

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, NOVEMBER, 1853—  
Volume 3—No. 11

---

SYRIA AND ITS NEAR PROSPECTS.

(Concluded.)

The great events in the future prospects of Syria are so near at hand as to have already commenced their operation.

Having thus proved, though with great brevity, that the future of our earth is big with the most portentous, gracious, and glorious events that can befall any portion of universal creation, I now come to the point of producing sober and scriptural evidence that those events are so near at hand as to have already commenced their operation. I beg you still to be assured, that attention is rigidly directed to lay before you nothing but unexaggerated realities.

The most High God changes not. His word “will stand for ever.” Those mighty events must occur in some age of this world; why should they not happen in the period in which we are living? Does there exist any divine rule by which we ourselves are exempted from the operation of wonderful dispensations?

Surely we know the very opposite. We know that it is sober truth to say, “we are already living in an age of wonders.” Contemplate the last fifty years. Is there any similar period in the whole volume of history, to which may be applied with so much emphasis that prophetic indication of the approach of miraculous things, “many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased?”—Daniel 12: 4.

How immense and extensive has been the activity of man in civilised countries, and how wonderful and innumerable have been its effects! The discoveries and labours of tens of thousands of ardent minds and unwearying hands, in chemistry, natural philosophy, and mathematical and mechanical skill, produced in Hyde Park, in 1851, that exhibition of results in almost every branch of human knowledge, for which, certainly, no previous age could have shown anything like an equal. In every thing there, the flowers of human science and skill would appear to have been almost fully blown, and the time therefore to have come for the commencement of the great transition from flowering to fruition.

To select a few particulars from the state of the world at large, how great are the changes!

Thirty years ago, if, toiling through heat and dust, we traversed the 126 miles from Derby to London in thirteen hours, we thought the accomplishment prodigious. Now, the wonderful locomotive whirls us over it, with comparative comfort, in less than five hours.

Thirty years ago, although our hardy sailors sang lustily, “Britons never will be slaves,” yet were they notwithstanding, (as I have at times with some wonder contemplated), the most patient as well as the most submissive slaves of winds and tides; now, through the mighty power of steam, which our God has given, the winds and the tides are subject to them.

Forty years ago, astronomical science was limited, in regard to any thing that could be termed science, to our own little solar system. We knew nothing of the laws which governed, what were then called in utter ignorance, “the fixed stars,”—the visible universe beyond it. Now, by the aid of astronomical instruments of marvellous delicacy, and enormous telescopes of equally marvellous power, the abyss of visible space has been gauged; the almost unspeakable distances, and some of the orbits of the stellar classes, have been approximately calculated; and the fact established that there is “ONE KING OVER THEM ALL, AND HIS NAME ONE,” by the universal existence of the same mighty laws which control with precision the movements of our little system, which make an apple to fall to the ground, and which, with the voice of omnipotence, say to own tumultuous ocean, “Hitherto shalt thou come, but no further; and here shall thy proud waves be stayed”—Job 38: 11.

Forty years since, the hieroglyphics of Egypt were a dark dead letter, and the mounds of Nimroud remained the unproductive, worthless heaps, that they were when Xenophon (about 2250 years ago) passed by them. Now, the Rosetta stone has furnished the real key to open the doors of Egyptian tombs; and strange and venerable forms issue from them, which unite with Sennacherib, Esarhaddon, and Nebuchadnezzar, from the mounds of Assyria and Babylon, in testifying to the accuracy of Holy Writ, and in proclaiming to the ears of this our generation, “THE WORD OF GOD SHALL STAND FOR EVER.”

Half a century ago, almost all that we knew about our Antipodes, Australia, was, that it was a vast island nearly as large as the continent of Europe, and that the insufferable dregs of England’s wickedness were poured out upon a spot on its eastern coast. Now, the seas of the Pacific and of the Antipodes are covered with the shipping of civilised nations, and their shores alive with the activity of commerce. Important states have sprung up in the wilds of Australia, and its bosom is pouring forth treasures which bid fair to produce immense revolutions in the conditions of social life. Nothing equal to it, that we know of, has occurred in the history of man.

In the last particular it is not a little remarkable, that, whether in California or in Australia, the earth has only directly disclosed her riches to the Anglo-Saxon race. They are the lords of the soil in which these extraordinary discoveries have taken place.

Forty years ago, if the governments of France, England and Ireland, had been disposed to coalesce in telegraphic communications, days would have passed in which correspondence would have been impossible, and, at the best of times, the operation for sentences of any length would have occupied hours. Now, not only may a merchant, seated in the telegraph office in London, converse with his friends in Paris or Dublin, as though they were in the

same room, but beyond this, the only insurmountable obstacle to the extension of this marvellous advantage to Sydney, Adelaide, or Melbourne, is the character of man in the districts through which the transmitting wire must pass. The intervals of sea are none of them very great between England and Australia, by the route of the further peninsula of India.

Consider the foregoing realities of human progress; you yourselves know them to be realities, things that have really occurred, and are even now in actual operation about you. Each one of them in itself is a stupendous wonder; and, taken altogether, as prominent examples in the indescribable mass of extraordinary circumstances, moral, scientific, and physical, which the history of the last half century records, they do certainly establish this period to be an age distinguished high above all that have preceded it, for marvels of the general beneficence of God.

We certainly live in an age of natural wonders, what wonder, then, if, flowing as they do from the opened hand of the God of revelation, the God of Israel, He should design them as initiatory to the miraculous wonders which He keeps surely treasured up for his national people, his chosen land, the whole race of man, and the whole face of nature?

In further proof that we live in a period of extraordinary transition, I cannot do better than quote the words of that illustrious person, in these momentous days, the closest to the throne of England, I believe, to help to bind the people closer to the crown, and the crown to the people. I quote them, begging that not only the leading statement may be observed, but also the principles and duties which it involves. Carried to their fair and full extent, they will be found to be most coincident with those which I am now seeking to impress upon you.

At the Lord Mayor's banquet, preparatory to the Great Exhibition, Prince Albert is reported to have spoken as follows (Official, Illustrated and Descriptive Catalogue of the Great Exhibition. Introduction, page 3.): —

“Gentlemen, I conceive it to be the duty of every educated person, closely to watch and study the time in which he lives; and as far as in him lies, to add his humble mite of individual exertion to further the accomplishment of what he believes Providence to have ordained. Nobody, however, who has paid any attention to the particular features of our present era, will doubt for a moment that we are living at A PERIOD OF MOST WONDERFUL TRANSITION; which tends rapidly to the accomplishment of that great end, to which indeed all history points, —the realisation of THE UNITY OF MANKIND.

\* \* \* \* \*

“So man is approaching a more complete fulfilment of the sacred mission he has to perform in the world. His reason being created after the image of God, he has to use it to discover the laws by which the Almighty governs His creation, and BY MAKING THESE LAWS HIS STANDARD OF ACTION, to conquer nature to his use, —himself a divine instrument.”

These most sound and most important observations, have been carried far and wide throughout the British Empire and the civilised world. May they produce energetic, abiding, practical effects, from every sober and prudent person, of whatever class of society he be; and may the exalted pair, who took so prominent a part and so deep an interest in that wonderful palace of crystal, in which the representatives of the civilised world assembled in peace and enjoyment, but which has now passed away like “the fabric of a vision,” become still more

prominent, and still more intensely interested in preparing the way for the construction of that glorious temple at Jerusalem, around which all nations shall bow in adoring love and mutual harmony, and which shall endure for ever! The brightest gem the crown of our Queen could bear, would be one on which was inscribed the sacred motto, probably destined for her from all eternity to all eternity, "A NURSING MOTHER TO NATIONAL ISRAEL."

The foregoing evidences, however, of the near approach of mighty supernatural events, are but little more than presumptive, strong and extraordinary though they be; let us therefore pass to some, out of the large number, of the striking signs of our times which are direct proofs. We must remember always, that we have to do with a faithful Creator, whose words and warnings are never uttered lightly, or "in vain." Every expression is directed to, and intended for, the very individual that it reaches: in condemnation, if he perverts or neglects; in exaltation, if he receives wisely and acts faithfully. An invisible pen, even now, records the words of him who speaks, and the thoughts of those who hear him.

1. Napoleon Bonaparte, the omen-king of our age, a character unequalled in mere human history as a forerunning cause and sign of most extraordinary consequences, died in 1821. Commencing almost from the year of his dissolution, a series of very great public events, linked indispensably the one to the other, reached at length to the effects of establishing entirely new currents of opinions and feelings in the Turkish government, and throughout its vast empire; and of giving to the great European powers (especially to England,) an amount of influence in Syria before unknown.

Up to this period, the travelling of scientific men in Asiatic Turkey had been carried on under risk so considerable, and restraints so burthensome, that but few entered the field of exploration. Now, "the gates of brass" were broken—Isaiah 45: 2. Travellers of all classes and countries, especially from Great Britain, Germany, and North America, poured in upon Syria. The geography and statistics of this and the neighbouring districts became well understood; and politics and commerce combined with science and religious aspirations, to stimulate facilities for rapid passenger conveyance. A tour in Syria is now little more than a cheap and easy spring or autumn relaxation.

The gratification which the tourists experienced, and the knowledge they acquired, have reacted most powerfully on their parent communities. The press in England, Germany, and America, has been loaded almost to satiety with their narratives. Our tables are spread with the productions of their pencils. Models and Exhibitions of scenes in Jerusalem and Palestine have been numerous, popular, and lucrative; even the favourite novel of the day a few years ago was directed to the subject—"Tancred," by Disraeli, and the spirit of this country, at least, has been awakened to interest of a depth and amount before unknown, for the Holy land and for the Jewish people.

Your own conduct is an evidence that I am describing to you sober realities. When in 1850, soon after my return from Syria, I, in compliance with your wishes, gave you an address upon that country and its present condition, this room was filled to repletion; and now again, when in response to your repeated invitations I have come to offer my opinions upon its "near future prospects," I find a complete audience and the deepest attention. My own observations have led me to believe, that throughout the length and breadth of this island, the public mind is ready to give to the subject the same close

and hearty consideration and welcome. The train is already laid; there is wanted but a spark of divine fire to illumine the whole horizon of England.

We certainly have sound reason to be even sure, that of the thousands who have thus travelled, and of the hundreds of thousands who have thus become deeply interested, a very large proportion have been influenced by love and veneration for the holy word of the God of Israel. The interest in any thing, of like considerable numbers, is without a parallel in the page of history. It stands out broad and clear, as a most peculiar feature of our own wonderful times.

Of what then is it a sure and certain scriptural warning? Is it not, that “THE TIME TO FAVOUR HER, (Zion,) “YEA, THE SET TIME IS COME. FOR THY SERVANTS TAKE PLEASURE IN HER STONES, AND FAVOUR THE DUST THEREOF?”—Psalm 102: 13.

The passage just quoted, immediately continues with the subjects that I have before closely placed in the same connection and sequence as follows:—

“So the heathen,” the nations, “shall fear the name of the Lord, and all the kings of the earth thy glory. When the Lord shall build up Zion, He shall appear in His glory.”

The warning is then most expressly addressed—to whom do you think? Perhaps to you; it is “a message from God” to you certainly in greater probability to you than to any other generation that has lived, or will live, upon earth. This address is as follows—

“This shall be written for the generation to come:” and the people which shall be created, “which shall be in existence when God shall commence the restoration of Zion, shall praise the Lord!” Think upon it! If it be a message from God to us, let not the NINEVEH marbles which have just come to our museums, speak out in judgment against us! —“So the people of Nineveh believed God . . . For word came to the King of Nineveh, and he arose from his throne.”—Jonah 2: 5-6

2. Another very great direct evidence of the commencement of the marvellous period I have described, exists I conceive in the almost complete inversion of the state of feelings which so long subsisted between Christians and Jews. It is not too much to say, that for nearly eighteen centuries they, as denominations of men, hated each other with most deep and bitter enmity.

