

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, February, 1856—  
Volume 6—No. 2

---

THE FROG-POWER ASCENDANT.

“It is becoming painful,” says The Leader, “to visit any circle of intelligent men on the Continent. Questions are put which an Englishman knows not how to answer. Taunts are uttered which it is impossible to repel. But the experience is useful, for it teaches us to look at our own policy, from an external point of view. Allowing, for instance, that the sympathies of America are with Russia—why not? What is the law of sympathy? Americans may say that it is their interest to preserve friendly relations with Russia. England professes to be ashamed of America—England, which is dragged into every adventure suggested by a Buonaparte usurper, which sacrifices her laws, and the very spirit of her institutions, to his will, which represses the liberal populations of Europe, and forbids them to move. Which alliance were more natural—that of America with Russia, or that of England with the December dynasty? Whatever liberalism exists among us is powerless—has not the slightest influence on public policy—is contradicted and disowned by the governing classes. The French Emperor exerts more influence in Great Britain than the whole body of progressive politicians. He is the inspirer, controller, leader. THE WAR IS HIS (he brings the kings of the earth and of the whole habitable together for the war. —Editor Herald), and the British army is his contingent. Great Britain has no longer a policy; Turkey no longer an existence. Constantinople is the Eastern Capital of the French Empire. The entire European side of the Bosphorus is in French military occupation. The lines at Gallipoli, fortified at the suggestion of an English engineer, constitute an impregnable and commanding French citadel. The English hold one acre of ground, containing barracks for about five hundred men and horses, on the Pera side—their position is on the Asiatic shore. In the city, the police is French; the public buildings are French—above all, the prestige is exclusively French. So in Europe, particularly so in Russia, England has lost that which she thought to prize above every possession, in the endeavour to perfect an alliance which may prove an abyss.

Yea, verily, and it will prove an abyss—the presentment of The Leader almost breathes the inspiration of the prophetic word. What politician in 1852, when French policy began the agitation about the Holy Shrines of Jerusalem, would have believed, that it should be paramount in Constantinople in 1855, and that it should then be “a common joke” there, “that the next Sultan will be a Frenchman?” Yet such is the fact; and a remarkable fact it is—the Frog-Power is in the very Mouth of the Dragon, as he is also in the Mouth of the False Prophet. French military power is paramount in Rome and Constantinople. The “effluences” therefore proceeding thence cannot be otherwise than warlike and unclean.

The war was commenced in the interest of Turkey—to maintain the independence and integrity of the Turkish Empire! But where is its independence? Gone where its “integrity” will soon follow it; and that is, to perdition. “Turkey,” says The Leader, “no doubt is condemned to political dissolution. The present contest must accelerate that result. Already it is a common joke in Constantinople, that the next Sultan will be a Frenchman.”

Here then is a situation being created which will prove fatal to the alliance between France and England, and change the character of the war. The Anglo-French desire to maintain the independence and integrity of Turkey was not from love of the Turk, but from an anxiety to preserve the balance of power. This policy, however, is defeated by the very means adopted to effect it. If the political existence of Turkey be extinct, the balance is destroyed; and if the Frog-power be augmented, it is also gone. Turkey cannot stand alone. If evacuated by the Allies tomorrow, she would soon be swallowed up of her neighbours Austria and Russia. It is evident, therefore, that the present situation of affairs is that of the balance of power destroyed in the East by the successful operations of the Allies; and that the Frog-power is the only gainer by the war.

The Frog-power is the master of the situation. Every one can see this. But the future—what of that? It is the abyss. The Powers will not endure that the Frog-power rule the East. Its greatness will excite their envy, jealousy, and hatred. But not immediately. Its grandeur in Constantinople alone will not be the crisis of its career. Its policy in Rome must consummate the situation it is forming in the East. Providence placed its forces in that city in 1849 with reference to the culmination of its career. The French troops may be said to be providentially waiting in Rome until the Frog-power shall cross its meridian. They will not be voluntarily withdrawn from thence. They will hold the city until, like Sebastopol, it becomes too hot to hold them—until the papal powers in confederacy with Austria and Russia shall expel them from the blood-stained ruins of the Harlot, made desolate and naked by their fire—Revelation 17: 16.

Reader, art thou awake, or like the world at large, asleep? Dost thou heed the voice from beyond the vasty deep which proclaims that “Turkey has no longer an existence?” That is, that its sovereignty is supplanted in its own capital by the French. Does this voice import nothing; does it impart no warning unto thee? Is it not a notable sign of the times, that a power which for several hundred years caused the domain of Antichrist to shake to its foundations, is politically eclipsed, and on the verge of dissolution? Has not “the great river Euphrates,” as an independent power, become “dried up?” While all the world, save Russia, were flattering the Turk on the success of his arms, and predicted for him a glorious issue from the strife, did we not in these pages urge upon you that the integrity and independence of the Ottoman power could not be maintained, though all the earth colleagued in its behalf? You see then that our interpretation of the sure word of prophecy was not only with assurance, but it was correct. Have you considered why this loss of independence was decreed—why its power was to evaporate? The Lord Jesus has informed you in the words following—“that the way of the kings of the East might be prepared:” that is, that a situation might be created for the manifestation of the saints or sons of God—Romans 8: 19. When this situation, or “way,” shall be created or “prepared,” then he says, “BEHOLD, I COME AS A THIEF!” This, which The Leader styles, “the French Emperor’s war,” or as we would call it, “the Frog-power’s war,” is preparing the way. “Great Britain has no policy.” The policy which goes forth to Sardinia, Sweden, Spain, Austria, Prussia, Germany, &c., &c., to stir them up to war against Russia, is his. “The Kings continue to visit Paris,” says The

Leader, “and Sardinia has already left his own dominions, to take counsel at the capital of Napoleon. The King will come on to England, but he will only spend five days in this country. The real business of his journey, we are led to infer, will be commenced and completed in Paris; he will find in that city the Disposer of events, and will probably learn how far, though no farther, he may extend his frontiers southward. \* \* \* Impatient as our (British) representatives in the Baltic may be to signalise themselves, they await the word of command from Paris; and the Parisian scheme, so far as we can judge it by the overt acts, embraces an immense field of operations, comprising, directly or indirectly, the Baltic, Sweden, Germany, and Switzerland. If forced to carry on the contest, Napoleon will be obliged to throw into it new forces, and he appears to be mustering his allies and supporters with great industry, and at present with great success.” November 24. The policy which prepares the way is manifestly his. He works successfully, and will continue so to do until he has excited a conflagration he cannot control. The fire will get away from him, and his own house will be consumed. But this will not put a stop to it. Europe in flames will be “the abyss” on fire which all the engines of the world, diplomatically worked, will not be able to extinguish. When this war, kindled by the Frog-power, shall have worked out its necessary and inevitable results, those results will be the way prepared. Then, O then comes a crash, such as this world has never known before, and such as will not be forgotten while immortality endures! The King of the Jews appears from heaven in Judea; he delivers Jerusalem and his land from the power of the Gentiles; and inaugurates a time of trouble such as has not hitherto been since the confusion of tongues—Daniel 12: 1.

Reader, art thou prepared for this catastrophe of the war? If you would be “blessed,” watch and keep your garments. Be sure your garments are of the wedding type. A covering consisting of tradition put on by dipping is mere filthy rags. Believe the gospel of the kingdom the Samaritans believed, and afterwards do as they did (Acts 8: 12), and you will be clothed aright. You will not then be “naked;” but one of the wise virgins having their lamps trimmed, and ready to go forth and meet the bridegroom joyfully. Short of this, you are not prepared.

EDITOR.

\* \* \*

### THE ITALIAN CRISIS.

Italy has reached a new historical crisis. The Austrian oppressors, taking counsel of their fears, are fortifying the Italian provinces of their dominion, increasing the garrisons, even throwing up earthworks, and stationing huge armies at points whence they may descend to display the Austrian genius for massacre, and reerect the Radetzky gallows. At least 150,000 men are under the command of that fierce veteran, who petitions his government for the license of martial law. Evidently, a struggle is at hand; and when it arrives, neither France nor England can remain indifferent spectators.

There are two principles in the field—Sardinian constitutionalism, represented by king Emmanuel; and Italian republicanism, represented by Mazzini. Enmity and jealousy divide them. The king persecutes the ultra-liberals; Mazzini denounces the king. In this lies the peril of Italian independence considered irrespective of a side-wind from France.

In view of this, an English journal says, “We may fairly put it to Italians of all shades of opinion, whether a national government upon any liberal basis, were not preferable to that

ignominious subjection under which the flower of the Lombard youth are torn away as conscripts in an Austrian army. Is not “Italy for the Italians,” better than “Italy for the Austrians,” and for a score of despicable tyrants, who flourish by the disunion of the Italian people? The object of the patriots should be to restore the nation to independence, after which they may found such institutions as will best represent its genius, and enable it to hold a high position in Europe.”

There is no doubt that Italian independence and social amelioration would be best promoted by the adoption of Piedmontese constitutionalism, under the guarantee of France and England against Austrian and Papal aggression. But then, “Italian Independence” is a mere fairy vision, sporting itself with the hopes of a Liberalism ever deceiving and being deceived. So long as the Times of the Gentiles continue, Italy must groan under the yoke of the “despicable tyrants,” whose system of misrule is represented by the Ten Horns, the Lionmouth, and Name of Blasphemy, pertaining to the Beast of the Sea—Revelation 13: 1-2. We do not mean to say, that no conflict for independence will ensue attended with partial success. This is very probable; nay, almost necessary to establish the end. But we do say, that the success will be as little permanent as when the hopes of Italy were excited by Napoleon I. “Italy for the Austrians,” “Italy for the Italians,” “Italy for the French,” are the faiths of the Austrians, Italians, and French, for which they have combated for ages. But they are all heresies. “Italy for the Saints” is the only true faith, which is forgotten by all, but the Saints themselves. But until “the heritage of the nations” is given to them by Jehovah’s power (Psalm 111: 6), “Italy for the Austrians” will triumph over all the rest. The French may overrun the country, and even drive the Austrians out, as they were driven out by Napoleon I, and in 1848; but reaction will come on. The French will lose all their acquisitions; and Austria, strengthened by Russia and Germany, will reduce Italy to a province of the Two Horned Beast of the Earth. Piedmontese constitutionalism, and Mazzini republicanism, will have breathed their last. Sardinia will be “plucked up by the roots.” Its constitutionalism, its confiscation of ecclesiastical property, its freedom of the press, its aid of the Western Powers, its defiance of the Pope’s excommunication, its hatred of Austria, &c., &c., which now make it dangerous and obnoxious to despotism in Italy; will then be punished by political extinction; and absorption of its territory into the dominion of “the Beast and the False Prophet.” The loss of Italy will soon be followed by the confiscation of France. The mission of the Frog-power will have been completed. Russia, Austria, and Germany, will again give law to Europe from the French capital. The Napoleon Empire will vanish; and France will again resume her normal position in the European system—a Toe of the Assyrian Image, and a Horn of the Fourth Beast.

