

HERALD
OF THE
KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.

“And in their days, even of those kings, the God of heaven shall set up A KINGDOM which shall never perish, and A DOMINION that shall not be left to another people. It shall grind to powder and bring to an end all these kingdoms, and itself shall stand for ever.”—DANIEL.

JOHN THOMAS, Editor. NEW YORK, DECEMBER, 1854
Volume 4—No. 12

SACRIFICE IN THE AGE TO COME.

Brother Thomas:—Will burnt-offerings and sacrifices be offered in the Age to Come? Paul says, in Hebrews 10: 6: “In burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast had no pleasure;” again, he says, in Ephesians, that “Christ abolished in his flesh the law of commandments contained in ordinances;” and in Colossians 2: 14, that “Christ blotted out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, and nailed them to the cross.” If you have light on this subject, I hope you will let it shine through your very valuable paper. The truth is what I want.

PETER H. BOUK.

Pelham, C. W., March 6, 1854.

* * *

REPLY

The answer to the question—Will burnt offerings and sacrifices be offered in the Age to Come?—must be sought for in the testimony of God. He only can tell; and I am gratified in being able to inform our correspondent, for his satisfaction, that He has graciously condescended to do so. He instructs us in his Word that the sacrificial offering of beasts shall be a part of religious worship or service in the World or Age to Come. Of this there can be no doubt with those who believe the prophets; but, whether we can reconcile the restoration of sacrifice with the sayings of Paul without being led to a denial of either, or to the affirmation that a contradiction exists, is another thing, and a question to be settled, not by the opinions of the learned, but by reason enlightened by the handwriting of God.

The first witness to be summoned in the case is Malachi. He testifies that a time shall come when, “from the rising of the sun even to the going down of the same, my name, saith Jehovah of armies, shall be great among the nations, (baggoyim,) and in every place incense shall be offered to my name, and a pure offering; for my name shall be great among the nations, saith the I-shall-be of armies.” This is evidently in the future, because it has never obtained in the past. Now, when the time for the offering of this incense and pure offering in every place shall have arrived, a purified priesthood will have been prepared to offer it among the nations: for the same witness testifies, saying, “The Messenger of the Covenant shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver: and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold

and silver, that they may offer to Jehovah an offering in righteousness. Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant unto Jehovah, as in the days of old, and as in former years.”

The next witness we shall call up is Isaiah. He testifies that at the time when “the Lord God gathereth the outcasts of Israel, the sons of the stranger that join themselves to the Lord to serve him, and to love the name of the Lord, to be his servants, every one that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it, and taketh hold of my covenant even them will I bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer: their burnt offerings, and their sacrifices shall be accepted on my altar; for mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all peoples.” When these words were written, the temple of Solomon was still standing as the house of prayer for Israel. But the prophet speaks here of a future temple, which should be a house of prayer, not for Israel only, but for all peoples. That house has not yet been erected, but will certainly be, for Zechariah testifies that “the man whose name is The Branch shall build the temple of Jehovah”—a temple very minutely described by Ezekiel. Upon the altar of this temple, then, the burnt-offerings and sacrifices of the sons of the stranger will be accepted: offerings which shall be selected from the flocks of Kedar, and the rams of Nebaioth. For, says Isaiah, the Gentiles shall come to the Light of Jerusalem, and kings to the brightness of her rising, when she shall arise and shine, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon her; and “they shall bring gold and incense; and they shall show forth the praises of the Lord. All the flocks of Kedar, shall be gathered together unto her, the rams of Nebaioth shall minister unto her; they shall come up with acceptance on mine altar and I will glorify the house of my glory.”

Again, Isaiah tells us that in a time, which has hitherto never obtained, when “the Egyptians shall serve with the Assyrians, and Israel shall be the third with Egypt and Assyria, a blessing in the midst of Palestine—then shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, a pillar at the border thereof to Jehovah. And it shall be for a sign, and for a witness unto Jehovah of armies in the land of Egypt, for they shall cry unto the Lord because of oppressors and he shall send them a Saviour, and a Great One, and he shall deliver them. And Jehovah shall be known to the Egyptians, and the Egyptians shall know Jehovah in that day, and shall do sacrifice and oblation; yea, they shall vow a vow unto Jehovah, and perform it.”

When they do sacrifice and oblation thus, it will be at the yearly festival of Tabernacles; for “every one that is left of the nations which came against Jerusalem shall even go up from year to year to worship the King, the I-shall-be of armies, and to keep the feast of Tabernacles.” Now the feast of Tabernacles cannot be kept without sacrifice, as will appear by consulting the law by which the festival was decreed, which reads thus: “The fifteenth day of this seventh month shall be the feast of Tabernacles, seven days unto Jehovah . On the first day shall be a holy convocation; ye shall do no servile work therein. Seven days ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto Jehovah, on the eighth day shall be a holy convocation; ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto Jehovah; it is a solemn assembly, and ye shall do no servile work therein.” For the Gentiles to keep this feast, they must observe it as the Israelites did before them, according to the law; and not as they “keep the Sabbath” now, observing the first or eighth instead of the seventh day, after a fashion of their own, and omitting those requirements which are inconvenient.

The Feast of Passover is also to be observed in the Age to Come; which, however, cannot be

kept without sacrifice. Jesus said to his disciples, "I will not any more eat of the Passover, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God". This was equivalent to saying, "When the Passover is fulfilled in the kingdom of God I will eat of it". Hence we find its restoration testified by Ezekiel in these words: "On the fourteenth day of the first month ye shall have the Passover, a feast of seven days; unleavened bread shall be eaten. And upon that day shall the Prince prepare (by the priests who offer his burnt-offerings and his peace-offerings, Ezekiel 46:2) for himself and all the people of the land, a bullock for a sin-offering. And seven days of the feast he shall prepare a burnt offering to Jehovah, seven bullocks and seven rams without blemish, daily the seven days; and a kid of the goats daily, for a sin-offering. And he shall prepare a meat offering of an ephah for a bullock, and an ephah for a ram, and a hin of oil for an ephah." And in the next verse the feast of tabernacles is thus referred to: "In the seventh month, on the fifteenth day of the month, shall he do the like in the feast of the seven days, according to the sin-offering, according to the burnt-offering, and according to the meat-offering, and according to the oil"

The reader will observe, however, that the Passover is a feast for Israel's observance, not for that of the nations. The Prince, or High Priest, is to prepare it, "for himself, and for all the people of the land," that is, of Palestine; because the passover is the memorial of the deliverance of the Twelve Tribes and their rulers from the power of all that hate them. In this deliverance, when it is fulfilled in the Kingdom of God, the nations are punished after the manner of the Egyptians; become a sacrifice at the hand of the destroyer, while he passes over Israel whom he comes to save. The Passover is the Fourth of July for Israel— the anniversary of the independence of their nation; which can only be celebrated by those Gentiles in the Age to Come who acquire citizenship in their land. In respect of the Feast of Tabernacles, or Feast of Ingathering, the nations may well rejoice with Israel in the celebration thereof; for it will memorialize their ingathering into the Abrahamic fold when they shall all be blessed in Abraham and his Seed. But the possibility of national ingratitude for so great a benefit is implied in the following words of the prophet: "And it shall be, that whoso will not come up, of the families of the earth, unto Jerusalem to worship the King, the I-shall-be of armies, even upon them shall be no rain." But this would be no punishment to Egypt, because rain does not fall there: her fertility is maintained by the inundations of the Nile. It is therefore decreed that, "If the family of Egypt go not up and come not, that has no rain, there shall be the plague wherewith Jehovah shall smite the nations that come not up to keep the feast of tabernacles. This shall be the punishment of Egypt, and the punishment, of all nations that come not up to keep the feast of tabernacles."

This same witness concludes his testimony relative to the constitution of things in the Age to Come by declaring that sacrifice shall be offered in a temple in Jerusalem. His words, are: "The pots in the house of Jehovah shall be like the bowls before the altar. Yea, every pot in Jerusalem and in Judah shall be holiness to the Lord of armies: and all they that sacrifice shall come and take of them, and boil therein; and in that day there shall be no more the Canaanite in the house of the I-shall-be of armies." This can only relate to the future; because the sacrificing is to be practised at a time when the Canaanite no more intrudes where it is unlawful for him to go. "The Canaanite" is a phrase put for the enemy of Israel— the enemy shall no more be in the house of Jehovah. But the enemy is now lord of Jerusalem, and has established a temple of his superstition upon the site chosen of Jehovah for the house of His name. The Ottoman is for the present the Canaanite of the Holy City— the desolating abomination of the glorious land. But better times are fast approaching, when the last of the Canaanites shall be ignominiously expelled. Hear what Zephaniah says upon this subject: "Sing, O daughter of Zion; shout, O Israel; be glad and rejoice with all the heart, O daughter of

Jerusalem. Jehovah takes away thy judgments, he casts out thy enemy; the King of Israel, Jehovah, is in the midst of thee: thou shalt not see evil any more." Then shall the stone refused of the builders have become the head of the corner; and those of the city who behold him shall say, "Blessed be He that comes in the name of Jehovah! The mighty one is Jehovah who showeth us light: bind the sacrifice with cords to the horns of the altar . . . O give thanks unto Jehovah, for he is good; because his mercy is for the age!"

