

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, DECEMBER, 1853—
Volume 3—No. 12

MOSES AND THE PROPHET LIKE UNTO HIM.

Moses was the great-great grandson of Jacob in the line of Levi, Kohath and Amram. He was born in Egypt in the year of the world 2383, which, according to our computation published in Elpis Israel, was 727 years after the Flood, and 350 years after the confirmation of the promise of Canaan to Abraham and his Seed for an everlasting possession. He was named Moses by Pharaoh's daughter, importing that he was saved out of the water. We do not propose here to compile a history of this, the greatest man of his time, and of the sixteen centuries and a half which succeeded the passage of the Red Sea. It cannot be better related than it is in the admirable writings current in his name. Our object is to call attention to him as a representative man— a man representing or typifying another man, even "the Man Christ Jesus"

The history of Moses is representative from his flight into the country of Midian, Arabia Petrea south of Mount Sinai, to his decease when the Lord hid him from his nation. There was a likeness, indeed, between Moses and Jesus in their infancy; for while the life of Moses was jeopardized by the decree of Pharaoh, Jesus was also endangered by the mandate of Herod against Rachel's children of two years old and under. But Jehovah preserved them; and thus were they cast upon Him from their birth, and kept in safety, or "made to hope" upon their mothers' breasts—Matthew 2: 13-18; Psalm 22: 9-10. There was a resemblance also in the high qualifications and faithful self denial of these two personages in their manhood. "Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians, and was mighty in words, and deeds." This was previous to his attaining the age of forty years. To this time, though the adopted grandson of Pharaoh, and heir apparent of the Egyptian throne, and surrounded by the licentious notables of its court, where the God of Abraham was unknown, Moses was a man of faith— a learned, mighty and faithful man, who might have worn the crown of the greatest monarchy of the age, with all its treasures; but he renounced them all, and became a fugitive, and companion of oppressed bondmen, that he might share in the kingdom to be

established under Abraham's Seed in the adjoining country of the Canaanites—Hebrews 11: 24-26.

Jesus, too, was the most learned and the wisest man of that or any other age before or since. He was wise and learned by divine intuition—John 7: 15-17; and in the language of Cleopas, "was a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people"—Luke 24: 19. His political self-denial was as conspicuous as that of Moses. Thrice he refused dominion and a crown at the hand of any power inferior to God—Luke 4: 5-8; John 6: 15. "All these tetrarchal kingdoms of the land", said their possessor, "will I give to thee, if thou wilt do homage for them to me"; but on such terms he rejected them. He knew that all upon Israel's land was His, and the world in its widest sense beside. A then present possession would have saved him much suffering, and have exalted him at once to honour and glory. But he knew that to receive even his own at the hand of the enemy would be to forswear the supremacy of Jehovah, and to become Satan's king instead of God's. "Thou shalt do homage to the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." These were the words of Moses to which he had respect as the words of Jehovah. He knew that to receive the kingdom, glory and dominion of the world from any other power than God would be to descend from the high position of the predestined representative of the Divine Majesty upon the earth for ever, to the degradation of a mere equality with Caesar and the world-rulers of the age. Yea, like Moses, "he had respect unto the recompense of the reward"; and "for the joy that was set before him" he refused to let the people make him king, "choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season." The "kingdom is not from hence"—John 18: 36. It can only be received with eternal honour and glory from thence; that is, from God, not from Satan nor the people. Moses and Jesus understood this well; therefore Moses forsook Egypt, and Jesus forsook Palestine, that they might receive the royalty from God at the appointed time.

Thus far the resemblance between Moses and Jesus is complete. Cradled in peril, saved of God, and hopeful of the same promise, they were men of renown in word and deed, whose faith was "made perfect" by their works after the example of their father Abraham—James 2: 22, leaving behind them illustrious exemplifications of the truth that the enjoyment of the pleasures of sin for a season is incompatible and fatal to an inheritance of the kingdom of God.

But here the present similitude between them is suspended. Moses and Jesus were indeed the rejected of the nation, as is already implied in the allusion to their departure from their people, the one into Midian, where he met with God in the bush; and the other to a far country, where he is still in the presence of Him whose glory illumined the rocky Arabia: but as yet, unlike the case of Moses, Jehovah has not sent Jesus from "holy ground", shining with unapproachable light, to be a ruler and a deliverer, to bring the tribes of Israel out of the land of the enemy, even those tribes which said unto him, "Who made thee a ruler and a judge? Away with such a fellow; we will not have him to reign over us!" But Moses, whom they refused, they afterwards received as their commander, legislator, and king. They placed themselves under him as Jehovah's representative, through whom the nation should obtain political independence and organization, and by

whom it should be put into possession of a country, even of that country from which their fathers came before they migrated into Egypt, and which was promised to Abraham and his Seed for an everlasting possession.

This was an acceptance of Moses which finds no counterpart in the annals of Israel and the history of Jesus. They have refused him as they refused Moses, but a like acceptance of him is yet to come.

From the accession of Moses to the leadership of the Twelve Tribes of Israel, his history is that of the nation also. He is no longer to be contemplated as an individual isolated from his people; but as a prophet—Deuteronomy 34: 10, a mediator—Exodus 24: 2; Deuteronomy 5: 5; Galatians 3: 19, a lawgiver, a man of war—Exodus 14: 25-27; Numbers 21: 34, and a king—Deuteronomy 33: 5. These were his relations to Israel from his second appearing in their midst to the end of his career. He was a mediator- prophet, a lawgiving-prophet, a warrior-prophet, and a royal-prophet. He was not simply a man through whom God spoke to the tribes of Israel as he spoke to them through Ezekiel—a man whose functions were restricted to the utterance of the divine purpose; but a man who was not only to speak but to execute the will of Jehovah, whose servant he was.

Now the reader will see by consulting the references that Moses was precisely the kind of prophet we have indicated. During his administration of the national affairs, Jehovah spoke by him alone. At the commencement of his career, before he was accepted by the nation, he was sent to the people as a prophet-preacher, announcing that the time had arrived to redeem Israel from the power of them that hated them, and to establish the kingdom of God in the promised land—that glorious kingdom of which they were to be the priestly and holy nation—Exodus 19: 5-6. This proclamation of "the Everlasting Gospel" they believed for a while; and in consequence placed themselves at the disposal of Moses, that they might obtain its promises at his hand. "The gospel", says Paul, "was preached unto them"—Hebrews 4: 2; that is, by Moses: but it did not profit that generation, because their faith failed them. They had faith enough to escape from Egypt, but they had not faith enough to enable them to enter the promised country, and to possess it Mosaicly; much less faith had they to obtain a right to it everlastingly, under the covenant which provides for the priesthood and royalty of Christ.

But, as is well known, the character of Gospel-preacher was merged into that of the prophet-judge of Egypt, and the warrior-prophet of Israel; for Moses, having preached salvation to the tribes, executed judgment upon their oppressors, and by the hand of Jehovah his strength gave the nation baptism into himself in the cloud and in the sea, as its sovereign under God. Henceforth, Moses was every thing to the Twelve Tribes. Having once heard Jehovah's voice thundering forth the Decalogue from Sinai's cloud-capped, burning, and trembling mountain, He granted the petition of their terror-stricken hearts that henceforth He would speak to them only through His servant Moses, lest they should die. Jehovah spoke to Moses in their hearing thus that they might believe him for ever—Exodus 19: 9; for if they should believe Moses, they would not fail to believe in him of whom he was afterwards to write. As Moses was to Aaron, so he was to all Israel, "in the place of God". He gave them the bread of heaven to eat, and water out of

the flinty rock to drink, and clad them with raiment that waxed not old upon them. What a prophet-king was this! Truly the father of his people, who sustained them in life and food and raiment, and taught them wisdom from above. What nation ever had such a king as Moses? and what were David and Solomon to Israel after him? As the servant of Jehovah, he gave the nation an existence, ushering it into being, amid storm and fury, and the ruin of a mighty host, from the depths of the sea; he sustained it from the stores of heaven for forty years; beat down their enemies, and trampled them as the mire of the streets; gave them a holy, just and good, but inexorable law; and brought them to the verge of Canaan's land, a well trained and disciplined nation, fit and prepared to take possession of it under the conduct of a successor worthy of himself. He was Jehovah's servant, "faithful in all his house, for a testimony," or representation, "of those things which were to be spoken after." He was the greatest character the world has known, with one exception. The world's great ones are not to be named in the same breath. Moses! What meekness, disinterestedness, faithfulness, self-denial, wisdom, knowledge, power, honour, glory, and exaltation, doth that name represent! A man that was dead and is alive again—Matthew 17: 3, and lives forevermore; yet though living still in hope, "not having received the promise," but waiting for it, that all who believe may be glorified together in the kingdom of God restored again to Israel.

Dost thou not, O thoughtful reader of the living oracles, recognize in the foregoing sketch the Moses of the Pentateuch? Yea, verily, it is a true portrait of the original in outline, left unfinished in detail, that thou mayest fill in the lights and shadows of the picture at thy convenience. Study Moses, and see if he was not the kind of prophet herein described. Do you think you would have a true conception of his prophetic character, if you knew no more of Moses than as a preacher of the gospel to Israel before he visited the court of Pharaoh? No, indeed. You must know the whole written history of the man to be able to say, "I know the prophet Moses;" for Moses was a prophet to the end of his career. You cannot separate his prophetic office from his mediatorship, or his legislative, or regal functions. His code is a great symbolic as well as verbal representation of the truth—a speaking prophecy to the eyes and ears of his nation, and to all others who comprehend it. You must contemplate him in the entirety of his mission; you must view him as a whole, and then, and not till then, will you be able to say if Ezekiel or any other prophet be "a prophet like unto him".

Moses, the prophet thus fully manifested in Israel, was a representative man. This is evident from the following passage in his writings. Addressing the Twelve Tribes he says, "Jehovah thy God shall raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee of thy brethren, LIKE UNTO ME; and unto him ye shall hearken; according to all that thou desirest of Jehovah thy God in Horeb in the day of the assembly, saying, Let me not hear again the voice of Jehovah my God, neither let me see this great fire any more, that I die not. And Jehovah said unto me, they have well spoken what they have spoken. I will raise them up a Prophet of their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words into his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him"—Deuteronomy 18: 15-19. This passage attests the truth of what we have said. It plainly and explicitly declares that the prophet Moses was typical of a

future prophet who was to appear in Israel. In other words, that this future prophet was to be like Moses. Now, beloved reader, suppose you and I had been living at the time Jehovah spoke these words by His servant Moses, with whose extraordinary history, which was national, we were quite familiar, what should we have expected would be the mission of the prophet to come? I say, "the mission;" for it is the mission that supplies the characteristics of the prophet by which his resemblance to Moses can be determined. Should we not expect the Moses-like prophet to preach the everlasting gospel to the Tribes of Israel; to overthrow their oppressors; to baptise the nation into himself as their deliverer by its passage through the sea; to stand between them and Jehovah to speak to them all that He should command him; to give them a law; to build a temple in their midst; to organize the nation; and to fit and prepare it for entrance into the land of Israel under the covenant of an everlasting possession, which is the nation's hope? Should we not expect a prophet whose mission should be to accomplish something like this? Should we not expect him to perform these things in the midst of the Twelve Tribes after the manner of Moses? Certainly we should.