The present condition of Italy is wretched in the extreme, and is thus set forth in the journal referred to: “Italy, half as large again as Great Britain, inhabited by twenty-four millions of a race as finely organised as any in the world, one in blood, one in language, one in the essentials of character, but never yet one in policy, is distributed into Seven States, of which Piedmont alone is comparatively free. Even there Radetzki menaces the soil, and may at any time, while the choicest of the Sardinian troops are absent in the Crimea, push an army over the frontier. In the Lombardo-Venetian territory, six or seven millions of Italians await a conflict with his semi-barbarous soldiers collected from Central and Eastern Europe. Six millions of the same race in Naples, are ruled by the regal lieutenancy of Austria, whose tender mercies are cruel. In the Papal States two millions and a half submit to the unspeakable degradation of ecclesiastical government, and two thousand French soldiers guard the Holy Pope. Tuscany and the lesser states suffer under maladministration and bigotry, equally injurious to body and soul. The wealth of a fourth part of the land is drained into the Austrian

exchequer to maintain Austrian functionaries and troops in Austrian uniform. Its youths are levied to serve on distant stations under alien generals. Its courts of justice are subject to Austrian control; its schools and colleges to Austrian superintendents; its writers to Austrian censorship; its journals, with the exception of one or two official gazettes, are suppressed; its very catechisms and grammars are tinctured to the Austrian taste; public assemblies of all kinds are prohibited; foreign sentinels patrol the streets; every man, woman, and child, is at the mercy of Austrian insolence.

Elsewhere, five or six states are absolutely governed by princes or grand-dukes, who in their turns are governed by Russia, Austria, or France. Only in Piedmont 'can a man think, speak, or act as a being made in the image of God.' Do not the friends of Italy recognise this picture? No doubt the King of Piedmont acts partly upon selfish, in other words, upon dynastic principles. But the Italians have in Piedmont a citadel which they have never before possessed—a state under the guarantee of England—and they will do well not to depreciate this advantage."

Never was Despotism more oppressive and desolating of human happiness than that in the Austrian and Papal provinces of Italy, and in the kingdom of Naples. This, however, is only a specimen of the abyss into which Europe is about to fall. When Russia and Austria, &c., shall have coalesced, European "liberty" will be dead and buried, never to arise again. The present condition of Italy will be that of Continental Europe at large; and the power ruling the situation, "Gog, of the land of the Magog, prince of Rosh, Meshech, and Tobl." Is not such a power most appropriately styled "the Devil and his Angels?" The elements of its diabolism exist in the now distinct tyrannies of Russia, Austria, Naples, and the Papacy. But, combine them together into one political compact, and give them unity of action, and the unhappy nations of the old world will groan with "the torments of the damned." At this crisis, Europe is not only chained, but her chains are riveted. One policy will rule its destinies, and that will be the policy of iniquity, transgression, and sin. The HEAD OF THE SERPENT will be lord of the situation. For the time, the kingdoms of the world will be his; for their rulers will have "one mind, and shall give their power and strength unto the Beast. For God hath put it into their hearts to fulfil his will, and to agree, and give their kingdom to the Beast, until the words of God shall be fulfilled."—Revelation 17: 13, 17.

When this shall have come to pass, the nations will be in the abyss, dwelling preeminently in the land of the shadow of death, where the light itself will be darkness. What other can be their situation when subject to such awful and cruel despotisms and superstitions as those already named? The kings and priests of Rome will educate and govern the nations under the Imperial Satan; and prepare them for the hardy enterprise of making war upon the Lamb—Revelation 17: 14, who shall then have unfurled the banner of the kingdom upon the mountains of Israel. The reader may, perhaps, think this too gloomy a situation of affairs to be real in so enlightened an age as this. But he must remember that this century is only deemed enlightened by those who know not the truth, and consequently cannot see. In no country are science, literature, and the arts more advanced than in France and Italy; but what truly Christian intelligence have they diffused there? The knowledge of divine truth is as nothing in the most civilised and enlightened of the nations; nor will it be till "THE KING OF THE JEWS" is placed by Jehovah as an ensign upon His mountains, and shall shine gloriously into the regions of death.

It is a great mistake to suppose that the King of Israel will reappear in Palestine in an enlightened period of the world. His appearing is at "the set time to favour Zion," and until

that set time, she is to be trodden under foot of the nations. “When the Lord shall build up Zion, he shall appear in His glory,”—Psalm 102: 16. The building up of Jerusalem and the appearing of the Lord, are events belonging to the same crisis. When, therefore, he appears in his glory, he arises upon Zion and has mercy upon her. He is, consequently, Zion’s Light and the glory in the midst of her. When, therefore, the prophet addresses Jerusalem and says, “Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of Jehovah hath risen upon thee”—Isaiah 60: 1, he speaks of the appearing of the King of the Jews in the capital of his future dominion. Now mark the reason given for this glorious apocalypse; “For,” continues the prophet, “behold the darkness shall cover the earth, and gross darkness the people; but Jehovah shall arise upon thee, and his glory shall be seen over thee.” This is the Scriptural sentence pronounced upon what the nations boast of as the light of modern times. Their light is darkness to be felt, in which reign cruelty, injustice, and pious blasphemy, and fraud.

These fruits are the natural products of Italy, which began its historical career by carrying fire and sword into the homes of its neighbours, and consummated its lust of dominion by subjecting the nations to its anti-christian imposture. God is righteous in all his ways, just and true in all his works. He has given Italy to foreigners, to tyrants, and to fools, in judgment for its idolatry; and the blood of his saints so copiously shed by Italians. His saints, being prevailed against, are no more—they sleep in safety till the great trumpet sounds to vengeance and to arms! The sons of their assassins, writhing under the heel of tyrants, groan in chains and slavery, calling upon heaven which regards them not. God rewards peoples as well as individuals according to their works. “Italy for the Italians” is a dream. They have forfeited it to the slain; who shall rise from the dead, and execute judgment upon their murderers, and subdue the country for themselves. In this really holy war, “a Lake of fire burning with brimstone,”—Revelation 19: 20—will Italy then become. The Beast and False Prophet dominion will be destroyed there; and thus will God have avenged his own. The Beast being slain and his body consumed with the burning flame—Daniel 7: 2, the King of the Jews and his associates will govern the realm of Caesar for themselves. Then will Italy for the first time be ruled in righteousness, and Italians be truly happy, united, enlightened, and sufficiently free.

EDITOR.

\* \* \*

## ANALECTA EPISTOLARIA.

“IGNORANCE OF FOOLISH MEN.”

“Such is the will of God, that with well-doing ye put to silence the ignorance of foolish men.”

Dear Brother. —Some four weeks ago I visited the Universalist House in this city to hear Thomas Jefferson Whitcombe, of Buffalo, N. Y., “on the identity and recognition of friends in the future world.” His text was Philippians 1: 23. I was somewhat surprised, but nevertheless strengthened to find that instead of sticking to his text, he laboured to confute what he termed “the soul-chilling views” entertained by some on the mortality of the soul. His discourse was exceedingly uninteresting, and dark as the carnal mind unenlightened by the word of truth.

The Campbellites lately held their anniversary here. President Campbell, as he is now popularly known, with a number of his Evangelists, were in attendance, some of them continuing the meeting for a week. Dr. Silas E. Shepard, of N. Y. city; Messrs Austin, of Baltimore; J. T. Walsh (or, as the President styled him, while a renegade from Bethanyism, with which he has since made his peace, “Philosopher Walsh”); R. S. Coleman, used up at Fine Creek; C. Bullard, S. Shelburn, and others were in attendance. But with the exception of about two discourses from the President, Dr. Silas E. Shepard, a new man in these parts, was almost the sole spokesman. I heard him three times. I attended the first Lord’s day night of their meeting. The house, which is ample, was filled. I got a seat at the extreme end. The President preceded Dr. Shepard with a long, and to me, inaudible prayer. The doctor then commenced by reading Matthew 19 and taking as his text the words of Jesus to his apostles, namely, “Verily I say unto you, That ye have followed me in THE REGENERATION, when the Son of Man shall be seated upon the throne of his glory, ye shall also be caused to sit upon TWELVE THRONES, ruling the Twelve Tribes of Israel.” This text he parallelised with Luke 22: 30—“Even I am covenanted for you, as my Father covenants for me a kingdom: that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and be seated upon thrones, ruling the Twelve Tribes of Israel.”

Now, although I was sorry to see a man like Dr. Shepard, apparently a man of learning, having a good-shaped head, a good voice, and fair reasoning powers, with tolerable aptness for teaching—although I was sorry to see such an one opposing the glad tidings of the kingdom: yet I was rejoiced to find that the truth is now being so much agitated and proclaimed, that he too thought it proper to dedicate the latter and greater part of his discourse to the work of combating the views we hold concerning the kingdom of God.

After having occupied some time in quite an interesting, and, doubtless, correct criticism upon the word “regeneration” in the text, and which he affirmed meant change of government, without any reference to change of heart, as popularly understood—shameful to say, he left the straight path, and affirmed that it had its fulfilment on the Day of Pentecost when Jesus was crowned king, and his apostles were crowned kings, and “the regeneration,” or change of government, took place; and the ruling over the Twelve Tribes of Israel began !!! Among other things affirmed by this Northern Light of Campbellism was that David never had a literal and visible throne; that his throne was from Dan to Beersheba—his throne was his regal authority. He told us that David’s throne was now the Universe: also that the Ten Tribes were not lost on the Day of Pentecost (as some suppose) to the Apostles, no more than a man’s spectacles are lost when resting upon his nose! The apostles knew where they were; and that all the tribes were represented on that day. The saying that they “may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom” proved that the kingdom was possessed by persons in need of the loaves and fishes to sustain life; and was not therefore to be understood as referring to the future world, or to the immortal saints. Added to this he remarked, that John the Baptist, who, he affirmed very truly, was far greater than any Baptist of this day, taught that the kingdom was at hand; and, indeed, came to hand on the Day of Pentecost. On this, I observed to a gentleman near me, that according to the preacher’s theory the Baptists are in the kingdom of God: and that as the Bible says, “the least in that kingdom is greater than John the Baptist,” the least of the Campbellites and Baptists are greater than John!

I heard President Campbell follow Dr. Shepard on two occasions; once, he seemed to be trying to vindicate himself against what he styles “The slanders of Elder J. B. Jeter.” He is now, I should judge, but a poor specimen of what he has been. He looks quite old, and

somewhat infirm. I really felt sorry to think that he should ignore “the Covenants of Promise.”

The meeting seemed to be quite a dull one. The Rev. R. E. Coleman, of Fine Creek celebrity, struggled hard to create excitement; but they were unable to succeed. They had no additions; so that on Campbellite principles there was “no good done.”

