

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 September, 1852—
Volume 2—No. 9.

“PROVE ALL THINGS.”

Our article on the “Scarcity of Gold in Turkey, &c.,” published in our sixth number, has been reproduced in the Advent Harbinger, of Rochester, N. Y., with the following “Remarks” appended to it by our worthy friend the editor; and which we take the liberty of inserting here under the caption of

NO PRE-ADVENTUAL COLONISATION OF JUDEA.

As we suppose the above article was written in view of what has been published in the Harbinger on this subject, and as the questions embraced are highly important and not well understood by some honest minds, we in the spirit of kindness, and for the sake of eliciting light, offer the following remarks on the several points noticed in the article before us.

1. Whatever may have been the ‘original plan for settling the question of the holy places,’ by selling the land to M. Rothschild, it is evident that that plan has proved a failure: for from subsequent authentic accounts which we have published in recent numbers of the Harbinger, according to the absolute wishes of the Emperor of Russia and the imperial decree of the Grand Turk, no change in the ownership of the Holy Places is permitted at present to take place. And besides, it has been credibly announced that Rothschild, at the last account of him, was ‘dying at Frankfort on the Main.’ And further, as we understand prophecy, the land of promise cannot be purchased, nor possessed by a Jew or Jews, before the Lord shall come, for it is to be trodden down by Gentiles, until their times shall be fulfilled, and then Christ whose right it is, will come and possess it by right of inheritance. The Jews can never possess that land on any other principle than by right of inheritance. If they can, where in the sacred volume is that right guaranteed? Echo answers, Where?
2. If the ‘twelve tribes shall be redeemed without money,’ as the word of prophecy predicts, and as the Herald admits, it is reasonable to infer that their city and land must be purchased of their oppressors. Are there any such stipulations in the Gentile lease of two thousand five hundred and twenty years’ continuance from a certain date, or of its repetition of two thousand and three hundred years, from another period, or in any reference to it in the Bible, which justifies them in asking a price for that land, when their lease expires, or their times end? We know of none. They are usurpers, and have held and trodden down the land by mere sufferance; hence no Jew

is under any obligation to purchase it of them at any time, and more especially when the time has come when they are suffered to hold it no longer.

3. We fully endorse the expression of Bro. Thomas, that ‘the restoration of Israel will not take place until after the appearing of Messiah in power.’ But we cannot believe that there will be a restoration, or as he expresses it, ‘A lifting up of an ensign,’ or a ‘re-settlement of the land by the Jews to a limited extent before the battle of Armageddon,’ or ‘before Messiah returns,’ as Bro. T. teaches. Certainly the texts he has quoted, as we understand them, do not prove such a position. We will look at them.

Isaiah 30: 17. ‘One thousand shall flee at the rebuke of one; at the rebuke of five shall ye flee; till ye be left as a beacon upon the top of a mountain, and as an ensign on an hill.’

Mark, this text does not speak of ‘a lifting up,’ nor of a ‘re-settlement,’ of a limited number of the Jews to constitute ‘an ensign,’ but it predicts that after they should be wasted or cut off by wars and other judgments for their often repeated and unrepented of sins, as ‘a tree bereft of branches’ or boughs, (margin.)—So they would be ‘LEFT as an ensign on an hill:’ not ‘an ensign,’ but as an ensign that had been deserted by the power that had sustained it. Precisely in this manner has a small remnant of Judah been ‘left’ in the land of Palestine ever since the nation was cut off and scattered. This remnant that has been ‘left’ like a deserted ensign on an hill, is not to constitute a ‘re-settlement,’ for they have ever been there, neither are they to become an, nor the ensign to which the dispersed tribes of Israel and Judah in a limited capacity even, are to be gathered, for Christ is to fill this high station: for ‘unto him shall the gathering of the people be.’ And ‘in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people.’ ‘I Jesus . . . am the root and offspring of David.’—Isaiah 11: 10 and Revelation 22: 16.

Ezekiel 39: 9, 11-12. ‘And they that dwell in the cities of Israel shall go forth, and shall set on fire and burn the weapons, both the shields and the bucklers, the bows and the arrows, and the hand-staves and the spears, and they shall burn them with fire seven years.’

‘And it shall come to pass that day, that I will give unto Gog a place there of graves in Israel, the valley of the passengers on the east of the sea; and it shall stop the noses of the passengers: and there shall they bury Gog and all his multitude; and they shall call it, The valley of Hamon-gog.’

‘And seven months shall the house of Israel be burying them, that they may cleanse the land.’

We cannot conceive how these texts sustain Bro. Thomas’ position; for they say nothing about Judah or Israel becoming or being ‘an ensign,’ or there being a ‘re-settlement’ of them ‘to a limited extent’ ‘before Messiah returns,’ but they do speak of the battle of Armageddon that does not take place until after the Lord comes—and instead of Israel being gathered to ‘a limited extent’ at that time, the 28th verse of the same chapter clearly shows that they will all be gathered then, for it says, ‘I have gathered them unto their own land, and have left none of them any more there.’

That the great events predicted in the thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth chapters of Ezekiel will take place subsequently to the coming of Christ, we think is incontrovertibly proved in our reply to Bro. Grew, under the head, ‘The Advent Near,’ in the Harbinger for May 22, to

which we refer the reader, and also to our reply to Bro. Magruder, under the same heading in the Harbinger for May 8. All will do well to read those articles with care.

4. If the 'proposal' relative to the Rothschilds purchasing Palestine is to 'become an accomplished fact,' and if 'that fact' 'will be a sure and certain sign of that speedy appearing of the Son of Man in power and glory,' then it must be a clear subject of prophecy, and as the prophetic Word is sure, Rothschild must purchase the land of Palestine before the Lord shall come; for all 'sure and certain signs of his speedy appearing' must be fulfilled. —But if it should turn out that Rothschild is dead, or that the imperial decrees of the emperors of Russia and of Turkey have defeated this plan, what then? Has a 'sure and certain sign' failed? Or has Dr. T. been mistaken relative to its being such? The latter must be the case.
5. If "no one need expect that appearing to be manifested until a Jewish colony be lifted up 'as an ensign upon an hill,'" the Bible must plainly reveal the fact. —But we say, fearless of contradiction from any one, that no such revelation has been made in that Book. If we are mistaken, we would kindly thank Dr. Thomas, or any other person, to set us right by giving the proof; not however in inferences, assumptions, nor mystical expositions, but in the PLAIN WORD OF THE LORD. We can make nothing else the foundation of our faith, for 'faith comes by hearing, and hearing, and hearing by the word of the Lord.'
6. If 'the present calm—is for the blossoming forth of Judah's plant,' or that a colony of them may 'be lifted up as an ensign upon an hill'—we would be exceedingly thankful to be convinced of the fact, by the plain word of the Lord; for we now have no faith that such is the case, for the very good reason that no such thing is taught in the Bible, and furthermore its infallible testimony is against such a conclusion. For the Jews were to be captives among all the world, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled. — Luke 20: 21. Then their next, second, or final gathering is not to be a 'limited' one to be succeeded by a third, for a third gathering is no where promised in the Scriptures. But a second is, (Isaiah 11: 11) which is to take place after Christ stands as an ensign, (Isaiah 11: 10) and is to embrace the entire remnant of Judah and of Israel, 'from the four corners of the earth.'—Isaiah 11: 12.
7. 'Still we should like to see him M. Rothschild adorn his brows with the diadem of Judah's kings. It would be to the believer, an earnest,' &c. How this sentiment can be in harmony with the following prophetic word, we cannot conceive; we think they are in direct opposition to each other; and if the 'diadem of Judah's kings,' should 'adorn Rothschild's or any other Jew's 'brows,' excepting the Lord Jesus, it would prove the prophetic Word untrue, which says:
 'Thus saith the Lord God, remove the diadem, and take off the crown; this shall not be the same: exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn it; and it shall be no more, until HE COME WHOSE RIGHT IT IS, and I will GIVE IT HIM,' (Ezekiel 21: 25, 27.) not to M. Rothschild, nor suffer him to purchase it.
Hence, should he 'adorn his brows with the diadem of Judah's kings,' instead of its being to 'the believer an earnest, that the crown of David would ere long illustrate the majesty of his Son and Lord'—it would shake the very foundation of his faith, relative to his ever being thus adorned, or wearing the crown on David's throne.
8. We see no greater difficulty in the way of Rothschild 'rebuilding Solomon's temple,' or 'the temple of Jehovah' and being a 'king and priest' on David's throne than we do of his adorning 'his brows with the diadems of Judah's kings.' And indeed we cannot see why he must not do all this before the Lord shall come, providing that the

‘proposal’ if it ‘become an accomplished fact,’ will ‘be a sure and certain sign of the speedy appearing off the Son of Man in power and great glory,’—for that ‘proposal,’ contemplates the ‘rebuilding’ of the ‘temple of Jehovah,’ as clearly as it does the adorning ‘the brows’ of Rothschild with the ‘diadems of Judah’s kings.’ All such contemplations doubtless will fail, for they are not justified by the inspired Word, but opposed by it.

Finally, we heartily concur with Bro. Thomas, that the recent discoveries of gold in vast amounts, in different quarters of the earth, indicate that God is making preparations to carry out his purpose as predicted in Isaiah 60: 17, and other parallel prophecies. But we are far from supposing that these predictions will have their fulfilment until the Lord shall come; for the heaven is to retain him until the times of restitution, which God hath spoken of by the mouths of all his holy prophets, since the world began—Acts 3: 20. Here is an invulnerable point from which we all shall do well not to depart: there can be no restitution, of either the people, land, or city, in full or to a ‘limited extent,’ until the great Restorer shall come. This he will soon do, for the times of the Gentiles are nearly out. May we be counted worthy by him to take a part in the great and glorious work, and to share in its inconceivable blessings.

* * *

REPLY.

THE REMNANT OF A PRE-ADVENTUAL JEWISH COLONY, THE REFINED
THIRD PART ADVENTUALLY DELIVERED.

“Two parts in the land shall be cut off and die, but the third shall be left therein. And I will bring the third part through the fire, and will refine them as silver is refined, and will try them as gold is tried: they shall call on my name, and I will hear them: I will say, It is my people: and they shall say, The Lord (Jesus) my God!”—Zechariah.

The remarks in the preceding article are offered, the writer says, “in the spirit of kindness, and for the sake of eliciting light.” I accept them in the same spirit; for I am sure the editor of that Harbinger (I wish I could say the same of the conductors of all Harbingers) is too honest a student of the word, too sincere a lover of truth, and too much imbued with the benevolence of “the gospel of the kingdom,” to find it in his heart to be ill-natured towards a fellow-student, who does not see eye to eye with him in all things, nor occupy the same position as he. I am satisfied he wants to be convinced if in error. The progress he has already made from mere anti-creedism to the belief of the gospel of the kingdom, proves this. —He has found himself on the wrong side of a question more than once, and when aware of it, has honestly confessed that the position was untenable, and magnanimously abandoned it. This is the sort of a man I like to talk with; because his object is to get at the truth; and so is mine. Neither he nor I is infallible; for I have made a “confession and abjuration” of errors as well as he: so that we can meet upon an equal footing in this respect, and endeavour to enlighten one another.

