

**HERALD**  
**OF THE**  
**KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.**

**“And in their days, even of those kings, the God of heaven shall set up A KINGDOM which shall never perish, and A DOMINION that shall not be left to another people. It shall grind to powder and bring to an end all these kingdoms, and itself shall stand for ever.”—DANIEL.**

-----  
-----

JOHN THOMAS, Editor. RICHMOND, VIRGINIA, May, 1852—  
Volume 2—No. 5

---

THE RELIGION AND MORALS OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

We reproduce the following well written and truthful sentiments, from an article which appeared in No. 8, Volume 17, of the “Southern Literary Messenger,” intitled “The Nineteenth Century.” The writer seems well convinced of the fact, in regard to popular religion and morals, that “all is not gold that glitters.” He sees many dark spots on the disc of “the glorious Nineteenth Century.” He has not been struck by the sun of “gospel light now shining;” therefore he retains his senses, and can see things very much as they are—a mere travesty of the truth. We do not remember that we wish to alter a sentence; but would earnestly commend it to the attentive perusal of the reader, that seeing “the corruption that is in the world through lust,” he may repent and turn to God, and obtain forgiveness, and eternal life and glory in his kingdom, which is destined to rule over all. The following is the extract:

“Estimated by their immediate and material results, the arts and sciences were probably never in a more flourishing or brilliant condition than they are at present. They subserve all the purposes of Aladdin’s lamp and have proved the magic instruments of the wonderful development of our material resources. The augmentation of wealth by their aid, and its rapid diffusion through all the viaducts of national production, have been such as might have amazed even the wildest credulity. We may well speak in terms of high laudation of the present intellectual condition of the world, and deem that a boundless heritage of good is before us, if we are content to judge of intellectual achievements by the beggarly and false canon of a monetary scale, and to estimate science with the spirit of Mammon. If a man was designed to be a mere money-making machine, then great is Diana of the Ephesians, and greatest of all her worshippers is Demetrius, the silversmith. But if human destiny points to other aims, the Nineteenth Century must be judged by other standards. All may be gilding and glitter without, but when we look more closely, and with less sordid vision, at the condition of the world,

what is the fruit of the aggregate operation of all our arts and sciences, and systems, and intellectual schemes? What is the harvest which we have reaped from our alleged intellectual greatness in Religion and in Morals, in Politics, in Society, and in Private Life?

“Growing discords and dissensions in Religion: —the abandonment of old doctrines and the substitution of new ones in accordance with the dictates of a vague, unreasoning fantasy: —a fretful restlessness and a feverish lust of change: understanding subordinated to inconsiderate zeal, and the meek performance of duty exchanged for an ignorant and verbose faith—a general indifference to every thing but the lifeless shell of the various creeds—the soulless formulae which do not so much serve to embody truth, as they suffice for a mystic incantation, by which to recognise the initiated: \* —the severance of religious prescription from any controlling influence over our ordinary avocations: —the impotence of such Christianity as is current in the world to check the lust of gold, or to direct to ends sincerely, not ostentatiously, charitable the employment of our means; —its utter isolation from all practical authority over our relations to our neighbours in life; —and its almost meaningless restriction to ascetic, splenetic, individual, dreams and fancies. We greedily grasp at the rewards which religion offers in the promise of heaven, and we enter into the service of God with the same spirit with which we seek the mines of California. We avail ourselves eagerly of the threatened condemnations off the wicked, in order to assign them to our adversaries, and thus pour, in no scriptural sense, coals of fire on the heads of our enemies. We liken the Courts of heaven to a Bankrupt Court on earth, and recur to both with scarcely dissimilar hopes, when our own efforts or follies have threatened us with temporal ruin. These things, and things like these, comprise nearly the whole extent of the power of Christianity over the mass of our modern societies, and with the blind recognition of some inherited or accidentally acquired ritual, constitute the body and soul of our religion. Whither have fled those strong bonds of sympathy, charity, and mutual attraction, by which it was to unite all the sheep of one shepherd into one fold? What weight do we attach to its denunciation against avarice? or what significance do we practically recognise in the solemn declaration that we cannot serve two masters—God and Mammon?

---

\* “Formularia,” says Leibnitz, “sunt quaedam umbrae veritatis, ac plus minusve ad puram mentis lucem accedunt. \* \* Sed pluris contingent ut devotio ritibus suffocetur, lumenque divinum humanis obscuretur opinionibus.” Praef. Theod. Leibnitzii Opera. Ed. Dutcris. Tom. I., p. 36.

---

“When the ordinary apprehensions of men, religious in their professions and self-estimation, attach so little real importance to religion, it is not to be wondered at that the spirit of the age should be marked by wide-spreading infidelity; nor that the arrogance of Science and Philosophy should endeavour to reconcile the popular practice with the conclusions of reason, by explaining away the divine nature and supernatural significance of Christianity, as has been done by Strauss and the German Rationalists; or by overwhelming, after the fashion of Hippo and Epicurus, all divine agency under the play of phenomena, and the functions of secondary laws, as has been attempted by Comte.

The human mind yearns for obedience to the supremacy of a law: the heart of man pines for submission to the authority of a God: —these are necessities of our nature: —and the law will be recognised and the God adored, although, through our blindness, we fancy the dream of a fevered imagination to be the one, and discover the other in the calf made with our own hands. But, when the aspect of religion in the world is such as has been represented; —oscillating as it is through all the shades and degrees of infidelity, indifferentism, mysticism, ignorant zeal, adhesive credulity, and ascetic formalism; — assuredly it is as bad as the blind boasting off their sight, when we lend our voices to swell the noisy chorus of those who laud and magnify the intellectual glories of the present time.

“Does the world fare better in point of Morals than it does in respect of Religion? Is the age of implicitly believed Illuminism entitled to all its own praises on the score of its sublimated morality? When our Religion is so impotent and inoperative in regulating and determining the procedure of our daily actions, it could hardly be anticipated that men would yield a permanent obedience to the feeble dictates of the unsanctified conscience. It is true that the distinction has been widely drawn even by Christian philosophers between Religion and Moral Prudence, and between religious practice and moral propriety of conduct. It is a distinction which we are reluctant to admit; for we think that, if permitted to be drawn, it concedes the argument to all the infidel casuists, and that it has tended more than any thing else to ostracise Religion from the ordinary avocations of life. It is reverting in principle, if not in terms, to the difference conceived by Sulpicius and Varro between the religion appropriate to the philosophers and that which is requisite for the vulgar. Moreover, even in the hands of those who have established the distinction, it has left morals a purely negative virtue, comprising little more than abstinence from those open vices and flagrant crimes which are punished by the secular laws. But, conceding the distinction, what is the moral condition of this enlightened and purified generation? We may be referred to Penitentiary Reports and Statistical returns, which furnish only the anatomy of crime, inasmuch as it may be a violation of the municipal law: —yet even they bear but feeble testimony to the supposed excellence of the age. But when we look more carefully into the phenomena of the civilised world around us, do we find that any obligation is habitually regarded as sacred in private practice; or is any duty habitually enforced by the strong coercion of public sentiment, or the stronger influence of the conscientious observance of the right? There is none. The ideas of obligation and duty have given place to considerations of gain and expediency: immutable right and unchangeable wrong are measured and tested by the surplus or deficit of their aggregate money returns. Our lives are guided over the vast ocean of existence, without compass and without rudder, at the mercy of the shifting gales of interest, passion and caprice: impulse has usurped the functions of principle, and calculation is substituted for conscience. Rare indeed are those who are actually governed by the noble maxim: *Fais ce que dois, advienne que pourra.* (Mde. De Stael. *De l’Allemagne*. Ptie. iii., chap. xiii.) Not merely our systems of Moral Science, but still more our ordinary practices, are desecrated by beggarly notions of Benthamite expediency. Both are controlled by the wretched fallacy of the greatest happiness-principle, which transferred from the Benthamite Cabala into what Touchstone calls “the vulgar,” means not the truest happiness of the greatest number, but the immediate

gratification of the most important number—Number One. Thus all action is introverted, and turned from the contemplation of duty and of God to the isolating, debasing, corrupting consideration of self. The bounds of society are thus rotted and broken asunder; communities are no longer held together by the latent, because deep-seated ties of dutiful correlation among its members: they exist by the mere force of outward pressure, by temporary interest, or by the pure apathy to every thing but money, which prevents their internal disorganisation from producing actual severance. Of those great principles of duty, which are the foundations of all domestic, individual and public morals—family rights and obligations—which one has not been publicly scorned and is not habitually disregarded? The reverential obedience of children to parents is a dim recollection of a less enlightened age: —the sanctity of the marriage tie is obliterated in the advocacy of the freedom of divorce, and the assertion of the chimerical rights of women. Respect for age, and veneration for the dead, promise no returns for our outlays, and are therefore cashiered as sentiments unworthy of our intellectual advancement. These cankers of our domestic tranquillity have eaten their way into the very heart of society, which is thus left without the regulating influence of the vital principle within: —without the moral restraint of unquestioned obligations: —and is wholly given up to the fluctuating and factitious guidance of transient expediencies. How the hollowness and corruption of the age are illustrated by the demoralisation of the vicious eras which have preceded it! The pages of Aristophanes and Thucydides, of Machiavelli and Guicciardini, portray the rottenness of our present social system as clearly and not less truthfully than the philosophic expositions of Comte, or the wild declamations of Carlyle.

“When private morals are so loose and unstable, whence should we expect any fertilising dews to descend upon public virtues? All our political organization is effete and corrupt: Cabinets held together by the private interests or the peculation of their members: —governments sustaining themselves by plunder and systematised bribery: —parties united by the greed of appropriating the spoils of office, and warring with each other for their possession: —catchwords usurping the place of principles of statesmanlike policy—public men staking the interests of their country, often even of humanity, with their consciences and votes, on the hazard of a die, which is more important as settling their own temporal prospects, or as deciding the loss or gain of a bet, than as determining the procedure of great nations, or as affecting the welfare or misery of a large portion of mankind. Such are the phenomena of politics here and in Europe: and to this depravity of the leaders is united the uncertainty of nearly every rule of law, and of every maxim of political wisdom. Everywhere the highest and most permanent interests of the human species are shuffled about and ultimately sacrificed to the diabolical rivalries of personal avarice. As if any thing were wanting to complete the confusion of this moral chaos, a specious but deceptive Philanthropy steps in, with sanctimonious unction, glorifies its own silly and ineffectual labours, and proclaims the wreck to be the glory of advancing civilisation achieved by the mighty intellect of the Nineteenth Century.”

\* \* \*

DIFFICULTIES PRESENTED.

Dear Sir:

I have read the book you have published by the title of Elpis Israel, and am much pleased with it, especially that portion treating of the promises made to the fathers, the Kingdom, &c. But I find in reading the New Testament, some portions of scripture that do not appear to agree with your exposition. In Matthew 16 it is written, "that there be some standing here which shall not taste of death till they see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom." Matthew 24: 30, it is written, "they shall see the Son of Man coming in the clouds of Heaven, with power and great glory." Matthew 13: 26, testifies to the same thing. See Luke 9: 27. It is true that the power of God was in the Roman army at the destruction of Jerusalem; but in what sense did Christ come in his kingdom then; and if this be his second coming, where is the promise of the third? In relation to the dead sleeping in the dust of the earth till the resurrection, it is written in John 3: 13, that "no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven," &c; but then I find it recorded in 2 Kings 2: 11, that Elijah was taken up into heaven by a whirlwind. There is the case of Enoch also; and of Moses and Elijah on the mount, at the transfiguration. I should like very much to hear your views on the above named passages. By so doing you will confer a great favour on one that wishes to know the truth as it is in Jesus Christ.

