

HERALD
OF THE
KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME:
A Periodical,
DEVOTED TO THE INTERPRETATION
OF THE
“LAW AND THE TESTIMONY,”
AND TO THE DEFENCE OF THE
“FAITH ONCE DELIVERED TO THE SAINTS.”

BY JOHN THOMAS, M.D.

RICHMOND, VIRGINIA:
1852

HERALD
OF THE
KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.

“Earnestly contend for the Faith, which was once delivered to the Saints.”—Jude

Volume 1—Number 1 (January 1851)

ON THE NAMES OF OUR PERIODICALS

Since 1834 the Editor of this paper has published eleven or twelve volumes of periodical numbers. Six were styled the “Apostolic Advocate,” one “The Investigator,” and five the “Herald of the Future Age.” The first of these was to advocate what he then supposed to be the doctrine of the Apostles, under the impression that the New Testament, as expounded by certain writers, was a sufficient rule or measure of faith and practice. He therefore called it the “Apostolic Advocate.” But in process of time he perceived that this impression was not made upon his mind by the scriptures of truth. From the study of these he discovered that the measure of a man’s faith was exceedingly defective which did not embrace an intelligent belief of the Old Testament as well. The words of the Apostle to the Gentiles sounded in his ears, that he testified to the people and their rulers, “saying, none other things than those which the Prophets and Moses did say should come,” Acts 26: 22. It was evident, therefore, from this and numerous other passages which might be quoted, that a christian should know and believe the things that God had spoken to the Fathers of Israel by the Prophets. Under this conviction he applied himself to the study of them, and proceeded to call the attention of his readers to them also. Thus the interpretation of the sure word of prophecy was superadded to the advocacy of what was supposed to be the Apostles’ doctrine. This was an advance which seemed to indicate the propriety of amplifying the title of the paper; and it was accordingly named “The Apostolic Advocate and Prophetic Interpreter.”

In 1839 the last volume of the Advocate was concluded. Having removed to the North-West, to a country which was being filled up with raw materials from all parts of the Union, and the British Isles, the Editor thought that the state of things there at that time rather demanded investigation of what existed than the especial advocacy of what he then believed. Whether this were a correct view of the nature of things or not, he acted upon it, and in recommencing his literary labours he styled his paper “The Investigator.” The country, however, was too new, its population was too much engaged in “subduing and replenishing the earth,” for examination of the high and important matters pertaining to things unseen and eternal. The Editor was, therefore, removed from this place to another, where spiritual ideas command more attention and respect. The mission of the Investigator came to an end, but the Editor still survived.

A few months after the Apostolic Advocate was commenced, the Editor was entangled in divers controversies. The principle he had set out upon was to “prove all things and to hold fast that which was good.” He supposed that the spirit as well as the letter of this apostolic precept

was the honest and ingenuous policy of the ecclesiastical community with which he found himself associated by the force of circumstances. Perhaps these circumstances expressed the will of God, who had thus placed him there for his trial and preparation for some future work. He learned patience and obedience by the things which he suffered; and acquired an experience which could be purchased only by endurance. He found that he was at liberty to “prove all things” provided that he held fast only what the rulers allowed to be good. This was setting up a mere human standard of faith and practice, a substituting their views of truth for the truth itself, which was certainly not the meaning of the precept, and therefore could not be submitted to by those who aspired to the liberty of the Sons of God. The manifestation of this disposition to arbitrate with despotic authority in the community—to say, “thus far shalt thou go and no farther”—originated within its pale a diversity of opinion in the premises which predisposed to the examination of principles which might lead to a difference of faith and practice.

The principle which first turned up as the result of proving all things, was that the immersion of an individual whose “faith” was not the faith of the gospel was a valueless immersion—it was not christian baptism. This principle has been a leading one, implied if not expressed, in all the Editor’s teaching from 1834 to 1850. From this he has never swerved, and cannot possibly depart so long as reason holds her own. Out of this principle grew another, namely, that a knowledge of the truth acquired subsequently to such an immersion did not convert it into obedience of the gospel or christian baptism. These principles were warmly opposed by the rulers. At first some of them reasoned, but their reasonings proving weak and their position untenable, they changed their tactics, and resorted to denunciation and to attacks upon character. This only widened the breach and rendered highly improbable a restoration of unity among the old materials of the sect.

But to return to the principles. While they were maintained by the Editor and others, they were advocated under the supposition that the faith of the gospel consisted in believing in Jesus Christ as the Son of God, in his death for sin, his burial, and resurrection, and that “baptism was for remission of sins.” They did not then perceive that these things did not constitute the faith of the gospel, although some of them are unquestionably items of the mystery of the gospel. “Baptism for remission of sins” was then proclaimed throughout the land as the “Ancient Gospel” to all who should repent and believe that Jesus was the Christ. Many of the leaders in this proclamation had been preachers in the Baptist denomination, who, when this “Ancient Gospel” was first propounded to them, violently and acrimoniously opposed it. It was obvious then that when they were immersed they were, if not ignorant at least entirely faithless of it. But afterwards they ceased their opposition, and declared that they believed that faith in Jesus as the Christ and remission of sins by baptism were the gospel, and so they continued to preach. Now the two principles stated above became to these people so many thorns in their flesh; for they resolved their immersion into a mere introduction into the Baptist body instead of a putting on of Christ by union to his name. They therefore turned upon the Editor, saying in effect, “Forbear, for in teaching these things thou condemnest us also!” This, however, was a trifling consideration; for he had assumed the position that the truth must be spoken, maintained and defended, though all might be condemned including himself. This position he has consistently and perseveringly maintained for years, and is prepared to uphold it to the end of the chapter.

Shortly after the controversy about the scriptural foundation of immersion commenced, the Editor propounded certain questions for examination without affirming his belief in any of them. Among these were some bearing upon the subject of immortality. No sooner were these announced than the rulers seized upon them as a kind of godsend. They declared that they were not simply inquiries, but bona fide articles of faith—a creed to which he proposed to convert their community. They raised a great dust, hoping, doubtless, thereby to obscure the real question at issue about the two principles. But good very often is educed from present evil. It was so in the case before us. The clamor and attacks made by the rulers compelled the Editor to study the subject of immortality so that he might be able to state the truth concerning it, and to defend it from assaults on every side. The result was that he discovered for himself that immortality is a good thing, which like all other good things to come is promised to the righteous, and to them alone.

This hope of immortality raised the question when will this hope be realised? He saw clearly that it was not at death, but at the resurrection of the righteous from among the dead. This resurrection then was a great epoch in the future history of the world, and the commencement of an era of wonders upon the earth. It was introductory in truth to an Age and Dispensation in which the “exceeding great and precious promises of God” would be realised by all the saints. The scripture testimony of these things created in his mind a hope which looked beyond the resurrection epoch, and contemplated a kingdom, glory, and dominion under which all nations should be blessed. This economy is styled by the Apostle “the Age to come,” Ephesians 1: 21, or the Future Age. Of this age the Lord Jesus is the Founder, and therefore he is styled by the prophet “the Father of the Everlasting Age,” which being an age of undisturbed repose confers upon Him the honourable and glorious title of “the Prince of Peace.”

To advocate the claims of this age upon the faith and hope of his contemporaries, the Editor recommenced his literary labours, and bestowed upon the periodical devoted to it the name of the “Herald of the Future Age.” He was the more induced to designate it by this title because he believed that the Age was at hand or fast approaching. If he had thought that it was far off he would not have styled it the “Herald” of that age. He believed then as he believes now, that it was near, even at the doors; he therefore heralded forth that announcement though upon different principles from “the cry” that was then sounding throughout the land. That cry as a question of time has been shown by events to have been discordant with the word; the truth of the advent, however, has not been at all affected by the mistake. The word of the Lord lives and abides forever, and though men may err in their interpretations, the declaration of his will standeth firm that all things here shall be subjected to his dominion, so that “his will shall be done on earth as it is in heaven.”

From 1834 to '46 or '47 the Editor had been bringing out and advocating great and important truths. During this period every effort had been made by the rulers to prevent their discussion and to turn away the ears of the people. But the Editor was bound to persevere although discouragements obtained pre-eminence on every side. He advocated the truths because he believed them to be true; and because all truth that God has condescended to reveal in his word is worthy of being known, and when known is calculated to soften the heart, and improve the dispositions of men. At that time he would not have said that the knowledge and belief of them was indispensable to a participation of the everlasting blessings of the age to come. He had

not the testimony before his mind to justify such a conclusion; consequently could not venture to affirm it. But in process of time he came to see that they were the gospel in ruins—its integral parts lying as the fragments of a wreck all around. Having made this discovery he proceeded to rebuild the fabric—to bring the dismembered elements together, and to set them forth as one harmonious whole.

His faith had now attained an amplitude it had not possessed before. It embraced the hope of God's calling to his kingdom and glory in the name of Jesus as the future Lord and sovereign of the world. He now perceived what the faith of the gospel was that was necessary to constitute an immersion christian baptism. It was nothing less than the Gospel of the Kingdom of God and name of Jesus as the Christ; and he discovered accordingly that if a man would inherit that kingdom he must believe with an honest and good heart the things concerning it. It was not simply a Future Age of glory, but it was "a kingdom, glory, and dominion" in that age with "honour and immortality" that were the glad tidings of "the truth as it is in Jesus." To become a joint-heir with him of this kingdom the Editor was immersed in 1847. Having thus obeyed the gospel himself, he forthwith commenced its announcement to others in the United States, and afterwards in Britain. Thousands upon thousands have heard the joyful sound during the two years that are past; and if it be God's will that it should be still further proclaimed in these States the Editor holds himself in readiness to do it to the full extent of the means afforded him.

Having returned from Europe for this purpose, he begins this work by the issue of the "Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come." As the things of the Kingdom of God and of his Anointed will be the great theme of this periodical, he has amplified the title of the former work. The "Future Age" and the "Age to Come" signify the same thing; he has therefore for the sake of euphony adopted the latter phrase as a substitute for the former, and inserted "the Kingdom" before it. This is the great fact of the Age to Come, and the promise made to the fathers, the hope of Israel, and the faith of all believing Gentiles, who are not highminded and too wise in their own conceit to learn. The kingdom has become the topic of the present age which cannot be set aside. The acceptance or rejection of the doctrine concerning it will determine the destiny of every man that hears it; for it is the subject of the gospel by which we all must be saved.

Thus from the beginning to the present time progress has marked the Editor's career. There has been no vacillation with him. He has not professed and recanted, and professed again, not knowing his own mind for two successive moons together. Though hampered for want of means to carry on efficiently the work in which he has been engaged these seventeen years, he has never sold his birthright for a mess of pottage. Such "grains of sense" as these he has inherited from none. He has proved by his works his faith, and when his traducers can do the same, he will cheerfully yield to them the palm of equal disinterestedness with himself.