Observe the testimony on both sides of the question, of Shakespeare; from an intellect unsurpassed in any age for accuracy of discernment of character, and who knew well what would most gratify the taste of his times. Introducing an imaginary Shylock, a person of wealth and consideration, he makes of him one of the most loathsome of men, because he was a Jew. “I hate him for he is a Christian . . . he hates our sacred nation”—“Merchant of Venice,” are represented as being the deep seated, habitual effusions of Shylock’s heart, producing acts of the greatest atrocity.

Of a similar kind is the evidence of Walter Scott.

“Saxon, Dane, and Briton, however adverse the races were to each other, contended which should look with the greatest detestation upon a people,” the Jews, “whom it was accounted a point of religion to hate, to revile, to despise, to plunder, and to persecute. They were alike detested by the credulous and prejudiced vulgar, and persecuted by the greedy and rapacious nobility.”—“Ivanhoe.”

Of these, and of other similar proofs too numerous to describe an oft-recurring shout at our own convivial meetings may remind us. H.E.P. H.E.P. H.E.P., the initials of ‘Hierosolyma est perdita,’ “Jerusalem is lost,” was the death cry of detachments of crusaders, while in passing through the towns of Germany on their march to Palestine, they, eager to be doing, drenched their swords in Jewish blood.

Let it not be supposed that I am seeking to extenuate the practices of the Jews, at the expense of the character of the (so called) Christians. History testifies that the inhuman hatred was reciprocal; but in the scattered condition of his nation, the Jew, generally the weakest, had to “lay his body as the ground, and as the street, to them that went over.”—Isaiah 51: 23.

There was the intense darkness of another Egyptian night—a darkness that might indeed be felt. Answer me faithfully in your hearts—Does it still continue? You know as a most unquestionable reality, that it does not. Every person of tolerable information is aware, that in civilised countries it has almost wholly passed away.

The bright morning of a new moral creation has much more than dawned, “with healing in its wings.” The Jew now generally takes his suitable place in social life, “sans peur et sans reproche;” and his intercourse with persons of other creeds is not accompanied by stronger or more frequent sensations of uncomfortableness, than those which exist between the members of the different Christian denominations.

Regarding this state of things altogether by itself as a matter of political cause and consequence, it certainly is, in itself, a powerful direct indication of the near approach of great events. It is opposed to all reasonable probability that the great impulse which in the last half century has done so much, should lose its momentum at the present medium condition. It is on the contrary (reasoning from mere natural laws,) in accordance with the highest probability, that impulse will increase in the very proportion of nearness of approach to the centre of mighty attraction. Have we not, in addition, the “FIAT,” the “LET IT BE,” of the Supreme Controller of all events for such a conclusion? And if so, who shall hinder it?

“Who hath heard such a thing; who hath seen such things? Shall the earth be made to bring forth in one day? Shall a nation be born at once? for as soon as Zion travailed, she brought forth her children.”

“Shall I bring to the birth, and not cause to bring forth? saith the Lord. Shall I cause to bring forth, and shut the womb? saith thy God!”—Isaiah 66: 8-9.

3. The divine declaration just quoted may connect the great point of evidence last considered, with that upon which we now enter. Its fulfilment springs as a necessary consequence from the last subject, whilst it is in itself a portion of the present.

“THY PEOPLE,” it is solemnly announced, “SHALL BE WILLING IN THE DAY OF THY POWER”—Psalm 110: 3. The Jewish people have begun to be, wisely, practically, and scripturally willing; in a manner in which, from the period of the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, they never before have been willing; on this ground alone, therefore, we may soberly expect that the great day of Divine power HAS COMMENCED. —Hardly; but rather is on the eve of commencing. —Editor of the Herald.

It may be urged in confutation, that the Jews have always been willing to return to their own land; and that this frame of mind has been proved by their never-ceasing prayers and declarations, and, in former days, by several protracted and desperate efforts. I have no wish to evade this, or any other reasonable objection. It is not for me, or any man. To endeavour presumptuously to bend down the Most High from the throne of His revealed Word, and of His providence, to any course of events of which our wisdom might approve. My desire is, on the contrary, to bend my heart, and, so far as in me lies, the minds of all to whom I may have access, to the truth, which, in the mighty points at issue, the Divine word or Divine Providence may be even now proclaiming.

Examining the question before us on these principles, I would confidently say, that the state of mind of a considerable number of Jews at this moment, as contrasted with that which, for eighteen centuries has prevailed in the nation at large, is as different in its nature as life from death. The long-expressed desire to return, was either an inactive expression, a faith without works, dead as being alone; or a faith producing fierce and desperate, precocious efforts, unhallowed works, which the God of Israel did not accept or honour. The spirit that has sprung up of late years recognises the duty and propriety of action, to the extent, at least, of energetically improving the condition of the Jews resident in Palestine. In fact, if not in expression, it is sensible of the momentous, scriptural responsibility of preparing the way for the greater exhibitions of Divine power; while it seeks, not presumptuously to force providence to its ends by measures, desperate, violent, and untimely, but humbly and faithfully to discover the warnings which that providence itself pronounces, and to follow up the openings which it creates.

Depopulated and desolate Palestine has been thrown open; the Ottoman government has become tolerant, considerate, and earnestly desirous for the regeneration of its vast Asiatic empire; throughout the civilised world, the Jewish people have been delivered from the degradation and oppression of ages; Why should not this great combination of circumstances be improved to the full extent of reasonable and lawful advantage?

I must not here attempt to describe at any length the most persevering and self denying exertions towards the amelioration of the condition of his brethren in Palestine and throughout the world, of that expansive and large-hearted man, Sir Moses Montefiore. Calculated to attain to a distinguished public position in any age, he has, in that in which we live, become a most prominent and extensively influential means of producing the great and happy change of feelings between Jews and Christians, of rescuing the former from oppression and persecution, of drawing public attention towards the Holy Land, and of fostering the disposition for industrial occupations, which has arisen among its Jewish residents.

I, you are aware, can speak from personal experience in regard to one of Sir Moses Montefiore's visits to the land of his fathers—that of the year 1849. I had once (as I informed your Association in 1850) the intention of laying a narrative of that deeply interesting journey before the public; but, to my great sorrow, other affairs, unexpected, and of a very harassing character, obliged me to postpone the attempt. During this tour, as well as in that of 1839, which Lady Montefiore has described in a private volume, petitions were presented to Sir Moses by different bodies of Jewish residents, for his influence to obtain for them the permission and the means to support themselves by the cultivation of the soil.

From, (I think,) in a very considerable degree, the stimulus of these beginnings have arisen three active associations.

One, managed by Jews and Christians in union for "Promoting Jewish Settlements in Palestine;" chiefly, as may be seen by its address, through the encouragement of agricultural and pastoral occupations in the more northern districts.

Another, under the management of Christian Gentiles and Jews, comprising as may also be gathered from its published statement several separate undertakings in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem.

And a third, which is now being attempted by an American Christian, (Mr. Wardour Cresson,) who has embraced the Jewish creed, in which it is proposed that the direction shall be placed in the hands of the Jews only. Its first efforts are to be, like the second, for Jerusalem and its neighbourhood.

Concerning these three plans, I may here be allowed to remark, that my confidence, in regard to any extensively beneficial effect, rests absolutely on the first. I am not speaking in any personal reference to the members of the different committees of management, many of whom circumstances may remove; my observations are directed only to the plans of government.

In regard to the third scheme, it is, I think, most evident, that Jews cannot effect any extensively beneficial results of themselves; and as evident, that Christians will not render them any effectual support, without a fair share in the control and management.

My objection to the second plan would be nearly that to the third, inverted; —that Christians cannot effect any extensively beneficial results of themselves; and that the Jewish people, as a body, will not work with them, without, not only a just share in the management, but also substantial safeguards to the point, that the object of temporal amelioration shall be exclusively pursued, totally and honourably unmingled with attempts upon the Jewish creed.

The plan first mentioned, avoids every objection that either Jews or Gentiles can, with justice, make. No interference is permitted with the peculiarities of religious creeds, with the policy of the Sultan's government, or with that of the governments of other countries from which subsidiary aid may be procured. By these arrangements also, the supreme and indispensable advantage is embraced of conformity to the revealed scriptural standard, which declares and requires, as has been already shown, that, for

the great end in view, Jews and Gentiles shall work in concert in preparing the way for the mission of Solomon. —1 Kings 5.

The sphere of operation of the last-mentioned modern effort, may, of course, be extended to any part of Palestine. I feel persuaded that the plan in itself will stand and prosper. I would recommend honourable and faithful adherence to its simple fundamental principles; a rigid severity in maintaining them against all aggressors, internal and external, and most hearty support for it from all persons, Jews and Gentiles, who desire to enjoy the happiness of participating in the greatest movement that has ever yet arisen in the world; a movement fraught, I repeat, with benefits to mankind at large, and to all, whether nations or individuals, who may engage in it.

I would now beg you to return in your minds to the main argument, excusing the digression into which you have been led from it. That argument, you will remember, was, that as the Jewish people had begun to be wisely, practically, and scripturally willing, therefore, on this ground alone, considered in connection with the Divine declaration, that the people of God should be willing in the day of his power, we might soberly expect **THAT THIS DAY OF MARVELLOUS POWER HAS ALREADY commenced.**

4. Your attention has been called to the facts, that the Holy Land prepared by depopulation has been thrown open to easy access, that interest has been excited most deeply and extensively toward it, that the Jewish people have been raised from centuries of oppression and degradation, that the long standing death-feud between themselves and Christians has ceased, and that they have begun to be practically willing to improve and strengthen their position in Palestine. I now proceed to offer as the last proof to be here produced of the approach of a marvellous change, that a Gentile nation has been prepared, and stands summoned, to commence the movement.

Great Britain is, in a marvellous manner, precisely at the period when she ought to be, ready for the mighty operation.

Abounding in wealth at home as no nation has ever before abounded, from the addition of the golden stores of Australia to the produce of her former unparalleled trade and commerce; powerful in arms on sea and land; her dependencies overshadowing the earth to its extremities, and her influence penetrating into almost, if not altogether, every community under heaven into which the hunted Jew has been driven; peaceful within herself in a manner rarely equalled in the history of mankind; she is certainly ready for the most glorious work, if she have the heart to arise and do it.

Moreover, she is not only ready for it, but is summoned to it.

If she does not hear the still small voice of Deity which invites her, as “the end of the earth” that is to proclaim the time and to assist in “casting up the way”—Isaiah 62, as “the land overshadowing the globe with its extremities,” that is to be the means of blowing “a trumpet” and lifting up “a standard” to the nations, \*(See next page) as “the daughter,” or representative in the modern world, of ancient Tyre, which is to be “there with her gift,” as the tin-producing “Tarshish,” whose ships are to be **THE FIRST** to bring returning Hebrews to the name of the Lord their God.—If she does not

hear these invitations, she may, at least, attend to a call which might issue in the earthquake and in the whirlwind—the necessities of her commercial existence.

---

\* Isaiah 18. —It is not “the land widely overshadowing with wings (dominion) from beyond to rivers of Cush,” that lifts up the standard, and blows the trumpet; but the Lord then in Zion; who says, “I will be still (yet in my dwelling place I will be without fear) as dry heat, impending lightning, as a cloud of dew in the heat of harvest.” The trumpet to be blown is Messiah’s proclamation from Jerusalem, specially to the overshadowing land, and generally to the inhabitants of the world announcing that the hour of judgment has come, and commanding the return of his nation in the ships of Tarshish to the place appointed. —Editor of the Herald.

---

Let England be deprived of her colonies and dependencies, and she would, as a matter of course and necessity, fall at once into the condition of a second-rate state. Deprive her yet further of her colonial trade, and of the foreign commerce which is procured and kept for her by her foreign possessions, and the rejected divided papers of her national debt, would furnish fuel for a flame that would soon burn her as bare as the rock of Tyre.

Divine providence has placed Syria and Egypt in the very gap between England and the most important regions of her colonial and foreign trade, India, China, the Indian Archipelago and Australia. She does not require or wish for increase of territory; already has she (that dangerous boon), more direct dominion than she can easily maintain; but she does most urgently need the shortest and the safest lines of communication to the territories already possessed.

