

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, JUNE, 1853—  
Volume 3—No. 6

---

THE NEW JERUSALEM EXPLAINED.

“I will write upon him that overcomes the name of New Jerusalem, the city of my God.”—Jesus.

Referring to Revelation 22: 2, 15, a correspondent inquires, “Now, provided the Sin-power be destroyed, and we have all the blessings described in the fourth verse of the chapter before, why do we need the Tree of Life; and why are dogs, sorcerers, &c., said to be without?”

The direct answer to this is, that we have no need; and that dogs, and sorcerers, do not then exist without. This answer, however, is on the hypothesis that “the Sin-power is destroyed,” and that “the blessings” indicated in Revelation 21: 4, are possessed by all the dwellers upon earth, when “the throne of God and of the Lamb” exists in the Age to Come.

But this hypothesis cannot be sustained. The Sin-power is not destroyed until a thousand years after the appearing of the Son of Man in power. It is bruised and chained at his appearing, but not destroyed; as is evident from the prediction that, “when the thousand years are expired, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall go out to deceive the nations which are in the four quarters of the earth, the Gog and the Magog, to gather them together for war; the number being as the sand of the sea.”

“The blessings” referred to are postmillennial. It is true, however, that the saints who possess the kingdom will enjoy those blessings during the thousand years. But then Revelation 21: 4, is not the passage that predicts their consolation. The prophecy relating to them reads thus—“I beheld,” says John, “and lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kingdoms, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands: and they cried with a loud voice saying, ‘The salvation (be ascribed) to him who sits upon the throne of our God, even to the Lamb!’ These are they that came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. Therefore are they before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in his temple; and he that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them. They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more; neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat. For the Lamb who is in the midst of the throne shall feed them, and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters; and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes”—Revelation 7: 9-17. This multitude, whose representative number is 144,000, and their

representative measure 12,000 furlongs square about, 12,000 furlongs high, and walled in by an altitude of 144 cubits, are the gold, and silver, and precious stones, tried in the fire, of whom Paul speaks in part in 1 Corinthians 3: 12, as “built upon the foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner”—Ephesians 2: 20—“a living stone, chosen of God, and precious” to them that believe—1 Peter 2: 4, 7. These are the Lord’s in that day when he makes up his jewels—Malachi 3: 17—the sapphires, agates, carbuncles, and pleasant stones—the children of Jerusalem in her exaltation—Isaiah 54: 11-13, who is the mother of them all—Galatians 4: 26.

These sons and daughters of faith and tribulation are those, who, in the days of their probation, love Jerusalem, and believe the “glorious things God has spoken” concerning her. Believing these promises, they become “the children of the promise who are counted for the seed,” who are to inherit the Gentiles. They therefore stand related to the metropolis, or mother city of their kingdom, as mother and offspring—all of whose children shall be taught of God, and great shall be their peace.

This great multitude has a twofold existence—first, as flesh and blood suffering tribulation; and secondly, as palm trees flourishing in possession of the kingdom of God. In the former state their fortunes, or rather misfortunes, are concurrent with those of Jerusalem as “a woman forsaken and grieved in spirit.” Hence they are described in the Book of Symbols as “the Holy City trodden under foot of the Gentiles forty-two months”—Revelation 11: 2. But, when Jerusalem becomes “free,” and she who now “drinks the dregs of the cup of trembling, and wrings them out,” shall awake and put on her strength, and be endued with her beautiful garments, and the uncircumcised and the unclean come into her no more—Isaiah 51: 17-23; 52: 1—then will the great multitude John beheld awake also, and put on their strength, and beauty, and rejoice in the prosperity of the Holy City, for her glory will be also theirs. Jerusalem is then exalted, and become “the joy of the whole earth.” Well may the poet say on view of this, “If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning. If I do not remember thee, let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth; if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy”—Psalm 137: 5.

“Jerusalem a rejoicing and her people a joy,” compared with anything pertaining to her on former days, is a new Jerusalem—the Hierusalem, “the higher, or more exalted, Jerusalem;” and by virtue of her being the theatre of divine manifestations, and “the throne of the Lord,” she is styled, “the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem,” to which even now all believers come by faith, and rejoice in hope of her glory, of which they are joint-heirs with her “Great King.” This being their relation to her, every one that inherits the glorious things spoken of her, is inscribed with her name; as saith the Lord Jesus in these words, “Upon him that overcomes I will write the name of the city of my God, the New Jerusalem, which descends out of the heaven from my God.” Each of this great multitude, then, is named after the Free Woman subsequently to his resurrection; for it is not till then that their acceptance as those who have by their faith overcome the world’s enticements, is declared. Now Paul teaches that this multitude of resurrected and glorified saints will be caught up to meet the Lord in the air—1 Thessalonians 4: 17; 2 Thessalonians 1: 8. John saw them there in vision, and represents them as those who had gained a victory, standing on a sea of crystal, mingled with fire, and rejoicing—Revelation 15: 2. But these citizens of the New Jerusalem do not always remain “in the air;” for in another vision John saw them as “the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down from God out of the heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband.” But before he saw this, an angel said to him, “Come hither, I will show thee the Bride, the Lamb’s wife.” So “he showed me,” says John, “that great city, the

holy Jerusalem, descending out of the heaven from God.” It is clear from this, that the New Jerusalem John saw was not a city of architecture, but a polity made up of glorified saints. The phrase “the Bride, the Lamb’s wife,” applied to the descending city, proves this. In the nineteenth chapter and eighth verse, she is represented as being “arrayed in fine linen, clean and white;” which white raiment is said to be representative of “the righteousness of the saints;” which is equivalent to saying that the Bride is the aggregate of the saints. They are collectively the Lamb’s wife, according to the teaching of Paul, who says that they are “members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones;” which was Eve’s relation to the first man.

This city, or body corporate, of Jehovah’s glorified sons and daughters, is representatively exhibited and described in Revelation 21: 11, to 22: 5. It is set forth as a city having a great and high wall of Jasper, in which are twelve gates of as many pearls, with wall-foundations of choice stones, each one of the twelve being decorated with all manner of precious stones. These rare and brilliant insets, which highly adorn the State, are worked into pure crystal-like gold, by which the city-multitude of its street, or Broadway—*hee plateia tees poleoos*, is represented. In the midst of this polity is the throne of God and of the Lamb, from which issues a life-inspiring stream that flows along the plateia, refreshing and invigorating all the members of the State. There also stands “the Tree of Life in the midst of the Paradise of God,” nourished by the river which streams amid its roots; “bearing twelve fruits, through one month yielding its separate fruit, and its leaves for the healing of the nations.”

#### THE NEW JERUSALEM WALL.

Such is the municipality of the Kingdom represented by most expressive symbols, which I shall now briefly explain. First, then, of the “great and high wall of Jasper.” The wall is representative of a federal person; and the material, of that person’s preciousness. That “wall” is used of person in Scripture is evident from these texts—“What shall we do for our sister in the day when she shall be spoken for? If she be a wall, we will build upon her a palace of silver. I am a wall, and my breasts like towers: then was I in his eyes as one that found favour.” This is a Bride that has found favour; and she is styled a wall. The Lord said to Jeremiah, “I will make thee unto this people a fenced brazen wall, and they shall fight against thee, but they shall not prevail.” Speaking of Jerusalem delivered from her desolators, Jehovah says, “I will be unto her a wall of fire round about, and will be the glory in the midst of her.” “Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion; for lo, I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord.” The Bride, then, is a wall, and the Lord is a wall to her likewise; for being a wall of fire to the city standing on Mount Zion, he is also a wall to that glorious city’s corporation. The Lord as the wall of the Kingdom’s municipality encloses all its members, who, having been “baptised into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit,” are “in God the Father and in the Lord Jesus”—walled or enclosed in him, which is the idea represented by the symbol.

The enclosure of the New Jerusalem community—the wall; and their “light”—the glory of God—are both represented by transparent jasper stone. “I will be the glory in the midst of her, saith the Lord;” that is, “I will be a stone most precious, even like a jasper stone, clear as crystal unto her.” And this interpretation of the jasper-light of the commonwealth, is sustained by the words of the angel, who says, “And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it; for the glory of God lightens it, and the Lamb is the light thereof.” This is taught without symbol in the prophets. “The man whose name is the Branch,” says Zechariah, “shall bear the glory, and sit and rule upon his throne.”—

“Then,” says Isaiah, “the moon shall be confounded, and the sun ashamed, when the Lord of hosts shall reign on Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously.” These “ancients” are “the City or State, that hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God,” and whose Prince is Christ the Lord, its everlasting light and glory.

The relationship of the Lamb and the Bride in regard to the City Wall, will exemplify the idea of “no temple being there.” The wall of a house or temple is the building itself; for no wall, no building. Believers in Christ in the present evil world are styled in scripture, “the house of God,” and “the temple of God.” “Know ye not,” says Paul to the Corinthians in Christ, “that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?” “Ye are God’s building;” but without the Lamb, that is, not being built into him, they were neither house, temple, nor builded wall. Individually, they were separate and distinct elements, like unconnected stones accumulated for building purposes. While thus, they were neither wall nor temple. But when cut and polished, and built in by the Spirit, through Paul as “a wise masterbuilder;” that is, “constituted the righteousness of God in Christ Jesus,” who became to them “wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption,” they became “One Body,” having him for their head; and therefore, one wall, one temple, and one building with, and inseparable from, him. This being so, such a society needs no temple, being its own temple. This is not to say, that there is no temple in Jerusalem at the time. John’s instructor is not speaking of things unsymbolical pertaining to men in mortal flesh; but to Saints immortalised. Ezekiel treats of the unfigurative, which become symbols in the construction of the Apocalypse. The temple he treats of is the house of prayer for Israel and the nations; but the temple constituted of the Lamb and his Bride, is for them who are “pillars in it, and shall no more go out.”

#### THE PEARL-GATES.

The Twelve Gates of pearls in the wall represent the relationship subsisting between the New Jerusalem Municipality and the Twelve Tribes of Israel. The names inscribed on the gates show that they are representatives of the tribes; and that, consequently, the members of the New Jerusalem community became such by adoption into the Commonwealth of Israel, on an angel-principle, and so “entered in through the gates into the city.” The twelve angels stationed at the gates represent twelve messengers, by whose message, believed and obeyed, the gold and precious stones of the polity came to “enter in through the gates.” The names of these angels or messengers are inscribed upon the twelve foundations of the wall, being “the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb.” These are the angels of the pearly gates of this glorious city, sent by the jasper-light of it to turn men from darkness to light, and to invite them to God’s kingdom of glory. This they did by preaching the gospel of the kingdom for “the obedience of faith;” by which obedience a people were separated from “all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues;” and adopted as citizens of the Commonwealth of Israel, in the hope of that remarkable and favoured nation. They thus became a part of Israel, and therefore styled by Paul “the Israel of God;” which, in its glorified state, with Israel’s God and King in the midst of them, was displayed in vision descending from the air to Mount Zion, before the mind of the apostle John.

The organization of the Israel of God has relation, therefore, to the foundation of the Hebrew Commonwealth in the twelve sons of Israel, and their own engraftment into Israel’s Olive, through the ministration of the twelve apostles, who issued from the tribes. Hence, in other parts of the apocalypse, they are represented by twenty-four elders wearing crowns of gold, who, with the four living creatures full of eyes, explain their own representation in the

songs ascribed to them. When exhibited as a city, the twenty-four are divided into twelves, whose names are inscribed on the gates and foundations of the wall; and the eyes of the living creatures become the garnishing precious stones of each apostle-foundation. They are “the servants of God sealed in their foreheads”—the “144,000 of all the tribes of the children of Israel,” become “Israelites indeed” by that which is sealed upon them: for in relation to the glorified inheritors of Israel’s kingdom, “the flesh profiteth nothing.”

