

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, AUGUST, 1855—
Volume 5—No. 8

BICHENO'S THOUGHTS ON HIS TIMES.

REVISED BY THE EDITOR.

The kingdom which God is to set up under the Messiah, according to the prophets, is to be a kingdom of righteousness, peace, and joy. “Unto us a Child is born—the government shall be upon his shoulder.” “Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end.”—Isaiah 9: 6-7; “The wolf and the lamb shall feed together.”—Isaiah 65: 25; “He shall speak peace to the heathen.”—Zechariah 9: 10—who have long been the prey of destroyers, and of one another. If we contemplate the principles of the kingdom of Jesus Christ, they promise fair to produce the enjoyment of all that which the prophets predicted. But where is the effect? The annals of the “Christian world,” as well as those of the Pagan, discover to us little more than the history of ambition, superstition and bloodshed. The faith of this kingdom began in piety towards God, and in love and peace to all mankind. But systems of error, superstition, and oppression soon interrupted its progress, and perverted its principles. Christianity has been converted into a system of commerce, and those called the ministers of Christ, have been a corporation of traders in the souls and liberties of mankind.

Were I to attempt to define the character of Antichrist, I should say, It is all that which opposes itself to the faith and hope of the kingdom of Christ, whether it flow from the ecclesiastical or civil powers. The civil constitutions of nations, as well as the ecclesiastical, so far as they accord with, or have a tendency to promote, that pride and that ambition which lead to oppression, persecution, and war, are Antichristian. Whatever in religion is destructive of union among true believers, which leads to domination over conscience, to hinder free inquiry after truth, or any way oppresses and persecutes men for matters only cognisable by God, is Antichristian. Wherever there is intolerance; wherever we find conditions of communion among Christians imposed, which Christ hath not clearly enjoined; wherever creeds and modes of worship are enforced by human power, and men are made to forfeit any of their civil rights, or are stigmatised on these accounts, there is that spirit which is not of God. Wherever one Christian, or a number of Christians, assumes the seat of authority and judgment in the church of Christ, whether they call for fire to destroy those who dissent from them, or only exclude them from their communion and affection, there is a portion of that spirit of Antichrist which has so long opposed itself to the benign principles of the kingdom of the Prince of Peace, has been the cause of so many evils to humanity, and the occasion of making the inconsiderate esteem the amiable yet distinct and uncompromising

religion of Jesus, as a source of mischief, instead of benevolence? Alas, how much of this spirit remains amongst us all! How few have learned that “In Jesus Christ circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God.”—1 Corinthians 8: 19.

But we are assured from the scriptures, that all these usurpations and Antichristian principles shall have an end; and that the gospel of the kingdom shall produce the various happy effects which are predicted. The religion of the age shall then no longer consist in meat and drink, but in righteousness, peace, and joy—Romans 14: 17; the practice of justice, the cultivation of harmony, and the diffusion of happiness.

The question is, When may we hope to see these predictions accomplished? Long have the faithful few had their eyes fixed on the promises of God with ardent expectation, and been crying, “How long, O Lord, ere thou wilt avenge the blood of thy saints, and create Jerusalem a quiet dwelling-place, and Zion the joy of all the earth? Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly!” “Behold I come at an hour when ye think not! blessed is he that watcheth.”

Some suppose that all our inquiries about the time of the accomplishment of the predictions relative to the downfall of Antichrist, which is to prepare the way for the peaceful kingdom of the Redeemer, are in vain. If so, wherefore is it said, “Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear, the words of this prophecy?”—Revelation 1: 3. “Here is wisdom—let him that hath understanding count the number of the beast.”—13: 18.

Though the meaning of the prophecies is necessarily wrapt up in modes of expression not easily to be understood, as they would otherwise operate against their own accomplishment; yet they may not be absolutely inscrutable; and especially when their accomplishment approaches nearer, and increasing light is cast upon them by the arising of circumstances connected with them. This seems to be intimated by the angel, Daniel 12: 4, 9-10. “But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end: many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased. The words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end. None of the wicked shall understand, but the wise shall understand.” The meaning of these words, according to the learned Dr. Lowth, is, “The nearer the time approaches for the final accomplishment of the prophecy, the more light shall men have for the understanding it; for the gradual completion of this and other prophecies shall direct observing readers to form a judgment concerning those particulars which are yet to be fulfilled. From hence we may observe the reason of the obscurity of several prophecies in scripture; and it may be observed, that generally those prophecies are most obscure, the time of whose completion is furthest off. For the same reason, in interpreting the prophecies relating to the latter times of the world, the judgment of the latter writers is to be preferred before that of the ancients, because the moderns living nearer the time when the events were to be fulfilled, had surer marks to guide them in their expositions.” Lowth’s Exposition Daniel 12: 4, 9, he paraphrases thus: “Be content with what has been made known to thee (Daniel): for the fuller explication of this prophecy is deferred till the time of its accomplishment draws near.” The opinion, then, of this learned commentator was, that God would so dispose things that observing men should, from the signs of the times, be led to understand the true meaning of those prophecies, relating to the latter times of the world, which had not been before understood, so as hence to foresee the approaching downfall of Antichrist, and those other great events connected with it; and by which means the divine word will be much accredited, men be cured of their infidelity, and God hereby be honoured.

My mind has of late been much affected by the appearances of things in the Anti-christian world, and with the occurrences which have, within these few years, burst upon us—occurrences which are unparalleled in the history of nations.

In America a revolution has taken place, which is singular in its consequences, and especially as they concern the fate of religion. We have long been told that if religion were left unprotected by establishments, and unsupported by emoluments, it would soon be borne down, and all its solemnities forsaken and despised. The experiment has here been made, and fact demonstrates the fallacy of such conclusions. The people are eased of a heavy burden, and what is called “Christian religion” flourishes more than ever. State hirelings have withdrawn, but its species of piety, virtue, and charity increase. But a few years after this grand event, one of the first nations of Europe, long enslaved, and blinded by superstition, at once broke its chains, and tore away the bandages with which Popish priests had bound the eyes of the multitude. Civil liberty had long been forgotten, and, for more than a hundred years, no liberty of conscience was permitted to the insulted people: and, as a nation, they had for ages been made, by their tyrants, the scourge of all their neighbours. This people have, to the astonishment of the whole civilised world risen up as in one day, and, in opposition to the combined power of their king, their priests, and nobles, have dared to say: “We will be free; we will have just and equal laws; no man shall be punished, but as the law commands. The poor as well as the rich shall be protected; conscience is the property of God, and every man shall worship his Maker as he pleases; we will never make war but in self-defence, and will embrace all men as our brethren.” And this was not the resolution of a few—it was the solemn covenant of twenty-six millions of people. What a phenomenon in the history of man! What an epoch in the history of the church! But German despots and their creatures, whose existence depends on the ignorance and servility of mankind, fearing the influence of such an example, have been exerting all their power to crush this rising spirit of liberty, and to support the falling Papacy. By whose hand was it that they and their remnant were driven back with loss and shame? His, who maketh the wrath of man to praise him. Alas! the calamities which opposition to the most benevolent sentiments has occasioned! The passions of men have been enraged, and in the paroxysm of resentment, fear and despair, the best of causes—the cause of liberty—has been stained by the commission of crimes which afflict a great majority of their own nation, and all the genuine friends of liberty and justice throughout the world. None can contemplate them but with the keenest anguish, except those who are watching for occasions to slander all who resist oppressors. * The circumstances of this wonderful revolution, mark it as an event of vast importance, and as probably big with consequences beyond all conjecture.

* Mr. Bicheno here alludes to the Reign of Terror; which was divine vengeance on France for slaying “The Witnesses,” in the previous century. It was called at the time, “National Justice;” and though terrible, it was richly deserved by the French. —EDITOR.

The prophecies respecting the downfall of the Antichristian usurpations, must have their accomplishment in some era; it may be the present. It is therefore surely worth our while to inquire how far the predictions of God’s Word will agree with the rise and progress of known events.

Thus it has appeared to me, and the more I examine and think upon the subject, the more I am convinced, that the last days spoken of by God’s servants, the prophets, are fast approaching; “When Babylon the Great shall come in remembrance, and God will avenge the blood of his saints, and the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of the Lord,

and of his Christ;" by not only professing the religion of Jesus, but by acting under its influence, and copying after his example, who was meek and lowly in heart, and who came, "not to destroy men's lives, but to save them." And this kingdom shall not be a kingdom of anarchy, but a state of things, in which the governors and the governed, and all the different ranks in society, will unite to promote the general good. It is not impossible that the present shaking of nations should bring about this desirable event. Some, however, object, that the progress of the French revolution has been marked with too much outrage and blood; and that the persons engaged in it are of a character too bad to admit it to be from God—a work which he approves, and which he intends as the introduction to those happy days of which the prophets have spoken.

It would not be a very difficult task to prove that those German princes and foes to liberty, who have opposed the emancipation of France from the yoke of royal and priestly tyrants, have been the occasion of almost all the horrors which have been committed, and at their hands will much of the blood be required, which has been, or may hereafter be, shed in this mighty and interesting struggle, between men roused up by the severity of their sufferings, to claim the rights they had long been robbed of, and those continental tyrants, who, for ages, have been the scourges of the human race. But, granting that the leaders in the French revolution have been as atrociously wicked as represented, this does not, in the slightest degree, affect our hypothesis.

(After justice had been avenged on the French nation, it was made use of, under Buonaparte, to scourge the adjacent countries. —EDITOR.)

Though many of the instruments which Providence employs may be unworthy characters, and though the extraneous evil connected with the revolution in France may afflict our hearts, and provoke not only our censure, but our indignation, still the great principles of it may demand our homage, and the end to be hoped for—the triumphs of truth and justice over superstition, persecution, and oppression—may excite our joy.

Cyrus waded through the blood of kings and armies to plunder the earth, and subject nations to his will; (he spared not children, Isaiah 13: 18;) but we have been taught to venerate his memory, as the righteous man of the east. And why? Not because all his exploits, as his, were righteous, but because we have seen the issue, and been informed, that he was made an instrument in the hand of God, to execute his righteous judgments; that it was He who gave nations before him, and made him rule over kings, that Babylon might sit in the dust, and captive Israel go free. What was Henry the Eighth who began our reformation? A monster. What were his motives? The gratification of his lusts. What were the means which he employed? —how blind is man! We only know, that in God dwell the attributes of wisdom, justice, and goodness, but we are incapable of tracing the sphere of their operations. He saw fit to make use of the Jewish rulers, and to direct the worst of human passions, for the purpose of effecting our redemption, by the death of Jesus Christ. Are established systems of superstition and tyranny to be overthrown by a few smooth words of benevolence and wisdom? Happy if they could! Are the dragon and the beasts which have so depopulated the earth for ages, to perish without convulsions? Read: "They have shed the blood of saints and prophets, and thou hast given them blood to drink, for they are worthy."—Revelation 16: 6. When this period shall arrive, there will be much work to do, for the execution of which the meek of the earth are by no means qualified. To censure disorder, to shudder at bloodshed, and to practise mercy, is our present duty; for neither God's secret counsels, nor his providential judgments, are to be the rule of our conduct in the absence of the king. We know

who hath said, "Love your enemies, and do good to them that hate you." This is our rule until He comes.

Sir Isaac Newton had a very sagacious conjecture, which he told to Dr. Clark, from whom Mr. Whiston says he received it, viz.: "that the overbearing tyranny and power of the Antichristian party, which hath so long corrupted Christianity, and enslaved the world, must be put a stop to and broken in pieces by the prevalence of infidelity, for some time, before primitive Christianity could be restored; which seems to be the very means now working in Europe for the same good and great end of Providence." "Possibly," says the relater, "he might think that our Saviour's words—Luke 18: 8—imply it. 'When the Son of Man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?' Or, possibly, he might think no other way so likely to do it in human affairs. It being, I acknowledge, too sadly evident, that there is not at present religion enough to put a stop to such Antichristian tyranny and persecution upon any genuine principles of Christianity."—Whiston's Essay on the Revelation of St. John. —Second Edition Page 321. Printed in the year 1744.

