

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. NEW YORK, APRIL, 1853—
Volume 3—No. 4

THE GOODNESS OF GOD.

“Despisest thou the riches of his goodness * * *; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance?”—Paul.

The phrase “the goodness of God” is found occurrent in various places of the Holy Scriptures. It is not peculiar to the New Testament, but common to it and the Old. It occurs first in the writings of Moses, who, speaking of the effect of his narrative of Jehovah’s severity upon Egypt and deliverance of Israel upon the mind of his father-in-law, says: “And Jethro rejoiced for all the goodness which the Lord had done to Israel, whom he had delivered out of the hand of the Egyptian.” From this the reader will perceive that the Lord’s goodness is comprehensive both of good and evil. It is not unmixed good—good, pure, and absolute—but mixed and relative. If his goodness had been pronounced upon by the Egyptians, they would have characterised it as pure evil; because his goodness plagued them with grievous plagues, and destroyed their army with a terrific overthrow. But this pure and absolute evil upon Egypt was unqualified goodness to Israel; for it delivered them from a sore and cruel bondage, and commenced the fulfilment of the “good thing”—Jeremiah 33: 14—which Jehovah had promised to Abraham, Isaac, and to Jacob, and their seed. God’s goodness, then, is good in act and promise to his people; but only evil to them who afflict them, and blaspheme his name.

God’s goodness to his people, and severity upon his enemies, are the necessary result of his peculiar character. Hence his goodness and character are inseparable; so that to declare “THE NAME” of the Lord is at once to make known his character and goodness, which stand related as effect and cause. Because of this, it is written, “I will make all my goodness pass before thee, and will proclaim the name of the Lord before thee; and I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and I will show mercy on whom I will show mercy.” Jehovah, therefore, descended in a cloud, and stood with Moses on Mount Sinai, and proclaimed the attributes which constitute his character, saying, “Jehovah, Jehovah, a God, merciful and gracious, long suffering, and abounding in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, and transgression, and sin, and destroying not utterly the guilty; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children’s children, unto the third and to the fourth generation”—Exodus 33: 19; 34: 6-7.

Such a God is Jehovah in his character, or relations of goodness to those whom he chooses for his people; but at the same time “a consuming fire” to his enemies—Hebrews 12: 29. He is a great and absolute sovereign in all his doings, having mercy upon whom he will, and hardening at his pleasure—Romans 9: 18. He chose Israel for his people, or nation, to whom he granted a constitution, laws, and institutions, burdensome to be borne, but most agreeable to himself, and promotive of his purpose in the manifestation of his goodness concerning them in the latter days—Acts 15: 10. All his promises emanate from the essential goodness of his nature, which is favour, forbearance, abounding in truth, faithfulness, pardoning, and corrective but not utterly destroying. His promises are made to Israel, and to Israel alone; nevertheless he has condescended to invite those of all nations who believe his promises to share in them when the time shall arrive to perform them. To Israel he is gracious; to Israel he is long-suffering; to Israel he is abundant in goodness and truth; for thousands of Israel he keeps mercy in store; he forgives Israel’s iniquity, transgression and sin; and he corrects Israel, but he does not utterly destroy him, as his history shows even to this day. He hath not dealt so with any other nation. “Jehovah found Israel in a desert land, and in the waste howling wilderness: he led him about, he instructed him, he kept him as the apple of his eye”—Deuteronomy 32: 10. There is no nation so dear to him as Israel; for “Israel is beloved for the fathers’ sake”—Romans 11: 28. So tenderly compassionate is he of his nation that he saith by his prophet, “He that toucheth you, O Israel, toucheth the apple of Jehovah’s eye”—Zechariah 2: 8. And all this mercy to Israel is shared by those Gentiles who believe the promises and obey the law of faith; for believing Jews and Gentiles are all the children of God through the faith (dia tees pisteos) in Christ Jesus. For as many of these believers as have been baptised into Christ have put him on. They are therefore all one in Christ Jesus; and if Christ’s then Abraham’s seed or Israelites, and heirs according to the promise—Galatians 3: 26, 29. Being thus adopted, the Gentiles who believe the gospel of the kingdom in the name of Jesus, are no more strangers and foreigners, or aliens from Israel’s Commonwealth, and strangers from the covenants of promise, but fellow-citizens with the saints of Israel, and of the household of God, which for about seven years after the resurrection of Jesus consisted only of faithful Israelites—Ephesians 2: 12, 19.

It is an attribute of Jehovah’s goodness to “keep mercy for thousands.” These thousands for whom mercy is kept are “those who love him, and keep his commandments”—Exodus 20: 6—the Israel of God in the higher import of the phrase. The mercy kept for them is the chesed styled the berith olahm chasdai Dahwid, or Age-covenant mercies of David, rendered by Lowth “an everlasting covenant, the gracious promise made to David,” which shall never fail—Isaiah 55: 3. These gracious promises, or loving-kindness, or mercy which Jehovah keeps for thousands, are based upon the chesed or mercy to Abraham, to which Mary and Zacharias refer in these words. “He hath holpen his servant Israel, in remembrance of his mercy as he spake to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed for ever:” “Jehovah hath raised up a horn of salvation for us (Israel) in the House of his servant David; as he spake by the mouth of his holy Prophets, which have been from the beginning of the age: that we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us: to perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant; the oath which he swore to our father Abraham, that he would grant us (Israel) that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life”—Luke 1: 54-55; 69-75. The birth of Jesus was a proof that Jehovah remembered the mercy he had promised to Abraham and David. Jesus, the born king of the Jews, was the Horn or Power by which the nation is to be saved from all its enemies; he is therefore styled “a horn of salvation for Israel.” He has not saved them yet. They are still subject to the Horns of the Gentiles, and have no part in their native land. So long as their condition remains as it

is, the mercy promised to Abraham and David continues unfulfilled. The resurrection of Jesus, however, is the earnest that it will be accomplished in the appointed time; and that he will certainly deliver them from the tyrants “who destroy the earth.” Hear this, ye infidels, who profess to love the Lord, but believe not what he saith, “Behold, saith he, the days come that I will perform that good thing which I have promised unto the house of Israel and to the house of Judah. In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of Righteousness to grow up unto David; and he shall execute judgment and righteousness in the land. In those days shall Judah be saved, and Jerusalem dwell safely: and this (is his name) which shall be proclaimed to her. The Lord our Righteousness—vezeh asher yiqurah lahh Yehowah Tzidkainu. For thus saith Jehovah; David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the House of Israel: neither shall the Priests the Levites want a man before me to offer burnt offerings, and to kindle meat offerings, and to do sacrifice continually”—Jeremiah 33: 14-18; 33: 5-6. This “good thing” is the subject-matter of the mercy promised to Abraham and David, which Jehovah, the fulfiller of promises, keepeth for thousands; and which is as certain to be communicated as that he exists, for “he magnifies his word above all his name”—Psalm 138: 2. That good thing in its details is abundantly spoken of by the mouth of all the Prophets through whom Jehovah hath kept alive the remembrance of it from the foundation of Israel’s Commonwealth. It is Israel’s Hope, and therefore the hope of the true christian; for “salvation is of the Jews.”

Behold, then, the promised goodness of God! An Immortal King shall reign and prosper in the land of Israel, and shall execute judgment and justice there over the Twelve Tribes, and the obedient nations of the world for a thousand years. This is the oath which Jehovah swore to Abraham, saying, “In thee and in thy Seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed,”—a blessedness, in the establishment of which Israel will have been delivered out of the hand of all their enemies, and thenceforth enjoy the privilege of serving Jehovah without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him all the days of their mortal career. The nation of our adoption will then be the chief of all the nations dwelling safely in its own land. Gentiles by birth, but Jews by regeneration, the goodness of God promises us resurrection from among the dead, and exaltation to the highest honours of the State; as it is written, “the saints of the Most High shall possess the Kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever.”

Such mercy Jehovah keeps for thousands of Israel and adopted Gentiles who believe the promises he has made to the fathers. But his goodness promises even more than eternal life and honour to the just. It promises them wisdom, and knowledge, and physical strength, the possession of the world and the fulness thereof, glory, equality with the angels, and the high favour of God for ever. He keeps this mercy in store for them that love him, and obey his word. Who that believes these things would hesitate to respond, “Jehovah is good, for his mercy endureth for ever?” Yea, it is even so; for “the mercy of Jehovah is from everlasting to everlasting upon them that fear him, and his righteousness unto children’s children; to such as keep his covenant, and to those who remember his commandments to do them.” Mark, dear reader, “to such as keep his covenant and obey him.” Dost thou know what it is to keep Jehovah’s covenant and obey him? Know then that it is to believe the gospel of the kingdom, and to be baptised, or united to the name of Jesus, and thenceforth to continue patiently in well doing. The covenant is the covenant concerning the kingdom of which the gospel treats—the oath of national blessedness through Abraham and his seed, which Jehovah swore to him when he brought him into the territory of the future kingdom. You must believe this same particular gospel or you cannot “keep the covenant,” or have any part in the kingdom it proclaims.

Now, beloved reader, “Despisest thou the riches of this goodness of God?” Read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest the good things of his mercy we have brought up herein, and say if they are not of peerless import. Are not endless life and good days, boundless riches, honour, and eternal glory in a kingdom of God’s establishment upon the earth, more to be desired than all the world can give you now? Can you be of sane mind and despise all these riches of goodness? Can you be rational and self-possessed? But if you despise them not, but “believe on God,” that is, be fully persuaded that what he has promised he is able to perform, and will do it, will you not likewise be willing to make any sacrifice to obtain them? If you were till a certain time devoted to the world and the enjoyment of the flesh, but came afterwards to believe in these promises with an honest and good heart, or as men say, “sincerely,” would not your views of things present and future have undergone a radical change? Would you not cease to set your affections on earthly things; would not your affection rather be transferred to the things contained in that “mercy kept for thousands?” Yea, verily. And would you not have been led to this change of views, affection, and will by the goodness of God exhibited in the testimony of his holy prophets? Even so; and you would then be a practical illustration of the Bible sentiment that “it is the goodness of God that leadeth to repentance.”

God’s goodness leads to repentance. It leads believers to place themselves in such a relation to the truth, that “repentance unto life” may be “granted unto them”—Acts 11: 18. The goodness of God is like to choice and goodly wares exhibited in a bazaar for sale. Their goodliness attracts the attention of passengers, and leads them to desire to possess them. The merchant grants their desire on certain conditions. They accept the terms, and receive the right of property in them; and he promises to put them in possession of them at an appointed time. The goodness of God which leads to repentance is exhibited in the gospel of the kingdom, and no where else; for this gospel is the grand theme of the word of God contained in the scriptures, old and new: and because it is displayed in that royal proclamation, therefore, John the Baptist, Jesus, and the apostles before their Lord’s crucifixion, went through the towns and cities, and country parts of Judea, “preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, saying, Repent; for the Majesty of the heavens is arrived”—Matthew 3: 2; 4: 17, 23; Mark 1: 14-15; Luke 4: 18, 43; 9: 2, 6. The kingdom and arrival of its king were preached to lead those who believed it to repentance. The goodness of God set forth in the doctrine of the kingdom was preached also after the resurrection, to lead men to repentance, that they might be made meet for its inheritance; but the motive thereto, founded on the personal presence of the king, was not repeated. It could not be; for “the Majesty of the heavens” had departed into a far country—Luke 19: 11-12. The apostles no longer said: “Repent; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand;” but, “Repent; because God hath appointed a day in which he will rule the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained, whereof he hath given assurance to all in that he hath raised him from the dead”—Acts 17: 30-31—in other words, “Repent; because the Majesty of the heavens, who hath departed, will come again to rule the world in righteousness.” This is now the glad tidings of the kingdom for repentance unto life.

That “the gospel” and “the goodness of God” are phrases importing the same things, is clear, from the use of them by Paul. He says: “the Jews became enemies to the gospel for the sake of the Gentiles.” It was no good will to the Gentiles on their part, that they refused to believe; but their refusal was the result of hardness of heart: therefore, as a punishment, God blinded and hardened them still more, so that, instead of filling his house or kingdom with believers who were “Jews by nature,” he determined to make up the complement of the redeemed by believers separated from “sinners of the Gentiles,” who should become Jews by adoption, through faith in his goodness. Judah, though still beloved for Abraham, Isaac,

and Jacob's sake, fell from gospel favour through want of faith; while faithful Gentiles were grafted into the stock of Israel's olive, and recognised as Israelites in every respect, save the accident of birth. This was just severity towards Judah; but gracious goodness towards Gentiles.