#### THE FOUNDATION-STONES.

Each foundation-stone of the city wall is a great precious stone, “a living stone”—and represents an apostle. Each polished gem would be beautiful alone; but how much more beautiful when decorated by all manner of precious stones beside! The meaning of this symbol is expressed in Paul’s words to those whom he had “sealed on their foreheads,” and brought into fellow-citizenship with the Saints of Israel. “What is our hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at his coming? Ye are our glory and joy.” They were not “wood, hay, and stubble,” but gold, and silver, and precious stones. There is no use for destructible materials, such as wood, hay, and stubble, in God’s municipality; it is only those who stand the fire can be admitted there. Such were many of the apostles’ converts to the faith. They will rejoice together in the presence of the Lord; and those who have been brought to the obedience of the faith by an apostle, will be to him the garnishment of precious stones in the holy city.

The elements of the wall and the precious stones, are built upon the foundation stones. The idea incorporated into this symbol is found in the words—“Ye are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner; in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit;” which in the New Jerusalem association, issues from his throne, and flows through every member of it, as “a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal.”

#### THE MAGNITUDE OF THE CITY.

The idea of “a great multitude which no man can number” constituting the New Jerusalem society, is represented by the symbolical magnitude of the city. Twelve is the radical number, and multiplies by twelve. Twelve thousand were representatively sealed, and identified as a tribe of the Israel of God. Twelve times twelve thousand give the 144,000 on Mount Zion with the Lamb. Each 12,000 occupies a definite space, which is 4000 furlongs square; and for all the thousands representatively stated as 12,000 furlongs square for the whole city, 48,000 furlongs the four square; giving 144,000 furlongs for its sectional contents. The symbolical height of the city is equal to its length and breadth. The height of the wall is twelve times twelve cubits; sufficiently high to indicate the impossibility of “any thing entering into it to defile it,” or that is “not written in the Lamb’s book of life.” Here is multitude innumerable symbolically represented, by 1500 miles length and breadth, and altitude besides; showing, doubtless, that this glorious polity is the medium of connection between the nations of the earth and heaven.

#### NEW JERUSALEM THE MILLENNIAL GOVERNMENT OF THE WORLD.

Such a community as this can need no lamp, or sunlight, to enlighten it; for “there shall be no night there.” Every individual of it will “shine as the brightness of the firmament;

and those of it who have turned many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever.” Being righteous, they shine as the sun; for “the Lord God giveth them light; and they shall reign for ever and ever.”

This saying proves that the New Jerusalem is a community of kings—“they shall reign for ever and ever”—eis tous aionas ton aionon, to the ages of the ages. Over whom shall they reign, and where? “He that overcometh and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations; and he shall rule them with a rod of iron:”—“He shall sit with me on my throne, even as I overcome and sit with my Father in his throne.” In view of these promises the heirs of the kingdom sing in their new song, “Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us unto our God kings and priests; and we shall reign on the earth.” And when the time comes for this to be fulfilled, John sees “thrones,” and he says, “They sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them—and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years.” “And the nations of them that are saved (survive the judgment of the saints) shall walk in the light of it (the New Jerusalem government), and the kings of the earth (the victorious saints) bring their glory and honour into it. And the gates of it shall not be shut at all by day: for there shall be no night there. And they shall bring the glory and the honour of the nations into it.”

“And judgment was given unto them;” that is, says Daniel, “to the saints.” This is their honour. “Let the high praises of God be in their mouth, and a two-edged sword in their hand; to execute vengeance upon the nations, and punishments upon the people: to bind their kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron: to execute upon them the judgment written: this honour have all his saints”—Psalm 149. But the sword only prepares the way for the world’s regeneration. It hews down embattled hindrances to the improvement of mankind; but it adds nothing to the spirituality and intelligence of them that escape. The mission of Christ and his brethren, the saints, is to regenerate the world, as well as to “break in pieces the oppressor;”—to heal the nations of all their maladies of soul, spirit, and estate.

The agency by which this great work is to be accomplished is the Spirit of God operating through Christ, the Apostles, and the rest of the Saints—the New Jerusalem association of God’s kings and priests. This idea is represented by the pure river of living water, the Tree of Life, the twelve fruits, through one month yielding its separate fruit; and the Leaves of the Tree for the healing of the nations. That “a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, issuing from the throne of God and the Lamb,” is the symbol of the Holy Spirit may be perceived from these words: —“I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground: I will pour my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring: and they shall spring up as among the grass, as willows by the water courses.” “If thou knewest the gift of God, thou wouldest have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water.” “He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of him shall flow rivers of living water. This spake he of the Spirit, which they that believed on him should receive.”

#### THE TREE OF THE KINGDOM.

What the Tree of Life represents may be learned from the following texts. “Wisdom is a tree of life to them that lay hold upon her.” “Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is. For he shall be as a tree planted by the waters, which spreadeth out her roots by the river, and shall not see when heat cometh, but her leaf shall be green;

and shall not be careful in the year of drought, neither shall cease from yielding fruit.” “What is the vine tree more than any tree?” This text from Ezekiel shows that in the scripture style, the vine is regarded as a tree. “I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit, he taketh away; and every branch that beareth fruit, he purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit. I am the Vine,” continued Jesus to his apostles, “ye are the Branches. He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for severed from me ye can do nothing.”

“In the Word was life; and the life was the light of men.” That Word was made flesh, and named Jesus, who proclaimed himself the resurrection and the life. Hence, as the true vine, he is the Tree of Life, watered by the Spirit, which he received without measure. He is “a tree of life to them who lay hold upon him;” for he is “the power and wisdom of God unto them which are called.” In the book of symbols, Christ on the throne of his kingdom, and encompassed by the 144,000, is represented as “the Tree of Life in the midst of the Paradise of God.” “I am,” said Jesus, “the bread of life which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world. If any man eat of this bread he shall live—eis ton aiona, in the age.” Hence, one of the inducements set before the faithful to overcome, is, in the words of Jesus, “I will give him to eat of the Tree of Life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God;” and “Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the Tree of Life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.”

To eat of this tree is to become one of the leaves of it; and to partake, consequently, of that nourishment which rises from the root through the stem and branches thereof. This life-sustaining and invigorating principle, is that “pure water of life” which issues forth from the throne, and maintains the tree in everlasting freshness and beauty. It is the Tree of the Kingdom to which Jesus referred when he said, “The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and sowed in his field; which indeed is the least of all seeds: but when it is grown it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof.” The birds of the air are the chiefs of the nations, which saved-nations seek its fruit from one new moon to another ministered to them by its healing leaves.

#### THE HEALING-LEAVES.

The Leaves of the Tree for the healing of the nations. That is, the water of life is health-imparting to the saved-nations through the Leaves of the Tree of Life. The apostles being the branches of the true vine-tree, those who are ingrafted into that vine by the obedience of faith through their testimony, are the leaves, or breathing organs, of the tree. The Spirit that issues from the throne of God and the Lamb will breathe upon the conquered nations through the Saints, who then “possess the kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven.” He breathed upon the 3000 Pentecostians through the Apostles; and the result was, their acceptance of Jesus as King of the Jews, raised up from the dead to sit on David’s throne; and obedience to the kingdom’s gospel in his name. “He breathes where he pleases.” He breathed in Jerusalem of old; he will breathe thence anew; not upon a few thousand Jews only, and through twelve men of Israel; but through “a great multitude which no man can number,” upon all the millennial nations of the earth; so that as a consequence, “the knowledge of the glory of Jehovah shall fill the earth, as the waters cover the sea.” Then “shall the Gentiles come unto Him from the ends of the earth, and shall say, ‘Surely our fathers have inherited lies, vanity, and things wherein there is no profit.’”

That “a leaf,” or leaves, when used metaphorically in Scripture signifies a person, will appear from the following texts. Job, in his reasoning with God concerning his hapless condition, says, “Wherefore holdest thou me for thine enemy? Wilt thou break a leaf driven to and fro?” That is, “I am a leaf, as it were, driven to and fro, wilt thou break me?” as it were, that is, metaphorically. Isaiah addressing the transgressors in Israel, who practised idolatrous rites in gardens and under oak trees there, says to them collectively, “Ye shall be ashamed of the oaks ye have desired, and ye shall be confounded for the gardens ye have chosen. For ye shall be as an oak whose leaf fadeth, and as a garden that hath no water.” In this, apostate Israel in church and state is likened to a withered oak, and a parched-up garden, the very opposite similitude to that in the apocalypse, where the government of their nation is likened to a tree of life; that is, to one whose leaf shall not fade; and to a well-watered garden, “the Paradise of God.” The dried leaves of Israel’s withered oak have done nothing for the nations, which are unhealed to this day; and will so remain for ever, unless their olive tree do “blossom and bud, and fill the face of the world with fruit.” But, let the reader mark the figure, how that trees are used in Scripture sometimes as representative of polities, good or bad according to the nature and condition of the trees.

There is a notable instance of this in Daniel. Nebuchadnezzar in a dream that he had, describes a tree he saw, saying, “I saw, and behold, a tree in the midst of the earth, and the altitude thereof was great. The tree grew, and was strong, and the height thereof reached unto the heaven, and the sight thereof to the end of all the earth: the leaves thereof were fair, and the fruit thereof much, and on it meat for all; the beasts of the field had shadow under it, and the fowls of the heaven dwelt in the boughs thereof, and all flesh was fed of it.” This tree was representative of “the kingdom of men,” on whose Chaldean throne Nebuchadnezzar reigned as king. Hence, Daniel said, in showing the significance of the tree, “It is thou (or thy kingdom), O king, that art grown and become strong: for thy greatness is grown, and reacheth unto heaven, and thy dominion to the end of the earth.” The stump of the tree when felled, banded with brass and iron, was the kingdom of Babylon during the seven years of its king’s dethronement, made sure to him on the recovery of his reason. The fair leaves of this tree which were shaken off, were the nobles and dignitaries of the kingdom detached from all connexion with Nebuchadnezzar during the days of his calamity.

The passage already quoted from Jeremiah shows that a person is likened to a tree as well as a kingdom; and that his excellency is manifested in the condition of its leaf, and fruit-bearing quality. When a tree represents a body corporate, its foliage is generally expressed by the plural “leaves,” but when only one person is meant, the singular is used, as “leaf.” Thus, it is written in David, speaking of the man who is blessed, “He shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; his leaf also shall not fade: and whatsoever he doeth shall prosper.” This is predicable of the blessed men when he is a leaf among the leaves of the tree of life—whatsoever he doeth then shall prosper. By synecdoche, a leaf for a tree represents a man; as an eye in the apocalyptic living creatures symbolises an individual; the rule being, a part for the whole for the decorum of the symbol. A multitude of eyes, and a multitude of leaves, are a multitude of people, constituting a community, incorporated into a divine polity in that represented by the tree-stock, and the cherubic creatures—fire, light, and spirit, the symbols of the God-head in manifestation through body, styled “God manifest in the flesh.”

I trust that the reader will now be able to answer the question scripturally and rationally, “What is represented by the apocalyptic city of gold and precious stones? And what by the throne, the river, and the tree of life?” They are all things representative of Christ

and his breastplate-Saints \* in their governmental relations to the millennial nations. There is one point, however, I have only hinted at in my exposition, which I will briefly notice here. The common version reads, “the tree of life which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month.” The words in bold type were inserted by the translators to make out what they conceived to be the sense. Their rendering, however, is not satisfactory. The words are, a tree of life, producing twelve fruits, through one month yielding its separate fruit. In this rendering no supplemental words are introduced. But what is the meaning of it? I believe that it is symbolical of something already declared by the prophets; for the whole book of the apocalypse is a symbolical representation of “the mystery of God as he hath declared to his servants the prophets.” In these writings he has promised blessedness and saving health to all nations; and we read of them saying in their convalescence, “Come and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways.” Who will teach them? He who is the tree of life in the Paradise, or Garden of God. He will then produce, or reveal knowledge, pertaining to “his ways,” which knowledge is contained in “the Law” and in “the Word,” which are to go forth from Zion and Jerusalem. The law and the word of God will issue from his throne through his king, through stated times, or “from one new moon to another.” The “twelve fruits of the tree of life,” are the knowledge of good tending to life, being made known in all the year. Fruit is anything produced. It is not produced to all the world at once; that is, in a single month: but at every new moon of the year’s twelve shall strangers present themselves in Jerusalem for instruction, “and from one Sabbath to another.” The tree produces the knowledge, the leaves yield it to the nations, according to the administrative institutions of the new constitution and order of things; which I understand to be represented in the text before us.

