

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 October, 1852—
Volume 2—No. 10.

PREACHING TO SPIRITS IN PRISON.

“In which having gone, he preached to the Spirits in prison.” —PETER.

“To this also was the gospel preached to dead ones.”—PETER.

The editor of the Christian Magazine says that the apostle Peter teaches that after his decease Christ Jesus ‘preached, having the imprisoned dead as his congregation.’

Speaking of the dead who ‘never heard of Jesus while in the flesh,’ he says, because he was appointed their judge, ‘therefore they must hear of him in the Spirit in order to their acquittal or condemnation.’

Again, ‘in the Spirit Jesus preached to the dead.’

Referring to those that suffer for the truth, even unto death, he says, ‘by death they cease from sin, and like Christ, may enter upon an extended ministry among the dead.’

These notions he considers as sustained by the doctrine of scripture, which teaches that ‘Christ died to reconcile’ ‘things in heaven’ even ‘the invisible.’ He refers to Colossians 1: 20, and Ephesus 3: 10-13, and concludes from the premises, that ‘God is the God of the DEAD, as well as of the living.’ If so, Jesus has made a slight mistake; for he says, ‘God is NOT a God of the dead, but of the living: for all live unto him’—Luke 20: 38; that is, by resurrection unto life, which he was arguing to prove.

Speaking of ‘ministering angels,’ whom he styles ‘bright and joyous stars,’ he says, ‘Ranks and hosts of these spread themselves throughout the spiritual world, like beings of different grades in this, and under Christ carry on the scheme of his redemption for the benefit of millions, who either by age, or tyranny, or imbecility, could never hear of him while in the flesh.’ By this agency his theory provides for the salvation of ‘infants, idiots, and pagans.’

He says furthermore, “We never commit the body of a single human being to the grave, for whom it is not a pleasure for us to know that his soul has already entered where the knowledge of Christ may yet be his; and that if at last condemned, it will not be for any

thing that was unavoidable in his outward circumstances on earth.” And on the hypothesis of his own salvation, he continues, ‘our happiness, we apprehend, will consist in giving knowledge to all to whose capacity and advancement we may be, there as here, adapted.’

The foregoing novelty is taken from an article on “Spirits in Prison.” In defending it against an attack made upon it by the President of Bethany College, he says, ‘I have uttered an opinion, that men who have not heard the gospel will hear it before they are condemned by it. This is the substance of the whole matter’—and a very gospel-nullifying ‘substance’ truly!

This novelty appears to be based upon a rendering of Peter’s words, which the editor says, was authorised by Mr. Campbell in his controversy with me some years ago; but which the same learned gentleman now finds it convenient to repudiate. The words are, en ho kai tois en phylakee pneumasi poreutheis ekeeruxen, rendered in the ‘New Version’ (Third Edition)—‘by which also he made proclamation to the spirits in prison.’ In this, Mr. Campbell has thrown out the word ‘poreutheis’ as I find the same omission in Jones’ ‘revised and corrected edition’ published in London in 1842. Why have these critics omitted this word? The common English version retains it, and renders the text ‘he went and preached.’ Mr. Jones is dead; but Mr. C. still lives to answer for himself. —The other words of Peter in the premises of the new theory are, eis touto gar kai nekrois enegeenlisthee, rendered by the above critics, ‘For to this end the gospel was preached to the dead;’ in James’, ‘to them that are dead.’ ‘The dead’ is not the literal rendering of the adjective nekrois; it should be ‘to dead’ with ones, or persons, understood. Dead ones are a particular class of the dead in general.

While the editor of the ‘Magazine’ accepts the rendering of the King’s Version, ‘to them that are dead,’ he adopts the sentence, ‘in which Spirit, also, he went and preached to the spirits now in prison,’ as the true representative of the original. This, he says, clearly to his mind ‘conveys the idea that Christ, by his spiritual nature, or by the Spirit, did preach to the spirits of the invisible world.’ To this he adds, ‘and if as to include all, the apostle refers to those who died in disobedience in the days of Noah, which would make his language equivalent to all the dead.’—These words show that he considers the phrase ‘the gospel was preached to the dead,’ as importing that it was preached to all the dead—‘to those now dead, not ‘in the flesh’ (but) now in prison.’

The English of this seems to be, that the editor considers that there is in man an ‘immortal soul’—‘his spiritual nature’—capable of disembodied existence, an existence which begins at the last pulsation of the heart. Next, he believes in ‘a Spirit-World,’ into which ghosts, or separated human spirits, or souls, are received at death. He believes also that there are good and bad human spirits, and some that are neither good nor bad, such as baby-souls. Now, in all this he is approved by all pious Musselmen, all devout Papists, and all sincere pagans, and others. But he does not appear to believe in the ‘Hell,’ which, we hesitate not to say, is falsely ascribed to ‘Jesus Christ and his apostles,’ and is thus indicated in the words of Mr. Campbell; ‘everlasting torment, in utter seclusion from the presence of the Lord, and of everlasting agony, without one ray of hope forever and ever.’ M. H. p. 440. The editor of the ‘Magazine’ is horror-struck, as he may well be, at such a not worthy, I suppose, of being translated destiny in reserve for non-believers of the gospel, which God in his providence had never ceased to be proclaimed to them. —He rejects such a fiendish dogma; and, therefore, instead of dividing his Spirit-World after the Bethanian fashion, he constitutes it more after the model of the present visible ‘evil world,’ save that here is all matter, while there it is all naked spirit. Heaven and hell in the spirit world are very much like

heaven and hell here, said to be in our midst every day—a state of mentality be it good or evil. The Spirit-world of evil consciences, is the newly discovered hell, or “prison,” in which are provisionally confined the dead-alive spirits of infants, idiots, and pagans, with all other sincere unfortunates, who are yet uncondemned by the gospel, because they have had no opportunity of hearing it!

The issue between the editor of the Magazine and the editor of the Harbinger seems to be purely hellish; that is, whether all unbelievers, without distinction, shall everlastingly agonise in torment, mental and physical, without one ray of hope; or, some of them, and that a vast majority, be afforded an opportunity of repentance and deliverance? The Harbinger’s prison has no back door; the Magazine’s has, and this seems to be the tweedledum and tweedledee of the matter. They may dispute about the merits of their respective theories for ever, and each denounce the other for heresy till doomsday; but they will neither of them be any nearer the truth than when they began. It lies beyond their grasp, and must ever do so while they despise Moses and the Prophets, and make immortal-soulism the fulcrum upon which their levers rest.

The passage they are disputing about is an interesting one, and difficult of interpretation only to those whose minds are spoiled by ‘philosophy’ and ‘science falsely so called.’ Leaving the editors for the present to play at single stick undisturbed, we will turn from their logomachies to the words of truth and soberness indited by the apostle.

The ‘elect through sanctification of the Spirit’ to whom he wrote, were ‘in heaviness through manifold temptations,’ or persecutions. The Gentiles spoke against them falsely as evil doers, and therefore buffeted them. He terms this ‘suffering in the flesh’ ‘for righteousness sake,’ which was an evidence that they had ‘ceased from sin,’ not by returning to dust, but by unwavering obedience to the truth; and intended no longer ‘to live the rest of time in flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God’ The living in flesh to the will of God is living to God in spirit; and to be persecuted for so doing is to be ‘condemned by men’—a condemnation which in apostolic times often resulted in death. It did so in the case of Christ. He was put to death in flesh, ‘but made alive by the Spirit.’ Now unto suffering the elect are called; because ‘it is through much tribulation they must enter the Kingdom of God:’ and the reason is, because “Christ also suffered for them, leaving them an example, that they should follow his steps.” No suffering, no kingdom, seems to be the rule; as it is written, ‘if ye suffer with him, ye shall also reign with him.’

To be ‘called of God unto his kingdom and glory,’ is to be called to suffer for it; according to the saying, ‘that ye may be counted worthy of the Kingdom of God, for which ye suffer.’ Therefore says Peter,

‘Think it not strange, beloved, concerning the fiery trial which is to prove you, as though some strange thing happened to you: but rejoice inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ’s sufferings; that when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy. If ye be reproached for the name of Christ happy are ye; for the spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you.’

They were, therefore in the Spirit.

This persecution for the Kingdom’s sake, he styles ‘judgment beginning at the house of God.’ It was judgment inflicted on the elect by ho antidikos diabolos, the legal adversary causing to transgress—the public prosecutor of the day, who sought to devour them judicially.

The ordeal to which they were subjected through him was so fiery, that it was too much for the faith of some, and almost overpowering to all.

‘The time is come,’ says the apostle, ‘that judgment must begin at us, what shall the end of them be that obey not the gospel of God? And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?’

In the Spirit-world to be saved by preaching, if they have not heard the gospel before! But this is manifestly foolish. We will therefore proceed.

The reason, then, why the gospel of the kingdom was preached to Jews and Gentiles was that they might constitute the house of God in this present evil world, and by suffering in flesh for a time prove themselves worthy of the Kingdom. —When Peter wrote his epistles, many of these Christian heroes were mouldering in the dust. They were the nekrois, or dead ones to whom the gospel had been preached, and who in flesh had been ‘condemned by men;’ but all the time of their warfare had ‘lived to God in Spirit;’ for ‘though they walked in flesh, they did not war according to flesh.’ They were a strange spectacle to their former boon companions, who refused to subject themselves to the obedience of faith; spoke evil of them, and maltreated them. But this conduct God will not wink at, as he winked at their evildoings in their ignorance. For the apostle says,

‘They shall give account to him who is in readiness to judge living and dead ones. For to this end also was the gospel preached to dead ones, that in flesh indeed they might be condemned (to suffering) by men, but in spirit live to God.’

Peter does not mean by this, that the gospel was preached to their ghosts while their bodies were rotting in their graves; but preached to them while working the will of the Gentiles, but since deceased, and dead while he was writing about them. Jesus is in readiness to judge living and dead ones. Not the dead universally; for those to whom the gospel has not been preached the scriptures teach are not to rise—

‘They are dead, they shall not live, they are deceased, they shall not rise; thou hast visited, and destroyed them, and caused all the memory of them to perish’—Isaiah 26: 14.

The living and dead ones to be condemned at their resurrection, are the ‘all’ who have sinned wilfully against the truth; the rest are ‘condemned already,’ to sleep eternal in the dust.

Now to elect living ones before they become dead ones, he says,

‘Holily reverence (hagiasate) the Lord God in your hearts: and be always ready with an answer to every one asking you a reason for the hope that is in you with forbearance and respect; having a good conscience, that whereas they speak evil of you as evildoers they may be put to shame who accuse falsely your good deportment in Christ. For it is better, if God’s purpose require it, to suffer for well-doing than for evil-doing. Because Christ also suffered once for all on account of sins, a just one in behalf of unjust ones, that he might lead to God, having been put to death indeed in flesh, but made alive by the Spirit: in which also having gone he preached to the Spirits in prison, having formerly refused belief at the time the long-suffering of God waited once for all in the days of Noah, while an ark was being built, in which few, that is, eight souls were preserved in safety through water, an antitype to which baptism also now saves us * * * through the resurrection of Jesus Christ, who, having gone (poreutheis) into heaven, is at the right hand of God, angels and dominions and powers being placed at his disposal.’