Thus it is apparent that the principle according to which the position of Judah and the Gentiles relative to Jehovah and his mercy was changed, was that of faith. To continue in the faith of the gospel was to continue in the goodness of God. Judah did not continue in that goodness, because the Jews did not continue to believe it. They were therefore "cut off." The offer was to be made to them no more. Judah should indeed be grafted in again to the national olive: that is, reorganised with the rest of the tribes as a nation and commonwealth, or kingdom, in their own land, under the sovereignty of "Jesus of Nazareth, the king of the Jews;" but those of them contemporary with the national blindness should have no share in "the joy" of their king—in those good things offered to individuals in the gospel of the kingdom. This gospel announces that the God of heaven will set up a kingdom and dominion upon earth, under whose righteous administration Israel and the nations will be blessed with all temporal and spiritual blessings for a thousand years; such as, that there shall be war no more; that oppression and injustice shall cease; that the earth shall give her increase; that the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord's glory; that the poor shall be comforted and protected; that there shall be but one religion, and so forth—these are gospel blessings for the world, when, by conquest, it is brought into subjection to Israel's king; but the gospel promises the glory, honour, power, majesty, and riches of the kingdom and dominion only to those persons who, before the manifestation of them, while they are yet a matter of faith, and not of sight, believe the promised goodness of it, and continue in it.

To Gentile people, the apostle saith: "If ye continue not in the goodness of God, ye also shall be cut off." In the same place, he saith: "Thou, O Gentile, standeth by faith." That is, so long as the Gentiles continue to believe the gospel of the kingdom, there shall be scope for repentance unto life, that they may inherit the kingdom; but when they become faithless of the gospel, as Judah was before them, the door of mercy shall with like destructive violence be closed against them. "Be not high-minded, but fear," saith Paul; "for if God spared not the natural branches of the olive tree, beware lest he also spare not thee." In the apostle's day, there was a disposition in the Gentile mind to high-mindedness, and to boast against Judah, who had stumbled at the stone of stumbling, and rock of offence. They do not seem to have entertained the idea of the re-engraftment of the broken-off branches, but concluded that God had cast Israel away as a people for whom he had no further use or affection. This was not the general idea; but some seem to have held it, or the apostle would not have contradicted the supposition. "God forbid," says he, "that such a thing should be; he hath not cast away his people, Israel, whom he knew before he received the Gentiles into favour." But, though the apostles so promptly repudiated the notion, he did not succeed in repressing it. That Israel was finally rejected and cast away, took strong hold of the Gentile professors of Christianity, who in after times thought they were doing God service in persecuting the Jews. Even at the present day, after a lapse of eighteen centuries, the receiving of Israel into favour again is regarded as fabulous by "christian professors." Being "wise in their own conceits," they boast themselves against the Jews, and denounce as "carnal Judaisers," those who, with Paul, affirm that "God hath not cast away his people, Israel, whom he foreknew." Hear, O ye smatterers in prophetic lore, what Jehovah saith of Israel: "Thus saith the Lord, who giveth the sun for a light by day, and the ordinances of the moon and of the stars for a light by night; who divideth the sea when the waves thereof roar—the Lord of hosts is his name." "If those ordinances depart from before me," saith the Lord, "then the seed of Israel also shall cease

from being a nation before me forever.” Mark the “if,” which is still further emphasised in the next verse, saying: “If the heaven above can be measured, and the foundations of the earth searched out beneath, I will cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done,” saith the Lord—Jeremiah 31: 35-37. This is equivalent to saying, Israel shall never cease from being a nation before me, though they have done grievously in my sight; for the hypotheses upon which their casting away is predicated are absolute impossibilities. It is as impossible for their national existence to cease forever, as it is for feeble-minded man to measure heaven, or to search out the centre of the earth.

We have said, that the non-restoration of Israel was not the general idea entertained by Gentile believers in the apostle’s day. To say that it was, would be to affirm that they did not generally believe the gospel; for there can be no kingdom without the restoration of the Jews. There are those in our day who deny their restoration. This is proof-positive that they do not understand the gospel, which is the glad tidings of the restoration of the kingdom again to Israel, and the blessedness of all nations through their government; for, we repeat it, “salvation is of the Jews.”

The spiritual condition of the Gentiles at the present crisis, in all countries of “Christendom,” is the exact counterpart of Judah’s at the period of the dissolution of their commonwealth. The Jews were without faith, and so are also the Gentiles of today. But thou wilt perhaps say, O reader, how can that be? Are there not thousands upon thousands of holy men engaged in preaching Christ in every land; and are not they sustained by millions of faithful men, who contribute immense sums for the propagation of the Christian faith? We admit there are multitudes of preachers, and millions of sincere professors of religious faiths they call Christian; but where are the preachers and believers of the gospel of the kingdom; and rarer still, where are the believers thereof, who obey it? “Faith,” such as it is, abounds but “THE faith” is known to very few, and preached by still fewer. The Jews believed the gospel of the kingdom, but they refused to obey it in the name of Jesus, as king of Israel. They stumbled at him. They did not believe in him as Jehovah’s Anointed One; and therefore rejected “the mystery of the gospel” in his name. It is so likewise with the Gentiles at this day. They preach a character they call Jesus, whom Paul did not preach. Compare the popular notions of Jesus Christ with the Christ delineated in the old and new scriptures, and you will be astonished, O reader, at the want of congruity between them! The Gentiles stumble at the character called Christ in the Bible, even as the Jews did at Jesus. These repudiated a suffering Messiah; the Gentiles reject a Christ who shall subdue the nations by the sword; replant Israel’s olive in its native soil; restore the kingdom and throne of his father, David; sit upon it for a thousand years, and as sole monarch of the world, rule all nations as Jehovah’s vicegerent upon the earth—the Bible is at variance with them both, for it not only reveals a Christ who should be made perfect through sufferings, but one that should do all these things besides.

We repeat it with profound conviction, that the gospel is not preached, it is not believed, nor is it obeyed by the religionists of our day. The exceptions to this statement are so very few that they do not affect the generality of its application. If, as in the days of Elijah, there be seven thousand in Christendom who believe the truth and have obeyed it, our statement is not at all invalidated thereby. They who believe in a gospel of kingdoms beyond the skies to be possessed with a Jesus who is to return to earth only to destroy it, believe a gospel that has no place in the Bible. How high minded and wise are professors in this day in their own conceit! They plume themselves in their Christianity and spiritual intelligence, saying “they are rich and increased in goods, and have need of nothing; but know not that

they are wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked.” So Egyptian is the darkness which beclouds their minds that they discern not the awful crisis which is advancing upon them with gigantic strides. They are sporting themselves with their own deceiving, while destruction is at the door. Faithless of the gospel, high-minded, and wise in their own conceit! This is itself a great sign of the times. By faith we stand; by unbelief we fall. What then remains? Nothing more, but that the Gentiles be cut off, and the process of their engraftment be terminated. Short will be the work when it is once fairly under weigh. The cutting off accomplished, the gathering in of Israel’s tribes will then proceed, and shall not be intermitted until “all Israel shall be saved.” Hear, in conclusion, what Jehovah saith by the hand of Moses concerning this time of trouble coming upon the world: “The day of the calamity of Israel’s foes is at hand, and the things that shall come upon them make haste. For the Lord shall judge his people, and repent himself for his servants, when he seeth that their power is gone, and there is none shut up or left. See now that I, even I, am he, and there is no god with me. I kill, and I make whole; I wound, and I heal; neither is there any that can deliver out of my hand. For I lift up my hand to heaven, and say I live for ever. If I whet my glittering sword, and my hand take hold of judgment, I will render vengeance to mine enemies, and will reward them that hate me. I will make mine arrows drunk with blood, and my sword shall devour flesh; with the blood of the slain and of the captives, from the beginning of revenges upon the enemy.” When this shall be perfected, then “Rejoice, O ye nations, with his people; for he will avenge the blood of his servants, and will render vengeance to his adversaries, and will be merciful unto his land, and to his people.”

EDITOR.

* * *

THE PROPHETIC STYLE.

In the prophetic style the figurative and the real are wonderfully intermixed, to the utter confusion of the rules of the technical rhetorician; insomuch that, if I err not, Dr. Blair, the father of our Scottish school of taste, (which, however, has less to do with Scotland than with any land, true indigenous Scottish intellect and deep Scottish feeling having ever rejected it as a miserable and unnatural importation from the cold-hearted and infidel school of France,) could find only one complete and faultless metaphor or figure in the Old Testament which is not mixed with the literal: for nothing do they abhor so much as a mixed metaphor. Poor word-slaves! How unsufferable are ye! What puny minds, bound in fetters of feebleness! Ye should imitate God’s word, and not ask God’s word to imitate you. If ye had the same free and rich spirit, ye would have the same free and rich language. But, with your miserable canons of taste and criticism, ye have now, these fifty years, been starving the free and deep spirit of the Scottish people with correct and elegant compositions, as ye term them, which have in them no nourishment of truth, and are as little entitled to the name of sermons as my child’s toy to the name of that real thing which she fancies it to be. Oh, I abhor and nauseate, as much as any Scottish peasant who wears the blue bonnet, these empty, heartless, feckless, foisonless productions of what is called the moderate school of Scotch preaching, at the head of which stands the Rhetorical Professor referred to above. But, to return from a digression which the bitter memory of many blighted parishes of my native land forced me into. I observe again, that it is the use and wont of the prophetic style to intermingle the figurative and the literal: for this reason—that truth is one, and the creation, in all its parts, an expression of that one truth. The similitudes are therefore not accidental resemblances, but real, though diversified expressions of the same truth. The figures of the Scripture, taken from nature, are the Holy Spirit’s expressions of what nature was fashioned and is preserved to body forth,

concerning the one purpose of God, which is complete in Christ. For those rhetoricians, who neither know nor believe this, it may be very well to insist that the similitude shall be told out, in order that we may see whether it be a true similitude or not; but for those who understand the deeper secrets of nature, who are nature's true poets and bards, and have in them somewhat of the holiness of the prophet, inasmuch as they are conversant with the realities and not the mere shadow of things, it will ever be the privilege and the inclination to fall in, more or less, with the method of the Prophets: which is, to pass out of one region of creation into another—the elemental, the vegetable, the animal, the intellectual, the spiritual—by means of that clue of Divine discernment with which the spiritual man is gifted, of whom it is said, that “he judgeth all things, but he himself is judged by no one.”