This was a very sagacious conjecture indeed; and it is not unlikely that it may soon be realised. (This was written in 1793. It afterwards turned out as Sir Isaac conjectured. Infidel France became the scourge of the Papal powers. —EDITOR.) There are reasons for fearing that ere long infidelity will as generally prevail as the name of Christianity has done. It is vain to flatter. It is too evident, that though there has been a genuine Christianity of individuals, yet that of nations has been only in name. "By their fruits ye shall know them." The generality of governments have been oppressive; a great majority of the ministers of religion have not only been men of the world, who have sought after nothing but gain, but they have been cruel lords over their heritages, persecuting instead of feeding their flocks; teaching men to hate, oppress and murder one another, for opinions, instead of inculcating those lessons of love taught by Jesus Christ. Among the rich and great, even the forms of religion are scarcely to be found. The spoil of the poor is in their houses, and because they are full, they forget God, and are waxed wanton. If we descend, pride, covetousness, deceit, oppression, riot, impurity, irreligion, impiety, perjury, and baseness present themselves, without secret search, at every step. And yet these are called Christians! But he who was taught the religion of Christ, not by man, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ, hath said, "Faith without works is dead." Alas! they have walked in a vain show. But it is probable that this disguise, before the consummation of all things, will be stripped off, and the nations be made to appear in their true character, and thus may be fulfilled, in a sense that has not been suspected, that prediction of the prophet Isaiah—chapter 25: 7: "He will destroy the face of the covering (the mask) cast over all people, and the veil that is spread over all nations. My thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are my ways your ways, saith the Lord."

The French revolution, then, may be of God, and designed to issue in good, although conducted by infidels, and disgraced by outrages which nothing can justify.

ANALECTA EPISTOLARIA.

THE GOSPEL IN MILWAUKEE.

Dear Bro. Thomas: —Since I last wrote to you, informing you of my own immersion by brother Wilson, of Geneva, Kane. Illinois, I have had the pleasure of immersing two very intelligent believers into "the Hope of Israel, for which," says Paul, "I am bound with this

chain,” and a prisoner in Rome. These brethren are Daniel McNealage and James Clark. The former was immersed into the Baptist denomination; the latter, into the Campbellite theory of remission of sins as ministered at South Bridge Hall, Edinburgh, where he heard you discourse in '48 or '49, from which time he has found no peace until now. Like the Ethiopian, they are now going on their way rejoicing. Several others are earnestly searching Moses and the Prophets, Christ and the Apostles, which I trust will end in the obedience of faith, and love, and living hope.

I herewith send you a new subscriber for the Herald. He used to be a strong Adventist, then a Storrite. He has read the Expositor from the beginning; and has been so well pleased with most of the articles from your pen re-published there, that he has concluded to take the Herald. He is an intelligent man; but like most Adventists, would like to call all pious people good Christians and brethren, whether they are subjects of the “one baptism,” or not. I think the Herald just the thing he needs, especially that article in it published about three months ago on Christ’s Baptism. “Thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.”

Some out here felt much surprised that you took no notice of Mr. Cook’s review of your lectures in Rochester, N.Y., at their last Conference. For my part, I thought that brother Marsh answered him completely, and that, too from your own pen. But as Mr. Cook solicited a notice from you, I thought then, that a compliance with said wish might have done good with that class, who acquiesce in almost everything that proceeds from him.

Earnestly desiring you much success in your labours of love, and that many may be turned from error to the truth, and be approved in the day of the appearing, I remain,

Yours Rejoicing in the Blessed Hope,

ROBERT HARPER.

Milwaukee, Wis., May 7, 1855.

* * *

J. B. COOK, JUSTIN MARTYR, AND PAUL.

That was a principal reason why I left Mr. Cook alone in his glory. No doubt he thought he had used me up in his review; but then brother Marsh timidly interposed, and salting him with my words, eat him up so completely as to leave scarcely a bone for me to pick. Now, I am generously disposed towards Mr. Cook, whom, though the past of his spiritual antecedents has been very eccentric, I have taken to be an amiable, well-intentioned, sincere, but hitherto unsuccessful seeker after the truth. I say, I have a very friendly feeling towards Mr. Cook; for, though he has said some very hard things against me in his reviews, that were considered as too unchristian to appear in print, and therefore suppressed, he showed me much civility and kind attention while I sojourned in Rochester. I do not mind the hard things; and, as I have said, being generously disposed, I have abstained from slaying twice the slain, and picking his bones. Time is eating up Mr. Cook’s theories, and confirming mine. I can afford to wait. I requested him to read Anatolia, and to point out all the errors he thought he could discover. He has done so; but I did not promise to criticise his criticisms. They are before the public, who can take them for what they please in the light of brother Marsh’s comments. Mr. Cook’s position in relation to the gospel is not mine; and as I believe mine to be the scriptural one, or I would not occupy it, my conclusion concerning his position is obvious. A man who cannot see the truth in relation to “the simplicity which is in Christ,”

is not likely to escape ship-wreck among the symbols of Daniel and the Apocalypse. For example, in 1840 or thereabouts, the pious and amiable Crito was the pastor of a popular Baptist church. Every one knows, that the creed believed and preached under the patronage of such an institution, is not the glad tidings of peace to the twelve tribes of Israel, to be manifested when their Messiah shall reign over them in Jerusalem upon the throne of David, as King of Israel and the nations, announced to Judah by the Lord Jesus. A popular Baptist church does not believe this; neither does it believe that the Apostles were sent to invite men to become heirs with the King of the Jews of such a kingdom as this—a kingdom to be possessed only by righteous and immortal men, who attain to justification and eternal life on condition of believing the things covenanted to Abraham and David, the things concerning Jesus, baptism into his Name, and subsequent continuance in well-doing. This used to be the faith of the Baptists long time ago; but it is esteemed as heresy by them now. The pastor of the Baptist church in Stanton Street, N.Y., is said to have this faith; but he dare not preach it to his flock, because they will not tolerate it. Popular Baptistism is Gentilism immersed. Hence, the immortality of the soul and its translation to a spirit world at death, is the gospel it adopts in common with all sects; so that it now stands associated with Episcopalianism, Presbyterianism and Methodism, as one of the “orthodox four!”

We would invite the attention of modern Gentiles, disciples of their several systems of piety, to the words of Justin Martyr, who was a Christian contemporary with the apostle John. In his “Dialogue with Trypho” he argues that the Millennium will be beyond the Resurrection, and in the Restitution of All Things, quoting Isaiah 65, and others of the prophets as proof, especially these verses, &c. When questioned by Trypho in regard to this faith, he answered, “I am not such a wretch, Trypho, as to say one thing and mean another. I have before confessed to thee that I and many others are of their opinion (belief in the Millennial Reign), so that we hold it to be thoroughly proven that it will come to pass. But, I have also signified unto thee, on the other hand, that many, even those of that race of Christians who follow not godly and pure doctrine—do not acknowledge it. For I have demonstrated to thee that these are indeed called ‘Christians;’ but they are atheists (not deniers of his existence, but without God), and impious heretics; because that in all things they teach what is blasphemous, ungodly and unsound.”

Then, after saying that he will commit his dialogue to writing that others may know his faith, because it is of God, he continues, “If, therefore, you fall in with certain who are called ‘Christians,’ who confess not this truth, but dare to blaspheme the God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in that they say there is no resurrection of the dead, but that immediately when they die, their souls are received up into heaven—avoid them, and ESTEEM THEM NOT CHRISTIANS, &c. But I, and whatsoever Christians are orthodox in all things, do know that there will be a resurrection of the flesh, and a thousand years in the city of Jerusalem, built, adorned, and enlarged according to the prophets.”

But, to return to the amiable Crito and his flock. Is it not evident, that if they had lived in the time of Justin Martyr, that he would have denied their Christianity; and have classed them with that race which followed not godly and pure doctrine; but were without God, and impious heretics, teaching what is blasphemous, ungodly and unsound? These heretics, impious as they were, were immersed professors, passed for “Christians,” and understood Christianity better than the moderns; yet because they taught the immediate translation of immortal souls into heaven at death, which led them to conclude, that there would be no resurrection of the flesh, a man who learned Christianity of the contemporaries of the apostle John, and was, doubtless, well acquainted with his judgment concerning all the current

heresies of his day, said, “avoid them, and esteem them not Christians.” But a greater authority than Justin has recorded the same sentence against them. “How say some among you, Corinthians,” asks Paul, “that there is no resurrection of the dead?” Here was the very “race of Christians” in Corinth, Justin Martyr speaks of. How came they to say there is no future resurrection? “Because,” says Justin, “they hold that souls are received up into heaven immediately when they die; which makes a future resurrection, and the millennial reign or kingdom of God unnecessary.” It is a practical denial of the truth. Now, hear the sentence of Paul upon the holders of such doctrine—

1. “If there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen;”
2. “If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain;”
3. “If our preaching be vain, then is your faith vain;”
4. If your faith be vain, then ye are yet in your sins; and consequently “not Christians;” and,
5. The so-called “asleep in Christ” are punished; and the future, therefore, to them an everlasting blank.

Our conclusion then is, that Crito and his flock, though immersed in water and professing to believe in the divine sonship of Jesus, even as the “race of Christians” indicated by Justin and condemned by Paul, are nevertheless no more entitled to be regarded as Christians than they; because they hold with those primitive heretics traditions logically destructive of the gospel of God.

But, on the supposition that Crito believed and preached the truth in 1840, we find him an apostate from that system in 1843! At this date he was no longer pastor of the flock. Something had separated them. Heresy had crept in, and the pastor and the flock were sundered. Crito had departed from their faith and embraced another; therefore, we say, he had fallen away, or apostatised, from their standard.

But he was happy, gloriously happy, in his new position; and very zealous for the propagation of his new faith and hope. And what were these?

1. That the Lord was coming in 1843;
2. That he was to burn up the world at that crisis;
3. That out of the general wreck a new earth would appear;
4. That all pious believers in the '43 movement were the living remnant that would be changed in the twinkling of an eye; and who, with all the resurrected saints, were to reign with Christ on the new earth for a thousand years;
5. That they were to reign over the beasts of the fields and the fowls of the air, as Adam did in paradise; * and consequently,
6. That there would be no restoration of the natural Israel, and no dominion over nations of mortal men for a thousand years.

* This is no joke; for I put the question to a leading preacher of the party who gave me this for the answer.

Now, these six points will give the reader a general idea of the creed of Crito and his new associates in 1843. In those days, Crito was very zealous for these traditions; and used to lampoon all who affirmed the contrary of his sixth article as “carnal Judaisers!” Before 1843, I used to maintain, and offered to show from the scriptures before the people, that all

these points were contrary to the covenanted promises of Jehovah; and that they reduced his word to falsehood and foolishness. But it was useless; infatuation reigned; and the ears of Millerism were deaf as a post to anything that controverted its Shibboleth. But time is a great enlightener. He proved the theory to be the baseless fabric of a vision, and anything but “the truth;” nay, utterly subversive of “the truth,” for its affirmations gave the lie to God.

This system of falsehood Crito and many others came at length to repudiate; and by that repudiation they confess, that for years they “loved and made a lie.” Suppose they had died while zealously preaching that invention, does Crito imagine for a moment he could have been saved? In view of the facts, it would be difficult for him to extract such a consolation from Revelation 22: 15! But Crito, who thought when he left the Baptists and plunged into Millerism that he had turned from error to the truth, began to discover that he had only exchanged one form of error for another. He began to see that the immortality of the soul, eternal torments, the non-restoration of the Jews, and the annihilation of the nations, elements of Gentilism, were but traditions subversive of the truth; and like an honest man, he renounced them, and proceeded zealously to preach the contrary. This was well. A man should always advocate what he believes to be the truth; but he should, also, be very careful first to ascertain whether what he believes be indeed true. Crito’s mind was not yet established. The last time I had the pleasure of his company his mind was occupied with some new speculations about Louis Napoleon, and an exegetic-theologico-aerial Jerusalem floating balloon-fashion over a Jerusalem below. But, I know not whether these have matured into a new proclamation. He will, no doubt, act according to the last edition of his convictions in all sincerity, if not in truth.

