

HERALD
OF THE
KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME:
A Periodical,
DEVOTED TO THE INTERPRETATION
OF THE
“LAW AND THE TESTIMONY,”
AND TO THE DEFENCE OF THE
**“FAITH ONCE DELIVERED TO THE
SAINTS.”**

BY JOHN THOMAS, M.D.

“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.

NEW YORK:

PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR, 526 BROADWAY.

1854.

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, January, 1854—

Volume 4—No. 1

MAN IN SOCIETY.

BY THE EDITOR.

Man, in the history of his race, presents himself to our notice in two states—the social and the savage. The social is his original condition; the savage, that into which he has sunk as a consequence of licentiousness. At his formation, Man, who was made male and female, was pronounced “very good;” and appointed to live in society, because it was “not good for him to be alone.” The primeval society of Eden was constituted of divine and human elements—of God, the Elohim, man and woman: of God, “whom no man hath seen;” of the Elohim, whom he hath often seen; and of man and woman, the perfection of flesh and blood. This social state was free and devoid of evil; yet was its liberty not absolute, but restrained and regulated by law. Though “very good” and undefiled by sin, man was not permitted to do as he pleased without restriction. A law was given to him by his Creator, expressive of the divine sovereignty over society, and his position in the social state. Hence, society is a divine institution, originally characterised by intelligence, goodness, law, and liberty. Woman belonged to man, because she was his own flesh and bone, and given to him of God; and they both belonged to God, because He had formed them for himself. Society, therefore, belongs to God; so that whosoever hath the honour of membership therein is free to do whatever he pleases that is not contrary to the letter and spirit of His law. This is the liberty God permits in society, which is his. Beyond this man must not go if he would continue in the divine favour. Law is the boundary line between liberty and licentiousness. He that crosses it diabolises, and takes the first step in the descent, which terminates in the anarchy of the savage state.

From the constitution of society, then, at the foundation of the world, we see that law was an essential element of the social state; and that social liberty is freedom restrained by law. Absolute liberty, or freedom unrestricted by law which defines “order” and “decency,” has no place in the divine plan. Man aimed at this. He virtually asserted, that he had a right to do what he pleased with the Tree of Knowledge as with all other trees; but experience at length proved to him that he had no unconditional rights; but a right

only to do according to the law. He did as he pleased, and in consequence lost the favour of God, as will all others who pursue a similar course.

The existence of society depending upon the maintenance of law, it behoves all intelligent and wise people to cooperate to that end. If flesh were not sinful, or if all men were wise and good, the knowledge of the requirements of the divine law would be sufficient. They would know and do. But flesh is sinful, very sinful; and all men in society have not intelligence, nor faith sufficient to walk by, nor wisdom, nor a love of order, nor a sense of decency; therefore, a simple knowledge of what God requires in society, or a simple reference to what the law says, is not enough to answer the necessities of the case. Law cannot apply itself, it must, therefore, be placed in the hands of an administration, that lawlessness may be restrained, and decency and order maintained in society.

The savage state is the opposite to the social in every particular. The "philosophy" of the Gentiles, "falsely so called," teaches that the savage is the original condition of man; and that society has grown up out of it as a result of necessity. One who believes the Bible, however, discards this as mere foolishness. Divinely constituted society is the primeval state; and savage life the extreme consequence of a departure from its laws. It originated in transgression of God's law, or sin, which, before the flood, acquired such force as entirely to corrupt the way of the Lord, and to fill the whole earth with violence. Its career was similar after that catastrophe; and where it was not antagonized by divine interference, but allowed in its fleshly inworking and manifestation to acquire absolute sway in portions of the human race, it reduced them to the condition of the natives of New Holland and the Feejees. The "liberty" of these aborigines is absolute. They do what is right in their own eyes upon the principles of "liberty and equality" in the abstract. They are without law to God, and know no rule but the necessity of their own lusts. They are nature's freemen, democrats of the largest liberty, who, under the impulse of desire, edify themselves without regard to the sensibilities and wishes of the unfortunates who fall into their hands.

This is the extremity arrived at by the uncontrolled working of that principle called "sin in the flesh." Cannibalism, however, is but the extreme manifestation of that "liberty" contended for by some, which impels them to a gratification of their own selfishness and vanity at the expense of the order and decency of the social state. The latter is sin modified in its display by circumstances, which restrain it by present consequences from murder and theft; but leave it rampant in the manifestation of "hatred, variance, jealousies, wraths, strifes, divisions, sects, envyings," which, though thought little of by the carnally-minded, as effectually exclude from the Kingdom of God. —Galatians 5: 19-21.

Now, by comparing the savage and social conditions of man, it will be perceived that, in his transition from the savage to the social state, he sacrifices, as he ascends the scale of being, more and more of what the natural man calls "his liberty." The nearer his approximation to primeval excellence, the more is the liberty of the flesh restrained, and reduced to a minimum. Between society divinely constituted, and the purely savage state,

there are many intermediate social conditions. Greek, Mohammedan, Papal, and Protestant Socialisms, are sin, or the flesh, variously displayed—incorporations, in other words, of "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life," in which the works of the flesh are manifested with little rebuke. It is for this cause that they are glorified by the multitude which is religiously tolerant only of that which condemns "what they have no mind to." Still we see in these barbarisms the liberty, or rather licentiousness of the savage state considerably retrenched. Law and legal administration are recognized and obeyed; for experience has proved that without these, human society cannot exist.

The practices tolerated in the ecclesiastical organizations of the world, cannot be permitted in a society constituted of God. Variance, jealousies, strifes, envyings, and so forth, must be abstained from. No member of such a society is at liberty to indulge in these, or in any thing tending to them. The law of love that proceeds forth of Zion positively and absolutely forbids them. The savage, the barbarian, the Papist, the Protestant, are free to serve sin; but not so the Christian; he is free only to serve righteousness, as a humble and faithful servant to God, who esteems that man most highly who is the least subservient to the lusts, passions, and instincts of the flesh. Therefore it is written: "Mortify [or put to death] your members which are upon the earth;" "present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, and acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service". "Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamour, and evil speaking, be put away from you, with all malice; and be ye kind one to another, tender-hearted, forgiving one another." "Walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise, redeeming the time, because the days are evil." "Be ready to every good work; speak evil of no man; be no brawlers, but gentle, showing all meekness with all men;" and "Let all things be done unto edifying."

Absolute liberty, which is licentiousness, does not belong to God's society. The members of it surrender some of their individuality for the benefit of the whole, of which each person is a very small part. This is a first principle, and there can be no society without it. Now, that portion of individuality which each foregoes, he transfers from himself to the functionaries of society in assenting to their appointment, or in applying for admission, and in being received, into a community where they exist; so that he consents that he has no right to do individually what pertains to them officially. Functionaries, then, are the acting members of the body, administering to its social requirements—its eyes, ears, mouth, hands, and feet; while the body in which they are placed itself is constituted of the generality of its constituents.

These things being understood, there will be no difficulty in comprehending those which more especially pertain to what is commonly termed "a church."

A church is a society constituted upon principles divinely revealed. It is a company of believers organized for the worship of God, the support of the truth, and their mutual benefit. Union is strength; but there must be union in fact, or association is incorporate weakness. It is not good for Christians to be alone; therefore it is a privilege and a blessing for those who are partakers of the divine nature to be together in society. They

afford the truth a local standing; they give it utterance, minister to its necessities, encourage one another, and assist the poor.

Baptism organizes believers of the gospel of the kingdom into the One Body of the Lord. In the beginning, this consisted of 120 persons, with the twelve apostles as their eyes, ears, mouth, hands and feet; their eldership, in short, which comprehended all their office-bearers, who attended to the ministry of the Word, and to the serving of tables. When the 3,000 were added to this Church, they continued under the apostles' sole administration of things spiritual and temporal, until the seven assistants were added to the twelve, to relieve them of the secular concerns. Deacons, therefore, were not essential to primitive church organization, seeing that they were only added to meet the exigencies of the case which arose some time after the day of Pentecost. The apostolic eldership was infallible, having been imbued with the Spirit from on high, which guided them into all truth, and made them what they were. Their administration was, therefore, the "ministration of the Spirit," by which each of them was endowed with the "word of wisdom," "the word of knowledge," "faith," "the gifts of healing," "the working of miracles," "prophecy," "discerning of spirits," "kinds of tongues," and "the interpretations of tongues." This was the Model Church, which was of one heart and one soul, and great grace was upon them all.

The churches among the Gentiles were formed after this model; that is, with an eldership or presbytery embodying the spiritual gifts. These gifts were not common to all the baptised, but to those only which constituted the eldership; and, perhaps, the deacons, who may be indicated as the "helps." Those who had the spiritual gifts were the spiritual men, or "members" of the body "in particular." The elderships of the churches, however, differed from the Jerusalem church, in that each particular elder did not possess all the nine gifts, as did each apostle; but only some of them. The gifts were distributed among several for the profit of the whole body. These supernaturally endowed persons, by the particular gifts they had received, were constituted "apostles" of churches, "prophets," "evangelists," "pastors," and "teachers." They were all elders, but of different orders. Apostles ranked first; the prophets next; then the teachers; and after them the helps and governors; so that the ruling elders occupied the lowest rank in the eldership, and acting, therefore, under the direction of the ministers of the word; yet, though these diversities obtained, they were exhorted to have the same care one for another.

It was the function of these elderships to edify the body of Christ. In other words, the body edified itself through these "members in particular," who constituted in each society the branched candlestick of the church. The unction of the Spirit burned in them, shining as lights, holding forth the "word of truth." All these gifts worked that one and the self-same Spirit, "dividing to every man severally as He willed." The gift most to be desired was that of "prophecy," or the faculty of speaking by inspiration to the edification, exhortation, and comfort of the hearers. The eldership had a plurality of prophets, who might all prophesy in the meeting, provided they did so without confusion. The Corinthians were desirous of "spirits," that is, of spiritual gifts, by which they might be distinguished. They appeared to have desired the gift of tongues above all others; but

the Apostle exhorts them to desire that of prophecy: and whatever they acquired, to seek the acquisition of it, that they might excel to the edifying of the church.

From this brief outline, it is evident that democracy had no place in the apostolic churches of the saints. The Holy Spirit constituted certain of the saints overseers, that they might feed the flock of God, and minister to all its necessities, as the pillar and support of the truth. As the prophets and teachers were ministering in the church at Antioch, the Holy Spirit said to them: "Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them. And when they had fasted and prayed, and laid their hands on them, they sent them away." In this way the rulers and instructors of the body were appointed by the Spirit, and not by the brethren at large. The Father, the Son, the Holy Spirit, the eldership, and the brethren in general, were the elements of God's society in apostolic times. The Father and the Son, by the Holy Spirit, through the eldership, was the authority established in the church. Democratic republicanism would have been subversive of this; and, if tolerated, would have produced confusion and every evil work. The authority of the people and the authority of God cannot coexist. All things of God, and as little as possible of man, is a principle characteristic of the social state originating from heaven, in Eden, in Israel, and in the church. Decency and order can only be maintained by the authority divinely appointed and sustained by the wise and good. This cooperation suppressed turbulence, and put to silence the foolish talking of the wise in their own conceits, who thought more highly of themselves than they were entitled to.