In Christian love I subscribe myself  
Most affectionately your’s  
In Hope of the Kingdom of God,

JOHN N. DAVIS.

Richmond, Virginia, December 9, 1855.

\* \* \*

#### SATAN’S MINISTERS CONFOUNDED BY THE WORD.

Mr. Editor. —The millennium will be introduced by the personal, literal, and visible advent of that same Jesus who went up into heaven and “shall so come in like manner”—Acts 1: 11, and he “will build again the tabernacle of David which is fallen down”—chapter 15: 16; for “The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David”—Luke 1: 31; and “when he shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him, THEN (not till then) shall he sit upon the throne of his glory”—Matthew 25: 31.

At his advent his dead saints shall rise—1 Corinthians 15: 23, and 1 Thessalonians 4: 16; but the rest of the dead will not live again until the end of the thousand years—Revelation 20: 5; but “Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death shall have no power, but they shall be ministers of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years”—Revelation 20: 6. The Spirit said by David, “the heavens and the earth shall be changed,” i.e. regenerated or renovated—Psalm 102; and Paul applies this work to Christ; therefore we are sure he will do the work, —Hebrews 2: 12.

He again says by Isaiah (65: 17-19), “I create new heavens and a new earth; and the voice of weeping shall be NO MORE heard in Jerusalem.” Again he says by Peter (2 Peter 3): The present heavens and earth shall pass away with a great noise; but I promise you a new heaven and a new earth.

Again A.D. 96, he revealed to John that these “things shall come to pass hereafter,”—Revelation 1: 19, and “shortly,” verse 1; and after this he gave John a miniature, or panoramic vision, of the “new heaven and new earth,” in which he shall sit upon his throne, and then “he that sat upon the throne said, Behold! I make all things new”—Revelation 21: 5; and to all these things Jesus alluded when he said before to his apostles, “In the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit upon the throne of his glory, you also shall sit upon the throne of his glory, you also shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel”—Matthew 19: 28, as he had said before by David, “Thrones of the house of David”—Psalm 122: 5. Now if God be for us, who can be against us? Is not God greater than Satan and all his ministers? Yea, verily.

Is he a minister of God who says “Those who talk about the restoration of the tribes of Israel, had better talk about the restoration of their own lost senses?” No.



Ministers of Satan transform themselves into ministers of Christ, and humbug their followers by telling them that “the regeneration and all the promises in Matthew 19: 28, were fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, more than 1800 years ago.”

The Devil was a liar from the beginning, therefore his ministers are liars also: let the cap fit those to whom it belongs. President A. Campbell said in A.D. 1832, there are but two comings of the Lord mentioned in the holy scriptures; the first was literal, personal, and visible, and it is past; the second is yet future, and will be literal, personal, and visible to every eye, and not figurative nor symbolic. See “Family Test. Appendix” p. 97.

Now he being judge, the coming of the Son of man, Matthew 25: 31, has never yet taken place; therefore the Son of man is not yet sitting upon his throne, Matthew 19: 28, and Luke 1: 31. Messrs Campbell and Shepard told us at a late meeting in Richmond, Va., that “when the Son of man sits upon his throne, the regeneration also takes place, and the apostles also sit upon twelve thrones as promised in Matthew 19: 28.” Now, Mr. Editor, I want you to guess from the above, what else Messrs C. and S. told us at the aforesaid meeting. Please publish the above and your guess, and if you guess very wrong, I will correct you, not otherwise. The name of Mr. Campbell’s periodical imports faith in the future and personal reign of Christ and the apostles a thousand years in Jerusalem; for Mr. C. does not believe “The Millennial Harbinger” was obsolete on the Pentecost, nor that the millennium expired 800 years ago, or he would not now publish “The Harbinger” and subject himself to just ridicule. I wish you would notice these things and define Mr. C’s position. Is he in a dilemma? Excuse my real name, but I am—OLD.

P.S. Your periodical may with propriety be called, The Millennial Harbinger and Herald of the Everlasting Kingdom. OLD.  
Richmond, Virginia.

\* \* \*

#### “THE REGENERATION.”

There are three things to be approved by the faithful in the truth, which are good, better, and best. Opposition to the gospel of the kingdom is good, belief of it is better, and obedience to it, best. If men will not believe and obey it, the next best thing they can do for the truth, is to oppose it with all their might and main. This is good; not for themselves indeed, but for the dissemination of the truth. Lucifer match paste is incendiary and destructive; but left alone it is neither. Is it not so also with the truth? Leave the truth alone; bring it not forth from its magazine; let there be no agitation about it, and the truth will be as innocuous, as peaceable, and harmless, as a lamb—no one would be converted by it; and no man’s crotchets would be endangered nor disturbed. We rejoice, then, with our correspondent to hear that the adversaries of David’s throne and kingdom are making war upon them in Richmond. We hope they will give them there and elsewhere no rest. Let them bring all their “men of learning,” all their “good shaped heads” and “good voices,” with all their holy tones and nasal twangs; let them array all their “powers,” tacts, and talents, against them—“The virgin, the daughter of Zion, despises them, and laughs them to scorn; the daughter of Jerusalem shakes her head at them;” and the merest stripling of David’s house will hook their nostrils and bridle their lips, and turn them back whither they came—Isaiah 37: 22-29. Collision will cause the truth to shine with a brightness destructive of the enemy. Let him

oppose, it is good; their opposition is the rage of an infant against a rock; the demonstration is attractive, proving they are troubled by what they cannot subdue. All the President and his congeners are good for at the present crisis is to call attention to the gospel by opposing it. They have proved themselves to be the reverse of “honest and good hearts;” and as the truth was only designed for such, it is therefore not for them. Like Demas, they love the present world, whose approbation and good things they seek and obtain; and with him they will vanish into perdition, unless they repent and turn from their wickedness, and be healed. The truth alone can bring them to this; and against the truth they harden their hearts, and close their eyes. Surely, such a generation is nigh to cursing!

In our correspondent’s letter, we have given Dr. Shepard’s text as we find it in the original. Abstractly *παλιγγενεσια*, rendered “regeneration” there, signifies a producing again—a meaning which implies that the thing or things so produced existed in some state previously to REproduction. In Matthew 19 the word is used in reference to thrones, tribes, glory, ruling and rulers; which are the elements of a kingdom. It is therefore used there in a political sense, and implied when so used by “the King of the Jews,” that those things did not then organically exist, but that they should be thereafter reproduced. The kingdom of the twelve tribes had existed in the Holy Land, the only country where it can exist; but when Jesus spoke the words, the Holy Land was a province of the Little Horn of the Goat—the power that afterwards destroyed Jerusalem and the Temple. From the days of John the Baptist’s proclamation to the time Dr. Shepard made void God’s word by his traditions at Richmond, Jehovah and his king’s land has continued to be a province of the Little Horn. “WE HAVE NO KING BUT CAESAR,” was the public avowal of a fact attested by all history to this day. Caesar has been de facto; though not de jure, king of the Jews ever since. The Sultan is for the present the representative of the Goat’s Little Horn. Could a kingdom be set up in the Palestinian province of his empire under a proclamation that M. Rothschild was king of the Jews, and not Abdul Medjid, against the Sultan’s will enforced by the Pasha of Jerusalem? Neither could a kingdom be established there under the old Sultan Tiberius Caesar, in the presence of his Pasha Pontius Pilate, under a proclamation that Jesus, and not Tiberius, was king of the Jews. Not only was Caesar’s pasha ready to suppress all such treasonable attempts, but the Jews themselves and their rulers, were determined to uphold the Gentile government against any movement in the name of the hated Nazarene. No, the kingdom of the Twelve Tribes did not exist when their de jure, but not de facto, king Jesus spoke the words: nor has it in any sense existed there since. To affirm the contrary is preposterous—sheer ignorance or stupidity, or both. President Campbell and his congeners might just as well affirm that the United States was set up in Great Britain, because the American Ambassador and his fellow-citizens met at the London Tavern to celebrate the Fourth of July!! It would require something more to set up the Union there, than to celebrate American Independence, and to hold meetings to preach its principles, and to make proselytes to universal liberty and equality. So long as Queen Victoria ruled the land, with the army and people on her side, there could be no setting up of Presidentialism without treason against her person and authority. A kingdom or republic is something more than an abstraction, or unorganised elements. Two hostile kingdoms cannot coexist in the same capital; much less possible is it for Caesar and Messiah to reign together over Jerusalem; and to prate about the Apostles reigning in or over that city, where, at the will of Caesar’s vassals they were cast into prison, and finally expelled, is too absurd for serious confutation.

The throne of David, and the thrones of David’s house, the Glory of Jehovah, the twelve tribes, and their twelve ruling princes, all existed in Jerusalem and the Holy Land in the days of David and Solomon; seeing then, that they did not exist when the greater than

Solomon was there, nor since, it follows that reproduction in relation to what Jesus and his Apostles were interested in, imports the restoration of those things to their appropriate place. This is what the apostles themselves understood was to be accomplished “in the regeneration:” for, after Jesus had been discoursing to them about the kingdom some forty days subsequent to his resurrection, they inquired of him, “Wilt thou in this time restore the kingdom of Israel?” This question shows that they did not consider that Israel possessed a, or the, kingdom; therefore, they wished to know if he would not then re-produce it. What does the President and his congeners do with this? How do they evade the force of it? O nothing more easy! “The apostles were ignorant, and did not know what they were talking about!” They had not studied at Bethany, or at some other equally orthodox school of Gentilism; and were, consequently, too carnal, too Jewish, in their notions of the kingdom? Then we must study Gentile theology to understand the words of Jesus and his apostles! Reader, is this your condition? If it be, then burn your Bible, and cast the Herald into the bottomless abyss; you have no use for either.

In the re-production of the kingdom of the twelve tribes, the territory, the nation, and the capital, will all be the same—the Holy Land, the Twelve Tribes, and Jerusalem. The government will be monarchical “as in the days of old.” This will not be changed. The persons by whom the government will be administered will be different. Instead of David, succeeded by Solomon, succeeded by Rehoboam; it will be “Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews” succeeded by no one; and instead of the princes of David succeeded by the princes of Solomon, &c.; it will be the apostles and brethren of Jesus, the immortal princes of the house of Bethlehem, succeeded by none: for “THE KINGDOM SHALL NOT BE LEFT TO OTHER PEOPLE,” as in former years—Daniel 2: 44. None, who have not previously been the subject of “a change of heart”—“renewed by knowledge after the image of God”—can have any part in that kingdom. This will exclude “the President and his evangelists;” for “they are alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them;” but sincerely do we hope that they are not yet “past feeling.” At present, they despise “the word of the kingdom;” and it is written, that “Whoso despiseth the word shall be destroyed”—Proverbs 13: 13. Without knowledge there is no righteousness—“Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth.” Ignorance of this truth is a barrier against sanctification by it. The truth must be known to be believed; and without faith, or belief of the gospel of the kingdom, it is impossible to please God: and he that pleaseth not God is not righteous; and “the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God.”