Such, I believe, is a rendering of Peter's words that cannot be improved. The exhortation with which they begin is excellent, and worthy of all reception by our contemporaries. I wish the two editors in question would attend to it, and in presenting their answers, 'speak as the oracles of God;' and let them remember that, when Peter wrote these words, the only oracles so recognised were the writings of Moses and the Prophets. As they therefore profess to contend for apostolicity of practice, will they be so good, for the sake of truth and the salvation of themselves, and of those who hear them, as to speak according to Moses and the Prophets? If they will only do this, and abandon their vain logomachies, or strifes about words to no profit, they will speak in harmony with the apostles also; for the apostles said 'none other things than what Moses and the prophets testified,' save that to some extent as yet, they found a partial accomplishment in Jesus. If they will kindly consent to this course, all 'profane vain babbling' about endless agony in torment, preaching to ghosts, sky-kingdom heavens, spirit-world hells with postern gates, immortal souls, and all that sort of foolishness, will fall into desuetude. Let them cease then to 'despise the word' as 'an old Jewish almanac,' or a system of 'thundering Jewish phrases.' The 'christian scriptures' are contained in the Book of the Abrahamic Covenant, with the New Testament as a codicil attached for the illustration of the mystery. While they neglect Moses and the Prophets, they are doomed to blindness and the blackness of darkness for ever.

Jesus, the holy and the just one, suffered hyper, not 'over,' as the editor of the Magazine renders it after others, but 'for or in behalf of' persons, who were in an unjustified state at the time of his sufferings, which were sacrificially consummated in his death and resurrection. It was *peri* 'for or on account of,' their sins that he suffered hyper, in their behalf; that being justified from their past sins 'through his name,' they might be, the rest of their time in this evil world, in a state of reconciliation with God. Christ did not suffer in their stead, that is, that they should not suffer, as their being made 'partakers of his sufferings' by a 'fiery trial,' proves. Had he not died and risen again, they would have perished as the beasts; but by his stripes applied, or inflicted, so to speak, upon the old man of sin within them, by faith in the gospel of the kingdom in his name presented, they are healed in conscience; and will hereafter be healed also of that 'loathsome disease' that imprisons them in the dust. 'For the transgression of my people was he stricken,' saith the Lord. 'By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities.' Of this 'many' Isaiah was one. Hence he says, 'He was wounded for our transgressions (or sins;) he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.' Paul also was one of this 'many,' of which all mankind are not—a many which is constituted of persons whose justification proceeds *ek pisteos*, out of faith in the kingdom and name, and is consummated in the sprinkling of the heart from an evil conscience with the blood of Jesus, when faith in his blood is counted to a believer of the gospel of the kingdom for righteousness, in the act of putting on his name in baptism. The apostles were of this 'many;' the living ones to whom they wrote were also of the number; as well as those of their company who had been devoured by the executors of Caesar's will. These 'dead ones' of this 'many' had been 'washed, sanctified, and justified by the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of God;' and had resisted the enemy 'steadfast in the faith.' Bruised in the heel, they lie sleeping in the dust, waiting for the trumpet sound to wake them into life. In behalf of this 'many,' Paul says, 'God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died hyper, for us;' 'when we were enemies we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son;' 'being reconciled, we shall be saved in his life,' by being planted in the form of his resurrection.

'That he might purge our conscience from dead works to serve the living God,
He is the Mediator of the New Will, that being subjected to death for

redemption of the transgressions against the First Will, THE CALLED might receive the promise of the age-inheritance.’

No man ever kept the law of Moses but Jesus, and he came under its curse by what was done to him. That law being weak through the flesh could give no one a right to eternal life as a consequence of justification thereto. Devout and undevout Israelites, therefore, were all upon the same footing in relation to it—all of them cursed; as it is written,

“Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things written in the Book of the Law to do them.’

‘From faith’ in the gospel of the kingdom, the justification of the devout transgressors of the first covenant proceeds; as ‘through the faith,’ beginning in the Christ and ending in Jesus, comes the justification of the Gentile constituent of the ‘many.’

I have made the above remarks for the especial benefit of the editor of the ‘Magazine,’ who, by his handling of the Greek particles, forcibly betrays his want of understanding in ‘the righteousness of God.’ In other words, he does not understand the doctrine of justification; that is, how a man may be accounted righteous before God; nor the purpose for which righteousness is proclaimed. The other editor is not much ahead of him in this particular; or he would not advocate the traditions he does. The common idea of religion haunts their imaginations, and makes them see strange sights ‘beyond the skies,’ and in their spirit-worlds beneath. The popular notion is, that religion is for the keeping of the ‘immortal souls’ of all who get it, out of the bottomless pit of burning brimstone; and for the translating of them to an ethereal heaven beyond the skies. The alternative it offers to the world is get this religion, or be damned to this hell for ever and ever, men, women, and children, infants and sucklings, idiots and pagans. Ferocious minds revel in this alternative, always flattering themselves that they are safe. They call it one of the sanctions of the gospel; and are ready to hang, draw, and quarter with satanic fierceness, the unlucky wight that shall breathe a doubt of the scripturality of their speculation. Calling upon such to do justice, is like seeking mercy at the jaws of a dragon. There is neither justice nor mercy for their opponents in the hearts of men who would attribute to God the decretal of such an alternative. Benevolent and justice-loving minds revolt at it; and hence arise universalism, restorationism, baby-salvationism, salvation without faith in the gospel, and preaching deliverance to the damned. But ‘they err not knowing the scriptures;’ that is, Moses and the Prophets, the only scriptures extant when Jesus uttered the words. There is no such alternative in them. God does not propose to reap where he has not sown; nor to punish them for not working whom he has not hired; nor to reward those to whom he has made no promise. He intends to found a kingdom and empire on earth; and he intends that they shall be governed by men chosen upon certain well-defined principles—that is, by the ‘many.’ He does not invite all mankind, nor every creature of all mankind, to the possession of this kingdom; but ‘every creature’ of the ‘all nations’ of the Roman dominion, contemporary with the apostles; and those of after ages and generations, who can discover the truth by the study of the word—the remnant of the Woman’s Seed. There are, and have been, systems of nations to which he has never spoken. These need no gospel to condemn them because of its rejection. They are ‘condemned already;’ but not to the same condemnation which the gospel threatens. They are condemned to return to the dust, and to abide there for ever; but the gospel condemns its rejectors to a resurrection to punishment in the judgment of the Beast, and the False Prophet. The alternatives of the Bible are:

1. Possession of the kingdom with all its appurtenances, by a resurrection to eternal life; or,
2. Resurrection to punishment, consequent on rejection of the gospel and unworthiness, of the kingdom; or,

3. A return to original dust, and sojourn therein for ever, consequent on necessitated, and therefore unavoidable, ignorance of the whole matter.

With the third class, or that characterised by the ignorance of necessity, the gospel has nothing to do; therefore we need not trouble ourselves about them. But with the first and second it has. They both stand related to it as acceptors or rejectors, by believing, refusing to believe, or believing and walking unworthy of it. The gospel can only be accepted or rejected in this present world; because, when the kingdom, which is the subject of the gospel, is established in the resurrection-period, 'the world to come' will be an existing fact, and there will be no more good news about inheriting the kingdom, to preach. The good things that are now promised, will then have been performed in the bestowal of them upon the saints. The acceptors and rejectors of the gospel are either living or dead. If they be living, they are above ground among the living; if dead, they are in the ground, or 'spirits in prison,' 'sleeping in the dust of the earth.'

They are well termed 'spirits' as contrasted with organised flesh and blood; for they are without form, image, likeness, or substance. They have evaporated into divers spirits or gases; and nothing of them remains, but 'dust and ashes;' and their characters written in the book of God's remembrance. Like the spectral impression of the coin upon the mirror, though invisible, it is there, and can be brought out by breathing upon the surface; so the men and women are, as it were, spectrally in the dust, but knowing nothing, and as unsubstantial, save their ashes, as nonentity itself, till the afflation of God's formative Spirit refashion them; and, as in the case of the few loaves and fishes which increased in quantity sufficient to feed thousands, from a little dust give them the bulk and stature of adults with their former identity restored. They will then be no longer 'spirits in prison,' but 'the dead cast out of the earth.'

That the 'prison' is the tomb, or place where dead bodies are laid, must be apparent to every one. They are fettered there by the necessity that binds them, and they can not come forth. The grave is their prison-house, and they the captives or prisoners of death, which has taken them captive.

'My flesh shall rest in hope; because thou wilt not leave my soul in the grave (nephesh le-sheol;) neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption.'

Here 'flesh,' 'soul,' and 'Holy One,' are all regarded by the prophet as confined in the grave (sheol;) the lowest dungeon of which is 'the pit,' called also 'the lowest hell,' indicative of the state of invisibility as the result of corruption being complete. Hence the Holy One's resurrection, or release from prison, is again referred to by David in these words,

'Thou hast brought up my soul from the grave (min-sheol nepheshi;) thou hast kept me alive (preserved me from decomposition) that I should not go down to the pit.'

And again,

'Thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest grave (sheol.)'

In another place the Holy One in prophecy supplicates Jehovah in these words,

'Attend unto my cry, for I am brought very low: deliver me from my persecutors; for they are stronger than I. Bring my soul out of prison, THAT I MAY PRAISE thy name.'

There needs no more testimony to prove that Christ's 'flesh' was his 'soul,' and that when it was dead, and walled up in the sepulchre, it was in prison; and that as 'in death there is no remembrance of God,' and 'in the grave no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom,' it is clear that Christ neither in body nor soul 'preached to a congregation of imprisoned dead;' for while in prison he could say nothing in praise of his Father's name.

Let it be remarked, that Peter does not say that Jesus preached to the spirits in prison, but that Christ did so; that is, that which ‘made Jesus both Lord and Christ,’ namely, the anointing or Holy Spirit. The apostle distinctly indicates the time when the Spirit that made Jesus alive preached to them, to wit, about 2400 years before Jesus was born, that is, in the days of Noah. And why does the apostle cite the case of Noah at all? Because as Jesus had predicted it had even come to pass. Peter wrote his epistle when ‘the end of all things was at hand’—the end of all things constituted by the Law of Moses: and James, referring to the same crisis, says, ‘the coming of the Lord draweth nigh.’ Now, Jesus on Olivet also speaking of the fall of Jerusalem and ruin of the State, says,

‘Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only. But as the days of Noah were, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be. For as in the days before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage until the day that Noah entered into the ark, and knew not until the flood came, and took them all away: so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be.’

From James’ and Peter’s two epistles it is evident, that the Jews, with a few exceptions only, were as demoralised as the antediluvians. The Spirit had been preaching to them through the apostles of ‘judgment to come’ for nearly forty years; but they heeded his proclamation no more than the antediluvians did when he preached to them through Noah. Christian Jews said, ‘My Lord delayeth his coming,’ and became iniquitous; while others scoffingly inquired, ‘Where is the promise of his coming?’ But they were willingly ignorant, or unmindful of the events of Noah’s age. They resisted the Spirit in refusing to believe the apostles; therefore the fate of the antediluvians overtook them, and a few of the baptised only escaped, who, like Noah, believed the word.

When Peter brought up the case of the antediluvians they were as now, ‘spirits in prison;’ but when the Spirit went and preached to them through Noah, they were like the contemporaries of the apostles, living men and women at large upon the earth, enjoying ‘the pleasures of sin for a season.’ ‘The dead know not any thing;’ what then is the use of preaching to them? They must be made alive by the Spirit as Jesus was—and then something might be done. When they come forth they will indeed hear the words of the Lord; but there will be no mercy in his speech; for he will pronounce them ‘cursed,’ and command them to depart from his presence. There are other prisoners, however, who will rejoice in the year of liberty and release. They are styled ‘the Lord’s prisoners,’ in the pit where no water is. Thus, Jehovah addressing the king who rides the ass into Jerusalem, says, ‘As for thee, by the blood of thy covenant I have sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit wherein there is no water.’ He also styles the Jews scattered among the nations which keep them back from the occupation of their country, ‘prisoners of hope;’ as it reads,

‘Turn you to the stronghold (to Zion,) ye prisoner’s of hope * * * when I have bent Judah for me, and filled the bow with Ephraim, and raised up thy sons, O Zion, against thy sons, O Greece, and made thee as the sword of a mighty man. And the Lord shall be seen over them,’ &c.