Very respectfully,  
Your friend and well wisher,  
J. T. NORMENT.

Henderson, Kentucky, April 14, 1852.

\* \* \*

#### DIFFICULTIES CONSIDERED.

CHRIST COMING IN HIS KINGDOM—RETURN OF JEHOVAH'S GLORY TO JERUSALEM—CHRIST'S PERSONAL APPEARANCE AT HIS COMING—THREE COMINGS, BUT ONLY TWO APPEARINGS—ELIJAH NOT WITH JESUS—CHRIST NOT YET AN ENTHRONED CONQUEROR.

Dear Sir:

In the preceding communication you propose the inquiry—In what sense did Christ come in his kingdom, (at the destruction of Jerusalem,) and if this be his Second Coming, where is the promise of the third? —in reply to which I would say that if you have understood me to teach that Christ, that is, the Anointed One, came as king in his kingdom, in the sense of that kingdom being set up, at that epoch, you have mistaken my words. You will see by Matthew 10: 23, that the Son of Man was to come in some certain sense before the apostles had preached "the Gospel of the Kingdom" in all the cities of Israel's land. The sense in which he did come in those days is indicated in Matthew 22: 7. —He came in sending forth his armies of Romans, and by them destroying his murderers, and burning up their city Jerusalem. This was coming according to the legal maxim, which is a scriptural one also, that what is done by one's agent is done by one's self. That Gentile and Pagan armies may be God's armies is testified in Joel, where the Chaldeans who destroyed Zion are styled "his army"—Joel 2: 11; and in Isaiah, where the Medes

under Cyrus are termed Jehovah's sanctified and mighty ones for his anger—Isaiah 13: 17, 19, 3.

If you turn to the Herald of the Kingdom, Vol. 1 No. 10, page 217, you will find how variously the word “kingdom” is used in the common version of the Bible. When the Son of Man sent his armies to destroy Jerusalem he came to his kingdom, in the sense in which Louis Phillippe (to compare great things with small) would have gone to his kingdom had he sent an army into France to overthrow the Republic there. If the Son of Man were present at the siege of the city he was not visible to the combatants. Visible or invisible, it matters not which, so that he was there, he had both come to his kingdom, and was in his kingdom, in the sense of being in the royal territory or land of Israel, which is a basiliad, and not a ducal, or republican, domain—a territory, where kings have, and “a King will reign and prosper, and execute judgment and justice”—Jeremiah 23: 5; 33: 15.

But the passages you have quoted do not refer to the coming of the Son of Man to destroy his murderers and their city. They refer to his coming in power and great glory as King de facto as well as de jure—in manifestation as well as of right; an appearing which Jesus says shall occur when he shall reward every man according to his works—Matthew 16: 27; and which no one, I suppose, will pretend to say happened at the destruction of the city. This context of the scripture, cited by you, likewise indicates the coming of the Son of Man in his kingdom at the time of his appearing in the glory of his Father with his angels; “and then,” saith the word, “he shall reward every man;” for “Behold the Lord God will come with strong hand, and his arm shall rule for him: behold his reward is with him, and his work before him”—Isaiah 40: 10; 62: 11; Revelation 22: 12.

By taking the twenty-seventh verse of Matthew sixteenth, with the twenty-eighth, you will perceive that the coming of the Son of Man in his appearing in his Father's glory, as well as in his own glory, and that of the holy angels—Luke 9: 26, —even that glory which is to be given to him when he is brought before the Ancient of Days to receive the “dominion, glory, and kingdom,” as revealed in Daniel, “that all people, nations, and languages should serve him”—Daniel 7: 13-14, 27. So obvious is this that in some original manuscript copies of Matthew the phrase *en tee basileia hautou*, rendered in the common version in his kingdom, is represented by *en tee doxee hautou* “in his glory.” Both phrases convey the same data to him who reads the New Testament in harmony with the Old; because, for the Son of Man to come in his kingdom with the angels, is for him to appear in the glory which he receives of his Father; and to appear in his glory, or majesty, is to come in his kingdom—this coming and appearing are concomitant and inseparable events. They are the manifestation of what Ezekiel saw in vision when standing, as it were, at the gate of that temple hereafter to be erected in Jerusalem by “the man whose name is The Branch”—Zechariah 6: 12-13; even by that man whom he describes as of a bright and glowing, amber-like appearance, sitting upon a sapphire throne—Ezekiel 2: 26-28; 40: 3. From this similitude of Jesus in his glory a voice proceeded, revealing to him the things off the invisible future pertaining to the kingdom. In vision he was brought to “the gate that looketh toward the east,” that is,

towards the mount of Olives; “And, behold,” says he, “the glory of the God of Israel came from the way off the east: and His voice was like a noise of many waters—Revelation 1: 13-15: and the earth shined with his glory”—Revelation 18: 1; Ezekiel 43: 2. This Glory-Bearer of Jehovah in Israel having in vision entered the Millennial Temple, thus addressed Ezekiel from within concerning the place in which he was speaking—“The place of my throne, and the place of the soles of my feet, where I will dwell in the midst off the children of Israel for ever, and my holy Name shall the children of Israel no more defile, neither they nor their kings \* \* \*. Now let them put away their whoredom, and the carcasses of their kings far from me, and I will dwell in the midst of them for ever”—Ezekiel 43: 7-9. By consulting the scriptures referred to it will be clearly seen, that Ezekiel, Daniel, Zechariah and John, all write of one and the same personage, that is, Christ, and therefore of Jesus whom we believe to be the Messiah of Israel. Jehovah reveals to us through them that Christ is his terrestrial glory-bearer, even the chief of the Cherubim of glory, through whom he will shine forth in the Age to Come. That he will come from the way of the east, and alight upon mount Olivet, where Jehovah’s glory stood when about to ascend from Israel’s land in the reign of Zedekiah—Ezekiel 11: 23—to return no more until it shall be borne by Christ (who also ascended from the same spot) when he shall appear in power. He reveals also that when Christ shall shine forth from the east as the Sun of the New Heavens, he shall rise upon Jerusalem and them that love her “with healing in his beams;” and upon his sapphire-throne therein established reign in the midst of Israel as king off the whole earth for ever. This is the New Testament appearing of the Son of Man in his glory and kingdom, unto which we are invited as joint-inheritors with him in the gospel of the great salvation—1 Thessalonians 2: 12.

But do you inquire, How will he appear to human eyes when he is thus manifested in the glorious majesty of his kingdom? Read the narrative of the transfiguration, and your inquiry will find the best answer that can be given. Here were three witnesses who tasted not of death till they saw “his majesty,” or the glory with which he will be invested when he sits as King of Israel on the throne of his father David’s kingdom, which is also “his kingdom,” and “the kingdom of God.” These eyewitnesses in mortal flesh saw him as he will appear “at his appearing and at his kingdom”—kata with accusatives at in the sense of in. His personal appearance will be earth-illuminating wherever he goes, and shining as the sun—the Spirit of the Father as from electro-magnetic poles glowing through an incorruptible body. He will “shine as the brightness of the firmament, and as the stars, for ever and ever.” Hence he is styled “the Bright and Morning Star”—Revelation 22: 16, having “a countenance as the sun shining in his strength”—Revelation 1: 16—the Day-Star of the morning that dawns—2 Peter 1: 19—at eventide—Zechariah 14: 6-7. Moses’ face shone with glory—the Spirit glowing through mortality as the changed exterior of Jesus; how much more enduringly brilliant the Spirit’s glow through incorruption! “The moon shall” then indeed “be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when (Jesus) the Lord of hosts—Revelation 19: 11—shall reign on mount Zion; and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously”—Isaiah 24: 23.

Now this transfiguration scene is styled by one of the eyewitnesses “the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ,” “his majesty,” “the receiving from God the Father honour

and glory”—2 Peter 1: 16-18. Peter had made known to the elect sojourners off the dispersion “the power” of Jesus, and reminds them in this place that he had made known to them also “the coming” as illustrated in the representation on the mount. He says, that what he told them was “no cunningly devised fable,” but a reality which will assuredly come to pass. He saw it, and John and James also saw it; yet he saith, “We have a more sure word of prophecy to which ye do well to take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place.” In this saying Peter magnified the testimony of the prophets above his own. Consult the prophets, and remember their words; they will remove a multitude of difficulties imagined by those who consult only the brief narratives and epistles of six of the apostles and two of their companions; and among these obscurities that off the coming of the kingdom, and Jesus in it, in the last days of Israel’s commonwealth under the Mosaic law.

The phrase “second coming” is not scriptural. “Christ will appear a second time,” says Paul, “to them that look for him \* \* \* unto salvation.” There are three comings, but only two appearings. John the Baptist preached Christ’s coming—Acts 13: 24, which was the first; Jesus declared of himself that he would come before the apostles should have preached in all the cities of Israel, which coming was the second; and lastly, the apostles preached his coming to subdue all things to himself, to raise the dead, and to reign over the nations, which is the third. Christ’s first coming was an appearing in humiliation; the third coming will be a second appearing, not however in humility and suffering, but in exaltation with power and great glory. At the second coming there was no appearing at all.

In regard to your difficulty concerning Elijah, I would remark, in view of the words of Jesus you refer to, that Elijah, though in heaven, is not in the heaven indicated by him. Jesus really said, “No one hath ascended into the heaven, except he from the heaven having descended, the Son of Man he being in the heaven.” When he spoke these words he had not ascended—John 20: 17; but when John wrote them he was in the heaven where he hath remained ever since. “Being in the heaven” he will yet descend from it at his second appearing; and being descended he will then be the only one on earth who hath ascended to the heaven, and descended from it. But you will perhaps inquire, where is this particular heaven? I reply, where the Father is en tois ouranois tois hypseelois in the highest heavens—the region of light “which no man can approach unto”—1 Timothy 6: 16. It is there the Uncreated Majesty of the Universe resides sitting upon his throne. Neither Enoch, Moses, Elijah, nor any other terrestrial, hath gone there. Jesus, of all terrestrials, is nearest to that throne, but not upon it. He is “at the right hand” of the Paternal Majesty—Hebrews 1: 3; 8: 1; 12: 2. There may be others at that right hand from other systems of the Universe; but there is none other than Jesus there from ours. Even he is at the Eternal Father’s right hand in the highest heavens for a time only; that is, until the time comes to re-establish Jehovah’s terrestrial throne in Zion, when he will be seen by mortal eyes at the right hand of power in our terrene abode—Matthew 26: 64. “I sit down (ekathisa) with my Father on his throne,” saith the Lord Jesus. When? We ask the question, because ekathisa is in the indefinite tense. It is not now certainly, because it is testified that he is at present “at the right hand of the throne of God,” and therefore not upon it. When does he sit down upon the Father’s throne? When Jehovah’s

throne, upon which David and Solomon sat, shall be restored. This restoration will be the result of Christ's foes being subjected to him by omnipotence; therefore saith the Father, "Sit thou at my right hand until I make thy foes thy footstool. I will send the sceptre of thy power out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies"—Psalm 110: 1-2. Jesus doth not grant to sit down in his throne hereafter, because he hath overcome and is now set down on the throne of the Universe; but because he overcomes and sits down upon Jehovah's throne, restored in Zion at his appearing in his kingdom. Enikeesa and ekathisa in the twenty-first verse off the third of Revelation are both aorists, leaving the time of the conquest and enthronement unfixed; the nineteenth chapter, however, shows that they will both be subsequently to the overthrow of the kings of the earth and their armies, which is contemporary with the utter destruction of the Beast and False Prophet. It can no more be said of Jesus that he has overcome or conquered, than it can that he is enthroned, while "the powers that be" exist and do according to their will, and tread his land, city and people, under foot. When he shall have overcome, and shall have been enthroned in David's kingdom, he will then be able to reward his joint-heirs by giving them "power over the nations," and a share with him in his throne. But not before.