\* \* \*

#### HEIRS AND SUBJECTS OF THE KINGDOM.

The President and his congeners have not yet learned the difference between the subjects of a kingdom and the heirs of a kingdom. The latter are they who are to rule over the kingdom, and to possess the glory and honour of it forever; the former, the nation which is to obey their statutes and ordinances. Christians are not the subjects of the kingdom. They rank higher than this. They are to rule. They are joint heirs of all things promised to their Elder Brother—the Joseph of the family. If the President and his evangelists understood this, they would not prate about a kingdom being set up in Jerusalem on Pentecost. The apostles and their brethren were all joint heirs, and rulers of the kingdom elect. This is irrefutable; where then, were their subjects? Let them answer this if they can.

The subjects of the kingdom are the generations of the ages—those generations of the Twelve Tribes contemporary with the reign of Jesus on his father David’s throne in

Jerusalem: the descendants of the old clothes men of Chatham Street, New York, and of Rag Fair in London; and of the down-trodden and despised outcasts of Israel in all the Ghettos of Rome, Constantinople, and other sinks of Gentile abomination and iniquity. These outcasts, however degraded, are not lower in the social scale than the Egyptian bondsmen from whom sprang the generations that conquered Canaan, and were the terror and admiration of the Orient under David and Solomon. The first generation that shall be resettled in the Holy Land by Jesus will be brought into the righteousness prepared of God for its justification. “Their sins and iniquities will I remember no more,” says Jehovah, and “they shall be all righteous”—a righteous nation, whose shepherds shall be after Jehovah’s heart, and shall feed them with knowledge and understanding—Jeremiah 3: 15.

There was no “change of government” effected in Jerusalem on Pentecost. All the Jews that resided or sojourned in that city, whether Nazarenes or not, continued to obey the laws. The Roman government was not changed; and the municipal and the ecclesiastical customs were observed as usual, and for nearly forty years after. All that the Christian Hebrews did was to cease from seeking righteousness by works of law. A Christian in Britain abstains from seeking salvation through state-church, or dissenting institutions; nevertheless, he pays tithes, and taxes, and is careful not to violate the law. It was so with the Pentecostian Christians—they continued to render unto Caesar what belonged to him, and to God the things that were his.

The great event of the Day of Pentecost was, the proclamation for the first time of repentance and remission of sins in the name of Jesus as the Messiah, to all those who believed the gospel of the kingdom, and recognised his claims to its throne. All such were baptised, and became a society in Jerusalem; not a kingdom, but suffering tribulation in hope of receiving one.

\* \* \*

### THRONE.

“Throne is used for that magnificent seat whereon sovereign princes usually sit to receive the homage of their subjects, or to give audience to ambassadors; where they appear with pomp and ceremony, and from whence they dispense justice.” The Scripture describes the throne of Solomon as the finest and richest throne in the world. Thus it is written in 1 Kings 10: 18; “Solomon made a great throne of ivory, and overlaid it with the best gold. The throne had six steps, and the top of the throne was round behind, and there were stays on either side on the place of the seat, and two lions stood beside the stays. And twelve lions stood there on the one side and on the other upon the six steps; there was not the like made in any kingdom.”

This description shows that “throne” is a word representative of something occupying less space than “from Dan to Beersheba.” It is true that “throne” is also put for sovereign power and dignity, it being the symbol of royalty and regal authority—“Only on the throne,” said Pharaoh to Joseph, “will I be greater than thou.” It is not pretended that Jesus is to sit upon the identical piece of palace furniture made by David’s cabinet maker, or Solomon’s goldsmith. Dr. Shepard is accustomed to amuse himself and his audience in this city, with ill-timed levity about “David’s wooden throne” as if we were such fools as to suppose that a wooden throne, once sat on by David, was the precise article to be restored for Jesus to sit upon! No; *θρονοϛ*, thrones, from *θραω*, thrao, to sit, signifies an elevated seat with a

footstool; and the city that contains such a seat occupied by a king, is also styled In Scripture a throne—the container being put for the contained. Hence, as Zion and Jerusalem were the dwelling-place and seat of David and his dominion when he ruled the Twelve Tribes as king for Jehovah, they are styled “the throne of Jehovah,” and “the throne of David”—Jeremiah 3: 16. To restore the throne of David, therefore, is to set up a royalty in the Holy Land with the regal authority located in Jerusalem. But this is not all. To constitute the throne of the monarchy, David’s throne, the twelve tribes of Israel must be planted in the land, and the person occupying the throne must be a Son of David. A royalty in the Holy Land with British or French for the subjects, and a Gentile reigning over them on Mount Zion would not be David’s throne, though the regal authority were seated in Jerusalem. It is the regal authority in David’s house, executing judgment and justice in the Holy Land from Jerusalem, as its palatial residence, that is David’s throne—the regal authority enthroned, or seated there, and exercised by himself or a descendant. We look for the reestablishment of such a throne as this in Jerusalem, when we speak of the restoration of David’s throne; without regard to the cabinet or upholstery work of the material seat, be it of wood, ivory, or gold. The Messiah, as his father Solomon, will exercise his own wisdom and taste in the matter; it is enough for us to believe the testimony, which Dr. Shepard seeks to render null and void by a pulpit joke about old wooden thrones! But, there is no place like the pulpit for dry wit and foolish jesting.

\* \* \*

#### RESTORATION OF THE TRIBES OF ISRAEL.

The Doctor is right in saying that the Ten Tribes of Israel were not lost to the apostles. The apostles knew where they were when they addresses the 3000 on Pentecost. Every one else knows who believes the Bible, as well as they. “Jehovah was angry with Israel, and removed them out of his sight: there was none left but the tribes of Judah only”—2 Kings 18: 18. “So was Israel carried away out of their own land to Assyria unto this day”—verse 23; and “they were placed in Halah, and in Habor by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes”—verse 17: 6. “But they took this counsel among themselves, that they would leave the multitude of the heathen, and go forth into a further country, where never mankind dwelt, that they might keep their statutes, which they never kept in their own land. And they entered into Euphrates by the narrow passages of the river. For the Most High then showed signs for them, and held still the flood, till they were passed over. For through that country there was a great way to go, namely of a year and a half: and the same region is called Arzareth. The dwelt they there until the latter time. And now when they shall begin to come, the Highest shall stay the springs of the stream again (see Isaiah 11: 15-16) that they may go through”—2 Esdras 13: 40-47.

Josephus also, who was contemporary with the Apostles, in his speech to the factions, persuading them to surrender to Titus, told them that it was useless to hold out, expecting succour from the Ten Tribes, as the Parthians lay between them and the Holy Land; who would not permit them to march through their country, if they desired so to do. The apostles knew that the Ten Tribes were in a far distant land beyond Parthia. But this is nothing to Dr. Shepard. He can have ten apostles sitting upon thrones in Jerusalem, ruling ten tribes of their nation in Arzareth (supposed to be Afghanistan) without having the least power to make their will known, or to enforce a simple decree!! But nothing is too hard for Gentile credulity—it can give credence to any absurdity; but for the testimony of God it has no faith.

We deny that the Apostles have yet ruled the Ten Tribes in any sense; but, with full assurance of faith and hope, we believe, that Messiah will bring them back to the Holy Land, and “settle them there after their old estates;” and that then, and not till then, will the apostles rule them according to the promise.

But Dr. Shepard, or one of his congeners, at the Richmond meeting, according to the testimony of our correspondent “Old,” says, that “Those who talk about the Restoration of the Tribes of Israel, had better talk about the restoration of their own lost senses!” Of course, he that utters this does not believe in their restoration. It is therefore very certain that he does not believe the gospel of the kingdom; for no restoration no kingdom; and no kingdom no salvation for Jews or Gentiles. Then we have lost our senses, and are new cases for that lunatic asylum, where the Jews placed Jesus—John 10: 20 and Festus, the apostle Paul—Acts 26: 24. As we have said, we assuredly believe that all the tribes will be restored to the land covenanted to Abraham and his Seed; and that not a single straggler will be left behind. Now hear, oh ye pious infidels, so wise in your own conceit, what a madman of ancient times testifies concerning Israel’s return: —

“Thus saith Jehovah Elohim; Behold I, even I, will both search my sheep, and seek them out. As a shepherd seeketh out his flock on the day that he is among his sheep that are scattered; so will I seek out my sheep, and will deliver them out of all places where they have been scattered in the cloudy and dark day. And I will bring them out from the people, and gather them from the countries, and **WILL BRING THEM TO THEIR OWN LAND**, and feed them upon the mountains of Israel by the rivers, and in all the inhabited places of the country. I will feed them in a good pasture, and upon the high mountains of Israel shall their fold be: **THERE** shall they be in a good fold, and in a fat pasture shall they feed upon the mountains of Israel. . . . And I will bring that which was lost, and bring again that which was driven away, and will bind up that which was broken, and will strengthen that which was sick: but I will destroy the fat and the strong; I will feed them with judgment”—Ezekiel 34: 11-16.

“And I will set up one shepherd over them, and he shall feed them, even my servant David; he shall feed them, and he shall be their shepherd. And I, Jehovah, will be to them for Elohim, and my servant David, a prince among them. . . . And they shall **NO MORE** be a prey to the nations, neither bear the shame of the nations any more. . . . for I will take them from among the nations, and gather them out of all countries, and will bring them into their own land. . . . And I will make them one nation in the land upon the mountains of Israel, and one king shall be king to them all . . . And David, my servant, shall be king over them . . . and shall be their prince **FOREVER**”—verses 23-24, 28-29; 36: 24; 37: 22, 24-25.

Any honest, unsophisticated mind, reading this can understand it. Such a one can see that it relates to Israel’s future, and to that only; for the testimony declares, that Israelites shall no more be a prey to the nations, and bear these nations’ reproaches and ill-treatment no more: but they do now endure them all, and are now a prey; therefore the word being true, it follows that the testimony concerns the future.

Yes, and not a single straggler shall be left in a foreign land, however indisposed he may now be to return to Palestine. Hear this, ye Gentiles, who make the word of God of none effect by your nonsensical traditions, what that glorious old “madman,” as ye call those who believe his doctrine, says in regard to this: —

“And it shall come to pass,” says Moses, “when all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse which I have set before thee, and thou shall call them to mind among all the nations whither I shall be thine Elohim hath driven thee, and shall obey his voice according to all that I command you this day, thou and thy children with all thy heart: that then I shall be thine Elohim will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will RETURN and gather thee from all the people, whither I shall be thine Elohim hath scattered thee.”

“If any of thine be driven out unto the outmost parts of heaven, from thence will I shall be thy Elohim gather thee, and from thence will he fetch thee; and I shall be thine Elohim will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it; and he will do thee good, and multiply thee above thy fathers”—Deuteronomy 30: 1-5.