Here, then, are two classes of prisoners—the one class, in the prison-house of the captive dead; and the other, in the Gentile prison-house of the living captives of Israel. Jesus being the Christ is therefore to perform the Christ’s mission, which is, ‘to be a covenant for the people (Israel) a light to the nations; to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness, Show yourselves.’ This will be the proclamation of a two-fold liberty to the Lord’s captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound—to Death’s prisoners in Sheol, of the dust; and Death’s captives in the Sheol of Israel’s

political bondage among the Gentiles. The Spirit, through Jesus, will make this proclamation to spirits in prison at his appearing in power and great glory; for 'the dead shall hear his voice and come forth'—the dead in their graves, literal and political; and this is all the preaching to the spirits in prison Jesus will deign to do.

EDITOR.

* * *

Imprint the beauties of the prophets upon your imagination, and their morals upon your heart.

* * *

WHO BAPTISED THE APOSTLES?

In 'The Christian Age,' one R. Brown writes to its editor, and asks, in relation to John 3: 22, 'whether Jesus baptised the Twelve Disciples, or who did baptise them?' Evidently unable to answer the question, the Editor, in what he calls a 'reply,' says, 'I suppose you mean who baptised the twelve at Ephesus! !' Would such a supposition ever enter thy head, O reader, from such a question? When a man asks, 'Did Jesus baptise Twelve Disciples?' would any man in his senses suppose he meant, 'Did Jesus baptise twelve disciples at Ephesus twenty-five years after his ascension?' R. Brown wants to know about those disciples mentioned in John 3: 22, and not about disciples mentioned in Acts 19; but editor D. S. Burnet supposes he inquires about what Jesus did at Ephesus, although, as the lesser light of 'this reformation,' he ought to know, that Jesus was not sent to the Gentiles, but only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and was therefore never at Ephesus, nor in any of the cities of the Greeks. It will not help the editor out of his bewilderment to say, that he supposed the twelve at Ephesus were twelve of the disciples named in John 3: 22, who, twenty-five years after, were found by Paul at Ephesus. The only disciples mentioned in the New Testament, called 'the twelve,' are the Apostles. R. Brown wants Mr. Burnet to tell him, if Jesus baptised the twelve disciples, and if he did not, who did baptise them? But he does not even suppose that the Ephesian twelve were of the disciples named by John, for he says, 'I am disposed to think that Apollos, who then only knew the baptism of John, baptised those twelve at Ephesus.' He has a disposition to think this, and consequently does not think it; and therefore has no demonstration to offer: in other words he is stone-blind upon the subject, which is sufficiently obvious.

But why not have the candour to confess his ignorance? A man, though an editor and a satellite, had better do this, than publish such an egregious blunder as that before us. Does he think that the intelligence of his readers is so completely prostrated and perverted by Bible, missionary, college, and publication speculations, that he can safely publish any absurdity without liability of detection? Men, like himself and brethren, experimented after this fashion even in the days of the apostles and succeeded; and from the signs of the times among 'reformers,' we discern that the experiment is being repeated and with like success. We were informed lately by letter from Washington, D. C., that many of the members of the Campbellite church there believe the things we advocate, to some extent, but dare not avow it publicly for fear of Alexander Campbell! Alas! And do such people call themselves free Americans, to say nothing of their being free-men because the truth has made them free! Afraid of A. Campbell! O 'tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon; lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice, lest the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph!' In this

same church a member in speaking made use of Daniel and the Apocalypse in reference to setting up the kingdom, but he was told he had no business to use Daniel and the Revelation, as they were highly figurative! Thus the testimony of God is silenced, and intellectual torpor is the result. 'Reformers' have apathetically surrendered themselves to their scribes, among whom there is not one who dare tell them truth unpalatable to their Bethanian Papa. Instead of adding 'knowledge' to their faith and goodness, they are fast letting slip the little they ever knew. Their periodicals are a standing proof of their deep declension. Their 'pure literature,' as D. S. Burnet styles it, is puerile and unreadable; and if read, leaves the reader as much in the dark concerning the thoughts and purposes of Jehovah, as if the page were a perfect blank. Some of their editors lament that the scriptures have fallen into neglect among them. This testimony is true; and as a consequence, editor D. S. Burnet can, with impunity, suppose any sort of reply to questions he pleases, even to the supposition that his brother, R. B., is an ignoramus, and that John 3: 22, had a reference to twelve disciples at Ephesus!

After telling R. Brown he supposed he meant the Ephesian twelve, when he asked about Jesus and the twelve, he refers to John 4: 2, as proof that Jesus did not baptise with his own hands; from which the reader is left to infer that Jesus neither baptised the twelve at Ephesus, nor the twelve apostles. But R. Brown inquires 'Who did baptise the Apostles?' for he asks no question about the Ephesian disciples at all. In his 'reply' to this query, his 'dear brother Burnet' deposes not a word! He gives it the go-bye as completely as though R. B. had never made the inquiry. It is fair then to conclude that the editor of the C. A. knows nothing about the matter; and as he gives it up, probably as 'an untaught question and speculation,' untaught that is in his divinity, we will see what we can do with it for the instruction of D. S. B., his brother Brown, and our own beloved and right worshipful readers.

Who then baptised the Apostles? The answer to this question is emphatically, John the baptiser. The apostle Andrew is styled by the apostle John, one of John's disciples—John 1: 35, 37, 40. This testimony is decisive as to him; but how are we to get at the certainty that the twelve were all baptised of John? We reply, that John's baptism divided the Jews into two classes—the first class comprised 'all the people that heard, and the publicans;' the other, 'the Pharisees and Lawyers.' The former class was very numerous; for 'Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, were baptised of John in Jordan, confessing their sins.' Referring to the completion of this work, Luke says,

'Now when all the people were baptised, it came to pass that Jesus also being baptised, and praying, the heaven opened.'

The other class being composed of the 'upper ten thousand,' were 'respectable' and few. They were 'the righteous,' who, in their own estimation, needed no physician, having no occasion for repentance. As a class, they despised the people as cursed, knowing not the law. They regarded a baptism of repentance for remission of sins as quite unsuited to them; so that 'they rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptised of John;' while the people, on the contrary, who thought more humbly of themselves, 'justified God, being baptised with his baptism'—Luke 7: 29-30.

The testimony saith that 'the publicans,' or tax-gatherers, were baptised of John as well as all the people. Now the apostle Matthew was one of the publicans of Judea, and styled in the list of the twelve, 'Matthew the publican;' we may therefore safely infer that he, as well as Andrew, was baptised of John.

The apostles were all attendants upon John's preaching. One of them says,

‘That which was from the beginning which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of life * * that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you.’—

1 John 1: 1-3.

John affirms this of himself and the rest of the apostles. Matthew and he have written accounts of some of the things they saw and heard ‘from the beginning’—a beginning indicated by Mark as characterised by the commencement of John’s baptismal proclamation, which he styles ‘the beginning of the glad tidings of Jesus Christ’—Mark 1: 1. All the apostles were ‘witnesses unto Him,’ therefore what John and Matthew and Andrew saw and heard, they were all able to testify to from personal observation. John and Matthew heard John preach, saw him immerse Jesus, saw the Spirit descend upon him, heard the Father’s voice, &c.; and because they saw and heard these things they were able to declare them. Peter also intimates, that he and the ten were well acquainted with the things that pertained to ‘the beginning;’ and declares that it was necessary that the candidates for the twelfth place in the apostleship should be as familiar with them as themselves.

‘Of these men,’ said he, ‘who have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the baptism of John unto that same day that he was taken up from us, must one be ordained to be a witness of his resurrection’—Acts 1: 21-22.

He must be able to testify the things concerning Jesus in connexion with John’s baptism as well as with his resurrection. If he were unable to do this, how could he testify that God had anointed him, or made a Christ of him? The conclusion, then, is certain that all the apostles heard John’s proclamation that the King of Israel was about to appear, and that they should prepare to receive him; that he came baptising in water to the end that God might set his seal or mark upon that one of the baptised whom he should choose for king; and that having witnessed the promised sign descending upon Jesus, he testified that Jesus was the Son and Lamb of God, whom he had chosen to take away the sin of the world. The apostles all heard this, and having heard it have declared it unto us.

This being admitted, then, it is equivalent to admitting also that the apostles were baptised of John’s baptism; for the testimony we have already quoted says, ‘all the people that heard justified God, being baptised with the baptism of John.’ The apostles were of the people, not of the ruling class, they heard, and believed what they heard, and were therefore baptised in the hope of the king’s making his appearance soon. Nor were they long held in suspense. When John pointed to Jesus as the king, Andrew and another introduced themselves to him and had the honour of an invitation to spend the day with him at his abode. On leaving, he sought his brother Simon Peter, and told him they had found the Messiah, that is, the Anointed. Peter then went to see him, and having entered his service received a change of name. After this Philip, a fellow-townsmen of Andrew and Peter, was enlisted. Philip then told his friend Nathaniel, ‘we have found him, of whom Moses and the prophets did write;’ and when Nathaniel had conversed with Jesus, he recognised him as Son of God and King of Israel.

But it is further certain that the apostles were all disciples of John, (and they only were his disciples who were baptised of him.) before they were disciples of Jesus, from the consideration evinced in the answer to the following question—From which of the two classes above mentioned is it certain Jesus would select his apostles? Would it be from that class which rejected the counsel of God against themselves in not being baptised? From the Pharisees and Lawyers? No; these were they upon whom he pronounced his woes. It follows

then that he selected his apostles from those who ‘justified God in being baptised with John’s baptism.’ There is no other conclusion open to us. It is this or none at all.

But one may say, Were the apostles not afterwards rebaptised in the name of Jesus, and if so who immersed them? No, they were clean without it. Their case was peculiar, and cannot occur again. Jesus did not baptise in his own name. Indeed there was no baptising into any name before Pentecost There could be none; for although Jesus had power on earth to forgive sins, his name had not acquired a sin remitting efficacy, because he had then as yet neither died nor risen again. John’s baptism was the immersion of believers into repentance for remission of sins; so was the baptism Jesus preached. The difference existing between them was in that believed by the disciples of John and of Jesus. Both classes believed in the Hope of Israel; John’s, however, expected the coming of Messiah to put the nation in possession of its hope; while the disciples of Jesus believed that he was already come, and that Jesus was he. Many of John’s disciples, it is likely, though expecting the King whom Jehovah had provided, did not receive Jesus as that personage; but to ‘as many as did receive him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God.’ Among these were the apostles, and those on Pentecost and afterwards ‘who believe on his name.’ The faith that served for baptism before Pentecost would not suffice on that day. It must expand, for it had to comprise the king’s death for sin and his resurrection for justification unto life, in addition to what was believed before. The baptism of believers into repentance for remission of sins was the nature off the three baptisms administered first by John, then by Jesus, and afterwards by the apostles on Pentecost; while the faith of John’s disciples was positive; that of Christ’s, comparative; and of the apostolic converts, superlative.