I know not in what part of the heavens Enoch, Moses, and Elijah are. All the information given us upon the subject is that they are in heaven; that is, not on the earth. It is certain that they are not "at the right hand of God." That is the place of honour for Jesus only; he alone being "the Man of Jehovah's right hand, whom he hath made strong for himself"—Psalm 80: 17; that he may "strike through kings in the day of his wrath"—Psalm 110: 5. Thither hath no man ascended save the Son of Man. He has been there many centuries, but the time of his departure from that far country is near at hand, when he will come suddenly and stealthily, and spoil Satan of all his ill-gotten goods, chattels, and effects.

May we not only "watch," but all put on the wedding garment, and keep it unspotted from the world, that when he appears we may not walk naked, and be put to shame.

In earnest hope of Israel's consolation,  
I remain,

Yours faithfully,

THE EDITOR.

April, 28<sup>th</sup>, 1852.

\* \* \*

#### INFANT-RHANTISM INSTEAD OF CIRCUMCISION UNTENABLE.

Dear Brother:

The Paedo-baptists in their controversies with us believe that they have in the substitute relation of Christian baptism to circumcision, a stronghold of defence for the practice of infant sprinkling: deducing from this proposition the conclusion that, as

infants were of old the divinely appointed recipients of the primal token of the first ordained "Covenant of Promise," the new one conveyed in baptism, which has superseded it, may, by a parity of reasoning, be legitimately communicated to them now. Their inference would be plausible, perhaps, if sprinkling were baptism, which it is not; and the immersion of an infant the "one baptism" of the Messiah's institution, which it is not either. But if the propriety of calling the name of the Lord in immersion of an infant were a correct deduction, it is obvious, that the doing so in sprinkling might not be such at all. To those, however, who view the subject in the light irradiated by the doctrine of Christ, the fallacy of their conclusion in itself, as well as their erroneous application of it, is fully apparent; and their stronghold is seen to be a very insecure entrenchment. Permit me to exhibit this in a few remarks on the Covenant tokens of circumcision, and the name of the Lord.

As I have intimated I believe their premises to be true and scriptural, and therefore reconcilable and consistent with the scripture truth, that an enlightened, faithful, adult is the only fit recipient of the three-fold name of God.

Of the import of circumcision there can be no dispute. Concerning it God said to Abraham, "It shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you;" and Paul declares, "Abraham received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of his faith." It was at once a seal and a token; a seal in submitting to whose impress he received a ratification of the "exceeding great and precious promises," which God had given to him; and a token, a memorial of them, and witness to him of their certain fulfilment hereafter. To his descendants also in the line of Isaac and Jacob, circumcision was an individual ratification of the covenant made with their federal head; certifying to each of them their joint participation with him, so long as they walked in the footsteps of his faith. And found without it, they had no part with Abraham; for Jehovah had said of the uncircumcised "That soul shall be cut off from his people." Thus circumcision, as an indispensable seal of conveyance, invested each obedient Israelite with a title to inherit the blessings of the covenant when the time should come for its promises to be present realities; these being an everlasting and coetaneous occupancy with the Christ whom Abraham "saw afar off," of the land of Canaan; and of the incalculable increase of Israel, with their future dominion over, and ministry of blessing to, the nations. I am aware that it is urged against this view of the significance of circumcision, that that institution was connected with the law rather than the gospel; in proof of which, Paul declares its recipients under an obligation to keep the law; resulting simply and solely from their being circumcised. It is true that he does this, but circumcision is nevertheless, as to its design, "not of Moses, but of the fathers." It was instituted antecedently to the law, though it bore afterwards an important relation to it. This arose from its character as a mark distinguishing Israel from the gentile world around. It exhibited their separation from the nations, as a people consecrated to their God and King; to whom beneath Sinai's mount, they had vowed fealty and subjection. By affixing on each one a badge of his relationship to Abraham and Abraham's God, is asserted Jehovah's right to his loyal obedience; showed him a subject of Israel's Divine Monarch; and therefore "a debtor to do the whole law" promulgated by his sovereign. But this was not the primary import of the "token;" its bearing on the law was accidental and irrespective of its design. We see

this illustrated in the fact, that its observance was discontinued, and even in apostolic teaching, prohibited; whilst the disciples remained subject to the Mosaic code in many things. Though they did not look for justification from it, they were nevertheless obedient to its civil requisitions; and did not scruple on some occasions, to conform to its religious ceremonial, as in the case of Paul, who, to convince the Jews that he walked orderly and kept the law, fulfilled with four others the vow of a Nazarite; to complete which, he must offer by the priest two lambs and a ram for a burnt offering, sin offering, and peace offering.

But to return. This covenant still remains the charter of the rich recompense of our reward. Its seal of circumcision is set aside; it has no longer significancy. But the covenant, being in force, must have, judging by the analogy of the past, now, as formerly, some initiative and memorialising “token.” That the name of Jesus communicated in baptism, the only institution of our Lord’s, except the commemorative supper, is the substitute of circumcision, may fairly be inferred from its supplying its place as an inductive and indispensable ordinance, bringing its subjects into a new position towards God and towards his people, essential to the realisation of covenant blessings in the future. “The uncircumcised shall be cut off from his people;” and the parallel is, “except a man be born of water and of the spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” “Baptism doth now save us.” Admitting its substitute relation to circumcision, the substitution itself—the change of the ordinance may be accounted for as resulting from events which transpired in relation to the Christ, viz: his manifestation, death, burial, and resurrection; or rather from Jewish incredulity of his Messiah-character of whom they were witnessed. —These facts formed as it were a codicil to Jehovah’s will, bringing in the death of his representative testator, and affirming that Jesus of Nazareth was he. These supplementary articles being of equal force and verity with the testament itself, their rejection necessarily invalidated faith, which had respect only to the covenant as dissevered from them; for it is not a part of the truth, but the whole—the things of the kingdom and the name—which constitutes the one essential faith. Had Israel as a nation received these truths, it does not appear that an alteration of the covenant token would have been requisite; for though it might have been expedient for Gentile introduction into the church, yet we cannot say that these would ever have been “grafted in,” but for Israel’s unbelief. Had they nationally acknowledged Jesus of Nazareth for their king, the new ordinance might have been superfluous. But as they rejected the superadded codicil there was hence a necessity for an institution, in which the minority who received it might express their faith therein; might be identified, and distinguished from the rest. — This was supplied in the command, “Go and teach all nations, baptising them into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.” The ambassadors of Israel’s King went forth accordingly; and, as we read, “baptised into the name of the Lord Jesus.” Thenceforth circumcision became a rite of the past, and was put away as a thing effete; for it was a “token” only to those who believed promises, independently of the then present commencement of their fulfilment. To the mark in the flesh was substituted the name of Jesus, called upon the believer in Him in an immersion of divine ordinance. This is christian baptism—a taking of the name of Jesus indicative of a recognition of his Messiah character in the bath of “pure water” of his appointment. In view of this, how significant is this name? How pregnant with meaning our invocation of it! The name—it

is for us the badge of saintly citizenship as circumcision was of old; the title to every faithful one who bears it to an everlasting possession of Palestine in resurrection glory. And one reception of it—it is our witness to Jesus that he is very Christ; our testimony before God, and angels and men, that he is Jehovah's Son, and Israel's Prophet, Priest and King.

Now it will be evident that a recognition of the Messiahship of Jesus having become indispensable to participation in "the blessing of Abraham" an individual interest in this could no longer be ratified to an infant of days, because it must of necessity be incapable of acknowledging the Son of Mary. It is therefore that we see the voluntary subjection of an intelligent adult required to the new token instead of the passive reception of infancy. Baptism is predicated on a confession of Jesus as the Christ, and this no babe is capable of; therefore to baptise, to say nothing of to rhanitise, an infant, either Jewish or Gentile, is a palpable absurdity.

But apart from this consideration, the Gentile is ineligible to receive the token of a covenant made with Israel only. Abrahamic sonship is the divinely appointed qualification for admittance to heirship with Abraham. Jehovah said to him "I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed." Every Israelite being of his seed by natural birth, was, in virtue of this, entitled to receive the token until it, and, by necessary consequence, its subjects were changed. But the Gentile was excluded by the very terms of the covenant. The Paedo rhanitists lose sight of this. Because the infants of Israel were eligible to the primal token they suppose the offspring of Gentiles are so now in relation to its substitute, which is certainly a not very logical deduction. They do not consider that the Gentile is born an alien from Israel's commonwealth, and consequently cannot enjoy the citizen's privileges. He can stand naturally in no relation to it save that of a stranger. His name is not found in the provisions of the will, hence to confer on him the token of inheritance is an empty and deluding mockery. It is true that God has provided for this natural disqualification in "the mystery of the gospel," making the Gentiles conditionally fellow-heirs with his people by adoption. But it is only conditionally; on a principal of faith and obedience that they can be grafted into Israel's olive. "They which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham." "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus; for as many of you (who believe) as have been baptised into Christ have put on Christ." And the principle of his adoption operates towards the Gentile precisely as the substitution of the name for circumcision did in regard to the Jew. It makes him, whilst an infant, ineligible to it; it disqualifies him for partaking of it then. —Faith is essential; but an infant cannot believe; therefore it cannot be constituted a son of Abraham. The sonship of the Jew is natural; that of the Gentile is by adoption, spiritual only, and contingent on character. Since the day of Peter's vision on the tanner's roof, God has admitted all who possess a believing apprehension of "the things of the kingdom of God, and of the name of Jesus Christ," on their baptism to the degree of faithful Israelites; but never in apostolic records do we read of the introduction of a characterless babe into saintly fellowship. To profess to engraft such into Christ's Body by any immersion, pouring, or sprinkling; by any formula scriptural or unscriptural, accompanied with prayers, is simply to exhibit the wilfulness of the flesh, in an attempted usurpation of the office of him who alone can change the "child of wrath into a child of

grace.” This is God’s work. “No man can come unto me except the Father who hath sent me, draw him.” He does this through providential actings suited to individual circumstances, by his Word as the instrument of transformation, producing voluntary obedience as the consummation. He graciously makes us co-workers with himself, but then it is our part to follow his guiding, not to lead him. To attempt to direct or anticipate the actings of the Lord our God, in his union of members to his Body, is a mere fleshly assumption, and utter presumption. His name may be called on the passive, unconscious being, and it may be said to be “born again,” but it is a birth of the will of the flesh, of the will of man; not of God.

In conclusion, I would remark that a Gentile, in whom the word of truth has developed the family likeness of the sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty is, prior to taking hold of God’s covenant by the name of Jesus, in the position of the Israelitish babe, before the eighth day. —Baptism into Christ is to him what circumcision was to it—the boundary-line that must be passed, if he would inherit with Abraham the kingdom of God. Let him cross it, and he needs then but to endure faithful to the end, and all is well, eternally well with him, who has come to trust under the sheltering wings of the God of Israel. But we must take his name if we would be one with Jesus our Lord. “I have espoused you as a chaste virgin to Christ,” says Paul. This is the ceremony of the Bride’s espousals; it is the grafting of the branch into the vine; it is the cementing of the stone to the temple whose foundation is Christ Jesus. Of old in God’s “holy and beautiful house” he put his name, and now he records it on every stone of his spiritual temple. Yea, verily, “the name of the Lord is a strong tower; the righteous runneth into it and is safe.”

