

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, JULY, 1853—  
Volume 3—No. 7

---

RACHEL WEEPING FOR HER CHILDREN.

Dear Sir:—I would like to see an exposition and harmony of Jeremiah 31: 15-17, with Matthew 2: 17-18. I remain yours in the hope of the Kingdom of Christ Jesus.

Z. W. LAMPORT.

Aurora, Kane. Illinois, November 17, 1852.

The passage referred to in Jeremiah reads thus—“Thus said the Lord: A voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation, bitter weeping; Rachel weeping for her children, refused to be comforted for her children, because they were not. Thus saith the Lord: Refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears: for there is a reward for thy work, saith the Lord; and they shall return from the land of the enemy. And there is hope for thine end, saith the Lord, and thy children shall return to their own boundary.”

A voice was heard in Ramah. Ramah was one of those cities which were allotted by Joshua to the tribe of Benjamin on the frontier of this canton, and that of Ephraim. The word signifies an eminence. Sometimes it is put simply for a high place, and then signifies neither a city nor a village. In Ramah, or on the high places of Benjamin and Ephraim, was a voice to be heard—in the city of that name, and in all the region round about. This voice or cry was foretold by Isaiah as well as by Jeremiah. “Ramah,” says he, “is afraid, Gibeah of Saul is fled. Lift up thy voice, O daughter of Gallim: cause it to be heard unto Laish, O poor Anathoth.”—Isaiah 10: 29-30. Gallim and Anathoth, the latter the birthplace of Jeremiah, were cities of Benjamin. Referring to the same event, Hosea says, “Blow ye the cornet in Gibeah, the trumpet in Ramah; cry aloud Bethaven after thee, O Benjamin. Ephraim shall be desolate in the day of rebuke: among the tribes of Israel have I made known that which shall surely be. The princes of Judah were like them that remove the bound; therefore I will pour out my wrath upon them like water.”—Hosea 5: 8-10. Hence, the voice to be heard was lamentation and bitter weeping on account of the desolation and slaughter, of Benjamin and Ephraim, by the enemy, and their deportation into their destroyer’s land. The contexts of these references show that the predictions relate to the removal of the whole twelve tribes from their land by the Assyrian power. Benjamin stands for Judah and Jerusalem as well as for its own particular canton; for the kingdom O Judah included Benjamin, and Jerusalem was one of the cities that fell by lot to it when Joshua subdued the country. Ephraim represents the rest of the tribes, or kingdom of Israel as distinguished from that of Judah, inasmuch as Samaria, the seat of government, belonged to Ephraim and Manasseh.

The prophecy of this voice of lamentation in Ramah found its initiatory accomplishment when the overthrow of the twelve tribes was consummated by Nebuchadnezzar, the Chaldean head of Assyria. Then captives of Judah's kingdom were gathered together in Ramah, and with them Jeremiah the prophet, at the disposal of Nebuzaradan, the captain of the guard—Jeremiah 40: 1. The voice of lamentation ascending from these prisoners, can better be conceived than described. The tender and delicate of the upper and wealthy classes of the state, whose children and relatives had been slain by the sword, and their palaces and mansions burned with fire, were those assembled to be marched off by a barbarian soldiery into their enemy's land. The cry of that day was a loud, shrill, and bitter lamentation, not confined to Ramah, but extending throughout the land from Beersheba to Laish or Dan. Jeremiah, though especially protected by the favour of God and the king his servant, mingled in that lament for his country's ruin. "How doth the city sit solitary," he exclaims, "that once was full of people! As a widow is she become! She that was great among the nations, and princess among the provinces, tributary is she become! She weepeth sore in the night, and her tears are on her cheeks: among all her lovers she hath none to comfort her: all her friends have dealt treacherously with her, that are become her enemies. Judah is gone into captivity because of affliction, and because of great servitude: she dwelleth among the nations, she findeth no rest: all her pursuers overlook her between the straits. The ways of Zion do mourn because none come to the solemn feasts: all her gates are desolate: her priests sigh; her virgins are afflicted, and she is in bitterness. Her adversaries are the chief, her enemies prosper; for the Lord hath afflicted her for the multitude of her transgressions: her children are gone into captivity before the enemy"—Lamentations 1: 1-5—that is, "they are not." But notwithstanding all that calamity, "there is hope for thine end: they shall come again from the land of the enemy—they shall return to their own border."

And they did return in part as an earnest, so to speak, of the great restoration in Israel's "latter end"—Deuteronomy 32: 29. Benjamin, the son of Rachel's sorrow, and the son of Jacob's right hand, returned with Judah, his fraternal ally, from the land of the enemy to his own border, seventy years after his deportation. This was the first and only restoration of the Hebrew commonwealth. But there was little comfort in it. Ephraim and Manasseh "were not," being still exiles beyond Bashan. These were Rachel's children as well as Benjamin, being the descendants of Joseph her first born. They have never yet returned from the land of the enemy to their own border. The time for this is not arrived; but of its certainty there can be no doubt in the mind of him who is intelligent in the faith, believing the words of Moses and the prophets.

But the voice of lamentation and bitter weeping was not stifled by Benjamin's return. There was another crisis in Hebrew affairs to be encountered, which would cause that voice to rend the air with piercing cries of lamentation and woe. Its echoes would sound from one end of the Roman world to the other, and be hushed only by a second deportation of Benjamin into the land of the enemy. After this the cry would be heard no more in Ramah, or on the high places of the land of Israel. "Refrain thy voice from weeping, and thine eyes from tears." This "refrain" hath continued hitherto. Since the destruction of Benjamin's city, the metropolis of Judah's kingdom, the tribe's lament has no more been heard in Ramah; for Rachel's weeping and tears can only result from the eyes and voice of her descendants in the land.

The reason why the voice of weeping no more ascends is because there is hope for Benjamin, Ephraim, and their companions; and this hope is, that they will return from the land

of the enemy to their own border. This restoration is the subject of Jeremiah's prophecy found in his thirtieth and thirty-first chapters. Let the reader peruse them in connexion. They contain the gospel of the kingdom with its mystery unexplained. The following are a few quotations from them. "The days come, saith the Lord, that I will bring again the captivity of my people Israel and Judah: and I will cause them to return to the land that I gave to their fathers, and they shall possess it." Speaking of the day of Israel's future engraftment into their own olive, he saith, "Alas! for that day is great, so that none is like it: it is even the time of Jacob's trouble; but he shall be saved out of it. For it shall come to pass in that day, saith the Lord of armies, I will break his (Gog, the Russo-Assyrian) yoke off thy neck, and will burst thy bonds, and strangers shall no more serve themselves of him. But they shall serve the Lord their God, and David (the beloved) their king, whom I will raise up unto them." "I am with thee, saith the Lord, to save thee: though I make a full end of all nations whither I have scattered thee, yet will I not make a full end of thee; but I will correct thee in measure, and will not leave thee altogether unpunished." "Behold I will bring again the captivity of Jacob's tents, and have mercy on his dwelling-places; and the city (Jerusalem) shall be builded upon her own heap, and the palace shall remain after the manner thereof." "Their children also shall be as a foretime, and their congregation shall be established before me, and I will punish all that oppress them. And their nobles (the saints) shall be of themselves, and their Governor (Christ) shall proceed from the midst of them: and I will cause him to draw near, and He shall approach unto me"—or be High Priest. "In the latter days ye shall consider it."

In reference to these "latter days," the Lord saith, again, "I will build thee, and thou shalt be built, O virgin of Israel: thou shalt be adorned again with thy tabrets, and shall go forth in the dances of them that make merry. Thou shalt yet plant vines upon the mountains of Samaria; the planters shall plant, and shall eat them as common things. For there shall be a day that the watchmen upon the mount Ephraim shall cry, Arise ye, and let us go up to Zion unto the Lord our God. For thus saith the Lord: Sing with gladness for Jacob, and shout among the chief of the nations; publish ye, and praise ye, and say, O Lord, save thy people the remnant of Israel. Behold, I will bring them from the north country, and gather them from the coasts of the earth," the land of the enemy; "for I am a father to Israel, and Ephraim is my firstborn. Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it in the isles afar off, and say, He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him, as a shepherd doth his flock. For the Lord redeems Jacob, and ransoms him from the hand of the stronger than he"—"and they shall not sorrow any more at all." Then comes the passage about Rachel in Ramah.

These quotations show what the hope is for Rachel's end; and what is meant by the return of her children from the land of the enemy to their own border. There is a mystery, however, connected with this the obvious import of the prophecy, which I shall explain presently. But before proceeding to this I would remark, that Rachel is representative of the polity of which Benjamin, Ephraim, and Manasseh, were important constituents. Rachel was the mother of Joseph and Benjamin; and literally, or in fact, never wept for her children "because they were not," inasmuch as she died long before them. The voice of lamentation is therefore affirmed of her in a figurative sense. The voice was a real voice of woe, and declared of Rachel in the case of her descendants. The appointment of Joseph's two sons, Ephraim and Manasseh, as patriarchs of tribes with Benjamin, made her the mother, or matriarch, of a fourth part of Israel; and by their political relations to the other tribes, the chief mother of the flock. Hence, the inheritor of Joseph's pre-eminence is styled "Ephraim my firstborn." Laban would have had Leah for the matriarch of Jacob's posterity; but God, who establishes all things by an election, chose Rachel, as he had done Isaac and Jacob in

preference to Ishmael and Esau, the beloved of their fathers, to be with Sarah and Rebekah, the matriarchs of Israel.

Rachel's children, then, are constitutionally the whole twelve tribes. She died and was buried near to Bethlehem-Ephratha, afterwards rendered famous as the birthplace of David, and his son Jesus Christ. Sleeping in the dust of Judea, she is personified as weeping in bitterness of soul for cruelty inflicted upon her sons in the land of the living. Her tears fall from their eyes when Nebuzaradan, Herod, or Titus, become a sword in the hearts of their children and friends; and as Israel's mother she refuses to be comforted so long as they are in the land of the enemy, exiles from home.

But there is a mystery, or hidden meaning, to this prophecy, which doth not appear to the careless reader. Hosea, referring to the restoration of Israel, says to Rachel's son, thus saith the Lord, "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself: but in me is thine help. I will be thy king." "The iniquity of Ephraim is bound up: his sin is hid." "I will ransom them from the power of the grave; I will redeem them from death: O death, I will be thy plagues; O grave, I will be thy destruction: repentance shall be hid from my eyes." Ephraim is politically dead, and buried; so also is "the whole house of Israel;" for, say they, "Our bones are dried, and our hope is lost: we are cut off from our parts," or native homes. But, saith the Lord God, "Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel." The bringing them into the land of Israel is national restoration. The nations are the graves in which Israel is nationally entombed; but the time is at hand when their king shall say "to the north, give up; and to the south, keep not back." He will be the plagues of these death-dealing and destroying powers; and until this come to pass, Rachel will not be comforted, individually nor matriarchally; for till then she will not be raised from the dead to see her beloved Joseph and Benjamin, and her children the whole house of Israel, rejoicing within their own border under their glorious Shepherd, "the Stone of Israel," wearing Joseph's crown as the one like him who was "separate from his brethren."

Rachel being the constitutional matriarch of Israel, is the mother of the tribes according to "the adoption which pertains to Israel;" for all Israel not being her natural descendants, they become her sons by a constitutional provision. At present "they are not;" but when God shall graft them into their own olive upon a principle of faith, with believers of all other nations of past generations, she will no longer "refuse to be comforted." She will rejoice because "they are"—because they are children returned from the land of the enemy to live in their own border, and a multitude of them for evermore.

But saith the inquirer, if this exposition be admitted, what does Matthew mean by saying that Herod's slaughter of "all the children that were in Bethlehem, and in all the coasts thereof," was the fulfilment of this prophecy of Jeremiah about Rachel? Matthew does not say that that event fulfilled Jeremiah's prophecy, but the to reethen, the saying. The saying was fulfilled in an appropriate sense; for Bethlehem and the limits thereof were the resting-place of Rachel's dust, which might be figuratively said, in the words of the prophet, to utter a voice of lamentation and bitter weeping, when the cry of her daughters rent the air for their bereavement. On that occasion "a voice was heard, lamentation, and weeping, and great mourning." This was a fact. The mothers of the murdered infants would not be comforted, because they were dead. This was another fact. It was also a fact, that the mothers were Rachel's people; but it was figurative to say that Rachel wept. Taken altogether, the saying of Jeremiah was very applicable; especially as it was the earnest of a lamentation which would be the accomplishment of his prophecy in full—an accomplishment to which

Jesus alluded when he said to the women who bewailed and lamented him, “Daughters of Jerusalem, weep not for me, but weep for yourselves, and for your children. For, behold, the days are coming in the which they shall say, Blessed are the barren, and the wombs that never bare, and the breasts that never gave suck. Then shall they begin to say to the mountains, Fall on us; and to the hills, Cover us. For if they do these things in a green tree, what shall be done in the dry?”