It will hardly be necessary, I think, after this exposition, to say much about the “dogs and sorcerers without”—the Gentiles and teachers which they have heaped up to themselves after their own lusts. It must be obvious to every one that there can be none such within: but that the words are strictly true in the very nature of things, that “there can in no wise enter into it anything that defileth; but only those written in the book of the Lamb’s life.” The Lamb’s life-community is the world’s unchangeable government for a thousand years. Flesh and blood cannot be a constituent of that government. It is “without;” and until that government is triumphantly established, it is in open rebellion, cursing, and wailing, and gnashing its teeth. But of this hereafter at a more convenient opportunity.

EDITOR.

\* Aaron under his foursquare breastplate of judgment, the Urim and Thummim, the ephod, gold, blue, purple, scarlet, and fine twined linen in the most holy place, was a type of the New Jerusalem; that is, of Christ and his Saints in glory. Compare Aaron’s foursquare with the foursquare of the Apocalypse, Exodus 28. Concerning Christ as the precious seven-eyed stone “like a jasper and sardius to look upon,” Jehovah says, “I will engrave the graving thereof,” which graving is represented in the workmanship and names engraved on the gates and foundations of the city.

\* \* \*

## LETTER TO ALESSANDRO GAVAZZI.

Modern Protestantism an interest, not a principle—Adverse Politicals advocate it, and flatter its enemies, for the sake of their votes—Lying the order of the day—The oldest Church of Christ in Rome, Jewish and not Italian—“Catholic” a name of faction—No “Catholics” in Peter’s day—The Church of Christ in Rome not the “Church of Rome”—The Catholic faction Paganised into the Catholic Church of Rome under Constantine—This Emperor Pagan, Pontiff, and Catholic Hierophant—Christianity defined—not intended for a political constitution—The Nations and their Governments the enemies of God—Popery cannot be annihilated till Christ comes—Signor Gavazzi and the mark of the Beast—The good news of the Gospel indicated—The Israelitish kingdom and empire of the future—Christ and his brethren to subdue the nations and enlighten the world.

Dear Sir—Though neither papist, protestant, nor “Roman Catholic of Peter’s time,” I have not been altogether an unconcerned observer of your endeavours in this great Babel of the West. I sympathise with the efforts of all, of whatever race or nation, who seek to emancipate the human mind from the bondage and tyranny of sin, superstition, and unbelief. For this reason I sympathise with you, and wish you God speed, and great success.

In reading a brief report of your speeches, I perceived that some things had fallen from your lips which evinced that you were considerably in advance of the current Protestantism of this cloudy and dark day. This discovery afforded me real gratification. The Protestantism of this country is but a fashionable Demas, competing with popery for the votes of the Democracy, which at heart they both cordially despise. Soul-saving is the pretext; the loaves and fishes of the state, daily sumptuousness, and power, the real end of the enlargement of their phylacteries before the people. The Protestantism of Luther, Calvin and Wesley, has doctrinally accomplished all it is capable of against Romanism in its papal manifestation. “The Reformers” all erred in supposing that popery could be reformed; and in admitting that the Roman Catholic church was ever a true church. You admit this in part. In so far then we are agreed. No independent mind enlightened by Moses and the prophets, Christ and the apostles, thinks of paying any regard to an Episcopalian, Presbyterian, or Methodist protest against popery; for if the papal church be the “Mother of harlots” as they say, they are unquestionably “the daughters”—the “women” of Revelation 14: 4. As you truly remark, therefore, “to protest against popery is very little:” hence the position you have assumed is great and impregnable, to protest against all sects, and to “preach Christianity as it was in the early church.” This is what few can do. I have heard of no man in this city competent to the task. There are many pretenders; but “a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth,” is yet a desideratum for this corrupt, blind, and demoralised community. The gospel preached by the apostles is unknown, and supplanted by “philosophy and vain deceit” for the entertainment of the “itching ears” which have heaped up to themselves pulpit orators after their own lusts. Antique spiritual bazaars, luxuriously embellished, whose pews are auctioned off to the highest bidder, are the places of resort they call “churches”—places of spiritual merchandise, where papist and protestant priests make long prayers, and wrest the scriptures to please the taste of the sinners who hire them to cure their souls. This is the “religion” of the world here—a religion of fashion, lust, and intense selfishness, which leaves the people to “perish for lack of knowledge.” It circulates the Bible indeed; but at the same time pronounces Moses and the prophets unintelligible, and represses with bitterness all truth not represented in their miserable sectarian creeds, and confessions of faith. From such a system, gospel-liberty and enlightenment are not to be expected. Fostered by such Protestantism as this, popery is a deadly viper warming into virulence destructive of every good. Italy and Hungary have nothing to hope for from its sympathies, unless indeed, gold and diamonds may be extracted from their soil in more than Californian or Australian superfluity. In that event, Protestantism would evince all due alacrity in filibustering against

Austria for the annexation of those countries to the land of liberty and the model Republic of the world.

Your case, Signor Caro, would have been a dead failure, if in the opening of your brief you had proclaimed yourself the champion of Protestantism. If you had assumed this position you would have been vulnerable at all sides, and could only have defended yourself, as protestants do, by proving that of two blacks popery is the blacker most intensely. So long as you advocate that Christianity found in the Bible without regard to popery and Protestantism, Archbishop Hughes, the representative of the Beast's Image in this city will take special care how he troubles himself with so inconvenient an antagonist. If I mistake not the man, he has assailed Protestantism in newspaper controversy with a Presbyterian champion named Breckenridge, whom he gained a decided advantage over on the question of baby-rhantism, or sprinkling. This you know, Signor, is not taught in the Bible, but is a dogma of the Apostasy established by papal authority. Hughes maintained this, and urged truly that the protestant "baptism" was a popish institution; and that if popery were proved to be a lie, baby-sprinkling was a part of that lie; and as protestant creeds made it essential to salvation, as proved by John 3: 5, no protestant could enter the kingdom of God; in which conclusion more truth than fiction is contained. Hughes has the soul of a Jesuit, and consequently all the serpent-cunning of that creature, but with none of the harmlessness of the dove, where he can bite without being bitten. He fears you doubtless as you now stand. Beware, however, of the protestant Jesuitism of the political press. If dagger "John" of New York, Cardinal expectant, make any move against you, it will probably be by setting his underlings to work upon the fears of the editors, who, instead of being the enlightened leaders of the people in the way of truth and righteousness, are the mere breath of political factions, whose "principles" are summarily expressed in the proverb "to the victor belong the spoils." The popish vote in this city is very great, and can be controlled here as in other parts of Papal-dom, by a corrupt and vicious priesthood. In view of this influence the party editors are cap in hand to the priests especially, whose motto is that also of the clergy of all sects, "disturb not that which is quiet." Hence they are very sensitive on the subject of religious controversy. They readily endorse that maxim of a rotten cause so ardently cherished by all who live by it, that "controversy is dangerous to religion." The political editors know how repugnant it is to the priests or clergy of the Old Mother and her Daughters to have their creeds and confessions unceremoniously scrutinised and tested by scripture; they therefore repress all such investigation with the understanding that they will direct their pious influence in the true channel of political orthodoxy. Do you think that a Whig editor's sympathy for human liberty and detestation of Austrian and papal cruelty is so hearty and disinterested that he would do and say in New York what he would in London? By no means. He might be very eloquent upon the platform at Exeter Hall in behalf of liberty and the Bible; and even threaten the tyrant with America's frowns and indignant sympathy with the oppressed; but come you, Signor Gavazzi, to this Babel of the West, and deliver the same sentiments, and speak for God as well as for man, and denounce that Roman Mountebank, the ninth of his official name—expose the demoniac hypocrisy and impiety of him, his system and his priests—show up the imposture naked before the public, and demonstrate "the mystery of iniquity" they incarnate—and that same hypocritical politician will denounce you for a sower of discord among brethren: for if he were to stand by his transatlantic eloquence, he would offend the priests, and they might alienate the votes of papists from Whiggery to its rivals. I speak this not alone of Whig editors, but of Democratic and other faction writers, also—*ex uno disce omnes*.

This is the philosophy of that denunciation you recently experienced from these same editorial partisans for stripping off the veil from the hideous idol to which they burn incense

for the votes of its besotted worshippers, but whose idolatry they neither love nor venerate. You say truly that “popery is essentially against all freedom, and therefore against all republics.” I endeavoured to convince the citizens of Louisville, Ky., of this truth while incognito editor of a daily paper in that city in 1843, at the time of the popish excitement in Philadelphia. The paper was denounced by Whigs and Democrats, and the Jesuits for a piratical craft. The Whig Presidential electioneering procession halted opposite the office, and yelled forth groans and hisses against the Louisville Tribune, a paper advocating the election of their candidate, Henry Clay; and some proposed the demolishing of the press and types, because this same paper, in showing the essential and historical hostility of popery to liberty, and the well-being of society, it was apprehended would alienate some Romish votes from their political idol. About the same time the elections for the State Legislature were coming on. The Louisville Tribune created quite a panic in this direction also. One of the candidates visited the office under great excitement, demanding what they were all doing there, and exclaiming that he had lost two hundred votes by the articles on popery in the Tribune. He was given to understand that they were “publishing the truth as nearly as could be ascertained.” “Yes,” said he, “but the truth must not be told.” He was, however, informed, that so long as the Tribune was published there, there was no help for it; it must and would be told. He asked permission to publish a card. It was granted. It was a laudation of the Romish priesthood, telling what fine fellows they were, and how intimate he had been with several of them for years, &c.; but apprehending he might be taken for a papist, and so lose more protestant votes than he would gain, recover, or retain by flattering the priests, he abruptly concluded his “card” by saying, “I am a protestant.” This anecdote, now first reduced to writing, may illustrate to you the relations of politics in this country to its multifarious and multitudinous sectarianism. Mormonism, a mushroom imposture of the baldest character, is flattered and fawned upon by editors who despise it, for the sake of its votes. This was notorious in the election of Governor Ford, of Illinois, under whose administration they were afterwards expelled from Nauvoo by force of arms. God’s unadulterated truth, then, need expect no quarters from protestant political editors and partisans; therefore, Signor, give none. Tell the truth as fully, and as fast as you learn it, and put them all to shame. Annihilate popery if you can. There is no harm in trying; though you are certain not to succeed: for in the providence of God both popery and Protestantism have a mission to perform. Their natural antagonism in the old world is bringing on a crisis which will be the ruin of them both. But their destruction is neither in your power nor mine, nor in that of all the disaffected throughout antichrist’s dominion. If you have the ear of the Italians, show them what the truth is as preached by the Apostles, and leave the death and damnation of the apostasy unto God.

You are reported to have said, that you are “not a protestant in any sectarian sense, and wish to be called rather by the name of Roman Catholic.” But why by this? “Because,” say you, “the Roman Catholic church is the most ancient church in Europe, and you wish to be considered a Roman Catholic of Peter’s time, before the church had become vitiated and corrupt.” But, Signor Gavazzi, why not be satisfied with a scripture designation? Where in all the Bible you advocate, do you find any mention of Roman Catholics, or a Roman Catholic Church? We find there a letter from Paul to all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called saints, “whose faith was celebrated among the faithful throughout the whole empire of that city.” Now for several years after the ascension of Jesus, even until Peter visited the house of Cornelius in Caesarea the only Christians in Rome were converted Israelites, and not Italians. The gospel of the kingdom was introduced to Rome by neither Peter nor Paul, but by “Roman strangers, being Jews and proselytes”—Acts 2: 10—who heard the Apostles and obeyed the things they taught on Pentecost. When these, on their return from the celebration of Pentecost, carried the doctrine of Christ to Rome, that city was Pagan, and so continued, in fact and

name, until Constantine revolutionised it. The Christian Jews in Rome were collectively the church of Christ in Rome; but so far from being “Catholic”—universal, or general, they were a small minority, compared with the population of unbelieving Jews and pagan citizens of Rome. The saints never were catholic, and for years were not even Roman, or Italian, but Jews. These Christian Jews were the “One Body” in Rome, not of Rome, nor the Roman Body; but the one Body of the “One Lord,” having the “One Faith,” and washed with the “One Baptism,” and animated by the “One Spirit,” and called with the “One Hope,” by the commandment of the “One God and Father.” I repeat it—this was not the Roman Catholic Church. This church does not appear in history until many years after, and was an apostasy—“a falling away” from the One Body of the Lord.