PRISCILLA DERBE.

\* \* \*

### OUR VISIT TO BRITAIN.

INVITED TO EDINBURGH—RETURN FROM ISLAY TO PAISLEY—VISIT KERR’S SHAW-FACTORY—ARRIVE IN EDINBURGH—TWO PARTIES OF “REFORMERS” THERE—INVITED TO VISIT BOTH—ATTEND A SOIREE—INTRODUCED TO THE COMPANY—MADE A ROCK OF OFFENCE TO BIGOTRY—SATAN FLOORED—“MODERN ATHENS AND ITS “SOCIETY”—A QUIET TEA PARTY SUDDENLY TRANSFORMED INTO A SEMI-PUBLIC CONVERSAZIONI—INVITED TO PRESENT AN OUTLINE OF VIEWS—PROPHECY PRONOUNCED UNINTELLIGIBLE BY A DIVINE—PROPHECY DEFENDED—ABSQUATULATION OF THE DIVINE INTO OUTER DARKNESS—STULTIFICATION—CROSS-FIRING—FORLORN-HOPE.

The Glasgow Convocation brought together delegates from various parts of Scotland as well as from England. Among these were friends from Edinburgh, now settled in Wisconsin. They witnessed the violent and unprincipled proceedings of the Wallis faction in the scene of confusion with disapprobation and disgust. These delegates were not sympathisers with us. They had heard of us, indeed, through the British and American Millennial Harbingers; but to hear of us in these periodicals was to hear of us only that which was evil. The “infidel” “factious,” and “wicked madman,” they saw for the first time defending the Lincoln church from expulsion and excommunication, because it had requested him to represent it in a convention assembled to consider how

the gospel might be best disseminated throughout Britain. Their faith was Campbellistic; his was altogether the reverse. It cannot be said, therefore, that there was any factious sympathy between us. They came to the Convention on the side of the enemy, but departed from it, if not as friends, at least more favourably disposed than before.

When they arrived in Edinburgh, they reported to their brethren what they had seen and heard. The rumours which had reached them concerning us had made an unfavourable impression; still they felt a curiosity to hear what we had to say, for they had heard that great interest had been created in Glasgow in our discourses there. It was determined, therefore, to invite us to visit Edinburgh at our earliest convenience. We received the invitation before we left Glasgow for Islay, and were assured of a respectful, if not a cordial, reception in Auld Reekie. We accepted, of course, being thankful under any circumstances that a door of utterance to speak the gospel of the kingdom was opened in so important a city as the Athens of Caledonia.

In returning from the Hebrides, then, to London, our tour was to take in the city of Edinburgh. We had intended, when we arrived at East Tarbert, to proceed to Glasgow by way of Inverary and Loch Goilhead; but the delay occasioned in getting the cattle on board at Port Askaig, made us too late for the steamer, which had passed on to Inverary before we arrived. This was disagreeable, as it detained us in Tarbert till next morning, and compelled us to return the way we came. But there was no help for it; so it became us, as we endeavour to do in all cases of disappointment, to mingle contentment with a patient waiting for deliverance. Morning came, and with it the steamer, which, having taken in a cargo of Highland cattle, pigs, fish, &c., left the pier at 10 A.M., for Glasgow. Our destination was Paisley where we were to speak the next day; and as we wished to vary the route, we concluded to leave the steamer at Greenock, and take the rail thence to Paisley, where we arrived at 4. 30 P.M. we spoke twice at this place the next day, which was Lord's day, October 23, 1848. About this time twelve persons were immersed by authority into the church; but upon what premises in each case we are not prepared to say.

Before leaving this town we visited a shawl factory, said to be the largest in Europe, owned by Mr. Robert Kerr. The dying, weaving, shearing, washing, drying, and mangling of shawls and vest patterns, were all processes carried on in the establishment by hand and machinery on a large scale. The dying department, in which a hundred men can work, had only one man and two boys employed, so dull was trade at the time. The highest price (wholesale of course) for shawls fabricated at those works, was ten guineas. —They were very handsome looking goods, and a considerable stock of them appeared to be on hand in the warehouse, which was, fortunately, not attached to the factory, which, in about ten days after our visit, was totally consumed by fire. It was considered quite a privilege to view the place which was not accessible to all; for some Russians, not long before, had been refused admittance by the proprietor.

We arrived in Edinburgh on the 27<sup>th</sup> October. We were met at the station by two friends, who conducted us to a Mrs. Petries, 21 Lothian Street, near the University. As nobody in Edinburgh had any confidence in us, we were kept at such a distance as was

compatible with civility. This was the reason of our being taken to private lodgings, and not permitted to share in the hospitality of the domestic hearth. We did not know that this was the feeling towards us at the time. But we had no reason to expect otherwise —All strangers together, and our proscribed self in bad odour; certainly not in the “odour of sanctity” with our dear friend Campbell’s coreligionists. Of these, there were two parties, which had formerly been one church, of which one was much more Campbellistic than the other. The Oak Hall, and the South Bridge Hall, are the styles by which their churches are known. The former was said to be of the real covenant spirit, which did not partake much of the “milk of human kindness.” Law and authority unencumbered with the bowels of mercy and compassion, were supposed to hold their own in the Hall of Oak. The demerits of the case between the two halls we are unable to give. It is no affair of ours. All we knew was, that there was no union or communion between them; and that we were in questionable relationship to them both. Our invitation to Edinburgh came from the South Bridge friends, whom we found, with three or four exceptions, to be kind, just, and liberal. Their religious theory was Campbellistic; but their disposition was in advance of their theory. They were willing to hear, and to prove “all things;” and did not endorse the notion that all wisdom and knowledge was comprehended in the Bethanian theory of baptism for the remission of sins. There were three or four among them disposed to kick against the goads. They found, however, at length, that in kicking they hurt no one but themselves. They therefore wisely concluded to kick no more; but though they ceased to kick, the disposition to lift up their heels against us continued hardly latent to the end.

Our quarters were very comfortable. It is true, we were alone; but then we are “never less alone than when alone, nor less idle than when idle.” With the Bible and materials for writing, we can neither be idle nor alone. Studying this great book, and writing upon its contents, have become a habit which rather impatiently endures interruption. The luxury of silence and solitude, after much speaking and conversing, none can duly appreciate who have not enjoyed it. But in our three tours we tasted not much of this enjoyment. We were, so to speak, not our own. We were a bearer of “strange things” to the people’s ears, and were, therefore, expected to be at the service of every one; and which we endeavoured to be with as much affability as we could command.

We were waited on at separate times by individuals from both the Halls. The Oaks wished us to be at their meetings on the following Lord’s day, but we declined; intending to be at neither their’s, nor at the South Bridge, but to attend our own appointments elsewhere in the afternoon and evening. Certain of the South Bridgians having heard our version of American troubles, in which a more remarkable effort has been made than history furnishes for many a year, to extinguish a humble individual for daring to think and speak his convictions independently of religious factions and their self important inflations, —they insisted on our attending their meeting, and worshipping with them. We demurred to this for several reasons. We had not come to Britain to put individuals or churches to the test of fellowship. We came to announce to them the gospel of the kingdom, and to call their attention to the signs of the times as indicative of the Lord’s approach. We asked fellowship of none, but a patient hearing from all. They

insisted. We objected; especially as we understood that the Campbellite spirit was rampant in a few of them. We had so often been tilted at by drones of no personal weight or consideration, just to lift themselves into notice by an affected zeal against heresy in us, who are regarded as fair game for any unprincipled fowler, that we declined being made an occasion of unprofitable controversy in the church. They urged that they wished to test the question, whether one or two were to dictate to all, what they should hear and whom. We declined being made the test, but agreed to attend their meeting as an observer of their doings, when in church assembled.

On the evening of our arrival in the city, we attended, by invitation, a soiree given by the friends at South Bridge Hall. We found a very respectable company assembled to partake of the good things provided for the inner and outer man. It was here we became acquainted with some whom we hope to call our friends “till the Lord comes;” when, we trust, as the result of their obedience to the faith originally delivered to the saints by the Spirit of God, and of a patient continuance in well-doing, we shall rejoice in his presence. The evening, or soiree, was harmonious and interesting. Pieces, called “sacred,” were well sung; and speeches, humorous and instructive, delivered with agreeable effect upon the hearers. Mr. Alexander Melville Bell, Professor of Elocution, and a very successful practitioner in the art of teaching the tongue of the stammerer to speak with ease, convulsed us all with mirth, by his imitative illustration of the pseudo-sublime and real-ridiculous exhibited by speakers, who, fuller of themselves than their subject, repeat the speeches they have conned by rote. From this, it will be seen, that the evening was not devoted to the subject of religion exclusively. The topics were various, and the company, likewise, persons of other sects, and of no sect partaking in the proceedings as well as those of the South Bridge congregation, who got up the meeting. —Mr. Bell, whom we have the pleasure of calling our friend, (for he proved himself such both in word and deed,) belongs to the Baptist church in Edinburgh, presided over by the Rev. Mr. Watson; and our humble self, to no human ecclesiastical organization whatever. We were unexpectedly invited to address the audience, which we could not very well avoid to do. What we said, or what was our text even, we do not now remember. Suffice it to say, it was our opening speech in Edinburgh, and advanced us a “wie bit” in the good graces of them that heard us.

The Lord’s day following was October 30<sup>th</sup>. We were guided to the place of meeting by the friend who insisted upon our going thither. Very reluctantly we consented to accompany him, with the assurance that no difficulty would be provoked. But it availed not. When the congregation was gathered, he arose and observed that he understood that there would be opposition, by some, to Dr. Thomas’ breaking bread with them, he therefore wished to know, before the meeting was opened, what was the decision of the church in the case. He was opposed to proscription for opinion’s sake, and with American difficulties they had nothing they had to do. He and another brother were acquainted with both sides of the question between Dr. Thomas and Mr. Campbell; and without assuming to judge between them, they were satisfied that there was not just and sufficient grounds for them to refuse Dr. Thomas the bread and wine, if he pleased to partake of them. The opposition, whoever they were, seemed taken aback by this initiative. Whatever they felt, its expression was feeble. Some dissent was expressed, but

their premises were vague, and easily overturned; and their conclusions, consequently, without effect. The pros and cons having subsided into silence for want of more to say, we interjected a few remarks before sentence was pronounced. We observed that we had come there as a spectator, at the request of the friend who had introduced the subject before them. We came not to test their fellowship, or to raise any question of the kind in their midst. We came to Edinburgh at their instance, indeed, but for a very different purpose—it was to lay before them the Gospel of the Kingdom, and to define the Signs of the Times as evincing its near approach. We asked none for their fellowship, but simply to hear with candour what we had to say, and then to search the scriptures and see if what we said were not the truth of God. Fellowship was an after-consideration. —We eat bread, not as an act of fellowship, but as an act of remembrance, discerning no test there, but only the Lord's body. If they said we might eat of the bread they had provided, it was well; if not, it was also well. They would of course do as they pleased. Either way we were content. Whatever was the opinion of these remarks, nothing more was said on either side, and it was agreed, on the responsibility of Messrs. Muir and Gray, who had testified in our favour, that the bread and wine should not be withheld.