THE HERALD OF THE KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME may be considered as the organ of all those, be they many or few, whose hope the kingdom is. The Editor is their humble servant for the truth's sake. When they can find another who will serve them in that truth more patiently, perseveringly, and self-denyingly, he will readily give place to such an one, and retire into that obscurity which is far more congenial to his feelings and habits than a notoriety which exposes him to the rancor and ill will of the rulers of the present darkness, and of those who do their will. Till then, however, it is to be hoped that they will bestir themselves, and not allow his

efficiency to be cramped by a parsimony of which the world itself would be ashamed. Much can be done with a little as he has proved; but the armies of the aliens cannot be effectually encountered if the locker be entirely destitute of shot. A word to the wise is enough.

THE DESTINY OF THE NATIONS.

If we look upon nations as so many great individuals playing a drama, we shall perceive at once that each has a distinct and intelligible character; each a peculiar mission to fulfil, and a corresponding career to pursue.

No two great nations bear much resemblance to each other. They are as unlike as two distinct men, and their principles and motives of action are as different. The Jews had a theological mission, and the whole world has felt the power of it. The Greeks had a philosophical and artistic mission; and to this day the world condescends to be their disciples, and in many respects their humble imitators. The Romans had a political mission, and we see their rules and forms of government incorporated with all civilised nations. These three great nations of antiquity have laid the foundations of modern civilisation. What would the world have been, had one of these nations been wanting? Very different altogether from what it is at present. We can scarcely imagine what would have been the consequence.

The character of Spain is very different from that of France or England. It is a half-breed, like one of its own mules, between the despotism of the East and the civilisation of the West. It is the only one of the great Christian nations which was for ages possessed and peopled in part by Mahomedans; and, though at last they were driven out of the land, their spirit of tyranny and chivalry remained behind them, and lingers even still, despising the commercial utilitarian habits of the north-west. To Spain was allotted the great dramatic part of discovering the New World in the 15th and 16th centuries; and in the fulfilment of that most important mission, the peculiar character of the nation was developed in hard and definite outline. The worshippers of God and Mammon were never, perhaps, in the whole history of the world, elsewhere combined in so picturesque and imposing a manner. The conquerors of Mexico and Peru had no Bibles and tracts, or even preaching missionaries, like the cooler and more rational nations of the North. With a crucifix in one hand, and a sword in the other; with one eye on the gold, and the other on the silver that they found in their path; small in number but powerful in faith, and full of the pleasing hope of riches in this world, or heaven in the next—they pillaged the temples, ransacked the dwellings, tortured and burnt the sovereigns and nobles, set up crosses and images of the Virgin in room of the pagan idols, said masses to the bewildered natives, persuaded them to submit to the rite of baptism, to take the eucharist, cross themselves and bow to the Virgin, and even held out the cross to their victims to kiss whilst they were burning them at the stake for pagans, infidels, and traitors. It is a marvellous history; so very unlike the history of the Anglo-Saxon adventurers, who laid the foundation of the great republic in the cooler and more northern regions of the New World. But, amid all this wantonness, cruelty, and inconsistency, this unnatural union of avarice and devotion, there was mercy to be found. The conquerors mixed their blood with the vanquished. They regarded them, so soon as converted, as men of the same origin and rank with themselves. A common faith was, in their eyes, a common blood; and a new race of men arose from the mixture of the white and red races. But to this day it is an unsettled race; and none of the countries which the Spaniards colonised in the New World have been able

to settle themselves under any definite or permanent government, but remain to this hour, like political volcanoes, always burning and always threatening another devastation. The appetite for gold was the ruin of the mother country; and the irrational and violent system of converting the Indians has only laid the foundation of an inferior civilisation, which has never been able to distinguish itself, or exercise even a re-active influence on the civilisation of the old world. It was a work of passion; and passion still prevails over reason in regulating the destiny of Spanish colonies; whilst Spain herself, still doggedly adhering to her old principles, reluctantly submits to her inevitable destiny.

The history of France is altogether different. The French are a gay and a social people, and therefore peculiarly adapted for taking the lead in an age like the present. Their conquests are at home rather than abroad. They have no colonies. Their great ambition is to lead the world, by leading the civilised nations, and making Paris the capital of civilisation; and they have, to a considerable extent, accomplished this end. But being merely a dependency of Rome in its ecclesiastical capacity, the nation is fettered in one of its legs, and incapable of forming other than a political or philosophical centre for the circumference of civilisation. In fact, there may be said to be no other principle in France but Popery and philosophy. Between these two there is eternal war—a war without hope—for the weakness of the one is the strength of the other. But Popery not having her dwelling place or centre in France, philosophy has taken the lead in her government and her literature, and may be said to form the intellectual mission of the nation. Moreover, the French politicians are remarkable for the logical form which they give, or attempt to give, to all their disputations. They seek for authority in abstract principles, and the common laws of Nature, and endeavour to establish the paramount authority of reason, in opposition to the authority of faith, which is dictated from Rome. In doing so, they prove the power and weakness of reason at the same time—its power to shake the foundations of old society—its weakness to discover a firm foundation for the new. France is wandering in the desert of thought, or at sea without a compass, on a voyage of discovery for a new world, but, like Columbus, only discovering a number of islands. Her systems are an Archipelago of political islands, which are so far from satisfying the mind of the enthusiast, that they only tempt him to go out to sea in search of a continent.

Look at Germany, and you will see something very different from France and Spain. The name of Germany denotes the land of the universal man, all-man (*alle-magne*.) and the destiny of Germany is merely a commentary on its name. In Germany you have every species of government—an empire, kingdoms, principalities, dukedoms, municipalities. It is a world in miniature. But it is a world divided. It has not a capital. Each distinct sovereignty has its own capital, its own money and its own laws; and yet there is a common literature belonging to all. Political discussion has been suppressed in Germany, but religious discussion has been tolerated; and as in Germany the sects are numerous, the theology of Germany has received a wider development from the mere fact of the field being open for its almost unrestrained cultivation. The consequence has been, that the Germans have come out, by necessity and opportunity, the most profound thinkers, and the greatest innovators in opinion, and speculations in abstract notions, of any people in Europe. Almost every novelty in opinion seems to originate in Germany. The French themselves borrow copiously from the Germans, only clothing their ideas in more easy and readable language, and giving them wings for circulation throughout the world of civilisation. The German nations once broke down the Roman empire by the inundation of the

northern tribes in their rude and uncultivated state. In a later period they poured in a torrent of innovation under the leadership of Luther, which shook the spiritual empire of Rome to its foundation; and at present they are pouring in floods upon floods of philosophy into the South, which are re-issued from Paris as the capital of philosophy, and ascribed to the fickleness and inventive genius of the French nation. Germany is like a spirit without a body, for want of a capital, and that spirit seeks and finds its body in the capital of civilisation.

How very different from any of these nations is England—the land of general but modified liberty! In Germany there is more theological and philosophical liberty, and the universities are open to all sects, even to a chaos of opinion. In France there is more social liberty. In Spain there is more geographical, or rustic liberty. But in England there is more of all the liberties taken collectively. We have but little rustic liberty in England, for our soil is too valuable, too highly cultivated, for such a blessing. Our poor therefore probably enjoy fewer privileges than those of Spain, where the habits and customs of the olden times are still preserved, and where modern art has done little or nothing, either to enclose the commons, to fence the fields, or to interdict the free passage of the people over the surface of the soil. Our social habits are very strict; our universities are still in the hands of the established clergy, under more severe discipline than now prevails in France or Germany, and perhaps even equal to that of Spain herself. But then our press and our tongues are at liberty to speak upon all subjects, to discuss political and ecclesiastical questions, unrestrained except by the censorship of public opinion. This has given a moderation to the tone of controversy in England which is found in no other European nation; and, at the same time, it has made the English press a better representative of the mind of the people than any other European press whatsoever. The fact is important, as it invests England with a peculiar species of universality—a universality of an intellectual character, and therefore of a higher order than that which belongs to Germany—a universality of a political and ecclesiastical character, and therefore higher than that which belongs to France, which, like the cow with the crumpled horn, is deficient in one of its intellectual developments.

The language of England, moreover, is singularly illustrative of this. It is chiefly a mixture of the German and the Roman. German is rather alien, or opposed to the languages of the Roman empire, like the Germans themselves, who have been a thorn in its side from time immemorial. French, Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese, are almost exclusively Roman. But English is a compound of all the languages of Western civilisation, and is, therefore, the best representative of that great and increasing interest. Nor is this intellectual symbol of universality without its corresponding political and geographical facts to illustrate and confirm it. The colonisation by England is now the most extensive and the most prosperous of all. The Anglo-Saxon race is to be found in every habitable latitude and longitude of the globe. It is re-peopling the old world, and peopling the new. It is spanning the earth, and even threatening to possess it as its destined inheritance.

To this great people the commercial mission is given, in a special manner; that very mission which is calculated, above all others, to facilitate the intercourse between different nations of the world, to make a way through the deep and through the desert, to climb the mountains, and to cut through the forests.

England, as the mother and representative of this people, is a little world in herself, distinct in all respects from the Continent. Unlike France and Spain, she has her Church within herself. Unlike Germany, she is united under one capital and policy. Unlike Italy, she is the representative of modern times, and not of mediaeval superstition and exclusiveness. She stands alone amongst the nations, like her island home in the Atlantic Ocean. And, as her character and position, so is her mission, so is her destiny. It is one of great breadth and universality. She holds this commission from Heaven, and none can deprive her of it. It is fixed, from of old, in the geographical shape of the earth, and the political and ecclesiastical distribution of ideas and systems amongst the surrounding nations. The role which she enacts in the great drama of humanity, is appointed by the Great Manager of the Theatre of Society, and it needs but little of the gift of prophecy to discover that, as yet, the greater part of her destiny is before her—that she is but at present buckling on her armor for the great work to which she is appointed. No other nation is, as yet, in advance of her. All the nations of civilisation have been shaken but herself. She stands at present unmoved, like a rock in the ocean, which the lightning will not strike, and the breakers cannot harm.

Yet she wants unity, and there lies her weakness. How can this be cured? Rome boasts of unity; but it is like that of a poker, too stiff to bend or to play the part of a pair of tongs. It is an impotent unity, even if it were real. But it is not real. The Archbishop of Paris has just condemned the Popish press of Paris, and accused it of all manner of ecclesiastical outrages—accused it even of defending miracles which the Church has not sanctioned. The *Univers*, an ultra-catholic paper, answers the Archbishop, by publishing the sanction of the Pope himself to the miracles alluded to! If the priests themselves are not united, how can the people be? There is no unity in the world. England is not singular in her want of unity. But still it is a great want; and, until it be supplied, her universality can be productive of little positive benefit to the poor or the world.