In the fifteenth verse of Matthew 2 there is another example of a prophet’s saying being fulfilled, or rather applied to an incident to be taken as an earnest of the fulfilment of the thing predicted. “When Israel was a child,” saith Jehovah, “then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt”—Hosea 11: 1. This is an historical fact. But Matthew intimates that it is more than history; that it is a prophecy also: and this intimation is found in the saying that the exodus of the child Jesus from Egypt, was the calling of God’s Son out of Egypt in a sense of the prophet’s saying. Christ is called Israel in Isaiah 49: 4. He bears Jacob’s new name, and the name of the nation of which he is king. God loved his people Israel in childhood, and Jesus too. He called them both out of Egypt, where pneumatically the tribes are to this day. But “out of Egypt call I my Son.” Their king’s exodus is an earnest of theirs. Ephraim, God’s firstborn of the nations, will come out of Egypt’s antitype, to return again no more. Then will Hosea’s saying find its accomplishment in full, when “the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people which shall be left, from Egypt.” Out of Egypt will Ephraim then be called.

\* \* \*

#### LONDON QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF PROPHECY.

A Trumpet of Uncertain Sound—The Journal and “The Coming Struggle”—The Journal denounces the Herald for Blasphemy—The Journal’s Untruthfulness—Its Notice of Elpis Israel—The Journal’s Hypocrisy—Its Infallibility—Letter of Elpis Israel’s Author to the Editor of the Journal.

The Quarterly Journal of Prophecy is a periodical of about a hundred and three pages of reading matter, printed in Edinburgh, and published in England by Nisbet & Co., 21 Berners street, London. It is printed on good paper, in clear type of a size larger than the Herald, with some pages in brevier, and embellished frequently with Greek and Hebrew in their own peculiar character; which, however agreeable to the reader, is “foreign stuff,” held in low esteem of all the compositors we have had to do with here. The pages are seven lines shorter, and about six lines narrower, than the Herald’s; but withal a well printed and highly respectable looking affair, at the very aristocratic price of \$6.62 per volume, postage included.

When I was in London I made inquiry for the best magazine published in Britain on the subject of Prophecy, being desirous of procuring some good articles for the readers of the Herald on that all-important subject—absorbingly important to him who would be saved. The Quarterly Journal was recommended, so I ordered it in hope of being able to make good use of it for the more effectual and speedy illumination of my readers in the “sure word of prophecy,” than, I presumed, I should be able to accomplish single handed without its assistance. The cost was great for so small a work; but that I did not regard if the matter it conveyed should prove to be “speech seasoned with salt.”

Before subscribing for the Journal, I sent a copy of Elpis Israel to the editor; and have since furnished him with the Herald gratuitously, in hope of being able to impart light to him for the benefit of his readers, as I expected he would to me for the advantage of mine. But I

fear his mind is so darkened by the fog in which he lives, and moves, and had his being, that, like my friend, the Bethanian President, it is impervious to the pure, white light that shines beyond his own peculiar mist.

That copy of *Elpis Israel* defined my position with the *Journal*. Its editor just touched and then dropped it, wringing his hand and blowing his finger-tips, with divers gyrations and contortions, like one that had picked up a live coal from off the altar! He was wonderfully affected. He gave a groan, somewhat like a growl of hopeless anguish, made an ugly face, and then swooned into the peace of the grave. Knowing, however, that “the religious press,” as it is styled, was in the hands of the ecclesiastics of the country, I was not surprised at the convulsion fit that seized upon the editor of the *Journal* in perusing *Elpis Israel*. This work is well known to be anti-clerical, and holding no man’s person, lay or clerical, in admiration for the sake of advantage. It was not likely, therefore, to be even in common esteem with the reverend incarnations of the clerical system, which fosters pride, vanity, hypocrisy, and self-conceit; and leads men to seek honour one of another rather than that which comes from God only. I remembered this, and making all allowances for the wounded dignity of the editor’s cloth, subscribed for his paper for the reasons already stated.

The editor knows how little use I have been able to make of the viands he has “cooked” and served up for his readers’ refreshment; for he has been in the monthly receipt of the *Herald* as long as I have subscribed for his. There has been a good deal of Greek and Hebrew criticism, which has displayed the respectable acquaintance of the writers with the grammars, lexicons, and uninspired authors in those tongues; and at the same time their very superficial knowledge of “the things of the Spirit”—Hengstenberg, Elliot, &c., to wit. Such essayism may do for the blind men of Oxford, Cambridge, Highbury College, and a College nearer home; but it will not do for my readers, who care more to know the meaning of “the word,” than the opinions of disputatious ecclesiastics, who are ever reading, and writing, reviewing and being reviewed, and yet are never able to come to an individual or mutual understanding of what the truth is! If one gets a few good ideas in a consecutive page or two, presently whole paragraphs of theological foolishness thrust themselves in and throw all into confusion and mystification. Still there is one commendable thing pertaining to this trumpet of uncertain sound—it advocates the literal interpretation of prophecy in opposition to the absurd spiritualism of its pseudo-orthodox contemporaries. With all its faults, I like the *Journal* for this. There is hope of an editor, even though a clergyman, who admits this rule. Unfortunately the *Journal* is not over skilful in the use of it. A man may know all the uses of a saw, and yet be unable to skake it aright. He is not a good workman, being literal only where it suits his theology, whatever it be; but more mystical, or even mythical, than literal, where it don’t.

The *Journal*’s head piece seems to be pretty well “crammed” with the learned lumber of the schools; but this is manifestly a disadvantage to him. It prevents him setting his house in order. Everything is, as the old ladies say, “higgledy piggledy”—without arrangement or neatness. The “philosophy” of his confusion, which Paul has associated with “vain deceit,” is his unhappy ignorance of the gospel when he sees it, whereby he lets it slip, and seizes hold of some church creed which he glorifies in stead thereof. He seems to believe in the kingdom, though his understanding of it appears very limited and confused. This confusion is his weakness; and prevents him from stepping in advance of the rank and file, and saying, “Come on! this is the way; let us charge the foe!” He is the rather content to keep his associates in line. He has an idea that the enemy is lurking somewhere about; he is, therefore, afraid to move from his position for fear of a surprise. Timid as a hare, he screams out like an

hysterical maiden, if a man but look at him. We have an illustration of this in his issue for April, No. 19, as I will now relate for the amusement of my readers.

#### THE JOURNAL OF PROPHECY AND "THE COMING STRUGGLE."

A pamphlet has been recently published anonymously in Edinburgh by a friend of Elpis Israel, entitled "The Coming Struggle among the Nations of the Earth," on the fifth page of which the author states that "The position of the world clearly intimates that the end has come, and events now furnish an explanation of the hitherto dark visions of Daniel and John, and by a careful examination of these and other prophets, the political history of the next fifteen years is spread out before us, nay, we are enabled to pass beyond that period, and trace almost accurately the regular course of events down to the beginning of the thousand years. Dr. Thomas of America was the first to find the key, and they who have read his book will at once be able to understand the following description of the period mentioned. For the sake, however, of those who have not seen Dr. Thomas's work—and we believe this applies to the majority of general readers—it will be necessary to give a rapid and connected sketch of the prophecy on which the whole hangs, and point out the errors into which former interpreters have fallen."

A copy of this pamphlet was sent to the Journal of Prophecy, whose conductor would learn from the cover that seventy-three thousand copies had been sold. This fact, with the extract just quoted, was too much for his equanimity. He had in 1850, *ex cathedra* "disapproved," and "discommended," Elpis Israel; and for it to be brought so extensively into notice, nevertheless, in 1853, was not to be calmly and patiently endured. Besides, was the like ever heard since clergymen began to speculate upon the prophets, that it should be proclaimed to seventy-three thousand people and their friends, that a layman, and a practitioner of medicine, in the wilds of America, was "the first to find the key" to Daniel and John, whose "hitherto dark visions" had foiled them all? Were Sir Isaac Newton, Bishop Newton, Faber, Bickersteth, Keith, Elliott, the Duke of Manchester, Moses Stuart, Hengstenberg, and last, though not least, the editor of the Journal, and a host of others, convicted of error by the expositions of Elpis Israel? Our editor could not endure the thought. In the excitement of the hour he forgot, that "God hath chosen that the foolish of the world should confound the wise;" and that he hath hid his wisdom from the wise and prudent, and revealed it unto babes; for so it seemed good unto him. But these things were as nothing to him. Zeal for his own craft was the one thing ascendant, which blinded him to everything else. He could restrain himself no longer; but seizing his pen and dipping it into the blackness of darkness, he dashed off the following lines, and printed them for a "review!"

"The Coming Struggle among the Nations of the Earth," &c.

"As pure a piece of prophetic quackery or claptrap as we ever read. The author seems a disciple of Dr. Thomas of America, whose magazine is a specimen of low scurrilous Socinianism and Universalism. Perhaps the author of this pamphlet might not like to identify himself with these blasphemies; but we greatly miss in his pages anything that gives us any indication of his theology."

The readers of the Herald well know that its pages are never defaced by Socinianism or Universalism, which, like Calvinism and Arminianism, equally as absurd creeds, are removed from my faith as widely as the poles asunder. The editor of the Journal knows it too. But when craftsmen are roaring hot for their shrines, they would as soon "invent a lie" to

serve their Diana, as receive a guinea for a sermon in her praise. This appears to be the case with him. He sticks at nothing, because he hates the truth which identifies his ecclesiasticism with the Apostasy, and converts his sanctimoniousness into the sepulchral whiteness of an ancient Pharisee. Hear the prayer of this Journalist who bears false witness against his neighbour. It is a standing “notice” on the last page of every number. “All readers of the Journal,” says he, “are earnestly besought to give it room in their prayers; that by means of it God may be honoured and his truth advanced; also that it may be conducted in faith and love, with sobriety of judgment and discernment of the truth, in nothing carried away into error, or hasty speech, or sharp, unbrotherly disputation.” It is not difficult to discern hypocrisy by exhibiting in juxtaposition the words and actions of mankind.

The things we advocate we have a right to call “the truth” until they shall have been proved to be contrary to the express words of Moses and the prophets, and of Christ and the Apostles. We have heard of no one who has undertaken this work, not even this specious and anonymous journalist in Edinburgh or London. He asserts without proof that the Herald is “a specimen of low scurrilous Socinianism and Universalism.” Having imposed this absurd falsehood upon the credulity of his readers, he advances another step, and pronounces the undefined fictions he attributes to me to be blasphemies; and me, therefore, as their utterer, by inference, a blasphemer. Ecclesiastical thunderings may be heard rumbling in these words, which, when clergymen had their way, were “awful;” but now, in Britain and America, they whom the truth hath freed regard them no more than the idle wind. I would rather be denounced for a blasphemer by the clergy than held to be just and orthodox in their esteem. I advocate that “gospel of the kingdom” preached by Jesus as the message sent from God to Israel: and which he said, should be preached among all nations. I advocate that gospel, and his claims to its kingdom, as son of David, and son of God by birth of flesh, water, and spirit. If this be blasphemy, it is the blasphemy on account of which he was pronounced “guilty of death.” “He hath spoken blasphemy,” said Caiaphas, “what farther need have we of witnesses? Behold, now ye have heard his blasphemy.” Ecclesiastics have always been great denouncers of blasphemy; but they have never yet scripturally defined it. They cannot, being ignorant of the truth. Did they but understand this, they would see themselves as Christ’s freedmen see them, the veriest blasphemers in the land. \*

---

\* Since this manuscript settling up arrears with the Journal of Prophecy was completed, I have fallen upon the following paragraph in the number for last January, which throws light on what the editor means by the “low scurrilous Socinianism and Universalism” designated “these blasphemies.” In his notice of “The Life and Times of John Calvin,” he refers to that persecuting ecclesiastic’s “Psychopannychia,” or “Sleep of the Soul,” directed against the Anabaptists of Germany, whom the editor styles with much bitterness, “these wretched blasphemers.” After twaddling about “the real world of disembodied spirits,” he exclaims, — “A soul sleep! A being in whom the Holy Spirit dwells, become unconscious! A saint cease to love God—cease to be holy—cease to long for the Lord’s appearing! It is strange that this Arabian fable, this dream of Arian fanaticism, should have been revived in our day! In Richard Baxter’s time, it was held by none but Socinians; Baxter frequently refers to it, giving in one place twenty successive reasons against this Socinian blasphemy. In our own day, this wretched fable has been revived and advocated in America, in a periodical conducted by Socinians and Universalists. We might not have noticed this, had it not been that some of its American revivers profess to be expectants of the kingdom; and we think it needful to enter our testimony against this figment of Arabian fancy, Socinian blasphemy, and Universalist profanity. Like Jesuits, its defenders are labouring hard to blind and mislead the students of the prophetic word, by telling them, that, in admitting the blessedness of the intermediate

state, they obscure the 'blessed hope.' Let no millenarian be deceived by such sophistry, or led to suppose that, in order to believe aright the glory of the resurrection, we are to hold that the dead are not blessed who 'die in the Lord!'"—Thus he builds a man of straw, and then demolishes him, in the fashion most approved by gentlemen in black! As an offset to this shallowness, and real quackery or claptrap, we would ask the writer, if Paul, who was "a being in whom the Holy Spirit dwelt," did not fall into unconsciousness when he went to bed at night; or did he never sleep after he received the Spirit? Does not a saint cease to love God when he is asleep? Does he not then cease to long for the Lord's appearing? Seeing this obtains on an average every eight hours of the twenty-four, or for upwards of twenty-three years in a soul's life of seventy-four, why may not unconsciousness obtain for twenty-three hundred? It is a non sequitur that 'the dead who die in the Lord' are not blessed because they are unconscious till the redemption of the body. They are blessed notwithstanding; for "they rest from their labours; and their works do follow them." Their blessedness in death consists in this.