We were quite pleased at the order of the meeting. The scripture readings were from the Old and New Testament, in regular course; the prayers were not random outpourings, but the thoughtful petitions of the thankful and necessitous; the singing was scientific, melodious, and appropriate to the words chosen from “the Songs of Zion,” which used to be sung in Israel's praises of Jehovah and his goodness forevermore; and the exhortations were words of truth and soberness. Still there was a something wanting. They were courteous, but there was not that sunniness of aspect indicative of unanimity and oneness of soul. It requires a hearty belief of the gospel of the kingdom to bring a church to this—a faith which, at our advent to Edinburgh, we did not find at all occupying the minds of the ungodly or devout. As a society, the South Bridgians were liberal and independent; and though believing in the Bethanian philosophy, they refused to recognise its president-Professor as their master; or his Nottingham representative, and the Fife-Kingdom committee, as the gaolers of their conscience, and directors of affairs. Had they submitted to their dictation, which they had successfully resisted before our arrival, we should not have been invited, nor received. But Providence had ordered all things well. The bigotry which encountered us at the Glasgow Convention of delegates, was defeated by their co-religionists in Edinburgh, who, though they believed not, were willing to hear in a Berean Spirit, and to open to us a door of utterance, that they might know the things that had excited so much attention and interest among the people.

We sojourned in Edinburgh two weeks, during which we spoke to audiences amounting sometimes to more than a thousand people. This was very well for so Presbyterian a city, whose inhabitants, though mainly addicted to free-churchism, are but little disposed to make excursions beyond the pale of “orthodoxy,” and conventional “respectability.” Edinburgh is a beautiful city, favoured of nature and adorned by art. Royalty, Covenanter-Calvinism, physic, literature, and arms, are enthroned there, attracting, consequently crowds of retainers, and expectants of the good things ordinarily dispensed to those upon whom “fortune” smiles. These constitute “society” in “Modern Athens,” in ministering to whose wants they, who are not “society,” obtain their daily

bread. This is the substratum off the upper soil underlying which are things villainous and without estimation in the purlieux of the Cowgate and Grassmarket of the lower town. This is the base upon which society rests, as base as it is low in the scale of being; the swinish multitude, whose habitations filthy in the extreme, are a malarious and piggish exposition of its brutality and desolation. Though sent to the poor and humble, for “dogs” and “swine” the kingdom’s gospel was not proclaimed—Matthew 7: 6. The advertisements, therefore, of our meetings, where the holy things and pearls of God’s truth would be exhibited for the admiration and acceptance of the public, found no response among the “baser sort.” Neither were they responded to, to any remarkable extent by Athenian “Society;” which is so pious, so highly refined, in such favour with Heaven, and on such complacent terms with itself, knowing and believing all that is “essential to salvation,” that it cares not to trouble itself with the “strange things” and “new doctrine” brought to its doors by the “setters forth of strange gods,” as it regards Jesus and the resurrection prophetically exhibited at this day. Our audiences were drawn neither from the high nor low, but from the odds and ends of Edinburgh, who in every city are the most independent and Berean of the population. We addressed them some ten or a dozen times, mostly at the Waterloo Assembly Room, in Princes Street, a spacious and elegant apartment, and capable of seating some thousand to fifteen hundred people. The impression made upon them was strong, and, for the time, caused many to rejoice that Providence had ever directed our steps to Edinburgh. Our expositions of the sure word of prophecy interested them greatly, causing our company to be sought for at the domestic hearth incessantly, to hear us talk of the things of the kingdom and name of Jesus, and to solve whatever doubts and difficulties previous indoctrination might originate in regard to the things we teach.

Our new friends had but little mercy upon us in their demands upon our time. They seemed to think that premeditation was unnecessary, and that we had nothing to do but to open our mouth, and out would fly a speech! Of our two hundred and fifty addresses in Britain, all were extemporised as delivered. There was no help for it, seeing that we had to go oftener than otherwise from parlour conversation to the work before us in the lecture room. Indeed, our nervous system was so wearied by unrest that we could not have studied a discourse. Present necessity was indispensable to set our brain to work. Certain subjects were advertised, and had to be expounded. We knew, therefore, what was to be treated of; and, happily, understanding “the Word of the Kingdom,” we had but to tell the people what it taught, and to sustain it by reason and testimony. In this way we got along independently of stationery and sermon studying, which would have broken us down completely, and would have absorbed more time than our friends allowed us. “Come,” said one, “and take a quiet cup of tea with us on Saturday evening?” we hesitated, being desirous to have the last night in the week to ourselves, at least. “There’ll only be two or three whom you have met before. You can just take it as easy as you please—talk or not, as it suits yourself.” This seemed very fair, so we agreed to go. We found some two or three additions to our friends domestic circle, as he had said; and among them one of the pastors of the church to which he belonged. The tea-table conversation was without point: that is, nothing was touched upon concerning which the pastor and we would find ourselves in opposition; for he is respectably orthodox according to Athenian concession, while, as for us, it is well known that we have no

pretensions that way. Wherever “a divine” is present, there is generally formality and stiffness in the circle, all “feast of reason and flow of soul” being quenched by the mystic afflation of his presence. His “people” look up to him as their theological syntax—the rule by which they are expected to order their words in speech. Hence their sentences are measured, and their tone subdued into harmony with his supposed approval. This is irksome to a free spirit who knows what is in the clergy, and, therefore, hath no admiration for them, yet wishes to give no cause of offence to friends who hold them in esteem. This irksomeness was fatiguing, and predisposed us to accept, with a good grace, any event that might turn up to dissolve the spell that bound us.

Nor was a change of affairs far off. It was even at the doors. The tea service was not removed ere the bell at 13 Hope street, Charlotte Square, announced frequent arrivals from divers parts of the city. The ladies and gentlemen were ushered into an adjoining room, where our friend is wont to teach clergymen and others to read their sermons and to speak with fluency and propriety. Our little quiet tea party was invited to adjourn to this arena, when, to our surprise, we found there in fashionable costume a company of from twenty to thirty individuals. This was too bad. “O,” said our friend, “I thought you wouldn’t mind it!” The assembly was pleasant to the eye, but how it would prove to the ear was another question. Its materials were not homogeneous. We cannot define them. Some were deacons, others members of Mr. Watson’s church, some officers of the United Service, lawyers, sons of Abraham in flesh and spirit, &c. —all honourable persons, courteous, and well esteemed. Having been introduced to them, our friend remarked that, “not wishing to monopolise the good things to himself, in which he knew they were interested as well as he, he had taken the liberty, without consulting the doctor, of inviting them to meet him on the present occasion, to hear conversationally more about them. He hoped, therefore, by way of introduction to an interchange of ideas, he would favour them with a brief outline of the subject matter brought to their ears in the interesting lectures they had attended.” In doing this, we called their attention to what the prophets had spoken concerning “the powers that be,” the nations, Israel, and the saints—that “the powers” were to be abolished; the nations to be subsequently universally blessed; Israel to be organised into the kingdom of God; and, that to the Saints and their Chief, immortalised and made equal in nature to the angels, are to be given eternal glory, honour, and dominion over all the inhabitants of the earth. That these were the things of the invisible future revealed in the Scriptures of truth as gospel, or glad tidings of great joy to all people. The prophets had given us the signs by which we might know the times when those things were about to be. These signs were political events, whose character was discernible by the light of their testimony shed upon the present and the past. That we had more particularly to do with the present in which predicted events were speaking to us trumpet-tongued, of the speedy coming of the Kingdom of God. We had come from the sun-setting to call the attention of the people in Britain, to the prophetic significancy of the notable events affecting the French, Austrian, Papal, and Turkish dominions, for their practical, individual, and everlasting weal. If they inquired, how they were to be benefited by comprehending the import of these things? —we replied, that seeing the day approaching when the King of the Jews was about to appear in his kingdom and glory, they might separate themselves from “the error of the wicked,” and “be found of him in peace, without spot, and blameless.” To do this they must believe the Gospel of the

Kingdom—the glad tidings of that Kingdom which the God of Heaven had promised in a multitude of places to set up in Israel’s land, given to the fathers Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and their seed in Christ, for an everlasting possession in the Age to Come—not the gospel of kingdoms beyond the skies. This gospel, which indeed is no gospel, is “the error of the wicked,” from which a man must cleanse himself if he would find salvation in the Kingdom of God. The world is full of gospels. Every sect has its gospel, and the world is full of sects. These are very well in their way. They give order to society, and give the wicked pause; but can give no man an introduction to the Kingdom of God. There is but one gospel can do this; that gospel, namely, preached by Moses, promised and amplified in the holy prophets, and preached also by John the Baptist, Jesus, and his Apostles before and after Pentecost: this gospel it is that is the power of God for the salvation of those who believe—Romans 1: 16. —God’s power to save is in no other gospel than the Gospel of the Kingdom we advocate. It is that concerning which the wholesome words of the Lord Jesus aver that, “he that believeth and is baptised shall be saved, he that believeth not shall be condemned”—Mark 16: 15-16.

To this effect we spoke as nearly as we can recollect at this time. Having resumed our seat, our host observed, that “the subject was now before them, and he doubted not it would afford Dr. Thomas pleasure to consider any difficulties his outline might have suggested to the minds of his hearers;” and then turning towards his pastor, sitting on a sofa near the door, he inquired if he would not favour the company with his views upon these important themes? To this he replied, that “he agreed with several of the particulars expressed by Dr. T., but that as to prophecy we could not know much about it before it was fulfilled, and was of opinion that time be more profitably engaged in attending to what could be understood.” Thus he delivered himself substantially, and then relapsed into silence, from which it is to be inferred, that, though a professional interpreter of the Bible, the greater part of which is composed of history and prophecy, he had no views upon these important themes! Being convened for friendly social interchange of thought, we did not wish to disturb the harmony of the evening, by seeming to enter the list against our ecclesiastical friend. Having put himself in our power, we might have made him contemptible before the eyes of all. We might have demonstrated his utter incompetency for “the work of the ministry” in which he claimed to be engaged; and have convicted him of extreme presumption in assuming to speak to men in the name of the Lord, while confessedly and profoundly ignorant of what the Lord had spoken by the mouth of his holy prophets. But, out of respect to our worthy host, and that we might not be accused by any of acting offensively, we lost sight of the pastor, and imposed silence upon ourselves, for a time at least, that others might offer their ideas if so disposed.

The silence being unbroken, as we thought, sufficiently long, we observed that we would briefly hold their attention to what the scripture testified for our instruction in Peter’s second epistle—2 Peter 1: 19-21; 3: 17. We then read the words following—“We have also the prophetic word more sure to which ye do well to take heed as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until its day dawn, and a light-bearer arise in your hearts.” These, we observed, are “wholesome words,” and the literal rendering of the original. The prophetic word is sure, and the things Peter, James and John had witnessed on the Mount of Transfiguration confirmed it, or made it surer. Thus made doubly sure, it

became a shining light, not a feeble invisible light, such as pure hydrogen burning in day-brightness; but a light blazing as the sun in a place otherwise dark, dark as Egyptian night with blackness. We need not wonder at the sure prophetic word being radiant with brightness; for Jehovah who gave it is light, the Light of the Universe, “in whom is no darkness at all.” It is “a light that shineth in a dark place.” The heart of man is this dark place. The word auchmeros signifies not only dark, but “squalid and filthy.” This is a man’s mental and moral condition, squalid, filthy, and dark, by nature—a condition before God, if not in the estimation of his fellow-men, in which he continues hopelessly until the sure word, termed by Paul, “the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, shine into him”—2 Corinthians 4: 4. Consider the savage, the semi-barbarian, and the “civilised” man. Not to go beyond “Christendom” for examples, contemplate the man of letters, philosophy, politics, and “religion,” not to mention the thoughtless multitude, whose minds embrace no other topics than such as arise spontaneously from their “fleshly lusts that war against the soul.” Converse with these several classes of mankind upon “Moses and the Prophets,” the apostolic testimony, the mission of Messiah, the future of nations, the destiny of the earth and of man upon it, &c., and you will find that “darkness covers the earth, and gross darkness the people;” and as the necessary consequence of this universal ignorance, or blindness of heart to the sure prophetic word, their works are evil, and that continually.