The doctrine of the restoration of the twelve tribes was also inculcated by the “Prophet like unto Moses,” who said to his contemporaries what is equally applicable to ours, “If ye believe not Moses’ writings how can ye believe my words?” In his prophecy on Mount Olivet, he said, “The Son of Man (the I shall be thine Elohim of Moses) shall send his messengers with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his chosen (people) from the four winds, from the outmost heavens even to their extremities”—Matthew 24: 31.

Such is the concurrent testimony of Ezekiel, Moses, Isaiah, Jesus, Paul, &c., all speaking by one and the same Spirit. Had they lost their senses? If we have lost ours in believing and looking for the accomplishment of what they wrote, then certainly they had lost theirs in predicting such improbabilities as the Gentiles regard them. Only think of it, reader, here are President Campbell, and his own evangelists, a fair specimen of the blind leaders of the blind in general; here are they charging the Holy Spirit in effect with having lost his senses!! We know not how much nearer men can come in these times to the “sin against the Holy Spirit” than this. Happy, happy is he who believes the simple truth; yea, thrice happy is he who is stigmatised as a lunatic by such blind guides. “Christians!”—call them Christians and ministers of Christ, who deny the work the Father hath appointed Him to do! “To bring back Jacob to him: to raise up his tribes, and to restore the desolations of Israel: to establish the land, and cause to possess the desolate estates”—Isaiah 49: 5-6, 8: deny this, and pretend to understand, believe, and teach the truth as it is taught in Christ Jesus! Preposterous—such teaching can only be tolerated and endorsed by those who exclude Moses and the prophets from their pulpits, and are taken captive of Satan at his will.

\* \* \*

#### THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN AT HAND.

Dr. Shepard and his congeners teach, that in the words of our English Version attributed to John the Baptist, namely, “Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand,” be taught, that “the kingdom was at hand, and indeed come to hand.” Now this is very lame for men like President Campbell and Dr. S. E. Shepard, who are engaged in preparing for the public an accurate translation of the scriptures—the one a translator, and the other a revising critic! They tell us the kingdom was set up on the day of Pentecost, and that it had come to hand seven years before, that is, when John began to preach. Now, we would like to know of these two associates in the same opinion, how they settle it between themselves, that the kingdom was come and not come at one and the same time? If the kingdom had come to

hand when John began to preach; and was not set up till the day of Pentecost, seven years after, where was the kingdom during that seven years? By “kingdom” they understand “reign,” according to the teaching of George Campbell of Aberdeen; but, will they just think for themselves, and tell us where the reign was that had “come to hand,” but was not administered till after seven years?

Leaving them to their dilemma, we proceed to remark, that the translation of John the Baptist’s words into Greek by him who prepared the first version of Matthew in that tongue, is, *ηγγικε η βασιλεια των ουρανων*, *engike he basileia ton ouranon*. It is well known, that the English version does not render this correctly. The French has it, “Le royaume des cieux est proche”—“the kingdom of the heavens is near.” The Spanish renders it, “Se ha acercado el reino de les cielos”—“the kingdom of the heavens has acceded.” In the Italian, “Il regno de’ cieli è vicino”—“the kingdom of the heavens is near.” And the German, “Das himmelreich ist nahe herbey gekommen”—“the heaven-kingdom is near by here to come.”

None of these versions accurately express the meaning of the Greek. The difficulty in their case has been with the words *βασιλεια* and *ηγγικε*. The former they have rendered kingdom in their several languages, as the nominative to the verb *ηγγικε*; which they could not render according to its proper tense, which is the perfect, not being able to see in what sense John the Baptist could say “it has approached.” If they had rightly comprehended *βασιλεια* the difficulty would have been removed; we shall therefore show what we conceive to be its import, that we may escape from the entanglement.

Etymologically then, *basileia* is a substantive derived from the neuter plural of the adjective *βασιλειος*, which signifies royal, regal, or any thing pertaining to a *βασιλευς*, *basileus*, or king. In its radical sense, therefore, *basileia* signifies what pertains to a king. Hence, a kingly territory, regal authority, majesty, royalty, the title and honour of king, royal power or dignity, &c., may all be expressed by *basileia*. But, which of these senses are we to adopt in interpreting the words of John? That must be determined by the context. Now the context shows that John the Baptist was alluding, not to the reign, nor to the territory, nor to the power; but to the person to whom the title and honour of king belonged—“THE LORD.” The quotation from Isaiah which immediately follows proves this. Turn, reader, to Matthew 3: 1-3, and Isaiah 40: 3. Matthew tells us that John came preaching in the wilderness of Judea, saying, “Repent ye, for the *basileia* of the heavens *engike*.” He then quotes Isaiah, showing that John and what he preached, were the fulfilment of one of his prophecies. “For this (John) is he,” says Matthew, “who was spoken of by the prophet Isaiah, saying, The voice of one crying (or preaching) in the wilderness.” What did he preach? Matthew has told us; but what saith Isaiah? Hear him—“Prepare ye the way of JEHOVAH, make straight in the desert a highway for our Elohim,” \* \* \* and then adds, “the *kevod* Yehowah, the MAJESTY, shall be revealed.”

This “Majesty of Jehovah” was the *basileia ton ouranon*, John proclaimed as having approached. John was “Jehovah’s messenger sent before the face of Jehovah’s Majesty, to prepare the way of His Majesty before him.”—Mark 1: 2. “Thou, child,” said Zacharias to John, “shall be called the prophet of the Highest; for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways.” The messengers sent from Jerusalem to John asked him, “Why baptisest thou if thou be neither the Christ, Elijah, nor the Prophet?” John replied, “I baptise with water: but there standeth one among you whom ye know not: He it is, who coming after me is preferred before me \* \* \* for he was before me. And I knew him not: but that he (the Majesty of Jehovah) should be made manifest (or revealed) to Israel, therefore am I come



baptising in water.”—John 1: 25-31. “I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptise in water, the same said to me, upon whom thou shalt see the spirit descending and remaining on him, the same is he who baptiseth with the Holy Spirit. And I saw, and bare record that Jesus is the Son of God.”—verses 32-34.

From this testimony we learn—

1. That the kevod yehowah and the basileia ton ouranon are the same; and that they refer to a person;
2. That this Royal Person had come, and was living in the midst of his nation; but that neither John, nor any of his contemporaries, were able to identify him;
3. That John knew Jesus, because he was his cousin; but did not know that his cousin according to the flesh was the Majesty of Jehovah and Israel’s Elohim;
4. That his Divine Majesty, the King of Israel, was to be revealed to Israel by a notable and unmistakable sign from heaven;
5. That this sign was the descent of the Spirit upon him in the form of a dove, and remaining;
6. That said sign rested upon Jesus, and with the voice accompanying it, proved him to be the Majesty of Jehovah; and,
7. That John’s proclamation “the Basileia hath approached,” was made during his incognito; that is, before his manifestation at his baptism.

In Mark the phrase basileia ton ouranon is converted into basileia ton theon, “kingdom of God.” In his dissertation upon this phrase, Dr. George Campbell considers “the heavens” as a metonymy for “God,” who is in scripture, sometimes by periphrasis, denominated “he that dwelleth in heaven.” In support of this, he quotes from Daniel, where it is written, “Thy kingdom shall be sure unto thee after that thou shalt have known that THE HEAVENS do rule.” The prophet had said in the preceding verse, “seven times shall Passover thee, till thou knowest that THE MOST HIGH ruleth in the kingdom of men.” Thus he who is denominated “the Most High” in one verse, is termed “the Heavens” in the following.

I have no objection to this view of the matter, βασιλεια standing for “Majesty;” and ζων ουρανων of the Heavens, for “of Jehovah.” The verb ηγγικε should be rendered with its appropriate sign of the perfect, and then the sentence will be complete—“The Majesty of the Heavens,” or “THE MAJESTY OF JEHOVAH HAS APPROACHED.”

In his preaching, John made this the reason why those who heard him should “repent.”—“Repent ye;” said he, “because His Divine Majesty is in the midst of you; and about to be revealed through my baptism.” This was a very cogent and intelligible reason why they should prepare themselves by righteousness. The King of Israel, who was then about speedily to appear from the water of the Jordan, was a king who would “fulfil all righteousness;” it was therefore fitting that at his manifestation he should find a people having the knowledge of salvation by the remission of their sins, whom he could recognise as his associates. This people he found in John’s disciples, from whom he selected his apostles;

because, unlike the Pharisees and Lawyers, they honoured God in yielding obedience to the proclamation of John. —Luke 7: 29-30.

Let us not be misunderstood. We give the foregoing exegesis as applicable to the words of John the Baptist, of Jesus, and of his apostles, in their proclamation of repentance; and not as an interpretation of *ἡ βασιλεια ζων ονρανων* wherever they occur. *Basileia* has more significations than one; but which of its several is to be used in a particular place must be determined by the context.

But here we must dismiss the subject for the present, in hope that our Campbellite and other sectarian friends will be able to discern the truth of the matter; and in so doing be delivered from their embarrassing speculations about a kingdom being at hand at a time when no such intimation was ever given; but on the contrary the very opposite was diligently enforced. Jesus spoke a parable to discourage so untimely an expectation. —Luke 19: 11. No kingdom till his return.

EDITOR.

ADDENDUM. —In 1832, or earlier, President Campbell published in his “Extra on Remission of Sins” these words—“Josephus, the Jew, called the return of Israel to their own land and institution, “THE REGENERATION,” or *παλιγγενεσια*, **palingenesia**.” Josephus was right; and as he wrote after the day of Pentecost, he did not consider the tribes in any sense returned, though, as Dr. Shepard assumes, all of them might have been represented there that day.

\* \* \*

#### THE GOSPEL IN THE CAPITAL OF THE UNION.

Dear Brother. —Since I wrote to you last we have had an addition to our “little flock,” directly from the Methodist quarter of Babylon; and as far as I can judge, he is quite an acquisition. As soon as he desired to put on the name of Jesus, we wrote to Baltimore, giving brother Lemmon an invitation to come and speak to the people at the water. He accepted the Macedonian call, and spoke at the shore of the Potomac for about an hour.

There was another who used to meet with us from the Baptist section of the Great City. He had some idea of the truth; but when we spoke of the importance of obeying, as well as of believing the truth, he very soon became tired of us, took wings and caged with the “Campbellites,” whose “easy virtue” is more congenial to the laxity of his theology.