But, we have introduced our fictitious friend, Crito, to the notice of the reader, not so much for the sake of his opinions, as for the consideration of the various eclipses of his former self, and their startling results. When shining as a sun in the Baptist heaven, the orb of Millerism came into conjunction with him and “his people;” so that when they looked upon him his face was black as sackcloth of hair! This was a total eclipse. But, though he set upon them, he arose brightly in the heaven of ’43; but, in process of time, “CARNAL JUDAISM” formed a conjunction; and his face was again veiled in total darkness to his friends. Here, then, were two notable obscurations, not to speak of more partial ones, which involve our friend Crito in a two-fold apostasy—first, from popular Baptistism; and second, from Millerism.

Now, as Crito professes to be not only a preacher and a critic, but also a Christian, if he were at my elbow I would like to ask him a few questions bearing upon that assumption. We will, however, suppose that he is at hand, and converse with him accordingly. Let us proceed, and we shall hear him answer according to his present faith.

Editorial Dialogue with Crito.

Editor—Dost thou not, friend Crito, believe, that the scriptures are a sufficient rule of faith and practice?

Crito—Yea, verily; I admit that with all my heart.

Editor—Do they teach the existence of an immortal soul in all or any of mankind, derived by natural descent from the first man?

Crito—Certainly not; there is not the shadow of a foundation for such a notion in the Bible.

Editor—What do you think of immediate translation to heaven at death?

Crito—It is pure folly; for there being nothing in man capable of disembodied existence, there is nothing to translate.

Editor—What do you suppose led Justin Martyr and Paul’s contemporaries to deny the Resurrection and the Millennial Reign or Kingdom of God?

Crito—Doubtless, their belief of the pagan dogma of inherent immortality.

Editor—Then you believe, that when Paul argued against the heresy which taught that there was no future resurrection, he was opposing immortal soulism and translation to the stars?

Crito—There can be no doubt of it; the denial of a future resurrection and the kingdom of God were the necessary consequence of the dogma.

Editor—Then Paul and Justin were warranted in unchristianising such?

Crito—It seems so; for Paul evidently leaves a man in his sins who does not hold the truth concerning them.

Editor—Is a man in his sins, that is, one who has not been pardoned, a Christian?

Crito—He is not; for repentance and remission of sins are promised to all in becoming Christians.

Editor—May I be permitted, friend Crito, to put the question to you without offence, for I intend none, Art thou a Christian?

Crito—I hope so.

Editor—Allow me to press you a little upon this point. You know I am acquainted with your antecedents, and this knowledge it is which puzzles me to determine upon what you base your hope or conviction. Is not a believer justified from his past sins by obeying the truth?

Crito—The apostle Peter says so.

Editor—Can a man obey the truth of which he is ignorant?

Crito—If he can, the how is unknown to me.

Editor—When you entered the Baptist church did you understand the truth; and understanding, did you believe it? Be careful of your answer.

Crito—I did. When the Lord converted my soul I became a Christian, and was afterwards immersed to join the church.

Editor—I expected something better from you, friend Crito, that that! Now tell me; if in embracing Baptistism, (which teaches immortal-soul and sky-kingdomism, and which you admit Paul and Justin Martyr repudiate), you embraced the truth, why did you apostatise to Millerism?

Crito—Oh, I still believed in the divine sonship of Jesus.

Editor—And did not Justin Martyr’s “race of Christians” believe the same thing whose minds were perverted with immortal-soulism? Did you not believe in this and sky-kingdomism when you say God converted your soul?

Crito—It is too true. But you alarm me at the idea of my being an apostate.

Editor—Nearly all apostates believe that Jesus is Christ the Son of God. Judas believed this while he was tying the halter about his neck; the demons believed it and trembled; the Popes believe it; all the crowned heads of Europe believe it; those who are drunk with the blood of the saints believe it with as much assurance as you; but what good will it do for them? None; and why? Because they believe not his words which are to judge men in the last day. Will you say, then, that you distinguished yourself from this cloud of miserable sinners by believing the words, or glad tidings of the kingdom, which Jesus was sent to preach?

Crito—Nay, I will not say that, for in my day Baptists were not made by faith in that subject. It was never heard of when I joined the church.

Editor—I conclude, then, from your admissions, that when you became a Baptist you did not become a Christian. I congratulate you, Crito, upon this; for not knowing the truth you could not embrace it; and not having embraced it you could not apostatise from it; so that though an

apostate from popular Baptistism you were not an apostate from Christianity. There is hope, therefore, in your case.

Crito—But when I left the Baptists I embraced the truth in professing my faith in the coming of the Lord, which I hold to now.

Editor—In saying this you virtually admit that you did not believe in his coming while you were a Baptist; which is tantamount to saying that you did not believe the gospel; for no one can believe the gospel and deny his coming to reign on earth in power and great glory. But though you believed in his coming, you dressed it up into such a fantastic shape as to make it a very different sort of a coming to that predicted. You believed that particular truth under a mountain of rubbish which threw a deep and dismal shadow upon the veracity of God. You made him a liar by your traditions. Although he says of Israel after the flesh, in as plain language as can be spoken, “I have chosen thee, and not cast thee away,” you heaped ridicule upon all who contended for this truth; and boldly declared that he had cast them away forever! You ignored all the good things promised by Jehovah in the last twelve chapters of Ezekiel; in short, you made a whole burnt offering of all Jehovah’s goodness and truth, which you could not twist into conformity with your crotchet of ’43! Do you call that faith? Nay, rather, as Justin Martyr says of your “race” in his day, “in all things they teach what is blasphemous, ungodly, and unsound.”

Crito—Hold, Mr. Editor, you are getting very uncharitable and censorious! We were not blasphemers!

Editor—Excuse me, dear Crito, but the truth must be spoken though the heavens fall. To blaspheme one is to injure his reputation. Your traditions injured the reputation of God, who had sworn by his own life that certain things should be, which could not possibly have happened, if your teaching had been verified. But your audacious declarations have all been falsified, and God has vindicated himself in forbearing to endorse them; he has adhered to his own word, and convicted you of error from first to last.

Crito—We admit, that as Millerites we were all miserably deceived.

Editor—It is useless to deny it, for it is patent to all the world. But, Crito, I would like to know of you, which faith do you select as the foundation of your hope that you are a Christian—your Baptist or Millerite faith?

Crito—Truly, Mr. Editor, when I come to take a retrospect from the position I now occupy, I see nothing very captivating in either of them. If the belief of the Divine Sonship of Jesus is not of itself justifying, as you argue, I am of opinion that they are both equally worthless.

Editor—And pray, dear Crito, what is the position you occupy at the present time? Will you be so kind as to define it?

Crito—Well, I must confess I am not in love with definitions in theology; which is a science more conveniently professed in general than particular terms. However, as you request it, I will do the best I can in the premises. Define my position! And where shall I begin?

Editor—Truth comes first you know, and then baptism.

Crito—True, Mr. Editor, but there I’m hampered in the start; for I have just admitted that the old faiths of ’40 and ’43, from both of which I apostatised, as you say, are worthless. If you will consent to waive that point of order, and let baptism precede faith, I can soon satisfy you of the scripturality of my position. What say you?

Editor—I can’t hear of it for a moment, most worthy Crito! You admit that the faith you had before you were immersed into the Baptist church was worthless; you therefore reduce your capital to two elements, piety and immersion. Will you say that a man is justified by either or both without faith or the belief of the truth?

Crito—Indeed I will not; for it is written, “we are justified by faith;” and also, that “without faith it is impossible to please God.”

Editor—Very good. It is an intelligent belief of “the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of the Lord Jesus” acquired before immersion, that makes that immersion the “one baptism!”

Crito—If that be so, my position will not bear a definition; but if it be not so, then I would say, that I was immersed to join the church; and after experimenting in divers opinions, I successively abandoned them until I now think I am about right or nearly so; and guess that if I am not quite up to the mark I shall still be able to mend my faith until being perfected, it will be a reflex operation, repair my old immersion, and convert it into a bona fide obedience of the truth.

Editor—Alas, poor Crito, and hast thou come to this! And you are contented to enter into the presence of the Judge of the living and the dead in such a tatterdemalion attire as that! Hath God not given reason and intelligence to men? but where are thine? Crito the critic had better become Crito the catechumen; and learn what be the first principles of the oracles of God. What a position is thine? Thou mightest well say that it would not bear a definition!

Crito—Well, I am rather ashamed of it myself; but then, for a preacher and a critic, who has been taking a lead in a great movement which proclaimed the untruthfulness of everything but itself, to come out and avow himself self-deceived and no true Christian, is a crucifixion most excruciating to the flesh. I have felt, and said hard things too, of you, Mr. Editor; for when I think of what a stickler you are for “the obedience of faith,” in immersion, which cannot exist in the absence of the “one faith,” I feel mortified and vexed; and get filled with zeal for my old church position, which, I confess, has become very dilapidated since I left it, and greatly needs repairs. However, I believe the gospel of the kingdom now; though I confess I do not feel so happy in that belief as I did in what I now consider as God-dishonouring Millerism; for when I have preached a pretty fair gospel sermon, as I think, when I descend from the pulpit, instead of receiving the congratulations of the brethren, brother A. says, “You preached the truth today, sir; but,” continues he, with a queer expression, “have you obeyed it yourself?” And another says, “Friend Crito, if that be the gospel we have heard from you tonight, what sort of a gospel did you preach when you were a Baptist shepherd?” And when I urge upon believers of the gospel of the kingdom the necessity of being immersed, they most provokingly retort, that their position is as good as mine; arguing that belief of the truth without immersion is better than immersion without the belief of the truth, alluding to my immersion into the Baptist church. All this makes me feel bad; and makes me sigh for the good feelings I experienced in ’43; when there was so much love, and joy, and peace, in believing, and no doubting about one another’s Christianity. No matter what a man’s mother sect, if he sincerely believed in the soon coming of the Lord, he was cordially acknowledged as a saint and brother in the faith. But things are not so now. Everything is changed; and no one’s spirituality and zeal for interpretations can screen him from the inquiry, “Art thou a Christian?” “Hast thou practised what thou preachest?” “Wert thou immersed on the belief of foolishness; or of ‘the things concerning the kingdom of God, and of the name of Jesus Christ,’ after the example of the Samaritans?”—as though I were no better than “a Samaritan, and had a devil!” These things are grievous to be borne; and cause me to groan in spirit, and to exclaim against you, Mr. Editor, and the captiousness of the times!

Editor—Indeed, friend Crito, you seem to be in hard case. But, it appears to me, you have no one to blame but yourself. Your trouble is the old Jewish one—“a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge.” You are zealous to establish your old sectarian righteousness which is according to the law of your mother church; and consequently have not submitted to the righteousness of God. If you had understood and believed the truth when you were immersed you could not have plunged headlong into Millerism; but would have protested against it as a lie subversive of the truth and veracity of God, as you do now. “No lie,” says the apostle, “is of the truth;” do you imagine, therefore, that if you had been “of the truth”

when a popular Baptist preacher, you would have embraced what you now say is “a lie,” a pure invention of poor old Miller, unless you had become a reprobate? Impossible. In all your career you have displayed more zeal for your opinions, and those of the crowd you have associated with, than for “the righteousness of God.” Zeal for Baptistism, and ‘43ism, and Storrism, and Dennisism, though swathed in the sincerest piety, is not zeal for God according to knowledge. You must empty yourself of your tradition by which your amiability has been defiled. Think what a common sewer your brain has been since you were immersed! Can torrents of Babylonish filth flow through a man’s mind for twenty or thirty years, and not incrust it with odious accretions? Is a mind thus defiled qualified for a fair and scriptural criticism of the discourses and writings of one who, having been taught of the word, which is God’s teaching, has never forsaken it for the fanaticisms of the carnal mind? I know I am your text, or topic of discourse, dear Crito, in the weekly discharge of your ministerial functions. But this does not disturb me. Could you succeed in proving all my positions untenable, it would by no means improve your own. Two wrongs do not make one right. I would suggest that you abandon criticism and preaching, and begin in the disposition of a little child the study of first principles. When you shall have attained to an Abrahamic grasp of the promises of his God, and be fully persuaded of the things concerning Jesus, having more faith in his words than in sectarian pietism, then bravely confess the truth, and be immersed in his name for repentance and remission of sins; and the experience of all past ages for it, you will feel a better and happier, and become a more useful man than in all the ecstasies of fanaticism it has been your misfortune to pass through for so long a series of years.