The case of the apostles, we have said, was peculiar. John the Baptist was not immersed at all; not even by Jesus: but Jesus was immersed by him, how much more necessary therefore for the apostles. They had all bathed religiously in Jordan’s bath. After this Jesus took them under his especial care. He instructed them in ‘the mysteries of the kingdom of God,’ and indoctrinated them with the divine testimony. This had a cleansing effect upon eleven of them, but not upon Judas. As the three years and a half of his ministry drew to a close, he proceeded to perfect the work he had commenced upon them. Two days before the Passover, being at Bethany, he supped at Simon the leper’s. After supper he began to wash the apostles’ feet, for a double purpose; first, to complete their cleansing; and secondly, to teach them a lesson of humility. Peter, however, objected, judging that Jesus was humbling himself too much. He did not perceive what was intended by the act; but his Lord told him he should know afterwards. He still declined, saying, ‘thou shalt not wash my feet unto the age;’ to which Jesus replied, ‘If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me;’ that is, in that age. It is evident from this remark, that there was more in this particular feet-washing than a mere lesson of humility. Peter’s salvation depended on his compliance; for to tell him he should have no part with Jesus, was the same as telling him he should be lost if his feet were not washed by Jesus. When Peter heard this all objection not only vanished, but he rushed into an extreme of willingness, offering not only his feet, but his hands and head. But Jesus reminded him that this was unnecessary, on the ground that he and the rest had already bathed, and bathers when they had left the bath needed only to wash their feet, and were then clean every whit. His words are, ‘He that is bathed (ho leloumenos) hath no need but to wash (nipsasthai) the feet.’ This being the case with the apostles, Jesus refused to do more than wash their feet. John had bathed them in Jordan, and Jesus completed their investiture by the word he had spoken to them, and the washing of their feet. Their feet were now ‘shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace.’ Before, they were girded with truth, and had on the breast-plate of righteousness; but they were not shod. The word spoken to them by Jesus let

them into the mysteries of the gospel of the kingdom, which are ‘the preparation of the gospel;’ for no man can have part with Jesus in that kingdom, which is his joy, unless he is prepared by indoctrination into the Mystery. Thus indoctrinated, bathed and washed, Jesus addressed them saying,

‘Ye are clean, but not all. For he knew who should betray him; therefore said he, Ye are not all clean.’

But Judas had heard the same things, been bathed by John, and washed by Jesus, why was he not clean even as the rest? Because, not being a man of honest and good heart, the word sown there could not germinate and grow. What he understood had no genial influence upon him. It found him a thief and left him a thief and a traitor, therefore his bathing and washing proved of no account. But it was not so with the eleven. After their washing Jesus said to them,

‘Ye are now clean through the word which I have spoken to you.’

Their cleansing was complete and permanent by the water through the word.

Thus by reasoning on the testimony we come to the full assurance that the apostles were baptised of John, and cleansed by Jesus with water and the word. He exhorted them to wash one another’s feet, as a memorial, doubtless, of their being shod, and of the humility he exemplified for their imitation. Such a feet-washing was never before or since, nor will ever be again. The lesson inculcated remains in all its force. Jehovah’s future king of the world washing the feet of the thief, who he knew, within two days, would sell him to his enemies that they might put him to death! No meekness and humility ever exceeded this. But here we must pause till a more convenient season.

EDITOR.

* * *

He who makes an idol of his interest, makes a martyr of his integrity.

* * *

OUR VISIT TO BRITAIN.

FIRST TOUR CONCLUDED. —RETURN TO LONDON. —WRITE ELPIS ISRAEL. —ATTEND A PEACE MEETING, WHICH PROVES VERY WARLIKE.

Having completed a tour of nearly five months, I again found myself in London, with health considerably impaired from the fatigue I had undergone. Recuperation was therefore the first thing to be attended to. Rest of mind, and a little medicine (for however professional it may be to prescribe much, I have a very great aversion to the conversion of my own interior into a receptacle for the quantities usually exhibited on the placebo-principle) to restore the cerebro-organic equilibrium of the system, effected this in two or three weeks; so that by the beginning of the new year I was enabled to commence the composition of Elpis Israel. I did not allow the grass to grow; but worked while it was called today, and much of the night also. For six weeks the world without was a mere blank, except through a daily perusal of the London Times; for during that period I had no use for hat, boots, or shoes, oscillating, as it were, like a pendulum between two points—the couch above, and the desk below. In about four months the manuscript was completed; but whether it would ever hold the light of the public countenance, or remain in the obscurity of an old chest, with the blessing of the enemy upon it so long as it mouldered there, depended on the humour I should find the people in on visiting them again. With the exception of two discourses at Camden Town, and two at a

small lecture room near my residence, and an opposition speech at a peace society meeting, (See Chapter 36.) I made no effort among the Londoners to gain their ears. I distributed printed bills, indeed; but a few hundreds or thousands of these among upwards of two millions of people were but as the drops of a passing cloud to the ocean. For the truth to create a sensation in London, its advocates must have a large purse, or be introduced to public attention by some influential religious party. The latter alternative is an impossibility; for there is no party in that great city of any weight on the side of truth. The press, secular and ecclesiastical, is dead against it; the former, because it is satisfied with what exists, or has no faith in anything but its own faithlessness; and the latter, because, like Ephraim, it is joined to its idols, and welcomes no truth at variance with them. Could I have hired Exeter Hall for a hundred and twenty-five dollars a night, and have placarded the town in all its thoroughfares, from the India House to St. James's Palace and Hyde Park; and from Shoreditch Church to the Elephant and Castle, I might have obtained a crowd. But the expense would have been equal to the purchase of a small Virginia farm; and though by charging something for admission, as the custom is, the cost might have been reduced, perhaps covered; still I did not feel justified in encountering the alternative of success, or incarceration in the Bench prison for debt. This would have been too gratifying to the enemy; for he would then have got the advantage over us, indeed; being seized of one's body, wind and limb."

The Peace-Society people seemed to be the only available medium of access to the public on a large scale. They were trying to convert the world to the 'peace and safety' cry which precedes the sudden destruction from the Lord; and to bring about a system of arbitration for the settlement of national differences, faith in which would of necessity prevent faith in Moses and the Prophets, who preach peace only to the righteous; and to those generations of humanity which shall be blessed in Abraham and his Seed, when Christ shall have 'subdued' them to himself by the energy of God. This Society is treading upon gospel-ground; and by its emissaries hardening the hearts of the people against the kingdom of God, which is to 'grind to powder and bring to an end' all the dominions of the world. I felt called upon, therefore, though but one feeble voice in the vast wilderness of the people, to protest against their utopian and unscriptural conceit.

On Thursday evening, Feb. 22nd, 1849, a public meeting was to be held at the British Institution, Cowper Street, City Road, for the purpose of adopting a petition to Parliament in favour of Mr. Cobden's motion for special treaties of arbitration instead of war in the settlement of national disputes. I determined to attend the meeting. But as I intended to oppose the adoption of the petition, which would, perhaps, bring down the anathema of all present (for the leaders of public meetings are generally intolerant of every thing that does not glorify their crotchet, and the peculiar 'wisdom' that sanctifies it) I deemed it best that my presence should be sanctioned by authority. I therefore addressed the following letter to the Chairman:

Mr. Charles Gilpin,

Sir: In one of the morning papers I perceive an advertisement of a public meeting at which you are to take the chair. The object of the meeting is stated to be the adoption of 'a petition to Parliament in favour of Mr. Cobden's motion for special treaties of arbitration to supersede the cruel and costly war system.' As one of the public, I write respectfully to inquire, whether the originators of the meeting advertise the public to convene to discuss the principles of peace and war as the basis of a petition expressive of the sentiments of the majority; or, merely to come together to hear speeches in favour of the foregone conclusions

of a party, and to vote its petition as a matter of course? In either case would it be considered improper to grant me the liberty of showing cause why such a petition ought not to be adopted? An answer at your earliest convenience will confer a favour on, Sir, very respectfully yours,

JOHN THOMAS.

In reply to this, I received the following note, enclosing bills headed 'Arbitration instead of War,' and with the inquiry 'What does it cost?'

'Charles Gilpin begs to refer John Thomas to the Secretaries of the Peace Congress Committee, 15 New Broad street, for any information respecting the subject of his note beyond what is conveyed in the enclosed.

5 Bishopgate Without,
2 Mo. 21st, 1849.'

I next addressed the Rev. Henry Richard, one of the Secretaries referred to, from whom I received the communication annexed:

'Sir: In reply to your question relative to the public meeting about to be held, I may say that the object certainly is not 'to discuss the principles of peace and war,' but to adopt a petition in favour of Mr. Cobden's motion for treaties of arbitration, the very phraseology of the bill, as it seems to me, very clearly implying, that the parties invited to be present, are supposed to require no discussion on the evils of war or the desirableness of peace. At the same time while replying thus to the question so directly put by you as to the object of the meeting, I do not presume to say, that you will have no right to move an amendment to the resolution proposing a petition should you think fit to do so.

I am, sir, yours respectfully,

HENRY RICHARD.

15 Broad street, February 21, 1849.

Arrived at the place of meeting, I found an audience assembled of about two thousand men, principally of the working class. Two persons from America were expected to address them. These were a Mr. Clapp from Massachusetts, and Elihu Burritt, 'the learned blacksmith.' After the chairman had opened the meeting, and the petition had been read, the former delivered his speech, which was chiefly remarkable for its length of wind. Though the meeting was convened for 'no discussion on the evils of war, and the desirableness of peace,' Mr. Clapp's speech was a discussion of the subjects from first to last. But I found afterwards that by 'no discussion' was meant discussion in solo, but not in duobus. If a speaker's arguments were all in favour of Peace Society principles, the utmost liberty of speech was granted; but if the arguments were contrary to these, the clamour became deafening, and speech impossible. Mr. Clapp's address, like all others on the same subject, resolved itself into three heads; first, the costliness of war; second the cruelty of war; and third, its anti-christian character. It would be very unprofitable to occupy our space with any of his sayings. He talked a good deal about Christianity and its adaptation to all national emergencies; but being entirely ignorant of the 'mystery of godliness,' his speculations were all wide of the mark, and by no means worth the trouble of transferring them from the notes before me."