You will be aware, I presume, that Dr. Barclay has returned to Washington. He was sent to Palestine to convert the Jews to Campbellism; which, if he did anything, was all that he could do. I had a conversation with him lately, and find that he does not understand the Gospel. Since his return here, I received an invitation to attend a Bible-class meeting usually held on Sunday mornings. The first morning I was there, the doctor was presiding. They read 1 John 2, with the seventh verse for their more especial consideration. One of the doctor’s brethren wanted to know what the “word” was that was spoken from the beginning. “The old commandment is the word which ye have heard from the beginning.” The doctor was very liberal; more so, I believe, than he will be again. He invited all who were not connected with him to ask questions, or participate with them in searching the scriptures. They talked a good deal about “love.” I took an opportunity of striking in here, and of pressing upon their

attention the real question before them, requiring an answer. I urged that an answer to this question was important; inasmuch as the love of God cannot be perfected in us if this word did not abide in us. I then quoted the fifth and twenty-fourth verses, showing them, that if that word did not abide in them, they did not abide in the Father, nor in the Son. I was prepared to show them from the Law and the Testimony, that this “word” was synonymous with “the gospel.” After giving this explanation of the word from the scriptures, and finding that I was not opposed, I ventured to ask them what the gospel was? They had no perch to fly to but 1 Corinthians 15: 1-4. The breastwork thrown up here was soon weakened, by referring them to what Paul did preach, and to what the Corinthians had received. At this point, one of the elders perceiving where we were drifting; or rather, where the truth was going to land them, arose, and wanted to know our motive for introducing such a subject as this? Alas, what a sample of the reformation of “this reformation!!” After he had done spitting out his venom, I told them our motives; and on this occasion took an opportunity to bring the truth before them as forcibly as I was able; and you may depend upon it, I did not fail to show them their position. After I had finished, I was very kindly taken by the hand by a middle-aged gentleman, who among other things inquired if I had any of your publications? I have since lent him Elpis Israel, and a copy of the Herald. I hear that the Campbellites express their fears that this gentleman is lost to them. He desires to purchase Elpis Israel, but I had to inform him, that they were all sold.

They could not get this subject disposed of. At length, one of them arose, and made a pretty long speech; and you may easily guess what the matter thereof was like, from the fact of his setting the congregation a laughing at him. He affirmed that Christ’s kingdom was established; and that he was prepared to prove it. It was agreed, that he should take the affirmative, and we the negative of that proposition.

Next Sunday, brother Jacobs showed them from the New Testament, that the kingdom of God was still a matter of hope. He spoke about an hour; and when he quoted Acts 1: 6, “Wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?” Dr. Barclay interrupted him by exclaiming, “Oh, that is a Jewish kingdom!” I took a note of this, as I had to speak after brother Jacobs.

I divided what I had to say into four propositions, and had my proofs alongside of each. The propositions were:

1. The scriptures only speak of two Kingdoms; the one, the Kingdom of God, and the other, the Kingdom of Men;
2. The Kingdom of God at one time existed; but now exists nowhere;
3. The hope of the restoration of this kingdom again to Israel under a better covenant, is the only hope set before us in the gospel; and,
4. The gospel preached on the day of Pentecost was the Hope of Israel in the name of Jesus.

After I had shown them what the Hope of Israel was, I contrasted their hope with it; and illustrated its ethereality by quoting the following words from one of their “Spiritual Songs,” wherein is found much of their divinity in rhyme:

“With thee we reign, with thee we rise;  
And kingdoms gain beyond the skies!”

These lines stirred up Dr. Barclay’s inwards. He interrupted me, and said that we were not discussing “kingdoms beyond the skies.” He affirmed that they did not believe in such kingdoms: in short, he got ashamed of his own faith, which stands out so notably in their own rhymes.

Next first day, they have to affirm that the kingdom is established. If spared till the examination of this subject is over, I will let you know how it ends.

Dear brother, I do feel glad that I have been spared to hear the sound of the gospel. It is truly the power of God to the salvation of every one that believes it. It is the pearl of great price. I would like you to write to me; but I can hardly expect it, as you have so much writing to compose. I am sorry when I hear of brethren not walking in the truth. May the result of the waywardness of some in New York we have known, be a warning to us; and stimulate us to stand fast in the faith once delivered to the saints.

In the love of the truth, I remain, yours,

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

Washington City, D. C., December 22, 1855.

\* \* \*

#### THE GOSPEL OF THE KINGDOM DENOUNCED AS BLASPHEMY BY THE EX-CAMPBELLITE MISSIONARY TO JERUSALEM.

Bro. Thomas: —I am writing in a hurry. Yesterday we listened to an oration from the Campbellites, to prove the kingdom of God to be now existing on the earth, in reply to Bro. A. Campbell’s discourse the Sunday previous, proving the kingdom existed nowhere at present, &c., as he has informed you in his letter. A man by the name of Dickerson began and simply proved there was a kingdom; when one of their members arose and informed him that he had not produced one “Thus saith the Lord,” to prove the kingdom was set up on Pentecost; he further said that his faith in the kingdom being set up on Pentecost had been shaken; and that Bro. Dickerson had failed to restore it, he therefore wished Doctor Barclay to give his testimony for the kingdom being set up on next Lord’s Day.

Dr. Barclay consented; but stated that there should be no more arguments in the church on that subject; and that the name of Jesus was blasphemed by those who preached the personal reign of Christ upon the Throne of David over the Jews, (restored), and the nations in virtue of the Covenants of Promise made to Abraham and David, and brought into force by his resurrection from the dead. Dickerson also remarked, that it was awful for a man to think of Christ coming to this earth to reign personally on David’s Throne, over the wicked nations; and to cut them in pieces with swords! But of all the nonsense I ever heard from lawyers and divines this surpassed all. Bro. Stewart, one whom we have lately taken from the M.E. church, was present, and said such language disgusted him, and he was glad he had escaped such ignorance. I suppose we shall have the Campbellite kingdom proved next Lord’s day, but we want the testimony. Bro. Lemmon was in Washington and spoke at the water when Bro. Stewart was immersed.

I shall write again soon, and give you further particulars of our Campbellite friends. I remain Yours in the One Hope,

RICHARD A. BOARMAN.

Washington, D.C., December 24, 1855.

\* \* \*

#### A LIBERAL WISH.

Dear Sir: —I am well pleased with the Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come. I believe all you say on that subject. Will you please send me word whether or not you will come to Illinois next summer; and if so, will you come to Adams Co.? If I were able I would send you two hundred instead of two dollars for the Herald.

I remain yours in hope of being planted in the likeness of Christ's death, that I may be with Him in the Age to Come.

G. W. ROBINS.

Camp Point, Adams, Illinois, December 22, 1855.

A visit to Illinois is not impossible at the time specified; but more than this I cannot say just now.

\* \* \*

#### A WORD IN SEASON FROM THE FALLS OF GENESEE.

Dear Friend: —I have been a constant reader of your Herald of the Kingdom for a number of years, and I do cheerfully and gratefully say, it is free from the contaminating thoughts of sophistry, its monthly advent is hailed propitiously by me, and some of my friends also. Its lucid, clear and exegetical, deductions of the word of life, increase in me, more and more, a profound reverence for the word of God; and the great and glorious purposes he has revealed to the children of men. So the more light shines on my mind the more I feel infinitely indebted to God who gave it.

Your two last articles on the "Mystery of the Covenant of the Holy Land" promised to Abraham, and sealed by the blood of Jesus Christ, his great seed, is truly good and instructive. I think I hear my Father say as he has said of Israel, "This people have I formed for myself, they shall show forth my praise."—Isaiah 43: 21.

The prominence you give in the Herald to the "Gospel of the Kingdom and the name of Jesus Christ," I appreciate; and it meets my most hearty approbation, and most assuredly would I consider my faith defective, and coming short of the faith of the Gospel, were I ignorant of the Gospel preached to Abraham, which was none other than that which is set forth in all the Prophets, by our Lord himself, and by all his Apostles, even the Gospel of the Kingdom. And as assuredly would I consider my "obedience" in immersion invalid and defective, had I not had that glorious Gospel of the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, shining with intelligence and delight on my mind, and in the full exercise of my definable and intelligible faith, on that day when you, dear friend, was an eye-witness of my going into the water, and putting on the name of Jesus Christ. I say whatever may have been my former "faith" and "obedience" in the sincere honesty and integrity of my heart, and however much tolerated of God in my ignorance, but with the light of the Gospel of the kingdom of God and the name of

Jesus Christ, as it now pours its genial rays into, and upon my mind: were I to neglect, or be unwilling to yield obedience to that Gospel of which Messiah the King anointed said, “He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved; and he that believeth not shall be damned:”—I again say, were I to refuse that obedience in demurring to be baptised into that Gospel, my own conscience would condemn me, and I think our Lord Jesus likewise.

Herein I think, speak and write freely and independently, not forgetting courteousness, so far as circumstances will allow; for there is a time when forbearance ceases to be a virtue, but even then courtesy is becoming in us.

I admire your free, untrammelled, independent mind, and manner of giving expression to the word of God, aside from the theological bias and platonic philosophisings of the day; which have for many centuries rested like an incubus or night-mare on the public mind, to the grievous perversion of the pure and unadulterated word of the living God, which alone giveth life.

Your “Elpis Israel” I have had nearly from its first publication; at first reading, I admired its profoundness, and feel thankful for the light it has thrown, and continues to throw on my mind, on many Bible subjects; not that its interpretations could or should mould my mind, except as I perceive truth in them; for I think I have learned from experience to “cease from man whose breath is in his nostrils.” In saying this I am not arguing for the right of private judgment; neither do I mean to be understood as claiming a right to say to you, or any other man, my judgment is as good as yours; but I do mean to say to every man, that you, nor I, can have any right to think we honour God by our faith, whilst our intelligent judgment and conscience are not going along with the things believed. I may be bowing to it, but I am conscious I am not believing it; for “with the heart man believeth unto righteousness.” Some few things in the Elpis Israel, in the exercise of my reasoning faculties, my mind does not consent to as yet, but I do not want to be understood as saying you are wrong or in error, by no means; but the probability is rather I do not perceive them in the light you do by not understanding them. God’s word is truth; this I do believe. Yet some things may be taught in it as yet I may not see righteousness in; if so, I am conscious then I do not understand their meaning; for if I did I consequently would see righteousness in it.

“ANATOLIA” I have perused with care and elaborate study, and am much instructed by the able and masterly manner you have pursued the developments of the kingdom of men, (particularly since Jehovah gave the kingdoms of this world wheresoever the children of men dwell into the hands of the King of Babylon—as in Jeremiah 27 and Daniel 2, —and has never yet recalled that grant), progressing on its course from the root and stump of the tree through all the grandeur of the prophetic symbols, so beautifully portrayed by the unerring pen of inspiration on the prophetic chart.

You have, to my mind, accurately kept in juxta-position the Little Horn with Eyes and Mouth, and the Little Horn of the Goat; their fraternity is apparent, manifestly so; and that the little Horn of the Goat will yet represent the power of the whole dominion under one chief, I can have no doubt of. I have examined Anatolia very carefully, with various historical authors before me, to satisfy myself of your accuracy; for I cannot believe anything without indisputable evidence, and I am free to say your historical facts I have found correct, so far as my reading extends.