When the daily sacrifice was taken away by the Fifth Horn of the Grecian Goat in the days of Titus, it was only an interruption, not a final abolition, of sacrifice. It was a suppression of it for "many days", at the expiration of which it will be restored with other things suppressed. This is apparent from the testimony of Hosea, who saith, "The children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince (or High Priest), and without a sacrifice; afterward (after the "many days" have expired) shall the children of Israel return (to Palestine) and seek Jehovah their God, and David their king: and shall fear Jehovah and his goodness in the latter days". These "latter days", then, succeed the "many days" which have not yet expired. When they arrive, Israel will again have a king, a prince, and a sacrifice; and that king will be David II, who will be a prince, likewise, after the order of Melchizedec, for one thousand years. And to this agrees the testimony of Jeremiah, who, speaking of the perpetuity of David's throne from the commencement of the reign of the man whose name is The Branch, saith, "In those days shall Judah be saved (which cannot be affirmed of Judah yet) and Jerusalem shall dwell safely; and this is the name which shall be proclaimed to her—Jehovah our Righteousness". And here is the reason given for Judah's salvation and Jerusalem's safety: "For", continues he, "David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house (or kingdom) of Israel: neither shall the priests the Levites want a man before me to offer burnt-offerings, and to kindle meat-offerings, and to do sacrifice continually." Here is an offering of sacrifices by Levites contemporarily with the reign of a son of David upon the throne of Israel. It is evident, therefore, that the "never" in the text commences with a henceforth, which is yet in the future. The epoch of that henceforth is the salvation of Judah, and the placing of Jerusalem in such a position that she may be safely inhabited, which cannot be till her enemy is cast out. From that time David shall never be without a successor in the throne of Israel; and that successor shall be Messiah, during whose priestly reign Levites shall do sacrifice continually.

Reader! Canst thou break Jehovah's covenant of the day and of the night, that there should not be day and night in their season? If thou canst, "then also may my covenant, saith Jehovah, be broken that I have made with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne: and with the Levites, the priests, my ministers". This is equivalent to saying that no combination of powers on earth or in heaven can prevent the Messiah, who is David's son, reigning on Mount Zion where David reigned; or the Levites superseding the Mohammedans, Greeks, Latins, and Protestants in Jerusalem, and doing sacrifice there continually.

From the evidence, then, of these witnesses it is clear that sacrifice and offering will be elements of divine service in the Millennial Age. They will be "pure" and "pleasant" offerings to Jehovah; because they will be perfect offerings, and offered in righteousness by a purified priesthood. They will be perfect, because they will be perfected by the sacrifice of Him whose expiatory death they represent. They will be pure offerings and pleasant, because the offerers will present them with enlightened faith and purified hearts. The Levites, refined as gold and silver, will slay the sacrifices of the peoples; while the Sons of Zadoc, once dead, but then alive for evermore, and "kings and priests for God", with the Prince of Israel in their midst, will approach and stand before Jehovah to offer unto Him the fat and the blood: they shall

enter into His sanctuary, and come near to His table, to minister unto Him; and shall keep His charge. —Ezekiel 44: 15.

Such, however, was not the case in the Mosaic Age. The offerings were neither perfect, pure, nor pleasant to Jehovah. They were imperfect, not having been perfected by the expiation they typified; but keeping up a remembrance of unpardoned offences every year. This will not be the case with the perfect offerings of the Age to Come. These will not be remembrancers of transgressions unforgiven; but memorials of pardon through the sacrifice of Messiah the Prince. There is no day of annual atonement in the future age. Israel's offences are blotted out once for all as a thick cloud when the New Covenant is made with them on their re-settlement in the Holy Land when that age begins; a forgiveness of national offences which lasts for ever, as it is written, "I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities I will, remember no more".

But, the Mosaic offerings were not always unpleasant to Jehovah. It was the abominations of the offerers that made them disgusting in His sight. The High Priests and their sacerdotal households, who ought to have been "Holiness to Jehovah, " were very often men of reprobate character setting an example to Israel which they were not slow to follow, thus verifying the sayings, "Like priests, like people", and "The leaders of my people cause them to err".

This view of the matter accords with the handwriting of Jehovah by Malachi. "Judah", saith he, "hath dealt treacherously, and an abomination is committed in Israel and in Jerusalem; for Judah hath profaned the holiness of Jehovah which he loved, and hath married the daughter of a strange god. Jehovah will cut off the man that doeth this, the master and the scholar, out of the dwelling-places of Jacob, and him that offereth an offering to Jehovah of armies. And this have ye done again, covering the altar of the Lord with tears, with weeping, and with crying out, insomuch that he regardeth not the offering any more, or receiveth it with good will at your hands. Ye have wearied Jehovah with your words: yet ye say, Wherein have we wearied him? When ye say, Every one that doeth evil is good in the sight of Jehovah, and he delighteth in them". The saying, "insomuch that he regardeth not the offering any more, or receiveth it with good will at your hand", implies that there was a time when He did regard the offering, and did receive it with good will, or pleasure, at their hand. Indeed the Spirit saith so in so many words when testifying of the purification of the sons of Levi; as it is written, "Then shall the offering of Judah and Jerusalem be pleasant to Jehovah (or regarded, and received with good will) as in days of old, and as in former years".

In reading Jehovah's reasons for taking no pleasure in the sacrifice and offering; and burnt offerings, and offering for sin which were offered in Judah by the law, we are forcibly reminded of the sectarian practices and dogmas of our day. When ecclesiastics want to "bring down the Holy Ghost", they assemble the people to what they call "the altar of the Lord", which, like Judah's priests of old, they "cover with tears, with weeping, and with crying out". This was the practice of Baal's worshippers, from whom the Jews learnt it; and it is the idolatrous custom in these times of those who profess to go to the Lord to "get religion"! But the reader will perceive from the words of Jehovah Himself that He despises such religion-getting, and turns His back upon it; so that the fruit of these ecclesiastical demonstrations are not of God, but of the carnal mind unenlightened by His truth.

The priests also who practised this Baalism held a dogma essentially the same as Universalism. They taught that "Every one that doeth evil is good in the sight of Jehovah, and he delighteth in them". This was in effect affirming that men would be saved however evil

they might be; for it is only in the saints that Jehovah delights. Such doctrine and practices, then, as these caused Jehovah to take no pleasure in the sacrifice and offering He had ordained in the Mosaic law; and therefore Messiah came to do, or establish, the Second Will— to bring it into force through the offering of the body the I-shall-be had prepared for Himself. It was not possible, besides, for the blood of bulls and of goats offered by the law, to take away sins. They needed perfecting in their antitype the restored body of Jehovah. "Therefore coming into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou requirest not: but ears hast thou restored to me; in burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin thou hast no pleasure. Then said I, behold, I come (as it is written of me in the volume of the little book) to do that which is thy will, O God. Saying above, Sacrifice and offering and burnt offerings and offering for sin thou desirest not, neither hast pleasure, which are offered according to the law: then said he, Behold, I come to do that which is thy will, O God. He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second. By which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body by the anointed Jesus once only"

Messiah having thus been obedient unto death, and brought the Abrahamic Will, or Covenant, into force, will, when he comes again in power and glory, carry out the purposes of the New or Second Covenant, and in so doing cause to be offered to Jehovah by the sons of Levi in Judah's midst, pure offerings that will be pleasant to Him as in the days of former years; his own one offering having perfected for a continuance the things which the Mosaic Law could not; for nothing was perfected by it.

As to Ephesians. 2:15, the subject of the discourse is the abolition of the cause of enmity between Jews and Gentiles, which was "the law of the commandments in ordinances" which prevented peace between them. This ground of enmity he abolished, when by the one offering of his body on the cross he took it out of the way, and established the "better covenant" which promised good things to Jews and Gentiles upon the same conditions. If Christ had not died and rose again, the Mosaic law would have continued in force to this day and there would have been no union of Jews and Gentiles in "one body", and consequently the Gentiles would have continued helplessly, "without Christ, being aliens from the Commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the Covenants of Promise, having no hope, and without God in the world". To enable us to get at Christ, by becoming citizens of the Commonwealth of Israel, it was necessary to remove the Mosaic law out of our way, and to introduce another that would be more favourable. By becoming proselytes of Judaism, Gentiles might come to be with Moses, and citizens of Israel's commonwealth under his law; but as this could not make alive, they would remain under sentence of death; and enjoy nothing beyond the temporal advantages of a residence in the Holy Land in common with the natives. It could give them no right to be citizens in the Age to Come, and to reign for ever with Messiah over Israel and the nations for a thousand years. This right is derived from that Covenant which Jesus established or confirmed in dying and rising again. If we take hold of it by believing the things promised in it; and also take hold of him, by faith in him, as the confirming sacrifice, or Mediator, thereof: and become obedient to the "Law of Faith", which commands such believers to be baptised into the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, we become the children of the covenant; and through Jesus acquire citizenship in the Israelitish Commonwealth of the Age to Come. To such obedient believers, "who have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins"; but a looking for the Second Appearing of Jesus without blood unto salvation. As he comes, however, "without blood" in himself, the redemption he hath purchased by the blood which once flowed in his veins, will be represented by the shedding of the blood of bulls, rams, &c., in the Age to Come.

The text in Colossians 2: 14, relates to the same topic as that in Ephesians; namely, the taking

away the cause of division between Jews and Gentiles, the Mosaic law, or handwriting, which made it "an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company, or come unto one of another nation". While this handwriting was in force, there could be no union between Jews and Gentiles in "one body", as members of which they were to love as brethren. The law divided them, and set them at variance; as the gospel now separates those that obey it from all religious fellowship with disobedient unbelievers.

The Abrahamic Covenant, which was ratified by God for Christ—eis Christon—430 years before the law of Moses was given, knows nothing of that law. The law was an addition, not to it as a codicil, but as a distinct covenant, or will, additionally presented and enjoined upon the natural descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, until The Seed, or Christ, should come, to whom the promise of the everlasting possession of the Holy Land was made in the Covenant, ratified for him. — "It was added because of transgressions" among the Israelites, who while in Egypt served the gods of the Egyptians; and were fast merging into forgetfulness of the good things covenanted to their nation under Christ.