"When he had concluded, I rose to speak. On this there was a call for Elihu Burritt. I remarked that I had the floor with the consent of the chair, and was desirous of addressing them before Mr. Burritt. He was the great Peace Society apostle, and consequently, no doubt,

a very efficient advocate of its principles. Now, I intended to controvert those principles, and I wished him to attend to what I had to say, that when I had done he might point out to them wherein I had failed in sustaining the anti-peace society principles to be submitted to them in the amendment I was about to propose. But the clamour was still for 'Elihu Burritt'; and as speech was impossible in the midst of so much tumult, I yielded. Mr. Burritt, however, refused to present himself. He had a cold, or a headache, or something, and therefore begged to be excused. I was then suffered to proceed in quietness for a few moments. I invoked their patience while I made a few remarks introductory to the amendment I held in my hand. The objection deemed to be the strongest against war by the advocates of peace, seemed to be its costliness. This was an appeal to the pocket, as though the public conscience were chiefly, or mainly, accessible through that useful receptacle alone. The cruelty of war, and its anti-christian character, were indeed treated of; and appeals were made to the scriptures to prove the abominableness of its practice; but still the great peace-gun discharged against it, was the suffering inflicted upon acquisitiveness by the expenditure incurred. War in itself is an evil; and so is the amputation of a limb. They are cruel inflictions to those who suffer by them; but often salutary in their results. Institutions are not to be judged of by their immediate workings, but by the remoter purposes they are to establish. War, punishments, and surgery, are three institutions, without which, though evil and painful operations, society would be greatly damaged. Surgery, which is cruel work, and often practised with little or no feeling, has saved the life of many a useful member of society. Men do not petition for its abolition, because it is costly, and cruel to the patient's feelings, and no where sanctioned in the Bible. On the contrary, notwithstanding these things, they regard it as a blessing, because, though a severe remedy, it saves the lives of men. The punishments of imprisonment, transportation, and death, are costly to the state, excruciating to the feelings of their victims, and often ruinous to their families; but are they not, nevertheless, beneficial to society? Now war is to nations, what punishment and surgery are to society and the subjects of them—a necessary evil and 'blessing in disguise.'—The world could not progress without it. This day is the anniversary of Washington's birth. Would Messrs. Clapp and Burritt say that the Republic he is styled 'the Father' of, was a too-costly, cruel, and anti-christian thing? Would they say it was no blessing to the world? Would they not say rather it was a blessing in which, sooner or later, all mankind would be blessed? And how, pray, was this inestimable blessing procured? By the extermination of the Indians, the sacrifice of 100,000 combatants, called 'christians,' and at a cost of £136,000,000 sterling to this country, to say nothing of what it cost the successful colonists. You see, then, that war in its results is a blessing to the world, notwithstanding its costliness, cruelty, and supposed antichristian character, even peace society advocates themselves being judges!

But while war ultimates in civilisation and blessedness to the non-combatants of our race, it is the fiery indignation and wrath of God upon nations for their wickedness, and cruelty to his people. Let the nations, if it were possible, forsake the evil of their doings and turn to him, and there would be no war. But this they will not voluntarily consent to do, therefore war is necessary and indispensable. —You profess to be groaning under the cost of former wars. And why should you not? War has generally been popular with this nation. Your forefathers endeavoured to rivet a yoke upon the necks of the Trans-Atlantic colonies which they were unable to bear. This cost you £136,000,000. The French having taken vengeance upon the Power that reeked with the blood of the Huguenots, drew the sword against the destroyers of civil and religious liberty in foreign lands. Instead of rejoicing in so righteous a retribution, in which God was giving them blood to drink, and scorching them with fire—Revelation 16: 6, 8, for their cruelty to his saints and prophets, you expended £1,625,000,000 sterling in sustaining the Continental tyrannies against the Corsican firebrand and Gallic

sword of God. And now you cry out about the cost of war! Those who make war in support of Austria and the Papacy, and therefore against civil and religious liberty, ought to suffer. The retribution under which you groan is just.

The objection to war on the ground of its anti-christian character is fallacious. —The doctrine concerning the Christ and his mission is Jewish; and is taught in Moses and the Prophets. The New Testament writers were all Jews; and they taught no other doctrine than what agrees with the Law and the Testimony. Now these holy writings show that war is in perfect harmony with Christ's mission. —They also teach, however, that during his absence from our planet his disciples are not to take the sword, nor to avenge themselves. Christ's mission extends beyond the past. It belongs especially to the near approaching future. He is intitled the Prince of Peace—Isaiah 9: 6; and as a prophet was sent of God to preach peace—Acts 10: 36, not immediate, nor through the schemes of a peace society, but through the restoration of the Kingdom again to the Israelites. Though he came to preach peace, he did not come to bring it.

'Think not,' says he, 'that I am come to send peace upon the earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword'—Matthew 10: 34. —

Christ has not yet earned his title of Prince of Peace; for as yet he has given no peace to the world, nor will he give any, until he has purified it with judgment, and rebuked the strong nations of the earth—Micah 4: 3. We have been told tonight, that 'the time has arrived to establish peace among the nations.' This is an unscriptural notion. —The Bible rule is 'first pure, and then peaceable.' This is the divine principle, applicable to the consciences of men, and to peace on earth. 'There is no peace for the wicked, saith God;' they at present possess the nations, which of right belong to Christ—Psalm 2: 8; Daniel 7: 14; —therefore their destruction must precede his speaking peace to them—Zechariah 9: 10; that they may 'learn war no more'—Isaiah 2: 4. There can be no peace until his Kingdom is established. Nor is it desirable; for such a peace implies the permanent establishment of Satan upon the throne of the world. —I for one protest against peace until he is dethroned, and shut up in the abyss—Revelation 20: 1-3. I long to hear the signal gun of that coming strife, which shall bring down Christ from 'the right hand of power,' to mingle in the combat, with Israel for his battle axe—Jeremiah 51: 20; Isaiah 41: 15, and Judah for 'his goodly horse in the battle'—Zechariah 10: 3; Revelation 19: 11. Had his Kingdom belonged to the kosmos, or constitution of things, contemporary with Pontius Pilate, his servants would have fought that he should not have been delivered to the Jews—John 18: 36. It belongs to the coming crisis looming ahead—to the kosmos, represented by Nebuchadnezzar's image standing upon its feet 'in the Latter Days'—Daniel 2: 28. Then his servants, Israel and the Saints, will fight—Psalm 149: 6-9; Daniel 7: 22; Zechariah 10: 5; 12: 6; 14:14; —and 'break in pieces the oppressor,' 'because the Lord is with them,' in person as well as power. The idea, therefore, of war being of anti-christian character in the abstract, is a mere notion. The righteous dead who have been murdered by the Sin-Power cannot be avenged without it; nor can the Kingdom of Christ, which is to be the medium of peace to the world, be established in the earth, if arbitration be resorted to instead of war. I therefore, beg leave to protest against all Peace-Society contrivances for the abolition of war in the world's present condition; and to repudiate their cry of 'Peace and safety, when sudden destruction is at the door'—1 Thessalonians 5: 2-3. — I would therefore also advise you to have nothing to do with their petition, but to adopt the amendment I shall now read to you in its place.

The reader is not to suppose that while these ideas were being expressed, the peace-meeting was in a very peaceable state. Peace was in the petition, but war in the people's hearts, and on their lips. —The audience proved to be nothing more than a mob of anti-tax

fanatics. They were prepared to applaud any absurdity provided that its key-note was anti-taxation and the costliness of war. The leading sections of the peace-socialists are the 'financial reformers,' and the Quakers. —The former are for cutting down the taxes at all hazards. The head of this faction in Parliament is Mr. Cobden, the apostle of Free Trade; and a man who can conceive of no millennium other than unbounded scope for getting rich by commerce and manufactures. This is the one idea of Free Trade policy, which is struggling to establish its ascendancy in the government. With this party, manufactures are the basis of commerce, and must be fabricated at the least possible expense, that the British manufacturer may be able to sell as low, or a little lower, than his foreign rivals in the markets of the world, whose workmen feed on the cheap bread of an unprotected agriculture. To attain this minimum of fabrication-cost, free traders have obtained the repeal of provision laws, so that workmen can get as much food as before for less money, and masters can lower prices for labour to a certain proportionate degree above actual starvation. Still wages are not considered low enough. Hence, free traders have got up a scheme of 'financial reform,' to reduce the taxes on tea, coffee, tobacco, &c. But as this cannot be effected without reducing the expenses of the state, they go in for lopping off all institutions that are not productive, or manufacturing, as it were. In this work, they come in contact with the fanatical element of Quakerism. This is a system that combines the worship of Mammon with a species of Spiritualism, characterised by non-resistance and passive obedience; the abrogation of Christ's institutes, baptism and the supper; and the subjection of the Holy Scriptures to natural reason, which they absurdly style, 'the light within!'—This was just the system to sanctify financial reformism in the estimation of 'the pious,' who are opposed to Church and State. Quakerism and Financialism formed an alliance in the scheme of lowering wages to the minimum of existence for the enriching of capitalists by encompassing the globe with British commerce and manufactures. But, as I have said, this scheme cannot be carried out to the desired extent without materially reducing the expenses of the State. Financialism, therefore, lends itself to the Quaker cry off the cruelty and anti-christianity of war, though it cares for neither its cruelty nor supposed Christlessness; for acquisitiveness being the key-note of financialism, it has the heart of Mammon, which cares only for getting rich. On the other hand, Quakerism chimed in against the costliness of war by which it greatly captivated its ally. Now financial reformers are people of all sects and parties, political and ecclesiastical, that are the partisans of a manufacturing and commercial, rather than an agricultural, England. Hence it consists of Whigs, Radicals, Chartists, and religionists of all sorts, possessed of the demon-principle, 'with all thy gettings get money at all risks.' This is the supreme good! And that cotton lords, bankers, and silk marquises, may be more abundantly enriched, they set the unthinking multitude to clamouring against war, and for the abolition of the army and navy, militia and armed constabulary, that the £21,000,000 a year which they cost the state, may find their way into their pockets.

It was Mammon shouting and hissing, and yelling through this unthinking multitude, who made the delivery of my protest almost an impossibility. When I could get a chance, I told them they might just as well hear me peaceably, as I intended to maintain my ground, if I had to stand there till morning. I saw a well-dressed, white-headed man in the centre, gymnasticising with awful energy. Of course I could hear not a word he said; but by the shaking of his head, beating the air, and flourishing, now his cane and then his fist, I interpreted his signs as very ominous to the security of my cranium, were it within his reach. The tumult was terrible, and I doubt not instigated by peace-loving enemies to peace, except according to their own crotchet. I had expected to meet a respectable, religiously-disposed, and sober-minded audience; but it proved the very reverse. It was a mere mob of swine, to whom it was not only useless, but dangerous, to cast the pearls of truth. But I was engaged in

the fray, and being single-handed, I had to open for myself a way out as best I could. Having at length got through my remarks by snatches, I promised to conclude if they would agree to hear me read my amendment peaceably. They seemed to assent to this, so I read as follows: -

‘AMENDMENT.’—

‘Resolved, that war being an institution of Divine appointment for the bruising to death of the Serpent-power, though disastrous to the subjects of it, has proved of great benefit to the human race; that civil and religious liberty have been won by the war power in connection with the advocacy of truth, which it has often protected; that the rights of God in the earth, the vengeance due to the blood of His people poured out like water in past ages, the chastisement and overthrow of civil and spiritual tyrants, the defence of liberty, and the establishment of peace based upon the ascendancy of right over wrong, of knowledge and faith over ignorance and superstition, and of a well ordered and enlightened liberty over despotism—are things of infinitely greater value than gold or human life; —that those who rule the nations, being men who have been trained in the school of State superstition, arbitrary power, covetousness, and contempt of the laws of God, and the rights of humanity, are malprincipled, seared in conscience, and amenable only to fear; that natural wars to avenge the injured, and defend liberty, are neither impious nor impolitic; —that while a Bible Christian must not fight in the absence of the captain of his salvation, the Scriptures leave the nations to do as they please, holding them, however, **NATIONALLY RESPONSIBLE** for the principles and manner in which they make war; —that the nations of Europe, being Papal, Protestant, Infidel, and Mahomedan, and **NOT CHRISTIAN**, the question of international war as compatible or incompatible with the spirit of Christianity, is extraneous; —that while taxation to maintain an extravagant and luxurious regal establishment; to enrich a pampered and vicious aristocracy; official sinecurists in Church and State; to bribe religious sects with costly endowments; and to build royal and episcopal palaces in the midst of impoverished and almost breadless populations, is odious and abominable—taxation to maintain an efficient military and naval force in the present condition of the world is wise, prudent, and indispensable; —that an army and navy are as necessary to the body politic of nations as at present constituted as the right and left arms to the body natural; —that considering the known traditionary ambitious designs of the Court of Russia, and the threatening attitude of the Autocrat in relation to Schleswig-Holstein, Transylvania, Turkey, and Persia, in which countries its ascendancy would be to bring the Cossacks to the gates of Britain in Europe and India, a reduction in the army and navy of England is loudly to be deprecated by all the real friends of liberty and humanity in the **TWO WORLDS**: that these things being so, it is the enlightened and sober-minded conviction of this meeting that whatever may be the merit of Mr. Cobden’s financial speculations in other respects, ‘special treaties of arbitration instead of war’ is a visionary, utopian, and impracticable project; and that his ‘motion’ to that effect ought not to be sustained by petitions in its favour.