After this general outline of the dramatic character of nations, it is easy to perceive that it is well for humanity at large that this diversity has been established. Each by it has been compelled to cultivate different gifts, and to do different parts of the great work of mundane civilisation. If men had succeeded in making them all alike, and subjecting them to the same laws, a similar development would have taken place in all; the diversity would not have appeared, and less real positive work would have been done. The division of labor increases the facility of execution, and is a better guarantee for the final beauty and perfection of the work. Man must labor for the final rest that is promised to the world; and, during that labor, a principle of division of labor—a well-known law of Nature—is as scrupulously pursued in the government of nations, as it is in the government of factories and workshops. But when labor is over, then comes rest, then comes enjoyment; and that rest is as positively promised to the world, as ever labor was positively ordained. The time must come when the nations will rest—when war will cease to the ends of the earth—when the bow will be broken, and the spear cut asunder, and the chariot of war be burned in the fire. The people of all Christendom pray daily for this consummation, when they say “Thy kingdom come;” but they forget the meaning of the words, for their eyes have been blinded by the dead philosophy, and they have forgotten the hope upon which the civilisation of the world has been built. —Family Herald.

From the Millennial Harbinger.

IS NOT CHRIST TO SIT UPON THE THRONE OF DAVID?

Louisville, April 24th, 1848.

Brother Campbell, Dear Sir:

It is not my intention to write on the subject of the “coming of the Lord,” nor indeed to consider that subject at all, neither as it respects the time, the preparation for it, nor the circumstances attending it. What I now write may be considered to have some bearing on that point, or the things stated may involve it; but yet, that is not my present subject. So much has been said and written, that what might now be said, could not claim any attraction on the score of novelty. A subject may be treated until the readers and hearers may complain of something like, or perhaps more than satiety. Such a thing may have taken place when Noah was building the Ark. It is highly probable that the subject was heard much in the days of Jerusalem’s overthrow. Since the days of Miller, something like a sceptical propensity seems to prevail, and a disposition to lay the matter aside, is beginning to manifest itself. The Editor of the Millennial Harbinger has not at all times kept his eye upon the same point, or, perhaps, not looked at the object from the same point; and hence, some appearance of change even in him. This appearance I do not, however, blame or find fault with, when the rage for speculation on that rich subject prevailed to so great an extent. Indeed, it begins to be among the things of the past, and like a tale often told it attracts no attention. Some of those who have been prominent in the discussion, have not evinced their faith by works corresponding; and, therefore, the people have concluded that the “affair” is but the dream of an enthusiast, and unworthy of their notice. Notwithstanding this general disposition to put the question, —“Where is the promise of his coming?” I find in the community “here and there a traveller” who lives like a pilgrim, and thinks that, as the Apostles besought the disciples to look for the coming of the Lord, and prepare for it, such teaching should exist even now. Eighteen centuries have passed since the Apostle wrote, and yet the faithful long and look for that glorious appearing.

But whither am I wandering? This is not my subject, and it seems I shall say much with respect to it. This very state of affairs of which I speak, may be a better indication of the near approach of that time, than any calculation which may be made from periods given in prophecy, or dates afforded by history. It is true that iniquity abounds and the love of many waxes cold. Novelties in the way of convert-making, and plans for uniting Christians, so called, are very abundant. The plain old way of preaching Christ and him crucified, of living a godly, quiet life seems to be forgotten; and stupendous scenes on the “one idea” system for bringing all churches into one, swallow up that “simplicity which is in Christ.”

One item in my religious creed reads as follows—

“And the angel said unto her, fear not, Mary, for thou hast found favour with God. And behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end.”—(Luke 1: 30-34).

And another reads thus, —

“To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me on my throne, even as I also overcame and am set down with my father on his throne.”

From these I conclude that there is a throne on which Jesus will sit. This he calls his, (my) to distinguish it from his father's. It is now evident that he now sits on a throne in the heavens. This throne is either God's or David's. If it is God, his heavenly father's throne on which he now sits, then, hereafter he will sit on his father David's throne. But, if that on which he now sits be David's, then hereafter he will have one which is called his. That there will be a change of thrones is evident from the portion last cited. That he is not now on his father David's throne, is evident from the fact of his being seated with his father on his (his father's) throne. I say this is evident, unless some one can prove that David sits on his throne in heaven. I think this will not be assumed by any one. Therefore, the throne of his father David is yet to be occupied by him. To strengthen this conclusion, I will quote Isaiah, —

“Unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end; upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom to order it, and to establish it with judgment and justice, from thenceforth even forever. The zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this.”

Of the Jewish people and Jerusalem, Jesus thus speaks—(Luke 21: 24)—

“They shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive unto all nations: and Jerusalem shall be trodden down of the Gentiles, until the time of the Gentiles be fulfilled.”

This language needs no comment, yet I must observe that a part of this has been, to the letter, fulfilled. The Jews are now in all nations, and Jerusalem has been trodden down by the Gentiles for nearly eighteen centuries. When the time of the Gentiles shall be fulfilled, then will the Jews cease to be scattered, and Jerusalem to be trodden down. Blindness in part, says Paul, has happened to Israel until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in. That same blindness is yet theirs. But when the fullness of the Gentiles is come in, then will that blindness cease. This seems too plain to be mistaken. I know not for what purpose this nation is kept and preserved as it is, if all the scripture relative to them has been accomplished. Verily I believe they are destined to hold the kingdom under the whole heaven, the sceptre of which will be in the hand of our Prince Messiah, and if the subject were not a common one, and if the people had not heard it before, I would go about to give a reason for the belief that is in me. Talk of missionary operations to convert the heathen, and of like societies to convert the Catholics! Strange that men should thus talk when God has pronounced sentence on a corrupt race; and when our only hope for the world lies in the resurrection of the sons of Abraham from their religious death. Not that I object to such efforts when properly directed. But when I see heathens at our own doors, and irreligion fill our streets, I rather think that expediency would say, convert your neighbours and your own sons, and then, when these are converted, go with one heart, one faith, one purpose, to the distant land. The mighty Colossus of superstition that bestrides European, African, and Asiatic nations will fall only by the visible manifestations of the Almighty's power. Long since has the prophet said of Jerusalem, —

“The nation and the kingdom that will not serve thee, shall perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly destroyed.”

To the sons of Abraham, engrafted on their good olive, do I look as the only means of a world's conversion. Who will persuade the Archbishop of Canterbury to descend into the Thames, or the Pope of Rome and his cardinals into the Tiber, that they may imitate him, who in his humility,

was buried in the waters of Jordan? Who or what can reconcile the jarring and discordant elements of the present Protestant associations? Will any one say the Gospel will do this? I answer, have they not heard? And, again, who hath believed our report? The apostolic (there is no other,) Gospel has been sounded in the length and breadth of the land, and though many, comparatively, have heard, what multitudes neither hear nor will hear? Who will convert the more than one hundred millions of Romanists now bound, body and soul, to their miserable superstition? How can the gentle voice of peace be heard amid the clash of swords that is now preparing in western Europe? There is a spirit abroad that will rouse to fierce conflict the nations of the earth, —but it is not the spirit of faith, —no, but the spirit of infidelity. God says to the nations, since you will not hearken nor believe, make experiment of your unbelief. That experiment will be made, and the consequence will be, the present associations, political and religious, of the Old World, will be like chaff before the wind. The extremities, feet of Nebuchadnezzar's metallic image, seen in his dreams, will now be smitten; and, as Daniel says, become as the chaff of the summer threshing floors. This will terminate the dreams of Protestants about a world's conversion. But I wander. Vain, however, are our hopes from the existing state of affairs for the salvation of the world. Our effort is a noble one. It will prepare a people for the Lord; it will save multitudes from sin, and lift them up from the condition of slaves of sin to that of sons of God. We will labor with perseverance and fidelity, that we may be found without spot and blameless. But my faith is in what God has promised to his Son. He has promised him the throne of his father David. Paul says we are heirs of God and joint heirs with Jesus Christ; and in his letter to the Galatians,

“If ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's, and heirs according to the promise.”

God has promised to Abraham the world for an inheritance, a heavenly city for a habitation; to Christ, the throne of David and his kingdom, and to all who are faithful a joint possession.

“Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth.”

If it be alleged that Abraham looked for a heavenly country, I answer, that the ideas of such persons are not consistent with the ideas of those souls whom John heard sing, the last words of which song, are, —

“Thou hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth.”

But Peter says our inheritance is reserved in heaven. Let this be the answer to all objectors of that sort, —that the earth is our inheritance, and our city and its king are in heaven. The inheritance is compound, or twofold. God will remove his tabernacle and dwell among men. Jerusalem, therefore, says Paul, is the mother of us all. That the new heavens and earth will be the habitation of the saints, and that the Messiah will be king is nothing new. But that he will sit upon the throne of his father David and reign over the house of Jacob forever, is a subject to which I have not known the attention of this people directed. This is the point to be decided. You may think that in my own mind, at least, this is decided. True, it is so. But not so firmly and immutably fixed as not to be changed by a good reason to the contrary. I am ready to admit, that I can, at present see no consistency in the bible promises unless this is so. Nor can I see why the nation of Israel should be preserved a distinct nation, unless they are designed for some grand purpose, such as that already named. Now, sir, if you can spare time to say a few words on that point, the occupation of the throne of David by the Messiah, you will confer a favor on, not myself only, but others, your constant readers. I have said much more than I intended at first; but perhaps not more than the nature of the case demands. The present movements in Europe are events of importance to the student of the good book; and make up the hope that the end is not far off, —I

mean the end of the great apostacy. Should you think those remarks worth of a place in your Harbinger, give them publicity; if not, lay them aside, but a few lines relative to the point above named, will be gratifying to me.

Yours with much esteem and love,

H.T. ANDERSON.

Remarks on the above hereafter. —A. C.

From the Millennial Harbinger.

THE THRONE OF DAVID.

An opinion has been occasionally propagated at different periods of the Christian Church, that the conversion of the Jews would be effected at once in a national way, and that by a personal and literal return of the Messiah to the literal and earthly Jerusalem in Judea, where our Lord was crucified. This opinion has again been revived in connexion with other kindred notions, propagated also at different periods of the Christian Church concerning the state of the dead, of which I cannot now speak particularly. But the recent attempts to revive the oft alleged, and as often refuted, notions of the personal and literal return to Jerusalem of the Messiah to sit upon the literal throne of David, and thus to convert the Jews by sight rather than by faith, demands a passing notice at our hands, and more especially as it has now been presented to our consideration by our much esteemed brother Anderson, of Kentucky. At present we can do little more than exhibit an induction of what is said in Holy Writ, on the subject of the Throne of David. And first, then, we shall place before the reader what the scriptures say on this subject.

1. Abner's oath runs in these words:

“As Jehovah hath sworn to David even so do I to him—to transfer the kingdom from the house of Israel, and to set up the throne of David over Israel and over Judah from Dan even to Beersheba.”—(2 Samuel 3: 9-10).

Thus we are first introduced to the throne of David.

Jehovah's oath, or covenant to David, runs in these words:

“And” (David) “when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt lie down with thy fathers, I will raise up thy seed after thee,” (Solomon) “who shall proceed from thee, and I will establish his kingdom; he shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever.”—“And” (David) “thy house and thy kingdom shall be steadfast for ever before thee, thy throne shall be established forever.”—(2 Samuel 7: 12-16).