Now, at present he firmly believes that I am in error upon a certain point connected with the restoration of Israel, which leaks out in the aforesaid article; which, however, was not written, as he supposes, “in view of what had been published in the Harbinger on the subject;” but as corrective of the notion of a general restoration of the Jews, and a rebuilding of the

temple before the eternal king of Israel shall appear; as well as by way of comment on the latest news from the east. My friend's idea is, that there will be no return of Jews at all (save as they have journeyed thither as pilgrims for ages) before the Lord appears. We agree that the Twelve Tribes will be restored to the land promised to their fathers; but he considers it entirely post-adventual, and immediately subsequent to the battle of Armageddon. I differ from him in believing, that there will be a pre-adventual limited colonisation of the country by Jews, under the protectorate of Britain; and that the prosperity of this colony, together with a desire to cripple or subvert the British power in the east, will be the cause of the country's invasion by the Russian 'Clay,' styled Gog, &c., by Ezekiel. I consider that this colonisation is going on while Russia is engaged in the conquest of the west—while it is mixing with a fragile union the iron leg and toes there with the 'miry clay.' The invasion of Israel's land, and conquest of Jerusalem, is the end of the formative process; for then the eastern and western legs and the ten toes are fashioned into feet, being combined together by Russo-Assyrian Clay.

This is the crisis to which things are now working out, and by which a necessity is created for the appearing of the Lord. The Anglo Jewish colony is just 'an element in the situation.' It is planted in Palestine in the interests of Britain, providentially as an ingredient in the bait to tempt the Gog-nations to come up to battle against Jerusalem, that the Lord may "plead with them for his heritage Israel." The invasion will be a time of great trouble to the colony; for 'two parts in the land will be cut off and die; but the third part shall be left therein'—Zechariah 13: 8. It is this third part that calls upon Jehovah's name for help. The Lord says, 'I will hear them;' and in consequence of so doing, descends, and smites the assembled host; and, by Michael, their great prince, delivers them—Daniel 12: 1. Then comes the resurrection. They who cry for help are in the land; to be there they must have previously returned; they cry because of the oppressor; they cry of necessity before they are heard; and the oppressor is broken in pieces in answer to their cry.

In the battle of Armageddon, which breaks the feet, the Jews fight 'because the Lord is with them'—Zechariah 10: 5; 14: 14. These combatant Jews must therefore have returned to Judea before the battle; and consequently before the coming of the Lord, as our friend admits that his advent and the battle are contemporary.

The post-adventual restoration of the Twelve Tribes is a work of time. It will not be consummated till the end of forty years after the battle of Armageddon. I have shown this in an article soon to appear in the Herald. This forty years occupies the space between the advent and the commencement of the thousand years; and affords scope for Elijah to 'restore all things,' and for Jesus and his brethren to torment 'the devil and his angels.' These things may sound strange in unpractised ears; but let such wait till they have examined what I have to publish on the subject before they presume to judge. There is more in the divine testimony than Gentiles of this age have thought of yet.

From what is now presented the reader may gather some of the points at issue. I need not, therefore, dilate upon them more just now.

The latest news from the east is but a shadow of coming events. What I have written concerning it was hypothetical. I said, 'it is probable that the financial scheme of the Turkish government may be the initiative of the preadventual colonisation of the Holy Land.' 'If the proposal become an accomplished fact, that fact will speak in unmistakable and infallible terms to the believer.' The initiative result of the Turkish policy has been to unsettle the

whole question; and to stir up the Autocrat. The interference of the latter only affects the present aspect of the case. When he gets his hands full in strengthening Austria and the Pope, with the ulterior view of restoring the Bourbons, Britain will have something to say that will be pre-eminently anti-Russian, and promotive of her own policy in the east. There are several Rothschilds. The London Rothschild is the alleged purchaser; not he of Frankfort on the Maine, who is said to be dying. However the colonisation be brought about, it will be the sign of the time indicative of the speedy coming. There are signs that the practiced eye can already see; but that will be a sign, which, if men were not stone-blind, no one could fail to discern aright.

It is just because the colony I speak of, will not possess the land by faith, (which is what, I suppose, my friend means by 'right of inheritance,') that they are so terribly disturbed in their possession by Gog. There can be no continued peace and prosperity there for Jew or Gentile, till the land is inherited by right of the Covenant dedicated by the blood of its future king.

I have but little confidence in the idea of settling the land as the result of a money transaction with the Porte. It may, and it may not. Britain may subsidise the Turk against Austria and Russia, and assume the protectorate of Egypt and the Holy Land, as she does the Ionian Islands, in return. I do not see the details off the affair in prophecy; but the colonisation itself I perceive without obscurity. This is the great thing; the measures leading thereto, are merely matters of interesting speculation as they arise.

I do not adduce the text in the thirtieth of Isaiah to prove that the settlement of a colony is to be the being 'as an ensign on a hill,' referred to there; but to show that a small number of Israel as compared with the whole nation, is in scripture language likened to 'an ensign on a hill,' or 'a beacon on the top of a mountain.' To be 'left as an ensign,' and to be 'lifted up as an ensign,' are different ideas. I speak off the colony being as a pre-adventual ensign. This will be composed of the remnant left, (which our friend admits is as a deserted ensign, abandoned by the power that had sustained it,) and of the new colonists, whose aggregation to the old remnant does not at all affect its ensign, or beacon, resemblance. Now before the Lord appears, the fair ensign, so gaily wafting in the breeze under the shadowing wings of Britain, is torn down, and trampled under foot by the Prince of Ros. The silver and gold, cattle and goods, unwalled villages and peaceful dwellings, become a prey to the spoiler. The 'merchants of Tarshish, and the young lions thereof,' that is, the British power, as I have proved in Elpis Israel, threaten and oppose the destroyer in vain. There is none can save, or lift it up, but the Lord God of Israel. He comes to do this; and when he comes, 'all the men that are upon the face of the land shall shake at his presence'—Ezekiel 38: 20. The result is the destruction of the army of the Gog-nations, of which only 'a sixth part' escapes; and the setting up of the ensign erect again, no more to be trampled under feet of the Gentiles. Thus, 'the Lord their God shall save them in that day as the flock of his people; for they shall be as the stones of a crown, LIFTED UP as an ensign upon his land. For how great is his goodness and how great is his beauty! Corn shall make the young men glad, and new wine the maids'—Zechariah 9: 16. The colonisation I termed, 'a lifting up of an ensign,' (a phrase of comparison of course, 'as' being understood,) to distinguish it from the lifting up of the Lord, and by the Lord—an ensign lifted up by the British power; itself, however, unconscious that the colonisation was a sign.

The passage quoted from Ezekiel by our friend, proves a settlement of the land to some extent before the advent by implication. The battle of Armageddon, which breaks the

Image, is at the Lord's coming; the war, which reduces its fragments to chaff, is after his return. Ezekiel speaks of the battle in particular; and in the conclusion of his prophecy announces the result of the general war, which is not only the comminution of the whole image, but the full accomplishment of the work of restoration, as expressed in the words, 'I have gathered them unto their own land, and have left none of them any more there' in the enemy's country. 'They that dwell in the cities of Israel,' who go forth to burn the weapons and bury the slain, are precisely the survivors of that colony residing in the land at the time of the battle, to save whom the Lord strikes the blow. The salvation of this third part by the Advent victory is the beginning of deliverance to the whole nation. It must have been pre-advantageously settled in the land, or it could not be there to witness the fight. It would be very incongruous for there to be so great a carnage, and all the survivors fled, and no Israelites at hand to put Gog's multitude under ground. The circumstances of the case evidently necessitate a pre-advantageous settlement to some extent.

True; the Jews were to be 'led away captive into all the nations,' (ta ethnee,) but it does not say that they were all to continue captives in exile, without remission, till the times of the Gentiles were fulfilled. They were led away by the Roman power into all the nations of that dominion; but not into 'all nations,' and 'all the world,' in the modern Gentile sense of those phrases. It is Jerusalem that is to be trodden down of the Gentiles until the fulfilment of their times. A little transient good fortune to the city in no way affects the verity of this. Jerusalem, in the days of the Saracens and Crusaders, became the throne of a kingdom which continued many years. 'King of Jerusalem,' is one of his Austrian Apostolic Majesty's titles, derived from his ancestral relation to that Kingdom. Hence, as in the days of Pontius Pilate, the Jews acknowledged 'no other king but Caesar;' so now, Caesar, the imperial chief of 'the Holy Roman Empire,' claims the same sovereignty. His 'rights' will in due time be assumed by the Russo-Assyrian Gog, whence comes his present sensitiveness in regard to the eastern question; so that none, be he Jew, Turk, or infidel, can become Emir, Bey, or King, of Judea without having the Autocrat for his inveterate foe. But Britain will see to this in due time. I refer to Jerusalem's middle-age royalty here to show that her transient independence is quite compatible with a continuance of the Gentile times. But a colony, with Jerusalem for its provincial capital, is still a Gentile dependency. A Jewish colony surrounded by the Ottoman, the Russian, the Persian, the Arab, and the Egyptian, could not sustain itself unless protected by a strong maritime power. It must therefore be like Judea under the Persians of old, a province of a Gentile dominion until the Lord shall come. But its prosperity under the power shadowing with wings—Isaiah 18: 1—will soon pass away. The Assyrian river will overflow it even to the neck, and breach the very walls of the Holy City, which Sennacherib could not do; for 'the city shall be taken'—Zechariah 14: 2. The worst of the Gentiles then trample it in the dust. Its brief colonial well-being will have vanished like a dream; and have given place to a barbaric degradation, evincing that the 'wickedness' of her captors is indeed 'great'—Joel 3: 13; for 'the houses shall be rifled, and the women ravished,' and half of its inhabitants sent off as prisoners by the enemy. This semi-deportation of the people by the chief of the 'all nations' assembled at the siege, characterises the future capture of the city. Zechariah prophesied after its Chaldean overthrow, and during its restoration under the Persians. He must, therefore, have referred to a future overthrow. His prediction could not have been fulfilled under Titus, because all the people who remained were led away captive; and the city was wholly destroyed: whereas the prophet intimates, that the city will not be destroyed, in saying that 'the residue of the people shall not be cut off from the city.' The city therefore remains, and half the Jews with it, earnestly desiring their Messiah to appear, and deliver them if ever they did. There has been no siege since the Roman armies (who were the Lord's hosts for the destruction—Daniel 9: 26, explained by Matthew 22: 7) destroyed it, in which

the Jews withstood a Gentile assault; it can therefore only be a future event, and contemporary with the going forth of the Lord to 'fight against those nations.' He did not fight against the Romans; but on the contrary, fought against Judah and Jerusalem until they were destroyed utterly: but in the future siege he will fight against the Gog-armies of the nations 'as when he fought in the day of battle'—Joshua 10: 11, in victorious defence of Jerusalem and the Jews of the third part. It is 'then'—after the coming capture of the city garrisoned by Jews and their protectors—that the Lord goes forth with his mighty ones—Joel 3: 11; 2 Thessalonians 1: 7, and stands with his feet on the Mount of Olives, the place from which he ascended to 'the right hand of power.' His electric tread evokes an earthquake that divides the Mount, as a mountain was divided on the west of the city by the earthquake in Uzziah's reign. All these things characterise the siege and capture as one unexampled in the history of the world. The deliverance of Jerusalem and the fall of Rome are the glorious incidents that mark the fulfilment off the Gentile times; and until they happen no arithmetical calculation of the 1335 days can be admitted which does not stretch forward to that desirable consummation.

It is readily agreed, that there are but two gatherings of Judah from captivity, and one of the Ten Tribes, which is subsequent to Judah's second; for 'I will save the tents of Judah first,' saith the Lord. But the colonisation, I speak of, will not be a gathering of the tribe of Judah. The great bulk of the tribe will be shut up in the nations subject to Gog—the north and the south, which 'keep back,' and refuse to 'give up.' But there will be sufficient for British policy forthcoming from other parts. The Lord saves the Tribe of Judah, while Elijah is fulfilling his mission with the Ten; which will be perfected by the reunion of the Twelve into one stick in Messiah's hand, by the Lord himself—Ezekiel 37: 16-28.