When the mystery of the Fellow-heirship of the Gentiles with Christ was revealed, they were admitted to the fellow-heirship of believing Jews in Rome and elsewhere; and became partakers of God’s promise in Christ by the gospel believed and obeyed. See Ephesians 3: 6, and Romans 16: 25-26; Acts 10. The church in Rome, then, assumed a mixed character. It was composed of Jews and Gentiles, who thus became brethren and “one in Christ Jesus.” In process of time, “blindness in part happened to Israel,” and the church ceased to be recruited from among the Jews. The church in Rome, then, came to consist only of believing Gentiles who had been immersed into Christ, and so united to his name, and therefore called Christian. The blindness of Israel was infectious. It extended itself to the Gentiles, who were becoming “wise in their own conceit;” and however sound in doctrinal theory, they did not continue in “the love of the truth that they might be saved: and for this cause God sent upon them a strong delusion, that they should believe a lie: that all might be condemned who believed NOT THE truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.” The Gentile professors went on from bad to worse, until their bloody quarrels excited the reprobation of the idolaters.

In 251, a schism occurred in the church at Rome by means of Novatian, one of its elders. Many drew off with him, and formed a community entirely distinct from that which fellowshiped the bishop. Their adversaries confess they were sound in the faith, though excessively rigid and severe. The seceders (and you call yourself a “Seceder,” Signor) were called “Cathari,” or pure, because they contended for virtue, innocency, and purity in the lives of all who belonged to the christian church; the contrary of which obtained in the generality to a lamentable degree. It was now that the distinction arose which has continued to this day. The majority who courted popular applause, and sided with the chief bishop, or elder of the church, were called Catholic, and those who seceded, no matter on what account, were styled Heretic.

In consequence of this division, instead of there being a church of Rome, there were TWO RIVAL CHURCHES IN ROME. This was in A.D. 251, nearly two hundred and twenty years after the introduction of the gospel to that city by the Jews, who had heard Peter on Pentecost. There was no Catholic Church heard of until this date. The chief overseer, who afterwards grew into a full-blown Pope by favour of Justinian, Phocas, and Charlemagne, was the Head of the Catholic Party. Now you reject that head, how then can you claim to be a Catholic? If you contend for fellowship with the most ancient church in Europe, you must renounce the Roman Catholic, and identify yourself with the older body existing there before any Gentiles or Italians were admitted to its fellowship. This was the church in Rome in Peter’s time; a church that knew nothing of Popes, Cardinals, Archbishops, Monks, Friars, Nuns, or priests’ harlots, or any other hypocrisy and abominations. The Saints in Rome were all God’s clergy or lot; his sons and daughters, without distinction of clergy and laity, “kings

and priests” elected for the kingdom soon to be established on the ruins of the kingdoms, empires, and republics of the world.

It is unnecessary for me to trace minutely the history of the Novatian Church and the Catholic Church in Rome. In their beginning they were neither of them “the Church of Rome,” because the Italians of that city were catholically, or generally, pagans, the christians indeed and in name being only the exception to the rule. If you were settled in New York as pastor of a congregation of two or three hundred Italians, would you be justified in calling your little flock “the church of New York,” by which it would be understood that all its citizens belonged to your church, or that you claimed jurisdiction over them as the pastor or “Archbishop,” or Pope of New York? Would not all your contemporaries here hold your pretensions in perfect and well-merited contempt? It would have been so with the Novatian and Catholic Churches in Rome had they either of them in their beginning assumed the title of the Church of Rome. There was no Church of Rome claiming ecclesiastical jurisdiction over its citizens in A.D. 251. If the title “Church of Rome” be admissible at all, it is only in a pagan sense of the term. The Emperor being *ex officio* “supreme pontiff,” was the head of that church which, at that time, was the true church in the estimation of all Italians, save the comparatively few, identified with the proscribed faith.

But the Church of Rome did not always continue strictly pagan. Its constitution was modified by the revolution which changed the form of the Roman Government in A.D. 312. Till this date all its pontiffs, from Julius Caesar to Maxentius, were priests of Jupiter and his companion gods, to whom they sacrificed hogs, fit emblems of the worshippers. The God of Israel, and his King, the crucified Nazarene, found no favour in their eyes; but were the objects of persecution and hatred in the persons of the saints. But in the beginning of the fourth century an Emperor appeared, whose admiration for Apollo and Christ, the Gods and the Martyrs, was pretty nearly balanced, but leaning rather more towards Christ and the Martyrs than towards the others. This man, styled Constantine the Great, was reputed a christian by the Catholic party for fourteen years, although he was not immersed until three days before his death. As a proof of his double-mindedness, I would remind you that he enjoined the solemn observance of the Lord’s Day, which he called the day of the sun, *Die Solis*, after his favourite god; and in the same year, A.D. 321, directed the regular consultation of *Auruspices*; and during all this time he was permitted to enjoy most of the privileges of the Catholic Church, praying with the members, preaching on theology, celebrating with “sacred rites” the vigil of Easter, and publicly announced himself not only a partaker, but, in some measure, a priest and hierophant of the “christian mysteries.”

Thus, the Roman World now saw for the first time a “Pontifex Maximus” who officiated for Israel’s God, and the sun, &c.! Subsequently to his imperfect proselytism to Catholicity, he caused his son Crispus, of whom he was jealous, to be put to death. Here, then, we have a semi-pagan and a murderer placed by a successful revolution at the head of the pagan church of Rome. He was the type of his body the church, as Christ is of his. The revolutionised church of Rome was a den of thieves and murderers, robbers, and slayers of heretics, as before the revolution it was of all who professed Christianity of any kind.

Now, Signor Gavazzi, which of the two schisms in Rome expanded into the church of Rome, the Novatian or the Catholic? You will, doubtless, answer—the Catholic. You are right. The Novatians separated from the Catholics before they assumed that name, because of their having abandoned “the love of the truth,” and the practice of it. So that catholic is but another term for apostasy. It has always been associated with sin in all its manifestations of

superstition, bigotry, hypocrisy, cruelty and crime. The best men having seceded from the church in Rome, the vicious majority that remained had free scope for the next sixty years to mature their ambitious projects; which was, by the strengthening of the catholic influence, through the proselyting of multitudes, and the favour of infidel politicians, with whom paganism and catholicity, as popery and Protestantism are now, were but tools that knaves do work with, to make such a revolution as would give the Catholic Clergy the loaves and fishes of the State, then monopolised by their rivals and persecutors, the priests of Jupiter and his court. From A.D. 270, to the end of the century, “ecclesiastical discipline,” says the historian, “which had been too strict, was now relaxed exceedingly: bishops and people were in a state of malice; endless quarrels were fomented among contending parties; and ambition and covetousness, had, in general, gained the ascendancy in the Christian Church. Notwithstanding this decline both of zeal and principle; notwithstanding this scarcity of evangelical graces and fruits, still Christian worship was constantly attended, and the number of nominal converts was increasing; but the faith of Christ itself appeared now an ordinary business.” Eusebius the historian, himself a catholic of that period, says, “We heaped sin upon sin, judging, like careless Epicureans, that God cared not for our sins, nor would ever visit us on account of them. And our pretended shepherds, laying aside the rule of godliness, practised among themselves contention and division.” A perfect type of things existing now.

Such was the Catholic church in Rome, and indeed the Catholic faction or schism throughout Italy and Gaul, when the ambitious Constantine conceived the project of becoming sole emperor of the Roman world. Himself a fugitive in Britain from imperial designs upon his life, he naturally entertained a fellow feeling for others similarly circumstanced. He became therefore a banner for the disaffected unfurled for a revolution the most remarkable in the history of the empire. His armies were crowded with Catholics, whose champion he had become, and it soon became manifest, that the real struggle was between that corrupt party and the partisans of the pagan church for ascendancy in the State. The catholic woman and her man-child triumphed; and being therefore enthroned, they seized upon the temples of the gods, and ejected their priests. They superseded the gods by the ghosts of the martyrs, to which they dedicated the temples, and appointed the catholic clergy to officiate at their altars in the character of priests. Thus, instead of Christianising paganism, Catholicism was paganised, and expanded into the church of Rome; which in the fulness of its development, and loaded with the fruit peculiar to it, stands before the nations as “the Mother of Harlots, and of all the abominations of the earth.”

From what has been said, then, it has been made to appear clearly, that you are mistaken in the supposition, that the Roman Catholic church is the most ancient church in Europe; and that there were any Roman Catholics in Peter’s time. Such a church, and such Catholics, were altogether unheard of and unknown. Their church is a schism, and themselves Schismatics. I trust, therefore, you will renounce “Roman Catholic” as a name, as well as papist. Bible names for Bible things; no human nomenclature can better designate the things of the Spirit than the Spirit’s own words and phrases.

New Testament Christianity was not promulgated as a civil and ecclesiastical constitution for peoples and nations. It appears to me, from the reports of your speeches, that you think it was. Hence, you talk about “Italians being Roman Catholics because they are Italians,” by which you intimate that they are Christians of the early church, because they are Italians. But, as I have shown, Christianity is not a specialty of Italians, though Roman Catholicism is. This is the mother schism, and peculiar to Rome. Lutheranism is German popery Lutheranised; Presbyterianism, Scotch popery Calvinised, and so forth. These

modifications of Romanism are all political systems, and constitutionally suited to English, German, and Scotch peoples, as civil and ecclesiastical constitutions. But it is not so with Christianity, which is utterly at variance with them all in doctrine, aim, and practice. CHRISTIANITY is “the Gospel of the kingdom” for the obedience of faith, with the “all things” enjoined upon the baptised by the apostles. This is the best definition I can give in Bible terms to a word which does not occur in the Scriptures. The Gospel of the kingdom is an invitation to Jews and Gentiles to become heirs of God’s kingdom and glory, on condition of believing “the things of the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ,” and being immersed into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit— Acts 8: 12. They are invited to separate themselves from the institutions of the nations, which are of no spiritual account in the affair of salvation. In believing and obeying the truth, this separation is effected; and though the believers live under the schismatic constitutions of the Gentiles, as Jewish Christians in Palestine lived under the Mosaic constitution, they have no use for them as spiritual institutions. You may see from Acts 15: 7-19, that God sent the Gospel invitation to the Gentiles “to take out of them A PEOPLE for his name.” If there be a hundred bushels of grain, and I “take out of them” ten quarts, that is surely very different to taking the whole bulk. God sent the Gospel to Rome, not to take all Italians for his people; but to take out from among them some who by obedience should become his people. The Italians are constitutionally the Pope’s people, as the Turks are Mohammed’s, and the Greeks are the Russian Autocrat’s. If Italians would become people of God, they must separate themselves from every form of Roman Catholicism by believing the gospel of the kingdom and obeying it. Let me press this point upon you, Signor. “If judgment begin at the house of God,” says Peter, “what shall the end be of them who obey not the gospel?” Hear what Paul says in answer to this question. “The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with the angels of his power in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.” A man may protest against popery, or he may annihilate it; he may by his eloquence create a sympathy for the down-trodden of all nations, and kill his ten thousands of the Philistines in battling for liberty and the rights of man—but what of all that? Is he therefore justified from all his past sins, and has he thereby acquired a right to the kingdom and eternal life? By no means. These are only to be obtained by believing the gospel and obeying it, and thenceforth living a sober, righteous, and godly life in this present evil world.

I would enquire, how can one of Peter’s church, or rather Christ’s in Peter’s time, scripturally become the advocate either of peoples or of their oppressors? The peoples of the world are sinners by nature and practice, living in their sins, and therefore enemies of God. These sinful peoples constitute the world; and the Scripture saith, “the friendship of the world is enmity with God. Whosoever, therefore, will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God.” Again, “If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him.” “Whosoever is born of God overcometh the world; and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.” And again, “If I yet pleased men (the world), I should not be the servant of Christ.” This separation from sinners is a great principle of Christianity, and quite incompatible with the christian’s advocacy of the people’s cause against their oppressors. A christian can only lawfully plead the cause of God and the Gospel, against which both oppressors and the oppressed are united in the strictest fellowship and alliance. They may hate one another cordially, but they do not therefore love God the more; for, saith he, “if ye love me, do what I command you;” for “love is the fulfilling of the law.”