---

But other writers not being blinded by hatred of Elpis Israel, do not consider "the Coming Struggle" (some of which I should expunge, and new matter insert, to make it invulnerable) as prophetic quackery or claptrap. A non-religious but politico-ecclesiastical paper in Edinburgh, called "the Scottish Press," says, "Although some may be disposed to class this little book among the profitless speculations on the prophecies of scripture, they ought not to do so hastily, for any one acquainted with the aspect of the Continent at the present moment will at once be prepared to admit that the author's views are in the main far from being unreasonable."

The British Banner says of it, "it is a pamphlet of a somewhat remarkable character. The writer we know not, but he is deeply in earnest, and has written with much feeling and not a little power. The pamphlet is a rush of emotion, the staple of which is an argumentative exposition. Highly improbable as some of its points seem to us, they are worked out with great power. In truth, were we to judge from the merit of the pamphlet, we should be inclined to ascribe it to the eloquent pen of Mr. Wylie. We are giving no hint. We are absolutely ignorant of the authorship."

The notice above quoted from the Journal is a specimen of the treatment all works receive which do not burn incense to ecclesiasticism and its incarnations, if they find themselves scripturally incompetent to enter the lists against their opponents. One small octavo line of denunciation is styled a "review" of a pamphlet of thirty-two pages by an editor who prays for "sobriety of judgment," and to be "in nothing carried away into error, or hasty speech!" It is evident that God pays no regard to the prayers of the editor, or of the Journal's friends; and for the obvious reason that that it is not conducted with love to enemies, sobriety of judgment, and unhasty speech. The readers of the Journal have a right to know the demonstration which convicts a pamphlet, illustrative of the interesting and important prophecies of Daniel and John, of "pure prophetic quackery or claptrap," seeing that so many thousands of the people have pronounced in its favour. In speaking of a work called "The Jew," he says, "we do not need to commend a work like this, that hath reached a fifth edition!" Here the number of editions is taken as an indication of so much merit that even the editor of the Journal cannot benefit it by his praise! But then, "The Jew" admits, that "the work of redemption" is being "carried on in" what the Journal recognises as "the church," while "The Coming Struggle" refers to "orthodox" interpretations as "a mass of obscurity, contradiction, absurdity, and error," completely mystifying both their authors and the world—as a host of commentaries and opinions, that must of necessity be thrown off by the present

generation, if it would come to a knowledge of the truth. But, if five editions of “The Jew” be proof of superlative merit, why should not seventy-three editions of “The Struggle,” of a thousand copies each? Will the editor explain this? But why impose this task upon him! Truth and righteousness are not to be expected from an editor hired by a London publisher to prepare a Journal that will be acceptable to pious sinners, who are ignorant of “the glorious gospel of the blessed God.” He must advocate the literal interpretation of prophecy; but that rule must not be applied to the endangering of the theology or church creed they have assumed, and are determined to glorify at all hazards. This is the key to Journal politics—the doctrines and commandments of men first; then God’s word so far as not subversive of these. Hence, the “quackery or claptrap” is all on the side of the Journal, and the “unwashed generation” it delights to honour.

#### THE JOURNAL OF PROPHECY AND ELPIS ISRAEL.

Two thousand copies of Elpis Israel have been sold in Britain and America, and another edition is in request in the former country. When an octavo work of over four hundred closely printed pages, is sold to that amount of copies in spite of the studied silence of reviewers in general, and of the brief, sharp, snappish growl of some particular ones, when they venture upon the experiment of trying to bark, it is evidence, at least, that the book is worthy of respectful consideration. The author has spent nothing in advertising it beyond the limits of the Herald, yet three fourths of the second edition are expended, and the book continues to sell. When a thousand of the first edition had been distributed, I left one for the Journal of Prophecy at the publisher’s, in hope that a periodical professedly devoted to the prophetic word would, at least, acquaint its readers with the new and unique interpretations it presents of passages, which had hitherto served only to make the darkness of the self-styled “orthodox” mind, intensely visible. But my hope was vain; and instead thereof, there appeared among its “reviews” the following lines; the italics are mine.

#### ELPIS ISRAEL, AN EXPOSITION OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD. BY JOHN THOMAS, M.D.

“That there is much truth in this volume, forcibly put forth, we do not deny; but there are so many serious counteractions, both in the errors which it contains and the tone in which it is written, that we cannot but disapprove and discommend it. The author’s contempt for other men, other churches, other sects, is quite unbounded. To differ from Dr. Thomas is to be a fool, if not worse. The advertisement of the author’s portrait need not have formed part of his book, but might have been reserved for a newspaper.”

On the last page of the number in which this “review” of Elpis Israel occurs, the editor of the Journal says, “It is the Lord’s work, not man’s that we are engaged in. It is his guidance that we are seeking, and his honour that we desire to advance.” This is pretty high ground for such a party to assume; but by no means surprising when we contemplate the position assumed by the chief of the clergymen of Anti-christendom in Rome! So, then, the Journal’s opinion of Elpis Israel is the Lord’s, and not man’s! It is infallible, then, and we have nought to say! Only convince me of this, and I will do my best to recover all outstanding copies, and with the few that remain, I will make a bonfire, and never publish a line on prophecy again without first submitting it to the scrutiny of his Infallibility of the Journal. Surely when such a man pronounces me a blasphemer, I ought to be as convincingly satisfied with the sobriety of his judgment in the case, as I shall be of Christ’s judgment in the case, as I shall appear at his tribunal! The Journal is the Lord’s work—the Lord is the editor! —for, the writer says, “it is

the Lord's work, not man's, that we are engaged in." Now he is engaged in editing the Journal of Prophecy—that is his work; and one not in the secret would say, it is Nisbet's editor's work; but this gentleman repudiates the idea, and says, "it is not man's." If Punch, the Journal's facetious contemporary in London, were asking the question, he would perhaps say, "Is it the gentleman in black, respectfully styled his Satanic Majesty's" "Avaunt, no!" is the indignant retort; "out, Imp of Folly; the Journal is the Lord's!"

O the hypocrisy of clerical fellowship with the Lord! They violate all candour, consistency, impartiality, and honesty of principle, and palm their pious frauds upon the Lord! This journalist repudiates from public favour the "much truth in Elpis Israel" because of its errors and its tone: and on the very same page, in noticing "The Last Days" by Edward Irving, says, "We have often mourned most sadly over the errors into which, in his latter days, Mr. Irving was permitted to fall. Still let us not refuse the good on account of the evil. Let us not adopt the unmanly, not to say unchristian, tendency of the present day, to despise every thing a man writes because he has written many things that are erroneous." This indiscriminate, unreasoning, childish method of judging is wholly inconsistent with the exhortation, "prove all things, hold fast that which is good." This blowing hot and cold as it happens to suit them, they call "the Lord's work!" Surely, the notice of Elpis Israel and this of "The Last Days," cannot have been written by the same hand; if they were, then to such a shameless editor there is due only the reprobation and contempt of all good and honest men. Of this we are certain, that the Lord has nothing to do with such editors or their works, but to despise them.

I was glad when this notice of Elpis Israel saw the light. It was beyond the power of the Journal to injure the sale of the book, so that I could well afford to play with the editor's artillery. He aimed his thunderbolt at the life of Elpis Israel, but instead of hurling him to Tartarus, it flit athwart his portrait a will o' wisp. The notice afforded me "a text," which I was not slow to "improve" for the illumination of my reviewer, and his preparation for more honourable displays of his genius in times to come. I fear, however, from recent manifestations, my friendly endeavours have been in vain. But that the reader may see that I was not negligent of his good, I will here publish a copy of the letter I addressed to the editor on receipt of his "review."

#### LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE JOURNAL.

Dear Mr. Editor. —Accept my sincere thanks for the flattering notice you have given of Elpis Israel in the Quarterly Journal of Prophecy. I feel really quite overcome with gratitude for the justice you have done me, your readers, and God's holy truth, in the half-a-dozen lines, or so, you have bestowed on a work of more than 400 closely printed pages, in which you say "there is much truth forcibly put forth." Positively, when you re-peruse the inklings of your review department, "the answer of a good conscience before God," which shall minister the balm of consolation to your righteous soul, must be truly enviable! The use you have made of "the two-edged sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God," is amazing, and exceedingly edifying! Your justice, candour, and impartiality (if your notice of Elpis Israel be a fair sample) constitute you a perfect prince of reviewers; and must assuredly confirm your election to the Theocracy of the Age to Come, as a fit and proper person to "rule men justly in the fear of God," when the Holy and Just One with his Saints shall possess the Kingdom under the whole heaven for evermore!

But irony aside, your brief notice of Elpis Israel confirms the opinion I had formed, that editors of “religious periodicals,” so called, would not venture to give the work fair play before their readers. Their motto is, “disturb not what is quiet,” which is a capital maxim for a rotten cause. They dare not think in advance of the sect or ecclesiastical faction by which their papers are sustained; and the proof of this is that they do not; and treat with silence works that put them to the proof. Instead of leading the public mind into truth, and indoctrinating it with ennobling principles, they are the laggards of the age, folding their arms in spiritual slumber, waiting until the advance of the people themselves shall make it safe to peep abroad, and glorify the crotchet of the day. Public sentiment, and not the word of God, is the censor of their lucubrations. What is believed, and who believes it, and not what is written in the word, or what saith the Lord, is the authority to which they defer. Aware of this, I expected that Elpis Israel would experience no favour at their hands; for, if what it sets forth be “according to the Law and the Testimony” (which no Scribe has attempted to disprove), not only is the craft by which they have their wealth, endangered, but one and all of the systems in which they confide for salvation are set at nought as mere doctrines and commandments of men.

I thought, however, that a Journal of Prophecy might possibly be an exception to the general rule, but I find that the Diana-spirit is as rampant in you as in the other members of the fraternity. You disapprove “the errors” and the “tone” of Elpis Israel. This is no more than your duty, if what you call “errors,” and the “tone” to which you except, be proved to be such, and exceptionable, from the oracles of God. But you have no literary or scriptural right to palm your ipse dixit upon the public for demonstration. I know not what sect of “Christendom” you belong to; but, if you be of the State Church, your judgment of Elpis Israel’s errors will have been formed by your Puseyite, High Church, or “Evangelical” creed; if of some unprivileged sect, by its peculiar symbol. A judgment formed thus, is not a judgment according to the truth, but merely according to your party opinion of that truth. Such a judgment is not satisfactory to those who repudiate sectarianism, and its unscriptural dogmata. I acknowledge only “the Law and the Testimony.” They do not regard the opinions of editors or reviewers as settling any thing. If you are of opinion that a book which contains “much truth forcibly put,” also contains “errors,” you are bound in justice and common honesty, to state the error in the author’s words, to adduce the testimony he refers to, and then to show the erroneousness of his reasoning, and therefore fallacy of his conclusions. This you have not done, so that your opinions of Elpis Israel’s errors will weigh only with those who look up to you as an oracle of their creed.