The respect and consideration that was due to the elders is clearly set forth in the Epistles. "We beseech you, brethren," says Paul, "that ye know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and that ye esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake." "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine." Again: "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God. Obey them, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief; for that is unprofitable for you. Salute them all."

On the other hand, the elders are exhorted to "feed the flock of God, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint but willingly; nor for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind neither as being lords over the heritage, but being ensamples to the flock. And when the Chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away. Likewise, ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder; yea, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility; for God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the humble."

After the manner of these exhortations were decency and order maintained in the churches of the saints; yet even with this divinely constituted authority, the heady and highminded could scarcely be restrained. It was the ministration of the Spirit, not in word only, but in power; yet evil found admission, and became "the Mystery of Iniquity, secretly working." The power could punish, and did punish, even unto the infliction of disease and death, and could also pardon and heal the penitent. It was evidently, however,

not exercised to the full, but with considerable long-suffering, and forbearance; though, in many instances, it was pushed to extremities, as a terror to the evilly disposed.

Now, to this point I have endeavoured to show:

First, that the social was the original condition of man, on the principle that it is not good for him to be alone.

Second, that in this state he was free, yet subject to law, which is an essential element of society.

Third, that social liberty is defined by law, by which it is prevented from degenerating into licentiousness, which is liberty unrestrained by law.

Fourth, that as law cannot apply itself, an administration must necessarily exist.

Fifth, that man in society must needs surrender some of his natural or individual liberty for social protection from those who may be stronger than he, and for the general good.

Sixth, that office-bearers constituting the administration are representative of that portion of each member's individuality surrendered for social need.

Seventh, that these principles were incorporated in the churches of the saints established by the apostles.

Eighth, that the churches of the primitive age were constituted by the apostles and evangelists, who, having gathered the baptised believers of the kingdom's gospel into distinct societies, ordained elders in them, who being qualified for the discharge of their several duties of teaching, feeding, ruling, and serving, by spiritual gifts, were therefore constituted by the Holy Spirit.

Ninth, that the elderships were the many branched lamps in which the holy oil, or spirit, burned for the illumination and wellbeing of the generality.

Tenth, that the existence of these spiritual elderships necessarily excluded from the church what, in modern times, is styled democratic republicanism.

Eleventh, that the principle upon which all church affairs were conducted is expressed in the sayings, "let all things be done to edifying;" and, "let all things be done decently and in order;" and "let all your things be done with love," And,

Twelfth, that the churches edified themselves through their elderships, which were composed of "members in particular;" that is, of members selected from the "multitude," according to specified conditions.

One thing, then, is evident, from a review of the premises before us, and that is, that there is no ecclesiastical organization extant like that which we see existed in the apostolic age, and that of the elders who outlived the apostles. And, furthermore, that however intelligent and excellent of purpose and character certain Christian professors may be, they could not by any unanimity establish one. The reason of this is, that the gift of the Holy Spirit is a wanting: then, the Spirit called believers, and qualified them for the eldership, and through it instructed and ruled the body; but now, the Holy Spirit is neither in elderships nor people; at all events, neither of them afford any evidence of the fact, being more conspicuous for want of wisdom, and knowledge, and understanding, than for the possession of them.

But, because we cannot have the ancient order which existed in the infancy and childhood of Christianity, (for which, indeed, it was specially designed,) is that any reason why, when "a measure of an age of the fulness of Christ" has been attained, and the ancient order discontinued, believers in society should have no order at all; but that A. B. and C., however incompetent in the estimation of all but themselves, should be at unrestrained liberty to violate all the principles embodied in that ancient order, and to set all the rules of courtesy and good breeding at defiance? Certainly not. This is anarchy, and utterly disruptive and subversive of the social state. Men cannot live in society, literary, political, domestic, or Christian, where such licentiousness prevails. There must be system, and such an one, too, as shall be a restraint upon the presumptuous, and a praise to them that do well.

Seeing, then, that the divinely constituted order of things is not attainable, and some organization must be established if believers are to cooperate in society, it evidently follows, that the God of wisdom, knowledge and love, has left it to the most intelligent, wisest, and best disposed of His sons, to devise a system embodying the principles of His ancient order, through which may be carried out most effectually His benevolence to His children and the world. The case of Moses and his father-in-law establishes this. God had said nothing to Moses respecting the daily judging of the people, which all rested upon his shoulders, to the certain injury of his health. Jethro perceived this, and, though not an Israelite, suggested a division of labour, in the appointment of "able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness," who should be rulers with him, to judge the people at all seasons. "If thou do this thing, and God command thee so, then thou shalt be able to endure." Moses took the advice; and though it is not written that God approved it, yet, as Moses was faithful in all his house as a servant, we are justified in concluding that he did; for Moses would have established nothing contrary to His will, nor, if established, would it have been permitted to continue. We are in the wilderness state, and in a somewhat similar position. God has removed the divinely constituted elderships, or branched candlesticks, and permitted his heritages to be despoiled and scattered. We are endeavoring to gather the dispersed together in divers places; but, in doing so, we find the times vastly changed. We are here and there companies, who

profess to believe the same gospel as Paul preached, and, like him and his associates, to have obeyed it. We desire to be organized, but the Holy Spirit neither calls any of us to office, nor bestows on us any special gifts. If he prescribe to us no organization for modern times, and he have cut us off from access to the ancient one, it is manifest that, if we are to organize at all, we must do as Moses did at Jethro's suggestion, and organize ourselves, if God command us so; and we infer he does, as he has not told us how to organize, yet exhorts through the apostle "not to forsake the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is."

It might be objected here that this reasoning would sanctify all the ecclesiastical organizations of Christendom. But I say, no; because, in the first place, they are not organizations of Christians, their members never having obeyed the gospel, so that they are not Christian organizations; and, in the next place, the organizations do not embody the principles of the apostolic one. No organization can be acceptable to God which is not comprehensive of his children; while, on the other hand, I believe he would not be displeased at any system of rule and order they might devise promotive of their own improvement of heart and understanding and growth in faith, humbleness of mind, brotherly kindness and love; and which would enable them to support the truth, and sound it out effectively in the world; all of which premises that their system embody the principles inculcated in the Word.

Who then should initiate the organization of unassociated believers? I should answer, in view of Paul's instructions to Titus, He or they who have been instrumental in opening their eyes, and in turning them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God. It is reasonable that he who has been able to do this, is more competent to "set in order the things that are not done, and to ordain elders," than any one or all of the proselytes put together. He has in the nature of things more scriptural intelligence than they, seeing that they had been blind until he happily enabled them to see. The democratic mode of setting things in order, and ordaining elders, has been abundantly tried, and found wanting. It results in every evil work, and in all presumption and confusion. The vote of the majority puts men into office who are unqualified in every particular; and history shows that wherever this principle has rule in church or world, it invariably introduces turbulence, contempt of authority, and corruption; so that at length reaction necessarily supervenes for the prevention of the disruption of society which would otherwise certainly ensue.

The things Titus had to "set in order" were the prophets, teachers, helps, governments, &c., which "God had set in the churches" according to a certain order. See 1 Corinthians 12: 28. In doing this he constituted an eldership for the edifying of the body in love. If it were necessary that these men should have certain natural, social, domestic, logical, and doctrinal prerequisite qualifications, in addition to the gifts of the Spirit, to enable them to rule well, and to edify the body; how much more, important in the absence of those gifts, as in these times, that the office-bearers now should be men of wisdom, knowledge, holiness of life and disposition, courteous, and well bred! Timothy was ordered "not to lay hands suddenly upon any man;" and to let the deacons be tried before they were made permanent. This must be attended to now. The best men and the wisest must form

the Wittenagemot of the church; which indeed ought itself to be as a whole an assembly of wise men; but experience unhappily proves that such a condition is the rare exception to the rule. If all the members of a church were intelligent, wise, disinterested, and wholly devoted to the truth, the elder, overseer, or bishop's office would be a ruling and teaching sinecure; but this was not the case in the apostles' day, and it is much farther from being the case now. Men are more knowing than wise and prudent in all ages; and in proportion to their untempered knowledge and self-esteem, disposed to glorify and exalt themselves. The folly and turbulence and conceit of this class, which abounds in all communities, makes it particularly necessary that the very best men a church can afford should be appointed to its oversight.

As all things, then, must have a beginning, it appears to me that the names of brethren of the class indicated by Paul might be unanimously inscribed on a list by the members of the church, and be handed to him who called them out of darkness, that he might acquaint himself with them, and see which of them it would be advisable to leave upon the list for election. If two elders were needed, four or more good, apostolically characterized men might be inscribed on the list presented, which might be reduced, or not, according to the judgment formed of their eligibility by the scrutator who enlightened them. He might perhaps reduce the list to three. Two pieces of paper might then be each labelled, "For Elder," and put into a receiver with a third piece which should be blank. The three brethren should then successively put in the hand, and take one, upon which they of course who drew the labels would be elected, not by the people, nor by the scrutator, but by the lot. This appears to me to be as near as we can come to a scriptural election; and I cannot but think, that "able men, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness," so elected, would be approved by the Lord himself if present; and would certainly be deserving of all that respect and consideration the Scriptures claim for those who supervise the church. Brethren who would not submit to such men in the Lord should seek society elsewhere. A congregation's spiritual affairs might be safely confided to them, for all their endeavours would be to promote the welfare of their brethren, to diffuse the knowledge of the truth, to maintain order and decency, and to glorify the Father who is in heaven. But, if any better mode could be devised, all reasonable and truthful men would be ready to adopt it.

In some churches there are few that can speak; in others, there are many. As a general rule, brethren should be "swift to hear, and slow to speak;" for there are very few who can speak to the edification of any besides themselves. Some mistake talking for prophesying or speaking to edification, exhortation, and comfort. They talk at their brethren, to the greatest annoyance of those who listen to them, who, after they have done, are thankful, and feel no disposition to say, "Amen." These are "unruly talkers, whose mouths must be stopped," and it is the duty of the elders to do it; and to see that the time and patience of their brethren and the public are not unprofitably consumed by such. There is no worship in talking; and it should be remembered that a church convenes for worship and instruction, not to listen to unprofitable and random talk. James says, "be not many teachers, knowing that we shall receive a severer scrutiny. For we the whole miss many things. If any man offend not in word, the same is a perfect man, able also to bridle the whole body." Let then those who desire to hear their own voices, read the exhortations

of the apostles, and add few words, if any, of their own, unless they have prepared themselves as workmen rightly to divide the word of truth when they who rejoice in the truth will hear them gladly. He is a wise man who, with a small intellectual and scriptural capital, speaks few words; but shallow waters make a great noise; and so it too often comes to pass that they who have the least depth are the most prolific of wordiness and volubility. Speech seasoned with salt is excellent; but if it have no savour, it is fit only to be cast away as unprofitable and vain.