I am glad to see, Signor Gavazzi, that though mistaken on some important points, you are in advance of protestants generally upon others. You believe in the personal appearing of

Jesus Christ to establish in Palestine a kingdom of universal dominion and justice; also in the restoration of the scattered tribe of Israel to their fatherland; and that the time is fast coming when all denominations will disappear. These points believed, and added to your desire to “preach Christianity as it was in the early church,” “to preach the religion of Christ among the American people,” with your recent quotation of the condition of salvation, that “he who believes the gospel and is baptised shall be saved”—give me great hopes of you, that you are capable of receiving the way of the Lord more perfectly; and may be turned from the bootless effort of annihilating popery, and pleading the hopeless cause of sinners with sinners against their oppressors, to the more exalted mission of beseeching your hearers to be reconciled to God upon the stipulations presented in the Gospel of the kingdom.

But to qualify one’s self for this mission, we must understand and obey the truth ourselves. Pardon me when I say that I am apprehensive that you are deficient in this particular. If by a “Roman Catholic,” I am to understand one, who has no other “baptism” than what babies in Italy receive at the hands of Italian priests, I am certain that you have not obeyed the truth. Christians of Peter’s time were justified by their own faith; not by the credulity of ignorant godfathers and godmothers. Hear what Paul says, “Ye are all the children of God by faith which is in Christ Jesus.” Suppose we ask Paul, “What evidence is there that we are his children by faith?” Now, just attend to what he says in the next verse in answer to the question. —“Because,” says he, “as many of you (believers) as have been baptised (immersed) into Christ have put on Christ.” Thus, you perceive, that being intelligently immersed into Christ is the evidence of our being God’s children by faith, and if his children, then heirs of the promises made to Abraham and his seed.

On the supposition that you are a Roman Catholic, and therefore a schismatic from the church in Peter’s time, allow me to say, that your Italian “baptism” and “ordination,” are nothing more than “the Beast’s mark” and license to sell in what you truly call “the pope’s shop.” For as the scripture foretold, that pontifical power “causes all, both small and great, rich and poor, free and bond, to receive a mark in their right hand or on their foreheads; and that no man might buy and sell save he that had the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.” Now, Signor, you were once a popish priest, and sold spiritual merchandise in the bazaars of guardian saints to them who were privileged to buy. Confession, baby-rhantism, burials, marriages, masses, and so forth, were some of those wares you exchanged with purchasers for gold, and silver, and tithes, and divers other contributions. Could you have sold those things to the Italians, if you had not been signed with the mark, character, or sign of the cross on your forehead, and not been cruciated with the same mark in your right hand at your ordination as a seller of wares in the Pope’s shop? And could an Italian have purchased of you a burial in “holy ground,” if the deceased had not been signed with the sign of the cross in baby-rhantism? The affirmative to these questions being granted, I would just refer you to the sentence pronounced upon all such as do not take proper steps for the obliteration of so ignominious a mark as that of the “accursed tree.” Here it is. “If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive a mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of God’s wrath, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented in fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb. \* \* \* And they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name.” Here is the secret of Italy’s woes made patent to every reader. The Italians have sold themselves in past ages to imperial popery, and they are now reaping the bitter fruits. But the cup of suffering is not full yet. The mark of the Beast is upon them all, and what the malignity of Austria, Naples, and the pope has left unfinished, the just vengeance of the Lamb upon

them for the murder of his saints and their hatred of the Bible, will be fully accomplished. But after judgment, then comes the blessing of Abraham upon all nations.

Will you, Signor, continue to wear the livery of the beast's image, and his mark, and to labour to excite sympathy for them whom God hath doomed? America can do nothing for Italy. The only hope for Italians is to leave Italy to France, Austria, and the Pope; and in believing the gospel and obeying it, to wash out the beast's mark in the blood of the lamb. Being desirous to assist them in this work, I have addressed myself to you, in hope of putting you right, that being rectified yourself, you may be able to promote the good work in relation to them in England and the United States. To make this more practicable, I have sent you herewith a copy of *Elpis Israel*, published by me in London and New York; with the first and second volumes of the *Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come*, a periodical I issue every month in this city. What you will find in *Elpis Israel*, and the *Herald*, will, I doubt not, give you a view of what the Bible teaches in relation to salvation by the gospel of the kingdom, and to the future of Italy, Hungary, Turkey, France, Austria, Russia, Britain and the Jews, that will not be thrown away upon a man of your independence of thought, word and deed. You will find also some copies of a letter addressed to Louis Kossuth when in this city, and which has been republished in some of the English papers, and is about being issued in Edinburgh in pamphlet form.

In view of all that has been said, it is certainly an important question, "What is the gospel?" It is the good news that God purposes to send Jesus Christ to Palestine to re-establish the kingdom and throne of David there, and in accomplishing this to restore the twelve tribes of Israel; break in pieces the Gentile governments; cut up and disperse all their armies; annex the dominion of the whole world to the kingdom of Israel; enlighten the nations, and establish the authority of God on the final ruin of Greek and Latin popery, Mohammedanism, paganism, and Protestantism of every name and denomination. So that then shall come to pass the prophecy of Jeremiah saying, "In the day of affliction the Gentiles shall come unto thee, O Lord, from the ends of the earth, and shall say, Surely our fathers have inherited lies, vanities, and things wherein there is no profit." And "at that time they shall call Jerusalem the throne of the Lord; and all the nations shall be gathered unto it, to the name of the Lord unto Jerusalem; neither shall they walk any more after the imagination of their evil heart. In those days the house of Judah shall walk with the house of Israel, and they shall come together out of the land of the north to the land that I have given for an inheritance unto your fathers." When these promises become accomplished facts, AN ISRAELITISH KINGDOM AND EMPIRE will exist upon the earth, transcending in the greatness of its power, the extent of its dominion, the splendour of its majesty, and the justice and beneficence of its rule, any sovereignty existent since nations occupied the earth. This is that dominion of which the gospel of the kingdom treats.

But, it might be asked, What good news is that to us who may die before it is established? It is good news in this respect—that Christ and the Apostles say to us, that if we will believe the things testified in Moses and the prophets concerning it; recognise the claims of Jesus to the throne of the kingdom as son of David and of God, admit the doctrine of his death and resurrection as a propitiation for the sins of believers, and be immersed into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—if we will believe and do these things, and lead a holy and righteous life in hope of the kingdom and its eternal attributes, although we may die before the kingdom and dominion are established, Christ will raise us from the dead, associate us with himself in the work before him, and give us a share in all he shall possess. Hence an Apostle says, "God hath chosen the poor in this world, rich in faith, to be the heirs of that

kingdom which he has promised to them that love him;" and when the kingdom is ready, Jesus will say to his saints, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, possess the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world."

In conclusion, Signor, I would suggest that you are too belligerent for a christian of Peter's time. You glory in having borne arms against the Austrians, and are here preaching a crusade against him, and execration against French interference. Christ says, "love your enemies," though I admit not his; "bless and curse not." A spirit of cursing and hatred is not a right spirit. In the absence of Jesus, we are to do good to those who despitefully use us; and are forbidden to avenge ourselves. "Vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord." The time is not come till he returns, for the saints to draw the sword. Till then, the weapons of their warfare are not bayonets and artillery; but reason and testimony. These are mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds. "Though we walk in the flesh," says Paul, "we do not war after the flesh; casting down reasonings, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." When he comes the saints will have fighting to their heart's content; as it is written, "the little Horn (imperial popery) made war upon the saints, and prevailed against them until the Ancient of Days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High, and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom." Referring to this time, David says, "Let the saints be joyful in glory: let them sing aloud upon their beds. Let the high praises of God be in their mouth, and a two-edged sword in their hands, to execute vengeance upon the nations, punishments upon the people; to bind their kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron; to execute upon them the judgment written: this honour have all his saints." Thus, you will perceive, that the honour of liberating mankind from the tyrants that now heel them in the dust, is reserved of God to a superior order of beings to those who are now the champions of liberty and the rights of men—it is an honour reserved for those who have acquired the mastery over themselves in "bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ." That you and I may share in this honour, is the earnest desire of, dear Sir,

Yours faithfully, —JOHN THOMAS.

Mott Haven, Westchester, N. Y.

April 9, 1853.

\* \* \*

#### OUR VISIT TO BRITAIN.

Baby-sprinkling in Aberdeen at two and sixpence a head—The gospel of the kingdom gets a footing among the Campbellites—Visit to Plymouth—The pamphlet exposing the folly of the clergy excites the pious horror of one fishing for a call—Apostasy for a mess of pottage—Elpis Israels gambled for, and condemned to be burnt—Its author a serpent of the latter days—Liverpool visited.

As already stated, I journeyed to Dundee from Aberdeen. The "gospel of the kingdom," preached in this city of the north, was not without effect. The audiences were large, but not to be named after those of Glasgow. The attention of the people was strict, and, I suppose, the impression somewhat more than superficial. I come to this conclusion from the following words in a letter from that city—"Friend H—had two Sundays hard labour after you left to undo what you had done in his tabernacle. He was making a sore handling of matters, as I am informed. Poor gentleman, he could scarcely crow in his own Zion, though there were none to oppose him."

The gentleman referred to in this extract was formerly in the British army; but at the termination of the contest with Napoleon, was discharged with many others on its reduction to a peace establishment. In consequence of this, he changed the weapons of his warfare, and unfurled his flag in Aberdeen. Finding an unoccupied conventicle, he rented it on his own responsibility for "public worship." It is styled, I think, "the Christian Chapel," and is capable of holding several hundred people. The odour of sanctity in Aberdeen is not supposed to be intensified by any fragrance exhaling from his institution. The clergy there do readily detect most unsavoury perfumes when their orthodoxy occasionally snuffs the wind of his divinity. At least so it is said. Having ordained himself to the totality of the chapel offices, he can have no part with them in their apostolic successorship. The holiest hands laid upon his head were his own, so that whatever spirit was imparted to him by that formality emanated from himself; and being equally pious as they, or their ordainers, is as much the spirit of God as any that they can boast of. It is thought, however, that the alienation between him and the clergy is more to be attributed to his underselling them in the soul-market, than to his lack of due presbyterial ordination. They will not sprinkle babies for regeneration unless the parents are what they call "believers;" but this, I am told, is no obstacle in the way of Mr. H—. He grants the babe a dispensation for rhanthism without faith, and performs the ceremony for unbelievers' babes at two shillings and sixpence sterling a head. Now there are many infidel husbands and wives in Aberdeen, who still have a superstitious reverence for this "church ordinance." They want their children to appear like other children, who are considered more respectable than those who have not been sprinkled with the church water at the hands of "the minister." Now, Mr. H—, it is presumable, having as little respect for baby-sprinkling as an apostle, who says in regard to God's creatures, that "without faith it is impossible to please him," considered it a public grievance, that babies should suffer in their respectabilities for the short-comings of their parents, which they could in no wise prevent. He saw clearly, that believers' babies had no more faith than infidels' babies. To his mind there was no room for question or dispute upon this point. He very acutely perceived, therefore, that all babies were babies, and had an instinctive desire for no other milk than their mother's. For "the unadulterated milk of the word," he was intuitively and logically sure they had no more longing than for the Pope's tiara, of which they had never heard. Hence, he perceived that the clerical requisition for parental faith did not evade the apostolically stated impossibility; for, however pleased with the parents, it is obvious God could not be with the babies, who were perfectly indifferent to the milk of his word. He placed all babies, therefore, in the same category; and practically rejected the clerical sprinkling, as having no superior efficacy to his own. If the parents' faith in the Assembly's Catechism was a good substitute for the babies' ignorance thereof, his faith was as good a proxy for the parents' lack who became his customers. Mr. H—was, therefore, the catechism become flesh. He believed it with faith enough for all infidel Aberdonians; and could consequently sponsorise all the babes in Aberdeen in the event of all church-goers honestly avowing their babylike indifference to "the milk of the word." Was it not a public benefaction, the preservation of the respectability of multitudes of the rising generation at the low price of half a crown a head? It is said to have been so considered by many. The clergy thundered, but Mr. H—pocketed the lightning. His speculation succeeded. His bazaar was well frequented, and riches increased. Compared with his competitors in trade, his wares are as genuine, and his drafts upon heaven's bank as likely to be honoured, as the Archbishop of Canterbury's or the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland's. As may be supposed, he is liberal withal. He will not close the doors of "the Christian Chapel," against heterodoxy, if a penny can be safely turned by the opening of them. This is not the case everywhere. Orthodoxy loves money and is very prudent—wise as the serpent in all its doings. It will not let you into its houses for money, lest the heresy taught should alienate its customers, and so diminish its power and receipts. But Mr. H—, having

been a soldier, was brave, and had no such fear. Pay him for present accommodation, and he would run the risk. On this principle my friends obtained the use of his chapel. It was convenient, "the minister" polite and friendly, and the risk not over hazardous, considering the faithlessness of the times, and the constitution of the audiences addressed.