You might have selected a more appropriate word expressive of my view of ecclesiastical men and things than “contempt.” It is a principle with me to treat all men with respect as men; but when men individually and collectively assume divine honours, and an infallibility known only to a spurious orthodoxy, and use their usurped authority, and unscriptural position in effect to hinder the truth, I have no veneration nor regard for them in this character, nor for their decrees. You say, that “to differ from Dr. Thomas is to be a fool, if not worse.” No such sentiment as this has ever proceeded out of my mouth, nor flowed from my pen. If, however, the scriptures sustain the exposition set forth in Elpis Israel, then certainly to differ from it wilfully would convict a man of worse than foolishness; for unquestionably he is both a madman and a fool who rejects the truth.

“Other churches” and “other sects,” of which you say my contempt is unbounded, are phrases which imply some particular church and sect of which I am inferred to be the advocate. Well, I do plead for one in particular. It is for that church called in the New Testament, the “One Body,” which is animated by the “One Spirit,” having many individual

members, but only one head, even Christ. But I confess, I am at a loss where to find it among men, except in so far as I meet here and there a believer of “the Gospel of the kingdom of God,” waiting for the adoption, even the redemption of the body, at the manifestation of the King of Israel in his glory. I plead for this church, or aggregation of believers; and therefore, I belong to none of what you call “the churches,” because I do not regard them as churches of Christ. The oracles of God teach me that a church is an assemblage of men and women, who, “believing the things of the kingdom of God, and of the name of Jesus Christ,” separate themselves from sinners, and are imbued with the spirit of truth, as illustrated by the lives of the prophets and apostles; and who, upon an intelligent, heart-purifying, and love-working faith, have been immersed into the name of the Holy Ones; and henceforth perfect their faith by walking in the steps of Abraham’s, which he had being yet uncircumcised. Where will you find individuals of this description aggregated into congregations, and bearing the names which distinguish the sects and parties of “the religious world?” I should be happy to know of such, that I might cultivate their acquaintance and fellowship. If you believed in such a church as I have defined above, how much veneration would you have for “other churches,” which not only differed from it, but preached other gospels than that preached by the apostles? As to sects, I read of but one sect in the New Testament approved of God, namely, the sect of the Nazarenes everywhere spoken against. I have no veneration for any other sect than this. All “other sects” are denounced by the apostle as carnal and damnable. The Christian Body will be a sect as distinguished from and opposed to Gentilism and Modern Judaism, till the time comes for it to take the kingdom and dominion under the whole heaven. Then all the ecclesiastical factions of your “Christendom” will be abolished; and the nations will serve the Lord with one consent—Zephaniah 3: 9. But for the mystical body of Christ to be a sect in relation to the factions called “names and denominations,” State and Nonconformist, is a very different thing to itself being cut up into sects. Sects, or divisions, do not belong to Christ, who is undivided, though trodden under foot. Real christians “are all one in Christ Jesus;” Christians only in name belong to the Popish, Protestant, and Sectarian, system; and are zealous for the traditions of men. These are the “other sects” to which you refer. I have no faith in them at all. They are extra the fold of Christ, and have neither part nor lot in the truth, as must be manifest to a babe in him. They glorify themselves, receiving honour one of another, regardless of the honour that comes from God only; therefore the gospel of the kingdom is neither preached, believed, nor obeyed among them. I have proved this in Elpis Israel. Doubtless you think not. Show the contrary if you can. For myself, I am convinced, that, if our righteousness exceed not the righteousness of the Protestants of the straitest sect of “Christendom,” we can in no wise enter the kingdom of God.

The conclusion of your notice by reference to the advertisement of the portrait is truly ludicrous. This is an item with which you have nothing to do. It was addressed to the subscribers, who could not be reached through a newspaper. As editor and reviewer, your concern is with “the much truth forcibly put forth,” and what you term the “errors;” not with the author’s notices to his friends. But your reference to this little incident, shows the spirit of your mind. You have found Elpis Israel too much for the artillery of your creed; it is too well fortified with the Law and the Testimony, which you are unable to gainsay in fair and open combat; therefore you twang your bow, and let fly an unpointed shaft at the author’s notice to his subscribers, as a random shot, in hope that, hit or miss, it may help in the fabrication of the unfavourable impression you would like to get up against the writer and his book! But Elpis Israel laughs at the reviewers; for his life is beyond all jeopardy from their wooden swords.

As to the “tone” of Elpis Israel, it is written in the tone of one who believes he is right, and therefore as we say in America, “goes ahead,” sans ceremonie, and without circumlocution. When he speaks truth he does not fence it around with compliments and apologies. It is this practice that makes the religious literature of the day so vapid and pointless. The truth needs to be spoken out boldly, which you editors and reviewers are unable to do, seeing that ye do not know the truth, or, if knowing it, have not the courage to utter it. Ye are fettered by your contradictory creeds, and hampered by the clogs and shackles of the parties for which you write. An apologetic enunciation of truth makes no impression on the public mind. I believe conscientiously that the clergy and ministers are ignorant of the gospel of the Kingdom, and consequently do not, and cannot preach it. Believing this, I hesitate not to speak it, and that, too, without apologising for so doing. This doubtless gives a tone to Elpis Israel which you do not like. I cannot help it. What I believe to be God’s truth must come out; if you can show that I am in error, do so from the sacred oracles. The scribes, Pharisees, and lawyers, by no means relished the tone of Christ’s discourses; because in speaking the truth, he reproached them. It is the truth of a discourse that gives tone to it, and when that truth unveils ignorance and hypocrisy, it is by no means music in the ears of those whose consciences apply the truth to themselves.

There are several important and interesting prophecies, and chronological problems unfolded in Elpis Israel, which have hitherto completely foiled your sectarian theologians. I may mention the contemporaneous manifestation of the five elements of Nebuchadnezzar’s Image, and their simultaneous fracture “in the latter days;” the comminution of those parts to dust after the breaking of the imperial dominion which united them into one political fabric; and the substitution of the kingdom and empire of Jesus Christ for these kingdoms which he and the saints, and his armies, will have ground to powder. The Little Horn of Daniel’s Fourth Beast, and the Little Horn of the Macedonian Goat; the interpretation of the Eleventh Chapter of Daniel, especially from the 36<sup>th</sup> verse, the prophecy of the Two Witnesses and the Holy City; the Times of Daniel and John; the remarkable prophecy of the “Unclean Spirits like Frogs;” that of Gog and Magog; the Second Exodus, or grafting in of Israel into their own olive again, &c., &c.; these and many more that might be named, have been rendered intelligible in Elpis Israel. In Chronology, Stephen and Moses, Paul, Samuel, and Judges have been reconciled; the passage in 1 Kings 6: 1, interpreted; the 40 years of Acts 13: 21, accounted for; the commencement of the 70 weeks established; the 430 years signified by Ezekiel’s days indicated; the Age of the World proved; the forty years’ interval between the Advent of Jesus and the commencement of the Millennium brought out, &c. Besides these, “THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM” has been demonstrated; repentance and the remission of sins in the name of Jesus, exhibited: and as a whole, the subject so manifested as to convict “the divines” of “Christendom” of profound ignorance of “the principles of the doctrine of Christ.” Methinks you might have found some better employment for your pen in handling these topics as presented in Elpis Israel, than in penning the splenetic notice which has elicited these remarks.

That your eyes may be opened, and that you may attain to the acknowledgment of the truth, irrespective of human authority in matters of faith, is the sincere wish of

Dear Mr. Editor,  
Yours Faithfully,

THE AUTHOR OF ELPIS ISRAEL.

3 Brudenell Place, New North Road,  
London, April 3, 1850.

In conclusion, and by way of offset to the Journal's denunciation, I may quote the following words from a letter recently received from my worthy agent in London. He says, "My friend Lord Monteagle, the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer, has obtained from me a copy of Elpis Israel, and I am glad to learn that Lady Monteagle is much pleased with the work." The Journal, I apprehend, cannot object that "orthodoxy" does not reign in the Earl's family, for in presenting a petition concerning ecclesiastical affairs in Australia, his lordship expressed "the earnest anxiety which he felt with respect to the extension of the Church of England and Ireland in the colonial possessions of the Crown. The progress thereof in many of the colonies was most encouraging and satisfactory." I am glad, however, to see that his lordship, while approving the progress of Church of Englandism, has too much natural justice in his composition to desire to make it dominant or exclusive by law where there are so many of his fellow subjects who repudiate it. "I must be allowed to say," said he to the Lords Spiritual and Temporal of the Imperial Parliament, "that it would be impracticable to attempt to realise in our colonial possessions the idea of a dominant or exclusive church." He felt that this was important as a matter of principle, but he thought it was equally important as a matter of expediency. A christian may be satisfied with the legal ascendancy of the Church of England and Ireland in those countries on the ground that it excludes from power something worse. Better be ruled by Pope Victoria and her friend the Archbishop of Canterbury, than by the Pope of Rome and the Conclave. Protestantism in its worst form is better than Popery in its mildest and best. May Elpis Israel be a light in his lordship's circle, making the darkness visible, and demonstrating the way of truth.

EDITOR.

\* \* \*

#### A NEW GOSPEL.

The publisher's of the "Water Cure Journal" say, that "the world is cursed with three great evils—disease, drugs, and drug-doctors. The Water Cure Gospel will ultimately save the race from all three. Help us, good friends, to send it to the ends of the earth!"

This is unphilosophical and anti-scriptural. It is so, because it is unphilosophical to reason against the use of things from the abuse of them; and seeing also that the most successful physician that ever appeared among men, used moistened clay in blindness, followed by baptism in Siloam. I do not mean, therefore, to prescribe this in affections of the eyes; I only refer to it to show that the example of the greatest of physicians does not sanction water-cure-gospelism to the exclusion of every thing else as the panacea of our race.

I do not see that drugs, or drug-doctors are any more curses than water or water-using doctors. It is objected that drugs are poisonous and kill; true, but that depends on circumstances: water is poisonous and kills likewise, under certain circumstances. I have cured a man, who for two years had no use of his upper and lower extremities, nor any sensation in them, in a few weeks, with pills composed of jalap, aloes, calomel, and castile soap. In twenty-four hours after he began to take these "cursed drugs," sensation like the pricking of a thousand needles, began to return in the palms of his hands, and the soles of his feet; and in two months he was walking about in perfect health. Would he curse drugs and drug-doctors? On the other hand, I have cured myself of intermittent by the use of a single hot bath; and have on another occasion, submitted experimentally to cold-waterism without benefit. Drugs are good, and hot and cold waters are good; but they are often converted into evils of considerable severity by ignorance. Ignorant water-doctors are less dangerous than

ignorant drug-doctors, because the tool they work with curatively, is not so easily converted into an instrument of death. I have seen, however, precious time lost to the extreme jeopardy of the patient by water-using inefficiency and ignorance. Gravid-uterine irritation of the chylopoietic viscera, producing incidentally glandular swelling of the throat, was treated for quinsy by a leading writer of "The Journal" in this city! He was dismissed, and a fashionable drug-doctor called in, who pronounced it liver disease, and prescribed extract of taraxacum, &c. Next day he "sounded," and pronounced it lung disease, and altered his prescription! This satisfied the patient, who, because of cough and dyspnoea, imagined in the fulness of her nescience in pathology, that her lungs must be necessarily diseased. The ingredients of the doctor's compounds were not killing, and before many days, the irritation having subsided by abstinence, the quinsy, liver, and lung diseases (mere symptoms of uterine disturbance) all vanished; and the patient recovered in spite of "wet sheet packs," drugs, and the undiscerning users of the same. O, the art and mystery of all sorts of physic, how gloriously uncertain they are, be the pathists whom they may! What these require is not additions to the *Materia Medica*, but the knowledge of the motive power of living animals; how it may be regulated, and the ability to interpret the signs evolved by its disturbance. But the Pathists are like the Parsons, who undertake to cure "souls" of whose constitution or nature they know nothing. Where is the doctor, even among waterists, who can define what life is—what sets our organs into consentaneous action, and how this is maintained for threescore years and ten—and establish his definition? Or, where is the parson that can define the "soul" he intones with such pious awe? If a man were ignorant of the motive power and working constitution of a watch, would people knowing that fact, entrust him with their watches for repair? Not if they objected to the ruin of the constitutions of their watches. Seeing, then, that pathists and parsons are alike ignorant of "life" and "soul," why do the people confide themselves to their treatment for cure? Because the people are ignorant of their ignorance. This is the safety of both professions. Pathists and parsons are ignorant, but the people are more so: therefore neither party can stone the other. Pathists "cure diseases" upon the yankee principle of "guessing;" and all classes of them sometimes succeed with all sorts of heterogeneous devices. The parsons, however, never succeed; for all their efforts are directed to the "cure" of a thing they call "the soul," which has no existence in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth: the thing, therefore, being a nonentity, their prayers and preaching, or their means of cure, must be ineffectual in every case.