In a word, then, decency and order must be maintained; and, as far as I am individually concerned, I will identify myself with no organization of believers in contending for the faith once delivered to the saints that does not purge itself from the licentiousness which maintains the right of every man doing what is right in his own eyes, to the gratification of himself, at the expense of the inoffensive, and to the injury of the truth.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS.

In the preceding article I have shown, in the first place, what was the divine order of things in the heritages of God planted by the apostles, and ordained by them and the evangelists; and in the next place, how nearly this might be approximated in the Nineteenth Century. But it is much more easy to sketch out the plan of a solid, and substantial, and elegant fabric, than to build it; much depends upon the nature of the foundation, and the materials to be used. If the edifice be not laid in rock, and the materials be more effluent of the flesh than of the spirit, however admirable may be the plan, the structure will prove like the apples in Milton's hell, beautiful to the eye, but ashes between the teeth.

No organization, not even an apostolic one, can work well, that is, scripturally, which is not composed of elements more zealous for the advancement of the truth, and the promotion of the glory of its divine Author, than of their own notions and exaltation. The first necessary thing is, that the members shall have become as little children, having their old Adam subdued by faith, and Christ substituted in his place by the same principle. Without this disposition, which is "peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy," no organization could work harmoniously and efficaciously, though framed and administered by the apostles themselves. Even a bad organization with good materials would work better than a good one with a self-willed, heady, factious, and self-glorifying people. The members must all respect the apostolic teaching if they would have an organization that would be scriptural and satisfactory to all good men. This teaching says, "By love serve one another." "Be not desirous of vainglory, provoking one another, envying one another." "Submit yourselves one to another in the fear of God." "Stand fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the Gospel," "Let nothing be done through strife or vainglory; but in lowliness of mind let each esteem other better than themselves. Look not every man on his own things, but every man also on the things of others. Let his mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus." "Let your moderation be known unto all men." "Put on, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, longsuffering; forbearing one another, and forgiving one another, if any man

have a complaint against any; even as Christ forgave you, so also do ye. And above all these things put on love, which is the bond of perfectness. And let the peace of God rule in your hearts, to the which (peace) also ye are called in one body; and be thankful." "Be at peace among yourselves." "Be all of one mind, having compassion one of another: love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous." "Let love be without dissimulation. Be kindly affectioned one to another with brotherly love; in honour preferring one another." And the great teacher, even Christ, who, though the Lord of all, humbled himself and became the servant of the least, enstamps this doctrine with the seal of his authority, saying, "He that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased; and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted."

A people imbued with such doctrine as this would make almost any organization work well; and indeed would get along peaceably together without any written constitution at all; because peace, and righteousness, and the law of the spirit of life, would be written in their hearts and minds. A people so disposed is the great want of our age—a people who not only believe the gospel of the kingdom, but manifest the fruit of it in their walk and conversation, to wit, "righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit." It is the extreme scarcity of such that make it almost impossible to plant heritages in the land with administrations even remotely approximating to the apostolic. An association of believers is better without an eldership, than to have one made up of persons destitute of the qualifications indicated in Paul's letters to Timothy and Titus. All who have obeyed the gospel are not "blameless," "watchful," "decorous," "given to hospitality," "apt to teach," "of a well regulated mind," "judicious rulers of their own house", and of good external report. These qualifications are as necessary as faith and obedience to the gospel; and in order that their aptness to teach may be beneficially exercised, it is necessary that "the word of Christ dwell in them richly in all wisdom." Persons thus qualified would preside over an association of believers with great advantage to all concerned. These were the sort of persons the apostles exhort us to obey; but before we can do what they require in the premises, the right persons must be manifested. They do not exhort us to obey the incarnations of accident, or of majorities, or of party feeling; but only such as the Holy Spirit makes overseers—"able men, such as fear God; men of truth, hating covetousness." They should be wise, not in their own conceits; this the apostle forbids: but wise in the estimation of those that be wise, and disposed to avail themselves of their services. The greatest amount of the knowledge of divine things possessed in these days is but little at best. How very minute, then, that which is little compared with this! and how little ability is there to use this small amount aright! A little knowledge is a dangerous thing. It puffs up, and "lifts up with pride," or inordinate self-esteem. It is expedient, therefore, that a newly-formed ecclesiastical association should enter upon such an arrangement as would give expression probationally to the principles set forth; that being taught by experience they may be the better able to judge of measures and of the fitness of individuals to carry them into effect with permanence.

Now, a necessity, forced by circumstances upon certain believers of the gospel, has compelled them to initiate an organization which shall favour, as they believe, the congregational worship of God in spirit and in truth, and the dissemination of "the word of the kingdom" in the city of New York. They have entered upon this arduous enterprise

without conference with flesh and blood. They have seen and felt the necessity that exists, and have responded to it in the fearlessness of faith, the love of peace, the admonition of the truth, and the fear of God. It is an olive branch to all who love the truth better than themselves, but affords no scope for the unhallowed ambitions of the flesh.

Approbating the principles set forth in the article entitled "Man In Society" and these "Additional Remarks", they have agreed to the following constitution, as meeting the demands of the probational situation in which they are placed. It is published here for the benefit of all who may be interested in the subject of "Church Organization," which has been for many years a cause of much trouble to the professed friends of truth both in Britain and America. Unhappily, in modern times, about the first thing neophytes begin to do is to join battle with somebody about church government, instead of adding to their faith "goodness, and knowledge" of the divine testimony, that they may grow thereby, and become men, able to contend earnestly and valiantly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints. Infinitely more scriptural would it be for such to do this, than to consume their time and energies in striving against each other about place and power. A man thoroughly imbued with the truth would rather avoid these in this age than seek them. The least intrinsically deserving and qualified are, for the in most part, those who aspire after the petty distinction of place, being rarely capable of illustrating their position by the fruit of faith. They forget that we are placed here to learn obedience by the things we are called to suffer; not to "learn how to rule;" though to obey with a good grace is the first step to the commanding righteously the obedience of others. But, not to dilate more upon this point, which ought to be obvious to all, I proceed without further comment to

lay before the reader the **CONSTITUTION**

OF THE ROYAL ASSOCIATION OF BELIEVERS

IN NEW YORK.

Continued from here

1. —THE NAME OF THE ASSOCIATION.

In the age contemporary with the apostles "Christian" was a name unappropriated by any religionists, other than the true believers who were "first called Christians at Antioch." But in the nineteenth century, this is not the case. Every ecclesiastical association in "Christendom," from "the Mother of Harlots" to Mormonism, the most recent of her Babylonish and adulterous generation, now appropriates the once distinctive and unblemished appellation to itself. For this reason, we conclude not to attempt to distinguish our Association by a name so universally misapplied; differing also, as we do,

so essentially in faith and hope from all modern “Christian” names, sects, and denominations.

The “one faith” and “hope” we confess as “the children of the kingdom,” are royal. We believe in a Messiah, even Jesus, who shall subdue unto himself, and for his brethren, a royalty, bounded only by “the uttermost parts of the earth;” in which royalty we hope to participate, when, as Micah testifies, “The first dominion shall come to the stronghold of the daughter of Zion; and the kingdom to the daughter of Jerusalem.” The apostle Peter, in writing to his Christian brethren dispersed through the provinces of Asia Minor, who also believed in this royalty, saith, “Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people; that ye should publish the goodness of him that hath called you out of darkness into his wonderful light.” Besides this, the Apocalypse affirms that the Lord Jesus has made such “kings and priests, for God to reign upon the earth;” and adds in another place, “They sat upon thrones, and judgment was given unto them: and they lived, * * * and they shall be the priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years.”

Seeing then that it is fit that a society, or association, of whatever kind, should have a designation, and deprecating strongly the imposition of a name by which we should be characterized as the adherents of any person, however esteemed; we agree that the title of our confederacy shall express the great subject-matter of the gospel, i.e. ROYALTY. Our decision, therefore, is that our ecclesiastical union shall be entitled “THE ROYAL ASSOCIATION OF BELIEVERS* in New-York.

* This title is nearly equivalent to the Scripture phrase “ROYAL PRIESTHOOD,” used by Peter; that is, a Royal Order of Priests. “Royal” is a French word, from roi, a king. Anything pertaining to a king is royal. Hence an Association composed of “children of the kingdom,” who are “sons of God,” and therefore brethren of Jesus Christ, Jehovah’s first born and Israel’s King, believing also the glad tidings of the kingdom, is royal; and therefore named as in the text above.

2. —THE ASSOCIATION DEFINED.

The Association is an aggregation of persons who believe “the things” covenanted to Abraham and to David, “concerning the kingdom of God and the Name of Jesus Christ,” and have therefore been “immersed into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.”

3. —OBJECTS OF THE ASSOCIATION.

WE, THE UNDERSIGNED, whose scriptural position is defined in No. 2, DO HEREBY confederate ourselves into a visible association, for the weekly remembrance of the Lord Jesus in the breaking of bread; for the celebration of the high praises of God; for the reading of the Scriptures; for the support and proclamation of the gospel of the kingdom; and for mutual assistance in time of need.

4. —WHO ARE INVITED TO MEMBERSHIP.

“The wisdom from above being first pure, and then peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits, without partiality and without hypocrisy” —we cordially invite all immersed believers of the gospel preached to Abraham, Israel, and the Gentiles, by the Angel of Jehovah, Moses, Jesus, and the apostles, who are disposed to illustrate this “wisdom from above” in word and deed, to unite with the undersigned for the purposes set forth in No. 3.

5. —WHO HAVE THE PRIVILEGE OF CHRISTIAN WORSHIP WITHOUT MEMBERSHIP.

Being the Lord’s table, and not the table of the Association, all of good report within the city or without it, who, believing the gospel of the kingdom, have been immersed, are cordially invited to worship with us; the only privileges withheld being a participation in the direction of our affairs, and speech without previous invitation.

6. — WHO ARE INADMISSIBLE TO MEMBERSHIP.

“The kingdom of God” believed being “righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit,” we hereby disallow the membership of our Association to any immersed believers who cannot prove that they walk as becomes the kingdom of God and of Christ.

7. — ADMISSION TO MEMBERSHIP.

Immersed believers of the gospel of the kingdom are admissible to membership by the unanimous consent of the Association, the absence of any objection privately stated in the presence of the applicant, who will make his application for admission to a presiding brother, or silence, being taken for consent.

The immersion of a believer of the gospel of the kingdom by a brother of our society, appointed to administer it, of itself constitutes the baptized person a member of our Association.

8. —THE EXECUTIVE OF THE ASSOCIATION.