When I spoke of M. Rothschild adorning his brows with the diadem of Judah's kings, on the hypothesis of the news being true that he might assume the title of emir, bey, or king, in the event of the purchase being made; I did not refer to the crown of David, which none can wear but one of David's lineage, and that one will not be Zedekiah, but Jesus, the only living descendant of David, who is both David's Son and Lord. Judah has had Kings not of David's lineage. For 129 years Judah was governed by Jewish Kings of the tribe of Levi, the Asmoneans; whose race gave place to the Gentile dynasty of Herod. These were Kings of Judah, that is reigning over Judah's commonwealth until the sceptre departed from it; but who wore not the crown or diadem of David. My remark therefore does not at all clash with Ezekiel's celebrated prophecy of the abasement of David's crown and kingdom until the appearing of the Lord to restore, and take possession of them. If Rothschild, or any other Jew or Gentile, were to become governor of a colony of Jews in Palestine with the title of King, he would be either adorning his own brows, or some power would have done it for him, with the diadem of Judah's king, in the sense in which I used the phrase. Jerusalem is traditionally, as I have shown, a precious stone in the diadem or crown of "His Apostolic Majesty" of Austria; which would be plucked from thence by any one who should assume the title and possess the power. It would be an earnest as it were of returning royalty to the Jews; and be very far from shaking the faith of any one who regarded the present but as shadows of the substance which is of Christ.

The colonisation of Judea by Jews under the protection of a Gentile government, is neither "restitution," "restoration," nor "regeneration." Nothing short of a national establishment in the land, under Messiah and his brethren, constitutes either of them in the scriptural sense. The settlement of a colony there has no more to do with restitution than Meshullams farming in Artor's valley. A hundred thousand Meshullams in Judea would be no restoration. Restitution is not simply a return of the race, but the setting up again of

institutions that once existed there—the restitution or restoration of the kingdom again to the Twelve Tribes; this is the re-institution, or restitution spoken of by all the prophets from Moses to the revealer of the Apocalypse to John. No Gentile powers can accomplish this, though aided by all the Jews on earth: for the Restored Kingdom exists under an amended Mosaic code, whose emendation (diorthrosis) can only be defined, administered, and adapted to the exigencies of the world, by the King of Israel himself, and his associate priests and kings. Our worthy friend of the Advent Harbinger is, no doubt, very anxious for the appearing of the King in power and great glory. So am I, and for more reasons than need be expressed. But we must take care not to allow our wishes, or desires, to lead us to conclusions not in harmony with the testimony and sound reason. I would have no delay; but I am compelled to confess that there will yet be some. The working out of the approaching judgment upon principles illustrated in God's past dealings with nations, and empires, requires time—a dozen years at least; and in these days of steam and electricity how much may be accomplished in that period! This brief delay will, perhaps, be the salvation of many; for, how numerous are they who are praying for the appearing of the Lord, who have not even begun to prepare for his appearance. Let us not therefore be impatient of arguments that do not confirm us in our wishes. “Thy will, O Lord, not mine be done!” should be pre-eminently the disposition of the student of the prophetic word. I see a war among the powers resulting from an antagonism to French ambition, which must precede the battle of Armageddon; the Great City has also to be divided into three parts; and the Feet of Nebuchadnezzar's Image have to be fashioned into shape out of the materials that exist. This requires time; and during this time the colony is forming and prospering to tempt the spoiler to his destruction by the stone power, on the mountains of Israel. But I need add no more at present, than to say, that these explanations of points of difficulty are submitted to my friend and his readers in the same frank and benevolent spirit, so graciously manifested on his part, by his sincere well-wisher the

EDITOR.

* * *

THE BIBLE DOCTRINE CONCERNING THE TEMPTER CONSIDERED.

We have ascertained satisfactorily, because scripturally, as it appears to me, that the thing, styled in the Greek New Testament *diabolos*, and rendered devil in the English version, is SIN IN THE FLESH, He that “walks according to the flesh” “serves sin,” *diabolos*, or the devil. The mortal body is “the body of sin,” or Sin Incarnate, which with its affections, lusts, and transgressions, is styled “the Old Man;” than whom no imaginary devil can be more wicked, and defiant of God and his law. The Old Man in his individual, social, and political manifestations is the *diabolos* or devil of the New Testament mystery—1 Timothy 3: 16—(The New Testament is the exhibition of the great mystery of godliness.), and treated of accordingly. Destroy the ascendancy of the sin-principle of the flesh over the thoughts and actions, and you have a moral development of the New Man, and then eradicate it from the flesh by the Spirit in a resurrection or transformation to eternal life, and you the New Man in combined moral and physical manifestation, “*isangelos*,” “equal to an angel”—Luke 20: 36. There is no sin in the flesh of the angelic nature; therefore it cannot die. No element of it has “the power of death;” so that *diabolos* exists not in angelic society. The devil has no place there. Being nothing in their nature causing them to transgress, or Cross the line of the Divine will, there are no *ta erga diabolon*, works of sin, among them. But all is just as God would have it; and it would be so here but for the disturbing principle called Sin. Eradicate this, and “the will of the Father will be done on earth as it is in heaven,” that is, in angelic society.

From what I have set forth on this subject, our worthy friend will see that I do not speak in Elpis Israel of the agency in the original temptation as only an animal. If there had been nothing in the constitution of the original nature of man impressible by the suggestions of the Serpent, there could have been no transgression. Had Eve's nature been isangelic instead of animal, there would have been no internal response to the external enticement. That internal something was not essentially evil; because, though possessing it, Adam and Eve was pronounced "very good." It is not evil to admire the beautiful, and to wish to possess it; to desire to gratify the taste, and to aspire to the wisdom of "the gods," or Elohim; but all this becomes evil when its attainment is sought by crossing the limit forbidden of God. The seeking to attain by crossing the line, Paul teaches was the result, not of innate wickedness, but of deception. The Serpent beguiled Eve. Had she been certain of the consequences she would not have transgressed. She had no experience of evil. It might be a very agreeable thing for any thing she knew; and highly promotive of happiness. God had warned her of danger in the pursuit of knowledge through disobedience; but then, if they were to go back to the dust, that is, to die, what was the meaning of that Tree of Lives? Did not God mean something else? If they crossed the line in relation to the Tree of Knowledge, could they not eat also of that other tree, and live forever? There seemed to her mind to be an uncertainty about returning to the dust, when she lost sight of the law. This was "the weakness of the flesh." There was no uncertainty of consequences so long as she thought God meant what he said; but being deceived on this point, and so made doubtful of it, she ventured to experiment. But, however doubtful of what might be, if she had adhered strictly to what God had said, she would still have continued "very good." "Weakness," mental and physical, is an original element of animal nature; as "power" is of the angelic. Adam's nature was "very good" as an animal nature; but still it was weak, and therefore deceivable and terminable. This weakness is founded in the unfitness of air, electricity, blood, and food, to maintain organised dust, or flesh, in life and power forever. The life-principles being weak, the flesh is weak in all its operations, mental and physical. The life of the angelic nature, or spiritual body, is not maintained on animal principles; but by the direct action of God's Spirit on dust so organised as to be adapted to its operations. It is therefore strong. When Adam's weak nature began to think and act, independently of the divine law, its weakness, before an undefiled weakness, became evil in its workings, and deteriorating in its effects; and acquired the name of Sin from its having brought forth sin, or transgression of law.

The undefiled weakness of the flesh, enticed and deceived by sophistry from without, is, in few words, the definition of the original temptation. The law of God was weak through the flesh—Romans 8: 3, not through the strength of the Serpent. Had the flesh been strong, the Serpent would have been powerless with all his sagacity. But the weakness thrown into a ferment by serpent-subtlety became beguiling; and the beguiling subtlety, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived them, and by it slew them—Romans 7: 11. What I have said about the Serpent in Elpis Israel stands as it was. I have affirmed neither more nor less than what Moses and the apostles say. "It was more subtle," or acute, "than any beast, of the field which the Lord God had made." It is generally supposed that the serpent was employed by the Devil to beguile the woman. "It cannot be doubted," says Calmet, "but that by the Serpent, we are to understand the Devil; who merely employed the Serpent as a vehicle to seduce the first woman." This teaches the existence of an invisible devil before the Serpent. The Bible, however, does not teach this. Diabolos had no existence before the formation of man; but the Serpent had. Moses gives not the slightest hint of the existence of a devil before the creations of the sixth day. The Serpent first; then man; afterwards, woman; and lastly, diabolos, or devil. This is the scriptural order of their manifestation, the revelation in the flesh of the

incitant to transgression, or diabolos, being coeval with the Fall. Man existed before the devil, and will flourish in eternal glory after his destruction, when Sin and all its works are eradicated from the earth.

“The beginnings” of Genesis 1: 1; Matthew 19: 8; John 1: 1 and 8: 44, are manifestly not all the same. The “beginnings” of Genesis, Matthew, and John 1: 1, have relation to the creation week; but that of John 8: 44, to the conversation of the Serpent with Eve, and the murder of Abel. The Fall was probably several years after the creation week; and Abel’s murder certainly many. Father diabolos was not a murderer before he brought our first parents under sentence of death. It was then he slew them by the commandment. The beginning referred to in this text is the apo kataboles kosmou, or formation of the world, laid in its sin-constitution—Genesis 3: 14-21. Jesus is there talking to the Jews of their father, Sin, whose servants they were. They regarded themselves as the freeborn descendants of Abraham; but he told them, they were bondmen to their father, Sin. “Whosoever committeth sin, is Sin’s doulos or bondservant.” He offered to make them free of this yoke by the truth. “I know,” says he, “that ye are Abraham’s seed; but ye seek to kill me, because my word hath no place in you.” This murderous disposition constituted them the seed of a living father, as well as of the dead Abraham; for Jesus says, “I speak what I have seen with my father, and ye do what ye have seen—with your father.” Here was a question between them of fatherhood. Jesus claimed to be seed of Abraham and God; while he charged them with being seed of Abraham and Sin—they were in other words, begotten of sinful flesh, while he was begotten of God, sinful flesh being the matrice of both parties. They said, “Abraham is our father,” or begetter; but Jesus objected to this, because they did not do the works of Abraham; showing that he was speaking, not of lineage, but of sonship based on disposition and character. They contended for purity of lineage—that their fatherhood was not of Gentile idolaters, but Jewish believers in God, which constituted them children of God. Jesus charged them with doing the deeds of their father, which they understood to mean, of their Gentile paternity; for they said, “We be not born of fornication: we have one Father even God.” They considered that purity of descent from Abraham constituted them children of God, without regard to character; but Jesus taught them that “the flesh profiteth nothing.” If man would be “the children of God, being the children of thee resurrection,” it was by being like Abraham in faith and obedience; which they were not: but being Sin’s bondmen, he said to them in the words of the forty fourth verse, substituting Paul’s definition of diabolos for “devil,” “ye are of the father, Sin, and the lusts of your father (the lusts of sinful flesh) ye will do. Sin was a murderer from the beginning (or from the Fall) and caused not to stand (hesteken) in the truth (or law) because truth is not in it. When Sin uttereth a lie, it speaks of its own things; for it is a liar, and the father of it.” This is perfectly intelligible. All men are Sin’s children who are born of blood, of the will of the flesh, or of the will of man; and they continue such until they “become sons of God” by becoming Abraham’s seed through Jesus as the Christ—John 1: 12-13; Galatians 3: 26-29.

From what I have said under this head, our good friend will perceive that I teach that the devil or diabolos had a place in the beginning; as really as the Serpent; and that place was in the flesh; while the serpent was somewhere not far off from the woman and the tree.