The instances of this secret and sudden transfiguration from the figurative to the real are numerous in this very prophecy; indeed, just as numerous as the number of figures employed, for there is not one instance to the contrary. In Isaiah 8: 6-8, there is a notable example of the mixed metaphor, at which our critics might find great amusement; where the Assyrian is at once a river overflowing, and a bird with wings. In chapter 10: 16-19, he is a forest, a herd of fat cattle, a fruitful field, with soul and body, whose destruction is like the fainting of a standard-bearer. In chapter 11: 1, Messiah is a branch; in verse 2 he is a man full of the spirit: and so forth, in almost every instance of a regularly formed figure. But if we refer to mere similitudes, then they are heaped up one upon another from all regions of nature. This is the manner of the Prophets, and I take it of uninspired men also, according as they are endued with more and more of the spirit of wisdom and understanding. No objection, therefore, is it, to say of the figurative before us that it passeth likewise into the literal; for the wonder would be that it should not. Now, while we maintain the figurative sense, upon the grounds already set out, we see many indications of the figurative also; as, when it is said, verse 6, “And a little child shall lead them.” This must be understood either as conferring a literal and plain sense upon the wolf, the leopard, the kid, the calf, the young lion, and the fatling, or the whole must be taken as an allegorical painting, which we have already rejected. There would be no propriety in making a child to lead the great and mighty men of the earth; but there is a great beauty in a child leading these various beasts in one band of union and peace; it shows, not only the departure of their mutual instincts of destructiveness and fear one toward another, but likewise the return of their common subordination to man; and presents with all creation yielding its neck, not to the wise tamer, or the strong subduer, or the crafty catcher of the creatures, but to the face and image of upright man, stamped upon the weakness, the artlessness, the helplessness of a child.—There seems to me, again, another indication of the plain and literal sense in the words of the 7th verse: “And the lion shall eat straw like the ox.” This could not, without great refinement indeed, suggest itself to one who had only the figurative sense in his mind. That the lion should not devour the ox, is of easy and natural application from the figure to the thing set forth by it; but that the lion should eat straw like the ox, is a refinement which I think will hardly be found in the Prophets. But, taking it literally, it doth declare the law of their being to be changed, which at present is universally, and in all conditions, to feed on flesh; not only that they will not destroy and devour one another, which is the very instinct of many wild animals, and of some appears to be the chief end of their being; but, if flesh be presented to them, they will not use it for food, but reject as much as they now reject straw. The next verse, “And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice's den,” can, I think, admit of interpretation only in the literal sense; for as a figure I cannot tell what it means. It means, one may say, that the simplest of mankind may safely entrust himself with men naturally of the most deep and malignant character. But this, methinks, would have been better expressed by taking two animals; and it hath already been sufficiently expressed by

bringing the wolf and the lamb to dwell together. It may be said, moreover, that the figure of general pacification, being once begun, the rich and exuberant spirit of prophecy carries it onward, and finishes with this beautiful climax. I answer, that I find no such playful use or unnecessary expense of words among the Prophets; whom, the more I study, the more I admire, as gaining their end by the most simple, short and exact methods. But being understood literally as it is written, it brings out a most beautiful and appropriate meaning—that the enmity between the serpent's seed and the woman's seed should then be at an end; that the serpent should no longer, as the deodand for the horrid crime of which he had been the tool, be doomed as the most deadly enemy of his master, man; but, the redemption being completed, between the child of woman and the serpent there should be harmony; his subtlety should not betray the child, his venom should not hurt the child: he should be delivered from the sore badge of his having been a party to the great calamity of the Fall.—Proph. Exp.

* * *

OUR VISIT TO BRITAIN.

In Edinburgh again. —A present to the Editor. —Things as they were in Auld Reekie. —A Biographical Sketch of Pastor Erasmus, whom the gospel embarrasses. —Pietistic sentimentality intensely selfish. — Things as they are in Edinburgh in relation to the Kingdom.

On my second visit to Edinburgh, which preceded that of Dundee, a committee previously appointed, engaged the Wesleyan Chapel in Richmond street as the place of meeting. The interest in the lectures continued, and resulted in raising the subscription to *Elpis Israel* from a dozen copies to a hundred and fifty. An incident illustrative of this will more fully mark it than any thing I can say on the subject. After meeting at South Bridge Hall one afternoon, a gold pencil, and pearl-handled, silver-mounted, gold pen, were presented to me with the following note:

“Beloved brother—Will you please accept of the accompanying pen and pencil from a few of your sisters in Edinburgh, and consider that it is not from a desire to pay you wages for your good services in the cause of Christian enlightenment; but as an expression of our gratitude for the instruction and entertainment we have received from your excellent lectures; and as a token of our respect for your disinterested devotion to such a noble work as the unfolding of divine truth, that we take the liberty of presenting you with these mementos. We shall hope nothing else than that their service may aid you in the duty which you have marked out for yourself: that we shall continue to peruse occasional essays of your pen in the elucidation of prophecy; and enjoy a pleasure almost as great as we have heretofore received from your living voice in your emphatic and concise discourses.

“Pursue that benevolent enterprise, and know that your labour is not in vain in the Lord. Your path is watched over, and your progress observed with intense interest by your affectionate sisters in Edinburgh.

“Farewell; and may the blessing of the Most High always accompany you.”
Edinburgh, August 4, 1849.

The wish expressed in the above has been pretty fully responded to; for the original matter of the first and second volumes of this periodical, elucidating “the word of the kingdom,” has been mainly written by the pen so kindly and graciously presented. I only regret to add, that its nib is the worse for wear; and likely soon to fail in its cooperation with the hand that holds it, and the brain that gives it inspiration, in the great and important work of

stating, illustrating, proving, and defending the truth. If my friends in the modern Athens do not enjoy the “pleasure” of a continued perusal of my expositions of the prophetic word through this jewel of a pen, it is not because I do not work it diligently to the Lord. What they listened to with so much interest as it was extemporised before them, is now more digestedly exhibited in those monthly pages. Why then does not this periodical circulate more extensively in Edinburgh? Is the interest abated; or is the perfection of knowledge there attained, that nothing can be added to edification, exhortation, or comfort? A few extracts from letters will throw some light upon things as they were and as they are, with the reason of their diversity.

First, then, in regard to the things that were before I left Britain. A highly esteemed friend still of Auld Reekie, writes thus: —“We heard of your presence in Dundee through Dr. Dick, who expressed much regret at not having heard your lectures. We hope you excited as much interest there as elsewhere; and shall be glad to hear through any channel of your “work of faith, and labour of love.”

“We remain here in most respects as you left us. The ignorant remain ignorant, the prejudiced remain prejudiced; nay, hug their prejudices more closely as they are assailed by the voice of truth, unwilling to give them up.”

“Nothing has surprised me more than the complete ignorance respecting you, your faith, and hope; your doings and sayings, that is manifested by those unfriendly to you. The vaguest reports have been received as solid and substantial truths; and that without the least attempt at investigation! Your maligners have certainly much to answer for: you have, however, overcome a vast amount of prejudice, and will, finally, triumph over all, I have no doubt. Wishing you continued success, and the satisfaction arising from a good conscience, I remain your brother in the gospel hope.”

This was written in August 1849. Not long after the Auchtermuchty Covenanters’ meeting in Oak Hall, made overtures to the South Bridgians for a reunion. The Oak Hallists were Campbellites of the strictest sect of the profession, taking their cue from their American chief, and the exponents of his will in Nottingham and Auchtermuchty. The following extract from a letter written in November following will shed some light on the spirit that moved them.

“We are still going on,” says the writer, “as we did while you were here. The party that had separated from us have made strenuous efforts for a reunion; meetings were held, and questions (supposed to comprehend all that stood in the way) proposed, &c.: but the price demanded was no less than to surrender our judgments and consciences into their keeping, and neither receive a Christian brother, nor accept the right hand of fellowship from other churches, but with their consent. How men, not Papists, Prelatists, or Presbyterians, by profession, could make such demands, is a thing I cannot account for. Such is your left-hand friend Dowie of Cupar. But light and liberty must spread, though they may not produce godliness. Yours very truly, in hope of Christ’s appearing and kingdom.”

Had a reunion been formed, it is probable, that proscription would have become the rule in the South Bridge Hall. Campbell, Wallis, and Dron, would have been the Trinity worshipped there; and of course, in such a temple the kingdom’s gospel and its friends could find no place. I hear a rumour, however, that a reunion has ensued; but of the truth of it I cannot speak. I hear that it is so, and that things are now “very peaceable in South Bridge.” If

true, is it that peaceableness that results from purity of faith and hope, and conduct; or is it the peaceableness of compromise ratified over the suppression of those stirring truths, which created so much interest and attention while our living voice was sounding them in their ears? But it may be all rumour. Being in the dark upon the subject, the question must remain unanswered by me. Whatever may obtain there, I trust that the kingdom's gospel is not forgotten, nor the obedience which it requires.

After the publication of *Elpis Israel* I made a third visit to Edinburgh, accompanied by my daughter. We were very kindly received and hospitably entertained by Mr. A. M. Bell, of Charlotte Square, Mr. Symonds, and others. This time I addressed the public in the School of Arts Lecture Room, on the things of the kingdom and name of Jesus Christ. Among the audience was a Baptist preacher who had diligently attended all my lectures, and had also read *Elpis Israel*. After he had heard me through, he called to see me at Mr. Bell's. I listened patiently to his story for about two hours. His parents were Episcopalians, and his bias consequently, when young, was in favour of that sect. Some of the church evangelical leaders wanted to make him an out and out parish clergyman; but on coming over the thirty-nine articles he found that he could not conscientiously swear to them. They proposed, then, to train him for a missionary to the heathen, who required no particular oath of qualification to make him orthodox. But a lady acquainted with his case, suggested the expediency of delay; and generously gave him permission to draw upon her to the amount of 500 dollars, to meet his necessities in books, and board for six months. He concluded at length to enter the Church Missionary College. In process of time he fell sick, which the creed he was studying, and could not digest, considerably increased. His conscience was greatly distressed, and could find no relief till he communicated the burden of it to the Principal of the College, who advised him to leave when his health was restored. This he did, and then began to study medicine with a friend. A little bit of romance turned him from physic to school-teaching in France. He remained there some two years, after which he found himself in England, his wife preparing to keep a ladies' boarding school, and himself the pastor of a congregational church. Difficulty or coolness arose between him and his people; so that by the advice of the Rev. Dr. Styles he went to Boulogne to see what opening there might be there for a pastor among the English, intending to return in two weeks at the latest. Instead of the doctor keeping his friend's counsel, he told it to one of his own deacons. This man, who was afflicted with *cacoethes loquendi*, thought if he could get the pastor out he might work himself into the vacant pulpit. He, therefore, told an old gossip, who was a member of the church, that pastor Erasmus had gone to Boulogne, and would never return. Away she went to the pastor's trades-people to spread the tale. Alarmed for their bills, these "brethren" posted off to Erasmus' wife, told her what they had heard, and pressed an immediate settlement. They persuaded her to call in an appraiser forthwith, and to divide the spoil with them without delay. Being a woman of no remarkable strength of mind, and knowing nothing of the sinuosities of this naughty world they call "religious," she did the bidding of "the brethren," who would hardly advise her to do the worst, though for their own advantage! The fortnight being ended, and Boulogne offering no inducement to stay, Erasmus returned to England; and on landing, immediately drove off to the home he had left. But, as may be supposed, his amazement was blank and astounding to find the door plate gone, his wife departed, and the house closed against him! Pulpit, wife, and furniture all gone, and he for the time a ruined man. The wife he found at her father's, but all the rest had gone beyond recovery.

The future, whose very light was darkness, was all before him. Congregationalism was his only stock-in-trade, and for that he could find no customer. The home market was overstocked with the wares of more successful competitors. But what Independency would

not give down to one of its own children, “the benevolent Mrs. Fry,” and another Quaker, a London banker, voluntarily supplied. “If thee will go to Amiens and preach, we will allow thee £70 a-year.” This was not to be rejected, so to France Erasmus returned for the third time. How long he remained there I forget; but in process of no very long time he was in London again among the Independents. It was now he ventured to look into the New Testament to see what it said about baptism. “Till now,” said he “I always put the question as far from me as possible. I was afraid to read on the subject, apprehensive that I might find myself inconveniently placed. Your remarks I know to be true. The preachers will not investigate, fearing the consequences to which it might lead.” He read, examined, rejected infant sprinkling, and was immersed.

He was now a Baptist preacher, and soon after his immersion, united to a spouse of that denomination at £60 per year, from which her guardians deducted £10 per annum rent for the parsonage, or manse. This left but a poor pittance for family support. He tried to augment it by laying hold of physic again, which he had long ago thrown to the dogs in a paroxysm of romance. But the dogs began to growl, and show their teeth at him, because he had not been duly attested by the grand council. He found the experiment too hazardous to persist in; and as he could not make both ends meet without a secular vocation, which was denied him, he determined to remove to Edinburgh, and try his fortune there. Having arrived in this city he hired a hall for preaching. It was pretty well attended, and yielded enough to pay the rent, and support the family with a little extra effort of their own.

