

HERALD
OF THE
KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.

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

Volume 1—Number 12 (December 1851)

FEAST OF TABERNACLES.

“Therefore with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation,”—Isaiah 12: 3.
Before entering upon the interpretation of this verse, I will make the following extract from Bishop Lowth’s note upon this chapter: “On the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles they fetched water in a golden pitcher from the fountain Siloah, springing at the foot of Mount Zion, without the city; they brought it through the water-gate into the temple, and poured it, mixed with wine, on the sacrifice, as it lay upon the altar, with great rejoicing. They seem to have taken up this custom, for it is not ordained in the law of Moses, as an emblem of future blessings; in allusion to this passage of Isaiah: ‘Ye shall draw waters with joy from the fountains of salvation.’ an expression that can hardly be understood of any benefits afforded by the Mosaic dispensation. Our Saviour applied the ceremony, and the intention of it to himself, and to the effusion of the Holy Spirit, promised, and to be given by him. The sense of the Jews in this matter is plainly shown by the following passage of the Jerusalem Talmud: ‘Why is it called ‘The Place,’ or house, of drawing?’ (for that was the term for this ceremony, or for the place where the water was taken up.) ‘Because from thence they draw the Holy Spirit; as it is written: And ye shall draw water with joy from the fountains of salvation.’ We have already used this custom as the interpretation of these words in chapter 8.

‘Forasmuch as this people refuseth the waters of Siloah, that go softly * * * *
now, therefore, behold—the Lord bringeth up upon them the waters of the river
strong and many,’ &c.

And to this passage of the prophecy I believe that the words before us carry a reference. Of the judgments in the 7th chapter their fear and want of trust is assigned as the cause; of which repenting, they sing: ‘We will trust and not be afraid;’ of the judgments in the 8th chapter, their refusing the waters of Siloah is assigned as the cause; and now repenting thereof, they sing:

‘With joy shall we draw water out of the wells of salvation.’

That the Feast of Tabernacles, upon the last and great day of which this ceremony was wont to be observed, is to occupy a very prominent place in the eyes of the Jewish nation, and of the whole world, in that day, is declared in the very last chapter of Zechariah:

‘And it shall come to pass, that every one that is left of all the nations which came against Jerusalem, shall even go up from year to year to worship the King the Lord of Hosts, and to keep the Feast of Tabernacles. And it shall be that whoso will not come up of all the families of the earth unto Jerusalem to worship the King the Lord of Hosts, even upon them shall be no rain. And if the family of

Egypt go not up, and come not that have no rain, there shall be the plague wherewith the Lord will smite the heathen that come not up to keep the Feast of Tabernacles. This shall be the punishment of Egypt, and the punishment of all nations, that come not up to keep the Feast of Tabernacles'—
(Zechariah 14: 16-19).”

This I consider as the best commentary upon the verse under consideration, and proves that the words are not to be understood in a merely spiritual sense, but in a literal sense; for no one, after reading this passage, can doubt that it is a real Feast of Tabernacles to which the nations shall be required to come up. It remains, therefore, that we examine a little into the subject of the Feast of Tabernacles, in order to understand wherefore it should be set so prominently out, and be so peremptorily enforced, in the day of the millennial glory and blessedness. This feast, which, for the superior joyfulness and more abundant offerings, was called by distinction “The Feast,” and “The greatest of the feasts,” was held in the first month of the civil year, as the feast of the Passover was held in the first month of the year ecclesiastical. There preceded it two other feasts, held in the same month: the first, the Feast of Trumpets, on the first day, which proclaimed the entering upon the new period: the second, the Day of Atonement, on the tenth day of the month, whereby all sin was cleansed away and separated from the people. The third, the Feast of Tabernacles, commenced on the fifteenth day, in which the water was drawn from the pool of Siloam with exceeding great joy. These three feasts, following so fast upon one another in the beginning of the civil year (for until the deliverance out of Egypt the year began with this month,) point out to us three distinguishable events, in that great revolution of the Lord’s government, which shall begin at the restoration of his people. The first, the Feast of Trumpets, is thought to be commemorative of the creation, and anticipative of the restitution of all things, which shall begin to run after the harvest and the vintage of the ecclesiastical year have been accomplished (Revelation 14): and perhaps it answereth to the “great voices” of Revelation 19, or to the “new heavens and the new earth” of chapter 21. The second, the Day of Atonement, wherein every soul afflicted itself upon pain of instant cutting off by the Lord, represents that season of great trial and deep penitence with which his people shall be visited after they are restored to their land, and in which every evil and offensive thing shall be cut off and put away from the midst of them. This is described in these words of the prophet Zechariah 12: 10-14:

“And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplication: and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one that mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his first born. In that day shall there be a great mourning in Jerusalem, as the mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Megiddon: and the land shall mourn every family apart: the family of the house of David apart, and their wives apart; the family of the house of Nathan apart, and their wives apart; the family of the house of Levi apart, and their wives apart; the family of Shimei apart, and their wives apart; all the families that remain, every family apart, and their wives apart.”

This being accomplished, commenceth the third epoch or crisis of this great revolution, which is the Feast of Tabernacles: and accordingly it is said, in the very next verse of Zechariah (13: 1),

“In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness.”

This is the continuance of their estate, and the world’s estate, during that blessed period; and in their faithful observation of this Feast of Tabernacles standeth the well-being of the whole world;

in their neglect of it standeth their condemnation and destruction. Zechariah, by supposing the case of nations refusing to keep the annual festival, and by prescribing the judgments which will in that case be inflicted, doth as good as prophesy of such an actual falling away: for in the prophets there are no hypotheses without a cause, there are no mere auguries of evil: the spirit of God is too gracious and goodly to forecast the fashion of uncertain evils. And being this is supposable, but a real case, against which God would warn the nations in the millennium, as he heretofore warned Adam against the eating of the forbidden tree; being that this keeping of the Feast of Tabernacles is the condition of obedience absolutely needful for the well-being of the nations, as not to eat of the fruit of the forbidden tree was needful for the well-being of Adam in innocency: it is well worthy of consideration wherefore it should be so ordained.

Be it observed, then, first, with respect to the children of Israel, who are the proper subjects of our text, that the Feast of Tabernacles was for holy joy; and that therein were offered sacrifices in number far beyond those of other feasts; and that the people dwelt in booths constructed in the open field; all to keep up the remembrance of their having dwelt in tents in the wilderness, (Leviticus 23). The Feast of Tabernacles is in commemoration of a former houseless, homeless, wandering condition, and an acknowledgment to the Lord of all the joy and blessedness which they now possess: it is a continual saying,

“We were strangers and pilgrims, but now we have gotten from our God a city of habitation and rest.”

This our text declares the children of Israel shall with joy render unto the Lord,

“With joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation.”

There is no hint of their ever refusing to yield the obedience of that ordinance, on the tenure of which the millennial blessedness is held: they shall do it with joy and gladness: they shall acknowledge all unto the Lord. They shall year by year strip themselves of houses and of possessions, and be as their father Abraham was. They shall take the natural shelter of the woods, and thereby acknowledge that their glorious and strong city is all derived from God. They shall put themselves into the condition of our first parents, when driven forth of paradise, and acknowledge that all the magnificence of their estate is derived from Jah-Jehovah. They shall adopt the symbols of the condition of their fathers in the wilderness, when they had neither meat, nor drink, nor habitation; and acknowledge that all the abundance of the harvest with which their barns are full, and of the vintage with which the wine presses are ready to burst, is derived from Him who purchased the barren earth from the doom of sin, the curse of death, and made it to bud and bring forth abundantly. And this same thing shall the nations be required to do; but not in their own country, but at Jerusalem, in token of its being the city of the Lord and the metropolis of the whole earth; the centre of the blessing, from which it flows over all the earth; the reservoir for collecting all the praise and thanksgiving coming from the blessed earth into Jah-Jehovah, who hath made them glad. And when they shall cease thus to acknowledge the seed of Abraham as the blessing of all nations, when they shall draw off their allegiance to the nation of kings and priests; when they shall begin to conceive weariness of this yearly ordinance; when they shall conceive malice and enmity to the people who are thus honoured above all nations; then God, letting Satan loose among them, shall teach them how much they owe to Satan's restrainer, the Redeemer of Israel; for by him those malevolent humours shall be kneaded up into strong delusion, and they shall rebel against the Jews and their Divine King, and come up against the camp of the saints and the holy city in open rebellion, and fire, descending from heaven shall devour them all, (Revelation 20). This I understand to be the meaning of the

ordinance of the Feast of Tabernacles, during the blessed period unto which allusion is made in the verse before us, and with this concludes the first part of the song. —Prophet. Exp.

* * *

THE GOVERNMENTS OF CONTINENTAL EUROPE.

A certain writer hath said, “The world is governed a great deal too much.” Take, for instance, the Continent of Europe and look into how many different states it is divided, —in some instances a single nation being partitioned into a number of separate kingdoms or principalities, with different systems of government, different laws, different institutions. Thus Italy is divided into many States, and Germany into a far greater number. The result of such territorial division and subdivision and of such innumerable governmental establishments, is to dot the European firmament with a number of imperial, royal, and princely planets, each one serving as the centre of an assemblage of aristocratic stars—thus maintaining a fixity of systems and a monotonous order until some blazing comet or fiery meteor, like Napoleon, bursts on its wild and erratic path through the midst, extinguishing the planets and dispersing their satellites. But when the portentous visitation has passed and its influence is gone, the old planets light up again—the satellites fly back to their respective centres—and the firmament of Europe is once more dotted with all these false and factitious orreries. Such are the imperial, royal, and princely families of Europe: and such are the aristocracies that surround them. But do all these regal and noble families exist for the good of the millions generally, or simply for their own advantage? As a matter of course, for their own advantage wholly and solely: and it is in order that they may thus exist in their power, their wealth, their splendour, and their luxurious indolence, that the world is governed as much as it is.