And David in response said:

“O, Lord Jehovah, thou hast also spoken of thy servant's house for a great while to come,” (verse 19) “Therefore now let it please thee to bless the house of thy servant that it may continue for ever before thee: for thou, O Lord Jehovah, hast spoken it: and with thy blessing let the house of thy servant be blessed for ever.” (verse 29).

This Throne of David was by himself sworn, or covenanted to his son Solomon as his successor. Nathan the prophet commanded Bathsheba to put the following words to David: —

“Didst not thou, my lord, O king, swear to thy handmaid, saying, Assuredly, Solomon, thy son shall reign after me, and he shall sit upon my throne?”

And what did David respond?

“As Jehovah liveth that hath delivered me out of all my distress, even as I swore to thee by Jehovah God of Israel, saying, Assuredly, Solomon, thy son shall reign after me, and he shall sit upon my throne in my stead, even so will I certainly do this day.”—(1 Kings 1: 13, 29-30).

“Thus Solomon sat on the throne of David his father.”—(1 Kings 2: 12).

The throne of David is frequently called “the throne of Israel.”—(1 Kings 2: 4; 8: 25; 9: 5; 2 Chronicles 6:16; Jeremiah 33: 17).

“David,” saith Jehovah, “shall never want a man to sit on the throne of Israel.”

This name was given to the throne of David, before the nation was divided into two sovereignties—that of Judah, and that of Israel.

This covenant is again alluded to in the Psalms 89: 3-4. —

“I have sworn a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn to David my servant, Thy seed will I establish for ever, and build up thy throne to all generations.”

Again, Psalms 132: 11. —

“Jehovah has sworn in truth to David: he will not turn from it. Of the fruit of thy body will I set on thy throne.”

Before the birth of Jesus 740 years, Isaiah says, chapter 9: 7,

“Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end upon the throne of David and upon his kingdom, and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of Jehovah of hosts will perform this.”

During the captivity, Jeremiah prophesied, chapter 17: 25, that on certain conditions,

“There shall enter into the gates of Jerusalem kings and princes sitting upon the throne of David, riding in chariots and on horses, they and their princes: and this city shall remain for ever.”

This promise is repeated, Jeremiah 20: 4. This throne of David is again alluded to, but with no reference to our present subject, Jeremiah 22: 2; 29: 16; 36: 30. Such is a full induction of all the allusions in the Old Testament to the “throne of David,” bearing on the covenant concerning David and his seed as sitting on that throne.

In the New Testament, Luke, chapter 1: 32, an angel announces, that the son promised Mary “shall be called the son of the highest, that the Lord God will give him the throne of his father David, and that he will reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end.” Such are the prophecies and promises concerning the throne of David, in the Old and New Testaments.

But it is proper here to inquire, —Did, or did not, the Lord Jesus Christ obtain a throne in heaven, on his ascension, and if so, what throne is it? We propose the question for

the sake of form, and to give to our minds a proper direction, rather than as insinuating any doubt as to the fact of his coronation. It will be, I presume, admitted by every Bible student, that the Lord Jesus Christ, “born to be a king,” but not on earth, did, on entering the heavens, ascend to a throne, a crown, and a kingdom. Let us turn over again the leaves of the Old Testament prophecies.

David foretold that his son would be a king and sit upon his throne, —not on earth, but in the heavens. Psalm 2—

“Why do the heathen rage and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth array themselves, (Herod and Pontius Pilate—Caesar’s representatives and vicegerents,) and the princes take counsel together against Jehovah and his ANOINTED; saying—let us break their bands asunder and cast away their cords from us. He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh, Jehovah will deride them. Then will he speak to them in his wrath and humble them in his fury—yet have I set my king upon my holy mountain, Zion. Ask of me and I will give them the heathen for thine inheritance and the utmost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a sceptre of iron, thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter’s vessel,” &c.

We have here the authority of the whole Jerusalem church, with all its spiritual gifts for interpreting this passage and for applying it to Jesus as Jehovah’s anointed king in the heavenly Zion, the proper antitype of the city and throne of David. Despite of Caesar in his representatives—Herod and Pontius Pilate—Jehovah placed his king upon the holy hill of Zion. And who is this king but David’s son and David’s sovereign? Now, according to the angelic annunciation, (Luke 1: 32,) did not Jehovah, the God of Israel, at this time give to him the throne of his father David? —!

But we have other documents in the Jewish writings as explicit, and, perhaps more direct and striking than even these. What diligent student of the official grandeur of the Lord Jesus does not ponder with delight upon the 110th Psalm? —

“Jehovah said to my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy foot stool. Jehovah shall send the sceptre of thy strength from Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies. Thy people shall be willing (volunteers) in the day of thy power—(gubernatorial authority.) In the beauty of holiness from (more than) the womb of the morning, thou hast the dew of thy youth. Jehovah hath sworn and will not repent, —thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec. The Lord at thy right hand shall crush kings in the day of his wrath. He shall judge among the heathen. He shall fill the places with the dead bodies. He shall crush the heads over many countries”—or the sovereigns of great nations.

Was not Melchisedec a priest upon a throne, and is not our high priest of that order; now king of kings, as well as priest of the most High God?

Nay, we are constrained to admit that Jesus is now constituted Lord of all. Peter, on Pentecost, assured the fleshly Israel that God had anointed or made Jesus supreme over all. And Paul also indicates the same when he says, (Hebrews 8: 1.)

“We have such an high priest who is seated on the right hand of the majesty in the heavens.”

Even so speaks the Lord Jesus himself. He went from earth in quest of a kingdom and a throne, and found one, for he says—

“As I have overcome and am set down with the Father on his throne, so he that overcometh shall sit down with me on my throne.”

In all the visions of our ascended Lord, he appears invested with regal glory, “a prince and saviour,” exalted to a throne and a kingdom, having “all authority in heaven and on earth, — Lord of Lords and King of Kings.”

With this induction of all the passages that speak of the throne of David, and all that is said of the anointing or coronation of the Lord Jesus, can any one find a vestige of authority for the assumption that Jesus Christ will descend from the throne of God in the heavens, to sit upon any thing called a throne of David, in the literal Jerusalem; and thus, in the form of a man, reign as a prince and priest over one nation and people, for any national, temporal, or spiritual purpose!

But the emphasis recently laid upon this assumption, is such as to call for a still farther exposition of its baseless character. From the passages quoted we note the significant fact, that the throne of David is once and again said to be “established forever.” Now, that it continued till the birth of “David’s son and Lord,” would certainly be implied in the fact that it was “established forever.” That “the sceptre should not depart from Judah till Shiloh come,” I need scarcely say, is relied on by the so called Christian world universally, as a strong proof of the Messiah ship of Jesus of Nazareth: for till he came that throne or sceptre of Judah ceased not. But after his death, Jerusalem and the nation fell into ruins; and, according to Hosea, they have ever since been “without a king and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without a pillar, and without an image, and without Teraphim.”—Hosea 3: 4. Now, unless Jesus be king, and the throne of David be raised to heaven, how can it be said that the throne of David was established forever! For eighteen hundred years that throne has fallen down and been without a king, unless in the person of Jesus of Nazareth! !

Still there is a stronger argument, or, at least, one more explicit, than even this. It is as flat as a negation of this neophyte assumption as I can imagine. It is that cited from Isaiah 33: 17—

“For thus saith Jehovah, David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel.”

I own it may be translated—“There shall not be cut off a man from David before me,” i.e. He will always have a representative. Now, according to the oracle, so explicit, so definite, and so intelligible, David’s son and David’s Lord reigns upon his throne, as his royal representative.

But one fact is seen by those neophytes who assume so much on this subject. It is this, that David’s throne was originally the throne of God, and David was but his representative. Jehovah himself was king of Israel, and when Israel repudiated him, he gave them in his anger what they sought, i.e. “a king like other nations,” but he would merely depute him and authorise him by an unction in his name, thereby constituting him “the Lord’s anointed.” This is the mystery which none of these theological adventurers have yet been taught. * (See next page).

* I would refer all doubtful minds to the reperusal and reconsideration of the call and consecration of Saul and David. Let them read with care 1 Samuel, 8th, 9th, and 10th chapters in which they will find the call, consecration, and inspiration of Saul, as the Lord's anointed. Then let them read 1 Samuel, 18th chapter, in which are the same significant preliminaries to the call of David, and the same solemn accompaniment of his consecration as the vicary or vicegerent of Jehovah. The Kings of Judah were as much in need of inspiration in order to sit upon the throne of God, as were the Apostles of Christ, to give them authority. But when they became wicked the spirit of God forsook them, and this circumstance called for prophets to instruct, reform and admonish them. Hence, prophets became a necessary appendage to the kings who acted for God.

These are matters not properly weighed nor understood in all their amplitude, by many who choose both to preach and write on such lofty themes.

The kings of Europe and the Pope are yet hugging a kindred delusion. They suppose that the Pope's Chrism is the holy oil; and that the kings of Europe are severally the Lord's anointed. A few lessons to priests and modern kings, and even to his grace of Canterbury, on this subject, might do them no harm. But as certainly as Aaron was God's high priest, alone and exclusively, so David and his sons were God's only anointed kings, and just as exclusively and alone, as Jesus of Nazareth is his only begotten son and heir of the throne in the heavens—therefore with literal and exact truth after his resurrection, he said, all sacerdotal, political, regal, and divine authority, in heaven and earth, were his, and only his, and his forever. God reigned on earth in the persons of Judah's kings on David's throne. But after the Jews said, —“This is the heir, come let us kill him and seize the inheritance,” he translated the throne of David to heaven and placed his son upon it, and there it will continue as the seat of the Lord Jesus Christ till all his enemies fall before him.

And here we shall pause for the present.

A.C.

(The following article was written at the request of a friend in Glasgow, and published in the Gospel Banner. It is a brief review of Mr. Campbell's remarks on Mr. Anderson's letter; and it is reproduced in this place for the information of the readers of the Herald. —Ed.)

From the Gospel Banner.