Now to this sure prophetic word, or glorious gospel light, (for the gospel is still almost wholly a matter of prophecy,) the apostle says, “ye do well to take heed to it.” Surely he is an authority in the case, and one whose exhortation should be respectfully entertained. Would he tell us to take heed to the sure prophetic word if it were unintelligible? Can we take heed to a thing we do not, and cannot understand? Prosechontes, rendered giving or taking heed, signifies having in addition to. This is its derivative signification, and imports that we should have the sure word of prophecy added to our minds; but can this addition be accomplished unless we apply our minds to the word, or give heed to it? And what would be the use of studying it if it were essentially enigmatical, and unsusceptible of rational interpretation? On the contrary, we conclude from the terms of the apostle’s exhortation, that it is clear, worthy of diligent study, reasonable, and improving.

But Peter’s exhortation was not confined to his contemporaries. What he said to them he says to us. You do well to give heed to it “until its day dawn.” The common version has it “until the day dawn;” but this is not the translation of hoes hou hemera diaugase. Hou is the relative to its antecedent luckno which is synonymous with “the word”—hou hemera whose day; that is, the light’s day, or the word’s day—the day testified of in the light-imparting word of prophecy, in which God will rule the world in righteousness by Jesus Christ, whom he raised up from the dead, for that very purpose—Acts 17: 31. This is the day spoken of by Moses and the Prophets—“the acceptable year of the Lord,” the year-day, or Age to Come, of a thousand years duration, (which with the Lord are but as one day, says Peter—2 Peter 3: 8, “the rest which remains for the people of God”—the day when His king shall come in his kingdom and glory—this is the day—Ezekiel 39: 8—which succeeds “Today,” coeval with the Gentile governments; the Gospel-day, when Christ shall sit upon his father’s throne in Zion, and “govern the nations upon

earth”—Psalm 67: 4; 22: 27-28. This day has not yet dawned. We are in “the evening time of today,” when it shall be light—Hebrews 3: 13; 4: 7; Luke 23: 43; Zechariah 14: 7. We are of “today,” which is “a cloudy and dark day”—a day of ignorance, superstition, and foolishness; but when tomorrow comes, the day after “today,” these things will be abolished to the ends of the earth, and we shall no more need the prophetic word to give us light. But till then, the “heirs of the kingdom” can no more do without the shining light of prophecy, than mankind can do without the brightness of the firmament. Blot out the light of heaven, and confusion and death would soon pervade the world. The “children off the day”—1 Thessalonians 5: 5—must have daylight, or they would become sickly, and pine away, and die. They responded to the apostle’s exhortation, and apply their minds to the sure prophetic word, that in keeping their minds actively engaged upon it, a light-bearer may spring up in their hearts making their path “as the shining light, that shineth more and more unto the perfect day.” The way of the wicked is not so. It is darkness, and they know not at what they stumble.

We remarked, in conclusion, that prophecy is so intelligible that those who take heed, or apply their minds to it, can tell assuredly what shall come to pass before it happens. This was the case with those to whom Peter wrote. After writing about the coming of the Lord to slay his murderers, and to burn up their city, (his second coming, not his second appearing at his third coming,) in which he discoursed also of the passing away of the heavens and the earth constituted by the old Mosaic covenant then in existence, but since vanished away—he concludes by saying to them, “seeing ye know these things before, beware, &c.” They knew what was coming upon Jerusalem and the State; for they were observant of the Signs of the Times given by the Lord in his prophecy on Mount Olivet. Their presence enabled them to eschew “the error of the wicked,” who scoffed at the idea of the Lord’s coming to punish his enemies. It enabled them to be steadfast; and at length to escape “the judgment and fiery indignation, which devoured the adversaries.” To deny that we can know before hand what is to come to pass, is to affirm that we cannot understand the gospel; for the gospel is glad tidings of what is to be to all nations and to the saints. It is the report of good things promised. A promise is a prediction, and a prediction is prophecy. The gospel is a great prophecy of what God intends to do; and they who intelligently believe it know before hand what is to be done. The little that has been fulfilled in Jesus is an assurance to the believer that what remains will certainly be accomplished. He foresees the crushing down off the thrones, the abolition of all kingdoms, empires, and republics, the setting up of a divine kingdom in Israel’s land, the blessedness of all nations under the government of Messiah and his brethren, and the will of God done on the earth as it is in Heaven; with many more great and glorious things too numerous to mention at the present time.

When we sat down a dead silence ensued. Whatever was thought, no one offered, or seemed disposed to offer, a word of comment on what had been spoken. The pastor had sighed deeply while we were speaking, thinking, perhaps, that he had fallen upon evil times in consenting to be one of our quiet tea party. But this is only supposition with us. He may have been vastly pleased at our vindication of the prophetic word; for there are some minds so nobly constituted that they rejoice in the triumph of truth, even when the result of their own defeat. We fear, however, that he did not rejoice greatly; if he did, it

was with joy unspeakable for he said nothing; but rising and bending sufficiently forward to clear the sofa, he moved noiselessly toward the door, with his body at an angle of forty-five degrees with his understandings, and slid off into outer darkness, leaving us all in blank amazement at his sudden and not very dignified retreat! No remark was made, but the silence was expressive. The truth proved unanswerable, and was yielded to with prudence as the “better part of valour.” The fugitive’s vanishment from the light must have been mortifying to his friends; his retreat, however, was agreeably covered by a concerto performed on the piano and flute, which restored the balance of the evening, and prepared us for a new beginning, without reference to what had gone before.

A natural son of Abraham being present, a continental Jew who professed conversion to Gentile Christianity, our kind host invited to deliver himself upon the subject of Messiah’s coming. It was soon evident, however, that upon whatever topics he might be profound, he was far from being at home upon this. He had been a candidate for admission into Mr. W’s church, if we remember rightly, but grounds existed for suspicion that his motives were not loyal and true, so that he still remained a candidate. He was aware, doubtless, that the company was divided into believers of Christ’s personal reign on earth, and those who rejected it. He spoke so as to please both if possible; at any rate, as far as he was concerned, so as to leave them both in the right, rather inclining to the idea that it might be personal. We could not permit such stuff to pass without a word of comment. We expressed our surprise that a Jew could hesitate distinctly to affirm the personal appearing and reign of Messiah in Israel’s land as the only reign taught in the Bible concerning him. The figurative coming and reign of Christ was a mere Gentile tradition, a fiction of the apostasy, which no Jew instructed by the prophets could possibly entertain. We hoped he would make himself sure on this matter, and abandon the illogical supposition, that a proposition could be at once true and not true according to the opinion of an audience.

The repetition of music, and the introduction of refreshments, relieved our Jewish acquaintance from his entanglement, and, together, imparted a gift of tongues to the company at large. A cross-firing soon after commenced from all sides of the house. One question led to another, until a lawyer and a deacon, pious members of the fugitive pastor’s flock, led on a forlorn hope against our gospel-position, the account of which, for want of room, must be deferred to a future opportunity, which will not be unnecessarily delayed.

\* \* \*

“Time is painted with a lock before, and bald behind, signifying thereby that we must take time (as we say) by the forelock, for when it is once passed there is no recalling it.”—Swift.

“Many have been ruined by their fortunes; many have escaped ruin by the want of fortune. To obtain it, the great have become little, and the little great.”—Zimmerman.

\* \* \*

## ESCORTING TO GLORY—ERRORS OF THE WISE—THEIR ORIGENISM.

“He taketh the wise in their own craftiness.”

We have inquired in a previous article, Whence it comes, that historians, professors, college students, and their patrons (a classification which comprehends nearly all Antichristendom) with the Old and New Testaments, or Books of the Covenant, in their hands, have sunk into such visible darkness, and fallen so far behind the apostles in a scriptural understanding of the genius, spirit, and character of the kingdom of Christ? That they have done so is proved from the writings of the Cambridge historian of Christ's church, and of our luminous friend, the professor of Sacred History, in the sun-setting. Here are two great and shining lights in theology, one a wise man of the east, the other, as wise a man perhaps of the west, very fit and proper representatives of “the wisdom of the world”—1 Corinthians 3: 19, gravely and complacently imputing error, false ambition, and ignorance to the apostles, concerning that kingdom, the gospel of which they had been proclaiming throughout Judea! The reader will remember our quotations from the historian and the professor which need not be repeated; we shall, however, favour him with a passage from our millennial friend exegetical of the real sort of a thing he thinks the apostles ought to have looked for, and which he, more discerning than they, looks for, instead of the restoration of the kingdom again to Israel under the Messiah. He is commenting upon the words, “This same Jesus, who is taken from you into the heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into the heaven.” Referring to this returning, the Spirit saith by Zechariah, “His feet shall stand in that day upon the Mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east”—that day characterised in the preceding verses as the day when “all nations shall be gathered against Jerusalem to battle, and the Lord shall go forth and fight against them”—Zechariah 14: 1-4. But why is the Lord Jesus to return to Mount Olivet and fight with all nations? Hear the unvisionary averment of our imaginative friend—“Two angelic personages, of celestial mien and grandeur—probably a portion of Messiah's celestial train—returned to Olivet, and gave a rich and exhilarating promise, on which the faith of the whole church reposes with unshaken confidence, and around which its brightest hopes cluster with joy unspeakable and full of triumph. It is that the identical Jesus, who thus visibly and gloriously entered the heavens, shall as visibly and sensibly descend to earth again, to escort all his friends from this sin-polluted earth to a new paradise of God, in which the tree of life, in all its deathless beauties, shall bloom and fructify for ever!!” But can the reader divine what necessity there can possibly be for this return to escort, and especially to Mount Olivet, seeing that upon the hypothesis of college theology men's souls, at death, go direct to Jesus, where he now is, sitting upon David's throne, reigning personally over Israel, having gained kingdoms as indicated by the many crowns upon his head, beyond the range of the solar system in the Milky Way?! If the souls of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, of Moses and the Prophets, of John the Baptist and the apostles, and of the disciples of all ages since, be now with him reigning on David's throne in the Galaxy, and it was not necessary for Jesus personally to escort them thither, upon what principle is it necessary that he should return to escort the remainder who may happen to be alive at the epoch of return? Besides, to escort, is to attend and guard by land; would not to convoy them be a better word? But why escort or convoy at all? They both imply danger

on the route; or if not, are appointed as guards of honour. It is not Jesus who is an escort or convoy, but the honourable personage who is himself to be escorted. Let our critical friend be a little more choice in his composition. It is better occasionally to forego a verbal flourish than to be magniloquently small, and grandiloquently less. In dismissing for the present the “celestial mien and grandeur,” “Messiah’s celestial train,” the “rich and exhilarating promise,” the “church’s brightest hopes clustering with joy unspeakable and full of triumph,” around this wholesale emigration from our “sin-polluted earth,” we would humbly inquire of our extraordinary friend, “Where, in Moses and the Prophets, and in all the New Testament construed in harmony with them, is it taught that Messiah is to empty the earth of all the righteous it contains? Is not this taking away the righteousness, instead of the sin, of the world? Is it not a practical abandonment of the controversy between God and Satan upon the earth? Does not the escort theory indicate that Satan has gained undisputed possession of the battle-field; and that God is obliged to send assistance to enable his friends to make good a retreat to some undiscovered country, where their conqueror cannot pursue them, and whence none shall e’er more return?”