The reverend gentleman having succeeded, I suppose, in undoing the little mischief I had done among his flock, all things relapsed into their former sheolite condition. This was not the case, however, with "the Campbellite church," as it is called there. A correspondent, writing from Aberdeen, says, "the dust has been raised among us since you left. The teaching of 'the things of the kingdom of God' gave offence to some of the friends, and to one of our elders who is Campbellised, and spiritualised with a double distillation. He could stand it no longer, and therefore gave in his resignation. He could sustain his theory by neither scripture nor reason. He went privately to all the members he thought favourable to his notions, and got about half the congregation to side with him. We told them they could please themselves. If they thought fit they could go; but for ourselves, we were resolved to teach what we believed to be the truth, and were willing that they should exercise the same right: but we would not be restricted by the elder in question. By advice of some of his party he gave in; but he next made a proposition that no brother should speak longer than a quarter of an hour at a time. This, however, did not take. He lost his proposition, and in the meantime we are settled down; and I have hope that the most of his friends will in the course of time come to see the truth. He did them great evil, I fear; nevertheless, I think there are some of them beginning to see things in their true light. But, let the result be what it may, we are determined to be faithful. They are the intelligent and talented of the congregation that contend for "the gospel of the kingdom." Of this there can be no doubt; for it is only such that have the sagacity to discriminate between things human and divine.

On the night before I bid adieu to Aberdeen, I met about a hundred persons, I think, at a *soirée*, to which I was invited. This was a farewell tea-drinking, at which "all and singular" were at liberty to ask any questions concerning the things I had introduced to their notice, and the contents of the Bible generally. The time was occupied in this way till past eleven. The minister of the chapel we had occupied was among the guests. He would have asked some questions, but it was then too late, and he had not wished to prevent others from questioning by occupying the time. He thought they were all under great obligation to me for subjecting myself to a public cross-questioning upon so many topics, and for so long a time. He confessed that he should not like to go through the same ordeal. After a few more remarks in this strain, he concluded, and the *soirée* was closed.

Through friends in Nottingham, I became acquainted with a preacher residing in Plymouth, whom I will name Wood. He was formerly a zealous Millerite, or Anti-Jewish Restorationist. This crotchet, I think, he never got rid of; at least, so long as I knew him. In other respects, he receded from the Millerism of which Mr. Himes of Boston, is the incarnation, and became what I am unable to define. He was the pastor of a church in Plymouth, consisting of about seventy members, from whom he drew his support, which was restricted and precarious. They generally believed in the speedy personal appearance of Christ Jesus, which was the one idea defining their belief; but as to any other particular articles of faith distinguishing them from other professors, I am not aware that they possessed them.

By this Mr. Wood I was induced to visit Plymouth. What his motive was for urging me to it, I know not. I supposed it to be referable to a desire for the diffusion of as much knowledge as possible of the scripture testimony concerning the times, and the crisis

connected with the personal advent of Jesus. He was friendly, promoted the sale of *Elpis Israel*, and quite zealous in getting the people to hear me. The Mechanics' Institutes at Plymouth and Devonport were hired for lectures, which I delivered at intervals during the eighteen days of my sojourn. At the latter place, the audiences were quite large—several hundreds; but at Plymouth not so many. The hearers seemed deeply interested; but, save the sale of forty-six copies of *Elpis Israel* and a very animated *soirée* before I left the town, I have no means of knowing what faith the gospel of the kingdom commands in the hearts of those that heard it.

On my way to London it was that the conversation occurred, which set me to writing the pamphlet afterwards published as “*The Wisdom of the Clergy proved to be Folly.*” About twenty-five of them were sold in Plymouth by Mr. Wood, whose mind had undergone a remarkable change, apparently, at least, since the *soirée*, at which Mr. Wood made a speech which left the impression upon my mind that he was not far from the kingdom of God. But by a letter I received from him, expressing his opinion of the pamphlet, I clearly perceived that his mind had been alienated to something else. A thousand copies of that brochure have been sold, with the exception of a few copies in Britain, and more are demanded, but cannot be supplied there without a reprint. Speaking of it, Mr. Wood says, “For myself, while I know assuredly to my great grief, that many things therein stated are but too true, I am constrained, with painful reluctance, to differ from you upon various matters; —with reluctance, because I would that we all had the truth and the mind of God, and could see alike, —with pain, because I cannot but feel really horrified at some of your conclusions.”

Mr. Wood's pious horror originated from my strict construction of “the wholesome words of the Lord Jesus,” who before his crucifixion, said, “This gospel of the kingdom must be preached to all nations;” and added, after his resurrection, “He that believes and is baptised shall be saved, and he that believes not shall be condemned.” Like the serpent in the garden, he would have it that this was not true without exception. He maintained that multitudes “who believe not” shall not surely be excluded from eternal life, or “be condemned,”—they “shall not surely die.” The idea that they should, was too repugnant to his fleshly feelings, or something else, to be entertained for a moment. He wanted a doctrine more in harmony with “the thinking of the flesh,” forgetting that God's system of truth is an embodiment of principles the very reverse of what the natural feelings of sinful flesh respond to. “My thoughts,” saith he, “are not as your thoughts, nor your ways as my ways.”

The other point of horrification related to “the ministerial ordinances of the Lord's house.” The pamphlet “irreverently” demonstrates “with ungodly levelling,” as he thinks, that the existing orders of priests, clergy, and ministers, popish, national, and dissenting, as distinguished from “the laity,” are the servants of anti-christ, and not of God. That their united establishments are Babylon, and Rome the mother of them all. He called these “sacred things of the Lord's house,” and thought that what Paul says in Ephesians 4 about “apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers,” was a plain and complete refutation of my assertions and reasonings; as if what Paul writes of these appertained to the ecclesiastics of Catholicism, Protestantism and dissent, who presumptuously assume those titles! I did not then know that posthumous Irvingism operating upon his necessities ill supplied by his flock, had turned his head. Such I afterwards learned to be the fact. Had I known it when I received his letter I should have felt no surprise. I could have accounted for his new-born zeal in babyism, and ministerial ordinances! What a trying thing is poverty. What will not some men do for a crust of bread! This surely is the reason why God has chosen the poor to be the heirs of his kingdom—the natural tendency of poverty to test principles. Jesus and his apostles

were pre-eminently poor and needy men; but they braved all necessity, and adhered to the gospel of the kingdom. But all cannot do this, and Mr. Wood was among the number. After my return to this country I received a letter from Plymouth which drew aside the veil and exposed to view the ugly features of the case. The writer says, "Feeling a deep interest in the truth you so ably advocated in this place, I embrace the present opportunity of sending you some information in relation to its fortunes here. I grieve, however, to say that it is very discouraging in its especial relation to the person (Mr. Wood) who many of us thought would be its greatest advocate. The cause in this place is all but gone. Soon after the issue of your pamphlet, he went to Nottingham, Leeds, and adjacent places. On his return, I discovered that the sentiments he had entertained respecting some of the truths contained in your works were changed, though he had privately held the very same. About six months since he stood up in his place, and declared that his views were entirely altered respecting baptism, and that sprinkling was as much a baptism as immersion. In after lectures he said that infants were proper subjects for baptism; that there ought to be at the present, and that there is a fourfold ministry in the Church of Christ, namely, apostles, prophets, evangelists, and pastors. A few months since he denied any man's claim to apostleship, though he now affirms that apostles ought ever to have been in the church. He is now for every Christian paying the tenth of his earnings into the treasury, and maintains that there ought to be a regular succession of priesthood as in the Jewish system, of which Christ should be the chief. The result of his lecturing is, that most of his congregation have left him, myself and a very few others remaining to give him a full and impartial hearing. After the defection of so many, he declared that he had been preaching errors, although while uttering them he said he was taught by the Spirit. He now intends to join the people at the Central Hall, and invited us to go with him, and hear for ourselves, which a few did. We found the performance conducted much after the Roman Catholic fashion, the prayers read being the English liturgy. On inquiring their views, we were introduced to Mr. Walker the "evangelist," who commenced a course of private lectures to us, refusing to admit married females and all young persons without their husbands' and parents' consent. These private lectures were similar to Mr. Wood's, but with some additions. They profess to be the church of the living God, and refuse all sectarian names as an abomination. They are in fact Irvingites. They decry Luther's reformation exceedingly as being man's work, and not God's. They denounce the Bible as a cursed idol, because Dissent says it can read for itself; and in the next breath pronounce it a most Holy Book. They forbid men to interpret for themselves, and command them to receive the church's dictum; and consider that the tolerance of fox-hunting parsons in the established church is no sufficient ground of separation from it. On the second Sunday after our chapel was closed, Mr. Wood and three others were admitted by the "angel-evangelist" to the Irvingite fellowship, in laying his hand on their heads, and reading a prayer. The Sunday after the children were sprinkled, and what they call "the Lord's Supper" administered to them. This they are to receive three times a year, because the Jewish males went up to Jerusalem thrice annually to eat the Passover!! They contend that the sacrament has superseded the Passover, and baptism circumcision, and that therefore children are fit subjects to partake of both the ordinances. Yet they refused to admit us who were members of Mr. Wood's to partake until we were admitted members with them; and meanwhile desired us to go to our parish church and take sacrament there. They desired us, however, to pay the tenth of our earnings into their treasury before we became members. But our intention is not to embrace error if we know it.

"All their ministers, they say, are directly called of God. Mr. Wood is trying to get in as a minister, constantly writing manuscripts as specimens of grace. The apostle, who brings his prophet with him, is expected here soon, when it is augured that he will prophesy that Mr.

Wood is called of God to the ministry in his house. Since his change of views, Mr. Wood has declared that Elpis Israel is blasphemy; and the angel evangelist has desired the members to burn or destroy their copies. But some of us here prize that work next to the Bible. We do not intend to yield our obedience to any thing unsupported by the word of God. Elpis Israel has been the means of enlightening many minds in this place; though on some topics we still wish for more light. We are now cast upon the world as sheep without a shepherd. But God has promised to be a guide to all that confide in his name. This is consolation.”

In a postscript the writer says, “a copy of Elpis Israel belonging to a Central Hallist was raffled for at three pence a head; and the evangelist has declared in his public and private lectures that you are a serpent, quoting the testimony touching the Israelites being stung by serpents; so, he says, are you, a serpent of the latter days!”

Really, the malediction of such a fellowship of foolishness and imbecility is quite a compliment to Elpis Israel and its author. But poor, unfortunate, Mr. Wood! I was evidently not the serpent that charmed him. The eyes that allured him to folly glared from a ministry fed and clothed by the tenths extracted from those it had deceived. His zeal against a strict construction of Christ’s word, is easily explained. To have adhered to it rigidly would have excluded him from the tithe-sustained ministry. He could not afford this; therefore he dipped for a sop, and betrayed the truth into the hands of the enemy.