Impelled by this necessity, a railroad is already in progress through Egypt for the Red Sea route; while the Euphrates has been surveyed, and another railroad planned through Syria from Seleucia to Beles, with a view to the reopening of the great ancient line of Eastern commerce by the Persian Gulf.

Egypt and Syria stand in intimate connection. A foreign hostile power mighty in either, would soon endanger British trade and communications through the other. Hence the loud providential call upon her, to exert herself energetically for the amelioration of the condition of both of these Provinces. Egypt # has improved greatly by British influence, and it is now for England to set her hand to the renovation of Syria, through the only people whose energies will be extensively and permanently in the work—the real children of the soil, the sons of Israel.

---

# Egypt will either be occupied by Britain, or practically annexed by that protection which the strong afford to the weak. The aggressions of the Czars on Turkey may lead to this. Great Britain, however, will not be able to hold it permanently: for “the land of Egypt shall not escape. But the king of the North (the Russo-Assyrian Gog, or Czar) shall have power over the treasures of gold and silver, and over the precious things of Egypt.” This is Egypt’s fate in “the time of the end.”—Editor of the Herald.

---

The object may be pursued with the best feelings towards the Ottoman Porte, for so long as that government shall endure, well organised Jewish settlements in Syria would be to it sources of strength and wealth. Other powers ought not to take umbrage at it, for, first, it would be a mere copy of the system that some of them pursue for

themselves in the Turkish dominions. Even a citizen of the United States (Dr. Robinson), can remark, "France has long been the acknowledged protector of the Roman Catholic religion in the Turkish empire, and the followers of that faith find in her a watchful and efficient patron . . . . In the members of the Greek Church, still more numerous, the Russians have even warmer partisans . . . . but where are England's partisans in every part of Turkey? . . . . That England, while she has so deep a political interest in all that concerns the Turkish empire should remain indifferent to this state of things in Syria, is a matter of surprise." (Biblical researches in Palestine, by Dr. E. Robinson, Vol. iii, conclusion. —The Jews will become England's partisans for a while. —Editor of the Herald.)

And again, England could entertain no views of conquest by such a course; for however much her influence might be increased by the hold she would acquire upon the feelings and principles of a warm-hearted and honourable people (such as are the Jews), these very people would be among the first to resist any attempt on her part towards territorial acquisition.

In every way therefore, I conceive, is such a course eminently and urgently desirable for England, and devoid of any sound causes of objection.

#### CONCLUSION.

In conclusion, I would faithfully express the hopes—

That, breaking through the mist of this atmosphere of delusions, you may first, more clearly discern and grasp, that source of all, that greatest of all, that sum and substance of all, REALITIES; the intensely present, infinitely great, and infinitely minute God, the God of revelation.

That you will then (as every human being is authorised to do), as a responsible created thing, in your secret chamber, stand before His presence and His throne.

That you will there repeat and present the great realities occurring around you, which have been under consideration—realities that bear the aspect of being in strict conformity with the indications of His faithful, unbending, unchangeable word.

If these things are fulfilled in sincerity, the petition must enter His ear with a speed greater than that of your own electric spark. Will you not receive in reply, in characters of eternal light upon the heart, "IT IS COME AND IT IS DONE, SAITH THE LORD GOD, THIS IS THE DAY WHEREOF I HAVE SPOKEN!" —(Ezekiel 39: 8. —The day of the Lord's manifestation in power, as the stone to smite Nebuchadnezzar's image on the feet, compounded of the iron or Roman kingdoms, confederated with Russo-Assyrian clay. —Editor of the Herald.)

If, in this age of unprecedented natural wonders, it should happen to be really so if this great and crowning wonder the goodness of God to his land and to His people, is truly in its commencement, of what unspeakable importance it is to individuals and communities, that they should be braced up in preparedness for all the subordinate events and duties!

Our cherished Nineveh antiquities may remind us again, that when agents chosen for any especial duty, shrink from their required work, the Supreme Controller of the universe is not wanting in the power to bring them back to it, although it may be by means from which human nature recoils. —Jonah 2.

England, highly prosperous in most circumstances, has been for some years past visited by a really marvellous, unprecedented, and alarming class of evils. Her different administrations have been smitten with paralysis, decay, and dissolution; in modes so extraordinary, that notwithstanding our immense body of national political intelligence, experience, and activity, it has been scarcely possible, at times not possible, to find substitutes for them. A mighty nation, in great general prosperity, has been not unfrequently in the position of going a begging for a government.

Hitherto, under Divine providence, but little substantial evil has resulted. The ship has been sailing in a smooth sea, with a fair wind, in which it mattered not much that the eyes of the pilot should have been smitten with dimness, or the hand of the helmsman with paralysis. If the favourable gale had changed to a rotatory hurricane, what might have been the result to England?

Steadfastly persuaded as I am that the horizon is black with portents of danger, I would offer my carefully considered opinion (remembering always, as I do, that an invisible pen I, even now, recording my words as well as your thoughts,) that one very great cause of this remarkable infliction upon the British Empire, has been that of our blind negligence in regard to the lawful openings that have been presented for ameliorating the conditions of Syria, and of the Jewish people with it.

For this operation, among other great ends, God (I believe) has exalted and endowed England; but England shrinks from the duty and the work. My observations may seem strange to those who have not watched the progress of the subject; but, believe me, I am not speaking lightly in this matter, or of things that I do not understand.

So deeply convinced am I, from very close and careful observation, that the Most High has “risen out of His place” to commence His great work, and to make England the leading preparatory instrument of it, that I think no British administration will be allowed to stand, which does not wisely, heartily, and honourably engage in it.

I must not be understood to imply, that the neglect of the cause of Syria and of the Jewish people in connection with it, is the only circumstance in which England “in the balances is found wanting.”

Experience has taught me, as it may have taught you, that while in no country in the world is private morality at a higher standard than in Great Britain, in no nation is public morality more degraded. The fearful delusion lies at the root of this evil, that political conduct is more or less beyond the laws of God, and the rules of honour! I am not passing judgment on particular cases, or referring to any particular political parties; for experience has taught me, as it may have also taught you, that the whole political body is thus more or less infected.

Before England can stand as she ought to be, in the eyes of truly honourable men, and of the righteous Ruler of all, that spell of Circe, which degrades persons otherwise manly and

honourable into what I need not name to you, must be broken. These things must be done, and the great present end and object of Britain's chastenings and blessings, not left undone. She must "shake off her dust," and "arise," and do her duty as the messenger-nation, which has to be "THE FIRST" to "PREPARE THE WAY," for the long-restrained (and therefore the more energetic and boundless) mercies of the Great God of the universe, to national Israel; and, through national Israel, in the land whose wonderful fortunes we have been considering, to the whole family of man.

I cannot part from you, and from the present discussion of these subjects more appropriately, than by pressing on your thoughts and hearts, the words (first spoken nearly three thousand years ago), of one of the most perfect of men, of the wisest of statesmen, and of the bravest of soldiers, that this world ever knew;

"BLESSED BE THE LORD GOD, THE GOD OF ISRAEL, WHO ONLY  
DOETH WONDERFUL THINGS! AND BLESSED BE HIS GLORIOUS NAME  
FOR EVER! AND MAY THE WHOLE EARTH BE FILLED WITH HIS  
GLORY! AMEN AND AMEN!"

\* \* \*

#### DR. THOMAS AND HIS FOLLOWERS.

"Some years ago Mr. Thomas, a surgeon or doctor, was associated with Alexander Campbell of America, in preaching the peculiar views of that talented Discussionist. Three or four years ago, Dr. Thomas came to England, having previously withdrawn from A. Campbell. He has since made havoc of some of the churches in Scotland, which identified themselves with his former fellow-labourer. As I have met with the followers of Dr. Thomas nowhere but in Scotland my remarks must be understood to apply to them.

In giving the case of a single church, I shall be able both to say all I wish on the subject, and warn my readers, from the Scriptures, against the deplorable errors into which they have fallen. In one large city in the North, twelve months ago, a church existed, which numbered about sixty members. When some of them discovered, that although they had been all baptised, yet they required to be baptised over again for the kingdom. Accordingly, some got baptised over again, because their previous baptisms were regarded as worthless. The natural result was, that they required all to be baptised for the kingdom, but some were unwilling to follow their dictation, and the result is, that from this and other causes, the young church drawn together by Dr. Thomas' views, is split into three parts. From the first they could not allow any child of God to break bread with them, who was not immersed. But, when they had been immersed, was not this enough? Not for some of them, even years ago it was deemed requisite to be immersed for the remission of sin in their view of it; this stood for a time only, for after the arrival of the American teacher, every other baptism was discarded, but baptism into the kingdom. So that some of them have had three baptisms, instead of one, viz. baptism in the name of "the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost;" baptism for remission of sin; and baptism into the kingdom. Whereas the Word of God says, "One Lord, one faith, one immersion," not three immersions—Ephesians 4: 5. To my mind, baptism is a most solemn dedication of the whole man to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. When the believer is dead to sin, and to the world, then is he buried with Christ by immersion—Romans 6: 1-4. And surely those who thus trifle with God's one institution, as though they could die to sin and the world three times, and need as many burials, place themselves in a position as solemn as it is

deplorable, and on their part unstable and worse than childish. Their plea is, that they did not understand the kingdom when they were previously immersed, and that they do now.

1. Admit that their views are now Scriptural on the kingdom, but in some respects, soon to be noticed, they are not. Yet so far as they expect the restoration of Israel, and the Lord Jesus to reign on the earth they are. What then, are we always to be immersed over again, every time we get more light on God's precious truth? Certainly not. The first Christians were constantly making advances in their knowledge, but "one immersion," in the name of Jesus, served them; while those baptised with John's baptism were baptised into the name of Jesus, when they believed on him—Acts 19: 3-5. When once they were baptised into the Three-one God, we never hear of a second baptism. The new converts on Pentecost, at Jerusalem, and at Philippi, had learned enough in a few hours to be immersed, but they had many great truths to learn after baptism, yet their "one immersion" stood for all time. Let us thankfully take from God any teaching that he may give us, but let not man's baptism set aside God's
2. For what is the baptism into the kingdom, but a conceit of Dr. Thomas, utterly without foundation in Scripture? I call on him or his admirers, to bring a single command or example for baptising any one into the kingdom? I believe none can be produced. Baptism into the kingdom is Dr. Thomas's institution not Jesus Christ's, well worthy of a man wishing to be the leader of a party, but unworthy of any disciple of Christ.
3. Beside how can they be baptised into a kingdom which, according to them, is not yet set up? In this view also they are in the dark. The kingdom of Christ is set up over his church, although it is not yet extended to the whole earth. Hence Paul addressed the Church at Colosse thus, "Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and hath translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son."—Colossians 1: 13. The apostle does not say "will translate us," but "hath translated us;"—the work was already done. Will these over-confident followers of Dr. Thomas tell us how the Colossians could be translated into a kingdom which had no existence? How taught the king himself, "But rather seek ye the kingdom of God; and all these things shall be added unto you." — Luke 12: 32. What kingdom was this? The same as we read of in Luke 17: 21, "Neither shall they say, Lo here! or, lo there! for behold the kingdom of God is within you." (Margin, among you.) Paul thus speaks of it, "For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost."—Romans 14: 17. In the same sense the kingdom of God is used in many other parts of Scripture, such as the following: Matthew 3: 2; 4: 17; 11: 12; 12: 28; and about twelve times in the 13<sup>th</sup> chapter and in Matthew 23: 13. Christ was given to be "the head over all to the Church."—Ephesians 1: 22. "Christ is the head of the church: and he is the Saviour of the body. Therefore as the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be subject unto their own husbands in everything."—Ephesians 5: 23-24.

But if Christ is not a king now, he has no right to give law, and his church is under no obligation to obey his commands at all, and thus the Christian's subjection to Christ is set aside by this new, incoherent, and absurd doctrine. Every true Christian is now in the kingdom of Christ; the kingdoms of this world are not yet subdued to him, but they will be when he comes.