3. I come now to Mr. Cook’s third inquiry, “Does not the New Testament teach there is a Tempter, as really as a “Christ”—the tempted?” In reply to this, I remark, that in the case of Jesus, diabolos and satan were both concerned. When he was filled with the Holy Spirit he was led, Mark says “driven,” by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted, or properly, to be put to the proof under Sin—hypo tou diabolou. Their nature was his nature; for “the

children of God being partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same”—Hebrews 2: 14. Hence, he was sent forth “in a form of Sin’s flesh”—en homoiomati sarkos hamartias—Romans 8: 3; and thus God made him sin, (that is, flesh and blood) for us—2 Corinthians 11: 14, and on account of sin, gave judgment against sin in the flesh of Jesus.

The testimonies show that Jesus was “under sin” as a man under a burden. —He groaned under it in painful travail. While among the wild beasts of the wilderness a (similar situation to the first Adam’s) he felt the danger, and desolation of his situation, and the cravings of a long protracted fast. He ate nothing all this time, his life being sustained by the Spirit: and at the end became very hungry. Luke terms this, “being forty days put to the proof under diabolos,” or sin; that is, in his case, under the perturbation of weakened flesh and blood. This was before the adversary came to him. His nature was severely tried during this period; and it remained to be seen, whether his flesh thus weakened would stand in the truth; or like Adam’s, seek present gratification by transgressing the divine law. The end of the forty days appears to have been the prepared crisis of the trial. At this junction, one came to test him. Jesus styles him, as he termed Peter, “Satan,” that is, adversary. This individual, probably, was an angel; for angels were concerned in the matter, as appears from the testimony; and Paul says, “the very adversary (Satan) transforms himself into an angel of light,” or knowledge—2 Corinthians 5: 21. Christ’s visitor was evidently a person of scriptural information; and as he appeared as a tester at a time especially prepared for the trial, I have no doubt he was sent by the same Spirit that led Jesus into the wilderness there to be put to the proof. I conclude then, that he was “an angel of light,” not shining with brightness, but appearing as a friendly man, well instructed in the word.

Now Luke attributes what this concealed adversary suggested to diabolos, or one causing to transgress, but in this case without success; for they were suggestions to Jesus under the workings of sin’s flesh, seeing that “he was in all things put to the proof according to the likeness without offence.” The visitor, though styled “devil,” was not diabolos within, as in our case, but an excitant thereof; in “the likeness,” or sin’s flesh; therefore his sayings are recorded as those of diabolos. Jesus being begotten of God, as was Adam the first likewise, and not of the will of sin’s flesh, the promptings to transgression did not proceed from within. In this the form of sin’s flesh he assumed, differed from the form we possess. The promptings in our case do often proceed from within. In the two Adams they came from without—from the serpent in the one case; and from the angel of light in the other. These occupied for the time the position of the then as yet unbegotten diabolos relatively to their flesh, till the lust they might excite should by the strength thereof bring forth sin, when their personal missions would be terminated, and sin enthroned as the conceived diabolos of the form, or likeness of sin’s flesh.

In the second Adam’s case the testing adversary failed to move him from the stand he had taken of absolute obedience to the will of God, whatever might ensue. He appealed to the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life, but all without effect. The law of the Spirit of life within him was too strong for these appeals. He extinguished their effect by the word of faith, which was his shield, and emerged from the trial undefiled. The tester of his allegiance then left him; and whatever perturbation may have been excited, it subsided into the peacefulness of a conscience void of offence towards God.

In studying Christ’s trial it is important not to forget what I have intimated above about his nature; because it was the point of difference in the nature of the two Adams from

ours that caused the ordeals they were subjected to, to assume the forms narrated. No one has ever been put to the proof through a speaking reptile since Adam's fall; nor has any one been tried by an angel of light since Jesus successfully resisted his suggestions. —Paul's phrase "in the likeness of sinful flesh"—en homoiomati sarkos hamartias—I have rendered more literally "in a form of Sin's flesh." "Sinful" is an adjective expressive of the quality of the "flesh," and signifies flesh full of sin. —This is a form of flesh common to all mankind, and indicated by Paul in the words, "in me, that is, in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing." But Adam's flesh before his fall, and the Christ's flesh, were forms of flesh and blood to which the English word "sinful" is inapplicable. —They were not full of sin. The first Adam's was a form in which there was no sin at all, but only a physical weakness inseparable from flesh and blood. Luke styles him "Son of God," because he was begotten by his Spirit from mother earth. Having transgressed, his weakness was defiled, and became sin, and his flesh "Sin's flesh"—sarx hamartias—a form afterwards inherited by Abraham in common with all mankind. But Christ's was still another form of Sin's flesh than either Abraham's or Adam's before his fall. The homiomal difference of his flesh from Adam's consisted in its maternity. Adam's came directly from the dust of the ground; Christ's from that form of Sin's flesh styled "the seed of Abraham"—Hebrews 2: 16. It differed from this, however, in its paternity. Abraham's daughter, Mary, was "begotten of blood, of the will of the flesh, or of man;" but her son Jesus, of the will of God by his creative power, which constituted him a peculiar form of Sin's flesh; and hence the propriety of my more literal rendering of en homoiomati sarkos hamartias—a form of Sin's flesh—even the third form under which flesh and blood has been manifested since the creation-week.

In Hebrews 4: 15, the phrase "form of Sin's flesh" is expressed by the single word homoiotes, "likeness, resemblance, or similitude;" as, kata panta kath, homoioteta, "in all things according to the likeness." One thing may resemble another without being identical in every particular. This was the case with Christ's flesh. It was Sin's flesh so far as its maternity was concerned, but not as to its fatherhood. In this he differed from the Jews, who had Sin's flesh for their parentage on both sides, which they illustrated in their persecution of their maternal brother, who was "born after the Spirit;" thereby proving that they were the children and slaves of father, Sin, or diabolos. Still Christ's paternity did not destroy the physical likeness of his flesh to Abraham's seed; it only removed from it the reigning principle hereditarily transmitted by the will of man, called diabolos, or "devil." His flesh, however, was still reduced in strength below that of Adam's original nature, because of its maternal defilement. Hence, to place it on a par with the first Adam's, that there might be equality of strength, Jesus was anointed or Christened, by which he became "full of the Holy Spirit." This filling did not destroy the homoiotes or likeness to Sin's flesh. It was still possible for Christ to feel the force and influence of sophistical appeals to the lusts of Sin's flesh with which he was burdened as with "a loathsome disease"—Psalm 38: 6-7. Hence, says the apostle, "he was put to the proof in all things or according to the likeness," or resemblance of his flesh to his brethren's in its susceptibilities, "without offence."

There being no reigning diabolos, "devil," or Sin, transmitted by the will of man in Adam or Christ, as in the flesh of all mankind, that causing not to stand in the truth, or diabolos, is in their cases, and in their's alone, to be referred to the Serpent and the Angel of light. But this does not constitute them what the Gentiles call "the Devil," or "His Satanic Majesty." The Serpent, because of his agency in the affair, became the Bible symbol representative of the evil he had done in the unconsciously immoral use he had made of what he knew by observation, and was able to express in speech. —It would be very injudicious to rush to the conclusion that, because the Serpent and the Angel of light stood related to the two

Adams as the diabolos, or that causing to err, therefore, whenever the word diabolos occurs, it means the serpent or angel of light. If it did, it by no means follows that it would signify the Devil of gentile “organised theology,” which is as dissimilar from them as they are from one another. Christ was not put to the proof by a serpent, nor by the serpent; nor was Adam by an angel of knowledge, nor by the angel of light, who offered his suggestions to Jesus. They were both probed to the quick; but by provers suitable to the times, place, and circumstances around them.

But, though the proving agents in the trials of the two Adams have never experimented upon any others of our race, Christ’s brethren stand related to a power, styled *ho peiradzoon*, which is rendered in the English version, “the tempter”—1 Thessalonians 3: 5. —By reference to the passage it is manifest that the tempter alluded to there was not an invisible Devil, but a persecuting power under which the disciples lived in Thessalonica. They were suffering persecution when Paul wrote to them for their encouragement. “Let no man,” says he, “be moved by these afflictions: for yourselves know that we are appointed thereunto.” He then refers to what he had told them before, and not them only, but all others; that “it is through much tribulation that they (the baptised) must enter the Kingdom of God.” But he reminds them that they are not alone in their trouble, but are “suffering like things of their countrymen” that Christ’s brethren on Judea had of the Jews. This saying reveals the power as that of the Gentile authorities in Thessalonica, who, stirred up by “lewd fellows of the baser sort,” were carrying into effect as far as they could “the decrees of Caesar,” with all the pains and penalties annexed, against the refractory—Acts 17: 5-8; 2 Thessalonians 1: 4-5. These were torture, imprisonment, and death, which served to prove their inseparable devotion to the doctrine of God’s Kingdom, for which they suffered. These “persecutions and tribulations” might be avoided upon one condition which was offered to them by the enemy—if they would renounce the faith, and burn incense to Caesar’s image. This was the temptation offered to them by the tempting power. If they yielded to the temptation, they saved their lives, but lost “God’s Kingdom and glory.” Fearing this result in some cases, Paul says, “I sent to know your faith, lest by some means the tempter have tempted you, and our labour be in vain.”

In the case before us the tempter was the imperial pagan Roman power, styled in the apocalypse, “a great red dragon,” and “the great Dragon, the ancient Serpent, the surnamed diabolos and the Satan.”—Revelation 12: 3, 9. The Dragon, or Serpent, was the symbol of the Roman Sovereignty selected by the Romans themselves as representative of its imperality. Chrysostom, who flourished in the 4th century, says that “the Emperors wore among other things to distinguish them silken robes embroidered with gold, in which Dragons were represented.” Gibbon also says, speaking of the procession of Constantine from Milan to Rome, “He was encompassed by the glittering arms of the numerous squadrons of his guards and cuirassiers. Their streaming banners of silk, embroidered with gold and shaped in the form of Dragons, waved round the person of the emperor.” The emperor Constantine speaks of the Dragon as the symbol of the pagan Roman Sovereignty in his epistle to Eusebius and other bishops concerning the rebuilding and repair of churches. “Liberty being now restored,” says he, “and that Dragon being removed from the administration of public affairs, by the providence of the great God, and by my ministry; I esteem the great power of God to have been made manifest even to all.” Moreover, on the testimony of Eusebius, we are informed, that a picture of Constantine was set up over the palace gate, with the cross over his head, and under his feet “the great enemy of mankind, who persecuted the church by means of impious tyrants, in the form of a Dragon,” transfixed with a spear through the midst of his body, and falling headlong into the depth of

the sea. Hence it is evident that the species of serpent called the dragon was as much the symbol of the Roman power, as the lion is of the British at this day. The Romans probably borrowed it from Egypt, which had become a province of their dominion. When an independent monarchy under the Pharaohs, its majesty was represented by “the great dragon, that lieth in the midst of his rivers.” The annexation of so ancient and renowned a kingdom was very likely celebrated by the adoption of its ancient symbol into the Roman heraldry. Hence, the Roman dragon is styled “the ancient serpent,” or the Egyptian—Revelation 11: 8—The great city, or Roman empire, is here figuratively styled Egypt.