This Moses-like prophet was expected for sixteen centuries and a half. During all that long period, though many prophets appeared in Israel, not one of them was accepted as the one like unto Moses. None of them claimed to be like him, not even Elijah. Yet why should he not, if a great miracle-working prophet were the sum of the similitude to Moses? At length Jesus came, "a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people;" and some of them said, "We have found him of whom Moses in the Law, and the Prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph;" while others said, "This is of a truth that prophet that should come into the world;" and as the result of their conviction meditated the taking of him by force and making him a king—John 6: 14-15. This shows what sort of a Moses-like prophet the people expected, to wit, a prophet-king; hence Nathaniel, when he saw the man announced by Philip as the prophet foretold by Moses, recognized him as Son of God, and Israel's king.

Zacharias, the father of John, thus defines the mission of the prophet-king; "Jehovah hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David, as he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been from the beginning of the age; that we should be saved from our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us; to perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant—the oath which he sware to our father Abraham, that he would grant unto us, that being delivered out of the hand of our enemies we might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before him, all the days of our life". These are the ideas imparted to Zacharias by the Holy Spirit with which he was filled. They define the work to be accomplished by the Moses-like prophet, who is styled "a Horn of Salvation for Israel." This is just the sort of prophet Moses was. He was a Horn or power through whom Jehovah saved the tribes from Egypt. Moses was raised up in the house of Levi, but the Horn or power like unto Moses was raised up in the house of David. His mission was as stated. It was Mosaic: first, to deliver Israel from their oppressors; and secondly, to perform the good thing promised to their fathers in the holy covenant, and confirmed by an oath to Abraham. The work, which Moses performed, was but the earnest of that to be executed by the Moses-

like prophet. Moses delivered Israel, but the deliverance was not the everlasting salvation of the nation. They fell under the power of their adversaries again, and their condition has become worse than Egyptian. In the days of Jesus, ten-twelfths of the nation were outcasts among the nations beyond Parthia; and the other two, though still occupants of the land, were oppressed by the Roman Power. The Holy Spirit in Zacharias taught them to expect that the child about to be born would complete the work that Moses had begun in saving the Twelve Tribes with an everlasting deliverance, so that they "might serve Jehovah without fear in holiness and righteousness before him all the days of their life".

The mercy promised to Israel's fathers is the execution of judgment and righteousness in the land of Israel by the Branch of righteousness which was to grow up to David—Jeremiah 33: 14-15. In perfecting this work, the Holy Covenant confirmed by an oath to Abraham would find its manifestation in the kingdom of God restored again to Israel. The tabernacle of David which is fallen down, and whose ruins are trampled under foot, will then have been built as in the days of old—Acts 15: 10; Amos 9: 11. This work accomplished, and the Restorer will stand in the midst of Israel as the Moses-like prophet in full manifestation. His resemblance to Moses must be based on the historical representation of that distinguished man as the prophet- sovereign of the Twelve Tribes. No account is taken of Moses in the history during his forty years' absence from Israel further than that he was a keeper of sheep in an obscure country. Figuratively speaking, this is the employment of his antitype. He is superintending the affairs of his "little flock" in this nether wilderness—making reconciliation for his household—until the time shall arrive to leave "holy ground," where the glory of the God of Israel shines upon him. But in this there is no similitude between him and Moses as a prophet in Israel. The Moses-like prophet must be present in Israel's midst, surrounded by the Twelve Tribes, and discharging the duties which it is the function of a High Priest, or mediator, lawgiver, king, and commander to perform. Of the mission of Moses' antitype we shall speak more at large elsewhere; suffice it to say here, that Zacharias testifies that it is to save Israel from their enemies and all that hate them; and to convert what Jehovah promised to Abraham into an accomplished fact. The Holy Spirit testifies, I say, that the babe of Bethlehem was the Horn provided in David's house to perform this work, which is as political, national and warlike a mission as that of Moses. When this goodly child attained to manhood, did he save Israel from all, or even any of those that hated them? Did he not on the contrary strengthen those very enemies, and send them against them to slay them, to burn up their city, and scatter them abroad? O, but we hear some word-corrupting mystic of world-wide celebrity "piously" observing, that their real enemies that hated them were their sins and the devil, not sinners; and that when the Jews "confessed the Lord," and "obtained a hope," or "got religion," or were "baptised for the redemption of sins", they were "the saved"; and consequently "saved from their enemies and all that hated them" in the spiritual sense of the words! We pray for patience when we hear such stupid nonsense. The spiritual sense of the words is the obvious sense, which is in strict accordance with the grammatical or literal. "The Lord added to the church daily," not the saved, but "tous sozomenous," the present participle passive, "the being saved"—Acts 2: 47—persons, the subjects of a salvation which begins with the remission of their past sins, and is perfected when, having been raised from the dead, they

inherit for ever "the kingdom restored again to Israel" at their national reconciliation with Jehovah, and deliverance from their enemies, and the power of all that hate them. Hence Paul says, "we are saved by the hope"—Roman 8: 24, if we be not moved away from it—Colossians 1: 22-23, but keep in memory what he preached—1 Corinthians 15: 1-2.

But granting that salvation is complete at baptism, in some sense, the baptised of Israel were certainly not saved from all that hated them, which is the salvation under Jesus the words of Zacharias call for. The opposite is true; for those that hated them prevailed against the saved, delivering them over to torture and death, as they have prevailed against them to this day, and will prevail against them till the Ancient of Days come, and the saints possess the kingdom, and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom for ever under the whole heaven—Daniel 7: 18, 21-22, 27, not above it. Seeing, then, that Israel is not saved, but continue "a people scattered and peeled—a nation meted out and trodden under foot, whose land invading armies have spoiled;" that there is no king in Israel executing judgment and righteousness in their land; and that the holy covenant sworn to Abraham has only been dedicated with the precious blood of his Seed, and beyond this no more performed than in the days of Moses; the conclusion is inevitable, that the Lord Jesus has not yet accomplished his mission, and that he has not yet appeared as a prophet like unto Moses.

Now because this conclusion is true, and cannot be refuted, the Jews of our time refuse to confess Jesus as their ruler and judge; "whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting"—Micah 5: 1-2. Gentile theologians rightly affirm that He is the prophet of whom Moses wrote; but they do not affirm the truth in maintaining that in his appearing He resembled or was "like unto" him. So long as they occupy this ground the conversion of Jews by them to any respectable extent is impossible. "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of the prophecy"—the testimony of the prophecy is the spirit which testifies of Jesus—Revelation 19: 10; John 15: 26; 16: 13-14; 6: 63; 1 John 2:27. This spirit-testimony defines the mission of Christ which the apostolic history plainly demonstrates was performed by Jesus to a very limited extent; and they who affirm it was fully accomplished, aver what they cannot prove; and convict themselves of profound ignorance of the spirit-word, and exclude themselves also from that worthy company styled "the brethren of John having the testimony of Jesus." Instead of giving "death-blows to Jewish infidelity," they are stumbling-blocks in the way of Jewish acceptance of Jesus as the prophet like unto Moses, whom Jehovah promised to raise up in the midst of Israel. "Admitting," say the Jews, "that all affirmed of Jesus in the New Testament narratives be true, proving him to be a true man and no impostor, still he is manifestly from that account not the Messiah promised in Moses and the prophets, if, as Gentile philosophers teach, he is to appear no more upon earth, and to do no more for the Twelve Tribes of Israel, as such, than feeding a few thousands at two meals, and healing the diseases of a few sick Jews, as reported of him." This is an impregnable position, well fortified by the testimony of God. The New Testament history proves Jesus to have been Son of God, a great prophet, mighty in deed, Son of David raised from the dead and translated from the earth; but, deny that he is to appear in Palestine again and to reign there in the midst of the Twelve Tribes of Israel on David's throne, wearing the

crowns of all earth's kingdoms—deny this, and prove that he is to remain for ever where he is, and you deny that Jesus is the Christ, the prophet like unto Moses, concerning whom Jehovah hath testified in His word since the foundation of the world was laid.

On the other hand, that our Jewish friends may not boast themselves against Jesus, however justly they can exult over his pretended friends, which we admit they have ample grounds to do, we remark that if any prophet should appear among them, and re-establish them in Palestine, and make them a great nation, rebuilding the temple and restoring the law, and reigning over them in Jerusalem, yet he would not be the person of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write, if he had not previously been the subject of all the New Testament narratives concerning Jesus. He might be Moses, or Elijah; but the Messiah of whom Moses wrote, impossible. Such a king could not maintain them in everlasting possession of their land; he could not give them rain from heaven and fertility of soil; he could not blot out their transgressions as a thick cloud; neither could he bestow upon any of them eternal life, &c.; in brief, he could not perform the oath sworn to Abraham by God that "they might serve him without fear, in holiness and righteousness before Him, all the days of their life"—as a nation to die no more by the hand of hating Gentile tyrants; and as individuals under their own vines and fig-trees, none daring to make them afraid. Jesus, the great power of God, alone can accomplish this. It is the great work for which he has been prepared—a preparedness to which he has attained through suffering into obedience and perfection. Moses suffered affliction before he was exalted to the throne of Israel. He was an abscondant homicide keeping sheep in the desert—a fugitive from his people before he exchanged his crook for the sceptre of Jeshurun's king. This is Jehovah's rule—probation before exaltation. Israel's Messiah cannot be exempt from this law—a principle working out its results to this day in the experience of all who with him are "the heirs of God".

Gentile philosophy denies the reappearance of Jesus in Palestine to build again or restore the kingdom and throne of Israel. Against all this philosophy we proclaim implacable and unending war. It is the philosophy of rhantised and baptised infidelity, miscalled "religion." It blasphemes God, destroys the Messiahship of Jesus, nullifies the gospel, falsifies the prophets, stultifies the apostles, and makes men infidels; all of which we are prepared to prove at a moment's notice. The cause of this universal corruption with all its fruits is ignorance of the sure prophetic word. Talk of philological theologians being great and wise who are ignorant of the prophets! Great and wise men, and yet ignorant of the foundation of the faith they pretend to preach! Ridiculous. Persevere a little longer, ye wise, in the deeds of your fathers; a few more brief years and your wisdom will become foolishness, and he that is coming will come and take you captive in your own craftiness. It will be ours to harass you as we best can as the "enemies of all righteousness, who cease not to pervert the right ways of the Lord."

EDITOR.

* * *

REPENTANCE WITHOUT SACRIFICE INSUFFICIENT
FOR REMISSION OF SINS.

“Without shedding of blood is no remission.” —PAUL.