It is for the benefit of the Italians that their fine country is divided into the kingdoms of Lombardy, Sardinia, and Naples—the roman states—and the Duchies of Tuscany, Parma, Placentia, Modena, and Lucca? —or is it for the purpose of affording thrones for so many royal and ducal families, each throne having its accessory aristocracy? Again, is the best part of Germany divided into a number of petty kingdoms and beggarly duchies, for the benefit of the people generally, or for the special advantage of certain royal and ducal families who have sprung up like toadstools in the feudal morass of European corruption? The reader may now understand what is meant by the world being governed too much: and he will admit it is a maxim pregnant with truth and affording food for the gravest and most serious considerations.

That country is the best defended which has the greatest number of citadels scattered about it: in the same way the system of Monarchy and Aristocracy has strengthened itself by dotting the European Continent with as many thrones as could be conveniently raised up. Yet with such miserable inequality have the territorial partitions been made, that we have, for instance, Russia an independent country with 63,000,000 of people, and Lichtenstein also an independent state, with 6,000 inhabitants. Take France, Austria, Prussia, Spain, and Turkey, whose aggregate population amounts to 112,000,000, and place those five powers in juxta position with the five Duchies of Anhalt Bernburg, Anhalt Cothen, Hesse-Homburgh, Hohenzollern-Hechigen, Hohenzollern Sigmaringen, and Lippe-Schaumburg, with their united

population of 167,000: and then let us hear what our statesmen mean by talking of “the balance of power.” It is one of the base and despicable excuses which ambitious Sovereigns, unprincipled Ministries, and vile Aristocracies have ever had ready at their fingers’ ends, to wage sanguinary wars for purposes of rapine, coercion, and tyranny. Statesmen who talk grandiloquently about “the balance of power,” with such anomalies as I have just quoted before their eyes, are worthy defenders of that English system of representation which enables an electoral district of 200 constituents to return the same number of members as the electoral district with 36,000 voters!

By maintaining so many independent States in Europe, thrones are provided for so many royal families, and an excuse is found for the existence of so many aristocracies. Every one of these independent States must have its set of Ministers, its institutions, its laws, its mint, its army, and perhaps its navy. All these are the materials or engines of government: and government is, in plain terms, the art of crushing and enslaving the millions for the benefit of a few. Let us see how the system works. The population of Europe is 250,000,000 of souls: the permanent armies, fleets, constabulary, police, &c., furnish employment to 3,000,000 of men; and the divers governments of all the States employ an aggregate of 2,000,000 of officials. The royal, aristocratic, and non-productive population generally, consists of 20,000,000. Now add the military, naval, and police forces of all Europe to the number of government officials; and you will find that you have 5,000,000 of men either employed in governing or in defending governments. Then comes the enquiry—for whose benefit is so much government carried on? The answer is—for the benefit of the 20,000,000 of royal persons, aristocrats, and wealthy idlers. Next comes the enquiry—who are they that have to be governed by those vast armed forces and that host of officials? The answer is simple: deduct your non-productive idlers, your armed force and your government officials—25,000,000 in all—from the whole population of Europe, consisting of 250,000,000, and you will find that 225,000,000 constitute the number thus governed—or, in plain terms, coerced, crushed, trampled upon, and enslaved!

Just heaven! what startling anomalies transpire to the view of him who will look a little into the significance and the meaning of those figures. But three principal and astounding facts stand especially conspicuous. The first is, that the twenty millions of royal, aristocratic, and wealthy idlers, for whose sole benefit all government exists, require five millions of men to carry out or protect their system: thus showing that every four individuals of that worthless lot of idlers need one man either to mount sentinel with the musket in defence of their idleness, or else to justify and protect that idleness by means of chicanery, diplomacy, or class legislation. The second fact that arises to startle us, is that those twenty millions are actually living luxuriously upon the labour and industry of the two hundred and twenty five millions of oppressed, half-starved, scourged, and down-trampled slaves. The third fact is, that human patience and endurance must be of the most extraordinary quality when those two hundred and twenty-five millions of labour-slaves consent to toil from morn to night at their heart-breaking work, for the positive and actual benefit of those twenty millions of thankless, heartless, merciless oppressors.

The whole system of government in Europe has hitherto proved ruinous to the nations. Europe may be divided into fifty-six States, great or small; and out of them only are without a national debt. Of these eight Switzerland is the only country of any consequence; and the absence of a debt may be attributed to its republican form of government. The other States deficient in a national debt, are Tuscany, Monaco, San Marino, and four of the smallest German

principalities. Thus, with one brilliant exception of Switzerland, and the other peddling exceptions of beggarly States too poor to have any credit at all, —every empire, kingdom, duchy, and principality in Europe has contracted enormous debts under the old feudal system of government. Has not the world, then, been governed too much, since a comparatively few families have been enabled, by their miscreant ambition or their accursed lust for gold, to entail such ruinous consequences upon millions of people? Look at the sanguinary wars which have been waged in Continental Europe to support that miscreant ambition and minister to that lust for gold. Ah! ermine may be the favourite dress for monarchs and of aristocrats; but assuredly blood is their most familiar distinction!

Not only has there been too much government in the world; but I have proved that government to be of the most infamous description. Let us take the Emperor of Austria, as he is now situated in relation to his subjects, and with all the circumstances that surround him, and inquire whether that man is reigning for his own benefit, or for the benefit of the 35,000,000 of his subjects? Look at any geography to ascertain what is the form of government in the Austrian empire, and we shall find it described as “a despotism.” A despotism? —but this implies something horribly unjust, —something flagrantly revolting to all our ideas of common sense and common justice—something that wounds our tenderest sensibilities and shocks all our better feelings! And so it is. Then by what right does this one man dare persist in maintaining a despotism towards millions and millions of his people? If they dare to tell him that they do not like his system of government, he calls them rebels—he sends out his armies to dragoon, cannonade, and mow them down—he empowers his generals to commit the most diabolical barbarities—to murder innocent children, immolate helpless old men, and flog inoffensive women. He sends hundreds to the scaffold—he fills his dungeons with victims—and he flings thousands down into the earthly pandemonia of the quick silver mines of Idria. His rage sweeps like a pestilence over Hungary—traverses the Alps without being cooled by the eternal snows of Carniola—and carries death, slaughter, horror, and dismay throughout the finest provinces of Italy. And yet this man affects to reign “by the grace of God,” and is held up as a legitimate governor whom it is treason to disobey: and if he came to England he would be received with all possible respect, veneration, and love at the English Court, by the English Queen—by her husband Prince Albert—and by the English Aristocracy, —while a large portion of the English press would attribute to him every ennobling, god-like, and estimable quality. Yet is not this man a fiend—a veritable fiend, —a demon in human shape—a satanic incarnation, whose presence on earth, if tolerated at all, should only inspire loathing, execration, and abhorrence? Really! when we look at the monstrous crimes of that man and think how he is honoured, worshipped, and adored, —then must we begin to fancy that there is something vilely partial and unfair indeed in human laws, which sent such kindred spirits as Greenacre, Rush, and Manning to the scaffold. Greenacre! why, he was an angel of light compared to some of your Emperors and Kings! He only cut one human being to pieces, whereas your crowned monsters of the Continent have butchered and massacred thousands. In fact, I know not a single murderer that ever made his ignominious exit from the world on the drop at the Old Bailey, who does not deserve to be canonised and regarded as a saint, if your crowned assassins are to be worshipped, revered, and adored.

Who, then, will dare tell us that ‘tis for the good of those 35,000,000 of people, that the Emperor of Austria maintains his power and consolidates his despotism? Who will dare tell me

that any Emperor, King, Queen, or Duke would be tolerated in Continental Europe, if the nations themselves were consulted? It is clear as the sun at noon that they would all be swept away; — thrones and crowns, aristocracies and feudal systems—not a vestige of them would be left, were the millions of the Continent disposed to assert their power and proclaim their opinion. Then why should the world be governed in its own despite? Government is necessary: this the world knows full well; and every community will, for its own sake, choose some system of government. No nation, when suddenly left without a government, has consented to remain without one: no nation, having the power to frame its own government, has neglected to establish one. No nation has ever preferred anarchy to order—chaos to discipline. Then certain and sure it is that if all the present systems of government in Continental Europe were annihilated tomorrow, far more suitable ones would be immediately raised up. The sooner this change takes place, the better. The world can do with less government, because it is more enlightened than it was formerly, and because there is a spirit of fraternity abroad, prompting many nations to coalesce federally under one system. Let us, then, hear no more of the necessity of propping up “legitimacy’s crutch” in Europe: but let us hear that the day is fast approaching when there will be no more royal families requiring thrones to be provided for them—no more aristocracies ready to revolve around those thrones wherever they are set up—no more privileged orders living in idleness upon the labour of the industrious many—no individuals having the power to scourge whole nations, nor venturing to assert the tremendous blasphemy that they are privileged to be miscreants “by the grace of God.”

GEORGE W. M. REYNOLDS.

* * *

“THE IMPIOUS ENGLISH.”