I do not deny Christ's coming to reign on the earth, as my Six Lectures on the Lord's Second Coming testify. They may be seen in volume 1 numbers 33-35; volume 2 numbers 4, 11, and 20. Dr. Thomas' views of the sleeping of the soul after death, or its extinction until the resurrection are sufficiently refuted in my "Two Lectures on the Immortality of the Soul, or Mind of man proved from Reason and Scripture," and may be found in this volume, numbers 2 and 3. So that I am not aware of any important view which he holds different from what is taught in this periodical which I have not refuted.

Before closing, I would call attention to the spirit in which he writes. It may be consistent with his system to denounce all as "aliens" and condemned, who reject his peculiar views; but that taught by the Lord Jesus is love, leading us to "salute every saint in Christ Jesus." No system can be of God which infuses into the church hatred and schism. What can be more schismatical than first to sit in communion with those baptised, and then when some get "baptised into the kingdom," to drive the rest away. Consistent this may be, because, if their own previous baptism was useless, and this they confess in rebaptism, then consistency requires that they should declare, baptism in all cases to be no baptism, if it is not baptism into the kingdom; and then who can tell, but some new view may lead them to a fourth baptism, when the first three may also be declared useless. Let me ask them, when you were baptised at first were you believers or hypocrites? If the former, you were baptised scripturally; if the latter, your baptism was worth nothing. I should never hesitate to immerse a believer who had been either sprinkled or immersed before faith, but I should never immerse any one who had been immersed before, being at the time a believer. But if it is said, "I did not believe the gospel of the kingdom before," I should think you did, although you did not expect the kingdom quite so soon as you do now. At least, before I saw the Lord's coming to be pre-millennial, I believed in his coming, and in the restoration of Israel, and in his kingdom filling the whole earth after the Millennium, and I believe thousands do the same; therefore, had we been baptised over again, it would not have been into the kingdom, that we believed before, but into a particular time of the kingdom! To such a trifle as this, is Dr. Thomas' baptism reduced. It is a baptism of times and seasons. If any one when immersed believed in his own sinfulness, in the love of God in giving the Lord Jesus to die in order to put away sin, in his resurrection, and that forgiveness, and eternal life, freely given by God, and if he enjoyed them and took Christ as his Saviour, let nothing ever induce him to renounce these precious truths."—Truth Promoter.

\* \* \*

#### IMPORTANT EXPLANATIONS.

He that is first in his own cause seemeth just, but his neighbour cometh and searcheth him. —Proverbs.

The article, entitled "Dr. Thomas and his Followers," is taken from a paper styled, "The Truth Promoter," printed by the editor, Mr. John Bowes, at Cheltenham, England. The number before me is the second I have seen from Mr. Bowes' press. The paper appears to be worth reading; and is calculated, I dare say, to promote truth to some extent—though, in my judgment, short of the limit defined by the Scriptures. The article before us is not, I suspect, a fair specimen; for the truth has been rather sacrificed than promoted by its strictures. Mr. Bowes, I suppose, is the writer; and he has no doubt, written his honest convictions of the reality. He errs, however, in his statements. It would be remarkable, indeed, if he did not, seeing that he is personally unacquainted with my views.

In reciting the case of a church “in one large city of the north,” I suppose he refers to Glasgow, and to the church there organised some time after my return to America. He says, they had all been immersed, but that some of them afterwards discovered that they had not been baptised for the kingdom, and therefore submitted themselves to what he styles “rebaptism.” This very much astonishes Mr. Bowes, though he says, “I should never hesitate to immerse a believer who had been either sprinkled or immersed before faith.” Speaking for myself, I would say to Mr. Bowes, this is precisely the ground I occupy. Over and over again have I reiterated that immersion is of no value unless the subject immersed previously believe the truth. How can the Apostle’s saying, “Ye have purified your souls in the obeying of the truth,” be scripturally applied to an immersed religionist who, before his immersion, was ignorant of the truth? He could not obey what he knew nothing about. O, but, says Mr. Bowes, “I should think your followers did believe the gospel of the kingdom when they were first immersed.” But of what account is Mr. Bowes’ think-so in opposition to their affirmation to the country? “I think they did,” says he, “although they did not expect the kingdom quite so soon as they do now.” When Mr. Bowes believed what he called the truth at the time of his immersion, he held to a coming of Jesus, a restoration of Israel, and Messiah’s Kingdom filling the whole earth, after the expiration of the Millennium; all of which he now believes to be of pre-millennial accomplishment. I am glad he believes so much of the truth now; a confession, however, which convicts him of not having believed the truth at his immersion; a condemnation of himself to which I readily agree, for there is no coming of Jesus, nor restoration of Israel, nor filling of the whole earth with Messiah’s priestly Kingdom, after the thousand years are passed. For a man to believe there is, is to convict him of ignorance of the Gospel of the Kingdom which pertains to the thousand years. A gospel of a post-millennial kingdom, is not the Gospel of the Kingdom of God.

This is the essential difference between Mr. Bowes’ pre-immersional faith, and that of my Glasgow friends who were “baptised for the kingdom.” It is not a question of “a particular time,” as he supposes. Mr. Bowes’ kingdom is a nonentity—a Utopia unpromised in the Word of God; while that they look for has already existed once in Israel’s land; and, as he now admits, is destined to be restored under a new and better covenant. Their baptism is not predicated on the belief of the near or far-off establishment of the Kingdom; but on the “things of the Kingdom of God and name of Jesus” themselves. Believing that there will be a kingdom in some sense, is not believing in the Kingdom covenanted of God. No matter how many kingdoms we believe in, if we do not believe in the particular one promised, we do not believe “the exceeding great and precious promises,” and are, therefore, not prepared for remission of sins in the name of the Lord Jesus. The kingdoms of Gentilism are multitudinous, “kingdoms beyond the skies,” “the kingdom of Grace,” “the Church,” the post-millennial kingdom,” and so forth. The Gospel has nothing to do with such Gentile notions. They are the creations of the Apostasy—the vain imaginations of men’s evil and unsanctified hearts. The kingdom we contend for, as the subject of pre-immersional faith, is no “trifle.” It is God’s truth, and subversive of every Gentilism extant. Suppress this monarchical truth, and the Bible is reduced to a book of Jewish Annals, moral apothegms, and proverbial sayings. The Kingdom in its proper time, place, and circumstances, or none. It is the great subject of the Bible, and the faith admits no other.

“When you were baptised at first, were you believers or hypocrites?” says Mr. Bowes. He does not perceive that they might be neither. They were, like himself, misbelievers. He seems to have believed too much, and they too little. Baptism, predicated on hypocrisy, he says, is valueless. It is; and it is equally worthless when a misbeliever is the subject. The immersed are not justified by a belief of error, which is misbelief; but by the belief of the

truth. Believers are “scripturally baptised,” when they believe the Gospel of the Kingdom which Jesus commanded his Apostles to preach to all the nations of the Roman habitable world for a witness unto them—Matthew 24: 14, otherwise no. “He that believes, and is baptised, shall be saved.” Believes what, Mr. Bowes? “In his own sinfulness, in the love of God in giving the Lord Jesus to die, in order to put away sin, in his resurrection, and in that forgiveness and eternal life freely given by God.” A person may assent to all this, and yet be heathenishly ignorant of the Gospel. Mr. Bowes’ answer is too barren of particulars to be scriptural. The Lord Jesus informs us that it is the Gospel of the Kingdom that must be believed for justification by faith; and declares that he that believes it not shall be condemned. Now what truth-loving man, in view of this, I ask, will approve the immersion of an individual who believes not the Gospel of the Kingdom? If he believe in his own sinfulness, in God’s love, in Jesus’ resurrection, that God forgives, and bestows eternal life freely—is that believing that God will set up his Kingdom again in Israel’s land, re-establish David’s throne, place Jesus upon it, as King of the Jews, make Jerusalem the place of his throne, subject all nations to his sway, give his resurrected saints power, and glory, and dominion with Christ for ever, and so forth. These are things almost universally denied and ridiculed; yet are they the things of the Kingdom covenanted in the Gospel of God. A faith, defective of these things, does not embrace, far-off or near, the promises of God; and, therefore, is not that faith which justifies the immersed.

There are baptisms many among the Gentiles as there are also lords many, gods many, and faiths many; but in regard to the gospel of the kingdom, there is only “one baptism.” That which distinguishes the Gentile baptisms from one another is the particular crotchet connected with the immersion administered. Mr. Bowes was immersed on the belief of a post-millennial nonentity; therefore his baptism is a mere Gentile formality in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, which no one has any right to invoke, being ignorant of the truth, or sincerely believing “a lie.” It is not the use of this scriptural formula that converts an immersion into the “one baptism;” but the subject’s additional belief of the gospel of the kingdom and name. “Baptism for remission of sins,” in the Campbellite sense, is another mere gentile immersion. The crotchet that characterises it is historical faith in Jesus—a faith common to all Greek, Roman, and Protestant religionists, and illustrated by all their evil works. Greek baptism, Mormon baptism, church-door baptism, post-millennium baptism, sky-kingdom baptism, and so forth, are all crotchety immersions, which are of no more value for new covenant purposes, than is the putting away of the filth of the flesh contracted by infringements of the Mosaic law, for the answer of a good conscience before God in Christ Jesus. The point at issue between us and our opponents is, not whether there be more scriptural baptisms than the one; we agree that there is but one: but, what constitutes an immersion the “one baptism.” This is the point. We do not believe that “a man can die to sin and the world three times, and therefore needs as many burials.” We believe that sinners of the Gentiles, immersed on the belief of Gentile crotchets, have never died to sin, and have therefore never been buried in the spirit’s sense of the word, though buried in water as a bodily act. There is nothing can put a man scripturally to death, that he may be dead to sin and dead to the world, and, by consequence, alive to God, but the truth Abrahamically believed. Gentile crotchets make no man alive to God; a life which is evinced by a child-like, self-denying devotion to the truth as it is in Jesus. Look at Gentile pietists, and behold how wrathful and petulant they become when you try their systems and practices by the word of God. Behold their enmity to faith in the gospel of the kingdom as a prerequisite to immersion! They will tolerate with much pious sentimentality any thing for faith, if the professor be sincere. An immersed deacon in New England told me the other day, that he had no doubt there were good Christians among the Mohammedans and Papists; but was quite irritable when it was testified, that there was but

one gospel, namely, “the gospel of the kingdom,” and that it had been preached to Abraham and to the Israelites, whose carcasses had fallen in the wilderness! He was ignorant of this gospel, therefore the enmity naturally existing in the flesh had not been slain; and hence his impatience of the truth.

We advocate the “one baptism” as distinct and opposite to all Gentile immersions. Its subject is one who understandingly and lovingly believes the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ; its action is a putting out of sight in water; and its design, the union of such a believer to the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, that through the name of Jesus he may have his renewed disposition counted to him for repentance, and his belief of the truth for righteousness unto life in the kingdom of God. This is the only true baptism, and, as may be perceived, as diverse from current Gentile immersions as the thoughts and ways of God from the traditions of men.

