justice*, and without this there will be no peace. I do not say this of you, your father and brother Shannon, but of the said 'Virginia Brethren' of whose movements I am well informed. If I am mistaken, we shall see; for *justice must be done as the foundation of a lasting and a solid peace*.

As to the questions you put to me, I remark, that with the calumny [for such I consider it] afloat against my name before you, it is for you to say, whether I am one of what you term '*us*' in your letter. I believed the gospel and do still believe and rigidly contend for it as Paul preached it; I have obeyed it; and do *most earnestly avow my most full and perfect conviction that there is no salvation but by an intelligent obedience of it*. This is the foundation corner stone of my 'heresies.'—Those that are best acquainted with me can testify that I 'persevere in well-doing,' notwithstanding all the obstacles thrown in my way, by those who ought to know better. I can fellowship any one who is '*in Christ*.' Can you do *more*? If you can, I cannot: but I do not believe you can. If by the term *us* you mean all who are '*in* Christ, then most certainly, regarding myself as '*in* Christ, I consider myself as ONE OF *his disciples*; but whether others are willing to consider me as such remains with them to say. You will also be able to determine whether I am connected with 'the great reform movement of this century' by what you read in the Herald I sent you, and by the fact, that I labor without compromise for an entire and complete return to first principles in theory and practice, as a preparation to meet the Lord when he appears, which I believe is not far off. A brotherhood to be spiritual must be united on something more than the belief of the facts of the gospel." When you reflect you will doubtless agree to this. That Jesus died is a fact; so did Abel: that he was buried is a fact; so was Abel: that he rose again, is a fact; so did Lazarus. But what makes these facts in relation to Jesus of more interest to the world, than the same facts in relation to Abel and Lazarus? Is it not the meaning, truth, or doctrine of the facts? The truth is, 'he died for sins,' or 'was delivered for our offences,' and 'rose again for our justification.' The facts and the meaning of the facts, I regard as making up the *truth or gospel*. I consider myself *as one of a brotherhood united on a belief of the gospel as a whole and as defined, and who have been baptised into Christ on that belief*. Is it an opinion that Christ died for sin; that he rose for our justification; that immortality, glory, honor and eternal life are the reward of the righteous, and if so, belong not to the wicked; is it an opinion that the wicked are destroyed; that Jesus will come again in the flesh, that the dead in Christ are raised; the living believers changed at his coming, and that the rest live not till the 1000 years are ended? If these are opinions then what is faith? I believe and teach these things; but I GIVE LAWS TO NONE. I recognize all who are in Christ, and walk worthy of the gospel, though in some things, such as, 'the immortality of the soul,' 'the destruction of the wicked,' 'the visible manifestation of Jesus soon or 'the destiny of infants, idiots and pagans'—we may differ. The mottoes of the Chr. Bapt. are leading principles with me; *first*, 'Call no man Rabbi &c.;' and *secondly*, 'Prove all things and hold fast that which is good: to these I have adhered hitherto to the best of my judgment and ability, and trust I shall be enabled to do so even till the end. My friends will doubtless be ready to sacrifice any thing for peace, BUT *truth, liberty, equal rights, justice and character;* and this we know how to defend as 'the apple of the eye.

The word of God requires no sacrifice of these for the sake of peace; for myself I have weathered the storm when the tempest raged the fiercest, I do not think my bark will founder now that the wind has lulled, and the heavens are disposed for peace.

That truth and justice, if not peace, may be established and prevail is the sincere desire of yours faithfully,

JOHN THOMAS.

R. F. Ferguson to the Editor.—No. 2.

President Campbell not the 'principal brother'—Pamphleteering—Prospect of reconciliation—Christ "the Savior of all men"—Points of agreement or disagreement—Rule of Speech—Further mediation declined—Will not non-fellowship—A little irony, &c.

Office Christian Journal, May 4, 1844.

Brother Thomas,

Dear Sir:—Yours of the 1st instant is before me, and I hasten to disabuse your mind of some of the inferences you have drawn from my first epistle. I never received but one letter from Brother Alexander Campbell of Bethany in my life; and that one was simply a reply to one addressed by me to him some eighteen months ago, and contained no allusion to you, directly or indirectly. The letters which I receive from his clerks in his name on business I do not call his. We differ in the use of the word "*principal*:" when I use the phrase, 'principal brethren,' I only mean such as labor habitually and publicly in word and doctrine—there are a hundred *such* 'principal brethren,' in Virginia, I presume. I had supposed that the difficulties between you and some of the brethren in Eastern Virginia could be settled, without the mention of brother Campbell's name in the matter: but it seems that you regard the matter differently. In your letter, the 'Virginia Brethren' constitute one party, and "my [your] Brethren," another—in other words, there are two parties in Virginia—Alexander Campbell's and John Thomas's. As I have no knowledge of the existence of such parties, I, of course, am no ambassador from the one to the other, having not been accredited as such by either. It is true, that I have read some publications in which your name and brother Campbell's stand arrayed against each other, as also the name of his and your friends; but I do not acknowledge the existence of two parties. I look upon the differences, as between brethren, and therefore to be settled, if settled at all, *individually*. I have known many private difficulties in churches, which had they been made public, and the claims of each party espoused by two popular Editors, would in the eyes of the Editors at least, have produced quite a repectable schism—*respectable* in numbers alone. I am sick of these publications of private griefs, come they from whom they may. Now-a-days, the slightest case of discipline is sufficient to produce a pamphlet, and then the pamphlet must receive a reply. A man conceives himself to be injured, and the world is called upon to lament with him—a church conceives itself injured by the publication, and the sister congregations are invoked for sympathy. Christians of this age, have not learned how to suffer and *be quiet*, or as Longfellow beautifully expresses it, "To suffer and be strong." I have not so learned Christ. It is hardly necessary to say that the Apostles condemn it. But then, it is not on individual account that these publications are made! O no! "true causes" requires it at their hands! But I am digressing. Jno. Du Val is the brother who wrote in connexion with my father. I know him not; but his desire for peace, and his effort to effect it, speak favorably of him as a Christian; and I must still believe—("*know*" perhaps is too strong a word)—that the proposition was made in *good faith*. He did not request me to keep his name a secret from you. I did it for reasons of my own. The whole matter was left to my discretion whether to open a correspondence with you or not. I had but small hope of effecting anything towards reconciliation; but could not decline making an effort: and strange as it may seem to you, your letter, in my view, holds out some prospect of reconciliation. I have no objection myself to your exposition of what the Gospel is. That the facts of the Gospel and their import are inseparably connected, there can be no doubt. You acknowledge all who are "in Christ," as your brethren. You say that there is no salvation but by an intelligent obedience of the gospel. If you mean that there is *no salvation at all*, but in the gospel, I disagree with you, for Christ is declared to be "the Savior of *all* men, especially of them that believe." If, however, you mean that the *Gospel* salvation, can be enjoyed in no other way than by intelligent obedience, then we entirely agree. As to the destruction of the wicked, there is nothing taught more palpably in the oracles of God; but I find that the destination of the wicked was not the burthen of the Apostles when proclaiming the gospel; and when I speak or write of that destruction, I prefer doing it in Apostolic language, knowing that I cannot err in such a course. After a careful perusal of your letter, I have come to the conclusion that your difficulties with the brethren in Virginia should be settled *there*; and shall write to Bro. Du Val to address you directly, on the subject. I should be pleased however to hear from you again if it suits your labors and convenience. It would be highly reprehensible in me to say that I do not acknowledge you as a brother. I consider myself more indebted to bro. A. Campbell than any other *man* for my Biblical knowledge—perhaps Doctor you can say the same—but if the dearest friend I had on earth, were to *non*-fellowship a man, *that* would not induce me to do it. I must know the facts, in all such cases, *for myself* before I decide. It is a solemn, nay, a fearful thing, for a fallible mortal to treat another as an alien because others treat him so. In looking over your spiritual history as detailed by you, I find that you have greatly the advantage of me. Since you have been "in Christ," you have persevered in well-doing. I find many things to regret in my life since I took upon me the name of Christ, and this is another reason why I should not *non*-fellowship you. I hope we may meet the Lord as he descends to earth, and that it may be soon.

Your Brother,

R. F. FERGUSON.

Editor to R. F. Ferguson.—No. 2.

True motive for peace?—The Gospel for sinners; everlasting destruction to those who reject it—Endless torture the lever of the Apostacy—Rule of speech too temporising—Double entendre preaching—The Editor's rule of speech the only honest one—"Gospel salvation" defined—No eternal life without obedience—Christ not the Savior of all men—Gospel Nullification a salve for evil consciences—Fair weather ahead—Captiousness of ignorance—Publication of Correspondence approved.

[Herald Office, Main st., Louisville, Ky.]
June 10th, 1844.

Brother Ferguson,

Dear Sir,—A little while ago during my sojourn in Cincinnati, I received a communication from you in reply to mine. I should have answered it ere this but for want of time, being occupied in getting our printing office into order for future operations. On the 8th inst. your brief, and, I suppose, urgent and hurried, note of the 7th came promptly and duly to hand. I have, therefore, your two letters before me, which require grave and courteous answers.

The first in order is May 4, 1844. As you have declined further mediation between me and a few individuals, whose self esteem or something else has magnified them into "the Virginia Brethren." *Kat Exopheen*, all that part of your letter which relates to them may be dismissed as wholly extraneous to the things between us. You have done your part to my satisfaction, and I doubt not to theirs. I think I can understand the philosophy of the whole affair, and, however convinced you may be of their "good faith," for myself I am compelled to differ from you, and still aver my conviction, that the overture for peace did not originate in any good will towards me. Dr. Duval was loud in his denunciations against me last autumn, and I am not aware of having done any thing since then to make me more popular with him and his colleagues. But this is true, I have many friends in the region where he lives, and my subscribers have increased there from five to about thirty; now, I presume, that he finds his hostility somewhat inconvenient, and therefore, for the sake of peace at home is willing to bury the past and be at peace with me; not that he loves me better, but that he loves his own tranquility more. The *continued* endeavors of the party he belongs to, to destroy my character will not permit me to come to any other conclusion: it will take the strongest possible evidence to convince me that their "faith" me-ward, is any thing but *craft* to entrap me in some constructive, or pretended, "covenant."

I am glad to find that we agree as to *what the Gospel is*;" as to the destiny of the wicked; and the speedy personal descent of the Lord to earth. I endorse most readily, that sentence of your letter which says, "*as to the destruction of the wicked*, THERE IS NOTHING

TAUGHT MORE PALPABLY IN THE ORACLES OF GOD:" and furthermore, I agree, "that the destruction of the wicked was not the burthen of the Apostles when proclaiming the Gospel." This is self evident to every tyro in the construction of words and sentences. You and I agree, that "Gospel" is *glad tidings;* it is manifest therefore, that the "*Everlasting Destruction*" of those who "know not God and OBEY NOT THE GOSPEL &c" is good news neither to saint nor sinner. When I explain "the word of Life" for salvation I never proclaim the destruction of the wicked; because manifestly, there are no glad tidings in it. I hold out to my hearers "life and incorruptibility," or "glory, honor, immortality and eternal life," with the unsearchable riches of the Future Age to be attained when the Lord cometh, as inducements for them to depart from sin, and turn to the living God in obeying the truth for the remission of sins that are past. If they receive the word of life, it is well: they hear of no everlasting destruction from me. But *if they put it from them and judge themselves unworthy of Eternal Life,* I open up to them from the word, the "terrors of the Lord," when he shall come from heaven "with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and who obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power." I find that these two topics, namely *salvation* and *damnation*, both of them by Jesus Christ, were the burthen of the Apostolic proclamation. They did not do as the moderns, preach damnation to fire and eternal torture first, or at all, and then salvation; but they first made known "the wonderful works of God" and "his goodness to the children of men," that they might win them to the obedience of his law; and then, if their message are rejected, they announced in dignified and temperate language, *a resurrection to the damnation of hell*—or as Jesus, Paul and John affirm it, "everlasting punishment," by an "everlasting destruction" which is the "second death" —a "death ending in death"—which is indeed *a punishment without end.*

I admire the manliness with which you announce your conviction of what "the Book teaches." The destruction of the wicked is, as you say, "palpably taught in the Oracles of God;" nothing more so. The dogma of *endless torture*, as our opponents maintain it, is a mere heathen fable, and without place in the divine oracles. It is the mere rod of terror, by which priests scare men, women and children into subjection, or rather abjection, to their meretricious sovereignty. Destroy this rod, and their "occupation's gone;" for it is only by terror, a pagan terror, that they crowd their benches with devotees. Their superstitions are based on fear; their proselytes submit to their laws, that they may escape the fire and brimstone of the pit; whereas we, fearless of the Saturnalia of the Apostacy, obey the truth and hold on the troubled tenor of our way, that we may obtain an unfading crown of righteousness at the revelation of our Lord. We love God, because it is made to appear in the divine Oracles, that he loves us: may our adhesion to his truth, the best evidence of our affection for his Son, be unfaltering; and though evil entreated in this vale of tears, let us rejoice in the hope of the glory of God, and that we are accounted worthy to suffer shame for his name's sake.

But, brother Ferguson, though I commend you for these things, there are one or two items in your epistle to which I cannot say *amen* without a few words of friendly criticism. You say, "and when I speak or write of that destruction, I prefer doing it in apostolic language, knowing that I cannot err in such a course." This is very well as far as it goes; I only object to the rule because it does not go far enough. It savors too much of carnal policy *in its application* for my palate. Why do men prefer to speak of the destruction of the wicked in apostolic language *without explaining what that language means?* I fear, not because of their love of apostolicity, but *in order to keep their true sentiments from their hearers and readers, lest they should be charged with heresy, and on this account, perhaps be cast out of the Synagogue.* I do not say, my dear sir, that this motive actuates you; but I have reason to believe it does others.—Last winter there was a preacher in this city, who ministered oftentimes for the reformers, who declared to a friend of mine, that he had a sermon in his pocket on the destruction of the wicked, but that he was afraid to preach it! Why? Because it explained the "apostolic language;" yet he taught the destruction of the wicked "in apostolic language." But he was not detected; either because of the obtuseness of his hearers, or because of the Origenic system of interpreting "apostolic language," which the people have universally adopted without knowing it.

You know, that the professors of our day adopt the *double entendre* method of preaching and interpreting what they read and preach; that is, they pretend, that the word has some other meaning than the grammatical import of its language. Thus they say *destruction* relates only to the body, but not to the soul; hence, when a man is everlastingly destroyed, it means, that his "immortal soul" shall be tortured, or roasted, in fire and brimstone eternally. Now we know they attach these ideas to destruction; and when we tell the sinner in "apostolic language" the doom that awaits him if he refuse to obey, we *know* that they attach these false and pagan notions to our speech; now, is it honest in us, who believe we know the true doctrine on this subject, to allow them to impose upon themselves for truth mere old wives' fables as to the destiny of the disobedient? To me it appears like cowardice, like handling the word of God deceitfully to save our orthodoxy or popularity. Paul would not have done this, why then should we? You have not heard, perhaps, that the destination of the wicked, the non-"immortality of the soul" &c., have ceased to be an offence at Bethany! A lady called on Alexander while he was in Cincinnati and invited him to visit Louisville, hoping that it might lead to peace between us: but he negatived the conception, saying, that 'he did not care a cent for the theory, but the course the man had taken would prevent that.' Thus he spoke in substance as she reported to me. Formerly, *the theory* or "matter" was the offence; now, finding, I presume, that the theory cannot be suppressed, he affects great grievance at me on account not of the theory, but of *the course* forsooth. This however by the way. I mention the anecdote to show, that the theory, if believed by those in favor at Bethany will be no cause of offence, provided only they show no civility towards me! In conclusion upon this topic, I give you the rule according to which I dispose of this and all other questions before the public: *When I speak or write of the destruction of the wicked, &c. I do it in apostolic language; and knowing the ignorance which prevails of the meaning thereof, I explain that language by a collation of scripture, in order that men may know and understand their destiny as taught by the Oracles of God.*

The next item of criticism is contained in the passage which reads thus:—"If you mean," say you to me, "that there is *no salvation at all*, but in the Gospel, I disagree with you; for Christ is declared to be "the Savior of *all* men, especially of them that believe." If, however, you mean, that the *Gospel* salvation can be enjoyed in no other way than by intelligent obedience, then we entirely agree." Now, my dear friend, before you can comprehend my position in relation to this topic, which I esteem one of vast importance, I must define what I understand by the phrase '*gospel* salvation,' which however, is not of my coinage.

I believe the salvation set forth in the gospel to be *a release from sin, by which release, a man obtains* A TITLE *to eternal life; and, if he patiently continue in well-doing, he will attain to the resurrection of the just and die no more.* This is what I understand as "gospel salvation"—A DELIVERANCE FROM SIN AND DEATH. Mark me well! A man may obey the gospel, and thus obtain remission of all past sins, and *a title to Eternal Life;* but, unless he continue in well-doing, even though he have obeyed the truth, he will not see that life which endeth in life, but the wrath of God abideth on him—he will never realize the things promised to which he obtained a title —he forfeits it forever. Now, what I affirm, is this, that since the apostolic annunciation of the gospel, no man under the canopy of heaven either hath, or can obtain the remission of sins, and a title to Eternal Life, unless he obey the gospel preached by Peter and Paul; and further, that no man can attain to the resurrection of the just, or to the transformation of the faithful who remain, unless he first believe *the* gospel and obey it for a release from sin, and thenceforward continue in the faith, rooted and grounded to the end. If a man can attain to incorruptibility, glory, honor and life without obedience as set forth, show me where it is taught in the Oracles of God. Give me as unmistakeable a revelation to sustain it as I can to demonstrate the contrary. This salvation, which is indeed a "great salvation," is the *especial* salvation referred to in the text you have quoted to prove the salvation of *all* men by Jesus Christ. I affirm that there is no *especial* "salvation at

all, but in the gospel," and in this conclusion, I understand you to say, that you disagree with me. Jesus Christ is no where said to be the "Savior" of them "who stumble at the word, being disobedient;" but it does say in the scripture, that "being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all *them that obey him*;" and it also saith, that these who obey not the gospel shall be punished with an everlasting destruction." Are there any exceptions specified or implied in this decree?

But, my dear friend, "*Christ* is" *not* "declared to be 'the Savior of all men,'" as you write. Paul says "the *Living God* is the Savior of all men;" this cannot refer to Jesus, for Peter avers him to be "the *Son* of the Living God." God saves men by Jesus; but not in the sense in which He is "the Savior of all men." Now, *in what sense* is the Living God the Savior of all men? The question is answered in the following texts.—"God that made the world, giveth *to all*, life and breath, and all things; * * for in (or by) him we live, and move, and do exist—Acts. xvii. 24, 28. and "he left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness" ch. xiv. 17.

The next item, I would notice is founded on the ordinary construction of the part of your letter which reads thus:—"if, however you mean that the gospel salvation can be *enjoyed in no other way than by intelligent obedience*, then we entirely agree." Now, I conceive the notion, or speculation, wrapped up in this sentence, is one of the things for the knowledge of which, you are, as you say, "*more indebted to brother A. Campbell than to any other man.*" Permit me to say it is a notion which is subversive of the obedience of the Gospel, and no where to be found either palpably or inferentially taught in the New Testament. The sense in which this dition is ordinarily understood is that an *immersed or unimmersed man may be in the actual possession of remission of sins without knowing it, and because he does not know it he will be harrassed by doubts and fears, and cannot therefore enjoy it; but by acquiring a knowledge of the gospel, he will then learn, that he has really had the remission of his sins, perhaps years ago, and on finding this out, he will enjoy the Gospel salvation.* According to this a man may have remission of sins and never know it; he will not enjoy it, it is true, but that will not affect his eternal destiny! So that the command in effect, means nothing more than "be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the *mental enjoyment* of remission of sins;" as if Peter had said, 'you have remission if you did but know it, now be baptized, or believe in baptism for remission (which will answer as well as if you were baptized for remission, if you have been dipped before!) that you may enjoy it!" No—obedience to the gospel is for the possession of remission, and if the man does not know if his sins are blotted out or not, is plainly convicted of being still in his sins. To possess is both to know and to enjoy, if the thing possessed be agreeable. Men may work themselves up to self-delusion and sing of sins forgiven, when they are in truth only in the gall of bitterness and the bonds of iniquity—"Ye have put off the old man with his deeds, and have put on the new, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him." Had the Colossians "put off the old man and his deeds" *unknowingly*; and was it a discovery subsequent to their immersion that caused them to rejoice in the enjoyment of remission? I trow not. Forgiveness of sins without knowing it is a mere fallacy; an old wife's fable invented as a salvo for the consciences of those, who believe in the gospel for remission, but had not obeyed it. I call it gospel nullification, another and perverted gospel, which though orthodox at Bethany, will involve in a curse every man who preaches it—Gal. I. 8. You will understand me then to affirm, that the gospel salvation can be possessed in no other way than by intelligent obedience. How much I am "indebted to brother A. C. for my biblical knowledge," as you hint, may be found from our singular conformity upon all topics!!

I come now to your letter of June 7th.—I cannot but condole with you on account of the evil times upon which apparently you have unwittingly fallen. It certainly is a most awful thing to think, that you have been overtaken in the grave offence of harmonizing with me in some of my views of "what the Book teaches!" But my dear sir, I hope no harm will come of it! From the style of your note, the italicised "immediately," and the fact of two notes being despatched to me contemporaneously, I conclude that the heavens are equally in the vicinity of

Harrodsburgh. However, fear not: be courageous for the truth as far as you are prepared to demonstrate it. I lost 300 subscribers in one year for "heresy;" you may do the same. *No importe.* If we would reign we must suffer for the truth in some way or other. There is fair weather ahead, if not now, certainly in the Age to come.

On the other hand, I rejoice to learn, that the "dry bones" in your country are shaking. I have heard from many quarters, that the churches in Kentucky are in a very Sardian state; and that the little vitality that remains is sustained only by excitement. This is a condition then, "which entitles them to the scriptural appellation of "dry bones." Report says, that levity, worldly mindedness, religious close-fistedness, highmindedness, loving of pleasure more than loving of God, characterize the conduct of reformers. I know not if this be true, for I have no personal acquaintance with the interior of this state; but if true it be, I marvel not to hear, that you are troubled by the captiousness of ignorance or excessive prejudice or of both. Such products are the fruit of error, which will either suppress or persecute the truth. If you unfurl your banner for this, and fear not to defend your ground, faithfully and courageously, you may lay your account with cuts and thrusts which will cause you great pain, if you esteem the applause of men more than the approbation of God. But my voice is for war rather than succumb to the spirit of the Apostacy, which still flourishes among reformers. Let the "dry bones" rattle, the day is not far distant, when all who truly love "the unadulterated word" will, as the Lamb's wife, be purified from every thing that offends and be invested with a robe of righteousness, intelligence and peace.

I approve of your intention to publish our correspondence. It is due doubtless both to yourself, to me, and to the public at large. Rumor is doubtless busy in the Old Dominion as well as in Kentucky. All our letters should appear, as your true position cannot be comprehended, default of all the premises in the case. I shall likewise publish the correspondence in the Herald for the information of those who do not see the Journal; and, perhaps, an extra for the especial benefit of the readers of the Harbinger. Authenticated copies of your letters accompany this; and I trust you will be enabled to put "those interested," in possession of the matter "precisely" as it has occurred "between us."

In the hope that you may prove yourself worthy to suffer evil for the truth in all its bearings, I subscribe myself faithfully yours

JOHN THOMAS.

For the Herald of the Future Age.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

[The subjoined document was sent to the Religious Herald by a correspondent in Virginia. Our friend Sands declined to insert it. He is shy of all armor, but helmet and buckler, corselet and mail; and has an especial abhorrence of edge tools, especially of such as cut both ways. When compelled to fight "heresy," inconsistency and "faction," he would rather wield a single than a double-edged blade. The Jerusalem steel of Johannes while it slays the ghosts of Erin, disembowels the pursuivants of the Herald! Had this document demolished the evil works of Reformers only, it would doubtless have blazed forth in characters of living light; but in demolishing them to condemn us also was imposing too much upon the nervous sensibility of our alleged co-laborer and Roman "friend," the "Pilate" of the Rel. Herald! But we fear not to give our readers both sides of every question, even though we may be ourselves assailed; we therefore, readily comply with our correspondent's request to publish the communication.—Ed.]

Mr. Editor:—I have been an observer of men and things, for many years. And since the difficulties between the Baptists and the Disciples, commenced I have looked on in silence! Sometimes I thought that the Baptists were disposed to persecute, for opinion's sake; and, then, I thought the disciples did not look upon those points about which the two parties differed, as *opinions* at all, but as matters of faith; and, that, consequently,

they could not live together as a church, inasmuch as they did not have the same *faith*. The Baptists were for getting rid of these *Reformers*, but the Reformers wanted to stay in the Baptist church and not cause a division; at least, so they said. But, finally, they were *put out*, and *went out*, together, and then they turned around, and said you all were in *Babylon!!* Query: If the Baptists were in Babylon, why did *they* want to stay there? Did they want to stay in Babylon? Why did they complain of being cast out of Babylon? Why did they not rather rejoice? But, again—Have not these very Reformers been pleading for a union with these very Babylonians? I think they have; am I mistaken? Do they wish to go back? Ought they not rather to say—*Cave a signatis?* If the Baptists are *in* Babylon, ought they not to try to get them *out*, rather than to plead for a *union* with them? Now I do not blame these disciples for reforming, but I do blame them for their inconsistency in this matter. They once condemned all Associations, but, my good sir, what is the difference between an Association and a "Co-operation?"—Between a *clerk* and a *secretary*?—Between a Moderator and a President:—between "Dover Decrees," and "Richmond Resolutions?" Does a change of the *name*, change the *thing?* If you call a *thorn* a *rose*, is it not a thorn still? *Indocti discant, et ament meminisse periti.* But now these Reformers are in trouble! They wish to get *rid* of some *troublesome spirits!* How will they do it? By "Decrees?" No; but by "Resolutions!!" One more "general meeting," (not "general association;" no, that would be "sectarian"—"babylonish,") and they will "resolve" Dr. Thomas, and all his friends into a "faction"!! Indeed the Dr. already "smells of the fagot"! These Reformers are much *wiser* than you *poor* Baptists were! They *first* "resolve" into a "faction," and then apply the scriptures, which you know condemn "factionists"!! According to this plan they might condemn any body! They first *assume*, that the Dr. and his friends are "factionists," and then "resolve" they will have no fellowship with him at all! It seems to me, that they ought first to prove them "factionists," before they deal with them as such! Why did not the Baptists "resolve," that these Reformers were "factionists," and, then, put them out of Babylon?!! But they say that Dr. T. has broke a "covenant"!! "A covenant"!! I never heard of its being "a covenant" until recently! What sort of "a covenant" was it? What is a covenant? Covenant comes from an old French word *covenans*, and literally signifies "a writing containing the terms of agreement." It supposes *two* parties *equally* bound. This thing was first called the "Reconciliation," and not "covenant." Now, if it was "a covenant," who were the parties that were *equally* bound? The *preamble* will show who were the parties. They say, the Dr. *alone* was bound; if so, it was not "a covenant." Who ever heard of "a covenant," in which *one* party *alone* was bound? Did they mean *to tie* the Dr. "hand and foot,"—and then pour a storm—a tempest upon him? If the Dr. was bound not to discuss those points of difference, except in self-defence, were they not bound to say nothing, either *privately* or publicly, which would provoke the Dr. to come out in self defence? If it was "a covenant," assuredly they were. *Did they do this?* Again: ought not "a covenant" to be *signed* by *both* parties? Who *signed* this covenant? Did Dr. Thomas?—Did Mr. Campbell? Who will answer? Is it a truth, or fact, that the *only man bound* by the "covenant," *did not sign it?* Then *he* was not bound by it! The Dr. says that the "Reconciliation" was between him and Mr. Campbell. Those persons, or rather *some* of them, who *signed* it, say it was between *them* and the Dr. *Where are the witnesses?* Who ever heard of the *parties* to a "covenant," being *their own witnesses* in proving it? SO IT TURNS OUT THAT THEY HAVE NO WITNESSES!!! Well then, how is the matter to be settled? BY THE DOCUMENT ITSELF!!! *What does that say?* "We the undersigned brethren in free consultation met at the house of brother John Tinsley Jeter at Paineville, and after frankly comparing our views, unanimously agreed upon the resolution subjoined; and submitted the same for the consideration of brethren CAMPBELL and THOMAS—and Brother Thomas agreeing to abide the same, all difficulties were adjusted, and perfect harmony and co-operation MUTUALLY agreed upon between THEM." This is the preamble, then follows the resolution and signatures. But among them you will see neither the name of Dr. T., nor Mr. C. This, to me, is strange: The preamble and resolution furnish, in the absence of all witnesses, the *best testimony* we can have. The *declarations* or *affirmations*, of the parties, *balance* each other. The word of one party should be as good as the other. But, in this case, *one whole* party says the "reconciliation" was between him and Mr. C., and certain men, who signed it, *claiming* to be the other party, are not agreed as to whether the agreement was between *them* and Dr. T., or between Dr. T. and Mr. C!!! So the Dr. has the advantage. He being *one* party, says the "reconciliation" was between him and Mr. C. and *some* of the other party say he is right, and to cap the climax, the preamble speaks out and says the Dr. is right!!! It is possible for *men* to be influenced by their *likes* and *dislikes*, by their prejudices and partialities, but not so with this preamble, IT SPEAKS OUT THE SENTIMENTS OF THE MEN WHO DREW IT UP AT THE TIME THEY SIGNED IT. Men may change—they may be blinded—honestly blinded, but not so with paper and ink!! If this agreement, then, was not between Dr. T. and Mr. C., *why was it submitted to them?* "*All difficulties were adjusted and perfect harmony and co-operation mutually agreed upon between them.*" Between *whom?* "THEM"! What them? Between whom had there been 'difficulties?' Between CAMPBELL and THOMAS!! Who were 'reconciled?' CAMPBELL and THOMAS!! Between whom were "all difficulties adjusted and perfect harmony and co-operation mutually agreed upon between them"? CAMPBELL and THOMAS!! I do not intend to defend Dr. T. wherein he is wrong, but I like to see Reformers consistent; and so long as they act as they are now doing, they should take care not to throw stones, seeing *they* are in glass houses as well as their neighbors! I hope they will not reform *de mal en pis!*

Con amore, JOHANNES BAPTISTES.

A. J. Walk.

A SORE AND AFFLICTING INCIDENT.

Our readers will remember, that in No. 1, art. "Christ. Intell." we informed them, that a self-constituted body, which, because it consisted of 12 principals, who assumed to themselves inquisitorial functions, we styled "the *Duodecimal Inquisition*," had met in General Assembly in the Metropolis of Virginia, and had in the plenitude of their presumption, *resolved* the Parish Faction into the Church of Christ in Fredericksburgh, Va.; and that the occupants of that house were not worthy of *their* fellowship! The reader will remember the ground upon which these disciples were placed under the ban of this Legislative and Dogmatical Convention. It was because they would not shut their doors against us, and treat us with the indignity they consider as due to a heathen man and a publican. Upon this principle, which was incorporated in the fleshly organizations, principally of two contumacious individuals named Parish and Eve, the Metropolitans erected their co-religionists into the Church of Christ! Certain provincialists, we believe, followed suit, and ratified the deed!—Did we not suggest to these inconsiderate people the propriety of ascertaining, if they had the power of converting a faction into the Body of Christ by their unholy resolutions, before they hazarded the attempt? We did! Will they not now learn wisdom from the catastrophe which has befallen the fruit of their impotent resolves? Where is the church of Christ they built upon the sand of their blind prejudice and dishonesty? Where are their dear brethren to whom of right alone appertained the Bethel House? What do these brethren now think of the power of this Metropolitan Council—this Deliberative Assembly of Reformed Baptist Divines? Reader! When thou goest to Fredericksburg, and inquirest for the pretended Church of Christ, which was begotten of John Parish and born of Duodecimal Resolutions, and which claimed as its beloved brethren, Thomas M. Henley, James Goss, R. L. Coleman, James Henshall, Chester Bullard, Silas Shelburne, &c., &c., thou hadst better send abroad the town crier to make proclamation of your desire to know what has become of it! Thine own

individual research among the assemblies of the city will be bootless, fruitless, vain; some friendly townsman can inform thee, perhaps, that it was, but is not, nor e'er again shall be! Nay, start not! Though passing strange, 'tis true 'tis wondrous true 'tis pitiful! This man-made church has disappeared; the gates of hell have prevailed against it; and, O doleful to relate, its *members*, said to have been the majority of the orignal totality, have thrown themselves into the arms of their excommunicated friends, "the Factionists!" The following extract of a letter from Richmond will explain the mystery:

"Have you heard," says the writer; "from Fredericksburg—"the Christians" have all disbanded, and the most of them gone to "the Factionists." These however were not willing to receive their leaders, Parish and Eve, without confession; so they made application to one or two other places with the same want of success, and I believe they remain aloof yet." Thus endeth the first systematic effort to proscribe disciples, who have obeyed the truth for remission of sins, but who choose not to surrender their liberty and independence to Supervisors and Reformed Clergymen, whether in Kirk, College, or Council, dogmatically and inquisitorially assembled,

EDITOR.

JUNE 29, 1844.

On this day the power of the Ottoman Turks to slay the third part of men expires. The news of what is now enacting in the city of Constantine or the Turco-Roman Empire will not reach us for several weeks. We subjoin the latest news which we clip from the New Orleans Republican, and which shows that the last controversy of Heaven with the desolators of the Holy Land has commenced. Damascus was formerly a city of the Eastern Limb of the Roman Empire.

FRIGHTFUL CONSPIRACY AT DAMASCUS.—The Manheim Journal quotes a letter from Constantinople of the 30th ult. stating that a conspiracy for the massacre of the Turks, and the establishment of a native government had been discovered at Damascus. More than 600 Arabs of the best families are said to have been in the plot. They were betrayed by one of the conspirators, whom they massacred in the streets, on the discovery of his conduct, amid cries of "Death to the traitor." On this occasion a conflict, in which several persons are said to have been killed and wounded, is reported to have taken place between the Turkish troops and the Arabs.

The following came to hand recently in the Second Advent Herald.

TURKEY.

We have received accounts from Albania of another dreadful massacre; hopes are entertained that they may prove exaggerated, but there is every reason to suppose that they are too true. The Greek town of Egri Palanka, situated between Uscup and Giustandie, in Roumelia, is said to have been attacked, pillaged, and burnt, by a large body of insurgent Albanians; and it is added that upwards of two thousand of the Christian inhabitants were massacred.

The Turkish troops which have been marched into Albania, and ten thousand of which have been concentrated at Monastir, appear quite unequal to the task of quelling these ferocious marauders, who while evading an engagement with them, ravage the country and murder the defenceless inhabitants. The only judicious measure adopted is the military occupation of the defiles of Kiupriuli, which may have the effect of confining the depredations of the Albanians to their own province. The rebellion has now extended to every part of it, and intelligence has been received of the investment of Scodra, by a force of 1,500 men. A Turkish commander of the name of Ali Bey, attempted to relieve it, at the head of 2,000 regular troops, infantry and cavalry. After some very hard fighting he is reported to have cut his way through the besiegers. Eight hundred Turks, however are said to have fallen in this action, and Ali Bey himself was shot through the body while entering the gates of the town.

Beder-Khan-Beg, who commanded the expedition last year against the Nestorians, has been plotting similar schemes against the Jacobite Christians of Jabel-Tour. It is stated that his emissaries had succeeded in inveigling the Patriarch into an ambuscade, where he was taken and murdered. His head and intestines were, according to custom brought on a dish to the Kurdish Chief.

THE TWO VISIONS.

(CONTINUED FROM PAGE 57.)

Verse 20. "Then shall stand up" in Antiochus's place or "estate" his son Seleucus Philopator "*a raiser of taxes in the glory of the kingdom*," who shall succeed him. His reign was obscure and contemptible, occasioned by the misery to which the Romans had reduced the crown of Syria; and the exorbitant sum (1000 talents annually) he was obliged to pay, during the 12 years of his reign, by virtue of the treaty of peace concluded between the King his father and that people. Hence the business of his reign was to raise tribute for the Romans by causing the exactor to go through the Empire. In writing this, I cannot but exclaim, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgements, and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? Or who hath been his counsellor?" The Adoni described this son of Antiochus the Great "*one that causeth an exactor to pass over the glory of the kingdom.*" He reigned long enough to pay the tribute of the twelfth year; and then he laid down the sceptre as ingloriously as he had wielded it. "But within few days" that is, twelve years, "he shall be destroyed, neither in anger nor in battle." These few words evidently denote the short and obscure reign of Seleucus, and the kind of death he was to die. During the absence of his brother and son, the two heirs of the crown of Syria, Heliodorus, the prime minister of State, conceived that he might with very little difficulty, seize upon it, by taking Seleucus out of the way; accordingly he poisoned him.

Verse 21. "And in his Seleucus's estate shall stand up a *vile person* to whom they shall not give the honor of the Kingdom; but he shall come in peaceably and obtain the Kingdom by flatteries."

This "*Vile Person*" was the usurper—Heliodorus, who is mentioned 2 Macc. iii. He was *vile* because not of the royal family, and one, who had been conspicuous in the robbing of the Temple of its treasure, see Rollin B. xix, ch. 2. 2. The nation, however, did not give him "the honor of the kingdom;" for Antiochus, afterwards surnamed Epiphanes, had recourse to Eumenes, King of Pergamus, and Attalus, his brother, who seated him upon the throne, after having expelled Heliodorus. Thus, notwithstanding the circumstances, which seemed to threaten a war of succession, Antiochus "came in peaceably and obtained the kingdom by flatteries," or great adulations bestowed upon his Allies, and the party of the usurper.

Verse 22. "And with the arms of a flood," or invasion, "shall they," the Egyptians, "be overflown from before him," Antiochus Epiphanes; "and they shall be broken," or conquered.

The cause of this invasion was, that the Egyptians sent a deputation to Antiochus to demand the restoration of Cœle-Syria and Palestine. This was refused, and Antiochus being informed that the Egyptians were preparing for war, determined to anticipate them by invading Egypt.

"Yea, also the Prince" or High Priest, "of the" Mosaic "Covenant" shall be broken or put to death.

Scarce was Antiochus well seated on the throne, when in the year B. C. 174, Jason, brother of Onias the High Priest, offered the King a large sum on condition that he should appoint him in place of Onias. He succeeded in his negotiation; and accordingly Onias, who was universally revered for his strict piety and justice, was deposed, and Jason established in his room. He afterwards subverted entirely the Religion of Moses, and brought infinite calamities upon the Jewish Nation. But in B. C. 172, this Jason was himself supplanted by his brother Menelaus, who offered the King of the North a higher bribe for the High-priesthood than Jason had done. This new choice gave rise to tumults, disorders, murders, and sacrilegious acts; but the death of Onias, the rightful "Prince of the Covenant," who was universally beloved and revered, crowned the whole. "Antiochus," says Rollin, "hard hearted as he was, however lamented his death, and brought the murderer, to condign punishment."

"And after the league," or treaty of peace made "with him" Antiochus subsequently to his second invasion of Egypt, B. C. 170, "shall work deceitfully: for he shall come up" to Alexandria, the Capitol of Egypt, "and he shall become strong with a small people" or army.

Ptolemy Philometor was either taken or surrendered himself to Antiochus, who set him at full liberty. After this they lived "deceitfully" together. For some time Antiochus affected to be extremely careful of the interests of the young King his nephew, and to regulate his affairs as his guardian. But when he had once possessed himself of the country, under that pretext he seized whatever he thought fit, plundered all places, and enriched himself, as well as his soldiers, with the spoils of the Egyptians. Thus was verified the prediction of verse 24, "He shall enter peaceably even upon the fattest places of the province" of Egypt; "and he" Antiochus "shall do that which his fathers have not done, nor his fathers' fathers;" namely, "he shall scatter among them," his followers, "the prey and spoils, and riches: yea, he shall forecast his devices against the strong holds," of Egypt, "even for a time."

"And he shall stir up his power and his courage against the king of the South" Egypt, "with a great army; and the king" Ptolemy Philometor "of the South, shall be stired up to battle with a very great and mighty army; but he shall not stand: for they shall forecast devices against him. Yea, they that feed of the portion of his," the King of Egypt's "meat," his courtiers, "shall separate" or renounce "him, and his," Antiochus' "army shall overflow" Egypt; "and many" of the Egyptians "shall fall down slain."

Verse 27. "And the hearts of both these Kings," of Antiochus Epiphanes and of Ptolemy Philometor, "shall be to do mischief, and they shall speak lies at one table, but shall not prosper: for yet the end shall be at the very time."

The Alexandrians, seeing Philometor in the hands of Antiochus, and living with him in seeming friendship "at one table," considered Ptolemy as lost to them; they therefore denounced him by declaring his throne vacant, after which, they placed the crown of Egypt upon the head of his brother, Euergetes. H. Rollin B. xix. ch. 2. § 2.

Verse 28. "Then shall he return into his land" of Syria "with great riches; and his" Antiochus' "heart shall be against the Holy Covenant; and he shall do, and return to his own land."

Advice being brought to Antiochus while in Egypt of an insurrection in Palestine, he set forward immediately to quell it. The circumstances which chiefly exasperated him was, his being informed that the inhabitants of Jerusalem had made great rejoicings, when a false report had prevailed of his death. He therefore proceeded to "*do exploits.*" He besieged the city; took it by storm; and during the three days that it was abandoned to the soldiers, he caused 80,000 men to be inhumanly butchered. Forty thousand were also taken prisoners, and the like number sold to the neighbouring nations.

But not satisfied with *doing* these *exploits*, "his heart," was still "against the Holy Covenant." He entered forcibly into the Temple, as far as the Holy and Most Holy places. After this he added sacrilege to profanation. He carried away the Altar of Incense, the Table of Show Bread, the Candlestick of Seven Branches, with several other vases, utensils, and gifts of kings, all of gold. He then "*returned to his own land*" laden with the spoils of Judea and Egypt; those of the Temple alone amounting to 1800 talents, which are equivalent to about £270,000 sterling.

Verse 29. "At the time appointed he shall return, and come toward the South" Egypt; but it, the fourth invasion, "shall not be as the former or as the latter."

Being aware of the endeavours the Egyptians were making to retrieve the affairs of the kingdom, he determined to invade the country again under the pretence of restoring Philometor the dethroned monarch; but in reality to make himself absolute master of the kingdom. He defeated the Alexandrians in a sea-fight near Pelusium, marched his forces into Egypt and advanced directly towards Alexandria in order to besiege it.

The extremities to which the city was reduced caused the government to send deputies to Rome to implore the intervention of the Senate. In the meantime, Antiochus finding he should be compelled to raise the siege, marched towards Memphis, and gave Philometor, in outward appearance, possession of the whole kingdom, Pelusium excepted, which he kept as a key for entering Egypt when he pleased, and the instant matters, by a possible war between the Ptolemies, should be ripe for him to step in and crush them both.

But Philometor saw through Antiochus' design, whose retention of Pelusium opened his eyes. The instant therefore, Antiochus marched away, he sent to inform Euergetes that he was willing to come to an accomodation, which was arranged on condition that the two brothers should reign jointly.

At length "the time appointed" for his return arrived B. C. 168. As soon as he heard of the reconciliation of Philometor and Euergetes, he resolved to employ his whole force against them. Accordingly he marched at the head of a very powerful land force with the design to conquer Egypt openly. He penetrated as far as Memphis, subjecting the whole country through which he passed; and there he received the submission of almost all the rest of the kingdom. He afterwards marched toward Alexandria to besiege it, the possession of which would have made him absolute master of Egypt. *He would certainly have succeeded in this enterprise had he not been checked in his career by the Roman Embassy*, which broke all the measures he had been so long taking in order to possess himself of Egypt.

The ambassadors Popilius and his colleagues who, on the application of Ptolemy, were nominated to go to Egypt, had left Rome with the utmost diligence. When they arrived at Delos they found a fleet of Macedonian, or Greek, ships on board of which they embarked for Alexandria. They landed just at the time Antiochus was marching to besiege it. The ambassadors came up with him at Eleusine, which was not a mile from Alexandria. The King seeing Popilius with whom he was intimate in Rome when a hostage in that city, opened his arms to embrace him as his old friend. The Roman, considering himself as a servant of the public, desired to know, before he answered his compliment, whether he spoke to a friend or enemy of Rome. He then gave him the decree of the Senate, bade him read it over, and return him an immediate answer. Antiochus, after perusing it, said he would examine its contents with his friends, and give his answer in a short time. Popilius, enraged at the King for talking of delays, drew, with the wand he had in his hand, a circle round Antiochus, and then raising his voice; "*Answer*," said he, "*the Senate before you stir out of that circle.*" The King quite confounded at so haughty an order, after a moment's reflection, replied that he would act according to the desire of the Senate; Popilius then received his civilities, and behaved afterwards in all respects as an old friend. Thus the Roman with a few words struck terror into the King of Syria, and saved the King of Egypt.

Antiochus having left Egypt at the time stipulated, Popilius returned with his colleagues to Alexandria. He then crossed into Cyprus; sent home Antiochus' fleet; restored the whole Island to the King of Egypt; and returned to Rome, to acquaint the Senate with the success of his embassy. Thus was fulfilled the prediction "THE SHIPS OF CHITTIM SHALL COME AGAINST HIM;" it was accomplished to the very letter, in the Roman ambassadors in Greek ships coming against Antiochus, and snatching from him his prey.

And reader, what effect would you naturally suppose this check would have upon Antiochus? He would be greatly incensed; and being in fear of the Romans, he would turn from them, and vent his indignation upon others weaker than himself. This was literally the fact as was literally foretold; for it reads in this 30th verse: — "*Therefore he shall be grieved, and return, and have indignation against the Holy Covenant: so shall he do; he shall even return, and have intelligence with them that forsake the Holy Covenant.*"

Here then are certain things affirmed. *First* Antiochus should be enraged; *secondly*, he should return to Antioch; *thirdly*, he should be indignant against the Commonwealth of Israel; *fourthly*, he shall do, or perform deeds of indignation, or terror; *fifthly*, he should conspire with the Apostates from the institutions of Moses and of God to carry his CRUELTIES INTO EFFECT.

In his return march through Palestine to Antioch, he detached 20,000 men, the command of whom he gave to Apollonius, with orders to destroy the city of Jerusalem.

Apollonius arrived there B. C. 168, just two years after the city had been taken by Antiochus. The Sabbath after his arrival, when all the people were peaceably assembled in their synagogue, he let loose all his

troops upon them, and commanded them to cut to pieces all the men, and to seize all the women and children, that they might be exposed to sale. Not a single man was spared; all they could find being cruelly butchered, insomuch that the streets streamed with blood. The city was afterwards plundered and fire set to several parts of it, after all the riches that could be found had been carried off. They demolished such parts of the houses as were still standing; and with the ruins built a strong fort on the top of one of the hills of the city of David, opposite to the temple which it commanded. They threw a strong garrison into it to awe the whole Jewish Nation; they made it a place for arms, furnished with good Magazines, where they deposited all the spoils taken in the plunder of the city.

Thus was fulfilled the saying, that "Arms shall stand on his" Antiochus' "part." Apollonius and his troops, having perpetrated these barbarities, proceeded to accomplish the remainder of the prediction of this 31st verse, which says "and they" the Syrian troops, "shall pollute the Sanctuary of strength," namely, the Temple, "and shall take away the (burnt offering of) continuance (thaumid) and they shall place the abomination which maketh desolate" in the Holy Temple.

From the fort which overlooked the sanctuary, the garrison fell on all who came to worship the true God in the Temple; and shed their blood on every part of the sanctuary, which they polluted by all possible methods; so that it was no longer fit for the worship of Jehovah.

As soon as Epiphanes was returned to Antioch, he published a decree, by which the several nations in his dominions were commanded to lay aside their ancient religious ceremonies and their particular usages; and to conform to the religion of the King. This was aimed chiefly at the Jews, whose religion as well as their nation, he was absolutely determined to extirpate.

Atheneus, a man advanced in years, and extremely well versed in all the ceremonies of the Grecian Idolatry, was sent as commissioner to see it carried into execution in Judea and Samaria. As soon as he arrived at Jerusalem, he began by putting a stop to the *burnt offering of continuance*, and suppressing all the observances of the Jewish Law. He caused the Sabbaths and other festivals to be profaned; forbid the circumcision of children; carried off and burned all copies of the Law wherever they could be found; abolished all the ordinances of God in every part of the country, and put to death whoever was found to have acted contrary to the decree of the King. Athenæus and his Syrian soldiers were the chief instruments by which the Jews were converted to the religion professed by the sovereign.

To establish it the sooner in every part of the nation, altars and chapels filled with idols were erected in every city, and sacred groves were planted. Officers were appointed over these, who caused all the people in general to offer sacrifice in them every month, on the day of the month on which the King was born, who made them eat swine's flesh and other unclean animals sacrificed there. The Temple in Jerusalem was dedicated to Jupiter Olympius, whose statue was placed within it. Thus he did in his great indignation against Jehovah and his people Israel.

But those of Israel were not all Israel; neither because they were the seed of Abraham were they all Abraham's children. In the days of Antiochus, the Nation was mixed, as it was in the days of Augustus and Tiberius Cæsars. It was composed of those that "did wickedly against the Holy Law of God," and those who understood and regarded his will and pleasure. The wicked citizens of the Commonwealth not only forsook the law of their God, but they held traitorous "intelligence" with the King of Syria, and aided him all they could in the desolation with which he was overspreading their country. "*And he*," Antiochus, "*shall have intelligence with them who forsake the Holy Covenant.*" "*And such as do wickedly against the Covenant shall he corrupt by flatteries.*"

No people, says Rollin, appeared more eager to comply with the decree of Antiochus than the Samaritans. They presented a petition to the King, in which they declared themselves not to be Jews; and desired that their Temple built on Mount Gerizzim, which, till then had not been dedicated to any deity, in particular, might henceforward be dedicated to the Grecian Jupiter, and be called after his name. Their petition was complied with, and orders given not to molest them in any manner.

But the Samaritans were not the only apostates who forsook their God and their law in this trial. Several Jews also, either to escape the persecution, to ingratiate themselves with the King or his officers, or else from inclination or libertinism, did the same. From these different motives many fell from Israel; and several of those who had once taken this wicked step, joining themselves with the kings' forces, became, (as is but too common) greater persecutors of their unhappy brethren than the heathens themselves, employed to execute the king's barbarous decree.

But why did God permit these awful afflictions to fall upon "them of understanding" who were zealous for his Holy Law? The answer to this inquiry is contained in verse 35, to wit: "And some of them of understanding shall fall, *to try them, and to purge and to make them white for the* Time of the End; because it is yet for a time appointed." In other words, that their allegiance to God may be put to the proof, and thus manifesting themselves approved, they may be accounted worthy to stand in their lot, with thee O Daniel, at the end of the 1335 days.

To be continued.

DEBATE ON THE SALVATION OF INFANTS, IDIOTS & PAGANS,

BETWEEN "REV. A. CAMPBELL AND REV. N. L. RICE."

Selected from the Report of the Discussion held at Lexington Ky.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR.

GOD'S DESIGN IN THE CREATION OF THE WORLD.

A wise master Builder never begins to build without a *design*. This he drafts after a scale of so much to the foot. This is the extension, or time, so to speak, of the building to be erected. Having well considered the whole, he concludes, that it is the best possible plan that can be devised in harmony with the principles of architecture. It then becomes his purpose, his foreordination, predetermination, or design. All subsequent arrangements are made to conform to this recorded purpose, because it is the very best his most deliberate wisdom and ingenuity could devise.

The next thing he does is to collect together all the necessary materials, whether of brick, stone, lime, sand, wood, or aught else that may be needed. If a spectator desired to know what all these crude matters were heaped up together in one place for—the Architect would reveal to him his purpose by submitting the draft of his plan in all its lines, circles, angles, &c; and he would describe to him such an arrangement of the materials as would impress the spectator's mind with an image of the edifice, though it would fall infinitely short of the reality when perfected.

If we suppose the mansion to be now finished, the Architect would then order the materials which were left, as unfit to work into the building, and therefore worthless—such as broken bricks, split boards, sand and so forth, to be cast out as rubbish to be trodden under foot, or to burn &c. Thus the edifice is built out of the accumulated materials, according to the outline of the draft, or purpose of the Builder; and the work is done.

Now, the Great Builder of the Heavens and the Earth is God. He either made all things at random, or he did not. Who will say, that the Creator permitted chance to elaborate the terrestrial system? The scripture declares, that every thing was measured, meted out, and weighed, and that the Spirit of the Lord executed his work without any to counsel or instruct him. As it is written, "who has *measured* the waters in the hollow of his hand, and *meted out* heaven with a span, and comprehended the dust of the earth *in a measure*, and *weighed* the mountains in scales, and the hills in a ballance? Who hath directed the

spirit of the Lord, or being his counsellor hath taught him?—With whom took he counsel, and who instructed him, and taught him in the path of judgement, and taught him knowledge, and showed to him the way of understanding? Isaiah xl. 12.

God then, had in his own mind a pattern, or design, of all the work that was before Him, before he uttered a word or his spirit began to move. This design, or archetype, which placed the beginning and the end of all things before him in one panoramic view, was constructed in harmony with the principles—the eternal principles of his vast, unbounded, realm; which coincide with the immutable attributes of his character. The work he was about to execute was for his own pleasure; for says the scripture "Thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are, and were created." But *when the work is finished, which for his own pleasure, God labors to elaborate, what will it consist in?* This inquiry we make as spectators of the wonders of creation, providence, and redemption. We behold the materials of these departments of Eternal Wisdom, and we ask to what are they all tending? What temple, or edifice, is the Divine Architect raising for his own pleasure and glory? If we turn our thoughts within us, there is no voice there which unfolds the philosophy of his doings; if we soar into the heavens, or descend into the sea; if we search through the high places of the earth—we find no answer; for "who hath known the mind of the Lord, who hath been his counsellor, or who hath instructed Him?"—No; if we would ascertain what God designs to elaborate out of the past, the present and the future, we must be content to assume the attitude of listeners, that he may reveal to us from his own lips what he intends to evolve in the consummation of his plans.

God has caused a Book to be written for our information upon his design—his ultimate purpose in the works of creation, providence, and redemption; which are the three grand divisions of his labor, and are all tending to the development of one great and glorious consummation. This book is termed THE BIBLE.

If we take up a book, how would we proceed to ascertain the end the author had in writing his book? We should read it through carefully, and thus having made ourselves acquainted with its contents, we should be prepared to answer the question intelligently and accurately. Why do we not do so with the Bible? God is the Author; Moses, the Prophets, and the Apostles are but the amanuenses of the whole. If then the question be put, what end had God in view in the six days work of the creation; in his subsequent providential arrangements in relation to man and nations; and in the propitiatory sacrifice of the Lamb of God:—we proceed in the same way with the Bible in which he tells his own story, and answer according to the light we have acquired.

Now the Book of God is peculiar in this—it narrates the past, the present, and the future all in one volume. We learn from the accuracy of its details in relation to the past and the present, to put unbounded confidence in its declarations concerning the future. In ascertaining, therefore, the *ultimate design* of Eternal Wisdom in the creation of all things, we turn to the end of the Bible to see what God has said *shall be* as the consummation of what has gone before; for what he has said *shall be the permanent order of creation, must be the end he originally designed before ever the foundations of the earth were laid.*

Turn we then, to the last two chapters of the Book of God. What do we learn from these? We learn that there is to be a great physical and moral renovation of the earth. That every curse is to cease from off the earth; and that it is to be peopled with men who will be deathless, and free from all evil. That they will then all be the sons of God, a community of glorious, honorable, and incorruptible beings, who will constitute the dwelling place of the Lord God Almighty and the Lamb, the glory of whose presence will give a brilliancy to the globe surpassing the splendor of the Sun.—The Globe a glorious dwelling place, and its inhabitants an immortal and glorious people, with the presence of the Eternal Himself—is the sum of the consummation which God reveals as the answer to the question concerning his ultimate design. The following testimonies will prove it.

"The Inheritance of the saints in light"—Col. 1. 13";—"an Inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven—1. Pet. 1. 4";—"I saw a new heaven and a new earth, and there was

no more sea. And I saw the Holy City, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a Bride adorned for her husband. And I heard a great voice out of heaven, saying—the Tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself will be with them, their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes: and there shall be no more death; neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain; for the former things (or "Heaven and Earth" in which they existed) are passed away. And he that sat upon the throne said, 'Behold I make all things new.' And he said unto me 'Write: for these words are true and faithful.' And he said unto me, 'It is done' I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end. I will give unto him that is athirst of the fountain of water of life freely. He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God and he shall be my son"—Apoc. xxi. 1-7. "And there shall be no more curse." xxii. 3.

Now *the creating of all things new* implies that the constitution of things that preceded the New Creation was *an old system*, which had answered the end for which it was arranged in the first instance. This Old System, termed by John the former Heaven and the former Earth," is manifestly the system of the World, based upon the six Days Creation; for the "former things," which had passed away in the vision, were the sea, death, sorrow, sin, the curse and all their corelatives. This Old Creation with its Constitution of Time, then, is but a grand system of means to a still grander and inconceivably more magnificent Creation, which will be of an unchangeable and eternal constitution. The old Mosaic Heavens and Earth are to the New Creation, as the accumulated materials of a building are to the Edifice about to be built: and hold the same relation to the New Heavens, as the Animal system does to the Spiritual. We repeat, then, that the creation of the Six Days, which we have termed Mosaic, because Moses records their generations, was not the end but the beginning, when God commenced the execution of his purpose which he had arranged; the *ultimatum* of which was, to elaborate by *truth* and *judgement* as his instrumentality, a world of intelligent beings, who should become the glorious and immortal population of the Globe under an immutable and eternal constitution of things.

We come now to a very interesting, and indeed, immensely important inquiry, namely, upon what principle, or principles, did God propose to carry out this ultimate design in relation to the peopling of the Spiritual or Eternal World? Was it upon a purely intellectual, or purely moral, or purely physical principle, or was it upon all these three conjoined? For example, he peopled the present Animal World by creating a human pair, and placing them under the natural, or physical, laws; will he people the spiritual world by physical generation and physical regeneration, as contended for by Messrs Rice and Campbell, or upon some other principle revealed in his word? To these questions we shall endeavour to reply.

As the doings of the Almighty are all for his own glory, we would ask this question; would it have been to the glory of God, if he had made man a mere machine?—Had he made inexorable necessity the law of his nature, which he must yield to, as the tides to the Moon, or the earth to the Sun? Who will affirm it? The principle laid down in the scripture is, that *man honors God in obeying his laws;* but this honor consists, not in a mechanical obedience, such as matter yields to the natural laws, but in a *voluntary* obedience, while the individual possesses the power not to obey, if he thinks best. There is no honor, or glory to God, in the fall of a stone to the centre of the earth; the stone obeys the law of gravitation *involuntarily:* the obedience of man would have been similar had God created and placed him under a physical law, which should have necessitated his motions, as gravitation doth of the stone.

Does a man feel honored, or glorified, by the forced obedience of a slave? Certainly not; and for the simple reason, that it is involuntary, or compulsory. But let a man, by his excellencies, command the willing service of free men—of men, who can do their own will and pleasure, yet voluntarily obey him, and if he required it, are prepared to sacrifice their lives, fortunes, and estates, and all for the love they bear him;—would not such a man, esteem himself honored, and glorified, to the highest degree by such signal conformity to his will? Unquestionably! and

such is the honor and glory which God requires of men. Had he designed a mere physical obedience, he would have secured his purpose effectually, by at once filling the earth with a population of immortal adults, so intellectually organized, as to be incapable of a will adverse to his own—who should have obeyed him, as the piston rod and wheels do the steam by which they are moved. This will be the nature of Messrs Campbell and Rice's physically regenerated infants, idiots, and pagans, should they ever rise from the dead—the mere automata of a miraculous creation!! Would it not have been more benevolent to have created these infants, idiots, and pagans immortal adults at once, than to have ushered them into this mundane existence where they draw only the breath of depravity and sin? But why need we say more on this point? It is sufficiently obvious, that the physical regeneration of infants, idiots, and pagans by a miracle is a mere tradition, got up for the purpose, of masking a breach in the crazy old walls of orthodoxy.

The following testimonies will show the principle upon which God designs to people the Spiritual World. "I will give unto *him that is athirst* of the fountain of the water of life freely; and *he that overcometh* shall inherit all things;"—"blessed are they that *do his commandments* that they *may* have *right* to the Tree of Life and that they may enter through the gates into the city;"—"*to him that overcometh* will I give to eat of the Tree of Life which is in the midst of the Paradise of God;"—"he shall not be hurt by the second death;"—"to him that overcometh and *keepeth my works to the end*, I will give power over all nations: and he shall rule them with a rod of iron; &c;"—"if thou doest well, O Cain, shalt thou not be accepted?;"—"these things are written that ye may believe and that *believing* ye *may have* life *through his name*," not by a miracle;—"as many as received him, *to them* gave he the power to become the sons of God, *to them that believe on his name*; which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man (such as infants, idiots, pagans, or animal Jews)—but which were born of God;"—Except a man be born of water and the spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God;" "he that believes the gospel and is baptized shall be saved;"—"God will render to every man *according to his deeds*: to them, who *by patient continuance in well doing* SEEK FOR glory, honor immortality,—eternal life"!—but of testimonies there is no end. The law of the Lord is perfect and *without a single exception*. There are no "*perhapses*," or "*maybes*;" it is not "yea and nay, but amen—*so let it be*—in Christ Jesus."—The only way to the Spiritual World is in the path of obedience to the law of God.

Now, from these testimonies, it is plain, that to attain the rank of sons of God in the Eternal World, where indeed all are sons without exception, human beings without respect to age, sex or condition, must *believe and obey the truth*; for "without faith it is impossible to please God;" it does not except infants, idiots, and pagans; but it declares the principle without qualification. If faith then be required, it is manifest that God designed to move men *by motive*, not by necessity—but *by intellectual and moral considerations*.

Behold, then, the conclusion of the matter. There are two Systems, or Worlds, in the purpose of God; the one, the Animal, the other, the Spiritual. Out of the Animal, as the aggregate of building materials, God, designs to elaborate the Spiritual World, as a new palace in his empire. This new dwelling place for the Divine Majesty is to consist of a sealess and luminous globe, and peopled with myriads of glorious, honorable, and incorruptible men, of equal rank and station with the angelic host. The *means* by which he proposed to consummate this magnificent conception were *first* by his creative energy; *secondly* by his providential arrangements; *thirdly, by the moral force of truth, argued and attested*; and *lastly*, by judgement, and re-creative energy in the destruction of the wicked and formation of the New Earth.

The principle upon which animal men might attain to the Angelic Order in the Spiritual World of which we speak, he has laid down AS A VOLUNTARY OBEDIENCE TO HIS LAW under the several constitutions he has arranged. Hence, he created man "free to stand and free to fall"—capable of doing, or not doing, as he preferred; but responsible for the consequences to the extent of the knowledge imparted to him. It is true, God could have ordered things otherwise, and have prevented much present suffering; but he did not, and the best reason that can be given is, that it was not his pleasure.—*To be continued.*

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

WILLIAM HAIGH TO THE EDITOR.

South Street, Huddersfield, Yorkshire, England, August, 20, '43

BELOVED BRO. THOMAS:

Through the kindness of Brother John Christian, I have been supplied with several numbers of the Investigator. In perusing its pages I have been induced to rejoice, in the position you have taken. From the attempts now making by the (so called) "Reformers" in the United States and in England to press the baptists into their fellowship, there is just grounds to conclude that the compromise of the truth, will ultimately set aside the glorious doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins, to the penitent believer. Is not the fact notorious, that the Baptists generally are not only dipped into the opinions of men and not into Christ but that they are the most strenuous opponents of Baptism for the remission of sins. To fellowship with such is not only sanctioning their delusion—but virtually giving up the design of baptism. This subject is being agitated in England. A letter was inserted in the July Messenger on Re-immersion and two replies to it. From the letter which is from the pen of Bro. John Murdock of Bury, Lancashire, I copy the following extract: "What the Baptism of Christ is may be briefly expressed thus:—A believer is to be immersed in water for the remission of sins. We thus see four prominent features in this institution. The first is, that a believer is the subject; second immersion is the action; third water is the element in which that action is performed; and fourth remission of sins is the design."

"Now, before proceeding any further, let me ask which of these shall or may we dispense with, and still call it the baptism of Christ? The first,—the second—the third—the fourth? Or how many of them may we dispense with and still retain the institution of Christ? One? Two? or three? Some have dispensed with the design; some with the design and the subject; some with the design the subject and the action; and some have dispensed with them all, and each and all of these say that they have the baptism of Christ, and possess that gift which Christ promised to communicate to those who submitted to him—the remission of sins. But if we may lay aside one of these, why may not others lay aside another, or two or three others? In short, if we may alter it at all, why may not others dispense with it altogether? And if it still be the baptism of Christ without the design, is it not the baptism of Christ, without the subject and so on? If we begin to modify or to alter, we do not know where to stop. But God has joined those constituents of Christian Baptism together; and let those take heed to themselves who separate them. Or let those take heed to themselves who would for the above baptism, substitute one having other constituents."

The replies to Bro. Murdoch's letter are mere evasions of the question, and are very unsatisfactory. Bro. M. is about to forward a rejoinder. The evasion—the sophistry, and the fallacies contained in the replies by J. Wallis and Thompson may be easily detected and exposed. For the meantime the churches at Huddersfield, Halifax, Cleckheaton, Wakefield, Harrogate &c., are resolved not to admit any into their number who have not on a confession of their faith in the Son of God, been immersed into Christ for the remission of sins. They prefer having a few intelligent disciples who have obeyed the form of doctrine taught by Jesus and his Apostles, rather than have a great number (even though containing great names among them,) who teach a human tradition for Christ's institution. It has been truly said, that Anti-Christ has invented a Baptism for adults as well as for babies; we have however cast off the yoke of anti-christ, and resolved not to fraternize with those, who admit aliens into their communion—lest we should become partakers of their evil deeds.

In the recent number of the Messenger, there has been such anxiety manifested for the appointment of officers that those churches who will not at once proceed to appoint them, *qualified* or *unqualified*, are represented as having thrown off their allegiance to Jesus and are therefore recommended to re-

fire into the woods. The churches in this district, however heedless of the anathema of the Messenger—are resolved to adhere to the scripture testimony in the selection and appointment of persons to the eldership. If the qualifications specified in Paul's letters to Timothy and Titus are disregarded, why not at once set aside officers altogether? Paul's letters are recorded for our guidance, and the specified qualifications are to be proved—ere the appointment to office takes place.

I rejoice to state that the churches in this district, are laboring zealously for the spread of the truth. By *gratuitous* efforts in visiting and proclaiming the gospel in distant localities, and mutually co-operating for the extension of Messiah's Kingdom—the cause of Jesus is progressing. The church at Huddersfield, has been visited this day by several of our brethren from Halifax.—Two public addresses have been given by Bro. Benj. Wilson on the Kingdom of Heaven—and the mode of admission into the Kingdom. The last meeting was numerously attended and we had a little discussion afterwards with a Ranter preacher. May the seed sown be productive of a fruitful harvest.