When Lord Palmerston sent a fleet to the Piraeus last year to give Russia a hint at the expense of the Greeks who had offended him, the latter, forgetting how much they were indebted to Mr. Canning for their independence, denounced his countrymen in unmeasured terms. One of their poets, named Alexander Soutzo, wrote an article in the *Siecle*, entitled “The Impious English.”

“See (says he) these ravishers, these Carthaginians, who have seized the ships of Greece. The froth of their crime can be seen floating on the sea; but, whilst a single Greek exists, he will hand down to his posterity a relation of this disastrous epoch. Courage, my friends, courage! There is a God in heaven, and the earth has not given up to the tyranny of Great Britain, like the sea. Diplomacy at Athens and at Constantinople is generously working in our favour. Already are steamers ploughing the waves, and carrying to other Courts the news of this crime of England. Behold the Emperor Nicholas raising masses of men to crush the Ottoman. Citizens of free Greece, prepare yourselves. The English compel us to become another Alexander, to cut this Gordian knot—this important eastern question. Let us recommence the war, and the nation become an entire army! Let us, under the auspices of France, Austria, and Germany, restore the empire of the great Constantine, and thus be in possession of Western Greece from the Eurotas to Istra, and of Eastern Greece from the Nile to the Euxine, with three capitals—Athens, the seat of learning; Constantinople, the seat of government; and Jerusalem, the seat of religion.

The Greeks look to Nicholas as their chief. He is indeed the Pope of their church; and is destined to overshadow his Latin Holiness of Rome. The Russian autocrat will be emperor of the Greeks in fact, as he is by community of faith, even now, when the time comes. Then, when the Lord hath bent Judah for him as his bow, and filled it with Ephraim as his arrow,

“He will raise up thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece, and make thee as the sword of a mighty man. And he will be seen over them, and his arrow shall go forth as the lightning”—Zechariah 9: 13-14.

But before this comes to pass, the presentment in the mind of Soutzo and his friends, will have been realised; “the empire of the great Constantine” will have reappeared under a Russo-Assyrian head, whose superstition will have overtopped those of Mahomet and the Virgin; and Jerusalem have become for a brief space the seat of the religion of the Greeks—Zechariah 14: 2. But before this Hellenising of the Holy City by the Assyrian shall be accomplished, “the impious English,” the divinely appointed protectors of Zion’s sons until the Ancient of Days shall come—Isaiah 18: 2, will make thy land, O Greece, tremble in every haven where her flag shall flutter in the breeze—Daniel 11: 44.

The following clip will afford some idea of the working of things in the Mediterranean. Jerusalem has become again an object of superstitious interest to the Gentiles, both Greek, Latin, and Protestant. This is necessary as the precursor to the solution of the “important eastern question,” which Soutzo says is a knot that must be cut, but cannot be untied. Russia, Austria, France, England, and Prussia, have all their consuls, priests, bishops, and missionaries there, to watch each other, and to promote their individual ambitions. The Russo-Greek interest, however, will eventually prevail; though there will be much hard fighting, and terrible bloody wars by sea and land before “the Holy Sepulchre” will fall exclusively to the Greeks. The following is a recent notice of

THE FRENCH CLAIM OF THE HOLY SEPULCHRE.

The Constantinople correspondent of the Morning Herald, in a letter of the 5th instant, writes as follows: —“The French ambassador, M. La Valette, has not yet had the good fortune to settle his knotty dispute with the Sublime Porte respecting the Jerusalem claim on terms accordant with the national and personal influence he boasts of enjoying in the Levant. It does not require a conjuror to explain the reason of this defeat. The French claim the Holy Sepulchre as their property, forcibly occupied by the Greeks and other Christian population of the Porte, and produce documents by which they endeavour to impress the validity of their proceedings. Indeed, it is stated that the Sultan has ordered the minister of foreign affairs to cease all negotiations on the above question. By her way of managing matters in the Levant, France can have little influence; and yet it is great on account of her language, which is studied, and her literature, which, of all European learning, is alone known here. An attempt was once made to introduce English in the Levant, but as it would have been a work of time, our government crushed it at once, and patronised French instead. In every principal port French schools, and excellent ones, too, are established; whereas not an English school exists, and the English youth are, per force, educated as Frenchmen. There are abundance of English children growing up here who cannot properly pronounce their names, and, as in duty bound they are every Sunday taken to an English church without understanding a word of either service or sermon. Now the French have attended to this: they have established charity schools, have sent out Jesuits to conduct

them, and have made hundreds of converts to their religion; and have now, aware of their influence, advanced far enough to claim the very Holy Land itself, which, for centuries past, has been the exclusive possession of the Osmanlis. It is time that the English government should attend to this important matter, for the English, between old residents, engineers, workmen, and employers, are now becoming exceedingly numerous in Constantinople, and there are very few parents who have the means of sending their children to England for education on account of the enormous expense. You must not, therefore, be surprised if many of our young folks become French and catholics from mere neglect.”

The real ground of the late difficulty between the governments of Britain and Greece was not manifested to the uninitiated. The difficulty appeared to be about the payment of a few thousand dollars due to Messrs. Pacifico & Finlay, two British subjects residing in Greece; and some assault and battery upon certain Ionians in the military service of England. These mighty grievances were of many years standing, and might have stood unaccommodated to this hour but for a new instance of the maritime ambition of Russia, which happened to come to Lord Palmerston’s ears. The Autocrat was intriguing with the king of Greece for the possession of a certain island in the Mediterranean which he coveted for a naval station. He had negotiated with Austria for Cattaro in the Adriatic, but had been foiled, as he will ever be by Britain in every step taken with a view to maritime competition with her in the Levant. Having received information of the intrigue, Lord Palmerston immediately demanded redress of grievances, and payment of debts. This was only a blind, under covert of which he laid claim to the islands of Cervi and Sapienza in the name of the Ionian Republic under the protectorate of Britain. The territorial, and not the money, question was the real one. England’s policy is to keep Russia out of the Mediterranean, to uphold Turkey, and to befriend the Jews. These things become more and more necessary every year to make British interests safe in India and the East. England’s policy is therefore defensive; and as Russia seeks extension in that direction, it is aggressive; and consequently the two powers occupy the relation of “natural enemies” as the phrase is. In the late dispute with Greece, Russia cared nothing about the pecuniary aspect of the question; but was remarkably sensitive on the question of the islands, which she would not consent to be settled independently of her; as appears from the following note of Nesselrode to the Russian ambassador in London: —

COPYOF A DISPATCH FROM COUNT NESSELRODE TO BARON BRUNNOW.

St. Petersburg, 8-20th February, 1850.

Monsieur le Baron, —Almost at the very moment when we were addressing to you our dispatches of the 7-19th of this month, we learnt by your report (No. 17) that Lord Palmerston, relaxing those extreme measures which he has adopted against the Hellenic government, had consented to suspend them on accepting in this difference the mediation of France.

As in our eyes the interest of the Greeks is superior to every other personal consideration, we will not insist upon the want of courtesy of which we have felt ourselves called upon to complain; and our intention is not to ask to enter, after the negotiation has begun, into a mediation already commenced, and which, perhaps, at the time we are writing, may have borne, as we hope, fruits profitable to Greece. If the good offices of France can act efficaciously in favour of the government of King Otho, and can contribute to lighten for him the weight of the pecuniary claims raised against him, we are ready to congratulate ourselves sincerely on such a

result. Nevertheless, M. le Baron, in regard to what relates to the cession of the Greek islands, equally claimed in the name of the government of the Ionian Islands, as this is not purely a question of money between England and Greece, but is a question of territory connected with the delimitation established by a treaty concluded between the three cabinets which founded the Hellenic kingdom, it would, at all events be impossible for us, in our quality of signers of that act, to admit that this question should be treated by England and France to the exclusion of Russia. We feel it our duty, therefore, to make the reservation of our rights in this respect, and you will declare this to the English government in communicating to it this dispatch.

Receive, M. le Baron, the assurance of my very distinguished consideration.

(Signed) NESSELRODE

Oh, Count Carl Vassilievitch, how disinterested art thou and thy master Nicolas! In your eyes “the interest of the Greeks is superior to every other personal consideration!” Is it indeed! And why? Because by virtue of the superstition ye mutually profess, ye are Greeks in faith, in baptism, in body mystical, and in hope—considerations superior to the mere natural accidents of birth, language, and locality. To be zealous therefore for “the interest of the Greeks,” is to be zealous for your own. Greeks in faith, your traditions are anti-Moslem; whose expulsion from the Constantinian territory, and the restoration thereupon of the dominion of the founder of your superstition, is, you suppose, and rightly too, “the salutary end assigned to Russia by Divine Providence.” This is the hope of Javan—a hope, whose realisation must precede the Hope of Israel, “whose King shall be higher than Agag, (Gog,) and his kingdom shall be exalted.”

The affair with Greece is still unsettled, because the territorial question, the most important point of all, is yet untouched. The reader will see by the following extract from a letter, dated Constantinople January 30, 1850, which appeared in the London Times, the interesting and important developments likely to result from a disagreement between England and Russia on the subject.