The Abrahamic Covenant contains no cause of enmity between Jews and Gentiles; for it promises among other things that "In Abraham's Seed (Christ) shall all the Nations of the earth be blessed". All nations, include Jews and Gentiles. Not so the law, however. It was a "fiery law". In itself "holy, just, and good;" but notwithstanding its intrinsic excellence, "it was weak through the flesh" in which, Paul says, "no good thing dwelleth". On account, therefore, of this weakness, the holy, just, and good Mosaic law, which was ordained for the life of all under it, saying, "If a man do it he shall live by it," was "found to be death" to every Israelite; for it said, "cursed be every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them" which was too great a demand upon poor weak humanity to accord. Even Jesus, who was without sin, no fault being found in him, was cursed by it, saying, "Cursed be everyone that hangeth upon a tree"; thus he became a curse for us. This law, then, was found to be death to him; can it therefore after this be found to be life to any other mortal? By no means! Hence it condemns to death every Israelite, and every one else that seeks justification by it. And if God's people Israel with their King were sentenced to death by it, of what avail can it be to us Gentiles? Certainly of none; and therefore it is written, "Are we Jews better than they the Gentiles? No, in no wise: for both Jews and Gentiles are all under sin"; so that "all the world becomes guilty before God".

Here, then, we behold mankind in an awful dilemma—naturally, under the sentence pronounced upon Adam, which is death; and Mosaically, cursed to death by a law ordained for life, because humanity is too weak to keep it. If the state of the case had continued thus "the gates of Hades" would have prevailed for ever over Jew and Gentile, patriarch and prophet, from the first transgression to the natural extinction of the race, Enoch, Moses, and Elijah alone excepted as exceptions to the rule.

The wisdom of God in a mystery, however, devised a happier result than this. The world "being dead in sins", that is, dead Adamically and Mosaically because of transgression, He sent Jesus into the world to take the Mosaic Handwriting out of the way by nailing it to his cross. And this he did by fulfilling all the righteousness shadowed forth in that law which cursed him on the tree; a part of which representative righteousness was the atonement for sin by blood. Being nailed to the cross as the result of his voluntary surrender of his life, he may be said to have nailed himself to the cross by the hand of sinners; for, saith he, "No man taketh my life from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again. This commandment have I received of my Father"; and therefore it was

not suicide, but, "obedience unto death". In being without sin and in perfecting the sacrificial righteousness of the law, he nailed it to the cross, when he nailed himself there. Now, being Jehovah's representative in regard to the Abrahamic Covenant, he was the Mediator or Testator of that covenant; had therefore of necessity to die that it might come into force. Having therefore perfected the righteousness of the law in himself, the shadow was no longer necessary as the substance had come. In dying, consequently, he proclaimed "It is finished!" and being perfected, in a few years after "it vanished away". Thus, he blotted out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; having in this way divested the authorities and the powers of Israel (for they derived their ecclesiastical and civil authority from the law), triumphing over them in rising from the dead, he exposed them with boldness of speech by the apostles.

The Mosaic Covenant being taken out of the way by the sacrificial death of Jesus, the Abrahamic was brought into force by the same means; for the blood of Jesus which perfected the Mosaic Sin-offerings, also rendered purifying or consecrated the Abrahamic covenant, called "The New" though made before the law, because it came into force on nailing the Mosaic to the cross. The Abrahamic covenant, I say, was rendered purifying by the blood of Jesus; so that "whosoever believeth" the things of the covenant, his faith and resulting disposition shall be counted to him for repentance and remission of sins in His name.

The Abrahamic Covenant, however, does not exclude the use of sacrifice. It was typically ratified or confirmed by the sacrifice of animals consumed by fire from heaven before the Mosaic law was given; so, when the things it covenants are fully accomplished in the Age to Come, sacrifice will be restored, not as typical of the future, but as a memorial of the past. Blood shedding in the Age to Come will commemorate the shedding of the blood of Jesus in the end of the Mosaic Age. It will occupy the position in "the Service" that the breaking of the loaf does now to mortal believers of the truth in hope of the glory of God. "This do in remembrance of me." The broken bread and poured-out wine are remembrancers, or memorials, of the body broken and blood of Jesus shed for the remission of the sins of those who should become his brethren. When he appears a second time this form of remembrance will cease for it was to be observed, to use his words, "Until I come".

Shall we say that when this unbloody memorial of his sacrificial death shall cease by the statute which limits it, there will be no memorial ordained to keep it in remembrance throughout the Age to Come? If we affirm this we must reject all that testimony adduced in the former part of this article, which declares the restoration of sacrifice. Its restoration is certain. And when restored, upon what principle will it exist? Will it represent the sacrifice of a future Christ? That is impossible. Then it will not be typical. Will it be as the procuring cause of the remission of the sins of the people living in that age? That would be to ignore the death of Jesus, which is inadmissible. Will it be to render purifying a new covenant? None such exists to be confirmed and dedicated. Will it be for the cleansing of the resurrected saints? For them, there is "no more sacrifice for sins", having been by the one offering of Jesus sanctified and perfected for ever. It is upon none of these principles. There remains, then, but one other principle upon which sacrificial bloodshedding can be restituted in the Age to Come; and that is, the one already set forth, even as a memorial of the consecration of the Abrahamic Will by the blood of Jesus, styled "the blood of the covenant"; by the which the future rulers of the world are now sanctified; and the future nations of that world, Gentile and Jewish, will be made holy through the dedicatory offering of Jesus Christ once. Thus will "God have justified the nations through faith" as he promised to Abraham, saying, "In thee shall all nations be blessed". So that then "they which be of faith", be they individuals or

nations, "will be blessed with faithful Abraham".

But, though this subject is not exhausted by this article, which should be regarded more as suggestive of the great theme than otherwise, enough has been presented for the occasion, I think, to enable the reader and our correspondent in particular, to form an enlightened and scriptural judgment upon the question of sacrifice in the Age to Come, and its congruity with the present sanctification and perfection of the faithful in Christ Jesus, who shall be with him kings and priests for God, and therefore offerers to Him of the memorial blood of the world's sacrifices in honour of his goodness, and a hearty thanksgiving for all the blessings they enjoy.

EDITOR.

November 1, 1854.

* * *

THE WAR OF THE EAST.

"In every thing consider the end"—Proverb.

If we were called upon to work out "the end," or final result of the war between Russia and the Western Powers from the data supplied by the campaign of 1824, we might conclude with the North British that "no prophetic eye could foresee its results."

The grounds of this conclusion are, first, that so long as neutrality is maintained by Austria and Prussia the heart of Russia cannot be pierced by the lance of the Allies. Will she then give in? Secondly, the campaign in Asia has thus far been in favour of the Russians, and disastrous to the Turks. Thirdly, the intervention of the Austrians between Russia and the Porte, whatever it may be in appearance, is in effect favourable to Russia. Fourthly, the revolutionary condition of Europe is a defence for the Czar in being an embarrassment for the Allies. Fifthly, the jealousies that may arise between them may change the face of affairs. Sixthly, Prussia, whose sympathies are Russian, may declare for the Czar, and so open a way for him into France, by which the seat of the war would be transferred from the east to the west. Seventhly, the Autocrat's ally, winter, is at hand, which will suspend all attacks by sea and land; and eighthly, the firmness and endurance of Nicholas may exhaust the patience of his adversaries, and dry up the resources of Turkey, which may die before he obtain possession of the carcass.

From these considerations we might conclude that Russia would triumph in the end; but then there is to be considered on the contrary, the bravery of the Turks and the great wealth and power of England and France, whose fleets and armies have all proved themselves superior to the Russians. England has once withstood the world in arms, what, therefore, may not England and France combined effect against a single power. When we look at this side of the shield we see no prospect for Russia, but an humble acceptance of peace at the dictation of her imperious foes! Here then are two opposite conclusions; whose eye is so prophetic as to foresee which of them shall become the truth? The North British writer responds, "There is no prophetic eye can foresee the results of the present war!"

To this conclusion I have no objection apart from the word or testimony of God. No one could have foreseen the end of Napoleon I, judging from the contemporary circumstances that environed him at the epoch of Marengo and Austerlitz; neither from similar considerations

can the issue of the present war be predicted—the Allies may conquer or Russia triumph for any thing we can tell apart from the Scriptures of truth.

According to these, matters are progressing finely with reference to the end revealed. In promoting this the things to be accomplished are—

1. To create a war among the powers contrary to their inclinations;
 2. To develop that war in the west for a special purpose;
 3. To direct the storm against the sovereign power that governs Palestine; and
 4. To turn it against Jerusalem and the Holy Land.
1. With respect to the first indication, we have seen it fulfilled in the creation of the present war, which has originated remotely out of a jealousy between France and Russia concerning the Holy Shrines in Jerusalem, and proximately, out of that jealousy, intensified by the designs of Russia upon Constantinople and the east. England, France, Turkey, and Russia, were all as anxious to avoid war as Austria and Prussia at the present time, but their fears of what Russia disclaims, and their fears of revolution, have brought them to blows which they deal out with fitful uncertainty. The war is only in its incipient stage. The whole world is to be involved in it; so that Austria and Prussia, Spain, Portugal, Sardinia, Belgium, &c., &c., will be unable to escape.
 2. The war must blaze up in the west before the end come. There is a special reason for this, and that reason is the following. The power styled “Gog” by Ezekiel is to be mishmar, or PROTECTOR of bodies politic occupying certain countries indicated by the terms Magog, Rosh, Meshech, Tubal, Gomer, Persia, Cush, Libya, and Togarmah. These names indicate peoples of the east, south, north, north-west, and west of Palestine. Gog is to be a guard or protector of these, and to lead them up to battle against Jerusalem, that they may be punished there for their enormous iniquity at the hand of Israel’s king. Now, it must be evident to the merest tyro, that before Gog can lead these peoples against the Holy City he must establish his protectorate over the west. This is his special mission before he can arrive at Constantinople. If the Czar had made a dash at the city when Menschikoff and his retinue visited it in 1853, as he might have done successfully, he would have arrived at the third stage of the crisis too soon. He would then have been prepared for the invasion of Palestine before Palestine was prepared for him, and before he had any other armies to lead against Jerusalem than those of Rosh, Meshech, and Tubal, with which alone he is operating now. His invasion of the Principalities was enough for a casus belli, and this was all contemplated of God at present, as the result has shown: the Czar, however, intended more. He was for pushing on to Constantinople; but while man proposes, the disposal is of God. He could not for the present pass Silistria. Hence the success of the Turks, who will, with their Allies, continue to impede the progress of the Russians southward and eastward, until the Governments of the Papal West shall have agreed to give their power and strength unto Gog; and he shall become the High Protector of European Absolution against the fierce and turbulent democracies of the Continent.