Some modern writers, as well as founders of religious denominations, have boldly asserted that “sacrifices were never required to procure the pardon of sin, and that repentance alone is always sufficient.” This opinion has been well refuted by the “Rev” J. Oxlee, an accomplished Hebrew scholar, in his fourth letter to S. M., a Jewish correspondent in the *Jewish Repository*, vol. 2, page 462. The following are his remarks in regard to the unscriptural assertion alluded to:

“Sir, —The next erroneous statement on which I beg to animadvert, in your objections to the Messiahship of Jesus, is to the following effect: ‘For,’ say you, ‘according to our (the modern Jewish) faith, a strict and due observance of the Decalogue and precepts, as ordained by the Almighty in the law he gave to his chosen people, the Jews, is the only intermediate medium, or mediator, that they require to insure their salvation in the future state; and they offer in proof thereof how great a sinner king David was, and yet sincere repentance was the only mediating medium that procured him the Almighty’s forgiveness; for, as Jews, they would deem it to imply mutability in the Supreme, were they to entertain any belief that sincere contrition and repentance does now require a mediator to render it acceptable to the Almighty. Such are the opinions of the Jews on this head, and such are mine.’ —S. M’s Letter, *Jewish Rep.*, Vol. 2, pp. 148, 285.

“Though the doctrine here inculcated,” says Mr. Oxlee, “is somewhat confusedly expressed, the meaning I take to be that, with the Jews, a perfect conformity to the law of Moses will ensure his salvation in the next world; and that, for every violation of the Divine precepts, whereby eternal life should seem to have been forfeited, no other atonement or expiation either now is, or ever was required by the Almighty, than sincere repentance; for the proof of which an allusion is made to the pardon which king David obtained in the affair of Bathsheba. There is not, perhaps, a question of more vital importance to mankind, nor one which requires a higher degree of learning and candor, in order to a right and successful discussion of it, than the manner in which, most agreeably to the will of God, expiation is to be made for sin and transgression. That the Jews of the present age uniformly inculcate, that for every species of sin and transgression, sincere repentance and contrition are a full and satisfactory atonement, I readily grant; but that this notion is repugnant to the analogy of the faith, to the patriarchal and Mosaical institutions, to the express testimonies of Scriptures, to the positions of the Talmud, as well as the assertions of several of the most celebrated writers of the Jewish church, I will endeavour to establish on the most unexceptionable evidence.

“Before I proceed, however, to the general question, I shall invalidate the only apparent proof which you have been able to allege, of contrition and repentance being clearly accepted by God, without the intervention of sacrifice, as an atonement for sin. The pardon to which reference is made in the case of king David, though you have not expressly declared it, is, doubtless, in the matter of Bathsheba, as that is the only instance in which he deviates so far from inculpability of conduct.

“The circumstance is thus recorded in our English version: ‘And David said unto Nathan, I have sinned against the Lord. And Nathan said unto David, the Lord also hath put away thy sin: thou shalt not die.’—2 Samuel 12: 13. That part of the pasuk which relates to the pardon is thus expounded by R. Isaac Abarbinel: ‘But with respect to the answer of Nathan, who says, “The Lord also hath put away thy sin: thou shalt not die,”—I think, that, as David had said: “I have sinned against the Lord”—meaning that the sin had reference to Jehovah himself, and that in his hands were atonement and forgiveness—so Nathan rejoined, true it is that every thing is in the hand of the Lord; and because mercy and forgiveness are in his hand, he hath put away thy sin, so that thou shalt not die. And this he said, because that, when David heard the parable from the mouth of the prophet, he exclaimed, as the Lord liveth, this man is guilty of death; but the Lord, in decreeing concerning thee, hath put away thy sin, so that thou shalt not die; for he hath not decreed against thyself that thou shouldst die, but only against thy sons and thy wives; and this he hath done, because all things are from him, and through him; and because he hath a tenderness for thee before the decree. The words, therefore, of the text, “The Lord also hath put away thy sin,” are not to be expounded as consequent on the confession, but as antecedent to this, and as taking place at the time of the decree, when death was not awarded him, because the lord had a tender regard for him. Indeed, it is evident that the confession and repentance of David did not remove those punishments which had been awarded against him; though, by virtue of his repentance, his iniquities were expiated, and he was rescued from the hands of Absalom, and returned to his kingdom.’—Com. In Loc.

“Now, if any deference is to be paid to the authority of Abarbinel, the pardon which David obtained by the mouth of the prophet was not in consideration of his sorrow and repentance, but of that exuberant kindness which he had shown him from God; for, though the same author hath subjoined, that, by virtue of this repentance, his iniquities were forgiven him, it can only be meant that the blood of atonement was thereby rendered efficacious to the purgation of his guilt; as he lived under the Mosaic economy, and availed himself of that great day of atonement, of which the Jew, ever since the destruction of the temple, has been wholly deprived.

“There is not, indeed, in the whole volume of Scripture any evidence, either direct or indirect, that remission of sins was, under any age of the world, to be obtained by contrition and repentance. During the patriarchal dispensation, we read of sacrifices having been offered for the purpose, as is reasonably supposed, of appeasing the wrath of God, and of conciliating his favour; [of amicability with Him, and of continuance in His grace. —Editor.] but nowhere do we read that the efficacy of repentance was such as to

be a substitute for sacrifice. In the Mosaic dispensation there was no atonement without the shedding of blood; on the contrary, it was by virtue of his oblation only, and not by his sorrow and contrition, that the pardon of the culprit was obtained, and his guilt obliterated. Nor have the prophets affirmed any thing to the prejudice of this doctrine. Their frequent calls to repentance are not to be understood of mere invitations to the people to reflect on their ways, and to be sorry for what was past; but as strenuous exhortations to the strict and punctual discharge of the ritual, as well as of the moral precepts; a considerable part of which consisted in the due and regular performance of sacrifice for sin and transgression. R. Saul Ben R. Arjeleb has attested the truth of this position in more places than one. These are his words: 'for it is evident there is no atonement except by blood.'—Binyan Ariel, Fol. 30. Again, in another preceding column of the same work: 'there is no ground of atonement except by blood.' Thus we find the Jew and the Christian maintaining the same language, that by sacrifice only, and nothing else, can sin be cancelled and guilt obliterated.

“Indeed, that repentance is no ground of atonement, though highly pleasing to God, in our fallen and sinful condition, and even necessary to the right performance of every sacrifice, is demonstrable on the authority of the Talmud, which inculcates, that for all transgressions, not legally expiated by instant sacrifice, the culprit, however intense or sincere his repentance might be, could obtain no pardon till the great day of atonement; that, for certain sins of a flagrant complexion, it was wholly unavailable; and that, for others, of a trivial nature, it was absolutely unnecessary. For every violation of the Divine law, and for all sins whatever committed against God, the victims slain on the great day of atonement, together with the emissary goat, made a full and sufficient expiation of themselves, except in one or two cases, in which it would have been highly presumptuous on the part of the offender to expect any atonement, without the most unfeigned repentance accompanying the expiation; and in matters of wrong between one man and another, where, to render the atonement of any avail, restitution and satisfaction were first to be made.

“That this is a correct statement of the manner in which remission of sins was obtained under the Mosaic dispensation, is apparent from the Mishna, Masecheth, Shebnoth, Perek I. 'Moreover, for the wilful defiling of the sanctuary and its holy things, the goat which was disposed of within, and the day of atonement, made expiation; but for the other transgressions detailed in the law, whether light or heavy; whether committed in wantonness or in ignorance; whether with the knowledge of the thing eaten, or without the knowledge of it; whether against an affirmative or negative precept; whether amounting to the penalty of excision, or of death, inflicted by the Sanhedrin; the emissary goat makes expiation.'

“In this place there is no mention of the repentance of the culprit as a condition of the atonement being accepted, much less, according to the Jews of the present age, is its efficacy asserted to be of such avail as to procure for the offender the remission of his guilt, without the medium of a sacrifice. Seeing, then, that for several gross sins repentance is denied to be of any avail; that, for others of a less enormous complexion, it is not thought necessary; and that, even in those few cases where it cannot be dispensed

with, it sustains not the character of an atoning medium, but is merely the condition on which the expiatory sacrifice becomes efficacious; I am authorised,” (saith Mr. Oxlee,) “to contend, that the modern Jewish doctrine of repentance being self-sufficient for the expiation of all sin and transgression, is at variance with the Scriptures as well as with the Talmud; and has every appearance of having been dictated by the exigency of the circumstances in which the Jew is now placed, without any regard whatever to the real principles of Judaism. I cannot, therefore, but come to a very opposite conclusion with yourself on this important point: that it would imply mutability in the Supreme Being, were the Jews to expect that the most sincere contrition and repentance could now procure for them, whilst languishing under a state of punishment, the remission of sins; when they could not obtain it on such easy terms whilst living in their own land, and enjoying the privileges of the Mosaic dispensation.”

* * *

THE LABOUR OF THE YEAR.

The editor of this periodical has been asked, “Why do you not give your readers some account of your journeyings to and fro, and labours in the gospel?”—to which he has replied, that these journeyings and labours have hitherto left him no leisure to narrate them. He has now, however, at length arrived at the hibernating point, beyond which they are not likely to extend—a point of time on his annual career, whence it becomes necessary diligently to “drive the quill,” until the sun shall enter Gemini, in order to lay up in store sufficient surplus manuscript to keep the printers at work upon the Herald during his “runnings to and fro,” to diffuse a knowledge of the truth among the people.

Since my removal to New York, I have had no leisure. From December till June, of this year, I discoursed some sixty times to congregations in this city, assembling at Chelsea Hall, and Convention Hall. On arriving here, I found some seven or eight meetings in a private house, for their own edification and comfort: but doing nothing in the way of “sounding out the Word of the Lord.” Not that they were devoid of the disposition to do so; but from various circumstances, Providence had not favoured them hitherto with the ability.

Our first number of this volume, p. 18, I have related how we endeavoured to interest the people of this great Nineveh in Israel’s Hope. In our third number, I had to report, that the liberty granted to the Gentiles was converted into licentiousness, in their coming not to ascertain the sense of Scripture, but to speechify their own nonsense. They seemed unable to discern that Chelsea Hall was not rented to afford scope for every one afflicted with the very troublesome phrenal affection, *cacoethes loquendi*, to vex and mortify the sober minded with the thinkings of their untutored minds; but for an inquiry, or search into the system of truth revealed of God in his holy writings, which they who occupied the Hall were prepared to testify and prove. “Be swift to hear, and slow to

speak,” is an apostolic rule much to be respected. James exhorted his brethren to observe it, and advised them not to become “teachers” –didaskolos—because their condemnation would be the greater. How much more necessary is it in these times of ignorance that his counsel should be received! Foolish talking is one of the greatest hindrances to the truth in modern times. People who know little or nothing about it, are generally the most forward in delivering themselves concerning it. They rejoice in the sound of their own voices, and imagine all the time that they are rejoicing in the truth. They desire to be teachers, not perceiving that they have need “that one teach them what be the first principles of the oracles of God.” Such pretenders are not only troublesome, but injurious to the best of causes, which suffers more from injudicious and unenlightened advocates than from none. The apostle indeed says, “Despise not prophesyings,” and that “all may prophesy;” but then it is necessary that the things delivered be “prophesyings,” and the “all” be competent to do it. Prophesying is speaking scripturally to the edification, and exhortation, and comfort of scripturally discerning men. A man that cannot do this must be content to learn, and confine himself to the inquiry “What is truth?”