Of a long time I have disciplined my mind not to yield to the ipse dixits of men, although clothed in “ministerial dignity,” however much I revere and honour the divinely instituted office of “the ministry;” but that does not make the men officiating in that capacity inspired, more than you or me. Of course some things in Anatolia are yet presumptive evidence, and we must wait for future developments for their verification.

Meanwhile let us be as little children in simplicity, but men in understanding; still learning from the “lively oracles” what the mind and will of the Lord is; closely observing the signs and developments of the times; knowing that the coming of our Messiah draweth nigh, and that we are nearing the time when “the kingdoms of this world will become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his anointed.”—Revelation 11: 15; Psalm 102: 22. Till then let us watch and pray; ever “presenting our bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to our God, which is our reasonable service.” That we may be found doing this, is the prayer of your brother in waiting for the coming and kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ.

JAMES McMILLAN.

Rochester, December 28, 1855.

\* \* \*

#### IMMERSION APART FROM THE “ONE FAITH,” NO BAPTISM.

My Dear Friend: —I will now endeavour to state what I believe the scriptures teach on the subject of Baptism. But in order to meet more particularly what I suppose your difficulties are in regard to it, another question must be answered, which is What is the Gospel? Because you will say at once that the belief of the gospel is necessary previous to immersion, and that any person who is immersed while ignorant of the gospel is no more benefited by it than an infant who is sprinkled. Here we agree. Well then, the point of difference must be on what constitutes the gospel, and this is the point at issue; once arrive at the scriptural solution of that all-important and vital question, and all difficulties in regard to what is called re-immersion will vanish as darkness before the light.

There are two sets of views extant in what is called “The Christian World” in answer to this question. The first, and almost universally received views, is something like the following—“The gospel is the good news of salvation by Jesus Christ,” giving it summarily in one sentence. Analysed it is this—the belief of the facts touching the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus. The souls of those who believe these facts and live a consistent life will at death be separated from their bodies and carried to heaven beyond the skies, where Jesus sits at the right hand of the Father: that their bodies return to dust and at the resurrection these souls and bodies are re-united, then judged and taken away again back to heaven, according to which theology the poet sings,

“With thee we’ll reign, with thee we’ll rise  
And kingdoms gain beyond the skies.”

The wicked on the other hand at death have their souls separated from their bodies, sent down to hell there to be tormented till the resurrection when they are re-united with their bodies, judged and sent back to endure endless torments for ever and ever. This is the general view of the gospel in which you and I were instructed from our earliest infancy. The other view is this. The gospel is the good news or glad tidings concerning the establishment of the kingdom of God in the land of Palestine, over which Jesus of Nazareth, who once appeared in

our world as a sufferer, died, was buried and raised again the third day and is now ascended to the right hand of the Majesty in the Heavens, will, at his return in power and great glory, reign as “King of the Jews,” sitting upon the throne of His Father David, associating with Him the saints, who will then be raised from the dead, and those who are living changed, who will reign with Him as Kings and Priests in his Kingdom over the restored 12 tribes of Israel and the Gentile nations; which shall all become the kingdoms of Jehovah and of His Christ. Now here are two opposite and distinct statements of the gospel. Can you say that they are alike? or that both can be right? I think you who are accustomed to think philosophically will with an unbiased judgment answer, “No.” Truth is a unit, harmonising in all its parts, and no two truths can be antagonistic; but here are two theories laid down, both claiming to be “gospel,” and yet the one nullifying the other; if the former be “the gospel” which was preached to Abraham, of which Moses and the Prophets wrote and spoke and Jesus and his apostles proclaimed for the acceptance of mankind, then the latter must be spurious and fabulous. If the latter be “The gospel” then indeed must the former fall to the ground, and be reckoned among those traditions by which, Jesus said, the Pharisees of old “made void the law of God.” Now, I will not here stop to prove by testimony and argument which of these is “The Gospel,” as my object is now to show the position of those holding these theories in connection with Baptism. I will therefore assume that which I am also prepared to prove, viz.: that the latter of these is “The Gospel, and the only gospel, which was preached to all nations for the obedience of faith.” In using the term, “The Gospel,” in the following part of this letter I use it in this sense. Taking my stand here, then, I will ask the following questions, “What was that Jesus commanded his Apostles to go into all the world to preach?” Answer. The Gospel. — Having preached that gospel, what is next affirmed? Answer. He that believeth (the gospel) and is baptised shall be saved; and he that believeth not shall be condemned. —Did baptism in any instance precede the belief of the gospel, or did the belief of any thing substituted for the gospel and passing current for it, entitle the individual to Baptism? Answer. Baptism in no instance preceded belief; and no theory however sincerely believed, or dearly cherished, can be put in place of the gospel.

In relation to my own case, I asked myself these questions—Did I, when immersed fifteen years ago, believe the gospel? I did not know what the gospel was. I understood nothing about the kingdom of God, which is the subject matter of the gospel, supposing that it was now in existence in the world, and called the “Kingdom of grace,” and when I died my disembodied soul would be conducted beyond the skies to the “Kingdom of glory.” This being only human tradition, teaching me to look for things which God has never promised, and which consequently I never could possess, however sincerely believed, did my immersion avail anything? I answer, no. It was not the “obedience of faith” enjoined in the word; for my faith being defective, the immersion which followed that faith was defective also; and as Paul says, “There is one Lord, one faith and one baptism,” my faith and my immersion were both alike worthless.

So that if an individual believing any theory, and being immersed, afterwards comes to understand and believe the gospel, he must of necessity be immersed again, for the reason that belief of the gospel, and not a substitute for it, precedes baptism according to the law and command of Christ.

I think then you will perceive, that we are but consistent in demanding that those who come to the understanding and belief of the gospel, whatever they may have believed before for gospel, and though they may have been immersed, should be immersed again, that they



may be the subjects of the "One baptism," which can only result from their having embraced and holding on to the "One Faith," and "One Hope of the Calling."

Yours Faithfully,

CHARLES HALYBURTON.

New York City, 1855.

\* \* \*

EVERY THING ASSERTED, NOTHING PROVED.

Dear Brother Thomas: —I hope this will find you and yours in health and entered on a year that will abound in blessings to you.

Mr. Campbell of Bethany, was here with us a fortnight; I heard him once. —He appears to have made no progress in the knowledge of the Bible. He still dwells on the old themes, the coronation of Christ, and setting up of the Kingdom on the day of Pentecost, — that Christ was, the ruler of the Universe, and that the Father had vacated his throne in his favour. I did not hear him state all this, but I have it from good authority that he did so assert. It is wonderful, how boldly he asserts and how little he attempts to prove. The effect of time is very apparent on him physically.

I cordially congratulate you, my dear Brother, for the very able manner in which you have contended for the Truth in the Herald during the past year; if much good does not result from it the fault will not be yours. I believe the Herald is doing good, and trust therefore, that the circulation will be greater this year than ever. I want you to send me fifteen copies for this year, for which I herewith enclose you a check.

Yours most truly,

Wm. P. LEMMON.

Baltimore, Md., January 8, 1856.

Loud and positive assertion is the only resource left to President Campbell. He has no testimony to establish his theories; which are therefore nothing more than the fancy sketches of a lively imagination romancing in the flowery fictions of the schools.

Without doubt Jesus was "crowned with glory and honour" after his ascension, in the sense of being "exalted to the right hand of God, and made both Lord and Christ," for Paul and Peter so declare; but it is also true, as testified by Paul, that "all things are not yet put under him." The Twelve Tribes are some of these things; and we see them at this day as rebellious as they were, or even more so, than when he wrote his letter to the Hebrews. But David says of them, "they shall be willing in the day of his Son and Lord's power." This then, is not the day of his power, for his people Israel is not willing to submit to him: therefore the kingdom was not set up on Pentecost, nor since; but remains to be established: for when his kingdom exists, where that is, there will his power be.

We thank our beloved brother for his kind wishes, and liberal support; and trust that the seed sown with his generous cooperation will shoot forth and ripen to the honour of the truth, and our mutual advantage in the kingdom of God.

EDITOR.

\* \* \*

## A GOOD REASON FOR SUBSCRIBING.

Dear Sir: —Herewith I forward you the amount of the subscription to your periodical. I send it at my earliest convenience, esteeming the Herald to be a paper containing the most wheat, and freest from chaff of any periodical of my acquaintance. You will therefore please send it as before to my address, and so oblige.

Yours truly,

M. P. CHAPLIN.

Wooster, Kosciusko, Ind., January 1, 1856.

It is customary with authors and publishers of books to advertise the “Opinions of the Press” (those only, however, which are favourable to their interests) to induce the public to purchase without knowing their contents. The books commended cost “the Press nothing; are superficially scanned, and oftentimes not read at all, except where the authors are the reviewers of their own works, or a reviewer is paid to read and commend the book through thick and thin! If books were to depend for their sale upon the opinions of the public consequent on reading them, and thereby creating in them a desire to possess them for reference or a second reading, few would be sold. It is the “opinions of the press,” not the opinions of the public, that sell them, and fill the coffers of “the trade;” while their lean authors get leaner on the glorifications of the press, and the pittance eked out to them by the speculators, whose ambition is not to instruct the people, but to publish what will pay.

But truth, especially God’s truth, is a commodity unsought for by the world. It is an article in no-demand; and publishers being of the world, will not undertake to create a demand for it, except upon terms most hazardous, and often ruinous to the author. If the latter will work for nothing, and fund himself, and be responsible for all loss, they will publish for him, procure him favourable “opinions of the press,” and relieve him of all the profits by an extortionate commission. Our friend, Mr. Robertson, in settling with the printer and publisher of Anatolia in London, says, “I have strongly remonstrated with them against their charges; but so exceedingly fraudulent is shop-keeping generally, now carried on in this modern Babylon under the guise of ‘competition in trade,’ that few, if any, shop-keepers care to undertake any transaction which does not realise to them a profit of from fifty to one hundred per cent.”

Because the truth will not pay we have for our works “no opinions of the press” to advertise, commending their purchase to the liberality of a “discerning public.” We have to be content, therefore, with the slower process (but more creditable and satisfactory) of leaving them to make their own impressions, and to work their own way. The unpurchased opinion of independent and thankful readers is a more reliable commendation of a work than reviews and opinions of the press. Occasionally we present the former in our “Analecta,” as in the note before us: besides that our subscribers like to know the opinions of one another concerning the ideas they contribute to disseminate from one side of the earth to the other, we think they must be gratified in perusing the testimony that meets them from time to time, evincing that the works they enable us to issue are a power that enlightens and turns to God’s righteousness, because they are the truth.

EDITOR.