Our Executive is for the maintenance of decency and order in the meetings of the Association; the administration of the Supper and Baptism; attending to the admission of applicants to membership; the removal of any misunderstandings or difficulties that may

arise to the hindrance of the objects of the Association; the disbursement of its contributions; and for whatever else needs to be attended to in behalf of the society.

In the heritages of God, planted by the apostles — these functions, with teaching, were

distributed to “apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, teachers,” “helps and directors,” endowed with certain specified natural qualifications, and appropriate spiritual gifts, “for the perfecting of them for the work of the ministry, and the edifying of the body of Christ.” These perfected saints, or holy ones perfected for the work, were the many-branched candlestick of the heritage to which they belonged. They were, collectively, the eldership or presbytery of the association, and classified by Paul, in his letter to the Philippians, as “the bishops and deacons,” or, in another place, “members in particular.” We acknowledge the desirableness of an exactly similar institution as the Executive of the Association; and could we avail ourselves of brethren possessed of the natural qualifications, specified by Paul to Timothy and Titus, in whom “the word of Christ dwelt richly in all wisdom,” we should be disposed to submit ourselves to them as “over us in the Lord;” but, seeing that at present such are not available, we agree that the executive functions of our Association shall be discharged as follows:

Three, four, or more, as the necessity of circumstances may demand in the unanimous

estimation of the brethren, shall be selected because of their scriptural intelligence, good qualities and report. These select brethren shall not be regarded as “officers,” but simply as brethren in particular, specially interested in promoting the objects and welfare of the Association. After speaking of elders, called episcopoi, or bishops, i.e., overseers— Paul then proceeds to speak of others, called —diakonoi, or deacons, i.e., overseers of the poor, and of secular affairs, almoners, &c.

Of the latter, he says: “Let these ALSO first be proved,” implying by “also” that the episcopoi, or overlookers of the flock, should be proved as well as the diakonoi, or superintendents of secular affairs. These select brethren of our Association may therefore be considered, not as “bishops and deacons,” but as probationers, who may or may not become official.

¶4. One of these brethren shall preside in rotation at the meetings of the Association for the breaking of bread and mutual edification. He will regulate the meeting for breaking of bread, according to No. 11, and will be careful to see that “all things be done decently and in order,” as there prescribed. If any applications for admission to membership, or for baptism, be made upon his day, or during the ensuing week, it will be his duty to ascertain the candidates’ fitness in the presence of one or more. He will then make report of such fitness to the Association at its ordinary session, and during the “contribution;” and, if there be no objection, admission to membership shall be expressed on the following Lord’s day, by the presiding brother extending to the accepted the right hand of fellowship for the whole. If the application be for baptism, then the subject’s fitness being ascertained, the presiding brother shall administer it, or provide for its administration. At

the conclusion of the meeting, he will announce the brother whose turn it will be to preside at the next assembly.

9. —EXPOSITION OF THE WORD TO THE EDIFICATION OF THE ASSOCIATION.

In Ecclesiastes it is written, “Keep thy foot when thou goest to the house of God, and be more ready to hear than to give the sacrifice of fools; for they consider not that they do evil. Be not rash with thy mouth, and let not thine heart be hasty to utter any thing before God; for God is in heaven and thou upon earth; therefore let thy words be few.”

The Apostle James also saith: “Be swift to hear, and slow to speak, slow to wrath.” Yet it was said to certain of old time “perfected for the work” by the Spirit: “Ye may all prophesy, one by one, that all may learn, and all may be comforted.” “He that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification, and exhortation, and comfort.” Exhortation is, therefore, a part of prophesying, and, in being attempted, must be done without debate “to the edifying of the Church,” or not at all. Hence, the Apostle saith, speaking to the prophesiers, “Seek that ye may excel to the edifying of the Church;” and to all members in particular, “Let all things be done unto edifying.”

We understand from these and other portions of the Word, “that it inculcates much thought and few words.” Exhortation is hortatory instruction of a consoling character, founded on the testimony of God. We expect therefore, that those who “exhort” will first call our attention to some portion of Scripture by reading it, then show us the interpretation of what he has read, and afterwards bring it home to us in words of kindness, for our edification and comfort. To open a masked battery upon brethren is not “exhortation,” and, being neither courteous nor christian, will not be allowed, but will be the duty of the presiding brother to stop it immediately, by rising and politely inviting such offender against good manners to take a seat. “Let thy words be few.” In consenting, therefore, to suffer prophesying from uninspired men of ordinary talents and information, brethren will be expected to restrict themselves to fifteen minutes at most, unless at the discretion of the brother who presides.

10. —OF DIFFICULTIES AMONG MEMBERS.

If “Christ dwell in our hearts by faith,” the Spirit of Christ will be there; and “where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty,” or freedom from the dominion of the flesh, which is sin. Difficulties arise from the absence of this Spirit in one or both. It is the duty of brethren not to burden others with their misunderstandings, but to settle them before sundown by themselves. But if this cannot be effected, let them invite a brother to assist them in a return to oneness of mind. If the matter can by no means be reconciled, the case may then be referred to one of the select brethren, who, alone, or assisted by the other select brethren, shall labor to restore harmony without laying it before the Association. If this cannot be effected, the case may be reported to the Church, and we agree to withdraw the privileges of our society from the party who shall be manifestly in the wrong.

11. —THE ORDER OF WORSHIP.

After the custom of those instructed by the Apostles, the Association will convene for worship on the first day of the week. The members being assembled, the brother whose turn it is to preside will take the chair, and invite us to unite with him in invoking the blessing of the “Father of Lights,” and his acceptance of our spiritual sacrifices in the name of Jesus Christ, the Apostle and High Priest of our confession. After this the presiding brother will invite us to sing a portion selected from the Psalms of David or the “Paraphrases,” which may be proposed by himself, or by some other of the brethren, as he may prefer. The singing being ended, Scripture-reading will commence. A portion should be read from each of these four divisions: First division, from Genesis to Job, inclusive; second, from Psalms to Malachi, inclusive; third, from Matthew to Acts, inclusive; and fourth, from Romans to Revelation, inclusive. The presiding brother may distribute the reading among the best readers, reading a portion also himself according to his discretion. The four divisions are each to be read continuously to the end, beginning with the first chapter of Genesis, the first Psalm, the first chapter of Matthew, and the first chapter of Romans. After the reading, singing as before. A contribution will then be taken up, to defray whatever expenses may be incurred in carrying out the objects of the Association. The admission of members will be attended to at this juncture, according to Nos. 7, 8, ¶4.

The presiding brother will then proceed to the breaking of bread, any brother he may call upon being the medium of its distribution. He will remind the brethren of what it celebrates—as, the love of God, the self-sacrifice of Jehovah’s King for the saints, and for the world of which Abraham and He, and we with them, are all the heirs, &c. He will then give thanks for the things memorialized by the bread, or invite some other so to do. After its distribution, he will proceed in like manner with the wine.

When the wine is returned to the table, he will state how much time remains for the continuance of the session, and that it can now be occupied by expositions of the Word to edification according to No. 9. When these are finished, the meeting may be concluded with singing and prayer. This order may be succinctly stated as follows:

1. Prayer by the presiding brother.
2. Singing.
3. Scripture-Reading:
 - a. From Genesis to Job.
 - b. From Psalms to Malachi.
 - c. From Matthew to Acts.
 - d. From Romans to Revelation.

4. Singing.
5. Contribution, and Reception of Members, if any.
6. Breaking of Bread, &c.
7. Exposition of the Word to edification.
8. Singing.
9. Prayer.

Signed by

CHARLES HALYBURTON.***

HENRY O. BENNETT.

JOHN THOMAS.

THOMAS BARKER.

JOHN McDONALD.***

JAMES MERRY.***

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.***

WILLIAM TOWERT.

***The four with this sign affixed to their names consented to act as “select brethren” to carry out the constitution they have subscribed.

FORM SUBSCRIBED BY MEMBERS ADMITTED SUBSEQUENTLY TO THE FORMATION OF THE ASSOCIATION.

We, the undersigned, having duly examined the Constitution recorded in this book, in subscribing our names do thereby attest, that the position defined in No. 2 is ours; and that we approve and accept of its provisions, and are determined to abide by them, and to use our influence in causing them to be respected.

* * *

“NOTHING BUT PEACE AND PROSPERITY.”

“Blessed are ye when men shall revile you and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you, falsely, for my sake.”—JESUS CHRIST.

In Mark, the phrase “for my sake” is associated with “and the gospel’s.” The two things, Jesus and the gospel, are inseparable. He says that he was sent of God to preach the gospel of the kingdom—Luke 4: 18, 43; Matthew 4: 23; —and Jehovah hath said concerning Jesus, “Hear ye him!”—Matthew 17: 5—and again, “Unto him ye shall hearken. And I will put my words into his mouth; and he shall speak all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever shall not hearken unto my word which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him”—Deuteronomy 18: 15, 18-19. And Jesus saith, “He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, (the gospel of the kingdom which he preached,) hath that that judgeth him; the word (of the kingdom)—Matthew 13: 19, 23—that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day. For I have not spoken of myself; but the Father who sent me, he gave me a commandment what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that his commandment (when observed) is life everlasting; whatsoever I speak therefore, even as the Father said unto me, so I speak.” Again he saith, “The words that I speak unto you I speak not of myself; but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doth the miracles.” “If a man love me, he will keep my words. He that loveth me not, keepeth not my sayings: and the word (of the kingdom) which ye hear is not mine, but the Father’s which sent me.” It is evident then, from these declarations, that to be subject to any thing for Christ’s sake, is to be subject to it for the sake of the gospel of the kingdom preached by him. He judgeth of men’s attachment and devotion to his person by their veneration and devotion to the gospel he preached. He associates the not receiving of his words with the rejection of himself, and tells us plainly that a man does not love him who does not keep his sayings. This intimate connection between the preacher and his doctrine is not surprising, in view of his saying that he is himself “the truth.” “I am the truth,” saith he; and says Peter, “Ye have purified your souls in the obeying of the truth.” Hence, where the truth is, Christ is; therefore, Paul says, “God grant that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith.” He, then, that believes “the things concerning God and the name of Jesus Christ,” is the man in whose heart Christ dwells; because the truth dwells there with full assurance of faith and hope. The Bible is the truth in a book; Christ is the truth incarnate; and a Christian is the truth in his heart lovingly obeyed. It is nonsense for a man to talk of “loving the Lord Jesus” while he receives not his words. The Lord thanks no man for a mere lip-love—a love that rejoiceth not in the truth, believeth not all things, and hopeth not all things.

From what hath been said, then, the reader will see that to be spoken evil of for Christ’s sake, is to be spoken evil of on account of the gospel of the kingdom which he preached. Men will bear with you in any thing you may teach, provided you maintain nothing offensive to their self-complacency. They profess to be pious, to be zealous for God, to love the Lord Jesus, to believe the gospel, and to have obeyed it. Take care then how you

define Bible things; and see that you do not come to conclusions incompatible with their piety, zeal, love, faith and practice. If you do, then farewell to your good name and standing in the estimation of those under the malevolent influence of their revilings. I speak from twenty years' experience of the like, and therefore know truly whereof I affirm.