Crito—Ah, Mr. Editor, your’s is a nauseous prescription for a preacher!

Editor—It may be where “Self Esteem” or “Love of Approbation” are six-and-a-half upon a scale of seven. But, Paul speaks of the possibility of one preaching to others and being himself a castaway. Jesus says, that many of this sort will claim his favour, but shall not receive it. The greater the sacrifice the more obvious the sincerity. Preachers require more active treatment than ordinary men; because you have not only to cleanse them of their traditions, but to divorce them from “the loaves and fishes,” which are always in the larder of unfaithful cooks.

Crito—Your prescription is certainly simple, and to them that believe, doubtless, an infallible cure; but I lack the faith. I admit that your position deserves examination; and though your words are very disturbing, I will nerve myself to as calm a consideration of them as possible; knowing that you can have no other interest in labouring with me than that which results from “saving a soul from death and covering a multitude of sins.” I will bear this in mind; and if I continue to preach about your views, and to criticise your writings, I will remember that I am sitting in judgment upon a man of earnest convictions, who loves truth, and would rejoice to find me subject to what he believes is the obedience it demands.

Editor—Do, dear Crito, and all will be well. Adieu!

But to return to our friend Cook. I hope he will not attribute my not noticing his several critiques to personal disrespect. I was satisfied with what brother Marsh had done; and was happy in being freed from the necessity of crossing swords, which are dangerous implements of play, with so pious, sincere and amiable a friend. If he have been slain, his blood rests upon brother Marsh, and not on me. Peace be to the manes of the dead! So mote it be!

EDITOR.

* * *

A CLERGYMAN'S EXPERIENCE OF SOCIETY.

NO. 3

EPISCOPAL CONFESSION AND ABSOLUTION, WHAT ARE THEY WORTH?

December 11.

The Church of England pretends to ignore the doctrine of Confession and Absolution. As I have often said, she teaches that orders are a profession in the sense in which law and physic are professions. The clergy in this light, are the mouthpieces of certain doctrines. They are the appointed interpreters of the Bible. They deal with the souls of men. They tell this one and that one, the ignorant and the learned, of mysteries that no instinct could discover, that no reason can explain. But they stand in the presence of judges. All the members of their congregation can challenge their doctrine, sit in judgment on their teaching. In short, according to the theory which only a few have the courage to deny, they are invested with no authority. And yet, I dare to ask any clergyman in the world, whether his practice is in accordance with this theory.

Among the numberless duties I was called on to perform there was none which so humbled me in my own eyes as that of visiting the sick. I remember, with vivid distinctness, being called in to visit a sailor who was in the agonies of death. The disease was dropsy. He had passed through dangers the very mention of which would appal you. Often and often he had stood in the presence of death, but he had never flinched from his duty. In the face of destruction he had never lost his nerve. He had obeyed the orders of his captain, when he knew that to obey was to run the risk of perishing. He was full of courage, and yet his heart was like a woman's, full of love and sympathy. You talk of the British sailor, but you never know him till you see him in his home. Believe me, the lion can be tamed. He is not the swaggering, reckless roysterer that you imagine. I have seen the tear scald his cheek, I have seen him bowed down to very childish sympathy, subdued by a single word, although he had spurned the power of the elements. Well, this man was dying. You may have heard of the physical torture inflicted by dropsy when it rises to the heart. When I entered the room I heard a howl of pain: the man was literally writhing. His wife was rocking, in wild grief, upon a chair: the room was crowded with women. I went up to the bedside, and took hold of his hand. He had scarcely recognised me when all sense of physical pain was numbed by the consciousness of spiritual torture. "Thank God, sir," he said, "you are come. Why did they not send for you sooner? I see hell flames before me. Look there! the devil has me in his grip. Priest, save me! I know you, I have heard what you are. You have power. They told me that in the Sunday-school. If you are a man, take me out of his clutches." He fell back, exhausted with the effort. He was speechless, but he stared at me with his glassy eyes, beseeching, with dumb but awful eloquence, that I—a man—would save him from divine wrath. I knew that he looked upon me as a saviour. He could not live more than a few moments, and I gave him, with my own hands, a peaceful sedative. He was conscious enough to listen while I prayed. Had I been a Roman Catholic priest, had I even been a priest according to the theory of High Churchmen, I could have absolved him. I, of course, was not in full orders, and could do nothing; but even if it had been otherwise, according to the theory of the school in which I had been brought up, my services would have been practically null. As it was, I could only ask him, rapidly, a few simple questions, and tell him that if he believed, he was saved. I mention this as an extreme case. It is a proof that if one has not power to confess and absolve, one's office is well nigh useless. Gentlemen! why will you not face facts? You know that you must either claim supernatural authority, or lose your power. I insist, most strongly, that the only method of dealing with dying men, so as to satisfy them and give them peace, is to

confess them. Good God! are you ignorant of human nature? Do you think that they who framed the system of Catholicism were anything short of masters in the science? They knew the comfort of pouring out a tale of sorrow into the ears of one ready to listen and able to apply a cure. They took advantage of this, and became masters of mankind. They wrung out every sin from the tortured breast. With authority from Heaven they gave absolution. Can you marvel that you are babes in comparison with such giants? Either strike out from your services all passages which seem to recognise this Catholic theory, or carry them into effect. *
* *

I attended once an old woman who was dying of age. She was a Dissenter—Wesleyan, I think. When I first saw her, I said very little. She had a great deal to tell me about her miseries, the unkindness of her friends, the wretchedness of her situation, the want of common comforts. When I reminded her that I wished to talk on the subject of religion, she told me that she knew as much as I did about that. To listen to her, you would believe that you were in the presence of some eminent minister. Afterwards when I came to examine her more strictly, I discovered that she had not the remotest conception of the meaning of her own words. She used the ordinary platitudes about justification and the rest; but, although I did my best, I failed to get from her, in her own language, the shadow of an explanation. Obviously, she did not know what she said. She told me, very frankly, particular sins she had committed, but when I came to apply the doctrine she was at a loss to discover the relation between that and the sins. This is one among many cases. The Church of England has no remedy. It can only say “If you believe, you are saved;” i.e., it cannot accept the act of confession for repentance. Certainly, it recognises the connection between repentance and faith, but it does not enforce it as it ought to be enforced. Depend upon it, a priest without the twofold power of confession and absolution is no priest at all. Now, do you believe those doctrines or not? If you do, preach them. If not, you have lost the key to your system. Ignorance cannot comprehend abstractions. It must see a living priest in the place of an absent God. Use the knife, probe the wound, claim absolute dominion, and you may still be lords, for a while. I only ask you to be consistent. You profess to hold certain doctrines—why not take the best means for enforcing them? * * *

THE HEATHEN AND THEIR CONVERSION.

January 10

This is one of the most dangerous coasts in the north of England. Scarcely a winter passes but it is strewn with wrecks, and this winter has been marked by an unusual amount of destruction and death. Yesterday it blew a terrible gale from the north-east; the waves rose like huge mountains, dashing down upon the beach in wild tumult. Already six vessels had failed in their attempts to gain the harbour, and had been flung upon the shore, in the sight of thousands of spectators, who could offer no help. Towards night, a large Norwegian bark appeared in the offing. She struggled fiercely against her fate, but, within a few minutes after she had come within sight, she was lifted up on the crest of a giant wave, and thrown, with resistless violence, upon the beach. It seemed as if the waves had lashed themselves into fury for a last great effort. In an instant they recoiled, and the vessel was left in the shallow surf.

I cannot describe the scene that followed. The cargo, consisting of casks of wine and cotton, was thrown about in all directions. As if the darkness of the night was an excuse for the wildest excesses, hundreds of ruffians rushed through the surf, and began their work of plunder. Cask after cask was dragged on shore, and broken open. You might have seen half a dozen savages drinking from the same cask till they rolled away in stupid intoxication. All restraint was gone. Women were employed all night, sometimes in drinking, sometimes in carrying off their plunder. It was as if so many demons had been let loose from hell * * * .

Now it was to these people that I was to talk about religion. Why, they did not know what it meant. Many of them I had seen in their own homes. Some of course were the outlaws of society, who live by crime. But several were in the receipt of large wages, and had no motives for committing any open excesses. And yet, they were simply brutes. Their language was that of savages, —they could not understand any but the simplest words, and such as expressed common wants. When they were children, they had learned something about religion, and the words came back to their recollection, but without conveying any distinct idea. The only exception to this was their apparent belief in hell. They were possessed by a vague terror of physical pain; and I found that it was the common practice of religious teachers to work upon this feeling, and to glory in the excitement produced by such a process. But it was very clear that such persons could derive no benefit from the services of the Church. I sometimes introduced the subject of Christianity, and they listened as if the act of listening were enough. But I never produced any impression; I never felt that I touched their hearts until I addressed them from quite a different point of view. I never asked them to come to church. But they knew that I was a clergyman, and I first tried to show that religion had not unhumanised me. From the Christian point of view, even, the first thing was to awaken the consciousness of sin. But I certainly never followed the example of some clergymen who tried to produce a rapid conversion, by burning his “patient’s” finger in a candle, in order to give her some notion of the fires of hell. Only think of any one being scorched into religion. * If you will not make slaves of your people, you must meet them on some common ground, speak a language they can understand, begin with the religious instinct which is never totally obscured, but, above all, never forget to show that you are human. . . .

* In the middle ages the scorching men into religion was a common practice, as the saints can testify. Many unfaithful ones have been scorched into the Romish Superstition to save their unprofitable lives. But body-scorching has been superseded by mind-scorching. The practice is now to scorch people’s imaginations by preaching hell-fire and brimstone, that the terrified may rush into a priest’s flock for the salvation of their souls by the sacrifice of their fleeces! This is being “scorched into religion” theologically—a practice directly contrary to the word of God.

What can we hope to effect with the lowest classes, when those above them in the social scale are, in many respects, on the same level? I do not mean that they are actually so ignorant, but, for their position, they are quite as little open to new influences. It is astonishing, until one comes to know it, that a man can live in these days with open eyes, in the thick of everything, and yet remain as dull and narrow-minded as if society had not advanced a jot since the middle ages. Perhaps, indeed, it has not advanced so much as we are inclined to think. But I certainly was surprised to find what suspicion I excited as soon as I went out of the beaten priest-track. It happened that a Roman Catholic chapel had been built in—a short time before I arrived. The priest was a cultivated man, having received his education partly at Douay, partly at Rome. He knew not a soul in the place. His congregation was composed of the poorest of the poor. He went about his work with the stern, straightforward resolution that seems to characterise all the priests in that Church. He had no want of occupation, and his chapel was filled every Sunday; but there was no friend who could enter into all his thoughts, or talk with him on subjects that he knew and loved. He was a stranger to human intercourse, except with the poor, to whom he was nothing more than a priest. I made his acquaintance, and we used frequently to meet in our walks through the parish; but I never could visit at his house, nor he at mine. The scandal was bad enough as it was. Heaven knows what would have happened had I been so imprudent as to enter his house.

And yet this man had the courage to tell his congregation to receive my visits. He knew that I was no proselytising priest, hunting converts, and disturbing faith. God knows I often envied the simple belief of many a poor Roman Catholic.