There is a closer connection between the vocations of the pathists and parsons than a person might at first suppose. The pathists, by which I mean homeopathists, hydropathists, and allopathists, the last including many names not ending in *ist*, in treating disorder and disease, tamper with an evil principle within us, diffused through all the particles of our bodies, styled by Paul, a better physiologist than any of them, "sin in the flesh." It is so called, because it was established in our bodies as the consequence of the sin of the progenitors of "the race," which sin the scriptures define to be "the transgression of law." The name of the cause is put for the effect, even as a son bears his father's name. Hence, while our race continues to be "sinful flesh," there will be disease in man, which all the drugs, and all the water in oceans, lakes, seas, fountains, and rivers, administered by all the pathists under heaven, will never eradicate. The Journal proclaims the contrary of this; and announces that water, as applied in water establishments, and recommended in its pages, "will ultimately save the race from disease, &c." The parsons have a different theory. They prescribe a pious belief in their dogmas, which will take effect in the article of death. At this epoch of terror, the thing they call "the soul" separates, they say, from the body, which soon returns to dust. With Dr. Bush's disciples this is enough. The disembodied soul evolves in the act of separating into a spiritual body, which soars aloft to some sky kingdom—New Jerusalem! It

is then an inhabitant of “the Spirit World,” and no more liable to disease. It is cured. Bushite Hydropathists keep its body well washed unto death, and then give its incrustated germ a carte blanche to sky kingdomia. When all the race has got there, none remaining behind to depart, the earth will be empty, and “the race” saved from disease, drugs, and drug-doctors! unless the process is to go on eternally: and then I do not see how “wet sheet packs,” “sitz baths,” “douches,” &c., are to get “sin” out of the bones! But if “disease, drugs, and drug-doctors” are so effectually got rid of by evolving into a spiritual body, I would submit to all Swedenborgians of the Bush school, if the easiest and speediest “death” would not be the best salvation from the cursed evils of disease, drugs and drug-doctors! I would submit this to all the parsons who teach that the things they call “souls”—“immortal, undying souls”—go to celestial bliss at the last breath! The Death-cure Journal might supersede The Water-cure Journal with great propriety. Water-cure is nothing compared with Death-cure; the former may allay a burning in the flesh, called “fever,” which may break out again, while the Death-cure will put out the fire for ever, and send the “purified spirit” to everlasting bliss!

“The Water-Cure Gospel,” like the parson-gospel, is a poor affair for the salvation of the race from any evil that afflicts it. None can eradicate disease from the human constitution but He who planted it there. Disease is not a distinct principle; but irregular or abnormal evolution of one or other of the forces of the body, ultimating in increase or diminution of secretion and temperature, and sometimes in alteration of structure. This irregularity belongs to animal nature which no system of prevention or cure can counteract, so as to say, “see, there is an animal, the forces of whose system cannot be disturbed by anything within or exterior to it!” Before the race can be saved from disease, the flesh of that race must be changed. It is now animal flesh, begotten and born of the same; it must be turned into spiritual flesh by the operation of the power of God. Here are two kinds of flesh, the former of which belongs to men in the present state, the latter to angels, and to those of mankind whom God shall exalt to an equality with them. The nature of angels has no sin, or evil in it; but is clean, glorious, powerful, such as that possessed by Jesus in glory. The animal human nature is unclean, weak, corruptible, vile; and while it remains animal, is incurable. Pathists can do nothing with it, but experiment upon it. They cannot spiritualise a particle of it; but Christ, the great physician, will spiritualise the whole “by the energy wherewith he is able to subdue all things to himself.” Pathists have this truth to learn; and the parsons, the terms upon which men may attain to a condition of body in which they will be no more liable to disease. There is not “a divine” in this city can define these terms according to Moses and the prophets, Christ and the apostles. They may say “faith and piety are the condition of escaping hell-fire, and going to heaven at death.” This is arrant nonsense. For first, escaping what they call “hell-fire, and going to heaven” is not the question, nor is it a question mooted in the holy scriptures; and secondly, what they call “faith and piety” is not the condition of deliverance from disease. What Paul defines to be “the faith,” and what he styles “the obedience of faith,” are the terms; and it is of these the parsons of the land are as ignorant as the Pope of Rome.

Deliverance from disease implies salvation from “drugs and drug-doctors,” and all the long list of harpies who fatten upon the miseries of mankind. There is but one gospel of deliverance from these, and that is neither the Bethanian Water Gospel, nor the “Water-Cure Gospel” of friend Fowler’s Journal. Paul says there is but one gospel, which he styles his, and the “one faith;” and whosoever offers any other gospel to the world, even if he were an angel from heaven, he pronounces “accursed.” The clericals, and the inventors of these water gospels, do not seem to regard the apostle’s curse, or they would be more chary of dabbling in matters too high for them than they are. Let then the Scribes and Pharisees of our day attend

to this, the One Gospel of the Bible announces the deliverance of THE RACE from all political, physical, social, and spiritual evils; and invites all individuals of that race to whom it is made known, to the enjoyment of the blessedness of that deliverance on certain terms: this great deliverance will be effected by the power of God; who in bringing it to pass, purposes to accomplish it through the power of a kingdom to be divinely established in the Holy Land, whose inheritors will be filled with His Spirit to perfect all his will and pleasure. The proclamation of this one gospel with conditions proves, that the salvation purposed is not the deliverance of all the individuals of all the generations of the race that ever lived; but of the race, and so many of that race as accept the terms. In other words, the race saved will consist of all Adam's posterity that have conformed to the conditions propounded since the world began, till the consummation. This will be a multitude far less numerous, indeed, than the aggregate of mankind who have converted God's earth into an enemy's country; yet quite multitudinous enough for its adequate population when there is "no more sea"—Revelation 21: 1.

He, through whom God proposes to accomplish this grand display of power, has once for all announced the terms upon which man may obtain a share in the "glory, honour, incorruptibility and life" of this "great salvation." His words are these, and when read, let every dog, not dumb, bark their praise—Isaiah 56: 10-11. —"He that believes THE GOSPEL, and is baptised, shall be saved; he that BELIEVES NOT shall be condemned"—Mark 16: 15-16. —Belief of the gospel, and baptism, are the terms of acceptance. This is the affirmative of the case; he that doth not believe the gospel shall be condemned. This is the negative. Those in the negative need not trouble themselves about baptism, that is, immersion of a proper subject in water; for belief of the gospel stands between a sinner and baptism. Though dipped in water a thousand times, or water-cured on the most approved principles of the Hydropathic Gospel, a sinner cannot get at the baptism prescribed by the Son of God without first believing the gospel He preached, and his apostles after him. Believe this or not, as you please, O reader, the terms I have quoted are Christ's words, and by them you will be judged much sooner than you may be disposed to believe.

You see, then, that the great question to be determined is, —What is the gospel? — for belief or rejection of this will fix our destiny for all future ages. Read Acts 8: 12, and that will tell you what the good news is about, and what the Samaritan sinners did when they believed it. If you will not take the trouble to turn to this testimony, you are not worthy of being told here. Jesus says, "Seek first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness, and all things shall be added to you." Seek to understand "the gospel of the Kingdom," and the things set forth through the name of its King, that is, of "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews," and if you believe them with all your heart, and are then immersed into the Holy Ones, you will have found the Kingdom, and have become the subject of the righteousness of God. Happy are you then; for, if you "patiently continue in well doing," when Christ comes to raise the justified, to restore the Kingdom again to Israel, and to vanquish and dethrone "the powers that be," your corruptible body shall put on incorruptibility, and your mortal, immortality. Disease, death, and corruption, will affect you no more; for you will have eaten of that aromatic and life-inspiring drug prescribed by the divine physician, the ARBOR VITAE, whose Folia or Leaves, "are for the healing of the nations." Go to, then, ye Human-Gospellers, and learn what this means, that ye also may eat, and drink, and live forever.

The above is written as a contribution through these pages for our friends, the apostles of "the Water-Cure Gospel," and publishers of its Journal. They say, "all views and all systems, when properly presented, are allowed a place in the Journal. We desire to "prove all

things,” and to hold fast ONLY “that which is good.” I have endeavoured to present the Bible system (the book from which they quote) for the eradication of disease from the race, and its deliverance from the other two curses, in a proper manner. I hope the publishers will deem the endeavour “properly presented,” and allow it a place in their well conducted, cheap, and well executed monthly. I do not expect them of course to endorse a word of it; but as they have set forth a new gospel concerning water, I have thought, as one of their friends and readers, though a “drug doctor,” and therefore one of the “curses” of the race, they would have no objection to my opposing views to views, and a divine system to theirs and all others as well, that they might be enabled the better to “prove all things, and to hold fast that which is good,” according to their “desire” so emphatically expressed. That this may be their conclusion, is undoubtedly expected by their friend, the

EDITOR.

Mott Haven, Westchester, N. Y.,

May 16<sup>th</sup>, 1853.

\* \* \*

#### EVOLUTION OF THE UNCLEAN SPIRITS BY THE FROG POWER.

The Parisian correspondent of the London Lloyd's says, “It is necessary I should put you in possession of a remarkable view of present affairs which has been given me by a gentleman intimately connected with Turkish affairs. ‘The integrity of the Ottoman empire it is impossible to maintain. Either that empire must fall, or it must be reconstituted as a Christian or Byzantine empire. I know that Lord Palmerston and Louis Napoleon have for a long time been carrying on a correspondence connected with a scheme which has been kept in the background, and this will account for the friendly tone assumed towards the Dictator by your ex-foreign minister. Lord Palmerston detests Russia and Austria; and any body is an ally in his eyes who will join against those powers. The scheme is to found, as I have said, a New Empire, removing the Greek King to Constantinople, and thus ensuring the consolidation of a Christian empire. Switzerland and France would enter Italy, and proclaim the independence of Italy and Hungary, while England attacked Russia. This project is seriously under consideration, and I believe we shall not pass the summer without its realisation. With a Byzantine empire, Poland and Hungary free, and Austria annihilated, we should have nothing to fear from Russia.’”

But while the Frog Power is plotting with British Statesmen against Russian progress and ascendancy, it does not neglect its own advancement. In 1852, it laboured diligently through its ambassador, M, deLavalette, at the court of the Dragon in Constantinople, in procuring a firman or decree, conceding in it, as the eldest son or champion of the Roman Church, the protectorate of the Holy Shrines, or something similar thereto. A firman was granted, revoked, and granted again by the Moslem emperor, endowing the Frog Power with preferential rights in ecclesiastical affairs connected with the Holy Places in Jerusalem, which are construed by Nicolas of Russia, the Head of the Greek Church, as detrimental to the interests of his communion. Russia declared that she could not submit to changes thus introduced into the existing state of things, which were so humiliating to the Greeks, and favourable to the Roman Catholics. Having carried its point in Constantinople, the Frog Power endeavoured to maintain the advantage gained there by negotiation at St. Petersburg; but its instructions to the French minister were not of a nature to facilitate a settlement. The effect of Frog-diplomacy at St. Petersburg is seen in the fact, that when the Prince-Bishop Daniel returned from St. Petersburg to Montenegro, without previous notice he descended from his mountains at night upon the Turkish garrison at Zabljak, and slaughtered all the men

he found there. Thus the war that followed was a Russo-Montenegrin experiment against Turkey, remotely and unintentionally excited by the Frog Power. This little war has ended in placing things as they were before Daniel's treacherous attack, in relation to Montenegro, which was not what Russia wanted when she excited the war. The Autocrat hoped that a general war would ensue between Turkey and her provinces. Russia's Bessarabian troops were ready to enter the Moldo-Wallachian provinces, and the Sebastopol fleet was equipped for Constantinople. The pacific termination of the struggle has annoyed Russia, which accordingly now demands the independence of Montenegro: that is, that the mountain fastnesses should pass from Turkey to Russia, as there is no real independence for a horde of 200,000 men, surrounded by powerful neighbours. "The union of so many of the Slavonic race with Russia," says the writer aforesaid, "would be a fearful danger for Europe, the more that Austria has committed the folly of uniting with Russia out of hatred to England. The independence, so called, of Montenegro must be refused, if we would not see Russia make another great stride in Europe."