Now the great practical question at issue between me and my contemporaries, is "the gospel of the kingdom of God." We have seen by our references that the Lord Jesus preached it in obedience to the command of the Father. And besides this, he declared that the gospel which he preached before he was crucified, should be preached for a testimony to all nations. His words are, "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole habitable—for a testimony to all the nations" of that region. The same gospel then that Jesus preached to the house of Judah and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, was to be preached to the nations of the then civilized world. This the apostles began to do in the name of Jesus, several years after they commenced operations in Jerusalem on Pentecost. The difference between their preaching of the gospel and that of Jesus, was that between promises unfulfilled and promises fulfilled to a very limited extent. So far as the promises were fulfilled in the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus, as the Son and King anointed of Jehovah, the accomplished facts became the foundation or basis of the conditions, by conformity to which, Jews and Gentiles might become heirs of the promises yet largely unfulfilled. The facts and the doctrine or teaching predicated upon them, constitute "the mystery of the gospel," or "things concerning the name of Jesus," and therefore, "the mystery of Christ," which are not two mysteries, but one. Jesus preached the gospel of the kingdom minus the mystery in his own name, because it was still a hidden mystery, and must have so continued until he was "perfected;" the apostles preached the same gospel with its mystery, because it was no longer hidden, but commanded to be proclaimed.

Our contemporaries do not understand this matter: they have lost sight of the gospel of the kingdom; and as a substitute for it, preach a few items of the mystery imperfectly, as the condition of the salvation of what they heathenishly style the immortal soul in kingdoms beyond the skies! Our pulpit orators, who learn their divinity in theological schools and colleges, preach every thing but the gospel of the kingdom. With respect to this, they are in heathen darkness, knowing nothing as they ought to know. Their system of Gentilism is to blame for this. The systems make them what they are, and with grateful and devoted hearts, they uphold and glorify their Alma Maters in return.

My courteous friend, the President of Bethany College, is of this class of orators and orator-makers. So ignorant of the gospel of the kingdom is he, that he can pen the following rhapsody without a blush, as a specimen of the things that play not around the head, but come to the very heart itself!

"Man," says he, "the most sublime and awful object that man himself or angel ever saw, was predestined and created for a citizenship in the whole universe, and not for any locality in the solar or material realms. God and his whole creation is the patrimonial

inheritance of man. God himself is his portion. Therefore all things are man's, because man is Christ's, and Christ's is God's Son, and the heir of all things."

Thus, Mr. Campbell gives the lie point blank to God. I do not say he does so willfully; but in effect he does. He says, that "man is not created for any locality in the solar or material realms." Hear then what Jehovah hath decreed concerning Christ's inheritance, to whom, according to Mr. C., man belongs. "Thou art my Son; this day (of thy resurrection) I have begotten thee. I will give thee the nations for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." These are the "all things" of which Jehovah's anointed King is "the heir"—the nations and the earth. And the saints, his brethren, being "joint heirs with him," are heirs also of the same. Are not these material realms? "The kingdoms of the world become our Lord and his Anointed's, and he shall reign in the ages of the ages." If these realms are not material and located in the solar system, they must be no where!

"Jehovah," saith the Psalmist, "built his sanctuary like the earth which he hath established for ever." "The righteous," saith Solomon, "shall be recompensed in the earth: much more the wicked and the sinner." "The righteous shall never be removed; but the wicked shall not inherit the earth." "The heaven, even the heavens are Jehovah's: but the earth hath he given to the sons of men." "The earth abideth ever." "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth." "Thou hast redeemed us by thy blood; and hast made us kings and priests for God; and we shall reign upon the earth." Do not these passages prove that man is created for terrestrial locality for ever, when he shall have been freed from all present evil? Mr. Campbell says he is not; the Scripture says he is: therefore let God be true, and every man a liar that approves not His sayings.

Banishing man finally from this planet to some transpolar region, Mr. Campbell of course has no great faith in God's promise to Abraham in regard to his and his Seed's everlasting possession of the Holy Land. He reduces all these to a deception practiced upon the Friend of God, who died in hope of rising from the dead to possess the land in which he had been a wanderer and sojourner, dwelling in tents upon it, like his descendants, the Ishmaelites, with Isaac and Jacob. Virtually denying these promises, the gospel of the kingdom is to him "an opinion," "a fable," "an hypothesis," "a fiction;" and therefore no bond of union or term of communion.

The issue between Mr. Campbell, the supervisor of 300,000 "disciples," and myself is the gospel. I affirm that he is in heathen darkness concerning it, and utterly devoid of faith in the promises of God. He does not even know what faith is, as appears from these words: "It is a great point gained," says he, "to know and to appreciate that faith is the belief of facts!" What a wonderful attainment in College divinity! and yet how unscriptural! But Paul denies the supervisor's definition, and says, "Faith is the assured expectation of things hoped for, the conviction of things unseen." Things hoped for are not facts, but promises. A scriptural faith is therefore the belief of promises. This was Abraham's faith, but not Mr. Campbell's: his is a belief of facts, and hence the difference between the Friend of God and him. Matter-of-fact people are the children of the flesh, who are not the children of God; "but the children of the promise are counted for the seed." The

children of the promise are they who, believing the promises covenanted to Abraham, are constituted "in Isaac," by induction into Christ by baptism into his name. "In Isaac shall thy seed be called." "Now, we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of the promise. But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the spirit, even so it is now." Hence, Messrs. Campbell and Wallis, children of the flesh, like Ishmael of old, having neither reason nor testimony to adduce in defence of their positions, avenge their chafed and troubled souls in speaking evil falsely of him who convicts them of ignorance and sin against the truth. It is only occasionally that I catch a glimpse of their periodicals; but when I do, I find them still at their old work of slaying thrice the slain! No doubt they are gratified, and their readers more strongly walled in by the prejudice they have laboured to create against me. I read their foolishness with a mingled feeling of pity and gratification. I pity the poor men for their folly; yet I am gratified that in reviling me, and saying all manner of evil of me for the gospel's sake, they are preparing for me the blessedness promised in the text.

In the British Millennial Harbinger for May are two letters republished from the American Millennial Harbinger, with a few comments by editor Wallis. One is from an acquaintance, of mine in Paisley, Scotland, named Matthew Tannehill, a member of the Baptist church in that town, to Dr. R. Richardson, of Bethany College, Virginia. The other letter is from A. Campbell to what he styles the "Church of Christ meeting in Paisley." Matthew Tannehill, if I mistake not the gentleman, is brother to the Paisley poet of that name. While I sojourned in that town, he was quite friendly and attentive, and very desirous that I should correspond with them on my return to this country. He seemed to be quite interested in my lectures, and very gracious in his behaviour. But the word preached seemed to have its usual effect of disturbing the peace of the carnally minded. Some appear to have received it, but with what degree of intelligence I cannot say. There was no division, or talk of it, while I was there; but from Matthew's testimony to his "dear brother Richardson," it would seem that trouble appeared in the camp which was not allayed until a separation ensued. Before the separation the congregation divided upon the question of the gospel, some maintaining this, others that, concerning it. The minority was in favour of its having relation to the kingdom hereafter to be established in the Holy Land. The majority, ever opposed to the truth in all ages, was unconvincingly opposed to "the gospel of the kingdom of God" in the Paisley church. The minority, finding this, could not regret their exclusion from the Baptist church, styled "the Church of Christ" by Mr. Campbell. About thirty "were separated." As a consequence of this ejection from the synagogue, all agitation about the gospel ceased. So when Paul and his disciples were cast out, the synagogues reverted to their former peaceful ignorance of the truth. The majority had it all their own way. The contention for the faith once delivered to the saints was silenced! and skykingdom glorification of disembodied ghosts resumed its undisturbed sway over Matthew Tannehill and his co-religionists. "I have been," saith he, "a member of the Paisley church fifteen years, and at no period of its history was it in a more flourishing state than at present, (January 10, 1853;) and for a considerable time past—ever since the disciples of Dr. Thomas left us, or were separated—we have had nothing but peace and prosperity. I think the church has doubled its members, if not more, since that time." Peace and prosperity evinced by a dead silence respecting the Word of the kingdom preached by Jesus and the apostles; and the consequent doubling of

the numbers of the majority! Suppress the truth, Matthew, and the multitude will crowd your meeting-house, and keep the water of your “large pre-pulpit baptistery, so exceedingly convenient,” in constant agitation! Evil and the foolish multitude go hand in hand.

The minority who were striving for intelligence in the “one faith” became a dispersion; and Matthew Tannehill, not understanding God’s dealings with the friends of his truth, “thinks they are near their end.” Had Matthew lived in the days of the apostles, when the Jerusalem mother of all apostolic churches was scattered to the four winds, leaving only the apostles in the Holy City, he would have thought that the dispersed were near their end likewise; for Matthew would have been the same Matthew then as now—doubtless as profound a thinker after the manner of men. But with all his depth, he fails to discern from the examples or the Word, that it is no part of God’s plan for believers of the gospel of the kingdom to be living in peaceful and prosperous communities. When they got “rich, and increased in goods, and said they had need of nothing,” or “in a flourishing state,” as Matthew terms it, he put an end to their ecclesiastical prosperity and peace by scattering them abroad to preach the Word. The kingdom can only be entered through much tribulation, and not through prosperity and peace. Have peace among yourselves, but in the world ye shall have tribulation. Peace and prosperity keep tribulation from Matthew’s door. He and his have found a new course to the kingdom. They have left the stormy regions for the trade-winds of peace and quietness. All sails are spread to the gentle breeze, and the crew of the Paisley bark are lazily extended on the deck, dreaming of “nothing but peace and prosperity!”