Whether God in his providence influenced the governments of the world to represent their several sovereignties by peculiar symbols, I cannot say; but that he has adopted them in his word when treating of their policy and destiny relatively to Israel, and the Saints, is beyond all question. The Egyptian serpent, the Assyrian lion, the Persian ram, the Macedonian goat, the French frogs, &c., are all examples that he has done so. The adoption by the Romans of the serpent, styled in the prophets, “the piercing serpent, even leviathan that crooked serpent; the dragon that is in the sea”—Isaiah 27: 1, as the symbol of the sovereignty that rules the imperial territory, is singularly appropriate. Its scriptural fitness is seen in the fact, that “all the power of the enemy” with which God’s people have had to contend on the arena of prophecy, originated in the sophistry of the serpent; and is found civilly and ecclesiastically organised in the ancient and modern imperial dominion of the Roman earth. This power has ever been the adversary of Israel after the flesh and spirit, and of the truth, since the Holy land became a Roman province; and will so continue to be “until the Ancient of Days shall come, and judgment shall be given to the saints of the Most High; and the time comes that they shall take the kingdom, and possess it”—Daniel 7: 22, 18. It is not only their Adversary in making war upon them as a people who will hereafter seize upon its dominion; but when it gets them into its clutches, it endeavours to turn them from the faith, and to compel them to embrace its own superstition, and so cause them not to stand in the truth. It is, therefore, a power causing to cross the line, or to transgress the divine law, that is, a diabolos, as well as THE ADVERSARY, or ho Satan. It is for this reason the Spirit has “surnamed,” the imperial serpent, in the words of the English version, “the Devil and Satan,” or more articularly, “the surnamed Devil and the Satan”—ho kaloumenos diabolos kai ho Satan. —And here we will pause till our next issue.

EDITOR.

* * *

MISSION TO THE DEAD.

Immortal-Soulism is producing its own peculiar fruit in the sectarian churches and denominations, or Brotherhoods, Pagan Mesmerism, which is its ancient sire, and the parent also of all the spiritologies of our day, is possessing them with confounding effect. The brotherhood theologies have prepared professors for any and all of the speculations arising out of surrounding chaos. They have alienated the people from Moses and the Prophets; so that being disarmed of the Spirit’s sword, they are falling defencelessly, by thousands, before Mesmerism, theologically interpreted. Mesmerism proves all things conceived by the fleshly mind, because it is of and from the flesh. It begins in the flesh and ends in the flesh. Thus the circle is complete. Animal magnetism reveals the flesh to the flesh, being the spirit of the flesh. It is the magic lantern to the thalami off the optic nerves, passing before them the spectralia of “philosophy and vain deceit.” Hence, sky-kingdom heavens, aerial sheols in outer darkness fifty miles sky-high, subterranean hobgoblin hells, spirit-worlds, immortal

souls in mortal sinful flesh, baby-spirit salvation, pre-resurrection ghost-life, adult salvation without belief or obedience of the gospel, and a thousand other modifications of foolishness, are all satisfactorily proved in the opinion of the carnal mind by mesmerism. The brain thinks mesmerically, so that in the absence of scriptural knowledge, it approves them all. Thus, great flaming revivalists, to whom the bible was more or less of an embarrassment, have become so illuminated by animal magnetism as to reject the scriptures altogether. Now, it is a notable fact, that while they have done this, they continue brawling advocates for the “immortal soul” of the flesh, and the “spirit-world” adapted to it. This is consistent enough, for the Bible gives no aid and comfort to immortal-soulism; so that by throwing it aside as of inferior authority to mesmerism, or of no authority at all, their position is strengthened in argument with those who argue against immortal-soulism on natural grounds. The only immortality the Bible reveals is immortality of a resurrection, or transformed, body. It promises this only to the saints of God, to qualify them for an endless possession of his kingdom. The Bible is therefore unencumbered with the foolishness of Mesmeric Theology. It teaches nothing that the flesh approves in relation to the world to come. This conviction relieves us of much lumber, and enables us to make short work of otherwise interminable logomachies.

Mesmerised theology seems to be preparing troublous times for the Campbellite Brotherhood, among the rest. For years past Mr. C. has been labouring in a certain direction, which the editor of the “Christian Magazine” appears determined to alter. Mr. C., I believe, holds to a hobgoblin hell, in which immortal-souls writhe and shriek in eternal torture. He regards this as a Bible truth, and quite consistent with the attributes of God! The “Magazine’s” theory is opposed to this. “Speculations,” says J. B. F., “as to the exact nature and duration of punishment are unwise, because neither is clearly revealed. The Spirit which dictated the Bible, seems to have intended that an indefiniteness should spread itself over the whole subject.”—M. H., p. 393. These few words, if received, tell with humbling effect upon my friend at Bethany. They tell him, in effect, that he has misconceived the whole matter; which is doubtless true, without adding an atom of credibility to the Magazine’s assumption. Mr. C. has been contending for “the exact nature and duration of punishment” for a long period; but his editorial brother in faith tells him that they are not revealed: therefore all he has been writing hitherto is mere speculation; and “speculations,” says the Magazine, “are unwise.” Well, I do admit that my friend has been a very unwise and even weak speculator in his time, upon a multitude of topics; but with all his wanderings and meanderings, it must be confessed that he is right in repudiating the notion of the “indefiniteness” of the whole subject of punishment. Though Mr. C. cannot define the nature and duration of the punishment revealed in the Bible, its definiteness is nevertheless exhibited there. But to understand the subject, the mission of the Christ must be understood; concerning this, however, Mr. C. and the Magazine are, both of them, in the dark—therefore neither of them can be expected to talk any thing very sensible in the case. In regard to them it can only be a question of relative erraticism—whether the old absurdity or the new one, be the more unscriptural!

“Heaven and hell are in our midst every day,” says the Magazine, as quoted by Mr. C., who regards the saying as no evidence of its editorial wisdom. But there is more truth than fiction in the conceit. The present world is the Sinner’s Heaven, and the Saint’s Hell; hence it is styled “an evil world.” If hell be a place of suffering, the Saints have certainly had it here for ages. God has chastened them; and the Sin Power, and all in whom Sin’s spirit reigns, have tormented and destroyed them with dreadful cruelty. While the present state has been the hell of the Saints, it has been a place of Paradise for their enemies. These have the glory, and honour, and power, and riches off the system, at their control. They possess fine farms, well stocked and tilled, and yielding abundance of wealth; splendid mansions; accomplished

families, and all that heart can wish. It is the Sinners who possess these things in superfluity; and so much do they enjoy themselves, that they would hold on to them for ever if they could. This is all the heaven they will ever possess, unless they embrace the gospel of the kingdom, and devote their substance to the Lord, and become his stewards of the same. Heaven in this world or state, and heaven in the next, is an allotment granted to none of the sons of men who would partake of the joy of the Lord. Heaven now and hell hereafter; or Hell now and heaven in a future state, are the alternatives presented to mankind under times of knowledge. Who that understands 'the word of the kingdom' would prefer the Sinners' Heaven to the Saints'? Or, who would not rather endure the past and present torments of the Saints in body and estate, than encounter the terrors of the Lord in the Sinner's hell to come? It is better to pass from a terrestrial heavenly state, as the Saints will do; than to descend from the Sinner's into a hell to be manifested in the territory of the Fourth Beast of Daniel, for the torment of the goat-nations and their rulers at the appearing of the Lord. A heaven and a hell, then, 'are in our midst every day;' but not the heaven of the Saints, nor the hell of the wicked. These have neither of them an existence yet; and can have none till the Lord comes, and literally turns the world upside down.

But the foolishness of the Magazine becomes flagrant in its notion of a 'posthumous mission to the dead, (who have not before heard the gospel,) in order to translate them from a miserable prison to heaven.' The ghosts, or disembodied immortal souls, of dead evangelists, I suppose, are to be sent to immortal miserable, or hellish spirits, in the spirit-world, to preach the gospel to them, to induce them to repent, and to exchange their misery for bliss! I do not find what sort of a gospel is to be preached in that mesmeric world; but I suppose the same sky-kingdomism, with spirit-baptism in spirit-water, for spirit-remission of fleshly sins, as contended for by the brotherhood to which the editor of the Christian Magazine belongs! Nearly all hell will doubtless be emptied in twenty-four hours, if the gates be wide enough for the out-rushing crowd, after the spirits of the missionaries arrive, preaching translation to heaven; nearly all, I say, for it is the vast majority alleged to be there, who have never heard of gospel truth.

A gentleman of Pittsburgh, rejoicing in the name of the Church, who constitutes himself 'armour-bearer' to my friend the Supervisor, writes concerning the Magazine's 'hallucination,' in the following words:—'I am truly sorry to see that bro. Ferguson has got a maggot in his brain'—the Caledonians say 'a bee in his bonnet,' which is decidedly more elegant. 'This,' he continues, 'will destroy his usefulness and influence,' that is, in propagating Campbellism; 'and probably end in his becoming a wandering star, like Mr. Thomas. This figment of bro. Ferguson's is, in my estimation, infinitely worse than Thomasism. If there be 'a damnable heresy' this is unquestionably one. I can see in it a perfect Pandora box. I regard the propagation of such a sentiment as the destruction of all that is vital in religion.'

Poor Mr. Church! What dost thou know of what thou callest 'Thomasism!' Many years ago thou didst see a few things from my pen when I was in fellowship with the darkness out of which thou hast not discovered star-light enough to wander for the last twenty years. Thou hast read all the foolishness palmed upon me by thy Supervisor; but of what I really believe and teach, thou art as ignorant as the 'maggot' in thy brother's brain. Whatever it be, it seems there is something 'infinitely worse' than what constitutes me 'a wandering star.' But if thou knewest what I teach concerning thy religious system, I doubt if thou wouldst favour my supposed views with the admission of an infinite betterment compared with the 'unquestionably damnable heresy' before us. Thy religious system is without vitality, and can

never live unless what thou dost ignorantly style 'Thomasism,' be infused into it, that is, 'the gospel of the kingdom.' The bee in thy brother's bonnet can do the vitality of a corpse no harm. His religion is thy religion, and for all it can offer, a man who understands Moses and the Prophets, would not exchange a pinch of snuff.

* * *

Since the above was written, the eighth number of the Magazine has come to hand. The editor declares that my friend C. has misrepresented him. I regret to be compelled to testify, from dear-brought experience, that he is quite capable of doing so. 'There is not a statement,' says the editor, 'which he makes, with regard to our views, that is true.' We doubt not but the Magazine knows its own sentiments best; and is quite competent to say if fairly represented or not. Mr. C. does not faithfully quote the scripture; therefore it is not to be expected he will do the fair thing by an opponent. This is a pity; for no end is promoted but evil. But I almost despair of teaching him better manners. Let the Magazine take him in hand, and see if it can make anything of him; may be he is not incorrigible.

The editor cries out for justice, sheer justice, as all he asks; but this, we opine, he'll never get. We never could obtain it; and his heresy is pronounced to be 'unquestionably damnable,' and 'infinitely worse than' ours—being destructive of all vital religion. Mr. C. never acknowledges that he has committed, or is in the wrong.

The editor says, that the substance of the whole matter between him and his opponents is the utterance of 'an opinion, that men who have not heard the gospel will hear it before they are condemned by it.' By 'men will hear it,' I suppose he means disembodied immortal souls will hear it in prison, or hell, as he may define it. For this opinion there is not the shadow of a foundation in the Bible. It is absolutely true, that men who have not heard it will not be condemned by it. They are 'condemned already' by the Adamic sentence under which they are born—Dust thou art, and to dust thou shalt return. From this sentence, nothing can deliver men but the gospel of the kingdom, faithfully obeyed in their present corporeal entity, in the times before Christ appears and shuts the door. Men are not held responsible under 'times of ignorance;' for 'the ground of condemnation is that light has come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light.' This implies the offer of knowledge and its rejection. Where it has not been offered, there will be no resurrection to gospel-condemnation; this is reserved for those who sin against the light.