I am happy to hear of the labours of yourself and Bro. Christian in the "Far West," a friend from this neighborhood, who lives in (I think at Rochester in Wisconsin,) states in a letter that, he was much delighted and interested with the addresses. He never saw the way of salvation so clearly or beheld the excellency of the Christian system so fully before. I hope ere long to hear of our Yorkshire friends in America becoming obedient to the faith. Brethren persevere in your labours—the time soon shall come when you faint not.

From yours faithfully in the Lord,

WILLIAM HAIGH.

We should like to receive Bro. Murdock's tract on Apostolic Succession if one can be obtained.—Ed.

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR TO A FRIEND IN THE FAR WEST.

LETTER IV.

LUNENBURG, VIRGINIA, August 23, 1848.

MUCH ESTEEMED FRIEND:—After a few hours disturbed sleep, I fairly awoke about 3½. Did you ever retire to rest, knowing that the stage, boat, or cars were to start by a certain early hour, and that if you did not present yourself at the starting place at the appointed time you would be left behind, and perhaps in this way be delayed for several days, to the complete overthrow of all your arrangements? This was my fear; for, although bro. Covington had ordered the carriage to be at the door by 4 o'clock to carry me to Miller's Tavern, distant some three miles on another road, yet the negro man might oversleep himself, and I might be left behind. This would have inconvenienced me greatly; for I had forwarded an appointment to Corinth, in Powhattan for the Saturday following which I could only fill up by being in Richmond on Wednesday or Thursday; and had I missed the stage at Miller's, I could not have arrived in Richmond until Monday evening, unless by some other accidental conveyance. But the servant was punctual. I had left my bed two or three times to view the heavens, to discover if possible how long to the coming dawn; at length I concluded, I might as well be up and dressed, and finish my nap in a chair, and wait in this posture until summoned to depart. But before I had completed my preparations, the carriage was at the door; and, having bid bro. Covington

adieu, I was soon on my way to Miller's where I arrived about ten minutes before the stage.

We left Miller's about sun rising. The morning was cool and damp, with the prospect of a fine day. We travelled at a very good rate for a two horse mail. Our driver was one of those merry good natured, talkative, fellows, who seemed to be burdened with none of the weighty affairs of life. He had been "Uncle Sam's mail" in thirteen states of the Union; which was no inconsiderable item in the estimation of his importance among men. We breakfasted at Aylett's warehouse about 10 o'clock; after which "all right" summoned us to re-seat ourselves in Uncle Sam's conveyance. Our progress to the Old Church was not so rapid as from Miller's to Aylett's; nevertheless the mail was too express for the interests of "the stand" at that place. The deputy P. M. complained much on behalf of Mr B because of the too early arrival of the mail at Old Church! Our conductor declared himself to be truly astonished at such an objection. He had heard of many complaints about mails being too slow, but never until now, had he heard of such a thing as a mail being too fast! We were certainly as much astonished as the man himself; but the secret of the affair was soon manifested, when he explained, that "by coming at 12 o'clock instead of 2 o'clock, the stand had no chance of making fifty cents a head by serving up a dinner of cold ham and chicken fry!" Thus the public interests are often made subservient to those of private individuals.

Nothing of any interest occurred during the remainder of the route to the Capital. The days of romance in travelling, especially in the Union have passed away. Steamers, coaches, and cars have reduced every thing to common place. You may drop down the Illinois, Mississippi, and Ohio rivers to New Orleans, without fear of a volley of musketry perforating the sides of your boats, your chest, or the bony convexity of your skull. Nothing but "a snag" or "a sawyer," or a collapse, or a fire, can convert a passage along these streams into a voyage of unusual interest, or any thing like adventure. And as to highwaymen, like Othello, their "occupation's gone." For where would the man be found so foot hardy as to arrest a stage upon the national road, or a train en route, to demand of their travellers "your money or your life?" Not adventure must be sought in the bye ways; for in the highways of the people nothing but "bars," "entertainment," "porters" and others lay in wait for the purses of the simple and unwary.

Things appear to be improving in and around Richmond, every thing except the horses; and I think I never did behold such miserable skeletons upon four legs as those which frequent its markets, especially such as traverse the road from the Hanover Slaughter. We overtook a team of laboring beasts, which, from the squalid misery of its appearance, caused our driver to stay his progress, that we might ascertain the name of the wretch that could perpetuate the famished existence of four such *anatomies vivants*. If I could remember it, I would place it on record, that it might be handed down to posterity among the Daniel Deneens and other inhuman monsters of the age: Nothing but the stimulus of the whip, upon the whole rather mercifully applied by the negro, who seemed both to feel and be ashamed of the quadrupeds he was goading, made them advance one foot before the other. He was about three miles from the city, and at the pace he was crawling, he would certainly not arrive there in less than six hours. Could not this cruelty be corrected by the corporation of Richmond passing an ordinance, proscribing the entrance of such starvlings into their city? Their reputation for humanity demands their interference in some way; for what is more disreputable to a city, than to behold its citizens sumptuously housed, and decked off in splendid apparel, and their streets filled with dumb beasts, whose bodies are worn away and their hide-clad bones tottering under their burdens between life and death!

We arrived at Richmond about three o'clock, or perhaps earlier; and just in time to share in the good things provided for the refreshment of the outer man by our worthy friends Mrs. S., and her sister B. A warmer welcome no one could receive than that with which I was greeted by them after my long absence. I remained their guest until Friday morning. In the meantime, I visited other friends, and on Thursday evening Sycamore Meeting House, the former theatre of

my well intentioned, though bootless, endeavours to restore the religion of Jehovah in the city of Richmond.

On Friday morning my friends in Powhattan despatched a servant to this city with a horse to carry me thither, the weather was very hot, and its heat very considerably augmented by the reflection of the sun's rays from the gravelly turnpike. However, after a few hours' ride, we arrived at our old friend's hospitable abode. No reception could be more cordial than that extended towards me by brother John and his worthy sire. As you may suppose, I felt quite at home, and under no apprehension of being treated as a heathen man and a publican. We had much to discourse upon both of a secular, ecclesiastical, and scriptural character. Our ancient brother is as firm as a rock, and patiently waiting till his change come, or the consolation of Israel appear.

I spoke at Corinth meeting house, which is within sight of his residence, on Saturday and Sunday. Our audiences were small owing perhaps, to certain popular sectarian gatherings in the neighborhood. They might possibly, have been larger, if the same scenes had been enacted here as at Fredericksburg and Rappahannock. But every thing passed off peaceably and in order, there being as I suppose, no *evil consciences* to disturb the tranquility of the church; which is constituted of those, who have all believed *the* gospel and obeyed it for the remission of sins.

Our bro. John W—— had kindly offered me his riding horse to complete my tour in these parts, which I expect will occupy a month, or five weeks from this time. But on Saturday, while we were refreshing ourselves with the good things which make up a Virginia dinner, our old acquaintance from Lunenburg arrived with a barouch, to take me on to that county. I was greatly surprised and at the same time rejoiced to see his friendly countenance, as I did not suppose that any in these parts were aware of my appointment in Powhattan. Nor, indeed were they. But supposing that I might be at Richmond, from whence is no public conveyance to Lunenburg, the brethren had concluded to send on to that city, calling at certain places on the rout where it was possible I might be found if I had crossed the James River. As it happened very opportunely, I arrived on Friday late, and brother William Arvin the next day at dinner time.

On Monday morning we left bro. Wrenn's for Paineville in Amelia county. We arrived at this place after dark in the midst of a heavy rain. What varied recollections in connexion with this village present themselves to my mind! I am now sharing with mine host in his accustomed hospitality to the travelling public; but about five years ago, I encountered my old friend, the champion of Protestantism and the Pagan tradition of the immortality of the soul, in yonder "church," an old relic of the days of former years; and in that mansion looking building, shaded by the foilage of lofty trees, we met in opposition and separated in apparent peace;—now, that residence of reputed wealth is no longer the property of him that entertained us, but has passed into the hands of others, to satisfy a portion of the claims upon the firm, that once imparted the little life to Paineville of which it could boast. I could scarcely make inquiry after former friends and acquaintances without being met by the rejoinder "they are gone," or "they are burst up." Four years ago, I left this place with a small company for Northern Illinois, and now I am at the same point, with a faithful friend, halting at the tavern on my way to the arena of my former controversies for the truth. A congregation meets in this place, but concerning it, I can say little. The members with whom I used to mingle, I presume, are nearly all scattered; several have been added which have supplied the loss numerically: the former things have truly passed away, and I sincerely hope, that they may have become new in deed and in truth.

In the morning we departed from Paineville for the vicinity of the Double Bridges in Lunenburg. On our way we halted at Liberty Meeting House in Prince Edward. There had been a meeting there for several days, held by Messrs Bullard and Silas Shelburn. The religious exercises were ended, and the people for the most part had dispersed. However, we unhitched and advanced toward a group in which we discovered some of our old friends and brethren. After some general remarks an adjournment was proposed, and an invitation tendered to us, to accompany them to the house of Bro. H—— W.—— hard by; but he being at Court,

and we desirous to get to our journey's end, it was concluded, that we would meet at Concord on Thursday following.

In company with several brethren I arrived at this place. Many persons were assembled, of whom a goodly number; as I was informed, had convened to hear me address them. The appointment, however, was not mine; nevertheless had I been unanimously invited, with the acquiescence of the preacher, I would have gratified them. I entered the house and took my seat, soon after which the congregation organized for the business of the day. I had not been seated long when a friend observed to me, that certain persons on the ground wished me to walk out, and accompany them to the Spring (a retired place in the forest a few hundred yards from the house) as they had certain inquiries to make of me. Accordingly I withdrew with him. On approaching the draw-bars between the woods and the yard, I perceived a company sauntering towards the Spring as if expecting me to join them. I did not pass the openings, but stood and told my friend, that if any one had questions to put to me I was prepared to answer them before all men; and that I should consent to *no secret conferences*, having nothing to conceal or of which to be ashamed. By this time they had returned to the bars. I found that many had come to Concord to hear me speak, and that a few were opposed to it. The latter with others in divers parts of Lunenburg and Prince Edward, who sympathised with them, professed to believe that I had come "*to make a split*," &c. They objected, therefore, to my speaking, fearing also that I should teach and discuss things which it is not lawful to teach according to the decrees of Bethany, whose Presiding Elder was not here to oppose me, and had no substitute present who was able to defend his views! This is in fact the substance, though not the words of an objection raised to persuade my exclusion from the "sacred desk" of Concord. What, said I, have you or any other persons to do with the misunderstanding between me and Mr. Campbell? Leave us to settle our own affairs; if I speak here or elsewhere, I shall discuss whatever subjects I believe are revealed in the Scriptures, and shall teach the doctrine of the apostles and prophets *according to my own view and understanding thereof*, and not according to Mr. Campbell's interpretations, however popular or orthodox they may be now-a-days. Were I to do otherwise I should be a hypocrite, and altogether unworthy of the confidence of the wise and good. But it was urged, that Paul would not eat meat if it caused his brother to stumble; were there not things, therefore which, though true, would be better let alone? But would Paul suppress truth lest his brethren should be offended? If I must speak according to this rule I must stop every time a thought passes through my mind which is not orthodox, and turn to some weak brother, and inquire of him in an undertone, saying, 'brother Debilis, I was thinking thus and so, would it think you, do harm to speak it out?' Proceeding thus, how long would it take to get through a discourse which should be purged from all things calculated to hurt the feelings of the weak among us, offend the prejudice of sectarians, or "do harm" in the estimation of the Judaizers of the day? No, in speaking every man must be free to teach according to his own judgement of what the Oracles of God declare; *testimony and law* and not *mere human authority*, must be the standard of truth and error, of good and evil, until the Lord shall come; whose right alone it is to pronounce sentence, as the judge of the living and the dead. I am willing to leave things to this issue, nor will I in the meantime submit myself in these things to any judiciary, but on the contrary will earnestly contend against any such assumption by few or many. Several things having been said after this manner, it was proposed to put it to the vote whether I should be permitted to speak or not. There were not more than four or five dissentients, though probably there were some in the house who would have joined the vote. The vote was taken several times with the same result. However I positively refused to speak under existing circumstances. It was Sil. Shelburn &c.'s meeting; they, as I was informed, did not fellowship me; indeed I know not how the latter can consciencionsly after having declared, as reported to me, namely, that I had "*no more religion than his horse.*" I had been charged with forcing myself upon the brethren in Fredricksburg, and had I consented on this occasion, I might have been charged with forcing myself upon them again. My friends at length saw the propriety of this determination, and

though it was a disappointment to very many who had come thus far, they concluded it was better to make an appointment for me at Freedom, and invite the brethren generally to attend.

Thus ended the third act of this drama of human prejudice and imbecility; further comment upon which I shall defer until my next.

In the meantime be assured that I am ever yours in the full assurance of the faith that none will attain to eternal life but those who obey the uncorrupted gospel of Jesus Christ, and patiently continue in well doing until the end.

JOHN THOMAS.

LETTER FROM DR. MAY TO MR. CAMPBELL.

Lunenburg Co., Va. July 11 '44.

Bro. Campbell,—Sir,—You appear to have entirely misapprehended the purport of my letter to you of June 1843. You say you read it. Was your mind at the time you received the copy so engrossed with the covenant breaking affair, and was your mental vision so distorted as not to perceive the object of my epistle; or must I conclude that you had resorted to artifice to divert the minds of your readers from the true issue between us? The cause of my writing to you in June 1843 was this. You had, a short time previous, made the impression that "the reconciliation" between yourself and Dr. Thomas was based on Dr. Thomas and his friends having renounced the Mortality of Man, having been convinced by you during the Debate at Painesville of the Immortality of the Soul.

This I very well know to be utterly erroneous, and therefore endeavoured to present the matter in its true point of view before yourself and the readers of the Millen. Harb. I did not in that communication say one word in relation to the alleged breach of covenant; indeed the charge of covenant breaking was not made by you, that I know of, against Dr. Thomas until after the date of my letter. I was not aware that you preferred any such charge against him. It really appears to me to have been an afterthought. You frequently talk about logic. Is the following a fair sample of your logic?

Dr. May says, that to the best of his knowledge about sixteen out of the twenty three committee-men had renounced the doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul. ——But, thirteen of the twenty three say there was a covenant between the Doctor and themselves.

Therefore—these thirteen had not rejected the Immortality of the Soul!!!—and Dr. May is deceived, and guilty of exaggeration!

Could not these thirteen express their opinion that the Doctor had covenanted with them to discontinue the discussion of "certain things" in relation to the mortality of man in order to maintain peace and harmony in "this reformation" without having abandoned during the Painville Debate, or indeed since, the scripture doctrine of Immortality? My Dear Sir, you may accuse others of sophistry, but you are certainly liable to the charge yourself.

It may appear to yourself and some others excessive presumption in "a little *man* one Dr. May's" passing a critique on any thing said or done by *le grand homme* but by the blessing of our God the little as well as the great in this country enjoy liberty of thought and action.

Why did you not inform your readers of the cause I assigned for the delay in sending on the copy of my first letter?

You say you can "see nothing in that epistle other than the partiality of Dr. May for Dr. Thomas and his Materialism."

I love Dr. Thomas. I consider him my brother in Christ, "he that hateth his brother is a murderer." It was, too, by his reasoning out of the scriptures that I became convinced of the truth. I obeyed it & am now in hope of attaining to the resurrection. Thus I have double cause for loving him.

But let me say to brother Campbell, I love ALL who walk in the truth.

You may style us "a few unstaid, fickle-minded persons, &c." you may with the "Ch Intelligencer" call us disputatious, immoral,

[illegible] and private correspondence of the [illegible] Herald and Intelligencer may be [illegible] not to asperse the character [illegible] is a God, who knoweth the hearts in [illegible] to put our trust.

By the bye, there is one question you [illegible] asked, which I would [illegible] to answer, provided you would inform me what you intended by the phrase "your connexion?" By a due definition of the term I would be glad to ascertain whether I regard [illegible] connexion or, for this is rather a doubtful matter judging from the manner in which you speak of me. Had my communication been full of invective against Dr. Thomas I do not doubt I should have been styled "bro. ——" and very probably "our brother" or perchance "our dear brother."

Respectfully Yours,
CHARLES MAY.

Brother Thomas,—You have seen or heard of Dr. Dejernette's letter. He is a man with whom I do not wish to come in contact; and if he were as well known abroad as at home any notice of him at all would, be deemed superfluous. Regard him not. It, however, the following statement should prove of any

[illegible] during the service in your [illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

In the *Messenger* for July I advanced certain arguments to prove that those who had been immersed into the opinions of men ought to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; and answered a few objections which had been urged against that proposition. I now resume the business of answering objections, the most of which are to be found in the *numbers* of the *Messenger*, already referred to, where they are to be seen in their connexion and in the words of those who have stated them. The others have come to me through other channels. I shall commence by stating the

Sixth objection. "There is not a page nor a sentence in the whole volume to my knowledge that will direct me in this matter, therefore your arguments rest entirely upon *human opinion*. This is my reason for my designating it a *speculative subject*."

Answer 1. Indeed! Because *you do not know* of such a page or sentence, *therefore my arguments* rest entirely upon human opinoin, do they? But I should like to know how *your ignorance* on this point, could possibly prove *my arguments* to rest upon what you say. 2. I had a desire to see your authority from the scriptures for receiving into your fellowship without baptism such as I would receive by immersion for the remission of sins; but you now tell me and the world at large, that there is not a page, not a sentence in the volume to be heard or believed; therefore, on your own shewing, *you act without faith*; and in so doing *you sin*; for whatsoever is not of faith is sin (Rom. X. 17 & XIV. 23) And if this be your real position, as it most clearly is we may well retort, and say in your own words, that you have put a yoke of bondage upon yourself, unauthorised by the word of God, which if it do not entirely strangle you will greatly retard your usefulness in the world, and, I may add, which will keep you in fellowship with his Holiness of Rome of whom you profess so great a dread, and entail upon yourself the punishment denounced in Scriptures against those who would add to the words of the book. 3. But if there is not a word to direct you in this matter, then you must leave the Baptists out of the Kingdom or receive them as you would any other or else do as you have done, and sin. You will not do the first, and the last is sinful; you must therefore adopt my course and say, "be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." as Peter did before us. This is inevitable from your own acknowledgement; and it appears to me to settle the whole question. As there is not a sentence to direct us in receiving them otherwise, we must receive them by remission of sins, as the apostles received other people. In the face of this, then, you cannot say we have not a sentence to direct us in the matter although when this is said of yourself it is perfectly true. 4. You call it a "speculative subject;" and we have seen that your side of the question is speculative enough; when there is not a sentence in the bible to direct you. But if you mean to say that baptism for the remissson of sins is a speculative subject, then the Gospel is a speculation; for one is not more clearly stated than is the other, and if so, there is no end to speculations; we are at sea without compass or helm, and liable to be tossed about with every wind of doctrine, But he who dares to call either the one or the other a speculation has very nigh denied the faith, and is on the verge of that position in which he would be worse than an infidel. I now refer again to the nineteenth chapter of Acts, and what I have already said upon it in reference to this subject.

Seventh objection. "What this passage has to do with the subject, I cannot perceive."

Ans. If you have not been able to see hitherto, you must just look again, and try if you can see a re-immersion there: secondly, perhaps you will be able to see that as, "the gift of the Holy Spirit was a blessing in no way connected with the baptism of John," and as the remission of sins is in no way connected with the baptism of the Baptists, these two baptisms are equally different from the baptism of Christ, with which the remission of sins is most intimately connected, and, thirdly, you may be able to see that the subject of both the former are in equal need of submitting to the latter. If you can see this, you can see all. I wish you to see at this time on this point. But if you do not see this, I must just leave you in the hands of God; I cannot furnish you with eyes.

Eighth objection. "It has often been remarked that there is a perfect analogy between the kingdom of nature and that of favor. And as it is not necessary the those who have been born into unfortunate circumstances in the former, should be physically re-born; so neither ought the Baptists, who have been born into unfortunate circumstances in the latter, to be re-born of water."

Ans. This is only clothing the subject in a figure; and as we have examined it in its nakedness and found your position untenable, it is not likely that you will gain much by presenting it in a new form; and it would only be wasting time to examine it over again. 2. But lest you or anyone else should think that I am evading your objection or argument, I will even waste a little time upon it in its present form. The analogy of which you speak would go to prove that as there are bastards in the one kingdom, so there may be in the other; and as in the first kingdom they remain such, so also in the second they must either be re-born or remain bastards and not sons, who like the child of the bond woman must be cast out as not fit to enjoy the privileges of sons. 3. But, again before we admit your conclusions, you must prove to us, that the Baptists of whom I speak were born into the kingdom of favour, you must prove that a person can be born into the kingdom by any other baptism than that which is for the remission of sins. And when you have done this the whole work will be finished. 4. And then, instead of the Baptists coming out of the kingdom to join you in your kingdom, you will have to return to them; for theirs is the kingdom, and they are in it. And so on, to the end of the chapter of difficulties and absurdities which you have begun. The figure does not seem to help you anything.

Ninth Obj. "Before baptism, there must be in existence a degree of *faith, repentance, and knowledge*; but what degree, is not for you to determine."

Ans. I do not profess to determine; I take the determination of Scripture, which is ready to my hand. And what is there determined, seems to be, that the person should *believe* the *gospel*, *repent* of his *sins*, and *know* what he is about. That he may know this, Peter tells him to be baptised in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; and he who does not know this, has not the knowledge the Scriptures intended him to possess.

Tenth Objection. "Are you prepared to say that these principles did not exist in the minds of any of the Baptists in the United Kingdom, when they confessed the Lord?"

Ans. 1. I have little doubt but some few individuals, who have been *among* the Baptists, did hold those principles prior to their baptism; but if they did, they were not Baptists although they were among them; although they were with them they were not of them. 2. To "confess the Lord" is to obey him; and he who is not baptised *for the remission of sins*, neither obeys nor confesses him: for this is as clear a command as ever was. So that those of whom you speak did not confess the Lord; they merely confessed men, by submitting to an institution of men.

Eleventh Objection. "What I ask, ought they to do, who believe Jesus is the Christ &c. ?"

Ans. They ought to listen to the words of Scripture, and repent and be baptised for the remission of sins.

Twelfth Objection. "But if they consider that baptism is a command to which they ought to submit, and that they never heard of remission in connexion with it, will you condemn them if they obey the Lord? Ought they not in this way to obtain a good conscience, and be married to Christ?"

Ans. 1. How their baptism, which was not for the remission of sins, could be the means of securing to them a good conscience, remains to be shown by you, and also, how they could be married to Christ in their sins by a baptism not for the remission of sins. 2. And instead of condemning them for obeying the Lord, I exhort them to obey the Lord, and get out of their present state of condemnation, by submitting to the baptism of Christ.

Thirteenth Objection. "Should any of them afterwards discover the privileges to which they are entitled, one of which only is the remission of sins, will you recommend them to be re-immersed, that they may be married over again?"

Ans 1. No, I would recommend them to be re-immersed for the remission of sins, that they might be married for the *first time* to Christ. 2. As to the privileges to which they are entitled for obeying men, I know them not. But of this I am certain, that remission of sins, is not one of them; and, therefore, I would have them accept of that in the proper way.

Fourteenth Objection. "You appear to re-

strict baptism for the remission of sins only, whereas in my judgement, it comprehends much more than this."

Ans. 1. Whatever else is comprehended in it, is involved in, or is consequent upon the remission of sins. 2. When a person is baptised for the remission of sins, he is baptised for the purpose commanded. He is no where commanded to be baptised to be married to Christ, to obtain a good conscience or the like; but he is commanded to be baptised for remission. When however he has obeyed in this way, he has told us in the epistles of the privileges and relations to which he has been born. So do I. As the knowledge of remission is given in Acts, before baptism, I contend for it; and as the other knowledge is not given, I do not contend for it. I shall just be guided by Scripture, and take things in the order and manner which God has given them. 3. Please to point out some of the other designs of baptism.

Fifteenth Objection. "Because the individual does not know how to use his privileges aright, would a fresh title to them assure the right use of them?"

Ansr. 1. I do not admit that he has the privileges of which you speak that being the very point at issue; hence to be baptised for the remission of sins is not to obtain a "*first title*," but to obtain the thing itself for the first time. 2. The Scriptures do not speak of a title to the remission of sins being bestowed before that blessing itself. This title at one time and remission at another, seems an invention necessary to the patching up of the theory which I oppose. 3. Although a *first title* might not assure the right use of those *imaginary privileges*, a re-immersion would secure to the subject thereof the privilege of the remission of sins, provided he had the necessary knowledge before hand: and this is what we contend for.

Sixteenth Objection. "Does the right use of money give possession of the money to be used; or the wrong use of that commodity prevent the person possessing it?"

Ans. 1. No; but the right use of the money gives possession of the things to be obtained for it, as the right use of the water to the penitent believer the possession of the remission of sins. 2. If a person have spurious money, he cannot obtain for it the desired benefits, any more than a spurious baptism will secure the remission of sins.

Seventeenth Objection. "To say that ignorance of the use of baptism does away with its validity proceeds upon the same principle as to say our ignorance of the right use of fire will do away with its scorching properties."

Ans. 1, If this assertion be correct, then remisson of sins is as inevitably and certainly connected with a dipping in water, as burning is with fire; and an infidel, a drunken or even a dead man, will as certainly obtain the remission of sins in an immersion as in a burning in fire!! But it is meant that this is the case only with a believer who does not know the use of baptism, I must remind you that that is the point at issue; and that your assertion will not do instead of proof.

Eighteenth Objection. "Suppose I were put in possession of a certain medicine, as an infallible cure for a disease with which I was afflicted, but was not informed at the time I received it of the way I ought to apply it, what would you think of the sense of that man who should insist that there was no way of using the medicine aright but by obtaining an additional quantity, and throw away what I had, formerly obtained, and that any information I might afterwards procure was of no use because I did not procure it at the time I first received the medicines."

Ans. 1. Suppose that I said he shewed great wisdom; would that settle the question in my favour? Or that he manifested a great want of wisdom, would it settle it in your favour? Or would my answer to that great question of yours affect the subject in the least? But suppose you did obtain medicine, and that you misapplied it, you would have to obtain more with proper information, and apply it properly to derive the desired benefit; and so with your baptism. As you have through ignorance misapplied baptism, just with the information you now profess, go and be baptised for the Scriptural purpose.

Nineteenth Objection. "We might as well argue that, because a man did not fully know the extent of the obligations and duties under which he laid himself at marriage, he must be married again before he can recognize those obligations and duties, as to argue for re-baptism in the cases under consideration."

Ans. 1. This has been urged a long time now, just as if it were a complete settler. But how does it affect the case? The parties concerned in marriage, if legally married, are joined to one another, and if joined to each other, they are bound to all the consequences, whether they know of them beforehand or not. Now to make the cases parallel, you must prove, by some other means, that the subject of the disputed baptism has been united to Christ; and by the time you have done this, you will have no use for the parallel. 2. But suppose the marriage to have been illegal, then it must be gone over again; and if you admit the existence of the analogy for which you at first contended, the baptism also must be repeated: or rather, he, who was the first time, the subject of a baptism of man must now submit to Christ's baptism.

I have paid more attention to the last four objections than I think they deserve, lest in passing them by should be improperly construed by any one. I maintain that the illustrations used favor my side of the question, as I think I have shown; but what of that? They will *prove* nothing. And if our opponents have nothing better to offer as arguments it is surely time to give up. Money, fire, medicine, and marriage are thrust in to support a tottering cause, and how they support it, I leave others to judge. These things may do tolerably well to illustrate what has already been proved by other arguments; but to rest upon them for proof seems to me a striking manifestation of conscious weakness.

Twentieth Objection. "The use or abuse of anything implies the possession of it; so when you speak of not making a right use of baptism, you admit that a right use might be made of it; which is admitting the whole point at issue; for it is impossible to abuse any thing which cannot be used: that deficiency, then, being not in the baptism, but in the abuse of it, why should it be repeated in order to turn it to its right use?"

Ans. The last sentence contains the question and its own answer:—why should it be repeated? In order to turn it to its right use" to be sure. I thank you for answering your own question. As for a person *possessing baptism*, it is a thing I do not at all understand. I do not know how a person can possess baptism!

Twenty-first Objection. "That which constitutes baptism valid is not the use which is made of it, but the pre-requisites which qualify for it."

Ans. But the use which is made of it depends upon the pre-requisites. If a person do not know the true import of it, there is no saying what he may be baptised for, or into whom he may be baptized. Now supposing that the pre-requisites are belief of the gospel and repentance, and that a man should happen to be dipped in water for some physicality would this dipping be valid christian baptism? If you say "no!"—then you acknowledge that these are not all the pre-requisites; that the mere circumstance of a person being dipped in water after he has believed something and repented will not constitute him the subject of a valid baptism. Indeed it is clear, that the pre-requisites are faith in the gospel, repentance, and a knowledge of what he ought to be baptised for; and that there is no standing or resting place between this and the idea that any unintentional dipping after belief of the gospel is a valid baptism. If there be any such resting place, I wish you would point it out.

Twenty-second Objection. "When the promise of the remission of sins is mentioned to the unimmersed, it is never as a pre-requisite; but as a motive or inducement to obey the command. Let us distinguish between things which differ."

Ans. We have already seen that this motive, as it is called, is unnecessary; and therefore, it becomes a pre-requisite, as well as a motive. But the plain saying of Scripture, which does not puzzle us with 'pre-requisites' motives, and the like phrases, is, "be baptised every one of you in the name of Jes. Christ for the remission of sins.' Here it is positively commanded, let objectors say what they will; and he who is not baptised for remission of sins does not obey this plain command of God. Let us, then, distinguish between things which differ, between the ingenious reasonings of men, and the positive declarations and commands of God.

Twenty-third Objection. "Nothing can change the ordinance of God, but a change of either the ACT or the SUBJECT, and I challenge any one to disprove this position."

Ans. I presume that the meaning of this is, that if you simply believe the gospel facts; the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus and repent, that a dipping in water, without knowing what for, will be sufficient; that will be the ordinance of God. If this be the mean-

ing, and the connexion shews that it is, there was no necessity for such a challenge, as I was busily engaged discussing that very subject. But to throw down a challenge has a mighty effect on some people; it makes them think that he who does it is very powerful; and, forgetting what he has really done, or left undone, they are apt to be carried away by his unsupported assertions. Thus, by his mere apparent boldness, he swamps rather than convinces those who are influenced by him. As the challenge has been thrown down I take it up. But as I have already shown the absurdity of the position, and also what the scriptures teach on the subject; and as the proof devolves upon you, and only the dispute upon me, I wait your further attempt to sustain that position. Bring forth your arguments, and I, God willing, will be in waiting to examine them. As for challenging me to prove a negative, it is something like the rest of your assertions on this subject, absurd. But before you do this, you will have to answer all my arguments already advanced, two of which only have been nibbled at, and the rest passed by. To have done this at first would have looked much better than your throwing down a challenge when there was more before you than you could accomplish.

Twenty-fourth Objection. "The position you have taken upon this question produces dissention."

Ans. The preaching of the resurrection produced dissension in the days of the Apostles; the preaching of any item of the faith once delivered to the saints produces dissension at this very day; but shall we not contend for the truth, because some will dissent from us for so doing? And shall we cease to preach baptism for the remission of sins to those who have not been baptised for that purpose, because you, or any one else, may have such a bad temper that you cannot listen to us without offence? Nay verily! But there will be very little discussion if the like of you will obey the truth.

Twenty-fifth Objection. "You are adding mere human opinions to the scriptural terms of fellowship."

Ans. This is only one of many equally unfounded charges which have been preferred against us by the same individual. But his bare assertion is not enough to establish it; nor has God constituted him judge of what are the proper terms of fellowship. We must learn that from God himself; and learn this accuser to dictate to those who pay him for going about preferring false charges against churches and slandering individuals.

Twenty-sixth Objection. "Those who contend for re-immersion are ignorant on other important points of Scripture doctrine, and are wanting in character."

Ans. This is a sample of the charges which this person brings against those who have courage enough to oppose his unscriptural conduct; and who will not be fettered by the opinion of any man or set of men. *But the charge is false* as applied to the congregations in this quarter, who have taken this stand on this point with us; as I know from actual observation; for I have been among them. But supposing that they were wanting in character, would that prove that this individual's immersion was Christian baptism and therefore need not be immersed into Christ for the remission of sins? And if not what have such charges to do with the discussion of this question? But this is only another proof of the weakness of the cause which he has espoused. Instead of meeting us honestly and openly on Scriptural grounds, he will have recourse to slander, to cowardly backbiting, and that too, of persons to whom he dare not lay himself open.

I think it unnecessary to say much more at this time. To answer all the little childish questions that are asked by our opponent would be to repeat much of what has already been said; which would be unprofitable and disagreable. And to spend time in repelling the charges of being "inquisitional," "presumptuous," of being "guilty of instituting a worse species of tyranny and sectarianism than dwells in any sect save the Church of Rome;" of being guilty of "galling oppression," would only be devoting precious time to an unnecessary purpose. Those charges only betray the weakness, and in some cases the wickedness of those who prefer them. Let this self-inflicted punishment serve them. Let them cultivate more love and manifest it.

In conclusion, I think, it is manifest, that those who have not heon baptised with a knowledge that it was for the remission of sins, but were merely dipped for any of the human purposes now in repute, ought to be now immersed *into* Christ by being baptised *in his name for the remission of sins.*

It is also clear, I think, that my two opponents are setting up a new system, midway between this and the Baptists: or a *reformation* in which the subject of a re-immersion of those who were baptised not for the remission of sins is made a matter of forbearance. Of course we have no right to restrain them by any other means than argument; nor can we pronounce sentence of condemnation upon them. Let them do so, let them follow their leaders. But if we be not content with what some people call a "*reformation*," but must just have the words of Christ and his apostles to guide us in every step, and will not be led by any man or any set of men or be influenced by numbers or talents, we claim liberty to carry out our principles, without having their anathemas hurled at us. And if they will fellowship with the unpardoned, and if one of them, be, himself, unpardoned, we must of course, non-fellowship them and their "Reformation." We now see how we stand in relation to them; that instead of making their stand with us on one Lord, one faith, and baptism for the remission of sins, they are our open opponents, holding, I know, not how many baptisms. If they will return into Babylon we must bid them farewell: we put on Christ to go on, and shall not turn aside or back, but, in the strength of the Lord, go on unto perfection.

JOHN MURDOCK.

NOTE.

The twenty-fourth objection was stated to me, at Ashton under Lyne, by Wm. Thomson, who also stated the twenty-fifth, and the twenty-sixth, to the brethren at Halifax.

To be continued.

READ THIS AND ACT UPON IT.

The following sentiments written by an English Jew who believes that Jesus is the King of Israel, are precisely to our mind; we would that all our readers would permit them to sink deeply into their hearts.—*Editor.*

"In poetry and the fine arts, we may be indulgent to an enthusiasm which, leaving the sober and prosaic region of fact, soars into the aerial abodes of fancy, and portrays the mirage it has there beheld; but in all the earnest purposes of life, it is dangerous to tamper with the sacred majesty of truth.

"He who is thoroughly convinced that the pursuit of any given object is a duty, needs not to have that object dressed up in gaudy colors; not represented as being nearer, or more easily attainable, than it really is. Those companions in a great enterprise, from whom the difficulties that attend it must be concealed, are not desirable coadjutors; it is better at once to say to them, as to the army of Gideon: "whosoever is fearful and afraid, let him return and depart." The laborer to whom, "Thus saith the Lord," is not a sufficient encouragement to persevere, is but capable, at best, of wavering purposes and feeble efforts.

"O that all who seek to serve the Lord would trust in the omnipotence of Truth! For what is truth? It is the inner reality of things, as seen by the eye of God. Shall we prefer to exhibit the delusive shows and semblances of things, as seen by men who only "look on the outward appearance?" It were well if all the professed followers of Christ, would take truth as their only ally, *discarding expediency*, and concealment, and flattering words, and "the wisdom of this world which is foolishness with God." We are not afraid that truth will injure the cause of Christianity; we are only afraid that falsehood and exaggeration may; and instead of considering the cause of Christianity strengthened by making men mere nominal Christians, we think it it is greatly weakened thereby."

Some of our readers are troubled at the agitation of the question concerning the destiny of four-fifths of our race, who are physically or circumstancially incapable of obeying the Truth. They think it will do harm; though to what they depose not. For our part, we conceive it to be a harmless, interesting, and, in its relation to other truths, very important question. We are not alone in this conviction, as will appear from the following items taken from the Star in the West. 'Agitation' can do no harm save to Party and party-policy.—*Ed.*

"Universalists have frequently pressed the fact upon the attention of Partialists, that their doctrines necessarily lead to the belief of the final damnation of all pagans; especially the idea of no change after death, and the necessity of faith in the gospel and repentance in this life, in order to salvation hereafter. These results of their system trouble them; and they generally hesitate to express their real sentiments on this subject.

The question is now under discussion in the Louisville 'Baptist Banner,' &c.

Mr. J. C. Walker "has expressed the opinion that the Pagans *may be saved* without a knowledge of Christ and his gospel; and argues that the doctrine that excludes the heathen from heaven, would exclude idiots and infants; for they require a change after death in order to be saved, and cannot comply with any conditions in this life.

"Mr. Pendleton thinks the heathen *cannot* be saved without the gospel;—that is, that they are to be finally damned for not doing what is utterly *impossible* for them to do, and what they were never told they *ought* to do!

"John L. Waller occupies the same position; and from his article in the Banner of July 18, I copy the following extracts:

'Your correspondent rather squints at the position, that the heathen are in the same condition and are saved pretty much in the same way as infants and idiots; and hence, with a confidence which conscious security alone could prompt, he says, 'if the Elder has any *mode* o. showing it (the salvation of infants and idiots,) I will *show* by that *mode how heathens may be saved also.* This, I say, *may* imply that a heathen adult stands precisely in the same attitude as the infant and idiot! If not what can it mean? And yet, I am persuaded, that your correspondent is not prepared coolly to endorse such a proposition. For, what follows on its admission? Why, that all the heathen, like infants and idiots will be saved! Aye, more—that the gospel has been a curse instead of a blessing; for had all the world been left in heathenism, then all mankind would have been saved!! But does this correspond with the Bible representation of heathenism?'

Farther along, in the same article, he expresses similar sentiments;

If the heathen may be saved without the gospel, so may every one else. And if, as some suppose, on account of their ignorance, heathens stand precisely in the attitude of infants and idiots, then the gospel instead of a blessing has been the direst curse ever sent upon the world, for without it, all mankind being left in ignorance, would have been saved! Did I believe this. I would urge that every Bible be burnt, every church disbanded, every minister silenced; that it should be made penal for the name of Jesus to be mentioned, and that every means be speedily put into operation to obliterate the last and the least remains of the gospel from the recollections of mankind."

"DAMNATION OF INFANTS."

The six 'league' Editors of the 'True Catholic,' seem to be shocked at the Romish doctrine of infant damnation, as if themselves held that all infants would be saved. The following paragraphs are cut from that paper of July 17.—The 'Council' referred to is the Council of Trent.

"In the foregoing decision of the Council we have it asserted that baptism is necessary to salvation; that newly born infants are baptised for the remission of sins, and that the original guilt is expiated in the laver of regeneration in order to obtain eternal life, and that the original sin is remitted by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ bestowed in baptism.

On this point we select the following from the Catechism of the Council of Trent; 'Baptism washes away the stains of sins,' p. 152 'The law of baptism extends to all insomuch that unless they are regenerated through the grace of baptism, be their parents Christians or infidels they are born to eternal misery and everlasting destruction,' p.162. 'If, then, through the transgression of Adam, children inherit the stain of primeval guilt, is there into stronger reason' to conclude that the efficacious merits of Christ the Lord must impart to them that justice and those graces which will give them a title to reign in eternal life? This happy consummation BAPTISM ALONE CAN ACCOMPLISH,' p. 163, and the authorities quoted there. Infants, unless baptised, cannot enter heaven."

This is very explicit in relation to the Romish doctrine; and I now propose to show that both Presbyterians and Methodists hold similar opinions. These may be considered the vanguard and rearguard of the redoubtable 'league.'

First let us hear the Presbyterian Confession of Faith—the standard creed of that church, a denial of which is heresy. See chap. x. sect. iii. 'Elect infants, dying in infancy, are regenerated and saved by Christ,

&c. Election among Calvinists, implies non-election and reprobation.—Hence, their non-elect, *reprobate* INFANTS, that of course can *not* be saved. But more to the point, see chap. XXV. sect. ii. 'The visible church, . . . , consists of all those throughout the world, that profess the *true religion*, (Presbyterianism of course,) and THEIR CHILDREN, and is the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ; . . . . . *out of which* there is no ordinary POSSIBILITY of *salvation*!!

If this does not express the exclusion from heaven of all but Presbyterians, and 'their children,' I know not what language could; *unless* the presbyterian Confession of faith, recognizes some other 'religion' as 'true,' and not Presbyterianism; or, that there are more 'true' religions, than one!

2. Now let us look at the Methodist creed, for edification on the same subject, and then we shall learn with what reason Methodist and Presbyterian 'true Catholics' have to be shocked at the Romish doctrine of damnation of some infants dying in infancy. See Methodist Discipline, chap. iii; sect. ii., New York Edition of 1836, p. 100—1, on 'the Ministration of Baptism to Infants.' The minister is to say; 'Forasmuch as all men are conceived and *born* in SIN, and that our Saviour, Christ saith *None* can enter into the kingdom of God, except he be regenerated and born anew of *water* and the Holy Ghost; I beseech you,' &c. This implies that *infants* cannot be saved without baptism for the language is used at the baptism of infants.

Afterwards, before baptizing the infant, the minister is to pray thus; 'We beseech thee . . . . . look upon this *child*; wash him and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost; that he being *delivered* from THY WRATH may be received into the ark of Christ's church, etc.

Now will the four Presbyterian and Methodist editors of the 'True Catholic,' copy this article into the next number of that paper? or at least, whenever they again allude to the Romish dogma of the non-salvation of unbaptised infants.

E. M. P.

Thus Rabbis, 'dispute, change hands, and still dispute' not knowing the end God proposed to himself in the creation of man; nor the principle, according to which he intends to accomplish it.—*Editor*

FRANKLIN COLLEGE.

We have been favoured with a visit from the agent of this Institution—Bro. T. Fanning of Nashville, Tennessee. While sojourning in this city he delivered a lecture exegetical of the System upon which the Franklin College is conducted. It proposes like that of the renowned Fellenberg of Switzerland, to educate the whole man. In his address Bro. Fanning contrasted the modern systems of *education* as they are mistermed with what he conceives to be the true one of which, of course, he considered himself the advocate. He showed clearly, that to store the heads of youths with words, of whatever language they might be, was not to educate; inasmuch as education is the *training* or the development of the intellectual, moral, and physical faculties of the head, hands, and body in general. As to Colleges in the general, we think but little of them, and when any system of divinity is taught, however near to the truth, we regard them as a positive evil. Colleges, instead of educating, dissipate young men; they do not train them, but instil into their heads prejudices and wild conceits, and demoralize them, first, for want of sound moral training, which is entirely deficient, and secondly, by the mutual licentiousness of their students. But, when we thus speak, we do not oppose education. We doubt not but there will be a system of education for the training up of youth in the way they should go in the Future Age: for then men and women will attain much more nearly to what God designed they should be, than they have yet done since the Fall; we repeat it. There will be the education of youth in the Millennium. It will be a perfect system; and we doubt not it will be based on the constitution of man as an intellectual, moral, and physical being. Mankind will then be well trained. They will be trained in the way they should go, and so trained that they will show their good breeding in all the

same fate, and like him was also defeated and killed in the battle.

The news of this double defeat being brought to Antiochus, he was exasperated to fury. He forthwith assembled a mighty army, and determined to destroy the whole Jewish Nation, and to settle other people in the country. But hearing that the King of Armenia had rebelled against him, and that Persia had discontinued the regular payment of the tribute, he divided his army into two parts; one of which he sent into Judea under Lysias to subdue the Jews; and the other, he led into Armenia and Persia. In performing the mandate of Antiochus, the several detachments of the army effected a junction at Emmaus, near Jerusalem, where they encamped to the number of 40,000 foot, and 7000 horse. A thousand slave merchants of considerable wealth, assembled in the Syrian camp, in order to buy up at the rate of 90 for a talent, all the prisoners they expected to take in the war.

To oppose this host, Judas had only 6,000 men; and after making proclamation according to the Law, that those who had built a house that year, married a wife, or planted a vine, or were afraid, were at liberty to retire—his little army was reduced one half. With this small body of men he attacked the Syrians in the night. He spread such terror and confusion into every part of it, that after 3000 of the enemy had been cut to pieces, the rest fled, and left him the whole plunder of his camp; 6,000 more were slain in the pursuit, and the greatest part of those who escaped were either maimed or wounded. After this he destroyed 20,000 in a great battle against Timotheus and Bacchides, two of the King's lieutenants. These were great exploits.

In the year B. C. 165, Lysias encamped at Bethsura, south of Jerusalem, with 60,000 foot and 5,000 horse. Judas encountered him with 10,000; and in the full confidence that the Strength of Israel would assist him he fell upon the enemy, killed 5,000 of them and put the rest to flight.

Judas being left master of the country by the retreat of Lysias to Antioch, took advantage of this interval of rest, and marched to Jerusalem, where he recovered the Sanctuary from the Heathens, purified and dedicated it to the service of God. News was sent to Antiochus informing him of Lysias's defeat, and also that the Jews had retaken the Temple, thrown down the altars and idols he had set up, and re-established their ancient worship. At this news his fury knew no bounds. He threatened to make Jerusalem the burying place of the whole Jewish Nation, and not to leave one single inhabitant in it. He had scarcely uttered these words, when he was struck by the hand of God. He was seized with incredible pains in his bowels, and the most excessive pangs of the cholic. Worms crawled from every part of him; his flesh fell away piecemeal; and the stench was so great that it became intolerable to the whole army. At length, he acknowledged that it was the God of Israel by whom he was smitten. He made mighty promises of amendment and liberality, if the Almighty would turn away his indignation from him. But, adds the author of the Maccabees, "this wicked person vowed unto the Lord, who now would no more have mercy upon him;" and "thus the murderer and blasphemer having suffered most grievously, as he treated other men, so died he a miserable death," after a profligate administration of eleven years.

From the 35th to the 40th Verse is AN INTERVAL of about 2,000 years; which may be thus arranged:

First Period.—From the beginning of the government of Judas Maccabeus to the end of the reign of the Asmonean Princes, when the LITTLE HORN besieges Jerusalem, takes it, and places Herod upon the throne; who had been declared King of Judea by the Roman Senate, is a period of 129 years. This happened B. C. 37.

Second Period.—From the assumption of sovereignty over Judea by the Little Horn or Roman Senate to the Time of the End, which is 1881 years to the present A. D.

Between the events of verses 35 and 36 is an interval of 129 years. After verse 35, we read no more of the Kings of the North and South until verse 40. One hundred years from the 20th of Ptolemy Philometor, the kingdom of the South, or Egypt, became a province of the Roman Empire; also in about the same space of time from Eupator, the son and successor of Antiochus Epiphanes, the Kingdom of the North met with the same fate.

But, while these kingdoms were declining

to their fall, Judea was rising to independence of both of them, until she became a Kingdom under the Asmoneans, and admitted among the friends and allies of the Roman People.

The chronology of verse 36 is B. C. 37; for in that year, the Roman Senate "*did according to its will*" in relation to Judea. This may be clearly discovered from the fact, that they declared Herod, who had gone to Rome to solicit the sovereignty of Judea for Aristobulus, brother of Mariamne, to whom he was betrothed,—King of Judea; who was at once conducted to the Capitol to receive the investitures of the crown at the hands of the Consuls. And besides this, when they had put him in possession, they put the ex-king Antigonus in chains. They condemned him to die, and executed him in the same manner as common criminals, with rods and axes of the lictor, and fastened to a stake; "a treatment says Rollin, "with which the Romans had never used any crowned head before."

From the incorporation of Egypt, Judea, and Syria into one Empire all rivalry and hostility would cease. Hence no more is said of the kingdoms of the South and North from the 36th verse to the 40th; for until our own day, they have belonged mostly to the same dominion; and besides that, the fate of Judea is of little importance separated from that of its inhabitants. From B. C. 37 till now, it has been in the hand of the Desolator, under whose ravages it has been doomed to bleed at every pore, "until that which is determined shall be poured out." But, in these latter days, we see the King of the South reappear upon the arena; but we see Syria still under the dominion of the Turco-Roman Horn. Yet, we have both the kingdoms revived in these latter times—"in the Time of the End"—Mehemet Ali, the King of the South, and Nicholas of Russia, the King of the North, in relation to Judea.

That the reader may have some idea of the events, which happened between the time of Judas Maccabeus and the appearance of the "King" that was to "do according to his will," I shall present the following chronology of the times.

B C.

163. The Syrians invade Judea with 80,000 foot, all the cavalry of the kingdom, and 80 elephants. An angelic horseman marches before Israel, clothed in a white habit, in armor of gold, and a lance in his hand. The sight filled them with new ardor. They threw themselves like lions upon the enemy killed 12,600 men, and put the rest to flight.

The decree of Antiochus Epiphanes revoked, and liberty granted to the Jews in all places to live according to their own laws.

Timotheus invades Judea with 120,000 foot, and 2,500 horse. Judas defeats him with a loss of 30,000 men.

The king in person invades Judea with 100,000 foot, 20,000 horse, and 32 elephants with 300 chariots of war. Judas surprises the Syrian camp in the night, and kills 4,000 of the enemy. Judas retires to Bethsura. It surrenders by capitulation.

Antiochus Eupator marches against Jerusalem and besieges the Temple. Peace is concluded.

B. C.

162. Bachides, the Syrian general, and Alcimus, the High Priest, invade Judea; after them Nicanor. Both armies defeated by Judas. Nicanor invades Judea a second time with 35,000 men. They were all slain to a man.

Judas sends an embassy to Rome; which is well received by the Senate, who pass a decree by which the Jews are declared the friends and allies of the Romans, and a defensive league is made with them. Judas Maccabeus killed and succeeded by Jonathan in the government.

153. Jonathan accepts the High Priesthood from Alexander Bala, which continues hereditarily in the Asmonean Family till Herod's time.

143. Simon succeeds Jonathan, who was treacherously murdered by Tryphon. The king of Syria confirms the High Priesthood and Sovereignty to Simon, and exemption from all kinds of tributes and imposts.

141. "In a general assembly of the Priests, the Elders, and whole people of Jerusalem, Simon was elected general; and they gave him the government, with the title of sovereign, as well as

that of high priest; and declared this double power, civil and sacerdotal, hereditary in his family.

B. C.

139. His title acknowledged by the Senate which caused consul Piso to write to five kings, all the States of Greece, Asia Minor, and the islands, with which the Romans were in alliance, to notify to them, that the Jews were their friends and allies, and consequently that they should not undertake any thing to their prejudice.

135. John, surnamed Hyrcanus, son of Simon, proclaimed high priest and Prince of the Jews in his father's stead.

Jerusalem capitulates to Antiochus Sidetes; its fortifications demolished.

130. Hereafter neither Hyrcanus nor any of his descendants were dependent in the least upon the Kings of Syria; they threw off entirely the yoke of subjection, and even homage.

127. The Roman Senate decreed, that the Syrians should make amends for all the losses the Jews had sustained from them; and that the Kings of Syria do renounce their pretended right to lead their troops into the territories of the Jews.

109. After a siege of one year, Samaria surrenders to Hyrcanus, who immediately orders it to be demolished. It was not rebuilt till the time of Herod.

105. Alexander, Prince of the Jews, besieges Ptolemais, now St. Jean d' Acre.

106. Aristobulus assumes the diadem and the title of king, which none of those who had governed Judea since the Babylonish Captivity had done before.

He conquers the Iturcans, and compels them to embrace Judaism, as Hyrcanus had the Idumeans some years before. Iturea formed part of Cœle-Syria, on the northeast frontier of Israel, between the inheritance of the half tribe of Manasseh on the other side Jordan, in the territory of Damascus.

97. Alexander Janneus, king of the Jews, reduces the ancient and famous Gaza to a heap of ruins.

95. While officiating at the altar as high priest, the people throw lemons at his head calling him "slave" and unworthy of the crown and pontificate. In revenge for this insult he killed 6,000 of them.

92. The people revolt against him. Civil war is waged for six years.

86. Alexander crucifies 800 rebels in one day; and cuts the throats of their wives and children before their faces while suspended on their crosses. This war cost the lives of more than 50,000 men on the side of the rebels.

78. He dies. His wife Alexandra submits to the direction of the Pharisees; which conciliates them and confirms her in the sovereignty. Her eldest son, Hyrcanus is appointed High Priest.

The decree by which John Hyrcanus, father of the two last kings, had abolished all their traditional constitutions, is repealed by Alexandra at the instance of the Pharisees; they are more generally received than ever; the Pharisees persecute all who oppose them.

70. Queen Alexandra dies this year. Her son Aristobulus siezes upon 22 towns and castles, which put him in possession of all the national troops. The people weary of the cruel administration of the Pharisees, declare for him. He obtains the crown and pontificate. Hyrcanus retires to private life. The tyranny of the Pharisees ends with this event.

65. Antipater, the Idumean, intrigues to replace Hyrcanus upon the throne by which he hopes to elevate himself to high honors under him.

Hyrcanus applies to Pompey. The Jews also petition him to free them from the rule of both; urging that they ought not to be ruled by kings; that they had long been accustomed to obey only the high priest, who without any other title administered justice according to the laws and constitutions handed down to them: that the two brothers were indeed of the sacerdotal line; but that they had changed the form of the government for a new one which would enslave them, if not remedied.

Pompey marches into Judea. He obliges Aristobulus to put all his strong holds into his hands, by signing orders to that effect to their commanders.

As soon as released, Aristobulus hastens to Jerusalem, and prepares for war. Pompey advances toward that city. Aristobulus alarmed, goes out to meet him with overtures of accommodation. Pompey detains him, and sends Gabinius, at the head of a detachment, to receive the money offered. The gates are shut against him with a refusal to ratify. Upon this Pompey puts Aristobulus in irons; and moves his entire force against Jerusalem.

Aristobulus' party retired to the mountain of the Temple to defend it; the party of Hyrcanus open the gates to the Romans. Pompey besieges the temple, which is carried by assault after a siege of three months, with a terrible slaughter of 12,000 Jews.

Pompey with many of his superior officers, entered the Holy of Holies, in to which the high priest alone is allowed to enter, and that only once a year, on the Day of Expiation; the Jews bitterly enraged against the Romans for the profanation. This was Pompey's last victory.

B. C.

63. Pompey orders the walls of Jerusalem to be demolished; re-establishes Hyrcanus, and sends Aristobulus and his two sons, Alexander and Antigonus, to Rome. He imposed a tribute upon the kingdom of Judea, and left the administration of affairs to Antipater, who was at the court of Hyrcanus, as one of his principal ministers. As yet the Romans are not exalted to the sovereignty of Judea. Hyrcanus is king by right of descent.

57. Gabinius, Roman Governor of Syria, succors Hyrcanus against Alexander; he restores Hyrcanus to the high priesthood, and changes the civil government from monarchical to aristocratic.

54. Crassus, on his march against the Parthians, stops at Jerusalem, and plunders the temple of 10,000 talents, about £1,500,000: being all the riches of the treasury.

47. Aristobulus' son Antigonus, who had escaped from Rome, supplicates Julius Cæsar, who was then in Syria, to re-establish him on the throne of his father, who was lately dead. But Cæsar decrees, that Hyrcanus do retain the dignity of high priest, and the sovereignty of Judea, to himself and his posterity after him for ever; and gives Antipater the office of Procurator of Judea under Hyrcanus; by this decree the Aristocracy of Gabinius is abolish ed, and the government re-established upon the ancient footing.

Antipater causes the government of Jerusalem to be given to Phasael his eldest son, and that of Galilee to Herod his second son.

44. Cæsar permits Hyrcanus to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem. Cæsar was assassinated this year. During the civil war which ensued between Antony, Lepidus, and Octavius, Judea was agitated by violent troubles.

40. The Parthians in the interest of Antigonus, seize Hyrcanus and Phasael, and put them in irons. Herod escapes to Egypt and then to Rome. Having plundered the city and country, they place Antigonus on the throne, and deliver Hyrcanus and Phasael into his hands. Phasael dashes out his brains against the wall of his prison. Hyrcanus' life is granted to him, but his ears are cropped off to render him incapable of the high priesthood. He is then sent off to Parthia as an exile; he remains a prisoner in Seleucia till the accession of Phraates, who caused his chains to be taken off, and gave him in tire liberty to see and converse with the Jews of Babylonia, who were very numerous. They looked upon him as their King and High Priest, and raised him a revenue sufficient to support his rank with splendor. He returned the year following to Jerusalem at the invitation of Herod: who some years after caused him to be put to death.

Herod, the Idumean, is declared King of Judea by the Senate, and conducted by the Consuls to the Capitol, where he is invested with the crown in the customary manner.

39. War between Antigonus and Herod for the "Throne of David."

38. Herod invests Jerusalem with a well

appointed and numerous army of 60,000 men. Sosius, the Roman Governor of Syria, is general of the forces; and receives orders from the Senate to put Herod in full possession of the Kingdom of Judea.

Herod married Mariamne, daughter of Alexander son of Aristobulus, and of Alexandra, daughter of Hyrcanus the second, and thereby grand-daughter to the two brothers, Aristobulus and Hyrcanus. Herod espoused this fair Asmonean to gain the affections of the Jews.

B. C.

37. Jerusalem taken by the Romans after a siege of six months; they fill the city with slaughter, and plunder and destroy all before them. Antigonus surrenders to Sosius, who puts him in chains and sends him to Mark Antony at Antioch. Herod gives a large sum for the death of Antigonus. He is condemned to die, and was executed as a common criminal, with the rods and axes of the lictor, fastened to a stake.

Thus ended the reign of the Asmoneans after a duration of 129 years, reckoning from the beginning of the government of Judas Maccabeus. Herod entered by this means upon the permanent possession of the kingdom of Judea, now virtually a province of the dominion of the LITTLE HORN.

"This singular, extraordinary, and, till then, unexampled event, by which the sovereign authority over the Jews was given to a stranger, an Idumean, ought to have opened their eyes, and rendered them attentive to a celebrated prophecy, which had foretold it in clear terms; and had given it as the certain mark of another event, in which the whole nation was interested, which was the perpetual object of their vows and hopes, and distinguished them by a peculiar characteristic from all the other nations of the world, that had an equal interest in it, but without knowing or being apprized of it.—This is the prophecy.—"*A* sceptre [or, sovereign power]—shall not depart from Judah, nor a judge from among his descendants until SHILOH (the Giver of Peace) come; and unto HIM shall the gathering of the People (Israel) be."

This prediction is reduced to two essential points. The first is, that as long as the Tribe of Judah shall subsist, it shall have pre-eminence and authority over the other tribes; the second, that it shall subsist, and form the nucleus, or body, of a republic, governed by its own laws and magistrates, till the Giver of Peace comes.

The first point is verified in the series of the history of the Israelites, wherein that pre-eminence of Judah evidently appears.

In the second point we have only to consider it with the least attention. When Herod, the Idumean, and consequently a stranger, the nominee, in fact, of the Little Horn, was placed upon the throne by the Romans, the authority and superiority which the Tribe of Judah had over the other tribes, *began to be taken from it.* This was an indication, that the time of the Messiah's Advent was not far off. Judah has no longer the supremacy; it no longer subsists as a Body Politic from which the magistrates are taken. It is manifest, therefore, that Messiah has come. But at what time did that tribe become like the rest and was confounded with them?—answer.—When "the People of the Prince," or when the "King,"—the Little Horn destroyed "the City and Sanctuary," and dispersed Judah to the four winds. It was, therefore, before those times that Messiah came.

In the events we have chronicled, we see the manner in which, or the causes which led to the introduction of "THE KING" or Little Horn, into the prophecy delivered to Daniel by the Mertus; and we discover, too, that he came up out of the Horn of the Syrian kingdom of the Goat. Pompey and Gabinius, and Sosius came against Jerusalem from Syria. This "King" of Dan. xi. 36 is thus described ch. viii. 9, which treats of the Vision of the East. "And *out of one* of the four notable horns came forth *a little horn*; which waxed exceeding great toward the South," Egypt, "and toward the East" the Euphrates, "and toward the Pleasant Land" of Palestine; 'and it waxed great" *ad*, over, beyond, or above, "the Host of Heaven" or of Israel, "and it cast down some of the host, and of the stars" or nobles, "to the ground, and stamped upon them" as when he beheaded Antigonus, &c. "Yea, he magnified himself" *ad* above "the Prince of the Host" Messiah the Prince, "and by Him" the Little Horn, 'was taken away the daumid, or continual (burnt-offering) and the place of his" the continual's "SANCTUARY was cast down. And an host [izaba, army] was given against the continual because of transgression, and it cast down (*tawhilack*, i. e felled as a tree] the Truth [*about* the things constituted by the Law of Moses] to the ground."

To be continued.

DEBATE ON THE SALVATION OF INFANTS, IDIOTS & PAGANS,

BETWEEN "REV. A. CAMPBELL AND REV. N. L. RICE."

Selected from the Report of the Discussion held at Lexington Ky.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR.

GOD'S DESIGN IN THE CREATION OF THE WORLD.

(CONCLUDED FROM PAGE 98.)

The carrying out of this principle necessarily involves great loss of human, or animal life; for if virtue is the subject of reward, vice must also be of punishment. Because if vice be unrestrained, it would gain the ascendancy; eradicate virtue from among men as before the flood; and defeat the principle, upon which it is proposed to effectuate the work, and thus destroy the original design.

The mere fact of duration, by the power of God expressed in creation and the physical laws, assuming the form of men, does not, therefore, entitle them to the glories of the Spiritual World, or expose them to the alternative of damnation in eternal death. These are doctrines predicated upon a *moral* not a physical constitution of things. The destiny of the whole animal world including man is physically the same, they are all under the physical laws, and consequently have no pre-eminence the one over the other. Man differs from other animals, as these differ from one another; and, it *his race* attain to the Angelic Nature, which God designs it shall, it will not be because it is human, but because it is *voluntarily obedient to his Laws.*

The peopling of the Spiritual World upon this principle we have demonstrated from divine testimony. It is a principle, which annihilates all human sophisms and traditions about "Immortal Souls:" "the disembodied existence of immortal souls in heaven for ages before the resurrection;", "the damnation and salvation of infants, idiots, and pagans;"—"the salvation of all mankind;" that "some are ordained to salvation and others to damnation" by a sort of physical necessity; "physical regeneration before death;" "purification by death and resurrection without previous remission"—and much more "unscriptural, irrational, and absurd" jargon of the schools of the same sort.

Universalism, to which many of Mr. Campbell's speculations appear very nearly allied, is based upon a mistaken notion of God's ultimatum in the creation of the Animal World. It is assumed by that system of speculative philosophy, that the design was "the greatest possible good to the whole creation." This certainly was not his design, for the principle we have demonstrated is utterly subversive of it. *The involuntary obedience of free men* implies the possibility as well as the probability of their *voluntary disobedience* predicated upon the known capriciousness of human nature. Now, as the very existence of God upon his throne, depends upon the suppression and therefore, punishment of sin, which is sorrow and pain so long as life lasts, the greatest possible good to *all* men in the universal sense of the word, was no part of his design, it being incompatible with the principle and ultimatum of his enterprise. "The greatest possible good of the whole creation," then, being no part of his design, it is a mere conceit, that his purpose 'requires the salvation of all infants' idiots, pagans, Mahommedans, &c, &c. His purpose requires no such thing. *His purpose requires only the salvation of a number sufficient to people the earth when Spirit-*

ually constituted, without sea, be that many or few. 'What a paltry, contemptible, few,' exclaims one, 'compared with the immense mass of human flesh and blood, which will have existed on the earth for 7000 years!' Granted; but what is needed more than an adequate population for the New Earth? If this immense mass of corruption and sin, living and dead, had listened to the voice of reason, would have believed God and obeyed him, a glorious provision would have been made for them; but they would not, and the consequences inevitably follow. The principle is an eternal one. It is persistent as God himself; a principle without an exception, and as uncompromising as truth. 'But,' exclaims another, 'I have an exception to the principle! The thief on the cross, he did not obey, and yet had the assurance of a place in Paradise!' This would seem to be an exception, if he who had "power upon earth to forgive sins," had not himself declared it. But this in reality is no exception; for he did not "die in his sins," as voluntarily impenitent transgressors and the constitutionally depraved do; he was "*released from sin*" before death, which was sufficient in his case.

It is proved, then, that God's purpose is *to people the Eternal World with a Race of Immortal Men, who shall have attained to the Angelic Nature, Order, and Dignity, on a principle of enlightened and voluntary conformity to his Law.* We maintain, regardless of the conclusions to which the principle leads, that no human being will exist in that World, who does not obey the Law of God anterior to "the End."–1Cor. xv. This is the Bible principle from first to last–the eternal axiom of the Divine Government, and the spiritual Polar Star of the Herald of the Future Age.

We proceed to remark, that had Messrs Rice and Campbell understood and recognized this first principle of the Book of God, they would not have bandied about such unscriptural dogmata as the moral, and physical regeneration of infants, idiots, and pagans without the word! But what could be expected of them more than they developed, seeing that their heads were filled with mere theological abstractions about "immortal souls," and "spirits burning in Hell for ever and ever." With them, every piece of organized dust in the shape of a New Hollander, a Guinea Bip ed, or a New Zealand cannibal, is inspirited by "an immortal soul"–a something they cannot define, and of which the bible is as silent as death, but which they say is *a particle of the Divine Essence.* This is a very puzzling assumption, which, when it ferments in their philosophy, evolves very inconvenient contradictions. This is their assumption:—all infants, idiots, and pagans have immortal souls. Hence their dilemma, that when infants, idiots, and pagans die, their immortal souls go to Heaven or to Hell; they cannot go to hell, say Dr. Servetus and Mr. C, that is too "horrible a decree;" and they cannot go to heaven says Mr R, 'unless regenerated before death;' which Mr. C denies; so that between Dr. Servetus, Messrs C. and R. infants, idiots, and pagans go neither to heaven nor to hell in the popular sense; which is in some sort the bible doctrine in the case.

But Messrs C. and R. agree in opinion, that their immortal souls are saved from the flames of eternal torments, though they oppose one another as to the *means.* Well, the immortal souls have to be saved!–but, as the Bible says nothing about "immortal souls," or their salvation, each falls back upon his own resources and studies out a theory to please himself and those who regard them as oracles in the case!