The mission of Austria at this stage of the business has evidently been to release Russia from active warfare against Turkey, and to act as a break upon the chariot wheels of the Anglo-French alliance, that it might not effectually cripple Russia and put an end to the war which has a higher and more glorious result than any proposed by Lord Aberdeen and Napoleon III,

who are mere subordinate actors in the play. God's moves upon the political chessboard are admirable. Sinope brought the declaration of war; Silistria, the Austrians into the Principalities; this, the invasion of the Crimea, the fall of Sevastopol (?) What then? God knows, but the Powers do not, for "all beyond is chaos" to them!

If the Anglo-French force instead of landing in Turkey had left Omar Pasha to contend with the Russians on the Danube, and had straightway invaded the Crimea, the junction of Luder's battalions with Menschikoff's would have been effectually prevented and the conquest of that peninsula facilitated. This would have been a great embarrassment for Russia, from which, however, it has been delivered and enabled to concentrate its forces against the enemy by the intervention of Austria. With the sanction of the short-sighted rulers of France and England, Austria has been permitted to make a separate treaty with the Porte by which she has been allowed to take possession of the Principalities as trustee for Turkey, to which she promises to restore them at the end of the war! The Anglo-French army arrived in Turkey, but instead of hastening on to the scene of action, it wasted the summer in doing nothing, and at length arrived at Varna where there was nothing for it to do; for just at this crisis the Russians raised the siege of Silistria and retired across the Danube, while Austria entered like a wedge between them and the Allies, and persuaded them very politely not to trouble themselves any farther in that direction!

What then had 70,000 French and English come all the way from home to do? To give their "moral support" to Omar Pasha and to die of the pestilence! They had marched up the hill and seen their friends "covered with glory;" were they to face about and march down again? What awaited them at home? A general outburst of scornful derision. To return would be disgrace and ridicule—revolution perhaps in France, and impeachment of the English ministers. Hence orders were received to do something, and that something is the capture of Sevastopol if they can.

But look at Austria; there she is in the Principalities—a rearguard to Russia; hereafter, perhaps, the advance of a Russo-Austrian tempest, destined to sweep over the city of Constantine like a whirlwind from the north. It is not probable that Austria will ever voluntarily evacuate Wallachia and Moldavia. When the second stage of the current war converts Germany, France, and Italy into the arena of the strife, Austria cannot remain in status quo. Whatever bearing she may now sham towards the Anglo-French alliance, war in Italy with the French there can only be Anti-Austrian, and therefore a Russo-Austrian contest for supremacy over the west. In such an eventuality as this, the days of Turkey are numbered. The Sultan cannot demand the evacuation of the Principalities so long as he is at war with Russia. Austria can therefore hold Wallachia and Moldavia, continue at peace with Turkey, and with Russia, her ally as at present, carry on war with France, which may be at the same time in amity with the Sultan and at enmity with Austria. Thus through Austria Turkey may be insulated and kept in leading-strings until the war in the west has given the western Leg and Toes of Nebuchadnezzar's image their last premillennial form; and Russia and Austria released from that work; that what remains may be consummated, that namely which consists in bringing Persia, Cush, Phut, and Togarmah, with all their bands, under Gog, or the completing of the image that it may stand on its feet of iron and clay on the mountains of Israel previous to its fall.

A refusal to evacuate the Principalities on the part of Austria may cause the Anglo-French to seize on Egypt and Palestine, notwithstanding their agreement not to appropriate the property of others. Treaties will not bind Napoleon longer than it serves his turn to observe them, and

his faithlessness will become a plea of justification for the British government to follow his example. As usual, pretences will not be wanting for excusing violence and spoiling their friends. The plunder of a traveller is the common property of the thieves until an heir is provided in the rogue who has sagacity and ingenuity enough to escape the halter; so of the future plunderers of the Turk, whose possessions in the east may be appropriated by France and England as “material guarantees;” but in the event of France being brought under the Protectorate of Gog, and Turkey being over-run by the Northern King, Egypt and Syria will fall to England, and the Ottoman Empire will be no more.

- 3. It is to consummate this that the war will enter upon its third stage, which is thus indicated by Daniel—“And the king of the north shall come against him (the power that divides the Land of Palestine for a price) like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships; and he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow, and pass over.” This will be doomsday to the Ottoman world. England and France, and all the native indomitability of the Osmanlis will avail them nothing then. Constantinople will fall, and the Turks will be absorbed into the armies of Gog as the Mohammedans of the Mogul empire are in the battalions of the Anglo-Indian hosts of Tarshish in the east.
- 4. The fall of the French and Ottoman empire is the result of this war in the second and third stages; events which imply the dissolution of the alliance between England, France, and Turkey. My conviction is that England will have to destroy the French navy. This will become necessary for self-preservation. France being one of the ten toes of Nebuchadnezzar’s image—“a tenth of the city”—cannot continue imperial; and that revolution which reduces it from the imperial to the regal constitution will Russianise it; that is bring it under the protection of Gog, the natural enemy of England in all wars of the east. War still continuing between Gog and England, the French marine will become Russian, and prepared for operations against the ports of Britain; hence England must either succumb to the Lord of Europe or destroy the then Russo-French fleets at her very doors. She will embrace the latter alternative, which, with the defence of Egypt and Syria, will keep her fully employed until the King of Israel appears. Successful by sea she will not be without disasters by land. The flourishing condition of Egypt and the Holy Land under her shadowing wings will draw down upon those countries the plundering cupidity of the Romanoff Chief of the Latin and Greek Confederacy then enthroned in Constantinople. He will “think an evil thought, and will say, I will go up to the land of unwalled villages; I will go to them that are at rest, that dwell confidently, all of them dwelling without walls, and having neither bars nor gates, to take a spoil, and to take a prey; to turn mine hand upon the desolate places inhabited, and upon the people gathered out of the nations, which have gotten cattle and goods, that dwell in the midst of the land.”
- To accomplish this purpose will introduce the belligerents into the fourth stage of the war, which Daniel indicates in these words, when speaking of the king of the north’s in “the time of the end,”—“He shall enter into the land of glory, and many shall be overthrown, . . . and the Land of Egypt shall not escape. But he shall have power over the treasures of gold and of silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt; and the Libyans and Ethiopians shall be at his steps. . . . And he shall go forth with great fury to destroy and utterly to make away many. And he shall plant the tents of his camp between the seas, even to the mountain, the glory of the holy.” This invasion of Palestine brings the armies of the Catholic and Protestant Powers upon the

arena where the eastern question is to find its solution. The fate of Sennacherib will be theirs. The Messiah of Israel will descend from the right hand of power and scatter them to the four winds of heaven. Then will begin “the war of the great day of God Almighty,” which will not end until the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of Jehovah and of his Anointed. Amen!

EDITOR.

* * *

VISIT TO VIRGINIA.

No 2.

Having passed the two brethren of the Corinthian Elymas, Messrs. Winfree and Harris, through the baptismal waters, brother R.K. Bowles and myself returned, as I said, to brother Winfree’s house, having concluded to defer our journey to Louisa county until the morrow. It was agreed that our meeting at Fine Creek was highly satisfactory. We only regretted that the house had not been filled, that a multitude might have heard, instead of the comparatively few that were there; and have witnessed the weakness of Campbellism Colemanised in Elymas, and the power and invincibility of the truth expounded from Moses and other prophets, and harmonised with the doctrine of Jesus and the apostles. The impression we know to have been made on the people who had attended, encouraged us to make Fine Creek a standing place of meeting on our future visits to the State; and we would here suggest, that brethren Magruder and Anderson, when they pass to and fro from Charlottesville to Lunenburg, make Fine Creek on their way. Some friend would doubtless meet them at a station on the Virginia Central, and take them to an appointment at Temperance or Webster’s, where brother Winfree would find them, and thence convey them to Fine Creek, and from this to Tomahawk station on the Richmond and Danville road, by which they would get to Lunenburg in a short time. Should they conclude on this, they can write to brother Winfree, whose post office is Jefferson, Powhattan. If Elymas present himself (and he has presumption enough for any thing, his presumption and hardness of face being in proportion to his ignorance, which is the only thing in which he is profound) they will know how to give a good account of him before the people. Of Moses and the prophets he knows literally nothing; and of the New Testament consequently, the little he pretends to know, is mere foolishness. He cannot reason. Declamation, anecdotes, and a “holy tone,” are the sum of his speechifications. Strip him of these by confining him to testimony and argument, and you nail him to the counter for what he is—a sham. From all such may church and world ere long effectually be freed!