Having got rid of this obstacle, we proceeded in the work of “declaring the testimony of God” in the midst of difficulties unnecessarily created by misdirected zeal. Still several were added to the professed adherents of the gospel of the kingdom, and the church began to assume numerical respectability, amounting, I believe, to over thirty members. It was thought that removal to a more eligible hall would be expedient. The suggestion was adopted, and our meetings were forthwith transferred to Convention Hall. We commenced operations there in May, and for the information of the people issued a placard of which the following is a copy: —

REPUBLICANS HEAR YE!
AN ISRAELITISH KINGDOM,
Is to be established ere long in the
HOLY LAND;
That is, at the crisis of the overthrow of the now rising
RUSSO-ASSYRIAN EMPIRE:
And furthermore,
To this kingdom of the Twelve Tribes restored to Palestine there will be attached
DOMINION OVER ALL NATIONS,
Whose allegiance will then have been transferred from all
EXISTING GOVERNMENTS,
To the equitable and glorious sceptre of their invincible conqueror,
JESUS OF NAZARETH, THE KING OF THE JEWS.”

The things concerning this kingdom constitute the only gospel set forth in the Bible, and are expounded and testified out of the Scriptures for the information of ingenuous Jews and Gentiles, at Convention Hall, 175 Wooster Street.

PROOF.

Daniel 2: 44; 7: 14, 18, 22, 27; Psalms 2: 6-9; 45: 2-7; 1 Chronicles 17: 11-14, 22; 28: 5; 29: 23; Jeremiah 33: 14-18; 3: 17-18; 16: 19; Isaiah 2: 2-4; 9: 6-7; 11: 10; 24: 23; Micah

5: 2; Zechariah 2: 5-10, 12; 6: 12-13, 15; 14: 3, 9, 16; Ezekiel 34: 23-31; 36: 8-11, 26, 35; 37: 21, 28; 38; 39; Daniel 11: 40-45. —Luke 1: 31-33; 4: 43; Acts 10: 36-37; Matthew 4: 23; 24: 14; 19: 28; 27: 11, 37; Acts 1: 6-11; 2: 30; 8: 12; Revelation 19: 19; 17: 14; 11: 15; 2: 26-27; 5: 9-10; Psalm 149.

Meetings at the usual hours on Sundays. —
Signed, JOHN THOMAS,
Author of *Elpis Israel*, and Editor of the *Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come*.

We call this our “Manifest,” by which in few words is declared the platform upon which we take our stand. We have not yet made much use of it, though where it has been exposed to view it has attracted much attention. We have kept in abeyance, until my journeyings for the season shall have ceased, as its demonstration will of necessity principally devolve on me. In July it was republished and posted about the walls of Halifax, Nova Scotia, with a call suitable to the provincial subjects of a monarchy instead of “Republicans.” The placards were not allowed to remain up long, having been torn down with a zest peculiar to all “lewd fellows of the baser sort.” We do not post them on the walls in this City, but on boards which we expose by day and withdraw at night, at various convenient points.

About the first of June, I visited Rochester, N.Y. by special invitation of the friends there. The visit was to me agreeable and laborious, and I hope profitable to all. I had visited that city some seven years before, when the things spoken were as fables to the deaf. The gospel of the kingdom then found no response in the hearts of my hearers. But I am happy now in being able to report a marked and radical change in favour of the truth. “The things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ,” or “the truth as it is in Jesus,” command the faith, love, and zeal of all who look for the scriptural appearing of “Jehovah’s Servant” in power and great glory. The gospel of the kingdom has taken root among the “Adventists,” and will doubtless grow into a fruitful tree, affording assurance and peace to all among them, who may scripturally claim to be “taught of God.”

At the time of my visit, numerous friends of progress had convened from parts remote and near to confer on the interests of the truth, and to hear what I had to say on the sure prophetic Word. I discoursed on this all important subject twice seven times during my sojourn; for, as the report of the meetings has it in the *Advent Harbinger* for June 18th, “the time allotted to preaching was, by common consent, or rather desire, given to Dr. Thomas, several of the ministers having come to the conference for the purpose of hearing him on the Prophecies”—which conference, it adds, “as a whole was one of the best attended and most interesting we have enjoyed. Brethren were present from nine States, and from Canada West.”

I am unable to report what “good” was “done” by my visit. This cannot be ascertained till the resurrection of those who sleep in Christ. Four individuals, intelligent in the gospel of the kingdom, became obedient to the faith, in being immersed. The hearts of all I conversed with—among whom I may mention those candid and earnest friends of

truth and liberty of speech upon all, Bible questions, Bro. Marsh, the Editor of the Advent Harbinger, and Bro. J. B. Cook, who takes care of the flock in their city—were enlarged and strengthened in the assurance of the hope. I am not aware of any theoretical difference between Bro. Marsh and myself. We believe that a sinner is justified from all past sins by the one faith, which embraces “the things of the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ;” and I think he also believes, that this justification is communicated to such a believer, through the name of Jesus, at the instant of his being united to that name by immersion; and that consequently, if a sinner shall not have been the subject of the “one faith,” which infolds within it the “one hope of the calling,” previous to immersion, the immersion is “no better than a Jewish ablution,” as my friend Campbell has it, because the said sinner had not the true justifying faith as defined by Paul. If I have not accurately stated this matter he will no doubt put me right. I do not know if he would admit all the consequences which flow from this accord. The application of a principle is always a delicate affair. But that he will admit whatsoever can be proved to be the mind of God as expressed in the Word, I have no doubt. This I am satisfied is true also of my worthy friend J. B. Cook, although I have not been able to convince him that the Devil and Satan of Scripture are not the Devil of Gentile theology; and that a pre-immersional belief of “the exceeding great and precious promises,” the facts concerning Jesus, and the doctrinal mystery of those facts, is indispensably necessary to a sinner’s justification unto life. He is the intelligent advocate of the “one faith” and “one hope of the calling” now; but upon the supposition of his having attained to the understanding of them since his immersion among John’s disciples, * will his post immersional belief of the truth concerning the kingdom of God, and name of Jesus convert John’s baptism into that administered by Paul? I have not been able to convince him that it will not. Of this, however, I am satisfied, that if he come to the perception of the reality, whatever it may be, he will not only accept it, but do it with all his heart.

* The Baptists who denominate themselves after John the Baptist: and who are immersed because Jesus was immersed of John in Jordan: hence the saying, “baptised to follow Christ”—as if one could follow Christ without believing “the Gospel of the Kingdom of God,” which he preached! —Editor Herald.

Shortly after my visit to Rochester, I set out for Halifax, Nova Scotia, where I arrived the first week in July, and experienced a cordial welcome from the friends I had acquired in the gospel. My coming had been duly advertised and placarded, to the annoyance somewhat of certain of the leaders of the people, who exerted their influence to prevent the goats from straying from their folds. In this effort they were doubtless successful to some extent; for the assemblies were not so large as at my former visit. The Temperance Hall was taken as before, and occupied for three weeks, which, I think included four Lord’s days. I lectured four nights in the first week, and three nights in each of the other two, besides twice on Sundays, being in all about eighteen discourses. On Lord’s days the congregations were considerable; and though much smaller in the week, all were attentive, and apparently composed of persons interested in the subjects treated of, and desirous to understand. The Prophecies expounded proved attractive to several of the superior and non-commissioned Officers of the Army and Navy on the station, and in garrison there. They originated interesting debates among the Sappers, a class of soldiers

engaged upon the fortifications of the citadel. Some thought we could know nothing about the future; others believed we could: others again were surprised that the clergy never told them any thing about the things I had shown were revealed in the Bible. More of the soldiery would have attended if I could have commenced at seven o'clock instead of half past eight, as they could not be out of their quarters after nine without special leave. I regretted I could not oblige them; for if we had appointed the hour to accommodate the military, we should have inconvenienced the citizens, who were the majority, and could not leave their stores at an earlier hour.

Voices issuing from certain pulpits, advised the people not to go to the Hall. One divine said, he had read Elpis Israel, and that it was full of blasphemy and infidelity. Another of the same spiritual order on hearing this, remarked in private, that he had read the work, and that there was put little he could not say Amen to; and that the book contained neither infidelity nor blasphemy. Here were two divines "called and sent of God," and "set for the defence of the gospel," who could not agree upon what constituted infidelity and blasphemy! Surely in such a case

"When doctors disagree
Disciples may go free;"

This was the conclusion of some, who, following the bent of their own minds, thought it best to go and judge for themselves.

Some, who could not gainsay what was spoken, tried to close the peoples' ears by saying that the lectures were just a money-making scheme. "The Church Times," the National Church organ in that region, was particularly desirous of making this impression before my arrival. It was stated in the advertisement of our meetings that on the week nights four pence admission would be charged to pay the rent of the hall, "&c." The editor of The Times expounded the "et cetera" as meaning "something for the doctor himself." In consequence of this effort to depreciate the disinterestedness of our motives in calling the attention of the people to the signs of the times as indicating the near approach of the kingdom of God, I was requested to make a statement of the facts in the case. This I did at the conclusion of my last address, and stated from a memorandum furnished me, that enough had not been received to pay the rent of the hall by £2, 16s. 2d. It was evident from this that the "something" for myself could not be very enriching. The fact was that to the time of this statement, I knew not if any thing would be forthcoming as a compensation for the time and labour expended for their instruction and edification. When invited to a place to expound the kingdom of God and the things pertaining to it, all I stipulated for was that my travelling expenses should be paid, leaving it to the conscience of my friends, and their appreciation of the things set before them, to supply the necessities of my dependants at home, on the principle that the ox should not be muzzled that treadeth out the corn. The editor of "the Church Times" being present, I remarked, for his especial consideration, that the clergy of the Established Church were the last in "Christendom" that ought to object to a man reaping some compensation for his endeavours to enlighten the public mind. The dignitaries and pluralists of "the Church" would do nothing for the instruction of the people unless they were first assured of ample payment for their services. The Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of London, with all the hierarchs of their church, received thousands of pounds sterling per

annum for reading stereotyped old print, with pomp and pageantry of state. Would any of them in Britain or the provinces come to New York as I had come to Halifax, and for a month nearly without fee or reward, spend and be spent for the public good? Not they! No pay with them, no preach! Yet such are they who impute mercenary motives to one, who has been teaching the people with a deficit before him of £2 16s 2d for rent incurred for the accommodation of the public. It certainly behoves them to pull the beam out of their own eyes ere they presume to extract the mote out of mine!

My labour in Halifax was apparently not in vain. Sixteen applied for immersion. Five had been members of Dr. Crawley's church, which belongs to the Baptist denomination. They could not exist longer on Acadian theology; and therefore died to the system, were buried, and rose to gospel life. Others had been immersed upon a Millerite foundation, and others not at all. One gentleman, a medical practitioner, came nearly two hundred miles to be baptised. The Bible, with the aid of *Elpis Israel* and the *Herald*, humbled him to the obedience of the faith. More might have been immersed, but upon examination they were advised to wait until, by a diligent study of the Scriptures, they had obtained a more satisfactory understanding of the word. The immersions were administered at Melville Island, a rural and beautiful spot at the head of the North Arm, upon which is situated the old French prison, well furnished with guests during the war. The use of this was obtained for us of the admiral by a sympathising friend and member of the Baptist Church. Our proceedings attracted the attention of certain relatives of the archdeacon, who became spectators of the baptising from their boats. They seemed to enjoy themselves very much at our expense. My back was towards them, so that I did not observe their folly. It is well I did not, or I might have been tempted to silence them by contrasting the expressiveness of an intelligent believer's immersion with the unmeaning and impious ceremony of baby-sprinkling. How perverse, and how hostile is human nature, though animated by the blood of an archdeacon, to the institutions of God! A conclave of hierarchs and nobles can encompass an archbishop, and with grave and solemn faces behold him sprinkle a puling scion of royalty without intelligence or faith in the name of the Holy Ones, and call it Christian baptism; but behold with scoffs and jeers the immersion of an intelligent believer into the name of the Lord Jesus.