The diplomacy of the Frog-Power having indirectly kindled a flame in Montenegro, it reacted upon the Beast-Demon of Austria, from whom the unclean spirit peculiar to it issued forth against the Dragon-Demon of Constantinople. Count Leiningen was sent with great haste as the bearer of a threatening message, demanding the termination of hostilities against Montenegro, &c. No sooner, or rather, scarcely had the Moslem yielded to Austria, than an avalanche of insolence descended from Russia upon the unfortunate Abdul Medjid. Prince-admiral Mentschikof, minister of Marine, governor of Finland, and a relative of the Czar, arrived at Constantinople, unexpectedly to the Sultan and his Divan, but not to the Greek population of that city. He appeared in Byzantium as the alter ego, or other self, of the Autocrat. He was surrounded by a brilliant escort of rear-admirals, generals, aide-de-camps, and many distinguished persons. He was met at Topana by all the officers of the embassy on horseback, by all Russian subjects, and protégés. Men in full uniform, loaded with orders, gold, and diamonds, the Ambassador in an open carriage, and surrounded by his staff, advanced toward the palace of the embassy, which he reached with difficulty, owing to the dense crowd of Greeks. This show of popularity was obtained by promises and money. The promises had reference to their obtaining the mosque of St. Sophia for the Greek Catholic worship, while whispers were adroitly circulated in their ears about a Byzantine empire.

This sudden apparition of quasi Russian majesty in the city of Constantine, excited the surprise of "the Great Powers," who are ignorant of Russian movements, though they seem to divine its ambition. It is considered by the best informed that there is at the bottom of this affair "some vast design emanating from the intriguing head of Nesselrode," whose son accompanied the embassy. Within certain limits Turkey has been progressing. Her military organization has improved; her statesmen seek to improve her financial system, and her trade; she is making roads, and preparing even railways, &c.; which is all very distasteful to Russia. The object of Mentschikof's mission is, therefore, to check Turkey, to humiliate and bend her to Russia. To effect this, the Autocrat makes demands directly antagonistic and subversive of the firman granted last autumn to the Frog-Power in favour of the jurisdiction of the Papal Church, and of French influence in the Holy Land.

Thus, popish superstition, in accordance with Napoleonic ambition, has placed the Frog-Power in antagonism to Russia and Austria on a question relating to Jerusalem and the Holy Land. What Power shall have the ascendancy there? Shall Turkey, Russia, or France? This the real question created between them by the Frog-Power. It cannot be peaceably settled. It is certain that the French cabinet feels much irritation at the conduct of Russia; but

it is convenient and politic for the present to appear as well satisfied and pleased as possible. The world is not permitted to know the real condition of affairs between “the Powers,” until it can no longer be hid. This question about Turkey and the Holy Land, usually styled “the Eastern Question,” will be the cause of working out a change in Europe as well as in the East. The antagonism between Russia and England is inevitable. This natural antagonism of England to the most grasping of all despotisms; and the diplomatic antagonism of the Frog Power to the same despotism, place England and France side by side in disputing the progress and ascendancy of Austria and Russia in Turkey and the east. Nor need the alliance between France and England be jeopardised on account of Egypt and the Holy Land. The relations of France to the Papacy cannot continue permanently as they are. The predilections of the Papal government are Austrian. Austria sustained by Russia presents a more stable support to the palsied Pontificate against the revolutionists than the Imperial upstart ruler of the fickle Gauls. I have no doubt but an antagonism will spring up between Napoleon and the Pope, which will place the former in hostility to the priest-power. Hence, as Louis’ religion is only an affair of convenience and policy, his present zeal for the “Holy Shrines” will evaporate with his respect for the clergy, whom he uses as the mere tools of his ambition, even as they use him as the tool of theirs. It is true, he has entertained the notion of converting the Mediterranean into a French Lake, which, if persisted in, would originate implacable war between him and Britain. But other questions are exhaling from the bottomless pit subversive of that idea. Italy, and a frontier to the Rhine, with Belgium, and perhaps Spain, are worth more to France disenthralled from Jesuitism, than Egypt and the Holy Land. If England recognise French dominion in Italy, &c., the Frog Power might concede Egypt and the Holy Land, and certain Mediterranean islands, to the protectorate of Britain, which, being a Protestant Power, might even admit of Roman Catholic ascendancy over the Holy Shrines in Jerusalem, if required.

Thus we see, from the working of things, that the Frog Power is the disturber of the general tranquillity; yet, in the approaching tumult of nations, no Power will make so little real capital out of the disturbance as it. “France,” says a Frenchman, “is, of all the great European Powers, the one which has most to suffer in an eventual dismemberment of the Ottoman empire. Whenever it shall be accomplished, it will be, above all, to the advantage of Austria and Russia, and not without compensation to Great Britain, by the definitive abandonment to her of Egypt, and by the concession of some islands in the Archipelago—Candia, for instance; to Prussia, by that of the territory she covets in Germany, and which will contribute to maintain her preponderance. But France is not placed in the same favourable condition; no indemnity can be granted to her. She is, then, menaced with the prospect of the ruin of an ancient and constant ally, (Turkey), and of the partition of its spoils, without obtaining anything. This is, perhaps, the fatal consequence of her position in the centre of Europe—a position in other respects advantageous, but which is far from being so in the present circumstances; and it is not at all improbable that France will be forced to witness the partition of Turkey in the course of the nineteenth century, as she witnessed that of Poland in the eighteenth. The danger of such an act was great, indeed, after the revolution of 1830—it has augmented since 1848.”

If the alleged scheme of Palmerston and Louis Napoleon be initiated, the uproar of nations will be tremendous. All the nations of the Old World will be involved in war. When the reader sees this war, let him trace out the causes of it, and he will find it to be the result of the working of the Frog Power upon the Moslem “Dragon,” the Austrian “Beast,” and the Italian “False Prophet,” as I have been showing it. These three Powers, again, act upon one another, as we have seen Austria operating against Turkey; and these three finally upon “the kings of the earth, and of the whole habitable,” as in Turkey sending for the British fleet, and

Austria assuming a threatening attitude against Switzerland and Piedmont, and in making common cause with Russia out of hatred to England. In this way the “time of trouble such as has not been since there was a nation upon the earth,” foretold by Daniel, is evolved. John, in the Apocalypse, refers to it in these words, “the nations were angry,” that is, greatly enraged. “The slaughter of the Turkish garrison of Zabljak, by the Montenegrin Rob Roy, will now be recognised,” says the London Daily News, “as just that little distant black speck on the horizon which warns the tried mariner to make all snug for the coming storm. The speck has swelled into a heavy black impending cloud, which no one can ignore, and few can misunderstand.” There may be a lull, and an amicable arrangement be effected, as is reported; but it can only be temporary. The breeze will again rise, and suddenly become a hurricane. The French and English ships now watching events in Turkey, will be too late; for “the king of the north shall come against the Moslem like a whirlwind, with chariots, and horsemen, and with many ships: and he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow, and pass over.” Turkey will fall, and the Moslem dynasty of the Dragon will give place to the Russo-Assyrian Clay. Henceforth, there can be no permanent peace between England and Russia. “An evil thought will come into the mind” of the Autocrat, the carrying out of which will make Palestine again the battle ground of nations. Russia will subdue Egypt, and take possession of Jerusalem. But there her progress will be stayed. Toward India she will advance no further, for the wings of the overshadowing land will extend to the rivers of Cush.

The French empire has been revived by the Watchers and the Holy Ones to work out this result. The Holy Shrines in the hand of the Autocrat is the crisis of Nebuchadnezzar’s Image. When his army, composed of troops drawn from all his subject nations, shall encamp on the mountains of Palestine, that Image will be standing there upon its Feet of Iron mixed with Clay. The descending Stone, which the Israelitish builders refused, will fall upon it, and break its Feet to pieces. The commixture of the Assyrian Clay with the Roman Iron is thus proved to be of very temporary continuance—a temporariness represented by the saying, “they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men; but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed (or permanently mixable) with Clay.” This shivering of the Feet to pieces is termed by John “the seizing of the Dragon, that old Serpent, which is the Devil and Satan.” The Euphratean dominion is thus finally “dried up,” and no obstacle remains to “the manifestation of the Sons of God,” apocalyptically designated as “the Kings of the risings of the Sun,” styled in the common version, “the Kings of the East.” At this crisis the Euphratean dominion is Russo-Assyrian, not Moslem; the dynasty having been previously changed, or the sovereignty over the mixed population of the Dragon territory transferred from the Sultan to the Czar.

The Gold and Clay of Nebuchadnezzar’s Image are the Assyrian element at tow several remote epochs thereof. The gold represents its manifestation in the dynasty of Nebuchadnezzar; and the Clay its manifestation in the dynasty of Ezekiel’s Gog. The Image in all its combinations is essentially Euphratean, that region being always of first importance to it which is watered by the Euphrates. The Image is therefore representative of a Euphratean Dominion with a diversity of elements and sovereignties. These are the golden, argentine, brazen, iron, and clay. Hitherto this dominion as a unit has never stood upon its Feet. The golden or Nebuchadnezzar sovereignty was Euphratean; the Medo-Persian, or argentine, also; likewise the brazen or Macedonian and Greek; and the iron or Romano-Greek and Moslem: but the Ferro-Aluminous, or iron and clay, Feet Sovereignty has not yet appeared on the Dragon territory. When it does, however, it will be Euphratean when manifested in full; for Persia, Mesopotamia, Syria, and Judea will be included in its domain. The Moslem Sovereignty of the iron element is already Euphratean and drying up; and the

clay has approached nearly to the source of the Euphrates, where at Mount Ararat, the Russian empire joins Turkey and the kingdom of Persia. The mission of the Frog Power is to bring down the confines of the Russian empire from the north, so as to include the greater part of Assyria and Palestine. This is prevented for the present by the Circassian resistance to Russia in the Caucasus. But when the schemes of Napoleon shall cause the Czar to seize upon Constantinople, and to pour his Cossacks into the plains of Anatolia, he will be able to cut off their supplies, and to take the Circassians in the rear, and so bring their resistance to an end. The Clay element will then be on the Image territory an Euphratean Sovereignty. The clay-head being sovereign of 12 millions of Romano-Greek Catholics—the ferro-brazen element—and upon the Dragon-territory of the Image, will present before the world, “the iron mixed with miry clay”—Isaiah’s Assyrian, “the stretching out of whose wings shall fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel!” But “the Lord shall cause the glory of his voice, to be heard, and shall show the lighting down of his arm, with the indignation of his anger, and with the flame of a devouring fire, with scattering, and tempest, and hailstones: for through the voice of the Lord shall the Assyrian be beaten down, who smote with a rod.” Thus shall the giving of God’s Son to Israel “be with burning and fuel of fire.”

EDITOR.

\* \* \*

#### A MOTLEY FAITH.

“Be ye perfect, even as God is perfect.”—Jesus.

Dear Sir,

I wish to be saved; but surrounded by such a multitude of different faiths as there are in the world, I am at a loss to know what I must do to that end. I thought I knew something about this matter once, having “experienced a hope;” but some of your writings have fallen under my notice, the perusal of which causes me to doubt of I ever knew anything upon the subject as I ought. I am so shaken in mind that I can hardly tell what I believe at present; but some time ago I thought (I will not term it “believed”) that there existed in my body a soul capable of living eternally unconnected with body of any sort. I thought that when the separation of the body and undying soul occurred, the soul if pious would be wafted into realms of bliss beyond the skies, and remain there till the last day: I believed, and do still, that Jesus called Christ is the Son of God, and somehow or other the Saviour of sinners; but I thought he was to come in person and burn up the earth, and destroy all the impenitently wicked upon it; after which he and the saints would reign over the earth (over whom I cannot say), the place of wolves, lions, tigers, and serpents, whose fierceness had been changed into the harmlessness of sheep, and domestic cattle. I regarded this reign of Christ and his saints as “the Kingdom of God;” and supposed that when their reign commenced, it would be signalised by the reunion of their souls with bodies raised from the dust. I called this good news, glad tidings of great joy; and the preaching of it I considered as the preaching of the gospel. As to the restoration of carnal Jews to Palestine, that was in my eyes pure foolishness, and those who preached it I styled “Judaisers.” As to baptism, I believed immersion was the most scriptural form; but by no means essential to salvation: yet to be safe, as I thought, I considered it best to be immersed. You see, then, what was my faith, or creed, and practice. I was very zealous for these things, considered as pious, and delighted to think that the Lord would soon appear. Now what I want to ascertain is, in being immersed upon such a faith, did I believe the gospel and obey it? Your conviction of the matter will much oblige

A SEARCHER AFTER TRUTH.