“The blockade of the Piraeus by the British fleet under Sir William Parker, has naturally produced a great sensation at Constantinople. The Turks dislike the Greeks, of course, and are glad to see them receive a chastisement from the hands of a foreign power; but the very vigorous measures adopted by England with regard to King Otho will, it is natural to believe, cause great irritation at St. Petersburg. Some days since M. de Titoff sent off an extraordinary courier over land with dispatches for Count Nesselrode relative to the blockade of the Piraeus. All the world saw the irritation of the Czar at the intervention of England in the question of the extradition of the Hungarian refugees. Every one remembers the conduct of the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs to lord Bloomfield. If the Emperor Nicolas were irritated then at the humiliation he was forced to undergo, his anger will now be increased by a desire to avenge the wound which his pride received at that time. The demands made by Mr. Wyse are of too trivial a nature to warrant so decided a measure as blockade. One is, therefore, led to suppose there must be some more potent motive hidden beneath. The Turks fear that the entente cordiale will be broken between France and England, and that the latter Power will have to engage Russia single-handed. Should such be the case, the first step made by Russia will be to take possession of the Danubian principalities. The Czar has but to adopt a Scythian mode of warfare, and he may successfully defy our power. We cannot send our fleet into the Black Sea; for even if the treaty

of July did not shut up the Dardanelles, there is no port in the stormy Euxine where our ships could find shelter. Sebastopol is the only safe harbour on that coast, and there are stationed 50 Russian men-of-war, lying at anchor under the guns of formidable batteries. There is no fear that the Russian fleet will leave its present quarters should a hostile British squadron be in the neighbourhood. The Czar's ships will remain where they are, and if we wish to meet them we can only do so by entering the waters of the Dnieper. We have no land force at all proportioned to the army which the Emperor Nicolas has at present stationed in the Danubian principalities, nor, had we a force disposable, are there means for employing it efficiently. It is, therefore, evident, if hostilities should occur between England and Russia, that the Czar may put into execution his long-cherished prospects of aggression against Turkey without its being in our power to interfere. We cannot make war against Russia without the cooperation of one of the continental powers, and the nation which alone efficiently serve us in such circumstances is our natural ally, France. The Ministers of the Sultan see that the representatives of France and Russia have already begun to act in concert at Athens, for both have protested against the blockade. It is this which gives at present such disquiet to the Porte; for should England engage single-handed with the Czar, Turkey will be the first and greatest sufferer."

The policy of Russia as carried out under the direction of Count Nesselrode, Chancellor of the Empire and Minister of Foreign Affairs, is the subject of high commendation by the emperor, who, in the following note addressed to him, not only expresses his appreciation of his services, but also avers his conviction, that Divine Providence has assigned to Russia the preservation of Europe from incalculable calamities, which would inevitably subvert "the bases of all legal order," and let loose an anarchy which no power can control but his. Thus he writes:

—"Count Karl Vassilievitch! —The eminent labours which have signalised your career, so gloriously devoted to the service of the throne and the country, inspire me towards you with sentiments of sincere esteem and lively gratitude. Your name, which is connected with the most striking events of contemporary history, will pass to posterity with the souvenir of the salutary influence which the power of Russia has exercised over the destinies of Europe. You were the active assistant of my well-beloved brother, the Emperor Alexander of glorious memory, in the memorable transactions which have procured to Europe, freed from the yoke of an ambitious conqueror, 33 years of peace and repose. In presence of the effervescence of public opinion, of anarchical excesses, of the disturbances which have afflicted the West, and which threatened to overthrow the bases of all legal order, you, faithfully acting up to my sentiments, have known how to direct the policy of Russia towards the salutary end assigned to it by Divine Providence. The cooperation of the military forces of Russia accorded to Austria has crushed the Hungarian insurrection, and given a mortal blow to the subversive schemes of the enemies of social order. It is thus that by the grace of God it has been once again given to Russia to preserve Europe from the incalculable calamities with which it is threatened. During the time which was required for the accomplishment of this undertaking you were constantly near me. Appreciating the importance of your services, and desirous of offering you a testimonial of my sincere sentiments, I send you herewith my portrait, ornamented with diamonds, to be worn at your buttonhole.

"I am ever your very affectionate,

"NICOLAS.

"Warsaw, 22nd August (3 September.)"

Russia's "salutary influence" is its anti-social, anti-liberal, and anti-democratic antagonism placed at the disposal of the old, decrepit, tyrannies of the West. She exercises no healthful influence in behalf of the peoples. In no country do we find her promoting the diffusion of knowledge, education, and a wholesome development of liberty. Her endeavours are to consolidate despotism as the vanguard of her own authority, and the earnest of her future ascendancy over all Europe. In doing this, she is fulfilling her appointed destiny—her divine mission, as it is in fact; for the decree hath long since gone forth, that the tyrannies of the Gentiles are to be assembled unto her, and "a guard" or protector shall she be to them. This is her "salutary influence" in their behalf. Left to themselves they could not stand three months before the liberalism of the age. They would come to an end before "the words of God were fulfilled;" and the time of birth would have arrived without any thing being produced. Democratic and Social Republicanism, however useful as an Apollyon in the earth, to embroil Satan and confound his policy, is not the end assigned to the crisis that hath overtaken the world. Russia is the protector of the thrones against the Democracy until the words of God be fulfilled. Her autocrat knows his position, and feels the responsibility; but he is blind and cannot see afar off. He sees Russia the ruler over all continental Europe, and lord of the East; but he does not see, that when her work is perfected she is "broken without hand," and the allegiance of the nations, peoples, and languages of her dominion, is transferred to the bruiser of her head, the Woman's Seed.

The autocrat is a man of faith, a firm believer in destiny. The faith he patronises is the faith so useful to tyrants, whose rule is incompatible with liberty, righteousness, and truth. Sixty, or a hundred millions of people, ignorant and superstitious as Hottentots, obedient to the traditions of Greek popery, governed by a despot for his own glory, and the honour and profit of a few thousand aristocrats and office-holders whom it may be expedient and necessary to promote, is his beau ideal of "legal order." The basis of such legality as this is what he calls "faith," and which says, "has entirely disappeared in the West;" but happily for the world, "the truth faith" still "exists in Russia alone!" Reader, what think you of that? Greek popery the true faith! "It exists in Russia alone," and the want of it is the cause of all the disorders of the world! "I have this faith," says he; "I have it firm!" How fortunate! How fortunate for Europe and Turkey just now that he is not fanatically inclined! "I am not a fanatic," says he. But if thou wert, O Gog; if thy firm faith were to exuberate into fanaticism, O then what wouldst thou do? Would it not become a principle with thee to unsheathe thy glittering steel; and, like another Mahomet, as Commander of the Faithful to lead thy hordes to battle, with the cry of "Popery or Death!?" Put not your trust in princes. They are the angels or emissaries of the evil one. They are cruel and deceitful, and know not the plague of their own hearts. They are every thing by turns to suit the policy that happens to be the order of the day. Nicolas, the Prince of Rosh, is no exception to the rule. He does not know himself. He is a fanatic, and needs only to be aroused to make manifest his "faith." None but a fanatic could give utterance to the ideas contained in the following address to the Russian and Polish Bishops, whom the Emperor assembled at St. Petersburg in 1849, translated and published by the London Times. Nicolas says:

"I do not wish for a new religion. A new sort of Catholic creed has been invented abroad, and I desire that it may not be introduced into my empire, because these innovators are the worst agitators, and without faith it is impossible that any thing can subsist. The West at this

moment offers a fair specimen of what men come to if they have no faith—how great are the follies and absurdities which they commit. Look at Rome; I predicted all that would happen there. Faith has entirely disappeared in the West. The manner in which the Pope has been treated is a plain proof the true faith exists in Russia alone; and I hope (making the sign of the cross) that this holy faith may be maintained here. I told the late Pope Gregory the Sixteenth things which he had never before heard from any body else. The present Pope is a good man; his intentions are excellent; but his principles savour too much of the spirit of the age. The King of Naples is a good Catholic; he had been calumniated to the Pope, and now the pope is compelled to have recourse to him.”

Bishop Holowinski replied—“Your Majesty, the Holy Father was obliged to yield to circumstances and the spirit of the age.”

The Emperor—“Very possibly; but all these disorders arise from the want of faith. I am not a fanatic, but I have firm faith. In the West they run to two extremes—fanaticism and impiety.” Addressing the Polish Bishops, the Czar continued—“You are the near neighbours of these misguided men; let your example be their guide. If you encounter obstacles, address yourselves to me. I will employ all my power to stem this torrent of impiety and revolt, which is spreading more and more, and threatens even to penetrate into my dominions. A revolutionary spirit is the result of impiety. In the West there is no longer any religious faith, and this evil will increase still more.” Addressing himself to the Metropolitan Bishops, and kissing his hand, the Czar concluded by saying—“We have always understood each other, and I trust that it will always continue so.”