On Saturday, September 16, I met the people at Temperance, Louisa. The congregation was so good that I never wish to meet better. The house was full, and the audience apparently intelligent, more men than women, well-behaved, and fixedly attentive. I say more men than women, not that I do not like to see a goodly number of women at a meeting; on the contrary, I like to see a fair proportion of each; but I do not like to have to speak to a great majority of women with only a few men huddled up in a corner as if merely there upon sufferance, or about to take to their heels if a parcel of children in petticoats happen to come in! Besides, the mind of this generation is of a skim-surface and frivolous character at best; and generally speaking, even according to the testimony of the better sort of their own sex, women are more lightminded and unthinking than men. Hence, they have crowded the men into the rear; and carried off the tinkling cymbals and sounding brasses of their Zions—the dear, holy toned, orators of their “sacred desks”—and made them their own peculiar treasure. This is not the

sort of audience for our doctrine. We want men and women who can think and do think; and who are not afraid of truth which does violence to the thinking of the flesh. Such an audience as this we seemed to have at Temperance. They seemed to listen as though they were thinking upon what they heard; and such are the only people that will ultimately be led captive by the gospel of the kingdom.

Next morning we left the neighbourhood of Temperance for Webster's in Goochland county, where a houseful were assembled to hear about the New Doctrine; and some, we are informed, to act the part of the Ephesian craftsmen, who delighted in uproar. But, though the doctrine was too "hard" for some immersionists, who beat up a retreat as more pleasant to their feelings than hearing an argument to the end, by the clatter whereof they more or less disturbed their more candid neighbours who were otherwise disposed, the rest, and among them the predisposed to turbulence, behaved themselves as became persons of respectability and decorum.

The subject discoursed upon was, 1 Corinthians 15: 1-4, being the point of Mr. Coleman's hour's declamation. I had not time to notice on the previous Thursday. I was the more inclined to treat of this, as several who were at Fine Creek were to be at Webster's, and came accordingly. I showed that those who took the words of the third and fourth verses as Paul's declaration of the gospel took a very shallow and limited view of the subject. In these verses no mention is made of Jesus except by implication. Paul affirmed aoristically, or indefinitely, that Christ dies for our sins, is buried, and rises again according to the prophets, the only scriptures then extant. When he visited the synagogue in Corinth he affirmed this, but while so doing, carefully abstained from saying any thing about Jesus. He confined himself to what the prophets testified concerning the sufferings of Christ, and the sacrificial character of those sufferings in dying; namely, that it was for the transgression of Jehovah's people, whose iniquity was to be laid upon him. He did not "first of all" affirm, or deliver, that Jesus was that Christ, but simply that whoever he might be, he would have to die, be buried, and rise again. And that this is true, is proved by Luke's narrative of Paul's proceedings in Acts 18. He therefore informs us, that "Paul reasoned every sabbath, and persuaded the Jews and the Greeks;" but that he said nothing about Jesus until Silas and Timothy joined him from Macedonia: when, however, they arrived, "he was constrained by the spirit, and earnestly testified to the Jews that Jesus is the Christ." Until Silas and Timothy came, all things went on peaceably enough in the Synagogue all the sabbaths he reasoned there, because he made no mention of Jesus, who was "a stone of stumbling, and rock of offence" to them; but as soon as he applied his logical conclusions about the Christ to Jesus as that personage, they began to oppose and blaspheme. Paul's past experience of the Jews had taught him to expect this result. He was, therefore, careful to defer the application of his argument to Jesus until he could well indoctrinate those who were looking for Christ, the king of Israel, with the idea of his appearing as a dying, buried, and rising heir to David's throne. When the Jewish mind comprehended this, it was most guilefully captivated, craftily prepared, (if we may so speak in the best sense) for confessing that the obnoxious Jesus was indeed both Lord and Christ; for they had no other objection to him than that he died, and was buried; whereas, they had been taught that when Messiah appeared he would live for ever without tasting of death. If on the first sabbath that Paul visited the Synagogue in Corinth, he had straightway declared that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, as Gentile orators do, they would have opposed him on the spot, blasphemed, and turned him out of the assembly, and there would have been an abrupt finish put upon his mission to the Jews. But he did not act so unwisely. He first laid down his premises—"reasoning with them out of the prophets, opening and alleging that the Christ ought to suffer, and to rise from among the dead;" which being demonstrated, he then

affirmed, saying, “This is the Christ, even Jesus, whom I announced to you;” an affirmation he proved by adducing his own testimony of having seen him since his crucifixion; a testimony which the Lord himself confirmed by enabling Paul to do wonderful works in his name.

It is well to inquire, What was Paul about all the sabbaths he visited the synagogue of Corinth, while Silas and Timothy were in Macedonia? The general answer is, Doing what he did for three months in the synagogue at Ephesus, and in all the other synagogues he visited till they expelled him. And what was this in particular? “Disputing and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God”—Acts 19: 8—“Expounding and testifying the kingdom of God, persuading concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses and out of the Prophets;”—“Teaching the Word of God among them,” as Luke says he did among the Corinthians for a year and six months.

This word Jesus styles “the word of the kingdom,” a phrase by which he designates “the gospel of the kingdom” which he began to preach in Galilee; and which he ordered the apostles to proclaim to all nations, as a testimony to them—Matthew 24: 14. Concerning this word, Paul says, “I declare the glad tidings I evangelised to you, which also ye received, and in which ye stand; through which also ye are saved, if ye hold fast to a CERTAIN WORD—*tini logo*—I evangelised to you, unless ye believed in vain.” This “certain word” in the Common Version is rendered “what,” and relates to “the glad tidings” he refers to in the first verse. But what glad tidings is there in the simple statement that “Christ dies for sins according to the writings of the prophets?” Suppose it was admitted that when he came he was to do this, was he to die for antediluvians, Jews or Gentiles? And what were they to gain by his dying for their sins? And how were they to have access to the things procured by his dying for sins? There is not a word of this in the third and fourth verses, and yet these are said to “declare the gospel” Paul preached! The things expressed in these verses are not the gospel; for a “the gospel was preached to Abraham, saying, In thee shall all the nations be blessed.” They were only “first things,” as I have shown, submitted to the Corinthian synagogue in the absence of Silas and Timothy; for he says, “I delivered to you,” not “first of all,” as in the Common Version; but *en protois*, “among the first things what also I received.”

Paul recalls their attention to these “first things,” one of which was, the resurrection of the Christ from among the dead, and which they had admitted, as premises for an argument against a heresy that had been introduced among them by “false apostles;” who, teaching the pagan dogma of the existence of an immortal soul in every descendant of the first Adam, said “there is no resurrection of dead persons;” or what is the same thing differently expressed, “saying that the resurrection is past already.” They concluded that resurrection was useless, if human souls, as they believed, were immortal, and went to heaven at their separation from their bodies at death. But their premises were false, for Paul teaches that where no resurrection is there is no future life; and this future life by resurrection he declared to be the result wholly and solely of the resurrection of the Christ, which he had testified to be scriptural, and which they had admitted.

Having settled the question of resurrection, he went on to “declare the gospel which he preached to them.” He “files his declaration,” as the lawyers say, in what remains of the chapter. In this we find his points, such as, the coming of Christ, at the epoch of the resurrection of the saints; His reign till he has put down all enemies; the delivering up of the kingdom at the destruction of death, the last enemy; baptism for the resurrection from among the dead, the kind of body with which the dead rise, that it is glorious, incorruptible, powerful,

and spiritual; being the image of the Second Adam, the life-imparting Spirit, the Second Man, the Lord from heaven, the Heavenly One: the necessity of this, being because the kingdom of God is indestructible, so that they who are to inherit or possess it must be incorruptible; the transformation of those saints who are alive at the coming of Christ, and who shall therefore be exempted from death; the victory of the saints through Jesus; and so forth. These are the points of the apostle's declaration filed on this fifteenth chapter of his letter to the Corinthians; points from which the reader may form some idea of the gospel preached by Paul; and judge whether the pulpit orators of the Gentiles have any scriptural pretensions to be in fellowship with his teaching. The apostle's points thus declared were sustained by "the testimony of God," called also "the testimony of Christ;" and many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptised; and being thus obedient, they henceforth "waited for the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ," that "with Him" they might possess "the world," "the kingdom," "judge angels," and "inherit all things." This was something like glad tidings—good news to all who laid hold of them, and acquired a right to them in recognising Jesus as the anointed Son of God and heir of all these things, and in being united to his name for repentance, remission of sins, and resurrection to the kingdom of Jehovah, destined to subvert all other kingdoms, and to stand for evermore.

Having discoursed thus for some two hours or so, the meeting was closed. Our friends from Fine Creek expressed themselves as well satisfied with this annihilation of this theological Bomarsund. The stronghold of human tradition was in ruins. They saw that Paul does not declare the gospel in two brief texts; but only a very few of the "first things" treated of before he was pressed by the Spirit to speak of Jesus. Besides the inherent power of the testimony, they were much strengthened when they perceived the weakness of the enemy. "Never," said one of them, "have I felt so strong in the faith, as since I have witnessed the feebleness of Mr. Coleman's exposition of Campbellism as the gospel Paul preached, in his attempt to convict you of preaching another, and therefore, a false gospel!" Alas, for him; he made a plunge: and sunk like lead, to rise no more!

On the morrow, I took the packet boat for Richmond en route for King William county, where I arrived by the help of brother Davis on Tuesday afternoon, at the hospitable abode of brother J.B. Edwards, under whose shadow for many years past, we have been refreshed after the burden and heat of the day. This is true alike of all the brethren in that region; of brethren King, Littlepage, Edwards, Robins, &c., who, under all discouragements, have firmly defended the faith, and stood by it when all but ready to expire under the miasma of rampant and triumphant foolishness. But here we will rest awhile, as, in fact, we did; for no appointment awaited me till the ensuing Friday. In our next we shall conclude our visit to Virginia for 1854.

EDITOR.

* * *

BAPTISM.

It is strange that the action of gospel obedience should have occupied so much time, and so many volumes to define. Water is admitted to be the medium through which it is performed; and that the terms used in connection with its administration are burial, planting, birth, "body

washed.” Can a man be buried, or a seed planted, without being put out of sight? And is not a birth an emergence from a cavity in which the thing born was previously concealed? Then water baptism is a being put out of sight in water, and to be born of it is to emerge from the bosom of the deep.