Mr. Editor—A reader of the British Millennial Harbinger has directed my attention to two articles which have appeared in its February number under the caption placed at the head of this communication. They purport to be from two of my acquaintances on the other side of the Atlantic; the one Mr. Henry T. Anderson, of Kentucky, the other Mr. Alexander Campbell, of Bethany, Virginia; both of them “Reformers,” and in fellowship with each other as “much esteemed brethren”; at least so it appears from Mr. Campbell's remarks, though Mr. Anderson addresses him simply as “Dear Sir,” and subscribes himself “yours with much esteem and love”:—yet by comparing the articles it will be found that their faiths are as wide asunder as the poles. I mention this that your readers may understand, that “Christian fellowship” in the States, is not

so much predicated upon what a man believes, as who he is that believes it. I am happy in being able to say, that with one or two unimportant exceptions, I entirely agree with the sentiments expressed by Mr. Henry T. Anderson, although this avowal places me with him in that class of believers styled by Mr. Campbell, 'neophytes' and 'theological adventurers.' The former, however, does not exactly apply to either of us; though possibly, we may be very accurately defined by the latter. We are not 'new converts' to the doctrine of the Lord Jesus Christ sitting upon the throne of his father David. I taught it by word of mouth, and published it in the Apostolic Advocate about the year 1836, as Mr. Wallis can testify, seeing that he republished an article upon the subject from my pen with approbation in the Christian Messenger. Since that time Mr. Anderson has assented to it—for he was a subscriber to the Advocate—and I rejoice to find that he still holds on to it; for it is God's truth, and no man can refute it. As to our being 'theological adventurers,' I have the honor to plead 'guilty' in my own behalf. Unless a man adventure to cut loose from the theology of schools and colleges; and to lay hold of that doctrine of God—Theou logos—revealed in 'the Law and the Testimony,' he will neither reign with Christ at the right hand of the Majesty in heaven, nor on earth when He, his Apostles, and the Saints shall occupy the thrones of the House of David, and then wield a divine sceptre over Israel and the Nations in the Age to Come. The Pharisees considered the Apostles as 'theological adventurers.' They have ever been a self-denying, and independent class of men; "proving all things and holding fast" what appeared to them to be "good." I will, therefore, being true to my class, adventure to examine Mr. Campbell's theology on the subject before us, premising this one word, that there is no argument in opprobrious epithets.

Mr. Campbell says that 'the recent attempts to revive the oft-alleged, and as often refuted notions of the personal and literal return to Jerusalem of the Messiah to sit upon the literal throne of David,' demands a passing notice at his hand. From this, then, it is evident, that he does not believe in the personal and literal return of Jesus for any such purpose; consequently, if it can be proved that such a return is taught in 'the word of the kingdom,' as I have done in Elpis Israel, it is clear that he does not believe the gospel, what ever his faith may be as to the identity of Jesus with the person described in Moses and the prophets. He styles this heaven-revealed truth 'a notion,' and affirms that it has been 'often refuted.' Now this assertion I deny in toto. When, where, and by whom has it been often refuted? In the absence of all other testimony in the case, we must take him as answering the question, and saying in effect, 'I have refuted it in my reply to Mr. Anderson.' Well then, let us see!

Mr. C. says 'we are first introduced to the throne of David' in 2 Samuel 3: 9-10. This is not exactly correct. The first allusion to the throne in connexion with David is in 1 Samuel 13: 14.

"Thy kingdom," said Samuel to Saul, "shall not continue: the Lord hath sought him a man after his own heart, and the Lord hath commanded him to be Captain over his people."

And again in chapter 15: 28,

"The Lord hath rent the Kingdom of Israel from thee, Saul, this day, and hath given IT to a neighbour of thine who is better than thou."

In the next chapter the Lord said to Samuel,

"I have rejected Saul from reigning over Israel; and have provided me a king among the sons of Jesse."

He then sent Samuel to anoint one of them as king elect to succeed Saul. When David came into his presence, the Lord said—

“Arise, anoint him: this is he.”

After this David slew Goliath, and received the acclamations of the people. Saul’s envy was excited, for they had placed David before him in feats of arms. He was very angry, and said—

“What can he have more but the kingdom?” (1 Samuel 17: 1).

This transfer of the kingdom of Israel from Saul’s heirs to David was well known in Saul’s family; and was the ground of all their animosity to the son of Jesse. When Saul and Jonathan were slain, Saul’s son Ishbosheth was made king over the Israelites, except Judah, by Abner, Saul’s uncle. Being offended with Ishbosheth, Abner vowed he would transfer his allegiance to David, and swear to him “as the Lord had sworn to David.” What had the Lord sworn?

“To translate the kingdom from the house of Saul, and to set up the throne of David over Israel and over Judah from Dan even to Beersheba.”

Ishbosheth was assassinated after reigning two years, and David henceforth acknowledged as king in fact, and Jehovah’s Anointed over the whole nation. From this, then, it is evident,

1. That David was king elect for several years before he became king in fact.
2. That he was divinely elected and anointed to be king over Saul’s kingdom, whose throne was to become his throne;
3. That Saul and David’s throne and kingdom were identical with the throne of the House of Israel, and the kingdom of Israel;
4. That when David became king in fact over all Israel, the Lord had fulfilled his promise to him as far as his being Saul’s successor was concerned, but no more;
5. That ‘we are’ not ‘first introduced to the throne of David’ in 2 Samuel 3: 9-10.

The question now presenting itself is, Seeing that the throne and kingdom of Saul were transferred to David, was the dominion over all Israel, that is, over the twelve tribes in one united nation, to be established in his family forever; or was it to be taken away as it was from Saul, and given to some one else of another tribe, family, or nation? This question is answered in 2 Samuel 7: 12-15. In this passage is recorded the covenant of Jehovah with David concerning the everlasting possession of the throne and kingdom of Israel. The things of this covenant are styled in Isaiah 55: 3 and Acts 13: 34, “the sure mercies of”—or gracious promises made to—“David”; to an inheritance, or possession of which, all who thirst for the honor and glory of the kingdom, are invited as joint-partakers in “the joy of their Lord.” David, in his last words, styles these promises “all his salvation and all his desire, though he made it not to grow;” that is, although the Lord had made no move towards its present accomplishment. The covenant has relation to David individually; to David’s House; to David’s throne and kingdom; and to David’s son, who should sit upon his throne for ever. As to David, he was to “sleep with his fathers,” and secondly, “his house and his kingdom are to be established for ever BEFORE HIM.”—Now, seeing that “David is both dead and buried,” and “is not ascended into the heavens,” it is certain, that his house and kingdom are not now established before him, that is, in his presence. Again, they are to be established where he is, and as he is not in the heavens, his house, kingdom and throne are therefore not there; but, as they are to be “established for ever before him,” David must be raised from the dead immortal, that he may be co-existent with his son’s everlasting throne and kingdom, which is to “break in pieces, and consume all kingdoms, and stand itself for ever.” In this way the covenant contained a promise of everlasting life to David; he might therefore well say, “it is all my salvation and all my desire.”

But who is the son of David spoken of in the covenant? ‘Solomon,’ says Mr. Campbell!! And so say all the professors and disciples of College Divinity! “I will set up thy seed after thee,” saith the Lord: ‘even Solomon,’ add those who make void the word of God by their traditions. But the apostles do not say so. They tell us plainly that the seed spoken of in the covenant before us is Christ even Jesus, the greater than Solomon. Referring to this, Peter says,

“David knew that God had sworn with an oath to him that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh he would RAISE UP the Christ to sit on his throne.”

This was the purpose among other things for which he was raised from the dead—that sitting on that throne he might “judge the world in righteousness” as the ordained of God—Acts 2: 30; 17: 31. Did Jehovah “raise up” Solomon to succeed David? The seed referred to was to be “raised up.” This was David and Peter’s understanding of the words “set up”—to be raised from the dead to sit on the throne of Israel, when “the kingdom shall be restored again to them.” Our question is answered by the facts in the case. Solomon has not been raised from the dead; therefore he is not the son referred to in the place.

But the matter is triumphantly settled by Paul; for he quotes from the very passage applied by divines’ to Solomon, and applies it to Jesus. Reasoning about the superiority of the resurrected Jesus over the angels, he says,

“To which of the angels said he at any time, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee? And again, I will be to him a Father and he shall be my Son.”

Both these quotations are applied to the same person, who at the close of the argument is declared to be Jesus—Hebrews 1: 5, 9. God swore that the Christ should possess David’s throne for ever; and David swore that Solomon should succeed him; but more than this he could not say.

As I have explained the things of this covenant in detail in my recent work, I need not enlarge here. I shall therefore pass on. Mr. C. quotes about seventeen relevant and irrelevant passages from Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Jeremiah, Psalms, and a solitary one from Isaiah, occupying with a few comments not quite two columns of the B.M.H., and then winds up by saying, ‘Such is a full induction of all the allusions in the Old Testament to the throne of David bearing on the covenant concerning David and his seed as sitting on that throne!’ This statement will be immediately recognised as utterly erroneous by those who have possessed themselves of Elpis Israel; and clearly evinces how little Mr. C. understands the subject, which he says has been so ‘often refuted.’

He adds one more text from Luke, and then inquires, ‘Did or did not, the Lord Jesus Christ obtain a throne in heaven, on his ascension, and if so what throne is it?’ After putting this, he goes on to say, ‘I presume that every Bible student will admit that he did on entering the heavens, ascend to a throne, a crown, and a kingdom.’ He says that Jesus was ‘born to be a king, but not on earth:’ and adds that David foretold that his son would be a king, and sit upon his throne—not on earth, but in the heavens; which he regards as ‘the heavenly Zion the proper antitype of the city and throne of David.’ He then finishes a paragraph by asking, ‘Now, according to the angelic annunciation—Luke 1: 32, —did not Jehovah, the God of Israel, at this time—his ascension—give to him the throne of his father David?’

He has not adduced one iota of proof that Christ is to reign where he now is for ever, and not upon earth. He has attempted it, but signally failed, having mistaken a prophecy for a history. He quotes the second Psalm which has been only partially fulfilled. His comment upon “yet have I set my king upon Zion the hill of my holiness” is, that ‘despite of Caesar Jehovah placed his king upon the holy hill of Zion.’ This construction of the text turns upon a piece of theological alchemy; such as, Zion does not mean Zion; but somewhere called ‘the right hand of the majesty in the heavens!’ Then the three thousand did not come to Mount Zion on the day of Pentecost, when they believed the gospel of the kingdom which sets forth to the eye of faith, Zion on which they stood, under a heavenly constitution, when God shall have made the horn of David to bud—Psalm 132: 13, 11; —but they were come to the right hand of God! After this fashion it is that the scriptures are tortured and twisted, and made to signify anything deemed expedient in the art of special pleading. The right hand of God where Jesus is, is nowhere called Zion in the sacred writings. This proper name belongs only to the Mount on which David dwelt within the walls of Jerusalem; and to that community of the faithful in their resurrected state, which stands related to the things to be revealed there, when David is raised up to witness them. When Jesus dwells and reigns on Zion,

“He will abundantly bless her provision; satisfy her poor with bread; clothe her priests with salvation; make her saints shout aloud for joy, and be the lamp of David’s house. His enemies will be clothed with shame; but upon himself shall his crown flourish.”

Mr. C. next quotes Psalm 110 to sustain his interpretation; but this is singularly against his transtherial Zion. Jehovah says to Christ,

“Sit thou at my right hand TILL I make thy foes thy footstool.”

Then, as a proof that this is accomplished at the time contemplated, it is added,

“Jehovah shall send the sceptre of thy power out of Zion; rule thou in the midst of thine enemies.”