But why trouble we ourselves with England’s quarrel with the Greeks, and the ambitions and fanaticism of Russia, in the Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come? Because the events growing out of them are the means by which the way is being prepared for the introduction of that Kingdom and Age. It becomes therefore a Herald thereof to treat of these things. The interval between the present and the Age to Come is brief; a small fragment of time, termed “the Time of the End.” It is emphatically the time of preparation—the time “afore the harvest when the bud is perfect, and the sour-grape is ripening in the flower.” The grapes upon the clusters of the earth’s vine, are not yet fully ripe—Isaiah 18: 5; Revelation 14: 18; but ripening fast. The ripening influence is found in the political phenomena which shoot athwart the heavens revealing the latent principles at work, which, though hid from the unwatchful, are perceived as beacons of faith by them who know the truth. Prophecy is being fulfilled, and ever has been fulfilled, by human policy antagonised and controlled by men and angels, to which angels God hath put in subjection the present world. The past is but the type of the present and future. Prophecy is being fulfilled as in the days of old; and is as ever a sign to them that believe. It is a light shining in a dark place by which we are enabled to watch. They who have not the light run into extremes—one saying the kingdom will immediately appear, perhaps tomorrow; another, that it will not appear for two or three hundred years; and a third, that it appeared eighteen centuries ago! All wrong, and astray, because they know not the scriptures, and are unable to discern and read the time. They know not what or where the kingdom is, how then can they know the means of its introduction. Satan’s hosts must be marshalled, and his Head must lead them on to battle. When this work is done, “Gog, of the land of Magog, the Prince of Rosh, Mosc, and Tobl,” and his army, will be encamped in Israel’s land, and in possession of the Holy City. There will be

then “the Serpent’s Head,” unsuspectingly awaiting the appearance of the Woman’s Seed to bruise him. That “Head” is the Russo-Assyrian Autocrat, and the “Serpent,” his dominion. But how comes this Serpent dominion under one head to be organised, and what induces its chief to erect his imperial palace on the Holy Mountain of the Lord? These are events pertaining to the not very distant future, which grow out of the antagonisms and ambitions of “the powers that be;” which will continue to work as they have been doing until they bring ruin upon themselves, and the purposes of God are fully established. The nations will then be awakened from their dream of political optimism under a popular sovereignty. Democracy will be taught obedience, and not to meddle with things too high for it. Kings, and priests, and nobles will be prisoners in chains, awaiting, like Agag, Adonizedec, and their contemporaries, at the hand of Joshua and Samuel, the punishment due to their crimes. Victor Hugo and his cis-Atlantic political seers, amiable enthusiasts that they are, will find their gospel of universal republicanism but the shadow of a dream. The era of revolutions will be past. The mighty God will have spoken peace to the nations. Demagogism will be suppressed, sectarianism abolished, and a social regeneration established under the heaven-born sovereignty of Jesus and the Saints. Success, then, to Russian ambition; for the speedier its consummation the sooner will “the kingdom come to the daughter of Jerusalem.” “Even so; come Lord Jesus, come quickly;” for our hope is in thee!

EDITOR.

* * *

“TRANSLATED INTO THE KINGDOM.”

We commend the following article to the attentive perusal of the reader. It was sent to the Gospel Banner in England for insertion there; but that periodical having been discontinued, it has been forwarded to us for the Herald. The writer is a young lady, formerly of the National church in that country, whom we had pleasure of assisting to the understanding and obedience of the gospel, under considerable persecution for the times in which we live. The article is well written and very much to the point, and evinces considerable progress and proficiency in the truth. We delight in such correspondents, and have but one wish concerning them, and that is, that they may hold fast their begun confidence to the end, and multiply a thousand fold. —Editor Herald.

To the Editor of the Gospel Banner:

Dear Sir—There being a good deal of disagreement among your correspondents just now as to the situation of believers, whether they be in the kingdom of God or no, I offer you a few remarks on that subject, which, if you think well to insert in the Banner I shall feel obliged.

One of the principal passages in dispute is contained in Paul’s letter to the christians of Colosse, chapter 1 verse 13.

“Who hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear son.”

There is a similar phrase in 1 Thessalonians 2: 12.

“Who hath called us unto his kingdom and glory.”

Why in the English the preposition is different in these two phrases is a mystery to me, as in the Greek the same is used. If he hath translated us into the kingdom he hath called us into his kingdom and into his glory. If christians be rejoicing in the glory, then are they enjoying the

kingdom, but we know they are “rejoicing in hope” (Romans 12: 12. Hebrews 3: 6.) of the glory, and even so are they by faith enjoying that kingdom which is theirs in reversion. And just as Abraham “rejoiced to see the day of Christ” (compare John 8: 56, Hebrews 11: 13, 27.) “afar off,” so do we “look upon Zion the city of our solemnities” and “rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory” while contemplating “by faith” the setting up, not the creation of that kingdom, the characteristic qualities of which are “righteousness, peace, and joy.”

It is too generally forgotten, or overlooked, that when the kingdom of God shall be established under Messiah the Prince, it is not the creation of a thing which has had no previous existence, but the setting up again of that which has been down. To illustrate from the word: Amos 9: 11. “In that day,” viz. (verse 9.) when the house of Israel has been sifted among the nations, and all the sinners of the Lord’s people (verse 10) are dead by the sword, “I will raise up” saith the Lord “the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it as in the days of old.” The tabernacle of David is the house and kingdom of David as can be easily demonstrated from the scriptures; they have been built once but when Jehovah took away the hedge of his vineyard and broke down the walls thereof, letting in the boar out of the wood to waste it, and the wild beast of the field to devour it, then was the strong-hold of David brought to ruin, its glory made to cease, and its throne cast down to the ground. (Compare Psalm 80. Isaiah 6: 7. Psalm 89: 38-45.)

Nevertheless though the tabernacle is in ruins, it exists; though the stakes are removed, and the cords that united them broken, though the covering of glory is rent, and the ark of the covenant taken away, yet are all the portions and materials in existence, waiting for the return of the builder, in the appointed time, to put them together and set them up in righteousness, enlarging the place of the tent, stretching forth the curtains of the habitation, and all on such an enduring basis, that it shall “never be taken down, not one of the stakes thereof ever again be loosed, nor any of the cords thereof broken.”

But, to quit the allegory—this dilapidated tabernacle, I conceive, illustrates and proves the present state of the kingdom of God. The constituent parts are existent, but all is separation, all is scattered, all is low and abased, save the King himself, who, for various reasons, has been exalted to the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens. There is He retained; his subjects are dispersed, his capital in the hands of his enemies, his land desolate; his fellow heirs, the aristocracy of his kingdom, some of them sleeping in the dust, and the rest lost and hidden from the world’s eye, yet all in some sense existent. And this is the point to which I would more particularly direct the attention of your readers, that when the kingdom is set up again, it would be incomplete without an aristocracy, just as it would be incomplete without subjects, or, without a capital, or, without a king. If then when set up, it would be incomplete without any of these component parts, each of these parts before its setting up is in fact a portion of the kingdom; and when a sinner is turned from darkness to light, from the power of Satan unto God; when he is, through the law of spiritualisation, grafted into “the commonwealth of Israel” and becomes by mystical union to the Head a member of the very body of Christ, surely it may be said with propriety that “he is translated into the kingdom of God” without necessitating the fact of the kingdom being now set up; since he is converted from his former state of uselessness to God and service to Satan, into the royal priesthood of God’s kingdom, without which necessary order that kingdom cannot be established. I trust I have made my meaning sufficiently plain, but

lest it should not be so, I will just refer to the “tabernacle of witness” to illustrate—Exodus 39: 33. The component parts tho’ in a state of dismemberment are called “the tabernacle”—“and they brought the tabernacle unto Moses.” Then follows an enumeration of the different portions, after which Moses sets it up. Again, Numbers 4, the charge of bearing the tabernacle when taken down is committed to the three families of the Levites, and yet it is said of each family, (though bearing only a portion of this taken down tabernacle,) “bearing the tabernacle”—Numbers 10: 17, 21.

With all respect I remain,
Mr. Editor, yours sincerely,
SIBELLA ANNE THORPE.

Derby, June 17th, 1851.

* * *

SINGULAR OBSTACLE TO THE ERECTION OF A BRIDGE AT ROME. —Among the curious facts which have turned up in the course of the Mortmain Committee’s rather discursive investigations, we are told that a ferry across the Tiber, at Ripetta, in Rome, could not be replaced by a suspension bridge as proposed by Pio Nono, because the penny-toll belonged to the souls in purgatory, by legacy of the original proprietor; and the security of a bridge was not held by the trustees to be half so permanent as the natural obstacle of a water privilege; and hence they refused, on behalf of the disembodied spirits, their clients, the chances of increased revenue from the “work pontifical,” which might some day be declared toll free.

* * *

HERALD
OF THE

KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.

RICHMOND, VA., DECEMBER, 1851

“FACTS ARE STUBBORN THINGS.”

The present is the last number of the first volume of the “Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come.” In commencing it we promised no more than is implied in the title—to publish “the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the Name of Jesus Christ.” This implied promise we have not failed to perform; but have laboured diligently, and in all good conscience and sincerity, to enlighten our subscribers, and to make them “wise” in the wisdom and knowledge of God, as he hath revealed it to his servants the prophets of Israel, and the apostles of Jesus. We have earnestly endeavoured to enlighten them that they might be saved in the kingdom; so that being there, they may “receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing”—Revelation 5: 12, with David’s Son and Lord, as joint-heirs with Him who is Heir of all these things for evermore. We have burned gallons of “midnight oil” in the development of our arduous, but self-improving and agreeable, enterprise. We have suffered

indeed from weariness of flesh and spirit; still, though surrounded by discouragement on every side, we have never flagged—our course has been onward, untiring and as yet untired. And be it remembered, this uncheered perseverance is not a thing of yesterday, but an affair of seventeen years persistence. He that knew us in the beginning finds us now as then, “examining all things; seizing upon the good”—1 Thessalonians 5: 21; and without reward, or fear of consequences, making it known that others may share and enjoy with us the fruits of our research. We speak boldly, and as some may suppose, boastfully in these details. Be it so. “As the truth of Christ is in me,” said Paul, “no man shall stop me of this boasting in the regions of Achaia.” We testify of facts, and commend not ourselves in doing so; for we have done no more than we ought to have done, and could not have done less without hazard of condemnation by the Lord at his coming. But we remind others who believe of these things, and who are better able than we to go and do likewise, that we may “provoke them to love and to good works,” that they may lay up in store for themselves a good foundation for the future (eis to mellon) that they may lay hold of the life of the Age to Come—1 Timothy 6: 17-19. We have proved our devotion to the truth, and disinterestedness in its advocacy, by our works as the indispensable manifestation of the perfecting of our faith. We desire to see others do the same, that they may not be dismayed and put to open shame at the coming of the Master. “WHAT HAVE YOU DONE?” and not “what have you professed?” will determine the acceptance of the saints. If their doings are resolvable into mere words that cost nothing but a feeble effort to pronounce them, they can have no part in the kingdom of God and the Age to Come. Thus saith the Lord; therefore let no man be beguiled by vain deceit.