Leaving them and their traditions we proceed to remark, in view of the grand principle we have brought to light—that the Human Race is Animal. It belongs as much to the Animal Kingdom as the Lion and all other bipeds and quadrupeds. Man, as chief of the Mammalia, "*has no pre-eminence above a beast:—all are of the dust and all turn to dust again.*" "*As the one dieth, so dieth the other, yea, they have all one spirit.*" This is the declaration of the Bible. "I said in my heart concerning *the estate of the Sons of Men*, would that God might manifest them, and that they might see *that they themselves are beasts*' or mere animals. Why did the Preacher wish the Sons of Men to discern this? Because, when they could be brought to appreciate this in all its force, they would then search out *how they might become immortal*, or in other words, attain to *the estate of the Sons of God.* We shall not multiply passages to show, that men and animals differ from one another only as the Lion rom the Elephant, or the Dog from the Camel:—they are all *flesh*; corrupti-

ble or depraved flesh; differing in kind as fish does from fowl, fowl from quadrupeds, quadrupede from men, and men from angels. Angels are spiritual, or incorruptible flesh, and therefore termed *Spirits*; but men and animals agree in this, that they are *corruptible* flesh, and therefore, termed *flesh* in opposition to *spirit*: but distinguished from each other by form or *organization*. Because, human flesh is corruptible, it is styled "*Sin*;" because this corruption was the consequent of sin. Living human flesh is living corruptible mat er however beautiful it may be sometimes to look upon. The air and blood sustain the flesh and Moses says "*the life of the flesh is in the blood*," and this life *in* the blood, modern discovery has shown to be derived from the air–the oxygen of the air; which is the living spirit in the blood, or soul of the flesh. Air, blood and flesh are the basis of living animals, and these are ultimately resolved into the constituents of earth and atmospheric air. *Breathing dust* is the Living Soul of the Mosaic Writings whether it assume the form of man or other animals.

In the Animal Man thus defined, consisting as we have seen of "*body, soul, and spirit*," there is no immortal principle. "In me," says Paul, "that is, in my flesh dwelleth no good thing." When man dies, his *spirit* is breathed upwards, and goes to God who gave it–that is, it goes whence it came, and it came from the great aerial reservoir of life, which presses upon our globe in every part, namely, *the firmament of heaven.* His body, or his flesh and soul rot; or as the Psalmist says, "like sheep they are laid in the grave; and death shall feed upon them." This is the end to which all shall come alike, all are of the dust, and all turn to the dust again.

Now, I have said, that the grand difference between the Human Biped and the quadrupeds—or between Man and Animals, is in their *organization.* Man has a Head to think, and a Hand to execute which transcends the heads and hands of all other creatures. Why have not all animals heads of one uniform shape? Because animals of different genera are designed of God to develope *different degrees of intelligence*, therefore different conformations of brain were required, each conformation being adapted to the class of mind proposed to be elaborated. Hence the form of heads differs among animals and men. Why is man the only one of all animals to whom God has spoken? The reason is, because the Human Brain is the only organization capable of comprehending what he says. God speaks to man as a being capable of understanding speech, of comparison, of investigating the philosophy of things, of loving, of hoping, of love of approbation, of worshipping, of discerning between good and evil, &c. all of which he is capable of doing from the peculiar conformation of his brain, with which organ all living creatures think, tho' not in the same degree. No other animal can do these things; if they could, then, their heads would all assume one shape, whatever other forms their bodies might possess.

The *principle*, then, of difference between men and animals, is the same as that which constitutes the difference between a steam saw mill and a steam boat. They are both moved by steam, yet they both produce different results. The difference consists, not in the matter of which they are made, but in the organization, or mechanical arrangement of that matter. This peculiarity it is which makes out of the same kind of matter, two different conformations, organizations, or machines, termed saw mill and steam boat. So the matter of the Animal World is the same, but the mechanism thereof, as diversified as the individuals of the Animal Kingdom.

This doctrine, Mr. Rice considers as "subversive of all religion." Yes, it subverts 'all religion' but God's religion; and hence the clamor raised against us, by those who hold in admiration the traditions of the Apostacy, of which the disputants before us, are the exponents and apologists. The pagan dogma of the "Immortality of the Soul" is the "*vital spark*" of these religions; if this be extinguished, they are indeed utterly subverted: for the world's religions only propose to save this '*vital spark of heavenly flame*" from the fiercer flames of Hell; they do not presume to offer man any thing of which he is not possessed as an animal being.

But, reader, behold and admire the wisdom of the Eternal. Here is the World of Animal Men, corruptible and sin, lying under the sentence of "thou shalt return to the ground; for out of it thou wast taken, for dust thou art, and to dust thou shalt return."–a

sentence of "death ending in death,"–a destiny which is eternal. To such a World, we say, God has sent a proclamation, announcing his intention of organizing a New World, in which there shall be no sorrow, pain, curse or death: and in which He will himself dwell for ever; and inviting every man, *who will believe his Word and obey his Laws*, to occupy a place among the glorious and honorable Immortals of the Angelic Host.

Now, reader, look at the grandeur of this divine conception, and compare it with the frivolous, empty, and puerile imaginings of the speculative philosophers, who decorate themselves with the style of 'reverend.' God offers men what, by nature, they do not, and cannot possess. He offers them 'glory, honor, incorruptibility, and eternal life;' and invites them to the enjoyment of all these in the Renewed Earth. If infants, idiots, and pagans can believe his word and obey his laws, then they also are all invited to partake in "the gracious *GIFT* of God," which is Eternal Life: but *if they cannot*, either from physical or circumstancial impediments, then, as we believe that all things are arranged by his providence we conclude, that he did not intend that they should be a part of the population of the Eternal, but simply, of this Provisional or Temporal, World. It is of no use for men to quibble; if they do not like the doctrine, let them overturn *the grand principle*, which we have shown to be, the very foundation corner stone of the moral universe of God. The following testimonies will show, that there is less speculation in the doctrine we have set forth, than some would have others believe.

"*Infants are holy*," says one! Let us see. "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me"–Ps. LI. 5;–'who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one.' Job xiv. 4;–"how can he be clean (holy) that is born of woman?" Job xxv. 4

"*God will take care of them*," says another. Let us see how he takes care of them in this world; for what can we reason, but from what we know? 'Go,' said the Lord to Saul, "smite Amalek and spare them not; but slay man and woman, *infant and suckling*" Sam xv "Samaria shall become desolate; for she hath rebelled against her God. They shall fall by the sword; *their infants shall be dashed in pieces*" Hos. xiii. 16. Besides these texts, look to facts and see how many are worn out by lingering diseases, and destroyed by accidents of fire, flood, &c. Mr. Rice teaches that infants do not die by accident, and that all that die are "elect infants!" were the infants of Amalek and Samaria, slain by the sword, "elect infants?" Is not such violence a strange way of treating the "holy" and innocent "elect!"

"*Infants are immortal*," say the Scribes. Let us see. "Why died I not from the womb? now should I have lain still and been quiet, I should have been *as though I had not been*: I should have been carried from the womb to the grave." ch. x. 18. All this looks very much like an immortal destiny!!

'*To deny that pagans, (to whom God has not granted the means of eternal life) will rise from the dead, is rank Sadduceanism, a speculative and untaught question, and highly schismatical*," say others. Let us see!—"O Lord our God, other Lords beside thee have had dominion over us" Israelites, "but by thee only will we make mention of thy name. *They* (the other Lords—or Gentile Rulers of Israel down to the Restitution) *are dead*, THEY SHALL NOT LIVE; *they are deceased* THEY SHALL NOT RISE; therefore, hast thou visited and destroyed them, and made all their memory to perish"—Isa. xxvi. 13. "The man that wandereth out of the way of understanding shall *remain in the congregation of the dead*—Prov. xxi. 16;"—"as many as have sinned without law, *shall also perish without law*."—But to sinners under law, there is a resurrection, for "as many as have sinned under law, shall be judged by the Law *in the day* when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ by my gospel—Rom, ii. 12."—Thus, by the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every thing be established.

What, then, is the destiny of the third class of humanity, composed of those who cannot, from physical or circumstancial impediments, obey the law of the Lord? We answer, they die under the constitution of sin, which sentences them to the dust in which they eternally remain. In what state was Adam before God formed him? Non-existent; he was no where. Such will be the state of this class when they return to earth again.

Truth, the object of reason, the best reformer.

CORRESPONDENCE

BETWEEN

JAMES WALLIS AND JOHN MURDOCH

ON RE-IMMERSION.

(CONCLUDED FROM PAGE 117.)

The preceeding article was sent to the Editor of the Christian Messenger for insertion; but instead of that, it was returned (without even any notice being taken on the cover) with the following note.

Nottingham, Sep. 23, 1844.

BELOVED BROTHER MURDOCH:

I have now returned your long manuscript. It is not my intention to print anything more on the subject of re-immersion.

I am quite content to abide by the sentiments contained in your last paragraph: and when you can find a *sentence* or a passage in the New Testament to authorise me to re-immerse a gentile, who on profession of faith has been immersed in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, I will promise to put it upon record if it be within my power to do so. At the same time I may mention that whilst I have never once preached re-immersion to man, woman, or child, either in Public or Private, I have re-immersed more persons than any other man either in England or Scotland. To man I am not accountable in this matter, and therefore shall not admit you as my judge.

If I mistake not, should you ever arrive at the age of fifty, you will neither *think*, *write*, nor *speak* on the subject as you now do

Yours Affectionately,

J. WALLIS.

On the 6th of December, I sent a short reply to the above. This reply, being merely in answer to a private note, was not intended for publication. However in the Messenger for January 1844 it appeared with a "Reply" by the Editor, to which I sent the following answer.

Shuttleworth near Bury, Lancashire, Jan, 7 1844.

SIR.—In reply to your letter of the 16th of December 1843, addressed to me in the Messenger for this month, I tender the following. And as you have preferred several charges against me in that letter, I think that you are bound to insert my reply. When I wrote to you last, I had no idea that my letter should be published; but I do not complain; you are welcome to publish anything I say; only do it fairly; let the whole be known. But I do complain of having that which was intended for publication rejected, when it was positively called for by your previous remarks, answers, and interrogations, together with those of W. Thomson. But to the reply.

1. I have no fear of the light, and so I am ready to account for my last taking [so long a journey and being so long on the way: altho' I do not think that this was a subject worthy of notice in a public journal. I sent it and the rejected rejoinder to a friend in Glasgow (who had been asking if I had "backed out" of the controversy with you and W. Thompson, as there was nothing from me in the M.) that he might see how the matter stood, and so be able to make known what you would not do. This will also shew that I am just doing "in the dark" what I do in the light, or, at least, what I wish to do in the light.

2. You said to me some time ago, that it was not your intention to print any thing more on the subject of Re-Immersion, and yet the very third paragraph of your letter is on that subject, and so is the sixth. I now see that your intentions and performances are very opposite things. To this, however, I have no objection, provided you will do justice, by allowing your opponent to be heard as well as yourself. But it is very strange indeed to find you saying in one place, that the end

of strife is better than the beginning, and to find you in the very next paragraph, making another "beginning!" Strange that you should apply to this, the words "leave off strife before it be meddled with,' and that the very next word is a re-commencement of this same "strife!" It is a very convenient way of managing a controversy to ask your opponent questions, to pronounce his answers to be what you think proper to call them, and at he same time take very good care that what he says shall be kept 'in the dark.' But convenience is one thing, and straight forward honest dealing another sometimes; but whether these two things happen to have met on the occasion in question, I leave to the decision of disinterested parties.

3. I *have* "opened the New Testament," but I could not open your eyes, nor could I get you to lay before the proper auditory the article in which I pointed to "teaching or example." You say that the introduction of a certain passage "will not satisfy any intelligent person on the subject." How do you know this? Because it does not satisfy you, does it necessarily follow that it will not satisfy any intelligent person? Is your intelligence the standard by which that of all others is to be measured? Or do you know what will satisfy any intelligent person? You have compared my pretensions to those of the Pope —but yours defy comparison. You are far above the Pope, you know what will, and what will not satisfy *any* intelligent person! But I will not enter into the matter here; let us have a fair discussion of the matter in the pages of the M. where it was commenced, and where it ought to be ended honorably.

4. You tell me that you sent me notice that you did not feel yourself under any obligation to open the pages of the M. for such a controversy between W. Thompson and me; that you sent me his address, wishing me to controvert the point with him to my heart's content. Well, what of this? Was this enough, after what even you had said? Accuse and condemn me publicly between you, and then send me word to the effect that I might controvert the point to my heart's content privately! Those who can play such pranks as these upon honor and honesty are not likely to have their intelligent minds satisfied with any passage of Scripture on any point. But, Sir, your omission seems to have extended beyond the Messenger; for I never saw such a thing as the above word. And if it had been posted by you, it was likely to come in safety to hand.

5 Altough I said that the readers of the Messenger had recived a false impression, you do not believe it. This unbelief on your part, notwithstanding my attestation must be attributed to your thinking that my testimony is unworthy of credit. At least, I can see nothing else to which I can ascribe it. But I can give you the names of persons who have expressed their false impression. But if I am such a reprobate that my word is unworthy of credit I am bad enough to forge names; so that names would be of no use. You speak of not publishing letters on account of their personalities. Why, then do you not carry out your professed principle and refrain from publishing your own personalities, accusations, and condemnations? You can compare a person to the Pope, to a Mormonite; you can tell him that you do not believe what he says, and yet not be personal!—but if I expose the fallacy of your reasoning in a successful manner, I am so very personal, and so very something else that I shall not be allowed to speak through the Messenger.

6. And to the above must be added, that my object seems to be *victory*, not truth; a most unworthy motive. This is not personal! "Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that's in thine own eye? Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, let me pull out the mote out of thine eye, and behold a beam is in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite first cast the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye, MATT. vii 3. 5. He whose object is victory is likely to have recourse to the most likely means of obtaining it; and he who loves the truth is likely to pursue it. Now whatever your object may be, you have in effect stopped the mouth of your opponent by arbitary means; a sure way of gaining a victory in the eyes of men, until the truth gets out. I, on the other hand had recourse to discussion one of the highways to truth, but in my progress I was violently arrested, by you, who proclaim your own victory, by saying that I had nothing new to advance. But there is so much of the truth out now that the victory is seen to be attain-

ed by the dishonest means of stopping your opponent's mouth when he is willing and ready for the conflict. Vanquish me! yes; you have done what ten thousand could not do. But to be vanquished thus is far more honorable than to vanquish.

7. I have no more of the truth than the rest of the disciples, nor have I become the infallible standard; so that no such thing is meant when I say that the truth is identified with me. My words are easily understood when we take into consideration how apt people are to judge of the merits of a privlege by the success of its advocate in defending it.

8. Accept of my thanks for your exhortation that I should go on to perfection; and to your exhortation I add my earnest prayer to God. I do not however see the necessity there for your advice that I should give up harping on this first principle; as you did not show from Scripture that I am to leave the first principles so far behind, that I am not to recommend them to others, or defend them when assailed, in whole or in part.

9. I have already given you an example of what I am doing "in the dark." I may add here, that I have made the contents of the rejected address known to several persons who travel the country; so that it is already more widely known than you were likely to have any good idea of.

10. I will now give you the proper example of what I conceived to be a good motive and underhand craft. I was informed that you objected to the discussion of the subject controverted by us, lest such discussion should lead to divisions in certain churches. The goodness of this motive, I did not call in question, although I did and do reprobate the conduct. If, however, your motives were as bad as your conduct, the greater the pity; and if my logic in this case was at fault, such fault must be referred to my charity, which may have been exerting too much influence over my reasoning faculties at the time. And if it be a specimen of my general mode of reasoning, it only proves that in such matters I reason very charitably.

I remain,

Yours truly and affect'ly

JOHN MURDOCH.

Instead of this letter in the body of the M. the following appeared on the cover for that of February 1844.

"We are in possession of another letter from John Murdoch, which for spirit, matter, and manner, is equal, if not superior, to the one which appeared in our last. This will not be published. For the present, we do most cheerfully accept his last farewell. That our readers may know what he and his associates are doing among the brethren, and as expressive of the mind of one who can distinguish between bitter and sweet, we give an extract from a letter just come to hand, to which several others might be added."

Perth, January 19, 1844.

"We have had a very great many letters from Mr. Gowans of Glasgow, and a long epistle from Mr. Murdoch of Bury, which he wishes us to take a copy of. For my part, I feel it a great burden to read it, much more to copy. He has sent for it in great haste in order to send it to Horncastle, as the brethren there are to take their stand with them. I am very sorry about these men; their own minds are spoiled; and they will endeavour to spoil others. Gowans is wild in the extreme. I could have no hope of such a man. He seems to be quite delighted to get a mark to fire at. When he could give us no more, he found that we were Teetotallers; and for that he called us Papists, Infidels, and all that is vile. He, as a servant of the Lord Jesus, could not acknowledge us!! May the Lord enable every right-minded reformer to possess and maintain every where a right spirit.

Your's affectionately,

J. T."

REMARKS UPON THE ABOVE.

Seeing that J. Wallis has had recourse to the above expedient, that of traducing my character, instead of meeting my argument fairly, and giving the world satisfactory answers to them, as I think he ought to do; and seeing also, that he will not even let me be heard in my own defence when he had accused me publicly, and stated falsehoods concerning me, but that whatever he can get hold of which will in his opinion operate against the principles I advocate is published, it appears to me high time to give him up, and have recourse to some other means of advocating

the truth of God. Accordingly, I do not intend to trouble him any more for the present, with the matter, manner, or spirit of my letters. To do so would be like "casting pearls before swine:" and so do others think as well as myself But for all this, I do not intend to let the truth lie in darkness or to be silent; when I am traduced I shall pen what I conceive to be the truth and vindicate my own character and actions, and leave the publication thereof in the hand of my heavenly Father, who knows whether I advocate the truth or not, and whether I have deserved the treatment I have received at the hands of James Wallis.

In the first place, I have to notice here that my friend will not publish my letter, which, as any one who will take the trouble to look, can see was imperatively called for by what he said in his letter. How he could reconcile his own conduct in this matter with his profession, I cannot see. First to bear false witness against me in the most public manner that he could, and then when I disprove his assertions, answer his questions, and refute his arguments, will not allow those before whom he accused me, to hear what I have to say for myself. Thus, when he has it in his power to disabuse their minds of what he knows to be false impressions which, too, he has himself made, he will not do so by letting them hear the truth, when he knows also that it is the truth. It will, perhaps, be said that an editor has a right to publish or suppress what he thinks proper, and that no one else has any right to dictate to him in such a case: to which I reply, that an editor has no right to practice injustice, especially when he knows it to be so. And further, he was not the unconcerned spectator of a controversy between somebody else and me; he was himself my opponent; and as such ought to have sustained that character throughout. But no: that would not do. He could not, at first, carry on the controversy on re-immersion, without beginning to abuse, although there is not one single abusive word in all that letter which opened the discussion: and then, when he began his abuse, he conld not continue even that in an open honest manuer, but had recourse to the meanest artifices; insinuations were used when he dared not speak out: my letters were suppressed when he dared not publish them, lest his nakedness should be exposed: and to make a bad job as bad as could be, he had recourse to the poor shift of publishing extracts from private correspondence, which should have had no existence (as I know) had it been known that the same should have been published: extracts, too, which are false almost from beginning to end. There must be some awful defect in the man, or in the principle, or in both, when such expedients are resorted to. Surely the truth requires them not. And would not an honest man scorn them? As for the insinuation that my letter is bad in "spirit, matter, and manner," it is just of a piece with the rest: but he takes good care that his readers shall not have it in their power to judge for themselves in the matter. No: to give them the opportunity of seeing what I said, would be first giving them an opportunity of seeing that what he had said and done before were not what they ought to have been. So he will not publish my letters, and he will not even give an extract from it to prove that it is defective: but will just *tell* his readers in effect, that it is defective in every point of view, in *spirit*, *matter*, and *manner*. This insinuation goes also so far as to condemn the letter which was printed in the previous number of the Messenger. On this it may not be amiss to remark, that even supposing the letter to have been rather severe, it is to be borne in mind that it was only intended as a *private* expostulation that in it I was only "telling him his fault between him and me alone," as the Lord commanded; (Matt. xviii. 15) and that, what I said was not for the purpose of exposing him to the world but for the purpose of "gaining" him, leaving a public exposure of his conduct until he had shewn that he would not hear me or one or two more. But he makes it public I am blamed for it. I may here notice his conduct towards J. Gowans, as compared with my conduct towards himself. When he treats me, as I think improperly I write to him quietly before publicly exposing him, although he has abused me publicly. But when J. Gowans does something obnoxious to the reprobation of J. T. of Perth and J. Wallis, the same must he published to the world, before they go to him privately for an explanation or any thing else, although what he did or said was in a private manner. I am willing

that our conduct in this matter be examined in the light of Scripture and judgement given according as the living oracles shall direct. I have here spoke on the supposition that J. Gowans was guilty of what they lay to his charge which supposition I do not at present believe to be founded in the truth. But more of this hereafter.

After his own insinuations as to the spirit &c. of my letters, comes a rich extract from the letter of a correspondent who can distinguish between bitter and sweet; this is that his readers may have this persons opinion, and see what I and my associates are doing among the brethren. And what am I doing? If what this discriminating person says be true, I have sent my long epistle to Perth, I have requested some one or more there to copy it; I have sent it to them in order to send it to Horncastle as the brethren there were to take their stand with us This, if it be true is what I am doing, or perhaps this is a sample of what I am doing among the brethren. But let no one be deceived. I did *not* send my long epistle to Perth; I did not ask them to copy it; nor did I send to them for it, in order to send it to Horncastle, any more than I said that the brethren there were to take their stand with us. No gentle reader, I did not. What reliance, then can be placed in the word of such a person as J. T. who can set forth the above as true, when the same J. T. knows it to be false? Or what deference are we bound to pay to the opinion of such a person? even when accompanied with a certificate from J. Wallis, as to the possession of such extraordinary discriminating powers that they deserve to be publicly recorded. But supposing that I have sent my letter to Perth and the rest, I do not see that there is any thing in it that is criminal or that could be laid hold upon as shewing that I was doing any thing wrong among the brethren. Have I not a right to send my letters where I think proper? Or has it come to this that, as J. Wallis dare not publish it in the Messenger, lest his nonsense and that of W. Thompson be exposed, I am bound not to publish it either? that although they say what they think proper about me and my principles in the Messenger, I dare not spread these principles and arguments in favor of them in the form of one single copy of a letter? Possibly they think so but I have not yet seen any thing to justify such thoughts.

Perhaps when they wrote this, they saw that it would prove nothing against me or the things I advocate, even if it were true, and to make as sure a job as possible of my condemnation, they say that my mind is spoiled, and J. Gowans is wild in the extreme. He has called them Papists, Infidels and every thing that is vile, because they are Teetotallers. Surely [think they] this will condemn him: this is a state he cannot survive. J. Gowans has done so and so, therefore I have done something that is not good; my mind is spoiled. Supposing that he had done so, how does it prove any thing against me? J. Wallis has opposed Teetotallism, and has talked, or written the veriest nonsense against it, but I never took this to prove that "J. T" or any one else who may agree with him in opposing what I contend for, was an Antiteetotaller, or any thing else of the kind. I never could see that Wallis' nonsense against teetotallism could prove that J. T's mind was spoiled, or even that there was any agreement between them on that point; and how J. T. could find out that my mind was spoiled, and that I would do what I could to spoil others, because Gowans happened to oppose their teetotallism, I am quite at a loss to know, unless it be that they were driven to this beggarly shift because they could find nothing that even they could lay hold of against me.

But is it not strange that Gowans's opposition to teetotallism should be a crime, and that Wallis's should not?—that Wallis should be innocent in this matter, and that Gowans should not only be guilty himself, but should involve me in the same guilt?—and is it not passing strange that I should be guilty in this affair, and I myself a decided teetotaller? What a suitable handmaid to malignity is ignorance!

I now appeal to any one who reads this—am I not clear of all that has been laid to my charge by the discriminating J T and Wallis who certifies that J. T can distinguish between bitter and sweet!?—and in clearing myself, have I not necessarily proved that at the very least their minds are spoiled?—and that they have a way of reasoning, when they wish to convict one man of guilt by the actions of another, that is 'wild in the extreme?'

A word or two about Gowans, etc. I have made inquiry, and my conclusion is this, that

when he used the words attributed to him, & said that he, as a servant of the Lord Jesus could not acknowledge them, he was representing that the Teetotal Society had in it Papists, Infidels and the like; and that he could not acknowledge or have communion with a society composed of such members; and I do not believe that he called J. T an infidel or a papist. Now had J T written to Gowans on this subject, as I did to Wallis when I wished to have a proper understanding with him, and as Jesus commanded us to do, Gowans would not have been traduced as he has, and 'J. T.' would not have been convicted of publishing that which was not true, in as much as an explanation would have set the matter clearly before the eye of all who had any business with it.

Gowans and I have controverted the point and at this very time the discussion is in hand but I have seen no reason why I should attempt to expose him publicly, until I see he is unmoved by arguments when urged privately; nor has he, that I know of, published my follies, as he may consider them, for the purpose of injuring my reputation, as J. T and Wallis have dealt with him. I have my own opinion of his opposition to teetotallism: and be that opinion good or bad, it shall be expressed to himself, between him and me alone. And I must say this, that if disputants on any point took care, at first, to have a proper understanding of the words of each other, before they pronounced their sentences of condemnation, they would have fewer of such sentences to pronounce; they would gain a worthy point sooner; and they would leave the arena much better friends than they generally do. And to go and publish detached, and distorted portions of private correspondence, instead of conferring with the correspondent on the objectionable parts, seems to me a very great outrage; especially if such portions of correspondence had a tendency to injure the reputation of the writer. If it were all good, and nothing in the same calculated to injure any one, it would be different. But my space is nearly occupied and I must come to a

CONCLUSION.

I shall do so by taking a concise view of the controversy and making a few remarks thereon.

I commenced this discussion in a letter which contained as I thought six distinct arguments which proved that those who had not been immersed for the remission of sins ought to be re-immersed; it contained also answers to a few objections, and I think nothing but what was to the point. What I said I said in courteous terms; I used no harsh words, and I accused no one of anything that was bad: as to my own feelings, I can say that they were the very best. I had no ill will towards any one; but on the contrary, I had a great desire to do good to all who were concerned in the controversy if I could do good and was desirous that truth might be discovered, and the same should triumph.

There were two articles written in answer to this: one by J. Wallis and the other by W. Thompson, these articles which they call 'replies' couched upon *two* of my six arguments, and only *two*. In these 'replies' I was accused of 'tyranny,' presumption and the like; I had a number of very polite compliments paid to me after the same beautiful manner. Thus, in the very first attempt of my opponents, to answer what I said without saying any evil of any one did they disgrace themselves and the discussion by introducing abusive language instead of arguments, and low personalities when they could not overturn what I had established. These replies were also beautifully embelished with rich figures, wonderful comparisons, and "perfect analogies."

I rejoined and met every thing they had set forth under the name of argument, whether the same were to be found in a figure, an analogy, or a comparison, taking a mere passing notice of their abuse. And whether I meet their so called arguments or not, may, partly at least, be concluded from the circumstance that my rejoinder would not be published. And here I may say the discussion ended; for anything that has been said or written on either side, seems to have been written with the intention of injuring my reputation, on the one hand, or of defending me on the other. Then came another tug of war. My person became the subject on which my opponent had more to say than on my argument And instead of answering these, he has engaged himself a good deal in the honorable business of establishing his own credit on the

ruin of mine. But I do not think that he has succeeded well after all. There is a God in heaven, who sees what is being enacted here, and who does not see all without some concern: he has made the truth to appear in some little degree already, so that many perceive now that it stands thus. J. Wallis has shrunk from the discussion of the subject with which we commenced, and made an attack upon my character; and when I met him on this point also, he has found it as necessary as before to have recourse to the suppression of what he knows to be the truth.

I will not conclude without saying that I am heartily sorry for those who have treated me so unchristianly, and who have persecuted the truth for which I have contended. As for any pain they have inflicted on me, it matters not. I am sorry they should be doing themselves so much injury in their attempts to injure me. And I am glad that their attempts to suppress the truth have tended to shew that it was the truth that they did persecute; and that persons having recourse to such means could not have the truth on their side or in their possession.

May the Father of Lights cause the light to shine into their minds, and shew them their present error! May he have mercy on them, and spare them, that they may have time to repent, and to become what they ought to be! May they be delivered from those worldly & slavish opinions which seem to lead them to do those things which are contrary to the will of God. These are my fervent prayers for them; and further I will add, may they be found among the few that shall be caught up to meet the Lord in the air when he comes!

May the truth spread, and bless men with peace and joy; and may God be glorified in the salvation and glorification of many who shall enjoy him for ever and ever.

JOHN MURDOCH.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR.

We have inserted the foregoing correspondence, not only to gratify our brethren in England, but that our friends here also may be apprised of the spirit of the times there in relation to reform; and as illustrative of the species of opposition the truth has to contend against both here and there. Friend Wallis and his truth-trimming associates seem to have become proficients in the policy of their brother ecclesiastics on this side of the Atlantic. They have manifestly taken their cue from the fuglemen of our supervisariate; and have elaborated the same dishonesty, and treachery against the truth as their coadjutors are guilty of among us; and they seem to have committed themselves "soul and body" to the traditions of collegiate wisdom, as the Alpha and Omega of their theology! To be thus enslaved is a thing of woe. We once hoped better things of our once frequent, but now, estranged correspondent, Wallis. But alas! how few men dare be true to principle in the face of rabbinical authority and numerical applause. These are the Syren, whose witchery will captivate thousands of the unstable souls of this generation of religionists, whose man-fearing and man-worshipping delinquency will leave them to the "overflowing hail storm, fire, and sulphur," when the Lord comes. Let the opponents of the truth—of the intelligent obedience of the unperverted gospel—be afraid; for, he is assuredly at hand to come, and will certainly punish all such, be they whom they may.—2 Thess. i. 8.

We regret to have it in our power to corroborate the testimony of bro Murdoch against friend Wallis. He has, doubtless, of late become dishonest. If men strike hands with perverters of the truth, they will become dishonest, if not previously so. He permitted the Rev. James Henshall of Richmond, Va. —the discoverer of a new way into the Kingdom, to slander us in the Messenger, and that too, under times of reconciliation! We replied; but he would not let it appear. This was the beginning of naughtiness, but the end doth not yet appear. By this policy, which is very crooked for a Christian Editor, tho', not unusual for Reformed Baptist ones, he left us under the stigma of the reverend gentleman's misrepresentations. The poet, we believe, hath this sentiment:—"he that takes my purse steals trash; but he that filches from me my good name, steals that which ne'er enriches him, and leaves me poor indeed.' Such a theft, these two gentlemen—depredators upon mens' reputations, committed upon us in Albion. This is robbery of the most unprincipled description; but this kind of religious light fingery is so common that it is nothing tho't

of. May God in heaven, in some way or other, lead these *professors* to repentance before they reach that bourne beyond which no repentance is! The names of parties being changed, bro. Murdoch's article would suit the lattitude and longitude of this Union as well as those of Bury, Lancashire, England. We thank him in behalf of the truth for its able vindication, and for the manifest discomfiture of its opponents.—*Editor.*

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR TO A FRIEND IN THE FAR WEST.

LETTER V.

Lunenburg, Va. Sept. 12th 1844.

Much Esteemed Friend,

According to appointment there was a considerable attendance of our friends and opponents. The congregation was seated before I entered the house to address them. In the midst were several of my oldest and firmest friends in this region, who, at one time, had you known them then, you would have supposed were too devoted to a fellow man. Not having seen them for about four years, and being conscious of no wrong towards them could I do otherwise than greet them most cordially? I felt truly glad to see them; their countenances reminded me of former pleasant and most agreable times, which were as "times of refreshing" when the shafts of sectarians, and the bolts of the "US" of the "new denomination" were driving like hail against our corselet and shield. Prompted by these feelings, I extended towards them my right hand of friendship and goodwill. But! while some reciprocated my salutation with cordiality, others radiated a coldness, which penetrated my heart with the frost of an Arctic winter. It is conceded by all unprejudiced persons, that I teach the same things which formeriy *they* approved; why then should their demeanor be thus changed? Have I become their enemy because I continue to urge upon them the truth? Or have they become weary of that stand which admits of no compromise with the errorist who would popularize the truth, that they may cease to be evil spoken of by the Apostacy, and annoyed by the compunctions of a conscience ill at ease?

In conformity with the request of many I took up the "charges" against me in detail as set forth in the Publisher. I should not have troubled myself about them on the present occasion, but for the request alluded to. It seemed, however, to be the general wish, as it had been very diligently reported that I had come to Eastern Virginia "to make a split!"

Now you know that I left Illinois upon a very different business than split-making. I was prompted to my departure, first, that I might settle up my affairs in Va. and receive the surplus remaining; and secondly, to fulfil the wishes of the Lunenburg brethren to pay them a visit. Until I had arrived here, I had heard nothing about "a split." I should have supposed that I had abundantly proved some five years ago, my peaceable disposition, in holding in abeyance some things for the sake of peace. Had I been ambitious of making a party for my own glorification, I should never have left Va., and have thus abandoned the whole field to my opponents. They have had four full years to strengthen themselves in. They have had professional preachers; editors colaboring with them, and the influence of elders, presidents, and professors to build them up; surely if one man's influence could be destroyed, they have had time and agents enough to make sure the fold, and to secure the flock against his imbecility! Ah! but the grand secret is, my friend, there is a magic in the truth they cannot withstand.—But!—what do we behold? A Macedonian phalanx to bear me down? No! but like Parthians, shoot their arrows as they fly, and raise the insensate shout "he's come to make a split!"

But, by whom, think you, is this cry raised? —By men who have obeyed the gospel, unmixed with human tradition? By men who consistently practice the precepts they deliver? By men who change *not* from Baptistism to New Denominationalism, and from this to preaching "faith alone," and from this to immersion for remission of sins? Or is it raised by baptist preachers, loving Egypt so well, are aiming at a return at the head of the people, that they may enjoy the leeks and the onions and the flesh pots, or "creature comforts" to be derived from the fleece of a more numerous fold? Are these the men who charge me with coming to Virginia to make a split? No; it is not those 'men and brethren,' who, having understood and believed *the* gospel, have obeyed it, and preach what they have obeyed. Though they may have been somewhat biassed by the incessant droppings of prejudice upon their minds, they have too much regard for truth and consistency, to throw themselves wholly into the ranks of my traducers. Those who have heard me with candor know, that I teach the truth, if that truth is to be found in the prophets and apostles; they will, therefore, pause before they pitch themselves against me like the others; lest haply in blindly withstanding me, they may be found fighting against the truth of God.

The 'schismatics,' 'factionists,' and split-makers, my dear friend, are those who labor to suppress the truth of God's word. It is common for such to denounce its advocates by these evil names, in order to excite a feeling of hostility towards them, because they know if they can effect this, they will generally succeed in closing the ears of their followers against the things they contend for. The advocates for the truth have been persecuted by the religious in all ages as factionists and schismatics. The truth is essentially schismatic; for it will *divide* "asunder the soul and spirit, and the joints and marrow;" it will "set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother." "Think not," said Jesus, "that I am come to send peace on the earth; I come not to send peace, but a sword." It is, indeed, "two-edged, sharp, and piercing," and in the midst of whatever community it is displayed, it will, if that community be impure, split or divide them asunder; for it is the nature of truth to contend with error, as it is of light to dispel darkness; and it will never rest till it have subdued it. I have come hither to tell the people what God has said, as far as I can discover his meaning. I have endeavored to adhere closely to what is written in the scriptures and to advance nothing for which I cannot adduce authority from the "testimony of God;" now if this 'make a split,' the fact will prove its necessity; for any body of people, that is 'split' by the truth must be corrupt, and the sooner such a fellowship is broken up the better. Those who oppose the truth, and NOT HE WHO PRESENTS IT, are therefore, the schismatics and factionists in the case.

After disposing of the "charges" against me, I proceeded to address the audience in relation to the religion of God. I shall publish the subject matter of this discourse at some future time. The people were very attentive in the general; but at the passage where I was speaking of man as placed under the Constitution of sin, there were several individual heads dropped upon their breast as though the things they heard produced uneasiness within them. I need not detail those things to you; you will easily understand their drift, when I tell you that many were confirmed in the conviction that "that which is born of the flesh is flesh," or purely animal and mortal, and that, if we under this dispensation ever attain to immortality, it will be alone by a strict conformity to the uncorrupted gospel of Jesus Christ.

And here I must inform you, that Mr. B. had sent a question to me by a friend, which I was requested to answer in writing (I think) "yes or no." Not being disposed, however, to answer inquiries in this way, I caused a note to be forwarded to him in which I declined replying to interrogations, except publicly before all men. I had nothing to conceal, I wished every thing therefore to be conducted openly and aboveboard. This would prevent many perversions; or if they were made, it would be the means of securing many witnesses for the truth.

While the brethren were singing, I went up to Mr. B. and invited him to close the meeting; designing thus to prove my disposition to co-operate with him, not doubting but he would be willing to do so; had I supposed otherwise, I should not have invited him. He did not close it however; but rose and put

the question to me, which I had refused to answer by a simple "yes or no" in private He presented his own case, or as we should say, reported to me his "experience." This would fit the case of a man, who had almost believed the gospel and other things besides, but had not obeyed it, that is, had not been understandingly baptised in the name of Jesus Christ for remission of sins. He wanted to know upon such a statement, whether I would fellowship him? "Yes or no!"—He put this question variously at several times. I declined, however, to answer it in the way he desired, being neither the church, a casuist, nor the judge of the living or the dead. He seemed to be considerably annoyed in not being able to extort from me such an answer as to suit his purpose. But, I thought I could fathom the pit he was digging for me, but into which he either did, or almost tumbled himself. He had in his own peculiar way (I do not say by his profound exhibitions of the testimony of the Prophets and Apostles; nor by his "reasonings out of the Scriptures;" neither do I affirm by his boisterous and big sounding declamation *about* the gospel, wound up by some pretty periods about sparkling gems, and diadems which wreath the brow, and finished off with some brain bewildering songs: I do not ssy by these means, for, upon this point I leave others to decide; who are better acquainted with the Apostolicity of his style and matter than I; but)—in his own peculiar way, he had induced many to go down into the water to be immersed for the remission of sins. Now if he could have manœuvred so as to elicit from me a sentence of non-fellowship, I suppose he thought all his proselytes would have been up in arms against me, for if he, their "ghostly father," were adjudged to be "no christian" by Dr. Thomas, what would become of them and their religion? Thus, as he that cuts off another, schismatizes the excised, so by cutting him off from fellowship, I should have been convicted of making a schism, which would have admirably suited his purpose to establish against me.

Mr. Chester Bullard having failed to accomplish his ends, Mr. Silas Shelburn next tried his hand. He arose in all due form with some printed documents, and, as a restlessness was evinced by the congregation, he prefaced his undertaking by requesting their attention. His object was to prove me to be a factionist He refered to a certain covenant, or understanding, or something else, which had been entered into by him and certain others, by which all past difficulties were settled or hushed up or disposed of (I do not recollect which) down to that time. This non-descript document was on record, I believe he said, in the "Christian Publisher" which he held in his hand, and I think he remarked, but of this I am not positive, that it was agreed or understood, that *re-immersion was to be mentioned no more*. That every thing was quiet until the Investigator came among them, which had opened the subject afresh, and therefore, he considered me as a factionist, as I was the cause of the existing state of things in relation to it. I interjected here, that I had nothing to do with their covenant; that till I had come to Lunenburg, I was not even aware of its existence. This however seemed to have no weight with him; for he proceeded to remark in continuance of his discourse, that since their agreement, they had received about *"fifty from the Baptists into the Kingdom!"* 'Yes!' said I, 'where were they before you gave them the right hand of fellowship into the Kingdom? Here, Mr. Bullard exclaimed, 'you do n't mean that!' 'Yes I do!' rejoined Mr. Silas Shelburn. 'To be sure he does,' said I, 'he means what he says! "No, you do n't!" cried Mr. Bullard. 'I do!' said he. 'Certainly!' said I, 'that is Henshallism!' "It is a *lapsus!*" agonized Mr. Chester Bullard! At length, Mr. Silas Shelburn discovered his unhappy dilemma. It was too much for his nerves; he stammered out something amid the surrounding merriment, about not being 'a critic in words' [nor much of one in things either, we opine]–and as the least difficulty to be encountered, like a wise man resumed his seat, from which he ought never to have risen.

I think it was at this crisis, that Dr. L* * * W* * * [who had previously become so dissatisfied with his *inner man*, that he could'nt fellowship himself, and had therefore, got re-immersed *privately*, for fear, I suppose, of the Pharisees, who love their own regular Baptist righteousness better than God's)–arose, & propounded to me what he styled a 'paradox' in my practice, which, seeing that he could not fellowship himself without being cleansed, was equally so in his! Said I, "You have obeyed the gospel, Doctor?' "Yes," said he; 'then,' I rejoined, 'there is no controversy between you and me: I can fellowship you." He very properly said no more, and sat down.

Lastly, uprose another son of Æsculapius at the instigation, it is said, of Mr. Non-Critical Shelburn, who sat near him. He held a number of The Advocate in his hand. The theme of his conceptions was to prove me a liar! While he was making a preface to his oration, a friend came up to me, and advised me to take no notice of any thing he might say; that he was out of the church; and that the community paid no regard to his statements. A brother who was sitting in advance of him while he was descanting on my character, told him he had better look after his own; to which he replied with considerable excitement, "that he had left the church to get rid of such company as his." I then observed, "Dr. Dejernette I am informed, that you are a subject of church discipline; I advise, therefore, that you first clear up your own character, before you undertake to adjust mine." The Doctor was confounded,

the audience considerably tickled, and, by a simultaneous movement, broke up the meeting and dispersed to there abodes! Mr. Shelburn, however, made an expiring effort to retrieve the fortunes of the day. He and his *protege* proceeded to the yard, where, I am told, Esculapius mounted a stump to speechify. His merry congregation paid little deference to him or his oratory. "Hear him!" cried Elder 'No-Critic-in-Words.' But it was of no avail; the day was lost! Alas! my dear friend, how true it is, that there is but one step from the sublime to the ridiculous–a verity, most felicitously exemplified by my opponents on the present occasion.

But this letter has extended to a greater length than I anticipated; I must, therefore, bring it to a close by assuring you of my imperturbation in the midst of these things; and that I am, as ever, most sincerely yours, in the earnest expectation of our Lord to settle all disputes,

JOHN THOMAS.

IMMORTALITY ONLY TO THE RIGHTEOUS.

We extract the following from a letter of the English Correspondent of the Baltimore Sun; a paper just come to hand from bro. Magruder of Charlottesville, Va., and for which we return him sincere thanks.

The reader will, doubtless, discover a perfect unanimity between Mr. Dobney and ourselves on the subject of Immortality and Eternal Life. How comes this? The ancient philosophers of Greece and Rome, and the New Platonists of Papal and Protestnnt times though in daily communication have not been able to come to an agreement on the question *Is Man congenitally mortal or immortal; and if mortal, how is he to obtain immortality?* But in the case before us, here are two individuals, entire strangers to each other and their literary productions; the one, a Regular Baptist Divine; the other, a physician; the former resident in England, and the latter, in Kentucky, upwards of 4000 miles apart: these persons both come precisely to the same conclusion;–a conclusion, at variance with the orthodoxy of the generations with which they have to do, in every particular. We repeat; How happens this? The answer is, that they are of the few, who read the scriptures without reference to human authority, construe them grammatically, and embrace the interpretation thus obtained as the truth. In this way they are "taught of God;" and, whether they be in Britain or America, having One Teacher and One Book—God by his Word, operating upon men of teachable dispositions, they become of "One Mind and One Spirit," to the great vexation and perplexity of the men-worshipping and men-discipled bondmen of the age.

Reader!–"search the scriptures," for in them you will find the true doctrine of "Life and Incorruptibility;" and, if you read them *that you may learn*, in the spirit of a little

child, and not to bolster up, or palm off for truth some antiquated preconceptions, we doubt not, but you will forthwith abandon the hypotheses of the Demonologists, and co-operate with those, who go for "the unadulterated milk of the Word" that, instead of remaining dwarfs all the days of their probation, "they may *grow* thereby," to the fulness of the stature of perfect men in Christ Jesus.

Editor.

"If I have not trespassed upon your time, I will touch upon one more subject and close; it may prove interesting to the religious portion of your readers. A work has just been published in London entitled "Notes of Lectures on Future Punishment," and which has attracted great attention by the novelty of its propositions, and the vigor of its arguments. It is from the pen of the Rev. H. H. Dobney, pastor of the Baptist Church, King street Maidstone, being the substance of a course of lectures delievered before his congregation during the Spring. He is said to be a talented and deservedly popular preacher, and a general favourite among what may be termed for the sake of distinction, the "low" or "moderate Calvinist." But he is one of those enquirers after truth, who does not like to be shackled by the trammels of rigid Orthodoxy, or a blind adherence to opinions because of their antiquity; and has put forth though by no means arrogantly or presumptuously some startling views on the *duration of future punishment.* I cannot here give you a fair idea of his argument, as indeed I have not had time to give it a close perusal, but it appears to be grounded on the idea that absolute immortality to man indiscriminately, is no where promised in the Scriptures and that after a certain amount of punishment of a judicial character to the impenitent they will be annihilated or finally destroyed. But I will give you an extract from his pen, that your readers may judge for themselves.

"Does Scripture teach that immortality is the portion of every man? That man as he is, and independently of character, is immortal? In other words, do they teach a universal and absolute, or contingent and conditional immortality?" After a brief survey of the creation of man in the Old Testament, he proceed thus: "What then does the New Testament reveal concerning immortality? We have not found it the inherent, absolute and inalienable prerogative of man, as man, prior to our entering the school of Christ; what shall we find here? Much about 'life'—'life eternal'—'immortality,' &c. We will bring the various passages together, and then see to what conclusion they conduct us. 'The righteous shall go into *life eternal.*' 'He (that is, the righteous,) shall receive in the world to come *eternal life.*' He that believeth in Him shall have *eternal life.*' 'I give unto my sheep *eternal life* and they shall *never perish.*' 'To them who *seek for* glory, honor and *immortality, eternal life.*' 'The gift of God is *eternal life* through Jesus Christ our Lord.'—And many others. Now, before we draw any conclusion from the manner in which the Scriptures uniformly speak on the subject, let us see, also, how they speak of those unhappy and inexcusable sinners who do not come to Christ for the blessing of his salvation;—'He that believeth not the Son shall *not see life.*' 'The preaching of Christ to *them that perish.*' 'Vessels of wrath *fitted to destruction.*' 'Many walk whose end is *destruction.*' 'Who shall be punished with *everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord.' 'Lusts, which drown men in *destruction and perdition.*' This is the *second death.*' etc., etc. We observe one thing to be very prominent on the face of all these declarations, that he alone hath everlasting life who seeks salvation from Christ. It is the prerogative of the true believer to say with the apostles, 'this corruptible shall put on incorruptibility,' etc. It is they only who, by patient continuance in well doing, 'seek for glory, honor and immortality, that will have eternal life. While the 'second death,' 'perdition,' 'everlasting destruction,' await those who will not come to Christ that they might have life. Of course we are not unaware of the common practice of explaining 'life,' 'happiness,' and 'immortality,' to mean an eternity of bliss, while 'destruction,' 'perdition,' and 'death,' are explained to mean an eternity of miserable existence. Nor is it to be denied that 'life' is often used in the sense alleged, but that it is invariably used so no one will affirm, while on the other hand it is frequently understood in its primary and common signification. Waiving as I am compelled to do, all investigations into the precise force of the words as used in the numerous passages now adduced, I present them merely as illustrative of the manner in which the scriptures uniformly speak of the future portion of the two opposite classes of mankind—the pious and the ungodly. And it does seem to me that unwarrantable liberty is taken, when these words, touching the future state, are invariably taken in their secondary sense, their primary being set aside, chiefly because *expositors have* previously *determined, that all men, without exception, are immortal*; which ASSUMPTION of course necessitates their seeking for some other than the natural interpretation, when *immortality* is promised on one hand, and *destruction* threatened on the other. For, if man be absolutely immortal, an endowment already possessed *it cannot be a matter of promise*; and so also if he be immortal, he cannot literally perish, or be punished with everlasting destruction; so that another sense has to be sought for these terms. For my own part, I am disposed to urge in its obvious sense the exhortation of our Lord: "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him who is able to *destroy* both soul and body in hell."

So far Mr. Dobney. His work will evidently create considerable excitement among his more orthodox brethren, while his known & popular talents will secure it an extensive perusal."—*Balt. Sun.*

JUNE 29, 1844.

We extract the following from the Advent Herald.

TURKEY.

"Our advices from Constantinople are to June 27. The Sultan had renewed to Sir Stratford Canning his promises in reference to the Renegade Question. Letters from Syria state that Namik Pacha had left Aleppo with 4,000 troops on their way to Orfa. At Mount Lebanon, Roman Catholic intrigues are carried to such an extent, that it was stated that the construction of the Protestant Church at Jerusalem had been discontinued in consequence of the interference of the local authorities. A large quantity of property and upwards of 1000 lives have been lost in consequence of an inundation at Adana. Albania was tranquil when our letters thence were despatched."—*Adv. Her.*

Our readers will remember, that the Turkish Government very recently surrendered the right, obtained by conquest, and which it has exercised in the city and empire of Constantine for the last 391 years, to slay men who should apostatize from Mohammedanism to the Greco-Catholic or other religion. Such an apostate is regarded as *a renegade*, a crime by Moslem Law hitherto punishable with decapitation. This right to punish the apostacy of unfaithful Mussulmans with death, undisputed for ages, has at length been called in question by England, France, and Russia. Hence the phrase the *Renegade Question.* The Sultan, it appears, has renewed his assurances of religious liberty. Religious Liberty in Constantinople under the very shadow of the Mosque of St. Sophia, and of the Palace of the Commander of the Faithful! This is certainly a remarkable sign of the times. Behold the contrast! Formerly, the Moslem alternative to all was, the Koran, Tribute, or Death, and this without alternative to apostates: this, in scripture language, was exercising the "power given them to slay the Third Part of Men," or the people of the Greco-Roman Division of the Old World, for so long a time. Quite recently a man was publicly beheaded in the streets of Constantinople as a renegade; and though the British and French Ambassadors interceded for his life, they were told it was an affair of religion, and the Government could not interfere. But the times are changed; in other words, their time is run out, and their power to slay is taken from them. Reader, is not the abduction of this power from the Turco-Roman Government at this crisis—a time previously set in order, and declared by the Spirit of God seventeen centuries and a half ago, demonstrative to you of the verity, and, as we have previously pointed out the time of its abduction

–of the *perfect intelligibility* of the Apocalypse of John? Could the opening of a blind man's eyes in attestation of the Book, be more convincing? Do you not discern in the present verification of this prophecy, that God is directing the policy of the nations? Do you not also behold in this an illustration of the Sixth Vial, under which the power of the Ottomans is dried up preparatory to the return of Israel to their own Land?

But this is not all. Their power "to slay the third part of men" is not only religious, but political in the broadest sense. By the capture of Constantinople they blotted out a Kingdom from the map of the Roman World –hence the revival of one at this crisis would seem a fitting event to consummate the whole. We present the reader with the following as indicating the tendency of events in that direction.

RUSSIA AND TURKEY.

"The Hamburg Papers state, that letters from the Principalities on the Danube, have been received at Hamburg, alleging that extraordinary sensation had been caused in the higher circles by the intelligence said to have been received from St. Petersburg, that endeavours are making on the part of Russia to unite Servia, Wallachia, and Moldavia, with the adjacent Turkish provinces into a Kingdom, under the supremacy of Turkey, and the protection of Russia.

The report adds that the Duke of Leuchtenberg is designed to be the sovereign of this New Kingdom; whereas according to other accounts, Russia would leave the choice entirely to the Porte, and the great European Powers. Some steps are said to have been already taken at Constantinople to bring about this project, which is considered the only means of relieving the Porte from dificulties with which it is surrounded on every side. It seems that some intimations have been made at Vienna—at least this is thought to explain the reports in circulation, respecting the object of the Emperor of Russia's visit to to the British Capital."—*Adv. Her.*

Previous to the capture of Constantinople in 1453 by the Turks, two Kingdoms existed in that region, the one, the Greco-Roman, then reduced to the City of Constantine and its suburbs:—the other, the Ottoman. When the Turks captured the City, the former merged into the Ottoman Empire, which, till the Greek Revolution and the then recent conquests of Russia, has continued identical with the Eastern Limb of the Roman Empire or "*the Third Part of Men.*" It would be reasonable to expect some notable events, coeval with the expiration of the time appointed for the Euphrateans "to slay" this section of the world with Political death. The renewal of the Sultan's promise concerning the "renegade question" is not the least remarkable; but if the revival of a Kingdom out of the Provinces of the Turkish Dominion, take place at this particular crisis, it will not only be a highly characteristic and marked event, but it will be restoring things to their relative position as at the commencment of the time allotted to them "to slay."

The rapid decline of the Ottoman Empire is a notable sign of the near approach of Messiah's Advent. It is as marked a precursor of his Second Appearing, as the departure of the Sovereign Power from the Tribe of Judah was of his First Advent. Indeed the wasting away of Turkish dominion is given in the Apocalypse in connexion with the warning of Jesus coming as a thief. "Blessed is he that watches, and keepeth his garments lest he walk naked, and they see his shame"—Rev. xvi. 15.

The following is from the Paris Correspondent of the New York Observer.

The attention of Europe is also fixed on *Constantinople.* The members of the Divan and the Mahomedans generally, are divided into two parties. One of these parties wishes to open regular communications with Christian nations; they feel that the Turkish Empire must perish, if it does uot keep up with the progress of civilization, and does not undergo a great reform. The other party, faithfull to the spirit of the Koran, refuse all change, reject every improvement. It is composed of ferocious men, intolerant Mussulmans, ever ready to shed the blood of Christians. The Divan vacillates from one side to the other, according to circumstances. When England and France complain loudly, the Sublime Porte answers by the fairest promises. When the people murmur, the Turkish government resumes its persecutions. It would seem that there have been scenes of atrocity near Constantinople: several Christians have been massacred. God grant the hour may soon come when these barbarians shall be driven from Europe. where they have been to long tolerated." X.

There are *two* subjects on which God is silent, and man most solicitous to know—*the world of spirits*, and HIS OWN FUTURE DESTINY!

A. C.—Mill. Harb. Vol. 5. No. x. p. 470.

THE TWO VISIONS.

THE PERIOD OF THE LITTLE HORN.

FROM BEFORE JESUS CHRIST 37, TO HIS SECOND ADVENT.

(CONCLUDED FROM PAGE 127.)

In Verse 23 of chapt. viii, this Little Horn is styled "KING," and is thus spoken of: "and in the latter time of their [the King of the South, or of Egypt, and of the North, or Syria's] kingdom, when the Transgressors" of Moses' Law in Israel "are come to the full, a King of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences" or, the Latin language unintelligible to Jews, "shall stand up. And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power;"—for he shall not be an hereditary, but an elective, king. "And he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper and practice, and shall destroy" Israel, "the MIGHTY AND THE HOLY PEOPLE. And through his policy he shall also bring to maturity mischievous fraud by means of his power; and in his heart he shall grow proud, and by FALSE PEACE he shall destroy multitudes. And against the PRINCE OF PRINCES he shall stand up; *but* WITHOUT HAND *he shall be shivered to pieces.*"

But that we may be in no doubt as to the identity of this king, who is great, but not by hereditary right, the Merae thus amplifies the description of him in the Eleventh of Daniel.

"And the King shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak wonderful things against THE GOD OF GODS, and shall prosper TILL the indignation" against Israel and Judah "be accomplished; for that which is determined shall be done. Neither shall he regard the gods of his fathers–*Alei abethiu*–nor the DESIRE OF WIVES, nor regard any god; for he shall magnify himself above all. And on his Throne–*kanu*–shall he give honor to a GOD OF GUARDIANS–*Ale megnozim* ("saints," and angels invoked as guardians, or, protectors)–and an Accursed One–*Alue*–whom his (pagan) fathers knew not, shall he honor with gold, & silver, and with precious stones, and pleasant things. Thus shall he do in BAZARS OF GUARDIANS–*mebetzari megnozim* ("churches" dedicated to "saints") "in the presence of an ACCURSED DISSEMBLER, whom he shall acknowledge and increase with glory; and he shall cause them" the Priests or Merchants (REV. xviii: 11-23.) of these Bazars "to exercise authority over multitudes, and he shall divide *adame*, not *aretz*–ground, dust of relics, or land of Judea? Which is it?–"for gain."

Reader! behold the living portrait; who can mistake the identity of the Little Horn? He is to "prosper until the indignation be accomplished:" he was in process of time to disregard the gods of his pagan fathers; and the desire of wives, in other words, he was to "forbid to marry;" and he was to magnify himself above all objects of worship. At a later period, he was to give honor to an Accursed One upon his [the Little Horn's] throne of whom, his Conscript Fathers of Pagan Rome were altogether ignorant Upon this Accursed Dissembler, by John styled THE IMAGE OF THE BEAST," he was to heap riches, honor, and glory. But the most singularly curious part of this prophecy is the manner in which buildings, called "Churches," "Chapels," and "Cathedrals," are indicated. Inthe Hebrew the phrase is *Betzari meozim.* BTZR in Root II. Park. Lex. signifies "to enclose with a wall, or the like for safety. As a noun, it signifies *store, or treasure so secured* Derivative–A BAZAR, a kind of covered market-place among the Eastern Nations, somewhat like our Exeter 'Change in London, but frequently much more extensive." When we consider the use to which 'churches,' &c, are put; namely, as places of deposit for silver crucifixes, relics, pictures, images of the precious metals, of fairs, etc., the prophetic title of Bazars is very appropriate. But when we remember, that these Bazars of priestly merchandise, are dedicated to Guardian Saints, the style BAZARS OF GUARDIAN SAINTS designates in a wonderful manner St. Peter's at Rome; Our Lady's at Paris; St. James' di-

Compostella; St. Paul's at London; and an innumerable catalogue of other places of spiritual traffic, dedicated to Guardian Saints and Angels all over the world—the veritable Bazars, at which are sold the wares of the Accursed Dissembler, who is still acknowledged by the Little Horn.

From Verse 36 to 39 inclusive, two prominent characters are brought to view, and which, in the interpretation of this VISION OF THE EAST, must not be confounded. These are the MELAK and the ALUE, or the King and the Accursed One. The latter, who is also termed the Dissembler, is indebted to the King for his throne, glory, honor, and riches. In the Apocalypse, this King is styled "THE DRAGON," and the Accursed Dissembler, by Paul, "the Man of Sin." This 'Wicked One' now sits upon the throne, or "in the estate," or office, of the Dragon King; who, in Pompey's time, reigned, as 'the Power of the Air' in the City Rome. But, the Power which, 'in the latter days' is represented in Daniel by "the King," and in John by "the Dragon' must be sought for in Constantinople, or New Rome: for, it was to this City, that the Little Horn transferred his throne.

In Dan. ii. 45, the Roman Empire is compared to a "Mountain;" as it is written, "the Stone was cut out of THE Mountain without hands;" that is, the Kingdom of Messiah, who is himself the Stone rejected by the Jewish Builders, was organised from the nations of the empire by human agency indeed, but not by human power as displayed in the formation of the Kingdoms of the World. This Mountain was subsequently divided into two parts, the one towards the East, the other, towards the West: or, to change the metaphor, the Monarchy was bifurcated into *TWO LIMBS*, the Eastern and Western Limbs of the Great Metallic Image; notwithstanding, however, this bifurcation, they are of one body politic, namely, the Roman.

Now the symbol termed the Little Horn, represents the Roman Body Politic; and in the Book of Daniel, is introduced with reference both to the Eastern and Western Limbs. If he behold a *Vision of the Western Limb* he sees the Little Horn growing up amid Ten Horns; but when he contemplates a *Vision of the Eastern Limb* he views the Little Horn as rising up out of *one of the Four Horns of the Goat*. Now John in the Apocalypse, symbolises the Ten Horns and the Little Horn that has eyes [see Dan. vii. 8.] by a Beast with Ten Horns and Ten Crowns; and "Another Beast;" and an Image of the Beast with the crowned horns–c. xiii. These three, the Ten-Horned Beast, the Two-Horned Beast, and the Image, express all and more, than is represented by Daniel's Fourth Beast with Eleven Horns in relation to the Western Limb of the Roman Body Politic. But the Little Horn as coming up out of the Horn of the Macedonian Goat, and which is the symbol of the Eastern Limb of the Roman Body, is represented by John under the symbol of "a Great Red Dragon," who gives his throne, or seat of empire, Old Rome, to the Beasts and their Imperio-Pontifical Image, the Accursed Dissembler of the Merae's discourse: so that, while Old Rome is the Throne of the Alue, Constantinople, or New Rome, to which the Emperor of the World removed his residence is the Throne of the Dragon, or Little Horn, in the East.

The Sultans of Turkey are the successors of the Roman Emperors in the Eastern Limb of the Image. They reign over the same people, though mingled with other races; they possess the same old Roman territory; and the seat of their government is the same New Rome of Constantine. In truth, their power is represented, both by Daniel and John, by the same symbols, namely, by the Dragon and the Little Horn. Indeed it must be so; for, the Little Horn of the East, is to be shivered to pieces without hand as well as the Little Horn of the West; and the Dragon also is represented as contemporary with the Second Advent of Messiah, who is to bind him for a thousand years. But the old Roman Empire was not broken without hand; nor has any other power been shivered to pieces in this way since Daniel wrote. This destiny then, of the Little Horn of the East and West, and of the Dragon is yet future, contemporary, and similar. The epoch of their destruction is when the Stone strikes the Image on the feet; when the Ancient of Days comes; when Michael, the Great Prince, shall stand up for Israel; when God shall have accomplished to scatter their power; and when Jesus shall come upon the world as a thief, and take from the nations their glory, power, and dominion This is *the time when*, and the *person by whom* and the *manner in which* they will all be broken—by a mighty earthquake, an overflowing rain, and great hailstones, fire and brimstone. Ezek. xxxviii. 22. Rev. xvi. 17-21. Dan. xii. 1

Daniel's interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's Metallic Image is a general outline of the political Constitution of the World, from his own time to the utter and final subversion of all national self rule, by the power of God; who, 'in the latter days' in which we live, should "set up a kingdom" on earth, which, at its introduction would break in pieces all kingdoms existing at the time; while it should itself occupy their place, and stand for ever.

But in the first year of Belshatzar, God gave Daniel a more particular account of the same general events in the Vision of the West. But why did he this? In order to let him know something more about the Iron Part of the Image in relation to its connexion with the introduction of the Everlasting Kingdom; the duration of that kingdom; the King thereof; the condition of the saints under the Iron King; the destiny of this king; and the universal subjection of all nations to the Son of Man. The great catastrophy of this Vision is that *Jehovah's King destroys the Little Horn of the West, and delivers his people out of his hands.*

The Vision of the East develops the same crisis, only introduced by events in connexion with the natural Israel, upon whom as upon a pivot turns the destiny of the world. This Vision ends by the revelation of Messiah from heaven; to deliver Israel from the King of the North; to shiver to pieces the Roman Body Politic in both its Limbs; to separate the dead and transform the righteous living; and to open upon the world a Dispensation of righteousness and peace, which will be the great characteristics of THE FUTURE AGE.

The chronology of Dan. xi. 40, I consider to be that of the pushing of the King of the South, Mehemet Ali who has recently abdicated the throne of Egypt in favor of his son Ibrahim, against the Little Horn, or Mohammedan form of the Roman Power reigning in Constantinople. This occurred A. D. 1839, when the Egyptians gained a great victory over the Ottoman Desolator of Judea near the Euphrates; by which they possessed themselves of Syria including Palestine, and bro't the Little Horn in the East to the verge of ruin: as it is written, "and AT THE TIME OF THE END" of the Vision of the East "shall the King of the South push at HIM," the King, who had hitherto been doing according to his will-v.36.

I shall now chronicle the leading events which connect the Seventy Weeks of the 2300 days with the end of those years, as far as they relate to the pleasant and glorious land of Judea. I shall record them according to the year from the going forth of the Decree to restore and rebuild Jerusalem, on the 1st day of the 1st month of the 7th year of the reign of Artaxerxes, and before Christ 457. I shall indicate this epoch by the initials P. D. A., which signify in our tongue *after the decree of Artaxerxes.*

P. D. A.

457. Birth of Messiah the Prince at Bethlehem of Judea, in the last year of the reign of Herod.–He is called out of Egypt whence he goes to dwell in Nazareth.

466. The sceptre passed away from Judah, and Judea became a Roman Province.

483. John, the Elijah of Malachi, and the 'Voice crying in the Wilderness,' spoken of by Isaiah, makes his appearance along the Jordan.

The confirmation of the Prophet before many for "*One Week*" of years begins. This is the last year of the 'seven weeks," and "threescore and two weeks' conjoined.

487. Jesus begins to be about 30 years old. He is manifested to Israel at his baptism, by a voice from heaven, and by being anointed with the Unction of the Holy Spirit, which descends upon him in the form of a Dove. Thus, a mark, or seal, is set upon him as the Prophet–*Berith*–'purification sacrifice' which was to come.

He walks among the Jews "to-day, to-morrow, and the day after," being a day for a year; which brings us to

490. *The Seventy Weeks end*: and with them the confirmation of the Prophet who is "cut off, but not for himself." HE IS RAISED FROM THE DEAD; by this event, the transgression of the Law is finished; the efficacy of sin offerings

P. D. A.

extinguished; a reconciliation made for iniquity; and everlasting righteousness brought in.

On Pentecost, the Word of Reconciliation is proclaimed to Israel; 3,000 believe and obey the New Law.

497. The Proclamation of Eternal Life by Jesus Christ made to the Household of Cornelius. This was the opening of the Kingdom of Heaven to the Gentiles.

502. A great famine in Judea. This is the "beginning of sorrows." A rumor of war.—Acts xii 20.

506. Troubles in Judea under the administration of Cumanus.

515. Disturbances between the Jews of Cesarea and the other inhabitants.

522. 'Fearful sights and great signs from heaven' seen at Jerusalem during the Passover.

523. Cestius Gallus, governor of Syria, comes to Jerusalem; numbers the Jews at the passover. "Commotions" at Cesarea and Jerusalem. Florus puts several Jews to death. The Jews rise and kill the Roman garrison at Jerusalem. A massacre of the Jews at Cesarea and in Palestine. All the Jews in Scythopolis slain in one night. Jerusalem encompassed by the Roman armies under Cestius. He besieges the Temple; retires; is defeated by the Jews. The Christians of Jerusalem seeing these things conclude that "the desolation of the City is nigh." They depart therefore, "out of the midst of it," and retire to Pella, in the kingdom of Agrippa beyond Jordan.

By this time, the "Gospel of the Kingdom had been preached in all the world for the information of all nations.'

524. Vespasian enters into Judea; subdues Galilee. Josephus taken prisoner. Divisions in Jerusalem. The Zealots seize the temple and commit violence in the City. They slay "Zacharias, son of Barachias, between the Temple and the Altar."

525. Vespasian takes all the places of strength in Judea about Jerusalem.

526. Josephus liberated. John of Giscala heads the Zealots. Eleazar son of Simon, forms a third party: makes himself master of the inner Temple, or Court of the Priests.

527. "The end comes." Titus marches against Jerusalem, and encompasses it with the Roman Eagles. The factions unite at first against the Romans, but afterwards divide again. The Romans take the first enclosure of Jerusalem: then the second. They make a wall all round the city, which is reduced to great distress by famine. Parents eat their offspring. "Great tribulation" in the city, "such as was not since the beginning of the Jewish State to this time."

July 17. The Continual burnt offerings, or Daily, ceases in the Temple. The Romans become masters of the Court of the Gentiles and set fire to the galleries. A soldier sets the Temple on fire, notwithstanding Titus commands the contrary. Thus "the place of his sanctuary was cast down," and, "the city was destroyed," and thus was verified the saying "he shall cause the sacrifice and oblation to cease." Dan. ix. 27.—The Romans being now masters of the City and Temple, offer sacrifices to their Gods; and thus set up, "the abomination that maketh desolate spoken of by Daniel the prophet in the Holy Place." The last enclosure of the city taken.