The wisdom of theological historians and professors, and the foolishness of the apostles! Which does the reader prefer? Jesus to return to Mount Olivet to become an escort in a flight; or the Lord Jesus to return to the earth, and at the head of the Saints, and of Israel as their king, to contend here in battle with Satan’s hosts, to subdue them on every side, and having thus removed all obstruction, set up the throne of David, restore the kingdom again to Israel, and then bestow it and the dominion of the subject nations, upon the apostles and the believers of the gospel of the kingdom for ever? Which is the only scriptural hope, besides which all other theories are only superstitious rhapsodies, the airy flights of imaginations perverted and bewitched? That we believe, is the only true hope which finds the consummation of the divine purpose upon the earth; and, with the apostles, looks for the realisation of its expectations in the restoration of the kingdom again to Israel as in the days of old.

“I have again began to read modern theology,” writes our professor of Sacred History. We beseech him to let “theology” alone. He has read too much of it already, intoxicating and bewildering as it is. We would humbly advise our sublime friend to read the Acts of the Apostles with all accuracy and reflection before he proceeds further in his essays, if he would “enlarge the empire of truth by a more rapid consumption of the Man of Sin.” If our consuming friend would compass this, he must be accurate. To explain what we mean. Speaking of “the first Acts of the Apostles” after their return to Jerusalem, Mr. Campbell says, “During the ensuing forty days, Peter, the first of the Twelve, the Elder Brother of the apostolic family, arose, and after a short speech, moved the election of an apostle for the chair vacated by the fall of Judas.” We make no note of the expressions “apostolic school,” “first convention,” “chair vacated,” scattered over the page before us. It is natural for our academic friend, himself the proprietor of a college, and occupant of a chair, and patron of conventions, to see schools, conventions, and chairs, in things apostolic and prepentecostal, and to speak according to what he thinks he sees; but we cannot pass over the palpable error in the above extract without a word or two concerning it.

We beg leave humbly to remark to our learned friend, that forty days did not ensue from the return of the apostles to Jerusalem on Ascension-day, to Pentecost. He is altogether out of his reckoning here. Let him answer this question: How could forty days remain between the ascension and Pentecost, when it is stated that Jesus was seen alive by the apostles forty days after his release from death, during which time he conversed with them concerning the things pertaining to the kingdom of God? This long period of discourse about the kingdom—discourses which prompted the question about the restoration of the kingdom at that time to Israel—would leave only seven days to Pentecost. Our discerning friend, we presume, is aware that there were only fifty days, not eighty-three, from the crucifixion to Pentecost! We will take it for granted that he is really aware of this. Now, if he will put on his Brazilian pebbles, he will perhaps discover the following division of the fifty days:

From the Crucifixion to the Resurrection, say—	3 days.
From the Resurrection discoursing about THE KINGDOM—	40 days
From the ascension to Pentecost—	<u>7 days</u>
Total from Crucifixion to Pentecost—	50 days.

Our computative friend has been misled by not understanding the saying of Jesus to Mary, “Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father.” This was a private ascent, which doubtless occurred; as he afterwards permitted his apostles to handle him freely. Our discriminating friend has unfortunately confounded the two ascensions, which may have been the cause of his extraordinary calculation of forty days between the return from Olivet and the day of Pentecost!

Our rhetoricating friend errs, we think, in styling Peter “the first of the Twelve, the Elder Brother of the Apostolic family.” This sounds very popish; and as there are a vast number of unenlightened and weak-minded people who look up to him as a living oracle; and, supposing that he knows every thing, receive his quotations and rhetorical flourishes, as if the words of scripture itself, it behoves that he should convey in what he writes that only which is in strict accordance with the ideas of God, and the spirit of his religion. Great errors in past times have originated from trifling departures from the literal in the beginning. “If any man speak let him speak as the oracles of God.” These oracles no where exhibit Peter or any other as “the first,” or as “the Elder Brother.” Christ’s teaching was, he that would be greatest, or first, let him be the servant of the least. He himself set the example, by washing the feet of Judas. Just as though our towering friend should wash the feet of the man with the “big head,” who is so utterly worthless, as he says! Christ and Judas; Mr. Campbell and the untaught and unteachable dogmatist, what a confounding antithesis! But not to lose sight of Peter. To style him “the Elder Brother of the Apostolic family,” is to place him just where the ignorant and superstitious papists put him, that is, in the place of Jesus Christ! They make Peter the elder brother, and hence the transition was easy to ascribe the same position to his pretended successors, who at length boldly averred the principle in the assumption of vicegerency for Christ. We would suggest to our unambitious friend, that the apostles were all brethren and elders, having no one first or last among them. “James, Peter, and

John seemed to be pillars,” says Paul; but of these he places James first. As for Peter, he says of himself that he was “an elder,” not the elder. The preaching of the gospel of the kingdom in the name of Jesus was indeed committed to Peter, as the enunciator thereof to the circumcised, for the sake of order—to avoid confusion by many speaking at once—not for primacy; and even this prominence he was appointed to as the apostle having least ground of all to assume ascendancy over the rest. We offer these remarks to our child-like and teachable friend to guard him against indiscreet aspirations on his own part, and ascriptions of dignity to men not warranted by the scriptures of truth. Knowing how conscientious he is, and how singularly devoid of all desire of fame and worldly honour, we would strengthen him in these virtues, and fortify him against the allurements which environ theological professors, supervisors, and presidents, as with a thick cloud. We wish to keep primacy out of his head, and to establish ultimacy and minimacy in his heart, fearing lest, if he come under its influence, “this reformation” might be transformed into a basket of loaves and fishes, and himself into the chief baker and elder brother of the craft. Let our unostentatious friend remember then, that “One is your Master,” that is, the first and the elder brother, “even Christ, and all ye are brethren.”

But to return, in conclusion, to the historians, professors, collegiates, and their patrons. These are a generation of unfortunates. They are the children of a system originated by erring men in a period of extreme darkness, which had been superinduced by the Origenizing of the sacred writings; that is, by imposing upon them endless allegorical interpretations, and torturing their doctrine into platonic notions concerning the soul of the world, the transmigration of spirits, and the pre-existence of souls. “Origen’s numberless comments on scripture,” says Milner, “constitute a system of fanciful allegory, which pervades the whole of the sacred oracles: the just and plain sense is much neglected; and the whole is covered with thick clouds of mysticism and chimerical philosophy.” “He threw all things into inextricable ambiguity.” He flourished in the third century, and is the great father of the age, to whom may be likened our philosophical friend of the nineteenth. If our ingenious friend’s theory of spirit-possession be entertained, we might suppose, that the soul of the learned and pious Origen had left the realms above at our friend’s nativity, and having entered into him then, or wrapped him up as in a spirit-halo, had mantled him until this present, and had kindly presided over him as his guardian angel, directing his lucubrations into all their eloquent and sublime rhapsodies, in which our friend, still soaring in his flights, disappears from mortal ken in the “grandeur” of “exhilarating” and “celestial” obscurity! “Origen’s quickness of parts, and his superior ingenuity,” says Milner, “served only to entangle him more effectually, and to enable him to move in the chaos of his own formation with an ease and rapidity that rendered him unconscious of the difficulties in which he had involved himself.”

The sacred scriptures disappeared at length from the generation of unfortunates in the shadow of Origenism, in which they were totally eclipsed for over a thousand years. In the fifteenth century they reappeared under certain men called “Reformers,” who had been thoroughly indoctrinated into the Mystery of Iniquity which was their Alma Mater. The Bible made terrible havoc with the orthodoxy of their age, but failed to enlighten them in the good news of glory, honour, and immortality through Jesus in the kingdom of

God restored again to Israel. They saw that justification of life was by faith, but they could not define the subject matter of the faith which justifies. And the generation which glories in them in this particular, without their courage and independence. They founded Protestantism; or schisms, in the Roman church, which protested against the Pope's jurisdiction over them, instead of which they at length set up popes of their own, living or dead, the dead ones ruling them by the systems of divinity, or religious opinions which survived them. These systems preside over all modern schools and colleges, Bethany among the number; for our orthodox friend says, "it is being well known to all Protestant parties here, that we are just as sound, in all the so-called 'essential doctrines of Christianity,' which they call orthodoxy, as any who have, by concession, obtained that name and character." Protestantism, or reformed Romanism, is Origenism restored and divested of the grosser superstition of a thousand years. It is philosophical religion, which in the hands of our ideal friend assumes a transcendental form, transporting him amid the remotest conceivable nebulae of the Galaxy, on the principle that the spirituality of a hope is in the ratio of the squares of the reality's distance from the sin-polluted earth on which he dwells. The generation of unfortunates of the nineteenth century is trained and schooled in this double distilled, above-proof, spirituality, of which the apostles, and those who received their word and abode in it, were as ignorant as babes unborn. When it began to appear it was as the tares which the enemy had sown. They vapoured not at all about kingdoms beyond the solar system, a David's throne there, and escorts from thence to abrept from the earth all the righteous it may then contain. These are the day-dreams of the Origenists—the clouds that obfuscate their intellects, the mirage that tantalises and bewilders their brains. Under its influence they call evil good, and good evil, themselves wise and the apostles foolish. Be it so. Give us the apostles' foolishness, and be it ours with them earnestly to desire, and incessantly to look for, the restoration off the kingdom again to Israel, when Jesus shall "sit upon the throne of his father David, and rule over the house of Jacob for ever."

EDITOR.

\* \* \*

"The New Man is renewed by exact knowledge, (eis epignosin,) after the image of his Creator."—Paul.

\* \* \*

"THE CHRISTIAN MAGAZINE."

OR THE LITTLE VALIANTS OF TENNESSEE EXTINGUISHED.

"The Christian Publication Society of Tennessee," is an association of persons in that State which affixes its seal to the traditions of our friends Scott and Campbell, attesting that they are the very truth itself. This association styles itself "Christian," and professes to be devoted to "the spread of the Gospel." Christian and gospel are fashionable terms of general application, and inscribed in the nomenclature of every form and variety of superstition in Anti-christendom. These words, in the theological use of them, no longer represent the ideas attached to them in apostolic times. Were we not

therefore in possession of some of the publications of this society, we should be at a loss to know what sort of Christianity it professed, or what kind of gospel it laboured to disseminate. We know what the word christian represents in the Bible, and we know, too, what gospel is exhibited there; so that when we contemplate this society in its publications, we are prompted to exclaim, “Jesus we know, and Paul we know; but who are ye?” We see the seven sons of Sceva associated to adjure men by Jesus whom Paul preached; but we find neither the doctrine nor the gospel which they proclaimed for the obedience of faith. “Who are ye,” ye exorcists of Tennessee? Ye, who undertake to extract the mote from the eye of others, and behold not the beam in your own! “Christian,” you say, and spreaders of the gospel—What gospel? The gospel of the extatic revelry of dead men’s ghosts in the Milky Way! The gospel oracularised from “the chair of Sacred History”—mere college divinity bewitched!

As this society, then, spreads a peculiar gospel, which gives character to its Christianity, it should be styled, not “Christian,” but “The Bethanian Sky-Kingdom Publication Society of Tennessee.” By this designation its nature and mission would be defined, and no mistake. The public would know its real character and position, and be no more imposed upon by its substitution of a tinsel imitation for the pure, untarnished, gold of truth.