## A MOTLEY FAITH PROVED TO BE VAIN.

“Your faith is vain, and ye are yet in your sins.”—Paul

The question proposed turns upon this for the answer, has God promised the things stated as the subject matter of our correspondent's faith? If he have, then he has believed and obeyed the gospel; but if he have not, then he has not believed it, and consequently cannot have obeyed it. But has God promised the things stated? Has he promised them to Abraham or to David, the holders of the promises? Or has he promised them to mankind at large through any of the prophets and apostles? Nay, so far from having promised these things, he has promised the very reverse—things in truth utterly subversive of our correspondent's “thoughts.”

The scriptures of the prophets, as is admitted by the highest authorities of “the Schools,” are silent as death on “the immortality of the soul.” They do not teach it. Although believed in Egypt while the Jews were enslaved there, Moses, who was skilled in all their lore, makes not the least allusion to it in any of his books. This being admitted, it follows that it is not taught in the New Testament; for the writers of this volume through one of their company, declare, that they taught none other things than what Moses and the prophets said should be. Hence, being an unscriptural dogma, it is an unscriptural faith that professes it; consequently a “vain faith,” and responsible for all the conclusions that flow from it.

If every child of Adam be born of the flesh with immortality in him, as is taught by the pulpit orators, then Paul's doctrine is not true, and is virtually denied. He says, that God will render eternal life to them who seek for immortality by a patient continuance in well-doing: but there is no sense in this—it is nonsense to that mind which responds to the tradition of congenital immortality. But Paul is right: men must “seek for” immortality, because they have it not. If they had it, the apostle would have proved himself but an unskilful workman, to have urged them to “seek for” what they already had in actual possession. He did not teach after this fashion; nor did any man whose eyes were opened by his instrumentality, and who continued in the faith formed in his mind by the apostle's teaching, come out and aver his belief of congenital immortality, disembodied existence, and consequent sky-kingdom glory. Therefore, as it was in the beginning, so it is now, and ever will be, that like causes produce like effects. The belief of the truth will produce truthful results, and vice versa. If a man profess with his mouth mere human hypothesis and tradition, it is certain he has not believed the truth with his heart; for out of the fulness of the heart the mouth speaketh. It is with the heart man believes unto righteousness, and with the mouth that confession is made to salvation. A man may lie, and confess what he does not believe, or believe what he does not confess. But we are not dealing with such. We are supposing that there is no hypocrisy. In such a case, then, we say, that apostolic, or scriptural teaching believed, never prompted the confession of faith in congenital immortality and sky-kingdomism; and that consequently “such a faith,” being a belief of untruth, is unjustifying and vain.

To confess faith in congenital immortality, disembodied existence, and sky-kingdomism, (for they all go together) is virtually to deny that “life and incorruptibility were brought to light by Jesus Christ in the gospel;” it is virtually to deny the resurrection of the just, and by consequence, that of Christ; also the kingdom of God in the land promised to the fathers. But one may say, I believe in congenital immortality, disembodied existence, and “gaining kingdoms in the skies;” and I believe also in the resurrection of Jesus and all

mankind; and in the kingdom of God in Palestine! Then concerning such a motley faith it may be said, that the incompatibilities of which it is compounded resolve into an olla podrida—a perfect mess, from which no one certain thing can be extracted, and called “the word of truth.” Such a composite reminds one of the baquet, or magnetic tub, filled with a medley of the most absurd and senseless kind. It is written of God’s people, “They shall be all taught of God;” but assuredly no one was ever taught of him who rejoices in his word made void by tradition. A man deceives himself who imagines he believes in the gospel of the kingdom, while at the same time he believes in sky-kingdomism. If a man be scripturally convinced of the former, he rejects the latter of necessity as incongruous and incompatible. The Bible teaches but one system, and that is unique, and subversive of all others. He that is the subject of this teaching feeds on “the unadulterated milk of the word,” and has no sympathy with the unenlightened thinkings of the flesh. A man who professes to believe two opposite and nullifying systems is double-minded, and consequently unstable in all his ways. His faith is neither this, nor that; but all things as it happens: an indefinite, intangible, impression. Such a creed is unworthy of the name of “faith,” and to be eschewed by all searchers after truth.

There is no such kingdom promised in the Bible as that of Jesus and the Saints reigning over the earth occupied only by animals bereft of their ferocity. To affirm the burning up of all who are not saints at the coming of the Lord, is to deny the solemn and positive asseverations of the Almighty. All nations will not be destroyed at the appearing of Christ. They will continue to occupy their own lands, and to exercise themselves in commerce, manufactures, and all the arts of peace; and of their abundant prosperity they will bear willing tribute to Israel’s King, reigning on Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem gloriously. But this is denied by the dogma of “all the wicked will God destroy at the coming of the Lord.” A faith, therefore, characterised by this dogma, is not “the full assurance of things hoped for (or promised), the evidence or conviction, of things unseen;” and therefore unjustifying and vain.

The mission of the Lord Jesus is not to destroy the nations, but to destroy their governments and oppressors, and to enlighten, regenerate, and bless them. He that does not see this, does not see the truth concerning the Christ, which is abundantly exhibited in the prophets: therefore to deny this, or to affirm something contrary to it, is to deny the truth concerning Jesus. Of what avail is it to admit that Jesus is the Christ, while we deny or make of none effect the things revealed in the prophets concerning him? To affirm of him what is contrary to Scripture, is to believe in “another Jesus” than he whom Paul preached. That man is not taught of God who does not believe what he has said concerning him in the prophets; and if not taught of him, he is no member of his family or household. It is said of the Christ, and therefore of Jesus whom God hath acknowledged, “he shall govern the nations upon earth;” “he shall break them in pieces as a potter’s vessel;” “Jehovah girds him with strength for the battle,” “subdues the people under him,” and “makes him the head of the nations.” “The Lord God shall give him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of David in the ages; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.” “He shall sit and rule upon his throne as a priest upon his throne, and bear the glory.” “He shall build the temple of the Lord;” “and execute judgment and righteousness in the land.” These are things affirmed of Christ, not one of which has received the least accomplishment in Jesus. He is indeed a priest over the house of God, that is, over them “who hold fast the confidence and rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end;” but he is not yet “a priest upon his throne;” if he were, then the saints would be there too, for it is written, “To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me on my throne, even as I also overcome, and sit down with my Father upon his throne,” that is, in Zion which God hath chosen to place his name there. Now all this is

utterly at variance with burning up the world, for in this event, there will be no governing of nations upon earth, and ruling as a priest, upon David's throne. I conclude, therefore, that he who believes in world-burning at the coming of the Lord, does not believe the gospel, but in traditions, that make it of none effect.

Without the restoration of the Jews, the gospel-kingdom cannot be. Empty Britain of its inhabitants, and leave only Victoria and the government, and there would be no kingdom; and for the obvious reason, that there would be no nation to rule over, or subjects to govern. Let the Jews, then, remain in their dispersion, and, though Christ and his brethren might be in Jerusalem, there would be no kingdom, as they would be a staff without an army, a government without a people. "The children of the kingdom" are Israel. There are two classes of them—the rulers, and the ruled. Both classes are styled "the children of the kingdom" by Jesus in Matthew; because in the aggregate they are all one nation. Deny the restoration of this nation to the land promised to Abraham and his Seed for an everlasting possession, and you make God a liar, and the gospel a mere invention of designing men.

When the two kingdoms of Israel were broken up by the Assyrians, the people of Seir said, "These two nations and these two countries shall be mine, and we will possess it: though the Lord was there." If what these Idumeans said became a fact, it is clear that Abraham and his Seed would not henceforth possess it. But Jehovah had sworn to Abraham that he and his Seed should have it for ever, which was virtually denied by the saying of the Idumeans, who, in flattering themselves with the prospective possession of the land, "spoke blasphemies against the mountains of Israel," and in so doing "multiplied their words against God." Therefore he makes the following decree against Seir, saying, "As I live, saith the Lord God, I will make myself known among Israel when I have judged thee. And thou shalt know that I am Jehovah, and that I have heard all thy blasphemies which thou hast spoken against the mountains of Israel, saying, they are laid desolate, they are given us to consume. Thus with your mouth ye have boasted against me, and have multiplied your words against me: I have heard them. Therefore, when the whole earth rejoices, I will make thee desolate"—Ezekiel 35: 10-15.

Now the principle revealed in this portion of the word is, that a party affirming a thing which, if established, would contravene the fulfilment of a promise of God, is, in so saying, speaking against that promise, and multiplying their words against Jehovah. To do this is to injure the reputation of God for veracity; which, to use a Greek word for an English phrase, is to blaspheme him and his promises. Mount Seir was guilty of this, and is consigned to desolation as a punishment. Is it a greater offence to blaspheme the mountains of Israel than to blaspheme the nation of Israel; and is it not as much multiplying words against God to say, that their tribes shall be always dispersed, as to say of them and their mountains, "they shall be ours, and we will possess them?" I can see no difference at all; for to affirm the non-restoration of Israel to Palestine, is as much a denial of the promises of God, as to say that Idumea (and, consequently, not Abraham and his seed) should possess the land. It may seem a very light thing to this generation to affirm things logically subversive of God's promises; but the scriptures show clearly that no greater offence can be committed against Him, who says, "I HAVE MAGNIFIED MY WORD ABOVE ALL MY NAME." Ruin came upon Mount Seir for this blasphemy, and think ye who practise the same abomination, that God will hold you guiltless? Hear the word of the Lord, ye despisers of Israel, and wise in your own conceits;—"If the ordinances of the sun for a light by day, and of the moon and stars for alight by night, depart from before me, saith Jehovah, the children of Israel shall even cease from being a nation before me in the age: if heaven above can be measured, and

the foundations of the earth be searched out from beneath, I will also cast off all the seed of Israel for all that they have done, saith Jehovah.” Now, the departing of these ordinances, the measuring of boundless immensity, and the searching out of the foundations of the earth, by men is impossible; it is therefore also impossible that Israel can continue in everlasting exile from the Covenanted Land. “Hear the word of the Lord, O ye nations, and declare it in the isles afar off, and say, He that scattered Israel will gather him, and keep him, as a shepherd doth his flock. For the Lord redeems Jacob, and ransoms him from the hand of the stronger than he: Therefore they shall come and sing in the height of Zion, and shall flow together to the goodness of the Lord, for wheat, and for wine, and for oil, and for the young of the flock, and of the herd: and their soul shall be as a watered garden; and they shall not sorrow any more at all. Then shall the virgin rejoice in the dance, both young men and old together: for I will turn their mourning into joy, and will comfort them, and make them rejoice from their sorrow. And I will satiate the soul of the priests with fatness, and my people shall be satisfied with my goodness, saith Jehovah”—Jeremiah 31: 10-14.

I say then, hath God cast away his people, Israel, whom he knew in the days of old? Yea, saith the pious sky-kingdom gospeller! “God forbid,” says an apostle; “God hath not cast away his people whom he knew before. If they abide not in unbelief they shall be grafted in: for God is able to graft them in again . . . when the fulness of the Gentiles is come in.” It is clear, then, that the faith of such a gospeller is not in harmony with Paul’s. He looked for a restoration of his countrymen to the favour of God, and their land; while the other consigns the whole race to perdition at the burning up of the world! Is such a faith, “the substance of things hoped for,” although it believes in the divine sonship of Jesus, and his history? A faith justifying that repudiates the restoration of the kingdom again to Israel, that denies the reestablishment of David’s throne in Zion, and scoffs at the idea of Jesus, the crucified King of the Jews, wielding the sceptre of the world from thence! Impossible. It is a faith that gives God the lie, and exposes its possessor to a curse when the Lord appears.

From these premises, then, I conclude, that our correspondent’s immersion was not obedience to the gospel. The New Testament baptism administered by the apostles on and after Pentecost, was the obedience to “the faith” prescribed by “the law of faith.” That faith is defined by Paul “the hypostasis of things hoped for, the elenchus of things not seen.” Hypostasis is a word opposed to phantasia, i.e. mere appearance or phantasy; or, I would say, doubtful supposition, or opinion; and signifies, foundation, substance, a firm persuasion, confident anticipation, or assured expectation. Elenchos is whatever serves to convince; and therefore argument, proof, demonstration, which, laying hold of the heart or mind, becomes conviction. Hence, Paul, in writing to persons having this faith, says, “We desire that every one of you do show the same diligence to the full assurance of hope unto the end:” and again; “Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith . . . let us hold fast the confession of THE hope.” The faith then which justifies, is “the full assurance of things hoped for, the conviction resulting from demonstration of things not seen as yet.”