The circumstances under which the minority separated were very unfavourable to peace among themselves in the outset. If they could have had some one with them well instructed in the truth to show them at once the way in which they should walk, having the disposition to know and do the will of God, there would have been no scope for disputings. But being only in the beginning of things, and having none to help them, it was only by a mutual expression of their various convictions that the truth could be more fully brought out. This collision of views would naturally have a winnowing effect on the original thirty, so as to “sift them as wheat” till all the chaff would fly away. This sifting process, if Matthew’s testimony be correct, seems to have reduced their number considerably. But there is no help for this. “Many are called” (to God’s kingdom and glory,) but only the “few are chosen;” for the few alone have faith enough to be saved. The agitation so much deprecated by the lovers of “smooth things,” is God’s agency for the taking out of the few for the name of Christ that may be for the time being hid in the churches of the Gentiles. Where there is “nothing but peace and prosperity” there are either none of “the few” to bring out, or they have all been separated, and none but the chaff or tares remain. Let a Baptist or Campbellite, or other church, remain in “nothing but peace and prosperity” undisturbed, and there is no chance of a soul of them coming to the knowledge of the gospel preached by Jesus and his apostles. They remain perfectly shut up in unbelief—shut up to the faith once revealed, but now generally lost sight of. Their pulpiteers cannot teach them, being ignorant themselves; and if their orators, and editors, and college professors, be in outer darkness, what can the people do? Their case is hopeless. They have the Bible, indeed, but they say the prophets are unintelligible; and

if these cannot be understood, it is impossible to understand the apostles; for these only “preached the gospel of God which he had promised before by his prophets in the Holy Scriptures.” The parallel between the Jewish synagogue of old time, and the modern churches of the Gentiles, in regard to their being “shut up to the faith,” is exact. It was only by sending a “pestilent fellow” like Paul among them to agitate their minds, that they could be brought to see into the meaning of the prophets. What he preached threw them into an uproar, turned them into debating societies, caused them to devour each other, and to proceed to the greatest extremities, so that he was himself oftentimes in jeopardy and sore afraid. He “necessarily became repellent” to the unbelieving, who resolved all his reasoning from the Scriptures into mere opinion and speculation. Still it was wisely and benevolently arranged. To agitate the synagogue by introducing new things among them, was God’s plan for “opening their eyes, and turning them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God.” The result of the apostle’s stormy disputes was good. The honest and good hearts of the bystanders received the kingdom, and were at length separated by the apostle from the rest who blasphemed the Word and reproached the speaker. Having accomplished this, the agitation died away, and “nothing but peace and prosperity” prevailed among the unbelieving Jews, after they had expelled that “unfortunate man,” Paul, and his disciples.

It is said that “History is ever reproducing itself.” It seems to be so to some extent in the history of my career for a few years past. Jesus sent Paul to agitate the peaceful synagogues; I am invited by peaceful societies to come and lay before them my views. I go, and expound to them what I see written in the Scriptures. I go to speak what I believe is the truth, not to ascertain what they believe, and then repeat it. It matters not to me what the society believes; I go to tell them what the Scriptures teach. This is all that I or they need care to know. I speak it without circumlocution or apology, in an open and straightforward manner, and leave it with them for their consideration. It would be strange if the Word rightly divided in this cloudy and dark day did not agitate men’s minds. It is a good sign when such an effect is produced. Where it is not, it argues a hard-hearted insensibility to “the deep things of God.” Intelligent, thoughtful minds must be agitated when they find that God’s way is not theirs. They express their views of what has been shown them. They begin to think it must be so. Their brethren are alarmed for the old creed, and become suddenly filled with zeal, and speak evil of the “new doctrine.” Finding their position unsustainable by Scripture, they resort to clamour, to reproach, to the exercise of authority, and at length to expulsion of the “perverted.” Their peace has been disturbed, indeed, but the agitation has proved a benefit—it has separated the wheat from the chaff, which having been thoroughly cleaned, is preserved until the time arrives to remove the chaff out of the way. Like the “pestilent” Paul, I have the honour to be reproached by the enemy, who naturally entertains no good will towards the disturber of his peace. He speaks “all manner of evil of me falsely,” I am happy to know, and charges me with views and practices which have no existence save in the malevolence of his own fleshly mind. The following tirade is a specimen of this sort of thing from the pen of President Campbell. It forms three paragraphs of his letter “to the Church of Christ in Paisley, with its bishops and deacons;” which appears to have been elicited by Matthew Tannehill’s epistle to Dr. Richardson; a morsel of gossip too precious not to be magnified into a more formal condemnation of myself and friends. The following are his words: —

“Doctors of theology, as such—doctors of medicine—doctors of philosophy—doctors of opinions (to which learned class Doctor Thomas belongs)—have no moral chairs or moral authority, no ecclesiastical power, no prescriptive rights over the understanding, the conscience, or the hearts of the citizens of Messiah’s spiritual empire. There is no spiritual nourishment in mere opinion, or in human science, falsely so called. These play round the head, but come not to the heart.

“Opinions and speculative views on any subject—human depravity, divine grace, election, the fall of man, the millennium, the essences of things, divine or human—flatter pride, feed the imagination, centre in self-esteem, and terminate in schism.

“The history of this unfortunate man is a monument of its fatal tendencies. With respectable talents, a medium education, a decent diction, and many good opportunities, he has only bewildered himself and a few disciples; and by his own puffing, has puffed them up into a bloated self-esteem, and a supreme contempt for all who will not do homage to the idol which he has set up. A speculative, self-confident neologist, on any subject, with some fervour and fluency, may bewilder a few unstable souls, and lead them captive at his will. But the spell soon passes away. The human mind demands a more substantial bill of fare. Ephraim became lean while he fed upon the wind, but when joined to his idols, the oracle commanded to let him alone. To reason against dogmatism, is as hopeless as to reason with a spiritual rapper of the present day, or as it was with a second Adventist in the year FORTY-SEVEN. It is a wise and benevolent arrangement, that such theorists necessarily become repellent, and like some of the pests of ancient times, devour each other and annihilate themselves.”

This extract is a sketch of the original as it appears to the limner through the haze of his own prejudices and misconceptions. All things with friend Campbell are “opinions and speculative views,” which are not comprehended in his limited matter-of-fact creed. He very carefully keeps out of sight “the gospel of the kingdom,” which is the real ground of difference between me and all others who oppose. This is not one of his “facts,” and therefore rejected as an opinion. What he calls my opinions and speculative views, I am prepared to show are the things revealed in the Word of God for faith. My full assurance of their truth, and earnest expression of it, he styles “dogmatism;” and the gospel of the kingdom, the idol I have set up for all to worship! He perceives, however, that any attempt on his part to reason successfully against the things I advocate, is hopeless. It is; for he must bring not only reason, but God’s testimony, to bear against me. This he is incompetent to do, dwelling in outer darkness as far as intelligence in the “sure word of prophecy” is concerned. “This unfortunate man,” as he styles me, “is a monument” of strong men being prostrated by God’s weakness in modern times. God has ever chosen persons despised by their contemporaries to bring to nothing the theology of the schools. He does not use the wise in their own conceit, professors and presidents of divinity establishments, to enlighten the people. He leaves them in their solemn foolishness as blind to lead the blind; and takes fishermen, and carpenters, and tentmakers, and healers of the sick, &c., to reduce their “wisdom” to absurdity, “that no flesh should glory in his presence.” This is very mortifying to the founder of Bethany College, who “desires to fit and furnish men for church and state, as well as for the physical, the intellectual, the

moral, the spiritual, and the eternal universe.” But God will not accept his services in this work; for the simple reason, that he is unqualified for it. One thing thou lackest—understanding and faith in the promises of God. Without this, thy desires are vanity and vexation of soul.

When a great dog bays the moon, all the little village curs must take a turn. This is often annoying to the weary traveller, who would rather sleep than count the hours of the steeple clock. But experience teaches the expediency of letting the dogs bark until they perceive that the great dog sees no more in the moon to bay. It is no use giving chase to them with wrath. The exercise would be too fatiguing, and bootless withal; for bark they will until there is no more bark in them. Paul appears to have been a good deal annoyed by dogs; therefore he cautions all who follow his track to “beware of dogs.” I apprehend it was not the barking dogs he cared so much for, as about those sneaking, grinning, snarling curs, which Isaiah describes as “dumb dogs that cannot bark; sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber; greedy dogs that can never have enough,” and when they come upon you they would as soon “bite and devour” you, as seize upon a bone. “Give not things holy unto dogs,” saith Jesus; for “it is not fit to take the children’s meat and to throw it unto dogs.” There are no dogs in the Holy City. This is constituted of Christ’s sheep; and all “the dogs are without.”

But to return from this digression about the dogs, or “blind and ignorant watchmen,” to editor Wallis of the *British Millennial Harbinger* by a reference to whom I was about to conclude this article. His great exemplar, my friend the Bethanian President, having bayed “this unfortunate man,” whom he styles “moon-stricken,” to his heart’s content, the small gentleman of Peck Lane seizes the opportunity of bow-wowing approbation of the great growl generated by Matthew Tannehill’s piquant allusion to “Dr. Thomas’ disciples,” and echoed in the epistolary extract above recited. “Elder” James Wallis thus delivers himself in a note appended to the president-professor’s letter to the Paisley “Church of Christ.”

“Any theory of religion, or speculation of the human mind, that causes division among those who are united together in Christian fellowship, on the principles of one body, one spirit, one hope—one Lord, one faith, one immersion—one God and Father of all, who is above all, through all, and in all disciples of Christ—is not from God. The union produced by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of believers, is that which springs from love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, fidelity, meekness, temperance, for against such there is no law. ‘And they that are Christ’s have crucified the flesh, with the affections and lusts.’ Since, then, we are made alive by the Spirit, let us also walk in and by his directions. Let us not be vainglorious, provoking one another, envying one another, because of the different gifts and temporal blessings conferred upon any, and of which we may not ourselves be partakers. So far as our knowledge and observation extend, no novel theorist or bold materialist has caused more divisions and unfruitfulness of soul among his associates, than the celebrated Dr. Thomas, to whom the above letter refers.”

The writer of the above assumes for an acknowledged truth, what he, or any one else connected with him, has never proved, namely, that those communities he styles churches of Christ are congregations of true believers. Nothing is from God that divides a genuine Christian church; and that is an offence of which I am entirely guiltless. The things I have brought out from the prophets and apostles have divided churches of Campbellite and Millerite “disciples;” but never a church of Christ. A church of Christ is not so easily divided; because it is composed of people who have intelligently obeyed the gospel of the kingdom; and such are not to be turned about by every wind of doctrine that happens to blow. The members of such a church have “full assurance of faith and hope,” and are not to be turned from their steadfastness by “any theory of religion, or speculation of the human mind.” The divisions I am accused of making have been produced by some embracing “the testimony of God” declared. Mr. Wallis errs in stating that “those” he refers to “are united together in Christian fellowship on the principles of” the unities he quotes from Paul. The Campbellite body is not the “One Body.” It is infidel of the “One hope of the calling.” Its faith is not the “One Faith,” but a mere belief of facts; and its immersion is not the “One Baptism,” because it is not predicated on the one faith of the things hoped for and unseen. From the one faith, hope, and baptism, it is as alien as any of its sister sects. Campbellite churches profess indeed to be united together on the principle indicated; but we have learned to know that “profession is not principle” in this world of hypocrisy and sham. Paul was “bound with a chain” for the one hope, which he tells us is “Israel’s hope,” but one which the Campbellite “disciples” ridicule as a mere carnal and Jewish idea, beneath the regard of a Christian! There is no “indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of” such believers; for the Holy Spirit dwells not with scoffers at “that good thing which Jehovah hath promised to the house of Israel and the house of Judah:” he dwells not in hearts which are strangers to the promises; nor is he the author of Campbellite “union, love, joy, peace, &c.” These result from mere partisanship, as I know by hard-earned experience. Cease to glorify the president of Bethany College; show that he and his preaching associates are now and have been for years constituting themselves transgressors by building up again the things they laboured to destroy; testify in behalf of the neglected and despised prophetic writings; plead for the gospel of the kingdom of God, &c., and you will soon hear the cry raised, “This fellow is not one of us! He is a sower of discord among brethren, a dogmatist, a schismatic, a disturber of the peace wherever he goes, a bold materialist;” with many other epithets of a like complimentary character. All their love, joy, peace, and gentleness are gone; but every evil work remains. They condemn in others what they glorify in themselves. Look at their Supervisor! He writes to the Baptist church in Paisley, styling it “the Church of Christ” there. Now, if that be a church of Christ, so are all the others of that denomination in fellowship with it. Where, I ask, is the man that has created more schisms in such churches of Christ than A. Campbell? He acknowledges them to be churches of Christ, and their members Christians; and yet has set them all by the ears, has destroyed many of them root and branch, and made them a standing jest in word and deed! Yet this is the man with his associates that speak evil of me; because, in “reasoning with the people out of the Scriptures,” communities which I do not acknowledge are Christ’s are agitated, and sometimes divided by the majority casting out the few who may respond to the testimony presented! But why is Mr. Campbell so changed as by his present practice to convict himself of sin, of defiling the temple of God, and therefore himself obnoxious to