528. Titus demolishes the Temple to its very foundation. He also demolishes the city. Titus returns to Rome with his father Vespasian, "the Prince of the People who should come." War overspreads the land like a flood; to the end of which there were desolations. Judea is conquered.

Immediately after the tribulations of these days "*the truth was cast down to the ground.*" By *the truth* is signified the civil and religious polity of Israel as constituted by the Law of Moses. This is figuratively expressed by *the Sun being darkened, the moon not giving her light, the stars falling from heaven, the powers of the heavens being shaken.* Paul alludes to this then approaching convulsion of the things constituted by the law, when he says, "yet once more I shake the heaven. And *this yet once more* signifieth the removing of those things which are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain."

Thus, by the host that was given to the Little Horn against the Daily, "the heavens and the earth" contemporary with the Apostles, were set on fire, and "the elements of the world" constituted by the Law, were "melted with a fervent heat;" and the Land also, and the works, or towns, villiages, &c. which were upon it were desolated with fire; and thus "all these things were dissolved' by the abomination which made desolate the unfortunate country of the Jews. But in view of these calamities, so agonizing to the patriotic Jew, great was the consolation presented by the Apostles in these words, "nevertheless we according to his promise, look for a New Heaven and a New Earth"—the Restoration of the Kingdom to Israel—"in which dwelleth righteousness."—2 Pet .3. 13.

We proceed now with the chronology of the principal events from

P. D. A.

528. When an end was put to the Polity of the Hebrew Nation as an independent people. To prevent the rebuilding of the city, Vespasian establishes a garrison of 800 men on Mount Zion. He also commands strict search to be instituted for all who claimed descent from the House of David, in order to cut off, if possible, all hope of the restoration of that royal race, and more especially of the Advent of a Messiah, the confidence in whose speedy coming still burned with feverish excitement in the hearts of all Israelites.

538. Vespasian dies. *Trajan.* In this reign, the Jews in Egypt, Cyprus, and Mesopotamia lose more than 500,000 men on the field of battle, or, in the sack of towns.

Adrian. An edict is issued forbidding circumcision, the reading of the Law, and the observance of the weekly sabbath. Barchochab claims to be the Star which should arise out of Jacob. This false Messiah seized 50 castles, and a great number of open towns. Bether was the last of these which held out against the Romans. It was defended by Barchochab in person. It was sacked; and with the Star, whose glory was extinguished in the carnage of Bither, the False-Hope of Israel fell to the earth. In this war, 580,000 were slain, besides those who perished by famine and disease. The whole of Judea was converted into a desert—wolves & hyenas howled in the streets of the desolate cities, and all the villages were consumed by fire.

After these events, a new city was built on the waste places of Jerusalem and peopled by Greeks and Romans. It was named Ælia Capitolina, after the prænomen of the Emperor, and Jupiter Capitolinus, the tutelar deity of Rome, to whom it was dedicated.

An edict is issued by Adrian, interdicting every Jew from entering the new city on pain of death, or even approaching so near as to be able to behold its towers. The more effectually to keep them away, the image of a sow was placed over the gate leading to Bethlehem. Thus did "the King with a fierce countenance destroy wonderfully the mighty and the holy people."

781. Constantine establishes the Apostacy *from Original Christianity* as the Religion of the Roman World.

787. He removes the Seat of Government from Rome to Constantinople.

794. He dies.

820. Julian issues an edict for the rebuilding of the Temple, which is miraculously prevented from taking effect.

852. The Roman Empire divided into its Western and Eastern Limbs; Old Rome the capital of the West, and Constantinople of the East to this day.

933. This year synchronizes with A. D. 476 when the Imperial Authority is superseded by the Gothic Power, which as the Seventh Form of Government prevails in Old Rome for 60 years.

993. This year corresponds to A. D. 536, when *the Beast* which was to *rise up out of the sea* appears with *Seven Heads* complete. The crowning of his Ten

P. D. A.

Horns not yet effected. The Dragon & the Beast are now before us. We turn from the latter, to chronologize exclusively events in relation to the dominion of the Dragon King.

Palestine continued subject to the Little Horn in its Greco-Roman Robe until the rise of Islamism changed the face of Western Asia.

1093 or A D 636, Omar plants the Crescent on the walls of Jerusalem, and lays the foundation of a Mosque where the Temple formerly stood.

1100. Omar, the Saracen Khalif, assassinated in Jerusalem.

1325. Achmet, a Turk, who, from governor made himself sovereign of Egypt, conquers Jerusalem.

1362. The Holy City returns under the dominion of the Khalifs.

1392. Mehammed Ickschid, another Turk acquires possession of Jerusalem.

1593. Meleschah, the third of the Turkish race, takes Jerusalem and ravages the whole country. 'Jerusalem in the 12th century,' says Benjamin of Tudela, 'did not contain more than 200 descendants of Abraham, who were poor, depressed, and calumniated. At Tiberias the seat of learning and of their sovereign patriarch, there were not more than 50.'

From P. D. A. 1149 till the Crusades the preponderating sovereignty of Asia Minor was the Seljukian Dynasty of Roum, or Turkish Rome. It was with this dynasty that the Crusaders contended so long for the possession of Judea and the Holy City.

1532. The Seljukian Turks possess Palestine under the Khalifat of the Fatimites of Egypt.

☞The opinion very generally prevails, that the end of the world is at hand; this induces vast numbers to sell their possesions in Europe, to enable them to visit the Holy Land, there to await the coming of the Lord.

1556. Jerusalem taken by the Crusaders, and declared the capital of a New Kingdom.

1644. The Kingdom of Jerusalem destroyed by Saladin. This Kingdom comprehended Palestine, with the cities of Sidon, Tyre, and Ptolemais, or St. Jean d' Acre. The destruction of this Kingdom was the occasion of the Third Crusade. A. D. 1189.

1675. The Sixth Crusade. By a treaty, Jerusalem and several other cities of Palestine were restored to the Crusaders; or soldiers of Papal Rome.

1701. The Carizmian Turks, oppressed by the Moguls, seize on the Holy Land, pillage and burn Jerusalem. After this they fall under the dominion of the Sultan of Egypt.

1748. The soldiers of the Papal Cross finally expelled from Palestine, by the loss of Tyre and Ptolemais which were conquered by the Mamlaouks of Egypt. All attempts of the Court of Rome to revive the crusades after this prove ineffectual.

1839. The Holy Land subject to the Mamelouk Sultan of Egypt till this year, when they are dispossessed by a body of Circassians, who invade and overrun the country. It was afterwards overrun by Tamerlane. At his death it reverted to Egypt.

1910, or A. D. 1453 Constantinople taken by the Ottoman Turks. It now becomes the throne of the Little Horn, or Roman Dragon in the Turkish Dress.

1973. Selim ix., Emperor of Constantinople carries his victorious arms from the Euphrates to the Lybian Desert, involving in one general conquest all the intervening states; thus incorporating Egypt and the Holy Land in an empire, which with the strictest propriety, may be regarded, as the Eastern Roman, under an Ottoman Dynasty. This is the last of a period of 880 years, which have elapsed since the Caliph Omar wrested Judea from the Greek Emperor of Constantinople. Selim as we have seen, again unites it to the Empire of New Rome.

The civil history of Palestine for three centuries after this is nothing more than a relation of the broils, the insurrections, the massacres, and changes of Dynasty, which have periodically shaken Turkish Roum, or Rome, in Europe as well as in Asia.

P. D. A.

2256. Napoleon Bonaparte, with the ulterior view of establishing his dominion upon either bank of the Ganges, aims at the conquest of Syria and Egypt as preliminary steps. He invades the Holy Land with 10,000 chosen troops. He takes El Arish, Gaza, and Jaffa, or Joppa. At the last place which had vigorously resisted him, the slaughter was tremendous. It was given up to plunder. A few days after he caused 4000 to be massacred in cold blood.

He besieges Ptolemais, or St. Jean d' Acre. "On that little town" said he, to one of his generals, "depends the fate of the East. Behold the Key of Constantinople or India!" The siege lasted sixty days; and was raised on May 21st, when the French marched back to Egypt the way they came. They lost 3000 men in the siege.

The motives which induced Napoleon to persevere so long in the siege of Acre, are thus stated by himself. "I see this paltry town has cost me many men, and occupies much time; but things have gone too far not to risk a last effort. If we succeed it is to be hoped we shall find in that place the treasures of the Pacha, and arms for 300,000 men. I will raise and arm the whole of Syria, which is already greatly exasperated by the cruelty of Djezzar for whose fall you have seen the people supplicate Heaven at every assault. I advance upon Damascus and Aleppo; I recruit my army by marching into every country where discontent prevails, I announce to the people the abolition of slavery, and the tyranical government of the Pashas; I arrive at Constantinople with armed masses; I overturn the dominion of the Mussulman; I found in the East a new and mighty empire, which shall fix my position with posterity: and perhaps I return to Paris by Adrianople or Vienna, having annihilated the house of Austria."

"His eyes were turned towards the Jews, who, in every commotion that affects Syria, are accustomed to look for the indications of that happy change, destined in the eye of faith, to restore the kingdom to Israel in the latter days. It is not improbable, that the notion had occurred to Napoleon during his eastern campaigns of employing them for the purpose of establishing an independent sovereignty in Palestine, devoted to his ulterior views in the countries beyond the Euphrates.

2278. Greek Revolution begins in the Morea.

2281. The power of Egypt brought to bear against the Greeks. After the successes of the Egytians under Ibrahim, the European Powers began to look upon him with distrust.

2284. A treaty for the settlement of the Morea signed July 6th 1827.

The Turko-Egyptian fleet destroyed at Navarino by the Allies. The operations of the Egyptians paralysed for a time.

After this, war breaks out between Egypt and the Sultan. This happened as was predicted in Dan. xi. 40—"and at the time of the end shall the King of the South push at Him" the Little Horn of New Rome. Egypt was successful in her efforts against the Turkish Emperor; for, she created for herself a King who claimed to be independent sovereign of Arabia and Syria, as well as of Egypt.

2296. The King of the South again declares war against the Dragon. A general battle is fought near the Euphrates, in which the army of the Sultan is entirely cut up, and his fleet taken and carried into Egypt. The fleet consisted only of two first rates and three frigates. The King of the South refuses to give them up, and declares, if the Allies attempt to take them from him, he will burn it.

2297. The Sultan and his allies, the combined powers of the Eastern & Western Limbs, save France, associate for one purpose, and offer the King of the South, "*all that part of Syria extending from the Gulph of Suez to the Lake of Tiberias, together with the province of Acre, for life.* The King of the South refuses the offer, claiming the country as his own for ever; but *such is not the destiny of the Land which God gave to Abraham.*

The Allies make war upon the King of the South. They take Jaffa, Beirout, and St. Jean d' Acre; and compel

P. D. A.

him to evacuate Syria and Palestine. He also surrenders the Turkish ships. Thus, Judea is again under the dominion of the Little Horn.

2300 ending A. D. 1844. The Turks massacre 50,000 Nestorians. RELIGIOUS LIBERTY *conceded by the Porte to the demands of* FRANCE *and* ENGLAND.

On 29th June 1844 the time allotted to the Ottomans to "slay the third part of men" expires; being "an hour, a day, a month, and a year"-equal to 391 years and 30 days from the capture of New Rome A. D. 1453.

2301. This is the current year, dating from June 1844, and the first year of "*the cleansing of the Sanctuary*," or Holy Land. Preliminary to this, we consider, the Ordonnances of the French Government for the organization of the Jews in France, to take effect in January 1845.

The administration of Jewish affairs in that country is to consist of a Central Consistory, Departmental Consistories, Chief Rabbis, Communal Rabbis, and officiating Ministers. The Central Consistory is to sit in Paris.-The Consistorial Chief Rabbi is appointed for life; the appointment subject to the Royal approbation. The Central Consistory is intermediate between the French Minister of Public Worship, and all matter referring to the administration of Jewish affairs over which full control is vested in the central consistory. The Central Consistory may be dissolved by Royal Ordonnances and the authority committed meanwhile to the Chief Rabbis and four Notables appointed in the Ordonnances.

The Consistories are to make an annual report to the *Prefet* on the state of all Jewish Institutions. The Crown reserves a Veto on all elections to the Consistory. These are charged to watch that nothing be done contrary to the doctrinal decisions given by the *Grand Sanhedrim*, convened by Napoleon in 1807; and that no assembly for prayer be formed without authorization.

"No deliberative assembly can be formed, and no doctrinal or dogmatic decision promulgated, except on the express authority of government. Every measure designed by, or calculated in any wise to effect, Jewish ecclesiastics, must be deferred to the King in council before it can have validity. No Jewish ecclesiastic can give a decision at variance with those of the Grand Sanhedrim, or those to be hereafter pronounced by synodal assemblies, convened by Royal authority."

This organization is regarded by English Jews as a 'voluntary subjection of all the most delicate and essential interests of Judaism to the control of a Gentile government."—France and England are doubtless the natural protectors, while Russia and Turkey are the natural enemies of the Jews. We see a policy in this organization hostile to Russia, which is oppressing them to ruin. The anti Russian interests of France and England require the Restoration of Israel, which cannot be much longer delayed.

Mehemet Ali, King of the south or Egypt, abdicates in favour of his son Ibrahim. This is the latest news of Mediterranean affairs.

While the year 1844 ends the Vision it does not end the Discourse of the Revelator. The 40th v. brings us to "the Latter Daye," and what follows, is a revelation of "what shall befal "Daniel's people" during that time. These "latter days" make up "*the Time of the End.*" It is apparent from the prophecy, that a power styled "*the King of the North*"—north in relation to Judea—is to re-appear upon the theatre of Oriental Affairs. That this King of the North is to *come* against Him, who, though Israel be restored, still possesses the sovereingty of Judea; namely, the Emperor of Constantinople: the King of the North will besiege, not New Rome, but Jerusalem: for 'he shall enter into the Glorious Land." He is to come "*like a whirlwind*," or as Ezekiel says, "*like a storm*"—ch.38. 8, the land of Egypt will not escape out of the hand of the King from the "north parts;" "but he shall have power over the treasures of gold and silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt." It is furthermore apparent, that the "King of the North," of Daniel, and Gog of the Land of Magog, Rossiprince of Meshech and Tubal of Ezekiel are one and the same power. *First*, because, they both come against the Land of Israel in the latter days: *Secondly*, because, Ethiopia and Lybia are in alliance with them both; *thirdly*, because tidings out of the northeast trouble them both: *fourthly*, because, they are both contemporary with the Advent of the Prince of Israel; *and fifthly*, because, they are both "broken to pieces without hand:" they all, the Little Horn, the King of the North, Gog and all their Allies, 'come to their end and none shall help them.'

SYNOPSIS OF DANIEL XI.

I shall conclude what I have to say at present on this chapter, by laying before the reader a synopsis of the sections into which it is divisible as into so many periods.

SECTION 1.

From the first year of Darius to the invasion of Greece by Xerxes, comprehending a period of 58 years, from B. C. 538 to 480; when Xerxes "stirred up all against the realm of Grecia" and fought the first battle at Thermopylæ—Verses 1 and 2.

INTERVAL 1

Between the battle of Thermopylæ and the fall of the Persian Monarchy, a period of 150 years. This empire had continued 208 years from the 1st of Darius the Mede, under fourteen kings: namely, Darius, Cyrus, Cambyses, Smerdis the Magian, Darius Hystaspes, Xerxes 1, Artaxerxes Longimanus, Xerxes 2, Sogdianus, Darius Nothus, Artaxerxes Mnemon, Artaxerxes Ochus, Arses, and Darius Codomannus. Darius the Mede and Cyrus the Great reigned conjointly for two years in Babylon; and as Cyrus continued several years longer, this conjoint reign is designated as the first, and Cyrus as the first king. Smerdis the Magian was an usurper without right, title, or blood royal. He was slain by seven conspirators, of whom Darius Hystaspes was one. Smerdis, therefore, in these prophecies is not recognized as a king; hence Xerxes is styled "the fourth." This is the reckoning; first Cyrus; second, Cambyses; third, Darius the son of Hystaspes; and fourth, Xerxes.

SECTION 2.

From the standing up of a mighty king, Alexander the Great, to the plucking up of his dominion for Four Other Kings beside those of his posterity. This period extends from B. C. 330 to 301, the year of the battle of Ipsus, by which the empire of Alexander was divided into the Kingdoms of Egypt, or "the South;" Syria, or "the North;" Greece; and Thrace. This is a period of 29 years—Verses 3, 4, and 5.

INTERVAL 2.

From the battle of Ipsus to the time when the Kings of the South and of the North contracted a marriage alliance B. C. 249, being an interval between the events of Verses 4 & 6 of 52 years.

SECTION 3.

From the marriage of Berenice, daughter of Ptolemy Philadelphus with Antiochus Theos, King of Syria, to the murder of this lady by Laodice, the divorced queen of Antiochus B. C. 246—Verse 6.

SECTION 4.

From this tragical event to the return of her brother Ptolemy Euergetes into his kingdom with the spoils of Syria, B. C. 244-Ver. 7, 8, 9.

SECTION 5.

From B. C. 242 when civil war broke out between the sons of Seleucus Callinicus, son of Antiochus Theos and Laodice, to B C. 187, in which year Antiochus the Great was killed-a period of 55 years—Verses 10 to 19.

SECTION 6.

Contains twelve years from the death of Antiochus the Great, to the death of Seleucus Philopater. B. C. 175. Verse 20.

SECTION 7.

From the Usurpation of Heliodorus B. C. 175, to the time when Israel was "*holpen with a little help*" by the valor of Judas Maccabeus, contemporary with the last days of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, B. C. 164, after a reign of eleven years. Verses 21—35.

INTERVAL 3.

The period which elapsed between verses 35 and 36 is equal to the 129 years of the Asmonean Sovreignty of Judea, which terminated by the subversion of their Dynasty by the Little Horn, or Senate of the Roman People, which appointed Herod, the Idumœan, in place thereof. B. C. 37.

SECTION 8.

From B. C. 37 till the King of the South re-appears in the Prophecy, and pushes at the Turco-Roman Power at the Time of the End of the Vision of the East A. D 1840: which is equivalent to the year after the decree o

Artaxerxes 2297. Verses 36—40.

SECTION 9.

From the invasion of Palestine by "the King of the North"—*Russia and her Allies*—to the conquest of Egypt by that coalition. Verses 40—43.

SECTION 10.

From the time the King of the North receives troublesome tidings from the north and east—*British India*—to his wonderful overthrow by power from heaven. Verses 44, 45.

The Eleventh Chapter of Daniel has been one o the strong holds of our Millerite *friends*, not a few of whom may be termed *brethren*; because they have obeyed the gospel for remission of sins, and continue to live as men, who have here no abiding city. We have a friendly disposition towards all *honest* Millerites (for among them, as among all other sects, there are doubtless many *dishonest* ones) —but we do not regard them all as brethren; for, comparatively few of them have *obeyed* the gospel, and that with us, is the rule by which we recognize men as Christians and brethren, irrispective of the nicknames, or party names, by which they may be distinguished. We therefore speak of them as 'Millerite Friends,' when we speak of those who adopt Mr. Miller's views, as a body; but when we would designate the Christians among them—in particular, we style them our Millerite brethren to distinguish them from our Campbellite brethren, who have obeyed the gospel and prefer Mr. Campbell's views to any other. We hope, therefore, that no offence will be taken by either party as none is intended. We must speak as well as act according to principle, so that our readers may always know where to to find us. But to return.

We call the attention of the Editors of both parties to our interpretation of this chapter. It is new and strictly grammatical and historical. It is perhaps the most difficult of all God's revelations; and of course we consider ours the only true one: but, if any can show it to be fallacious, or can present a better one, let it be forthcoming. The views we have given subvert much of Mr. Miller's theory, and lays the foundation of an exposition of the Word which will present the Millennium or Future Age, in a light different from any yet conceived.

TWELFTH CHAPTER OF DANIEL.

A continuation of the Revelator's Discourse —emendation of ch. xi. 45.—criticism on Michael—the time of trouble—deliverance of the Jews from the King of the. North —Dead Souls sleeping in the dust come to life—who the saints in this chapter— when all shall be finished—emendation of verse 11—taking away of the daily &c.

We come now to the examination of the contents of the Twelfth Chapter of Daniel. It consists of thirteen verses, and is a part of the Discourse (daber) in the eleventh. The whole of it is still prophetic, that is, has reference to what shall be hereafter.

The first verse declares, that "*at that time* shall Michael stand up," &c. At what time? At that time of vengeance—ubot—when the King of the North shall pitch "the curtains of his royal tent between the seas before the mountain, the glory of the holy" land—*ler tzabi quodash* ch. xi. 45. When therefore we see this sign we may know that the Lord is at hand.

Michael is the angelic title of Messiah, who is the power of God. The word Michael is reducible to three Hebrew words, *Mi* who, *ka* like, *al* God; *Who-like-God* is the name of him, who is to stand up for Israel. Some light may be thrown upon the identity of the personage by what follows from Zachariah: "In that day shall the Lord defend the inhabitants of Jerusalem; and he that is feeble among them at that day shall be as David; and the house of David *kaleim*—like the Aleim, like the Angel "or Personator,—*kamelak*, of Jehovah before them"—ch. xii. 8. Thus according to this testimony Jehovah will stand up for Israel by one who is to personate Him, and that Personator in Daniel is named Michael, becuse he is *like God*. He is styled *the Prince the great one*. In ch. ix. 25 he is named '*the* Messiah *the* Prince;' and in ch. viii. 11 he is called 'the Prince of the Host,' and in verse 25, he is styled 'the Prince of princes;' and in the last text Messiah is thus spoken of in connexion with 'the King,' who is to 'be broken without hand.' Michael the great prince, then, is identical with Jesus, who was crucified, because he maintained, that he was 'KING OF THE JEWS,' or the Great Prince of Israel.

Daniel is informed, that this personage is to be revealed as the champion, not of his countrymen then in captivity, but of the *beni* descendants therof in the latter days; when the King, for whom Tophet is prepared should rise against them. The epoch of those events is described as a time of horror—"a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation to that same time." Some persons cannot reconcile this with Matt. xxiv. 21 where speaking of the trouble connected with the destruction of Jerusalem, Jesus says "for then shall be great tribulation, such as was not since the beginning of the world to this time, no, nor ever shall be." I would observe, the difficulty lies in the phrases "since there was a nation" and "since the beginning of the world" Was not the Flood, a trouble surpassing all that will again befal the family of man? Truly, but the phrases do not carry us up to the world before the Deluge. Before that epoch there were no nations; the human race was one community, but afterwards divided into nations by the confusion of tongues. Hence the phrases in Daniel signify "since the confounding of human speech." As to the other text "the beginning of the world," we must bear in mind the topic of discourse. Jesus was speaking about the Jewish Commonwealth or world–*Kosmos* constituted, or framed, by the Law of Moses; the phrase therefore means since the promulgation of the Law. "No, nor ever shall be," that is, no such tribulation shall afflict the Jewish State as that which happened to it in the days of vengeance. The trouble of the Latter Days, will effect chiefly the Gentiles for it is to them a day of judgement, but to Israel a Jubilee of jubilees.

There are many passages in the prophetic writings parallel with Dan. xii. 1. I will quote only one at present; It is from Isaiah xxxi. 4—"Like as the lion roaring on his prey, when a multitude of shepherds are called forth against him he will not be afraid of their voice, nor abase himself for the noise of them: *so shall the Lord of Host* COME DOWN *to fight for Mount Zion and for the hill thereof.* AS BIRDS FLYING *so will the Lord of Host defend Jerusalem*; defending also he will deliver it; and passing over he will preserve it." Read also Zech. xiv. 2.

"At that time" Daniel's "people shall be delivered" from the invasion of the King of the North; "every one found written in the Book" of the Law living in Jerusalem Isa. 4. 3. shall be delivered from the dust of death. These verses, namely, the first, the second, and third identify the epoch of which they treat with the last vial, or Seventh Period of the Seventh Trumpet, which proclaims the resurrection of *the dead in Christ*." Then, "they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament" for glory; 'and they turn many to *righteousness* as the stars for ever and ever.' But, said the Adoni, "thou O Daniel, shut up the words" of this Discourse, "and seal the hieroglyphic scroll—*sapher*— until THE TIME OF THE END: many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased"—v. 4.

After this, an Angel inquired of the Adoni of glorious appearance, who stood upon the waters of Hiddekel, "*How long to the end of these wonderfull things?*" And the Adoni asseverated, that it should be "*for a time, times and a half, even unto the end of the dispersion of the power of the holy people*" and then all these wonderful events shall be developed. By this I understand, that the 1260 years, during which the Little Horn should *break* in pieces—*metal*—the holy ones *quodishi*—'of the Most High Aleim–*oluinin*:' should terminate with the dispersion of "their power." Some think that '*the saints*' in Daniel's visions is applicable only to "*the people* of the saints" —the *om quodishi oluinin* people of the holy ones of the Most High Aleim,—or those, who since the breaking up of the Jewish State, become 'saints,' or Christians, But the original text does not appear to me to warrant such a conclusion. The holy people [Deut. vii, 6.] or saints of Daniel's visions were a people *who once had power*, but which was subsequently broken and dispersed; which cannot be affirmed of the Disciples of Jesus subsequently to the destruction of Jerusalem. Now *the end* of the dispersion of the Jewish Power will be *the end* of the 1260 years during which the Little Horn is to prevail against them; this will be the end, which will synchronize with Michael's revelation from Heaven: but when the beginning of the 1260 is to be dated is a question to be deduced from other data. Of this we are certain the

period indica ed in Dan. vii. is not yet expired because the power of the *om qudash* the holy people, is still in a dispersed condition

Having informed Daniel, that the 1260 years mentioned in the Vision of the West ch vii,, was to end, when the Ancient of Days came to deliver "the mighty and the holy people" from the Little Horn–more than which Daniel understood not; the Adoni said to him —"Go thy way; for the words" of the discourse "are closed up and sealed TILL THE TIME OF THE END. * * none of the wicked shall understand, * * but THE WISE SHALL UNDERSTAND." He then proceeds to tell Daniel about the times which pertain to the Vision of the East; 1st, as to *the continuance of desolation*; and 2ndly, as to the *period when Michael shall appear*; by which he converges the times of the Two Visions to a point.

From the 11 v. as it now stands, one would suppose that the 1290 days were to commence at the taking away of the Daily. But this is not the fact. If we date them from the year 70, when "the sacrifice and the oblation were caused to cease," they leave us in the midst of a desolation which overspread the Land under the banners of the Papal Cross. We must therefore, have recourse to the Hebrew text and see if we cannot throw light upon the subject by a more literal translation. I present the following to the criticism of the learned reader. *Umot eusher etamid ulatat sequotz semem imim aleph matim utsoim*: 'and from the time of vengeance the Daily shall be taken away, even for to place AN abomination of desolation 1290 days.

"These be days of vengeance," said Jesus, when he was speaking of the dissolution of the Jewish Heavens, and consepuent cessation of the Temple-Worship; and the Hebrew word OT expresses that idea. It was from that 'time of vengeance' that the Daily disappeared; and it was taken away, that, *at some subsequent period* "AN abomination of desolation" might be placed in the Holy Land and City. That desolation still continues; therefore the 1290 years have not yet run out: the question, then, 'when will the period of desolation be accomplished?' still remains open for discussion.

The reader will observe, that the translation I have given, does not imply that the days began at the taking away of the Daily; but, that the Daily was taken away in order to make room for an abomination which was to desolate Judea for 1290 days or years, and which, whenever they might begin, were to end when the desolation should cease: and that was all the understanding Daniel could obtain of the matter.

But secondly, he was led to expect that it would be more days than 1290 to the period when he should 'stand in his lot,' even 45 more years. That is, that that number of years would elapse between the end of desolation and the standing up of Michael the Great Prince. 'Blessed,' continued the glorious Adoni, is he that waiteth, and labors for the 1335 days. But go thou thy way till the end; for thou shalt rest in Sheol 'and stand in thy lot at the end of the (1335) days.' Thus he concludes his discourse, having brought the end of the times of the Two Visions to a convergence: namely, of the 1260 and of the 1335 days; which evolve a consummation most ardently to be desired by every true and faithful expectant of the ANCIENT OF DAYS.

SPECULATIVE INTERPOLATION.

In Acts xxiii. 8 in the original Greek is this *mee einai anastasin, meede aggelon, meete pneuma*. This is the opinion of the Sadducees, and in the common translation is correctly rendered, that they say, *'that there is no resurrection neither angel nor spirit.'* This is a strictly grammatical translation, and cannot be improved. But it does not exactly suit the theory of the Demonologist as it stands there. Hence in the third edition of Mr. Campbell's version of Messrs Campbell, MacKnight, and Doddridge, certain words have been inserted expressive of his opinions; and thus the text is so interpolated as to appear as if the question between the Sadducees and pharisees was about *dead men's ghosts*, instead of, as it was in truth, whether Angel or Spirit had any existence at all.

Thus he interpolates it, "that there is no resurrection neither *good nor evil* angel, nor *departed* spirit. The words are in Italics to show that they are inserted, and they have no countersigns in the Greek. This is tampering with the scripture somewhat upon Beza's principle, to steal a march upon the heretics.

There are other places which have suffered a twist, doubtless for the same pious purpose! We shall look at these hereafter, and endeavour to straighten them. However, we congratulate Mr. Campbell on his apparent subsequent illumination; for, if we mistake not, in a later edition, perhaps the last, he has expunged the words "good and evil" and "departed:" but which he ought not to have done, if the insertion of them there was right in the first instance. This vacillation in a publisher proves that incertitude beclouds his mind upon the points of oscillation! *Editor.*

"IMMERSION" NOR "RE-IMMERSION,"

BUT

OBEDIENCE TO THE FAITH OF THE GOSPEL

FOR

THE REMISSION OF SINS.

BY THE EDITOR.

We neither preach 'Immersion for Remission of Sins,' *nor Re-Immersion*: but we reason with men out of the Scriptures, opening and alleging, that the prophets teach, that the Messiah who should come, should be a sufferer, or sacrifice for the sin of the world; that he should be buried in the rich man's tomb; and that he should not see corruption as others, but arise from the dead, and be thus begotten as the Son of God with power &c:–that he was to be delivered for our offences and raised again for our justification unto life. We go into the prophetic testimony freely upon these points in order to work faith in the minds of our hearers in relation to the great prophetic character; and this testimony we find only in 'the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms' or the Holy Writings of Israel.

We next proceed to prove, that of all claimants to the character of Messiah but one only, and He, Jesus of Nazareth, has established his identity with him of whom the Prophets speak. In doing this, we adduce the testimony of the Apostles and Evangelists. By these means we persuade men, that Jesus, and He only, is the Christ, the Son of the Living God; and so, we elaborate an intelligent belief in the doctrine concerning the Christ of the Jewish Oracles, and of the oneness between Him and Jesus.

If our pupil have rightly appreciated the Prophetic Records, he will have learned the gospel of glad tidings concerning the Christ, though he shall not have advanced so far as to apprehend that Jesus is that Christ. A Jew may believe thus far; but from, prejudice, refuse to examine the claims of Jesus as set forth in the New Testament: the belief of the gospel of God, which he had promised afore by his Prophets in the holy scriptures Rom. 1. 2. —will avail him nothing, unless he receive Jesus as the Son: this principle is the boundary line between the faith of Jew and that of Disciple of Jesus. Satisfied of the truth of the Apostolic Testimony, he admits the claims of Jesus; and in doing this, he applies the doctrine concerning the Christ to Jesus, and says, I believe that the blood of Jesus, is *the Blood of the New Institution, which was shed for many for* THE REMISSION OF SINS. In believing this, he believes the Gospel of Remission of Sins by the Name of Jesus. The Apostles believed this, before they understood how this Remission could be obtained; and in these times, men may believe the same thing, and yet die in their sins. Thus, a man convinced of sin, and believing that Remission of Sins is provided by the death and resurrection of Jesus, is prompted to inquire, 'Men and brethren what must I do that I may obtain pardon by this gospel of Jesus?' Were there none to reveal to him the secret, the mere belief of the gospel would avail him nothing–no more indeed, than a blind man's belief that the Sun shines, avails him for the purposes of sight.

Now, if our audience consist of the immersed and the unimmersed, and they apprehend that we have demonstrated "the truth;" then if this doctrine be *new to them*, the immersed demand, 'what the scripture teaches a man should do who believes this truth concerning Jesus and Remission of Sins?' the unimmersed manifest equal interest in the question. It is at this crisis, which modern audiences leave us to suppose may have arrived, that we turn to Acts ii 38, and read to them the cheering announcement, "Amend your lives, and be every one of you" who believe the Gospel, 'baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for remission of sins." And they that gladly receive this word are some of them *re-immersed*, and others, immersed for the first, and last, time; for *an intelligent obedience to the truth once, is all that is required of a sinner for remission of sins and a title to Eternal Life.*

We object to preaching "Baptism for remission of Sins" unless with strictly scriptural discrimination. We know, that many have no other idea of baptism than dipping in water; they do not understand, that it is the belief of the Gospel by the subject, which makes immersion, baptism: hence, they believe in "Immersion for Remission of Sins," by mistake, for "the Gospel or God concerning his Son Jesus Christ." No man, though "immersed for the remission of sins" is the subject of pardon, unless previous to his immersion he believed the truth. "Ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth," and before this can be obeyed, it must be understood and believed.

On similar grounds we would object to preaching re-immersion. It might lead to the idea that re-immersion, or a double immersion in water was necessary to remission: than which no idea can be more unscriptural. Preach, or rather teach, the uncorrupted gospel of Jesus, and it will lead to re-immersion in the vast majority of cases. There is no efficacy in water abstractly considered. Fifty immersions would not impart remission to an unbeliever. It is the belief of the true gospel, and that alone, which gives remission to the immersed; but, as we have shown, a belief of the truth, without immersion into Messiah, which is the obedience required, would leave a man unreconciled, unsanctified, unjustified, unpardoned, unwashed, unsaved.

The grand principle we desire to promote among men is *the intelligent belief of the gospel* in order to a spiritual purification, such as the Glorious King will own when he appears We speak of Re-Immersion, and of Baptism for Remission of Sins, as of questions at issue between men. We believe in both of them as explained above; and the following are the reasons why we contend for re-immersion in order to Baptism for Remission. These are found in the *facts* of the case. And first as to Greeks, Mormons, Baptists, &c, or that class of mankind who are Water-Dipped, immersion being the fashion, ceremony, or notion of themselves and "the church," to which circumstances, family connexion, or caprice, &c, may have inclined them.

The Water-Dipped, then, of the multitudinous class, have all been "immersed in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." This is a fact. Now, if immersion in the name etc,' be true baptism in these cases, then they are all pardoned; for Baptism is for remission of sins, and they are all "baptized." But this is a conclusion to which no one, intelligent in the scriptures, would come. The religionists we have enumerated, do not themselves admit it. The Mormon tejects the immersion of the whole of them, the Baptist also of the Mormon, and the Russo-Grecians, that of the Water-Dipping schisms of the West. Their reasons for rejecting one another's immersions are as diversified as their faiths: but it is not for us to compose their strifes. The fact, that they are at variance among themselves upon the question of *what makes immersion true baptism?* is all we wish to direct the attention of t he reader to in relation to them.

Does its validity depend on the administrator, the form of words used in connexion with it, the age of the subject, the position and times of dipping, etc? We reply, upon none of these; for the administrator, though ever so true a christian, can impart no efficacy to water, nor can he supply the deficiencies of the proselyte: a form of words is equally impotent, otherwise to immerse an infidel, saying, "I baptize you etc, for remission of sins" would by virtue of that form, impart to him "justification unto Life," which, though practically maintained by Baby-Dippers & Sprinklers, no enlightened man believes: the age of the subject imparts no efficacy to immersion, neither does a forward nor a supine position,

or one, two, or three or more plungings. But what saith the Scripture? This is the all important consideration.

We therefore, demand *upon what principle are Immersion, the Breaking of Bread, Prayer, and Contribution valid, and acceptable service to God?* We answer of Belief of the Truth in the worshipper, for it is written, that 'without faith it is impossible to please God:' and again—"we know that God heareth not sinners, but if any man be a worshipper of God, & *doeth his will*, him he heareth' God, then accepts that service, which consists in *doing believingly the thing that he appoints to be done*; and of all other service, or worship, which he has not instituted, and which therefore, when rendered is mere 'will-worship,' he says—'When ye come to appear before me who hath required this at your hand, to tread my courts? Bring no more vain oblations * * they are a trouble to me; I am weary to bear them. And when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you, yea, when you make many prayers, I will not hear.'

'Without Faith,' then 'it is impossble to please God.' But, what is this faith a man must have, and without which it is impossible to please Him? Is this a question for an enlightened man to put in the face of testimony, 'there is one faith?'—Belief of the Cospel, which is styled 'the faith,' 'the Law of the Spirit of the Life,' &c, is that One Faith, hence the Oracle reads 'without belief of the Gospel it is impossible to please God,' for he rewards them with remission of sins, &c, only who diligently seek Him in the Way he has appointed

We affirm, then, without fear refutation, and in the face of all the immersed world, that ,Immersion in the name, &c. is true Baptism only when predicated upon the belief of the Gospel of God concerning his Son Jesus Christ;' the subject must understand this and believe it (for he cannot believe it unless he understand it) or water will do him no good, though he may have been ceremonially 'immersed for remission of sins.' Men must be immersed into water into the faith of remission by the blood of Jesus, if they would enjoy the Remission of Sins in Baptism.

2. I reject the dipping of the immersionists before named on the ground of ignorance of the 'Gospel of God,' or the belief of *a perverted gospel.* I speak now in general terms; I do not refer to particular cases, which may be adduced as exceptions to the rule.

First, then, I regard the immersion of the Water-Dipped multitude, in the general, as invalid, because the subjects thereof are not believers in the scripture sense. "But" says one, "they all believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God!" They may, or they may not; but, if "faith is the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things unseen I deny that their faith is any thing but 'vain.' Let us look to facts; these "winna ding."

Is it the practise of the Baptist clergy to "reason out of the scriptures, opening and alledging, that the Christ must needs have suffered, and rose again from the dead; and that this Jesus whom Paul preached, is the Christ? Having proved this by the testimony of prophets and apostles—the only way it can be proved—do they then announce to the believers, that "to him give all the prophets testimony, that *through his name*, whosoever believeth in him shall receive the remission of sins?' Do they enjoin upon such as ask them what they shall do to obtain the remission of sins through his name, to "repent and be baptized every one of them in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins?" Are these the things they teach? If they be, then they are "faithful men and able to teach others."

But who will affirm that this is the character of their ministrations? Were any of their number to preach or teach thus, they would be cast out of the synagogue. They have been cast out for less "heresy" than this. The fact of the expulsion of preachers on this ground, fixes on the Baptists the sin of rejecting "the Gospel of God;" for, if they call them heretics who thus teach and believe, what further proof need we that they are enemics to the gospel, though indeed, ignorantly so? But what do they preach? We answer, the Traditions of Men!

Having "heaped up to themselves teachers after their own lusts, having itching ears; they have turned away their ears from the Truth, and are turned unto Fables. These who teach for the hire, are the fountain and origin of the faith and intelligence of the Baptists in general. From 'the sacred desk' they proclaim, that "the word of God is a dead letter, which kills"—"for the letter kills, but

the Spirit makes a alive!" Fearful of being killed by the word, yet taught that they are already dead, and therefore, no more understand and believe the killing letter than dead men, the ignorant world, yet with sense enough not to expend their time in puzzling themselves with what they are told they cannot comprehend (for the preachers themselves are blind)—trouble not themselves to read the scriptures. The Word is dead, the World is dead, and the Clergy and their outpourings, blind, dead, and ready to be entombed—in such a System of Death, whence can we expect to behold the Light of Life to arise?

Having sufficiently elaborated the uselessness of the Word of the Living God in the conviction of men, to the ample satisfaction of the People; the Bible, which they say is their religion, hath degenerated among them to the humble station of the Clergyman's Scrap Book! It is his Book of Texts, or Mottoes, from which, like a black spider he spins the thread, and weave the web of his discourses, 'sporting himself with his own deceivings, and beguiling unstable souls.' The benevolent and merciful character of the Divine Majesty, he clothes with the attributes of fury &. cruelty whoseglowing unappeased vengeance will damn to unfathomed depths of liquid fire, the immortal souls of the impenitent and unbelieving; who, in the same voice, are taunted with the agonizing and fiendish dogma, that however ardent their desire to repent, however willing to believe the truth, however intense their anxiety to escape this heaving Cauldron of burning Sulphur they can neither believe nor repent, unless this Awful Deity send his Spirit to make alive,—to give them faith and repentance unto Life!!! Who is the Philanthophist in all this? Certainly not the God, who commands faith and repentnace, knowing that the World is dead, and can neither see, hear, believe, or act unless he do these things for them! But who can question the philanthropy of the Clergy? For 'the love of souls' they preach the terrors of the Damned in Hell; and besiege Heaven with many prayers, both loud and long! If 'much speaking' would move the heart of the Divinity, whose Ambassordors they claim to be; if intense and valuable obsecration can attest their benevolence, then the palm of kindness and sympathy for the spiritual woes of mankind must be decreed to them! But, believe it who may, we expect the 'love of money' has more to do with these flaming ministrations than the 'love of souls.'

Those of the People simple enough to believe the fables and traditions deleivered to them, and maddened to the furor of despair, crowd to the benches, seats, or pens appointed for the anxious, and mourning devotees of these soul-loving gentlemen! Upon what principle, we ask, do the Clergy and the People join in the Mourning Bench Exercise? On the principle that they are the Mediators between God and the Mourners, and that the People are more willing to besaved than God is to save them; for, the fact is that the Clergy 'bear up the souls to a throne of grace,' as they say, and beseech God to send his spirit to give them faith, repentance, and pardon for which spirit they are waiting and agonizing to receive! But after all, even if He sends the the Spirit, as they allege, he grants it, perhaps, only to one or two, and the rest he sends away empty!!

Such is the philosphy of Mourning Benchism! It is a 'vain philosophy,' and predicated upon the most consumate ignorance of the Truth. This truth teaches, that God loved the World so intensely, that he sent his son to die for it; that 'if any man will hear his voice and open the door he will come in to him, and will sup with him:' in this spirit of kindness he merits the affections of men. 'Come', saith he, all ye that are weary, and heavy laden, and I will give you rest!'—'Though I was rich, yet for your sakes I beaome poor, that ye through my poverty might be rich.'—God is willing to be reconciled; he requires, and needs no agonizing; no loud, long, and boisterous outpourings to beseech him to be reconciled to men: he sent the Apostles as his Ambassadors and substitute for the personal ministration of his son, to preach by the Spirit the Word of Reconciliation. God therefore, by their writings doth now beseecht he world to be reconciled to Him. The Clergy direct their prayers to the wrong parties; instead of praying to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to come down and save these willing sinners, they ought to pray to the sinners and beseech them to be reconciled to God by obeying the Truth.

Well, the few accepted ones, to whom say the Clergy, 'God has spoken peace,' have

now obtained a hope!' What do they hope? They hope they have 'got religion;' they hope they have obtained pardon by the spirit; they hope they are Christians; and *because they hope they are pardoned* they are immersed to enter the Baptist Church! Now, put all these things together, and then tell us how much of the Gospel of God can be elaborated from them! A dead word, a dead man, a hireling textuary, damnation in fire, long, loud, and boisterous prayers to God, to give his spirit to sinners to enable them to repent of they know not what, to believe without testimony things of which they are as ignorant as Hottentots, &c, what is there in, all this purifying to the soul, or worthy of the name of Gospel? Is there any faith here, or the means of faith? What but solemn mockery and sin; aninsult to the Divine Majesty, a blot and stain upon the benevolence, justice, wisdom, and truth of God? *Ex nihilo nihil fit*—from nothing nothing comes is the only conclusion in the case as far as their belief of the gospel is concerned.

Now these are facts, notorious facts, which demonstrate that the Clergy and People neither understand nor believe the gospel: if they do, then they are vile for practising such abominations in the name of Christianity: if they do not, then, they are truly worthy of commiseration. The last alternative we believe to be the true one. Now we speak to those who understand the scriptures, and inquire, *do you honestly believe, that immersion predicated upon such premises is Christian Baptism?* If you are intelligent and of a God fearing spirit you will answer, '*I do not.*' You know that these cases are not the exceptions, but the rule; if then you be a man of true and honest heart why would you smuggle such persons into a church, professing primitive Christianity, by giving them simply 'the right hand of fellowship?' We protest against such a practice, and repudiate it as fatal to the purity and peace of the Church of God.

But, if it be urged, that these immersed people believe that Jesus is the Christ, that he was put to death for sin, and rose again, and that therefore their immersion is true baptism; we rejoin possibly they assent to these things as matters of common credence, but then how much more Human Tradition do they believe with them? The Pharisees made void the Law by their traditions; so the Clergy make void the Gospel by theirs. The Man of Sin affirms that he believes all these things which make up the Gospel, he is an ample believer; for he believes too much, and therefore makes of none effect the truth he does believe. Immerse the Son of Perdition who 'believes' all things; would his immersion be true baptism? Why not? Oh! he believes so much that is false; and this is true of every other son of perdition, who believes a gospel compounded of truth and error. His baptism is invalid; and he is yet in his sins.

If the Clergy preached the gospel, or if the scriptures were, not only *read* (for their reading is objectless; chiefly to satisfy conscience) —but searched as for hid treasures, or as men say *studied*; both in public meeting and privately—it would be reasonable to expect to find many *obedient believers* among the Immersed in spite of the viciousness of a corrupt system. But to use the scriptures in the 'Sacred Desk' as a book of texts or mottoes, and to read a chapter night and morning from a sense of duty, is not 'searching the scriptures because in them ye think to obtain eternal life.' Man may read the gospel in this way, as we ourselves have done till 28 years old, and thousands all the days of their life, and be as ignorant thereof as though their eyes had never ran over the Scriptural Typography. Men must read and investigate, they must examine the Word as a whole, as a complete revelation of the Way of the Lord to Eternal Life—if they would be renewed in the spirit of their minds. But we say again, this is not the way men use the Bible, and hence the poverty of their faith as evinced in their worldlimindedness, and subserviency to human tradition instead of submission to the Divine Law.

Again, it is proof of the ignorance of the immersed, the fact that they oppose the gospel for remission of sins imparted to the true believer in baptism. Clergy, and People denounce those who hold this as 'heritics'. Some of them, however, subsequently confess they did this ignorantly, and that now they perceive these 'heritics' were right. Is this change of opinion tantamount to obeying the gospel, which formerly they opposed? Their own declaration proves that they were ignorant of the gospel, for it was because of this ignorance they denounced those whom they

now profess to believe are right. Is the immersion of such true baptism? They were ignorant (or if not ignorant they were dishonest)—as their opposition proves; they were then *mis*believers: is the immersion of a misbeliever, any more than that of an *un*believer, true baptism? Is there more efficacy in believing a *wrong* thing than in believing *no* thing for remission of sins? We conclude, not; but that misbelief and unbelief are equally disqualifying, and that immersion or re-immersion predicated upon either of these are not more purifying to the conscience than the sprinkling of an infant upon the eighth day.

We conclude, then, *as a general rule*, that the unimmersed opponents of the gospel are not the subjects of Christian Baptism; but justice, honesty, and truth, all require the confession that, *neither are multitudes, who believe in, and are immersed for remission of sins*. This doubtless may startle some who are called 'reformers;' but to them, we say, "strike, but hear us."

1. The Mormons all profess to believe in baptism for remission of sins, and are also immersed for remission. While descending the Illinois River in 1843, we asked a Mormon elder on board to see what he would say. 'Pray sir, amid all the contrariety of views upon the subject, what answer would you give to the inquiry 'what must I do to be saved?' He replied, 'if you believe that Jesus is the Christ, repent and be baptised in his name for remission of sins'!—This was very good. 'Why then,' says one, 'would you not acknowledge him as in Christ?'—Because, though he believes the truth for remission, he believes so much more than the truth, which is downright blasphemy, that the truth he does believe is corrupted, and thus made of 'none effect.' The Mormon like the Pharisee, has made void the Law of God by his traditions. The belief of a perverted gospel is as fatal as the belief of no gospel at all. For this reason, then, we repudiate his pretensions to a Son of God.

2. But, if the Mormon believes too much, there are others immersed for remission, who believe too little. We know as matter of fact that numbers are immersed upon a simple *profession* that they believe that Jesus is the Christ. Now immersion upon this profession, or confession, looks fair, and in apostolic times was doubtless all sufficient, but, we affirm, that it is not sufficient now.

We say, we take the scriptures for our rule of faith and practice: we would prove this saying. What do they say?—'Go preach THE GOSPEL to every creature, he that believes and is baptised shall be saved, he that believes not shall be damned.' But how is this rendered by some in these latter times?—'he that believes *that Jesus is the Christ*, and is immersed shall be saved.' Now here is a marked discrepancy, and the fruit which results from each is as diversified as the belief of the two proclamations.

The reader will perceive, that the subject matter of the commission given to the Apostles was THE GOSPEL—'Go preach the gospel; he that believes, &c'—Believes what? That Jesus is the Christ? No, but 'he that believes the Gospel and is baptized shall be saved; he that believes not the Gospel shall be damned.' This is the grammatical, and therefore only true construction. A man of this age may profess to believe that Jesus is the Christ, and not believe the Gospel; but he cannot believe the Gospel and not believe that Jesus is the Christ.

The Apostacy objects to the practice of the Reformers, that they will take any one who says he believes that Jesus is the Christ and immerse him for remission of sins. This objection is raised in defence of its own practice of extorting 'experiences' from proselytes. But two wrongs will not make one right. Unfelt experiences are refuges of lies, which added to a profession of faith in Jesus, pervert it, and make it of none effect. Reformers have thrown these experiences overboard, leaving behind only '*the faith in Jesus*,' which in modern acceptation, the Apostacy know to be worth no more than '*faith in Mahomet*' to a Turk. And why? Because, both these 'faiths' are mere matters of general report. A believes in Mohammed for the same reason that B believes in Jesus; not from the examination of testimony, but because they are born in Mahomedom or Christendom: every body says so, and therefore it is so. This is not faith, but credulity.

We fear, that there is too much truth in the objection. Let us analyse the system of proselyting *in numerous instances*. We are not speaking of universals; there are many honorable exceptions: we speak, however, of what is known, to reform and not to irritate.

A meeting is convened. One rises, and delivers a discourse upon the theory of spiritual operations in which those who hold the popular view come in for no little ridicule; or he may preach against creeds and 'experiences,' and sweep every thing before him but *Credo* that Jesus is the Christ; his audience is convinced, that the Spirit operates only through the word, and that this is all a man need believe. The preaching is wound up by a warm exhortation, which is finished off by a stirring song, called 'a recruiting song.' An invitation having been given for persons to come forward and be immersed for remission of sins, one or more present themselves. The question is then put, 'Do you believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God?'—A simple 'yes!' gives all the information, that the inquisitor dare ask for consistently with the doctrine delivered in his discourse. Upon the thing implied in this 'yes,' the subject is immersed for the remission of sins. 'Well,' says one, 'how do you know but that all is as it should be?' We reply, 'by their fruits ye shall know them.'—If the tree yeild good fruit, we conclude, that the subject knew more of the truth than he could possibly have derived from the discourse, or there was implied in the monosyllable 'yes:' if the tree yield evil fruit, it is no more than might be expected. When we see professors, though immersed for remission, more addicted to 'battling the sects,' than to 'contending earnestly for the faith:' whining about persecution instead of 'rejoicing that they are accounted worthy to suffer shame;' religious only in a crowd of co-religionists, straying off to the folds of the Apostacy save when an evangelist presents himself in their neighborhood to preach against sectarianism, or on spiritual operations &c, arguing for union with those whom formerly he proclaimed to be in Babylon, demonstrating how little difference there is between Baptists and Reformers; brawling against 'untaught questions and speculations;' crying "peace, peace!"—and either reverting to the Baptist or the non-professing world: when we see these fruits among others, we know that the truth never entered the heart of that man, because, such are not the fruits of the truth of God.

Unless a man be acquainted with the doctrine concerning the Christ as taught by God's ancient Prophets, how can he know whether Jesus be the person? If men are led to imagine, that the Old Testament is the Book chiefly of the Religion of Moses—an old almanac, as it were, of past events—where are they to learn that doctrine? The Prophetic testimony concerning the Christ is indeed glad tidings to the intelligent, and their confession that Jesus is that Messiah is the 'good confession' of a truth which has renewed them after the Image of him who created them: but this is not the confession of the generality; these repeat the words, but understand not of what they affirm, and hence the unregenerate and degenerate fruits which they bring forth. The immersion of such is of as little efficacy as that of any other class of 'professing christians.'

The great evil seems to be, that there is too much theory and too little of the Divine Testimony presented to the people. What does it matter how the spirit operates to produce faith; lay the testimony before them, and a few will believe it. There is no room for oratory here; but the practice is apostolic, and it will create believers of the truth, who will be an honor to the name of Christian. Such preaching of the word will make disciples of a primitive character, and you may know them, as men who are free, and who fear nothing but to hold error, and to practice iniquity; and whose present anxiety is to be ready for their coming Lord.

While we repudiate the fabulous experiences of the Apostacy we contend that proselytes ought to be better instructed than they are before immersion. Ask a novice in science, 'of what is water composed?' He cannot tell: but vary the question, "Do not Oxygen and Hydrogen, when chemically combined in certain definite proportions, which are exact multiples of one another, form water?'—What is more easy than to say 'yes!'—So that if you ask, 'Do you believe the gospel?'—He says 'yes!'—but ask him *what the Gospel is?* and he is as much at a loss to tell, as to define the constitution of water, of which he knows nothing. A man can tell what he knows, but, if he does not know, it is certain he cannot tell; and if he cannot tell

it is the business of the brethren to instruct him through their elders, who should be "apt to teach," and to whom the matter properly belongs as part of their duty.

The declaration 'I believe that baptism is for remission of sins,' if by baptism is meant simply immersion, is not The Gospel, for immersion in water, without belief of *the* truth, is not purifying. The 'One Faith' is made up of the belief, that the Christ died for sins, was buried, and rose again from the dead according to the Prophets. This is the 'Gospel of God promised afore by his prophets in the holy scriptures—Rom. 1. 2.' Here is a sacrifice set forth, who, when he should appear, should by the one offering of himself procure remission of sins. Jesus is that Christ, who was to be both Son of God and Son of man. I believe then on the testimony of Apostles and Prophets, that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the Living God, and that he was delivered for the offences, and raised again for the justification of all, who will submit to his government. This, connected with the "One Hope of our Calling," is glad tidings of great joy to the believer; and creates in him a desire to avail himself of the benefits of this gospel which he believes. What must I do? Do? Why obey the gospel you believe! What does that obedience consist in? In being baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for remission of sins.'—When such a believer is immersed, he has "purified his soul in obeying the truth through the spirit:" who would not thus "Wash and be clean?"

ECCLESIASTICAL POLITICS.

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR TO A FRIEND IN THE FAR WEST.

LETTER VI.

Richmond Va. Sept. 28, 1843.

Much Esteemed Friend,

The signal overthrow with which my 'doing God-service' opponents were routed, the details of which I forwarded to you in my last, operated like oil upon the troubled sea. As far as I know, the coalition was broken; at all events, they ceased to interrupt me any further. I had met them single handed, and face to face before a full house, and though marshalled in full force, they failed at every point and decamped discomfitted. This is the way I like to beat the enemy in fair and open combat. If a man have the truth on his side and a mind conscious of rectitude before God and Man, what is there under the heavens in the shape of clay of which he need be afraid? I stood before them on the testimony of Prophets and Apostles, the advocate of the Ancient Gospel of Jesus Christ in contradistinction to their old worn out traditions. They made no effort to prove me wrong, but meanly conspired to entrap me, and by a delinquent church member, to break down my character by endeavoring to make me out at once a liar and a factionist! I always judge of people by their moral associations; and when I behold 'Evangelist' Chester Bullard, and 'Elder' Silas Shelburn making use as they seemed to do, of an individual, of whom I heard none speak in commendation while I remained in the county, but many to the contrary, to annoy and stigmatize one in good repute with some of the first citizens in Lunenburg, by whose fellowship they are honored,—when I see this, I say, I envy them not the kind of self respect they experience, nor the consciences they will possess when I confront them before the Judge of all: I scorn to encounter them with the weapons or the tactics they employ against me; if I cannot confute a man's arguments I will never have recourse to popish artifice of assaulting his character. I thank God! I am actuated by a nobler and more chivalrous spirit than this; the sin of such meanness shall never be justly laid to my charge. O my friend, I cannot express to you, how utterly I despise it!

After my introduction at Freedom, appointments were made for me at Springfield, Meherrin, Mount Olivet, Tussekiah, Mercy Seat, Oak Grove, and Concord. I was very kindly entertained by Brethren Arvins, Boswell, Leeter, Stone, Boswell, Ragsdale, May, Smithsin, Hardy, Geo, Crymes, J. & T. & S. Fowlkes, Jordan, Baym, Staples and others; in short, I had more invitations than I could possibly comply with. The hospitality was truly Virginian and Christian; and, I can assure you, that denounced as I am on every side for a person of evil and wicked disposition, it is no small gratification to be welcomed to the hearths of brethren who stand as high in the estimation of their fellow-citizens as these. Without, had been fightings, but now all was peace; and in our social intercourse we were free from fears. I visited from house to house and from one neighborhood to another, none venturing to withstand me. I spoke to the citizens without let or hinderance; nor do I think, that any of them will affirm, that I did ought but speak forth the words of truth and soberness.

There is a good deal of flash-in-the pan preaching in Lunenburgh, as well as elsewhere, I will tell you, what sort of consequences result from it. Here is a specimen. A preacher reads a passage. He then makes a brief exordium, with a pretty allusion to the text, which soon glides into an 'exhortation,' or rather declamatory harangue, which is involved in deep swelling undulations of vocal sounds. Like music, it charms the ear; but fails to improve the understanding or chasten the affections. These big swelling sounds all fall upon the outward ear: they rumble upon the tympanum, or drum, and like a boisterous knocking at the door at midnight arouse the inmates from their slumbers, with Cautiousness dreadfully alarmed. Had Causality been first awoke, the sleeper would have demeaned herself with order and decorum; but Cautiousness when frantic is blind, and rushes headlong to the perpetration of the greatest follies. So it is with this kind of preaching, or more properly *roistering*. It clamors at the outer ear, while all the other faculties are asleep but Cautiousness and dements the hearers or scares them. Immersion is then preached to them, and away they go to the water, and are 'baptized for the remission of sins.' What said one of these converts to me, 'would you think of such baptism as this? I read the Bible as a duty, but it is a mighty dark book to me, I can't understand it. I went to hear ——— preach, and got scared, and went forward to be immersed. I repented of what I had done, for I was not satisfied, and as I was going down to the water I would have turned back, only I thought it would be a disappointment to my friends: so I went on and was immersed for remission of sins. What do you think of it?' Nothing at all, I replied. This is not the only case, there are several others of the same sort. They were dipped for the remission of sins under excitement, produced by the means I have described: and the next thing you hear of them is that they are dissatisfied and 'refuse to commune.' There were four or five such cases added to the troubles of the ——— church shortly before I arrived there.

The philosophy of the agitation in Eastern Virginia, and other parts among 'reformers' is comprised in this question:—*Is the immersion of a subject in water 'in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit,' who is ignorant of the pure unadulterated Gospel of Jesus Christ, 'baptism in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins?'* And it may be added, *Does such an immersion predicated upon ignorance of the gospel become effectual for remission of sins, by acquiring a knowledge of the truth* AFTER THE FACT. This is the gist of the whole matter. In Lunenburg, 'Evangelist' B. and 'Elder Shelburn' who *'receive Baptists into the Kingdom'* by giving them their right hands of fellowship, say, *by this practice*, 'you we believe that such an immersion is baptism into Christ,' that it puts men into possession of remission, though they did not know it at the time; that it makes them fit for reception into 'the kingdom' by our right hands; that, though they are 'in Christ,' and pardoned, they are not in the kingdom, until they confess that Acts 11. 38 really teaches, that sins are remitted in baptism, and join us; and, in harmony with this, if they panegyrize the gospel with ideal flights, and by embellishments of the state of the damned, the giddy worlding is scared into the water

and immersed for the remission of sins, that he is not only 'in Christ but in the Kingdom!!, I say, whatever they may protest to the contrary, their actions, whose language is more intelligible and ingenuous than their words, loudly proclaim the construction I have put upon them. Now, can Messrs Bullard and Shelburn lay their hands upon their hearts, and before God, who knows the secrets of their inmost souls, declare that they understood and believed the unadulterated Gospel of Jesus Christ, as it is taught in the Acts of the Apostles, before they were immersed in water? If they cannot, then they are carnal unregenerate, nullifiers of the Gospel. They may have been 'born of water,' but on this hypothesis, they are yet unbegotten of the spirit, and therefore not spiritual, but animal, and in their sins. I do not wonder at their persecuting me by their mean devices; for, as in the days of Ishmael and Isaac, 'he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the spirit, even so it is now–Gal. iv. 29.'

Now, I must inform you, that there are a goodly number in Eastern Virginia, who dissent from Messrs Bullard and Shelburn's creed. I call it their creed; not that they have a regular written creed, unless the document in the 'Chr. Publisher' be considered such; but, as I am speaking of Lunenburg in particular, where they are the candles of that side of the question, I call the traditions delivered and practised by them and their 'colaborers,' *their* creed. Well; the Dissenters from this creed, maintain as a first principle, that sinners are '*renewed by knowledge*,' and not by water. That is, that a Man in his sins is styled by Paul' *the old man with his deeds*,' and in order for this man to become '*a new man in the image of his Creator*,' he must be created new, by a knowledge of the gospel, which Paul preached, and thus become a 'new creature,' or creation. Now, it is manifest, that to renew the Old Man he must first be indoctrinated with the unadulterated gospel. This is an immutable axiom in the religion of Christ; and in strict conformity with the scriptural exemplification of the manner in which the Apostles proselyted Jews and Gentiles to the 'One Faith.' These Dissenters maintain, that the Gospel is good news, and produces joy in the heart of him that believes it; and that by this, it may generally, though not universally, be known, whether the thing believed be gospel; that if the result of preaching be to generate fear, anguish, dispair, remorse, the thing believed, or received, is not gospel but a perversion of the gospel; and that they are justified in this conclusion, by the fact that *a tree is known by its fruit*. This good news, they contend is *the remission of sins and eternal life by the death and ressurrection of Jesus; to all who believe upon the testimony of the Prophets and Apostles, that he is the Son of God, that, 'he died for sins according to the scriptures, was buried, and rose again according to the Scriptures.'* They argue, that remission of sins comes by blood and not by water; as it is written, 'this is my blood of the New Institution, which is shed for many for the remission of sins;' and 'without shedding of blood is no remission;' and lastly, 'the blood of Jesus Christ, God's Son, cleanseth us from all sin.' That the intelligent belief of the truth concerning the blood of Jesus, styled, 'the blood of sprinkling, which speaks better things than the blood of Abel, is the 'sprinkling of the heart from an evil conscience' by the blood of Jesus Christ; but that the purification of the conscience is not perfected until the subject, or believer, 'obeys the truth.' They contend that these things are not understood, and therefore, not believed by the proselytes of the Baptist Denomination before they are immersed. That the popular gospel of this sect is *remission of sins by the spirit*, combined with a volume of traditions, which are sufficient to make even the apostolic gospel of none effect. That these being the premises, they believe too little truth and too much even to constitute their Creed a faith well pleasing to God, and that, therefore, an immersion predicated therein 'is nothing better than a Jewish Ablution,' which under the New Institution cannot purge the conscience.

Now, they contend, that as the professed object of reformers is to revive in the present age, the Christianity of the first, it is the duty of all to examine themselves by the word, and, that if they find themselves condemned, forthwith to obey the truth as well as to believe it; and furthermore in relation to those who are without, none ought to be added to the Disciples, who cannot prove that they understood the gospel before they were immersed.

The Dissenters believe in baptism in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins;' as already indicated; that is, they do not believe, that the immersion of a man in water who before his dipping is ignorant of the gospel, even though he is immersed for the remission of sins, is therefore pardoned, and consequently an heir of Eternal Life; nor do they believe an assent to the proposition. that Jesus is the Son of God, and a subsequent immersion, is baptism for remission; for the commission does not read—'Go preach that I am the Son of God.' He that believes and is baptized shall be saved; but it reads—'Go preach THE GOSPEL, he that believes (the gospel) and is baptized [or obeys it] shall be saved' from his sins:—but they believe, that he who first understands the unadulterated gospel, and believes what he understands, and is then 'baptized into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit,' is 'baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for remission of sins,' although the phrase 'remission of sins' may not have been expressed in the formula.

From what I have here written, you will readily discern the true ground of difference between these two classes. the former are contented with the belief of the gospel, and immersion; but the Dissentients, are dissatisfied with any thing short of an intelligent belief as the predicate of an immersion into Christ, upon the principles that 'without faith it is impossible to please God;' and that 'whatsoever is not of faith is sin.'

The Gospel is easy to be understood by an attentive student of the scriptures. I find it, however, very difficult to make the public understand it. People generally, have their heads so full of old traditions, as soon as one makes a simple statement, a crowd of veteran prejudices seize hold of and torture it almost to death. There is nothing easier in the world than to mystify; but to disentangle the truth from the discordant notions which interest and ignorance weave around it is a task which surpasses the fabled labors of Hercules. That we may hold on to it to the end with the gripe of death amid the conflicts of time is the prayer of your companion in tribulation.

JOHN THOMAS.

THE CHRISTIAN JOURNAL AND MR. B. F. HALL.

In the 13th no. Vol. 3, of the Christian Journal is the following note to its conductor from B. F Hall.

VERSAILLES, JUNE 11, 1844

BROTHER FERGUSON:

Dear Sir:—It is reported that you have told Dr. John Thomas in a letter that you agree with him in his peculiar views of the *annihilation* of the wicked, and have Christian fellowship for him, notwithstanding his sentiments concerning infants, idiots, pagans, &c, and notwithstanding also his treatment of bro. A. Campbell and other brethren in Virginia, and his bitter and uncompromising hostility to the Reformation generally.

A number of brethren join me in the request that you shall insert the above together with your answer in the Christian Journal.

Yours Truly,
B. F. HALL.

To this indictment, our brother Editor appends the following reply.