Thus were things with him when he attended my lectures at the School of Arts. “Now,” said he, “you are in possession of my story in its general outline, but I have not told you my belief. I believe that immortality is the gift of God to the righteous only; and that ‘the immortality of the soul’ is a mere heathen speculation. I believe that Jesus will return in power and great glory to establish the kingdom and throne of his father David; and sitting upon it in Zion, will rule all nations in righteousness with his saints. I have read Elpis Israel, and believe it sets forth the truth: but here is the extremity to which I am reduced. The support of myself and family depends on my preaching, what is generally approved. Believing what I do, I cannot continue to preach as I have done; and if I preach what I believe, my living is gone! What am I to do?” Preach the gospel of the kingdom, and walk by faith, trusting to God for all the rest. But, as it is the poor to whom it is preached, and who principally embrace it, the living obtained by the gospel from them is neither delicate nor sumptuous; but oftentimes quite scant and self-denying. If the people will not hear you in behalf of the truth, turn to some secular employment and labour in the gospel as you have opportunity. “I cannot,” said he, “preach at the Hall any more: but what is to be done doth not evidently appear.” Having discussed the question of emigration to America, and presented him with a copy of Elpis Israel, he departed with an expression of good intentions; but whether he carried them out, I have had hitherto no means of arriving at the proof.

The committee which undertook the bringing of the public together to hear me, were two Scotch Baptists, a Morrisonian, and I think, a Campbellite. They were quite zealous until Elpis Israel appeared, when their orthodox feelings experienced great revulsion. The Morrisonian, whose zeal was of a business character, remained firm; while the others became positively incensed. This was between the publication of the book and my last visit. A friend writing previous to this says, “I fell in with one of the committee who agreed with the good (?) folks of Derby, that you were the most dangerous man who had visited them. After half an hour’s conversation, I left him in a rather more reasonable frame of mind. Some speak against Elpis Israel who are quite ignorant of its contents; others, because you speak against the

clergy, &c. There are not many whose minds are free from priestcraft. I don't know who in Edinburgh are your friends now. Elpis Israel has repelled some; but has, I hope, attracted others better worth. Mr. Campbell can never succeed in any attempt he may make to neutralise the truths it contains. He might deter, or induce many not to read it; for the very influence of his name has already done so." One of the committee subscribed for four copies. He sold two, made a gift of one, and retained the fourth: but when he came to read it, it took all the music out of him, and set him on fire, so that he endeavoured to get them back, that he might commit them all to the flames. Such is pietism—unreasoning, sickly sentimentality, turned to rage, when the peace of its morbid conscientiousness is disturbed.

A correspondent writing from Edinburgh, well expresses himself, in regard to this pietistic mentality which displayed itself in the case to which he alludes. "Our friend at ----," says he, "has again started back, horror-struck at even an inquiry into the matters so interesting to us. How can such ever come to a knowledge of the truth? The so-called 'evangelical system' is based on the corrupt, innate selfishness of the human heart. It desires safety, comfort, peace, &c.; but what is for God's honour does not enter into the speculations of its adherents. Hence, talking to them of the necessity of obedience to a command, as necessary for them, is 'throwing a wet blanket' on the fire of their zeal, and we get half blinded by the smoke for our pains. The truth you have so well and boldly announced, is spreading in this place; but meets, of course, with the most determined opposition in the shape of ridicule, hard names, and other like harmless things."

In another letter from the same city, the writer remarks, "Few men appear able or willing to look steadily at both sides of the truth, which has two aspects—one, which respects God; the other, as respects man. Paul's desire was that God might be glorified; whether by his life or death, mattered not. If he could live and spread the glory of his name, well; if he must die in attestation of his testimony, also well, or better. Where is this absorption of self into the one desire that God might be glorified, to be found? The 'evangelical system,' so called, is essentially human—the glorification of man being its real object, barely concealed, indeed, under an appearance of love and zeal for the cause of God. In its more open manifestations, we see it evinced in the craving after magnificent churches, rich paintings, grand musical services, robed priests, and all the machinery and tricks of the stage: less manifestly, in the untiring efforts made by 'churches' to extend their peculiar doctrines. It is shown unconsciously by 'Sabbath Alliance' men, whether of the society or not; who, while they profess zeal for God's service, simply confess the real secret. 'Their feelings' are shocked by Sabbath desecration, and this same self, this intense selfishness, is very evident in almost all the memoirs of excellent and pious people, in which we see that their thoughts are eternally set on their own hearts, thoughts, frames, and feelings. If 'out of spirits,' then it is 'God hiding his face.' One would imagine that their God played at hide and seek with them! John Bunyan sends one of his heroes (in the body) to heaven and to hell. He finds his mother in heaven, who has no more any interest in the husband and children left on earth. He goes to hell, and converses with wretches burning in fire, ten thousand times fiercer than earthly flames, who are reposing on beds of burning steel, having, also, streams of burning brimstone poured down their throats, which are to continue pouring throughout eternity. He communes with these, and it is transported directly back to his home, where he appears like an angel of light to his wife and children, so great is the joy depicted on his countenance. Poor Bunyan has formed the minds of a vast number of these 'evangelical christians.' They see only one side of truth; or rather, have capacity to apprehend only one side. They want 'peace,' as you say of the world; 'they want a respite from the stings and remorse of conscience;' therefore they have no respect for any commandment which does not manifestly bear upon their frame of

mind here; and are unmindful of those things which have respect to the glory and authority of 'the Great King.' This human idol meets me at every turn. It has perverted the ordinances, and rendered the table of the Lord contemptible. How can there be love to God unless the effect of faith be, a simple desire that he may be glorified in us?

"I have not," he continues, "heard the particulars of the conclusion in Dundee. The church there had long ago cut us off from its fellowship; and we had ceased to have much consideration for it. I am glad to hear that some life has been infused into them—that all have not fallen asleep. We behold there and at Nottingham, that one-sided system of which I speak. Man is for ever trying to attain sovereignty, independent of the principles of Christ—the woman would rule if she could. May they learn better. The gospel certainly has the promise of this life; but he is a fool that stops there. Let him remember that 'which is to come.' The words 'to come' do not apply to that happy state in which the angels are around the throne of God. Next week is to come; and cannot be here or there now.

"Do not expect to see the seed you have sown spring up and produce fruit immediately, for it might wither as fast. Slow and sure applies to the growth of truth—to the seeds of real knowledge."

On September 23, 1850, I received a few last words from Edinburgh, which will conclude what I have to present, illustrative of things as they were in that city till I left Britain. The writer says, "I am happy to say we are all well in this quarter. Inquiry is still rife about "the kingdom;" and I perceive no diminution of interest in bible matters amongst those who have formed the society for investigating its contents.

"Mrs. ----'s former 'episcopal shepherd' came looking after her a short time ago, and discussing the merits of the party she had joined. Some observations were made on our non-payment of our pastor; and the very clear distinction that existed between the office of a pastor, and that of an evangelist. 'He could not see it;' and said that 'there was nothing he disliked more than these distinctions; that there was none; and that Paul expressly laid down the rule that the labourer is worthy of his hire;' and so on. By what fatality is it that they have united the pastoral duty with the evangelist's maintenance in their own persons, and yet seem to be ignorant of their double-dealing? The greater part seem to be as much victims of the system as the people over whom they rule! Any church with him is a Christian Church, provided they have a standing ministry, that is, a paid clergy; so that our little body is not a Christian Church, though the Papist, &c., are! What strange infatuation!"

Things as they were give no assurance of the character of things as they will be. "Ye did run well;" says Paul to the Galatians, "who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth?" They received him as an angel of God, and would have plucked out their eyes to serve him; and afterwards treated him as people bewitched would treat a man who sought to disenchant them of an agreeable delusion. This change in their minds towards him was superinduced by the influence of the zealous advocates of "another gospel," or faith by which the sinner may be justified, than that word of faith which he preached. The same cause has operated in Edinburgh. When I arrived in that city it was not perceived what I was driving at. The times were exciting, and my lectures were mainly illustrative of their prophetic character. They attracted thousands, of whom hundreds, by their subscription to Elpis Israel, afforded me the means, through that work, of re-announcing to this generation Paul's gospel for the obedience of faith. When it was in the hands of the people, and the printer duly paid, I made the gospel of the kingdom a primary subject of my discourses in my third tour. It may

be said, that “being crafty I caught them with guile.” Be it so. You must angle to catch trout. I was fishing men for the kingdom of God, and baited my hook with its gospel things. Some swallowed the bait, but their struggles not being exhausted, they have not yet come quietly to shore. Hence, one of these who believes, but struggles against obedience to his new faith, writes, “what has tended greatly to deaden the interest felt in the Herald’s exposition of the kingdom and age to come in Edinburgh, is, in my opinion, the position you have taken up in respect to the ground of a sinner’s justification; the faith by which a sinner may be justified, &c. You will be aware, of course, that secessions have taken place from some of the churches, owing, I believe, to differences on this point; and in some cases, to the unwillingness of the church to hear the expositions of those who had received your views. I hope it may be to their advantage, but I fear not.” There is disputation, then, in Edinburgh in regard to what men must believe and do to be saved. This is good. And though the Herald was for some considerable time without a subscriber there, I am happy in knowing that as the controversy goes on, its subscribers are increased.

EDITOR.

* * *

OBJECTIONS TO THE HERALD’S POSITION.

“Did Philip preach ALL the things of the kingdom? The answer must be, No.”—Edinburgh Correspondent.

“I have not shunned to declare unto you ALL the counsel of God.”—Paul to the Ephesians.

Dear Brother Thomas—What has tended greatly to deaden the interest felt in the Herald’s expositions of the “Kingdom and Age to Come,” in Edinburgh, is (in my opinion) the position you have taken up in respect of a sinner’s justification—the faith by which the sinner may be justified, &c. after much examination and mature reflection, I find myself unable to coincide with those views of the matter which you have expressed in the earlier sections of part second of ‘Elpis Israel.’ Not being qualified to discuss this matter, I will content myself with noting down such brief reasons as occur to me at the present moment, for not adopting your views.

The Lord Jesus, in his preachings, commonly, if not constantly, proposed himself—the man, the individual, as a guide, a protector, a leader, and a Saviour! In short, and irrespective of what he would do in future—as the object of faith! ‘Come unto me all ye who are weary.’ ‘Ye will not come unto me.’ ‘I will draw all men unto me.’ ‘Believe in me.’ Thus he showed that faith was a personal thing. In order to elicit this faith, it was necessary for sinners to know who Jesus was, and what was his character, his authority and power. Now, this was what the apostles did. ‘What we have seen, heard and handled, we declare unto you, that ye may have fellowship with us.’ Philip truly preached the things concerning the ‘kingdom of God;’ but did he preach ALL the things? The answer must be, No! For primitive Christians of some years standing had something more to learn: (so Paul tells the Ephesians, Corinthians, Hebrews, Galatians, &c.) to my apprehension, the things which concern and regulate the conduct of men and women who have been called out of darkness into God’s marvellous light—during their probation, &c. —are as much a part of the ‘things of the kingdom,’ as those which concern the future destiny of Israel, of Christ or his saints, or of the political and dominant aspect of that kingdom.

My idea of ‘faith’ in Jesus Christ is then, such, that my faith cannot be altered in character by any increase in my knowledge of what Jesus will hereafter do. Having chosen

him for my 'portion forever,' my choice remains unaltered, although his riches were proved to be even greater than they are. The knowledge of his future glory on earth certainly gives me additional motives for faithfulness. The language of faith is after this manner: 'Though the fields shall yield no meat, and the flock be cut off from the fold, yet will I rejoice in God.' 'Though all men forsake me, though death stare me in the face—yea! though he slay me, yet will I trust in him.'

You will be aware, of course, that secessions have taken place from some of the churches, owing, I believe, to differences on this point, and in some cases, to the unwillingness of the church to hear the 'expositions' of those who had received your views. I hope it may be to their advantage; but I fear not. All who love the Lord Jesus in sincerity, ought to keep together, and bear with each other's inequalities of intellectual power. Christianity is an affair more of the heart than the head. It seeks to engage the affections, and so win souls to Christ. 'This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil.' 'Ye will not come to me.' Paul says: 'they who had been aliens to God, hating him, were reconciled by the death of Christ.' God seeks men's affections, men who will 'worship him in spirit and in truth.' 'We love him, because he first loved us.' How did God manifest this love? —Was it by his promises? Nay! but by his deeds. 'God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.' 'He who hath the son, hath this life.' Therefore, in what has been done, lies apparently the 'converting' power, and in what is to be done, the sustaining and strengthening power.