EDITOR.

* * *

BAPTISM AN OBSTACLE OF PROGRESS.

“Baptism,” said an unbaptised friend to us the other day, “Is an obstacle to your progress. If it were not for that (and I commend you for your tenacity) your adherents would increase considerably.”

“There are several of the Campbellite Church in this city,” said another, “who say, they would unite with us if it were not for that second immersion.”

To the former friend we replied, that we were fully aware of it; but that if another never united with us because of baptism we must still maintain the Apostolical position, our object being, not to found and build up a multitudinous sect for our own individual profit; but to bring men to an intelligent obedience of the good message concerning the kingdom AS THE ONLY SCRIPTURAL PREPARATION TO MEET THE LORD AT HIS APPEARING.

It would be easy to gather a crowd of professors into an ecclesiastical society, provided they were not called upon to obey the gospel: for although Jesus has revealed himself as “the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey him,” and to none else, there is nothing that carnal pietism revolts from so instinctively as obedience. It will believe and do any thing and every thing not required of it; but the thing commanded for the “obedience of faith” is just the thing that it will not submit to.

With our latter friend we agreed, that an immersion founded upon the belief of the Campbellite definition of the gospel is of no more efficacy than infant sprinkling, to which most Protestant immersionists object because it is not preceded by faith; rightly judging that without faith no religious act or ceremony is acceptable to God. But an erroneous faith is no more justifying than no faith—they are in this matter virtually equivalents. We reject the Campbellite definition of the gospel as erroneous; and are able to prove that the gospel patronised by that sect is not the gospel of Christ. Now, men are justified by the belief of the true gospel, and not by the action of immersion; though it is true at the same time, that they cannot be justified without it. If they be ignorant, or faithless, of the true gospel they have nothing in their hearts to be counted for righteousness, justification, or remission of sins, in being immersed. Their immersion, therefore, goes for nothing; and we say, get faith, get wisdom, get understanding; and then you will be the subject of the “one baptism.” It is the quality, not the quantity of members, that gives strength to a church. We go in for quality, being satisfied that as soon as our Campbellite friends come to understand and appreciate the doctrine taught as it deserves, and as they ought, a second or a fifteenth immersion will be no obstacle to their rendering a ready and hearty obedience to the gospel of that kingdom, which Jesus and the apostles preached, and which he has promised to all that love God and “do his commandments.”

EDITOR.

* * *

From the Colonist.

EZEKIEL'S PROPHECY OF THE BREAKING OF THE MIGHTY POWER OF RUSSIA AND HER CONFEDERATES IN THE LATTER DAYS.

"We believe that the Most High who ruleth in the kingdom of men, will maintain the right, that Russia will be beat back into her own fastness, and Turkey and her noble allies be crowned with victory."

—Wesleyan paper, May 4.

Mr. Editor: —In the editorial from which the above is extracted, the writer states that "holding the views he does, he cannot conceive such a calamity"—as the defeat of Turkey by Russia, "at all probable." Such an event would altogether be opposed to his conception of what is right. And, therefore, he "regards the publication of confident assertions of Russia's success, drawn from the alleged certainty of unfulfilled prophecy, as inopportune."

I know of no other articles to which the Wesleyan can have reference, except those written by myself, and published in your paper. And I cannot see why these should be regarded as "inopportune," that is, unseasonable. If there be clergymen—such as the Wesleyan minister at Yarmouth, who "finds the whole story" of the present war, in the "Prophecy against Gog—Ezekiel 38 and 39,"—who give perfectly absurd and false interpretations of prophecy, in order to prove the defeat of Russia in this war, and, if these perversions of the sure Word of prophecy are published by the Christian Messenger, and favourably regarded by the Provincial Wesleyan; what but sheer prejudice, or a desire to keep the people in ignorance of unpalatable truths, than cause the latter to regard interpretations of an opposite character to those of brother Wilson's, of Yarmouth, as so inopportune. No man of common sense, the Wesleyan editor not excepted, can read the 38th and 39th chapters of Ezekiel, and not perceive how remote from the plain truth are the speculations of the Yarmouth minister, as published in the Christian Messenger of the 4th instant.

He agrees with myself in believing the Autocrat of all the Russias, to be the person called by the Spirit, Gog, and the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal; and this is a very material point. He then proceeds to tell us that Russia is described in the 38th chapter of Ezekiel, as invading "the house of Togarmah!" that is, as he says, "the modern Turks." But, plainly seeing that the invasion is said to be against "the mountains of Israel," "my people of Israel," and "the land of Israel," he endeavours to wriggle out of his difficulties by asking, "does not Turkey hold Palestine? Would not Russia like to grasp it? Besides, may we not take Israel here in a large spiritual sense?" And in this way he satisfies himself, that a predicted invasion of the land and people of Israel, may mean an attack upon Turkey, or something else!

"The helpers of Turkey" he finds in verses 5 and 6, namely, "Persia, Ethiopia, Libya, and the bands of Gomer," which latter, he says, mean England and France. In this, I believe, he is correct; and seeing that Gomer was the father of Togarmah, as we read in the 10th chapter of Genesis, I am inclined to think that "the house of Togarmah of the north quarters" means a people more nearly related to France and England than the Turks are, who came from beyond the river Euphrates. Is it not probable that the Germans may be meant? And if so, then the German powers and "all their bands" will be in league with Russia when Ezekiel's prophecy receives its accomplishment. "The conflict is to be beyond measure awful;" this, he who runs may read. "The RESULT, according to his understanding of the prophet, is "the utter overthrow of Gog in the great valley down which flow the Don and the Volga, down which

Russia marches her troops to the scene of the present conflict, the grand passage way of Russia—EASTWARD of the Black Sea. Driven back from the Danube, Russia may retreat to this valley, there make her final stand, and sustain her decisive defeat.” “Such are the speculations of brother Wilson,” writes the correspondent of the Christian Messenger, who furnishes the sketch of the lecture; and the outline being, no doubt, very much in accordance with the views of the Wesleyan editor, he says, “we should much like to see it.” The publication of such arrant nonsense, for an exposition of the 38th and 39th chapters of Ezekiel, I suppose he regards as opportune, and well “calculated to produce conviction on intelligent minds!” I wish that those who read this, would likewise peruse the two chapters in Ezekiel, which brother Wilson has so twisted and interpreted (!) to prove the defeat of Russia in the present war. Those who do so will see, without any difficulty, that if the house of Togarmah means the Turks, they will, at the time predicted by Ezekiel, be allies of Russia, as will also Persia, Ethiopia, Libya, Gomer, and all his bands, and people with them. The student of Ezekiel will also learn that this formidable confederacy of nations, headed by Russia, will, at some future time, when God’s nation is dwelling safely in their own land, “ascend and come like a storm like a cloud to cover the land.” “I will bring thee against my land,” saith Jehovah, “that the heathen may honour me, when I shall be sanctified in thee, O Gog, before their eyes.” Further on he will learn, that five-sixths of this immense host of Gentiles, confederated with Russia, as the leading power of the day, shall be destroyed—not in a valley on the east of the Black Sea—but, on the mountains, and in the land of Israel; not by “Turkey and her noble allies,” but by the power of God, who shall “go forth and fight against those nations, as when he fought in the day of battle;” in the days of Joshua, for instance. “I will plead against him,” saith the Lord, “with pestilence and with blood; and I will rain upon him, and upon his bands, and upon the many people that are with him, an overflowing rain, and great hailstones, fire and brimstone. Thus will I magnify myself and sanctify myself; and I will be known in the eyes of many nations, and they shall know that I am the Lord.”

What astounding changes must occur ere this prophecy can be fulfilled, what an amazing expansion of the power of Russia must there be, ere she can lead on the forces of the world, “to the battle of the great day of God Almighty!” Yet, it must come; no human power can set aside the decree of the Eternal One. “He has spoken and it shall come to pass.”

The present war will, I believe, give Russia possession of Constantinople. Daniel 11: 40, proves positively that Russia will overwhelm Turkey. This must be the first step towards the subjugation of all those nations who will give their power unto her, and be her confederates, when they receive the reward of their iniquities at the hand of God, upon the mountains of Israel.

How lamentable is the ignorance of the Wesleyan and brother Wilson, upon this subject, how contrary is the truth to their notions of what is right! The Wesleyan should remember that He “who rules over the kingdom of men, giveth it to whomsoever he will, and setteth up over it the basest of men,”—Daniel 4: 17.

J. R. L.

HALIFAX, N.S., May.

* * *

A CLERGYMAN’S EXPERIENCE OF SOCIETY.

[For the satisfaction of the reader, it may be noted that the papers which will appear under the above title are not only founded upon fact, but are literal records of facts. The writer of the diary was, for a considerable time, the curate of a large parish in England.]

It has often been said, let a man but write down his chapter of human experience; in the forcible language of truth let him make known his struggles; in the battle he has waged with ignorance and selfishness, let him exaggerate no triumph, conceal no defeat, and he will not fail to touch human hearts. One hears men talk of eventful lives. Why, every life is full of events. Seize upon the first wretched pauper that you meet—he could tell you things which should make your heart throb with pity and indignation. You—strong in intellect, knowing the world, exalted in social rank—would acknowledge that the vilest can claim brotherhood with the noblest. . . .

[We omit the rest of this, and pass on to the period when the writer was preparing for ordination.]

It was my fate to be ordained. Honestly, in looking back to the whole series of events, I cannot divine by what exertion of my own will, at any particular crisis, it could have been avoided. Of course, I might have withstood to the death. But, on the whole, I can say no more than this—I submitted to my fate. Knowing this beforehand, I trained myself into obedience. I am convinced that no disciple of Ignatius Loyola has ever gone through severer discipline, in obedience to the will of his superior, and “for the glory of God,” than I did, in the most painful struggle between inclination and destiny. . . . Still, or perhaps as a consequence of this, I formed the most brilliant conceptions of my future career. I honoured, with all my soul, the office of the teacher. I dwelt, with extraordinary satisfaction, on the thought that some word of mine—spoken with authority—might ease an aching heart. I wrought myself into the conviction that I had a message to deliver, and that I could deliver it most fitly, most beneficially, as an ordained minister of the Church of England. I was mistaken; and to those who are in the same case as I was, I dedicate these fragments. I leave it to them to decide who was in the wrong.