A notice of my visit to Liverpool brings me to the conclusion of the narrative of my journeyings in the service of the Gospel of the Kingdom. I visited that important city after being at Dundee. The effort to bring out the people, however, was but feeble there. Their energy had been overtaxed by their expenditure in support of President Campbell’s demonstration, so that they had only infirmity for “the glorious gospel of the blessed God,” which he contemns. They did what they felt like. A few handbills invited the people to their usual place of meeting. The attendance was very limited. Yet twenty-three copies of Elpis Israel were sold; and after my discourses were finished, Mr. Campbell’s friends, who had also become mine, regretted that a greater effort had not been made. They were kind and hospitable, and, I think, thoroughly dispossessed of the unclean spirits which go forth from the mouths of Bethany, Nottingham, and Auchtermuchty town. My visit to Holland, Prussia, Germany, Belgium, and France, will finish these notices of my runnings to and fro in the old world, whose present constitution being effete, is soon to pass away with a great noise, and in the fervent heat of the indignation and wrath of God. But enough, O reader, for the present; hereafter we may meet again.

\* \* \*

## MATERIALISM OR IMMATERIALISM?

BY G. H. LEWIS.

Comte remarks—and the remark is immensely significant—that the discovery of gravitation, the first great acquisition of positive Physics, was contemporaneous with the discovery of the circulation of the blood—the first fact which rendered positive Biology possible; and yet what immense inequality in the progress of the two sciences since that day, when the starting point of both was reached! Nor is this inequality solely and directly owing to the greater complexity of Biology; but also to the philosophic method which presided over the evolution of Physics, compared with the vague metaphysical method which has not yet

ceased in Biology—a consequence, let me add, of that very complexity. No one inquires into the nature of gravitation, or into its cause; to detect its law is deemed sufficient; but physiologists are incessantly inquiring into the nature and cause of contractility and sensibility, unable as they are to conceive these phenomena as two ultimate facts—properties of two special tissues. The only distinction to be drawn between these vital properties and the general physical properties is, that they are more special; but this speciality does not make them more explicable, for it is always in exact harmony with the corresponding speciality of the structure: it is only muscular tissue that presents the phenomenon of contractility (or, more rigorously stated, it is only fibrine); it is only nervous tissue that presents the phenomenon of sensibility. All those physical and chemical hypotheses that have been invented to explain contractility and sensibility have been as unphilosophic as the ancient efforts to explain gravitation and chemical affinity. For, as Comte truly says, after all they only represent vaguely the mechanical transmission of impressions produced on the nervous extremities, but do not in any degree explain perception, which thus remains evidently untouched, although it is really the most essential element of sensation.

A certain vague sense of the vanity of these attempts to explain the phenomena of sensation has caused an indignant reaction on the part of the metaphysicians, and by enlisting the prejudices of the majority against what is styled Materialism, has very seriously obstructed the tranquil path of inquiry. Every one feels an intense conviction that sensation and thought are not electricity, are not mere vibrations, are not “secreted by the brain as bile is secreted by the liver.” He knows that sensation is unlike all other things. He needs no revelation of science to tell him that it is different from electricity; and intimately persuaded of its speciality, he lends a willing ear to any harmoniously-worded explanation offered by the metaphysician as to its being as “immaterial principle,” an “o’er informing spirit,” a mysterious something which, whatever it may be, is assuredly not “blind unconscious matter.”

I confess that I have always had great scorn for what is called “Materialism”—equal, indeed, to that I felt for “Immaterialism;” and I have often called the quarrel a frivolous and vexatious dispute about words. But it was more than that. Though men squabbled about words, there were fundamental ideas working under them antagonistically; and, on the whole, I think the metaphysicians had more reason on their side than we on the other gave them credit for. Absurd as their “immaterial principle superadded to the brain” must be pronounced, it had this merit, that it kept the distinctive speciality of the phenomena of sensation in view, and preserved it from the unscientific, coarse hypotheses of some materialists.

That “blind unconscious matter could not think, was held as a notorious argument, in spite of the assumption implied in the epithets (for the aphorism amounted to this, —blind matter cannot see, unconscious matter cannot be conscious.) To any one who looks steadily at the question, however it may be shown that, as a matter of fact, the nervous tissue, and that only being sensitive, the biological proposition simply is, that “sensitive matter can be sensitive.” To claim for this tissue any superadded entity named Thought, is to desert the plain path of observation for capricious conjecture.

Why not call strength an immaterial principle superadded to muscular tissue, if you are to call thought one? The muscular action, and the nervous action are two special phenomena belonging to special tissues. Science can tell you no more. If your mind is dissatisfied therewith, and demands more recondite explanation, invent one to please yourself,

and then invent one for heat, for attraction, for every phenomenon you conceive; the field is open; imagination has wide-sweeping wings; but do not palm off on us your imagination as science!

What the metaphysician says in respect of the essential speciality of the phenomena of thought and sensation—their complete distinction from other physical phenomena—is therefore to be admitted as true. He builds on this basis an absurd superstructure; but the basis we cannot destroy. On the other hand, what the physiologist says respecting the identity of thought and nervous action is equally indestructible. That is his basis. Combine the two schools into one, and you have the positive philosopher, who says, “Sensibility is an ultimate fact, not explicable, not to be assigned to a knowable cause, but to be recognised as the property of a special tissue—the nervous.”

As far as the religious application of this scientific conception is concerned, Locke long ago pointed out how it was as easy to conceive God endowing matter with thought as spirit with thought. All that the metaphysicians claim is the speciality of the phenomena of thought—their difference from the phenomena of inorganic matter—and this the positive biologist claims also. —The Leader.

#### THE PLEASANT LAND.

“A land which the Lord thy God careth for: the eyes of the Lord thy God are always upon it, from the beginning of the year even unto the ending of the year.”—Deuteronomy 11: 12.

These words form part of an appeal which the God of Israel made to his people, wherein He calls for their allegiance and affection, on the ground of his great and gracious intentions. The Lord recounts what he had done in bringing them out of Egypt, in destroying Pharaoh and his hosts, and in judging the rebels who had risen up among them. “Your eyes (says Moses) have seen all the great things which the Lord did.”—Obedience is required of them as a condition of their peaceable and protracted possession of the promised inheritance. That heritage—“the land which God had espied for them”—is next described with much minuteness and beauty. It is contrasted with Egypt, and shown to be a more beautiful and fertile land than that far-famed country; and God engages that if they will love and serve him, the land shall continue to be a “delightful land.” But the testimony most worthy of notice is, that Canaan is a land especially cared for by God, and that his eyes are continually upon it. We are bound to believe this testimony, and should not let any thoughts or views unbecoming God’s greatness, and independence of places and localities, interfere with a full and ample reception of this declaration. The fact that the Most High, who filleth all space with his presence, cares more for this one little spot on our small world, is in agreement with many other parts of God’s Word; and it is his clearly revealed purpose, that in abolishing the times of the Gentiles, He will make the fact abundantly manifest.

How frequently did God speak with Abraham about this land—Genesis 12: 7; 13: 4-11; 15: 18-21, &c. &c. —and He did the same with Isaac and Jacob, and afterwards to Moses. Those who think that belief in the future glories of Canaan is puerile and wrong, have little sympathy with the Psalmist (105: 6-11), where the covenant with Abraham, the oath to Isaac, and its confirmation to Jacob, and “to Israel for an everlasting covenant,” are all shown to centre in this: “Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan; the lot of your inheritance.” This “covenant and word is said to be commanded to a thousand generations,” which has never yet been fulfilled.

Who that considers the past history, the present condition, and the future destiny of Canaan, but must see reason for all that God hath said about it? In that land he has displayed Himself, exhibited his character, and revealed his grace. It hath been the home of his tabernacle and temple, with its splendid rites and mystic glories. Its hills have resounded with the lyre of his prophets, and from its lovely valleys the prayers of his faithful ones have gone up from age to age. Thus he made it a beacon of light in a dark world, sustaining there a witness (though, alas! sometimes feeble), for his own unity and holiness, in opposition to the many and filthy deities of the heathen. In the fulness of time it became the chosen theatre for redemption work; over its surface and on its waters walked the feet of “Immanuel, God with us.” The Son of God, the Son of man, breathed its balmy air, plucked its clustering fruit, and gazed with pleasure on its lovely landscapes. But of one of its trees a cross was made, and he was hung upon it. From one of its mines iron was brought and fashioned into nails to pierce his blessed hands and feet. In one of its caves his breathless body was laid for a while, and after he left those gloomy shades, he still lingered forty days amidst the valleys, rocks and hills “of the land which God careth for.” Well may we wonder at all this; but we shall not stagger at the same, when we remember that he first took dust of our earth into indissoluble union with his divine nature. In our nature he ascended to heaven, still casting loving looks on the land of his birth and pilgrimage, and pronouncing, as he gave his last commission, the name of Jerusalem in tones of richest tenderness, ascended to glory, to make “the land that He cared for” the fountain of light, —living waters flowed from it, and made glad and beautiful many a barren Gentile wilderness. Thus his dying prayer was answered, and his parting command fulfilled. Jerusalem became vocal with his name, and many Jerusalem sinners were forgiven. But ere he died, his tears had been mingled with the dust of Judah; and wherefore felt he such bitter sorrow? He saw that the glory would depart—that the temple would fall—the people be scattered, and Jerusalem be trodden down. All was accomplished. He put not forth his almighty hand to hinder it, for he intended to make this long-favoured, guilty land, a monument of divine wrath, on which justice should write in broad, legible, characters, God’s hatred of sin, especially the sin of unbelief. There it stands, like a burnt mountain, still smoking with the heat of God’s anger. It reads the whole world a grand moral lesson, and bids the possessors of privileges “not to be high-minded, but fear.”

But its destinies are more glorious than its past history is wonderful. God will “heal the land.” “He will be merciful to his land and to his people.” (Deuteronomy 27: 43.) He whose purpose is steadfast as the ordinances of heaven, says: “Thou shalt no more be termed Forsaken; neither shall thy land any more be termed Desolate; but thou shalt be called Hephzibah, and thy land Beulah; for the Lord delighteth in thee, and thy land shall be married.” (Isaiah 62: 5.) Then, when “God’s sanctuary shall be in the midst of them for evermore” (Ezekiel 37: 28), shall God’s great idea be wrought out, “Jerusalem shall be called the throne of the Lord, to which the nations shall be gathered.” (Jeremiah 3: 17.) The land shall become “Immanuel’s land;” it shall be filled with holiness, and the divine complacency shall ever rest upon it. “His eyes and his heart shall be there perpetually.”

For thus regarding the land of Canaan, we indulge in no superstitious feelings; such respect for God’s inheritance is far removed from mere sentimentality. Such thoughts are sober and spiritual, and those who indulge in them are brought into sympathy with God. To “despise this pleasant land,” as regards that bright destiny which all the prophets unite in foretelling, argues, in this respect at least, a lack of sympathy with God in his thoughts and purposes.

But where does God's eye and his heart abide now? Who are his covenant people, in whom he takes pleasure? "Behold the eye of the Lord is upon them that fear him, upon them that hope in his mercy!" "To this man will I look, who is of a poor and contrite spirit." Such are related to him. He is "the Lord their God." They choose him, confide in him, and feel complacency in character, and that because he hath loved them with an everlasting love, and with loving kindness hath drawn them. As the God of their salvation, he will supply their need, succour them in sorrow, and save them with an everlasting salvation. Because He was their Lord God of Israel, He provided Canaan for their home, brought them into it, preserved it for their use, for in it they had safety, supply, and satisfaction. He took pleasure in seeing them happy, because He got glory to his name by their prosperity. And thus he deals with his chosen people now. He provides spiritual blessings; enables them to claim and enjoy them; guards both them and their inheritance; and all "to the praise and glory of his grace, wherein he hath made them accepted in the Beloved;" "that in the ages to come he might show the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness toward us by Christ Jesus." Oh, ye spiritual Israel of God! look up and catch the beamings of your heavenly Father's eye. "Cast all your care on him, for he careth for you." Ever abide where God's eye of delight ever rests, even in his beloved Son. Let that Church, as dear to him, be much cared for by you, and forget not to care for Israel and her down-trodden land; and then, when Israel shall "feed on Bashan and Gilead as in days of old," and the earth be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, you shall dwell in that heavenly city, composed of living stones gathered out of all nations; and which shall evermore possess the presence of God and the Lamb, to be its light and its glory. — Quarterly Journal of Prophecy, p. 191.