“Are we,” inquires Mr. Bowes, “always to be immersed over again every time we get more light on God’s precious truth?” By no means. But there is a certain necessary amount of knowledge to begin with; and that is, a heart-renewing knowledge of the exceeding great and precious promises of God. When this knowledge is attained, the believer will understand the covenants made with Abraham and David, and how far they have been fulfilled in Jesus, and therefore what remains to be accomplished. In other words, he will be intelligent in the gospel of the kingdom as it is preached in Jesus, and fit for union to his name by baptism, which thenceforth must be repeated no more. The apostolic command to such an one is, “Add to your faith goodness and knowledge.” It is not to be supposed that a man is expected to know all the Bible before immersion. The more he studies this the more he will come to know. Believe the gospel, and then go on to understand all that the prophets testify about the past, the present, and the constitution of things to come. The first Christians were constantly advancing, not in the knowledge necessary to make them Christians, but in that which is necessary to perfect the Christian character. The cavillers among the Gentiles are not like them. Our contemporaries begin in error, which is mere human tradition, with a mere colouring of truth. The “light they get on God’s precious truth” is just such a glimmering as slowly to reveal to them one error after another, until they come to see that nearly all their previous knowledge, faith, and practice, was mere vanity. They call this advancing in the knowledge of God’s precious truth; it is rather making a discovery that they know nothing as they ought—a very necessary preparation, however, in these times for coming to the knowledge of the truth. It is while passing through this transition period that they subject themselves to a plurality of immersions. A man may travel from Millerism to the gospel of the kingdom through Mormonism, Baptistism, and Campbellism. Believing that Christ was coming in 1843 to burn up the world, he was immersed for ’43; but this passing, he recognises that the Indians are God’s lost tribes, and that Joe Smith was his prophet. He is immersed again, but this time for Israel’s kingdom at Nauvoo. Joe Smith is shot, and he comes to see that his system is an invented lie. He abandons the imposture, and seeks admission to a respectable Baptist church. The Baptists reject, with merited contempt, the Mormon baptism; and he is immersed again to enter the Baptist church—baptism with them being the door of entrance to the church. In process of time, Campbellism turns his new society upside down, preaching “baptism for remission of sins” as the ancient gospel. This is a new gospel to him, and he comes at length to recognise it as the truth. So doing, he is immersed a fourth time, and now for remission of sins, on the ground of believing that baptism is for the remission of sins. Now, had this man known the scriptures in the beginning, he would rather have lost his right hand than have been immersed into Millerism, Mormonism, Baptistism, or Campbellism. He would have regarded them as all mere

Gentilisms, and have had nothing to do with them; for coming at length, as our Glasgow friends did, to the elementary understanding of the gospel of the kingdom, he renounces them all, and declares himself still unwashed, unjustified, unsanctified by the name of the Lord Jesus and the renewing of the word. What shall he do in this case? Shall he refuse to be immersed a fifth time, because he had erred four times from sheer ignorance of the truth? By no means; for his fifth will be the first enstamped with the signature of heaven.

“The new converts at Pentecost, &c., had learned enough in a few hours to be immersed.” This proves them to have been apter scholars than modern Gentiles. Their case, however, was different. They believed the gospel of the kingdom, and needed only to be instructed in the things of the name of Jesus. The Holy Spirit was their teacher, through Peter, and confirmed his teaching by evident signs. They learned of God in a few hours, indeed, what our contemporaries can scarcely comprehend in a life-time; some of them not at all. The cases are not parallel, and therefore irrelevant to the matter in hand.

“What is the baptism into the kingdom, but a conceit of Dr. Thomas, utterly without foundation in Scripture? I call on him or his admirers, to bring a single command or example for baptising any one into the kingdom? I believe,” continues Mr. Bowes, “none can be produced. Baptism into the kingdom is Dr. Thomas’ institution, not Jesus Christ’s, well worthy of a man wishing to be the leader of a party, but unworthy of any disciple of Christ.” Mr. Bowes has made a very important mistake in this paragraph. He has confounded Mr. Campbell’s baptism with that advocated by me; and as I reject “baptism into the kingdom,” I do not feel myself under any obligation to answer Mr. Bowes’ questions. He very pertinently inquires in the next paragraph, “How can they be baptised into a kingdom, which, according to them, is not yet set up?” Indeed, Mr. Bowes, I cannot tell. I preach resurrection, not baptism, into the kingdom. “We are baptised for the dead”—1 Corinthians 15: 29; Romans 6: 5, saith Paul, that is, “for,” or in hope of the resurrection of “the dead.” And why baptised for the resurrection? That by resurrection we may enter the kingdom of God. “Baptism into the kingdom is President Campbell’s conceit, not mine. I can adduce no command or example for it. Let Mr. Bowes inquire of him concerning it. I do not believe in it.

“The kingdom of Christ is set up over his church.” If so how can the church be “heirs of that kingdom?” A kingdom set up over a people converts them into its subjects. But the Church of Christ are not the subjects, but joint-heirs with him of the kingdom. Christ is the heir to the kingdom of his father, David, which has had no existence for upwards of 2,400 years. This is the kingdom of Jehovah and of his Christ; but I see no such kingdom existing over his church. Where is his church? A scattered and despised few, which the world doth not know. Mr. Bowes errs, not knowing the nature of Christ’s kingdom. The twelve tribes of Israel are the King of the Jews’ subjects, at present in rebellion, not the king’s brethren. These are his household for whom he is making reconciliation within the veil. The kingdom, preparing for them from the world’s foundation, is as yet only a matter of hope. They are waiting for it, having come to it by faith in the gospel concerning it, as they have come to Mount Zion, and the blood of sprinkling. A voyage to the covenanted land would take them into the kingdom in the sense of being in its territory. They have been by faith translated into the hope of it; for they walk by faith, and not by sight. When they see it, they will possess it, and be in it, but not before. Seek this kingdom by faith and obedience. “The kingdom of God is among you.” This was spoken to the scribes and Pharisees, whose king stood in their midst as the stone rejected of the builders. In this sense the kingdom of God, sometimes synonymous with God’s king, was “among them.”

“The kingdom of God is righteousness, and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit,” because, when its gospel or glad tidings are believed, it produces these effects, and not a regard to the Mosaic distinctions respecting “meat and drink.”

Christ is a king now, and died for maintaining his right to the throne of Israel. Louis XVIII was many years a king before he obtained the throne of France. But David’s case is more in point than Louis’. David, the representative of his Son and Lord, was king anointed several years before he sat upon his throne as King of the Jews, in Hebron. So it is with David II. God anointed him with his holy oil at his baptism. He then became king and high-priest of Israel elect; but prevented from ascending his throne by the Mosaic law, which would permit no man of Judah’s tribe to sit as a priest on David’s throne, because it had covenanted the priesthood to Levi only. Therefore, as Jesus could not be the royal high priest of Israel while the law of Moses continued in force, he set out upon his travels into a far country, until all legal obstacles to his rights be removed. All this time, however, he is king and priest elect of Jehovah’s nation, although for the present it refuses to acknowledge him as such. When Mr. Bowes comes to understand this, he will write more sensibly and scripturally than he has yet done upon this great question among the Jews. Our view of it will not then appear “incoherent and absurd.” He will then see that he is now incompetent to define “a true Christian,” and “the kingdom of Christ.” He doth not yet know them, for they are not Gentilistically discerned. The true Christians are marching onward to the kingdom through much tribulation. When they find themselves in it all their troubles will cease, and their jubilee begin.

I do not say that “the soul sleeps after death,” but that certain being dead, “sleep in Jesus,” and, out of him, dwelling in the dust. Therefore, says Isaiah, “Awake, and sing, ye that dwell in the dust.” And Daniel writes, that “many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake.” There are some in the dust who do not sleep, but are perished. They only are said to sleep in death who are to awake again; and there are some of whom Isaiah saith, “they are deceased, they shall not rise.” If the resurrection were universal all the dead might be said to sleep; but Isaiah says it is not; therefore sleeping can be scripturally affirmed only of them who are to rise. The man sleeps, not a supposed disembodied entity, called by Mr. Bowes, “the Mind of Man.” I use no such jargon as that “the mind of man sleeps after death.” The mind of a man falls asleep every night if the man be sound; but in death, it is the man, the whole man, commingled with his native dust, that reposes there until the trump of God awakes him to glory or shame.

Yea, “salute every saint in Christ Jesus.” This I am ever glad to do when I can find one. But there are such multitudes of pretended saints, that one is obliged to be cautious. I do not define “aliens” to be “those who reject my peculiar views;” nor do I condemn any. The Scripture defines an alien to be one who is not a citizen of Israel’s Commonwealth; and the Lord Jesus condemns all to perdition who do not believe the gospel of the kingdom he preached. The “love” he taught leads men to obey his word with willing and affectionate hearts; and to encounter hardship and reproach in the practice and advocacy of his truth. This love I profess, bearing “hatred” towards none. I admit that “no system can be of God which infuses into the church hatred and schism.” But where is “the church?” Is it Mr. Bowes’ church, or the church of England, or the Methodist church? Really, there are so many churches, that the phrase “the church” has long ceased to define any particular thing. Hatred abounded in these churches long before I visited England; nor was schism a stranger in their midst. I never yet caused hatred or schism in a church of Christ, though, I dare say, the doctrine I have taught has caused considerable disturbance in congregations of misbelievers.

But this is of no consequence. Infidel encampments ought to be disturbed; and all are infidel that believe not the gospel of the kingdom of God.

Thus I have noticed all that seems to require a note to be made on't in Mr. Bowes' endeavour to promote the truth at my expense. I suppose he thinks that the article, together with his two lectures on the immortality of the mind, have used me up. What he has said in the lectures, I know not; but if they are no weightier than the article before us, we need not be terribly afraid. Mr. B., however, has doubtless done the best he knows how; and what more can a man do than his best! We will then accept the will for the deed, and thank him for his good intentions. May he do better next time! In the meanwhile may he come to the knowledge of the truth, and to the obedience it requires; and at last having suffered for the kingdom, may he obtain an abundant entrance to the possession of all the good things which it affords!

September 3, 1853.

EDITOR.

\* \* \*

From the "Bible Examiner."

#### "THE BOLD ASSUMPTION."

Since our former article was in type upon this subject, the editor of the Bible Examiner has favoured his readers with the following additional remarks, which he penned in ignorance of what appeared in our October number. Let the reader peruse what is written in that issue upon our "bold, daring assumption," and then accompany Mr. Storrs in his luminous critique upon Bro. Marsh's good intentions, and our "self-proclamation of infallibility."

"In the Advent Harbinger of July 16, Bro. Marsh republishes our remarks contained in the last Examiner, on Dr. Thomas' bold assumption,' and thinks 'Bro. Storrs has misapprehended the real sentiment conveyed in the short extract which he made from the brief report of Dr. Thomas' discourse,' &c. Bro. Marsh charitably believes Dr. Thomas did not mean to convey the sentiment we attributed to him; and he tries to convince us that we take a wrong view of the grammatical construction of the paragraph we quoted. Bro. Marsh's effort is creditable to his heart, as he wishes to shield Dr. T. from the imputation of preaching 'another gospel' from that which Paul preached; but we must say, in our judgment, no other grammatical construction can be put upon the words than the one we put on them; nor do we believe that Dr. Thomas will thank Bro. M. for his attempt to make these words mean something else than what they clearly express. That he did intend to say, that 'Baptism is the law of justification' Dr. T. will not deny, we are sure. Bro. Marsh may deny it for him; but that avails nothing. We shall see if Dr. T. backs him up in that denial. If he does so, frankly, then we will confess we misapprehend his meaning—not his words as reported. Till his denial appears, the charge we made of a 'bold assumption' by him, and our new charge of preaching 'another gospel' from Paul, will stand as our distinct utterance of what we believe is true.

Nor is this the only 'test' which has come from the same quarter which we regard as a self-proclamation of infallibility. In the Harbinger of July 9<sup>th</sup>, Dr. T. says, his book—Elpis Israel—should be in the hands of every one desirous of understanding the glad tidings of the Kingdom of God, which is indispensable to all who would attain to it."

“Now the construction put upon this language is this, viz: ‘An understanding of the glad tidings of the kingdom of God, as I understand that subject, is indispensable to attain that kingdom, hence you ought to have my Elpis Israel.’ Now, will Dr. T. say that is not what he means? If it is not, we should rejoice to hear him say so unequivocally. The question is not now how much truth there may be in the work spoken of, but we do not believe any mortal has a right, or any authority, to make his particular theory a test of another’s fitness for the kingdom of God. ‘There is one lawgiver who is able to save and to destroy; who art thou that judgest another?’—James 4: 19. By disregarding this authoritative inquiry, men set themselves up as infallible judges in matters of faith, knowledge, and practice. This spirit brought on the great apostasy called papacy, and still continues to show itself in all persons who attempt to impose their theory as a test upon their fellow Christians. We blame no man for thinking his theological views are important and highly beneficial; but when any man steps beyond, and affirms that his peculiar views and practices, in matters of religion, are ‘indispensable’ for all other men, in order to a part in the kingdom of God, his words are of no weight with us; because his positiveness is prima facie evidence that, however good his heart may be, he is labouring under a hallucination, induced by a too exclusive contemplation of one subject, which unfits him to judge in the case. The denunciations of such persons, if they were issued with all the thunders that ever proceeded from the seven hills of Rome, would have no effect upon our mind, in the way of conviction, that their position is a true one, but rather the reverse.”