We are happy, from the evidence of the present number of the Magazine, to be able to acknowledge that we were mistaken in supposing, that the editor was a mere echo of our Bethanian friend. We have, however, still to complain of misrepresentation at his hands. But Mr. C. is repaying him in full for the measure he meted out to us. I have received no justice from the Magazine, and the Supervisor in return will grant him none. How admirably things work round in this crooked world of ours! "Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord." So let it be!

EDITOR.

August 10, 1851.

* * *

“SPIRITS IN PRISON.”

“Not the spirits ‘now’ in prison, but the spirits once in prison, while the Ark was preparing, which is, indeed, the key of interpretation. Peter’s key must open Peter’s lock.” But this happens not to be Peter’s key. It is Mr. Campbell’s, and completely fails of even passing the key-hole. He says, the prison was “a figurative prison.” True it was not a gaol; but then a gaol is not the only literal prison. Any place of confinement is a literal prison, be it a gaol, a grave, or a nation enclosing a captive nation. The prison referred to by Peter is manifestly literal; for in speaking of “the spirits” he says they are “in prison.” It is admitted that by “the spirits” are meant “the antediluvians;” now while the ark was preparing they had as much liberty as the unbelieving Jews of Peter’s day, or the people of the United States in ours. They did just what was right in their own eyes. In Noah’s time, they married and gave in marriage, caroused, and enjoyed themselves to their heart’s content, but how was it in Peter’s? They were literally in prison “body, soul, and spirit.” They knew nothing and could do nothing; and so they remain to this day—literally “in prison.”

To ascertain the nature or character of the prison, instead of referring to Moses and the Prophets, Mr. C. speculates on words in usu loquendi. He finds that “the specific idea” of the Greek family of words to which *phulakee*, “prison,” belongs, “is confinement.” This is doubtless a great discovery. The next revelation is, that “confinement has respect to time, as well as to place.” He ought to have said, “it has reference to place as well as to time,” for a place cannot be a prison independent of time. You may call a building a prison; but if it is to receive persons for no time it never can have an inmate, and therefore cannot be in fact a prison. Thus, whenever men are confined involuntarily for a longer or shorter time, there they are imprisoned, or in prison. Mr. Campbell says, Noah’s contemporaries were imprisoned for 120 years, unless they repented during that term; and he represents the deluge as the limit, or bound, or wall, as it were, of their figurative prison. He does not say where they were to go when set at liberty on repentance or death. Noah, I suppose, was set at liberty when he entered upon a year’s confinement in the Ark! But let that pass. If Noah’s contemporaries were in prison only for 120 years, were they set at liberty when engulfed in the deluge? Will Mr. Campbell tell us? And where do they enjoy their freedom? For liberty implies enjoyment. But, if the antediluvians were “in prison” while they were doing their own pleasure for 120 years, it is evident that Peter’s contemporaries of Israel were also “in prison” “on pain of destruction by a deluge” of war—Daniel 9: 26. Peter’s generation was the antitype of Noah’s; so that if the latter were in prison during Noah’s preaching by the Spirit for 120 years; the former were likewise for the forty years the same Spirit preached to them by Jesus and his apostles. “Noah,” says he, “by word and deed, preached to them repentance or death.” He preached to them in prison, did he? Yes. They did not repent? —No; therefore they were put to death at the end of their imprisonment! If this be granted, when sentence was executed they were then no longer in prison! This is the conclusion we are led to by Mr. Campbell’s premises!

Death, in the scriptures is styled “captivity” which was “led captive” by Jesus in rising from among the dead as the first fruits of a future resurrection. But Mr. Campbell’s speculation makes death, liberality; and by consequence, all the dead, freemen escaped from the figurative prison above ground! This is “the key of interpretation” Mr. Campbell uses in his attempt to demonstrate, that his own former rendering of Peter’s phrase “the spirits in prison” by “the spirits now in prison,” is “a mere speculative fancy.” This is another among many instances adducible, of “Campbell against himself.” But there is no telling what lengths a man will go to in stultifying himself when he undertakes to interpret the apostles without

regard to Moses and the Prophets. He has not found Peter's key yet. The apostle's is a lock that cannot be picked by any human invention. Immortal-soulism is a pick that cannot reach the bolt; and disables all that work by it from opening the prison door. But for this crotchet, Mr. C. would not have forged so fanciful an interpretation, which he has just constructed for the occasion to get quit of the editor of the "Magazine's" opinion, which is a natural inference from his own speculations upon "Life and Death."

There is nothing in the text or context to prove that the antediluvians were in prison in any other sense than that all mankind are in the "bondage of corruption," during Noah's preaching. Speaking of the Holy Spirit it says "having gone he preached to the spirits * * * formerly disobedient." When? "In the days of Noah." Where were they in Peter's day? "In prison;" therefore they are called "spirits in prison." Where the prison is must be determined by "the law and the testimony," not by reference to "the established laws of" sectarian "criticism," however "sound" it may be supposed to be.

EDITOR.

* * *

SALVATION WITHOUT FAITH!

"He that believeth not shall be condemned."—JESUS CHRIST.

Dear Brother:

Conversing a few days ago on the merits of Elpis Israel, one of the brethren who had read it, stated his concurrence in most of the things therein contained. But after all, he says he cannot assent to the exclusion of the heathen, &c., from the salvation promised in the gospel.

The salvation of the heathen then became the subject of discussion between us; brethren D. and B. contending for their salvation on some other principle than that of faith in the gospel; and I for it on no other.

I attempted to prove, and I think did prove, that the faith was the only principle laid down in the Old and New Scriptures upon which a man can be saved; and that they made no exception in relation to the heathen. To this they objected; and in support of their opinion quoted the second chapter of Romans. I demurred to this, that "Gentile" there spoken of as keeping "The righteousness of the law," could not mean the Gentiles in the sense understood by them, —a good, conscientious, virtuous, benevolent Gentile; but a gentile christian. In support of this I attempted to show that, if a gentile could, without ever having heard, or read the law, keep the righteousness of the law, so might a Jew have done; and then there would have been no need of having the law given to them; and thereby much trouble and expense have been saved. —Upon this we separated without coming to any agreement.

I write these few words, therefore, to request you to interpret the Bible teaching on this subject. The term "nature" seems to be the stronghold of the two brethren, and, indeed, of all natural religionists; and the second of Romans the chapter most relied on to prove this most mischievous of all traditions, "Natural Religion." If you can spare time, we should like to know if the heathen, by beholding the works of the Great Architect of the universe ever came to a knowledge of the living and true God, so as acceptably to worship him, or attain to salvation; or, has the mind of a gentile ever been so operated on by the contemplation of the wonderful works of creation as to impart to him a right to incorruptibility and life?

The doctrine of the Kingdom and Hope of Israel as exhibited by Jesus, the apostles, and yourself, is gaining ground here. I have returned hither (after an absence of three years) where once I met with such decided opposition from the brethren of “the reformation” in the advocacy of these sentiments; and now I meet with but few who do not entertain the same: not that I feel a pride in having first contended for them here; but because I rejoice in the spread of the gospel, and delight to see the Kingdom preached though for the sake of contention only.

Yours faithfully,
E. J. H. WHITE, M. D.
Fayette, Mississippi.

* * *

HEATHEN DEFINED—THE GOSPEL IS FOR THE SALVATION OF THE HEATHEN THROUGH BELIEF OF IT—NONE SAVED BUT THE DOERS OF THE WORD—IGNORANCE ALIENATES FROM ETERNAL LIFE—NATURE’S LOGIC—NATURE DEFINED—ORIGIN OF NATURAL RELIGION—ITS INVENTERS INDICATED—THINGS IN WHICH THEY AGREE—NATURAL RELIGION AND GOD’S RELIGION IRRECONCILABLE ENEMIES—“BY NATURE” EXPLAINED—HEART CIRCUMCISED GENTILES AND JEWS TO INHERIT THE PROMISES.

Heathen is the Saxon equivalent for the Greek word *ethnos*, and the Hebrew *goi*, and properly signifies nation. It is in this sense that it is used in the sacred scriptures. The word Gentile is of the same import, only derived from the Latin *gens*. All nations, except Israel, being under “times of ignorance,” were merged in hopeless superstition; so that to be of the nations was equivalent to being an idolater: the word heathen, therefore, came to represent a man, or nations, worshipping idols; though the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin originals, are never used in this sense in the scriptures.

The salvation promised in the gospel is the salvation of Israel and the Heathen, in the sense of blessing all nations in Abraham and his Seed, on the principle of individual and national faith and obedience. The gospel has been preached for eighteen centuries to the nations for the salvation of heathen, in the sense of idolaters and natural religionists—“to take out from the Gentiles a people for God’s name.” This people are to be the immortal rulers of the nations, or heathen, in the Age to Come; when the heathen, no longer idolaters and natural religionists, shall be enlightened and “serving the Lord with one consent.” They are then “the nations of the saved,” sitting under their own vines and fig trees, with no tyrants to destroy them, and make them afraid as now. The separation of mankind into nations, however, is finally to cease; and all of the race who attain to eternal life will be merged into Israel then become immortal, by “the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body;” as it is written, “I will make a full end of all nations whither I have scattered thee, O Israel, but I will not make a full end of thee”—Jeremiah 30: 11. The last eighteen centuries has been “the Day of Salvation,” the “accepted time,” a day of probation for individuals, who aspire to the glory, honour, and immortality of the Kingdom, as the reward of “the righteousness which is by faith:” the coming thousand years will be a day of blessedness and probation to the nations, saved from the evils now besetting them; in which vastly greater multitudes than now or heretofore, will become heirs of immortality and earth-inhabitation for ever, when the thousand years shall have passed away.

But, what the brethren D. and B. want to know is, is there not salvation from hell for idolaters, and natural religionists, idiots, and sucklings, now, without believing the gospel and being baptised? —They, and not they only, but all antichristendom, say there is salvation for them. —But the Bible has nothing to do with the soul hell they speak of. The salvation it proclaims is the deliverance of God’s people from sin, death, and the grave, and the bestowal upon them of glory and honour forever in his kingdom; and the deliverance of the nations, as already stated. —If they modify their proposition, and affirm that the parties indicated have part in this salvation without faith and its obedience, there is something tangible to lay hold of. Well, if it be so, it can be easily proved. There are the scriptures, show us the testimony; for the burden of proof lies upon D. and B. and the natural religionists. Ah, here they come with the second chapter of the letter to the Romans, telling us that the salvation of sinners without the obedience of faith is taught there! Now behold the proof—

“When the Gentiles having not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: who show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another.”

But I object to this as perfectly irrelevant, having not the least reference to idol worshippers, or the unenlightened. It refers to Gentile “doers of the law,” in the sense of their being justified by that system of righteousness which is “testified by the law and the prophets.” The “work of the law is written in the hearts” of such persons only, be they Jews or Gentiles. Of Israel under the New Covenant Jehovah says,

“I will put my laws into their mind, and write them upon their hearts.”

How is this done? Take an illustration from the doings on Pentecost. —The righteousness testified by the law and the prophets was put into the mind of the assembled multitude by the voice of the apostles; and written indelibly on their hearts by the divine attestation which miraculously confirmed it. The same thing occurred to the Gentiles afterwards at Cornelius’, where the work of the law was written on the hearts of all his company. When the law was thus written, they “showed the work of the law” in loving the Lord their God with all their heart, and with all their soul, and with all their mind, and their neighbours as themselves, in which all the law and the prophets are obeyed—Matthew 22: 37-40; 7: 12; “for love is the fulfilling,” or doing, “of the law”—Romans 13: 10.