Jesus, 'the son of man,' a wanderer, with not a place to lay his head; and Jesus, the son of man, seated on the throne of his glory, with all nations gathered before him, are one and the same being; even so, to my apprehension, the 'kingdom of God,' in its planting, in its forming, in its probation; and the kingdom of God, when it is manifested in its political dominion and glory, are one and the same kingdom. As the 'things' connected with Jesus in humiliation, differ from the things concerning him when on the throne of his glory, so do the things concerning the kingdom, in its separate aspects, differ. The 'stone' laid in Zion, the tried, sure foundation-stone, and the same stone, when it has become a great mountain and filled the whole earth, are one and the same 'kingdom:' It seems to me only a question of development, like the grain of mustard seed, compared to the future tree. The 'stone' is, and has been long in preparation.

Such are the ideas which I have obtained from the scriptures; you will see, therefore, how it is, that I am not a subscriber to the Herald.

You will be aware of the cessation of the 'Gospel Banner.' It lingered on some months after A. Campbell denounced it. This denunciation was its death-blow. We are now (many of us) without a periodical, as the matter in the 'Harbinger' is not to the taste of all. I would like a periodical that would take up a middle position between you and A. C. For both have 'excellencies,' and, as I conceive, defects also.

I must now conclude, by wishing you health and peace from God our father; and I am, dear brother, in the hope of seeing Jesus as he is, and in being like him, yours very faithfully,

***"

Edinburgh, Scotland, March 13, 1852.

OUR POSITION, SCRIPTURAL AND TENABLE.

“There is a generation that are pure in their own eyes, and yet is not washed from their filthiness.”—Proverbs.

That men are sinners, by nature and practice, is pretty generally admitted as an article of faith by all the sects of anti-Christendom. This admission brings the conclusion that they are therefore all under sentence of death; for “the wages of sin is death.” Sin reigning in them they are the slaves of sin, because they obey him. This obedience to sin is in consequence of the strong impulses of the flesh, unsubdued and unrestrained by the truth, understood and assuredly believed. Thus the understanding of sinners is darkened, and blindness pervades their hearts; and the consequence is that they “are alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them.” Sinner, then, is a term indicative of one who is a transgressor of the law of God; who refuses to submit to his commands, is ignorant of his truth, alienated from his life, and therefore under condemnation of death.

But one may be an enlightened sinner. Such a person is one who knows what is right, and still the wrong pursues. He acknowledges that thus and so is the truth, which enjoins such and such obedience; but he abstains from becoming the subject of it. He invents a refuge in which to hide himself from the necessity of a literal conformity to the word, vainly flattering his conscience that if he abstain from immorality, profess friendship to God and his people, assent to a theory of truth in sincerity of mind, God will not be over-particular in the literal construction of his word. Such an one forgets, if indeed he ever knew it, that “God has magnified HIS WORD above all his name.” He will therefore more readily pardon any offence than a slight upon, or want of conformity to, his word. Men think God is such an one as themselves—that he thinks as little of his word as they do of theirs. But no mistake is more fatal than this; “for without faith it is impossible to please God;” and “without holiness no man shall see the Lord;” and there is no holiness attainable except by faith, and through the faith in the obedience which it requires.

But God and men are at variance on that point. Practically, these creatures of his power think he ought to account them wholly upon principles approbated by the thinking of their flesh. Philoprogenitiveness attaches them to their offspring, as it does all other animals to theirs. Hence they will believe in no heavenly state hereafter which makes no provision for them. They think sincerity of mind in the belief of error ought to be accepted as an equivalent for the belief of the truth; judging thus because their feelings are so shocked at the idea of the few that will be saved by the obedience of faith. In all generations have God and his creatures been at issue on this point. He says, believe and do the truth; they say, sincerely, believe and do what you think is true, and though it may not be really so, you shall be saved. Thus, God predicates salvation, justification, holiness, &c., on “the obedience of faith;” while men inculcate sincerity of opinion as the panacea of their souls.

This diversity between God and man is the source of that distinction that obtains in the world between true religion and superstition, saint and sinner. A saint is one who believes and does the truth with the docility and readiness of an obedient child. He is therefore styled a saint; that is, a separated or holy person. He is separated from sinners in the obedience of the truth, which unites him to the name of the Holy, through which he is sanctified. The saints are God’s representatives in this evil world, who having acknowledged God, or rather, being acknowledged by him, are the pillar and support of his truth in his controversy with sinners. God has given them the Scriptures to wield in combat as the two-edged sword of their present warfare against “reasonings and every high thing that exalts itself against the knowledge of

God” therein revealed. The odds is, therefore, the saints against all the world, which they overcome by their faith, preparatory to its subjection by the sword of judgment, which they lay hold of as a substitute for the spirit’s sword, when the time comes for them to possess the kingdom under the whole heaven for evermore. Into their hands God has committed his word, in the absence of his Son, commanding that they “contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints.” They are to be lovingly intolerant of all principles nullifying the faith; for this faith is for the justification of sinners, and if they be unfaithful to their trust, how shall men attain to the life of God? If the saints make void the word of God by tradition, what scope is there for the transition of sinners from death to life? Can the blind lead the blind and escape the ditch? When sinners undertake to teach sinners the way of salvation, we are reminded of one with a beam in his eye fumbling over his brother’s to remove a mote!

But confessedly ignorant though they be of Moses and the prophets, sinners generally are vastly wise in their own conceit. Though knowing little, or perhaps nothing, of the Scriptures, which can alone make wise unto salvation, they turn with contempt from every thing incongruous to the thinking of sinful flesh. Sophistry is the “logic” of the carnal mind, which is always ready with an apology for coming short of the divine law. It is willing to impose upon itself a burdensome ritual, and the necessity of doing some great thing, to recommend itself to the favour of the Most High—it will even be immersed and believe the Gospel; but no, it will run the risk of eternal reprobation before it will adopt the divine order exhibited in the wholesome words of the Lord Jesus, believe the gospel and be baptised.

Romanism is the mystery of iniquity, the sophistry of sin; and Protestantism in all its forms is that same sophistry attenuated to the rarest subtleties. Though antagonist systems, yet are they essentially one and indivisible in antagonism to the principles of the oracles of God. They are opposed to each other on “the ground of a sinner’s justification;” but they agree against God in repudiating “the faith by which the sinner may be justified.” When Luther appeared, “the ground of a sinner’s justification” was the great question of debate between him and his brother catholics. These contended for justification by works, such works as papists approve; while he advocated justification by faith without such works. Paul taught justification by faith, so that there seemed to be an agreement between him and Luther. The agreement, however, was only in appearance; for the subject matter of justifying faith was known only to Paul. Luther was as ignorant of it as the papists, and as they who glory in his leadership and name. He was neither a believer in the gospel of the kingdom, nor had he ever been baptised; his idea of justification was therefore restricted to faith in what our sky-kingdom friend at Bethany styles “Sacred History”—the history of “the man, Jesus, the individual, as a guide, a protector, a leader, and a Saviour.” He took no account of his message. Like modern Protestants, he would probably have rejected this, while professing faith in the messenger; not knowing that justification from all past sins is predicated on a love-working faith in both.

Yes, as our correspondent says, “faith is a personal thing;” but he errs in avowing only a part of the truth. Paul shows that it is something more. He says, “it is the substance (or full assurance) of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen;” and when we inquire what the baptised Samaritans believed before their immersion, Luke replies, “the things of the kingdom of God, and of the name of Jesus the Christ.” Our correspondent says Philip did not preach all the things of the kingdom. What did he omit? Certainly nothing that made the doctrine of the kingdom good news or gospel. If he left out any thing he certainly did not omit the kingdom itself; for the gospel preached in Jesus’ name was the kingdom’s gospel—omit the kingdom, and the gospel is no more.

When I went to Edinburgh I found the city asleep, dreaming over justification by faith in sacred history; and with all its wisdom, no further advanced in divine knowledge than when John Knox fulminated his anathemas against papistry from his domicile in the High Street. If there were any believed in the kingdom and throne of David restored, being the kingdom of God promised to Jesus and the saints, of which the gospel treats, I have yet to learn it. There were doubtless some who believed in the restoration of the Jews, the personal return of Jesus, a millennium, &c.; but no one regarded them as essential. They might be believed or not without periling a justification by faith; for it was not perceived, that to deny the restoration of the twelve tribes, or the personal return of Jesus in power and great glory, was to deny the kingdom of God—it was not seen, that no restoration or return, there could be no kingdom.

It therefore startled many minds in their dreams to show that the gospel was concerning this kingdom, and that justification was predicated on believing that gospel in the name of Jesus as its king. Several who heard me had been immersed in ignorance of the nature, place, attributes and circumstances of that kingdom; and therefore had believed something else for gospel than the kingdom's gospel. This proved, and their justification was shown to be null and void; for being destitute of the "full assurance of things hoped for," their immersion was not obedience to the faith which Paul preached. Nevertheless, they seem zealous to establish their own righteousness. They argue that their faith is as good without the kingdom as with it. They "knew what Jesus was, and what was his character, his authority, and power." But the devils believed this, and trembled; they were not therefore justified. Devils believe it now; and, forming themselves into a "Society for the Propagation of the Faith," send their missionaries, under the Pope's patronage, to turn idolaters to their belief. This "personal faith," held in common with devils, is the hereditary creed of all anti-Christendom; and by all parties deemed faith enough for justification! It is the faith of the immersed and sprinkled, with more or less pious sentimentality mixed up with it, according to the education, training, or phrenological constitution of the pietist.

True, Jesus said, "Come unto me;" "Believe in me;" "This is the work of God, that ye should believe on him whom he hath sent;" and so forth. But this was not spoken to ignorant, misbelieving, or unbelieving Gentiles. It was spoken to Israelites, in whose ears Moses and the Prophets were read every Sabbath day, and whose hope was the promise made of God to their fathers, Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; to which hope their twelve tribes, constantly serving God day and night, hope to attain. This hope was the nation's hope, and had been planted in the national mind ineradicably by the sure word of the Prophets—it was the hope of national felicity and glory under a son of David reigning forever in Zion and Jerusalem. The hope was the kingdom restored again to Israel, and proclaimed by Jesus, the royal prophet to Israel, as approaching, when he preached "the gospel of the kingdom of God." In announcing this, however, he also advanced his own personal claims to the throne of that kingdom as that Son of David who was to reign over the House of Jacob forever. Thousands of Israel who believed the gospel of the kingdom, did not believe that its majesty was nigh, nor that Jesus was the king who was to bear it; therefore, said he, "Ye will not come unto me that ye may have life."