I repeat that friend Storrs misapprehends the meaning of the words reported. Bro. Marsh’s head is as clear as his heart is right in the matter; and I deny, in plain terms, that I either said, or intended to say, that “baptism is the law of justification.” The law or rule of justification is this, that a man must believe the gospel of the kingdom, and be baptised, in order that, in being so released from his sins, he may come under a sentence unto life incorruptible in the age to come. This is the law, rule, or way of life, which, when resolved into its constituents, consists of the gospel of the kingdom of God and name of Jesus, as the subject-matter of the faith; a command—Acts 10: 48—to be baptised associated with the subject matter, converting it into a “law of faith,” and baptism, which is the act enjoined. This, as thus defined, not baptism, but the command to believers of the kingdom’s gospel to be baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus is the law of justification, —a command which none but an intelligent believer can obey; for there is but “one baptism,” because there is but “one faith” recognised by the Word of God, in respect of “his righteousness.” Immersion, the only justifying form of obedience for a sinner, becomes the “one baptism,” if that sinner’s faith be the belief of the truth, working by love, and purifying the heart; and all men, no matter how pious they may be reputed, are sinners, or in their sins, until they obey the truth, in being baptised into the name of Jesus. I hope this is sufficiently explicit to prevent continued misapprehension on the part of Mr. Storrs, who would do well to consider what is meant by the saying, “nothing, if not critical.”

But “bold” and “daring assumption” are not the only allegations brought against me by my “Examiner” friend: he has added a new and more serious count to his indictment. He charges me with preaching “another gospel” from Paul. This he styles “our new charge,” and which he says “stands as our distinct utterance of what we believe is true.”

If this count can be proved against me, then am I indeed in an awful condemnation, for Paul saith of such, “Let him be accursed.” But, happily, the offence is only charged upon me, and that only by Mr. Storrs and not by Paul. As yet, no proof hath been adduced, unless Mr. Storrs’ grammatical mistake is to pass for such. We are “justified by faith,” saith Paul; yea,

saith Mr. Storrs, “by the law of faith;” certainly, say I, there can be no doubt of that. Then we are all agreed? By no means; Mr. Storrs differs from us both. Paul was immersed, to wash away his sins, three days after he believed that the hope of the twelve tribes—Acts 26: 6-7—would be realised through Jesus; who, he afterwards said, having been perfected, “becomes an author of eternal salvation to all who obey him.” This is the principle of justification, (and they only are eternally saved who are justified) contended for by me. No salvation or justification for the disobedient, or for those who do not obey the gospel, is the doctrine of the Bible, by whomsoever preached therein. Paul and I go hand in hand in this doctrine; but Mr. Storrs differs from us both. Defining his doctrine by his practice, he maintains the opposite principle. It is no matter what he says to the contrary. Actions speak louder than words. Whatever he may believe of Paul’s gospel, he does not occupy Paul’s ground. He has not obeyed Peter’s command to the Gentiles, to “be baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus;” but when Ananias uttered the same command to Paul, he obeyed. Hence the difference between friend Storrs and Paul in this matter, on the supposition that Mr. Storrs believes the gospel, of which I have no assurance, is, that Paul was baptised, Mr. Storrs is not. Now it is this same unwashed, and, therefore, disobedient, Mr. Storrs, who accuses me of “preaching another gospel from Paul.” The Apostle taught justification in obedience; Mr. Storrs, justification in disobedience, as he says, within an hour after believing, although he may never have been immersed!

As Mr. Storrs has undertaken to pronounce sentence upon me, as a preacher of another gospel from Paul, I should like very much for him to inform his readers what Paul preached as the gospel, which he designates as his. Declaring that “we are justified by faith,” is not preaching the gospel; what is incumbent on Mr. Storrs to show is, the testimony he declared. “I came,” says he, “declaring unto you, Corinthians, the testimony of God.” What did that testimony teach for faith, for justifying faith? Before Mr. Storrs can convict me of preaching “another gospel” from Paul, he must define what Paul preached—that the keeping in memory of which is necessary, even for the baptised, if they would inherit the kingdom of God. Charges are easily made; perhaps he thinks they can be as easily proved against me. Let him then be up and doing. He will, certainly, be conferring a benefit on the world by the demonstration; for I promise him, and my readers, to stop the Herald, and to preach no more, on conviction of the offence so confidently charged upon me by Mr. Storrs.

The saying that “baptism is the law of justification,” erroneously imputed to me, Mr. Storrs styles a “test,” or self-proclamation of infallibility.” But the saying being erroneous, the charge of proclaiming myself infallible falls to the ground, if there be nothing else to sustain it. As to the charge itself, it is ridiculous, in face of the “Confession and Abjuration,” published in the Herald of the Future Age, some years ago. Mr. Storrs mistakes the expression of “full assurance of faith,” and “full assurance of hope” for a proclamation of infallibility. “I believe, and therefore have I spoken.” I perceive what the apostles preached, what they did, and whom they converted. I have “full assurance” that they preached what I understand they did, and that all bearing the name Christian obeyed what they commanded. This full assurance is based upon piles of testimony, and is a full assurance in which all partook in the days of the apostles, without any Storrite imputation of proclaiming themselves infallible. The infallibility of the Pope consists in his assumption of competency to decide all spiritual questions whatever, without mistake, independently of the word. I lay no such claim for myself; but, on the contrary, believe that I can judge nothing aright, unaided by the sure prophetic and apostolic testimony. By this rationally interpreted, I believe I can be surely guided into all revealed truth, provided I take God as meaning what he says, and do not make void all reason by the dogma of non-essentials. This pestilent foolishness has ruined many a

pious individual, and is the Charybdis upon which Mr. Storrs' craft is drifting with imminent hazard to himself and crew.

But failing support from the aforesaid "test," he flatters himself he has another that will surely convict me of proclaiming myself infallible. He quotes a passage from the Advent Harbinger about Elpis Israel to prove it. But no one of tolerable skill in the use of language, would think of putting Mr. Storrs' construction upon it. My attention was directed to the article by a friend, who exclaimed, "Have you seen how completely friend Storrs has committed himself about you and Elpis Israel in his last paper?" When I came to read it, I was truly astonished. What friend Storrs could have been thinking about when he penned the construction he put upon my words, I cannot divine. If he cannot construe language more accurately than he has mine, I do not wonder that he makes so many mistakes in construing the word of the Lord, who speaks upon things so foreign to the Gentilism of the day. I have neither said, nor intended to say, that the possession of Elpis Israel is indispensable to the attainment of the kingdom of God. If I were, how came I myself to the understanding of it, as I believe I did, some years before I wrote the book? All who attain the kingdom, "shall be taught of God," for so it is written. I wrote Elpis Israel to clear away the rubbish of the pulpits, with which the reader's mind might be oppressed, that the light of God's word might enter in. It stands related to this, as Paul's reasonings did to the testimony he declared. "He reasoned out of the Scriptures." These were his weapons—reason and testimony, with which "he pulled down strongholds, cast down imaginations, and every high thing that exalted itself against the knowledge of God, and brought into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." They are Elpis Israel's weapons also, and its author rejoices to know, that though far in arrear of Paul, it has opened the eyes of many to the divine testimony, which testimony has turned them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God.

No. What I have said about the "indispensable" is, that the understanding of the glad tidings of the kingdom of God is indispensable to all who would attain to it. This is saying no more than what Jesus has himself said: "The seed is the Word of the kingdom." "He that received seed into the good ground is he that heareth the word, and understandeth it." This is the only soil that yields fruit unto eternal life in the kingdom. All other soil proves barren. An understanding faith in the gospel of the kingdom is essential to justification, without which there is no inheriting the promises. This is the indispensability affirmed by me, and forms the antecedent to the relative pronoun "which." I said that "Elpis Israel should be in the hands of every one desirous of understanding the glad tidings of the kingdom of God, which (understanding) is indispensable to all who would attain to it." There is no obscurity here, nor any thing like the construction Mr. Storrs has put upon the passage. I have full assurance that the kingdom of God is correctly expounded there, or I should not have published it; but I by no means suppose that the kingdom's gospel, as set forth in the Scriptures, is unintelligible without it. There may be much good ground yielding fruit in which the Scriptures without exposition have been the sower—persons who have obeyed the gospel, and are bringing forth its fruit unto eternal life, who have never heard of Elpis Israel. Still, how many myriads read and study the word without making any progress in the understanding of it, for want of some friendly voice to act the part of Philip in guiding them to the comprehension of what they read. Elpis Israel is for these, to help them to force their way through the Gentilism of non-essentialists, and to take the kingdom of the heavens by force—Matthew 11: 12.

Mr. Storrs is mistaken in supposing that I make my particular theory a test for his or any other's fitness for the kingdom of God. He says, he does not believe any mortal has a right, or any authority to do this. This, of course, would exclude that of the apostles, who have

never yet been anything else but mortal. Surely he cannot mean this, for they have exercised the right he disclaims. For myself, I have no particular test theory. All I pretend to do is, with full assurance of faith, to point out what the mortal apostles have testified concerning fitness for the kingdom of God. Paul says that there shall be “unto them who are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish.” And Peter inquires, “if judgment first begin at the house of God, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God?” All who became members of God’s house in the apostles’ day put on Christ, by faith of the gospel of the kingdom and baptism. This is New Testament fact, not a “particular theory.” All who did not thus obey, remained sinners. Mr. Storrs has not thus obeyed. This is not theory, particular or general; but as much of a fact as the rest. It is also a truth that God has passed no decree exempting Mr. Storrs from the necessity of believing and doing what his household did in the apostolic age. Paul and Peter, then, declare his unfitness for the kingdom of God. He has liberty now to do as he pleases, irrespective of testimony and reason. I judge him not. I only point him to facts being stirred up so to do by himself. Till his recent onset, I have written nothing concerning Mr. Storrs, pro or con; but when moved I speak what I believe. The word judgeth him, not I. It says that “the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God;” and out of Christ, no man is any more righteous than he is immortal. And how do faithful men get into Christ? The word replies, “as many of you as have been baptised into Christ have put on Christ.” It is clear then that an unbaptised man is out of Christ, and therefore not a subject of the righteousness of God. Thus doth the word judge with more terrible thunder in the not far distance than any that has yet reverberated among the hills of Rome. It is positive and sufficiently clear and intelligible to make Mr. Storrs, if he understand the truth, pre-eminently responsible for yielding any longer service to “the spirit that worketh in the children of disobedience,” and leads to death. “To obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams.” So said Samuel to King Saul; and all the revelations in the Word in all succeeding periods only go to illustrate and confirm the principle. All the Lord asks of mankind is to believe what he says, and to do what he commands them; but this they will not do, and I am sorry to bear witness that our friend Storrs is among the number. May he believe, repent, and become obedient, and in so doing pull out the beam which is in his eye, that he may be the better able to extract the mote he imagines he perceives in mine!

September 1, 1853.

EDITOR.

\* \* \*

## ANALECTA EPISTOLARIA.

### ENCOURAGING.

My Dear Friend: —Doubtless the late extraordinary excitement, occasioned by the menacing attitude of the Czar against the Ottoman Porte, has had some influence in stimulating the people here to inquire into the events which have been so ably noticed by you; but there is every reason to believe, that, in the event of these belligerent matters taking a pacific turn, the whole will be accounted as a nine days’ wonder.

I am, however, aware that there is no need to remind you of the importance of your continuing steadfast on your watch-tower, and sounding the alarm, that “the day of darkness and of gloominess, a day of clouds and thick darkness,” is near. The present signs are mere precursors of greater events; and exhibit the morning redness on the tops of the mountains, that ere long will shine in the splendour of eternal day.