This amendment having been seconded, it was put from the chair, whether it should pass as the resolution of that meeting? The show of hands was multitudinous against it. The reader, doubtless, will be curious to know, how many were in favour of it? I do not know exactly, but I do not think there were more than half a dozen. Myself and the seconder, it is probable, would have made eight; which was a large minority in the two thousand, compared with the Noachic minority in a world. One of the reporters asked me for a copy of the amendment, which I gave him, having furnished myself with two. From this, I was encouraged to hope it would appear in one of the London papers; but the expectation was vain. Nothing is admitted there unpaid for that calls in question the cherished crotchets of the

day. In its report of the meeting, the Morning Advertiser, simply remarked, that an amendment was moved by Dr. Thomas, which was not adopted. Seeing, however, that it had taken so much notice as this, I faintly hoped it might do more, if personally addressed. But no, I could not stir up a controversy with the enemy in the interest of the Kingdom. As it is here, so there, the leaders of the people are satisfied with what exists; hence their motto is 'disturb not what is quiet,' which has been well said to be 'a capital maxim for a rotten cause.'

The following is the letter which I forwarded to The Advertiser under the anti-peace caption of

WAR A DIVINE INSTITUTION.

To the Editor of the Morning Advertiser

Sir: Among the utopian speculations of the day, the introduction of the reign of peace among the nations, by the Exeter Hall-philanthropy of the 'Peace Society,' is not the least remarkable. The supporters of the scheme are, no doubt, many of them persons of large 'benevolence'—high in the medio-superior frontal region—and of feelings, which find much gratification in the contemplation of tranquillity and prosperity at any price among men. Their peculiar organization may be actuated by a pure and disinterested affection for their fellow-creatures, or it may not; for 'benevolence' may be actuated by 'acquisitiveness,' 'love of approbation,' 'self-esteem,' or by the nobler and more exalted sentiments of 'veneration' and 'conscientiousness.' Benevolence actuated by acquisitiveness produces that Commercial Philanthropy which would effect the abolition of war, because it interferes with the money-making business; actuated by 'love of approbation,' the benevolence of ostentation is the result; by 'self-esteem,' a self-important philanthropy, a self-complacent and self-glorifying benevolence; and actuated by 'Veneration' and 'Conscientiousness,' and a concern for human happiness and love of man, may be the consequence, having their origin in a conscientious regard for the law of the Almighty controller of human affairs. Now, if all men were of a uniform cerebral organization, we might say, that Peace Society efforts sprang from a common ground of action; but as this is not the case, we are justified in saying, that they result from a combination of various impulses as the basis of their operations. We cannot therefore censure or commend peace-socialists individually; but must speak of them in the aggregate as of a Society of the far-famed utopia.

This compound benevolence of the society professes to have one common object, namely, the abolition of war. Its orators appeal to their audiences arithmetically, commercially, religiously, and lastly and subordinately, to scripture. The strongest arguments I have heard are addressed to the pocket; as though the system of the world was constituted only with reference to cash! There has doubtless been a great deal of 'filthy lucre' wasted in war, and most burdensome debts entailed upon posterity that are certain never to be paid; but money, though it seeks to be omnipotent, both in secular and religious affairs, was never designed by him who laid the foundation of the world, to be the gauge of right and wrong. 'The love of it is the root of all evil;' and, I apprehend, that this idolatry of gold has more to do with peace speculations, than either love for man as man, or conscientious regard for the word of God.

That prismatic affair, current in the world called 'conscience,' is one of the greatest eccentricities extant. It is conscientiousness biased by prejudice; hence the phenomena which define the kind of conscientiousness are as varied as there are sects and parties in the several grand divisions of the earth. Men may act conscientiously, and yet be guilty of great impiety

and folly. The Bible recognises but two kinds of conscience, a good and an evil conscience. Conscientiousness trained in error is evil and its acts cannot manifest that 'wisdom which cometh from above, which is first PURE, then peaceable, gentle and easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without hypocrisy.' Conscientiousness enlightened by the wisdom and knowledge of God is a good conscience, which it is easily demonstrable is not the conscience of the Peace Society. These following points are the virtual consequences of its proceedings; —

1. While it appeals to the Scripture, it advocates a doctrine at variance with it;
2. It perverts the Scripture to establish its speculation;
3. Its success would militate against the veracity of God, and the best and permanent interests of the human race.

1. War was instituted as a part of the terrene system by Jehovah himself. Its appointment is thus decreed. Addressing the serpent he says, 'I will put enmity between thee and the Woman; and between thy Seed and her Seed: He shall bruise thy head, and thou shall bruise his heel.' Is not that war when two parties at enmity undertake to bruise one another? Or is it peace? Here then Jehovah declares there should be war between the Two Seeds; a war of enmity which he implants between them. In the first place, this passage is exactly literal, and secondarily, allegorical. The literal enmity is seen in the desperate hatred of man towards poisonous serpents; the allegory of this is the uncompromising and deadly enmity of mankind in their wars for 'religion' and liberty. Political and Scriptural Truth is the ground of enmity between the Serpent party and its opponent. The opponent party is composed of two classes; the one which 'contends earnestly for the faith once delivered to the Saints,' as commanded of God; and the other which does the fighting. The contention of the faithful brings down upon them the enmity, cruelty, and destructiveness of the Serpent Power, which is often vigorously antagonised by those who fear not to wrestle with it in desperate and bloody fray. To this providential arrangement, we, in England, America, and elsewhere, are indebted for all we have to boast of called civil and religious liberty, as the records of the past abundantly testify. But for the sword on the side of principle, the earth would have been the habitation of demons instead of men; things are bad enough in all conscience; but without war, they would have been reprobate of all good.

Does the Peace Society imagine that the present condition of things is a finality? That the fairest portion of the earth, the most magnificent countries, and the most genial climes, are destined to be forever what they now are, the productive soils of ignorance, superstition, oppression, and cruelty? It vainly imagines that nations can be persuaded into a millennium of peace and righteousness! A more unscriptural conceit never entered the heads of the wildest schemers. Even the Prince of Peace himself, and his Apostles could not persuade the masses into reason and virtue; and does the Peace Society imagine it can compass more than they? Nations never have been persuaded, nor ever will be, voluntarily to submit to 'the wisdom that is from above which is first pure and then peaceable.' Jehovah has a controversy with them for past offences yet unsettled; and he has placed it on record that 'they shall lick the dust like a serpent.' Can the Irish Priesthood be persuaded to loose the chains that bind the Celt to the papal car; will persuasion induce the continental rulers, even if they knew how, to reign in righteousness, to succour the poor and needy, 'and him that hath no helper,' to take care of the orphan and the widow, to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly before God? Will persuasion 'bruise the Serpent's Head?' No; the Serpent

Dominion must be broken up by violence, the old heroes of the faith slain in ages past in combat with 'the Beast' must be avenged, and oppressors brought to retribution; and this can only be effected by that armed enmity which Jehovah instituted when he laid the foundation of the world.

2. The Prince of Peace has declared,

'I am come to send fire upon the earth; think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword. I am come to set a man at variance against his nearest relative, so that a man's foes shall be they of his own household.'—

Here he declares he came to send fire and sword upon the earth; and if the Peace Society would only avail itself of history, it would have before it the illustration of this divine mission faithfully portrayed even to 1848, the *annus mirabilis* inclusive. This Society, however, seems most complacently blind to facts; and in conformity with its amiable darkness is virtually usurping the rights and honour of the Prince of Peace. The King of Israel has proclaimed war against ignorance, superstition, oppression, and against every high thing that exalts itself above the knowledge which comes from God; and which war he has ordained shall continue until his return. But this Pseudo-Peace Society says 'No, there shall not be war, if we can help it. We regard human life and commercial prosperity as of more importance than the vindication of the civil and religious rights of mankind by the sword of judgment; blood is more precious than principles; therefore we proclaim, Peace, peace, throughout all the earth.' How remarkably are the words of scripture fulfilled in this saying,

'The day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. For when they shall say, Peace and safety, then sudden destruction cometh upon them as travail upon a woman with child, and they shall not escape.'

Thus this Peace Society sets up for Prince of Peace, and hurls the rightful potentate from the right hand of his Father's throne.

The Society errs in not understanding, that the Lord Jesus is styled Prince of Peace, not because peace was intended to result from the preaching of the Gospel of the Kingdom in his absence; but because he would conquer a permanent and lasting peace when he should revisit the world. —Persuasions having failed, He will compel mankind to respect his Father's laws; for—

'He shall judge among the Nations, and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more'—Isaiah 2: 4.

He assumes his functions of Prince of Peace, when, as King of Israel, he shall sit upon the throne of the Restored Kingdom of David, as it is written,

'Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his Kingdom, to order it; and to establish it, with judgment, and with justice henceforth (from its restitution) even forever'—Isaiah 9: 7.

3. If the Peace Society's speculation were carried into effect, the mercy and goodness of God could not be developed, and his promises would fail. He has promised that peace shall be established on the earth as a fruit of righteousness; good will also among men; and that his will shall be done here as it is in other orbs of his universe. But this cannot be until evil in its various political, civil, and ecclesiastical forms is suppressed. Evil

and sin will not regenerate themselves; neither can they be regenerated; they must be subdued and extirpated. ‘The wicked are the Sword of the Lord;’ and ‘there is no peace for the wicked, says God.’—These are revealed truths—anti-Peace Society principles. War is the Almighty acting through human agency and subduing things to himself; by which he will prepare the way for the victorious establishment of a divinely implanted righteousness and peace among mankind.

Let then war prevail until the Serpent’s Head be crushed; until every form of diabolism, secular and sacerdotal, be subjugated throughout the earth, though it might raise taxes to enormity, and destroy the commercial mammoths of every nation of the globe. The world had better far be poor, independent, and justly ruled, than be splendidly victimised by oppression; and be the bond slaves to a bowelless acquisitiveness, a crotchety sentimentalism, and a fallacious spirituality.

In conclusion, the only peace at present desirable is peace among Bible christians; these ask no peace of the world, or for the world, and make no pretensions to greater spirituality or philanthropy than already sanctioned by the great Captain of their salvation. Their affectionate allegiance centres only in him; and they would lead men to that peace of mind in him which ‘the world can neither give nor take away,’ by considerations derived, not from electrical discoveries, locomotive inventions, or arithmetical calculations—(See Burritt’s speech in Morn. Advert. Jan. 16;) but derived from the absorbing realities, which they only understand, who are acquainted with ‘the things noted in the scriptures of truth.’ That many well-meaning, but manifestly, errant familiars off the Peace Society, may be converted to the divine peace which comes from purity alone, is the sincere wish of yours, respectfully,

JOHN THOMAS.

3 Brudenell Place,
New North Road, London.

* * *

THE BIBLE DOCTRINE CONCERNING THE TEMPTER CONSIDERED.

NUMBER 4.