The great event in the year is the meeting of the Missionary Society in a neighbouring town. At this season there are meetings everywhere in this district, but—is the capital, and a great centre of attraction. These travelling secretaries of religious societies seem to look upon themselves as the victims of self-denial. They come into your houses with the air of martyrs. You will recognise the picture at once. You have ordered a sumptuous entertainment. The town of—is to be enlightened on the subject of missions to the heathen; and so the clergy of the neighbourhood have been invited to dine. Incumbents and curates are assembled in your drawing-room. Being only humble provincials, they await, in anxious trembling, the arrival of the eminent Londoner, who has struck fear from the hearts of thousands with his eloquence. He is late, and you are painfully nervous lest your dinner should be spoiled. Presently, the rattle of wheels is heard—an impatient cab stops at the door—all is right, for the popular divine is come. He enters smiling and condescending. He shakes your hand with a truly Christian grip. He bows to all the clergy, even to the shy curate who has slunk into a chair in the corner. How does he command attention as he speaks, with audacious confidence, of the secrets of Court and State! I never met one of these travelling secretaries who did not know everything that passed in the Royal nursery. Then came refreshing and delightful anecdotes about the conversion of the blacks. Surely, we began to think, the days of miracles are not gone! And as the blood was warmed with wine, the interpositions of Providence were multiplied. It was quite charming to witness the triumphant joy awakened in every heart by the London preacher. I fully expected, sometimes, to see a whole company of women rise from the table, and take ship to Coromandel or Tingaroo. Good creatures, that they were, I believe that if the London preacher had but demanded the sacrifice, they would have willingly thrown their jewels at his feet. I could not sufficiently admire the quiet satisfaction that sat on the features of this martyr. It was obviously a terrible effort to travel about, at the expense of a society, to be entertained sumptuously, to be worshipped by the religious public in every town that he visited. He eat and drank of the best; he slept on downy beds; but it was all under protest, all because society would have it so. Now do tell me why you cannot give your money to the heathen without all this trouble? If you are really anxious for their conversion, you need not send for a London preacher to tell you how to pay for it.

H.

* * *

INVASION OF IRELAND BY THE ENGLISH.

Henry the Second, a man of high talent, boundless ambition, and great energy, ascended the throne of England in 1154. From the first, he was seized with a burning ambition to extend his dominions and especially to subdue Ireland to his sceptre. Pretending a wonderful and hypocritical zeal for the conversion of the poor Irish, he asked Pope Adrian IV, who was an Englishman, and whose name was Nicholas Breakspear, that he would license him to enter Ireland; in order to subdue it, and to convert its people to the true faith. He was easily persuaded to act as master of ceremonies in the matter, and to add so fine an island to his spiritual jurisdiction without any expense. So Adrian, in 1156, issued a bull in favour of Henry, in which he applauds his great piety, and makes over the island, in virtue of the incontestable principle, “that all Christian kingdoms belong to the patrimony of St. Peter,” and exhorts him to invade it, in order to extirpate the vice and wickedness of the natives, and

compel every household to pay a penny yearly to the see of Rome. Thus he gave to Henry the entire right and authority over the island, and commanded all its people to obey him, and gave his blessing to all such "godly means and instruments" as Henry should need for such a godly end. Papal Jesuit writers have sought to prove this bull of Adrian a forgery, because of the power with which it has been yielded against them, but in this they have entirely failed. Perhaps there is no one thing against which the papists of Ireland have so long and unanimously protested as the rule of their country by the British, or against which their patriots and orators have so energetically poured forth the vials of their wrath. But for all the good or evil of the British rule in Ireland, they must give credit to his Holiness the Pope. For a penny yearly from every household, he sold the "bestial people," to Henry II of England.

Armed with this authority to go at the head of his dragoons as a missionary of Adrian to convert the Irish, Henry only waited a fit opportunity to enter on his labour of love. Such a one was soon presented by the turbulent Irish themselves, in this wise. Dervorgilla was the pretty wife of the petty prince of Breffney; she was forcibly taken from him by Dermot, King of Leinster, a licentious tyrant. Roderic O'Connor, the King of Ireland, the injured husband, took the field against Dermot, and expelled him from the kingdom. Dermot hastened to the court of Henry and entreated his assistance to regain his kingdom, promising vassalage to England. Henry was then occupied by his French wars, and could not go in person, but he made the most lavish promises of royal favour to all who should assist Dermot. The Earl of Pembroke, surnamed Strongbow, from his feats of archery, offered to aid the enterprise on a certain condition; he was joined by two Norman knights; these with their followers, landed in Wexford, in 1169, and soon formed a junction with Dermot and his forces. The discipline of the English soldiers struck terror into raw recruits that opposed them, and they went from victory to victory. Dermot was more of a devil than a man. Three hundred of the heads of his enemies were laid as a trophy at his feet. As he tossed them about with his sword, he expressed great delight as he recognised different faces of his enemies; perceiving the head of one to whom he bore mortal hate, he seized it by the ears and bit off its nose!!

Wishing to share in the glory of subduing Ireland, and desirous of pleasing the Pope, Henry himself, with a long train of barons and soldiers landed at Waterford, in 1172. He greatly impressed the people with a sense of his power, and wherever he went princes and provinces submitted to him. On his arrival at Dublin, with great pomp he received and feasted all his vassals. King Roderic made a last effort to arrest the invaders, but he was easily subdued, and soon repaired to London, where he did homage to Henry as his liege lord. Thus fell the last king of Ireland; and thus, by the sale of the Pope for a penny a year from each of its households, by the treachery of its kings and nobles, far more than by the bravery of its invaders, fell the liberty of Ireland. —Kirwin.

* * *

THE POSITION AND PROSPECTS OF THE PRIEST POWER.

The priests of the Church of Rome are worthy of all admiration for their courage and perseverance, were these excellent qualities only exerted in a better cause. Here they are, all over this American continent, with assiduity and constancy amounting to heroism, doing all in their power to keep the human mind from advancing; or, more properly speaking, to roll it back to the fifteenth century. But for all they can do, and it is not little, the shadow upon the dial will not go back. As well might they stand in a row across a rapid of the St. Lawrence, wherever they could find footing, and try to stop the majestic river with their hands. The

agencies that are at work against them are more resistless than the St. Lawrence; and the sooner they see this, and accommodate themselves to the times, the better; for, though they cannot stop the tide of human improvement, they may throw obstacles into it, which will occasion many shipwrecks.

But what are the agencies opposed to them? Everything, we reply, that sets the human mind a-working—everything that facilitates the intercourse of man and man, nation and nation—everything that leads men to unite together for any purpose—is an agency of emancipation from the thralldom of a ubiquitous, obstructive, and tyrannical priesthood. The press is opposed to them—yes, even their own press, for it makes their people think and examine. Steam, in all its applications, is opposed to them, for it has done more than any other agency to promote travelling, reading, and other improvements inimical to Popery. The electric telegraph is opposed to them, for it stimulates the human mind. Popular institutions are radically opposed to priestcraft; and the sooner those who wish to grasp the Clergy Reserves, and accumulate property in mortmain, obliterate the franchise in Canada, the better for their plans. It is true, the priests may for a while work most efficiently, by means of submissive voters, through popular institutions, but one or the other must sooner or later go down. The priest power and representative government cannot continue to exist. If people govern themselves in secular matters, they will sooner or later do so in ecclesiastical matters.

It was probably an enlightened or perhaps an instinctive perception of these reasons, which caused the American people to view with the utmost indifference, the gigantic efforts made some years ago to fill the Mississippi Valley with Roman Catholic emigrants and to stud the country with cathedrals, colleges, and nunnery schools, at an enormous outlay of propaganda funds. The Americans welcomed the emigrants, pocketed the money, and laughed at the deep-laid design.

The result of the Canadian General Election is another striking instance of the importance of the priest power in the open field. Here have been the Bishops meeting at Quebec, and their slavish tools, the True Witness, Toronto Mirror, and other papers, giving out their behests in the most earnest, we might say frantic, manner; and what is the result? The point they made most prominent was the non-secularisation of the Clergy Reserves—our readers will remember the True Witness upon this subject—and they have succeeded in electing out of one hundred and thirty representatives how many to represent their views on this point? Why some three or four, all told, and those in the district of Quebec. The others are either pledged to secularisation as ministerialists, or more thoroughly pledged to it as opposition candidates, with the exception of a few of the old conservatives, who are probably returned independent of Romish influence. —Montreal (C. E.) Witness.

* * *

HINDRANCES TO “ANATOLIA” IN BRITAIN.

My Dear Friend: —I regret to report the continued slow progress of the sale of “Anatolia,” which, one of your worthy subscribers in Scotland, to whom I sent some copies for disposal, attributes to the literary market being inundated with cheaper works on the subject of prophecy; but this, I apprehend, although partly true, is not altogether correct, inasmuch as the modern Scribes and Pharisees, and their belligerent hosts of Proselytes, turn pale with malice against any instrument presuming to expound prophecy in the light of redemption on earth renewed; a doctrine which formidably militates against their favourite

dogma of happiness beyond the highest stars; independent of which, publishers now require heavy fees, in addition to their exorbitant commission on the sale of Books, to stimulate them to push forward any work, —verily all is bribery, and corruption, —Sic transit gloria mundi.

After a persevering struggle of upwards of forty years, I am enabled, with Mr. John Pell of Canonbury, now my only surviving early coadjutor in the proclamation of the Gospel of the Kingdom, to testify to the utter rejection of that heavenly message by professing Christians, and hence their unconcern and judicial blindness, concerning the events predicted to occur in “the latter days,”—events which our Lord commanded all to “watch,” as thereby some might be induced to seek a state of preparation for His glorious manifestation; and provided those demagogues who assume the function of christian teachers, devoted but a fraction of their labours to induce their votaries to lay hold of the precious truths of divine revelation, with the zeal they invariably exert to proselyte them to their own corrupt opinions, and self-glorification, the few scattered disciples of our risen Lord, would not, now, have occasion to mourn the complaint of the evangelical prophet, —“Lord when thy hand is lifted up they will not see”—Isaiah 26: 11. The time is however at hand, when, doubtless, “they shall see, and be ashamed of their malice.” “For when thy judgments are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world will learn righteousness.”

That you, my Christian Brother, may be privileged, so to employ the heavenly talents entrusted to your care, as to be preserved blameless unto the end, and obtain that inestimable reward “the wedding garment” of immortality, and thus be found in the likeness of our risen Lord at His glorious appearing and Kingdom, is the heartfelt prayer of

Yours, very sincerely, in the blessed Hope.

RICHARD ROBERTSON.

89 Grange Road, Bermondsey, Surrey, May 7, 1855.

* * *

REASONS FROM SCRIPTURE

For a Change of Views regarding the Immateriality of the Soul, and an Intermediate State of Existence between Death and the Resurrection.

“What man is he that liveth and shall not see death? Shall he deliver his soul from the hand of the grave?”

Genesis 2: 7. —“And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul.”

Thus man was man before he lived, and when he ceased to breathe he became a dead man, or a dead soul. “Man became a living soul,” and it follows that when he dies he becomes a dead soul.

Job 33: 22. —“Yea, his soul draweth near unto the grave.”

Psalms 89: 48. —“Shall he deliver his soul from the hand of the grave?”

Again. — Genesis 3: 19. —“In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread till thou return unto the ground. . for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.”

Not a word of an immaterial soul, or of any intermediate state of existence. “Dust thou (man) art and unto dust shalt thou (man) return.”

Psalm 146: 4. —“His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth, in that very day his thoughts perish.”

Ecclesiastes 9: 5. —“For the living know that they must die, but the dead know not anything.”

Isaiah 63: 16. —“Doubtless thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us.”

Hence the fallacy of the doctrine of an immaterial soul, or any existence after death till the resurrection.

“In that very day his thoughts perish.”

“The dead know not anything.”

“Though Abraham be ignorant of us.”

But again,

Exodus 12: 15. —“Seven days shall ye eat unleavened bread, even the first day ye shall put away leaven out of your houses, for whosoever eateth leaven from the first day until the seventh day, that soul shall be cut off from Israel.”