In regard to the Herald, seeing that we have done our part, we would enquire have our subscribers performed theirs? Some of them have not—why, we are not prepared to say. All who did not return the First Number constituted themselves subscribers for the volume, as it is written on page 27, “all who decline the work will please return this number.” About forty retained it and continued to receive it for several numbers, and then ordered its discontinuance without payment, thereby discrediting themselves and inflicting a loss of forty volumes upon us. Others from want of due reflection, we suppose, or perhaps, from an impression that we can print without money as well as preach, and that consequently all the “patronage” the nature of the case demands is to take it out of the office and read it gratuitously, have failed thus far to pay up their dues. Some of these kind, but inconsiderate and as yet unprofitable “patrons,” have not paid us for several years. What can we say of such? Can we commend them, and hold them up as bright and shining lights worthy of all imitation by the friends of literature and truth? If all our subscribers had “patronised” us with such truly “spiritual” patronage as this, we say not where should we have been, but where would have been the Herald of the Age to Come? Non est inventum! In the lowest sheol of literary abortions. But why is this? Why are our friends so remiss? Some of our profitable patrons—vos sane patroni estis—have suggested as the solution of the quandary that we do not “dun” them; for that certain are so constituted that they have no idea that any necessity rests upon them to pay their dues unless their creditors are incessantly knocking at their consciences. We trust, however, that this is not the case with our subscribers. It is true that we have done very little in the dunning way. It is a business we do not like, though we see it is practised very much by others. There ought to be no necessity for an editor even to hint a word about money in a paper subscribed for by persons who profess to be in search of truth by which they hope to “make their fortunes” to all eternity. Would they not willingly pay two dollars to a man who would only show them where by hard labour they could dig out gold

by little at a time? And do they begrudge to pay the same paltry sum to another who they profess to believe is able to show them where they may find, and how they may secure, eternal riches? There is an appearance of ingratitude, ignobleness of mind, and ungenerousness of disposition in such treatment of their friend who is subjecting himself to much trouble and some hazard for their improvement and everlasting weal. “The liberal deviseth liberal things; and by liberal things shall he stand”—is it a liberal thing to make an editor work for nothing and find himself? Will our subscribers in arrears study this text, and in as short a time as may be, make a practical application of the discourse?

We say so little about our wants that we fear our friends, with very few exceptions, have taken up the notion that we have no necessities at all! They receive their papers regularly; they read of our journeying from the States to Britain, travelling over that country in all directions, visiting the Continent of Europe, returning to America, “running to and fro” in Virginia, and finishing for the time being with a tour to Baltimore, New York, Boston, Halifax in Nova Scotia, and return—a journey exceeding 2000 miles; they find no appeals to their pockets for money to indemnify us for our time, labour, information, and expenses before we will go forth to diffuse the knowledge of the Gospel of the Kingdom; when among them, they see us well clothed, they hear no tale of distress, contributions of money are not solicited—if they give, they give; if they don’t, they don’t; and there’s an end on’t:—we make no personal applications for subscriptions to our works, and so forth, but leave all the cooperation we receive to emanate spontaneously from our friends themselves as the result of the inworking in their hearts of the truth believed. Knowing what incessant appeals are made by others for money to carry on their operations, they naturally, but not scripturally, suppose, that if we were in want of funds we would dun the public likewise. But if they really imagine this, they neither know us nor the principles and spirit which actuate us. When it comes to this that we can only carry on the work by squeezing unwilling counters from our friends, we shall wash our hands of their cooperation and retire to private life. It has puzzled many to divine how under all the adverse circumstances we have had to combat we have been able to persevere and keep afloat? When they have read the following statement their perplexity will not have considerably diminished; we will just tell them however so much as this, that the rule by which we work is—reduce personal expenses to the minimum and little money will be needed to supply them; economise that little, and there will be the more to spend in the service of the truth. We work by this rule, and its results will enable us, we think, to compare with the richest of our friends when the Lord shall confront us before his Judgment Seat.

The following is a statement of arithmetical facts showing what has been expended and how much has been received in the work of carrying on the Herald, and advocating the gospel of the kingdom from January to Christmas of the present year.

STATEMENT.

Subscriptions received for Herald	\$405.00
Donations received over actual travelling expenses	<u>\$186.75</u>
Total receipts for the Herald and Lectures	\$591.75
Aggregate expense of printing The Herald	<u>\$527.95</u>
Balance	<u>\$ 63.80</u>
Forty volumes spoiled by illegal Discontinuances	\$80.00
Subscriptions due on current volume by "patrons" actually receiving it	\$400.00
Time, labour, writing materials and knowledge, furnished for twelve months at the moderate estimate of	\$500.00
Keeping body and soul together while employed in editing; with current family expenses	\$500.00
Seventy lectures (besides home service for which no charge is recorded) this year at less than the ordinary clerical or "evangelical" compensation	<u>\$350.00</u>
	\$1830.00
Offset by balance including \$10 Counterfeit on Exchange Bank of Virginia	<u>\$63.80</u>
Editor's contribution to Gospel	<u>\$1766.20</u>

We do not think the above estimate an exaggerated one. We have supplied 200 copies to individuals at our own expense thus far; which, we opine, is a tolerably "liberal thing" for one of our means. We have also set down a thousand dollars for wear and tear of body, soul, and spirit, in the affair of editing. One of the political editors of this city gets eight hundred dollars a year for a narrow column, about a page of the Herald, per day, and often less, of a small neutral sheet. He gets no abuse, nor is there any reproach attached to the work he performs. Not so with ours. We are the jest of scorners, and held up to contempt by editors and advertisers in the public papers. This makes our editorialism worth something more in this life than his; we have therefore set down \$1000 and reproach, as about editorially equivalent to \$800 and peace and quietness. And besides, if one D. S. B., a Campbellite "evangelist," at Louisville, Kentucky, in 1843, was not over-paid at \$1000 per annum for three one-hour speeches a week, we conscientiously believe our services from morn till eve, week after week, are not over estimated at the same price.

The seventy lectures have averaged two hours each though some of them occupied three hours and a half. "Evangelist" D. S. B. would deliver in a year 156 speeches, which at his per annum would be \$6.41cts. a speech. Our seventy discourses come within sixteen hours of the duration of his hundred and fifty-six; and according to the scale propounded ought to be rated at eight hundred and ninety-seven dollars, and forty-four cents. But we have been moderate and put down the whole at three hundred and fifty; though we believe there are but few who would travel upwards of a thousand miles to speak fourteen hours for two dollars and fifty cents an hour: but we did so 0 per hour and fifteen dollars minus for expenses at that.

But, let it not be objected, "Oh, this is not money out of pocket!" True, it is not; but it is something expended of more value than money. Time, labour, and knowledge are capital; money is only the interest thereof. A money capital of \$2000 at 6 per cent per annum will only produce \$120; while \$1766, our contribution to the gospel, is the interest of 28,000. The capital we have devoted to the service of the truth for years would have made us rich in the things that perish had we applied it to the practice of our profession. Our old religious enemies in this city that hate us cordially, would employ us nevertheless, if we would return to Esculapian pursuits. But no; shall we turn from the service of the gospel of the kingdom to serve ourselves in patching up the crazy mortalities of the children of the dust for filthy lucre's sake? Not so long as we can make the world our debtor, and by labouring in the vocation of the gospel "lay up for ourselves a good foundation for the future." The time of a physician is valuable, for when professionally employed in a city it will yield greater returns than most other pursuits. We regret not the sacrifice we have made of the last seventeen years of our existence; we would repeat it could we retrace our steps; and God willing, we intend to spend the remainder of our days after the same sort. We will do all that is possible; more than this none can expect us to perform.

But, Oh, this "cooperation," what do men mean by that? Must we answer the question experimentally? Were we to do so we should point our reluctant finger to that ominous "balance" in the statement above! Knowledge confessedly precious, and a whole year's valuable time and labour, the contribution of one man, added to \$63.80 bestowed by the many. This is equality and fraternity, cheering to the heart, and strengthening to the hands of the mighty few who have to bear the burden and heat of the day! And what is this delectable cooperation for? For our own individual advantage and behoof? We refuse to accept it upon any such understanding. When we want money for our personal necessities we can do better than toil night and day for \$63.80 per annum. Is it then the cooperative contribution of the many for the service of the gospel? Is this the estimate the many put upon the gospel of the kingdom which they say is defined, proved, and advocated in no other paper in the world? Ought they not at least to contribute \$500 independently of the subscribers to perpetuate it? And would that after all be doing any thing to boast of?