From this apostolic definition of faith it is evident, that opinion, or supposition, is excluded. Hence, a man whose head is filled with a medley of truth and error, of which our correspondent is an example, cannot now have, or ever have had, the faith of the gospel; so that his immersion cannot have been the obedience of the gospel. If there were more of this faith there would be more christians of the right stamp in the world. The great desideratum of our day is faith, or a confident belief of the unadulterated truth working in the heart as a principle of action. This is scarcer than diamonds, and almost as rare as precious stones in the crater of Vesuvius. To apply the word faith to the credence of the day is a prostitution of

the term to an unholy thing. The popular mind is ignorant of the “things hoped for, and unseen as yet;” and being ignorant, or doubtfully disputatious, or scornfully opposed to them, cannot obviously, whatever the practice, be in the obedience of the things summarily indicated as “the truth.” This ignorant, disputatious, scornful state of mind, was the mental habitude of many immersed persons, who now reject what they regard as the foolishness of their past convictions; yet they cling to their immersion as a holy thing! As if any act could be a holy religious action which is predicated on a sincere belief of nonsense; for all is nonsense which is not the sense of scripture, no matter how firmly, and sincerely, or by whom believed.

The “full assurance of hope” presupposes the definiteness of the “things hoped for and unseen.” If it were not so, how could Paul with propriety exhort his brethren to “hold fast the confession of the hope?” “The hope” is a phrase that excludes all vagueness, and indicates certainty. “The faith,” “the hope,” “the word,” “the truth,” “the gospel,” are words which refer to some particular system of things of a cheering character, revealed of God for belief and expectation. “Things hoped for and unseen” are not what individuals may choose to hope for as most agreeable to their views of what ought to be. To assume this would be to reduce “the hope” to a hope; and the certain things that God has promised, to the vague, intangible, feel-like-its, and wishings, of the carnal mind. He that thinks God’s thoughts thinks in direct opposition to the thinkings of the flesh. Were it not so, there would be no need for men to be taught of God; for in that event he would have nothing to teach them, which the thinking of the flesh might not elaborate independently of his revelations. The thinking of unenlightened flesh is that man’s deadliest foe who regards it. It is the sophistry of sin, and leads him to conclusions contrary to the written word. Contentment with an immersion predicated upon ignorance or unbelief of the unadulterated word is a part of this sophistry. By faith are ye justified in the obedience of the truth; and not by dipping, being ignorant or faithless thereof.

We find then that the faith which justifies comprehends something more than the belief that “Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.” If this were enough, then were the “devils” justified of old; for it is written, “Devils came out of many, crying out, and saying, Thou art Christ, the Son of God.” The devils believed there was one God, and they believed that Jesus was his Son, and also the Christ; and we may add on the testimony of James, “they believed and trembled.” If then a trembling belief in the personality of Jesus were all-sufficient and justifying, why were not the devils justified? And if this were the great and sole salvation truth, why did Jesus rebuke them, and suffer them not to speak? For Luke says, “they knew that he was the Christ.” Again, in the case of Nicodemus and the rulers of Israel. “We know,” said he, “that thou art a teacher come from God”—was he, therefore, justified, or qualified to inherit salvation? By no means. Was Jesus content with this recognition of his divine mission? No. He forthwith directed the attention of Nicodemus to the subject matter of his teaching. As if he had said, “You admit that I have come from God, and that consequently my personality is such as I claim for myself, now why do you not believe what I preach about the kingdom? Verily I say unto you, Except you be born from above you cannot see it, nor enter into it.” Jesus was sent to preach the kingdom of God, and not to preach himself: he left this for his apostles to do, when they should preach the kingdom in his name.

But as it was in the days of Jesus, so it is even now—Devils believe and tremble. The word is daimonia, spirits, not “devils” in the Gentile sense, or as if the word were diaboloi. Spirits such as those whose manifestations originate from phreno-magnetic circles, and speak by mediums in our day. The policies of the Pope and Austrian emperor are styled pneumata daimonon, or the breathings of knowing spirits, or demons. They are, therefore, demons, or

devils, if the reader prefer the word. The term is applicable to all people of like faith and character. These devils, then, believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that he died and rose again for the sins of the world. And where is the God-dishonouring sect, Greek, Latin, or Protestant, that does not believe it? Adulterers, murderers, and thieves believe it, — pious and impious all alike! If this be the faith that justifies, what constitutes the difference between saint and sinner? The wisdom that is from beneath, and therefore earthly, sensual, and devilish, replies that the saint is a penitent believer, that is, sorry for his sins; but the sinner is not. The difference is a matter of repentance, not of faith. The wisdom from above, however, does not teach this. It is the faith that makes the difference between the saint and sinner. The saints believe in the things of the kingdom, and in the personality or name of Jesus, which lead them unto repentance; the sinner believes in the sonship and divine mission of Jesus, but he has no faith in the things of the kingdom promised, and is, therefore, “without hope,” and a sorrower unto death.

From the whole, then, I conclude that it is good, but insufficient for salvation in the kingdom, to believe that Jesus is a teacher come from God, whose Son and Christ he also is. It is likewise necessary to believe what the great teacher taught; for salvation is promised on condition of believing this. “This gospel of the kingdom must be preached among all nations,” said he; “he that believes and is baptised shall be saved; he that believes not shall be condemned.” Immersion without faith in this is not worth a centime. Of this I am fully assured; and being so, I submit my conviction of the matter as requested by “a Searcher after Truth,” to his candid consideration, in hope that he may arrive at a conclusion satisfactory to his own mind, and in harmony with the word of God.

EDITOR.

\* \* \*

#### “IMMANUEL.”

It remains further, that we open the mystery of the name “Immanuel;” which being interpreted, saith St. Matthew, is “God with us.” Now it is a thing worthy of remark, that the angel had immediately before instructed Joseph to call his name, not Immanuel, but Jesus. Where then, or how, it may be asked, was Christ called Immanuel? No where is he so called in the Scriptures, save in the next chapter of this prophecy, where it is said (verse 8), “The stretching out of the Assyrian’s wings shall fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel,” and in the 10<sup>th</sup> verse, where it is said, that “the counsel of the heathen shall not stand, because of Immanuel.” Now both of these passages refer to a time and an action which is not yet accomplished; though it hath had its beginning; for the counsel of the Assyrian and his confederacy have not yet come to nought, and the stretching out of his wings doth still overspread the land of Immanuel. Moreover, it may be truly said that Immanuel did not purchase the land until he had kept the conditions of the Old Testament, which stood in perfect obedience to the law; and, therefore, it could be called Immanuel’s land only with reference to a time posterior to his incarnation. And, since his incarnation, he hath not been with us, but absent from us. But before he departed, he gave a promise that he would come again, and receive us unto himself; “that where I am there ye may be also;” that is, he maketh a distinct promise, against a future time, that he and his people should never more be separated as they are at present. The present, therefore, is not the time when he can be properly be called Immanuel; for by his own account he is not with us in person, but only in spirit, in the Comforter. Wherefore Paul saith—2 Corinthians 5: 8, that “to be absent from the body is to be present with the Lord;” and—verse 6, that “to be at home in the body is to be

absent from the Lord.” And the time specified by the same Apostle, when we shall be ever with the Lord—1 Thessalonians 5: 17, is at the descent of Christ from heaven, the resurrection of the righteous dead, and the change of the righteous living. With no propriety, therefore, I deem, can the name of Immanuel be applied to the days of his flesh, during which, though the Word did tabernacle amongst us, it was only for a day, and not for a permanency; a brief season followed by a long absence, which again is to be followed by an eternal presence and residence with us. Besides, while he abode in the likeness of sinful flesh, he was not the Son of God to the knowledge and confession of the spiritual man; because it is written “No man can say that Jesus is the Son of God, but by the Spirit of God.” and again, it is written, “Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.” Besides, our blessed Lord, in the days of his flesh, did perform none of those great works which are prophesied of Immanuel in the following chapter; which are, to deliver his land from the Assyrian, to bring the counsel of the heathen to nought, to multiply the nation, to break the yoke of their burden, to sit upon the throne of David, and to establish the boundless government thereof for ever. Against what time, then, shall this name of Immanuel come to him by right? When he shall come in the glory of his Father to take up his eternal residence in the midst of Israel. And when is this? In the new heavens and the new earth, and the restored Jerusalem; when all things shall be generated anew, and the former things be passed away. In that dispensation, therefore, which is about to come upon the earth, the Son of the Virgin shall both be, and be known to be, “Immanuel, or God with us.” And this, indeed, shall be his distinction in that day, from the invisible, incomprehensible Godhead of the Father, who is not with us, but worshipped as apart from us; or rather, who is everywhere, and, therefore, not peculiarly any where. At present Christ is not “God with us,” but God with the Father, seated on the Father’s right hand; but then he shall be “God with us,” and not God with the Father: so that the successive conditions of the Son seem to be these three; —his eternal dwelling-place in the bosom of the Father; his present seat at the right hand of the Father; and his permanent abode with men; in the last of which I include the days of his flesh, which was to us the seal of all the promises and prophecies concerning the eternal manifestation of God, and the pledge of his coming to reside permanently with us, against the dispensation of the fulness of the times. He attained in the days of his flesh unto the humiliation of being the Virgin’s Son. He hath taken this lowly degree of existence, and seated it in honour and glory at the right hand of the Father; and the Father who hath given him this honour, is preparing all nations for his government; which being accomplished, he shall then come as a man of war and settle himself in victorious peace over the obedient earth, dwelling in the midst of his people, and enjoying the name “Immanuel.”—Prophetic Expositions.

\* \* \*

### THE PROPHECY OF THE INCARNATION.

It appears from this great prophecy of the incarnation, that the idea which was given of the Man-God, or Immanuel, was that of a deliverer and rightful inheritor of the land of Israel, the destroyer of all its oppressors, the remover of all its bondage, the multiplier of the nation, the increaser of its joy, the occupant of its throne, and the governor of its people for ever, yea, and the monarch of an universal and eternal dominion upon the earth. These predictions concerning the child are in this prophecy, and no others are in it. If it mean not this, it meaneth nothing. If a child was ever born of a virgin, it was for these ends he was born. And if he have not fulfilled these ends, then he is yet to fulfil them, nor would such a delay weaken but rather confirm the prophecy; for there is mentioned a mysterious waiting on his part, and rejection of him of their part, and a woeful visitation of darkness in consequence thereof. And

accordingly they are so found till this day, rejecting his aid in miserable woeful darkness, nothing of all the glory having been accomplished, but the very reverse; because the season of his waiting is not yet expired. The prophecy therefore waits still for its great accomplishment in the Son of the Virgin, by the act and power of the Son of the Virgin. If any one say, No; Jesus of Nazareth shall never sit upon David's throne, nor rule over the house of Jacob; then I say, Jesus of Nazareth is not the person here prophesied of, but some other. If they say, Yea, but he is the Immanuel born of the Virgin, who is now spiritually filling the spiritual throne of David, and spiritually reigning over the spiritual house of Jacob, and spiritually holding universal spiritual empire; then all I have to say, I do not know what the spiritual throne of David means. "It is the throne of a believer's heart." Where learned you to call a believer's heart the throne of David? "It is the throne of the Majesty on high." How dare you blaspheme, and call the throne of God, the throne of David? And what use was there to tell Ahaz, in his present straits, that a Son should be born and a child given, who should reign in the hearts of men, and be exalted to a throne of God in the skies? And what signs of such an event were those two which were granted? Besides, these spiritualists know not where they lead themselves. If they will have all the substance of Immanuel's work to be invisible and spiritual, then I will have his birth also to be spiritual and invisible upon earth. If they will annihilate the greater part to please themselves, I will annihilate the lesser part to vex them; and then what have they left of all this bright and glorious prophecy but the shadow of a dream? —Prophetic Expositions.

\* \* \*

#### OPPOSITION BENEFICIAL.

It is apparently a certain and standing law that the very opposition which is always being offered to the advancement of truth, whether by uncongenial circumstances or inconsiderate man, is overruled by principles as fixed, if not yet so calculable, as those disturbing forces that systematically retard the flight of Encke's comet, or drag big Neptune from his solar orbit. Both the new investigator and his hinderers may rest assured, that they unconsciously conspire at once to hasten and to steady the career of knowledge. —Edinburgh. Review.

\* \* \*

#### THE MOSLEM EMPIRE.

The latest news from Constantinople "before going to press" shows that the Sultan's last hour is at hand. His overthrow will be a cheering event to the student of prophecy, who will see in it the manifestation of "the Kings of the East" approaching. —June 15, 1853.

\* \* \*

Immortality is life manifested through incorruptible body.

\* \* \*

God only is essentially deathless; or as Paul expresses it, "God only hath immortality."

\* \* \*

"He that believes not the gospel of the kingdom shall be condemned."—Jesus.

\* \* \*