The natural religionists do not fairly quote their proof text. They should quote the whole passage. Their text is a reason given in support of the affirmation contained in the preceding verse, which they ought to have quoted to show what the apostle was writing about. The omitted words are, “not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified.” And even this is but the reason of another affirmation in the verse before, which declares that “as many as have sinned without law (that is, the Gentiles, who were never within the jurisdiction of the law) shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in (or under) the law (that is, the Jews to whom it was enjoined) shall be judged by the law; in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel.” This declaration is contained in the twelfth and sixteenth verses, the proof text of the natural religionists being the fourteenth and fifteenth, which, with the omitted thirteenth, are a parenthesis between. But again, all these verses even are but illustrative off the eleventh; which is itself the reason why God will render to both Jews and Gentiles according to their deeds, as stated from the seventh to the tenth verses both inclusive, that is, “Because there is no respect of persons with him.” Now, from the sixth to the sixteenth verses of the second chapter the doctrine taught is, that Jews and Gentiles are all in the same category with respect to the gospel; because, from the eighteenth verse of chapter one to the fifth of chapter two, the apostle had there “proved, that they are all under sin,” none being righteous, “no, not one;”

and “all the world” consequently “guilty before God”—Romans 3: 9, 19. Mankind, then, being none of them “doers of the law,” none of them are justified; and without justification there is no salvation. —What remains, therefore, is only a question of condemnation. Are Jews and Gentiles, equally vile in their conduct before God, to be subjected to execution in the same way? No; the Jews sinning against light, deserve a sorer punishment than the Gentiles who sin under “times of ignorance;” therefore, the Gentiles die and perish; while the Jews are reserved for judgment and execution till the day yet future, when Jesus Christ shall judge them “at his appearing in his Kingdom,” as taught of Paul in the gospel he preached. This implies the non-resurrection of those who being without law sin in times of ignorance; and the resurrection of those who sin under law. Of the former class, it is written in the prophet,

“They are dead, they shall not live; they are deceased, they shall not rise; therefore hast thou visited and destroyed them, and made all their memory to perish”—Isaiah 26: 14:

But of them under law, it is written,

“All they in the graves (*pantis hoe en tois mnemeiois*) shall hear of the Son of Man’s voice, and come forth; they having done good things for a resurrection of life; but they having worked evil things, for a resurrection of judgment”—John 5: 28-29.

So much for the guilty who are all under sin, and therefore heirs of death, being “condemned already.” But, whether that death shall be “unto death” so as to end therein; or, the sinners without law, and under law, shall pass from under sentence of death, and come under a sentence unto eternal life, depends upon both classes becoming obedient to the truth, or “doers of the word:” for it is “he who looks narrowly into the perfect law of liberty, and perseveres, not becoming a forgetful hearer, but a doer of work, he shall be blessed in his doing”—James 1: 22, 25.

The Jews and Gentiles in the days of the apostles were all in the same state with respect to God that the idolaters and natural religionists are at the present time—

“Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the perverseness of their heart”—Ephesians 4: 18.

Truth is ever the same. It is therefore as true now as when written, that ignorance alienates from God’s life. Let D. and B. look at this principle without blinking. —Their theory demands the salvation of creatures in their ignorance of “the knowledge of God, and of Jesus the Lord;” but the scriptures place an emphatic veto on the notion, and declare that, “Except a man be converted, and become as a little child, he can in no wise enter the Kingdom of God;” and out of that Kingdom there is no salvation. And again, “Except a man be born of water and of spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God;” which is equivalent to saying, ‘Except a man believe the gospel of the Kingdom, and is baptised, and raised from the dead incorruptible and immortal, he cannot be saved.’ There is no bliss in ignorance of God’s truth; if there were it would be folly to be wise; because wisdom and knowledge make responsible. —If the ignorant were in a salvable state, it was cruel to send Paul to them, “to open their eyes, to turn them from darkness,” or ignorance, “to light,” or knowledge, because, in so doing, he was bringing them into the jeopardy of persecution, and the hazard of the sorer punishment which is to devour the adversaries at the coming of the Lord. But the truth is, that neither Jews nor Gentiles, of any age, sex, or condition, can be saved, or “inherit the Kingdom,” which is the same thing, who live and die in their ignorance of the truth.

“This is life eternal, that men should know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.”

Paul was therefore sent “to turn them from the power of Satan to God” by enlightening them, “that they might receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them who are sanctified by faith that is in Jesus”—Acts 26: 18. Now, I argue that if this was necessary for the salvation of the heathen then, it is equally so for their salvation now; and that it was necessary, is proved by the testimony before us. To say that creatures may be saved without faith is to blaspheme, or speak evil of, God and his Christ, and to pronounce the scriptures a falsehood; for they testify that, “he that comes to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them who diligently seek him.” And again, “without faith it is impossible to please God;” and again, “no man cometh to the Father,” says Jesus, “but through me:” but these are all vain words, and they who uttered them liars, if human creatures “who know not God,” who do not seek him, and are ignorant of the faith; and not only so, but are “filled with all unrighteousness,” have inheritance with the sanctified—if we say, that these may be saved in their ignorance, we in effect proclaim our own faithlessness in the oft-repeated and positive declarations of God to the contrary—we declare it in defiance of testimony, sound reason, and common sense; not the common sense of the unthinking and fleshly multitude, for that is foolishness; but that natural sagacity which is common to the thoughtful and sober-minded among men.

But “nature” is truly the stronghold of natural religionists, although they profess to believe the scriptures. What they call “nature,” that is, their interpretation of nature, is of greater authority with them than a “thus it is written,” or a “thus saith the Lord.” It is their rule of Bible-interpretation; so that if God’s testimony does not speak in accordance with their interpretation of nature, they either reject it with contempt; or, give it a mystical signification; or, admit its truth, and at the same time contend that some contrary and nullifying supposition may be equally true. This last alternative is the gossamer that mantles the hypocritical infidelity of the age. “It is true,” say they, “that ‘he that believes the gospel, and is baptised, shall be saved;’ but it is also true that, if a man sincerely thinks he is right, he will be saved too, although he may not happen to understand the gospel!” “O yes, it is right to be baptised in the name of Jesus Christ for remission of sins,” says another; ‘but then, baptism in the name is not indispensable to forgiveness!’ ‘We admit,’ say others, that ‘without faith it is impossible to please God;’ but then, kind-hearted heathen, and babes, who are ‘germs of an immortal development—Chr. Mag. Vol. V. No. 7, p. 208, may be, yea are, saved without it!’ ‘Yes, we believe in the resurrection of the dead; that is,’ says the ‘Swedenborgian Christian,’ ‘the awakening of the soul at the last pulsation of the heart in the article of death;’ or, says some other mystic, ‘the revival of the dead in trespasses and sins when they get religion;’ or, says a third, ‘the restoration of the ancient gospel some twenty or thirty years ago!’ Thus it goes in all the world. There is scarcely a single truth admitted, but there is some nullifying hypothesis tacked on to it, by which it is rendered of none effect. And they who practice this call themselves logicians and philosophers. Precious logic to admit the truth of A, and at the same time to contend that B, which denies it in toto, is equally true! Yet such is the reasoning (save the mark!) of nature’s worshippers, who presume to subject the mind of God to the suppositions of their foolish hearts! Surely, it may be truly said, that

Truth hath fled to brutish beasts;
And men have lost their reason.

But, this ‘nature’ the perverters of the gospel so devoutly worship, what is it? In the universal sense of the word, it is what God has caused to exist subject to unvarying necessity—the existence in nature; the necessity, its laws. Persons who see but little of God in any thing, are accustomed to attribute the phenomena they observe to Nature, as though

Nature were the God in whom they live, and by whom all things consist. Nature, however, is a mere necessity, and exists simply because it is God's will and pleasure. Those who are 'taught of God' never look to nature as an authority in regard to things spiritual and moral, because they do not venerate the creature rather than the Creator.

Man, as he exists by procreation, is part of that terrestrial nature called animal. When allowed to ripen into maturity under the uncontrolled influence of his innate propensities, 'he has no pre-eminence over a beast'—Ecclesiastes 3: 19. His ideas and reasonings, if he have any, upon God, morality, his own constitution, origin, and destiny, are the workings of his veneration, conscientiousness, &c., styled by Paul 'the thinking of the flesh;' and the conclusions he arrives at are the teachings of nature, or Natural Religion. This religion begins in the flesh, and ends in gas; which is all the spirit it contains. Confucius, Zoroaster, Mahomet, the Council of Trent, Luther, Calvin, Wesley, Campbell, and Joe Smith, not to mention a host of others, are all naturalists, whose systems of religion are all essentially the same. The reason of this is, because they have all come to their several conclusions by natural reason, to whose dictates the least foolish among them have paid more deference than to the written testimony of God. It is remarkable that all these systematising naturalists believe in disembodied immortal souls, heaven in the skies, a hell of fire and brimstone for separate spirits somewhere, the same sort of a devil, the salvation of creatures of all ages, &c. The thinking of the flesh upon its own consciousness, and the phenomena of animal magnetism, the means by which nature teaches, have conducted them to this universal and boasted uniformity. How common is it to hear them adduce 'the universal belief of mankind' in proof of an immortal soul in man, capable of a disembodied existence among the stars! They do not see that this is a substantial reason against the notion, seeing that all mankind are in a state of ignorance, and therefore think only the thoughts of nature, or the flesh, which God says are not his thoughts. The only difference between Confucius, or Zoroaster, and Mr. Campbell is, that the latter mixes up the sayings of apostles with the thinkings of his flesh, which the former were unable to do, not having the scriptures. This is the essential difference between that form of Natural Religion, called Campbellism, and the others styled Magianism, Buddhism, and so forth. Let me not be misunderstood. I do not say they are the same in detail; but the same in origin, and that origin the thinking of the flesh, and not the revelation of the mind of God.

As the heresiarchs named were mere naturalists, the religions that go by their names, are mere natural religions. This is the nature of the religion of anti-christendom, call it Mohammedanism, Grecism, Romanism, or Protestantism. The thing is the same, whatever designation taste may give it. This is the reason why they are at variance with the Bible. The scriptures are from God, and reveal the thoughts, ways, and purposes of God; but the theologies, or orthodoxies, or whatever you may call them, are of the unenlightened flesh, and reveal the thoughts, or opinions, of the flesh concerning the Bible. Now, the thoughts of men and the thoughts of God, are as diametrically opposite as flesh and spirit. They do not, and can not, think in harmony; for 'the carnal mind (to phronema tou sarkos, the thinking of the flesh) is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So, then, they that are in the flesh (think and act according to the dictates of nature) cannot please God.'

From this it is clear that men cannot 'do by nature the things contained in the law,' in the sense of doing them from the dictates of unenlightened flesh. Nature, in this sense, would impel them to do the very reverse, for all the precepts of God are in contrariety to the dictates of the fallen humanity we possess.

‘My thoughts,’ says he, ‘are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways; for as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.’

‘If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me.’

‘The grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.’

These are not the dictates of nature, but of the spirit. Nature could not dictate such principles of conduct. It is as impossible as for a river of its own tendency to ascend a mountain.