Cooperation is two or more persons working together to one end. What is that "one end" in the case before us? Is it to support the editor of the Herald, or to diffuse the knowledge of the gospel of the kingdom among the people? If it be said, "to support the editor of the Herald," the editor begs leave most earnestly and respectfully to rejoin that he wants no such cooperation, and thanks no body for even suggesting it. But if it be said, "the one end of our cooperation is to diffuse the knowledge of the gospel of the kingdom for the obedience of faith," that is a working

together to a mutually profitable, honourable, and praiseworthy end. But cooperation is “a working together.” What does that mean? Is it all the work, all the hazard, all the self-denial, shall be laid upon one man, while nearly all the rest are devoting themselves to their temporal interest and enjoyment? We do not so understand the matter, nor do we acquiesce in such a definition of the thing. There is no reason why we should bear all, and others next to nothing. Will any physician or farmer change “cooperation” with us? Will he give us his practice or his farm and take our place? He will get no reward in heaven for serving himself in his secular calling; surely the exchange will be profitable, for our labour in the gospel will be recompensed in the kingdom of the Age to Come.

Such is the report with which we conclude our editorial labours for 1851. Next year the world will be on fire; and in the midst of the blazing elements we should regret having no medium of thought with the faithful, through which to stir up their pure minds by way of remembrance respecting the things coming speedily upon the nations. We shall therefore venture, if spared, to continue the Herald through 1852. We hope that at the end of the year we shall be enabled to report considerable improvement in their ideas of “cooperation,” and that they have learned that they are responsible to God for the diffusion of the knowledge of the gospel among their contemporaries as we, neither more nor less; and that our service, however abundant, is no discharge for their activity, self-denial, and contribution to the war.

* * *

“BEARDED WISDOM.”

An article has been forwarded to us by a friend in Britain intitled “The Pope and Dr. Thomas, the Prophet,” a caption that sounds in our ears very much like “The Devil and Dr. Faustus.” It is from the pen of the editor of “The Reformer’s Gazette,” a political journal of extensive circulation in Glasgow. Our friend says concerning it, “I enclose you a satisfactory document from the Gazette. It speaks the higher to your commendation because of the party it emanates from, who (although highly respectable both in character as a citizen and as an editor) is the very last in retracting even when discovered to be wrong.”

The caption of the article does not accord with the editor’s statement concerning us. He styles us “Dr. Thomas, the prophet,” yet says of us candidly and in truth that we “did not pretend to be inspired, but simply to interpret prophecy by the light of history.” We are neither a prophet, nor the son of a prophet; nor are we an evangelist, an ambassador of Christ, an apostle, nor a successor to the apostles. These appellations assumed by “ministers” and “clergy,” belong only to christian men spiritually endowed “for the perfecting” of such “for the work of the ministry.” Though there are many pretenders to these titles they possess them only by self-imposition, not by the bestowment of the Holy Spirit; for instead of being perfected for the work, and therefore infallible teachers—“workmen that need not be ashamed rightly dividing the word of truth”—they are but inexperienced apprentices unskilled in the oracles of God. We protest against being named in the same category with these. We are not of their series, order, or genus, having no attributes in common with them. They are indeed esteemed highly by the world, but not by us. We are a christian layman, who has studied the Bible without regard to their theologies, or systems of divinity; and has too much self-respect to be identified without protest with such a

motley crew. We desire to be respectable, and no one is so who pretends to a character he is not entitled to. All we undertake to do is to show what God has revealed in the scriptures “shall come to pass hereafter” in setting forth the glad tidings of His kingdom. If we are inspired we do not know it. We wish we were; for then we could speak and write by inspiration, which would save us much labour and anxiety. We know the truth, which is indeed an inspiration to any man who understands it. But beyond this we make no pretensions, and have no sympathy or fellowship with any that do.

The editor’s allusion to our beard is quite amusing. He seems to demur to the respectability of its appearance. But editors, as doctors, do sometimes disagree in theory and practice. If the editor of the Gazette prefer to appear like “a beardless boy” all the days of his life, our admiration of puerility is not so extreme as his. The gravity, heroism, dignity, and excellence of the ancient world are with the beard; the levity, effeminacy, dandyism and servility of all ages with the smooth-faced shaveling of ignoble mien. In these days when mankind is struggling to attain its manhood, the beard asserts its right to appear in all its fullness upon “the human face divine.” It is the symbol of manly thought and action uncontrolled by human imbecility; and therefore it is proscribed by the Pope, the Autocrat, and shaveling priests, and held in disrepute by all who look up to them as the respectabilities of the age! We can, however, assure our friend the editor that whatever “wisdom” we may be supposed to possess is not consequent upon the wearing of our beard; but our refusal any longer to inflict punishment upon our face and feelings from mere conformity to ridiculous and tyrant custom, is the result of it. Our “wisdom” is derived from a source which is accessible to every man who will renounce sectarianism and its traditions, and with child-like docility study the scriptures in the light of grammar, history, and unsophisticated reason, which is unadulterated common sense. It is gratifying to find that our words have not been forgotten, and that events in the political world are demonstrating their truthfulness to others, as well as to ourselves.

We are informed that Mr. Kidston, mentioned in the article, “is one of the great men of the city (a magistrate of Glasgow) who travelled through Italy, and has been to Rome, and has since been lecturing to show that the Pope is now dethroned, &c., because the French army is required for his support.” More than this we “ken” not concerning him. The article can now speak for itself. —Editor.

THE POPE AND DR. THOMAS, THE PROPHET.

Some of our readers may recollect that about two years ago, soon after the bombardment of Rome by the French, we had a visit in this city of a gentleman with a very long beard, who interpreted prophecy with wonderful gravity and precision, and who seemed to bring to the task considerable scriptural erudition, without apparently any of that raving enthusiasm which is the usual and prominent characteristic of reverend-looking pill-doctors, self-glorifying latter-day saints, oratorical Swedenborgians, and other individuals of that description pretending to the valuable gift of inspiration. Dr. Thomas was a grave, sedate, and, barring his long black beard, a very respectable-looking personage. He had, moreover, a particular way of his own, an intimate and enlightened knowledge of passing events, a considerable acquaintance with history, and enough of scriptural and etymological science, to impart a peculiar force and power to his

expositions of prophecy. He did not pretend to be inspired, but simply to interpret prophecy by the light of history.

We have been induced to recur to the learned expositions of this individual at present because in the recent and present position of Rome, it must be confessed that his interpretations appear to be very strikingly verified. At that time the Pope was an exile, and people were generally expecting that the Popedom would be overturned entirely. The Doctor said this was impossible, because it was predicted in some chapter in Revelation, to which he referred, that Rome and the Papacy would perish together, and the Doctor maintained that the inhabitants of Rome had not within themselves sufficient power of resistance to cause the entire destruction of the city in repelling the French arms. He very clearly and positively maintained that the French would not only take, but would occupy Rome for some time—it might be for some years; that the Pope would be recalled to Rome, and that at length the destruction of the city, as well as of the Papacy would be effected, by an attempt on the part of the Austrians to dislodge the French from the city, leading to a fearful collision between those great powers, of which Rome would be the theatre, and which would terminate at last in the expulsion of the French forces entirely and the utter overthrow of the city. In this struggle, said Dr. Thomas, Austria was to be backed by Russia, and latterly Russia was to take the lead in the movement, and after arraying the absolute powers of Europe against France and crushing that republic, —after doing all this, even the northern Autocrat himself was to be defeated at last in a struggle with Great Britain, while marching through the heart of Turkey to invade our Indian Empire. (This is not stated so precisely as we affirmed it. It should read, “in a struggle with Great Britain by the Lord from heaven unexpectedly and suddenly revealed while he is combating in the heart of Turkey on his march against the British empire in the east.”—Editor Herald.)

There was something so exceedingly plausible in this prospectus of possible future events, that it struck us at the time as worthy of notice in these columns, and accordingly we ventured to give our readers a sketch of the Doctor’s prophetic vision and the interpretation thereof. We did not expect, however, that the course of European events, up to the present time, would have so fully justified the Doctor’s prophetic sagacity. Whether his wisdom lay in his long beard we know not, but it is beyond dispute—and we strongly recommend the fact to Mr. William Kidston’s notice—that everything has happened precisely as Dr. Thomas foretold in 1849. The French took Rome without utterly destroying it; they occupy the city to this day; the Pope was brought back and has been making himself greater than ever; he is now heartily tired of the presence of his French friends, and has strongly recommended that they should withdraw from Rome, and allow the Austrians, on whom he places greater reliance, to occupy the city in their stead. Lastly, by the latest accounts, Austrian troops have actually advanced into the Papal States; it is strongly surmised that they have done so on the invitation of the Pope, and without the consent of the French. We leave our readers to judge what the consequences may be, and to place as much or as little faith as they like, or as future events may seem to justify, in Dr. Thomas’ beard. Perhaps if the expected or predicted collision should occur soon, the Pope may disappear from the horizon altogether, and the Papal Aggression Bill may become a superfluous measure, even before it passes through Parliament. Judging from its present rate of progress, of which it may be said that—

“Even in its very motion there seems rest”—this is by no means unlikely.

* * *

EXTRACTS FROM CORRESPONDENCE.

No. 1

To the Editor of the Herald.
Bermondsey, London,
August 2nd., 1851.

My Dear Friend:

From the numerous communications which I continue to receive from parties interested in the truths you advocate, it undoubtedly would appear that considerable benefit has been derived by many, who have thereby been induced to disenthral themselves from the “vain traditions of men,” and seek, from the fountain of truth, “the things pertaining to the Kingdom of God.” I would nevertheless remark that some explanatory article in the “Herald,” from your able pen, on the subject of baptism, might prevent several from clinging to peculiar dogmas somewhat resembling “baptismal regeneration,” and who are disposed to adopt the rite of baptism—which, doubtless, is figurative of the cleansing power of true belief—as a magical means of effecting such purified state of man and fitting him for the operation of the Holy Spirit, thereby falling into Jewish error in substituting the mere figure, or shadow, for the substance.