The organ of this society of Bethanists is a monthly periodical, published at Nashville, styled “The Christian Magazine.” It is well printed, and, if trimmed by the binder, would be decidedly neat. It contains about two pages and a half more typography, upon eight pages more paper, than the Herald; and is enclosed in a bright yellow cover. These artistic qualities are all we can see in it attractive. It comes to us periodically, which reminds us it exists. We look at the captions of the articles, and if we perceive any thing “taking,” we cut asunder the leaves and try to read. We find it, however, impossible, for the most part, to wade over much surface. To a student of the prophets and apostles “The Christian Magazine” is perfectly unreadable. There is an attempt at “fine writing” in a pious strain; but from whatever point the writers set out the print is sure to merge into Bethany traditions; which, having become as stale and insipid as “old wives’ fables,” are perfectly intolerable to the “taught of God.” Being thoroughly acquainted with them in the original, we cannot afford the time, and do not possess the patience, nor have we the ability to imbibe them anew, in the watery hash cooked up for the public by “The Bethanian Sky-Kingdom Publication Society of Tennessee,” and served out to them in its Magazine.

For the first time, for a long period, we discovered something amusing, if not edifying, in a recent number, which has induced us to bestow this passing notice upon the Society and its Magazine. It is known to our readers and to those of the Bethany Millennial Harbinger, a pretty numerous company in the United States, that our valiant friend, the President, after possessing a copy of “Elpis Israel” about two years, plucked up courage to draw his wooden sword to see how it would handle against it! Being “old field pine,” a wood all sap, he found his weapon very dull, light, and fragile; nevertheless, being a right valiant fencer, he thought the weight and power of his arm, and the terror of his mighty name, would compensate the inferiority of his weapon, and be the death of his

adversary from very fright! Our friend is a perfect Goliath of Gath, boldly defiant of Israel's armies, and willing to extinguish their Hope in the twinkling of an eye! It did the Philistines good to see the champion flourish his wooden claymore with stalwart prowess at Elpis; and before it was discovered that the rapid gyrations played off in bringing it from the "draw" to "cut one" had shivered it to flinders, they set up a shout, as though the battle had been fought and the victory won! Animated by this illusion, every uncircumcised Philistine became a Goliath! Even they had only to grin at Israel's Hope and it would be no more! Among these little valiants was one of the "conductors of the Christian Magazine," rejoicing in the initials "J.B.F." Seeing the big Goliath at fence, he must try his hand too! He had not discerned the flinders of the giant's weapon sporting in the wind, or he might have become prudent as the better part of valour; but bent on his own pantomime, he swelled into a bigger Goliath than his original, and forthwith flourished his lath to the terror of every suckling in Gath and her sister Askelon!

In the March number of the Magazine this redoubtable Philistine has two pages and a half of foolishness under the caption of "Religious Phases Extraordinary," which he introduces with a flourish of quotations, singularly applicable to himself and company, who have, indeed, departed from the faith giving heed to deceiving spirits, and to doctrines of disembodied ghosts (daimonion.)—1 Timothy 4: 1. After moralising upon ambition and merit, he snaps his mimic sword against the Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come. Following in the wake of Goliath, he runs a tilt against "the literal throne of David with our Messiah upon it." He does this in presenting his readers with a perverted and burlesque summary of the subjects treated of in this paper, taking care not to omit the "non-resurrection of infants, idiots, and pagans; and the final annihilation of all the wicked." This is done for effect. Being destitute of testimony and reason, he flippantly addresses himself to the blind propensities of the weak-minded, with whom the feelings of the flesh are the supreme law in morals, politics, and religion. There is nothing in the notice to grapple with, for it is impossible to deal with an interjection, a laugh, or a sneer. He has no proposition to be examined, nor does he attempt to show that any thing we have affirmed is untenable, or contrary to "the word of the kingdom." He says, we seem to rank as a prince among the saints of the Lord. We humbly trust it may not only seem so, but prove to be a reality when the Lord comes. He terms the name of this periodical "the wonderful title." It is doubtless. It announces a wonderful truth—that in the Age to Come the God of heaven intends to set up a Kingdom by Jesus Christ, which shall supersede all others. This wonderful truth, destined to become an accomplished fact by His agency, whose name is "the Wonderful," is the sling-stone to carry dismay into the souls off the Philistines, uncircumcised of heart and ears. Against this holy and glorious truth of God, this christian conductor of the Magazine has nothing to offer but an infidel exclamation and a sneer. He admits we have "read the prophets often and anxiously;" but hints that it has only been for sinister purposes; and plainly avers his belief, that we are "under the influence of an ambition that earth cannot gratify." This is a strange averment after admitting that our hopes are bounded by Messiah's reign on earth. If he had said, "an ambition that the present constitution of earth cannot gratify," he would have said truly. He must be "earthly, sensual, and devilish," that can be satisfied with it; for nothing but "the wisdom from beneath" experiences civility and respect at present. Our ambition, he says, "has led to the adoption of the crudest fables of

Jewish dotage and fancies of modern scepticism.” Thus, after the example of our friend his master, this unbeliever speaks of the restoration off the Kingdom again to Israel, the reestablishment off the throne of David on Mount Zion, the annunciation of Gabriel concerning Jesus, and immortality the gift of God to those only who believe and obey the truth. With him, these are but “the crude fables of Jewish dotage, and fancies of modern scepticism!” Are we not justified in saying that such men as he are ignorant of “what be the first principles off the oracles of God?” They know nothing of religion, and never will know any thing of it, till they become as little children, and humble themselves to be taught of God through the writings of his holy prophets. Marvellous spreaders of the gospel indeed! —blasphemers of the very things it proclaims as good news to Israel and the Nations. Surely, if Jehovah laughed at the vain efforts of Herod and Pontius Pilate, heaven’s conclave must echo with shouts of derision, when the angels hear earth’s reputed wise ones aver, that David’s throne is in the nebulous centre of boundless space, and his son Jesus now sitting upon it and reigning over the house of Jacob forever! Do they not apostrophise such folly, and exclaim, “O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken?!”

In Paul’s day there were “christians” who “preached another Jesus” as well as “another gospel”—2 Corinthians 11: 4. It is so even now. —The Jesus of the Tennessee Publication Society is not the Jesus whom Paul preached. Paul preached a Jesus to whom as yet all things are not subject, though even now crowned with glory and honour—Hebrews 2: 8-9—he preached a Jesus who shall be revealed from heaven with the angel’s of his power to destroy the Apostasy and its Chief—1 Thessalonians 1: 10; 3: 13; 4: 16; 2 Thessalonians 1: 7; 2: 3, 8—he preached Jesus prophesied of by Isaiah who shall reign over the nations, when they and Israel shall rejoice together—Romans 15: 10-12. Read Isaiah eleventh; also the ninth, tenth and eleventh verses of the fortieth chapter; the first seven verses of the forty-second; the first twelve verses of the forty-ninth; the sixty-first and sixty-second chapters, and the first six verses off the sixty-third. This is the Jesus whom Paul preached—one who came in weakness and humility, but is again to come in power as Jehovah’s servant to perform an appointed work—to smite the nations with the sword of Israel, to build up David’s throne, to restore his Kingdom, to give laws to the world, to enlighten mankind, to establish peace, and with his resurrected brethren to “govern the nations upon earth” as the kings and priests of God—Psalm 22: 27-28; 67: 4; Revelation 5: 10; 2: 26-27; 11: 15; 20: 4. This is not the Jesus preached by Bethanists and other sectaries. They preach a Jesus who was crucified and rose again, whose mission was so to do, to save ghosts from fire and brimstone who, before their disembodiment, believed that he died for sin and rose again for their justification; and then to depart to a mystic throne of a mystic David, to return no more to earth till the time came to destroy it by fire and so exterminate it from the universe of God! Here are two characters with two distinct and opposite missions proclaimed under the same name—the one character answering to the description of the prophets and apostles, and preached by Paul; the other, answering to the portraiture of neither, and imposed upon the public as Jesus Christ by “J. B. F.” and other blind guides of the apostasy, whom he and the rest who burn incense to the people’s idols, delight to honour. We cannot know Jesus personally till he comes again; if we know him at all, then, it must be as a character described. Which description doth the reader confess—Isaiah and Paul’s, or that of the college-

evangelicals? The latter are profoundly ignorant of the prophets, and consequently do not understand the apostles. Hence the character they describe is an unscriptural one, and therefore to be rejected. If you believe in the Jesus of the “sacred desks” you do not believe in the Jesus of the Bible, for they are diverse. “J. B. F.” is therefore at fault in saying that we teach the establishment of the literal throne of David with one he styles “OUR Messiah” upon it. We don’t believe in his Messiah, nor in the Tennessee Society’s Messiah, nor in any collegiate Messiah. We believe in the Messiah of Moses and the prophets whom Paul preached—in that Jesus Christ who is to come and raise the dead, build up the tabernacle of David and set up its ruins “as in the days of old.” We teach that this is the Messiah who is to sit upon his father David’s throne in Mount Zion. We do not teach that the sectarian or Gentile Jesus is to sit there. If their Jesus were to appear, and declare that he intended to reign in “old Jerusalem,” the preachers would not permit it, if they could hinder it. For they don’t believe in such a reign, which they ridicule as monstrous and absurd. They would be for sending him back beyond the skies with all haste, for to remain on earth would be to convict them of being fools and blind.

After characterising the things we sustain by testimony and reason, as “the crudest fables of Jewish dotage and fancies of modern scepticism,” he continues in the next sentence to remark, “we have never read his Elpis Israel, however,” that is, as implied by the adverb, “we undertake to affirm what he teaches in Elpis Israel, notwithstanding we have never read it.” So much for prejudice. This is quite in keeping with his master, our intuitive friend the President! He thought he knew what was in Elpis Israel before he read it, but to his mortification he has found himself deceived. Men who give judgment concerning things before they have acquainted themselves with them are neither honest nor well-informed. Why do not our calumniators meet us like honourable men, and convince us of error, or the public of our errors, in fair and open controversy? Let them cease their dastardly appeals to prejudice, and come forward with their strong reasons, and irrefutable prophetic and apostolic testimony, and overwhelm us with argument and truth. There are Elpis Israels and Heralds in Nashville and Bethany, let the enemy then quote them honestly, if possible, and contravene their positions if they can. Dare they do this, and admit us to try the temper of the spirit’s two-edged blade upon the weapons they may flourish in the fight? O infatuate their courage, Lord, and bring them to the contest, that through their defeat thy truth may be caused to shine brighter and brighter to the perfect day!

EDITOR.

\* \* \*

BLOODS.

“The Earth shall disclose her Bloods.”

“From the necessities of the case, in order to their representation to the senses of the prophet (John,) the disembodied martyrs appear in their own persons; and to guard the student of the vision against interpreting them like other symbols, as representatives

by analogy, they are expressly declared to be the spirits of those who had been slain for the word of God and for the testimony which they hold, and exhibited as uttering sentiments, and receiving an answer, appropriate to that relation to God.” Lord. They are “expressly declared to be” the souls (tas psuchas) not “the spirits” of the slain—“the bloods” of the witnesses crying, like Abel’s from the ground, for blood-avengment upon shedders thereof. This is the idea represented in the fifth seal. In the resurrection, they from whom “the bloods” were poured out will receive “white robes”—they will be covered with robes of righteousness, and garments of salvation. There is no allusion to “disembodied spirits” in the Apocalypse, which is a revelation of things past, present, and future upon earth in its past, present and future states.

\* \* \*

#### NO SYMBOL FOR “SEPARATE SPIRITS.”

“There is obviously nothing in the whole circle of the social or material world, that can properly symbolise the spirits of the martyrs.”—Lord’s Expos. Apoc. The reason of this is that there are no such existences as the living spirits of dead men. —On the author’s favourite principle of analogy there can be no symbol of “disembodied ghosts;” for as there is nothing of the kind there can be no resemblances to symbolise. Where there is no thing there can be no sign. God does not employ symbols where there is nothing to represent.

EDITOR.

\* \* \*