If he be now in Zion, then he is ruling in the midst of his enemies; and consequently, no longer at the right hand of God; for he is only to sit there, until he shall be established in the midst of his enemies, which is coeval with their being made his footstool. All Mr. C. claims is granted in regard to Jesus being already constituted Lord, King, and High Priest, after the order of Melchizedec. These things are part of his Name. But it is one thing to be constituted Lord of all, and another thing to be in actual possession of lordship, to be king in fact, &c. David, when he was anointed, was constituted by an oath King of Israel, many years before he became king in fact, by the removal of Saul and Ishbosheth. Jesus and all his brethren are “kings and priests,” but they are only kings and priests elected for the kingdom, to be established in the Age to Come. Melchizedec reigned in Jerusalem; and Jesus being a High Priest upon his throne after his order, must reign there also; for as Aaron and his race were High Priests of the nation, under the law of Moses, so Jesus is to be Israel’s High Priest under a law yet to go forth from Zion, combining in himself, like Melchizedec, the kingly and priestly offices, contemporarily with the continuance of sin upon the earth. But I cannot dilate further upon this subject here. See Elpis Israel under the head of the ‘Priesthood of Shiloh.’ Suffice it to say, that when Jesus is “King of kings, and Lord of lords,” in fact as well as by constitution or election, there will be no other kingdom or empire, imperial, regal, or sacerdotal, upon the earth, but his. The nations will be “blessed in him,” and Abraham; and the tyrants that now harass and destroy them, will be themselves destroyed from among mankind.

Mr. Campbell affirms that David's throne continued till the birth of 'David's Son and Lord,' as implied in the fact that it was 'established forever.' But to this I object, that David's throne and kingdom did neither of them continue till the birth of Jesus. He confounds Judah's sceptre, or sovereignty, with David's. David's throne has had no existence since the Babylonish captivity. And this reminds me of one of Mr. C's texts, namely, 'David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel.' This is one of his strong arguments for the translation of David's throne to heaven; because if it were not so, then David has been without a son upon his throne for eighteen hundred years! Aye, but what becomes of this strong argument—this 'flat negation of the neophyte assumption'—in the face of the fact, that between the Babylonish captivity and the birth of Jesus, about 583 years, no son of David wore a crown as King of Judah or Israel? Judah had no king until after Judas Maccabaeus, and then only for one hundred and twenty-nine years; and these were not sons of David, but Asmoneans of the tribe of Levi. They were suppressed by the Romans, and a Gentile became their king, even Herod the Idumean. Previous to the Maccabees, Judah was governed by the kings of Persia, and Macedon. What will Mr. C. do with this? While he is ruminating upon the matter, I will explain the text, the misconception of which has led him so far astray.

Has the promise of God failed, or is the time not yet arrived to fulfil it? To answer this question, let us hear what God said by Ezekiel to Zedekiah, the last son of David that ever sat on his throne.

“Thou profane wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come when iniquity shall have an end. Thus saith the Lord God: Remove the diadem and take off the crown—of David which he wore—: this—man—shall not be the same—spoken of in the new covenant with David—: exalt him that shall be low; —the coming Shiloh—: abase him—Zedekiah—that is high:”

But, then, when he is dethroned, what shall become of David's kingdom and throne?

“I will overturn, overturn, overturn it; and it shall be no more UNTIL HE COME whose right it is; and I will give it him.”

But when, Lord? When the time comes that the saints should possess the kingdom,

“There shall be given him dominion, glory, and a kingdom, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him.”

“It shall stand for ever;” and from that time “shall David never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel, before him.”(Ezekiel 21: 25, 27; Daniel 2: 44; 7: 14, 22.)

Here, then, with this paraphrase, I may dismiss Mr. Campbell's tradition of the translation of David's throne to heaven beyond the atmosphere! A person skilled in “ the Law and the Testimony” will know how to appreciate his refutation of our 'neophyte assumption,' so 'baseless' in its 'character,' as he affirms. His light is proved to be darkness; for he speaks not according to the word, which declares emphatically, that having received the kingdom, Jesus will return in like manner as he ascended; and will build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen down; and will build again the ruins thereof, and will set it up AS IN THE DAYS OF OLD. And if it be asked, 'for what purpose will he return to do this?' It answers,

“That the residue of men may seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles upon whom his name is called.” (Luke 19: 15; Acts 1: 11; Amos 9: 11.)

Having written upwards of four hundred pages about this kingdom and its relations, I could, of course, in these few lines give only a few thoughts upon the subject. Those who wish to go into the matter more deeply, are referred to Elpis Israel. Let this be digested, and the reader will be effectually cured of all credence in a throne and kingdom of David beyond the skies!

I remain, Mr. Editor, in hope of seeing Jesus sitting on the throne of his father David on Mount Zion in Palestine,
Yours faithfully,

JOHN THOMAS.

From The Voice of Israel

THE RESTORATION FROM BABYLON.

There are few events in Jewish history, the correct knowledge of which is more important to the student of prophecy than that of the restoration from Babylon. Vague and unscriptural notions on this subject have misled most Christian commentators; who, by referring almost all those predictions which relate to the national prosperity of Israel to the return from Babylon, have, in place of elucidating, obscured and perplexed the writings of the Hebrew prophets. We shall therefore endeavour to place this event in its scriptural bearing and magnitude.

After Jehoiachin and many of the Jewish people had been carried away unto Babylon, and Zedekiah reigned in his stead, the prophet Jeremiah had a vision, wherein was revealed unto him the Lord's purpose with respect to those who were then captives in Babylon, and also regarding that part of the people who still dwelt in Jerusalem and in the land of Judah. This vision is recorded Jeremiah chapter 24th, where we read that the prophet had shown unto him "two baskets of figs;" one basket contained "very good figs," and the other basket "very naughty figs," which could not be eaten, they were so bad (verses 1-2).

What was represented under these images the Lord informs the prophet, in the words which follow:

"Thus saith the Lord the God of Israel; Like these good figs, so will I acknowledge them that are carried away captive of Judah, whom I have sent out of this place into the land of the Chaldeans for their good. * For I will set mine eyes upon them for good, and I will bring them again to this land," &c. (verses 5-6).

"And as the evil figs which cannot be eaten, they are so evil, surely thus saith the Lord, so will I give Zedekiah the king of Judah, and his princes, and the residue of Jerusalem, that remain in this land, and them that dwell in the land of Egypt: and I will deliver them to be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth for their hurt, to be a reproach, a taunt, and a curse, in all places whither I shall drive them" (verses 8-9).

* We learn from this vision, that they were the best of the people who were at this time carried to Babylon, and that this visitation, although terrible in its outward aspect, was mingled with much mercy.

Again, in Jeremiah 29: 10, we have the Lord's gracious message to the captives then in Babylon, in which the time when he would visit and deliver them, and bring them unto their own land, is expressly mentioned.

“Thus saith the Lord, That after seventy years be accomplished at Babylon, I will visit you, and perform my good word toward you in causing you to return to this place.”

Let us next attend to the words which are spoken concerning those who are not gone forth into captivity, but still dwell in the land of their fathers.

“Know that thus saith the Lord of the king that sitteth upon the throne of David, and of all the people that dwell in this city, and of your brethren that are not gone forth into captivity, thus saith the Lord of Hosts: Behold, I will send upon them the sword, the famine, and the pestilence, and will make them like vile figs, that cannot be eaten, they are so evil. And I will persecute them with the sword, with the famine, and with the pestilence, and will deliver them to be removed to all the kingdoms of the earth,” &c. (verses 16-18).

Hence, it is very evident that the promise of a return from captivity at the expiration of seventy years, was expressly limited to those who were carried captive to Babylon in the reign of Jehoiakim and that of his son Jehoiachin (2 Kings 24: 1-16). To the rest of the people not one word of favour is spoken; they are given to expect nothing but dispersion, with heavy judgments and dire calamities attending them in all places whither they were driven. It is of the utmost importance to bear this in mind, as it will prevent much confusion, both in thought and expression, with respect to the Lord's dealings with the Jewish people, and also enable us to form correct views regarding many prophecies which still remain to be accomplished. From inattention to this, many confound the return of the Jews from Babylon with the prophecies which relate to their general restoration in the latter day.

We are expressly told that the seventy years spoken of by Jeremiah, terminated with the first year of Cyrus (2 Chronicles 36: 20-23,) when he issued his decree for the rebuilding of the Temple, and the return of the Jews to their own land. That Cyrus' decree was general, and had respect to all Jews within his dominions, there can be no doubt; the purpose, however, which the Lord designed to accomplish by this means, was special, namely, the good word which he had spoken (Jeremiah 29: 10-11).

That there were among the captives who returned from Babylon, a small number of the ten tribes is clear from several parts of Scripture. This is easy to be accounted for, if we consider the following things. When Jeroboam set up the calves in Bethel and Dan, the priests and the Levites (i.e., those who dwelt among the ten tribes) left their suburbs and their possessions, and came and dwelt in Judah and Jerusalem (2 Chronicles 11: 13-14). And there followed them out of all the ten tribes such as set their hearts to seek the Lord, who came to Jerusalem to sacrifice unto the Lord God of their fathers (verse 16). In the reign of Asa, likewise, very many of the ten tribes joined themselves to Judah (2 Chronicles 15: 9;) and at the Passover observed by Hezekiah divers of the tribes of Asher, Manasseh, and Zebulun, came to Jerusalem (2 Chronicles 30: 11). There remained some of the ten tribes at Jerusalem and other cities of Judah, and also in their own land, after the final deportation of the nation by the king of Assyria; for Shalmaneser swept not away all of the whole ten tribes, but left a remnant of them in their own country. These, or a

part of them at least, united themselves to the two tribes of Judah and Benjamin, and became sharers with them in their fortunes. And thus it happened, that, among those who returned from Babylon, there were a small number of the ten tribes. But surely none, who give any degree of attention to the subject will say that this was the accomplishment of the numerous prophecies which speak of the restoration of Judah and Israel to their own land in the latter day, of which the following is a specimen:

“Behold I will bring them from the north country, and gather them from the coasts of the earth, and with them the blind and the lame, the woman with child, and her that travaileth with child together: a great company shall return thither” (Jeremiah 31: 8).

“When I have brought them again from the people, and gathered them out of their enemies’ lands, and am sanctified in them in the sight of many nations; then shall they know that I am the Lord their God, which caused them to be led into captivity among the heathen; but I have gathered them unto their own land, and have LEFT NONE OF THEM ANY MORE THERE” (Ezekiel 39: 27-28).

red together, and appoint themselves one head, and they shall come up out of the land (or, “come up from the earth,” i.e., from all parts of the earth:) for great shall be the day of Jezreel” (Hosea 1: 11).

HERALD
OF THE
KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME

RICHMONT, JANUARY 1851.