But the Gentiles were in different case. Paul says, that they had "no hope," and were "atheists"—atheoi—"in the world." They had no interest or desire for God's Israelitish kingdom, and knew nothing about the "glory, honour and immortality" to be obtained in obtaining it. Jesus never preached to them at all; nor did the apostle ever address them as he did the Jews, who had hope towards God. The "work of God" for Gentiles is that they believe the gospel of the kingdom, and on him whom he hath sent, and will send to sit on its throne to

reign over all nations “with a rod of iron,” in power and great glory. Israelites, uncontaminated by Gentilism, in ancient and modern times, believe in the kingdom, but deny that Jesus is its Lord and Christ; while the most pious of orthodox Gentiles, “evangelicals,” as they style themselves, confess with their mouth that Jesus Christ is Son of God, but at the same time hold in pious contempt “the things of the kingdom” we have expressed. And this is not all. They are not only infidels in regard to the kingdom of God, as set forth in the scriptures of his prophets, but they despise, reject and ridicule things concerning his name. Jesus offers believers in the gospel of the kingdom “repentance, remission of sins, and eternal life” in his name; and commands them to be baptised into the name of the Holy, that by baptismal union to that name, they may receive those necessary prerequisites to the possession of the kingdom. But do the pious infidels of the Gentiles respect this offer and command? Quite the contrary. They have a righteousness of their own, which they compass sea and land to establish in the earth; and therefore, like the Jews of ancient days, they do not submit themselves to “the righteousness of God.” Their ground of justification is not God’s. Their faculties, phrenologically styled “conscientiousness,” “veneration,” “marvellousness,” “hope,” and “self-esteem,” are “full,” perhaps “large,” compared with the organs they possess in common with the inferior creatures. A spurious theology, the thinking of the flesh on things not spiritually discerned, is sown in their hearts as tares by the pulpit orators they have heaped up to themselves after their own lusting. Having taken root there, it morbidly excites the faculties we have named, and a sickly sentimentality, they call “piety,” is the result. Feeling marvellously sentimental, the afflation pervades their self-esteem, and they assume that they are of those elected from the foundation of the world to eternal happiness in sky kingdomia. Had they been born among pagans they would have ranked as brethren of the “pious Aeneas;” but being born into a system, which acknowledges that a man styled Jesus Christ appeared in Judea in the days of Augustus and Tiberius; that he was the Son of God, crucified, rose again, and ascended to heaven; and that he was in some sense the Saviour of the world—they assent to these things; and this assent, sanctified by their pious feelings, becomes for them a righteousness unto life. Having wrought one another up to this complacency, they have “obtained a hope,” and their “consciousness” is lulled into the tranquillity of fleshly repose. These are the Scribes and Pharisees of modern times, who appear unto men to be righteous. They are like sepulchres of polished alabaster, very fair to look upon; but, O reader, if you esteem their praise, peer not into their hearts with the lamp of truth. Call not their righteousness in question. Speak not to them of obedience. Be silent as death on baptism. Breathe no doubt upon the divinity and immortality of their souls. Let no suggestion escape you that it is possible the meek may inherit the earth, rather than the skies. Hint not the spuriousness of a faith that respects not Moses and the Prophets, and that transmutes the kingdom they predict into a receptacle of ghosts beyond the skies. If you value their traditions,

“Shake with them in dog-days,
And in December sweat;”

but have no mind of your own to question their conceits; for if you do, the wet blanket of your presumption would so affect their zeal that the smoke of their indignation would well nigh choke you in its cloud.

But, what is the real worth of a pious assent to a few historical facts concerning Jesus, when people substitute their own foolishness for the one hope of the calling to God’s kingdom and glory? Is such a faith justifying? Nay; rather it is reprobate, and hath this seal, “Ye have made it void by your tradition.” When Elpis Israel came into the hands of these

pietists in Edinburgh, it filled them with rage, like Naaman the Syrian, and stirred within them a fiery zeal. The truth it set forth antagonised their cherished righteousness; and caused one of them, a dealer in musical instruments there, to decree its consignment to the burning flames! What pleasure the conflagration would afford him! How much more musical would have been its author's groans to such a spirit, than the roar of its flame in the funnel of his stove! This fiery zealot was a Baptist of some particular order. Now, if it be granted that Elpis Israel interprets the Scripture correctly, of what worth is this man's piety and belief of the facts concerning Jesus? Was he justified by such a faith? —a faith that confesses the person, and commits the truth he preached to the flames! I cannot admit, that the immersion of such a believer, however pious, was obedience to the faith which Paul preached.

But there were other immersed people in Edinburgh as unacquainted with the Hope of Israel, before I called attention to it, as my fiery friend. They were pious, and their faith simply historical, which the Bethanian philosophy teaches is the best kind of faith! They differed from him, however, in this: that when they heard and read, they examined in a Berean spirit, and acknowledged that the things presented were the truth. But even these were not all agreed. Some admitted that the kingdom we set forth with its attributes, or things thereunto belonging, were the gospel hope—the one hope of the calling; others, that the things were true, but no part of the gospel, which they regarded as the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus for remission of sins to those who believed this. Practically, however, both classes agree in that they both assume that they were justified by faith before or in their immersion, (they are not agreed in the prepositions,) although that faith did not embrace “the hypostasis or full assurance of things hoped for.” I say they assume their justification, inferring, as I do, that being honest men, they would not put off reimmersion, if they did not think they were justified by their lame faith about the time they were immersed. Those who admit that “the things of the kingdom of God and of the name of Jesus the Christ,” are the subject matter of the gospel; and that when they were immersed they knew not the kingdom, and but little of the name as they ought; and believing that it is a love-working faith in the gospel that justifies the sinner—they are certainly at fault, and very inconsistent, in delaying union to the name of the Holy Ones by a second immersion. It is the kind of faith a man has that characterises his immersion. If he have such a faith as Paul defines, then one immersion is enough, and ought never to be repeated on any pretence; but if he have a lame faith, or “a vain faith,” rather, an immersion, no matter how oft repeated, is not “the obedience of faith,” as preached and ministered by Paul. “According to your faith be it unto you.” This is a rule given by Jesus. If therefore our faith be a belief of truth made void by human tradition, it is vain, and we get no good thing as the result; if we believe what is not promised, and cannot, will not exist, we shall get nothing, no matter how pious we may feel, or on what good terms we may be with our own selves; but if our faith embrace the unadulterated truth—“the things hoped for and unseen,” which God hath promised; justification unto life will then “be unto” the immersed who have been subjected to an immersion subsequently to their acquisition of such a faith.

They are, indeed, consistent in rejecting reimmersion who, admitting the truth of “the things,” yet say, it is of no consequence whether you believe them or not. They have compressed their faith into a nutshell, although in the scriptures the truth is found pervading the whole Bible. With them this has no significance; for being minute philosophers, their anxiety is to discover how little knowledge is absolutely necessary for getting into heaven with the skin of their teeth! But in this they are not wise. The character of a man's faith is altered by the quantity and quality of his knowledge. If a man be acquainted only with what is past, his knowledge is small in quantity and not of the right quality for justification by faith. His faith is of an historical character—mere sacred history—and devoid of doctrine. Such a

faith is not justifying. If another be acquainted with the past, understand the mystery or doctrine of its incidents, and be familiar with what God has promised concerning his kingdom and the age to come, the quantity and quality of his knowledge is altered, and the character of his faith is relatively changed. It is justifying. The eyes of his understanding are opened, and like Abraham, he can see afar off. We may choose Christ, but he may not choose us. Our election turns not upon our choice, but upon his. We may choose him upon our own principles, while he rejects us upon his. He chooses us through a belief of the truth, the unadulterated truth; men choose him by believing what suits them, and rejecting the rest. Such may choose Jesus as their “portion forever,” but they will assuredly have no portion in his joy.

It is a mistake to say that “Christianity is an affair more of the heart than of the head.” Paul was sent to the Gentiles “to open their blind eyes, to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God.” This was an affair of the head, without which the heart could not be touched. God has ordered his servants to be sealed in the forehead, which is the seat of intellect. They who are not sealed there do not belong to him. A pious heart, without due intelligence, is an unrenewed heart, and always ready to apologise for disobedience and ignorance, which Paul says, “alienates from the life of God.” The heart of ignorance, however pious in feeling, is never right with God; because it is not “turned from darkness to light,” and consequently not to him in whom is no darkness at all. When the forehead is sealed, the heart responds, and the man’s faith works by love to the fulfilling of the truth.

From the foregoing letter of my highly esteemed friend, it appears that if the Herald is to be popular in Edinburgh, it must assume more compromising ground in regard to a sinner’s justification. Suppose it did, would that alter the fact? If the Herald accommodated the truth to the taste of its editor’s personal friends, would that convert their belief of sacred history into justifying faith? It might make them more comfortable when they happened to read it; it would disturb their conscience less; but it would not alter the immutable fiat of heaven. No, when the Herald’s subscription list is reduced to such a few that its existence can only be perpetuated by heralding forth a system in accordance with “the thinking of the flesh,” its editor will lay down his pen, and write no more. Better far break granite on the roadside for a crust of bread, than to garble God’s truth to please one’s friends, or propitiate the foe. The Herald takes its stand on “the wholesome words of the Lord Jesus;” in their letter, spirit and order, that “he who believes the gospel and is baptised, shall be saved; and he that BELIEVES NOT shall be condemned”—Mark 16: 15-16. When the Samaritans and others believed that gospel, Luke says, “they believed the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus the Christ.” Believing these things, he adds, “they were baptised, both men and women.” Hence, the words of Jesus, historically defined by Luke, read thus: “He that believes the things of the kingdom of God and of my name as the Christ, and is baptised, shall be saved; and he that believes them not, shall be condemned.” (He believes them not, whose faith at his immersion is defined by the Bethanian philosophy or popular creed.) This is my position; who is general enough to turn it? The order is, first, understand the word of the kingdom and name; then, believe it; next, obey it in baptism. Who can improve this arrangement? Nay, who has any right to alter it? Or who, but one whose heart is not subdued by the truth, dare dispute against it? People of this class would have it thus: first, believe on Jesus; next, be immersed; afterwards, understand, perhaps, the word of the kingdom. Seek, say they, in effect, righteousness, or remission of sins, first; and then the kingdom of God. But Jesus himself reverses this dictum, and exhorts us to “seek first the kingdom of God;” because no man can be the subject of “his righteousness,” or justification, who has not found the kingdom: the righteousness being for those who believe what he has

promised concerning it. This is the Herald's "defect," the head and front of its offending. It is too adherent to the letter, and therefore spirit, of the Bible, to suit the vain philosophy of a sceptical and Laodicean generation. But this we consider as an excellency, which will be duly appreciated by all who prefer honesty of purpose and the simplicity of truth, to the double-minded latitudinarianism of the age. We go for our friends; but also for the truth before them all.

EDITOR.

* * *

ASSOCIATION FOR PROMOTING JEWISH SETTLEMENTS IN PALESTINE.

ADDRESS TO THE PUBLIC, BY JEWS.

No country in the universe can prefer claims to the consideration of mankind equal to those of Palestine. It is a land revered alike by Jew and Gentile; its memory is indissolubly associated with what is to them dearest and most sacred; at its name a holy thrill vibrates through the human heart; its very sound strikes a chord which sympathetically re-echoes through the innermost recesses of the soul.

But while Palestine has such high significancy in the eyes of the Christian, with how much greater interest must it be regarded by the Jew? If the force of events have thrown him from that country, towards it he gravitates as to his natural centre. If torn from his native soil and planted elsewhere, towards it he yet inclines as to the sun which gives him radiance and vitality. Thrice every day he devoutly turns his face to the Holy Land, whilst offering up the most sacred of his prayers; and the service commemorating his deliverance from Egypt he concludes with the fervent wish: "the next celebration at Jerusalem." No wonder, therefore, that numbers of Jews cling with tenacity to a country the memory of which, from the cradle to the grave, is thoroughly interwoven with their holiest feelings and yearnings; that, taking pleasure in her stones, and favouring the dust thereof, they bid defiance to all kinds of misery, hardship, and degradation, and do not consider that price too high for the purchase of the consolation of drawing therein their last breath, if not privileged to inhale in it their first; and of at last yielding themselves up to the beloved ground, if this could not be given to them.

But whilst in his faithful attachment to holy reminiscences, —whilst in his unshakable faith in the promise of God, the Jew heroically resigns his native country with its powerful associations, security, and comforts, and perhaps even affluence, is it just that we, followers of the law, —believers in the prophets, whose light, proceeding from Palestine, illumined our darkness, —is it just that we should look on with indifference at the struggle of the Jews in Palestine, for earning a scanty subsistence; that, at the utmost, we dole them out a miserable pittance, barely enabling them to linger out an existence useless to the rest of the world, and burdensome to themselves? True, there was a time when the intolerant policy of Turkey, joined to unwillingness on the part of the Jewish population to become instrumental in their own support, rendered any other assistance unavailable, save that in the shape of alms. But now that some more enlightened views have removed all legal obstacles to endeavours for self-support on the part of the Jewish population, —nay, when there is reason to hope that the Porte would lend its hearty cooperation to any scheme for that purpose; when that very population earnestly appeals to the world for the means of emancipating itself from the state of degradation entailed by pauperism, —is it just that we should withhold from it a helping

hand? Join, therefore, O fellow citizens, join this Association formed for the purpose of lending that helping hand to the Jews in Palestine.