I left Halifax early in August en route for this city by way of Annapolis, St. John's, Portland, and Boston. A dense fog oppressed us all the way from St. John's to Portland, Me. On diverging from the Bay of Fundy into Passamaquoddy Bay we got into bright sunshine for a short time; but on leaving Eastport, and passing the Bell Rock, we again drove into the fog, and saw no more of land till within about two boat' length of Richmond island, some twelve miles out of our course, about six o'clock in the morning. If it had been dark we should have certainly struck upon the rocks; for though we blew our steam whistle with the shrillest blast, no light-house bell sounded the bearings of our position. From Digby, at the mouth of the Annapolis river, to St. John's is forty miles across the Bay of Fundy. The outlet from the river is by Digby Gap, through which the tide flows with great rapidity and power. I found it very cold in crossing the bay, though early in August, when people were dying of heat in New York. I was detained a night at Annapolis, and at St. John's two nights, and a Lord's day. Knowing no one here, I was unemployed, except in making myself acquainted with the topography of the city and

adjacent country. The suspension bridge across the St. John's river well deserves inspection. The gorge it spans is the fissure through which the river rushes into the harbour, and not being sufficiently wide the tide is backed up, and makes a fall. This is a great place for lumber and ship-building, and seems to be, upon the whole, a flourishing port. The climate is very changeable, and in winter very cold; and no place for one who has passed some dozen years of his existence under a southern sun.

Shortly after my return from Halifax, I visited Worcester, Mass., where I remained about a week lecturing in Warren Hall. Though a convenient room it has acquired an indifferent reputation religiously, because of the notions which find currency there. Some teach that the millennium is passed already; others, that Christ is coming in 1854; and I know not what else beside. Unhappy will it be for the timists if such be the case; for they are manifestly unprepared. If a man would be blessed, he must not only watch, but keep his garments if he have any; and if not, buy of Christ raiment that he may be clothed. Darkness reigns in Worcester. I did what I could in eight lectures to shine away a little of it. How far I may have succeeded time only can reveal. Some seemed to give heed to the things submitted to them, while others stiffened their necks against them. The past-millennialists are of this class, a stiff-necked and sceptical generation. I never met with persons claiming to be Christians who seem to have less reverence for God's testimony than those in Worcester; and should I ever visit this place again I shall seek some other place of utterance than Warren Hall, illustrated as it is by the intense foolishness of the carnal mind. There are a few names, however, in this Sardis, who believe the gospel of the kingdom and age to come. I had the pleasure of immersing three, upon whom rests the responsibility of contending for the faith, and defending it against the traditions of men.

On my return from Worcester, I directed my course to Virginia. I arrived there on the 9th of September, and remained in the State till October 11. In this interval I visited Lunenburg, King William, King and Queen, Charlottesville, Temperance in Louisa, and Webster's in Goochland. There appears to be an increasing interest in the gospel of the kingdom in these parts, owing, I think, to "the Eastern Question," concerning which I have written much in former years, and which is now coming out as I have been showing the prophets foretold it would. Finding this, people, where the Herald and Elpis Israel circulate, are beginning to think that the gospel I have delineated may have more claims upon their consideration than in former days they were willing to admit. Brother A. B. Magruder who preceded me in King William and King and Queen Counties, was much encouraged. The attendance on his appointments was good, and the attention earnest. He had also the pleasure of immersing six who had long assented to the theory of the truth, but had not obeyed it. Besides these, were two others, one of whom was a reformer, and the other previously a non-professor.

In Lunenburg the people turned out well, and some three or four were baptised. At Cool Spring two meetings were held in the week, which would have been respectable even for Sunday. I spoke at Liberty, Prince Edward, on my way to Richmond, in the week. The house was full, and no audience could pay profounder attention. It is to be hoped that what they heard will turn them from the fables preached to them in ordinary to

the truth. Let them search the scriptures, and compare all things with their testimony. This meeting was on Wednesday. On Sunday following I spoke at Acquinton, and on Tuesday following at brother Norman's Meeting House, in King and Queen. The attendance here was small. His neighbours judged themselves unworthy of his anxiety for their spiritual welfare, and of our trouble in journeying twenty five miles to teach them.

At Charlottesville, I spoke three times on Lord's Day, and by accident, as it were, addressed the episcopal congregation of the town. Their Church being under repair, they had expected their clergyman, Bishop Mead's son, to read prayers with them at the Town Hall, as on previous Sundays. But we had engaged the Hall for that day, of which they were not aware. They came, but found me there expounding the Scriptures, instead of Mr. Mead. They remained, and would have had more use for Bibles than for printed prayers, if they had brought them. But the bringing of God's Word "to Church" is a custom but little honoured by the observance of the professors of the day.

Having filled my appointments at Free Union and Mount harmony, in Albemarle, I went to Louisa, and thence to Webster's. It being uncertain whether I should be at Temperance on Saturday, my audience did not exceed a dozen persons. Next day, the house was full. At Webster's it was doubtful if admission could be obtained by fair means. The house is a free one, and has been plastered and repaired by public subscription. Two ancients of the weaker sex, belonging to John's disciples, busied themselves somewhat in raising the money, a work which they imagined gave them some sort of control over the house, to let in and to keep out all whom they in their wisdom deemed to be fit or not to stand on the platform sanctified by the feet of their Mr. Smith. Being a heretic in their esteem, they had decreed that Dr. Thomas should not preach in their house. They spoke thus valiantly because they had "the power of the keys." But, the house being free, they were given to understand that it would be entered key or no key; for the people were determined to hear me. They very prudently left the door open, so that we had nothing to do but to walk in. The audience was more considerable than I expected. They listened very attentively, which is all that I can say; and after two hours' discourse I dismissed them, and departed.

I was told that the canal packet from Lynchburg to Richmond was to pass by Dover Mills about 1 A.M. on Tuesday morning. Thither I went to meet it, and arrived at the mill about midnight. I sat about an hour in the barouche with the cushions on my knees and around me to keep me warm. No packet came, and the caloric of my body was fast radiating to the freezing point. I left my retreat, and joined company with three Negroes, who were kindling a fire on the canal bank. With blocks of gypsum for seats, we hovered over the blaze, cold as frost behind, and smoked and scorched before, waiting for morning or the packet. Morning came, but not the packet. The Negroes slept over the fire more soundly than I am wont to do in bed. They swung in all directions over the blaze, which would sometimes awake their fingers to consciousness, but not their brains. Sleep refused to embrace me with the rest. Keeping up the fire, watching the East, and peering into the darkness for the packet, was the business of this weary and uncomfortable bivouac on the bank of the James River Canal. At length Aurora, daughter of the morn, began to appear, and the dying embers of our fire to return to dust. We had

been labouring under a mistake. The packet did not run on Monday night; so on Tuesday morning I returned to the friend's house I had left over night, and found him putting on his harness for the business of the day. Having warmed myself thoroughly by a blazing wood fire, I went to bed, and slept soundly for three hours. Breakfasted at 9 A.M., and departed for Richmond by buggy at 11. Arrived there about 4 P.M. Started by train at 9 P.M., and arrived at brother Lemmon's, in Baltimore, by 8 next morning.

Anxious to afford his fellow-citizens an opportunity of hearing something of the gospel of the kingdom, in connexion with the prophetic solution of the all-absorbing question of the East, brother Lemmon had hired the Masonic Hall for two week night lectures, and two on Lord's Day. We were by no means sanguine, but certainly anticipated more than we realised on Thursday and Friday nights, or the Masonic Hall would not have been taken for more days than Sunday. The lectures were advertised in the papers, which brought out not more than seven, besides other seven made up from brother L's family circle and myself. If the audience were not large, however, it was, certainly, intelligent. This was an important offset to the large hall and empty benches, and encouraged me to begin and to continue to the end of the subjects advertised, which were: "The Constitution of the World for a Thousand Years to Come;" and "The Rise, Mission, and Destiny of Mohammedanism Scripturally set forth."

But great ends have generally small beginnings. Advertising in the crowded columns of newspapers in such cities as Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston, is of very little use. They must be placarded if the attention of the people is to be gained. We found that something more must be done if the lectures on Sunday were to be better attended than the others. Fortunately brother Lemmon had one of my New York manifestoes, about three feet by two, of which a copy is before the reader. This was tacked on to a board, and placed in front of the Masonic Hall during Saturday. The effect was remarkable. Our expectations were small; our disappointment, therefore, most agreeable. When we arrived on Sunday morning the Hall was nearly full; and at night the assembly was larger still. The attention paid was most gratifying; and encouraged us in the belief, or rather hope, that the Lord may yet have some people to be made manifest by the gospel of his kingdom in this city. At present, like the Great King himself when preaching it, it has no place of rest in Baltimore—no doors open for its utterance—not unlocked by a golden key. Twenty five dollars opened the Masonic Hall; but unbelief closes all other places. Thus it is for the present, and perhaps will so continue to be, until the King shall come in his glory to subdue all things to himself. It is our duty, however, to persevere, and to deserve success, though we may prove unable to command it.

Such have been the labours of the year now nearly closed. Beside writing the Herald, I have spoken about 130 times, and travelled about 3,000 miles. This has been my individual contribution in the interest of the gospel of the kingdom—a small deposit laid up in Heaven for the Age to Come. Twenty seven have yielded obedience to the truth in baptism on the occasions presented. Besides these, brethren Magruder and Anderson have immersed some twelve or fifteen; and believers have multiplied in this city from seven or eight to upwards of thirty. How many of all these will attain to the inheritance none can tell but God. The reward is His; the labour to obtain it with fear and trembling,

ours. The Herald is slowly, but surely I trust, upon the increase. Three years ago there were no subscribers to it in Britain and its Provinces; there are now about a hundred. It has not experienced the same increase here; but is, nevertheless, indebted to the liberality of several brethren, the amount of whose subscriptions has appeared in our "Receipts," for the ability of its Editor to carry it on without falling into arrears. It is believed, I am happy to find, that the matter of its columns is worth the price, and that I have fully and fairly redeemed all I have undertaken to do.

As to *Elpis Israel*, the English edition is exhausted within a dozen copies or so; and of the American not more than about 180 remain unsold. It has made itself felt, and will, no doubt, yield a product which will appear to the honour and glory of God. Have all who believe thus far done the best they are able to do? If not, let them settle the account with God and their own consciences. I judge no man. Let us all do our best; and whatever profit we may have been to one another, let us remember, that after we have done all, to God we are but "unprofitable servants."

EDITOR.