Leviticus 17: 10. —“I will even set my face against that soul that eateth blood, . . . therefore I said unto the children of Israel, No soul of you shall eat blood.”

Psalm 69: 10. —“When I wept and chastened my soul with fasting, that was to my reproach.”

Thus, a soul can fast, can eat, and be cut off, therefore, the theory of an immaterial soul, that can neither eat, fast, nor die, is quite utopian, and gives the lie to the word of God. “When I chastened my soul with fasting.”

“No soul of you shall eat blood.”

“That soul shall be cut off from Israel.”

Once more, —

Joshua 11: 11.— “And they smote all the souls that were therein with the edge of the sword, utterly destroying them, there was not any left to breathe.”

Psalm 78: 50. —“He spared not their souls from death, but gave their life over to the pestilence.”

Psalm 119: 175. —“Let my soul live and it shall praise thee, and let thy judgments help me.”

Isaiah 38: 18. —“For the grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee, . . . The living, the living, he shall praise thee, as I do this day.”

Let no man after this say that a soul cannot die.

“They smote all the souls that were therein.”

“He spared not their souls from death.”

Nor that there is praise between death and the resurrection.

“Let my soul live and it shall praise thee.”

“The living, the living, he shall praise thee.”

Further—

Ecclesiastes 3: 19. —“For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts, even one thing befalleth them, as the one dieth, so dieth the other, yea they have all one breath, so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast. . . . All go into one place, all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again.”

Revelation 16: 3. —“And the second angel poured out his vial upon the sea, . . . and every living soul in the sea died.”

Thus man and beast “have all one breath;” and the fishes of the sea are “souls.”
“Every living soul in the sea died.”

Again—

Isaiah 53: 10. —“When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin.”

This clearly testifies to the death of Messiah’s soul.

Verse 11. —“He shall see of the travail of his soul.”

That is, he shall be rewarded for the death of his soul, or the sacrifice of his life.

Verse 12. —“Because he hath poured out his soul unto death.”

Thus the soul of Messiah died, or life became extinct. “He poured out his soul unto death.”

Matthew 26: 28. —“My soul is exceeding sorrowful unto death.” But,

Psalm 16: 10. —“Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell.”

That is, thou wilt not leave “my soul,” or body, in the grave, as shown by the following passages.

Psalm 49: 15. —“But God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave.”

Psalm 56: 13. —“For thou hast delivered my soul from death.”

What farther need of proof to show the utter fallacy of the doctrine of the immateriality of the soul, or the fact, when a man dies a soul dies. "Thou hast delivered my soul from death."

Again, —

2 Samuel 7: 12. —"And when thy days be fulfilled (David), and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers."

Acts 2: 19. —"Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day."

Verse 34—"For David is not ascended into the heavens."

Acts 13: 36. —"For David after he had served his own generation by the will of God, fell on sleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption."

Nothing for David for the time being, but that he "sleep with his fathers," and be, as recognised by Peter, "both dead and buried," and that he should fall asleep and see "corruption," as testified by Paul.

But again, —

Job 19: 25. —"I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God."

No expectation with Job until "the latter day," nor any hope of seeing God till after the worms had destroyed his body. An immaterial soul had not been heard of in his day, nor until the days of Plato, who first palmed it on mankind.

Daniel 12: 13. —"Go thou thy way till the end be, for thou shalt rest and stand in thy lot at the end of the days."

No promise to Daniel till the "end of the days."

Matthew 24: 30. —"And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven, . . . and he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds."

Luke 14: 14. —"And thou shalt be blessed, . . . for thou shalt be recompensed at the resurrection of the just."

No gathering of the elect till the "trumpet sound," and no recompense till "the resurrection of the just."

Luke 22: 29. —"And I appoint unto you a kingdom as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table, in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

Luke 23: 42. —"Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. . . In that day thou shalt be with me in paradise." (New Translation.)

No throne for the Apostles till Christ possess his kingdom, and no kingdom till he comes. “When thou comest into thy kingdom.”

Acts 1: 11. —“Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.”

Acts 3: 23. —“And it shall come to pass that every soul which will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people.”

No hope for the men of Galilee of seeing Jesus again until he “so come as they had seen him go into heaven;” and the “soul that will not hear,” or obey him, “shall be destroyed.”

Romans 8: 17. —“If children, then heirs; heirs of God and joint-heirs with Christ, if so be that we suffer with him that we may be also glorified together.”

2 Thessalonians 2: 1. —“Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and by our gathering together unto him.”

No glorification till Christ and his people are “glorified together;” and no “gathering” till he comes.

James 5: 7. —“Be patient therefore, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord.”

1 Peter 1: 13. —“Be sober, and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ.”

1 Peter 5: 4. —“And when the chief shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of life that fadeth not away.”

Thus, no favour till the “revelation of Jesus Christ,” and no crown till the “chief shepherd shall appear.”

Revelation 1: 7. —“Behold he cometh with clouds, and every eye shall see him.”

1 Thessalonians 4: 16. —“For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and with the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first.”

Revelation 20: 4. —“And 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 they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years.”

“They lived,” which at once pre-supposes that they had been dead, but this is set at rest by the next verse.

Verse 5. —“But the rest of the dead lived not again till the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection.”

Clearly showing that the souls which John saw in vision were the newly resurrected saints.

Thus the doctrine of an immaterial soul is found to be unscriptural, as well as the popish dogma of a purgatory, and the protestant theory of an intermediate state.

The soul of man is nothing more nor less than that body which God created, and into which he breathed the breath of life; thus when God made man He made a soul, hence we read, —Isaiah 58: 16—“The souls which I have made.”

Immaterial Soulism, then, and the doctrine of an intermediate state, are a delusion and an imposition on the human race.

“He that hath my word let him speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord.”—Jeremiah 23: 28.

Edinburgh, Scotland.

* * *

THE WORSHIP OF THE VIRGIN.

It is generally known that Pope Pius IX summoned a grand conclave of the chief dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church to meet at Rome, during the month of November last, to settle the question whether the Virgin Mary was herself conceived without sin, and thus free by birth from every taint of human impurity and imperfection, and thus a divinity who may properly be made an object of human adoration. Hitherto this dogma had not formed an authoritative part of the Roman Creed, and had been stoutly disputed within the bosom of the church itself; but it is expected by the more zealous adherents of the doctrine that it will be finally adopted by all the faithful without dispute.

As far as it can be ascertained by historical investigation, the worship of the Virgin was totally unknown among the early Christians. The first signs of it appear about the end of the fourth century among some Thracian or Scythian Christian women living in Arabia. These women were called in Greek Collyridians, from a small cake, collyrion, offered by them to the new Christian goddess. But even at the time of the example given by Irene, Tertullian, Origen, Basil, and Chrysostom, was followed; and Mary was considered as any other mortal, and spoken of by theologians with her faults and her virtues. Still the special worship began to extend beyond Arabia, and was accepted, to a certain degree, by the church in general, and in the following centuries church festivals were established in honour, as they called her, of the Mother of Christ.

In the twelfth century, however, the practice of Mariolatry acquired a certain dishevelled and extravagant character through various orders of monks and nuns. The immaculate nature of the Virgin, however, having thus been recognised in the twelfth century, some canons of Lyons took up the idea of her immaculate conception from her mother, and at once marked a day in the almanac for its commemoration. This invention, however, proved

too much for the hard-hearted order of the Dominicans, those bloody offshoots of the persecution of the Albigenses and of Vauclease in the South of France. The gloomy Dominican founder and those friars were the authors of the Holy Inquisition, and the Dominicans were ordained by the Popes to be the managers, purveyors, and masters of the ceremonies to the auto-da-fes. To the present day the Dominicans are the official inquisitors at Rome, and the Censure of the Index is principally in their hands. As we have mentioned, the Dominicans protested against the notion of the immaculate conception, and papal edicts allowed them to dispense with this theological subtlety. Thomas Aquinas, a disciple of Aristotle, wrote likewise against it, treating it as an absurdity; but Duns Scotus raised his voice in its favour; the order of Franciscans, founded by one of the least intellectual Italian enthusiasts, contained the leading defenders of the immaculate conception. In the fourteenth century, the Sorbonne, or University of Paris, decided in its favour, thus clothing it in a kind of high theological authority. The council of the Basilea, the Popes Sextus IV, Alexander IV, of infamous memory, the Council of Trent, and Gregory XIII, decided for maintaining the commemorative festival, without, however, making the question a dogma for the church.

The Jesuits, those antagonists and mortal enemies of the Dominicans, espoused from the start the cause of the Virgin against them. In the course of time, the Jesuits gave to this worship in general a feverish intensity, surrounding it with a sentimental and mystical halo, bestowing on it the most varied explanations and significations, and uplifting it among their adepts, and especially the lower classes and women. Thus they secured to themselves a closer and stronger hold over excited imaginations. Under the now overwhelming influence and impulse of the Jesuits, the present Pope seems to have determined to immortalise his name by finally settling the question, and eventually inscribing the immaculate conception among the binding dogmas of the church. —N. Y. Leader.

* * *

“FEET WASHING, BY J. N. DAVIS.”

BY W. W. JONES.

We publish the following article as it appeared in the Richmond Penny Post, at the request of the writer. He thinks Brother Davis’ “scribble” on feet washing “highly discreditable to the HERALD:” perhaps our readers may have the same opinion of his; so that between him and them the HERALD may be thought to be a gainer by neither! But he seems to regard Brother Davis’ remarks as an attack upon his position, which he very naturally desires to vindicate. We therefore grant him the privilege, with the understanding that the matter is to rest here as far as the HERALD is concerned, enough having thereby been done to prove to Mr. Jones that we are neither “one-sided in our views, practices, and feelings,” nor “too strongly inclined to our own ways, right or wrong,” as he affirms in his note accompanying the subjoined.

The following are the opinions of Mr. Jones on the article of Brother Davis in our number for June:

“Under the above caption I saw some days ago, in the ‘Herald’ of Dr. J. Thomas, a number of texts cited from the Old Testament, going to show that distinguished persons treated their strange travelling guests with so much hospitality as to give them provender for their beasts, water to wash their feet, and food to eat, and a place to rest and sleep. BUT not

one of the aforesaid texts informs us that any distinguished persons went with his domestics to another man's house, and rose up from supper and washed his domestics' feet, saying: 'If I wash thee not, thou canst have no part with me,' nor 'you shall wash one another's feet, because I, your Lord and Master, have given you the example, that you shall do to one another as I, your Lord and Master, have done to you, and happy shall you be provided you know and practise these things;' and hence no case cited from the Old Testament by Mr. D. is parallel or synonymous with John 13; for if the feet-washing in this chapter may be regarded as no more important than the case recorded in the Old Testament, then we may as logically argue that the common supper given the traveller in any given cases was equal to the supper given by the Lord the night on which he was betrayed, and that in giving his domestics his body and blood, Jesus only followed the example of Abraham and others, who gave their travelling guests supper as a mere act of hospitality. The argument of Mr. D. is therefore too absurd and too profane for grave and sober consideration, and we will let it pass, as proving too much, and therefore proving nothing, except it proves how loath men are to keep divine and positive ordinances.

"If it was a custom in that country for distinguished men to rise up from supper and wash their servants' feet, surely Peter would not have said, 'Lord! Thou shalt never wash my feet.' If Jesus washed Peter's feet, because it was a custom, or because his feet were dirty, or merely as an act of humility, or to make the flesh feel comfortable, then would our guileless and unsophisticated teacher have given Peter some one or all of those reasons for the service which he performed, after the supper was ended—Luke 22: 27; but no such reason nor reasons are given, and therefore it is neither logical nor allowable to corrupt the word of God with the addition of any such carnal reasons, for the word is perfect and admits of no addition or subtraction, and awful is the divine penalty against any man or angel who shall pervert the word of God. I tremble for such wicked men.