With this number of the Herald we resume our editorial labours in the United States. The past has been arduous and eventful, and the future, we doubt not, will be productive of interesting and important results. Of the recent past, that is, of the past two years and a half, we have much to say; but under the peculiar circumstances which press upon us, we cannot at present speak particularly. These circumstances will appear from the following brief account:

We sailed from Liverpool in the Marathon on the 11th October. This was a ship of about eleven hundred tons, chartered to convey emigrants to the United States. When her complement was complete there were stowed away in the upper and lower steerages five hundred and forty persons, principally from the Romish districts of Ireland. The lower steerage, which was a dark and loathsome hold, contained about three hundred, of whom not more than fifty had beds of straw to lie on. The filth and misery, as it appeared to us, seemed perfectly congenial to the subjects of them. The idea of getting to America was a panacea for all the inconveniences, and beyond that consummation nothing gave them the least concern.

Our cabin accommodation was excellent. Had all parts of the ship been judged of by this, it would have been deemed a comfortable and even elegant floating habitation. Its rosewood and gilded panels, its cushioned sofa and pier glass, however, were of but little concern to us who were wearied by a tedious voyage, and the incessant motion of the ship. Having been appointed

physician to the Marathon, time did not hang so heavily upon our hands as upon our fellow-passengers; nevertheless it added to our discomfort, for we were often more in need of attendance than able to look after the sick of whom there were not a few.

We were thirty-nine days from port to port. During these we had many days of calm. Two heavy gales only arose to vary the scene, all the rest were light winds until we arrived off Sandy Hook. A strong wind and tide compelled us to come to an anchor here with about forty fathom of chain cable, upon which was a powerful strain. We rode thus from Sunday afternoon until Tuesday morning, when a steam tug undertook to tow us to New York. We accordingly weighed anchor and proceeded. We got round "the beacon," but it soon became manifest that the steamer was not powerful enough to tow us round "the buoy." The strong wind and tide were fast drifting us on the shore, which, when the pilot perceived, the anchor was again let go. Nor was this done too soon, for in a few minutes more we should have been aground. We lay in this position, about half the ship's length from shore, exposed to a strong wind and tide, for four hours, when another steamer hove too and lent us its assistance. By this additional aid we were extricated from our perilous situation, and enabled to get round "the buoy," after which we had a prosperous navigation into port.

One incident only occurred to vary the monotony of the voyage, and that had nearly resulted in a terrible catastrophe. One night about eleven o'clock, as we were about sitting down to supper, our attention was suddenly drawn off from the table to things on deck. A great noise over our heads, and a cry of "Down with the helm! Down with the helm!" started us all to our feet and up the companion with a rush. The wind was blowing fresh and the ship going at ten knots, surrounded by a considerable fog. The first mate had left the bows only three minutes before when all seemed to be right a head; but on the fog opening a little a large ship had been discovered by the watch bearing right across us. A collision seemed inevitable. The helm was put down "hard a-port," which was all that could be done. The result was favourable. The ship answered to her helm, and the two vessels cleared each other within a stone's cast. A cheer announced that the danger was over, and we returned to the cabin penetrated with gratitude to our heavenly Father, that instead of being a floating wreck, or buried suddenly in the depths of the sea, we were still in the land of the living to praise him and call him blessed.

We arrived then in the United States on the 19th November, after an absence of two years and a half, in apparently good health; though, as the sequel has proved, with a latent predisposition within us to an almost fatal attack of disease. The clearance of five boxes of stereotype plates (from which *Elpis Israel* will be republished here) through the Custom House, and other matters, necessarily detained us a few days in New York. While tarrying here we accepted an invitation to lecture on "the things of the Kingdom of God." Three discourses were all we had time to deliver, and these were submitted to the public in the Hall of the Physicians' College, 67 Crosby street. On Lord's Day morning we attended at "the Disciples' Meeting House," Seventeenth street. This is occupied by the congregation which met at 80 Green street, and whose elders so gratuitously testified to the "kind of gospel" we preached, though they had never heard a word we had to say. These are now the elders of the body, and as hard hearted towards us as ever. One refused to give out the notice of our lectures, and the other's countenance fell like Cain's when on meeting him in the street the kind friend with whom we were walking, informed him whom we were. The change of meeting house is greatly for the

better. The new one is exceedingly comfortable. Dr. Shepard is their teacher at present. He is a kind, liberal, and worthy man. Of course if he hold Mr. Campbell's views our faiths are wide as the poles asunder. Of this, however, we cannot speak particularly; suffice it to say, we spent some friendly and pleasant moments together, and our conviction is, that he is worthy of better company than the illiberal and narrow-minded overseers it is his lot to be associated with. There are some worthy and excellent people in the congregation, and far too intelligent for the oversight of such men. But time and the word will remedy many evils.

We left New York on Thursday morning and arrived in Richmond on Friday night, November 29. On the following Lord's Day we spoke in the place where the brethren usually meet. A huskiness in the throat somewhat inconvenienced us, though otherwise our health seem tolerable firm. On Tuesday night, however, we were seized with a chill which introduced us to a sickness of a severer character than we have been the subject of for seven years. From December 3rd to the time we are writing this article, (January 1,) we have not left our bed. A continued bilious fever is the form of disease which has laid us low. Its effect upon us has been almost fatal. A change, however, for the better has taken place; and although our weakness is extreme and our bulk reduced to mere bone and attenuated muscle, yet we feel that we are improving, and that with care we shall be enabled to leave our bed in a few days. We long to stand upon our feet again, for there is an important work to be done, and but a short time to do it in. The Gospel of the Kingdom of God in the name of Jesus Christ has to be defined, advocated and defended, that men believing and obeying it may through the faith of it become heirs of it. Moses and the prophets must be expounded, and the great things they testify concerning the crisis that has come upon the world made as familiar to the faithful as household words. But of these things at present we are too debilitated to write more; therefore we close these remarks abruptly, wishing health and happiness to the reader till we meet again.

This number of the Herald has been sent to all our old subscribers who have given no notice of discontinuance. The terms are TWO DOLLARS, in advance. They will perceive that its appearance and typography are improved. The secret of this is the Editor is at home. Those who decline the work will please return this number; while all who retain it will be kind enough to act as if they were agents, and do the best they can to send us new subscribers to our list.

This number of the Herald has been sent to some of our friends in Britain, that seeing it they may inform us whether any copies will be required there. It can be supplied to prepaying subscribers in any part of the country on the same terms as to subscribers in the United States—that is, at Two Dollars, or Eight Shillings and Fourpence sterling the volume, which at the cost of printing in this city, is the lowest at which it can be afforded. The particular direction of each individual subscriber must be furnished as the numbers must be separately mailed.

Letters containing inquiries on any matters relative to the things of the Kingdom, from either side of the Atlantic, will receive due attention in the Herald. It must, however, never be forgotten that all communications to the Editor must be post paid.

Persons in Britain who wish to take the Herald can send their orders and subscriptions to RICHARD ROBERTSON, Esq., late Secretary of the Custom House, No. 1, Berwick Place,

Grange Road, Bermondsey, London, who will forward their names and subscriptions to the Editor.

ELPIS ISRAEL

This is the name of the work we published in London. When we come to reflect upon it the publication was really a remarkable event. Having been absent from Britain so long we returned to it almost a stranger. Those of our acquaintances we found alive were of no use to us religiously; and those to whom our name was known by report, only thought of us as one who was “the greatest enemy of their faith.” It was therefore, quite an extraordinary circumstance that such an individual should publish an octavo of four hundred pages and dispose of nearly 1200 of them in a few weeks.

The reader may know from this that there was something in connexion with this book that does not belong to books of an ordinary kind. It is considered the most readable book published on Bible subjects; at the same time one that requires thought and collateral examination of the scriptures in the reading. The author has been warmly thanked for its publication, both in public and private; and several have declared that if another copy could not be procured they would not take its weight in gold for their’s. This may be an extreme estimate of its value; but it results from the fact that it unfolds connectedly to the lover of the word of God that wonderful system of things which is revealed in the Bible. In short, it makes the Bible intelligible to the most ordinary capacity.

Now it is proposed to publish an edition of ELPIS ISRAEL in this country. It can be issued in one month from the time of going to press. The delay will therefore not arise from the work to be done; but from the time necessary to obtain a sufficiently large subscription to justify the undertaking. As soon as 500 copies are subscribed for in advance the Editor will proceed to its publication. He feels confident that the circulation of this number of copies in Virginia, among people of intelligence, would produce such a revolution in their minds that men have not experienced in this country since it was a colony. There are sufficient brethren of our acquaintance in the Old Dominion able to take up this number of copies among them and not feel it. If they would do it they could soon dispose of their copies among their friends and neighbours, and thus expedite proceedings. But our work since we obeyed the Gospel of the Kingdom has been a work of faith and labor of love. Such it continues to be, so that we have no misgivings as to the result. Elpis Israel will no doubt be published, for the difficulties are infinitely less than those already overcome in Britain. All we can do now is to make the announcement of what we propose. The work will be well got up in New York, and published with an excellent likeness of the author, engraved on steel, by an artist in London. The price of the work will be TWO DOLLARS a copy in advance. The subscriber should be particular in giving his address and in stating how he would have his copy forwarded. Further particulars will be given as we advance.

THE CRETANS.

The character of these islanders, as exhibited eighteen centuries ago, is recorded in Titus 1: 12. Many of the converts made from among them to the faith by Paul, seem to have been so inveterately imbued with their old habits of thought and action, that he despaired of making any thing of them that was even respectable in the eyes of the heathen. Quoting one of their own prophets or wise men, he says:

“The Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, slow bodies;” and he adds, as the result of his own experience with them, “this testimony is true.”

It was true not of the pagan Cretans only, but of the prominent persons in the body of Christ also in the island. These were “liars,” or as he says, “unruly and vain talkers, and deceivers.” The word “Cretan” then with us comes to designate a class of persons who profess to be “pious,” or religious, but who bridle not their tongues; but talk in an unruly and reproachful manner. We have had to do with a great many such in our time, whose pleasure it has been to prophesy evil things concerning us. The last exercise of their gifts in this way was to predict that we had absconded and should never return. The wish was father to the thought. The result, however, has proved them Cretans; and shown also that if we are able to make but few prophets for the truth, we can make false ones by the hundred. Our return has proved our detractors to be “liars;” and will be a lesson to them we hope for the future, not to judge of the principles and motives by which we are actuated, by their own evil and unsanctified imaginations.

From the Banner Extra

THE EDITOR'S FAREWELL TO HIS FRIENDS IN BRITAIN.