What offends me in the Church of England, is its glaring inconsistency. Perpetually, in the liturgy and elsewhere, it says one thing and means or does another. Very properly, no one should be presented for ordination who is deficient in learning, or what is called “godly conversation.” Of the godly conversation the less said the better; but no one who has been in the habit of mixing with the Church of England clergy, will venture to say much to their general proficiency in any learning that has the most distant connection with the requirements of this age. Why, then, perpetuate the farce of sending out men to teach, who lack the very essential quality of knowing what they should teach? Perhaps these Oxford commissioners may effect some change, if the government is wise enough, and strong enough, to carry out what I am certain they will recommend.

Well—with no indefinite conception of what I was about to undergo, well versed in the subtle arguments by which men, too weak to face the real difficulty of the ordination service, explain it away, and tempt the younger clergy to play fast and loose with conscience—I presented myself to the bishop. I do not remember that I was ever so deeply shocked as when I walked through that noble park to the splendid old mansion that lay concealed within its woods. I knew that bishops were very wealthy; but as the member of an ancient university—a Church of England institution—how could I be expected to chime in with the vile denunciations of the radical press, or the railings of the fierce democracy? On that day, however, the unconscious

indignation of a score of years was awakened in a moment. It was not the wealth—Heaven knows a bishop could find objects for charity that would swallow up an income tenfold that of the richest prelate—but it was the pomp of luxury—the powdered flunkies, who look down on humble creatures with the scorn engendered by much wearing of purple coats—the intense conviction that, from all I knew of the man—this bishop, at least did care for and idolise his wealth—it was all this, contrasted with the thought of the thousand beggars among whom I was to be sent, that drove the iron into my very soul.

We were to be examined. I remember, with painful distinctness, that I was imprisoned for three hours in a small room, to answer questions which are answered readily by National school children. Certainly I was made to write Latin, but I did not then, nor do I now, understand the connection between writing Latin prose and teaching men the way to heaven. At all events, I know that I was not examined on the subjects which I was about to teach. But, then, the bishop and the examiner had never had the charge of large parishes, and perhaps did not know what was required of us. Let me admit, however, that this was an exceptional case. I could mention several bishops, who so manage their intercourse with candidates for ordination, that whole years of vexation and disappointment cannot efface the impression.

The examination was over. Often during my life, I had listened to ordination sermons. I had been told that, in early times, the candidate passed the eve of his ordination in prayer and fasting. Wealthy canons had insisted on the necessity of self-denial. They had proved—oh! with how much force, from the New Testament and example of primitive saints—that it was only by strict subjection of the body that the soul could be brought into a fit condition for the Christian ministry. I do not mean that we were invited to become ascetics. Few men go so far as that. But, most assuredly, I have yet to learn that a luxurious banquet is the best preparative for services so intensely solemn as those for the ordination of priests and deacons. For myself, I know that I was struck with a painful sense of unreality. I thought then, and I think still, that whatever may be the customs of society, the clergy should at least endeavour to practise what they preach. They should give that one proof of their sincerity. They should stand forth to the world living examples of Christian virtues. As it is, the sight of one indolent priest does away with all the good that might be produced by a thousand sermons.

I arrived at my parish. I was now to test by actual experience, the truth of theories which, as I have already said, I had forced myself to believe. It was a large seaport town in a manufacturing district, and contained a population of several thousand souls. To an earnest man, entering upon a work so serious as that of a Christian teacher, the prospect was appalling. No language can describe the filth, misery, and utter degradation in which a large proportion of the people were sunk. Even of the rich there were scarcely a dozen families who could be described as belonging to the educated class. The majority of them had risen, by dint of honest industry, to the position of considerable wealth; they were sharp-sighted, clever men of business; but their knowledge was confined to the laws of trade and commerce. Scarcely one could date the beginning of his good fortune back than the last European war. And yet a more kind-hearted, hospitable set of men it would be hard to find. It was some time before I discovered what a depth of selfishness and narrow-mindedness was concealed beneath so fair an exterior. Some of these people belonged to the class of liberal politicians, that is, they had voted for the free-trade candidate, and were in favour of extending the franchise to their workmen. But these were exceptions to the general rule. The rest were obstinately convinced that Sir Robert Peel was a traitor to his country, and at the time of which we speak, would have willingly seen that eminent statesman carried off to the Tower, and imprisoned for life. Hence they were strongly opposed to all movements in favour of education, or any modern

improvement whatever. They were profoundly convinced, that to promote such objects was to conspire against the British constitution. As for religion, it was quite enough to attend a Sunday service. There could be no connection between that and the duties of common life.

Tradesmen, mechanics, and sailors made up the rest of the population. With persons of this class I had still to make acquaintance; but, at a glance, I saw enough to try the stoutest heart, the keenest intellect, the most consummate patience. The routine of daily and Sunday service was very simple, but it was impossible to be content with that. Had a clergyman no message to deliver except to the soul? Was it for me to witness social disorder and hesitate to proclaim the fact? Could I hold my peace in the presence of obstinate and wealthy ignorance? What was Christianity worth if it had no power to heal the ills of poverty, to speak to human hearts from a human point of view, to tell men something of the laws that should regulate society? I knew something of the questions which were vexing to the very heart of English life. I was the appointed teacher of hundreds who would never enter the place where I was to speak to them. According to a common theory among churchmen, I could hold no intercourse with them except on terms which they could not accept and I would not impose. They were used to instruments for making gold—slaves of slaves in this old land of freedom—and yet, though their masters would not or could not know it, they had hearts to love, and brains to think. Even more than this—they were “feeling after” mighty truths, which sooner or later must change the face of things. Could I lend them no helping hand, or would they accept the proffered aid from one whose very office must create suspicion? —[From the Leader.

* * *

THE PROPHECIES.

“Fürchte dich nicht, du kleine heerde: den es ist eures vaters wohlgefallen, euch das Reich zu geben.”
—Luke 12: 32.

If one doctrine is held forth more prominently than another in the writings of the Prophets and Apostles, it is the reestablishment of David’s Throne and Kingdom under the Lord Jesus Christ. So fully were the Apostles impressed with this idea, that the very first question they asked our Lord after his Auferstehung, resurrection, from the dead was, “Lord, wilt thou at this time again aufrichten (erect) the Kingdom of Israel?” Notwithstanding the Apostles were not at that time endued with power from on high, yet, that it was no vain wish, or anticipation, we shall bring forward the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to prove the correctness of our views. When the Apostle Peter addressed the Jews on the day of Pentecost, and three thousand of them became heirs to the Kingdom, and entitled to all the “glory, and honour, and unvergängliches wesen, imperishable existence,” which they would hereafter receive by a resurrection from the dead, when the time for establishing the Kingdom would arrive, by virtue of their then believing the Evangelium, Gospel, of Jesus, preached unto them by Peter, and being baptised for the resurrection of the dead, he assured them that “David being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; He, seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in Holle, Grave, neither his flesh did see corruption; this Jesus hat God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses.” And we can well imagine the irresistible force which such an appeal must have made upon the assembled multitude. In the neighbourhood of the speaker stood the tombs of their Prophets and Kings, David’s, and Solomon’s, the latter, in whose reign the Kingdom reached its zenith, and who was a glorious type of Christ, before he forsook the God of his fathers, and his heart turned

after the idols of the surrounding nations. In sad contrast to their former glory stood their beautiful Temple with the Roman abomination placed over it; and the three thousand were fully convinced that the “Sceptre had departed from Judah, and a Lawgiver from his feet, until Held, (Champion) come, whose right it is, and God will give it him.”

Matthew gives the genealogy of Jacob the father of Joseph, the husband of Mary, from Abraham in the line of David, Solomon, and Zorobabel; by which lineage it is demonstrated, that Jacob and Joseph were descendants of Abraham in the Royal line.

Luke gives the genealogy of Heli, the father of Mary, from Adam and Abraham in the line royal of David, Nathan, and Zorobabel; thus the families of Jacob and Heli were two branches of the royal house.

David’s throne and kingdom were decreed to the heirs male, as proved by 2 Samuel 7. A daughter of David, or female descendant could not, therefore, ascend the throne. The right of the Princess Mary, derived from her father Heli, of the elder branch, would consequently give way to those of Joseph, son of Jacob, though descended from the younger of David.

The families of Nathan, the elder, and of Solomon, the younger of the sons of David, by Bathsheba, united Zorobabel, governor of Judah under the Persians; from Zorobabel the family again divided into the branches terminating in Jacob and Heli.

By the marriage of Joseph, son of Jacob, with Mary, daughter of Heli, the two branches from Zorobabel were again united; so that all right and title to the throne and kingdom of David concentrated in Mary’s first born. He therefore became the head and hope of the family and nation: hence he is styled “the branch,” and at his decease the royal house in the direct line became extinct with him.

Jesus, the grandson of Heli, being born of Joseph’s wife, was born hereditary King of the Jews. Heli married the sister of the father of Elizabeth, the wife of Zechariah, and mother of John the Taufer, (dipper) who was therefore second cousin to Jesus. Elizabeth was of the daughters of Aaron; consequently Mary, daughter of Heli, and mother of Jesus, was of the house of David by her father, and of the house of Aaron by her mother; so that in her son Jesus was not only vested, by his birth, and the marriage of his mother, all kingly rights, but all rege-pontifical as well. In Jesus, therefore, is united the combined kingly and high-priestly offices of the nation of Israel: so that when the government shall be upon his shoulders, he will sit as a priest upon his throne, after the order of Melchizedec, being without predecessor or successor in the united office of King and Priest. See Zechariah 6: 12-13.