"Who among the lords in the Old Testament said to his servants, or domestics, or house, or proselytes, —I wash your feet, because except I do it you can have no eternal life, (Dr. T—?) Which of those ancient lords, after the Passover, gave his domestics a 'supper, and supper being ended,' rose up from supper, leaving them at meat, and washed their feet, saying: Except you do these things as I have set you the example, you shall not be happy (live forever?)

"Verily, we need not ask any more questions, nor make any farther remarks to show that the 'service' or 'feet washing after the supper' is without precedent or parallel in the Old Testament, and therefore it stands firmly before us as one of the ordinances in 1 Corinthians 11, and of this ordinance washing the saints' feet after the supper, in verse 23rd, Paul says, 'the rest will I set in order when I come,' verse 34: or I know not anything about parallel texts nor synonymous ideas. Who can have the hardihood to fly in the teeth of John, the beloved apostle of our divine teacher and Lord, and say, Jesus did not rise up from supper and set the example for his disciples to practise? Where is he who will say he did not command his disciples to observe these things, nor to teach disciples to 'observe all things whatsoever I command you' to observe?

"Dare any man say the apostles and the other disciples only broke bread—Acts 2: 42 without using the cup, because the cup is not mentioned in the text? How then can he affirm that they did not also wash one another's feet, because (as Mr. D. says) feet-washing is not mentioned in the text? How illogical and unscriptural are the reasonings, and inferences, and conclusions of Lawyer Davis, for our opponent is a 'limb of the law,' in the courts of his

locality, and he thinks I can never answer the article which I am now considering; but though it is out of my sight, and not in my possession, I can expose its errors without even seeing it again, though I am not able to follow his precise order nor quote his precise words.

“By many lights upon the first night (not day) of the week, the disciples broke bread, and Paul omitted nothing. Acts 20. —Oh! yes, he omitted feet-washing according to the logic and inference of Mr. Davis, and he also omitted the cup according to the same erroneous logic and inference, i.e., because the cup nor feet-washing can be found in the text. Is Mr. D’s influence and logic good against feet-washing, then it is equally good against the cup, and we must therefore break bread without using the blood; and as to washing one another’s feet after supper, why Mr. D. would not consider us even sane if we so follow the Lord as histories affirm primitive christians did when they assembled at night to worship, separated from the rest of mankind, in all of which they differed widely from Mr. Davis.

“Matthew does not mention feet-washing, but mentions the Passover, and the supper following, but John mentions the Passover, and supper, and feet-washing, therefore Mr. D. concludes Jesus did not wash feet in that order. What nonsense! One says Jesus went to a wedding and turned water into wine, but another does not mention that incident; will Mr. D. therefore conclude Jesus did no such thing? So much for his logic. At another time, we can show that Luke 22 and John 13 are parallel passages containing synonymous things; but it is passing strange that Mr. D. does not see all this, even to the cock crowing. —John 13: 38; Luke 22: 34, the same night.

“‘Breaking bread’ and ‘eating the Lord’s supper’ must be a good, lovely, and commendable work, and surely Paul included breaking bread, in ‘whatsoever things’ and ‘every good word and work,’ for he included feet-washing among good works, as Mr. Davis also affirms; but if Mr. Davis places feet-washing on a par with marrying and bringing up children, why is he married and bringing up children but never following Jesus, by washing the saints’ feet? Does he prefer carnal things to spiritual, and so bring feet-washing below par, and sink the act of Jesus to disrepute? It seems so, indeed!

“‘Woe unto you, lawyers! Ye entered not into the knowledge of the word yourselves; and them that were entering you hindered!’ The commandments in John 13, are made a test of a man’s love for Jesus, as recorded in chapter 14, verses 21, 24; but Mr. D. despises the test, and has never yet kept the ordinances which Paul and Jesus commanded us to keep. Mr. D. prefers a public snack by light of day, though neither Moses nor Christ delivered it, or anything like it, nor did Abraham or any other man of God: but ‘the man of sin’ is the file leader of all such corruption of the Lord’s Supper, delivered the night of the cock crowing, in John 13—the same night mentioned in 1 Corinthians 11: 23.

“I will now dismiss Mr. D’s scribble, for it is highly discreditable to ‘the Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come,’ or I have no knowledge of Christ. If the blind lead the blind, all must fall into the pit, for picking out a gnat and swallowing a beast (man of sin). The wisdom of men is a sandy foundation for faith, (i.e. understanding of the things promised in the law and the prophets.) Even Moses used in worship, bread, blood, and water, and so did Jesus in John 13, and so did all Christians, and even the Baptist denomination in the 17th century, as history tells us. Catholics also use bread, wine and water.

W. W. JONES.”

* * *

AUSTRIA—ROME—RUSSIA.

The following appeared in the Glasgow Saturday Post soon after I arrived in England, and has not hitherto been re-published in the Herald. It has laid in my portfolio long enough for time to prove the value of its previsions, which the reader will perceive have come to pass as indicated over five years before the manifestation of the events. The treacherousness of Austria, Russia, and Prussia, have become manifest. These powers have evidently understood one another all along; and the working of things has evolved the alliance prevised, and for the purposes pointed out in these words: —“These combinations being developed, England, France, Italy, Turkey and Egypt, will be forced into an alliance as principals for the common safety of Europe and the East.” Things have not yet been matured in Italy. The Italian power in alliance with the West is Sardinia. It is not to be expected that all Italy will join. It will become with Germany the battle-ground in the second stage of the war, when its powers will be compelled to cooperate with the lord-ascendants of the hour.

The other point so notably verified by events is Russia’s course, so unexpected by the West. My words were, Russia will deceive all their calculations, and fill them with consternation when the time appointed comes. And so it has come to pass; nevertheless, greater astonishment awaits them in a future not remote.

The following is the letter, which affords another illustration of the truth of the saying, that prophecy may be correctly interpreted in modern times previously to the occurrence of the events it foreshows. Be encouraged, then, to study the prophetic word; for it is written, “The wise shall understand,” and only they.

To the Editor of the Glasgow Saturday Post.

Sir, —A friend in your city has forwarded to me your paper of Saturday, 8th July, in which you have republished from a Liverpool journal an article entitled “A Missionary from the United States for England.” As the document contains one or more statements which are incorrect, and as the writer of this is the individual referred to, I trust you will allow me to amend them through your medium. In the first place, then, I am neither a “missionary” nor a “prophet” in the ordinary acceptation of the terms. A missionary is one sent by authority, human or divine. I am sent by neither; but, believing “the word of the truth of the Gospel,” I feel it my duty to “contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints,” without stipulated fee or reward. I am what you are, and what the hireling spoilers of goods term “a layman,” who, having been “made free by the truth,” obeys the scriptural injunction, “let him that heareth (i.e. understandeth) say, come.” While the mercenary clergy are distraining, the people are left to perish, and none layeth it to heart unless something can be made by “the transaction.” I propose, therefore, while they are milking the goats and fleecing their sheep, to contribute my quota towards supplying them with pasture to sustain and strengthen them under the torment they are compelled to endure. This is the reason of my visit to this country; and believing that a solution of the present revolutionary problem exists, I intend to demonstrate it, that some at least of this suffering and oppressed people may be prepared for the consummation.

A “Prophet” is supposed to be an “inspired foreteller of future events.” I make no pretension to this character, which belongs only to the personages of the Bible. My pretensions are confined to the interpretation only of what is already predicted by the spirit of

God, and to the instruction of the people in what I have learned. The Scriptures say “despise not prophesyings,” for, says Paul, “he that prophesieth speaketh unto men to edification, to exhortation, and to comfort;” and “greater is he that prophesieth than he that speaketh with tongues.” Such a prophet every believer of the truth ought to be, and may easily become, if he devote but a seventh part of the time to the study of the Word men generally do to the obtaining of their daily bread, and to the accumulation of effects for a reckless and ungrateful posterity.

The Liverpool editor says that I declare that a war is at hand, “which is to commence with the storming, sack, and destruction of Rome.” I have said no such thing, as you will see by the Morning Star which accompanies this. The war is already in its languid inception. The war-power in Italy is Austria, with the allies versus Italy and its confederates. Affairs will ere long become so complicated that the war will be general, and the crowning event, the finality thereof in Europe will be, the end of Rome’s sovereignty and the final destruction of the city.

Allow me to call your attention to one or two items of news bearing on the verification of the calculation I have presented concerning Russia and the East. I have said that after 29th June of the current year, we ought to receive information of important events in relation to the Turkish empire. Probably a movement on the part of Russia against the Sultan, &c., because on 29th June, the period of unmodified Turkish usurpation of Greek rights in the Constantinopolitan domain expires. The Autocrat is the political chief of the Greek superstition, as Austria is of the Roman; the Patriarch of Stamboul is its spiritual lord, as the Pope is of the Latin; and Constantinople its ecclesiastical throne, as Rome is that of the European Confederacy of the West. The Autocrat is, therefore, the real Greek Emperor of the age, and the Ottoman a mere pro tempore intruder upon his rights. “Coming events cast their shadows before” is so constantly observed as to have become proverbial; to one or more of these, therefore, I would point as illustrative of the probable verification of my interpretation.

In the treaty between Egypt and the Allies in 1840, it was stipulated that Mehemet Ali’s standing army should not exceed 18,000 men; whereas Ibrahim has augmented it to 50,000, on the pretence that he apprehends an invasion of the English from Aden. This is a warlike indication.

In the Times of 8th July is a copy of a dispatch from the Consulate of Jassy, dated 26th June, which states that a Russian army of 25,000, horse and foot, have moved from the Pruth to the Moldavian territory, “and would this very evening arrive at Jassy.” The Turkish Commissioner had, therefore, sent a courier to Constantinople, and ordered the Turkish armies to occupy the Principalities of the Danube. In the Times of 13th July, it is stated that the Augsburg Gazette of the 7th instant, received yesterday morning, has some interesting intelligence from the Principalities of the Danube. “The long foreseen revolution has at length broken out at Bucharest. The details of the insurrection in the city are as yet unknown. This much seems certain—that on receiving information of it, the Russian and Turkish troops stationed on the frontiers immediately invaded the country. The occupation of Moldavia by Russian troops is positively affirmed by several credible authorities. The Russian Consul-General, M. Duhamel, had hastened from Jassy to Bucharest, and thence to Servia. In addition to this formidable foe, adds the letter before us (written at Flausenburg on the 27th June,) we have another equally dangerous—the Cholera.”

In view of the present position of Russia, in relation to Germany, Le Reforme, according to the Times of the 12th instant, insinuates what is very probable, for Russia,

Austria, and Prussia are very treacherous, and exceedingly embittered against everything savouring of “liberty, equality, and fraternity,” viz., that a secret coalition has been formed by the Northern Powers against France. It says that “Russia has received the assent of Austria and Prussia to her invasion of the Turkish provinces. That as a compensation, Russia is to assist Austria in Italy either with money or arms; and Prussia in a similar manner in the Grand Duchy of Posen. Those affairs being settled, the next movement will be, according to the Reforme, against France.” These combinations being developed, England, France, Italy, Turkey, and Egypt, will be forced into an alliance as principals for the common safety of Europe and the East.

In your paper is an editorial from the Morning Chronicle, on “the present Policy of Russia,” in which a remarkable short-sightedness is displayed concerning the mission of that gigantic despotism. Baron Brunow’s diplomacy has evidently bewildered the presiding intellect of that journal. His personal amiabilities seem completely to have mesmerised the softest feelings of its editorial divan. If the Baron has only succeeded in enchanting Lord Palmerston and the Iron Duke, as he has the Chronicle, Russia may unobstructedly mature its plans, and with the rapidity of a whirlwind possess itself of the Sultan’s throne, while they are lost in a lack-a-daisical admiration of “the pacific, temperate, and dignified policy” of the Baron’s master, and of his rapidly progressing “internal regulation and improvement.” Russian diplomatists are like the national clergy, who, in the faithful performance of the work of their master the Devil, “have transformed themselves into the (successors of the) apostles of Christ, and ministers of righteousness,”—see 2 Corinthians 11: 13-15; even so the servants of Russia are like angels of light and peace for amiability, prudence, dove-like harmlessness, and serpent-wisdom, that they may the better blind the eyes of those whom it is the settled policy of their lord to overreach. But be not misled by the Chronicle and kindred prints; Russia will deceive all their calculations, and fill them with consternation when the time appointed comes.