To our brethren in faith we should say: Whatever your views, you cannot but respect the convictions of those who, anxious to fulfil the law of God in all its particulars, feel that this is practicable in the land only to which that law had a primary reference. We should further say: you have no hypothetical case before you, you have to deal with a stern reality. There is a Jewish population extant in Palestine, which for generations has been supported by European charity, and which still looks to the West for assistance. This support was moreover at all times considered as a pious and most meritorious work, habitually and cheerfully bestowed, to which they have almost acquired a right by prescription. Can you allow a system to continue, as degrading and pernicious to the recipient, as unworthy of and useless to the donor; when the alternative offers itself of converting pauperism into productiveness, privation into affluence, and misery into enjoyment? Can you allow it to be said, that they who associate themselves with every philanthropic movement, who assist in relieving every species of misery, among whatever nation and in whatever clime, should be deaf to appeals in behalf of those nearest to them, —should be insensible to misery of their own flesh and blood?

To our Christian brethren we should say: Your ancestors in ages of darkness were instruments in the accomplishment of the denunciations of our prophets against us: be you in these enlightened days as zealous to obtain the blessings promised to the benefactors of Israel. Remember, it was said, “I shall bless them that bless thee, and curse them that curse thee.” Cooperate with us, assist us, in ameliorating the state of our brethren in the Holy Land.

Palestine might be still, as of old, “a land flowing with milk and honey; a land of wheat, and barley, and vines, and fig trees, and pomegranates; a land of oil olive and honey.” Nor is it less capable of producing silk, cotton, indigo, sugar, coffee, and tobacco. In short, all elements for prosperous agricultural settlements are extant. It is not less the cultivators that call for the land, than the land for the cultivators. All that is necessary for the accomplishment of this object, is capital and security to property. The former, Europe and America in the first instance can supply; the latter must be the result, at first, of protection, and ultimately of a judicious internal government.

The cities of Safed and Tiberias, harbouring a numerous Jewish population, are situated in a district in every respect adapted to an agricultural settlement, it may be seen on reference to the subjoined sketch. It is therefore proposed: —

First, To solicit from the Porte a grant of a portion of land between these cities, now totally waste and useless, under conditions mutually advantageous to the government and the landholders.

Secondly, To allow the settlement its internal government. This is a condition which it is not expected would meet with any obstacle, since such is the actual policy of the Porte towards its Rajah subjects, whose respective nationalities and internal institutions it acknowledges.

Thirdly, To take such measures in the infancy of the settlement as would secure the lives and properties of the settlers, the necessary scope for development, and eventually self-protection.

These objects the Association will endeavour to accomplish by some such methods as the following: —

Address to the Sultan, for permission that Jews might occupy and cultivate, or otherwise turn to use, certain tracts of land, and for authority to form settlements, with privileges of internal government.

Addresses to the Queen, and Foreign Governments, for favourable interference with the Porte.

Petitions to the Legislature with the same view.

Subscriptions for supplying Jews in Palestine with cattle, sheep, horses, agricultural implements, boats for the navigation of the lake of Tiberias and nets for fishing, seeds, cuttings of useful trees and shrubs, and building materials.

Plans and means for improving the ports on the coast, and the roads in the interior, so as to give commerce and trade opportunities for development and increase.

In order that such an association should proceed with harmony, energy, prosperity, and effect, it would, of course, be most essential that its great objects should be worked out with honourable singleness of aim and effort on the part of all its members.

Friends to this great cause, and to such a mode of proceeding, are requested to send their names and addresses (post paid) to any of the gentlemen whose names are subjoined, or to the office of the Jewish Chronicle, 24, Houndsditch; and to proceed to obtain, in the districts in which they respectively reside, lists of patrons and supporters, and to form auxiliary associations in correspondence with the Parent Institution.

Dr. A. Benisch, 10, South-street, Finsbury; W. H. Black, Esq., 7, Bruce-terrace, Tottenham; Montague Leveson, Esq., treasurer, 18, Queen-square, Bloomsbury; Rev. John Mills, 12, King-street, Finsbury; Hugh Owen, Esq., Whitehall; Solomon Sequerra, Esq., Hon. Sec., 8, Bury-street, City. —English Journal.

* * *

“THE KING OF KINGS.”

The following is a leading article, under the above caption, taken from a British weekly journal of a recent date, named The Leader. It speaks, no doubt, truthfully in regard to the present condition of Europe, the platform of the dominions symbolised by the Ten-horned and Two-horned Beasts of the Apocalypse. “As to the greatest powers now triumphing,” says the writer, “who of us can pronounce the future?” Who of them, indeed! Not one. No mere politician can do more than guess. All he can do is to tell us what has been, and what exists; but as to “what shall be hereafter,” he has no data from which to reason out the truth. The problem is too difficult for the thinking of the flesh, unaided by light of revelation. Hence The Leader, who does not seem to suspect that it could find its solution there, gives it up, and in effect confesses, that the wisdom of the world can divine no plausible conjecture of the future of “the powers that be.” But let us hear what he has to say:

“If there is any one thing certain in the future of Europe, it is Revolution. As to the greatest powers now triumphing, who of us can pronounce their future? What insurance office would grant a policy on the life of the Emperor of Russia? What stock-broker of average intelligence and prudence, would give an English price for stock depending on the permanency of the House of Hapsburg? Who would even lay a bet on the position, or even the lodging-place of Louis Napoleon next year? None but a person who would go to a betting office. But that there will be some sweeping change; that these things which are maintained with so much effort, and which rest upon the flesh and bones of great peoples, who are incessantly betraying the torture they endure, must be displaced; that the region of despotism, in short, is only the region of a postponed revolution, such is the one thing certain.

“The outbreak in Milan was not a riot: it was only the irrepressible voice of the Revolution which has lived in Italy for so many years, which the Austrians know to exist among them, but whose whole extent they cannot compass. Like a great phantom, at times they see it in parts, but they cannot discover it. The revolution, indeed, is the only established power in Italy; for it is no construction of ours, but a plain historical fact, that in Absolutist Italy, not one of the Governments has been able to re-establish itself since 1848. They are only defending their possessions by an immense military force; in Rome, by the aid of foreign allies, whose troops remain in position. We have the Pope’s formal declaration to the Austrian minister, so long ago as 1849, —and he would not alter a letter now, —that if the foreign troops were to abandon his capital, he would be at the mercy of the fury of his own people. And we have the vain proclamations of Radetzky and his subordinates, heaping threat upon threat, as a means of frightening the revolution that they cannot extirpate. They cannot command the actions of the Italian people: the Secret Government of Italy can so far command it, that even after a popular movement has been prepared, it can be kept back, with the one exception of the rash men in Milan.

“There is the same uncertainty in other countries. Neither Turkey nor Russia, nor Austria, can dictate to the little province of Montenegro. Turkey sends an army against it, and dares not let that army conquer. Austria can only forbid Turkey, and dares not seize it herself. Russia offers to take it for Turkey, or for the Montenegrins themselves, but dares not grasp it on her own account. In Hungary, the people are all on the quiver, looking out for movements in Italy, and eager for news that Louis Napoleon has ceased to exist. And in Paris, as we learn by our own correspondent, they are already discussing the next revolution, which is said to be close at hand.

“We do not know whether the immense armies of the despots have not somewhat broken from command. They are becoming too big to be fed according to their appetites; wherefore they are growing dissatisfied; for your strong man with a hearty appetite likes to be full, and if he is not full, he is angry. There is many an officer in the armies of Austria and France, who thinks that he has been passed over; and, in retaliation, he is inclined to Passover. Independently of the possibility that Hungarians could not be calculated upon to coerce Italy as of old, and vice versa, there are ambitions in the heart of those armies, that may turn them against their own Governments. These are things not to be calculated beforehand; but unquestionably the people do not everywhere regard the armies as their inveterate enemies. They remember the Garde Francaise, who would not fire upon their countrymen. The latest rebellions of France, of Italy, in short, of Europe, have sickened the people with the ‘rose water’ style of action; and we might hazard a supposition, that in the next popular effort, the aim will be, not so much to fall indiscriminately upon adverse forces—not so much for the

populace to waste its own blood upon a Garde Francaise that may be arrayed against it, but not move against it, —as to call the ringleaders to account. That is the plan which the Absolutists have followed themselves, as well as the indiscriminate mode of attack; for they use both modes. So eager have they been for ringleaders, that they have picked out the mildest type for the harshest punishments—a Poerio, a Simoncelli, a Blum, or a Tazzoli. But the next time that the people have power in their hands, they will remember the perjurers who forget the clemency that they abjectly receive, such as the Bourbons, the Bonapartes, and the Hapsburghers. It is not for us to presume the actions of the people when next they rise in power; but that they will rise once again, and at a year not very far removed, we are certain. Under the protection of immense armies, the Absolutist Kings enjoy the present day; but they are by their own actions doomed, and they will have their hour. Their victims do but await the rising of the power which shall be greater than the oppressors. The only potentate in certain possession of the future is Revolution; that is the King of Kings.”

Thus, the future of Europe is all hypothesis! Yet The Leader thinks that revolution is a certainty, if in that future certainty hath any place. The student of the prophets knows that the future of Europe is more certain than its present; for there is much reported concerning this of a doubtful character; but of the invisible future there is certainty, and no mistake. Revolution is as certain as that the sun shines on a cloudless day. Nothing can stave it off. “The absolutist kings are by their own actions doomed, and they will have their hour.” The Leader is quite prophetic. They are doomed, and their “hour” is fast approaching: and Revolution is the King of Kings by whom they shall be judged.

But revolution made by whom? Who are the great actors in it that shall bring them to account? I answer, not the people. The “Sovereign People” is not the King “to execute upon them the judgment written.” No effort devised against them by King People can finally prosper. Reaction will repress all their endeavours, and only rivet their chains the faster. Democratic turbulence will only temporarily embarrass the kings; but at the same time force them into a position already marked out for them of God, and necessary to the full manifestation of his purpose. This is the usefulness of popular outbreaks—they are the excitants of a new course of policy, which the governments would never have adopted but for the force of circumstances they did not create, and could not control. Thus the present of Europe is all referable to the events of the 24th February, 1848. It attitudinised the powers towards one another, as we now behold them. That crisis was the ring-staple from which the chain of subsequent manifestations is suspended. It has brought out the French empire; another similar outbreak might convert that dominion into a dissolving view; and mould Europe and Turkey into the ferro-aluminous feet of Nebuchadnezzar’s image; but the emancipation of the nations from the kings, who, as Satan’s cabinet, rule them with an iron rod, it could never effect. The people! Sin incarnate. A revolution made by this is The Leader’s “king of kings!” The people is sin; and the oppressors are sin. Sin, armed to the teeth, destroying sinners, is the present of Europe and Asia. But earth is not to be always cursed by such a present. The invisible future—the “Hades” of the word—is pregnant with a revolution to be made by “the man at Jehovah’s right hand, whom he hath made strong for himself.” He being King of kings immortal, will make a triumphant revolution, in which his companions in arms and glory shall “bind sin’s kings with chains, and its nobles with fetters of iron.” “He doth judge and make war in righteousness,” and “overcome them” gloriously. This is the revolution to which they must succumb; this is the convulsion that will deliver Europe from its corruptors and destroyers, and bless all its nations in Abraham and his seed. O that the time were come!

EDITOR.

THE RIVER OF EGYPT.

The promise made to Abraham at Mamre, was in the following terms: "Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates." The question turns on the meaning of the words, "the river of Egypt."

If that river be the same as Sihor, referred to by the prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah, which appears to me almost certain, we are necessarily left to the conclusion that it was a perennial stream passing through a rich agricultural country, and probably navigable.

Isaiah speaks of the "seed of Sihor," and the "harvest of the river," as forming an important part of the revenue of Tyre; and Jeremiah places Sihor, precisely in the same position in reference to Egypt, as the Euphrates in reference to Assyria: treating them both apparently as border streams.

There are three suppositions respecting this river. The first is, that it is the same with the rivulet which runs into the sea near Dair, a few miles to the south of Gaza; the second, that it is the "Torrens Egypti," or torrent of Egypt, which passes about a mile to the north-east of El Arish, and separates the desert from incipient vegetation; the third, that it was the Pelusiatic branch of the Nile. The language of Isaiah certainly seems too magnificent for so small a stream as that of Gaza, though that stream traverses an agricultural region. It is clearly inapplicable to the El Arish torrent; while the descriptions of both the prophets correspond most accurately with the Pelusiatic branch of the Nile.