From all which it is evident, that if there lives any one who has a right to David’s throne, it can only be Jesus, and therefore he must have been raised from the dead; so that if the Jews of this age were to agree to restore David’s throne, they could not effect it, though all other things might favour, because they could not find a son of David to occupy it. Hence there is no one can re-establish it but God, who retains at his right hand the only descendant of David who is alive.

From the preceding testimonies, we conclude we have clearly proved that Jesus of Nazareth was the crucified and afterwards resurrected King of the Jews, now at the right hand of his Father, and shortly will appear in power and great glory. The next thing we have to prove is the duration of his reign. John says, “I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment

was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years.” But the locality where Christ and his Saints will reign is not defined in this text. The 10th verse of the 5th chapter in the same book supplies it. “And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God, by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation, and hast made us unto our God kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth.” Once more, “the Lord of Hosts shall reign in Mount Zion, and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously.” When the Kingdom existed under Solomon, it was a type of what it will be under the Lord Jesus Christ. There was universal peace; every man sat under his own vine and fig tree, none daring to make them afraid. All the kings of the surrounding nations paid tribute to him as lord paramount, and brought their offerings to Jerusalem. The fame of so great, wise, and rich a monarch, brought the Queen of Sheba to Jerusalem to witness his glory; and it is not improbable, when the greater than Solomon reigns in Jerusalem, the Queen of England may, like her royal sister, go on her pilgrimage likewise. For the Psalmist says, “The Kings of Tarshish and the isles shall bring presents: the Kings of Sheba and Seba shall offer gifts. Yea, all kings shall fall down before him: all nations shall serve him.” The visit of the Queen of Sheba to Solomon throws light upon a very interesting incident that occurred in Apostolic times. Solomon solved all her questions, and it is very probable gave her a copy of “the Law and Testimony,” by which a knowledge of the God of Israel was carried into her own land. This circumstance proved highly beneficial in after-times. The country of the Queen here named is generally supposed to have been Meroe, in Ethiopia, a district abounding in gold and spices, and accustomed, it appears from Acts 8: 27, to be governed by women. “And the angel of the Lord spake unto Philip, saying, Arise, and go toward the south unto the way that goeth down from Jerusalem unto Gaza, which is desert.”—Herald Future Age.

“And he arose and went and behold, a man of Ethiopia, a eunuch of great authority under Candace, Queen of the Ethiopians, who had the charge of all her treasure, and had come to Jerusalem for to worship, was returning; and sitting in his chariot, read Esaias the prophet.” The coming of the eunuch to Jerusalem to worship was predicted by the prophet Zephaniah. “From beyond the river of Ethiopia my suppliants, even the daughter of my dispersed, shall bring mine offering.” The eunuch filled an office under Candace, similar to that now held by Lord Aberdeen under Victoria; he was prime minister, or what we now call First Lord of the Treasury. Philip preached unto him the Evangelium von Jesu, (Gospel of Jesus,) and by him a knowledge of the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, were carried into his native land, and promulgated to his country.

“Not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble are called.” But there have always been some, and the eunuch is of the number. The time for the Saints to possess the kingdom under the whole heaven is near at hand. The present rupture between Turkey and Russia will produce that crisis. The sun power of Rome was darkened under the pouring out the wrath of the fifth schale, (cup,) and Turkey must be dried up before that great and notable day of the Lord can come. “And the sixth angel poured out his schale (cup) upon the great river Euphrates; and the water thereof was dried up, that the way of den Konigen von Aufgang der Sonne (the kings of the risings of the sun) might be prepared.” It is cheering to the believer to know that he is now living in that small period of time denominated by Daniel “the time of the end,” and that probably he may live to see the consummation of all the glorious verheisungen, (promises,) spoken of by the mouth of all the holy prophets since the

foundation of the world. —Luke.

I believe that the second advent of Christ is spoken of in Scripture not only as a point, but as a period of time; not only as regarding the mere fact of his coming, but also of his stay during a lengthened period, in which many and distinct acts are to be performed, commencing with the “resurrection of the just,” and closing with the “resurrection of the unjust.”—Note by the Rev. Mourant Brock, M.A., Chaplain to the Bath Penitentiary. —Brit. North American, Halifax, N.S.

* * *

THE APOSTOLICITY OF ROMANISM. —This is maintained by the Pope’s “children,” but denied by Protestants. If by “apostolicity” is meant existence contemporary with Peter and Paul, let it be granted. Protestantism gains nothing by the denial, and Romanism in essence did exist in the apostolic age, and is thus indicated by Paul, brother in Christ to “the first pope,” as papists style St. Peter—“The Mystery of Iniquity,” saith he, “doth already work:” it was out of this that Romanism, called in scripture “Mystery,” sprung forth into hideous manifestation when the pagan constitution of the Roman Empire was superseded by the revolution began by Constantine, the murderer of his son, and completed by Theodosius. So long as the Roman government continued pagan, “the Mystery of Iniquity,” which in its full manifestation is more cruel and destructive of liberty than paganism, could not openly show itself: but all political let and hindrance being turned out of the way it displayed itself as a superstition, which, in the words of St. Peter’s “beloved brother Paul,” “forbids to marry and commands to abstain from meats.” Hence the origin of priest’s houses for male and female devotees who dedicate their bodies to “the church,” and abstinence from beef steaks and mutton chops on Friday and during “Lent.”

* * *

A FREE GOSPEL. —The Louisville Examiner tells a story of a church member who had always been more remarkable for opening his mouth to say amen than opening his purse. He had, on one occasion, taken his usual place near the preacher’s stand, and was making his response with great admiration. After a burst of burning eloquence from the preacher he clasped his hands and cried out in a kind of ecstasy: “Yes thank God! I have been a Methodist for twenty-five years and it hasn’t cost me twenty-five cents!” “Bless your stingy soul!” was the preacher’s emphatic reply.

* * *

ARGUMENTS IN FAVOUR OF ROMANISM. —The amount of crime in Protestant and Roman Catholic countries stands in contrast thus:

England (Protestant) for each million of inhabitants per annum	4
Ireland (Catholic)	19

Belgium	18
France	31
Austria	36
Bavaria	30
Papal States	100

The number of illegitimate births per annum, in different cities, are as follows:

London (Protestant)	4 per cent
Paris (Catholic)	32 per cent
Brussels	35 per cent
Munich	25 per cent
Vienna	51 per cent
Rome	3500, in the Pope's own.

How does Romanism promote crime?

Protestants are taught that sin destroys both body and soul, while Romanism teaches that sin does not destroy, provided the perpetrator of any crime will purchase a pardon from the priest, which is done by a sum of money so small, as to render it plain to every Catholic that for the benefit of the priest, the more sin the better.

* * *

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

The Fourth Volume of the Herald closes with the current number. In reminding the reader of this fact, I have the satisfaction of being able to add, that its position is not worse than it was a year ago; though the increase of its circulation falls far short of what its friends acknowledge to be its merits. I do not think that its increase has exceeded twenty subscribers; which, however, is better than none and discontinuances to boot, which has been its fortune in former times.

A book is cheap or otherwise according to the importance and excellence of its contents. This is not the rule, however, by which booksellers and the unenlightened, judge. These estimate a volume by the number of its pages, the thickness of the book, and the character of the binding! But we do not set forth the Herald with such unenlightening claims as these; we base its value upon the substantial and Scriptural aliment it presents for the mind seeking to know what the truth revealed in the Bible is, whereby a man may attain to an inheritance in the kingdom of God. Its success in extracting honey from Paradise is acknowledged by its friends; some of whom assure me that they consider it a cheap publication, because of the preciousness of the instruction they derive from it.

But notwithstanding this, it appears to me that they are too well satisfied with their own individual enjoyment; that is, they do not exert sufficiently what influence they may have for the extension of its circulation, and making it self-supporting. To sustain a periodical that advocates a system of truth repudiated by nearly all the world, is an expensive undertaking; and were the Herald left to depend upon the revenue supplied by the single copies subscribed for by individuals in this country, the present number would of necessity be the last. By scanning our receipts it will be seen, that a few of its friends (to particularise whom might

appear invidious) by more considerateness than others, being more liberal of their surplus funds, are the helpers by which its continuance has been made possible. Will those who do nothing but subscribe for a single copy, and yet acknowledge the value of the Herald, see if they cannot increase its list? Its editor is not parsimonious of his endeavours to bring out "all the counsel of God." He does not keep it back, saying to his readers, "I have some very important information in my head, which I will print for your benefit if you will raise my subscription list to 10,000!" No; he brings it out as it comes up, whether he shall receive enough for the year's expenses or not; and one article is frequently acknowledged to be worth the price of the whole volume. Is this reciprocity? Is it cooperation? Still we persevere.

Many thanks, however, to those whose promptitude has furnished supplies for carrying on the work from month to month, which come and go with astounding rapidity. January will soon be here, and with it the first number of Volume Fifth. Thenceforth we shall be visiting the Post Office for orders and remittances with considerable regularity, always in hope of finding some of the needful to pay the printer, who never looks so sweet and pleasant as when he beholds us cash in hand.

To my friend, Mr. R. Robinson, in England, the Herald is under more obligation than I am able to express; if all its subscribers were Robertson, Lemmon & Co, the Herald would have nothing to do, but to thank God, and go-a-head; but under the present economy it has to do this not seldom dubious of results. Adieu, then, to 1854, and all its literary labours, anxieties, and fears! 1855 is hard upon us, and who knows what its future may produce? We shall see; and in the meantime we wish our friends much pleasure in the contemplation and anticipation of the Age to Come.

EDITOR.

* * *