From the premises now before us the inquiries concerning the tempter, may be analytically, numerically and concisely answered as follows:

1. When is ‘the beginning?’

Answer. It covers a space of several years, and includes the Creation-week; the probation before the fall, perhaps forty years, after the analogy of the forty days of Christ’s probation in the wilderness; Israel’s forty years under Moses; Judah’s forty years to the destruction of the temple; and the future forty years probation for the ten tribes under Elijah: it includes also, the Fall; and the subsequent murder of Abel, when he had attained to manhood and ripeness of character, at some time before the birth of Seth, Adam being then 130 years old.

2. Has not the 'Devil' a place 'in the beginning' as really as 'the Serpent?'

Answer. If by the 'Devil' is meant the devil of the Bible, and by 'the Serpent' the reptile of which Moses writes, I answer, Yes: but, if by these terms is meant the gentile 'Devil' operating in and through a serpent, I answer that such a Devil possessed Serpent has no place at all in the alpha or omega of our world.

3. Was there not a tempter in Christ's case personally distinct from Jesus?'

Answer. Yes. But that tempter was not a Serpent, nor 'the Serpent;' but one sustaining the character of a personal adversary to him.

4. If the tempter be distinct from Christ, the tempted, can we be safe, or justified, in departing from that idea?

Answer. We are not justified in so doing; therefore I have been careful to abide by what is written without regard to the glosses of 'theology,' and the petitio principii of 'divines.'

5. Does not the term 'Dragon' in Revelation apply to Rome as the oppressor of Israel and the Church?

Answer. If by 'Rome' is meant, an imperial power established first on the totality of the Roman territory; afterwards restricted to the eastern division of it; and hereafter extending far into the western—with first, the city, ROME, and subsequently and finally, CONSTANTINOPLE for its throne—it does: but, if by 'Rome' is understood that city, and the imperial power of the west connected with it, since the removal of the throne to Constantinople, by Constantine, it does not. Rome is the Episcopal 'throne of the Beast;' Constantinople, the throne of the Dragon.

6. Did not the term 'Dragon' anciently represent the Sovereign of Egypt as well as its sovereignty?

Answer. Pharaoh, was the title common to all the meki Mitzraim, or Kings of Egypt, as Czar is of all the Autocrats of Russia. It does not therefore define a particular person, any more than Czar means Peter the Great rather than Nicholas 1. In Egyptian, Pharaoh signifies the King; hence, 'the Pharaohs' indicates all the Kings of Egypt to its conquest by Nebuchadnezzar. The Pharaoh, then, is a power incarnate, defined in Ezekiel as that of 'the great dragon that lieth in the midst of his rivers'—Ezekiel 29: 3. The Pharaohship was the Egyptian Sovereignty—the kingly power symbolised by the most remarkable animal of the country, the Crocodile or Dragon of the Nile. The man, who was king for the time being, was the eyes and mouth or heading up of the power, nothing more. He did not give inspiration to the power, as 'the Devil' is supposed to have done to the Mosaic Serpent; but the power or Nile Serpent, inspired him. Without the pre-existence of the Egyptian Dragon, the man who was drowned in the Red Sea—the oppressor of Israel—would have been nothing. Jehovah addresses the power, not the individual who is the breath of the power, when he says,

'I am against thee, Pharaoh, King of Egypt, the great dragon that lieth in the midst of his rivers, which hath said, My river is mine own, and I have made it for myself.'

A certain man might have occupied the throne contemporary with the delivery of the prophecy, while another might have been the actual ruler at the time of its accomplishment. That made no difference, however; the prophecy being spoken against the power, whenever it was fulfilled, whoever might occupy the throne, would fall with it.

The Gogue—Ezekiel 38: 2—is to the Assyro-Roman—Revelation 20: 2 what the Pharaoh was to the Dragon of the Nile—a Gentile Dynasty without regard to the particular man who happens to occupy the throne. The prophecy is against the power which gives inspiration to a man as its head, chief or prince, who is the Gogue for the time being. Like the Pharaoh ap aionas, at the beginning of the Mosaic kosmos, or world, the Gogue is ‘the oppressor of Israel’ in the latter days—he is the ‘Head of the Serpent’ or Roman Dragon, a power causing to transgress, and therefore DIABOLOS, or incarnate sin politically embodied. This Assyro Roman Dragon to which the Gogueship belongs is Isaiah’s Dragon of the Sea, represented by him as contemporary with the resurrection of Jehovah’s dead ones.

‘In that day,’ saith the prophet, ‘Jehovah with his sore, and great, and strong SWORD (Messiah and his host) shall punish Leviathan the piercing serpent, even leviathan that crooked serpent; and he shall slay the Dragon that is in the Sea’—Isaiah 27: 1.

The Egyptian and Assyro-Romaic dragons are both alluded to by David—Psalm 74: 14, and the leviathan also as having a plurality of heads. Of these the Gogueship is the last. ‘Thou brakest the heads of leviathan in pieces, and gavest him as meat to the people inhabiting the wilderness.’—These people are the twelve tribes under Moses; and their descendants hereafter under Jesus, ‘the Lord of hosts,’ and Elijah, the restorer of all things; who shall break in pieces the seven-headed leviathan, even ‘the Assyrian, who shall fall with the sword, not of a mighty man, not of a mean man’—Isaiah 31: 8, but of God the Almighty; ‘for, by fire, and by his sword will Jehovah plead with all flesh; and the slain of the Jehovah shall be many’—Isaiah 66: 15-16.

Our friend, the inquirer touching the tempter, seems to think that a man called Pharaoh was to the Nile-Dragon, as the supposed person, called ‘the Devil,’ was to the Eden-Serpent; therefore he inquires,

7. Why not allow ‘the Serpent’ and ‘the Devil’ both the precise place they occupy in Scripture?

Answer. That is exactly what I have aimed to do. ‘Divines’ have studied Milton more than the Law and the Testimony on this subject; hence they have got hold of it at the wrong end. They have assumed the pre-existence of devil; so that it is with them first devil, then serpent; but the scriptures exhibit it as the serpent first and then diabolos. This is equally the order of things political as of things Mosaic. The dragon serpent of the Nile, or Rahab, and the dragon-serpent of the Sea, or Assyria of the Latter Days, are both antecedent to the diabolism and Satanism ascribed to them. ‘Devil and Satan,’ are surnames bestowed upon the Dragon-Serpent. Adam called the Mosaic reptile nahchahsh, or Serpent, most likely from its power to charm. This was its original name. But when its suggestions were responded to, and Adam by his act sinned, or crossed the law-line, and so introduced sin into the world, which, acting in, by, and through, mankind, originated and organised, politically, the dragon-power, that power retained the name Serpent as its patronymic; and because of the relations it sustains to God’s nation and land, which are deceitful, enticing, and adverse, it has received the additional names, expressive of its character, diabolos and satanas. These surnames are descriptive of a power, not of a person, in the texts where they occur. Its first appearance in the Apocalypse is as ‘a great red dragon’ ‘in the heaven,’ ‘having seven heads and ten horns, and seven crowns upon its heads.’ John saw this in vision, and styles it a seemeion, or ‘sign in the heaven;’ and therefore representative of something there. It was the Sign of a destroying power; for it sought to destroy a certain child about to be born, ‘in the heaven’

also. A war 'in the heaven' ensued between this destroying power and the partisans of the new born child. Its object was the expulsion of the great red dragon-power from the heaven. The enterprise succeeded, and no place was found any more for it and its adherents there.

This great red dragon power was of considerable antiquity. For 280 years antecedent to its expulsion, that is, from the crucifixion, it had been the adversary, and JUDICIAL ACCUSER (ho kateegoros) of those who 'kept the commandments of God, and the testimony of Jesus Christ,' styled by the partisans of the child who expelled him, 'our brethren.' His accusations were incessant, giving them no rest by day or by night. But 'steadfast in the faith,' they resisted him valiantly; yea, with a valour that ought to put to shame the downy, drowsy, narrow-souled, professors of our day. Their faith in the Lamb and the testimony overcame all the Dragon-power's endeavours to turn them after itself. Their constancy was victorious, 'for they loved not their souls (teen psycheen autoon) unto death.' Their Souls were tortured unto death, because they 'would not accept deliverance' at the price of apostasy, 'that they might obtain a better resurrection'—Hebrews 11: 35. This savage power, a principal element of which were the institutions of a cruel and debasing idolatry, 'deceived the whole habitable,' civilised, or Roman, world (ho planoon teen oikoumeneen holeen.) These things being affirmed of it; that is, its being the deceiving power of the world, and the adversary and judicial accuser of the Saints, and the enemy off Israel's Commonwealth, God has surnamed it ho Diabolos and ho Satanas.

This apocalyptic sign probably suggested the notion elaborated in Paradise Lost by Milton, of Satan with his rebel hosts being once holy angels in heaven, whence before Adam's day they were expelled for impiety and insurrection against God! ! But the conception is as wild and unscriptural as a poet's imagination can well be without actual insanity. It is true, that certain 'angels kept not their beginning, but deserted their own abode,' and that 'having tartarised,' or cast them down (tartaroosas) God 'committed them to perpetual bonds under intense darkness in accordance with a judgment of a great day.' But the judgment executed upon these angels has consigned them to destruction. They are all prisoners of death, none of them having liberty to roam over God's universe as the Devil is fabled to have done, seeking what portion of his glorious work they might throw into confusion in revenge for the overthrow they had received. This is a mere fiction of the poets. Jude does not say that they are 'reserved unto the judgment of the great day;' but eis krisin megalees heemeras—'by, or in accordance with, a judgment of a great day—God hath consigned them to perpetual bonds under intense darkness.' There is no escape from this sentence; so that, wherever the gentile Devil, or Satan of the poets, hales from, he cannot trace his genealogy to the archangel of the rebel host, whose fall was not from heaven, but a repression to his original sphere which it was unlawful for him to leave. Their bonds are aidian or perpetual; as existent now as when first imposed. 'The Devil and Satan' of the Bible are yet unbound. They are in rampant liberty, and will continue free, until the earth-enlightening angel, the Messiah, shall descend, and bind their original for 1000 years.

This original, the great red dragon, surnamed the Devil and Satan, did not, like the pre-Adamic angels, voluntarily leave his place in the heaven, but was forcibly expelled. He was cast out off the Apocalyptic heaven into the apocalyptic earth by intestine war. He kept his place as long as he could; but being defeated by Constantine, he lost the throne off the habitable, called 'the throne of God,' because it was conquered from the dragon by his people. But, though defeated, he had not lost all power, though his time was short, as

he well knew. The imperial Roman idolatry had lost the throne, but it still retained the provinces of 'the earth and sea.' These were still under his jurisdiction, which he exercised in 'great wrath,' especially upon those 'inhabiters' of them, who, by their devotion to Christ, were known to be in sympathy with the enemy that had expelled them from the heaven of the Roman world—Revelation 12: 3-12.

With these words, I think I may now dismiss the further consideration off the inquiries touching the tempter, without incurring the imputation of indefiniteness, or evasion. The subject of diabolos and Satanas is far from being exhausted. In leaving behind me Mr. Cook's queries, I shall not therefore turn my back upon the topic in hand; but, requesting the reader to correct for himself a few typographical errors that have escaped the eye of my compositor, not, however, affecting the sense at all, I propose to continue the investigation of the matter in the ordinary course of publication.

EDITOR.