In confirmation of this being the intended boundary of Palestine, there is reason to believe that from the earliest times, down to the subversion of the native Egyptian dynasties, Pelusium was the frontier town of Egypt. A few centuries later, it appears that Ptolemy I., carried the Egyptian frontier across the desert, and built Rhinocolura in the vicinity of El Arish. Very soon, however, we find the frontier again receding to its own locality, with the addition only of Mons Cassius, a little to the eastward, which was occupied by a garrison of Egyptian Jews. And thus the matter seems to have rested in Roman times.

Again, we find from Josephus, that so far back as the time of Nebuchadnezzar, the frontier of Syria, that is of Palestine, was held to extend across the desert to Pelusium. Though, as Pliny fixes the Arabian or Idumean frontier at Ostracina in his time, it may be presumed that Palestine had then receded to Rhinocolura. Now, whatever title belonged to Palestine in the age of Abraham, was certainly transferred to that Patriarch; and as history leads to the probability that the Pelusiatic branch of the Nile was the boundary between Palestine and Egypt in his day, this certainly aids the conclusion in favour of that river.

Again, so far as the promise itself can be gathered from the actual extension of the Hebrew Territory, Solomon's conquest of the territory of the Idumeans and Amalekites, tends further to show that the Nile was the boundary line.

On the other hand, the Gaza stream is so nearly parallel with Beersheba, that, taken in connexion with the common scripture expression, from "Dan to Beersheba," we might almost be tempted, except for the flowing language of Isaiah, to fix the Sihor here; though an important objection would still remain, in the fact that a considerable tract of fertile country lies to the south of that rivulet.

It would appear, however, that in different ages the intervening desert was regarded by both parties as disputed and border ground: each nation claiming or abandoning it in turn. And whether the title of Abraham extended to the Nile, which seems to me most probable, or fell somewhere short of it, Palestine must always have been partially held to begin where the desert ended, and consequently in the neighbourhood of El Arish.

The “Torrens Egypti,” we may further conclude, came to be considered the boundary of Palestine in Roman times, when the several provinces of the empire were adjusted, and the district beyond that torrent was definitively assigned to the Idumean or Arabian tribes. — Beldam’s Recollections of Italy and the East, vol. 1. pp. 342-345.

* * *

A GLANCE AT THE PAST.

I find the following in the “Apostolic Advocate” for October, 1834: “Mr. Isaac Leeser, reader to the Philadelphia Jewish Synagogue, says in his book, ‘The Jews and the Mosaic Law,’ pp. 35-6, ‘The sacred light of revelation was first lit up in the wilderness of Arabia, and from thence it has commenced spreading all over the globe. In every country some, at least, of the scattered seed of Abraham are to be found; their beautiful code of laws has been partially adopted in many places, and millions of human beings are drinking the waters of revelation, though they derive it from different and polluted channels. Upon the solid rock of our law have the Notzry (Nazarene) and Mohammed built their systems, and though in part erroneous, yet do these systems already acknowledge the true God, his revelation, and his supreme rule. May we not hope that the time will assuredly arrive when not alone the Nazarenes and Mohammedans but all the other families of the earth also will hasten to the Banner raised on the mountains, range themselves behind the ranks of the true believers (Israel) and exclaim ‘The Eternal is the God!’ The Eternal is the God? O happy time! O blessed hour! when our eyes shall behold the Restoration of Zion, the Rebuilding of Jerusalem, and the Temple on Moriah, and the reassembling of the Tribes of Israel!”

Affixed to this extract I find also the following remarks: “All these items of Jewish hope do we, the despised Nazarenes of the apostolic order, earnestly and ardently long for. But, O Jews, remember that the Banner will be lifted up, Zion restored, Jerusalem rebuilt, and the Temple reared (see Ezekiel) by the power of Jesus, the Nazarene, our master, whom your fathers crucified, and upon you shall hereafter look and mourn.”

We penned these remarks about eighteen years ago in that memorable number of the Advocate with the publication of which our editorial troubles began. The Apostolic Advocate, long since out of print, was the first periodical we ever published in connection with things ecclesiastical and scriptural, and this was the sixth number of the first volume. We had then been in some sort connected with Campbellism about two years, during which observation and experience convinced us that it needed regeneration in doctrine, spirit and practice. We commenced this unhopeful work by an article on “Anabaptism,” in number six; which calling in question the validity of immersion predicated on ignorance of the ancient gospel, stirred up the atrabiliousness of those Campbellites, who had been immersed on what they admitted was not the truth; that is, on the premises of Baptistism. In the next number, we began to advocate the second appearing of Jesus in power and great glory; not, however, upon the unscriptural and untenable principles, which some years after obtained currency under the name of

Millerism; but connected with the restoration of the twelve tribes of Israel, and the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the Temple, as above expressed. In about a year after, December 1835, I added to these topics that of immortality, denying the popular dreams, and maintaining that it was the gift of God to those only who believed and OBEYED the gospel, and not conferred till the resurrection and appearing of Christ to ascend the throne of his father, David. This was seventeen years ago; and though stated so long since, is a position still in advance of any writer upon the subject of whom I have heard as yet. We have heard of some advocating the doctrine of “no immortality out of Christ;” but they fall short of a practical application of this great truth, in not being able to lead their readers “into Christ,” for want of a scriptural understanding of “the word of the kingdom,” and the obedience it requires. There is no immortality for a son of Adam since the day of Pentecost, without obedience to the gospel of the kingdom; and a walk worthy of that kingdom and glory to which the gospel thereof invites them. This is my position on the immortality question; and one to which I have been happily led by the oppositions and controversies embattled against me by the advocates of “the immortality of the soul,” and the sky-kingdom gospel of the day.

By a review of the past, I perceive I have been steadily advancing towards the ground I now occupy. My writings which remain prove this. Until some seven years ago, I was advocating the gospel of the kingdom, without discovering that the things pleaded for were its constituents. I advocated them as truths, but by no means as truths the belief of which was essential to a justifying faith. I had been immersed upon the Bethanian historical faith, without concerning myself or being directed to the contemplation of “the exceeding great and precious promises, given through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus the Lord.” When Moses and the prophets with the apostles had opened my blind eyes, I came to discern the barren and unfruitful character of the belief of mere sacred history in relation to justification of life. The past, therefore, I counted as mere dross, and became obedient to the faith, which is “the full assurance of things hoped for, (or promised) the conviction of things unseen.” Thanks be to God for cornering me up to this decision. May the truth drive many to the occupation of the same ground. Christ dwells by faith in the hearts of those who are sealed on their foreheads; and becomes to them their life, henceforth briefly hid for a short space in God. They have the Father sealed, who, like Jesus, are intelligently and faithfully washed bodily in water, and “so put on the holy garment,” even “the righteousness of God.” They are then, in Christ and heirs of immortality, but not before.

Let our respected contemporaries look into this matter, and examine the position above stated. They have been hammering long enough at “no immortality out of Christ.” Their readers, doubtless, all admit it. It is time now to show them how immortality may be obtained in him.

EDITOR.

* * *

OAK-GROVE SUPERSTITION.

In mythology, the Oak is sacred to Jupiter, or Baal. The Druids worshipped in groves of oak, and ever held them sacred. To them they were holy temples, in which were their altars and sacrifices. “The shadow of the oaks was good—an agreeable retreat from the sun’s heat in a weary land. The idolaters assembled under them, after the fashion of a camp-meeting, to “get religion,” or conscience-salvos, through the priests of Baal Jupiter, or Jove—various names for the lord of all the gods. Very discreditable practices were indulged in by the

devout; too gross, indeed, to be named in print. Besides these orgies, they stormed heaven with vain repetitions and loud cries, which they termed prayers—shouting on the top of their voices for Baal to hear them, as if he were asleep, or were absent from home on a hunting expedition. A scene of the kind alluded to, is well described in the Book of Kings.

The Israelites, contaminated by the abominations of the surrounding nations, introduced this oak-grove superstition among themselves. Having forsaken the Jerusalem-Temple worship of Jehovah for the calves of Bethel, they prepared groves of oaks, poplars, and elms, upon the tops of the hills and mountains, and then offered sacrifice and burned incense to the idol-gods of the nations. Thus, God, by the hand of Hosea, writes an accusation against the ten tribes, saying, “They have gone a whoring from their God. They sacrifice upon the tops of the mountains, and burn incense upon the hills, under oaks, and poplars, and elms, because the shadow is good. Their daughters and spouses are separated with whores, and they sacrifice with harlots; therefore the people that doth not understand, shall fall.”

The cruelty, as well as the licentiousness of the Druidical Oak-Grove superstition appears from the inquiry put to Judah through Isaiah: —“Are ye not children of transgression, a seed of falsehood: inflaming yourselves with idols under every green tree, slaying the children in the valleys under the cliffs of the rocks? Upon a lofty and high mountain hast thou set thy bed: even thither wentest thou up to offer sacrifice.” With their hands dyed in the blood of these murders, they passed from the valleys of slaughter to the temple of Jehovah, presuming he would accept an allegiance divided between him and Baal, and all the abominations of his idolatry. “They have committed adultery,” saith Jehovah, “and blood is in their hands, and with their idols have they committed adultery; and have also caused their sons, whom they bare unto me, to pass for them through the fire to devour them. They have defiled my sanctuary in the same day, and have profaned my Sabbaths. For when they had slain their children to their idols, then they came the same day into my sanctuary to profane it”—Ezekiel 23: 37. The most celebrated of these valleys of slaughter was the Vale of Hinnom, southeast of Jerusalem, styled Gehenna in the New Testament, where it is translated “hell.” There, all these abominations were practised in the worst days of Jerusalem’s apostasy, in all their enormity. All classes of the people flocked thither to witness the horrors of the place, as the vile rabble among the Gentiles hasten in crowds to enjoy the spectacle of an execution, and to crack their ribald jests upon the scene—a scene of corporeal death, with benefit of clergy for the immortal soul! !

The earliest account of Oak-Grove superstition is that of scripture. There can be no doubt it was the same as that described by Julius Caesar as obtaining among the aborigines of the British Isles, and termed Druidical. It was probably introduced there by the Phoenicians, or Philistines, neighbours to Israel in Palestine, and traders in the ships of Tarshish to Britannia for lead, iron, and tin; an island they are supposed to have named so from Baratanac, “the Land of Tin.” There is a society in Richmond to which several Israelites belong, styling itself that of “The Ancient Order of Druids.” One of the Jews was appointed to invite me to deliver the annual oration. Had I accepted the appointment, I must have shown them the origin of Druidism in Oak-Grove superstition, and its discreditableness to Israelites who professed to be zealous of the law, and the unity of their nation’s God. But as becoming a Druid myself would have been necessary to my appearance as an orator before them, my popularity with the society was preserved from that ruin which certainly awaits the reputation of those who convict men of wrong in the establishing of the truth.

But the time is fast approaching when Israelites, instead of enrolling themselves in Druidical societies, will be ashamed of all things connected with the rebellion of their fathers against Jehovah. Druidism will fall into contempt when the Mighty One of Israel shall “redeem Zion with judgment, and her returned captives with righteousness. They shall be ashamed of the oaks which ye have desired, and ye shall be confounded for the gardens that ye have chosen. For ye shall be as an oak whose leaf fadeth, and as a garden that hath no water.” Yea, may the time soon arrive when Druidism and all its cognate absurdities and follies, may be abandoned by the Gentiles; and instead thereof, may they rally to Jehovah’s ensign, and in the words of his servant Moses, “Rejoice with his people, when he shall be merciful to Israel, and his land”—Deuteronomy 32: 43.

EDITOR.

* * *

“SOUL IN HELL.”

“David being a prophet, in the name of the Messiah, said: ‘Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell,’ or much rather, ‘Thou wilt not leave my body in the grave;’ “nor,” or much rather, “for thou wilt not suffer thine Holy One to see corruption”—Psalm 16: 10. An express promise we have to this purpose in the fifty-third of Isaiah, that he should be taken from prison and from judgment, and should prolong his days. By this, Messiah was to receive a public testimony of his filiation, of his commission, of the earnest perfection and acceptance of his work, and the first fruits of the reward of the travail of his soul.”—

FREY, author of the Hebrew Grammar and Lexicon.

* * *