'But a few words are necessary in answer to the above; I was applied to sometime ago, by two of the principle Brethren of Virginia, one of whom has had serious difficulties with Dr. Thomas, to open a correspondence with the Doctor in order to ascertain the possibility of effecting a reconciliation between him and the Virginia brethren. After serious reflections, I decided it to be my Christian duty to accept the mediation. The Virginia brother said he was *willing to bury the past for the sake of peace*, upon certain conditions, and some hope seemed to be entertained by him that all difficulties might be settled between the Doctor and our brethren. I entered upon the mediation in, I trust a right spirit, notwithstanding my non-fellowship of th Doctor's speculations and disapproval of his course. I

did not manifest myself to him as a *combatant*, but as a *mediator*: still I occasionally found it necessary to combat his views, passing by others *for the time*. Bro. Shannon was connected in this correspondence and approved of what I wrote; and although we had but small hope of effecting a reconciliation, the Law of Christ would not permit us to refuse to make the effort. I trust that my brethren will not do me the injustice to suppose that I would thus publicly notice a *private correspondence*, if mis representations had not been made concerning it. Even Dr. Thomas will perceive that we say only what is absolutely necessary—*no more*. Whilst I have no fellowship for a single speculation of the Doctor's, I did not write to him as if he were a *heathen*. If, from any expression in my letters to him it is inferred that I approve either of his course or of his opinions, I am misrepresented.' *Chr. Jour.*

1. We would remark that, it was in consequence of the report alluded to in Mr. Hall's epistle that bro. Ferguson dispatched the note which stands at the head of our correspondence. 'It is reported,' says Mr. H. yes! Who reported it? We state a fact, and the reader can judge for himself. Mr Hall was in Louisville recently and during his stay here, he saw our bro. Dr Stewart, who in conversation told him, that Bro. Ferguson believed in the destruction of the wicked; and in confirmation quoted a passage of Bro. F's letter, where he says "*As for the destruction of the wicked there is nothing taught more palpably in the Oracles of God.*' Mr. Hall returned to the interior were the report also found its way. Who carried it there? Who circulated it with the divers appendages affixed to it in his letter in Versailles and the region round about? We conclude that Mr. Hall did, and this conclusion we expressed, before the Journal came to hand.

2. Thus Mr. Hall circulates a garbled report in the interior, and then gets up a conjoint epistle to the Editor of the Journal setting forth the heinous offence of his alledged agreement with Dr. John Thomas in his peculiar views, &c! Not satisfied with this, in order to make the offence more odious, he affirms certain unblushing falsehoods concerning us and the reformation. So that if it should turn out to be a true report, his "bro. Ferguson," would be convicted of aiding and abetting, heterodoxy, faction, and rebellion, against A. C. the Virginia brother, and the reformation generally; and therefore deserving only the fate of Jonah, that 'the ship reform' be not overwhelmed in the tempestuous sea! Mr. Hall and his copartners in this note appear to us like the big fish, prepared to swallow up the Editor should he be found criminal and it prove necessary to throw him overboard. We no longer marvel, that our worthy brother should demand of us in such haste, copies of his letters, that *those interested might know precisely what had passed between us*!,

3. From the general tenor of M. H's note it appears to be regarded as an offence to hold fellowship with us, *because* of our views of the destiny of the wicked, and the third class of mankind who live and die under '*Times of Ignorance*;' and because we have spirit enough to defend 'the unadulterated word' and our rights and character from the assaults of A. C. and certain Baptist Divines, who co-labor with him, in moulding the reformation into a 'New Donomination' of which they aspire to be the overseers. This is not the place to justify our treatment of the parties in question; one thing, however, we will say without fear of condradiction, that in all our controversy with them, *we have* never *assailed their characters*. They may be what the world calls good men, but we feel assured they are mistaken men. We argue that our cause is good, yea, better than theirs. Does the reader ask us why? Because they do not appeal to testimony, to scripture testimony, and reason, but default of these they take refuge in calumnies to support their tottering positions. To such refuges as these we scorn to have recourse. If we cannot maintain our ground on fair and open controversy, we will abandon it and admit that it is indefensible.

4. But to return, it appears that the test of fellowship with Mr. Hall and his friends is, to believe their antithetic dogma to destruction, namely, *the existence of wicked men in burning sulphur to infinity*. Well give us the thus saith the Lord, and we will believe it. Men must furthermore renounce our sentiments concerning the third class; and they must condemn our course towards A. C. and so forth. This do, says Mr. Hall, in effect, and you shall live, that is, in his esteem! Is not this a creed, a test? I suppose, Bro. Ferguson had declared his argument with us in our views, and had avowed his inalienable right to aver and defend his conclusions, what would Messrs Hall and Co. have done next? But after all, what equivalent does Mr. Hall offer the man, who agrees with our views, if he will come out and assume a position against us? His fellowship!! We shall ascertian hereafter how much this is worth.

5. But, we have said, that Mr. H. has in his note affirmed unblushing falsehoods against us; and we repeat it advisedly. He charges us with '*bitter and uncompromising hostility to the Reformation in general*.' Now in relation to this calumny we declare that there is not one word of truth in it. In the first place, all our friends belong to what is technically styled 'this reformation,' they are members of those churches, professing to be based upon reformation, principles; and are contending with us for a complete return to original christianity as a preparation for the coming of the Lord. Have we any bitter and uncompromising hostility to 'them.' The idea is too ridiculous to be entertained for a moment. We are not then hostile 'to the Reformation *in general*.' This then is a false accusation. But we have been denounced by 'the Rev. Messrs' B F. Hall, A Campbell, Thomas M. Henley, J. Goss, R. L. Coleman, J. Henshall, Silas Shelburn, C. Bullard, and some others. True. But are these the Reformation in general.' By viewing their importance through the microscope of their own self esteem, it may possibly become tumefied into this thing; but even assuming them to be 'the Reformation in general,' we deny before the searcher of all hearts, that we foster any 'bitter and uncompromising hostility' against them. We scorn to entertain such a feeling against any man. We regard them as deceiving and being deceived, and, we doubt not conscientiously even, as Paul, who imagined he was doing God service in persecuting Stephen to death. What! A King and Priest of God, elected through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth, to share in the sovereignty with Christ over the nations of the Future Age, and be the victim of so demonical a feeling as that of *bitter* hostility to our poor deluded fellow-man! Perish the thought! Would that we could persuade our selves that our assailants were not possessed of this spirit! But we do not ragard these gentlemen as 'the Reformation in general.' With the exception of Mr. Henshall the discoverer of a new way into the Kingdom, they were all clergymen; and, except friend A. C., 'new measure-men;' patrons of mourning benches and anxious seats. According to Mr. B. F. Hall's own account of his 'Evangelical Labors!' (and we take him for a type of his brethren) they set the people to sobbing and sighing, and extorting piteous groans from the aching hearts;' called them up to altars and pens, or something else, to be prayed for; but after all, had to send them away 'uncomforted.' *Why were they thus sent away*? BECAUSE BEING IGNORANT OF THE GOSPEL, THEY DID NOT KNOW WHAT TO TELL THEIR FOLLOWERS TO DO, THAT THEY MIGHT OBTAIN THE REMISSION OF THEIR SINS? Now, if they knew not what to prescribe to others for salvation, how can they pretend that they had obeyed the gospel themselves? Reason and common sense plainly attest the dilemma in which they are involved. They see it, doubtless, and feel it too. *A man cannot believe that of which he is ignorant.* If they had obeyed the gospel, they knew what it was, and could have told others: but they did not tell them. Why? Either because they knew and would not tell them, or because they did not know, and therefore could not. To place them on the first horn, would be to charge them with mockery of the people; hence the only alternative is the latter. Now, they profess to teach baptism, or obedience to the gospel, or the truth, for remission of sins. Good. We wish them God speed in this proclamation; but we say, not only say but do! Why do ye not yourselves obey the truth? Why preach to others what you do not practice in your own cases? Do you call this reformation? If you do, we do not.

6. We advocate the Ancient Gospel in faith and practice by people and clergy. This is our old ground and we have never departed from it. Does 'the Reformation in general' plead for this in deed and in truth. If it do then we are agreed; if it do not, then, we ask of every honest disciple, ought we to cease to oppose those who call themselves reformers, but who nulify the truth in their own practice. They naturally dislike a principle which condemns them, and therefore it is that they treat us so unseemly. In the begining we did not address them personally as we do now; we simply contended for the principle that *where there is no knowledge there is*

no faith. They had sagacity to discover the application of the principle in their own cases, and hence their outcry against him who advocates the principle. Default of arguments they now resort to calumny, and, place a kind of necessity upon us to say something by way of counteracting their evil efforts. This they term hostility to the reformation, as if the chastisement of their evil deeds were hostility to reform! But their crooked policy is, so to identify themselves with the reformation as to make the public imagine, that the merited castigation of their naughtiness is bitter and uncompromising hostility to the Reformation in general:' no, this is not the fact, we '*rebuke them sharply before all*,' that they may become reformers indeed, and not to disgrace the reformation *by professing one thing and practicing another.* When we speak of this 'reformation' we quote it as expressive of *a theory unapplied to practice*, and not as a sneer at true genuine reform. We are the unwavering friend and advocate of the Ancient Gospel and Order of Things: this all who know us can fully testify.

7. A word in conclusion concerning this same mystical chameleon Mr. B. F. Hall, the first man, who, some years ago, voluntered his services against us under the *anonymous* signature of 'Plain Dealing' he denounced us to the world as a 'Factionist,' and predicted that we should be an infidel in six months from that time! Was Hall also among the phrophets? Even so; but they happen to be the false prophets; for his vaticination did not come to pass. At that time he was co-editor of the Gospel Advocate. H. may be 'a very fine man' as the phrase is for any thing we know; we speak of him only *theologically.* From his letter one would suppose, that he was just what a reformer ought to be: for he that undertakes to call others to account has doubtless an unblemished reputation for consistency himself! Well this very consistent Mr. Hall appears in the Journal as a sort of Champion of 'the Reformation *in general.*' Doubtless, the readers of the Journal, where he is not known, suppose him to be one of the stars of Kentucky—a burning and shining light in the way of truth. We are indeed informed, that at a general meeting in the interior after he vacated the Louisville pulpit, he announced himself 'as out of this reformation,' and that he declared also to an individual in this city, that if Mr. C. were to die he should be 'off from this Reformation,' but in him these are piccadilloes, he is still in 'full fellowship as *one of us*,' and keen to pounce upon the first unlucky wight, who shall be so hapless as to be supposed to agree with us in our views 'of what the Book teaches.'

But this is not all. A brother, who was an ear witness of the fact inform us, that this veritable Mr. Hall late pastor of the Reform Chuch in Louisville was called upon to preach the funeral of a wealthy sinner who died in his sins. That from some motive or other, he consoled the wealthy survivors for the loss of this modern Dives with the following anecdote. A certain king said he, went a hunting, and in the ardor of the chase he was thrown from his horse: but, though a great sinner he obtained forgiveness; for

Between the stirrup and the ground
He pardon sought and pardon found!

If this be not a fact, let Mr. Hall come and deny it; and we will confront him with our informant. Such was the doctrine taught by this Evangelical champion of reformation on that occasion. The anecdote bears a falsehood on the face of it! And reader what sort of an impression do you suppose, must have been made upon the bye standers of the Reformation in general' which countenanced, such ribald stuff as this in the sermons of its proclaimers. Behold the man, who claims to have been the preacher of remission of sins by obedience to the gospel in 1826, teaching not long since, that a man may live the villian all his days, and meet the fate of Judas, or this hunting king, and between a stirrup and the ground, about three feet apart, pray for pardon, recive the assurance of it, and proclaim the fact to the beholders. Is this reformation doctrine? Is an uncompromising hostility, yea, even a 'bitter' hostility to such wicked foolery as this, hostility to the reformation in general? Who will affirm it? Yet the preacher of pardon between the stirrup and the ground, is the man who has leaped into the arena to bring Bro. Ferguson to bay for agreeing with us! Suppose he does agree with us, and we are as wicked as he and his party would make us, is he the man to call his contemporaries to account? Rather let him reform from tho folly which besets him, and repenting of his clerical abomination, let him put off the old man, and by obedience to the truth obtain the remission of his sins and a title to Eternal Life. We will then rejoice in his fellowship, and, forgetting the evil he has attempted to do us, we will greet him as a fellow traveller in the straight and narrow way.

8. Bro. Ferguson's reply to Mr. Hall's note is worded so cautiously that we care not to embarrass him by any remarks upon it. We have published the correspondence, not to injure him, but to let the public see the immoraliiy of the opponents of the truth as we believe it. They hold out the Olive Branch of peace to us with the left hand, while, at the very same time, they are brandishing the sword of persecution against us with the right: to speak without a figure, *they offer us peace while they are laboring with all their might to prove that we are unworthy of fellowship.* We say, first cease your attacks upon our character, then we shall be prepared to pay some respect to your overtures for peace. If we are worthy of christian fellowship, then treat us as a brother ought to be treated: but if you conclude, that we are unworthy, then turn us out of 'the reformation' *if you can*: but while you flourish both the Olive and the sword, you may protest about your 'good faith, till the moon becomes green cheese, your protestation will fall upon our ears as a *vox et pratercea nihil*:*—we interpret your words by your actions, and not your sincerity by your words.—How far Bro. Ferguson agrees or differs from what he terms our speculations, or whether he has 'christian fellowship for us,' will appear by references to the correspondence already before the public. We leave it with this respectable tribunal to pronounce the verdict!

EPITOME OF REFORM.

Aug. 22 1844.

Dear Brother Thomas.

An opportunity has at length offered itself which enables me to drop you a few lines.

I obeyed the gospel for *remisson* of *sins* about the year 1837, and united with the *Reformers* who then met at———in this county, which is, I believe, the oldest reformed church in Eastern Virginia. In as much as I believed, at the time, I united with the congregation refered to above, that they had practiced what they preached, and had each been baptized into Christ; I felt myself surfounded by a band of brothers, who had set their faces zionward, and were 'seeking for glory, honour, and immortality.' I got along pretty well till the year 1841. Feeling a great solicitude for my former friends and associates, I ventured, about that time, to call their attention to that salvation which had been offered them in the gospel. I endeavoured to present it to them just as it is written, and was very particular in calling their attention to the simplicity in the divine arrangement, and very plain, tho' essential plan mentioned of Paul in speaking to the Corinthians, 'the Corinthians *hearing believed* and *were baptized*' It was by insisting upon this arrangement and urging my fellow men 'to go and do likewise,' that I found all was not well at———for in a short time after I had ceased speaking the Elder of that church told me I had preached 'another gospel.' I then began for the first time to inquire of myself, what kind of materials is this——church composed of? When the following history, presented itself to my mind.

This church was formed in 1828. And was composed, at the time of its formation of some 12 or 14 members, who, a short time previous, had been excluded from H——a baptist church in the same neighborhood, for contending that baptism was for the remission of sins, and some other, to them, new doctrine set forth by A, Campbell. Having attained the summit of this mount of *light* and *liberty* they raise the cry of persecution against their *old mother* H——and under the influence of that cry, materials are manufactured and put into the building, and in a few years

* A voice and nothing besides.

this pigmy has become as a giant, numbering some 75 or 80 members. Feeling themselves strong (in numbers) they now began to look back upon their quandum brethren and call upon them to come out of Babylon: but the call is rejected with contempt; this course of things is kept up for a time, and some of the most conscien ious among these wise ones at—begin to examine themselves and thus reason with themselves; 'is it possible that coming from' H——here to—with only a few new ideas of things, can make us better than our old H———Brethren? or in other words has a change of place or a change of opinions changed our state?'—And strange to tell, the result of this examination was, that many of these same reformers, obeyed *the* Gospel, and the faith of many others, as much shaken as to drive them behind that invulnerable bulwark thrown up by A. C. namely, a story about marriage contracts &c.

'In a very short time after these events, we hear a warning voice from the West, saying. 'Brethren you do greatly err not knowing the scriptures.' In making war against out Baptist friends, we have sinned! and the only chance for us to be pardoned, is to throw our missdoings into a common stock, with all the sects them, 'though our sins be many' we shall be 'white as wool.'

This will give you some idea of the rise and progress of one of the oldest Reformed churches in Virginia.—But 'how are the mighty fallen!' In the space of some 5 or 6 years, this body composed of 75 or 80 members, has wasted away, and 10 or 12 are all that can now be seen, and they are not all agreed among themselves, and father desolution yet awaits them—but even in this small number there are some who have obeyed the gospel, and wish to serve the Lord according to His Word, yet connected as they are with some of 'this reformation,' their efforts are much weakened by contentions within.

In such a case as this, what is to be done? Shall we continue with them, contending for 'first principles,' or shall we 'come out from among them,' and go on to perfection? I have asked many this question, and no one, as yet, has given me a decisive answer. Will you?

Hoping to see you in this part of Virginia during the present year, I must conclude by subscribing myself your Brother, in the hope of eternal life. W. B.

"WHAT IS TO BE DONE?"

Modern 'Churches' are mere conventional organizations: to be, or not to be, of their communion, does not effect unpropitiously the salvation of a true believer: for, to be a member of a church and a citizen of the Kingdom, are not synonymous. When churches are scripturally constituted and ordered, they are eminently useful & conducive to the glory o God; but when their organization is the result of expediency & their deportment misdirected by worldly policy they are positively injurious. In their original institution they were designed to be the eradiators of light to those who 'dwell in the Land of the Shadow of Death:' & the places of refuge, consolation edification, and spiritual sacrifice to God for the faithful in the dominions of the Evil One. Churches will be useful for these purposes when rooted and grounded in the truth—the unadulterated truth of God's Word—and only then. Such a church may not make many proselytes; but, '*walking in the fear of the Lord, and admonition of the Holy Spirit*,' it will be "*multiplied*" and thus it will commend the faith to every man's conscieence by the excellency of its fruits. But when a Church fails to fulfil the end for which churches were originally created, the sooner it is dissolved the better for the interests of the truth. The church indicated by our correspondent, whose narrative epitomizes very many of this reformation, appears to be of the useless and therefore, positively injurious class, and consequently a stumbling block in the way. It seems to have been an odor of damnation to primitive chirstianity which by this time had it been a true church, it would have eradiated with the conspicuity of a city set upon a hill which could not be hid. But its influence is evil, and it ought therefore to be dissolved, or abeted as a nuisance. In reply, therfore, to his question 'what is to be done?' our voice is, *come out from it and commence anew upon ridgidly gospel principles*. Let the righteous that are found in Gomorrah flee, and not look back. Imitate the apostolic models. Look primaturily to the *quality*, and secondly only to the *quantity* of proselytes. The prowess of Gideon's 300 nerved by God's assurances were more efficient than 32000 combatants, who trusted in their own policy und enterprise. Be valiant for truth, and live as freemen, and let men see, that you contend for principle and not men, but that you aim to do the will of God that you may be accepted of him, and thus attain to the Angelic Order and dignity of Immortal Men. You will then grow with the increase of God; all your quandum associates in religion, whose hearts beat high for such a destiny, will cleave to you; while the others will be lost in their original and inconstructible nothingness.—'Go on to perfection' by all means.

EDITOR.

"SOUL DAMNING DOCTRINE."

An article on 'Infidelity and Hypocrisy copied into the Advent Herald, from a paper called 'Hope of Israel,' styles the teaching of the 'Jews Return' 'soul damning doctrine.' This is very unguarded and intemperate language. The Bible does teach the doctrine, at all events, we should think that our Second Advent friends, who have been so positive and yet so mistaken in other matters, might express themselves with more diffidence in relation to their interpretations of other parts of the prophetic word. If they are candid & open to conviction, they will yet have to retract many things tney have said of the jews, and other matters *in futuro*.—EDITOR.

PENCILLINGS BY THE WAY.

"Friday the 14th, I travelled near fifty miles, to Louisville, and spent the night with *Bro. James Trabue*—merchant of that city. Saturday the 15, I spent the day in visiting the city, renewing acquaintances with old friends and forming new ones. Amongst the rest I became acquainted with DR. JOHN THOMAS, who is at present publishing the "Herald of the Future Age," in Louisville. As Dr. Thomas has been the cause of some difficulty amongst the disciples of Christ, both east and west, I hope a few reflections on his course and the course of others towards him will not be considered derogatory to the objects of a Religious journal. I found the Doctor a pleasant gentleman of about forty five years of age, much devoted to the study of the Bible, and one who thinks very intensely on all subjects which engage his attention. My own opinion is, Doctor John Thomas wishes to do right; but he labors under considerable embarrassments. Although he is an intelligent man, he is certainly very speculative,—is an abstractionist in the fullest sense—is devoted to his friends, but has no mercy to such as he esteems his enemies. I shall not pretend to enter into the merits or demerits of the Doctor's religious career. Suffice it to say, he may be an *injured man*, and he has in turn *injured*, in my judgement, every one who has come under his influence. His position in reference to the necessity of persons understanding the nature of baptism to enjoy its benefits, IMMORTALITY being a subject of promise in the New Testament, and the anti-christian character of Sectarianism, may doubtless be sustained by the Bible. Still, on all these subjects his language is generally too strong, or rather of a character to imbitter those who love it, more than pious instruction. His notion of the non-ressurrection of infants, idiots, & pagans, and annihilation of the wicked, are certainly subversive of all the benevolence of God, and contrary to the Scriptures of truth: yet he *admits* these things constitute no part of the Gospel of Christ, I regret, with the admission, the Doctor persists in such unprofitable speculations. From the Doctor's *peculiar oganization* and temperament, and the unmerciful opposition which some of his views have met, he has become emphatically a man of war, and always uses dangerous weapons. In the heat of conflict he not unfrequently knocks out the eyes and commits other damages on his best friends. Hence the idea that 'his hand is against every man' and every man's hand is against him. The evils resulting from his

course, have not been so much from *what* he has pleaded as from the STYLE of his teaching. His admirers generally possess the same spirit of the Doctor. While I blame the Doctor, I can but love him, and regret that his organization, and the circumstances which have governed him have been such as to render his best efforts worse than useless in the cause of Christ. I seperated with the Doctor with the conviction, if he could forget Alexander Campbell, would quit studying and *writing* upon his speculations, and could be thrown into *pious* society, where he would be told plainly his errors, by genuine friends, he might become a good and useful man."

From the Christian Review.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR OE THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW.

Public Fraternity with Dr. Thomas inexpedient—Things sustained by the Bible—Speculation and Abstractionism–Non-resurrection of certain sinners taught in the Bible—'Annihilation' defined, and proved triumphantly—A faithful man necessarily 'a Man of War—Peace in the Present Age inscriptural —Indifference to principle a certain way of securing peace—Dr. Thomas pronounced neither good nor useful, &c, &c.

Louisville, Ky; Sept. 8th 1844.

DEAR BRO. FANNING:

Your periodical for this month has come to hand, I am glad to find from it, that you have arrived amid your domestic circle in good condition and prepared for new "Themes of Discussion." In this epistle I address you as 'brother' without intending any offence. I would not '*knock out your eyes*,' or '*commit other damage*' upon you, by any means. Perhaps you may inquire, 'why suppose that I should be offended at your claim upon my fraternity?' I will tell candidly. On page 194 of your paper, you have introduced me to the notice of your readers, in a style such as a showman would describe some new individual of his menagerie, not as yet described by Naturalists! You nominate me about nine times; and in every instance, you style me either 'Doctor John Thomas,' 'Doctor Thomas,' or 'Doctor.' Now in looking over the whole article of "Notes on a Tour," I find you mention many other 'brethren' with whom you met for the first, or more times; and among these also 'Doctors,' or at least *reputed* ones. Thus, for instance we have "*Dr* .B. F .Hall," &c, now if I had looked no further, I should have concluded, that there was nothing meant in the appliance to my humble self of the oft-repeated "Doctor;" but on glancing at a subsequent paragraph, I there perceived this same 'Dr. B. F. Hall,' who sings:

Between the stirrup and the ground
He pardon sought and pardon found!

—spoken of as *Bro.* Hall! And furthermore, you speak of 15 or 16 other individuals, all of whom you style 'brother;' and in particular one of whom you write '*brother Doctor* W. D. Gorden.' Besides these, I find certain Doctors 'of the world' named; and of them you speak in the same style as of me. Thus you class me (perhaps, justly in your opinion)—with the 'sinners;' while our *deacon—patron* of dancing in Louisville, and 'Dr. Hall'—of whom—(but I forbear)—who pardons sinners 'between the stirrup and the ground' (!)—you put among the saints;" from these considerations, I say, I should conclude, that you deemed me unworthy of your fellowship *when at home*, and that, if I addressed you as 'dear brother,' it would be offensive to you. But, when I recollect, that you spent a considerable time with me, frequently repeated, in the most social, friendly and fraternal manner, and without qualification, or hesitation, styled me 'brother Thomas'—I thought I might venture upon the present occasion to return; what I hope was not a mere compliment (for I do not like such compliments) and address you as 'Dear Bro. Fanning' without offence.

Now don't let this 'knock your eyes out' (I quote your own phrase)—but the truth is,

I every now and then meet individuals in *private* who call me 'brother' who, when they speak or write of me in the hearing and seeing of '*Bro*. Campbell, *bro.* Challen, *bro.* Hall, *brother* this and *brother* that'—only know me as one of the profession of medicine in general! Is this honest in the sight of men? If their conviction is, that I am an 'alien from the Commonwealth of Israel,' an unpardoned sinner, and therefore not of the 'One Body,' then let them be honest, and say so. They will not offend me; but let them I pray cease to act two parts towards me—the one, when no eye sees us but God's; the other, when to fraternize with me might jeopardize their popularity with A. B. and C!

I perceive that, in the Review, you have devoted nearly a page to 'Dr. John Thomas;' in the exordium of which you say, 'I hope a few reflections on his course and the course of others towards him, will not be considered derogatory to the objects of a Religious Journal.' Well, I suppose your readers wont object to these upon that score; for I presume my course and that of my opponents, have at least as much to do with 'the objects of a Religious Journal,' as the 'Mammoth Cave,' 'compact limestone,' 'Gypsum' and eyeless fish, of which you write on page 193. For my own part, I have no objection, provided you prove yourself an exception to Reform Editors of my acquaintance' who 'knock out the eyes and commit other damages' upon the brethren, as concerns their estimate of my 'course and character, and refuse to allow me or my friends, (whose 'eyes' have not been 'knocked out') to prescribe for their relief, as becomes practitioners of the healing art. In a word, my good brother, I expect you to give insertion to this letter in your 'Review,' as an antidote to the fatal 'love' you have therein revealed towards the "pleasant gentleman' you formed an acquaintance with in this 'fashionable and luxurious city.'

You say, 'I found the Doctor a pleasant gentleman of about 45 years of age, much devoted to the study of the Bible &c.' First, you are mistaken as to my age; my looks may have deceived you: I am not yet 40, but let that pass. You are right as to my devotion to the study of the scriptures. I believe, you generally found me so engaged; the things they reveal are my study day and night, I study them by the midnight oil, that I may discover the 'wondrous things in God's law,' that I may show them forth to the faithful, who desire to know all the scriptures teach concerning 'Christ in us the hope of glory,' and 'the one hope of our calling.' These things 'engage my attention,' and, as the world would say, too much for my own interest: for you know, I am not a salaried religionist. You say, I think 'very intensely' on these things; that your 'opinion is Dr. T. wishes to do wright,' and that he 'is an intellectual man.' Now permit me to ask, if this be true, do you not think, that intense study of the Bible by an intellectual man who wishes to do wright, would be very apt to develop things from that book which would *appear* 'new' and 'speculative' to a generation immersed in the world, whose intense thoughts are concentrated upon the means of accumulating wealth for many years? The result of my application is, that I have come to conclusions, *which you admit* "MAY DOUBTLESS BE SUSTAINED BY THE BIBLE." These are the necessity of persons understanding *the gospel* before immersion can be any benefit to them; that 'Immortality and Life,' being *matters of promise* in the New Testament, to be bestowed at the resurrection, they constitute no part of the Animal Man; and that Sectarianism is anti-christian and therefore cannot produce christians. If these things among others, be sustainable by the Bible, they are true; and by this admission, you tread upon the position I hold in opposition to Mr. Campbell, who rejects them as 'speculative and untaught' in the Bible. But I no sooner think, I have a co-operator in you, than you suddenly retreat behind a 'still' (no *double entendre here*) 'his language is generally too strong.' But if the things be true, can language be too forcible to express the truth? If we would soften the truth, we must doubtless select the softest words, and construct our sentences with the least possible precision; we shall thus preserve our character for sweetness and piety; for truth is bitter to the errorist when unmistakably expressed.

You say, my dear brother, '*Although* Dr. T. is an intellectual man, he is certainly very speculative,—is an abstractionist in the fullest sense.' Now this reading would imply, that speculative men were not intellectual men. I should like to see a man, who spec-

ulates without intellect: he would be quite a curiosity. Well, I admit that I speculate; and will you tell me, brother Fanning, how a man can think without speculating, or speculate without thinking? I Speculate thus. I regard the Bible as a *speculum* or mirror, into which I look, and there I behold as in a glass the Image of God to which he requires me to be conformed; I think, I reflect, I look, or, if you will, I speculate upon this Image, and I behold the *Pattern* of Immortal Men; I see in this speculum, that this Archetype became Immortal by the resurrection of his mortal body from the dead: and I see it averred, that all his brethren who do his will shall become like him, perfect and complete, when he shall appear in glory. Yes, I am 'an Abstractionist' also; I abstract myself as much as possible from the world, 'hating the garment spotted with the flesh:' the industrious and busy Bee is an abstractionist; it sips the nectar and abstracts the honey from every flower; the Word is the nectary I sip, and its "unadulterated milk," the saccharine juice from which I abstract the nutriment of my faith. Avaunt this folly, my brother, and cease to pander to popular ignorance, by stirring up predjudice against a man, for being guilty of the noblest exercise of intellect, that of speculating and abstracting the heart cheering promises, and teaching of the Word of God.

You say, 'Dr. Thomas has no mercy on such as he esteems his enemies.' Believe me, I regard men personally as my *opponents*—mostly as opposing what they do not understand, and therefore, their leaders excepted, as "not knowing what they do." These leaders are hostile to me; and yet, if their "unmerciful opposition," as you term it, were confined to my 'views,' I should not complain; but they assail my character, and seem to lack only the power to extinguish me from religious and social existence. I am not their enemy; but I am their invincible and interminable opponent till they cease to "pervert the right ways of the Lord." My weapon, my 'dangerous weapon,' as you style it, is truth; I seek to take no unfair advantage of them; I do not circulate through the country, trumping up charges against them, as they do against me; but when they attack, I expose falsehood, intrigue, and malevolence, and in an avalanche of refutation make it recoil upon their own pates. If this be merciless, then be it so; and if they would spare themselves the mortification of defeat, let them beware how they tempt me to unshield the sword. If they will repent and do right, I will forgive them. I do pray for them, that the eyes of their understandings may be opened; that they may become honest men, and cease to pervert the truth; that they may act up to their old professions, and take their stand upon principle, and no more presume to dictate even to their inferiors as they may suppose them, what they *may* see in the scriptures and what they *may* publish as contained in the word of the Lord. Let them attend to their own studies, and if they do not agree with the results of other people's, let reason and testimony prove theirs the better; and let them remember, that Christ's freemen understand the liberty with which he has freed them from the yoke of bondage too well to permit them to lord it over their rights and consciences. I have 'no mercy' upon what I believe to be their perversions of the gospel, neither do I crave mercy; as men, peace be with them, when they shall prove themselves worthy of it, by having conquered it.

Again you say, 'he has injured, in my judgment, every one who has come under his influence.'—Well, this you give merely as your opinion. The assertion is a very broad one, you do not say wherein the injury I have done them consists. You ought to have been more explicit; for though you have a right to express your opinion, you have no right to injure me in vaguely exercising that right. You are not, I think, a competant judge in the case, because you are not acquainted with 'every one who has come under Dr. T's influence.' You only know a few, a very few: and if they have been injured, 'in your judgment,' you have no right to judge by the rule *ex uno disce omnes.* * If *you* have, so have I; and I could from a few cases, not difficult to find, show where they had become immortal after imbibing 'Bro.' Campbells opinions. Should I not then do him injustice in saying, that he had injured 'every one, &c,' because some whom he had influenced had become renegades? Did all the troubles you have been mixed up with for the last few years, originate from my influence? By whatever spirit they were actuated it could not be

* From one case learn all the rest.

traced to me; they were 'Bro.' Campbell's especial friends: but I argue nothing against him upon that account, any more than I argue against the doctrine of Jesus as injurious, because of the impiety of multitudes of his disciples and professed friends. Be more impartial and reasonable in your conclusions.

Again, 'His notion of the non-resurrection of infants, idiots, and pagans, and the annihilation of the wicked, are certainly subversive of all the benevolence of God, and contrary to the scriptures of truth.'—This is an imprudent declaration of yours. You ought to have said—'subversive of all *rabbinical views of* the benevolence of God, and contrary to *their interpretation of* the scriptures of truth.' By the Rabbis in this case, I mean, the teachers of the orthodox opinions of the destiny of infants and pagans; and of course, you among the number. I do not use the term derogatively, but as best suited to express my idea. Can you conceive no difference between your views of God's benevolence, and his benevolence itself; or do you conceive your benevolence and his, your interpretations and scripture itself, as identical? Now, I admit that my 'notions' are 'subversive' of your viws; but, I deny, and it is for you to prove, that they are 'subversive of all the benevolence of God,' and 'contrary to the scriptures of truth.

But I affirm, they are neither, and I put you and all your side of the question to the proof. I affirm that my 'notions,' as you style them, are in harmony with God's benevolence, and the plain, ungarbled letter of the word. I invite you to take up my review of Campbell and Rice's Debate about Infants &c, in nos. 4, 5, and 6 of the Herald of the Future Age, in all its several points, methodically; I invite you to grapple with the *grand principle* therein developed, and to annihilate the *testimonies* of the Spirit adduced; I invite you to take it up candidly, chivalrously, honestly and without fear, and see what you can do with it: and permit me to say that until this work is accomplished, it will be prudent for you to be sparing of your criticisms upon my 'notions' concerning pagans, &c, as subversive of any thing but the traditions of men.

As prejudice may prevent may of your readers from perusing the Herald of the Future Age, I present the following for their especial benefit, on the presumption that you will do me the justice to insert this epistle.

I do not use the word "*annihilation*" in speaking and writing; but, as my opponents force it upon me for effect, I will say a few words about it. It is derived from two latin words—AD to and NIHILUM *nothing*, which in combination are used to signify *a reducing to nothing*. Abstractly, this conveys more than I believe; because, I believe the wicked will be reduced to *dust* which is something: but, in the sense, that their organization, or that they, as men, will be utterly demolished, or reduced to no men, as there was no man before Adam was formed from the dust, in that sense they may be said *not to be* or to be 'annihilated.' Now the question is, do the scriptures teach that the wicked shall *not be?* On page 205 of the Review, you say, 'speculations are not wanted, but the teaching of the Holy Spirit.' Well here it is. I believe, you noted down the passages when I delivered them to you in my office.—Job, speaking of his brethren, who had dealt deceitfully, and forsaken the fear of the Almighty, says, 'the paths of their way is turned aside; they *go to nothing* (*ad nihilum*) and perish'—ch. vi. 18. "Thou hast destroyed the Wicked, thou hast put out their name forever and ever—Ps. ix. 5." A name represents something which exists; to *put out a name* is to put out of existence the thing for which it stands. "The Wicked shall perish; they shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away as the fat of (the sacrificial) lambs—Ps. xxxvii. 20." Can any destruction be more complete than this; it comes as near to 'annihilation,' as you style it, as words can express."—'Man that is in honor and understandeth not, *is like the beasts which perish*"—Ps XLIX. 20. What do you term the destiny of beasts? Call it what you please; such is the destiny, or end of the wicked. 'As a snail which melteth, let every one of them (the wicked) pass away: like the untimely birth of a woman, that they may not see the sun"—Ps. LVIII.—What is the end of an abortion? Has the Holy Spirit yet convinced you of the 'annihilation,' as you call it, or of the Destruction of the Wicked, as the scriptures term it; or do you need greater and plainer testimonies? 'In the

mouth of two or three witnesses,' Saith the scripture, 'shall every word be established;' but here are *five*, must I add the climax? Here then is the sixth Witness;—'consume them in wrath,' saith Messiah in prophecy, 'consume them that they *may not be*—Ps. lix. 10.' When they are in a state of *not being*, will you tell me, my brother, how much of the wicked, save dust, remains? Again, 'let them be blotted out of the Book of the Living—Ps. lxix.'—When blotted out of this Book are they living or dead? Again, 'when all the workers of iniquity do flourish, it is that they shall be *destroy ED* for ever—Ps. xxxii;'—not destroy*ing* for ever, but just as it reads. Do you still think something of the wicked remains, when they are consumed into smoke away, and cease to be? Well then, here is the last passage I will quote, and if that will not convince you, you must pursue the path of your own waywardness. "Let the sinners be consumed out of the earth, and *let the wicked* BE NO MORE—Ps. civ. 35." This is triumphant.

Is it 'contrary to scripture' to affirm, that a portion of the Pagan World will not rise again from the dead, to undergo the same punishment, which shall hereafter be inflicted upon those, who knowing God's law have refused to obey it? I will give you one passage, and when you have put that out of the way, I will give you more. Read the whole of Isaiah xxvi. beginning' 'IN THAT DAY shall this song be sung in the Land of Judah.'—In what day? See the context of the two preceeding chapters, and you will find the answer to be, in that day 'when the Moon shall be confounded, and the Sun ashamed, when the Lord of Hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his Ancients gloriously;'—in that day when he shall on that Mountain 'make unto all people a feast of fat things.' When 'he will destroy in this mountain the Face of the Covering cast over all people, and the Vail (of 'strong delusion' 2. Thess. 2. 11.) that is spread over all nations;"—when 'he will swallow up death in victory'—THEN 'shall be sung in the Land of Judah this song.'—This song occupies the whole of chap. xxvi—a song of victory which will be sung by Israel then become, by eminence, "THE RIGHTEOUS NATION." Having ascertained the *Time when*, and *the choir by which* this song shall be sung, we are prepared to appreciate the sentiments of the glorious melody. What are these as bearing upon the question before us? Let us see.

The subjects of the Song are the exultation of Jerusalem; the overthrow of the 'Lofty City;' the Destruction of the Wicked (parallel with 2. Thess. 1. 8.;) the *Non-resurrection of Israel's oppressors;* and the Resurrection of the Lord's Dead Men, at his appearing 'to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity.'

Now open your eyes, brother Fanning, if they are not 'knocked out,' and read what the Spirit saith about the 'non-resurrection of pagans.'—Verse 12.—'Lord thou wilt ordain peace for us (Israel;) *for* thou also hast wrought all our works in (or, among)—us. O Lord our God, other Lord's besides thee have had dominion over us: but by thee only will we make mention of thy name. *They are dead*, THEY SHALL NOT LIVE; they are deceased, THEY SHALL NOT RISE; therefore hast thou visited and *destroyed* them, and made all their memory to perish.'

Answer me now, who are these 'other Lords?'—Are they not those who 'have had dominion over' Israel from the first until this song of triumph shall be sung by them in the Land of Judah, when 'the Restitution of all Things' to Israel shall come to pass? Lords or Rulers, who have 'deceased' under 'Times of Ignorance' which 'God winks at?'—What else can you make of it? But, behold the contrast in *verse* 19, where it is written—'*Thy dead men* SHALL LIVE, *my Dead Body* SHALL ARISE. In view of this, the Prophet joyously exclaims, 'Awake and sing, ye that *dwell in the dust;* for thy dew (O Lord) is as the dew of herbs, and *the Earth shall cast out the dead*'—like dew from the womb of the morning—Ps. cx. 3. Where do the dead dwell? 'In the dust!'—What dead shall the Earth cast out? 'Thy dead men, O Lord!' Then they are neither in Heaven, Paradise, nor Hades, but dead and sleeping in the dust! Is this 'language too strong;' is it 'rather of a character to imbitter those who love it?' Do yon condemn this instruction as destitute of piety? Is this what you style 'unprofitable speculations?' Or, is it not rather a glowing theme; and a satisfactory vindication of the justice, benevolence and abounding goodness of God? Ah! brother Fanning, there is more soul expanding speculation,—more ennobling developments, than have yet 'entered into the hearts' of the editors; or have yet been displayed in the pages of the periodicals of this Reformation. You seem all of you to be colleagued against the truth in raising a stupid cry against speculation and untaught questions! Be more modest, I beseech you all; and confess, that you have as yet scarcely peeped into 'the things which God hath prepared for them that love him;' and which he hath revealed by his Spirit to his Apostles. 1. Cor. ii. 9.

Again, you say, 'Dr. T. *admits* that these things constitute no part of the Gospel of Christ.'—But, my brother, does the New Testament treat only of the Gospel? Does the Old Testament treat only of this? You say, I believe, that 'the Bible is your rule of faith and practice;' well does it testify of nothing but gospel, or glad tidings? Does it not treat of the destiny of man, as righteous or otherwise; or does it assign men all to one destiny? You must admit, that it treats of pagans, of the wicked under law, as well as of the sinners without law; as I have shown, it also treats of resurrection and non-resurrection; and a multitude of other things besides. I propose to explain, as far as I am able, whatever comes to hand. The Bible also is your rule of practice. Why do you not follow that rule? Paul offered the gospel to all men: when they rejected it he preached Damnation to them: the Apostacy has dishonored God in the misrepresentation of his dealing with the condemned; I propose to vindicate his character from its aspersions, by showing the true doctrine of the Word, if I can; and I believe I can: what possible objection can there be. Truth is dangerous to nothing but Error; have you, or others, any beloved traditions they fear to lose? I hope not.

Again, you say, 'the Doctor has become emphatically a man of war, and always uses dangerous weapons.'—Well, what is the use of weapons to a soldier unless they are 'always dangerous;' you would not have him encounter Satan's troops with a lath, would you my good brother? I wield a sharp two edged sword, but only against the perverters of the truth, as I believe it. My opponents have the same weapon within their reach, if they had valor and chivalry enough to use it according to the rules of fair and honorable warfare; Why don't they slay me, if my views are so very ridiculous; surely it is easy done! Is my weapon kept in too good order; is its edge too sharp, its point too piercing, does it chill their timid hearts to look upon it? They can shoot poisoned arrows from behind bushes; my corselet, helmet, and shield are sticking full of them, but they have not reached the skin yet! Thanks be to God who gives the victory, I have seen nothing in them yet to excite dismay. They are crying 'peace,' and 'let him alone,' and he will die away. These are the words of the 'fearful and unbelieving,' not of the conqueror who fights for a kingdom, a septre, and a crown of life.

But, assuming that you are correct, what objections have you to a christian being 'a man of war?'—Can a man be a *conqueror* without being a man of war? What do you call that man, equiped with girded loins, a breastplate, shield, helmet, and sword? Is he, not a very warlike person? Oh, but you say, his weapons are not always dangerous; they are not carnal! I admit, they are not carnal: they neither defend his flesh from wounds nor doth his sword draw blood from the flesh of his opponents. His defensive armour is spiritual; it is constituted not of brass and steel, but of truth, righteousness, faith, hope, and the sandals of a genuine gospel preparation: his weapon, is not a Damascus blade, or 'Toledo trusty,' but the word of God. Is not such a man, clad in 'the whole armour of God,' a warlike looking character? A soldier, who 'knocks out the eyes and commits other damages' upon Satan's troops, whether friends or foes, good, bad, indifferent, or 'best?'—If my 'best friends' are found fighting with the aliens against the truth, I exceedingly deplore it; and if they get their 'eyes knocked out,' and sustain 'other damages' in the affray, I am very sorry for it.

But, brother Fanning, men are mistaken in supposing that 'the Times of the Gentiles' were, in any portion of them, to be the Times of Peace to the Soldiers of Christ. THE PRESENT AGE (by this I mean, the interval between the Ascension and Future Advent of Messiah) is essentially a period of war: war for principle against the Apostacy in all its forms. Disciples obtain peace in this Age in proportion

as they are indifferent to principle. We are not to expect peace, and enjoyment; and if we are faithful we shall be certain not to get it. I hear men sing,

Must I be carried to the skies
On flow'ry beds of ease,
While others fought to win the prize,
And sailed thro' bloody seas
Are there no foes for me to face,
Must I not stem the flood?
Is this vile world a friend to grace,
To help me on to God?
Sure I must fight if I would reign;
Increase my courage Lord, &c, &c.

I say yes, there are foes enough for you to face, if you will contend for the faith without adulteration. Try it brother F; defend the 'position' I have taken against the opposite, and which you admit is sustainable by the Bible; and you will find foes start up against you like Dragon's teeth; who will take care not to allow the angels to carry you to the skies on flow'ry beds of ease! But, let men be indifferent to every thing that interferes with their worldly advantage, and they may sing for foes for ever, but they will find none; for the Devil feels so sure of them, that he will destroy the wretched factionist, if he can, who shall dare to disturb their schemes of peace, prosperity, and aggrandizement. for so very ridiculous an affair as principle.

If it be true, how can I help being Ishmaelitish, if every man's hand is against me? If they are determined to treat me as Ishmael they must expect a sharper sword than Ishmael's to cleave them to the dust. You love me' bro. Fanning? Ah! how can I persuade myself of this! Would a lover show up his beloved in such a style as you have exhibited me to your brethren and the public? Is it the part of one who loves another to treat him thus? Reserve your regrets, my dear friend for other times. You express them to early by 20 years. You will perhaps, then see no cause to regret, bnt rather to rejoice at our present posiition. I have no regrets, save the straitness of my means; but this may be overcome. My 'organization' is suited to what lies before me, and 'the circumstances which have governed me,' though they may have rendered my 'best efforts worse than useless, *in your opinion*, in promoting the worldly policy of a certain class of reformers; we will with your leave, defer a final judgement in the case of how much I have abused 'the cause of Christ,' until he shall come, and settle all disputes

You greatly err in supposing that a remembrance of A. Campbell disturbs the tranquility of my mind. It is true from the nature of things, that I do not forget him. So long, as he retains his present ground and I mine, we must necessarily be in opposition. I am sorry he has not more chivlarousness of disposition, if he had, he would not persist in what he knows to be wrong. You understand me? And it does appear to me, that a man of his intellect must know better than he acts. I hope I do him no wrong in this opinion. If he would study Demonology less and Christ olgy more, he would not be so tyrannous in his opinions. And could he be thrown into a less *parasitical* ('pious' tho' it be!) society than that which surrounds him, he would be prepared to discuss the truth with less arrogance and self sufficency, and have a better opportunity of becoming acquainted with his own foibles, from the testimony of 'genuine friends,' who like bro. Fanning in the case of Dr. John Thomas, might show him up on the pages of the 'Christian,' or some other 'Review!'

Finally, my brother, if you do, you ought not to love me (unless as an enemy; and that is evinced by heaping coals of fire upon his head)—Indeed, I do not see how you can love me; for you say, I am neither 'good nor useful:' seeing you say, that under certain circumstances I *might become* a good and useful man'—which is plainly declaring, that, *in your opinion*, I am neither one nor the other.

Wishing you better measure than you have meted out to me, I subscribe myself without intending to offend you, your brother in Christ. JOHN THOMAS.

A GOOD HIT.

"*Modes of Faith.*"—A work has recently been published in America, in which the representatives of 43 different sects of Christianity define and advocate their respective dogmas authoritatively. Is it too much to ask them to adjust their own differences, and settle which of them is the true Christianity, before the ancient faith of God's people be again summoned to surrender?—*Kol Iokob*

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR TO A FRIEND IN THE FARWEST.

LETTER VII.

Richmond, Virginia; October, 1843.

MUCH ESTEEMED FRIEND:

In my last I was explaining to you the causes of the moral phenomena, which developed themselves in Lunenburg during my late visit, as well as of the agitation in the body politic of 'this reformation' throughout Eastern Virginia, and other countries of the world. I say 'other countries,' because, it is not confined to America; for the agitation keeps alive the spirit of investigation and progress in England and Scotland likewise. In proof of this I send you an extract from a letter lately come to hand from Glasgow. 'I had a letter this week,' says my correspondent, 'from Bro. Wm. H———, of Huddersfield in which he states that the churches in this locality and the neighbouring towns are taking a decided stand on the question' (alluding to a letter he had written at my request to Mr. Wm. Taylor, pastor of a reform church in Perth, on the subject of an intelligent and scriptural obedience to the gospel—a copy of which he (Bro. H.) had sent to the Editor of the Christian Messenger requesting its publication in that paper.)—"The church in Halifax, however, having made a promise to send some money to the Evangelist's fund, when they wrote to the co-operation Meeting at Edinburg, have lately sent a fund in fulfilment thereof. They were not aware of Reid's compromising the truth, and of Thompson (the other Evangelist for Scotland) not having been scripturallv immersed till lately. For the future, they will avoid giving their sanction to the Evangelists, and are resolved not to fellowship with any who have not been scripturally immersed. * * * I wrote to the brethren at Wakefield on the subject, and have engaged to visit them to morrow, if the Lord will, when I shall have an opportunity of pressing on their attention, the importance of avoiding to give their sanction to those who are compromising the truth, and who have not been properly discipled to Jesus. Bro. Mowit was at Harrowgate a fortnight ago where the truth is progressing; much may be done to spread the truth by the gratuitous efforts of the Disciples." * * * *

It is pleasant to have to record such good news as the above—to find the principles for which I have so long contended, almost unaided and alone, at last taking such firm root and extending their radicles in every direction—principles for which I have been ridiculed, slandered, and stigmatized without measure by these perverted Evangelists; but in vain do they attempt to bind the truth-it is now waxing too strong for them. Why do they rage and imagine a vain thing? It has burst all their bands assunder; for it is all-powerful, yea mighty above all things and must prevail and triumph in spite of all opposition.

Such are the reflections of the faithful brother in Scotland. Really, I ought to thank God and take courage, seeing that nothing strange has befallen me in the persecuting attacks to which my character has been subjected during past years. The 'Evangelists,' as they are improperly styled, in Britain as well as in America, are the mischief makers in the churches. Do not misunderstand me as including all in this sentence; but my experience, as well as our Scottish Brother's, goes to prove that it is true of the majority. Were it not for Messrs Shelburn and Bullard in Lunenburg; Henshall in Richmond; Coleman in Charlottesville; Henley &c, in King and Queen, and a few others of less note in the catalogue of calumnious "Elders and Evangelists," with the veteran combatant, our friend the Supervisor at their head, the brethren would be harmonious and peaceable enough.—But there are salaries to preserve, an ascendency to maintain, popularity to acquire, numbers to proselyte, old worn out traditions to prop up, colleges to endow, and organizations to consoldidate, that a machinery may be constructed, by which to close the doors, and consequently the ears of churches, against 'unpopular doctrine,' and in this way to preserve things *in statu quo* for the interest and behoof of those whose living,

or ideal importance, may be suspended on the maintainance of a proscriptive policy.

Now, with the exception of friend Henshall, behold these gentlemen, who by such unhallowed means oppose the truth; perhaps without knowing it, and thinking at the same time, that they are doing God service. Who are they? I speak of them, not as citizens, for I doubt not they are as good citizens as other people: but who are they as professors of religious opinions? All sectarian clergymen; yes, and clergymen they still remain in spirit and practice. In the general, they are, or have been till lately intrepid denunciators of their quondam brethren, and in so doing denounce themselves. Why do they denounce them? Because they proscribe free discussion in their churches; shut their doors against them; subject them to the test of not preaching what they profess honestly to believe; because contrary to the opinion of the majority; because, they reject the ancient gospel, and ancient order of things; because of the hireling system, of the manufacturing of college bred divines, of the one man system; and of the usurpation of the privileges of the multitude by professional and strange guides. But do these clergymen of 'this reformation,' who have been translated from the Baptist ranks, maintain a fairer name for consistency and self denial than those, who in turn regard them as factionists and theological speculators? Can they justly taunt their opponents with inconsistency while they themselves profess to believe the Ancient Gospel and to urge it upon other men, but have not themselves obeyed it, themselves being judges? Can they justly complain of the popular clergy for suppressing investigation, while they are equally virulent in their opposition to others; who claim the right, not the privilege only, of searching the scriptures for themselves; and of telling all who invite them to speak, what they conscienciously believe is revealed, reserving to themselves also the right of judging whether it will do good or evil. Is it not hypocritical to pule about the populars shutting their doors against them, while they exclude others from theirs? Surely now we shall hear no more about the iniquity and proscription of Dover Decrees, since they have astracised me for my 'opinions,' and all who will not reject me as 'a heathen man and a publican!' And what shall I say more of the hireling-onemanism of Richmond, and Charlottsville, &c; of the $400, and $600, and $1000 per annum, which I could name, as the stipands of *non-itinerating* reformed clergymen, whose sole business seems to be, to deal out divided doses of a lifeless theology two or three times per week! Need I point to the 'Church Department' in the vale of Buffalo as the manufactory of college bred divines; who are destined to issue forth, and cover the land like locusts, scourging, as with whips of scorpions, all 'heretics' and 'factionists;' and to plant the standard of supervision, over all who once rejoiced in the liberty of this reformation, as that freedom with which the truth had made them free! And finally, to consumate this exposition of the inconsistency and aggressive policy of these clerical gentlemen upon the liberties of Christ's freedmen, I would notify you of the fact, that the stipendiary system in Richmond, and Charlottsville, and elsewhere, has reduced the Eldership to a nulity, and mutual exhortation and teaching, to a mere historical fact; which like some other apostolical institution, has become *vox et proterea nihil!* All is hushed, but the voice of the hireling into the stilnes of sheol? His interest it is, perhaps to still all didactics but his own; and thus his sermonizings become the standard of the divinity—the sum of all the 'speculations' and 'questions' taught in the Oracles of God.

But I have excepted friend Henshall from this list of *Baptist* Clergyman; perhaps, I ought likewise Mr. Bullard, who if I am rightly informed, was either an immersed Methodist preacher, or a preacher immersed by a Mathodist, before he assented to baptism for the remission of sins; at all events, be this as it may, it is said that he was not a baptist clergyman. As to friend James, who lately enlightened our darkness by revealing a new way into the Kingdom [and it is from him, that 'Elder' Silas Shelburn caught the phrase, 'recived so many Baptists into the Kingdom,' which precipitated him like lightning from the sublime to the ridiculous!]—in the better days of his spiritual life, he copied after Paul, 'working with his own hands,' and thereby ministering to his own necessities, and to those also

of them that were with him; but, alas! tired of the apostolic simplicity of so antique, yet honorable a practice, he has doffed the artizan and assumed the vestments of his order. He now ranks with the hierarchy of the ecclesiastical community of Richmond, the Metropolis of Virginia. He is therefore, a Metropolitan Pastor, and I am told maintains his clerical character with all becoming dignity! Thus it is, that we sticklers for apostolic practices demonstrate, how richly we deserve the approbation of the wise and 'prudent,' for our uncompromising and consistant adhesion to the principles, upon which we originally set out in the buisness of reform!

I am informed, that soon after I left Lunenburg, Messrs Bullard and Shelburn applied themselves to their dirty work again. From the time of their discomfiture till I left they held their peace; and instead of the churches being 'split to peices' things were universally tranquil, which was far from being the case when I arrived. Indeed, I heard that it had been suggested to depute a committee to meet me on the road, to inquire of me my intentions in visiting Lunenburg; and on my actual arrival, Major S—had been consulted about another to wait upon me when I should come to Concord! But they had consulted the wrong person. Bro. S— had too much good sense, liberality, and friendship to aid the Shelburnites, whoever they are, and it matters not who they may be in annoying me.

But the letter is already extended to a sufficient length; I shall therefore defer giving [illegible] the particulars of their immoral proceedings against my reputation till my next. Till then I subscribe myself yours in the hope of a better life, and a communion of honorable and righteous men in the Future Age.

JOHN THOMAS.

THE GREAT TENT MEETING.

Our Second Advent friends *pitched* their *Great Tent* in this city on Thursday the 26th ultimo; and commenced a series of lectures *on the immediate Coming and Kingdom of Christ*, which were continued for ten days, to large, attentive, and well behaved audiences. The tent was capable of holding about 3000 persons; it was well seated and at night well lighted. The great novelty of this tabernacle, the excellent singing of Mrs. Brewer, and the very pleasant weather, drew large crowds during the whole course. We have seldom witnessed at so large collections, more harmony and good order prevail, (except on the last night) nor seen greater interest manifested. The principle speakers were Mr. E. Jacobs, Superintendent, and Mr. Brewer, both formerly of the Methodist Episcopal Church and both, men of quite limited education. Their lectures were mere repetitions of Mr. Miller's views, with slight variations to suit *the times*. Mr. Jacob's manner of speaking is quite energetic and forcible, but neither graceful nor eloquent.

We regret to have it to say that while Mr. Jacobs, who understands much in relation to the Blessed Hope of the Gospel, is most superlatively ignorant of the Faith and Obedience of it; as his last lecture and subsequent conduct demonstratively proved. He is a complete 'Gospel Nullifier.' He pulls down Babylon with one hand while he builds it up with the other. Such is his ignorance of the very first principles of the Christian system, that he contends that repentance must precede faith. Now, how in the very nature of things is such a man capable of teaching others how to prepare for the coming of the Lord, who knows nothing of the obedience of the gospel, the very first step towards such a preparation, and, who himself has never obeyed it? As Mr. Jacobs is yet in Babylon, we exhort him to come out of Her by obeying the *Truth* and thus avoid her dreadful doom, and thus also prepare in reality for the appearing of the Blessed Hope, namely, the glory of the great God and of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Our Second Advent friends are again subjecting themselves to another serious disappointment. They are looking, with great certainty for the coming of the Lord between the 20th and 23d inst. These repeated disappointments we hope will make them more rational and cause them to reflect seriously upon the many unfulfilled prophecies relative to the restoration of the *'old carnal Jews'* as they call them, to their ancient country, the Sanctuary which is now about being cleansed.

W. BODENHAMER.

Louisville, Oct. 10, 1844.

A VOICE FROM PHILADELPHIA.

CONCERNING

THE CLERGY AND COLLEGE BUILDERS OF THIS REFORMATION.

While on this subject I hope my brethren the 'Disciples of the Lord Jesus,' will receive the word of admonition. I think you will acknowledge that, for a few years back, there has been a spirit of growing conformity to the maxims and precepts of men manifest among us; and, for fear we may, as a body, fall under the 'mark of the beast,' I conceive it my duty while addressing you, solemnly and effectionately to warn you against the inroads of the 'Man of Sin.' If I could raise my voice so as to be heard through the length and breadth of this land, and was certain it would be my last address, I would say, brethren 'give not, heed to seducing spirits'—'heap not to yourselves *teachers*,' who, for their own gain, would make merchandize of you and teach you that, to support them, you should sell your property, and make great sacrifices: and all, too, under pretence of contributing to the advancement of Christ's kingdom. Remember what Christ said of the Pharisees in his day: *'They bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders; but they will not move them with one of their fingers.'* Matt. xxiii. 4. Who ever heard or read of an Apostle dictating to disciples how much each one ought to contribute per week, or month? or demanding of a Christian congregation a salary for doing what Christ has commanded all to do to the best of their ability? When a congregation of disciples employs a brother to proclaim the Gospel to the world *he ought to be sustained by it*, but to give a stipend to any brother in the church able to support himself, that he may occupy the time for lazy or carnal professors, who care more for eloquent speeches than they do for the edification of the body by its own members, agreable to apostolic injunctions, is, in my humble judgement, anti-Christian, and dangerous to the true interests of Zion. It matters not whether the stipend be one, five, or ten hundred dollars per annum—whether it be in Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Louisville, or Richmond—the danger is the same, the duty of exhortation will be set aside, and the 'one man system' be put in its place; then follows, as a natural consequence, a *learned* ministry, collegiate students in preparation for the ministry, the abrogation, so far as such men are concerned, of the apostolic declaration. *'God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the mighty: and base things of the world, and things which are despised, hath God chosen, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are; that no flesh should glory in his presence.'* 1. Cor. 27 29. I am not opposed to educated men, but to their elevation above the congregations and institutions of my King. I would have *all* to be educated and especially in the BOOK, Brethren, be warned—set your faces as a flint against such inovations; stand fast in the liberty with which Christ has made you free, and submit to no yoke of bondage. Bring forth the fruits of righteousness, and 'Sow to the Spirit,' *not dollars to support a clergyman*, but that which is equivalent to 'walking in the spirit,' 'bringing forth the fruits of the spirit;' then, when the glorious King appears you shall be found, having on the wedding garment, and you will hear the welcome sound, 'Enter into the joy of your Lord.'—*J. L. Rhees, "a Christian Elder."*

HERALD OF THE FUTURE AGE.

If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abrahams Seed, and Heirs according to the Promise.

JOHN THOMAS, EDITOR. RICHMOND, Va. VOLUME I. NUMBER IX.

ALL ANTIQUITY TESTIFIES TO THE "HERESY" OF OUR OPPONENTS.

We invite the attention of the reader to the following testimonies from ancient authors against the Hymenean and Philetan Heresy, which constitutes Orthodoxy, or soundness of faith, in the opinion of our opponents! We dedicate them especially to the Professor of Divinity in the "Church Department" of Bethany College, seeing that he takes such singular pains to impress upon his patrons the conviction that we are co-heretics with "Hymeneus and Co!" But according to the testimony of Antiquity, the tables are turned upon him, as we shall show more abundantly hereafter. We quote from Brooks on Prophecy page 52.

"The condition of 'separate spirits' between the period of death and the resurrection has so important a bearing upon the Millennarian doctrine, that I must be excused if I notice it more at large. It is clear from Scripture and from the Fathers, that *the believer does not at death* "ascend into the heavens," any more than did David–Acts ii. 34:–or than Christ did between his death and resurrection, who went to Paradise,* and had not even *after* his resurrection yet ascended unto the Father–John xx. 17.

It is very plain from the testimony of Justin Martyr, that in the primitive church, *they held those* NOT TO BE CHRISTIANS, *who maintained that souls are received into heaven immediately after death*. Irenæns ranks these professors, in his work against Heresies (lib. 5.) as among the heretical; and the testimony of the church is uniform on this point [if we except some questionable passages in Cyprian] down into Popish times: and indeed it was the general opinion of the Greek and Latin Churches down to the Council of Florence, held under Pope Eugenius IV. A. D. 1439.

A passage from Bp. Taylor's 'Liberty of Prophesying' §VIII, will set this matter in a clear light. When showing how doctrines of antiquity were sometimes contradicted in subsequent ages by Councils, or BY SOME ECCLESIASTIC OF power or *popularity*, he says, "that is a plain recession from antiquity, which was determined by the Council of Florence—piorum animas purgatas, &c., mox in cœlum recipi et intueri clare ipsum Deum Trinum et Unum sicuti est; the English of which is, *that the souls of the pious being purified, are immediately received into heaven and behold clearly the Triune Jehovah just as he is*:–for those who please to try, may see it resolved dogmatically to the contrary by Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Origen, Chrysostome, Theodoret, Arethas Cæsariensis, and Euthymius, who may answer for the Greek Church. And it is plain that it was the opinion of the Greek Church, by that great difficulty the Romans had of bringing the Greeks to subscribe to the Florentine Council, where the Latins acted their master piece of wit and strategem—the greatest that hath been till the famous and superpolitic Council of Trent. And for the Latin Church, Tertullian, Ambrose, Austin, Hilary, Prudentius, Lactantius, Victorinus, and Bernard, are known to be of opinion, that the souls of the saints are *in abditis receptaculis et exterioribus atris*—in unseen receptacles and outer darkness—where they expect the resurrection, &c."

"The early Reformers maintained the primitive faith on this point, plainly perceiving, that the object of the Papists was to help forward the doctrine of purgatory and invocation

---

*We dissent from this. He went to Hades or Sheol, the place of the dead; as says David, "thou wilt not leave my soul in *Sheol*"–Ps xvi.–not *Paradeisos*. Hence Messiah's soul came out of Sheol on the third day, and ascended not to Paradise, but to the right hand of God, from whence he will return to Paradise, which is the Perso-Hebraic appellation of the Kingdom and Glory of the Future Age. —*Editor*.

of saints. Thus Tyndal, disputing with the Papists, says, "if the souls be in heaven, tell me why they be no: in as good case as the angels be? And then, what cause of the resurrection?"—Hymeneus and Philetus, Alexander the coppersmith and Alexander the President, &c., must necessarily answer 'NONE!'

"And afterward in reply to Sir Thomas More, who objects against Luther (as our opponents do against us—ED.)—that his doctrine on this point, encouraged the sinner to continue in sin, seeing it so long postponed the ultimate judgment, Tyndal says, "Christ and his Apostles taught no other, but warned to look for Christ's coming again every hour; which coming again, because ye (Papists) believe it will *never be*, therefore have ye feigned that other merchandize"—of the instantaneous translation of souls to heaven at dissolution.

"Calvin also, in his *Psychopannuchia*, replies thus to another objection against this doctrine:—"I answer, that Christ is our head, whose kingdom and glory have not yet appeared. If the members were to go (to heaven) before their Head (comes) the order of things would be inverted and preposterous. But we shall follow our Prince then, when he shall come in the glory of his Father, and sit upon the throne of his majesty."—p. 55.

"It is greatly to be lamented, that the Protestant Church of a later period should have fallen into the errors of the Papists on this subject [abating the distinct acknowledgement of Purgatory]—errors, the adoption of which has done more than any other thing, perhaps, toward withdrawing from the church the lively expectation of Christ's Advent."

In Mr. Duffield's work, we also find the following extract concerning the testimony of Justin Martyr alluded to by Mr. Brooks. Justin was born A. D. 89, about nineteen years after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, and suffered death for Christ at A. D. 163. He tells Trypho, the Jew, "that some indeed called Christians, are in fact atheists (*atheoi* without God) and impious heretics, because in every way, they teach blasphemy, impiety and *folly*." He gives proof of his own sincerity, and protests that he was "determined to follow not men, nor human authority, but God and the doctrine taught by him;" adding, "should you happen upon some who are called Christians indeed, and yet are far from holding these sentiments, but even dare to assail the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob with blasphemy and say, 'there is no resurrection of the dead; BUT INSTANTLY WHEN THEY DIE, *their souls are received up into heaven*' DO NOT COUNT THESE AMONG CHRISTIANS, even as they are not Jews, *if accurately considered*, who are called Sadducees, and the like sects of Genistæ, Meristæ, Galileans Hellenists, Pharisees, Baptists † and others; but under the name of Jews and Sons of Abraham, they worship God, as he accuses them, with their lips only, while their heart is far from him. But I, and all who are sound in the Christian faith, are acquainted with the resurrection of the Body, and *the 1,000 years in Jerusalem*, that shall be rebuilt adorned, and enlarged, as the prophets Ezekiel, Isaiah, and others declare."

As Justin Martyr himself affirms, he was contemporary with the Apostle John, who wrote the Apocalypse, in which mention is made of the 1000 years (or "season and a time" of Daniel) five times, in connexion with the universal subjugation of evil, the resurrection from the dust of the sleeping saints, their reign with the 'Lord of Glory, and the final brief revival of iniquity. Thus early did THE FUTURE AGE *or* '*World to come*' enamor the unsophisticated minds of the faithful. Justin appears to have been one of this class at the time he wrote this. We see that had Alexander the President been contemporary with Justin the Martyr, he would have been classed by the latter with the "Atheists and Impious Heretics;" whom he thus styles, because they taught "blasphemy, impiety, and *folly*," in affirming, as our contemporaries do in effect, "that there is no resurrection of the dead,' when they say, that 'instantly when they die, their souls are received up into heaven!" Justin seems to have had our Lord's conversation with the Sadducees before his mind when he penned this passage. He regards this dogma of soul-translation to heaven before the resurrection, "as

†Justin regards these as a sect of Jews. Probably they were disciples of John the Baptist, who preferred his leadership to that of Jesus: followers of the Baptist, hence called *Baptists*, as opposed to those immersed into Christ, and hence styled Christians. Too old a sect to be apostolic. EDITOR.

assailing the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob with blasphemy." And derogatory to God's truth it assuredly is, for it reduces it to absurdity and folly. How? In that to maintain such a tradition is practically to set aside the promises made to Abraham, and to nullify the resurrections of life and judgment. For, if men go to heaven as soon as they die, what need of a resurrection, or of a judgment, or of the coming of our Lord and saviour Jesus Christ? Manifestly, none; and hence we generally find that, those who profess this vain conceit, resolve the First Resurrection into a figure, and the appearing of the Lord of Glory into the flight of an immortal and departing soul, or spirit, upon the wing of an angel to him! We have heard of an "elder" in this city interpreting the first resurrection by the fact of the current reformation—a resurrection of the Ancient Gospel and Ancient Order of Things! And from the deep delled region of collegiate divinity in the west, we hear a voice averring that, the coming of the Lord is providential, not literal! Would these men utter such foolishness if they believed they would receive no glory, honor, incorruptibility, and life till the Lord should actually appear and raise their "vile bodies" from the dust? No indeed! They would then ardently long for a literal resurrection, and a literal coming; but now they rejoice in figures, because their 'immortal souls' are going to glory when they die!!