destruction? Why does he now condemn others for doing what he once gloried to do? In answer to the former inquiry, I reply that he has grown vainglorious in his old age. He seeks that sort of glory in which other men of the world delight—that of being the founder of a college, which, being endowed, shall place him in the estimation of posterity among the great men of their antiquity! When engaged in creating schisms among the Presbyterians and Baptists of former years, and denouncing schools and colleges, Bible and Missionary Societies, he was small in his own eyes; had not then been puffed up by the fulsome flattery of the ignorant multitude; and had not apostatised from the mottoes of his “Christian Baptist,” to the imposition of his own presidential and professional authority upon a confederacy of churches from a theological throne. Having matured his sectarian and collegiate speculations, and incurred heavy responsibilities in carrying them out, the mammon of unrighteousness is greatly in demand; and more is needed than can be extracted from his own flock. He finds it necessary therefore to milk the goats; and as the Baptists were once goats and treated as such, it became necessary to propitiate them! His policy is to cajole them now, and to preach up union and communion for the sake of the loaves and fishes they may be persuaded to contribute to the carrying out of his schemes. In reply to the latter inquiry, he condemns others for being remote causes of divisions, because it disturbs his schemes. Having worked things up to their present stagnation, he deprecates all agitation of his waters, lest they should be lashed into a storm, and mar his pride of life. Foolish and blind is he! Sowing to the wind with the certainty, if he live long enough, of reaping the whirlwind. Blind, and unable to see, not afar off, but objects near at hand! He is labouring to endow a college for his sect, that shall continue for ages; and cannot see that the Judge is actually standing at the door, and exclaiming, “Blessed is he that watcheth, and keepeth his garment, that he walk not naked, and that they see not his shame!” A pretty educator of youth for the church is this! Cannot discern the signs of the times; and yet pretends to “prescriptive rights over the understanding, the conscience, and the hearts of the citizens of Messiah’s spiritual empire;” of which he has no more scriptural conception than the tiara adorned prophet of “Eternal Rome!” We must look beyond the examples found in Messrs. Campbell and Wallis, for those who have “crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts.” Enjoying the fat things of the present evil world, and as much of its honours and wealth as they can grasp, they are the last men who should taunt me with neglect of the Christian duty. They have been labouring for years for what this world affords, and they have obtained it. They are rich in this world’s stuff. They can count up their thousands of mammon; their flocks and herds; their broad acres and coal fields; endowments and houses, and fashionable goods. But of all these things “the unfortunate man” they revile and speak evil of falsely is almost as destitute of as the Great Founder of Christianity himself. I have not laboured for these things, and therefore have not acquired them. While they have been covering themselves with fatness, I have been labouring without hire, and trusting to Providence for supplies, in the work of opening the blind eyes, and of turning men from Gentilism to the intelligent belief of the knowledge of God as revealed in the old and new Scriptures. The things set forth in these writings are doubtless “novel theories” to Mr. Wallis, whose mental vision is bounded by the horizon of the Bethanian theology. The greater part of God’s word is a novelty to this: as much as perhaps the “new doctrine” introduced into Athens was to the Epicureans and Stoics of old. I must not therefore be angry with Mr. Wallis for styling me “a novel theorist;” but rather accept it as a compliment to my

industry and independence of research, that notwithstanding so many thousands are professedly studying the Scriptures with all the aids that college learning can afford them, and fail to bring out any thing more than a fancied demonstration of the articles of faith bequeathed by the fathers of Protestantism; I, under no obligation to their theologies, have become celebrated for the new things I have extracted from the divine treasury, causing less of the soul-fruitfulness approved by the world's wise men, than any other. But Mr. W. does not intend the epithet as a compliment. I will not, however, quarrel with him for this. I plead guilty to the indictment. I have theorised new things from God's Word. That is, I have brought out God's theory, which is new to my contemporaries. It is the divine plan or system yet subsisting only in the mind of Jehovah, revealed in the Bible—a purpose, not yet an accomplished fact, but a matter of promise, and propounded to the heirs of promise, for their faith. In bringing out this novelty to Messrs. Campbell, Wallis and Co., I have done no more than every student of the Word ought to do, though it has, indeed, been very offensive to them, who have proved themselves incompetent to do likewise. Be not angry at me, my friends, for this thing; for it is commendable before God. "Every Scribe," saith Jesus, "instructed for the kingdom of the heavens is like to a man who is master of a house, that bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old." Ye style me "a novel theorist and bold materialist" for this; but Jesus, you perceive, regards the bringer-forth of new things as one "instructed for the kingdom." How different this judgement to yours! The soul-unfruitfulness of my associates consists in their not yielding fruit agreeable to your depraved tastes. But who in their right mind would care to be approved by you, seeing that your judgment is so diverse from His who spake not as man, but as the oracle of God? Suffer ye then this word of reproof; and be ye awakened by it to the conviction, that it is high time to awake from our daydreams to the stern realities of that great and terrible day which is stealing upon the world.

EDITOR.

* * *

OUR VISIT TO HOLLAND.

I propose in the following pages to begin the conclusion of the narrative of my visit to Europe. During my absence from America I had but little leisure for recreation, my travels generally terminating in interviews with the public, the anticipation of which necessarily prevented that unbending of the mind so essential to the free and easy, by which our constitutional energies are recruited.

Some of my friends very kindly invited me to accompany them to various notable places in their several vicinities; such as Keddleston Park, Dovedale, and Matlock, in Derbyshire; Knaresboro' Castle in Yorkshire; Newstead Abbey, the late Lord Byron's seat, in Nottinghamshire; Holyrood, the Falls of Clyde, the fine scenery of the Tay, Loch Lomond, Loch Catherine, the Trosachs, Bridge of Allan, Stirling Castle, &c., &c. The weather being fine on all these occasions, I need scarcely say, that the excursions were highly interesting and agreeable. I might say much of what I saw in all this beautiful

scenery, and of the impressions made upon my mind by the sublime and picturesque; but the story has been so often told by tourists, and my feelings in the case are of so little consequence to other people, that I deem it best to dismiss the subject by saying, that I have seen enough of the surface of our globe to satisfy me, that when finished it will make a sufficiently splendid and magnificent inheritance for intelligences of the largest capacities and most scriptural aspirations. It needs only that development of which it is capable by the hand of God, to make it a heavenly world. Substitute righteousness for sin, and perfect what remains unfinished in its wastes and barrens, and no better heaven need be sought than our earth, when the Lord is there.

I saw two relics of the past, in Stirling Castle, which, it may be interesting to the reader to know, have an existence. If he be a Presbyterian and rich, he would perhaps give as much for the one as a very foolish person gave for the coal-heaver's chair; * and if a son of the old Puritan church militant, he might not fall far short of his "true blue" companion in his bid for the other. These were Oliver Cromwell's hat, and John Knox's pulpit. The hat was made of black leather, and was large, heavy, and of very ample brim. It was made to fit upon an ordinary hat; and, I should think, rendered the head and shoulders beneath them safe from sabre-cuts. If the Scotch pulpits were generally like that in Stirling Castle, they were inferior to some I could name in our American wilderness, their "whittlings" nevertheless. It is John Knox's pulpit, the narrow square box in which the disciple of John Calvin stood when he thundered forth his denunciations against the Pope and Mary, the Scottish Queen. This has sanctified the wood in the "Covenant" heart, and to this present saved it from the flames of devouring fire.

* Huntington, a hypercalvinist or Antinomian celebrity of the last century, and originally a coal-heaver, who wrote a book styled "The Bank of Faith," and used to sign himself "S.S.," or Sinner Saved. His followers were so devoted to his memory that one of them gave £300, or \$1461, for his old arm-chair.

My labours in Britain having been at length brought to a close, I concluded on a visit to "the Continent" before leaving Europe for the United States. Two friends agreed to accompany me. Accordingly, on September 6th 1850, we waited upon the Prussian Consul-General for Great Britain and Ireland to obtain permission to travel in foreign parts, or, as our facetious friend expressed it, "to visit our foreign relations." We obtained three documents called "passports," one for each, in which were noted down our ages, heights, colour of our hair, eyebrows, and eyes; shape of our noses and mouth; beard or no beard, and divers other particulars by which we might be known to the gens d'armes of Europe as true and loyal persons, upon whom constables and jailers had no legal claim. In the left corner of the pass at the foot, we signed our names under the words, "undershrift des Pass Inhabers;" and in the right, opposite the green consular seal, "B. Hebler" signed his, not forgetting to demand of us ten shillings sterling a piece, for his "Koniglich Preussische" permission to cross the sea without being forbidden to go ashore.

Being thus royally provided, we left London on September 7th, at eleven A.M. in the steamer "Rhine" for Rotterdam, the birthplace of the renowned Erasmus. We were at sea

all that day and until 10 A.M. of the next day, being a tolerably pleasant voyage of twenty-three hours. It might have been shorter; but not being able to cross “the Brille” because of the lowness of the tide, we had to make a detour of several miles to get at the city. At 4 A.M. we were off Helvoetsluys, where we “lay-to” for a short time; and by way of settling the stomach (and not being in good health, mine was very infirm) after the qualms of the preceding voyage, we occupied the time in drinking, not Holland gin, but some muddy-looking and ill-flavoured coffee. During the next six hours we passed Williamstadt, Dordrecht, and several other old-fashioned Dutch towns. The natural aspect of the country presented but few attractions. It is low and flat, and but little above the water-level, and in many parts below it. Nothing but a pressure from without could have induced its original settlers to set up their habitations in so swampy and unpicturesque a region. The fens of Lincolnshire, or the extended marsh lands of other low countries in America, are a fair representation of this part of Holland.