Having now disposed of these matters, I will conclude this defence by saying a few words of valediction to those who have interested themselves in my movements and addresses since my arrival in this country. When this meets their eyes, I shall be either on the ocean, or in the United States; so that as far as we are concerned the curtain will then be suspended between the present and the past—a past as eventful and pregnant with future wonders, nay, more so, than any epoch manifested since the breaking up of the Roman empire. Moved by the interesting and exciting events of February and March, 1848, I was stirred up, as it were, to visit Europe; and to call the attention of the people of this island to the prophetic signification of passing events, as indicative of the approach of the Kingdom of God; that those who desired to attain to it might have the opportunity of preparing themselves for its introduction. Having been so long absent from England, I arrived here almost a stranger; and although known to many who read the American and British Harbingers of an imaginative Millennium, by report, I was known only as a “half-sceptic, half-Christian, fit only for the society of Voltaire, Tom Paine, and that herd.” This is the choice and elegant phraseology applied to me by Mr. Campbell. However, notwithstanding the prejudice thus created, and the efforts made by Mr. C's partisans to prevent it, I gained the ear of the public. I believe I should be far under the mark, in saying, that I have addressed 20,000 people in this country. Being composed of various sects and shades of opinion, they doubtless heard me with very different feelings. This, however, is known, that the congregations though ever so few in the beginning increased to a multitude before I left the towns, Derby and Lincoln excepted. If one inquire, what is the result? I reply, God only knows. I have sown the word of the Kingdom as seed broadcast into the minds of the promiscuous multitude. It is for me to sow, others to plant, and others again to water, but it is for God alone in

his own way “to give the increase,” if the fruit be unto eternal life. How much of the seed sown will come to maturity it is impossible for me to tell. Others may boast in what they have accomplished, in the numbers they have converted, the multitudes they have immersed, the triumphs of the gospel through their agency; but I have nothing to boast of after this fashion. I have perfected nothing. I have ploughed, broken up the clods, harrowed and sowed the land, and “laid it by” for the present. I now wait with patience to see what it will bring forth. If my eyes be shortly closed in death, I shall rest from my “labour of love and work of faith,” ignorant of present results; but when I awake from my sleep of death, and meet my friends and enemies before the tribunal of Christ, I shall then know what the toil of the two past years has produced. I have no anxieties. The truth will accomplish its destiny, for this is God’s decree.

If it be enquired, but what has your labor consisted in since your arrival in Britain? I reply, that I have travelled through this island thrice; addressed the people 250 times, averaging an hour and a half each time; talked with them at Soirees and in private about the Kingdom, &c., early and late; written an octavo volume on the Kingdom, of upwards of 400 pages, which would only receive about two thirds of what was written; published hundreds, yes, thousands of ephemeral articles for gratuitous circulation; written a multitude of letters; and last, though not least; have published a pamphlet of forty pages octavo, intitled, “The Wisdom of the Clergy proved to be Folly.” Of this I will say a word or two to the reader. It was published by request of certain who had seen the manuscript; and relates to the Gorham controversy, the Bishops, the Church, Repentance and Remission of Sins, Eternal Life, and the Kingdom of God. A correspondent writes thus concerning it: “I have just read your dialogue with much delight. I confess I anticipated a disappointment, which I did not experience. I seldom find dialogues well written, and to that is probably ascribable an aversion I have contracted to all dialogues: I feared much I should read yours with less relish on account of that aversion than if it were written in another form; but it was quite otherwise. Probably it is better for being based on an actual conversation, and indeed it is better of that fact being made known, as in the preface or introduction. I hope it will be read in England and I wish it were read in Scotland.” Another writes, “I have read the pamphlet twice through. I first got one as a kind of favour, but I mean to get a dozen. I think it will put them all right, not only as regards ‘the Kingdom of God, and the Name of Jesus Christ,’ but also with respect to that ruinous practice they call ‘free communion.’ Every day I am seeing the truth as taught in Elpis Israel, and the pamphlet made more and more plain from the Scriptures. I wish that every man and woman who has any love for Jesus Christ were possessed of a copy. I would like to have complimented you on many parts of it, but have no time tonight; but as a whole it is the best exposure of the clergy that I have ever seen, except from the mouth of our blessed Saviour. Altogether it is a masterpiece.” I have sent copies of this pamphlet to the principal bishops including the archbishops of York and Canterbury, Mr. Gorham, certain lords and members of the committee of Privy Council and to all the daily and weekly London Journals, and principal religious magazines.

The proximate results of my labour have been the convincing of many persons that what I have laid before them was God’s truth; the baptism of several who have believed, both men and women; the regeneration of the views of a church of some sixty persons in Nottingham, who will probably obey the truth they acknowledge; the organist of the Unitarian church in Derby became obedient to the faith by which their music was stopped; a church of twelve or fourteen has been commenced in Dundee; a church in Aberdeen brought over to the faith; the greater part of

churches in Edinburg and Glasgow also, where societies have been established for the investigation of the Bible and the things brought to light in Elpis Israel. Of these societies correspondents write. "You will be glad to learn, that our Bible-investigation society in Edinburg, which had been formed during your tour north and west, has been since progressing favourably. The avowed object of the society is to know the Scriptures, and we have proceeded consistently with that avowal. No authority is recognised but the writings of the Book of God, while every available source is made subservient to our object." Of that in Glasgow another writes, "In the evening I visited it, and got my soul delighted, refreshed, and enlightened. 'What is truth?' was the subject matter, and was handled beautifully by a brother. He showed that Christ as a king, was the ruling and grand truth of the Bible, for claiming which honor and dignity he was put to death. This view he supported out and out from the Old and New Testaments. He was followed by another who tried to prove that Jesus was put to death for calling himself the Son of God. But no one supported him; but on the other hand a goodly number followed in the same strain with the first speaker. Their views of the Kingdom and Second Coming of Christ are far, far beyond what I had any idea of, and they are also very intelligent. I am sure had you been there that evening you would have been much pleased, and have considered yourself well rewarded for the reformation you had given the Glasgow people on the future reign of Messiah." From Birmingham a writer says, "We meet under the New Jerusalem Church to read the Scriptures together with Elpis Israel, and to discuss the various subjects, with a view to be as well informed as possible in the absence of a teacher previous to forming a church." In Newark "the elder" has apostatized from Mr. Campbell to the State Church, but the flock whom "he has deserted" are found on the side of "the Kingdom and Name of Jesus."

Such are some of the visible results of my humble efforts in this land. The points indicated, will I doubt not, become centres from which will radiate and sound forth the glad tidings of the coming Kingdom to cheer the hearts of the few of this generation that may yet remain to complete the number of the guests required to fill the house and table of the Lord. I have done what I could and would have done more through the press had means been more abundant. In what I have done I have the satisfaction arising from the answer of a good conscience. I have coveted no man's silver or gold, nor any thing that is his. What has been contributed has been spontaneous and of good will, though considerably short of my expenses. I mention this not complainingly; but as an evidence of the unselfish character of my enterprise. Mr. C. and those that traduce me, are worldly wise enough to look to their own interests first, before they will stir hand or foot in carrying what they call the gospel to a foreign land. This has not been my rule of action. I have served what I believe to be the truth first, to the neglect of my temporal interests. Who of them I would like to know would go abroad for two years at his own cost, trusting to the effect their preaching might produce for a mitigation of the expense, for the advantage and behoof of men of whom they know nothing in the flesh, and many of whom were their enemies and would rejoice in their perdition? This I have done, and rejoice to know that many who were filled with bitterness against me, are now among my best and firmest friends. "By their fruits ye shall know them," and by my fruits I am willing to be judged.

Farewell, then, for the present, Mr. Banner, and all the friends of truth and justice on this side the Atlantic. Having returned from a tour of 1700 miles, through Holland and Prussia, Germany, Belgium and France, I am now upon the eve of setting sail for the New World. My literary labors in the Old will close with this communication to you. For the liberality you have

shown, though agreeing with me in scarcely any of the questions in dispute, I return you sincere and hearty thanks; and hope that so long as you continue to show regard to justice, mercy, and truth, my friends in this island, who are not few, will give you their countenance and support. And that you may at length be brought to see the truth, as I conscientiously esteem it, and in the end receive a crown of righteousness that fadeth not away, is the unfeigned desire of,

Yours faithfully,

JOHN THOMAS.

3, Brudenell Place, New North Road;
London, September 26, 1850.

THE EARLY CHRISTIANS

[A tract entitled “The epistle to Diognetus” is included in the works of Justin Martyr. In the judgment of the best critics it was not written by that Father, but by some Christian who lived in the same age.]

“Christians are not distinguished from other men by their abode, their language, or their manners. They do not dwell in separate cities, or use an extraordinary style of speech, or follow an unusual mode of life. They neither propose a system devised by human ingenuity, nor countenance, like others, some human dogma. They live in Grecian, or foreign cities, each where his lot is cast, and in clothing, food, and other usages of life, comply with the customs of the place. And yet their deportment and their relations to society are wonderful and confessedly paradoxical. They inhabit their respective countries, but only as sojourners. They share in all things as citizens, and endure all things as foreigners. Every foreign country is a fatherland to them, and every fatherland a foreign country. They marry like others, and become parents; but they do not expose their offspring. They place a common table, but by no means a common bed. They live in the flesh, but not after the flesh. They pass their time upon earth, but their citizenship is heaven. They obey the established laws, while by their lives they transcend the laws. They love all, and are persecuted by all. They are not understood, and are condemned. They are slain, and are made alive. They are poor, and they make many rich. They suffer want in every thing, and in every thing they abound. They are put to shame, and in the midst of their degradation they are covered with glory. They are defamed, and are vindicated. They are cursed, and they bless. They are injured, and are courteous towards those that injure them. They do good, and are punished as evil doers; but even when enduring punishment, they rejoice as being raised to life. They are treated as foes and barbarians by the Jews, and are persecuted by the Greeks; but their most bitter enemies can assign no reason for hating them. In a word, what the soul is to the body, that Christians are to the world. As the soul is diffused through all the members of the body, so Christians are spread through all the cities of the world. The soul indeed dwells in the body but it is not the body; so Christians dwell in the world, but they are not of the world. The invisible soul is garrisoned, as it were, within the visible body; and so Christians are known as the inhabitants of the world, but their reverence for God remains unseen. The flesh hates and fights against the soul, although the soul injures not the flesh, but only restrains it from indulging its pleasures. And the world hates Christians, although they do it no harm, but only oppose its pleasures. The soul loves the flesh and the limbs that hate it; and so Christians love those by whom they are hated. The soul is shut up in the body, and yet it protects the world; and Christians are shut up in the world, as in a prison, and yet it is they who protect the world. The immortal soul * dwells in the mortal body, and Christians dwell as strangers, amidst the

corruptions of the world, looking forward to the second appearing of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.”

* Diognetus seems to have been a New Platonist, for the apostolic christians did not believe in the “immortal soul,” as it is termed. —Ed.

THE WORD.

In a word, there is no sufficient certainty but of Scripture only, for any considering man to build upon. This, therefore, and this only have I reason to believe. This I will profess. According to this I will live, and for this, if there be occasion, I will not only willingly, but gladly lose my life, should any take it from me. Propose me any thing out of this book, and require whether I believe or no, and seem it ever so incomprehensible to human reason, I will subscribe it with hand and heart, as knowing no demonstration can be stronger than this; God has said so, therefore it is true. In other things, I will take no man’s liberty of judgment from him, neither shall any man take mine from me. I will think no man the worse Christian; I will love no man less for differing in opinion from me. And what measure I mete to others, I expect from them again. I am fully assured that God does not, and therefore men ought not to require any more of any man than this, to believe the Scriptures to be God’s word, to endeavour to find the true sense of it, and live according to it. —Chillingworth.