* * *

Many strange things have been proved true in our day. An open mind is the best mark of a philosopher. But we regret to say that indications of a philosophic temper have been nowhere so rare as in connection with the question, what is the truth, the great leading truth, of Moses and the Prophets? The closest students of their writings have been denounced, the most honest men discredited, the plainest testimonies scouted, and a dogged determination as far as possible shown that the evidences should not be examined. Such is the infatuate devotion of blind attachment to "organised theology"—it fears to investigate lest its discoveries should reveal the worthlessness of the system by which its zeal is kindled and sustained.

* * *

MODERN SERMONISING.

NUMBER 2.

As a faithful chronicler of what is passing in the religious world, especially among those who claim to be par excellence Bible Christians, and to plant themselves on the Bible alone, as their exclusive rule of faith and practice, the 'Herald,' may be expected to keep your readers informed of the kind of faith and preaching, the 'Reformers' now serve up to the public in their stated ministrations. Tributary to this object, I ask space to say that about a week ago, I heard a 'sermon' delivered in this town by Mr. R. L. Coleman—one of the authorised expositors off the Reformation creed—a brief sketch of which only, I propose to offer.

After reading portions of Luke's testimony in 18th and 19th chapters, stopping at the 11th verse of the latter chapter, just in time, it would seem, to save from utter confusion and contradiction, his cherished dogma of a Pentecostian Kingdom; the verses following, from the 11th to 16th inclusive, proving incontestably that the kingdom could not be set up until the Lord (the 'nobleman' of the parable) should 'return' (15th verse) from the right hand of God, where he now sits, he commenced his address by declaring that 'Matthew, Mark, Luke and John wrote to convince the world that Jesus Christ was the Messiah—the Son of God.' I marvel that one so well acquainted with the testimony in the case, should have again stopped

short of giving the Evangelists' whole testimony as to the object of their biography, as stated by one of them. 'These are written that you might believe that Jesus is the Christ—the Son of God and believing ye might have life through his name.'—John 20: 31. Was the omission to quote these last words of the verse occasioned by the Preacher's belief in the Pagan dogma of an 'immortal soul' already in man, which, of course, renders the having 'life through his name,' a matter of but little moment. If so, Mr. Coleman is consistent, for truly, if we have life—even eternal life—as we must have in our immortal souls, the mission of Jesus is among the Romish 'works of supererogation!' to that complexion, it must come at last. Truly, may we not ask, of what profit is it to us, to know that 'Jesus is the Son of God,' unless we learn also, that 'through HIM we may have life'—that He only 'hath the words of eternal life' and that 'this life is in (not out of) God's Son.'

Discarding all connexion between Jesus—his name and Mission and our having life through him—which his immortal soul creed obliges him to do—the preacher gave a loose rein to his fancy in setting forth the object of the Christ's Mission into this world. This he described comprehensively in these words, 'Jesus Christ came down from Heaven to carry men up to Heaven.' Alas! alas! what is become of the creed of 'this Reformation' which used to embrace this prominent item. —'If any man speak let him speak as the oracles of God'—1 Peter 4: 11. Where, let us pause and ask, where do 'the oracles of God' declare that such was any part of the Mission of Jesus? Is it in John 3: 13, where Jesus himself says 'No man hath ascended up to Heaven?' or in Acts 2: 34, where it is written, of a better man than this age can probably furnish, 'David is not ascended into the Heavens?' or in Proverbs 11: 31, where it is written, 'The righteous shall be recompensed in the earth; much more the wicked and the sinner.'

Is it not incumbent on Mr. Coleman to show his authority for the assertion above quoted? He is of age that we may 'ask him.' He is the editor of a paper, where he can be heard before the public and he is as all know, a gentleman of intelligence and independence—has been for many years a student and an expounder of the Scriptures, and there is no reason to doubt his sincerity and honesty in advocating the system he preaches. Let him show himself a man of candour, and willing to bring his creed to the test of the written word, by presenting these objections to his readers and proving they are unfounded. —The Bible does not contradict itself, yet what is quoted above is directly and flatly contradictory to his assertion that Jesus came to carry men up to Heaven. If He came for this purpose, let him show how men went to Heaven before Jesus came—such as Abraham, Noah, Moses, Job, &c., or does he mean to say that they have ascended since Jesus came. If so, where is the proof? If indeed good men go to Heaven at death, as he affirms, let him explain or account for Paul's strange sayings, on that hypothesis, in 1 Corinthians 15: 16-18, 'If the dead rise not, then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished.' How can the dead christian be said to have 'perished,' if he be alive in Heaven, seeing that this is so, whether he be raised or not? Truly, 'wisdom is justified of all her children,' but confusion and every evil work attend the gloomy pathway of error.

A. B. MAGRUDER.

Charlottesville, September 1852.

* * *

A GOD OF GUARDIANS.

‘In his estate shall the King honour a god of forces, even a god whom his predecessors knew not shall he honour with gold, and silver, and with precious stones, and things desired.’—Daniel 11: 38.

The Old Testament name for the Eyes and Mouth of the Little Horn—Daniel 7: 8, which are commonly called the Pope, is in Hebrew ELOAH MAHUZZIM, rendered in the common version, ‘a god of forces.’ He is also termed ELOAH NAIKAR, a Strange or Foreign God. The King or Little Horn was to honour him in his estate or kingdom, to acknowledge him, and to increase him with glory. All this has been literally accomplished as we have abundantly shown in Elpis Israel.

Eloah Mahuzzim is a very appropriate title for the Italian Overseer. Eloah is a passive participial noun, and used as a title to Christ as cursed by the law for his hanging upon a tree—Meshiach eloah limmenoo—Messiah cursed for us. Hence ELOAH signifies an accursed one, or a god, accursed because he would speak marvellous things against the God of gods—Ail ailim. Christ and Antichrist therefore are denominated ‘cursed,’ but on different grounds—Christ, because he became a curse for us by hanging upon a tree—Galatians 3: 13; and Antichrist, because of his blasphemy against God.

The papal Eloah is styled the Accursed One of Mahuzzim. This word signifies protectors, defenders, guardians. The Pope is the Head of these—the Chief on earth of the clan of Guardian Saints, therefore a god of guardians. These guardians are thus spoken of by Chrysostom in his Homily on the Martyrs of Egypt; ‘The bodies of those saints fortify the city more effectually for us than impregnable walls of adamant, and like towering rocks placed around on every side, repel not only the assaults of enemies that are visible, but the insidious stratagems also of invisible demons, and counteract and defeat every artifice of the devil as easily as a strong man overturns the toys of children.’ The Greeks and Latins made the most of these wonderful martyrs. They sent their ghosts to heaven to act as mediators and intercessors, and kept their bones and dust on earth to guard them from the ills that flesh is heir to! They were a cheap fortification for a city, church, or country, requiring no rations, and more effective, if Chrysostom be believed, than a whole host of living warriors armed to the very teeth! St. Patrick of Erin, St. George of England, St. Andrew of Scotland, St. Denis of France, &c., with the reigning Pope, is the definition in fact of Daniel’s ELOAH and his Mahuzzim.

EDITOR.

* * *

ELEGANT EXTRACT.

‘Dr. Thomas, in his vainglorious speculations, terminating in his Elpis Israel, rather than in the discovery of some new world, on which to inscribe his fame, has covered himself with shame, and reduced his metropolitan church in Richmond to less than half the twelve apostles. In such cases, with a slight modification, we may say with the poet—

“O Sons of earth, attempt you still to rise,
By fables piled on fables to the skies.
Heaven still with laughter the vain toil surveys,
And buries builders in the heaps they raise.’

A. Campbell, Mill. Harb. P. 329.

There is a little defect in the above, and that is, its entire want of truth. —What our friend styles our ‘speculations’ have very far from terminated in Elpis Israel, as every reader of that book and the Herald well knows, and as he knows too. Neither have we ‘covered ourselves with shame,’ save in the estimation of himself and satellites; which is an affair of little moment. We have never owned a ‘church’ in Richmond, or elsewhere; and therefore could not reduce such an one. And as to the ‘fables piled on fables to the skies,’ they are all on his side; and from hell beneath to kingdoms in the stars—presently threaten to overwhelm him and his ‘reformation’ in the confusion of Babylon worse confounded. Our friend is in a pitiable plight. He would like to ‘cover us with shame, indeed, by reducing Elpis Israel to an absurdity, if he could; but he dare not make the venture. His profound ignorance of Moses and the Prophets paralyses him. His only alternative therefore is, to give currency to the gossip of lewd fellows of the baser sort.

EDITOR.

* * *

AN EYE-BEAM EXTRACTOR OF MOTES.

“We cannot,” says our hyper (?) critical friend of Bethany, “but suspect any man’s want of confidence in himself, or of candour, who will take up an evil report against his neighbour, and reproach his principles and character, and will neither give him a hearing, or make the amend honourable.” M. Harb. V. 2 No. 7.p. 413. These are our sentiments exactly. In the same article, he says, “Mr. Anderson of the New York Recorder cannot defend himself, and therefore dare not allow his readers to hear us.” This is, doubtless, the logical conclusion from the premiss.

In view, then, of this, and of our friend’s own practice, we respectfully commend the following words of the Lord Jesus to his grave consideration—

“Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge so shall ye be judged. * * * And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother’s eye, and considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out off thy brother’s eye.”

These are wholesome words which should be memorised by all Eye-Beams, great and small. The Eye-Motes never forget them; because the Eye-Beamers are continually at work upon them practising their spiritual chirurgery, with irritating, but unsanitary, effect. —Their unsuccessful practice is doubtless owing to their neglect of the Great Physician’s prescription. They may be very dexterous mote-extractors, but then, unfortunately, the cataract in their own crystallines are so opaque that they are apt to mistake their own lesions for that of the wretched patient who happens to fall into their otherwise pretty skilful hands. The principles of our friend’s symptomatology are quite accurate. We commend them to the favourable regard of all his fellow-craftsmen, for whose daily use we reduce them to the following convenient form:

1. A man who combats an opponent with any other weapons than testimony and right reason is utterly devoid of self confidence, and candour.
2. When an editor, preacher, or any other person refuses to permit audiences to hear in defence those they assail, it is proof that they know that their cause is too rotten to sustain without damage an examination which truth always courts from its opponents.

EDITOR.

LUTHER'S CITADEL.

In addressing Charles V. and the great princes of the German Empire at Worms in 1521, Luther said, "since, great Caesar and illustrious princes, you require a specific answer, this is my decision. Unless I am convinced by proof from the sacred writings or evident reason, I cannot recall anything that I have written, or taught, for I cannot do what would wound my conscience. On the other hand, I have no faith in the Roman Pontiff and mere councils, and do not regard them as of authority, for they have frequently erred and contradicted themselves in their decrees, and are liable to misjudge and be deceived."—Strange that any one should ever have doubted so obvious a liability. Luther was right to yield only to testimony and reason. These were the citadel of his strength as they are ours. They were the apostolic weapons, as it is written,

"Paul as his manner was, went into the Synagogue to the Jews, and reasoned with them out of the scripture, opening and alleging."

Human authority, lay or clerical, is not to be regarded in an inquiry after truth. If all who profess to admire Luther would work by the rule he adopted, it would be more creditable to their understandings, and more profitable to their hearers, than the present mar-text expositions by which they stultify themselves.

EDITOR.

* * *

LAMB.

A lamb in the Apocalypse does not represent a lamb, but a man whose name comprehends the attributes of innocence and sacrifice for sin. "A lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven Spirits of God sent forth into all the earth"—Revelation 5: 6, represents that same Man as once dead, but alive again; and henceforth the depository of the unmeasured Spirit of God, by which (in the time of the vision) he is almighty and seeing over all.

EDITOR.

* * *