* * *

ON THE SUPPOSED SCRIPTURAL EXPRESSION FOR ETERNITY.

BY THOMAS DE QUINCEY.

Forty years ago (or, in all probability, a good deal more, for we have already completed thirty-seven years from Waterloo, and my remembrances upon this subject go back to a period lying much behind that great era), I used to be annoyed and irritated by the false interpretation given to the Greek word *aion*, and given necessarily, therefore, to the adjective *aionios* as its immediate derivative. It was not so much the falsehood of this interpretation, as the narrowness of that falsehood, which disturbed me. There was a glimmer of truth in it; and precisely that glimmer it was which led the way to a general and obstinate misconception of the meaning. The word is remarkably situated. It is a scriptural word, and it is also a Greek word; from which the inevitable inference is, that we must look for it only in the New Testament. Upon any question arising of deep, aboriginal, doctrinal truth we have nothing to do with translations. Those are but secondary questions, archaeological and critical, upon which we have a right to consult the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures known by the name of the Septuagint.

Suffer me to pause at this point for the sake of premising an explanation needful to the unlearned reader. As the reading public and the thinking public is every year outgrowing more and more notoriously the mere learned public, it becomes every year more and more the right of the former public to give the law preferably to the latter public upon all points which concern its own separate interests. In past generations, no pains were taken to make explanations that were not called for by the learned public. All other readers were ignored. They formed a mob, for whom no provision was made. And that many difficulties should be left entirely unexplained for them, was superciliously assumed to be no fault at all. And yet any sensible man, let him be as supercilious as he may, must, on consideration, allow that among the crowd of unlearned or half learned

readers, who have had neither time nor opportunities for what is called “erudition” or learned studies, there must always lurk a proportion of men that, by constitution of mind, and by the bounty of nature, are much better fitted for thinking, originally more philosophic, and are more capaciously endowed, than those who are, by accident of position, more learned. Such a natural superiority certainly takes precedence of a merely artificial superiority; and, therefore, it entitles those who possess it to a special consideration. Let there be an audience gathered about any book of 10,100 readers: it might be fair in these days to assume that 10,000 would be in a partial sense illiterate, and the remaining 100 what would be rigorously classed as “learned.” Now, on such a distribution of the readers, it would be a matter of certainty that the most powerful intellects would lie amongst the illiterate 10,000, counting, probably, to 15 to 1 as against those in the learned minority. The inference, therefore, would be, that, in all equity, the interest of the unlearned section claimed a priority of attention, not merely as the more numerous section, but also as, by a high probability, the more philosophic. And in proportion as this unlearned section widens and expands, which every year it does, in that proportion the obligation and cogency of this equity strengthens. An attention to the unlearned part of an audience, which 15 years ago might have rested upon pure courtesy, now rests upon a basis of absolute justice. I make this preliminary explanation, in order to take away the appearance of caprice from such occasional pauses as I may make for the purpose of clearing of obscurities or difficulties. Formerly, in a case of that nature, the learned reader would have told me that I was not entitled to delay him by elucidations that in his case must be supposed to be superfluous: and in such a remonstrance there would once have been some equity. The illiterate section of the readers might then be fairly assumed as present only by accident; as no abiding part of the audience; but, like the general public in the gallery of the House of Commons, as present only by sufferance; and officialty in any records of the house whatever utterly ignored as existences. At present, half-way on our pilgrimage through the nineteenth century, I reply to such a learned remonstrant—that it gives me pain to annoy him by superfluous explanations, but that, unhappily, this infliction of tedium upon him is inseparable from what has now become a duty to others.

This being said, I now go on to inform the illiterate reader, that the earliest translation of the Hebrew Scriptures ever made was into Greek. It was undertaken on the encouragement of a learned prince Ptolemy Philadelphus, by an association of Jewish emigrants in Alexandria. It was, as the event has shown in very many instances, an advantage of a rank rising to providential, that such a cosmopolitan version of the Hebrew sacred writings should have been made at a moment when a rare occurrence of circumstances happened to make it possible; such as, for example, a king both learned in his tastes and liberal in his principles of religious toleration; a language viz., the Greek, which had already become, what for many centuries it continued to be, a common language of communication for the learned of the whole (i.e., in effect of the civilised world, viz., Greece, the shores of the Euxine, the whole of Asia Minor, Syria, Egypt, Carthage, and all the dependencies of Carthage, finally, and above all, Rome, then beginning to loom upon the western horizon), together with all the dependencies of Rome, and briefly, every state and city that adorned the imperial islands of the Mediterranean, or that glittered like gems in that vast belt of land, roundly speaking 1,000 miles in average breadth, and in circuit running up to 5,000 miles. 1,000 multiplied into 5

times 1,000, or, otherwise expressed, a thousand thousand 5 times repeated, or, otherwise a million 5 times repeated, briefly, a territory measuring 5,000,000 of square miles, or 45 times the surface of our two British islands—such was the boundless domain which this extraordinary act of Ptolemy suddenly threw open to the literature and spiritual revelation of a little obscure race, nestling in a little angle of Asia, scarcely visible as a fraction of Syria, buried in the broad shadows thrown out on one side by the great and ancient settlements on the Nile, and on the other by the vast empire that for thousands of years occupied the Tigris and the Euphrates. In the twinkling of an eye, at a sudden summons, as it were from the sounding of a trumpet, or the oriental call by the clapping of hands, gates are thrown open, which have an effect that would arise from the opening of a ship canal across the Isthmus of Darien, viz., the introduction to each other—face to face of two separate infinities. Such a canal would suddenly lay open to each other the two great oceans of our planet, the Atlantic and the Pacific; whilst the act of translating into Greek and from Hebrew, that is, transferring out of a mysterious cipher as little accessible as Sanscrit, and which never would be more accessible through any worldly attractions of alliance with power and civic grandeur or commerce, out of this darkness into the golden light of a language the most beautiful, the most honoured amongst men, and the most widely diffused through a thousand years to come, had the immeasurable effect of throwing into the great crucible of human speculation, even then beginning to ferment, to boil, to overflow—that mightiest of all elements for exalting the chemistry of philosophy—grand and, for the first time, adequate conceptions of the Deity. For, although it is true that, until Elias should come—that is, until Christianity should have applied its final revelation to the completion of this great idea—we could not possess it in its total effulgence, it is, however, certain that an immense advance was made, a prodigious usurpation across the realms of chaos, by the grand illuminations of the Hebrew discoveries. Too terrifically austere, we must presume the Hebrew idea to have been; too undeniably it had not withdrawn the veil entirely which still rested upon the Divine countenance; so much is involved in the subsequent revelations of Christianity. But still the advance made in reading aright the divine lineaments had been enormous. God was now a holy spirit that could not tolerate impurity. He was the fountain of justice, and no longer disfigured by any mode of sympathy with human caprice or infirmity. And, if a frown too awful still rested upon his face, making the approach to him too fearful for harmonising with that perfect freedom and that child-like love which God seeks in his worshippers, it was yet made evident that no step for conciliating his favour did or could lie through any but moral graces.

Three centuries after this great epoch of the publication (for such it was) secured so providentially to the Hebrew theology, two learned Jews—viz., Josephus and Philo Judaeus—had occasion to seek a cosmopolitan utterance for that burden of truth (or what they regarded as truth) which oppressed the spirit within them. Once again they found a deliverance from the very same freezing imprisonment in an unknown language, through the very same magical key, viz.—the all pervading language of Greece, which carried their communications to the four winds of heaven, and carried them precisely amongst the class of men, viz.—the enlightened and educated class—which pre-eminently, if not exclusively, their wish was to reach. About one generation after Christ it was, when the utter prostration, and, politically speaking, the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish

nation, threw these two learned Jews upon this recourse to the Greek language as their final resource, in a condition otherwise of absolute hopelessness. Pretty nearly three centuries before Christ it was (284 years, according to the common reckoning), when the first act of communication took place between the sealed-up literature of Palestine and the Greek catholic interpretation. Altogether, we may say that 320 years, or somewhere about ten generations of men, divided these memorable two acts of intercommunication. Such a space of time allows a large range of influence, and of silent, unconscious peration to the vast and potent ideas that brooded over this awful Hebrew literature. Too little weight has been allowed to the probable contagiousness, and to the preternatural shock, of such a new and strange philosophy, acting upon the jaded and exhausted intellect of the Grecian race. We must remember, that precisely this particular range of time was that in which the Greek systems of philosophy, having thoroughly completed their evolution, had suffered something of a collapse; and, having exhausted their creative energies, began to gratify the cravings for novelty by remodellings of old forms. It is remarkable, indeed, that this very city of Alexandria founded and matured this new principle of remodelling applied to poetry not less than to philosophy and criticism. And, considering the activity of this great commercial city and port, which was meant to act, and did act, as a centre of communication between the East and the West, it is probable that a far greater effect was produced by the Greek translation of the Jewish Scriptures, in the way of preparing the mind of nations for the apprehension of Christianity, than has ever been distinctly recognised. The silent destruction of books in those centuries has robbed us of all means for tracing innumerable revolutions, that nevertheless, by the evidence of results, must have existed. Taken, however, with or without this additional result the translation of the Hebrew Scriptures in their most important portions must be ranked amongst what are called “providential” events. Such a king—a king whose father had been a personal friend of Alexander, the mighty civilising conqueror, and had shared in the liberalisation connected with his vast revolutionary projects for extending a higher civilisation over the globe, such a king, conversing with such a language, having advantages so absolutely unrivalled, and again this king and this language concurring with such a treasure, so supernatural of spiritual wisdom, as the subject of their ministrations, and all three concurring with political events so auspicious—the founding of a new and mighty metropolis in Egypt, and the silent advance to supreme power amongst men of a new empire, martial beyond all precedent as regarded means, but not as regarded ends working in all things towards the unity of civilisation and the unity of law, so that any new impulse, as, for instance, impulse of a new religion, was destined to find new facilities for its own propagation, resembling electric conductors, under the unity of government and of law—concurrences like these, so many and so strange, justly impress upon this translation, the most memorable, because the most influential of all that have ever been accomplished, a character of grandeur that place it on the same level of interest as the building of the first or second temple at Jerusalem.

There is a Greek legend which openly ascribes to this translation all the characters of a miracle. But as usually happens, this vulgarising form of the miraculous is far less impressive than the plain history itself, unfolding its stages with the most unpretending historical fidelity. Even the Greek language, on which, as the natural language of the new

Greek dynasty in Egypt, the duty of the translation devolved enjoyed a double advantage; 1st, as being the only language then spoken upon earth that could diffuse a book over every part of the civilised earth: 2dly, as being a language of unparalleled power and compass for expressing and reproducing effectually all ideas, however alien and novel. Even the city, again, in which this translation was accomplished, had a double dowry of advantages towards such a labour, not only as enjoying a large literary society, and, in particular, a large Jewish society, together with unusual provision in the shape of libraries, on a scale probably at that time unprecedented, but also as having the most extensive machinery then known to human experience for publishing, that is, for transmitting to foreign capitals, all books in the readiest and the cheapest fashion, by means of its prodigious shipping.