Rotterdam was a cheering sight after steaming six hours among these flats. On landing at the Stoomboot Maatschapij we were stopped by two gens d’armes in uniform, with swords at their sides, who in good English very courteously demanded our passports. After paying two dollars thirty-seven and a half cents apiece for them, and having use for them afar off, we were unwilling to comply. We desired to know when, where, and how, we should meet with them again. They informed us that the documents would be quite safe, and that we could obtain them next morning at the Bureau de Police in the Stadt Huis; where the “Signalement des Pass Inhabers,” or the particulars of the passports, are noted in a book, together with the name of the place to which you may be bound. Having surrendered upon this explanation, we passed on; and having no more baggage than we could conveniently carry in hand, we escaped detention by custom-house officials. Cabmen and “touters” crowded the pier, clamouring for “fares” and boarders with as much obstreperousness as in New York itself, only that the police will not allow them to rush on board as they do when steamers make fast to our piers. They rush upon you, however, as if they would “bag you” for themselves at all hazards. A traveller landing at the same place, says, “After delivering my passport, a custom-house officer cried ‘halt!’ but, on seeing my modest equipment, bade me pass on without examination. A few paces farther, at the verge of the quay, I was again arrested by a group of men who insisted upon my going to the custom-house. In vain I represented that my baggage had been ‘passed;’ whether or no, they would bar my passage. I made a feint of yielding, and doubling round a vigilante, as the cabs are named, made off towards the Berliner Hof, the hotel to which I had been commended. The party had perhaps watched my movements, for they rushed after me, and were about to renew their clamour, when a tall man came up and dispersed them, after inquiring in English if the officer had passed me. I afterwards found that the stoppage was ‘a dodge’ on the part of the cab drivers, their object being to compel their victims to escape from the difficulty by a ride.” The “touters” beset us more than the drivers, recommending their several hotels to our favourable regards. But we were deaf to their appeals, being determined on peripatensis, not being burdened with more luggage than each could conveniently carry; and on the agreeable novelty of making discoveries for ourselves in a strange city, where the language of the people was “all Dutch to us,” and therefore as unintelligible as could be wished. We pushed on, therefore, through the crowd, not knowing whither we went.

After walking for some time, in directions where hotels seemed to be remarkably scarce, I asked a boy about thirteen years old, in my own tongue of course, but under the supposition that he might possibly be an Anglo-Saxon, if he could tell me where I could find a respectable hotel? Whether my barbarian speech or my beard alarmed him, I cannot say; but he stared at me with open mouth for a few moments, and then by a strong effort, as if to break the spell which bound him, he started off with the velocity of a hare, without answering me a word. Observing the effect recently of my beard upon a Negro boy in Virginia, who on catching a glimpse of me bawled out his master's message some twenty yards off, and then retreated to the top of a fence, ready to drop over to the farther side and run at my approach; I suspect it was my appearance, and not my speech that made the miniature Dutchman increase the distance between us with all dispatch. I suppose he had never seen a beard before, for the Hollanders make their faces as much like those of boys and women as the keenness of a razor's edge can accomplish. I was very much struck with the difference in this respect between them and their former fellow-citizens, the Belgians. The latter, as well as the Prussians and Germans, wear enormous beards, unless the fashion has changed since my visit. I attribute this to a political cause. The Belgians, who rebelled against the Dutch government in 1830, are a revolutionary population, sympathising with the progressistas of all other European countries. The Hollanders are content to follow the customs of their fathers, whose plodding industry, and sturdy assertion of their rights and freedom, has placed them, in their own esteem at least, in advance of all the world. Progress, except in the accumulation of ducats, has no charms for the Netherlander. His fathers shaved; why, then, should he forbear? But other nations groaning under the despotism of shaveling priests and royal knaves, are not so contented with their lot as he. They cease to shave, as a testimony against smooth-faced hypocrisy, which they regard as the source of all their evils. Hence the beard has become the symbol of "advanced ideas;" and consequently obnoxious to all partisans of "old opinions," be they civil, ecclesiastical, or social. For this cause the Pope and his cardinals, bishops, priests, and deacons, "all shaven and shorn," and the clergy of all sects in western "Christendom," are hostile to the beard; and wherever their influence is felt, cause it to be suppressed. This is preeminently the case in Rome, where it is forbidden to be worn; and though Holland is intensely Protestant, yet, on the principles, I suppose, of anti-Belgianism or extremes meeting, the Dutch are in fellowship with the Pope in the repudiation of the beard.

Getting no information from the boy, we walked on, until at length we espied the Hotel d'Elberfeld, at the Vlasmarket Hoek and Speiger. Having introduced ourselves to "mine host" as well as we could with our English, imperfectly understood by a man who spoke a patois made up of his own Dutch and our Anglo-Saxon, we arranged to abide with him during our sojourn in Rotterdam. Having consigned our "affaires" to his care, we set out in quest of the novelties presented to foreigners in a Dutch town.

Some one has remarked, that if you would be thoroughly taken out of your own country, you should not travel to Constantinople, but to Rotterdam; which, by those who have visited the former city, is said to be true to a great extent; for in Rotterdam you see all in one, what can only be met with piece-meal elsewhere. If the streets in Philadelphia had canals running along their centres, and on each side of them paved thoroughfares for carts

and “foetpaden,” anglice, footpads or passengers, and these were filled with vessels, and vehicles, and rows of trees on each side of the water-courses, the tout ensemble would present a striking resemblance to Rotterdam. The canals, however, are wider than Chestnut and Walnut streets, and, in some parts of the city, afford havens for ships of the largest size. The description of Rotterdam in Hood’s poem is very exact. He writes: —

“Tall houses with quaint gables,
Where frequent windows shine,
And quays that lead to bridges,
And trees in formal line,
And masts of spicy vessels
From western Surinam,
All tell me you’re in England,
But I’m in Rotterdam.”

Hood further styles it “a vulgar Venice;” and to a stranger the queen city of the Adriatic can hardly present a more striking appearance. Land and water are so strangely and picturesquely intermingled; the busy life that pervades both is so thoroughly in keeping with the scene, that to walk about, and look on with curious eye, is occupation enough. Turn your eye which way you will, you see a bridge, its strong pillars rising aloft, bearing the great cross-beams by which each portion is counterpoised. The whole is painted white, and the wooden floor slopes gently upwards from each side to the centre. Presently, a tall-masted vessel floats up; the two men always in attendance at the little lodge erected close by, run out; they withdraw the iron wedges from the staples, and then, with a slight pull at the chain suspended from the cross-beams, each half of the bridge begins slowly to rise: before they are at the perpendicular the schuit has passed; a push at the cross-beams sends them up again; the men spring to the centre to accelerate the descent, impatient boys scramble after them, the wedges are replaced, and the stream of traffic, which had been momentarily interrupted, resumes its course with no more delay than is caused by the issuing of a dray from one of the side streets of a crowded avenue.

A tourist visiting this city says, “My walks up and down in Rotterdam gave me the key to several matters that had puzzled me when living in New York. The American farmer drives to market with two horses at a fast trot, harnessed to a light narrow wagon, with side rails rising high behind at a sharp curve. The Dutch farmer does the same. The New York milkman goes his round in a similar wagon, supplying his customers from two bright cans placed in front of his seat. The Dutchman does the same. New York builders frequently erect whole rows of houses, side, back, and middle, leaving the entire front to be built up last. I saw the same process in Rotterdam, where many new houses were

‘going up.’ Here, too, was the original of the clumsy truck or dray which the carmen of New York drive about the streets by hundreds. Here, too, the reason why shopkeepers’ names are so perseveringly painted on each door-post in Broadway, and other business thoroughfares. Here, too, the frequent occurrence of the announcements, Bakkerij, Bleekerij, and Hoekij, sufficiently explained why, in the over-sea city, a baker’s shop was called a bakery, a bleaching-ground a bleachery, a cake-shop a cooky-store; and the exposing of groceries in open barrels, ranged in rows in the shops, also accounted for the similar practice still existing in New York. Who would have thought that the early settlers at the mouth of the Hudson, whose town-council ‘met one day and smoked their pipes,’ would have left such enduring traces behind them!”

The signboard literature of the Dutch Venice is highly amusing to a foreigner. Over the windows of the provision merchants, they not only tell you that they have boter and kaas, butter and cheese, but, lest you should mistakenly suppose that they distributed it gratuitously, they are careful to tell you that they have it te koop, that is, to sell. This is common in the Hoog Straat as well as in the back lanes. In this street a printed label on a basement door stated, “Hier is een kelder to huur”—Here is a cellar to let. A conveyancer could not wish for greater detail or exactness. In all the Dutch towns the houses are numbered in districts. Thus, Wyk 2. 250 signifies No. 250 in the third wyk or ward; an arrangement which in some respects is by no means convenient. It is much easier to follow the numbers in a street than over a whole quarter, where you are ignorant of the direction of their beginning or ending.

We were very much struck with the leaning of the fronts of the houses towards the streets in numerous instances. We concluded that it was the subsidence of the foundations that caused it. This is said to be a mistake. It is admitted that it may be true in a few cases; but that generally it is to be attributed to the original formation of the houses. Whole streets are said to have been originally built in a sloping position: the backs of the houses present no such deviation from the perpendicular; neither is the roof line altered. Modern builders avoid this overtopping, which, however picturesque, looks dangerous; and new houses are now erected as perpendicular as elsewhere.

The appearance of the vessels, coasters and inland traders, which crowd the havens, is very remarkable. So clean, so bright, so polished: no scratches, no bruises, no marks of rough usage. The fenders suspended from the bulwarks are curved to fit the protuberant side, and strengthened at either end by polished brass ferules; the heel of the bowsprit, the bitts and windlass, the rudder head, are similarly decorated, and painted with gay colours. The little cabins are formal neatness itself, and the vrouw and her family not less clean than the most precise residents on shore. The tubs for washing clothes are so contrived as to hang over the vessel’s side by means of a bracket, so that the splashings fall into the canal, and the slopping of the deck is avoided. Many of these crafts are floating shops for the sale of matting, crockery, brooms, firewood, &c., and on fine days the stock in trade is displayed partly on the quay and on the deck. When business grows slack the owners cast off their moorings, and take up a new position in another street.

(To be continued.)

* * *

MOSES AND ELIJAH.

As Jehovah “sent Moses to be a ruler and deliverer of Israel by the hand of the Angel that appeared to him in the bush,” so will he send Elijah, the restorer of all things, to deliver the same nation out of its present captivity, and to bring it “into the wilderness of the people,” by the hand of the Angel of the Abrahamic covenant—even by Jesus, whom “He hath made both Lord and Christ.”

EDITOR.

* * *

“Where there is no talebearer the strife ceaseth.”

* * *