The peddling book-makers in Scotland are not altogether unmindful of their time of harvest, having eagerly seized upon the present opportunity to vend their wares of false doctrine; whilst others, burning with indignation at the successful issue of their competitors, have vented their spleen in vulgar abuse, emitting such trash as is contained in a recent pamphlet, entitled, "A Quietus for the Coming Struggle," with a demonstrated answer to the question, "Is either Beast of Revelation 13, the Papacy?"—whose anonymous author is evidently writhing under the painful fact, that the pamphlet entitled "The Coming Struggle," has reached the sale of 92,000 copies.

The multitude of correspondence which I continue to have from the readers of "Elpis Israel," and "The Herald," affords ample evidence that a large number of persons have, by your onerous labours, been stimulated to anxious inquiry into the things concerning the long-promised kingdom of our Lord; and doubtless many, who would otherwise have remained in utter ignorance, have thus been enriched with the knowledge of the way of eternal life. Under these circumstances, you, my christian brother, have abundant reason to rejoice that your work has thus far met with Divine approbation. And O, may your heavenly master still lead you to cling to him alone for aid to persevere faithfully unto the end, guiding you onward like a gallant, stately vessel, while my little barque glides humbly after, and we both rest together in the haven of endless glory.

Yours very faithfully, in Israel's hope,

RICHARD ROBERTSON.

89 Grange Road, Bermondsey, England.  
August 17, 1853.

\* \* \*

#### ISRAEL'S HOPE.

Brother Thomas: —It is with great satisfaction and pleasure that I am enabled to inform you, that I have been "baptised into Christ," upon the apostolic foundation of believing the things of the kingdom of God, and the name of the Lord Jesus, after the example of the men and women in Samaria. The more I examined the Word, after hearing your lectures at Rochester, New York, the more satisfied I became that I had not been immersed on the "one faith;" and had therefore not been the subject of the "one baptism;" and consequently not in the "one Lord;" and without any scriptural right or claim to the "one hope of the calling." My former guides had, unwittingly, perhaps, wrested the Scriptures to conclusions by which I had been misled. The gospel they preached declared the coming of the Lord Jesus to destroy all who were not heirs of immortality in the fires of earth's universal purification and renewal; and to fulfil, in their non-Israelitish sense, the promises made to the fathers. But I have now learned from the Word a gospel that makes this no gospel at all. I perceive that the promise made to Abraham embraces a multitudinous seed. In a national sense, it embraces Israel and all other nations contemporary with Abraham, as the covenant "father of many nations;" and in a spiritual, individual, and governmental sense, all who with Christ shall possess the kingdom of Israel, and the dominion over all nations "under the whole heaven for ever and ever." Christ, the saints, Israel, and the nations, in the Age to Come, are, indeed, a multitudinous seed—immortal rulers of a mortal world; all blessed in Abraham and Christ, as covenanted to the friend of God 430 years before the night of Israel's departure from the land of Egypt; and though Israel has been scattered among the nations, as

God foretold, they will also be gathered to the covenanted land, as God has promised; and to be expelled no more thence by the horns of the Gentiles.

Paul was bound with a chain for the gospel hope, called “the Hope of Israel,” “the Mystery of the Gospel,” and “the Mystery of Christ”—Colossians 4: 3; Ephesians 6: 19-20; Acts 28: 20. I read of but one hope in the Bible, styled there, “that good thing which Jehovah hath promised unto the house of Israel and the house of Judah”—Jeremiah 33: 14. Paul was in chains for maintaining that the promised goodness of the Lord to Israel was to become a reality through Jesus; and that all who would share in it must obtain the prize through him. I am willing to be bound with Paul for this hope. In his day men heard him proclaim this hope; they embraced it understandingly, and were baptised to become heirs of it. They were not, as is now the fashion with those who profess to be struggling out of darkness into light, immersed first, then, came to hear that there was such a hope, and afterwards to believe it. Immersion, hearing, believing, is now the inverted order of things; but in Paul’s time it was hearing, believing, and being immersed—Acts 18: 8; yet how few have discernment enough to see that a departure from this natural order renders of non-effect the truth. However, whatever others may conclude, I thank God that a different disposition has been created within me. I have embraced the angel of the covenant, and the covenanted things, and am therefore now scripturally united to the vine; and enjoy the answer of a good conscience on grounds that cannot be shaken by the sophistry of men.

Looking for the consolation of Israel, I remain yours in hope of the inheritance covenanted to the fathers,  
Canada West, August 1853. G.

\* \* \*

#### IMPORTANT PRINCIPLE.

No two truths can be antagonistic: hence, that which is certainly true makes everything antagonistic to it certainly false. This principle applied to the commission frees it from all misconstruction. It is certainly true that “He who believes the gospel of the kingdom, and is baptised, shall be saved;” it is therefore certainly false, that he who sincerely misbelieves, and is baptised; or, he who sincerely misbelieves, and is not baptised, “shall be saved.” The last three suppositions are antagonistic to the first, which is on all sides admitted to be certainly true. But no truths pertaining to the same thing can be antagonistic; therefore the last three are certainly false.

\* \* \*

#### “DEVIL,” “SATAN.”

True, some might declare you in error touching what and who are devils. As a scholar, your attention might be called to the fact, that all the words which are rendered in our version “devil,” “satan,” are susceptible of other translations, which would answer to the context quite as well; as “liar,” “deceiver,” “adversary;” and that if any of these meanings had been taken by the translators, the popular understanding of those passages wherein they occur would have been quite different. Your attention might farther be called to the fact, that there are more passages in which the original words for devil and satan are translated by other words, which afford the English reader not the remotest idea that the originals of any words in

such passages, are the very ones which in other places read “devil,” “satan,” and without any grammatical reason for such difference. Also to the fact, that “devil” and “satan” are the merely untranslated, Anglicised originals; and that if these originals had always been translated or put into appropriate English words, wherever they occur, that then the English reader would easily perceive that these words do not imply, as he may have imagined them to, a fallen angel—the great antagonist of God. And still further, that the translators used these Anglicised originals—“devil,” “satan”—wherever the context does not clearly forbid the idea of a “devil,” in the sense in which that word is usually understood. But in almost every case where the context forbids such idea, the originals are rendered into English words, which correspond to them in meaning; and thus they have, intentionally or otherwise, misled the public mind. And lastly, it might be inquired if Peter was THE DEVIL, when Christ said to him, “Get thee behind me, Satan.”

\* \* \*

#### EDINBURGH CHRISTIAN NEWS.

The following correspondence appeared in a paper published in Manchester, England, styled the “Truth Promoter.” “J. C. junr,” I suspect, is one of our friends in Edinburgh named James Cameron, a communication from whom will be found in No. 8. The reader will perceive how shy the Editor of the “Christian News” is of a close examination of the Gospel. This is characteristic of all errorists near and afar off. Being ignorant of it, they prefer rather to eulogise it as a glorious mystery than to attempt to define it in detail. J. C. junr. Has proved at once his own intelligence and the Protestant Jesuitism and timidity of the “Christian News.”

The following is the correspondence under the caption of

“LIFE OR DEATH—THE GOSPEL DISTINGUISHED.”

To the Editor of “The Truth Promoter.”

Edinburgh, July, 1852.

My Dear Friend, —The following letter was sent to the Editor of the “Christian News” for insertion, but was declined, for reasons which I consider very inconclusive. Considering the almost unlimited liberty of expression allowed on “Election,” “Predestination,” and kindred topics, the Editor’s aversion to admit the question, “What is the Gospel?” tends to confirm me in the views I have expressed in the letter. Presuming on your impartiality in conducting “The Truth Promoter,” I take the liberty of requesting you to insert it, along with the correspondence to which it gave rise, inviting you or any of your correspondents to put it to the test of the “law and the testimony,” feeling assured that truth, on whatever side it lies, can never be injured by free investigation.

I remain, yours faithfully,

J. C. Junr.

To the Editor of the "Christian News."

Edinburgh, 7<sup>th</sup> June, 1852.

Dear Sir, —In the number of your paper for June 3, I observe an article entitled "LIFE OR DEATH—THE GOSPEL DISTINGUISHED." The writer speaking of the Gospel, says, "There is one fact in that word, and but one work in all that God has done, the knowledge of which can give peace and safety to the soul of man. The statement of this ONE FACT is the GOSPEL." The one fact here referred to is stated to be (in substance) that a sacrifice has been offered by Jesus, and accepted by God, for the sins of every man. Now, while believing and rejoicing in this as a fact, it does not appear to me that the limiting of the gospel to this fact is in accordance with the teaching of Scripture. I am desirous of being put right, if wrong, and therefore take the liberty of shortly stating some of the reasons which lead me to this conclusion. The first reason is that the subject-matter of the gospel consists partly of accomplished facts and partly of promises which have not yet become facts; whereas in the article alluded to, the gospel is stated to consist of a past event. The subject-matter of the gospel, when preached to Abraham in these words, "In thee shall all nations be blessed,"—Galatians 3: 8, was entirely future; and at this day, the blessedness of the nations through Abraham is as much a thing of the future as it was in the days of Abraham, although, in point of time, nearer its accomplishment.

2<sup>nd</sup>. Paul, in preaching the gospel, was brought before Agrippa, and distinctly brought out the future element of the gospel, when he said, "I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers, &c."—Acts 26: 6. Paul was not judged for his belief in the past fulfilment of a promise, but for the hope of a promise the fulfilment of which was yet future.

3<sup>rd</sup>. The faith of the gospel is defined by Paul as having a distinct reference to the future—"Now, faith is the substance (or confidence, margin) of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." This definition of gospel faith, having for its object "things hoped for," appears to me to necessitate the idea of an element of the gospel which was then, and, of course, yet in the future.

4<sup>th</sup>. When Jesus went into the synagogue at Nazareth, it is testified that he opened the book and found it written—"The Spirit of the Lord is upon me because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor &c. And he began to say unto them, This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears." And immediately after, he went to Capernaum, where the people "stayed him that he should not depart from them. And he said unto them, I must preach the kingdom of God to other cities also, for therefore am I sent."—Luke 4: 18, 42-43. From these passages it appears to me, that being "anointed to preach the gospel" was capable of being expressed by the language, "I am sent to preach the kingdom of God." This appears to include something more than the one fact of sacrifice or propitiation. What was one of the results of this preaching of the gospel or kingdom of God? Luke testifies that, "Jesus added, and spake a parable, because he was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they thought that the kingdom of God should immediately appear. He said, therefore, A certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return"—Luke 19: 11. His preaching seems thus to have had a reference to Jerusalem, when it should "cease to be trodden down of the Gentiles, when the times of the Gentiles should be fulfilled"—Luke 24: 24. The effect of which was, that he being nigh to Jerusalem, the Jews expected that the kingdom of God should immediately appear, thus showing their slowness of heart to believe all that the

prophets had spoken, viz., “the sufferings of Christ, as well as the glory that should follow”—Luke 24: 25. “Jesus sent the Apostles to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal the sick. And they went through the towns preaching the gospel and healing everywhere”—Luke 9: 2, 6.

After the day of Pentecost the Apostles preached the same gospel. “Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and preached Christ unto them. And when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, AND the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptised, both men and women”—Acts 8: 5, 12. When Paul was at Ephesus, “He went into the synagogue, and spake boldly for the space of three months, disputing and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God”—Acts 19: 8. That Paul considered the kingdom of God and the gospel convertible terms, may be seen from Acts 20: 24-25—“The ministry which I have received of the Lord Jesus to testify the gospel of the grace of God. And now, behold, I know that ye all among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God shall see my face no more.” Also Acts 28: 23—“He expounded and testified the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus,” &c.; verses 30-31—“Paul dwelt two whole years in his own hired house . . . . Preaching the kingdom of God, and teaching those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ.” That the kingdom Paul thus preached constituted the future element of the gospel seems to me plain, from the passage (already quoted) in Luke 19: 11. “A certain nobleman went into a far country, to receive for himself a kingdom, and to return;” verse 15—“When he was returned, having received the kingdom,” &c., he proceeded to place his faithful servants over the cities, as a reward of their faithfulness. Compare this with Daniel 7: 13-14, where the return of the Son of Man is predicted “I saw in the night visions, and behold, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven . . . . And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom,” &c.