The voice of “peace and safety,” (1 Thessalonians 5: 3) or “peace, peace,” foretold by prophets, and apostles, as the fatal prelude to “sudden destruction,” is being uttered amongst the nations, whilst the said delusion is loudly responded to from the pulpits in this country, aided by the Peace Congress in Exeter Hall; and even the far-famed Chrystal Palace is deemed to have no small share in furthering these anticipated palmy days of lasting joy.

That we, my dear friend, may continue on our watch-tower, and in the end be accounted, by reason of our faithful warnings, free from the blood of men, is the heartfelt desire of

Yours very faithfully,
In “Israel’s Hope,”

R. ROBERTSON.

* * *

No. 2

OPINIONS CONCERNING THE “SYNOPSIS” AND “EXEGESIS”—THE GOSPEL
OF THE KINGDOM PROGRESSING—OUR ENDEAVOURS APPRECIATED.

England, October 2, 1851.

“Your Herald has just come to hand containing the “Synopsis of the Kingdom” with which I am highly delighted. I am sure you do indeed deserve the love and gratitude of all your friends for your constant and unremitting endeavours to enlighten us and to build us up in that faith to which we have committed our eternal destiny. That passage on “THE TEMPLE” which speaks of the six abolished things superseded by the more excellent and enduring substance is splendid; as also that passage in “THE SERVICE” on pages 283-284. Oh, that is inexpressibly beautiful! I read it, and my full heart found vent in tears, for I had no one near with whom I might commune on things unseen as yet. How perfect and admirable is that system which

Jehovah has constituted. The contemplation is overwhelming when our faith can realise the future glory, and calculated to make us look on ourselves (or rather I should speak only for myself) as unworthy of being clothed with such immortal honours. But at the same time the bare idea of the possibility of falling short is too dreadful to be entertained except briefly as an incentive to greater energy in striving for that prize set before us in the gospel. Surely I may not lose it—surely all united with us in Christ Jesus now may be glorified with us in the day of his appearing.

“In regard to the “Exegesis” concerning the restoration of sacrifices on page 233, it is excellent. A few of us here thought much upon the subject before your attention was invited to it. I satisfied myself, but not others. I noticed that not the daily offerings, but the yearly sacrifice of reconciliation Paul states to be put away by the one offering of Jesus Christ; and that it is not the yearly atonement which is reinstated in the future temple, but only the daily offerings. Thus I found there was no real contradiction. I am very thankful that you have so clearly elucidated the subject. In a letter received from Mr. —, he expresses his satisfaction, and his obligation to you for the trouble you have taken in this matter. It would do your heart good to read his letters, and to see his devotion to the truth.

“The Gospel of the Kingdom, through the testimony of the youth whom you immersed with us, has recently brought five men in Nottingham to the obedience of faith. Many of the congregation with whom they were associated are questioning their state before God, and I should not be surprised if ere many weeks be past more renounce their sectarian baptism, and submit their hearts in truth to the Lord.

“Brethren G., A., and your friend Dr. H., are about commencing a meeting in London at the house of the latter gentleman. I asked bro. G. if he had any message for you as I was writing. I transcribe his reply—“I have nothing particular to communicate to the doctor but kind love to him as a labourer in the field, ploughing and sowing the seed for the harvest; and that I am anxiously looking forward to the time when the Kingdom shall be established in our Father’s land, endeavouring to keep myself by the will of God in readiness to meet our Lord and Master, the King of kings, and Lord of lords.” In these sentiments I unite. And how much do we not owe you. Be assured you have a place in our hearts which none else can ever occupy. Our love cannot be shown in much besides words now; do you think there will be opportunity for the manifestation of affection in the kingdom? * (See next page.) Surely there will, and then you will know ours for you. Our hearts desire to return something besides words as a testimony and acknowledgment of the benefit received from you. And many there are who respond to the same sentiments. May God speed you onward, blessing and being blessed!

“But, I must say farewell. May we meet again ere long; and may we attain that which is our hope. The anchor is still within the veil; and though my barque is often in troubled waters, yet I trust in God I shall not let go my hold. Oh pray for me and for us all, that we may be kept from falling, and that our arms may be made strong by the mighty God of Jacob. This is my prayer for you, beloved brother. Accept the assurance of my unabated love, and believe me ever yours affectionately in Christ Jesus.

T. A. S.

* * *

* Yea, verily. That is the very place where love, joy, peace, and all the affections of the mind, will be perfected. Paul looked to the coming of the Lord in his kingdom as the time when there would be a reunion between himself and his children in the Lord, and they would rejoice together—he, because they had attained to the salvation he preached; and they, because of their renewed association with the beloved friend to whose labours in the gospel they are indebted for the eternal blessedness they possess—1 Thessalonians 2: 19. There will be no ground of reproach between them; on the contrary, “I was sick, in prison, in necessity, and ye ministered abundantly of your poverty unto me, and in so doing proved your devotion to our Lord and King.” Can there be ought but love and gratitude manifested between such when their reunion occurs in the kingdom of God? —EDITOR.

* * *

A British Consul is stationed in Jerusalem on account of the Jews. He has been sent to the Holy Land with special instructions to interest himself in behalf of the Jews, and has for his district the region formerly attached to the Twelve Tribes. —Narrative of Mission to the Jews, p. 149; 1839.

* * *

EXCOMMUNICATION OF QUEEN ELIZABETH.

The following paragraphs form a part of the “Damnation and Excommunication of Elizabeth, Queen of England, and her adherents,” by Pope Pius in the year 1570.

“PIUS, FOR A PERPETUAL MEMORIAL OF THE MATTER.

“I. He that reigneth on high, to whom is given all power in heaven and on earth, committed one Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, out of which there is no salvation, to the one alone upon earth, to Peter the Prince of the Apostles, and to Peter’s successor the Bishop of Rome, to be governed in fulness of power. Him alone he made Prince over all people, and all kingdoms, to pluck up, destroy, scatter, consume, plant, and build, that he may retain the faithful, that are knit together with the band of charity, in the unity of the Spirit, and present them spotless and unblameable to their Saviour. In discharge of which function, we who are, by God’s goodness, called to the government of the aforesaid church, spare no pains, labouring with all earnestness, that unity and the religion, which the author thereof hath for the trial of his children’s faith, and for our amendment, suffered to be exercised with so great afflictions, might be preserved uncorrupted.

* * * * *

“IV. Being, therefore, supported with this authority, whose pleasure it was to place us, though unequal to so great a burden, in this throne of justice, we do, out of the fulness of our apostolic power, declare the aforesaid Elizabeth, being a heretic, and a favourer of heretics, and her adherents in the matter aforesaid, to have incurred the sentence of anathema, and to be cut off from the unity of the body of Christ. And, moreover, we do declare her to be deprived of her pretended title to the kingdom aforesaid, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever: and also the nobility, subjects, and people of the said kingdom, and all others which have in any

sort sworn unto her, to be for ever absolved from any such oath, and all manner of duty, of dominion, allegiance, and obedience; as we also do, by the authority of these presents, absolve them, and do deprive the same Elizabeth of her pretended title to the kingdom and all other things aforesaid. And we do command and interdict all and every one of the noblemen, subjects, people, and others aforesaid, that they presume not to obey her, or her admonitions, mandates and laws; and those who shall do the contrary, we do innodate the like sentence of anathema.”

* * *

THE NEW COVENANT.

“We are not yet put in possession of that New Covenant described in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and quoted by Paul in the eighth chapter of the Hebrews, which is made to Israel, and, in Israel, to all the world; (for she is as it were the mediatrix and mistress of the nations at the time of her restoration) for the fourfold blessing of that covenant will by no means apply to any visible body at present on the earth; and only in the way of an earnest will apply to the spiritual church, which is invisible, and cannot be said to contain Israel, or, as little, to contain all men. We have had the covenant confirmed in the blood of Christ, and we have received the heavenly manna, and the waters from the rock, and the everlasting righteousness, and, for our faithlessness, we are wayfaring in the desert till the appointed times and seasons shall have been accomplished. We have not yet entered into our rest, any more than Paul, or the Hebrew church had entered into theirs; but we are looking for it in that city whose builder is God. We are under our prophet, who, like unto Moses, is conducting us; we have a prophet, and we have a priest, but we have as yet obtained no king, because we have not obtained the kingdom which cannot be removed, but look for it.”—Proph. Exp.

THE LAND OF ISRAEL.

“When Christ had dedicated the New Covenant with his own blood, and become proprietor of the Land of Israel, it was his to do with it what he pleased. And because it hath pleased him to let it without a condition against the day of Israel’s redemption, and in the meanwhile to wait his Father’s good time, He is to be held the sole proprietor of that land in fee simple; and the Jews, with whom he shall confirm the New Covenant, shall receive it of him in everlasting possession: and till then, every one—be he Turk, or be he Papist, or be he Jew, or be he Christian—who says that one stick, one stone upon it, is his, is a liar. It is Immanuel’s land; and those who dwell in it would do well to regard themselves as mere locum tenentes; or rather, indulged with a residence there, until the time come that his waiting be concluded, “and the Lord shall no more hide his face from the house of Jacob.” This claim the prophet puts in, when, in one word, he calls it Immanuel’s land.”—Ibid.

* * *