\* \* \*

#### A PARABLE.

A gentleman of the country, upon the occasion of some signal service this man had done him, gave him a curious silver cup. David (for that was the man's name) was exceedingly fond of the present, and preserved it with the greatest care. But one day, by accident, his cup fell into a vessel of aqua fortis: he, taking it to be no other than common water, thought his cup safe enough, and therefore neglected it till he had dispatched an affair of importance, about which his master had employed him, imagining it would be then time enough to take out his cup. At length a fellow-servant entered the same room, when the cup was near dissolved; and looking into the aqua fortis, asked David, who had thrown anything into that vessel? David said that his cup accidentally fell into that water. Upon this, his fellow-servant informed him that his cup was almost dissolved in it. When David heard this, and was satisfied of the truth of it with his own eyes, he heartily grieved for the loss of his cup; and at the same time, he was astonished to see the liquor as clear as if nothing had been dissolved in it or mixed with it. As, after a while, he saw the small remains of it vanish, and could not now perceive the least particle of the silver, he utterly despaired of ever seeing his cup more. Upon this, he bitterly bewailed his loss with many tears, and refused to be comforted. His fellow-servant, pitying him in this condition of sorrow, told him that his master could restore him the very same cup again. David disregarded this as utterly impossible. "What do you talk of?" says he to his fellow-servant. "Do you not know that the cup is entirely dissolved, and that not the least bit of the silver is to be seen? Are not all the little invisible parts of the cup mingled with aqua fortis, and become parts of the same mass? How, then, can my master, or any man alive, produce the silver anew, and restore my cup? It can never be; I give it over for lost: I am sure I shall never see it again." His fellow-servant still insisted that their master could restore the same cup, and David as earnestly insisted that it was absolutely impossible. While

they were debating this point, their master came in, and asked them what they were disputing about? When they had informed him, he said to David, "What you so positively pronounced to be impossible, you shall see me do with very little trouble. "Fetch me," said he to the other servant, "some salt water, and pour it into the vessel of aqua fortis. Now look," says he, "the silver will presently fall to the bottom of the vessel in a white powder." When David saw this, he began to have good hopes of seeing his cup restored. Next, his master ordered a servant to drain off the liquor, and to take up the powdered silver and melt it. Thus it was reduced into one solid piece; and then, by the silversmith's hammer, formed into a cup of the same shape as before. Thus David's cup was restored, with a very small loss of its weight and value.

It is no uncommon thing for men, like David in this parable, to imagine that to be impossible, which yet persons of greater skill and wisdom than themselves can easily perform. David was as positive that his master could not restore his cup, as unbelievers are, that it is incredible God should raise the dead; and he had as much appearance of reason on his side as they. If a human body, dead, crumbles into dust, and mingles with the earth, or with the water of the sea, so as to be discernible no more, so the silver cup was dissolved into parts invisible, and mingled with the mass of aqua fortis. Is it not then easy to be conceived, that as a man has wisdom and power enough to bring these parts of the silver to be visible again, and to reduce them to a cup as before, so God, the maker of heaven and earth, must have wisdom and power enough to bring the parts of a dissolved human body together, and to form them into a human body again? What though David could not restore his own cup? Was that a reason that no man could do it? And when his master had promised to restore it, what though David could not possibly conjecture by what method his master would do it? This was no proof that his master was at a loss for a method. So, though men cannot raise the dead, yet God, who is infinitely wiser and stronger, can. And though we cannot find out the method by which He will do this, yet we are sure that He who at first took the dust of the ground, and formed it into the body of man, can, with the same ease, take the dust into which my body shall be resolved, and form it into a human body again.

Nay, even if a body be burnt, and consumed by fire, the parts of that body are no more really lost than the invisible particles of the dissolved cup. As David, then, was wrong in thinking that it was impossible for his master to restore his cup, it must be at least equally wrong for us to think it impossible that God should raise the dead. —Hallett cited in Dr. Brown's Resurrection of Life, pp. 300-302.

\* \* \*

### THE TURKISH QUESTION.

To be meddled with at all, is for Turkey almost the same with being overturned. She has no position capable of being maintained except by sufferance. An exile from the heart of her own people, Turkey maintains a precarious rule alien provinces; and there is not one of those provinces in Europe which does not hold by a stronger inclination to some other allegiance. You may begin the survey where you like. The Pansclavonian intrigues of Russia in Grahova, behind the Bocca di Cattaro, have raised expectations and orthodox sympathies; and Grahova desires to unite with the Montenegrines: objects and influences which sway that small but important district much more than the Turkish allegiance. In Bosnia, a Mussulman nobility rules a Sclavonian peasantry from mediaeval castles, and a chronic rebellion smoulders. Along the military frontier, where such active hostilities were going on in 1836, the Sclavonians have fraternised with the guards of Austria; and upon the whole it may be

settled that the angle of Turkey stretching into the Austrian empire inclines to annexation, if the Sclavonian subjects of that Austrian border should not rather annex themselves to their brethren. Sclavonianism generally prevails along the great basin of the Danube; and the Danubian Provinces retain strong sympathies with the Bucharest scheme of 1848. Mismanagement has impaired the influences which Austria might have both in the East and West of this region. Stratimirovich, the Serbian chief, who, under the impulse of border nationality and military order, fought so stoutly for Austria against Hungary, has been rewarded with a paltry Lieutenant-Colonelcy. The same kind of slight has rewarded Yanku, the popular chief of the Transylvanian Wallachians; who was invited to Vienna, was patted on the shoulder by the Emperor, received promises, and found, after his return home, that the reward of his people was an increase of taxation!

Turkey itself is but a corner of the empire that bears its name; and when we come to the very capital, we find still the most startling disproportion. Of the 700,000 inhabitants, 300,000 probably are not Turks. The coasts round the Black Sea, the Sea of Marmora, and the Greek sea, are thickly strewed with Greeks, the holders of the commerce, the wealth, and the energy of the country. With finances utterly confused, compelled to seek a loan and then to disavow it at the dictate of this or that banker, of the French or the Russian Ambassador; burdened with factories of cloth, silk, or iron, and with model-farms destitute of farmers, enterprises that are no more than expensive toys; governed by an Emperor who means well, tries to introduce European improvements, but thinks chiefly of pleasure, and is cheated on every side, —Turkey presents the anomaly of a very small minority, without political convictions, governing much more numerous populations, with nationalities, convictions, and objects of their own.

The practical stamina of Turkey must be sought on the Asiatic side of the Black Sea, around Broussa, the destined abode of Abdel-Kader, just released by the politic Emperor Napoleon III from his captivity in Christian France. But here, where we find the stamina of Turkey, we find also in full play those qualities of the Mussulman character which absolutely prevent it from acting in European politics, —the rivalry of small military chiefs, the totally individualised selfishness of the Mussulman, the ignorance of external relations. The followers of Othman invaded Europe as armed hordes by mere force of military impetus; but unless it were to a victory, not destined for repetition, they can hardly issue from their own quarters: they have not the generalship, nor the geography, nor the commissariat, nor anything that is needed for external warfare.

Turkey, indeed, has her organised army at Constantinople; she can assemble 50,000 men or more within sight of the city—and they look brilliant under review, with their bright apparel and dashing manoeuvres: but it is very questionable whether there are amongst them any men of superior generalship; or whether they could resist the strong force which Russia keeps ready on the further shore of the Danube mouth, to be marched upon Turkey at the shortest notice. The Pruth is practicable at any part, the Danube is a Russian river, and the Balkan itself has proved to be no obstacle in the road to Constantinople.

Within the limits of the Turkish empire all is confusion; and though it is easy to foresee that any jar to the existing regime would set the whole loose in the most intricate commotion, it is impossible to see through that storm to the settlement beyond, unless we assume as unquestioned issue the overwhelming mastery of Russia. But if we look beyond that comparatively narrow region, we shall see other influences, not altogether to be despised. To begin with Greece: there is a strong Russian party, rather supporting the present regime,

for the present; but there is also the party of Young Greece, dreaming of the restored Hellenic empire, classically republican, and not without sympathies in the provinces still nominally Turkish. With a Southern fleet shut up in the Black Sea, Russia aspires to be a naval power, but is only a naval impotency. The Czar has long endeavoured to obtain from Austria the cession of the Bocca di Cattaro, which would give a great port for his fleet outside the Dardanelles: but, instead of making a cession so suicidal, Austria has developed that peculiar company of "Lloyd's," which has its agents extending through Asia even to Tibet, and in the Adriatic a fleet of more than fifty steamers, —not, indeed, war-steamers, but able to transport troops, and having strong ports along the Eastern shore as places of refuge and defence. Since the last European conflict, Austria has developed a strong power in the Adriatic.

The Eastern half of the Mediterranean is divided from the Western by the strait of which Malta is the key; but France is already encroaching on the Southern shore; she possesses Algiers, threatens Tunis and Tripoli, and hankers after Egypt. Were France advancing with hostile intentions against Turkey, she must ask the assent of the power that possesses Malta, or force the passage. But even if that passage could be denied to her, the independence of Turkey would scarcely be the better secured. If Turkey were to venture upon any war, Russia would seize Constantinople as an act of grand reprisal. If France or any other power were the aggressor, Russia would possess Constantinople, to "protect" it; and once in, there would be the utmost difficulty in dislodging her. Persuasion would scarcely prevail. An English fleet might force the Dardanelles, and the great city lies at the disposal of any commander ambitious of a *feu d'artifice* on a grand scale: but, however magnificent the conflagration, the Russians would not be dislodged, and Constantinople would not be twice burned down. Once in command of the portal between the Black Sea and the Mediterranean, Russia would not abstain from dictating in a much more peremptory voice, on such subjects as the Egyptian transit. Could England, single-handed, defend her interests in that quarter? The question may become a practical one.

Vast as the Ultra-Oriental power of Russia, it is still not so unquestioned as it might at first appear; and although polite diplomacy may hold itself precluded from alluding to the other influences latent in that region, practical speculators know that they exist, and that in times of necessity they would not be ignored. Austria looks very big from the Bocca di Cattaro or from the plains of Lombardy; but we all know that slights are felt, not only by neglected Slavonian allies like Stratimirovich, not only by jealous Bohemians, but even within our own army, where there is a growing sense that the supreme administration is stupid in its treatment of dependent nationalities and meritorious services. Russia has not yet subdued the Caucasus; she might be brought to an unexpected pause if new opportunities and combinations were to array against her the insurrectionary resources of that heterogeneous region called "Turkey," which she has traversed with her intrigues, has inflamed with her incentives, but has not reduced to discipline. —The Spectator.

\* \* \*

#### A MISERY TO BE LAMENTED.

Pastor Robinson in his farewell charge to his congregation at Leyden, before they set sail from Holland, in the *Mayflower* for New England, says to them—"I charge you before God and his holy angels, that you follow me no further than you have seen me to follow the Lord Jesus Christ. The Lord has more truth yet to break forth out of his holy word. For my part, I cannot sufficiently bewail the condition of the reformed churches, which are come

to a period in religion, and will go at present no further than the instruments of their first reformation. The Lutherans cannot be drawn to go beyond what Luther saw; and the Calvinists, you see, stick fast where they were left by that great man of God, who yet saw not all things. This is a misery much to be lamented; for though they were burning and shining lights in their times, yet they penetrated not into the whole counsel of God; but were they now living, they would be as willing to embrace further light as that which first they received. I beseech you to remember, that you be ready to receive whatever truth shall be made known unto you from the written word of God.”

If all who rejoice in Puritanism would give heed to this candid exhortation of their father, it would do more to advance them Zionward from that full stop to which they have long arrived like the “reform churches” of the pastor’s day, than any Blue laws, Sabbath-consecrations, or State-thanksgivings, &c., they can invent for the promotion of popular sanctity. We would especially commend pastor Robinson’s charge to our friends, the adherents of the Bethanian gospel of sacred history, who like the Lutherans and Calvinists, “are come to a period in religion,” as if there were no promises for faith and fulfilment in the word of God! —

EDITOR.