Paul, that clear-headed and enlightened veteran of the faith, taught no such Gnosticism as this. "Our life,' says he, 'is hid with Christ in God. WHEN Christ, our life, shall appear, THEN shall we also appear with him in glory." But how can this be Paul, if, as "Hymeneus & Co" teach, men have immortal souls, or spirits, which go to heaven the instant they "put off this mortal coil?" Are Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob after being *bodiless* in heaven some 3700 years, to be brought to earth and clothed with clay, and then sent back to glory? If this be indeed your doctrine, seeing you have amply demonstrated your apostolic character, I will lay my hand upon my mouth and affirm it, because you teach it: but reason is at fault, yet you are a great reasoner: I cannot, however, reconcile your doctrine with their's. But methinks, I hear Paul say, 'my doctrine is not to be tried by their *Gnosis*, or 'science falsely so called' —I have charged them that they 'teach no other doctrine, nor give heed to fables.' Regard not their "profane vain babblings, and oppositions of Science‡ falsely so called; which they professing, have erred concerning the faith" Hear ye this ye Mystics? Men, nor souls, go to heaven nor to hell at dissolution; but they await, "sleeping in the dust," the glorious appearing of the 'King of Glory' for weal or woe. Ye have, indeed, more of Gnosticism in your creeds than gospel truth. And well did Justin denounce your predecessors in dogmatism as "teachers of blasphemy, impiety and *folly*;" yet, ye are the men, who affect a zeal of God against the heresy of Hymeneus, Alexander and Philetus!! See ye not your own deformity reflected from the specula of these professors of 'philosophy and vain deceit?" For the present we leave you to your lucubrations by which to extricate yourselves from your enthralment as best you may!

EDITOR.

‡*Gnosis* in the Greek; *Scientia* in Latin; and *Knowledge* in our tongue. The opinions of the Asiatic Mythologists concerning *souls, immortality, heaven, hell, &c*, so called; professed by "*Hymeneus & Co.*," and subversive of the Apostles' doctrine on these topics.

Jan. 31. 1686. Albigenses and Waldenses forbidden to exercise their religion by the decree of the French King; by which their pastors were banished, and places of worship ordred to be destroyed.

☞ The Bartholomew Massacre of the preceding August, the political death of the Two Witnesses.

One Hundred and Five years are Three Lunar Days and a Half. During this time they laid "unburied" in the Platea of the Roman Babylon; and hence their resurrection to political life occurred A. D. 1790-1.—ED.

A. D. 1845. The 2,300 yrs having ended last year, this will be the first of the "cleansing of the sanctuary"—the political and spiritual Holies, viz. the Holy Land and City, and the Church of the living God. ED.

A CHRISTIAN is one who believes THE GOSPEL preached by Peter on Pentecost, and has been baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins. Is not this true?

THE CRISIS.

BY DR. BODENHAMER, OF LOUISVILLE, KY.

As the above caption appears to be quite a popular one of late with some of our writers, I too feel disposed to make, a few brief and desultory remarks under the same. And first, no one well acquainted with the rise, progress and present internal condition of what we commonly call *The Reformation* will deny that a crisis in its affairs has arrived, entirely new, unexpected and unprecedented in its past history; one which should demand the most prayerful and most profound attention of every disciple of the blessed Saviour, and of every lover of truth and christian liberty amongst us. The fundamental principles defined and ably advocated in the seven volumes of the Christian Baptist, published by Mr. Campbell; of which the following were the leading sentiments or mottoes; "*Style no man on earth your father; for he alone is your father who is in heaven; and all ye are brethren.*" "Assume not the title Rabbi; for ye have only one teacher; neither assume the title Leader; for ye have only one Leader the Messiah." "What a glorious freedom of thought do the Apostles recommend, and how contemptible in their account is a blind and implicit faith. May all christians use this liberty of judging for themselves in matters of religion, and allow it to one another and to all mankind." "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." The same excellent work advocated the following principles; the all sufficiency of scripture as a *perfect rule* of faith and practice. The right of each individual to judge for himself as to what is required by scripture. The equality of teachers and people, and the equality of the people themselves with each other; so that amongst us no man should be called Rabbi, Leader, or Supervisor; but that all should be brethren. The entire independence of each church. The liberty to search the scriptures for ourselves; the liberty to lay aside whatever in us we discovered to be wrong or contrary thereto; and the liberty to do with all our might what we learned by the diligent study of the same to be our duty The principle that there was no heresy spoken of in the Word of God, but such as originated in, was inseparably connected with, and inevitably led to sinful tempers and vicious practices; and that while after the first and second admonition, heretics were to be rejected, we had no authority under the heavens to reject any man whom Christ had received, and whom we believed to be walking in Christ, the principle, to receive one another without regard to difference of opinion, etc. These then were some of the numerous fundamental principles so efficiently contended for both by the press and the mouth. But are they now the principles and sentiments that obtain among us? No, far from it. They have been most shamefully abandoned, and that too by some of those very persons who so ably advocated them, and who suffered for them. To be convinced of this, it is only necessary for us to compare the seven volumes of the Christian Baptist to the last seven volumes of the Millennial Harbinger; to compare the conduct of the reformers of those days to the conduct of the reformers of these days; and then to ask ourselves the question in the fear of God, *wherein have we reformed for the last eight or ten years?* It is true we daily hear of the rapid march, of the great accessions, of the healthful & peaceful condition of the reformation. But let us not be deceived, let us look a little deeper than the mere surface of things. We must not be deceived by the mere boasting of some disingenuous vanegelist, nor suffer ourselves to be misled by the high colouring of some of the reformation presses; for some of these we truly regret to say are now becoming nothing better than the mere organs or echoes of party, and like the religious sectarian newspapers of the day, do often little more than 'brush and cry down' any truths they think might in the least militate against the interest of the mere party in whose employ they are. But the peace of this reformation is the peace of the grave; and the strength (of numbers) of which there is now so much boasting is in reality its weakness, and will ultimately prove its dissolution. In its early days it consisted of a small band of brethren and sisters contending earnestly by day and by night for the faith once delivered to the saints. They were surrounded by opposition of every kind. They were styled heretics, factionists, schismatics and disturbers of the peace of churches; and their names were cast out as evil, and they were considered as the filth of the earth; but in the midst of all this they remained steadfast, and continued in the Apostles doctrine, the fellowship, the breaking of bread, and the prayers, going on to reform both in theory and in practice as they learned the will of God. Then they had no need of a new organization, besides that of the bible, to keep them together, they were kept together by the cohesive power of love, love to the blessed Saviour and love to one another. Then they had no need of "College Bred Evangelists" to ride round the country, battling the sects, hunting up heretics and factionists; and building up a mere sectarian party. Then they were persecu*ted* but now many of them are persecu*tors*. Then they had no need of any earthly Leader being all brethren and having but one Leader the Messiah, but now they have one who assumes the title Leader or Supervisor, claiming to have been called to this office in the providence of God as Luther and Wesley are imagined to have been and dictating as to who should or who should not be his co-labourers in the church of Christ. Now even Luther himself was much more modest and not so presumptuous as all this; for he says when speaking on what we might term his call, "Wer weiss ob mich gott dazu berufen und erwaehtl hat;" that is; 'Who knows whether God has not called and chosen me for the very purpose.' And in another place he says, 'Ich sage nicht dass ich ein Prophet sey;' that is, 'I do not say that I am a prophet (or teacher).' Now is it not a fact that in accordance with the assumption of this Supervisor; has he not acquired as much power as in many instances to exercise almost complete dominion over reason itself. And can it be denied that with a very large number, that most any thing he says; or that issues from Bethany is equal to a 'thus saith the Lord.' Hence at his mere dictation, the Doors and Ears of this reformation can either be closed or opened; at his mere nod the hands of fellowship can be withheld. Let him just brand you with the odious epithet, Heretic, or Factionist, and your character so far as this reformation is concerned, is undone for ever. It is only necessary for him to say the word, and the work is done. To hear many of our brethren and sisters and evangelists, and read many of our periodicals one would almost be forced to the conclusion that he was more than mortal, that he was infallible. What is this but man-worship! What is it but the destructive spirit of ultra partizanship. The Lord knows we are not the enemy of this man, because we speak out the truth boldly and fearlessly; but we are the sworn enemy to his unscriptural ambition. We are not only willing but we are extremely anxious to accord to him his true character and position. He is indeed 'a great man' we freely confess; he is learned, he is persevering, he is energetic, he is bold, but he is endowed with an indomitable spirit of dictation; and thus preeminently fitted for what he is daily proving himself to be a great Partizan Leader. All that is now necessary to consummate his ambition is to put into operation his new organization; this is the yoke which he has now ready made; ready to be placed upon the necks of his followers, as soon as a sufficient number of them can be made willing to wear it. In the early part of his career, before the praises, the flattery, and exaggerated compliments bestowed upon him had intoxicated him and caused his head to grow dizzy; he was the 'plain Alexander Campbell;' he stood up boldly and fearlessly for those inestimable principles he now in practice denies. 'But the times are changed and we are changed in them.' For those early and excellent services, we honour him, and we shall ever hold them in greatful remembrance, and ever regret, sincerely regret that he whose life at one time promised such glorious results, should in his old age (like Solomon) sectarianize or 'forsake the house of his fathers (the Apostles) and go wandering after strange Gods.' This to us holds out a lesson, mortifying indeed, but pregnant with instruction. It teaches us not to put our trust in mortal man, whose breath is in his nostrils, but in the Living God who changes not. It will no doubt be considered by some, great presumption in as humble an individual as we are to make these remarks in reference to Mr. Campbell. But we have always been governed by the principle 'Love for all mankind; but fear for none.' 'For the fear of man brings a snare.' In the further prosecution of this subject, and in order to prove to demonstration the proposition, that we as the reformation have most fearfully departed from first and fundamental principles,

we shall refer to nothing but facts which are stubborn things. We shall compare the writings and actions of individuals and churches to their writings and actions heretofore. And we shall name them out, so that if any thing we should say, should not prove to be so, we can be corrected. But in the mean time Brother Thomas. Vale.

W. BODENHAMER.

"PASSED THE RUBICON."

Such is a phrase used by us in a number of the Investigator. It is of course metaphorical, as no Rubicon flows through the prairies of Northern Illinois where we resided when we thus ex ressed ourselves. Cæsar passed the Rubicon at the head of his legions towards 'the Eternal City,' a movement, which was construed into hostility to the Conscript Fathers of the Senate of the Roman People. In a non-literal sense, then, we also have passed the Rubicon, and marshalled our ideas in hostility to the crafty *policy* of the conscript fathers of Spiritual Rome, which has invaded and is fast extinguishing the vitality of 'this Reformation.'

When Cæsar 'passed the Rubicon' did he cease to be a Roman, or when he crossed that river, did he pass *out of* Italy? Certainly neither. So when in a figurative sense, we 'passed the Rubicon,' we did not cease to be what we were when our worthy brother Scot emerged us from the baptismal grave, neither did we pass out, or excommunicate ourselves from 'christian intercourse with any congregation' which 'holds not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect to persons.'

We have 'passed the Rubicon' in this, that we have no fellowship for any *organization of churches* with an evangelical order, a Collegiate Church department, and self constituted supervisor at the head thereof. We would rather be under an Association of Baptist Divines, than under such an organization of fallibles. This is the form which things have now assumed, and which, we suppose, constitute 'This Reformation' of 1845! When Mr. Campbell was little in his own eyes, before he was spoiled by the fulsome adulation of persons, who esteemed him magnificent in the ratio of their own inherent impotence, when we first knew him some twelve years since—*no such Reformation existed*; and then as is confessed by all who are acquainted with he facts, Ancient Christianity was practised & pleaded for with a scripturality & spirit tha no longer exist. We have no objection to the organization of churches spoken of in the Acts and Epistles, this was apostolic and ministered by the Spirit. It was *the kingdom of heaven in word and power*; an infallible administration of spiritual affairs of all churches, which cannot be reorganized until the Lord comes, for want of the '*gift of the Holy Spirit.*' Men may rejoice in the name 'Evangelist' etc, and become inflated with spiritual or rather Mystical pride, from their fancied self-importance; but they are no more in possession of the thing by which the saints were anciently perfected, for the work of the ministry and edification of the body of Christ' than are the sectarian clergy, who claim to be the Ambassadors of Christ. If we have the name, let us have *the power*, for pretensions formed upon mere assumption are absolute y and unqualifiedly ridiculous. When 'Evangelists' 'Elders' and 'Pastors' shall display this in something more scriptural than in votes of majorities we shall be prepared to admit their 'right to say what may be preached,' and to decide upon matters of faith, discipline, and opinion 'without appeal!' Till then, we repass not the Rubicon, though the heavens fall.

We have also 'passed the Rubicon' in this that we shall not cease to protest against the *indiscriminate* admission of our Baptist friends into churches professing to be engaged in preparing themselves for the marriage of the Lord (Rev. xix. 7—9.) If a church be 'the pillar and support of the truth' in a neighborhood it is its bounden duty to examine all candidates for admission to its fellowship, that it may ascertain whether they have obeyed the gospel preached by the Apostles If the candidates cannot satisfy it of this fundamental principles of fellowship, such church would be recreant to the truth, and an unfaithful 'steward to the mysteries of God' to admit them. Our counsel is therefore, and we presume to speak only as an advice, for no man under the sun has the right, or power to dictate authoritatively in matters of religion; our advice is, that where a church is about to be formed on *apostolic principles* none should be incorporated, who cannot prove to the satisfaction of intelligent persons, who have themselves obeyed the truth. That they have yielded an enlightened obedience to '*the* LAW *of faith.*' Upon this principle we, acted in St. Charles, and in this sense we then and there 'passed the Rubicon.' What honest reformer, unspoiled by human tradition, can consistently object to this?

When a church called 'reformed,' has so far departed from first principles as to close its eyes, its ears and its doors against the truth, it ceases to fulfil the end of its institution. We 'passed the Rubicon' in relation to such churches in that we resolved, though styled reformed, to protest against them. We are opposed to disciples separating themselves from churches so long as there is hope of reclaiming them. But if they are determined to rebuild the things which formerly they pulled down, and thus constitute themselves transgressors, we repeat that separation from such is a virtue: for in longer remaining with them we become partakers of their evil deeds. Were modern churches planted by apostles and constant in the faith, separation would be rebellion against Christ. Such was the crime of those in John's day of whom he wrote saying, 'who went out from us, but were not of us;' but even from an apostolically organized church, which should become corrupt, separation was a virtue, accordingly such a separation did occur A. D 250, when the division line was drawn between the Witnesses of Jesus and the Apostacy. But modern churches are not apostolical; it is our duty therefore, to contend for apostolicity in them so long as they will hear, and when they cease to do this, then pass the Rubicon in relation to them. This we have done, and are prepared to abide the decision of the great day, when the Lord will judge righteously between us and our opponents.

EDITOR.

PEACE BASED UPON OBEDIENCE TO THE GOSPEL.

TO THOSE WHO HAVE PURIFIED THEIR SOULS BY OBEYING THE TRUTH.

BRETHREN BELOVED,

Peace was one of the glorious themes sung by the angels of Heaven when Jesus our Redeemer was born. He is emphatically the 'Prince of Peace.' His gospel in every doctrine and in every precept breathes Peace among the true Israel of God. Jesus said to his disciples on one occasion 'These things have I spoken unto you that *in me* ye might have peace;' and again, 'Have Peace one with another;' 'God hath called us to Peace,' and the Apostle Paul informs us that one of the fruit of the spirit is Peace. The same Apostle in writing to the Thessalonians says to them 'Be at peace among yourselves' and he directs the Ephesians to endeavour to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of Peace.

We are commanded to love one another with a pure heart fervently even as Christ has loved us and given himself for us. We are taught that love is the fulfilling of the whole law, and the beloved disciple says 'this commandment have we from him that he who loves God love his brother also.' Now where this Love dwells, there must of necessity be Peace; for as Light & Darkness cannot dwell together, neither can Love and Discord exist in the same bosom.

But Love and Peace are the fruit of the Spirit; in order then to the possession and practice of those christian virtues, it is indispensably necessary that we possess the Spirit from which those virtues flow as Light procedes from the Sun. In other words *we must* ALL *believe and practice the things taught by the one Spirit. This belief and practice*, brethren *we hold to be the grand prerequisite for Love and Peace*, and our sole object in addressing you is the promotion of Peace in the different congregations of Jesus Christ. Error and its evil consequences have existed amongst us for years—the demon of Discord is brooding ov r us with outstretched win s and it i high

time that she should be compelled to retreat before the light of the Truth as the bird of night hastens from the face of day. What do the scriptures require us to believe and practice?

They require that we should believe the Gospel and obey it, and thenafter to persevere in well doing. So then belief of the Gospel, obedience thereto, and perseverance in well doing are grand prerequisites for Love and Peace, and when there is Discord it must be imputed to non-belief of the Gospel, to non-obedience to it or to non-perseverance in well doing.

But *what is the Gospel?*

Jesus after his resurrection from the dead thus commanded his Apostles 'Go ye out into all the world and PREACH THE GOSPEL to every creature he that believes [the Gospel] and is baptized shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be damned.

On another occasion he said, 'thus it behoved Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead the third day and THAT REPENTANCE AND THE REMISSION OF SINS SHOULD BE PREACHED IN HIS NAME among all nations beginning at Jerusalem.

From a comparison of these two passages it must be evident to the meanest capacity that *Repentance and Remission of sins in the name of Jesus Christ constitute the Gospel.*

What does the Apostle Paul style the Gospel?

How that Christ died for our sins according to Scripture, that he was buried, that he rose the third day according to Scripture.' Now in preaching that he died he had of course to show that Jesus was the Christ, for Jesus is the only one in whom the Scripture has been fulfilled, and in preaching that Christ died for our sins he necessarily preached Repentance and the remission of sins in the name of Jesus Christ.

How did the Apostle Peter fulfil his commission 'Preach the Gospel to every creature beginning at Jerusalem?'

He first proved that Jesus was the Christ. This truth *of itself* was no gospel. Gospel signifies good news and this was the worst news that could fall upon the ears of the Jews, for it convicted them of having crucified God's anointed. What then was the Gospel preached by Peter? 'Repent and be baptized every one of you [Believers] in the name of Jesus Christ for remission of sins and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.'

From these premises it is evident that the Gospel consists of Truths, Facts, Commands, and Promises. These Truths and Facts we must believe: we must believe the commands to be of divine authority and we must have faith in the Promise, and then, *and not till then* do we believe the gospel of Jesus Christ.

The Scriptures of the New Testament countenance the pretensions of no such man to christianity unless he has understood and believed these Truths, Facts, Commands and Promises, and the man who has obeyed THE Gospel knows what he has been immersed for—for the commands are Repent and be baptized and the promise is contained in what follows—'for the remission of sins.'

As then these things collectively constitute the Gospel and nothing but the Gospel, do we act scipturally in receiving into our fellowship persons who prior to their immersion understood but a part of the Gospel and that too in most cases, mixed up with human tradition? We do not ask is it expedient? With expediency in matters of Faith and Practice we have nothing to do. For our own part we place no value on a dipping in water unless the person immersed believed the Gospel, the whole Gospel and nothing but the Gospel at the time he went down into the water. The Scriptures no where teach that a sectarian baptism may become christian baptism by a change of faith in the individual in after life. We adhere to God's plan. Faith first and *afterwards* Baptism.

Brethren, if we continue to admit into the different congregations persons possessing other than the one Faith [in the Gospel] and the Baptism (in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of past sins) we unavoidably perpetuate Error and Discord.

Let us act Scripturally in this and other matters, and Peace will crown our labours. Some on seeing this may cry out "A Creed a Creed!" We say to such if there should be any, prove the doctrine here laid down to be other than the doctrine of Christ and his Apostles. Unless you can do this, neither we nor any who exercise the privilege of thinking for themselves will heed the cry.

Signed by order of the Church of Jesus Christ, commonly called the Oak Grove Church Lunenburg Virginia.

CHARLES GEE,
HENRY G. HARDY,
CHARLES MAY,
} ELDERS.

Jany. 19th 1845.

The Editors of the "Christian Intelligencer" and "Millennial Harbinger" are requested to copy.

CHARLES GEE,
HENRY G. HARDY,
CHARLES MAY.

"THE CRISIS" ILLUSTRATED.

DR. MAY TO THE READERS OF THE CHRISTIAN INTELLIGENCER & MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

You may remember that in the early part of the present year a document made its appearance in the Intelligencer and the Harbinger professing to be the cerificate of thirteen persons who composed the majority of the Committee who met at John T. Jeter's after the debate between Mr. Campbell and Dr. Thomas.

The persons whose names are appended to it are said to certify that said covenant was between Dr. Thomas and the brethren who signed it and not between Dr. Thomas and A. Campbell alone; but they affirm *concerning* a covenant without attempting to show that any covenant exists.

The sole object that Committee had in view was the reconciliation of A. Campbell and John Thomas. They accordingly proposed to these two men certain terms which being acceded to by them they, Campbell and Thomas gave each other the right hand of fellowship in presence of the Committee and here the labors of the Committee ceased. It must be evident, I think, from this that the twenty three acted as *Referees* and not as covenanters. Mr. Campbell and Dr. Thomas had met privately in Richmond not many days before for the purpose of accommodating their difficulties. This object was not attained and then at Painville finding that neither could convince the other of error they consented that the brethren present should consult together and propose some terms to the two by which they, the two men might be reconciled to each other, they A. C, and J. T. having the privilige of modifying or rejecting the terms. The brethren accordingly made a proposition to them—to this they both gave there assent and shook hands in token of reconciliation.

These being the facts in the case I would ask how came the committee to be a party to a covenant with Dr. Thomas. Will not every unprejudiced man infer from the facts that the matter of difficulty between Mr. C. and Dr. Thomas was REFERED to the brethren and that consequently the committee acted as referees only? Was there any difficulty between the majority of the twenty three and Dr Thomas at that time? It is well known there was none and if necessary it could be proved that, however bitter may be the opposition of certain of these to the Doctor now, they did coincide with him in his views at the time when as they allege he made a covenant with them But enough as to the covenant from me, this matter has been most ably handled by 'Johannes Baptistes' in the Herald of the Future Age.

The Editor of the Intelligencer claims a clear majority of the original signers on his side the question. Is it so! *Nous verrons* The original signers numbered twenty three. One of them is dead, another expelled, a third removed to the West and a fourth has withdrawn himself. The name of the last is however appended to the certificate published in the Spring. To that document there are thirteen names—these constitute the clear majority and besides these they are according to Dr. Jackson, a letter entitled to two others—James Chappel and Thomas E. Jeter. These names would raise the number to fifteen—quite a respectable majority now that every thing has to be determined by votes of majorities. If, for instance, the Preachers wish to recommend to the churches some duty

plainly taught in the sacred Scriptures forsooth they must embody it in a Resolution and take the vote upon it. Does a man learn something more from the Sacred Oracles than his fellows—if he will not submit to be gagged the majority votes him to be a heretic & cast him out of their church, & if this is not sufficient to destroy him some grey headed old "Brother" may possibly be found amongst the clergy who will set afloat a slander and thus endeavor to destroy him morally as well as religiously. I have all along been of opinion that no certificate was needed nor any voting necessary in relation to the Reconciliation, the Preamble and Resolution stand on Record and speak for themselves.

Before they claim fifteen signatures a very large majority I must admit, did they all but agree together in relation to that of which they testify. But unfortunately for Mr. Goss and Co. they differ and that materially, and there's the rub.

It would appear that a certificate originated from the fountainhead of Slander in Eastern Virginia; that thence it found its way into Lunenburg and other counties with certain signatures attached to it but that when presented to certain opposers of Dr. Thomas here they refused to sign it because *it* affirmed that the covenant was between the Dr. and the committee and *not* between Dr. Thomas and A. Campbell; and their opinion was that the Dr. had covenanted with *A. C. and* the committee. Well what was to be done? The Doctor must needs be put down. Why they put in the little word *alone* and then it read that the covenant was between Dr. Thomas and the committee and not between Dr. Thomas and A. Campbell alone. 'Tis true the meaning became dark and mysterious but what of that? The Priests have delighted in mysticism from the days of the Delphian Oracle to this time and by this Jesuistry the object was attained *apparent unanimity* amongst the signers. Thus we see that said signers do in reality hold different opinions in relation to what is styled the covenant. One party affirm, in effect, that there was one covenant; the other that there were two covenants and these two variant parties constitute the clear majority!

Two parties did I say? why I will show that amongst the fifteen there is yet a third variant party. And what does the third party of the 'clear majority, testify to? Will you believe it?—*They affirm that Dr. Thomas did not covenant with the Committee at all!!!*

Certain of the 'clear majority' then assert that Dr. Thomas covenanted with the committee alone; others of them affirm that the Dr. covenanted with Mr. Campbell alone and others that he covenanted with *both* Mr. C. and the committee. Really we cant help exclaiming with Desdemona. "'Tis strange, tis passing strange, tis pitiful, tis wondrous pitiful."

Do you ask how it happened that this third variant party of the 'clear majority' could sign such a certificate as that published in the Intelligencer? I will tell you how it happened, but first premise a few things.

Mr. Silas Shelburne of this county, formerly a preacher amongst the Baptists, now amongst Reformers, noted for his inveterate hostility towards Dr. Thomas in particular, as it is believed by many in consequence of the Doctor's advocating obedience to the Gospel of Jesus Christ, or if you please *intelligent* obedience for they are one & the same. This gentleman, I say was active in obtaining signatures to the said certificate and in the course of his peregrinations visited Mr. Henry G. Hardy. Having broached the subject of the 'covenant' he drew forth a paper and read or professed to read a certificate he invited Mr. Hardy to attach his signature to. Mr. H. wished to read the document before subscribing it and intimated the same to Mr. Shelburne speaking to the following effect, "I should like to read the paper for myself as I shall be better able to understand it than from hearing it read." At the same time he held out his hand to receive it, but Mr. S. retained it in his possession evidently unwilling to allow Mr. H. to see it. Mr. H. did not have the opportunity of reading it and did not sign it. Brother Hardy informed me of these circumstances soon after their occurrence and I was led to suspect every thing was not as it should be. When afterwards I saw the signatures of Messrs Horner and Booker to the document the idea occured to me that some imposition had been practiced on them, for from my acquaintance with these brethren I expected they would refuse to subscribe to any such paper. Then a letter was published in the Intelligencer from Dr. Jackson in which he states on the authority of Thomas F. Jeter that James Chappell approved of the sentiments expressed in the certificate. I was surprised but incredulous, and determined to write to Brother Chappell, but before doing so I heard that Messrs Horner and Booker had been deceived and that Mr. Chappell took a very different view of the matter from that reported. In order to be fully informed I wrote to Mr. C. and received the following reply.

Amelia Co. Va. July 26th 1844.

DEAR SIR,

Yours of the 19th inst has been received. You request me to inform you as to my understanding of a certain covenant between certain members of our church at Paineville and Doctor Thomas "who were parties to the covenant. Did Doctor Thomas covenant with the brethren or with A. Campbell or with both?' In answer to the questions proposed I have to say, that I was present at the time of the formation of the covenant aforesaid and that I understood the same to have been entered into between A. Campbell and John Thomas at the instance and through the mediation of the members of the Church present. That the agreement or covenant was only between the two persons above named and by whom, and for what reason the same was effected I have only to refer you to the remarks of Dr. Dejernette when he says 'the Brethren exclaimed now we have them in our hands and we will make peace with them before we let them go.' I deem it unnecessary to say more in regard to the subject than that I have recently had a conversation with Brother Horner and Booker and that they concur fully with me as to their understanding of the agreement or reconciliation above, and they informed me that at the time when they signed a certain certificate expressing an opinion different from what is here expressed they did not understand the purport of that certificate or they would never have assented to it.

I avail myself of the opportunity to record my approbation of the conduct of Dr. Thomas while he resided among us and that he maintained, and so far as I have been able to ascertain, merited the character of a gentleman and a Christian; that he left us in full fellowship with the Church, and carried with him the good wishes of his neighbours.

Yours in the Gospel,
JAMES CHAPPELL.

(Brother Campbell ridiculed the idea of my giving Brother Thomas a character, because I resided in Amelia but ten months. What will he say to the above written by a gentleman of undoubted veracity and a resident of the county for many years—for ought I know to the contrary during his whole life time hitherto.)

Bro. William Arvin Junr. afterwards went down to Amelia and obtained a certificate from the hands of Brother Booker and Horner which he sent to me, and which was to the following effect.

"Whereas there has appeared in the Christian Intelligencer and also in the Harbinger a certificate concerning the reconciliation that took place at Paineville in the fall of 1838 between brother Campbell and Thomas, and whereas our names are connected thereto, we feel ourselves called upon by a sense of duty to ourselves and also to brother Thomas, to give our reasons for signing the same and also to state our convictions of the truth of the matter. In the first place the certificate was presented us by brother Silas Shelburne who told us the Doctor had altogether denied the facts in the case that took place at Paineville in relation to the covenant. We had not seen what the Doctor had said on the subject and having had the utmost confidence in the statement of brother Shelburne we took it for granted that brother Thomas had so done. Our object in signing the certificate was simply to testify that brother Thomas had entered into a covenant and we signed that certificate not properly understanding its import. We have since seen brother Thomas's statement and do heartily concur in that statement of the matter and had we seen it before we would not have signed the certificate."

ISHAM C. BOOKER,
THOMAS J. HORNER.

Amelia Va. August, 24th 1844.

These Brethren testify that they had "the utmost confidence" in Mr. S. Mark how that confidence was abused! and that too by one styling himself a minister of the Gospel!!

Query—How many others subscribed that document through implicit confidence in S. S.?

(What character will Editor Goss give

Messrs Horner and Booker now! A little while ago he said they were men of "unimpeachable integrity" but surely there cant be a man of unimpeachable integrity amongst those who agree in sentiment with Dr. Thomas; at least we would scarcely suppose so from the character Mr. Goss gives of that 'faction.')

Moreover the names of Silas and Cephas Shelburne ought never to have appeared with the names of the Brethren at the foot of the committee resolution, for the matter of difficulty was referred to "*the Brethren*" and their certificate itself affirms that the covenant was between the Doctor and the *Brethren*. Now the Shelburnes at that time were not considered as brethren, for, some time before the Debate at Painville Mr. S. and son had withdrawn from the fellowship of the Brethren and had made an effort to unite with the Baptists but had met with a repulse from that quarter and it was not until some considerable time *after the Painevill meeting* that these difficulties were *glossed* over, and that they considered themselves in fellowship.

If then we take from the fifteen the names of Chappell, Horner, Booker, and the two Shelburnes there will remain but ten, and even these differ in relation to this very covenant, one party affirming that the Doctor covenanted with A. Campbell and the committee the other asserting that he did not covenant with A. Campbell at all but with the committee alone, of such heterogeneous materials, in this 'clear majority' composed that at the touch of investigation, it crumbles down to an insignificant minority.

I at one time intended getting up a counter certificate and could have procured quite a respectable number of the committee giving their opinion that the Doctor did not covenant with the committee at all but on considering how very clearly the Preamble and Resolution speak on this subject, I deemed it totally unnecessary. Besides I do not conceive that the opinion of any portion of that committee as entitled to any more weight—perhaps not to as much weight as the opinion of the same number of unprejudiced men who were not present, but who have simply read the Preamble and Resolution. Thanks to the writer of them they are couched in the most intelligible language as 'Johannes Baptistes' hath it 'Men may change, they may be honestly blinded, but not so with paper and ink.

In conclusion let me say a few words, to those who are opposing the Doctor in consequence of his unwearied assiduity in pleading for an intelligent obedience to the Gospel My friends you are, as he himself tells you butting your heads against a stone wall and if you continue to keep butting you will be very likely to lose what proportion of brains you may possess. Be advised then by one who wishes you well. "Purify your souls by obeying the Truth." Obey that Gospel which you appear so anxious for others to obey. Come forward manfully and do it and then teach the world by example as well as precept derived from obeying the dictates of your conscience and the peace of mind imparted by the *knowledge* of remission of sins will swallow up every thing else. "Be wise to day; tis madness to defer." Procrastination is the thief of time. "To day if you will hear his voice harden not your hearts. When you have obeyed from the heart the perfect Law of Liberty I presume we shall get along together in Peace and Love, but until then, there cannot be any *true* fellowship between us. I assure you that from my heart I wish you well, and while your life continues, I but hope, that you will prepare yourselves for the coming of the King of Kings.

One question and I have done: Would it not be a far more honorable course to come out candidly and confess, that your aversion to the Doctor arises from his earnest pleading for an intelligent obedience to the Gospel rather than act the hypocrite and cry out Speculation, no Soulism etc. etc.?

CHARLES MAY.

☞Read Dr May's address to the readers of the Harbinger and Intelligencer: Suppose the Editor to be as abominable as his opponents would make him out to be, is not their conduct most disreputable and disgraceful? A pretty set of covenanters truly! Campbell says he made no covenant with Thomas at all, others of them (his partizans too) say, you did, but it was not with him alone, but with him and us; others, and the more reckless, say, you are right, you did not in any way covenant with Thomas; others of the referees say, we did not covenant with Thomas, nor he with us, nor we with you, nor you with us, but if there was any "covenant" which has not been proved, it was between you and him alone. But why all this tergiversation on the part of Campbell and his partizans? Because he renewed the war upon us and hence denies the mutuality of agreement in order to shield himself from well merited rebuke; his partizans seeing his dilemma, have rushed to his rescue, determined to rescue him at whatever sacrifice of truth, principle, or integrity. But after all there are always two parties to a covenant at least All agree, if there was a covenant, *Dr. Thomas was one of the two parties*. Is it reasonable to say that he does not know with whom he covenanted? Was he asleep at the time? He had no difficulty with any *brethren* on the list; for as Dr May says truly Silas Shelburne was not of the brethren; he could not therefore have entered into a covenant of reconciliation with them. But he had difficulty with A. Campbell as all the world knows. It was to reconcile these two editors, that the least possible sacrifice was proposed by the referees to them—that if Bro. Thomas would consent to do thus and so, Bro. Campbell ought to be satisfied and be friends. Dr. Thomas was bound by nothing, but the good faith of Mr. Campbell, and his own desire of continued peace. This all the obligation he ever felt in the matter; with the views of others he has nothing to do, They can, and do, put what construction upon it they please, regardless of every thing but the crimination if possible of Dr. Thomas, that by making him odious their own delinquincy and unprincipled conduct, may be veiled from observation. We recognize no one in this affair, but A. Campbell; and he declares he did not covenant with Dr. Thomas at all!! Then there was no covenant; and having renewed the war upon us, things have resumed the "as you were" position, which will doubtless contribute greatly to the vindication of the truth and its real friends in the end. We have the history of this affair in manuscript, which in due time will see the light. At present we say no more.

EDITOR.

IMMORTALITY DEPENDENT ON THE RESURRECTION;

AND ONLY THROUGH JESUS CHRIST.

EXTRACTS FROM A DISCOURSE DELIVERED BY "HENRY MELVILL, BACHELOR OF DIVINITY, AND MINISTER OF CAMDEN CHAPEL, LATE OF CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY, ENGLAND"—A CLERGYMAN OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

This, with many other discourses of the same author, the most popular and gifted of the Established Clergy at the present day in England—is published with a preface and sketch of the author, by Bishop C. R. McIlvaine, of the Episcopal Church of Ohio. The text is founded on John xi 25 "I am the resurrection and the life."

In tracing the inseparable connexion between the resurrection of the body and the Immortality of the Soul, the author says, page 100:

"It seems to us, that, in claiming such titles as those which are to come under review, Christ declared himself the *cause* and the *origin* of the *immortality* of our bodies and *souls*. In announcing himself as the "resurrection" he must be considered as stating, that he *alone* effects the wondrous result of the corruptible putting on incorruption. In announcing himself as "the life," he equally states, that *he* endows the spirit with its happiness, yea, rather with *its existence* through eternity. If Christ had only termed himself "the resurrection" we might have considered him as referring merely to the body, asserting it to be a consequence on his work of mediation, that the dust of ages should again quicken into life. But when he terms himself also "the life," we cannot but suppose a reference to the immortality of the soul, so that this noble and sublime fact is in some way, associated with the achievement of redemption.

"We are accustomed, indeed, to think that the immortality of the soul is *independent* of the atonement; so that, although had there been no redemption, there would have been no resurrection, the principle within us would have remained unquenched, subsisting for e-

ver and ever accessible to pain and penalty. We shall not pause to examine the justice or injustice of the opinion. We shall only remark that the *existence* of the *soul* is nndoubtedly as dependent on God as that of the body; *that no spirit, except Deity itself, can be necessarily and inherently, immortal*; and that if it should please the Almighty to put an arrest on those momentary outgoings of life which flow from himself and permeate the Universe, he would instantly once more be alone in infinity, and one vast bankruptcy of being overspread all the provinces of creation. There seems no reason, if we may thus speak, *in the nature of things* why the soul should not die. Her life is a *derived* and *dependent* life, and that which is derived and dependent, may of course *cease to be*, at the will of the author and upholder, and it is far beyond us to ascertain what term of being would have been assigned to the soul, had there arisen no champion and surety of the fallen. We throw ourselves into a region of speculation across which there runs no discernible path-way when we enquire, whether there would have been an annihilation, supposing there had not been a redomption of man. We can only say that, the *soul has not* and cannot have, auy more than the body, *the sources of vitality in herself.* We can therefore see the possibility if not prove the certainty, that it is only because "the word was made flesh," and struggled for us and died, that *the human spirit* is unquenchable, and that the principle which distinguishes us from the brutes, shall retain everlastingly its strength and its majesty."

Again page 102. "We shall then, in the second place, attempt to prove, that the resurrection of the body is a great element in the demonstration of the "life,'–the immortality of the soul."

Again, "the original curse was a curse of *death* on the *whole man.*'

Now what I ask, do such statements as these indicate, but the simple and scriptural proposition, that man is *not* by nature an immortal being; that he is *not* possessed of an immortal soul; that it is only '*in Christ*' that we find "the cause and origin" of our 'life,' and immortality; and these are conferred at the resurrection? Mr. Melvill is right. The soul, no more than the body, possesses "the sourses of vitality in herself;"–is not *by nature* immortal.

Such are the sentiments of the most elevated in talents and reputation, of the living clergymen of England–of one of whom, the British Critic says: 'envy itself must acknowledge his great abilities and great eloquenee.' And yet for having advanced the same sentiments long before Dr. M., & with far stronger scriptural testimony, you are sought to be held up by certain arrogant leaders, and dogmatic pretenders in theology, as a sceptic, a Sadducee, an infidel, &c.

It is true, that Dr. Melvill's testimony does not settle the question. But, such opinions advanced from such a source, serve to show at least that your sentiments are shared and sustained by those whom the religious world esteems devoted and studious of the word of God; and who are honored for their talents and their virtues.

If you choose to publish the extracts sent, with this note, you are at liberty to do so.

A. B. MAGRUDER.

Miscellaneous.

MR. CAMPBELL SELF-CONDEMNED–OVERTURE OF PEACE–APOLOGY–"LIFE AND DEATH"–ECCLESIASTICAL AMPUTATIONS, &C.

MESSIEURS CAMPBELL AND CO. THE HERETICS AND SCHISMATICS, NOT WE, 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 martyr dom of Jesus, his Apostles, or of the first christians upon themselves, as any division now existing upon us.—*Millennial Harbinger p. 5, Vol. 5.*

This was written when the Reformers were charged with "Heresy" and "Schism" by the Baptists. At that time Mr. C. objected truly, that it was "he that excludes, and not he that is excluded, who is the schismatic and heretic in Paul's estimation." If this were true then, why is it not also true now? Is not truth essentially immutable; or is truth –truth only when it is on our side, and error when on the side of our opponents? O truly consistency is a jewel of the rarest kind! Now, Reformers proscribe and exclude their brethren for opinions' sake. When their brethren, the Baptists, excluded them for this cause, they said it was wrong, but now that they are the excluders, they say, it is right! Is this righteous judgment? Are 'right' and 'wrong' only conventional terms to be changed at pleasure? Why did the Baptists exclude you? BECAUSE YOU FORCED YOUR OPINIONS UPON THEM UNASKED! And why do you attempt to exclude us, and do actually exclude others? Because, as the Supervisor saith, in effect, *we force our opinions upon* HIM *and you unasked!* A good reason truly, if "this" be his, or your, "reformation," and not the Lord's! Ought you not to blush in being thus compelled to eat your own words? *Truth is*, indeed, *offensive to errorists*, and well Mr. Campbell knows it expetimentally; a truer saying was never placed on record. This is the Key to the whole mystery. The truth is offensive to you, coming through the channel it does; hence the violence and virulence of your opposition to our views. Errorists will wince when pierced by the two edged sword of the truth.

EDITOR.

OVERTURE OF PEACE.

DR. DUVAL, "Pastor of the Jerusalem Church," King William, declared to an individual who informed us, that he was dissatisfied with his baptism, If he be not indeed so, we doubt not he ought to be. Now, we make this proposal to him, namely;–if he now understand and believe the Ancient Gospel of Remission of Sins and Eternal Life by the name of Jesus Christ; and will obey it for the love of it, we will forgive him all trespasses against us in word or deed; for, we shall then be assured that our Father in heaven has remitted all his offences. We extend the Olive Branch to him on these terms in the spirit of gospel sincerity and truth. And what we say to him, we say to all others in like predicament.

EDITOR.

APOLOGY.

Our readers will doubtless be at a loss to account for the delay of the present number of the Herald of the Future Age; and perhaps, have almost concluded, that it had ceased to be. But, we are happy, in announcing to them, that its animation has only been suspended, not extinct. We left Louisville, Ky. Sept. 25th 1844 for Virginia, not knowing certainly, what move we should make on the chess board of future operations; aud therefore, we could not notify our friends when or where the present number would see the light.

We are now in Richmond where we formerly resided in 1834–5; from which, some think we ought never to have removed; and to which, others are of opinion, we ought never to have returned. Indeed we know not, judging from the extraordinary ebullitions of black bile lately, whether, if these persons could give effect to their atrabilious and portentous "swellings," we should be permitted the use of any *locus in quo* under the sun, moon, and stars where we might sojourn in our troubled pilgrimage through life! Albeit, gentle reader, here we are, despite the vain and foolish clamor, and paltry machinations of prejudice and interested folly; and more than this, it is here we intend to remain.

It was a strong inducement to us to resettle in this city, the fact, that here (Ultima Thule College vicinity, and Charlottesville excepted) we have been most slandered, and traduced. A mind conscious of rectitude neither fears the frowns, nor courts the smiles of its adversaries; because, it derives its strength, fortitude, and tranquility from principles of nobler, and 'sterner stuff' than they. They have been in a mighty bustle since our return; and judging from the amputations of the body corporate, we should conclude, that mortification was making alarming progress in the *physique* of the poor patient: corruption must be rife, or the presbyterial doctors, one

would think, would be less free in their excisions!

During the interval which has elapsed since our departure to the Far West, these practitioners do not appear to have progressed in the art, science, and mystery of spiritual physic. They seem to have but one remedy for all types of disease, which is pure quackery–and this is *amputation*. Does a member get tipsy? Cut him off! Does he dance? Cut him off! Does he fight? Cut him off! Does he harbor heretics? Cut him off! Does he charge the eldership with dishonesty and want of intelligence? Cut him off! Is one of their own partizans convicted of slander, or "lying."–this, we presume, in their spiritual pathology, or moral code, is no læsion; for, amputation is not performed on him: but, he continues to discharge his official functions in the face of day, as though he had "purchased to himself a good degree, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus!" The suspicion even of the same pathological condition in the idiosyncrasia of a "heretic," would set all the doctors and their apprentices on the alert to collect evidence of the suspected infringement of the spiritual law, that having found a case, they might display their zeal, sanctimonious devotion, and amputative dexterity before an audience, penetrated with a conviction of their partiality, and lack of wisdom, honesty, and intelligence. They do not seem to understand, that *discipline is to reclaim, not to destroy*; and that such practice as their's, is as judicious as the excision of a toe, a finger, a foot, a hand, or a head, for a pain in the ankle, the wrist, the nose, or a tip of an ear! Yet such is the perfection to which "this reformation" has attained in the Old Dominion under the administrative imbecility of theorists, who preach one thing and practice another!

Now, that we may advocate in the midst of the general corruption and defection from first principles, a better system, we have left the El Dorado of the Far West at considerable sacrifice of real estate, and have returned hither. We have, also, by fraternal aid bro't our press, corruption's foe and error's dread, to bear upon the enemy's lines from the central position of this city. This movement has necessarily consumed much time, both in the transit from Louisville to Richmond, and in refitting our office, which has been considerably resolved into "pie." As yet, we have but partially restored our materials to their wonted order; we hope, however, in a month to have a place for every thing, and for every thing a place; when we shall be more at leisure to attend to correspondents and to the spiritual wants of our contemporaries. Henceforth the Herald of the Future Age will visit its readers with that regularity which, we trust, no obstacle will arise to supersede.

EDITOR.

Richmond, Va., Feb. 19, 1845.

LIFE AND DEATH.

We have received an "Extra" from Bethany, having this title. We thank the Editor for his polite attention, more especially as he affords us so few occasions for such acknowledgements. We shall hereafter prove ourselves not unmindful of his attention, by analysing and refuting it. In the meantime we invite him to assimilate with his speculations the *facts* and reasonings of all post-apostolic antiquity set forth in our first article, if he can.

EDITOR.

ECCLESIASTICAL AMPUTATIONS.

Br. Richard Malone has been amputated from Laodicea (see Rev. iii 14–22) in this city, commonly styled 'Sycamore' by the uninitiated, because he has received us into his house, took us out in his barouch to an appointment, and showed forth the death of the Lord with us there. The "Elders!" admit that he was one of the best men in the congregation! Would that they were like him for the honor of truth and righteousness in Richmond! Particulars hereafter.

Feb. 9, they amputated another member for stating a self evident proposition, to wit, that the Eldership was neither honest nor intelligent. They met the charge by foregoing any explanation. An easy way of refuting a charge! *Query*; Is that an honest eldership of which, one advised a person to screw another up to the highest notch, because he loved money; and, although his advice was not taken, turned round upon that person, and pamphletized him to the world as an extortioner? A pretty ensample to the flock truly!

☞All communications to be addressed "to the Editor of the *Herald of the Future Age* care of Richard Malone, Richmond, Va.,"

EDITOR.

HERALD OF THE FUTURE AGE.

If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's Seed, and Heirs according to the Promise.

JOHN THOMAS, EDITOR. RICHMOND, Va. VOLUME I. NUMBER X.

"THE THINGS OF THE SPIRIT OF GOD."

SECTION I

A GOOD RULE–BECAUSE ADOPTED BY THE FEW NO ARGUMENT AGAINST IT—THE "GREAT, WISE, AND GOOD" OF NO AUTHORITY IN SPIRITUAL THINGS–"THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE" NOT THE "VOICE OF GOD"–THE THINGS OF THE SPIRIT NOT REVEALED IN THE WORDS OF MAN'S WISDOM—SOME OF THESE SPECIFIED—WORDS OF THE SPIRIT DEFINED BY THE SPIRIT–PAUL'S DOCTRINE THE ANTITHESIS OF THE ATHENIAN PHILOSOPHY.

It is a principle very generally adopted by a certain class of interpreters, that if a word or phrase be not used in Scripture the idea or thing of which it is the representative, forms no part of the divine revelation. Thus, they contend, that because the terms & phrases 'Trinity,' 'Triune God,' 'Eternal Son,' 'infant baptism,' 'infant regeneration,' 'Elect Infants,' etc, etc, etc, are no where used in the writings of the Prophets and Apostles, the things implied by them are untaught by the Spirit of God. Elect, regeneration, baptism, Son, God, and Eternal occur in numerous places; this is admitted: but 'Triune' and 'Trinity' are never used in construction with the word 'God,' nor indeed are they to be found separate or conjoined, with any other words in the Holy Oracles; therefore, say they, the Spirit of God does not teach the dogmas conveyed in these phrases, and which are so strenuously contended for by the 'great and good men' of the several *Christian* Sects, as a part of that orthodoxy, or system of right opinions, without which a man cannot be saved.

This class of interpreters consist of few persons; yet, though almost infinitely outnumbered by those that differ from them, they claim that they alone are right, and that their principle of interpretation is faultless. This is certainly high ground, yet it is consistent. Did we not believe in it, we would certainly not object to the correctness of the principle, because of the paucity of its adherents. We differ from them, however, not because the principle is unsound, but because of their partial application of it. If the principle be a good one, then it is good to apply it in all cases. But judging from their practice, they consider the universal application of the principle as *impolitic*. It is deemed inexpedient because, as it would seem, the application of it to some of their own theories would prove them fallacious. But, 'honesty is the best policy,' & it is expedient to apply a good principle of interpretation to the resolution of all words and phrases wherever they may occur in God's Book, although such an application uproot every theory implanted in our minds by the sectarian guardians and tutors of our early years. It is true, we are but few who dissent from the partial, disingenuous, and timid policy of these interpreters; but, few though we be, et them not consider that our position is untenable on that account: Let them not look upon their own things, but upon the things of others, for if we be few as compared with

them they should remember, that our relative minority is not so great as theirs when regarded in reference to the multitude of their opponents—for

'Numbers are no mark,
That you will right be found;
A few were saved in the Ark,
For many millions drown'd:"

'the Law and the Testimony,' and not numbers, and the authority of names reputed 'great and good,' are the marks by which alone it can be determined under the ascendancy of 'the Man of Sin,' whether the light of truth illuminate our understandings, or they be darkened by the thick clouds, which are suspended portentously over 'the Great City,' by the wine of whose spiritual abominations, the inhabitants of the earth have become inebriated.

If we ought not to be contemned by these interpreters because we are few, neither ought they to treat us contumeliously because we dissent from the theories of persons whom they may regard as wise, great, and good. A man may be wise and of understanding in the wisdom of the princes, or chief men, of this and past ages of the world; but this is wisdom and understanding which is under sentence of destruction and annihilation, for it is written, "I will destroy the wisdom of the wise and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent."

It is also written,

'He taketh the wise in their own craftiness;'

And again,

'The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the wise, that they are vain.'

And again,

'Great men are not always wise:'

and 'good' as they may be, they are nevertheless fallible; for even an apostle saith

"In many things we all offend.'

It behoves us therefore, not to 'glory in man;' for to those who are *in* Christ, and who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit, it is written, 'all are yours; whether Paul, Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present or things to come; all are yours; and ye are Christ's, and Christ is God's'—1. Cor. iii. 21.

From these premises, we confess we can discover no reason why we should receive more readily the interpretations of the 'great, and good' of this generation, than those of the same class in the Apostolic Age. They are equally frail, equally liable to err, and the multitude which confers upon its leaders the attributes of wisdom, greatness, and goodness is as little competent to judge of true wisdom, greatness, and virtue as were the 'blind' of former ages, who were led by 'the wise and prudent' just as they happened to be led. The popular voice proclaims them 'great, wise, and good,' who minister most successfully to their prejudices and passions, which are in harmony with that 'strong delusion' which God has sent upon them 'that they should believe a lie;' 'because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved'—2. Thess. ii. 11. Some 'great men' think that 'the voice of the people is the voice of God;' then, of course it is the voice of God which declares them wise, good, and great! This is doubtless very flattering to their vanity; but we cannot admit such an assumption The 'voice of the people' declared Herod's voice to be the voice of a God; but the Angel of the Lord smote him; Herod accepted the flattery, but he soon became convinced that God spoke not through the inconstant multitude. No, my readers, the voice of the people is the enunciation of that fell delusion, which beclouds their minds, and which as a covering is cast over them, and will continue to obscure and pervert their vision until the Lord of Hosts shall come and take it away, as it is written,

"He will destroy in this mountain (Zion) the face of the covering cast over all people, And the veil that is spread over all nations."

Were we sceptical, we would by no means object to the principle of interpretation in question, because it was at variance with the decisions of the great, wise, and good, of the popular party, nor would we condemn the few

interpreters who maintain it on that account. We remember that "great men are not always wise," and that though few, they may be right. Now all that we ask is, that they will treat us with equal candor. We admit their principle and contend for its application in all cases. This universality of application is objected to practically by men, whom it is their pleasure to style 'great, good, and wise;' but must we yield to this objection, because the ground we take is repudiated by them? Can these few interpreters consistently repudiate us as 'heretical and factious' because we try conclusions with their 'great, good, and wise men.' By the same justification with which they justify themselves against the condemnation of their 'great, good, and wise,' opponents do we claim exemption from their proscription. We hope then, that they will bear with us, and mete out to us such measure, not indeed such as they have received, but as they contend they have a right to expect from their 'great, and good,' opponents. And we would urge them the more to do this, as we agree with them in the principle, and do but invite them to apply it to practice in all cases. We invite them to practice what they teach; for if their principles be true, the universal application of them will do no harm to the truth.

Now, without controversy, we believe that 'the things of the Spirit of God,' are brought to light, or revealed, in such words and phrases only as in his wisdom he judges to be best adopted to convey them, and that he deliberately selects his words, and resolves them into such phrases and sentences as harmonize with the eternal and universal principles or laws of his dominion over things physical and moral. This constitutes the grand characteristic of spiritual language as contradistinguished from the words, phrases, and sentences, constructed by 'the Wisdom of Man,' in harmony with the hypotheses of his 'foolishness,' and ignorance of "the things of God." Hence the theological dialect of the Oriental and Occidental schools is a compound of foolish words and phrases, which make a foolish language, the product of confusion, mythology, and perversion of the truth. Such were the words of 'the wisdom of the (archontes) leaders of the age' contemporary with the Apostles, in which the Rabbis of Israel and the Philosophers of the Gentiles expressed their theological conjectures. Their speech, or phraseology, was fit only to express the conceptions of the carnal mind in relation to spiritual things, and for illustration by fictitious comparison, such as fables, parables, or similitudes. It was necessary to reconstruct 'the words which man's wisdom teaches' and to cast them into the mould of the Holy Spirit's wisdom before they could give a faithful representation of 'the things of God.'

'The things of the Spirit of God,' before they were made known in the first century of the Christian Era, are styled *sophian Theou en musteereo teen apokekrummeneen* i. e. the wisdom of God concealed in secret. Concerning this hidden wisdom, Paul says, *oudeis toon achontoon tou aioonos toutou egnooken* i. e. none of the chief men of this age had knowledge of. These were 'the secret things which belonged to God;' but since they have been made known by the Spirit to the Apostles, they have become 'the things revealed, which belong to us and our children for ever, that we may do all the things of his law'—Deut. xxix. 29. Now let the reader mark this well, that the Rabbis of Israel and the Philosophers of the Gentiles, who were the Archons, or princes, chief men, or leaders, of the time co-existent with the Law of Moses and the Apostles,—*were entirely ignorant of 'the things of the Spirit of God,'* as it is written by Isaiah, and quoted by Paul in a modified form,

'Since the begining of the world men have not heard, nor perceived by the ear neither hath eye seen, O God, beside thee, the things which He hath prepared for him that waiteth for him.' Is. lxiv. 4.

'but' adds the Apostle, 'He hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit; hence

they are styled 'the things of the Spirit of God.' And here we would enquire, *what are the things which Jehovah hath prepared for him that waiteth for him?* Paul refers to them when he says, 'Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world? Know ye not ye shall judge Angels?' 'We are temperate in all things that we may obtain an incorruptible crown.' The dead body is sown in corruption, it is raised in *incorruption*, it is sown in dishonor, and raised in *glory*, it is sown in weakness, and raised in *power*, it is sown a natural body, it is raised *a Spiritual body*.' As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the Heavenly Adam.' 'The dead (in Christ) shall be raised incorruptible and we (the living who remain at Messiah's Advent) shall be changed.' This Mortal (Body) must PUT ON IMMORTALITY.' 'That you may know what is the hope of his calling, and what the riches of the glory of his inheritance in the Saints.' 'We look for the Savior from Heaven, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body that it may be fashioned like to his glorious body.' 'Giving thanks to the Father who has made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in the light.' 'Jesus Christ hath abolished death, and hath brought life and [aptharsian] Incoruptibility to light through the Gospel.' 'God will render to every man according to his deeds: Eternal Life, to them who by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory, and honor, and (aptharsian) incorruptibility.' These are some of the things of the Spirit—things relating to the Destiny of the righteous; to incorruptibility, life, glory, honor, power, a spiritual body, the Immortality of the mortal body, the glorious dwelling place of the saints, etc: things of which the chief men of this age, had no conception. They had, indeed, speculated abundantly, wisely, and learnedly on Heaven, Hades, Souls, gods, immortality, ghosts, and demons, but their 'wisdom was foolishness with God,' who *by his revelation*' made foolish the wisdom of this world,' and thus made a show of it openly that 'the thoughts of the wise are vain.'

As we have said, God did not make these things known in the foolish phrases of the wisdom of the wise men of the age. No, we find no such phrases in his revelation as the Immortality of the Soul, the Intermediate state of the Dead, the Transmigration of Souls, Particle of divine essence, disembodied spirits, going to heaven on angel's wings at death, etc, etc: and the reason is, because these phrases of human invention do not express the truth concerning the living and the dead. Hence, the Apostle says of the things of the Spirit, 'which things we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but' in words 'which the Holy Spirt teacheth (sugkrinontes) interpreting spiritual (things) by spiritual (words).'—1. Cor.iii. 13

The rule, then, is a good one, that *if the theological phrases of the schools be not used by the Spirit in teaching the truth, the things which men design to express by them, constitute no part of the revealed wisdom of God.*

Among the scholastic phrases we recited are 'the immortality of the soul,' and 'the Immortal Soul.' As we have said, these phrases are such as 'man's wisdom teacheth,' and although of great currency in that age, even as they are in this, and highly esteemed, yet they were repudiated by the Holy Spirit as inexpressive of the truth; and a different collocation of words adopted by which to make known the new doctrine of 'Life and Incorruptibility.' We do not deny that the Spirit speaks of 'souls;' but we say that he uses not the word 'soul,' in the pagan, papal, or protestant sense of 'immortal soul,' for if he did he would certainly have adopted the phrase. This is obvious from the use of the word in James v. 20—'He that converteth a sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death;'—does this mean, save an immortal soul from death; can a deathless soul die? Again in Ezek. xviii. 4.—'The soul that sinneth it shall die;' is it an immortal soul that sahll die? And again, of Messiah it

is said in Isaiah liii. 10—'Thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin,' and in verse 12—'he hath poured out his soul unto death:,—Was it an immortal soul poured out unto death, or was it not Messiah's blood, in which was the life of his flesh, that became a sin offering? From these few passages it is clear, that the word 'soul' is not used by the Spirit in the sense of an 'immortal soul,' as the chief men of the age suppose.

The truth is, that the word 'soul' is used in the scriptures in a great variety of senses, in other words, we cannot say that *soul* means blood or life, and that it is to be thus interpreted wherever it occurs. *Its textual signification depends on the context.* This will give the true, or spiritnal sense; not of *soul* only but of all other words taught by the wisdom of the Holy Spirit, for the Spirit interprets his own terms.

'But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness to him.' He styles them 'untaught questions and speculation,' because they are at variance with the wisdom of the leaders of the age, in the jargon of which, as delivered from the theological chairs of schools and colleges he has been indoctrinated. They are indeed 'untaught' in his 'vain philosophy,' and unfortunately, 'he cannot have a knowledge of them, because they are, spiritually discerned:' that is, these things of the Spirit can only be examined by the light thrown upon them, not by the fleshly wise, but by the Spirit in the prophetic and apostolic writings. This light the natural man excludes from his understanding by a perverse adhesion to the traditions of 'the disputers of this world,' who have elaborated speculations on soul and spirit and heaven without regard to, and subversive of the teaching of the Spirit. Having hewn out to themselves broken cisterns which will hold no water of life;—having invented many crude theories, they labor to conform the doctrine of Jesus to their ideal flights; but the truth will not harmonize with fiction; hence they denounce it as 'foolishness,' and its advocates as 'pestilent' and 'mad.' The natural man loves darkness rather than life. For this reason the philosophers of Athens mocked the Apostle of Jesus Christ. He made known to them a 'new doctrine' of 'Life and Incorruptibility.' They taught that all men had immortality; but he declared, that 'God only hath immortality:'—they, that the divine soul in man was immortal; he that the dead body should PUT ON *immortality*:—they declared, that death dissolved the union between the immortal soul and the mortal body never to be restored, and at that crisis the soul sped its way to the region of everlasting light; he announced, that the dead should be raised to life eternal at the appearing of the Judge of the living and the dead. 'And when they heard of the resurrection of the dead, they mocked him.' If their theory were true, the resurrection of the dead was an absurdity; for if when the immortal soul 'bursts the cerements of its prison house' it is translated to the region of everlasting light, the resurrection of the dead body to life would be of one making two persons; one in heaven, the other upon earth; besides if the immortal soul be the man, upon their hypothesis, he went to God at death, which was all that could be desired. Assuming that their's was the true wisdom, they rejected 'the things of the Spirit of God' with contempt; and 'professing to be wise men they became fools,' and by their folly missed the prize of life and incorruptibility by a resurrection from the dead.

Unless they will condescend to receive the wisdom which is from above, this will be the unhappy lot of the chief men of this generation They have imbibed from their nurses and tutors before they could discern between truth and error, the crude speculations of the natural man of the preapostolic age. These theories have become a part of themselves, an as adorable as immortal self. Being thus thoroughly imbued with 'the wisdom of the wise and the understanding of the prudent,' when they read the word

of life, they can discern nothing in the words 'soul,' 'spirit,' 'heaven,' 'immortality,' etc, but the things which 'man's wisdom teacheth.' But God's thoughts are not as their's; neither is he bound by their decrees. 'His doctrine drops as the rain, and his speech distils as the dew;' they are peculiar to himself, wise, consistent, and true, and reveals things of which all antiquity is previously silent. Pained at the absurdities palmed upon the world for truth, we aim to disentangle 'the things of the Spirit of God' from the meshes of the vain philosophy of the Schools; and though we cannot flatter ourselves that multitudes will be emancipated from the thrall of learned ignorance and folly, yet we do hope that we may be able to open the eyes of some, that they may see out of obscurity and spiritually discern wondrous things out of God's law. But should success not attend our well meant endeavors, we shall yet have the satisfaction to be derived from the conscientious discharge of our obligations to God, our neighbors, and the truth.

SECTION 2.

Dogmas of the "Wise Men," "Scribes," and "Disputers," of the Apostolic Age

1. The Oriental, or Gentile Philosophers of Asia, taught that the earth, originally dark, was constituted, and populated with men and the lower animals, by one DEMIURGUS; a deity of a subordinate nature and rank to the Supreme Being, whom they styled BUTHOS, and who inhabits the AIOON PLEROMA, or Everlasting Region of Light.

2. They taught, that after he had formed men, Demiurgus communicated to them '*particles of the Divine Essence*;' which particles are the immortal souls *of a kindred nature to the Deity*, and without which, though living men, they would have remained destitute of reason and uninstructed, except in what relates to mere animal life.

3. They maintained, that while he continued in this world, man was compounded of *two principles* acting in direct opposition to each other: the one, an earthly, corrupt, and vitiated body; and the other, a Divine Soul, derived from the region of purity and light.

4. That this pure, intelligent etherial and immortal soul, being through its connexion with the corrupt and vitiated 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.

5. That to extricate these immortal souls from the evil matter in which they were confined, BUTHOS, the Supreme God, sent inspired teachers into the world, much to the displeasure of DEMIURGUS and his associate genii, who had rebelled against Him. Those divine particles of the Deity, which listened to the calls of BUTHOS by his messengers, they supposed, to be directly borne away on the dissolution of their bodies, pure, etherial, and disengaged from every thing gross or material, to the immediate residence of God himself

> "Borne on Angels' wings to heaven
> Glad the summons to obey!"

6. That those etherial and immortal particles of the Deity, which would not listen to the admonitions of their Kindred Essence, were denied the hope of exaltation to the skies, and could only expect at death, to migrate into new bodies, either of reptiles, beasts, or men as might be best suited to their base, sluggish, aud degraded condition.

To be continued.

"SUBLIME NONSENSE."

Many persons are very fond of dismantling nature of her glories, and making her a heap of ruins, as if she and not man, were the rebel against God. One would almost think that they held the ancient opinion of some philosophers, that *evil was essentially connected with matter*. Poets have spent no inconsiderable part of their time and talents in singing nature's funeral dirge, whereas very few have, like David and Isaiah, sung her regenerated glories. One poet talks of

> "The wreck of matter and crush of worlds."

Another, that

> "The great globe itself
> Yea, all that it inherits, shall dissolve,
> And like the baseless fabric of a vision,
> Leave not a wreck behind."

While a third chants very merrily, how

> "The stars rush headlong down in wild commotion,
> And bathe their glittering foreheads in the ocean,"

What ocean the planets Jupiter and Saturn, and the fixed stars will choose to bathe in, we are not told, We ought to have common sense on this subject, and not sublime nonsense. Those who use such expressions, misunderstand those passages of scripture which set forth the destruction of political things by natural images, for examples of which see Rev. vi. 12.–14, 'the sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the moon became as blood; the stars fell upon the earth, and the heaven departed like a scroll.' Yet no one who understands scripture, thinks this set forth the destruction of nature. See also Ps. xl. vi.; Isa. xxxiv. 29.

On the other hand, we find many things in the word of God which lead us to suppose that the fabric of nature is not that perishing thing some would fain have us believe. To this sure word of prophecy we do well to take heed, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in our hearts; and then shall we know the wonders, both of grace and nature, in the pure and steady light of glory.—Cox on the Coming and Kingdom of Jesus Christ. p. 116.

THE PROPHETIC STYLE A SPEAKING HIEROGLYPHIC.

The following extract is pre-eminently worthy the attention of those, who are looking for signs in the astronomical heavens; and who construe the sun, moon and stars of prophecy as almost uniformly identical with the celestial bodies of the physical world. Error upon this point will convert the sublimest predictions into the most preposterous absurdities.