Having thus indicated to the unlearned reader the particular nature of that interest which invests this earliest translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, viz., that in fact this translation was the earliest publication to the human race of a revelation which had previously been locked up in a language destined, as surely as the Welsh language or the Gaelic, to eternal obscurity amongst men, I go on to mention that the learned Jews selected for this weighty labour happened to be in number seventy-two; but, as the Jews systematically reject fractions in such cases (whence it is that always, in order to express the period of six weeks, they say forty days, and not, as strictly they should, forty-two days), popularly, the translators were called “the seventy,” for which the Latin word is septuaginta. And thus, in after ages, the translators were usually indicated as “The LXX,” or, if the work and not the workmen should be noticed, it was cited as The Septuagint. In fact, this earliest of scriptural versions, viz., into Greek, is by much the most famous; or, if any other approaches it in notoriety, it is the Latin translation by St. Jerome, which, in this one point, enjoys even a superior importance, that in the Church of Rome is the authorised translation. Evidently, in every church, it must be a matter of primary importance to assign the particular version to which that church appeals, and by which, in any controversy arising, that church consents to be governed. Now, the Jerome version fulfils this function for the Romish Church; and according, in the sense of being published (*vulgata*), or publicly authorised by that church, it is commonly called The Vulgate.

But, in a large polemic question, unless, like the Romish Church, we uphold a secondary inspiration as having secured a special privileged translation from the possibility of error, we cannot refuse an appeal to the Hebrew text for the Old Testament, or to the Greek text for the New. The word *aeonios*, as purely Grecian, could not connect itself with the Old Testament, unless it were through the Septuagint translation into Greek. Now, with that version, in any case of controversy, none of us, Protestants alike or Roman Catholics, have any thing whatever to do. Controversially, we can be concerned only with the original language of the Scriptures, with its actual verbal expressions textually produced. To be liable, therefore, to such a textual citation, any Greek word must belong to the New Testament; because, though the word might happen to occur in the Septuagint, yet since that is merely a translation, for any of us who occupy a controversial place, that is, who are bound by the responsibilities, or who claim the strict privileges of controversy, the Septuagint has no virtual existence. We should not be at

liberty to allege the Septuagint as any authority, if it happened to countenance our own views; and, consequently, we could not be called on to recognise the Septuagint in any case where it should happen to be against us. I make this preliminary caveat, as not caring whether the word *aeonios* does or does not occur in the Septuagint. Either way, the reader understands that I disown the authority of that version as in any degree affecting myself. The word which, forty years ago, moved my disgust by its servile misinterpretation, was a word proper to the New Testament; and any sense which it may have received from an Alexandrian Jew in the third century before Christ, is no more relevant to any criticism that I am now going to suggest, than is the classical use of the word *aeon* familiar to the learned in Sophocles or Euripides.

The reason which gives to this word *aeonian* what I do not scruple to call a dreadful importance, is the same reason, and no other, which prompted the dishonesty concerned in the ordinary interpretation of this word. The word happened to connect itself—but that was no practical concern of mine; me it had not biased in the one direction, nor should it have biased any just critic in the counter direction—happened, I say, to connect itself with the ancient dispute upon the duration of future punishments. What was meant by the *aeonian* punishments in the next world? Was the proper sense of the word *eternal*, or was it not? I, for my part, meddled not, nor upon any consideration could have been tempted to meddle, with a speculation repellent alike by the horror and by the hopeless mystery which invest it. Secrets of the prison-house, so afflicting to contemplate steadily, and so hopeless of solution, there could be no proper motive for investigating, unless the investigation promised a great deal more than it could ever accomplish; and my own feeling as to all such problems is, that they vulgarise what, left to itself, would take its natural station amongst the freezing horrors that Shakespeare dismisses with so potent an expression of awe, in a well known scene of “*Measure for Measure*.” I reiterate my protest against being in any way decoyed into the controversy. Perhaps I may have a strong opinion upon the subject. But, anticipating the coarse discussions into which the slightest entertainment of such a question would be every moment approaching, once for all, out of reverential regard for the dignity of human nature, I beg permission to decline the controversy altogether.

But does this declinature involve any countenance to a certain argument which I began by rejecting as abominable? Most certainly not. That argument runs thus—that the ordinary construction of the term *aeonian*, as equivalent to everlasting, could not possibly be given up when associated with penal misery, because, in that case, and by the very same act, the idea of eternity must be abandoned as applicable to the counter-bliss of Paradise. Torment and blessedness, it was argued, punishment and beatification, stood upon the same level; the same word it was, the word *aeonian*, which qualified the duration of either; and, if eternity in the most rigorous acceptation fell away from the one idea, it must equally fall away from the other. Well, be it so; but that would not settle the question. It might be very painful to renounce a long-cherished anticipation; but the necessity of doing so could not be received as a sufficient reason for adhering to the old unconditional use of the word *aeonian*. The argument is—that we must retain the old sense of *eternal*, because else we lose upon one scale what we had gained upon the other. But what then would be the reasonable man’s retort? We are not to accept or to reject a

new construction (if otherwise the more colourable) of the word *aeonian*, simply because the consequences might seem such as upon the whole to displease us. We may gain nothing; for by the new interpretation our loss may balance our gain; and we may prefer the old arrangement. But how monstrous is all this! We are not summoned as to a choice of two different arrangements that may suit different tastes, but to a grave question as to what is the sense and operation of the word *aeonian*. Let the limitation of the word disturb our previous estimate of Paradise; grant that it so disturbs that estimate; not the less all such consequences leave the dispute exactly where it was; and if a balance of reason can be found for limiting the extent of the word *aeonian*, it will not be less true because it may happen to disturb a crotchet of our own.

Meantime, all this speculation, first and last, is pure nonsense. *Aeonian* does not mean eternal; neither does it mean of limited duration; nor would the unsettling of *aeonian* in its old sense, as applied to punishment, to torment, to misery, &c., carry with it any necessary unsettling of the idea in its application to the beatitudes of Paradise. Pause, reader; and thou, my favoured and privileged reader, that boastest thyself to be unlearned, pause doubly whilst I communicate my views as to this remarkable word.

What is an *aeon*? In the use and acceptance of the *Apocalypse*, it is evidently this, viz., the duration or cycle of existence which belongs to any object, not individually for itself, but universally in right of its genus. Kant, for instance, in a little paper which I once translated, proposed and debated the question as to the age of our planet the Earth. What did he mean? Was he to be understood as asking whether the Earth were half a million, 2 millions, or 3 millions of years old? Not at all. The probabilities certainly lean, one and all, to the assignment of an antiquity greater by many thousands of times than that which we have most idly supposed ourselves to extract from Scripture, which assuredly never meant to approach a question so profoundly irrelevant to the great purposes of Scripture as any geological speculation whatsoever. But this was not within the field of Kant's inquiry. What he wished to know was simply the exact stage in the whole course of her development which the Earth at present occupies. Is she still in her infancy, for example, or in a stage corresponding to middle age, or in a stage approaching to superannuation? The idea of Kant presupposed a certain average duration as belonging to a planet of our particular system; and supposing this known, or discoverable, and that a certain assignable development belonged to a planet so circumstanced as ours, then in what particular stage of that development may we, the tenants of this respectable little planet *Tellus*, reasonably be conceived to stand?

Man again, has a certain *aeonian* life; possibly ranging somewhere about the period of 70 years assigned in the *Psalms*. That is, in a state as highly improved as human infirmity and the errors of the earth herself, together with the diseases incident to our atmosphere, &c., could be supposed to allow, possibly the human race might average 70 years for each individual. This period would in that case represent the "*aeon*" of the individual *Tellurian*; but the "*aeon*" of the *Tellurian RACE* would probably amount to many millions of our earthly years; and it would remain an unfathomable mystery, deriving no light at all from the septuagenarian "*aeon*" of the individual; though between

the two aeons I have no doubt that some secret link of connection does and must subsist, however undiscoverable by human sagacity.

The crow, the deer, the eagle, &c., are all supposed to be long-lived. Some people have fancied that in their normal state they tended to a period of two centuries. [I have heard the same normal duration ascribed to the tortoise, and one case became imperfectly known to myself personally. Somewhere I may have mentioned the case in print. These, at any rate, are the facts of the case: A lady (by birth a Cowper, of the whig family, and cousin to the poet Cowper; and, equally with him, related to Dr. Madan, Bishop of Peterborough), in the early part of this century, mentioned to me that, in the palace at Peterborough, she had for years known as a pet of the household a venerable tortoise, who bore some inscription on his shell indicating that, from 1638 to 1643, he had belonged to Archbishop Laud, who (if I am not mistaken) held the bishopric of Peterborough before he was translated to London, and finally to Canterbury.] I myself know nothing certain for or against this belief; but, supposing the case to be as it is represented, then this would be the aeonian period of these animals, considered as individuals. Among trees, in like manner, the oak, the cedar, the yew, are notoriously of very slow growth, and their aeonian period is unusually long as regards the individual. What may be the aeon of the whole species is utterly unknown. Amongst birds, one species at least has become extinct in our own generation: its aeon was accomplished. So of all the fossil species in zoology, which Palaeontology has revealed. Nothing, in short, throughout universal nature, can for a moment be conceived to have been resigned to accident for its normal aeon. All periods and dates of this order belong to the certainties of nature, but also, at the same time, to the mysteries of Providence. Throughout the Prophets, we are uniformly taught that nothing is more below the grandeur of Heaven than to assign earthly dates in fixing either the revolutions or the duration of great events such as prophecy would condescend to notice. A day has a prophetic meaning, but what sort of day? A mysterious expression for a time which has no resemblance to a natural day—sometimes comprehending long successions of centuries, and altering its meaning according to the object concerned. “A time,” and “times,” or “half a time”—“an aeon,” or “aeons of aeons”—and other variations of this prophetic language (so full of dreadful meaning, but also of doubt and perplexity), are all significant. The peculiar grandeur of such expressions lies partly in the dimness of the approximation to any attempt at settling their limits, and still more in this, that the conventional character, and consequent meanness of ordinary human dates, are abandoned in the celestial chronologies. Hours and days, or lunations and months, have no true or philosophic relation to the origin, or duration, or periods of return belonging to great events, or revolutionary agencies, or vast national crimes; but the normal period and duration of all acts whatever, the time of their emergence, of their agency, or their reagency, fall into harmony with the secret proportions of a heavenly scale, when they belong by mere necessity of their own internal constitution to the vital though hidden motions that are at work in their own life and manifestation. Under the old and ordinary view of the apocalyptic aeon, which supposed it always to mean the same period of time—mysterious, indeed, and uncertain, as regards our knowledge, but fixed and rigorously certain in the secret counsels of God—it was presumed that this period, if it lost its character of infinity when applied to evil, to criminality, or to punishment, must

lose it by a corresponding necessity equally when applied to happiness and the golden aspects of hope. But, on the contrary, every object whatsoever, every mode of existence, has its own separate and independent aeon. The most thoughtless person must be satisfied, on reflection, even apart from the express commentary upon this idea furnished by the Apocalypse, that every life and mode of being must have hidden within itself the secret why of its duration. It is impossible to believe of any duration whatever that it is determined capriciously. Always it rests upon some ground, ancient as light and darkness, though undiscoverable by man. This only is discoverable, as a general tendency, that the aeon, or generic period of evil, is constantly towards a fugitive duration. The aeon, it is alleged, must always express the same idea, whatever that may be; if it is less than eternity for the evil cases, then it must be less for the good ones. Doubtless the idea of an aeon is in one sense always uniform, always the same, viz., as a tenth or a twelfth is always the same. Arithmetic could not exist if any caprice or variation affected these ideas—a tenth is always more than an eleventh, always less than a ninth. But this uniformity of ratio and proportion does not hinder but that a tenth may now represent a guinea, and next moment represent a thousand guineas. The exact amount of the duration expressed by an aeon depends altogether upon the particular subject which yields the aeon. It is, as I have said, a radix; and, like an algebraic square-root or cube-root, though governed by the most rigorous laws of limitation, it must vary in obedience to the nature of the particular subject whose radix it forms.