It may be objected, that Paul’s definition of the gospel in his epistle to the Corinthians, excludes this element of it. This is by no means the case. Paul there declares the gospel to be—“Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that he was buried &c.”—1 Corinthians 15: 4. What does Paul mean, when he says, “Christ died for our sins?” What Paul preached at Corinth, is summed up by the sacred historian Luke, in Acts 18: 5 thus—“Paul testified to the Jews that Jesus was Christ.” This was the point which the Jews denied. They knew at least in part the character which the Messiah of their prophets was to sustain. He is called by Gabriel in Daniel 9: 15 “Messiah the Prince.” The Jewish high priests understood distinctly this part of his character when they said—“Let Christ, the king of Israel, descend now from the cross, that we may see and believe”—Mark 15: 32. The approved confession of the guileless Nathaniel is perhaps still more valuable—“Philip findeth Nathaniel, and saith unto him, We have found him of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write. —Nathaniel saith unto Jesus, Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of Israel.” Jesus distinctly commended Nathaniel in his reply in the next verse—John 1: 45, 49. The words of Paul would thus have been understood by Nathaniel, Christ the King of Israel died for our sins &c. In this passage then the kingdom of God is not omitted. —It is a concise statement of the gospel which Paul preached, not only at Corinth, but at Ephesus, and wherever he proclaimed the glad tidings. Your inserting these remarks will oblige,

Sir, yours faithfully,  
J.C. Junr.

Notice to Correspondents in "Christian News," of June 17.

J. C. J. has been perused. The writer, whose view he opposes, would quite readily admit that all good news connected with the dispensation of grace are of the gospel, but he was treating of the gospel which a sinner has to believe in order to his justification. Hence we think the article sent ill-judged and unnecessary.

To the Editor of the "Christian News."

Edinburgh, 18<sup>th</sup> June, 1852.

Dear Sir, —I am sorry that you consider the article I sent you, ill-judged and unnecessary, and that because of a distinction which you make between what is "the gospel," and what is "of the gospel." The very reason for which I took the liberty of troubling you was, that there is no such distinction hinted at in the passages which I adduced. I humbly think, therefore, with all deference, that my remarks were well-judged and not unnecessary, especially as no reason has been given why such a distinction should be admitted. I therefore wish it to be understood, that I employed the phrase, "the gospel," precisely as you define it, viz., that which a sinner has to believe in order to his justification—that gospel of which Paul declares "though we or an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed"—that gospel of which the Messiah himself said, "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations,"—Matthew 24: 14—a consummation which Paul testified had been accomplished concerning the gospel he preached—"the word of the truth of the gospel which is come unto you, as it is in all the world"—"The gospel which ye have heard and which was preached to every creature which is under heaven"—Colossians 1: 5-6, 23. Should you still decline to insert the article for the above, or for any other reason, I have only to request you to take up the passages I adduced in it, stating in your own way my views of them, and what you consider their correct teaching. Having no other object in view, but what I give you full credit for, viz. the furtherance of truth, I trust you will do justice for the truth's sake.

I remain, yours faithfully,  
J.C. Junr.

Notice to Correspondents in "Christian News," of June 24, in reply to above.

J. C. J. —We have perused his letter, and see no reason to alter our opinion already expressed. This only would we say, that no man who knows the gospel, in bringing it before a sinner, would deem it necessary to expound to him any or all the passages which J. C. J. quotes in his first letter; he would regard it as enough to put him in possession of the great master truth for the salvation of sinners, satisfied that this received, a way is immediately opened in his understanding and heart for the reception of all other gospel truths.

To the Editor of the "Christian News."

Edinburgh, 25<sup>th</sup> June, 1852.

Dear Sir, —I have read in your notice to Correspondents, your answer to my letter of June 18, but so far from finding in it a reason for your decision, I find in it the best of all reasons why you should have inserted my first letter. The language you employ differs materially from that employed in the article entitled "The gospel distinguished." In that article, one fact was singled out as "the gospel," while you now distinctly class that one fact,

among other gospel truths, as that truth which has first to be preached to a sinner. Your qualification of it as a master truth does not, in my view, materially alter the case. It simply amounts to this, that an important fact connected with the gospel is first to be preached to sinners. This differs so much from the “gospel distinguished” that I will content myself with what is stated above, only adding, in taking leave of the subject, that considering the freedom of expression, which in matters “of the gospel” you allow in your paper, I am not a little disappointed that you seem to be so averse to that freedom when the question is—What is the gospel? Paul determined not to know anything among the Corinthians “save Jesus Christ and him crucified.” Here is a distinction between the person and his work. Paul must make known Jesus Christ as the king of Israel, as well as the Priest and Prophet predicted by the prophets. Christ himself in preaching the kingdom of God, distinctly allowed its importance as part of the gospel, when he said, “Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein.”—Mark 10: 15.

I remain yours faithfully,  
J. C. Junr.

There was no response to the above in the paper for 1<sup>st</sup> July.

\* \* \*

#### FAITH THE PRIMARY PRINCIPLE.

“The state and condition in which we enter into life have been so ordered and appointed, that infancy and childhood must needs be to all a perpetual exertion of faith. During the first years of life, we cannot do any thing, we cannot know anything, we cannot learn any thing, not even to speak, except through faith. A child’s soul lies in faith as in a nest. He is so fashioned, is brought into the world in such utter helplessness and dependence, that he cannot do otherwise than put faith in the wisdom and in the love of all around him, especially of his parents, who, in this respect chiefly, stand in the stead of God to him. . . . But every child that comes into the world is to be trained up not merely as an heir of time, but as an heir of eternity. He is to be trained to live a life of faith. . . . When we have learned to look at childhood in its true light, as a discipline and exercise of faith—when we have recognised the beneficence of the ordinance, that, during our first years, our souls should grow up wholly by breathing the air and, as it were, sucking the milk of faith, we see how rightly, in ages before men were dazzled by the glare of their own ingenuity, it was deemed the fundamental principle of a wholesome education to bring up children in full, strict, unquestioning obedience. For every act of obedience—if willing and ready, not the result of fear or of constraint—is an act of faith, and that, too, in one of its higher manifestations; . . . . whereas the practice (now far too prevalent) of refraining from requiring obedience of children, without, at the same time, explaining the reasons for requiring it, by depriving the obedience of its personal faith and confiding submission, deprives it in great measure of its worth as an habitual element of the character; while, by appealing to the child’s own understanding as the supreme and qualified judge of what he is to do, it fosters that spirit of self-reliance which springs up too readily in every heart. . . . Perverse, too, and enervating, is the practice of coaxing or fondling a child into obedience—of winning obedience from love in its more superficial external workings, rather than as a duty, from faith. Let faith be the primary principle, and love will follow, and be dutiful and steadfast. . . Still more noxious is another habit, which also is deplorably common, of bribing children into obedience. Many parents are content if they get the dead works of obedience performed anyhow, and will promise their

children some plaything or dainty if they will only do as they are bid. Thereby, through a self-indulgent weakness, to spare themselves a little pain and trouble, they encourage stubbornness and reward disobedience. . . . Moreover, they do what in them lies to strengthen the child's carnal, sensual propensities. . . . They teach him that, even in doing his duty, he is not to do it for its own sake, but for the sake of some paltry outward gratification to be gained by it. They teach him that God's judgments are less to be desired than gold, and far less sweet than honey, and that in keeping them there is no reward comparable to an apple or a toy." This is well worthy of being pondered; it embodies much of the philosophy of teaching. —From Hare's Victory of Faith.

\* \* \*

### SPEAK AS THE ORACLES OF GOD.

"If any man speak let him speak as the oracles of God."—PETER.

"Whoever attempts," says Dr. Witsius, "to discourse on the subject and design of the divine covenants by which eternal salvation is adjudged to man on certain conditions equally worthy of God and the rational creature, ought, above all things, to have a sacred and individual regard to the heavenly oracles, and neither through prejudice nor passion, intermix any thing which he is not firmly persuaded is contained in the records which hold forth these covenants to the world. For, if Zalenous made it a condition to be observed by the contentious interpreters of his laws, that each party should explain the meaning of the lawgiver in the assembly of the thousand with halters about their necks; and that what party soever should appear to wrest the sense of the law, should, in the presence of the thousand, end their lives by the halter they wore:"—(Polynius B. 12c.7.)—and, if the Jews and Samaritans in Egypt, each disputing about their temple, were admitted to plead before the king and his courtiers, on the condition only, that the advocates of either party failed in the dispute, should be punished with death: —(Josephus Antiquities B. 13 a. 6.)—certainly he must be in greater peril and liable to sorer destruction, who shall dare to pervert by rashly wresting the sacred mysteries of the divine covenants; our Lord himself openly declaring that whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven—Matthew 5: 19. —OEconomy, p. 39.

\* \* \*

### "MINE EARS HAST THOU OPENED."

"Mine ears hast thou opened or bored," alluding to the custom used under the law, by which the willing servant was signified to be obliged, by his own consent or choice, to serve his master for ever. To this appointment the Son replied, "Lo, I come; I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart"—Psalm 11: 6, 8. To the same purpose the prophet says in the name of Messiah, "The Lord God hath opened mine ear, and I was not rebellious, neither turned away my back"—Isaiah 50: 5. The Messiah being in equality with the Father—Philippians 2: 6-11—became his voluntary servant to undertake the work of redemption. He did it cheerfully. Hence, before it became incarnate, the wisdom of God says, "My delights were with the sons of men from the foundation of the world." Thus, though a servant, he is a willing and cheerful one refusing to go free—Deuteronomy 15: 17; and being co-equal with God, He is his substitute and representative in all things pertaining to man—that is, THE MEDIATOR. —Editor.

## ANTICIPATED CONFLAGRATION OF ROME.

Dr. Cumming, in his “Apocalyptic Sketches,” and many other authors, have asserted, as their interpretation of some parts of the Apocalypse, that Rome will be destroyed by fire from Heaven, or swallowed up by earthquakes, or overwhelmed with destruction by volcanoes, as the visible punishment of the Almighty for its “Popery” and its crimes. I am unwilling to deduce any argument of this kind from the prophecies which are unfulfilled; but I behold everywhere—in Rome, near Rome, and through the whole country of Italy, from Rome to Naples—the most astounding proofs not merely of the possibility, but of the exceeding probability, that the whole region of central Italy will one day suffer under such a catastrophe. The soil of Rome is tufa, of a volcanic origin; the smell of the sulphur, which we found to be most disagreeable, must be the result of volcanic subterranean action still going on. At Naples the boiling sulphur is seen bubbling near the surface of the earth. When I drew a stick along upon the ground, the sulphurous smoke followed the indentation; and it would never surprise me to hear of the utter destruction of the entire of Italy. —Townsend’s Journal of a Tour.

\* \* \*

## CHILD SACRIFICES.

The abominable practice of sacrificing children to Moloch, the god of the Babylonians and of the ancient Hebrews, has lately received a curious illustration in the Babylonian cylinders published by the Syro-Egyptian Society. Among those cylinders one is found which contains a representation of a child with a chaplet round its head, and the hands tied behind, being led up to the Babylonian Saturn, who holds a sword in his right hand, while a female figure stands by in the act of supplication. The sign of Capricorn is in the Heavens above. In another a little figure is seated before Moloch—a female child, dressed very gaily, as if for presentation to the god; she has the right shoulder uncovered, and the hand on the same side is elevated, as if in the act of addressing earnestly or supplicating the god. The moon and a star are represented above. In a letter lately read before the same society from Dr. Grotefend, of Hanover, that learned Orientalist said he had deciphered an arrow-headed inscription in which Nebuchadnezzar is made to offer his son to be burnt to death, in order to ward off the affliction of Babylon, something similar to what we read of the King of Moab—“Then he took his eldest son, that should have reigned in his stead, and offered him for a burnt offering upon the wall”—2 Kings 3: 27.

\* \* \*

We should do our utmost to encourage the beautiful for the useful encourages itself.  
—Goethe.

\* \* \*

Critics are not the legislators, but the judges and police of literature. They do not make laws—they interpret and try to enforce them. —Edinburgh Review.

\* \* \*