"As in the natural world the things of creation are comprised in the Heavens and the Earth, and the Heavens are considered as the nobler parts of creation, so in the world polltic, in prophetic language, the Heavens mean thrones, governments, and constitutions; the sun, moon, and stars; emperors, kings, princes, and great men, as empires, kingdoms, and states; the earth signifies the great mass of the common people, or the countries and provinces ruled over: clouds mean multitudes; winds, hail, storm, and thunder, as well as earthquakes, signify wars and commotions among multitudes and nations. Thus in Isa. xxviii. 2. when God by his prophet, threatens to punish by war, the language is, 'the

Lord hath a mighty and strong one, which as a tempest of hail, and a destroying storm, as a flood of mighty waters overflowing, shall cast down to the earth.' And again [ch. xxxix. 6.] 'thou shalt be visited of the Lord of Hosts with thunder, & with earthquake and great noise, with storm and tempest, and a flame of devouring fire.' The next verse explains what this thunder and storm is: 'and the multitudes of all the nations that fight against Ariel shall be as a dream.' Sir Isaac Newton, on the language of prophecy, p. 18, says, 'Tempestuous winds, or motion of clouds, are put forwad, thunder, or the voice of clouds, for the voice of a multitude; a storm of thunder and lightning, and hail, and overflowing rain, for a tempest of war, descending from the heavens & clouds politic.' Dr. Warburton, in his Divine Legation, B. iv. Sect. 4. says, 'the old Asiatic style, so highly figurative seems by what we find of its remains in the prophetic language of the sacred writings, to have been evidently fashioned to the mode of ancient hieroglyphics both curiologic and tropical, of the second kind, which answer to the tropical hieroglyphic, is the calling empires, kings, and nobles, by the names of the heavenly luminaries, the sun, moon, and stars; their temporary disasters, or entire overthrow, by eclipses, and extinctions; and destruction of the nobility, by stars falling from the firmament, hostile invasions by thunder & tempestuous winds; & leaders of armies, conquerors, and founders of empires, by lions, bears, leopards, goats, or high trees. In a word, the prophetic style seems to be a SPEAKING HIEROGLYPHIC."

GREAT DEFECTS IN MODERN CHRISTIANITY.

At present God has a controversy not only with the nations but with his own people. Greater zeal for the salvation of sinners and the amelioration of the condition of human kind never was manifested than at present. This is ground of rejoicing to all the friends of the gospel. But there is one unhappy symptom of the present times with respect to christianity. ZEAL FOR THE PURITY OF DIVINE TRUTH HAS NOT KEPT PACE WITH ZEAL FOR THE SALVATION OF SINNERS. The great doctrines of the reformation are generally lowered or modified. Theories have been invented to soften some of the offensive features of divine truth, so as to form a more extensive ground for co-operation and love. With others, metaphysics has been placed on a throne to dictate to the Bible; and the Epistle to the Romans, must submit to have its account of human nature modified by the schools. Sound Philosophy, we are told, teaches us such a thing, therefore the apostles cannot teach us differently. The very foundations of the gospel have been virtually overturned in order to conform it to the dogmas of science. An unsound and chimerical criticism has been employed to lower all the distinguishing doctrines of grace.

Where now are the friends of ancient orthodoxy. Are there not still multitudes who adhere to the strong views of truth professed by the Reformers? WILL THEY QUIETLY SUFFER A SPURIOUS LIBERALITY, OR A SPURIOUS METAPHYSICS TO ROB THEM OF THE TRUTH? Are they afraid to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints? Is it more important to propagate the gospel than to preserve its purity? Paul thought it of more importance to contend for the purity of the gospel than to extend its reception by his personal ministry. He never laid down his weapons. He was unceasingly employed in combating the corruptions of the gospel. He considered the smallest modification or alloy as constituting another gospel; and, instead of teaching the disciples to regulate their doctrine by the philosophy of the age, he warned them against the deceptions of philosophy. Let not Christians then provoke the Lord to give up his truth to be trampled by its enemies, by their sinful backwardness to acknowledge and defend it. All the zeal at present manifested by the man of SIN, all the efforts of atheism are not so much to be dreaded as the present APATHY AMONG CHRISTIANS REGARDING THE INTEGRITY AND PURITY OF DIVINE TRUTH. If judgement shall be executed upon the house of God, this base acquiescence in the subversion of the gospel by false philosophy and false charity, will be the bitterest ingredient in the cup of suffering.

Carson.

THE CRISIS. 2.

BY DR. BODENHAMER, OF LOUISVILLE, KY.

Dear Brother Thomas.—For the want of something better which I have not time to elaborate, I send you the following for our second article of the Crisis, as it will still further illustrate the subject upon which we commenced. It is a reply to a letter I received from a well known friend and brother. The contents of this letter will be explained by my answer.

"Brother F—. Yours of the 25th ultimo duly came to hand, and according to your earnest wish I now answer you. That the distinctive excellence of the reformation of which you write, is fast merging into the gulf of *sectarian latitudinarianism*, is so very obvious that none but those who close their eyes to passing events, can but observe. And I am surprised that your vision has been so blinded that you yourself have not as yet made this discovery. Do anoint your eyes with eyesalve that you may see. But to aid you and to place what I have said beyond the possibility of a doubt, permit me to call your attention to the language of Mr. Campbell found in the very first article in the 'Christian Baptist' page 6 Burnett's edition. In speaking of the primitive churches which he then so beautifully held up to our admiration and so highly recommended as the only true model, he says, the order of their assemblies was uniformly the same It did not vary with moons, and seasons. It did not change as dress, nor fluctuate as the manners of the times. Their devotion did not diversify itself into the endless forms of modern times. They had no monthly concerts for prayer; (nor Big Revival Meetings, nor annual, nor Co-operation Meetings etc.) no solemn convocations; no great fasts, nor preparations, nor thanksgiving days. Their churches were not fractured into *Missionary Societies, Bible Societies, Education Societies*; [as many of the reform churches are now becoming] NOR DID THEY DREAM OF ORGANIZING SUCH IN THE WORLD. (Nor did Mr, Campbell and the reformers 15 years ago.) The head of a believing household was not in those days a *President* or *Manager* of a board of *Foreign Missions*; his wife the *President of some Female Education Society*; his oldest son the Recording Secretary of some Domestic Bible Society; his oldest daughter the Corresponding secretary of a Mite Society; his servant maid the Vice President of a Rag Society; and his little daughter a Tutoress of a Sunday School. THEY KNEW NOTHING OF THE HOBBIES OF MODERN DAYS. [Nor the hobbies of modern reformers.] In their church capacity alone they moved. They neither transformed themselves into any other association, nor did they fracture and sever themselves into divers societies. [Such as the general co-operation society of disciples in Virginia, Evangelist, Fund Society, Bible Society, Co-operation Society of Ky. of Indiana, etc.] They viewed the Church of Jesus Christ as the scheme of Heaven to ameliorate the world; as members of it, they considered themselves bound to do all they could for the glory of God & the good of men. They dared not transfer to a missionary society, or bible society, education society a cent or a prayer; lest in so doing they should rob the church of its glory and exalt the inventions of men above the wisdom of God.' This my brother was the language of Mr. Campbell in 1823. Did he really believe what he taught? If he did. Alas! 'how is the fine gold become

dross.' We now find him a munificent donor and an active patron of some of those very hobbies of modern days. We now find him engaged in robbing the church of its glory and exalting the inventions of men above the wisdom of God. If these societies, the mere inventions of men, were the hobbies of modern days in 1823, are they not still so? And if to aid any one of them either by a cent or a prayer was then robbing a church of its glory and exalting men above the wisdom of God, is it not equally so now? But Mr. Campbell is not the only one who is riding these hobbies of modern days, many of his partizans, particularly in this state and Virginia are following suit as a matter of course, somewhat on the principle we suppose of the sheep of Panurgus who all jumped into the sea because their Leader fell in! A bible society was lately formed at Versailes Ky. by the Reformers and Baptists; nearly every member of which was an officer, I believe there were no less than twenty vice presidents. It has now come to this, that the church of Christ does not any longer afford a sufficiently wide field for the unbounded benevolence and philanthrophy of these modern enterprising and aspiring reformers: hence they are forming themselves and fracturing themselves into divers societies, and making their most popular elders and evangelists Life members and themselves Presidents, Vice Presidents, Secretaries, and Directors, of the same; judging rightly that the humble church of Christ is not as appropriate a theatre for their own worldly glorification and aggrandizement; with them it is not glory enough to be a Priest and King, or a Life Member in the church of Christ. No, in that capacity alone they cannot any longer move. This would be giving all the glory to the church and none to themselves, and exalting the wisdom of God above their own inventions. No; this will not suit them for they want the largest portion of the glory themselves. This is the only rational reason that can now be given for this entire change in the Reformation in relation to these hobbies of modern days. This is the grand secret of the whole matter. They cannot bear either to be out rivaled by their neighbours the sectarians in carrying out their benevolent enterprises. These rapid transformations afford matter of astonishment to our good old Baptist friends who are looking on and exclaiming, how orthodox the Campbelites are becoming they will all soon join us; and thus we suppose get back into Old Babylon [as they used to call the baptist church] where they originated or were born.

As it regards your opinion concerning the union of all the sects etc., it is perfectly utopian. It is true we may by accommodating our principles to sectarian claims and prejudicies bring about a hollow truce; but rest assured nothing more: for the materials are as unfit for mixture as Iron and Clay. The true children of God are easily united together. I fear the great cry about Union, grows out of a spurious charity, a morbid liberalism and an ill directed zeal to throw open wide the doors of the church and to take in the whole world. Then away with your efforts to make proselytes at all harzards: away with all your endeavours to make the boundaries of the church of Christ less and less and distinct and perceptible, and to smooth the way and afford facilities for sectarians to pass from Babylon into the church without scarcely perceiving a change. Depend upon it the line that separates them is not an imaginary one, but as distinct as the Ohio River which here separates Kentucky from Indiana. Even Mormons are now taken into some of our churches, by simply giving them the right hand of fellowship. Does this constitute them christians? God forbid! for he no where has said so. This very principle carried out is what constituted the commencement of the Grand Apostacy. For the early christians did gradually adopt much of Paganism into the christian system, and this was doubtless done with a view to render this change in the New Religion, less perceptible and consequently less shocking to the prejudices of those Idolators who adhered so closely to their ancient institutions. This I repeat was the commencement of the grand apostacy.

I readily admit with you that Mr. Campbell made great efforts in his late extra, I will even go further, and say, it was an *Extra* effort. But after all it was nothing more than he himself would call "an interminable debate about a few words." His station now, much more than the force of his arguments, gives weight and character to his opinions. Be not uneasy my brother, his extra will be

duly attended to in due time. The old Pagan dogmas, "The Immortality of the Soul" and "The Unending Suffering in Hell of the Wicked," are indefencible by revelation, by reason, and by common sense; and cannot much longer withstand the progress of scriptural knowledge, or protract the epoch of their dissolution; hence the morbid sensibility of Mr. Campbell on this subject; his demonology too, and other *ologies* must now be sustained at all hazards, as if in reality the glorious fabric of Christianity demanded at his hands this eternal plastering and propping up of antiquated pagan notions and old wives' fables! Has he nothing better to attend to? Can we not persuade him to define precisely what he means by "ONE OF US," and to let us poor "destructionists" alone! For in his own estimation, and in that of his friends, he has so often vanquished us few, deluded, insane, factionists and heretics, that really if we were easily alarmed, we might imagine truly, that there was nothing left of us but *a grease spot!* We are sick, heartily sick, of this King Gambyses style of Mr. Campbell, and his oft repeated assertions, that he has for ever settled such and such untaught questions, and that he never will again revert to them, or condescend to notice them who hold them, a "few bankrupt professors,' 'a little faction,' 'a few straggling factionists" as they are. Yet scarcely a moon changes ere he renews the contest with, if possible, fresh vigor against them. Although he has vanquished them times without number, yet their ghosts are for ever haunting his imagination. We however know well how to appreciate this blowing and blustering, this "ricketty zeal" of Mr Campbell. We are pleased to see him fight his fights, and annihilate his already annihilated annihilationists. This kind of prowess is well exemplified in the lines

> Mov'd at the sight, the King grew vain,
> And fought his battles o'er again;
> And thrice he routed all his foes,
> And thrice he slew the slain!

In relation to the insinuations of Mr. Campbell against Dr. Thomas in his Crisis No. 5 of which you speak, I answer most emphatically that they have no foundation in truth, and that they are beneath the dignity of any high minded and honorable gentleman. I have been acquainted with the doctor for the last 8 or 9 years, and intimately for the last 18 months. I am also acquainted with his two brothers. They both spent the last summer in this city; and one of them in my hearing remarked when he read those insinuations, that they were "false in every part and infamous." I have also within the last year read extracts from private letters from the Doctor's father, brother, and sister in England, and I have scarcely ever read any thing breathing more of love, of sympathy, of affection, of kindness for him and his brothers in this country than these letters. Not one word of the Doctor ever having dishonored and abandoned his father and mother, nor of his ever having deserted his brothers in times of poverty and wretchedness. As to the insinuation of his having boarded out his wife and child on his more sympathetic friends, &c. I will give you two short extracts from a letter from one of the sympathetic [illegible] in Cincinnati with whom they boarded several months. I would be pleased to give the whole letter but have not room. "I can state that Dr Thomas made satisfactory arrangements with me for the board of his wife and child while at my house, that I never considered his being absent from her a matter of choice etc." "I consider the insinuations made by bro. Campbell, *gratuitous, unwarranted, unjust and cruel.* I felt hurt on reading them, and thought bro. C. should have been above such a *subterfuge* with any adversary." As far as I am concerned I gladly confess I am one of his sympathetic friends, and equally one of his unjustly assailed & calumniated as he is. I gave him the hospitalities of my house during part of the time he remained in this city. I would do the same again under like circumstances to him or any one else; knowing that such conduct meets with the approbation of our Heavenly Father and is commendable in his sight. But let us turn from those contemptible exhibitions of weakness and ill nature to some of more gratifying character. But my paper admonishes me to come to a close, leaving a great deal I wish to say for my next. In the mean time may brotherly love continue. May we seek peace and diligently pursue it

W. BODENHAMER.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR.

The foregoing is a copy of a letter written by Dr. Bodenhamer to a "Bro. F.," who is we

suspect Bro. Fanning of Elm Craig, near Nashville, one of the Editors of the Christian Review. The Doctor has not informed us so; but from a certain passage in it, compared with one in the Review, we have very little doubt of the fact. It appears that bro. F. had made us the subject matter, at least of a part of a letter, to which Dr. B's was a reply. The reason of his doing this, appears from this sentence above—"In relation to the insinuations of Mr. Campbell against Dr. Thomas in "Crisis No. 5" of which you speak I answer most emphatically, that they have no foundation in truth etc." Here then, it is manifest, that though our name is not mentioned in "Crisis No.5," three persons, namely, Messrs Fanning, Bodenhamer, and Gano, applied them to us. Why did the Editor of the Harbinger *skulk* behind insinuations against an anonymous person—insinuations so plainly expressed, and that from previous detraction in the Harbinger it needed not to name the individual to identify him? We knew that he aimed them at us, because his partizans in Louisville had been busy circulating the same slanders against us there. If he believed them to be true, why did he not say that Dr. Thomas was the man of whom he spoke? If he did not believe them, how dared he to insinuate them against us? Either he believed them true, or he did not, if the former, then his pusillanimity is contemptible, if the former, his baseness is extreme. Did he fear the State law against slanderers if he named us? We say to him, and to all mean men who seek to destroy our character, as the shortest way of putting to silence our arguments which are too strong for them, if you fear not the Law of God you need not fear the Law of Va. We are commanded *not to avenge ourselves*; for our King says "*Vengeance is mine, I will repay.*" Go on, ye stiff necked, & uncircumcised in heart and ears, slander and denounce us as much as ye will; time and circumstances in God's arrangements will justify us, and overwhelm you with well merited and withering contempt.

The tissue of falsehood which has attracted public attention to us, may be found on page 470 of the Mill. Harb. of Oct. 1844. We have not noticed it until now, hitherto concluding that the only notice it merited was a contemptuous silence. And, as far as the estimate we put upon the "insinuations" or overt denunciations of its editor, is concerned, we should permit them to waft by us "as the idle wind which we respect not;" but at the instigation, and for the sake of those brethren, who do not regard these calumnies quite so much in the light of blessings as we do, we have unwillingly consented to say a word or two in refutation of Mr. Campbell's unrighteous and malevolent vituperations.

First Insinuation. [Saying perverse things of good men and propagating his own vain speculations to gather round him a party.]—Name the 'good men' of whom we have said any thing 'perverse.' We will try their goodness by God's word, and see if they deserve the epithet. Till then this may pass. In relation to the "vain speculations,' in our last number we have proved our opponents to be the speculators, not we; and as to our object being a party for party's sake, God, who knows our hearts, knows there is not a word of truth in the charge. Would we have held any thing "in abeyance for the sake of peace' in 1838, or have moved to Illinois, if party had been our object? The charge is a weak invention of the enemy.

Second Insinuation. [He boarded out, or abandoned his family to his more humane and sympathetic friends.]—There is no character so despicable in our estimation as the Ecclesiastic, who thrusts himself into a prying scrutiny of the domestic affairs of 'heretics.' An ecclesiastical Paul Pry is a mean, ill mannered, meddler in other men's matters. Such are some of our opponents here and elsewhere. What has the world to do with the reason of a man's boarding out his family with "humane and sympathetic friends," or with strangers? If the board his paid, what is it to any body? We did board our family with Major Daniel Gano of Cincinnati; an excellent citizen and worthy man, well known to Mr. Campbell; a gentleman [which from his "Crisis No. 5," before us, is more than we can say of the writer thereof]—who presided as one of the Moderators at Campbell's and Owen's Debate; who we believe contributed in loan or gift, $500 to enable A. C. to publish or purchase the M. S., a gentleman at whose house Campbell saw our family in 1843—4: and where he might have learned the truth of the matter, and saved himself the infamy of insinuating

the falsehood that we have abandoned our family to our friends: but he made no inquiry then; and now he stands convicted by an extract from that getleman's letter to Dr Bodenhamer, as a fabrication of "unwarranted, unjust, and cruel insinuations."

Third Insinuation.—[He has dishonored and abandoned his parents!) Unhappy man that thou art, to rush blindfold to your own confusion! Reports of this kind had reached our ears. Accordingly we wrote to London on the subject, and while at Louisville we received a reply from our father, which we showed to Dr. Bodenhamer, who alludes to it in his letter. The following is an extract:—"as for "reports," I never wrote to Mr. Campbell but twice, if indeed more than once. I expressly styled you " a good son," and regreted nothing but your 'propositions,' and his "*indiscretion*" in encouraging your attacks upon the Sects; and I repeat what I have often said to strangers. that I do not think it ever fell to the lot of mortal man to have more dutiful children than mine have been. It must I should think be nearly eight years since I wrote to Mr. Campbell, and to no living soul did I ever utter a sentence to the disparagement of my children as such. Would to God, that every parent had a similar inheritance."—This we presume will be a sufficient refutation of insinuation no. 3!

Fourth Insinuation.—(Desererted his brothers in times of poverty and wretchedness.) This is false, false, false in every iota and particular. We have three brothers, one in England, one in Illinois, and one in this city. Mr. Campbell is personally acquainted with the first and second. Concerning our brother Henry in England, an extract from the same letter will show his feelings towards us;—"with respect to your visit to England, I say come! Henry's house is at your service. He says he shall be glad to see you. I say come. It will do your health good."—Again our sister writes, "Henry is continuelly wishing you were here. He says there is an excellent opening for a good practitioner; he is sure he could introduce you to a practice. He desiers me to say, he would give you board and lodging for a year, if you would come and make the trial."—Our second brother is acting as our agent in Illinois, and pronounces Mr. C's. conduct disreputable and mean; and the third gives the following certificate:—

"This is to certify, that I have read Mr. Campbel's insinuations against my brother as is supposed, in relation to his brothers and family, in "Crisis no. 5" of his October number of the Harbinger. That I deem it my duty in justice to my brother to state, that I regard them as paltry and malevolent, and the manner in which they are set forth, as mean and contemptible. That, when Mr. Campbell asserts, that he deserted his brothers in their difficulties, he asserts that which is a wicked and unqualified falsehood; for never, have we applied to him for aid, but he has rendered us all the assistance in his power on every occasion: and that Dr. Bodenham[illegible] has correctly stated my sentiments in the above letter, that the insinuations "are false in particular and infamous."

In my humble opinion, Mr. Campbell and his "[illegible]" would contribute more to their [illegible]or and respectability, if they, would cease their malevolent slanders against my brother; who has always sustained among his relatives and friends, a character for the strictest integrity, honor, and veracity; let them seek truth and pursue it, for at present they seem utterly destitute of it in relation to him.

ALFRED THOMAS.

March 10th 1845.

*Fifth Insinu[illegible]*ed on the good thing[illegible]ld, and repays it with maledictions.] This is superlatively ludicrous! Any one who knows how fat we have become in flesh and the world's stuff abstractly considered, or in comparison with the lean and poverty stricken Mr. Campbell, must be marvellously penetrated with the applicability of this insinuation to us!!! Mr. Campbell has become rich by his religious speculations and judging from his unrighteous Saul like persecution of our character, we have but little doubt, he is now reaping his reward. To our mind he is an illustration of the "deceitfullness of riches." He has become a "purse proud," overbearing, partizan leader; whose present developements prove, that he has, and is, making "gain of Godliness" to the utmost of his influence over a supine and too confiding community. Were wealth, honor, and worldly influence our aim, we should have sought them in some other channel

than in the bed of the current reformation, we do not desire them, neither seek we after them; we seek the honor which comes from God; an honor, which in this life is associated with poverty, tribulation, and reproach. He has indeed fattened on the world's dainties, and grateful to the world, which, as the scripture saith, "lieth under the Wicked One," he has abandoned his ancient principles, and conformed so far to its manners and customs as to have acquired its honor and applause. To pander to the ignorance, folly, and superstition of an apostate world is a sorry way to repay it for its "good things!"—It is but little we owe the world, and that little we would repay by a faithful defence of the Apostolic truth to its salvation or destruction, which it will determine for itself.

Such are the insinuations, and the only ones, that we are aware have been bandied against us, and which we see in this "Crisis no. 5." After the evidence we have adduced, we suspect that it will have brought a Crisis with respect to Mr. Campbell in the estimation of all candid and honorable men, of an exceedingly unenviable character. From such reformers as he, we pray to be delivered. "By their fruits ye shall know them," and assuredly from such fruits as "Crisis no. 5," not to mention numerous other instances, [illegible] satisfied, that whatever he may know of the *theory* of Christianity, that "*love* which thinketh no evil," 'envieth not,' "and seeketh not her own," is a stranger to his aspiring and jealous disposition.

To all interested in the good standing of the Editor, and of the Herald of the Future Age, no apology for this exposure of Mr Campbell's unholy assault will be necessary, and to those who are not interested none will be offered. Did we occupy a strictly private station in society, we should not concern ourselves about the matter; indeed we should not have then been the subject of such extraordinary developements of the carnal mind of this reformation as we have. But, occupying the position we do, we are necessarily obliged to notice our assailants sometimes: for he that pleads for truth and righteousness, should himself stand unsullied before his readers. We have offended Mr. Campbell, but, not because we desired to do so. As he says truly, "truth is offensive to errorists;" if then we love truth, and plead for it indeed, how could we advocate it, seeing that he rejects it, and not offend him? We have never desired to injure him or any other of our bitterest foes: had they not denounced and proscribed us, we should have confined ourselves strictly to the defence of principles without regard to names, but if they will be so reckless as to labor to compass our destruction at all hazards, let them beware of the consequence, for their iniquity will assuredly recoil upon their own pates. We neither fear them, nor court their favor. They possess nothing, which we are ambitious to acquire. On the contrary, we are willing to impart to them all we know of God's word without fee or reward. Should they ever come to the acknowledgment of the truth, they will acknowledge us; we solicit their good will upon no other terms. Their commendations and anathemas are alike to us, unless the former rest upon the eternal principles of the love of God. We write not for fame, but for the elaboration of the "One Hope," and the great and glorious arrangements of the approaching Dispensation of the Future Age.

The following letter will speak for itself. We trust that after this we shall be under no further necessity to defend our reputation against the slanderous and insulting attacks of Mr. Campbell and his mere partizans. We shall endeavor to pay no more regard to them. Sufficient testimony we hope, will have been adduced to prove, that the declarations of Mr. C. against his opponent's characters, or those he conceives to be obstacles in his way, are worthy of no more regard than the calumnious aspersions cast upon their adversaries by the organs of the holders or seekers, of political leadership to a world, whose principle is profession, and its profession a cloud of smoke.

Epistle commending the Editor to Brethren "in Christ."

"The Congregation of Disciples of the Lord Jesus assembled in this town, to the faithful in Christ, sends greeting; to whom be multiplied favor, mercy, and peace from God our Father, and from Christ Jesus, who is our Lord."

Brethren, beloved in the Lord, by this letter we recommend to you our beloved brother, John Thomas, as one known amongst us as faithful in the Lord, and "mighty in the scriptures;" by whose indefatigable labors among us here, as well as in more remote portions of our State, error has been successfully combated, and the Truth, as it stands revealed on the sacred page, exhibited to our admiration and astonishment: whilst many living witnesses, who are still connected with sectarian churches, and were virulently opposed to those glorious exhibitions of divine truth, say, they never expect to hear reasonings so conclusive, or arguments so powerful, as those advanced by our dear brother. We never knew our brother Thomas to act dishonorably to the christian character, nor yet to be reported to the congregation for any thing contrary to sound teaching.

"He was no Headman; assumed no undue authority over the weakest of his brethren; was never known to be dictatorial in the church, nor yet among his brethren in private—but on the other hand, an instructor of the ignorant, and a guide to them who needed counsel. Life, character, property were all readily devoted by him to the christian cause. We are not aware that any one can charge the subject of these lines with acting the dishonorable part of a Spiritual Merchant, thus worshipping at the shrine of Mammon. He was no hireling; he was the rather pleased to have an inquisitive congregation, to which he might impart the import of those hallowed truths, which he knew, if once they obtained possession of the mind, had the inherent power (being Spirit and Life) of regenerating the affections, and thus producing something like itself."

"We regret much the loss we sustain in the removal of our dear brother; and are only comforted by the consideration, that whilst his sphere of useful operation was too circumscribed in this new country, where much of the time and attention of the people is taken up in forming settlements; making improvements, &c., he may be rendered abundantly more [illegible] the intelligent population of [illegible] Hold up his hands Brethren, and [illegible] cause him to prosper a hundre[illegible] with him all who teach [illegible]ty.

S[illegible]f } †Jno S. Christian.
o[illegible]ga- } Joshua Schlosser.
tio[illegible] } Orange C. Baird.

†This brother was an elder in the congregation of Christian Brethren in Halifax, Yorkshire, England, and well known to Mr. James Wallis, of Nottingham, Editor of the Christian Messenger, in that country.—Editor.

"CAMPBELLITE T[illegible]S."

We hope to have done with these by the end of this volume. We have thus far triumphantly vindicated truth and character from the aspersions cast upon them by certain Baptist clergymen of "this reformation." This work once perfected will not need to be performed again; we shall then devote our time, space, and attention almost solely to the elaboration of the doctrine of the future economy, or Dispensation of the World to Come. Let therefore, every subscriber interested in the Kingdom of Messiah's Glory, which pertains to that Paradisaic State, act in relation to the Herald of the Future Age, as though he felt all the responsibility of its sustentation resting upon his own shoulders. Let every such an one become a patron indeed. Let him study God's word as though the unfolding of the doctrine concerning the "New Heavens and Earth in which dwelleth righteousness,' depended upon himself alone; and as though his manuscript were all prepared, and upon his sole self rested the provision of the ways and means, to convert the writing into a periodical pamphlet form. These are not things of private interest; they are God's truth, and it is as much our duty to spend our substance, time, talent and enterprise, and to be spent for them, as it is that we should disburse our funds "for the meat which perisheth." The Herald does not yet pay expenses, and hitherto our labor, which is both manual and mental, is unremunerated by its proceeds. Our profession, which is lu-

crative, we hold in abeyance, and set type without fee, that the Hope of the Gospel may be disentangled from the traditions of men. Is this self denial more incumbent upon us than upon thee, O reader? One brother has proved the sincerity of his faith by expending about $150 towards its support. Its prospects, however, are improving, but we must all bestir ourselves, if we would establish it upon an unshakable foundation. We are not solicitous about ourselves; God will take care of us as he has done hitherto; but we desire to see the Herald clad with a courageous bearing as with a cloak, and bravely to maintain its stand in the fore-front of the battle, tho' our labor may remain unrequited till the manifestation of the Paradise of God.

EDITOR.

☞Sometime since it was reported that we had suppressed [illegible] of the correspondence concerning the [illegible] peace on the part of certain hereabouts [illegible] Editor of the Christian Journal. If what we published be read with candor and impartiality, men will see that this report is untrue. All *the* correspondence was published. But when it was nearly all in type, we received from R. F. Ferguson two letters, mailed within three days of each other, one dated June 10th 1844, the other June 13th. In substance they are duplicates. The former was addressed to Cincinnati, the latter to Louisville; not that we were at the two places at the same time; but, that if we were in either place, one or the other of them might find us. Why was this anxiety manifested by the writer? Because, seeing how prompt we were to approve his determination to publish, he doubted lest the policy might not favor us more than it would serve him; and therefore he wrote these letters to dissuade the publication of *the* correspondence! The reason appears upon the face of them, for in one place he says, "I wrote to you in Cincinnati in a day or two after I sent you the note requesting copies of my letters, for upon reflection, I see no necessity for the publication, and so wrote, saying, however, that you might send me copies if you chose. The public has no business with *this* correspondence (composed of the letters of which he requested copies—*ED.*) and I shall not give it unless compelled by circumstances which I do not foresee. My note (requesting the copies—*ED.*) was written under some exitement, caused by the misrepresentation abroad, added to indifferent health. * * * I write to you (now—*ED.*) because there is an imperious necessity (to prevent if possible the publication of *the* correspondence—*ED.*) * * * I have made a short statement in the Journal of last week which will correct the reports (against him—*ED.*) I hope you will not consider yourself aggrieved by any thing there said. I worded it carefully so as to give you no occasion for controversy. * * * I would much prefer that our correspondence remain private."

To these letters we made no reply, considering them no part of *the* correspondence, but written upon another subject, which had grown up out of the former, namely, to dissuade the publication of the correspondence about peace. It is therefore a mistatement to say we suppressed any part of the correspondence. The corespondence was closed and nearly; all in type; and as we did not recognize the existence of any "imperious necessity" to suppress the publication [after the earnest desire of the writer himself to publish, we acted as though we had heard no more about it.

We had said in one of our letters to R. F. F., that we believed the whole was a scheme to "entrap us into some constructive or pretended covenant," The Editor of the Journal disclaimed any such intention on his own part; but we are informed by an ear wituess that Dr. Duval acknowledged we were right in our conjecture. His words, as reported to us, are substantially expressed in the dialogue:—*Reporter*:—"Why if Dr. Thomas is as bad a man as you say, did you make overtures of peace to him?—*Dr. Duval*;—If you knew as much of that as I know, you would not ask that question."—*Rep.*—"Tell me, then, more than I know of this matter." *Dr. Duval*;—'I did it to catch him.'—*Rep.*—'Why did Ferguson put the query to Dr. Thomas, whether he considered himself one of this reformation?'—*Dr. D.*—'I instructed him to ask that question; for, if he said he was not, he would place himself where we wanted him, but if he said he were, then he would place himself where we could take hold of him, bring him to trial, and place him where we wanted him to be.'—*Rep.*—'Then he was right in his conjecture, that the overture was designed to insnare him?'—*Dr. D.*—'Yes, he was!' Reader! What do you think of such 'christians?' Need you wonder, that we have no faith in them or their religion!

HERALD OF THE FUTURE AGE.

If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's Seed, and Heirs according to the Promise.

JOHN THOMAS, EDITOR. RICHMOND, Va. VOL. I. NUMBER XI.

HUMAN MAGNETISM.

The National Intelligencer informs the public, that on Thursday Jan. 16. 1845, a tumor was excised from the neck of a young lady near the carotid artery, while in the Mesmeric sleep without the slightest manifestation of consciousness. The operation was performed in the presence of Doctors Mott, Francis, Doane, Delafield, Rogers, and others all of them men of celebrity and standing in their profession in New York City, where the case occurred. The Magnetizer and chirurgeon was Dr. Bertronnier recently arrived from Paris. The operation being ended, an apparent disposition to awaken was immediately dispelled by a few 'passes.' The Doctors were profoundly amazed, and doubtless chargrined by the ocular demonstration before them of how far behind the age their scepticism had thrown them!

Cases of this description are accumulating and have already established the fact, that the body can be made insensible to pain under the severest infliction by the agency of a principle whose essence and *modus operandi* upon the nervous system are unknown and which for want of a better nomenclature is termed magnetic or mesmeric. Convinced by observation, we know, that Human Magnetism is not 'humbug;' and revelation, attests both its possibility and certitude. If men had believed the Bible, they might have been assured of both these things, and they would have been spared much painful, and unprofitable, inquisition: but scepticism plunges men into an abyss of perplexity, into whose profound obscurity, no ray penetrates to enlighten their ignorance.

Who first brought Human Magnetism to light? One says. 'Mesmer:' Another, the 'Egyptian Priests;' etc; but we say no! The Lord God revealed it unto Moses. The first surgical operation ever performed was effected by Him on precisely the same principle as the case above recited. He first put the patient into the magnetic sleep, and then operated upon him with consummate skill. The operation was performed without the least pain to the patient; for at that epoch, pain had found no victim upon earth. Does the reader inquire the nature of the operation? It was one that required great dexterity. It consisted in separating a *rib* from its attachment to the *pleura costalis* and spinal column. Every one acquainted with the anatomy of these parts, knows, that in the waking state it would be a painful and precarious performance. But the Operator in this instance, abstracted it without disturbing the patient's sleep, closed up the flesh, and by a *modus operandi* as yet undiscovered, from the crude material of the rib, organized a living woman, and made a present of her to the man! The history of the case is expressed in these words:—

"And the Lord God *caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam*, and he slept, and he took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; and the rib which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man.,'—Gen. ii. 21.—Human Magnetism, then, is anterior to the creation of woman, and was first practised on the Sixth Day of the World's Age.

Results which are identical are effectuated by causes which are one and the same. Here then are two cases, that of Adam, and that of the young lady, his descendant, in New York City. They are essentially the same, with

his difference, however, in favor of the former, that Adam's constitution had then suffered no deterioration. They were both thrown into 'a deep sleep,' the effect of which was the same in both cases,—they 'slept;' and the operators unclosed the flesh of both patients, abstracted a part of their living bodies, and 'closed up the flesh instead thereof,' unknown to either of them! The Lord God established the law, or rather created the principle, of Human Magnetism, and then operated upon Adam by the agency of that principle; in after ages, man discovered the means by which man might be subjected to this principle; and has unwittingly imitated the Lord God in his wonderful operation.

I doubt not, but means exist, yet undiscovered by man, by which this same principle might be employed to give form and life to matter. The Lord God formed Adam's rib into a woman; what was the formative principle, and by what means did he apply that principle to the elaboration of the rib into the image of the man? They are known to Jesus Christ, for by him exercising these means, the dust of the dead will be formed into the likeness of his own most glorious body with their identity renewed. He will indeed 'show wonders to the dead' and 'his faithfulness in destruction.' The Formative Principle is the Spirit of the Elohim, which 'caused a motion upon the face of the waters;' but by what means, rules, or laws the Lord God applies this Spirit to the elaboration of the individual forms of the terrestrial and supernal system, will occupy an eternity to reveal.

A miracle has been theologically defined, the suspension of some known law of nature. I suspect this definition is erroneous. A miracle is a work of God, and he works in harmony with, not by the supension of his laws. A suspension of physical law, would produce no determinate result, but contrariwise confusion. It certainly cannot be by suspension but by the application of, existing laws, that all his wonderful works are performed. The laws exist as universally as matter in its different forms; but their application being only special, and the means of their appliance limited to him who enacted them, the results are extraordinary and miraculous, and their attestation consequently divine.

EDITOR.

"THE FEAR OF THE LORD."

"The fear of the Lord," says the wise man, 'is the beginning of wisdom.' This is not the wisdom of the schools; it is not that wisdom which is 'earthly, sensual, and devilish;' and which makes up the carnal policy of all partizans, whether 'reformed or unreformed:' but it is that 'wisdom which comes down from above and which is *first* pure, *then* peaceable, without partiality, without hypocrisy, and full of good fruits,' even the fruits of the Holy Spirit.' The *fear* of the Lord which is the beginning of this heavenly wisdom, is not slavish but filial! It is the offspring of all the attributes of God, love, mercy, benevolence, justice, truth, and righteousness! What person who serves God from fear of punishment *alone* or *mostly* serves not God, but himself; and is not prepared to appreciate the character of the great Jehovah. He would not serve Him for a moment, but for the fear of 'eternal torments!' Take from him that motive, and he is at once immersed in the crimes of the deepest dye. But he whose mind is properly enlightened, whose conceptions are just, and whose judgement is unclouded by the mists of human speculation, and folly, will serve God from proper motives, and with a pure heart fervently.

JOHN T. WALSH.

TRUTH DREADS NOTHING.

He who worships at the shrine of Truth cannot be bigotted. He knows that truth never suffers from investigation. It is Error that loves the dark and gloomy caverns. Her dress is dark, her countenance is dark, and there is nothing but darkness about her. Darkness is her mother, and she is akin to nothing that is bright, glowing, and beautiful. But Truth courts investigation. Her dwelling place is in the light. Her mild glowing countenance blushes not at the most, scrutinizing gaze; while Error lies trembling lest reason should make some new discoveries that will weaken her.

If you love truth, be not afraid to investigate. If you entertain opinions, that you dare not risk against the attacks of your opponents, it is good evidence that they are unsound.

Luminary.

"THINGS OF THE SPIRIT OF GOD."

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 206.

7. That when the work of setting free all those souls should be accomplished, so that none of them should be lost but all restored to the divine Essence, from which they originally emanated, BUTHOS, they supposed would dissolve the fabric of this lower world.

Such was the creed of the magicians, astrologers, sorcerers and chaldeans of the ancient oriental world. It was a part of the wisdom of the princes of that age, which God has proved to be vain and foolish. It was the parent symbol of western lore; in other words, it gave birth to 'Jewish Fables,' and Grecian Philosophy. The 'science' of the Chaldeans & Egyptians, falsely so called,' was transferred to the Isles of the Gentiles by the Greeks. On thenorth, south, east and west of Israel's Land, the people 'dwelt in the land of the shadow of death, and walked in darkness.' Their teachers, notwithstanding their 'wisdom and understanding,' their science and philosophy were 'blind leaders of the blind.' They knew nothing as they ought. Their notions about God, souls, immortality, religion were consummate foolishness as the word of God declares. Paul refers to them when he says, 'Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ'—Col. ii. 8.

This caution which the Apostle gave the Disciples at Colosse was very important; but it was a caution which they did not regard. It was this same 'philosophy and vain deceit,' which had subverted the truth among the Israelites in the ages before the birth of Messiah. 'To them were committed the Oracles of God;' but these were made of none effect by the traditions which they received from the Chaldeans, Persians, Greeks, and Romans under whose sovereignty they successively passed. The darkness overpowered them, as it is written,

"There is none that understandeth They are all gone out of the way,"

They embraced the traditions of their rulers, who spoiled them with mythological 'philosophy and vain deceit after the traditions of men.' So long as they continued satisfied with the Law and the Prophets, their spiritual language remained pure, and uncorrupted by the phrases which 'man's wisdom teacheth.' 'They spoke not of immortal souls in heaven or in hell,' as is plainly testified by a certain writer, who says, that 'before the Captivity and the Macedonian and Roman conquests, the Jews observed the most profound silence upon the state of the deceased as to their happiness or misery. They spoke of it simply as a place of silence, darkness, and inactivity.' Appendix to New Version page 55.

This remark is true, as is manifest from the Holy Oracles. In these the style is, '*the Dead know not anything*, neither have they any more a reward, for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love, and their hatred, and their envy is now perished, neither have they any more a portion for ever in any thing that is done under the sun:' 'there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave [besheol] whither thou goest'—Eccles. ix. 5, 6, 10.—In Ps. cxl. iii, it is written concerning Messiah, 'the enemy hath persecuted my soul; he hath smitten my life down to the ground; he hath made me to *dwell in darkness, as those that have been long dead.*'—Also in Ps. LXXXVIII concerning the resurrection, it is written, 'Wilt thou show wonders to the dead? Shall the dead arise *and praise thee?* Shall thy loving kindness be shown in the grave? Or thy faithfulness in destruction? Shall thy wonders be known in the dark? And thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?' And in Ps. vi. it is written, 'in death there is no remembrance of thee, O Lord: in the grave [besheol] who shall give thee thanks?' And to Abraham the Lord God spoke, saying, 'thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace: thou shalt be bu-

ried in a good, old age. Abraham did certainly not go to his own 'bosom;' but 'to his fathers' of whom Terah was an idolator! Was Terah in heaven? Where Terah was, there was his son Abraham, sleeping in the dust till the Lord his God should raise him from the dead.

SECTION 2.

Dogmas of the Wise Men of Israel.

The principle sects of philosophy among the Jews were the Essenes, the Sadducees, and the Pharisees, which arose among the people after the restoration of the State under Ezra and Nehemiah.

1. Of the ESSENS, Josephus says that 'their doctrine is this, that bodies are corruptible, and that the matter they are made of is not permanent; but that the souls are immortal, and continue for ever: and that they come out of the most subtile air, & are united to their bodies as to prisons, into which they are drawn by a certain natural enticement; but that when they are set free from the bonds of the flesh, they then, as released from a long bondage, rejoice and mount upward: while they allot to bad souls a dark and tempestuous den, full of never ceasing punishment——which is built on this first *supposition*, that souls are immortal.' Book ii. c. viii. 11.

2. Of the SADDUCEES, he says, 'the doctrine of the Sadducees is this, that souls die with their bodies' Antiq. B. xviii. c. 1. 4. 'They also take away the belief of the punishments and rewards in Hades.' * Added to this Luke says, the Sadducees deny that there is any 'resurrection.'–c. xx. 27; also in Acts xxiii. 8 he remarks in addition, 'and they say, there is neither Angel nor Spirit.' 'And this doctrine,' says Josephus, 'is received but by few, and they of the greatest dignity.'

3. Of the PHARISEES, he saith, 'they believe that souls have an immortal vigor in them; and that under the earth there will be rewards or punishments, according as they have lived virtuously or viciously in this life: and the vicious are to be detained in an everlasting prison, but that the virtuous *shall have power to revive and live again*.'—Antiq. B. xviii. c. 1. 3.

In another place, he says, 'they say that all the souls are incorruptible, but that the souls of good men only are removed into other bodies, but that the souls of bad men are subject to eternal punishment.'—Jewish War B. ii. c. viii. v. 14.

From the testimony of this historian, it would seem, that three distinct opinions prevailed among the Jews concerning 'souls.' The first, that it was immortal or deathless: the second, that it was incorruptible, or had an imperishable vigor in it; and the third, that it was neither immortal nor incorruptible, but perished with the body. The Essens who taught the immortality of the soul, concluded that it reascended to the celestial regions of light and purity immediately on the dissolution of the body; and hence the idea of a resurrection did not enter into their system, for resurrection has reference only to body. This is obvious, seeing that resurrection signifies to rise again. It is therefore, affirmed of that which primarily arose from the dust at creation and returned to the dust at death, and shall come forth from the dust a second time, a new creation; this as we all know, is a substantial man who was fashioned from the dust by the Spirit of God.

As they believed in rewards and punishments after dissolution, these

* Jew. War. B. 2. c. viii. 14.

punishments where necessarily unceasing & eternally felt, 'on the supposition,' as Josephus says, 'that souls are immortal.' If this supposition be admitted as true; if it be received as an axiom, then it will be easy to prove that the destiny of bad souls is life and incorruptibility in fire and brimstone, though it will not be so easy to comprehend how, being incorruptible, they can suffer pain. Incorruptibility is the attribute of angels & of the Divine Nature, and admits of no sensations of torment; if it did, it would hardly be promised to the righteous as an inestimable benefit, for it is a part of their reward.

The writings of Moses do not speak in *unveiled* language of the resurrection. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Sadducees should deny it; for the Mosaic doctrine of a resurrection to eternal life requires a spiritual investigation to discern it. The written law, they contended, was to be interpreted without regard to figures or types and it was this law only they admitted as authority. The propbets and the psalms were of no consideration with them. Being men of carnal minds, and rejecting the light of these testimonies, they could not discover where Moses taught the doctrine, therefore they boldly avowed the dogmas of the Stoics and Epicureans, which are summarily expressed in the apothegm, 'let us eat and drink for to morrow we die.'

Two sects of philosophy, then, in Israel rejected from their systems, the resurrection of the mortal body to immortality, the one, inferentially, the other, avowedly. The Essens taught dogmas which subverted the faith of their followers in a resurrection; while the Sadducees denied immortality of soul, resurrection, future state. angels or spirits at one sweep as untaught in the Mosaic Law. The opinions of the Pharisees, however, were opposed to these conclusions.

From the history of Josephus, we do not learn what the Pharisees considered the essence of the soul of man to be. The Essens regarded it as an emanation from the most subtile air; but we have no reason to believe that this was the Pharisaic notion. The nearest we can come to their view is, that they regarded it as *the germ of the body*. That in this germ, there was an imperishable vigor, which did not, albeit, amount to life itself in active manifestation. The imperishable substratum of life remained under ground, where we are left to conjecture, whether it remained in the ashes of the deceased in dreamy somnolency, or assumed an ideal shape. I am inclined to think that the former was their supposition; for they supposed, that virtuous souls '*shall have power to revive and live again*.' which certainly implies, till they shall have the power, they are not living: yet they speak of rewards 'under the earth,' which endicates a degree of life capable of enjoying them. The theory however is a lame one, and well befitting the wisdom of the blind leaders of Israel.

They do not appear to have believed in the transmigration of souls; though at first sight it would seem they did. They believed, says Josephus, that 'the souls of good men *only* are removed into *other* bodies.' But, by this he means, that their souls only were removed from the old body into a new body at the resurrection who were good men; and not into the bodies of other persons. Transmigration of souls whether good or bad, is a notion which belongs only to that system of 'vain philosophy' and 'science falsely so called,' which teaches the pre-existence of souls in the essence of deity, and their consequent immortality. The Pharisees did not, as far as we can discover, believe in this absurdity, though sufficiently absurd upon other points.

The diverse dogmas of the Sadducees and Pharisees may be illustrated by Paul's metaphor of a grain of corn The unplanted naked grain consists of a body, and a seed-bud or germ. If set in the earth and it remain there without vegetating, the seed body and its germ would both be destroyed. This illustrates the opinion of the Sadducees. But, if there be 'vigor' in the

germ, though the seed body die, the bud will put forth, or germinate, and acquire a new body; and thus the seed revives, and lives again. This seems to have been the idea of the Pharisees in relation to the revival of the souls of virtuous men.

But the question naturally presents itself, in what did theyconsider the germ or soul, of the body to consist. As we have said, Josephus throws no light up on the subject in his history of their opinions. Whatever their conclusion may have been, it is obvious, that they supposed, that *a conscious vitality* resided in the germ, *which it was beyond the power of man to destroy*; and that the conscious particle, atom, or principle continued under the earth from dissolution until power should be confered upon it to revive and live. The absurdity of their theory consists in this, *that this vigor of the germ, or soul, should be enjoying rewards under the earth, and yet not live;* for it cannot be living if it is to receive power to revive and live, as they pretended:—to revive and live, if there be any def. inite meaning in language, signifies vigor and life are acquired in the act only of coming again to life, and that previous to this action, the subject has been absolutely dead.

From the phraseology of the sentence passed upon Adam, it is clear, that the germ of the body is its earthy particles; all the rest of it is gaseous or aeriform; which in the process of corruption, is mingled with the air and soil, and by its action on the radicles and leaves of vegetables, contributes to their growth and sustentation, '*Out of the ground wast thou taken, for dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return*'—Gen. iii,19. Thus spake the Lord God to our earthy progenitor. He declared him to be dust, and that he should become dust again; that he should return to his original earthiness. The answer to the question, *what is the germ of the mortal body?*–is found in this historical fact; the dust of the ground, or earth out of which man was originally formed; as it is written, 'the Lord God formed man, the dust of the ground.' It was from this the animal man first arose to life; it is from this also, the identical particles of earthy matter into which he is resolved by corruption, that he is to arise again to a second & unending life.

'But some will say, How are the dead raised up?'—How *can* the dust of the dead become living men? The answer to this question is contained in Rom. viii. 11, where it is written, if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also make alive your mortal bodies *by his Spirit* that dwelleth in you.' All things are possible with God. If God could of the stones raise up children to Abraham; or of five loaves and two fishes feed five thousand persons, he can doubtless by his Spirit reanimate the dust of the dead in all their personal identity. The animal man has been compared to the naked grain when planted in the earth; but the analogy is defective in this, that while the grain contains a living germ, the living principle of the mortal body is not within itself, but imparted to it by the Spirit of God at the instant of its resurrection to life. The Pharisees erred in supposing that an incorruptible semi-conscious principle of life was innate to the flesh. The life of the germ of the mortal body resides not in the particles thereof, but in Jesus who is the resurrection and the life. The incorruptible and vital principle is with him. Men can 'kill the body;' they can deprive it of life; but the life itself they cannot destroy. That life is beyond their reach. They may reduce the body to dust and ashes. and scatter it to the winds, but the life which shall reanimate that dust is infinitely above their control. It is hid; it is hid in God, not in the germ or dust, but with Christ. as it is written, 'our life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall we also appear with him in glory'—Col. iii. 4. But this the wise men of Israel did not believe.

From these hints the reader will be prepared to interpret with all consistency and ease the passages in Matt. x. 28. Fear not them which kill the body, but

are not able to kill the soul (psuchee); but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in gehenna'. The word 'soul' here is the same word in the Greek as in ch. xvi. 25, 26 where it occurs four times, being twice translated *life* & as often *soul*; thus it reads, 'whosoever will save his life [psuchee], shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life or soul (psuchee) for my sake, shall find it: [for what is a man profited. if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul or life [psuchee]? Or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul or life (psuchee)?' There is no good reason why in both these places *psuchee* should not be rendered *life* throughout. Hence the former passage will read 'Fear not them who kill the body, but can not finally extinguish the life, but rather fear him who is able to abolish both life and body in gehenna.' This is obviously the correct interpretation as it appears from the parallel passage in Luke xii. 4 which reads, 'I say unto *you*, my friends, be not afraid of them that kill the body, and *after that have no more that they can do*. But I will forewarn *you* whom *ye* shall fear: Fear him who after he hath killed hath power to cast into gehenna.' Cast what into gehenna? The body unquestionably; first kill and then finally destroy. Psuchee, life or soul is as applicable to the lower animals as to man; if therefore, it be contended, it signifies 'immortal soul,' it must be conceded, that the souls, of beasts are immortal as well as those of menwhich none but metempsychosians, we presume, will contend.

The Pharisees did not believe in the resurrection of the whole human family. They taught that the children of Abraham *alone* should be raised from the dead and enter into future happiness:'—C. Bapt. p. 57—and even this, it would seem, they understood only in a limited sense, as of those children of Abraham who imitated his example. This appears from Josephus, who says, that they believed that 'the souls of good men *only* are removed into other bodies,' and 'the vicious are to be *detained* in an everlasting prison,' and would therefore not have power to revive and live again; for they supposed that the virtuous as a part of their reward would have power to return to life.

1. First, then in relation to resurrection, they believed that the Heathen would not rise.

2. That the righteous sons, or children, of Abraham would rise from the dead.

3. That his unrighteous descendants would not rise, but be detained in the prison house of the dead for ever.

From these testimonies of Josephus, then it would seem, that they did not believe in a resurrection of the unjust. Paul, however, affirms in his defence before Felix, theyallowed that 'there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust.' There is an apparent contradiction here, which may be explained on the supposition, that some of the Pharisees believed only in a resurrection of good men as Josephus intimates, while others of them, of whom was Paul, believed that both the just and unjust of Abraham's descendants would arise from the dust of death. There, was, doubtless as much diversity of sentiment among them concerning the subject of the resurrection, as among us at this time; some affirming one thing and some another.

Unlike the Sadducees their rivals, the Pharisees received the Prophets and the Psalms as parts of divine revelation as well as the Books of Moses. It was from these they learned, the non-resurrection of Heathens, and the resurrection of the just and unjust. Isaiah had written in ch. xxvi. 13.—'other lords besides thee have had dominion over us: *they are dead* THEY SHALL NOT LIVE; *they are deceased, they* SHALL NOT RISE: therefore hast thou visited and destroyed them,' also in ch. xliii. 17, the same prophet teaches the non-resurrection of the Chaldean oppressors of Israel, saying, 'thus saith the Lord, your Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel: for your sake I have sent to Babylon, and have brought down all their nobles, and the Chal-

deans, whose cry is in the ships. *'They shall lie down together*, THEY SHALL NOT RISE, they are *extinct*, they are quenched as tow.' And in Psalm CXL. 9. 10. Messiah in prayer to Jehovah saith.' 'As for the head (or rulers) of those that compass me about, let the mischief of their own lips cover them. Let burning coals fall upon them: let them be cast into the fire, into deep pits, *that they* RISE NOT UP AGAIN.' And in Dan. xii. 2 'and many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.' These passages sufficiently establish the belief of the Pharisees on the points in question.

Thus far, then we have presented to you opinions of the Asiatic Philosophers, both Jew and Gentile, in relation to Immortality, Immortal Souls, Resurrection, and the destiny of the virtuous and unrighteous, extant in the world during the ages and generations preceding, and contemporary with that of Christ and his Apostles. In all this, our object is to show you the seeds of those things, which are now believed, and contended for by religious leaders, as gospel truths: things which have long been taken for granted as truth, but which, it is manifest, are only the foolish traditions of carnally minded men, and no part of 'the things of the Spirit of God.' In connexion with this branch of our subject, we have only to add the opinions of those who gave direction to public sentiment in the classic regions of Greece and Rome.

SECTION 3.

DOGMAS OF THE ANCIENT GREEKS AND ROMANS.

1. Pythagoras was the first man who styled himself a *philosopher*, which signifies *a lover of wisdom*. He flourished about 550 years before Christ. He spent about 25 years in Egypt, which in that age was renowned for its 'science falsely so called.' From this source he learned that the souls of all mankind lived in some preexistent state, and that for the sins committed there, some souls were sent into human bodies, and others into brutes to be punished, and purified from sin. As to the essence of these souls, he taught that they were an emanation from the substance of God who was the mover and soul of the world.

2. Socrates lived 400 years before Christ. He taught that *souls were immortal because immaterial.*

3. Plato flourished 348 years before Christ. He affirmed that there were a certain invincible malignity and corruption in matter insuperable by the power of God. That man's soul is a particle of the Divine Essence; and therefore immortal: and that evil must necessarily exist from the union of matter and soul in the same person. De mons he said, were an order of beings inferior to the Deity, but superior to men, and that they governed the world. Some of them he viewed as mediators, 'carrying men's prayers to God and his answers to men.'

4. Opposed to these opinions were those of Epicurus, who taught that the soul is mortal; and of Zeno, the Stoic, who supposed, that the existence of the soul was limited to a certain period of time.

5. The Academics despaired of finding the truth in such a variety of opinions; and therefore, came to the conclusion, that it was uncertain whether the gods existed or not; and whether the

To be continued.

MR. CAMPBELL'S EXTRA ON LIFE AND DEATH

BROTHER THOMAS:

The ninth No. of 'The Herald' etc, has arrived. This, to me was a source of gratification, for, although they say you have, been 'excommunicated' from the 'US' of the Harbinger, I look upon your paper as the best IN the reformation! I see you have received the extra on 'Life and Death;' and that you have promised to 'analyse and refute it.' I suppose the 'extra' is Mr. Campbell's ablest effort; that he has put forth his most gigantic power and annihilated *annihilation* itself; at least in his own estimation, and that of his own brethren! I look upon this production as one of the weakest, and most puerile, that the learned President and professor of Moral and Mental Philosophy, and Social History, has ever published to the world! I hope however that you will treat it with that respect, which is due to the productions of so learned an Editor. I see that he has paid his respects to me; and perhaps on this account, I should reciprocate the favor! At present I shall notice what he has said in reference to 'the Philosophy of the Intermediate State;' and, at some future time, I may, perhaps, notice his strong arguments on 'eternal punishment, and some other matters. All he says of me may be found on pages 569, and 570. He says 'I have but two faults to find with his (my) treatise on the intermediate state' The first of these might, by some utilitarians, be regarded as its greatest perfection. It is a valuable exemplification of the fallacy technically called *petitio principii*; or vulgarly, 'the begging of the question.' This declaration of Mr. Campbell's if he has read the pamphlet, evinces a disposition to misrepresent his opponents. When a disputant 'begs the question,' he assumes or takes for granted, what he ought first to prove. No unprejudiced man who has carefully read what I have written on the Intermediate State can affirm this of me. Mr. Campbell, when he writes upon his *Pythagorean speculations*, always assumes what he ought to prove; and then, lest he should be detected in imposing upon his too *credulous* readers, he very wisely contrives to make it appear that such is the plan of his opponents;

He continues: 'Any one who desires to see how far a man may wander from reason and common sense without seeming to notice it, will be edified by reading this extended assmption.' Such is the admirable logic of President Campbell! Why did he not let his readers see some portion of this 'assumption?' Is he to be, not only the 'supervisor' but the sole and absolute Judge of all the questions, controversies, and arguments, in 'this reformation?' Then Mr. C. professes to give my arguments, as follows: 'He disposes of the strongest passages in proof of Hades, on the separate state by this admirable argument:

A state of conscious existence between death and the resurrection is no where taught in the scriptures: therefore, it is not taught in this passage nor in that: therefore, it is not taught in this parable nor in that: therefore, it is not taught by Jesus nor his Apostles. Now reader, here we have a fair specimen of the honesty, fairness, and candour, of this Prince of Logicians! There is not a word of truth in the above statement; and the reader will search in vain for any such argument as this, which is put into my mouth by the author of this 'Extra!' Would it not have been more honorable to the head and heart of Mr. Campbell, to have presented to his readers the scriptural arguments I adduced as they occur, than to have so grossly misrepresented me; and, that too, 'without seeming to notice it?' But the secret of the whole matter is, that he never argues unless he has the advantage of his opponents. He knew *his* readers or at least very few of them, had seen the pamphlet, and that his verdict in the case would be 'proof,' to them 'strong as holy writ?' No man has wandered farther from 'reason and common sense' than Mr. Campbell has, on the subject of 'Demonology.' He has, in fact left 'reason and common sense,' and the Bible toiling after him in vain! And no man has been so inconsistent in his interpretations of the same passages. Mr. Campbell would have mere '*bodies*,' without soul or spirit, perambulating the streets of Jerusalem, after the resurrection of Messiah! Their

souls walking through the Elysian fields of Paradise; and their '*bodies*' through the streets of Jerusalem! If this exposition does not border on the supremely ridiculous, I confess I am at a loss to know what does!

At one time Mr. C. would have us believe, the 'demons' know a vast deal about the affairs of this world: that they are wandering about the tombs, and sepulchres, where perchance, 'their old mortalities lie in ruins! But when the voice of inspiration thunders the declaration in his ears, that '*the dead know not any thing*,' then, forsooth, 'they know nothing about the affairs of earth!' A while ago they knew a great deal, but now they know nothing of earth!! Is it not a wonder, Mr. C. that Dives had not forgotten that he had 'five brethren in' this 'world?' O! but that is a parable!' Very well, then let it go for one! and not convert it into a real history.

Mr. Campbell speaks of my 'irreverence for the authority of the Bible.' But, pray how does he estimate 'reverence?' If I had manifested great and profound respect for his '*obsolete* opinions,' and 'speculations,' which he has forced upon the world 'unasked;' I doubt not but he would have said that I had great 'reverence for the authority of the Bible.' But as I have dared to think for myself, and to publish my thoughts to the world, without consulting him, I have no 'reverence!' And I will remark here, that Mr. Campbell himself has taught me to think & speak for myself, and call no man 'Leader;' and it is too late now for him to unteach what he has all along taught. The thundering voice of truth, calling for '*full and free investigation*,' has been heard from the western hills of Va. and have echoed to the sea-board; and now we send back a hearty, long and loud response 'FREE INVESTIGATION'!!

No man could understand my views of the cases to which he refers; by reading them in this 'extra' assumption! And how Mr. Campbell can give such an exposition, as that refered to above, and then object to my expositions of the cases of Moses, Paul, and the thief, I know not! According to his views of Paul's case, the body must have been dead while his spirit was in Paradise, 'for the body without the spirit is dead,' if we are to believe the Apostle James! But what of that, when 'bodies,' without soul or spirit, can perigrinate the earth! *The dead praise not the Lord*,' says the Holy Spirit; but Mr. Campbell contends they do praise him, and thus strikingly evinces how much 'reverence' he has 'for the authority of the Bible!' But why should I say more? it is hard to reply to such 'waywardness, irreverence, and obsolete glosses!, So much for his misrepresentation of me. At some future time, I may notice some other matters. In the mean time Brother Editor, let us hear from you.

Yours in hope of immortality.

J. T. WALSH.

P. S. I offer no apology for the manner I have written. I have suffered myself to be treated rudely long enough, without 'seeming to notice it.' I respect Mr. C. for his learning and talents, and for his *past* services in *reform*. And I pray God he may not undo all that he has done! My motto is '*Respect all men and fear none*.' And so long as 'the Spirit of God is in my nostrils,' will I think speak, and write what my conscience, and the Bible bid me. I have as much right to do this as any other man, Mr. Campbell included, under the sun, moon, and stars!

J. T. W.

LETTER FROM THE EDITOR TO A FRIEND IN THE FAR WEST

LETTER VIII.

[Richmond Va. October 1843.

MUCH ESTEEMED FRIEND,

It has been well observed, that 'it has been a common artifice of the Papal church, a jesuitical proceeding, first to destroy the heretic, and then by way of an excuse to blacken his character, branding him as an immoral and vicious man.' This is true. The Papal church was once universal in Europe; and by common consent of all, save Disciples, whether found among Waldenses, Baptists, or Reformers, acknowledged as the Mother of all Churches. The Spirit by which the old Harlot has always been animated, is unclean in every respect; it is licentious, slanderous, mendacious and cruel. The Sectarian Progeny, which are the offshoots of her communion, all partake of the unclean spirit; which displays itself with more or less inveteracy according to the proximity or remoteness of their family relationship to their Old Mother. This spirit may be termed the Spirit of Antichrist, which is a perfect antithesis to the Spirit of Christ. This is a spirit of love. It suffers long, and is kind, it is not envious; thinks no evil, it rejoices in the truth, and takes not up a reproach against a brother; and it is full of mercy and good fruits. But in the ratio of a community's approximation to the Image of the Beast, so will it evince the characteristics of the foul and unclean spirit of the Man of Sin. Thus when this spirit gets possession of a sect, once pure and apostolic, it may then be said to have merged into Babylon, the symbol of the Apostacy. Now this is the terminus towards which 'this Reformation' is careering, and to which it will soon attain, unless the friends of truth rally around the standard of gospel liberty, and arrest its delinquent course. The spirit by which the mass is animated is antichristian, that is, it is licentious, intolerant, proscriptive, and unmerciful. Its licentiousness is manifest in the fact that reformers will not bear to be admonished without becoming rebellious, and obey the impulse of their lusts more than the Law of Christ. Look at the dancing and frolicking professors amongst us, who are better versed in the contents of the last novel, than in the doctrine of the New Testament. As to its intolerance, proscriptiveness, and cruelty, I have had too much personal experience thereof to doubt it. If any one would verify the truth of this let them take a decided stand for principle, and they will not be long ere they acquiesce in what I have written.

The degenerate spirit of the Reformation has been imported into it from Babylon and the World. Baptists and Sectarian Clergy, who have left their sects and joined reformers, have done so in conformity with a purely intellectual conviction. Their understanding of certain texts in relation to remission of sins, the Holy Spirit, the breaking of bread, Calvinism, etc, has been improved. Hitherto, however, they have violently; and in the spirit of Antichrist, opposed and ridiculed the Ancient gospel; now they acknowledge they were in error, and having been immersed though in their ignorance of what they now assent is true, yet reformers are so captivated at having caught a big fish, that they haul him on board and swallow him unwashed, uncleansed, scales, bones, and all! But, to turn from the topical to the literal. The Baptist Clergy change their opinions; they confess they were in Babylon while in their old denomination, which they evacuate to join the 'New.' I would inquire here, are they not still in Babylon? Does coming out of Babylon consist in changing one's opinions, or 'in putting off the old man with his deeds; and putting on the new, which is renewed by knowledge after the image of him that created him.' As to the Sectarian Clergy there are few of them in the Reformation compared with the Baptists. When they come out of Babylon they do so by obeying the gospel. This is as it should be; and if they would only leave the clerical spirit behind them it would greatly enhance their value as Disciples.

The great foible of the Clergy in all ages has been an insatiable avidity for multitudes of proselytes. This was the frailty of their old brethren the Pharisees. Quantity without regard to quality, has been death to the purity and scriptural intelligence of all sects with which they have had to do. They have translated this pestilent weakness from the Old to the 'New Denomination.' I say pestilent, for it was this desire to augment the bulk instead of to refine the character of the church which ultimately blended it with the World. In the Ten Kingdoms, it is all church and no world, or all world and no church, for there is really no difference. Among us, the measure of good done by our 'reformed clergymen' is the hundreds they have immersed for the Remission of sins! Their too frequent manner of getting their proselytes into the water I described in Letter 6, where I spoke to you of the '*flash-in-*

the-pan' style of preaching in Lunenburg. The brethren there have been paying $50 per month for evangelizing of this sort; which they will find will not fail to swamp reformation, if the practice be not reformed, before long. There are many cases which can be adduced, where large collections of immersed persons, termed reformers have literally starved out; not because of being spoiled by 'untaught speculations,' but purely by the exhaustion which comes from excitation. Great noise has been made about the good this or that preacher has done, how many he has immersed, but unless 'a pastor' is located among them, they squander off to other places where they can hear preaching, and thus almost as soon as born they die of spiritual inanition. How different in the days of the Apostles! Then they did not forsake the assembling of themselves together, but exhorted one another to love and to good works; and it is testified of them, that 'walking in the fear of the Lord and in the admonition of the Holy Spirit, they were multiplied.' This was growing with the increase of God. Why should it not be so now!

Thus, by bloating the body politic of the reformation with these scores of carnal proselytes, very aptly styled, 'big meeting Christians,' the clergy transfuse the spirit of the World into the Church, which compounded with their own, has developed an intolerant, persecuting, and proscriptive spirit. This pervades the country, and will either extinguish liberty and suppress the truth, or we must vanquish it, and trample it under foot.

'In regard to religious matters,' a friend from Lunenburg writes it is with painful emotions that I have to say there are some among us in this country who seem to be more busily engaged in sewing the seeds of discord among the churches and the brethren, than they are of preaching the gospel to sinners. They cry out loudly that Dr. Thomas is a schismatic, when they are in fact themselves the schismatics, for it is not uncommon to hear those who are opposed to you declare non-fellowship with you and those who hold you as a brother; but on the other hand I have yet to hear the first man who owns you as a brother declare non-fellowship with them who are opposed to you. It seems to me nothing can be done to keep peace and retain you as a brother. The voice that issues from Bethany seems to be as the sound of many waters, that you are to be rejected by the brethren. Yes, sir, this will be the case as long as there is a Cæsar on the throne. Who can wonder at the state of things that now exist as long as we have one who assumes the supervisorship of this Reformation? I used to think the reformers were slanderously stigmatized as Campbellites; but I must confess that in this I was mistaken, for experience has taught me, there are some among us who are Campbellites indeed.'