Reader, I take my leave. I have been too loitering. I know it, and will make such efforts in future to cultivate the sternest brevity as nervous distress will allow. Meanwhile, as the upshot of my speculation, accept these three propositions: —

- A. A. That man (which is, in effect, every man hitherto) who allows himself to infer the eternity of evil from the counter eternity of good, builds upon the mistake of assigning a stationary and mechanic value to the idea of an aeon; whereas the very purpose of Scripture in using this word was to evade such a value. The word is always varying, for the very purpose of keeping it faithful to a spiritual identity. The period or duration of every object would be an essentially variable quantity, were it not mysteriously commensurate to the inner nature of that object as laid open to the eyes of God. And thus it happens, that every thing in this world, possibly without a solitary exception, has its own separate aeon: how many entities, so many aeons.

- B. B. But if it be an excess of blindness which can overlook the aeonian differences amongst even neutral entities, much deeper is that blindness which overlooks the separate tendencies of things evil and things good. Naturally, all evil is fugitive and allied to death.

- C. C. I separately, speaking for myself only, profoundly believe that the Scriptures ascribe absolute and metaphysical eternity to one sole Being, viz., to God; and derivatively to all others according to the interest which they can plead in God's favour. Having anchorage in

God, innumerable entities may possibly be admitted to a participation in divine aeon. But what interest in the favour of God can belong to falsehood, to malignity, to impurity? To invest them with aeonian privileges, is in effect, and by its results, to distrust and insult the Deity. Evil would not be evil, if it had that power of self-subsistence which is imputed to it in supposing its aeonian life to be co-eternal with that which crowns and glorifies the good. —From Hogg's Instructor.

* * *

WYCLIFF'S TESTAMENT.

Within fifty years after the completion of his holy work, a copy of Wycliff's Testament is said to have cost about \$150 of our money. "Those who could not give money would give a load of hay for a few favourite chapters, and this in times when the possession of such a manuscript might very probably be the means of bringing the owner to the dungeon or the stake. They were forced to hide their treasure under the floors of their houses, and sit up all night, or retire to the lonely fields or woods, to hear and read without interruption the word of the Book of Life."—Martineau.

* * *

A VOICE FROM ST. HELENA ON THE EASTERN QUESTION.

Our attention has been drawn to some remarkable passages from conversations reported to have been held by Napoleon with Mr. O'Meara, in his "Voice from St. Helena."

We do not need to make any comment upon them. What we have been writing on this question from week to week, for the last six months, amounts to little more than an enlarged commentary on these extraordinary expressions of the ex-Emperor of France, which (bating some exaggerations natural to the speaker and the time) contain the exact rationale of the Eastern question as it stands at this moment.

The conversations took place in May 1817. On the 22nd of May, says O'Meara, after leaving the bath, Napoleon spoke about Russia, and said that the European nations would yet find that he (Napoleon) had adopted the best possible policy, at the time when he intended to re-establish the kingdom of Poland. This, he observed, would have been the only effectual means of stopping the increasing power of Russia. It was putting a barrier, a dyke, to that formidable empire, which it was likely would yet overwhelm Europe. "I do not think," he added, "that I shall live to see it, but you may. You are in the flower of your age, and may expect to live thirty-five years longer. I think that you will see that the Russians will either invade and take India, or enter Europe with four hundred thousand Cossacks and other inhabitants of the desert, and two hundred thousand

Russians. When Paul was so violent against you, he sent to me for a plan to invade India. I sent him one with instructions in detail.”

The conversation was resumed on the same day. “If,” pursued Napoleon, “Alexander succeeds in incorporating Poland with Russia—that is to say, in perfectly reconciling the Poles to the Russian Government, and not merely subduing the country—he has gained the greatest step towards subduing India. My opinion is that he will attempt either the one or the other of the projects I have mentioned, and I think the last to be the most probable.” Hereupon, Mr. O’Meara observed that the distance was great, and that the Russians had not the money necessary for such a grand undertaking. “The distance is nothing,” returned Napoleon. “Supplies can be easily carried upon camels, and the Cossacks will always insure a sufficiency of them. Money they will find when they arrive there. The hope of conquest would immediately unite armies of Cossacks and Calmucks without expense.”

On a subsequent day, the 27th of the same month, Napoleon again started the subject, and made use of the singular and most impressive statements which follow. They appear to us to approach as near to the truth and warnings of prophecy, as any political speculation we have ever known.

“In the course of a few years,” said Napoleon on this latter occasion, “Russia will have Constantinople, the greatest part of Turkey, and all Greece. This I hold to be as certain as if it had already taken place. Almost all the cajoling and flattery which Alexander practised towards me, was to gain my consent to effect this object. I would not consent, foreseeing that the equilibrium of Europe would be destroyed. In the natural course of things, in a few years Turkey must fall to Russia. The greatest part of her population are Greeks, who, you may say, are Russians. The powers it would injure, and who could oppose it, are England, France, Prussia, and Austria. Now, as to Austria, it will be very easy for Russia to engage her assistance, by giving her Servia and other provinces bordering upon the Austrian dominions, reaching near to Constantinople. **THE ONLY HYPOTHESIS ON WHICH FRANCE AND ENGLAND MAY EVER BE ALLIED WITH SINCERITY, WILL BE IN ORDER TO PREVENT THIS.** But even this alliance would not avail. France, England and Prussia united cannot prevent this. Russia and Austria can at any time effect it. Once mistress of Constantinople, Russia gets all the commerce of the Mediterranean, becomes a great naval power, and God knows what may happen,” &c.

The thirty-five years which Napoleon put as the limit to test his prophecy, expired in 1852; in 1853 the question is that which agitates Europe from end to end; and the nephew of Napoleon is on the throne of France. It is possible that if the exiled Emperor could have foreseen the resuscitation of his dynasty, he might have taken a more sanguine view of the possible results of that alliance with England which he thus so remarkably predicted. At any rate, here he speaks unmistakeably to us on the question so vital to the interests of Europe, and from his grave he dictates the policy which his nephew and successor can alone pursue with respect for his authority and name. — Examiner.

* * *

CONFESSIONS OF A JEW.

“How great was my surprise,” says a converted Jew in writing to a friend, “when I read those clear and striking descriptions of the prophet concerning the person, life, sufferings, death, and resurrection of the Messiah, which I had never seen or heard before! For, you well know that Isaiah fifty-third, Daniel ninth, and many other parts of the writings of the prophets, are not included in the Haphtorth, (that is, the portions selected to be read in the Synagogue,) nor are they read by many in private.”

“I now eagerly desired to know whether all that had been foretold by the prophets had been fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth. I therefore procured a copy of the New Testament, the first I ever touched; for you remember how often we were cautioned against it, and told that ‘to touch a New Testament was as defiling as to touch a swine.’ I read the gospels twice over. All was new and unheard of before. It is impossible to describe my astonishment in reading these writings. How different is the real character of Jesus from that blasphemous account of him called Tolduth Jeshu, which we were in the habit of reading every year on the evening before Christmas day. Truly he is the chief among ten thousand, and altogether lovely, and as the poet sung,

‘All human beauties, all divine,
In my beloved meet and shine;
His worth, if all the nations knew,
Sure the whole world would love him too.’

“I was equally surprised to find the most minute predictions fulfilled in Jesus. My judgment was soon convinced that he was the promised Messiah, and I began to rejoice in the hope of glory.”

If by the “most minute predictions” is meant “all that had been foretold by the prophets,” the writer is greatly mistaken; but if he mean that all predicted concerning the Messiah in the day of his mortality was most minutely fulfilled, he is perfectly correct. Much, very much, remains to be fulfilled of what the prophets have spoken concerning him. His work is yet before him; and therefore the indispensable necessity of his reappearance on earth, not in weakness, however, but in power and great glory. — EDITOR.

* * *

THE BIBLE.

“It is a remarkable fact, that the more self-conceited, worldly-minded, and wicked people are, the more they neglect, despise, and asperse the sacred Scriptures; and, on the contrary, the more humble and holy, the more they read, admire, and value them. What

the Lord said of his disciples is equally true of the Bible. 'If it were of the world, the world would love its own; but because it is not of the world, therefore the world hateth it.' No book, however, has had as many friends. Vast numbers of wise and good men, through many generations and distant countries, have agreed in receiving the Bible as a divine revelation. Many of them have been notable for seriousness, erudition, penetration, and impartiality in their judgment of men and things; living and dying they have recommended it to all others, as the source of hope, wisdom, and consolation. 'Reason itself,' says a judicious writer, 'dictates that nothing but the plainest matter of fact could induce so many thousands of persecuted and prejudiced Jews to embrace the humbling, self-denying doctrine of the cross, which they so much despised and abhorred. Nothing but the clearest evidence arising from undoubted truth, could make multitudes of lawless, luxurious heathens, receive, follow, and transmit to posterity, the doctrines and writings of the apostles; especially at a time when the vanity of their pretensions to miracles and the gift of tongues could be so easily discovered had they been impostors, and when the profession of Christianity exposed persons of all ranks to the greatest contempt and most imminent danger.'"—FREY.

* * *

TRUTH'S SIDE.

The truth creates "sides;" the for-it side, and the against-it side; and between these two sides there is no neutral ground. He that is not for me, saith Jesus, is against me; and he styled himself "the truth." If we are for the truth, we cannot encamp with the enemy, and cooperate with them. Being for the truth, it will place us in the minority, and identify us with those who suffer tribulation for the truth's sake. He that runs with the hare, but holds with the hounds, will never save the fugitive from being worried to death. There were men in the days of Jesus who would preach his doctrine, and not speak lightly of him, but would also carefully avoid identification with his unsavoury name. This is referable to the pride of life, love of popularity, or to some other equally unworthy thing. It is certainly a course not prompted by a devotion to the truth, or a love of righteousness. Moses acted not thus. He renounced the throne and treasures of Egypt for the society of enslaved brickmakers. Such a course evinces indecision of character which cannot be approved of the Lord when he appears. Skykingdomism is unscriptural and wholly false; and therefore subversive, wherever it prevails, of "the gospel of the kingdom of God," which is wholly scriptural and only and altogether true. Though I respect skykingdomism, yet, if I identify myself, without a standing protest against it, I become by example an enemy of that which I believe is true. Let these hints be ingenuously considered by those who admit the right, but still the wrong pursue. —EDITOR.

* * *