The word used by Paul, and translated ‘by nature,’ is *physei* from *phuo*, ‘to cause to be.’ *Physis* is that which is caused to be; hence, to do by *physis* is to do that which is caused to be done; that is, to do in effect. ‘When the Gentiles do in effect the things contained in the law, they show the work of the law written in their hearts.’ This is intelligible enough. The writing the law there, causes them to do the things it contains, which is doing as the effect of the writing; or doing in effect, that is, by *physis* or by nature. The Jews had the law, but did not do its work; the Gentiles had not the law; but yielding its fruit in their lives, they showed forth the law’s work; and in so doing ‘kept the righteousness of the law,’ and put the Jews to shame. The Gentiles who obeyed the gospel, proved themselves to be better Jews than the hereditary sons of Abraham who had the law; ‘for he in the appearance is not the Jew; neither is the circumcision in the appearance, in the flesh: but he is the Jew in the hidden man; and circumcision is of heart by Spirit, not by letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.’ He that is a Jew by becoming Abraham’s Seed, through Jesus Christ, is the Jew to whom glory, honour, and incorruptibility in the kingdom for ever, with Messiah, is promised in the covenant made with Abraham before the times of the jubilees were arranged. Such is the solution of the matter as it appears to me.

EDITOR.

* * *

QUERY CONCERNING THE “GREAT TRIBULATION.”

Dear Sir:

The ‘Synopsis of the Kingdom,’ in volume 1 page 193, is estimated here very highly. Two or three passages struck me as especially beautiful and touching; one particularly, where your pencil, by the light of testimony, studied and believed, portrays the entrance of Israel’s King into his dwelling place. ‘Tis a joyous, heart-thrilling scene. I seemed in reading it, as if already listening to the glad shouts of Israel’s sons, and witnessing, as these re-echoed round the world, the joy of the earth, and the gladness of the isles, because the Lord reigneth. Oh, my beloved brother, shall we be present with that rejoicing throng, and behold the fulfilment of all that we have hoped and prayed for? I often think this is too glorious a destiny for me—one that I can never be accounted worthy of. Yet, I have resolved long since not to abandon hope, or let the anchor go. It is always our wisdom to eschew despair, since we cannot possibly gain any thing by it, and may lose all.

I have lately met with some ideas on Matthew 24 that please me. These are that the ‘great tribulation’ must not be understood to have reference simply to the calamitous period

of the destruction of the Hebrew Commonwealth; but as beginning then, and terminating only with the completion of ‘the Times of the Gentiles,’ being thus co-extensive with the dispersion; and that the word ‘this,’ in verse 34, referring in the original to the thing last mentioned, the ‘generation’ there spoken of, is that which sees the signs indicating the Lord’s return, and the nearness of his kingdom; and not as you suppose, the generation contemporary with the passing away of the First Heavens and Earth. What think you of this view of the subject?

PERSIS.

England.

REPLY, WITH REMARKS ON “THIS GENERATION.”

If our friend will turn to Matthew he will find from the context that it is impossible that the ‘tribulation,’ referred to there, can be co-extensive with ‘the Times of the Gentiles.’ The sixteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first verses say, that the ‘great tribulation’ shall be ‘in the winter and on the Sabbath-day,’ at a period of ‘flight from Judea to the mountains.’ This winter period is termed ‘those days’ in the twenty-second verse, which ‘were shortened’ that the whole nation might not be destroyed. The tribulation being shortened for the elect’s sake, we are told that ‘immediately after,’ the luminaries of the Hebrew polity were eclipsed and shaken from their spheres—verse 29. The tribulation must therefore have preceded the actual suppression of the Commonwealth—a suppression, however, which is co-extensive with the times referred to; for ‘Jerusalem shall be trodden under foot of the Gentiles until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled,’ and then the throne and kingdom of David will be restored.

The genea autee of verse 34 is manifestly the ‘this generation’ Jesus had been treating of in his previous discourse, which led to the reproduction of Daniel’s prediction concerning Jerusalem and the Temple (see chapter 9: 26,) in the 24th of Matthew. ‘Serpents, generation of vipers!’ said he to the Scribes and Pharisees, ‘how can ye escape from the judgment of Hinnom’s vale?’ ‘Generation’ here is *genneema* in the sense of offspring—they were the Serpent offspring of that genea, who were to fill up the measure of their fathers’ iniquity, so that upon them might come vengeance for all the righteous blood shed upon the land from the death of Abel to the murder of Zacharias, son of Barachus, between the Temple and the Altar, during the siege of Jerusalem, as related by Josephus. The particulars that filled up ‘the measure of their fathers,’ and made up the crisis, or judgment, are termed ‘all these things’ in the thirty-sixth verse of the twenty-third chapter; and because they affected Christ’s ‘prophets, wise men, and scribes,’ as well as their persecutors, and therefore all classes of the nation, Jesus said, ‘Verily I say unto you, All these things shall come upon this genea, or generation.’ Thus we are presented with the relation of *genneema* to *genea*. The latter includes the former, as the whole includes a part, or the greater the less.

In Matthew twelfth, and forty-fifth verse, Jesus likens the then living race of Jews to a man in two states of diabolical possession, divided by a brief interval of sanity. In the first state he was wicked, but not totally depraved. He was therefore relieved of his malady for a time. His cure however was not permanent. Excitement revived, fear supervened, madness seized upon him, and he became sevenfold more desperate than before; so that the last state of the man was worse than the first. ‘Even so,’ said Jesus, ‘shall it be also unto this wicked genea or generation.’ And even so it was. When John the Baptist had fulfilled his mission he had ‘emptied, swept, and garnished’ the generation; for ‘there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptised of him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins’—Mark 1: 5. Judah thus prepared, ‘the people were in expectation, and all men

mused in their hearts of John, whether he were the Christ or not'—Luke 3: 15. The unclean spirit was gone out of them for a time; and when Jesus first appeared among them, 'they heard him gladly.' In process of time, however, the spirit that beheaded John gained strength, and possessed not Herod only, but all the rulers of the people, and at length all the people too. They crucified Jesus, killed his disciples, and abounded in all iniquity, so that their last state was worse than the first, when John came to them 'preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.' What was to be done with such a generation? Was it not condemned by the example of Nineveh, which repented at the preaching of Jonas; by that of the wisdom-seeking Queen of Sheba, who came from the far-south to hear the words of Solomon? For seven years John, the greatest of all the prophets, and Jesus, the 'greater than Solomon,' proclaimed repentance and the wisdom of God; and then almost for forty years, a great company took up the word and preached it to the people; nevertheless iniquity abounded, and even the love of the many who had embraced the gospel of the kingdom cooled. Was not the generation incorrigible—hath there ever been a generation of Israel like it before or since? Well, therefore, might Jesus liken it to Noah's, and say, 'This generation shall not pass away till all my words concerning it shall be fulfilled.' History attests the fact. The heaven and the earth of the Hebrew Kosmos passed away with a great noise, but not a jot or tittle that he had spoken failed of its entire accomplishment.

They who look for 'the signs' enumerated in the first twenty-nine verses of Matthew 24 as indicative of the Lord's return in majesty and power, may as well look for the signs that preceded the Deluge as indicative of the same event. They will see the one as soon as they will see the other, which will be as soon as they shall see the shadow of the degrees upon the dial of Ahaz go backward ten degrees. The signs of 'the coming of the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory,' are not significative of Judah's overthrow, but of the destruction of the Papacy, the fall of the Ottoman dominion, the subjection of the kingdoms of the west to the Autocrat, preliminary to the redemption of the whole Twelve Tribes of Israel, and the resurrection of the dead. The signs of these events are not in the sun, moon, stars, and constellations; but in 'the unclean spirits like frogs, which go forth to the kings of the earth and of the whole empire to gather them together to the war of the great day of God the Almighty,' whose operations may be discerned by all who 'watch' the progress of things in the light of scripture truth.

EDITOR.

* * *

TIMELY NOTICE.

There are three more numbers after this to the end of the volume. We have thought therefore that it is time to remind our friends in Britain, Nova Scotia, and Canada West, that our rule is to discontinue all papers to subscribers in those countries at the end of the volume. The reason of this is because we have to prepay the postage on all we send out of the United States. We discontinue, that we may not lose subscription and postage; the latter amounting to nearly 30 dollars a year. We have no fault to find with our present subscribers. We adopt the rule to prevent embarrassment; and apply it without partiality.

All then, in Britain, who wish the next volume, will please send in their names, residences, and subscriptions to R. Robertson, Esq., in orders on the Dock Head Post Office, Bermondsey, Surrey. Those in Nova Scotia, to Messrs. Lithgow & Jenkins, to either of them,

Halifax; and Canadians, to Geo. L. Scott, Paris, C. W; or direct to the editor. By attending to this promptly we shall make a fair start again in January 1853.

EDITOR.

* * *

QUERY CONCERNING THE RIGHTEOUS.

Dear Brother:

We have not forgotten you, nor the many occasions of intellectual enjoyment, nor the precious truths we learned while in your society, and attending your public lectures in Dundee, Illinois. They are of priceless value, and such that neither time, nor the fiendish jeers of ecclesiastical leaders of the populace can ever erase. We have kept a close and anxious watch upon your course since the time you left Illinois; and we regret that we have not patronised your publications more fully, which we would have done had it not been for our unsettled condition. But we hope we are now permanently situated in this far southern district, whence we may assist you more liberally in your great and important work of manifesting, and disentangling, the Gospel of the Kingdom from the traditions of men; and serve our Heavenly Father to the best of our ability, looking forward to the appearance of our Lord and Saviour, when he shall come again without sin unto salvation, and reign with his Ancients gloriously.

A friend wishes us to put a question to you, which you can answer at your convenience: —‘When do the righteous live who are to be raised at the second resurrection? And are the righteous subject to death during the Christ’s thousand years’ reign in Jerusalem?’—We remain yours in the Hope.

JOHN OATMAN, Senr. And Jnr.
Bastrop, Texas.

POST-MILLENNIAL HOPE OF THE MILLENNIAL RIGHTEOUS.

The resurrection, termed in common speech ‘the second,’ occurs at ‘the end when the Christ shall deliver up the Kingdom to God, even the Father;’ that is, one thousand years after he ascends the throne of his father David. The righteous who are raised then are they who have died during the previous thousand years—righteous, according to the law and testimony then established as the rule of faith and practice. The hope set before them during the reign, is the kingdom under its post-millennial constitution. They walk by faith of this in hope of attaining citizenship therein, as immortal subjects of ‘God even the Father,’ when sin, death, and priesthood, with its appurtenances, shall cease to be; but when Jesus and his brethren, though no longer priests to God, will continue pre-eminent as the cherubim and seraphim of terrestrial glory. The second-resurrection righteous live thenceforth on the renovated and sealess earth for ever, God being all in all of them as in Christ the Lord.

The word ‘righteous’ is applicable to two classes of the redeemed from sin and death. The first class is composed of those believers of the gospel of the kingdom who live upon the earth at and before the coming of the King of Israel in power and great glory; the second, of those who believe and do while He reigns Vicegerent of Jehovah as High Priest upon his father David’s throne. The first class are immortalised at his coming, and are consequently no more subject to death. They, with Jesus, are the rulers, or ‘kings and priests to God’ over

the nations—the dispensers of the blessedness which is to come upon them through Abraham and His Seed. —Editor.

* * *

TRANSLATING SCRIPTURE.

In reply to an inquiry, our learned friend of Bethany says, that a philologist who does not understand the scriptures is not competent to translate them currently. We are glad to see that we agree with him in something. No pagan Greek, nor blind Hebraist, can transfer the thoughts and purposes of God from the tongues of Moses and Plato, into the Queen's English. Hence our friend's utter incapacity for the work, which is much to be deplored, seeing that he is Supervisor of 300,000 'immortal souls,' or more, who look up to him as an oracle. A man who is ignorant of what Christ's mission is, may 'speak Greek' with as much facility as 'pigs squeak,' and make a speech on every line of Homer in the same tongue, and yet be baffled by a New Testament query of a single sentence. The world will never behold a critically trustworthy version of the Bible till the Lord comes. That event will confound all orthodox criticisms, and leave our learned friend and his Memphis associates among the dunces!

EDITOR.

* * *