'It seems to me that your enemies are determined to obey the Charlottesville and Bethany edicts. You are to be cut off any how. They find they cannot suppress the truths you teach in regard to Re-immersion, and the question of Immortality, and thereof put you down; they have, if you believe me dropped the cudgels in regard to the doctrine you teach, and resorted to the base weapon of calumniation. I was at the Co-operation meeting yesterday (Oct. 14) where your name was dragged before an audience of some 2 or 300 people in the most sarcastic manner you can conceive of.'

Was not the virulence of the bite inflicted by the Old Serpent upon our first parents extreme! It has poisoned the constitution of the Human Family with astonishing malignity; so that, even in this reformation the virus still festers, and keeps up the enmity between 'the Seed of the Serpent' and 'the seed of the woman.' And this is the philosophy of the whole difficulty. It is constituted of the two 'seeds,' that of the woman goes in for all the truth in word and deed, with liberty to discuss, and diffuse it every where; the 'seed of the serpent' goes in for truth and tradition; the former in theory, and *the latter in practice*, with liberty to discuss the truth *in part* and, commingled with tradition, to propagate the compound everywhere. In these times, when they are beaten in argument, they endeavor to bite our heels; but, like our Leader, the vanquisher of the parent snake, we 'bruise their heads,' which in the agonies of death writhe forth the hisses of despair.

(Though it was written a considerable time after my sojourn in Richmond after my return from Lunenburg, yet as the events relate to this period of my narrative, I shall here

append certain extracts from a letter written by an individual in that county illustrative of the spirit of the 'Reformed Clergy,' and of the state of things developed by their unhallowed ministrations.

'You are well aware of the course of your enemies towards you before you arrived amongst us last August; also of their almost perfect silence in relation to certain charges they pretended to have against you. While you were among us, one would have supposed from the silence they manifested in relation to those charges, that they would have remained silent in future, for the respect they ought to have had for their own characters as 'christians' and gentlemen, but alas!—Soon after you left, there was a 'Co-operation Meeting' at Liberty, Prince Edward, at which your character was most abominably assailed as I have been most credibly informed, and by those whom you invited to bring forward their allegations whilst you were present that you might have an opportunity of defence before the brethren generally.'

"Since the meeting we have had a continual harangue both against your private and public character; but being unable to substantiate any thing to your prejudice among the brethren and friends, they sought aid as we judge from circumstances, from bro. Henshall of Richmond; thinking, perhaps, he would be able to substantiate things, that would forever blast your Christian character amongst us in this section of Virginia! But alas for them! How vain were their efforts! Accordingly he came and commenced a faithful warfare against you, with apparently flaming colors, such as would make one almost think that he had nursed you from infancy. Oh! he knew you so well! But we soon found to our satisfaction, that his colors would not bear rinsing. Soon after he arrived in this neighborhood, I met with him at Bro. W. Doswell's, on which occasion he very readily brought you up as a topic of conversation, and spoke of you in a very reproachful manner, as I thought, but, in my opinon to his own disgrace; which I very much regreted, especially as I formerly cherished a very high regard for him. I shall withold the particulars of our conversation for the present for peace sake. * * * The efforts of these brethren since you left, in my opinion have fast tended to raise you in favor among the church and world. I am truly thankful to our Heavenly Father, that the minds of the brethren are so well prepared upon these things, that it is difficult to deceive them by such stratagems as your enemies are employing to put you down. They seem to be fully aware of the fact, *that it is the doctrine that you teach which they are aiming to stop by the destruction of your character*, being themselves unable to meet it by the word of truth. Their principal aim at this time appears to be, to prevent your attaching yourself to any of the churches in Eastern Virginia when you return; and one of the means they seem to be using to accomplish it is, by holding the rod of excommunication over the church that may receive you; and it appears chiefly to be those *speaking brethren* who are doing it all. They cannot be contented to allow the brethren to enjoy their own privileges and consciences in relation to matters: but thanks be to our Heavenly Father, I see that some of the brethren are determined to maintain them in this and all things, God has given us through his Son."

"I understand that Coleman and others are expected among us shortly, and I should not be surprised, if they were to inflict upon us another harangue. In this way they are exciting prejudice and confusion among the brethren; and then have the impertinence to say you are the cause of it. It appears to me, that men of common honesty would disdain such a course. My prayer to God is that they may cast away their carnal weapons, and be content to take up the sword of the Spirit and fight the good fight of faith, that they may at last lay hold on Eternal Life."

"The notice that '*The Publisher*' has taken of you, I think sufficiently nullifies itself with every unprejudiced mind. It cannot therefore possibly do you any harm, particularly among those brethren, who know you better than he does. The friends of the paper in this section, I believe, were ashamed of it. The brethren in this section have had a great deal better opportunity of knowing the character you deserve, than I presume, he had, and can say with safety, that we never knew any thing else of you, but that of an exemplary Christian, and the most powerful in the Word of God of anyman we ever have had among us; and I think you have labored among us four or five years. It is presuma-

ble, then, that it ought to take something more than declamation and base insinuation to sever our attachment from you. I suspect if your enemies would take the same pains to scrutinize their own characters, as they do in searching into yours, they would find at least as much rubbish in themselves as they pretend to have found in you. I would therefore recommend to them, to institute the highly important discipline of self-purification, and they would, then, be better qualified to cleanse you; in so doing I should expect to find a better spirit than we now see manifested by them. The spirit we now see manifest is that of pulling another down, instead of building one another up in the most holy faith and of becoming laughing stocks to the community, instead of lights to the world. May the Lord forgive them, and enable them to reform.

"My advice to you after all I have seen and heard in relation to the injustice with which you have been treated, is to bear it with christian fortitude, and have as little to say to them as you possibly can compatible with the defence of truth and justice to yourself; for I am inclined to think the evil will eventually cure itself without much effort on your part. Your enemies no doubt, would be glad to keep off the minds of the brethren from the true points at issue by these harangues about nothing. But I am in hopes the time is past with them here. I do not believe the brethren here will sacrifice one iota of the gospel to propitiate the traditionizers among them; they have too much respect for him who, by his death and resurrection, has secured to them remission by the belief and obedience of the Gospel, which in that obedience assures them of a right to the Tree of Life. I am in hopes likewise, that you will continue to contend with us for the true Gospel, and that we may all at last be wreathed with that crown, which never fades away."

Thus, my dear friend you discover it is no fiction of mine, that the spirit of the Old Harlot still haunts 'this Reformation,' and rankles in the hearts of its clergy. None but persons demoniacally possessed, would act so recklessly and suicidally. They have overacted the part assigned them; for while possessed of malice, they lacked sagacity in the prudent execution of their schemes. Such men, however, are of utility in the world; not for the spiritual good they do, but *by opposing the Truth*. They are like Turks rushing to battle in hope of a Paradise they never attain to; they pitch themselves headlong shutting their eyes and shouting like madmen, against the army of the faith which, but for such enemies as these, seeing that the world has become indifferent, might perchance disband, having no opposition. It is the enforcement of the flint against the steel, which elicits a spark, that might wrap the world in a sheet of flame; even so, by the efforts of such persons as these against the truth, it is brought into notice, and enkindle s a flame in the hearts of thousands, which all the companies and officials of the Man of Sin can never extinguish. I have just room to add that I am yours, rejoicing in persecution for the truth's sake.

JOHN THOMAS.

MR. ALBERT ANDERSON TO THE EDITOR.

BROTHER THOMAS,

Beloved for the sake of your faithful advocacy of The Gospel in all its parts, as commending itself to every one for the obedience of faith, may grace, mercy, and peace abound to you and all your co-laborers; and may they abound as coming from God, the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ, Amen.

I wish to define my position with reference to yourself and to all who are laboring in the same cause. In mind, in heart, and in life I offer you my help in behalf of the truth the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. This offer is predicated, not upon *respect of persons*, but upon conscientious regard to *principle*. I have been greatly exercised in meditation upon churches, as to their constitutionality, etc. Amid these meditations and consequent emotions of heart, The Jerusalem Church, i. e. the church or congregation established by divine authority in the days of the Apostles, and in the Holy City of Jerusalem;—this church, I emphatically repeat has been most prominently, strikingly, and conclusively presented before me, as described in sacred and living testimony. A vision in the silent watches of the night could hardly make a more vivid impression. Peter and the other Apostles, full of the Holy Spirit, and working conviction in the hearts of the hearing, heeding, attention-wrapt Israelites, and commanding the convicted to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins—these Apostles speaking as the Spirit gave them utterance, and rested upon with fire-like symbols are before me, as establishing the FIRST ARCHETYPAL CHURCH. They constrain me to contemplate it in its constitution or organization, in its ordinances etc, etc. And from all the divine promises, several conclusions, or deductions, of divine authority, present and force themselves before me. One of them I name at this time, and it is this, that *all the members of the Archetypal, or Model, Church, had been baptized for remission of sins*. The proof of this is in the sacred writings, as every truly intelligent disciple knows. How satisfactory is Peter's declaration as recorded in Acts ii, "repent and be baptized *every one* of you [devout Jews] etc,."—The history of the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins as preached and practised by John the Baptist, furnishes all the additional truth necessary on this point.

Now are Modern Churches established in conformity with the Model Church in Jerusalem? I would rather stand *alone* as a beacon, if nothing more, in the midst of surrounding darkness and gloominess, and tempests than be any longer, obscurely, and inegloriously associated with the corrupting *advocacy* of a Humanized Gospel.

For the gospel set before me in the testimonies of the Holy Spirit, I am willing to plead, with all the energies God has given, and not only to do this, but, if necessary, to suffer *all reproaches*, and even to *die* for its advocacy.

I have read with much interest and satisfaction, the last number of the Herald. I admire the bold, energetic, and faithful-like communication of bro. Bodenhamer. I heartily approve the communication from Oak Grove, and I accept in heart the invitation given to partake with the Brethren meeting at the Odd Fellows' Hall, given to all who have obeyed *the* Gospel, and continue to deport themselves in harmony with its precepts. With best love and wishes believe me

Yours in the Truth
ALBERT ANDERSON.

Athens, Caroline, Va,
March 16th 1845.

MAY A CHRISTIAN APPEAL UNTO CÆSAR?

BROTHER THOMAS,

It is known to yourself and some of the Brethren in Richmond, that in recently instituting *a suit for a libel* against our quondam Bro. Alexander Campbell, I have decided the above question for myself, in the affirmative. This conclusion was not reached except by a process of patient and scriptural investigation undertaken with a conscientious reference to my duty as a christian, in the premises. That it is not lawful for a christian to *seek vengeance* in any case is very clear; but that he is forbidden by any rule of the Gospel to defend his reputation, to uphold justice and to maintain truth, I cannot admit.

In the position in which I was placed, I was either to submit in silence without redress to a most injurious assault on my character as a christian and a man, or to appeal against such injustice to the means of redress afforded by the "powers that be"—to "God's ministers" "ordained of God"—"unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil-doers and for the praise of them that do

well," Happily I had an illustrious example before me in the great Apostle Paul—and I became an "imitator" of him.

In the 25th ch. of Acts we learn that when "the Jews which came down from Jerusalem stood round about and laid many and grievous complaints against him which they could not prove; that he answered for himself, neither against the law of the Jews, neither against the temple nor yet against Cæsar have I offended any thing at all;' and, when notwithstanding *his innocence*, his persecutors and slanderers sought his destruction, he said "I *appeal unto* Cæsar."

Again in Acts 22 ch. When about to be scourged and bound under a false accusation he invokes the protection of the civil law: "Is it *lawful* for you to scourge a man that is a Roman and uncondemned?"

Again in Acts 16 ch. where it appears the magistrates dreading the vengeance of the Roman Law and having found that they had misused one entitled to the protection of a Roman citizen had sent to order the release of himself and Silas from the "Philippian prison, Paul is not willing to accept his liberty, except upon the condition of a public acknowledgement of the injustice of their course and of his own innocence "They have beaten us openly uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast us into prison and now do they thrust us out privily nay, verily but let them come themselves and fetch us out. * * * And they *came* and *besought them* and *brought them out.*"

From these examples, I argue, that *where the aggressor denies the force of mutual christian relations*, it is, *lawful* to appeal to the powers that be, for the protection of one's reputation as well as personal liberty and safety. Paul certainly invoked protection for the latter, and unless it can be shown that a christian's *personal liberty* is dearer to him than his *character*, the apostolic example is available in both cases.

In Paul's day, truly, judicial tribunals erected for the avowed purpose of redressing injustice to one's reputation were unknown, yet such a consideration had no little influence in determining the decision of questions involving personal liberty directly, since an innocent man's character is always vindicated by the issue of a groundless prosecution.

It seems to me, then, that, whilst a christian may not avenge injuries by retaliation or by inflicting physical punishment, he may of right claim the privilege of defence before a tribunal which, in awarding to him and his accuser a fair trial, administers justice between them, and enables the innocent party to stand vindicated before the world.

My appeal to the "powers that be" having proved so speedily effectual, constitutes, in some degree, a fresh argument in behalf of its expediency.

All of which is submitted to the candid judgment of your readers.

A. B. Magruder.

☞The above was written by Mr. M. in defence of the course he recently and reluctantly pursued in relation to Mr. Campbell. This gentleman had been guilty of defaming Mr. M's character (the reader, we trust, will excuse the solecism!) and refused to accord to him the redress which honor, justice, and truth demanded. Mr. M. finding Mr. C. inaccessible to these considerations, caused a writ to be served on him to compel him by law to do what inherent christian principle was too feeble to accomplish. The suit was instituted for libel; damages $12000.00. The result was, that under fear of a very probable verdict he anxiously sought permission to do Mr. M. all the justice he had refused when left to the exercise of his own free will. Repentance though tardy, availed him through the liberality of the plaintiff, who on certain considerations agreed to suspend the suit. Further particulars of Mr. Campbell's visit to this city will be given it our next.

Editor.

☞We were mistaken in our conjecture that Dr. Bodenhamer was writing to the Editor of the Christian Review; "F" is some *one else, but who, we are not informed.*—Editor.

☞Our next number closes this volume We have only 40 complete copies on hand, will the well wishers of the Herald increase our list, remit for vol. 2., and dispose of the above? Editor.

☞The co-operation meeting in this city has proved a complete failure.—Editor

HERALD OF THE FUTURE AGE.

If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's Seed, and Heirs according to the Promise.

John Thomas, Editor. RICHMOND, Va. Vol. I. Number XII.

VISIT TO NEW JERSEY.

Judging a visit to her native state would improve the health of our partner in life, which had been in a precarious condition for many years, we consented to her departure thither in the summer of 1843. She arrived there safely, and after a sojourn of a few weeks improved considerably, and began to entertain strong hopes of a permanent restoration. But towards the end of the present winter, she was taken with a paralysis of the superior extremities, and extreme general debility. Having received information to this effect, we left Richmond on the 15th of March, on a visit to New Jersey to see her and if capable of sustaining the fatigue of travel, to remove her to the South.

It is at all times exceedingly repugnant to our feelings to make our domestic affairs the subject of public notoriety. We neither wish to know, nor to pry into the affairs of others, nor is it agreable to us, to trouble others with ours, or that they should meddle with things pertaning to us, which do not concern them. When we wish, the interference, of other people, we will take the initiatory upon ourselves. We prefer to select our own confidants, having no taste nor gratitude for the officious meddling of busy bodies.

We speak thus, & have said thus much of our private matters, to account for our absence from Richmond at this 'Crisis,' and to put to silence those mean spirited tattlers, who are busying themselves and troubling the public, with fictions of their own malevolence about us. We regret that the circumstances detailed have necessitated our absence; for we wished much to be present that we might observe the movements which we expect Mr. C. & his satellites will make against the truth. But the case was imperative; so we set out in the discharge of the obligations resting on us.

We left Richmond at 8½ A. M. by the cars on the 15th instan. We arrived at Wash. by the Powhatan from Aquia Creek at 5 A. M. From thence by stage to Balt. where we arrived at 11o'clock. We were anxious to push on for Phila. but found this to be impossible owing to the influence of 'the Sabbath Day Convention,' which met in Baltimore recently, and has succeeded in stopping the Cars and Steamboats from plying on the First Day of the Week' in most of the Eastern Cities. We therefore found ourselves confined to Baltimore during this day. The prospect was by no means pleasing, for the droppings of the sectarian sanctuaries have no charms for us, and, although there were professedly two churches of Disciples [opponents indeed] we did not know which of them had the best claims to be regarded as walking in the feat of God and the admonition of the Holy Spirit; and were we clear upon this point, so general has been the diffusion of an evil spirit against us, that we should still have been at a loss to know whether if we proposed to worship with them we should have been treated with civility, or otherwise. In the midst of this uncertainty we scarcely knew how to act for the best We remembered that Bro.—was a subscriber to the Herald of the Future Age, and although personally unacquainted, we thought from that circumstance we should stand a chance of more favor than from the party opposed to him and his friends. Still we did not know where they assembled for worship. We inquired of 'mine host' of the Eagle where we put up, if he knew such a gentleman, and if he could tell us where he

attended for religious worship? He thought in a room at, or near the Belvidere Gas House if we remember rightly; but was not certain. We searched the Directory, and found that he 'Disciples' met in North Street, but still we were at a loss to know whether Bro.— was of that company. At length we concluded that we would call at his residence, which we ascertained was opposite the Cathedral Bazaar of the Man of Sin, and inquire the location of the meeting house. Our determination was to remain, if possible, in strict *incognito*—to attend as a spectator, supposing that after an absence of ten years we should not be recognized. Our motive for acting thus will appear hereafter.

Accordingly we set out, and shortly arrived at the house of Bro.—We rang the bell which was responded to by a colored man. 'Can you inform me,' said we, 'at which place your master attends for religious worship?'— 'No sir,' he replied, 'but I will go and call him, he is in the parlor;' and he was about to start off. 'Stay!' said we, 'do not call him but ask him the question we put to you.'— Bro.——nowever, appeared at the door. We repeated our inquiry, and learned from him, that the house in North Street was the place where he and his brethren assembled. He inquired if we were a disciple? We replied in the affirmative. What was our name? A direct answer to this would necessarily destroy our *incognito*. We answered, that we did not care to reveal it, but that we would meet him at the house in North Street. He observed, that he did not wish to pry into our affairs, and would not press it, if not agreable etc. We remarked, that there was much prejudice attached to our name, and that we did not care to reveal it, upon the present occasion, and so forth. But, perceiving a liberality of soul about him, which seemed to be a guarantee against the perpetration of incivility and insult, so liberally bestowed upon us by men of vulgar minds, we revealed to him our name, and place of departure. Immediately he bid us a cordial welcome, and with great kindness of demeanor invited us in; Doctor Thomas was the very person he was just thinking of when he arrived at the door, as we might know by the pamphlet lying on the mantle shelf;' 'yes,' said we, 'we recognize in that some of our handy works.' He had been reading the Herald of the Future Age.

Being seated, we soon found ourselves in conversation upon divers matters and things. On the previous Thursday, Alexander Campbell had spent the afternoon with him in that same parlor. The President will doubtless long remember Bro.—plain and candid expostulation, against his departure from, and his own carnal advocacy of *expediency* [which is but *worldly policy* applied to religion] in defence of his reprehensibly tortuous proceedings in relation to Evangelists, bro. Magruder, the church in North Street, etc. He has yet to learn, that honesty, not expediency is the best policy; & that to pitch himself against others, who are willing to acknowledge him as a man of parts and respectable attainments and a brother while he demeans himself with christian propriety; but who repudiate his arrogant aspirations to a supervisorship over the House of God—is not the way to maintain the ascendency, which, like Constantine, he has seized in his unhallowed grasp, over the spiritual affairs of "this reformation." Brethren who will not burn incense to him are counted factious and heretical; while those who offend against the apostolic code of christian morality, provided they will sustain his itinerants and endorse his sectarian system or ecclesiastical organization, etc, are *patronized* as his beloved and faithful brethren, and consequently as the true church! This is well illustrated by the position he occupies in relation to the two congregations in Baltimore; and his short sighted subserviency to expediency in this matter has neutralized his influence in that city. He has thrown himself into the arms of a faction there, and the result is, that but few turned out to hear him; added to which, his unrighteous denunciation of bro. Magruder, which is appreciated in Baltimore, as it ought to be, has sunk him in the estimation of many even of his own friends. He left this city on Thursday at midnight, and arrived in Richmond, we suppose, several days after.

The time had now arrived for meeting We went forth not knowing how we should be received. We urged upon Bro.—that we did not wish to force ourselves upon the brethren: for if any captious spirit, having more zeal than knowledge or discretion, were present, we did not doubt, but a disturbance would be created as at Fredericksburg,

which would be credited to us. He did not however, apprehend any troubles; doubtless having a better opinion of the good sense of his brethren, especially as they had themselves been the victims of prejudice and misrepresentation. No training so efficient as that of experience.

Arrived at the Meeting House, we took the seat offered to us. Bro.—then stepped up to Bro.—one of the Elders, and informed him we were present. A word or two then passed between him and Bro.—another Elder, who presided upon that occasion. At the proper time, he arose and announced to the congregation, that Bro. Thomas of Richmond, Va., would partake with them in breaking the loaf, to which no objection was made by any. At the conclusion, Bro.—asked us, if we would speak there that night? We acquiesced. The presiding brother then announced the appointment. Upon this a brother arose and said he protested against Dr. Thomas being permitted to speak there. He did not approve of our opinions, and therefore he protested against it. Bro.—arose and made some very appropriate remarks. They ought to condemn no man till they hear him. They had themselves suffered condemnation without a hearing, and they ought to act to others as they would that others should act towards them. He had yet to learn that aught could be justly brought against our character; and though we might differ in opinion, it was no reason why a brother should be proscribed. This was the substance of the reply. The protesting brother again rose and insisted that Dr. Thomas ought not to be allowed to speak: if one member were opposed to it. That many wished Bro. Scott to preach there when in Baltimore, but that he was not invited, because a few were opposed. These cases were not parallel. Bro. Scott was considered as having identified himself with the party who denounced them, and upon this ground, and not upon that of his opinions, was the objection made to his speaking in North Street House. Bro.—arose and bore testimony in our favour. He had examined both sides of the question for himself, and could say that no just cause existed why we should be treated as an alien. This was the substance. The protesting bro. again protested against us, but was very properly placed *sub silentio* by the brother who presided; there the matter rested for the present. We omitted to say, that before the latter rose, we remarked that in order to relieve the brother in question, we were willing to waive the invitation of the Eldership, and to use the house, as if granted to a stranger passing through the city.

In the afternoon we again met. The Scriptures were read, etc, and exhortations delievered founded upon the passages read. In one of them was this query. "What shall I do to inherit eternal life, etc,?" We rose and called attention to it, making also such observations as we thought appropriate. Having finished, one or two of the elders spoke substantially to the same effect. When they had done the member who protested against us in the morning, arose up with the Bible in hand and commenced a stereotyped confutation of what he styled "soul sleeping!"— The conversation of Jesus with the Sadducees, Paul's absence from the body and presence with the Lord, etc, were laid under contribution to demolish the man of straw he had created! Having borne his testimony against the truth he sat down. An elder arose and bore testimony that nothing had been said about "soul sleeping;" or contrary to the word of God. We were tempted to speak; but the advice of Bro.—to take no notice of the attack, enabled us to resist the temptation. The presiding brother then rose, and parabolically, and very ingeniously rebuked the evil spirit which, we feared, was about to take possession of the brother in question.

We were much gratified at the manner the affair came off. It was a practical illustration before the whole church, of the way in which difficulties are created in congregations, and then attributed to us. There is a spirit of Campbellism, as well as of every other form of sectarianism. It is an evil spirit and when it gets into a disciple, it sets him beside himself. It excites confusion and every evil work; and has been the true cause of all the troubles in this Reformation, which it has deformed. It is prepared to destroy every one who has independence and courage enough to withstand it. It can bear no equal, and will brook no superior: *aut Caesar aut nullus*, is the motto of its shield.

We spoke in the evening according to appointment. The audience was doubtless larger than it would have been, had not the

display previously narrated evened. Our acquaintance with the brethren in Baltimore has thus been renewed, and we trust it will long continue undisturbed by malevolence, to our mutual edification in the "Things of the Spirit of God." We promised to visit them on our return from New Jersey, if no obstacle intervened; which all things being propitious, we shall endeavor to do.

Until this visit to Baltimore we had been entirely at a loss to determine, which of the parties in that city were mainly in the right; we say *mainly*: for, we believe that the North Street congregation do not pretend to say, that they were wholly in the right in all the *details* of the difficulties; in as much as certain of them nobly made apology for any intemperance of expression, into which they might have been betrayed; while the opposite party were unquestionably in the wrong, seeing that they fully confessed their sins, and sued forgiveness, and afterwards again broke out into overt rebellion. Bro.—put into our hands a pamphlet issued by the Elders on part of the North Street Church, which we read while steaming from Baltimore to Chesapeak City. It appears to be a temperate and impartial exposition of affairs, and clearly establishes the claims of their party to be the Church of Christ in that city. Their opponents meet in a small but neat building in Paul Street, where orthodox evangelists are received with all the honors due to itinerant heretic detectors. One Lord's day evening we believe a brother of 'Evangelist' B. F. Hall who sings,

"Between the stirrup and the ground
He pardon sought, and pardon found;"

dispensed to them the traditions most palatable to those who the right confess, but yet the wrong pursue.

On Monday morning, we departed about 7 o'clock, but were detained in port about an hour in consequence of the fracture of a link in the wheel chain. This læsion being repaired, we steamed away for Chesapeak City. We encountered a very heavy snow storm, which translated us practically from the blossomed spring of Richmond into the depths of another winter. We arrived in Philadelphia about 7 P. M.; from whence we started at 9 A. M. next morning by the cars for Trenton, N. Jersey, within three miles and a half of which, on the banks of the Delaware and Raritan sloop canal we now write this article for the Herald of the Future Age. The country around us naturally poor, presents a beautiful and highly improved and cultivated appearance. Lime and manure, and a judicious rotation of crops, skilfully applied by an industrious and thrifty people, has raised the value of the lands from $7 to 100 per acre. Such is the *physique* of the region round about, still there is a gloom overshadowing this land, which to the eye of intelligence, assumes a darkness, "black as sackcloth of hair;"—and this is the haze of 'Presbyterian true blue,' which becomes more and more intense as you approach the town of Princeton, which is the seat of a Calvinistic Seminary of Priests. We visited it the other day. It is a neat and aristocratic looking town in the midst of a most agreable country. Last night we attended a presbyterian meeting at a school house. A young seminarian paid his *devoirs* to the graces, and then addressed us from 'he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, etc.' He gave us a version of this passage rather new to us, though 'born of the flesh' into his mother church. It meant, he said 'he that believes in the Lord Jesus Christ, and makes a profession of religion shall be saved!' Alas! poor people, can we wonder at the gloom which overspreads your land, when you surrender yourselves to the spiritual direction of such blind guides

EDITOR.

Near Trenton, N. Jersey,
March 25th 1845.

☞We heard a sermon in this city in which the preacher stated, that a Presbyterian Divine, named Paterson, in a discourse delivered by him in Philadelphia, declared, that Hell was paved with the skull bones of infants not a span long! Of course, they were "non-elect" infants. Men who can believe such stuff, have doubtless small "Benevolence" and large "Destructiveness;" hence their views of God's character partake more of bloodthirstiness than of love.—EDITOR.

☞We are informed that a certain preacher, not of this city, declared to a company in Spottsylvania, that the "Evangelists have a right to say what may, or what may not be preached;' and he elsewhere further affirmed, that "there are but two elders in Eastern Virginia, who are scriptural elders, and these were ordained by him!"—Pretty modest assumptions these, for an uninspired mortal!—"Reformers!" Are you prepared to acquiesce in these pretensions? We pause for a reply.—EDITOR.

CHRISTIAN MORALITY ILLUSTRATED!

On our return from the North, we found that the President had departed for Augusta, in the State of Georgia, for the ostensible purpose of preaching, but for the real object of collecting funds for Bethany College. Paul milked the sheep of Christ's Flock for the benefit of "the poor saints which were in Jerusalem" to whom the Gentiles were indebted for 'spiritual things;' but our contemporary, *professedly* the advocate of the morality inculcated by the Holy Apostles of Jesus Christ, milks both the sheep and the goats for the perpetual behoof of a seminary of profane scholarship, with a 'church department' there unto attached, from which upon certain conditions, he has promised to send forth in five years 1000 seminarians, yclept 'Evangelists!' as it is written in the Christian Baptist, 'boys brought from colleges and sworn to maintain schemes that maintain them.' But with the Editor of that periodical, 'who was, but is not, yet is,' we say, 'Let us have no clergy at all, learned or unlearned—let us have bishops and deacons, such as Paul appoints, such as he has described 1 Tim. iii. 1—14. Tit. 1. 5. 9.'—Did Paul ever circulate throughout the Roman Empire, lecturing upon education, preparatory to, taking up a collection' for a college of which he was founder, president, and professor? Did he expend his energies and waste the precious time of his probation in descanting upon collegiate architectural statistics; or did the reader ever hear of the President of Bethany take any stand for truth by which he hazarded 'the loss of all things that he might win Christ?' Compare the lives and enterprises of the two men, and then say if Paul and Alexander of Bethany are co-laborers in the same field. We discuss not here the utility or demerits of Colleges, all we aim at now is to setforth the *true* position of the Supervisor of the Reformed Baptist Denomination. He once professed to advocate apostolic institutions, to the entire exclusion of all humanism; under this banner he obtained popularity, and influence, both of which he has prostituted to his own personal aggrandizement and worldly speculations; and Ancient Christianity now holds a very subordinate place in his ministrations. The building being perfected, the scaffolding is removed.

Having fulfilled his mission in the South, he returned to this city to co-operate with the Reformed Baptist Co-Operationists of Eastern Virginia and Baltimore. We have neither time, space, nor inclination to describe their very uninteresting and spiritless proceedings. Very few were convened, and the only resolution passed, as we are informed, was to adjourn till next October to some place not determinately reported to us!

MR. CAMPBELL'S DISCOURSE.

On Lord's Day morning, April 28th, Mr. C. undertook to expound Rom. viii. 1—23 to a house full of persons of the town and country. His aim in the selection of this passage was manifestly levelled at the 'materialists' and 'destructionists,' as he perversely styles those disciples of Christ who prefer their own understanding of the doctrine of the Prophets and Apostles to his interpretation. He said some good things. 'To be carnally minded is Death.' This he told us truly enough, was 'death *perpetual*:' in this we are agreed. 'If any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his.' This again is true; eternally true: and by it, unless he repent, Mr. C. is certainly condemned, as we shall abundantly show. Instead of restricting himself to the exegesis of this important truth, he 'turned aside to fables;' for misrepresentation is based upon fiction, and therefore fabulous. He affirmed in substance that certain persons taught that all the *Spirit* a man had was his temper and breath, or atmosphere which he inhaled; upon which assumption he reduced the interpretation of fictitious teachers, to a consequent absurdity As if it were written 'the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit (*breath*) is life because of righteousness!' He contrasted '*the Body*' and '*the Spirit*' in the 10th verse, asserting that whatever was affirmed of the body, 'was contrariwise predicable of the Spirit:' for if the body of a living man is dead because of sin, the spirit of that man is life because of righteousness; and if the body be alive because of righteousness then the spirit is dead because of sin! This was wonder-

fully edifying to the Platonists; who, like a nest of young birds, seemed to swallow these spiritual tit bits, as precious morsels patronally vouchsafed them, by the providence of the parent beak.

"The Creation was made subject to vanity.'—'*Ktisis* the creature,' continued he, 'not all animals, as John Wesly supposed; but *the mortal part of man*!'—This was made subject to *mataiotes*, 'vanity' or dissolution: and it is this which waits 'for the adoption, to wit the redemption of our *body*,' the creature, the mortal part of man—the *to ktidzon* as opposed to the uncreated spirit within us! He was careful to observe, that all the dead would be raised, 'and all babes too;' because 'as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive.' Thus, having placed himself in opposition to David, Job, Isaiah, Amos, Jesus, and Paul, he resumed his seat amid the smaller lights of the newly discovered constellation '*Ex Heemoon*'—OF US!

REVIEW OF MR. C'S. DISCOURSE.

That truth might be vindicated, we circulated a notice as extensively as circumstances would permit, that we would correct the misrepresentations of Mr. C. at the Odd Fellows' Hall at half past three that afternoon. This we attended to according to appointment. The spirit in Christ did nor cause him to misrepresent his opponents, nor to speak falsehoods against them, it did not cause him to flatter his admirers for the sake of their contributions to aid him in glorifying himself under pretence of laboring for the public good; nor did it cause him to hold men's persons in admiration for the sake of advantage: no; it superinduced an entirely different course of conduct—he did injustice to no man in word or deed. and consummated the whole by laying down his life for his enemies. Mr. C's. career being the exact counterpart of this, we conclude, that the spirit which was in Jesus is not in him, and therefore, that 'he is none of his.' In this way we know men 'by their fruits,' as He has said.

We do not teach that 'spirit' means disposition and breath *only*: but we affirm, that there are among the meanings of *spiritus, anima, pneuma, psuchee, nesheme, nephesh*, and *ruhe*, sometimes rendered 'spirit,' in the common version; and that in some passages (we do not say all by a great many) which have been quoted to prove 'immortality' or incorruptibility in 'sinful flesh,' they mean disposition, breath, and even body, and nothing more, as can be easily ascertained by the context without reference to Hebrew, Greek, or Latin. Let him not affirm the contrary to this our practice any more, or he will contract the guilt of *another* falsehood, if he have not already.

But we do affirm, that the word 'spirit' does signify spiritual mindedness, temper, or disposition *in this text*, and nothing more. For from verse 5, the Apostle is discoursing of carnal mindedness as opposed to spiritual mindedness. For to be carnally minded is to be '*in the flesh*,' and to be spiritually minded is to be '*in the Spirit*:' hence 'flesh' or 'body' are representative of every thing opposed *not to man's spirit*, but to 'THE *Spirit of God*:' which as 'the measure of faith,' and 'the proportion of faith,' dwelt in the Spiritual men of the congregation in Rome. 'The Spirit of God' of verse 9, is that power which developed the work of the Six Days Creation; which dwelt in Noah and the Prophets, which dwelt in Jesus without measure, etc., and which raised him from the dead. 'The Spirit of Christ' in the same verse is a different phrase and has a different signification. This imports the spiritual mindedness of Jesus who was the great power, or Spirit of God, and therefore styled 'the Lord the Spirit' (2. Cor. iii 17.) or a Quickening Spirit' as it is written in 1 Cor. xv. 45. 'The last Adam shall become a quickening spirit,' which is a Resurrected Immortal Man having the power of making *zoopion* others alive. To have the Spirit of Christ in us, is the same thing as to have 'Christ *in us* the Hope of Glory.' Now Christ dwells in us, by that faith which purifies the heart; as it is written, 'that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith'—Eph. iii. 17. when it is said therefore, that, 'if any man have not the spirit of Christ he is none of his,' it does not mean, 'the Spirit of God;' because, this would make the possession of 'the Gift of the Holy Spirit or the 'diversities of gifts,' the 'differences of administration,' and the 'diversities of operations,' the condition of being Christ's. But it means this, that *if Christ be not in us by a purifying faith the Hope of Glory, we are none of his.* 'And if Christ be in you,' thus, 'the body is dead because of sin;' though He be in you thus, the Body must return to the dust, being made subject to vanity' or desolution, because of the disobedience of the First Adam; but 'rejoice' in Jesus Christ our hope for 'THE Spirit' of God 'which raised up Jesus from the dead,' and now dwells in you by 'diversities of gifts,' will give you 'life'—'shall make alive your mortal bodies,' 'becaues of righteousness'—because you are 'constituted the righteousness of God to Him'—2 Cor. v. 21.—This appears to be the true import of the apostle's discourse.

The antithesis of verse 10,' is not as Mr C, supposes, between the body and spirit of the same man; but between—'sinful flesh' and 'the Spirit of God.' The spirit of man is no better than his body, for it is naturally, at evil as his body is physically corrupt; as it is written, 'every imagination of the thoughts of man's heart is only evil continually.' This is God' own revelation of the moral character, or spirit of the natural man. Now this spirit cannot be made alive, for it is 'enmity against God, for it is not subject to the Law of God, neither indeed can be.' Mr. C. taught that the spirit of man could be made alive by 'the Law of the Spirit of God!'—that the Spirit of God could not act upon bones and muscels alone; that spirit must have spirit to act upon, and therefore the spirit, of God acted upon the spirit of man, which it regenerated, and that when this regeneration, this purification of the human spirit supervened, because dead because of sin and 'the spirit of life because of righteousness.'

Will Mr. C. tell us how much spirit there was in the stones of Judea in the days of John the Baptist? If none, how then could God rsise up of those spiritless stones children to Abraham? Will he condescend to enlighten us, as to how much spirit there was in the dust, when the Spirit of the Self-Existent One formed men in the image of the Elohim? Or will he inform us how much of spirit there was in the putrid body of Lazarus when the spirit of God 'restored his soul' to life? Or will he tell us, how much spirit there was, if any, in the 'bones and muscles' of Jesus after he had been forsaken by the Spirit, and had yeilded up his own Spirit, when he was reanimated from the dead by the Spirit of God? When he shall have removed these difficulties it will be time enough for him to affirm what the Spirit of God cannot do.

Mr. C. proved to our satisfaction that the Spirit of man is congenitally mortal, and for sometime after birth; and in myriads of instances, eternally so! He did not intend to do this, but so it was, he brought us to this conclusion' On the *assumption* that the body and spirit of a man have opposite qualities, he argued, that when the body was alive because of sin, the spirit of man was dead. This was the case with every sinner, and *vice versa* with every saint. Here then is an epoch developed, at which the Spirit of the man passess from death to life; now we ask, before this passage occurred what was the attribute of the Spirit? The answer is, it was dead. The Spirit of a sinner, then, is dead: it is mortal; *it is not immortal*: which is precisely what we teach. Here then, we agree with Mr. C. in the conclusion, though not in his premises. Now Paul teaches, that all men are born into this world sinners, and therefore under sentence of death. All men are then born with mortal sprits. Those of them who are not purified by faith, must, therefore, remain eternally mortal for to be 'carnally minded is death,' death perpetual as Mr. C. remarked; but those who are 'spiritually minded,' or, as he says, whose spirits are made alive because of righteouness, become on the instant of their verification, immortal spirits, which he cannot prove. Be it remembered, however, that Mr. C. admits with us, that all sinners, not subjected to the Law of the Spirit of Life are not immortal, but heirs to perpetual death. This is true. He is therefroe; as much of a 'materialist' and 'destructionist' as we, if he had the penetration to discover the conclusion to which his assumptions inevitably leads.

'THE CREATURE.'

Were we disposed to mete out to Mr. C, the same measure he has dealt out to us, we could fasten upon him some very absurd expositions founded upon the definition of the word 'creature' as used by Paul in this chapter. He argues, that because we say ,that *spirit* means breath in some passages, we therefore, interpret 'spirit' by breath in all others where it occurs. Well, he says, that 'creature' signifies 'the mortal part of man,' suppose we were to jump to the conclusion, that he considers that the true import of the word every where else, he would charge us with misrepresentation and dishonesty?

For anything we know to the contrary, he may give it this interpretation in all other doctrinal texts; but we have not heard him say so, therefore we will not impose upon him so ridiculous a notion. We do not know, that he would render Mark xvi. 15 'Go preach the Gospel to every mortal part of man. Every mortal part that believeth, and is baptized shall be saved; but every mortal part of man that believeth not shall be damned'—though 'with the mouth' which is a mortal part of man 'Confession is made unto salvation.'

"EVERY CREATURE."

But the, 'every creature' in Rom. viii. is neither the 'whole creature' of quadrupeds, according to John Wesley, nor 'the mortal part of man' according to Alexander of Bethany; but the '*every creature*' to whom Jesus commanded the Gospel to be preached, that is, '*all the world.*' The phrases in Rom. viii. 22. and Mark xvi. 15. are the same in the Greek saving the variation of case, the former *pasa hee ktisis* or in the nominative, and the latter is *pasee tee ktisei* in the dative, and should be both rendered alike in English. Paul was the same phrase in the dative Col. 1. 2. 3.—'the Hope of the Gospel, which was preached *pasee tee ktisei* TO EVERY CREATURE which is under the Heavens.' The *pasa hee ktisis* then is equivalent to *ho kosmos hapas* the whole world, and not 'the whole creation,' in the sense of cattle, wild beasts, fowles, fish, reptiles and men! From verse 18 to 23 inclusive, Paul is speaking of the Sons of God and the mere Sons of Men, or the World separate and distant from 'we ourselves' of God,s family 'who have (had) the first fruits of the Spirit.' In some Greek manuscript ver19 reads 'for the earnest expectation of the faith (*pisteoos* not *ktiseoos*) looks for the manifestation of the Sons of God.' In other words, this manifestation of glory in the Sons of God is the Hope of the Gospel. Compare Titus ii. 11. —14. 'For the creature,' Man 'was made subject to vanity' or mortality,' not willingly, but—*dia ton s. theon*—by God, 'who hath subjected [*teen ktisin*—marginal reading] the creature; for the creature,' or world, 'also shall be delievered from the bondage of servitude, at the glorious liberation of the children of God. For we know that every creature,' or all the world, 'groaneth and travaileth together until now'—until the time of manifestation. And not only the world, but ourselves also who have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, looking for the adoption,' to wit the redemption of our body when we shall be manifested as Sons of God with power and glory according to Christ,s spiritual nature by onr resurrection from the dead. 'For we are saved by hope.'—Thus we paraphrase this passage in which we find nothing about the salvation of quadrupeds or reptiles, or of a mortal, as contrasted with an immortal part of man. That the natures of wild beasts and serpents will be changed is certain from other parts of divine testimony; but that it is taught in this passage requires, more than assertion or ecclesiastical authority to gain onr credence,

CONSCIENTIOUSNESS IN SOME MEN ACCESSIBLE ONLY THROUGH THEIR FEARS.

In our last number, we have related in brief how Mr. C. was brought to repentance for his sins against Mr. Magruder by the convicting power of the United States law concerning those who attempt to injure the good name of their contemporaries by falsehood and malice. We understoed on our return, that he had expressed great desire to do justice to all men, when in conference with Mr. Magrudar's counsel; albeit before tipstaff had mesmerized his susceptibilities, satisfaction was the last thing he was disposed to grant. We were glad to hear of his alleged conversion, being in hope that we should come in for a share of justce too! For we have proved him guilty of three palpable and malicious falshoods on the ground, that he meant us in his 'Crisis no. 5.' The proof of this stands recorded in the Herald. Mr. C. then stands before the public a convicted slanderer in two cases—ours and Mr. Magruder's. Mr. M. had obtained the promise of redress by law; we were determined to obtain the same result by milder measures if possible. Accordingly we dispatched the following letter by messenger on Monday morning.

Richmond, Va. April, 25h 1845.

Mr. Campbell,

Sir.

On leaving this city for the North, I instructed my agent to forward to you 'Extra no ii' of the Herald of the Future Age. You have I presume received it, if not from him, from some other person. The design of this letter, is not to offer any apology for its publication

not to propitiate you in the smallest degree; you have most greiviously wronged me, and inflicted upon me much evil, to the extent fully of your ability to injure me: nevertheless, I utter no lament, netiher do I seek to move you by appeals to your 'Benevolence;' nor, though you have indescretely placed yourself absolutely in my power, do I aim to intmidate you by menacing your 'Cautiousness,' or exciting your alarm. It is for you, Sir, that lamentation should be made, not for me: for you, Sir, I repeat, who once appeared to spend himself for the doctrine of Christ and his Apostles *as far as you had acquired the knowledge of it*, but who seems now to have turned to the 'beggarly elements' of the Apostacy, where we find you building up the things, which once you labored to destroy. This is indeed cause of grief, yea, and of extreme mortification to all who love the Ancient Gospel and Order of Things, rather then the sectarian devices, to which you are now in the winter of your days so zealously addicting yourself.

The case before us admits of no appeal to your 'Benevolence,' and were I ever so disposed to make the effort, the custody to which you seem to be committed;—the Evil Genii by whom you are surrounded, augur to unpropitiously for any favourable result.

Neither can I bring myself to yield to the suggestions of some, who would have me compel your presence at Cæsar's Bar, and to give an account of your misdeeds against my character, which is assuredly as dear to me as yours is to you, and perhaps more so, for what you may possess of this worlds goods may suffice you, and purchase you friends though you may have committed suicide upon your character (which, if I mistake not, you have if you persist in your present evil way) but not so with me. Steal my character from me, Sir, as you and your Satellites have *attempted* to do, and 'you leave me poor indeed, I would inform you, however, that the consideration, which *mainly* restrain me from Lyonizing* you, is the *possibility*, that, although you were immersed, I think by and in the Apostacy, you may be 'in Christ;' though, I confess that, judging you according to Christ's rule, '*by their fruits shall ye know them.*' I very much doubt, if the 'One Faith' and 'One Hope' of the Ancient Apostolic Gospel ever had root in your understanding and effections. Acting in view of the possibility of the case, that you are something more than merely an immersed Presbyterian Clergyman—that you may be 'in Chiist,' I am determined to give you the benefit of it: not because you deserve it; but that I may 'heap coals of fire upon your head,'and escape the displeasure of the King, one of whose Ambassadors has dared a Disciple who would go to law with a BROTHER before the unjust—1. Cor. vi 1. Acceptable, Sir, as would be a pecuniary acquisition at this 'crisis' I would scorn to wrest from you your '*vil trash*'—(and it is to this feeling you are mainly indebted for your recent escape from the law)—as a compensation for the injuty you have done me for the time being. Nor would I have you think I entertain a shadow of doubt as to the issue. There can be but one opinion as to the degradatian and humiliation you would be subjected to by a verdict in the case of John Thomas, *versus* Alexander Campbell for slander. Mark this, Sir, some of your own friends cry, or rather murmur, shame upon you, yet these have neither; the honesty and, faithfulness to rebuke you for yonr sin; nor the integrity to be righteous towards me. Had I been guilty of these things proved against you, should I not long ere this have been expunged from the humblest parrgraph in the Book of Public Favor? I have been rebuked and almost rapudiated, because I would not take legal measures against the traducers of my character; and Sir, I can assure you, I should have done it long since but for the consideration aforesaid. But I look to the recompense of the reward, which I do not wish to diminish by taking upon myself the affairs of self avengement in the present state. If ever we meet in the Kingdom of God, I shall congratulate myself, that I left your chastisement to the King of Israel, and not to Cæsar.

But Sir, a report has reached me, that in your 'Crisis no. 5' you did not make your insinuations against me, but against Mr. Walsh! Surley it is not possible, that you can have authorized such a saying. You certainly dare not endorse the trutn of this. If you were to swear it who would believe you? There is no resemblence between a single fact of Mr. Walsh's history and the fictitious character you have delincated in 'Crisis 5.' But impossible; you never could have authorrized such a report, you evidently intended it for me; for not only my friends, but my enemies—some of your friends—have tauntingly applied it to me. If you did not mean me, Sir, who did you mean? Do you fear to [redacted] lest he should be less scruplous than I, and exact reparation for wrong?

Well Sir, it can be proved, that you were libelling me when you published your insinuations against some one, *you had not the courage to name* in 'Crisis no 5.' On the ground, Sir, that I was the individual. I have demonstrated in 'Extra no. 2,' that YOU HAVE DEFAMED MY CHARACTER, AND HAVE SOUGHT TO INJURE ME BY MALICIOUSLY UTTERING FALSEHOODS AGAINST ME. This Sir, is my charge against *you* (to say nothing of the insignificant persons who take the cue from you)—before God and Man. The testimnies I have adduced in Extra ii convicted you of *false hood and malice*. This Sir, is the disgraceful attitude in which your blind prejudice against me has placed you. You may affect to treat this charge with levity, as yuo are alleged to have treated a similar one recent-

*To *Lyonize* is to employ Lawyer Lyons to extort redress according to law, as in Mr Magruder s case.—EDITOR.

lv. But Sir, levity is one of the fruits of the flesh; and you will remember, that levity is not tolerated at the tribunal where you and I and all must finally appear.

Now Sir, I ask you, and I *respectfully, but firmly demand an answer by the bearer of this*, WILL YOU GRANT ME REDRESS? I appeal now to your 'Conscientiousness,' which I trust will prompt you to answer *yes; to the fullest extent you can possibly and reasonably demand.*'—Sir, this would be acting nobly; I would then freely forgive you; for in this case forgiveness is mine: yes, and make peace with you too: though I would not surrender a single point of doctrine, privilege, or practice. I speak merely of personal relations.

Redress of grievances, then, is the object of this letter. I have been prompted to address you thus plainly, but calmly, candily, and firmly, by a hope, which I have thought recent circumstances would justify, that you would do justice. Since my return from the North, I learn that you refused to do justice to Mr. M. *when you were free to do as you pleased*; but when *in terrorem legis* you professed before his counsel great anxiety to do Justice to all! I have taken the hint; and, concluding that you had repented of the sin of injustice under the convincing power of a writ, I thought I also might obtain the benefit of your return to reason and rectitude. I have accordingly acted upon this hint, and do most sincerely hope, that as I have not employed Cæsar to intimidate you, you will be still more desirous of doing jusice to me, whom you have treated infinitely more abominably than any other person since you have assumed the Championship of Protestantism and the Supervisorship of this Reformation.

I do not now say what I shall do if you refuse to redress my wrong, lest you should construe it into a desire to intimidate you. I do not want to *extort* justice from you; I wish it to emenate from you as spontanously as possible: it will be more credible to you; and satisfactory to me. Use your own pleasure. 'yes,' or 'no,' as you may deem it most '*expedient.*'

In the hope that you may truly repent of your unrighteousness, carnality, and sin; that you will cease to event or circulate, malicious falshoods against your centemporaries, that you will do justice, love mercy, and do to others as you would they should do to you; and that abandoning your sectarian aspiration: you will, return to the old fashioned principles from which you have apostatized.

I subscribe myself
Independently and Benevolently Yours
JOHN THOMAS.

Having read the letter and pondered over it awhile, Mr. C. returned the document, saying, that he did not consider it a private letter, but one designed for publication; for which reason he should not answer it. The messenger, then inquired if he had seen the Extra ii refered to in the letter? He replied he had not, upon which one was presented to him.

Being determind to leave him without an excuse, we dispatched by the same hand another letter of which the following is a copy.

Richmond, Va. April 28th 1845.

Mr. Campbell,
Sir.

The Bearer of my letter, to you, which you have returned, informs me that, *you* do not *consider* it 'a private letter,' but one intended for publication; and therefore that you decline replying to it. I cannot control your considerations, but, it appears to me, that you might have come to a different conclusion from the following paragraph in it.—I do not now say what I shall do if you refuse to redress my wrong lest you should construe it into a desire to intimidate you. I do not want to *extort* justice from you, I wish it to emenate from you as spontaneously as possible. It will be more creditible to you, and satisfactory to me. Use your own plessure. 'Yes' or 'No' as yon deem it most, expedient.

If it were not intended for a 'private letter,' the communication would have been one of intimidation, and therefore designed to 'extort justice' under the apprehension of exposuae. If you had replied, that you would *fully* redress my grievance, the letter of course would have answered its intention; and therefore would have been as though it had never been. But as soon as you refuse to do right, and thus declare your intention to perisit in your unprincipled, or rather *mal*-principled, course, it then remains for me to say what further I intend to do.

The design of this note is to inform, you that you have taken a wrong view of the matter. But at this stage of affairs, I would *add* that it remains with you whether the public shall see the letter or not. If you will do justice, it shall remain private; if not I will give it the most extended circulation I can.

I would also inform you, that about 1000 copies of there futation of your slanders are struck off and mailed to subscribers of the Harbinger whose names appear on its cover. The same course will be taken with other documents, for I am determined, that your readers shall be enlightened upon the subject of your unhallowed proceedings.

What I require is, that you publish an article in the Harbinger, satisfactory to me, and fully exculpating me of all the abominable falsehoods you have circulated against my character. Will you do it? 'Yes' or 'No.'—The thing is soon determined.

Yours as before
JOHN THOMAS.

Having perused this also he laid it upon the Sofa between them, and observed, that he was 'unable to comprehend what the Dr. was aiming at in writing these letter to him.' Our messenger then reproduced 'letter no. 1,' and handing it to him, remarked, that that letter would explain what the Doctor required of him. He wants to know from you also whom you meant in 'Crisis No 5.' when you refered to a certain person abandoning his family, etc; some report that you meant the Doctor, and some Mr Walsh. To this he replied, 'if Dr. Thomas, or Mr. Walsh or any body else choose to place their own construction upon my writings they can do so. I have said that I shall not notice any thing that Dr. Thomas says. I wish to have nothing to do with him ecclesiastically, politically, or any other way; the Doctor is not one of us.' 'You have a right Sir, said respondent' to your own opinion about the Doctor, all he wants is justice done to his character which has been infamously assailed and basely misrepresented in different parts of this country and in this City; his enemies have not been able to substantiate anything against him, and have therefore resorted to manufacturing falsehoods. His character is as dear to him as that of other men is to them; all he ask is justice. He did not intend to notice your article on the 'Crisis' in the October number of the Mill. Harb.; but was advised to do so by his friends, who from the reports of his enemies etc, concluded that you aimed at him. Dr. Bodenhamer of Louisville, and Major Gano of Cincinnati, with whom you are acquainted have corresponded on the subject; have you read the extract from the Major's letter in the Extra no. ii, which I presented you this morning, Sir? Mr. C. replied that he had not; 'but that he knew, that Major Gano was very well acquainted with the Doctors character.'—'Yes Sir', continned our informant, he is very well acquainted with his character, & his letter to Dr. Bodenhamer shows it for he there speaks in commendation of him.' Upon this our messenger was about to depart when Mr. C. added 'I have nothing to do with the Doctor; nor do I intend to suffer myself to be *entwined* by him!'—'He wants nothing, Sir,' said respondent, 'but what is right, nor does he wish to entwine you.' And, thus the conference broke off.

After this exposure what are impartial men to say of M. C. as a teachor of Christian Morality? Had willful misrepresentation of our opponents, and three gross and malicious falehoods been proved upon us, and the defamation of the character of an upright man, as in the case of Mr. Magruder, what would not Mr. C.'s partizans have put into effect against us? But now we have proved him to be the criminal, they are silent as the grave concerning it.

From our informants conversation with Mr C. it is evident, that he did not believe our dislamer of intimidation; and consequently, that he was afraid to avow whom he meant in his article 'Crisis no. 5' lest, having elicited his confession before witnesses, we should then cause another writ to be served upon him for defamation of character. This would have been to 'entwine' him, which he did not intend to suffer us to do! Cowardly man, to slander an opponent by vile insinuation and fear to avow whom you intended to strike! You meant some one in your libel; whose character did you intend to assasinate? Was it ours,? Come forward, Sir, and confess; we have told you we will not harm you by the law. If you meant us we have proved you false; all we ask of you is to confess you have lied and to do so no more.

Mr. C. wants to have nothing more to do with us, for the cogent reason that 'the Doctor is not one of us!'—God forbid, that we should be one with Messrs Campbell Goss Shelburne, and Co.! But the captain of this band has persecuted us until he has fallen into his own snare, and now he wants nothing more to do with us! No doubt: the whale has been harpooned till he has swamped the boat of his tormenters, & now the mariners want no more to do with the whale! O no, they want now only to be permitted to swim; they failed to destroy him, and now they want nothing to do with him politically, ecclesialically or *piscatorially* unless they can surprise him, and then they will kill him! Mean spirited poltroons are all such men. They dared not have treated a man of the world as they have treated us, little as they pretend to respect our principles. But God will reward them in due time; for if men will 'sow to the flesh' as they are doing, they will assuredly 'of the flesh reap corruption.'

According to Mr. C.,s morality because a man '*is not one of us*' he is, therefore, not entitled to redress of grevances, if we are convinced of having done injustice to a savage we feel bound to repair the injury. We are to do to others as we would they should do to us, no matter who they are. Mr. C. has not learned this lesson yet, or he would act more like a good man.

Lastly Mr. C. admits that the testimony of Major Gano is credible, under the supposition, we presume, that it would be against us; but seeing that it is against him, the case may be altered. Surely reformers will not much longer countenance Mr. C.'s unrighteous proceedings—a reckless spoilator of men,s characters, and 'heady' as he is.—EDITOR.

CONCLUSION.

The first Volume of the Herald of the Future Age is now in the hands of our friends complete. We have given them 56 pages more than we agreed to do. These are equal

to three numbers and a half; which makes the volume in fact, consist of fifteen numbers and a half instead of twelve. In this respect, then, we have liberally exceeded our promise; and that too without our subscription list justifying the outlay of time, labor, and money.

We are the more disposed to dwell upon the extension of the volume, inasmuch as the malprincipled attacks of our gospel-nullifying opponents have compeled us, most reluctantly indeed, to occupy some of our pages in their exposure and our own vindication. The friends of the Herald are interested in the good standing of its Editor. If the character given him *by his enemies* [who have very little personal acquaintance with him] be his true one, every one of his subscribers is bound by every principle of christian morality, to repudiate him and all his works; they ought to discontinue the Horald to a man: but if our true character be that attributed to us by our friends, *who have known us intimately fot years*, who find us now, what we were the first day of our acquaintance, and what they have always found us in the interval, whether before the public or in the private circle–every principle of honor, chivalry, and christian rectitude require that they come forward and uphold our hands in the arduous enterprise imposed upon us, by the almost universal defection of '*Our* Periodicals' from the advocacy of the Ancient Faith and Hope, and Order of the Christian Economy, to the 'mean beggarly' devices of Sectarian Organization. Unionism, College Buildng, and Clerical Evangelisting, all which are alien and subversive of Apostolic Christianity in principle and practice; and fatal to the liberty with which Christ as made us free. Had the Editor been silent amid the storm; had he not breathed the 'still small voice of truth' during the intermission of their paroxysms,—might have been urged, that he said nothing because he had nothing to say; and so judgement would have gone against him, as it were by default. But we have spoken, because it was necessary; and we doubt not we have convinced all candid and impartial readers, that our reputation has been defamed, and that against our opponents lies the charge of hatred, malice and the circulation and invention of lies to our injury. In effecting this we have trenched but little if any, upon the space peculiar to the numbers in ordinary. We are by no means sensitively alive to what our enemies fabricate against us: we know that 'the tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity among the members, that defileth the whole body, & setteth on fire the course of nature; and it is set on fire of hell,' that 'no man can tame the tongue: it is an unruly evil, full of deadly poison.' We agree with the Apostle fully in this, we cannot tame them; but when their malicious falshoods turn away the ears of men from the truth, we confess we do feel this most keenly, this and are often tempted to administer an antidote to their misdeeds, more immediate in its operation than that which will take effect when the Great Physician shall appear. We vindicate ourselves only so far as the character of the Herald of the Future Age, and the glorious truths it has to devolope, reqnire it; we trust, we have nearly got through the fire. It has been pretty hot; but like Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah upon whose garments the smell of fire had not passed, we have come forth unsinged; while those who would have destroyed us, have been licked up by the flame their own cruelty and vindictiveness have fanned.

The student of the Bible will have found articles in this volume capable of giving him more expanded & juster views of truth than he can obtain from any other periodical extant. To name no others, the Design of God in the Six Days Creation, and the series under the Caption of The Two Visions, exhibits a view of the five last chapters of Daniel's Book, especially of the xith, which we confidently aver is the only true one, and unimpugnable by any writer on Prophecey in America or Britian. We consider these alone worth the volume. But the Herald is before the public, and will speak for itself.

Upon the whole the typography of our work is excellent. Viewing it with a practised eye, we admit that some parts are defective. Owing to our absence, typographical errors have crept in, which have very much electrified us at their discovery; & on one or two occasions, in consequence of sudden refigeretion of the air, the rollers have become hard, causing a defect in the inking of the types. The quality of the paper too, not uniform. That of the lsst four numbers is greatly superior to the formor, being whiter, thicker, and double the price. These with the fact, of its being printed at different offices, by compositors of various degrees or competencey, and of our removal from Louisville to Richmond will sufficiently account for its varied appearance, and the irregularity of its issue; though the volume has appeared within the period, it would have occupied, for the publication of fifteen numbers.

But concerning the future. We are not a person of many words and promises. We prefer to promise little and do much. We shall do the best we can under the circumstances which may come upon us. The mechanical execution will be uniform; and we shall do the best our means will afford to perfect it in this department, knowing, that matter well printed and illustrated, though as distasteful as truth generally is to ordinary minds, will be more readily entertained than when deformed by 'monks' and 'fr ars,' bites' and pages badly 'registered'.

As to the things destined to give spirit to the Herald during the second period of its existence, we cannot speak with certainty. The following list affords a specimen of documents on hand, which will appear as opportunity may serve. 'Knowledge the True Basis of Reform;' 'Critique on Josephus' Testimony to Jesus of Nazareth;' 'Unity of Christ's Church:' 'The Resurrection of Jesus;' 'The Bride of Aaron,' 'Restoration of the Jews;' 'Prophetic Works of Millerite Second Adventists;' 'Sure Word of Prophecy;' 'Jewish interpretation of Prophecy;' 'Shiloh, and Judah's Sceptre;' 'Jewish tradition concerning a suffering Messiah;' 'Unfulfilled Prophecy;' 'Non Perpetuity of the Law of Moses;' 'Origin of the notion that the Jews mingle Human Blood with their Passover;' etc. These are all interesting articles from the pen of a learned Christian Jew in England & never before published in this country. We have also an exposition of Matthew xxiv. etc, from our own pen, which like that of Daniel, differs from any other extant. Likewise articles on the 'Last Days' and 'the Latter Days:' 'the Witnessess;' etc; etc. What our friends may contribute to the Herald remains to be seen. We shall be glad to publish any thing tending to enlarge our views of divine truth, and to improve our readers in the conceptions and practice of Ancient Christianity. We shall not lose sight 'of the Future Age;' but shall endeavor to set forth its origination, political, ecclesiastical, and social, as developed in the Oracles of God.

From the position in which we find ourselves, we shall still be obliged to bestow some attention upon the Ecclesiastical Politics of the Present, or Living Age. Politicians of this order will doubtles afford us some matter for this department. We hope however, they will illusttrate the proverb, that 'a still tongue makes a wise head:' should they surprise us upon this point, we shall have cause to felicitate them upon their growth in the wisdom of this world at least, which if it will not save them, will shield them from many a rebuke, which hitherto they have not had the sagacity to avoid.

Upon the whole we are gratified with the position, things in general have assumed at this crisis. Bigotry and entolerance have struggled to gain the ascendancy, but have been signally check mated. They may open another campaign but their overthrow is as certain, as that 'truth is powerful and will prevail.' The old apostolic gospel has intrenched itself in the hearts of some; who will suffer ruin of all their worldly prospects rather than forego its defence against the treachery of pretended friends. Intelecttual freedom has been maintained in the face of the insensate clamor of ignorance, stolidity, and presumption, hypocrisy, has been unmasked; knavery unveiled, character vindicated, and the truth maintained. When we visited Virginia in 1843, swellings, and tumult assailed us on every side; but now we have cast ancher under the very guns of the enemy's fortress, and scarce the crack of a percussion cap vibrates upon the ear! Not because their hostility is assuaged, but because their caissons are emptied, and their ammunition spoiled and of none effect. What then remains for us, but to 'gird up the loins of our mind,' & panoplied In the armour of God, to do battle for the truth unto victory or death. This is our resolve: and while we have the means afforded us, we shall contribute our energies to the consumption of that Wicked One, 'whom the Lord shall destroy with the brightness of his coming;' and to the re-establishment of the unadulterated gospel and faith, hope, spirit, obedience, and life. May our Eternal Father crown our labors; and to his glorious and holy name be the honor and praise henceforth now and forever, amen!

EDITOR.

INDEX TO VOLUME 1.

	No.
Prospectus	1
Address to the Citizens of the U. S.	3
Letters to a Friend in the Far West 7, 43, 62 106, 138, 164, 181, 226	
Letter from Dr. May to Mr. Campbell	10
" " to "	110
Dr. May to the readers of the Harb.	193
Reformation in Louisville 12,	70
Review of the Charlottsville Intelligencer	18
Specimen Number	21
Progress of Reform	22
'Silas' and 'the Crisis'	23
Propositions	24
The World's Age 25,	49
The Two Visions 27, 52, 73, 91, 121,	145
The Occident and Amer. Jew. Adv.	32
Prophetic or Symbolic Time	35
Party the bane of Liberty and truth	36
Letter to the Editor of the Western Midnight Cry	37
" from John T. Walsh	39
Letter from Dr Bodenhamer	40
" " " on the Crisis, 188,	209
'Theological Tournament'	41
Campbell and Rice's Debate on the Salvation of Infants, Idiots, and Pagans 45,	57
Remarks by the Editor	77
Bishops	71
Letters from A. B. Magruder, 65, 197,	221
June 59 1814, a Great Chronological Crisis 66,	96
Notice	69
Dr Dejernette	73
Re-immersion, Murdock, on	81
" Correspondence on, between Murdock and Wallis of England 111,	131
Remarks by the Editor	137
" by the Editor	157
Correspondence with R. F. Ferguson on Peace	84
Signs of the Times	93
Sore and Afflicting Incident	95
Letter from W. Haigh of Huddersfield	105
Read this and Act upon it	117
Salvation among the Heathens	118
Franklin College	119
Immortality only to the Righteous	141
" " dependont on the Resurrection	197
The Ottoman Power	143
Russia and Turkey	144
Future Destiny of Man unrevealed says Mr. Campbell	144
Obedience to the Faith of the Gospel for Remission	157
The Christian Journal and B. F. Hall	167
Epitome of Reform	171
'Soul Damning Doctrine'	173
Pencillings by the Way	173
Letter to the Editor of the Christian Review	174
A Good Hit	180
Great Tent Meeting in Louisville	183
Voice from Philadelphia	184
All Antiquity testifies to the Heresy of our Opponents	185
Peace based upon Obedience to the Gospel	191
Campbell and Co. the Heretics and Schismatics not we Mr. C. being Judge	198
Overture of Peace to Reformed Baptist Divines by the Editor	199
Apology	199
Ecclesiastical Amputations	200
'The Things of the Spirit of God,'	201
" " " "	219
Sublime Nonsense	207
The Prophetic Style a speaking Hieroglyphic	207
The Great Defects in Modern Christianity	208
Epistle Ecclesiastical commendatory of the Editor	214
'Campbellite Troubles'	215
Human Magnetism	217
'The Fear of the Lord' by J. T. Walsh	218
" " "	"
Truth Dreads Nothing	"
T. J. Walsh's strictures on A. C.'s last Extra	225
Albert Anderson's position defined	239
Suit against Mr. Campbell for libel	232
May a Christian appeal to Ceasar	231
Visit to New Jersey	233
Christian Morality Illustrated	238
Conclusion	245