The course of Russia is thus outlined in the Great Book of the Destiny of Nations: — “The King of the North shall come against him (the Roman Power of modern days, both in Constantinople and Rome, its imperial cities. See Daniel 11: 36-39, for a description of it) like a whirlwind, with chariots and horsemen, and with many ships; and he shall enter into the countries and shall overflow and pass over. He shall also enter into the glorious land (Syria), and many countries shall be overthrown; but these shall escape out of his hand—Edom and Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon (countries of the Red Sea, and south of Palestine). He shall stretch forth his hand also upon the countries, and the land of Egypt shall not escape. But he shall have power over the treasures of gold and silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt; and the Libyans and Ethiopians shall be at his steps (i.e. subject to him). But (at this time) tidings out of the East * (from India), and out of the North (from Britain, &c.), shall trouble him: therefore he shall go forth with great fury to destroy, and utterly to make away many. And he shall plant his royal tents between the seas (in Palestine), to the glorious holy mountain; yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him.”—Daniel 11: 40-45. This is the career and fate marked out for Russia, and no confederacy or prudence can alter it.

* The bearings of these points must be taken from the Hiddekel, or Tigris, where the prophecy was delivered.

The verity of an interpretation must be decided by the actual occurrence of the facts it delineates. If, however, the interpretation of a particular be at variance with the obvious

averments of the general predictions of the Word of God, its incorrectness may be adjudicated in advance. I believe the statements I have made are in harmony with the scope of all the Prophets. I do not say, however, that the exegesis I have presented is infallible; this would be to assume the ground of the Roman Pontiff. But the times are extraordinary, and the subject of stirring and absorbing interest. Statesmen are at sea without chart or compass, and are at a loss to divine what is coming upon them next. The knowledge of their destiny is in the Word, but they know not where to find it; or, if they know, a spurious theology has rendered it unintelligible, or they have no faith in the record which contains it. But, blind as they are to the reality of things, let us hope that the press of the country will not be led by their infatuation. It is the honourable function of a journalist to chronicle the “new opinions” and events of his day for all classes of his contemporaries. I trust, therefore, that you will insert this as new matter on a subject of extraordinary interest, as there are a multitude in these kingdoms who appreciate much any light that can be thrown on the relation of current events to the truthful declarations of the Word of God. With due respect I subscribe myself

Yours,

JOHN THOMAS.

3, Brudenell Place, New North Road,
London, July 13, 1848.

* * *

THE JEWS IN THE DANUBIAN PRINCIPALITIES.

By Dr. Julius Barash, of Bucharest.

The Jews in the two Danubian Principalities differ materially, in their historical relations, from those who reside in many other European countries; for whilst the Jews in Poland, Germany, France, England, and Turkey have resided there for several centuries, their settlement in the Principalities is of much more recent date. Without exactly following the traces of their first settlement, we may safely assert that, anterior to two or three centuries past, no Jewish congregations existed in these countries, as is indicated by the absence of development in the congregational affairs, the want of burial-places, synagogues, and other Jewish congregational establishments, (especially in Wallachia,) as well as the absence of all mention of Jews in the ancient records of the history of Moldavia and Wallachia. Whilst, therefore, the Jews in Europe passed a great part of the middle ages with the peoples under whom they dwelt, such was not the case with the Jews of the Principalities; hence the sad bequests of these sad ages, especially the hatred toward the Jews, is here considerably less than elsewhere.

Before all, we must clearly distinguish the Jews of Moldavia from those of Wallachia; and among the latter, those of the Polish-German ritual from those of the Spanish-Portuguese.

The Jews in Moldavia are very numerous. The capital, Yassi, might fairly be called a Jewish town; for the mask-like and striking Polish-Jewish dress, especially in its ancient perfection, as it is hardly yet seen in the large towns of Poland and Prussia, shows itself abundantly here in every street, nook, and corner of this un-aesthetic town. The daily influx from Galicia, and especially from adjacent Russia, prodigiously increases the contingent of the Jewish population in Yassi. The new arrivals in great masses, for the last twenty to twenty-five years, since the issuing of the endless series of Draconic laws in Russia against the Jews, which followed like blow after blow—especially the law of recruiting Jewish adults and children, which caused numerous families secretly to take refuge in Moldavia—has considerably modified the original character of the Moldavian Jews, who had existed here

already under the former Jewish rule. We may, therefore, distinguish, in reference to the Jews in Moldavia, the period before 1829 from that after it, or the peace of Adrianople.

For three centuries the two Principalities have been under Turkish suzerainty; and although they possessed fine old legislative autonomic rights, the political, as well as the social influence of Turkey in the Principalities was, up to the last Russian war in the year 1829, very powerful. All classes of society were affected more or less by the proximity of Constantinople, the Jews included. The Jews in Moldavia, therefore, although originally emigrants from Poland, had altered their Polish-Jewish dress and manners, so as to constitute themselves a specific character. The Moldavian Jews wore long Oriental, that is to say, coloured (not, as in Poland, black) garments. In his house he loved cleanliness, like the Orientalist; and in his dealings he manifested a certain solidity, straight-forwardness, and honesty, which we so frequently found among the Mohammedan people. But then he also showed in his whole existence a certain mental indolence and immorality as only found in Oriental people. The study of the Hebrew language, and much less that of the Talmud, which so much engages the quickness of the mind, could not thrive there; only a solid material life was the brightest desire of his soul. This mental inferiority caused the Polish Jew to look down upon his Moldavian co-religionist with little respect, as he could be neither a Lamden (Talmudical scholar) nor a Meyuches, (descendant of a learned family); and the alliances between a good Polish-Jewish family and a Moldavian one were always considered as mesalliances. This want of mental quickness also prevented the principle of Chassidism from flourishing there, because Chassidism decidedly requires for its development a certain spiritual disposition, a kind of vivid conception and penetration of an idea.

The Oriental government knows nothing yet of special laws for the Jews, of systems for converting the Jews, of restrictions in trade, or in settlements, or in any other of their movements. In short, the Jews in the Principalities were then in a most favourable physical and political condition. Thus were things before 1829.

* * *

PHILOSOPHY OF LAW. —Law—is like fire, and those who meddle with it, may chance to “burn their fingers.”

Law—is like a pocket with a hole in it; and those who therein risk their money, are very likely to lose it.

Law—is like a lancet, dangerous in the hands of the ignorant; doubtful even in the hands of an adept.

Law—is like a sieve, you may see through it; but will be considerably reduced before you can get through it.

Law—is like prussic acid; a dangerous remedy, and the smallest dose of it is generally sufficient.

Law—is like justice, even as a copper gilt is like gold, and the comparative worth of the two is about the same.

Law—is like an eel trap, very easy to get into, but very difficult to get out of.

Law—is like a razor, which requires a “strong back,” keenness, and an excellent temper.

Law—is like a window of stained glass, giving its own peculiar tint and hue to the bright rays of truth that shine through it.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

That the Kingdom of God will be established upon the Earth ¹ and be everlasting in its duration.² That the once crucified Jesus of Nazareth—the Lord of Life, now exalted at the Father’s right hand—is the Anointed King.³ That the glorified Saints, washed from their sins in the blood of the Lamb, will be its princes and subordinate Sovereigns.⁴ That the Jews who own their supremacy, will be the immediate Subjects: to be gathered out of every nation for this purpose.⁵ That the Government will be absolute and Divine, and not left to the will of any people.⁶ That Jerusalem will be its Capital, and the Holy Land its immediate locality.⁷ That the Image of Human Satan-power, —The Constitution of Sin, —embodied in the governments of the world—ecclesiastical, monarchical and republican, will be destroyed.⁸ And that all Nations will serve and obey Him who is the appointed Governor of Nations, and participate in that glorious righteousness, peace and prosperity which shall characterise his Reign,⁹ are Truths which illuminate every page of the Bible; constitute the promise made to Adam,¹⁰ Abraham,¹¹ David,¹² and all the Ancients;¹³ and the Gospel proclaimed by Jesus,¹⁴ Peter,¹⁵ Paul,¹⁶ Stephen,¹⁷ and Philip;¹⁸—the Gospel to be believed for Righteousness and Salvation; and the only Glad Tidings which will revolutionise the mind, change the motives and sentiments, and induce purity of life, personal holiness, disinterested philanthropy and benevolence, and unreserved obedience to the will of God.

To participate in the honour and glory of this Kingdom, it is necessary to be adopted into the family of Abraham, by believing the things which concern the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, and immersion into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.¹⁹

Every statement of the above can be demonstrated by the obvious and grammatical sense of the Holy Scriptures.

Search, and see if this be not so.

TESTIMONY OF MOSES AND THE PROPHETS.

1—Psalm 2: 8; 72: 8-11; Jeremiah 23: 5, 8; Ezekiel 37: 20-28; Daniel 2: 35, 44; 7: 14, 27; Joel 3: 16-17, 21; Micah 4: 7-8; Zechariah 14: 9, 16-19; Obadiah 21.

2—Psalm 89: 29; Isaiah 4: 6-7; Daniel 2: 44; 7: 14, 27; Micah 4: 7.

3—Psalm 2: 1-9; Isaiah 9: 6-7; 53: 10-12; Jeremiah 23: 5-7; Ezekiel 37: 24-25; Daniel 7: 13-14.

4—Daniel 7: 18, 27.

5—Jeremiah 23: 5-9; 31; Ezekiel 37: 20-28; Micah 4: 8.

6—Isaiah 11: 2-5; Psalm 2: 9; 72: 2-4; Daniel 7: 14, 27.

7—Genesis 13: 15; 17: 5; Isaiah 2: 3; 24: 23; Micah 4: 4, 7-8; Joel 3: 17, 20-21.

8—Genesis 3: 15; Psalm 2: 9; 72: 4, 9; 49: 7-8; Isaiah 60: 12; Daniel 2: 35, 44; 7: 9-27.

9—Genesis 12: 3; 22: 18; Psalm 76: 60: 9-10; Isaiah 2: 2-4; 11: 1-10; Micah 4: 1-5; Zechariah 10: 11.

10—Genesis 3: 15.

11—Genesis 12: 3; 22: 18.

12—2 Samuel 7: 9-16.

TESTIMONY OF JESUS AND THE APOSTLES.

1—Luke 1: 32-33; Revelation 11: 15; 2: 26-27; 5: 8-10.

- 2—Luke 1: 33; Hebrews 1: 8; 12: 28; 2 Peter 1: 11; Revelation 11: 15.
3—Luke 1: 33; Acts 2: 31; 16: 31; Hebrews 1: 8; John 1: 49; Revelation 17: 14.
4—Matthew 19: 28; 1 Corinthians 6: 5-6; Romans 8: 17; 2 Timothy 2: 12; Revelation 2: 26-27; 3: 21; 5: 10; 20: 4.
5—Luke 1: 33, 68-75.
6—Matthew 28: 18; John 17: 2; 1 Corinthians 15: 27; Revelation 22: 4; Hebrews 2: 8; Ephesians 1: 22.
8—2 Thessalonians 2: 7-8; Revelation 17: 10, 14; 18; 19: 17, 21; 20: 1-3.
9—Luke 2: 14; Galatians 3: 8.
11—Galatians 3: 8; Hebrews 11: 10.
12—Acts 2: 30.
13—Hebrews 4: 2; 11; Jude 14.
14—Mark 1: 14-15; Luke 4: 43; 9: 2.
15—Acts 2: 30; 3: 19-26; 10: 37; 2 Peter 1: 11.
16—Acts 26: 6-7; 28: 23, 31.
17—Acts 7: 1-53.
18—Acts 8: 12.
19—Mark 16: 15-16; Acts 1: 38-39; 8: 12; Galatians 3: 25-27.

* * *