\* \* \*

## THE PUNISHMENT OF THE WICKED.

In regard to the “punishment of the wicked,” very little is correctly known of what the scriptures really teach upon the subject. The opinion of the populace formed for them by the clergy, is based upon the assumption, that the thing to be punished is an immortal soul. All words, therefore, found by them in the Bible used in connection with punishment, are, of necessity, perverted from their ordinary signification. “The wages of sin is death,” and “the soul that sinneth it shall die.” These are the words of the Holy Spirit, which reveal to the unsophisticated mind, that souls are mortal, and doomed to death if they labour in the service of sin. Nothing more than this can be extracted from them. But, if they are thrown into the theological retort of the Gentiles, and a little of their “philosophy” be cast in with them, their combined distillation will result in a very different product. The “soul,” say they, “is a particle of the Deity’s substance; immaterial, and therefore immortal.” This is their philosophy, which Paul cautions the Colossians against—an assumption, without a shadow of proof beyond the illusion of mesmeric psychology. If the victims of this delusion read the words of God, those words seem to reveal to them to them the very opposite. I say seem to reveal; not that they really do; it is the false assumption with which their brains are preoccupied that gives an interpretation to the words which does not appear to a mind unspoiled by Gentilism. They interpret the words of the Holy Spirit upon heathen principles. Thus read, the texts quoted affirm, that souls, being immortal, are doomed to endless dying, if they labour in the service of sin. Death, destruction, corruption, punishment, perish, &c., affirmed of “soul,” if said “soul” be declared to be immortal, or deathless, must signify dying, destroying, corrupting, punishing, perishing, &c., processes, which in the nature of things, can never be consummated. How a thing can be said to be dying which never attains to the consummation called death; or “punished” which is eternally in a state of unconsummated punishment; is an enigma which scripture and reason abandon to those who, being well practiced in straining out gnats, and swallowing whole herds of camels, have but to shut their eyes and open their mouths, and implicitly ingulph whatever comes redolent of “Mystery!” The old minister referred to in bro. Chase’s letter in our last number, appears to have been of this very sagacious generation. He assumed that the “these” were immortal; and from this assumption very naturally inferred that the “everlasting punishment” they were commanded to go away to, was an everlasting existence in a penal state. But the “these” being mortal, what then? A “horse laugh” is a resounding answer to so inconvenient a question! To have given this the only solution of which it is susceptible would have been confounding. The sophist would rather speculate on the word “everlasting” than be pinned down to the proof of his assertion, that soul is essentially immortal. This is the first thing for eternal tormentists to do; the next is, to prove that the words of scripture are to be taken in a sense contrary to what is usual. When they have accomplished this, we may burn the Bible as a provoking, pestilent, and incomprehensible, book; which is, in truth, the low standard to which the clergy have reduced it by their sophisms and unintelligible jargon, in the estimation of thinking men unenlightened in the truth. Everlasting punishment does not imply everlasting existence; it only implies that whatever the punishment may be, the party punished will never be delivered. The punishment is post-resurrectional, torment by pestilence, famine, pauperism, war, sufferings, &c., “ending in death.” This is the punishment of the *αιων*, whose judgments break in pieces the governments of the nations and their armies, stiled by the Lord our King in the aggregate, “the Devil and his emissaries,” into whose territories the resurrected “unjust” are commanded to go away or “depart,” that they there may participate in the dire calamities of the crisis. In these they will be ingulphed; and, as Paul says, “destroyed.” Israel and the Saints will punish the Devil, his angels, and the resurrected unjust. This is a

statement which few of this generation can understand: but they who know what the kingdom of God is, and how it is to be set up, will be at no loss. We can only affirm it now. Study the words, “judgment was given to the Saints,” and more will be seen in it than at first sight appears. From this judicial punishment there is no redemption; its calamities terminate in death from which there is no deliverance. The subjects of this interminable death—a death which does not end in resurrection to life—are punished with an everlasting punishment, or everlasting extinction of being.

EDITOR.

\* \* \*

#### MESSIAH’S BIRTHDAY.

Dr. Kennedy observes that the most remarkable events in the New Testament occurred on days memorable also, and no doubt therefore typical under the Mosaic dispensation; and he says, “It deserves our attention, that whenever the modern Jews celebrate their Feast of Tabernacles, which they never fail to do every year in its appointed season, they at the same time celebrate not only the birthday of the world, but of the promised Messiah too; for the Messiah was born on the first day of the Feast of Tabernacles, and was circumcised on the eighth, or great day of the same.” Again, he says, in another place, and upon another set of astronomical calculations, that, “It is undeniably certain that our Lord rose from the dead on the morrow after the 15<sup>th</sup> of Nisan;” the day on which the wave-offering of the First-fruits was made. On this day, the Lord Jesus Adonai Yehowah, arose, and became the first-fruits from the dead of the sleeping saints, as saith the apostle in 1 Corinthians 15.

\* \* \*

#### “THE CHURCH” INFIDEL.

“The faith of ‘the church,’” says a sectarian writer on prophecy, “is so low, as to be almost extinct. Knowledge of the doctrines of salvation, which the extension of general information has caused to be acquired with facility, is mistaken for faith in the word of God; and a very large portion of the Bible is as completely disbelieved, or perverted, or twisted into nothing by the majority of professing religious people, as it is by avowed infidels. From this state of practical infidelity which pervades the religious world, nothing can rouse and save the people but calling their attention to the things which the word of God reveals to be coming on the earth. Mr. Joseph Wolff declared to me, and desired me to make it everywhere known, that in conversing with one of the principal managers of the Church Missionary Society respecting the preaching of the gospel in Persia, he was told by him that the gospel ought not to be preached there, because it was dangerous for men to believe it; and that Russia ought to carry nominal Christianity into Persia, first of all before the Persians were instructed in vital Christianity. Now this opinion is diametrically opposed to the precept, and example of the Word of God; and contrary to all experience, as it is notorious that vital Christianity is much more reviled in nominally Christian countries than it is in other parts of the world. Yet this is the doctrine of too many of the chief supporters of Missionary Societies.”—Dral. On Proph. p. 358.

There is no reason why we should reject the testimony of sectarians against themselves; especially when that testimony is confirmed by universal experience. We know that the above is true, and have therefore, affirmed the same without reservation. What,

however, very much surprises us is that writers making such statements can still continue to regard such infidel professors as christians.

EDITOR.

\* \* \*

### IN WHOM DOES JEHOVAH DELIGHT?

If the answer to this question were to be deduced from that which is highly esteemed among men, it would be unintelligible to a mind unsophisticated by their traditions. The papist would say, that the delight of Jehovah is most certainly in “His Holiness,” the Vicegerent of Jesus Christ, enthroned upon the Seven Hills; and in all devoted to his sacred and pontifical majesty. But to this the Greek would decidedly object. He would say that Jehovah could have no delight in the chief of an image-worshipping faction, that “forbids to marry;” and, according to the testimony of Gregory I “has the pride and character of Antichrist” in assuming the “Blasphemous Name” of Universal Bishop. He would claim that the patriarch of Constantinople, or of late years, that the champion of the Orthodox Faith, the Czar of all the Russias, the mortal foe of the pagan Turk, the oppressor of the apostolic church, and defiler of the Holy Places in Jerusalem, with all the faithful of his communion, were they in whom Jehovah delighted above all the earth! Here is an issue joined at once between Greek and Latin; one, however, which all protestants agree cannot be sustained in favour of either party; both of whom are equally condemned as reprobate by the word of God.

A man instructed by this word will not object to this judgment of the protestant upon the worshippers of the dragon and the beast; but what will he say to the protestant implication, that because they are reprobate—because Jehovah has no delight in those that delight in popes and patriarchs, Greek papas and Latin priests—therefore he delights in “the names and denominations,” the sects and parties, of anti-Greek-and-Latin religionism! Does hatred of the one necessitate delight in the other? A man may protest against murder, adultery, and theft, with very virtuous indignation, having no inclination for these crimes; nevertheless he may be given to COVETOUSNESS, or the heaping up of this world’s riches, which equally excludes him from the kingdom of God. —Ephesians 5: 5; Luke 12: 13-21. The reader will therefore perceive that a zealous protest against flagrant evil may be highly characteristic of a man, or party; while sin in another form may be highly approved, and even made the basis of respectability in church and world. What sin is more practically respectable and approved by protestants than covetousness? The most pious of them are the most “diligent in business” to make money to spend upon their lusts; so much so that what they call “the world” is unable to surpass them. Their very benevolence is ostentation, and gratefully odoriferous to their pride of life. But in what are they rich towards God? “In subscribing liberally towards the erection of magnificent churches!” “God dwelleth not in temples made with hands neither is he worshipped by men’s hands.” Are they rich towards God in giving largely to “the clergy?” The clergy are not God’s, but Satan’s. They are the ministers of those temples, where he positively declares he does not dwell; and their ministrations never disturb that covetousness which excludes from the kingdom of God. How can they be God’s when he turns his back upon their holy places; and will not accept them for his abode? And if not his, whose can they be but his adversaries; and “he that is not with me,” says Jesus, “is against me!” Are they rich towards God in sending his gospel to the heathen? Alas! they know not that gospel, how then can they send it? Their zeal is the spirit of adventure and romance; a zeal without knowledge, that compasses the world for a proselyte, who when “converted” is ignorant of the first principles of the oracles of God: —“their fear is taught by the precepts of men.”

But, it may be asked, if Jehovah delights neither in Latins, Protestants, nor Greeks, who in “Christendom” remain for his delight? “His temple and altar, and them that worship thereat”—Revelation 11: 1; but in the court-occupants without that temple he has no delight; for they trample his holy community under foot. The worshippers at His altar are themselves the temple in which He dwells; and the only temple he has upon the earth. Paul, in addressing those that worship God in spirit and in truth, saith, “Ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, ‘I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean; and I will receive you, and will be a Father unto you, and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty.’” Jehovah delights in those sons and daughters “who walk uprightly, and work righteousness, and speak truth with their heart: who backbite not with their tongue, nor do evil to their associates, nor take up reproach against their neighbours: in whose eyes a vile person is contemned; but who honour them who fear Jehovah: who swear to their own evil, and change not; who put not out their money to usury, nor take a bribe against the innocent. They who do these things shall abide in Jehovah’s habitation, and dwell in his Holy Hill.”

But alas, how much cause is there of deep regret on account of some who pretend to the divine relation of sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty, because of their violation of these things! Our personal experience of the fact on the part of persons making specious claims to apostolicity of faith and hope, we are mortified in bearing witness, is but too abundant. We know something of Paul’s experience in Galatia, where, he says, that, notwithstanding the infirmity of his flesh, some received him as a messenger of God, speaking loudly of the blessedness they had been introduced to by his instrumentality; so that, continues he, if it had been possible, they would have plucked out their own eyes, and have given them to him! But what a change has come over some of them by the time of his writing his letter to them! They had been so estranged from him by troublesome pretenders to superior sanctity, that he had to ask them, “Am I become your enemy because I tell you the truth?” and to declare that he stood in doubt of them. This unhappy condition of things was produced by backbiting with the tongue, not speaking truth with the heart, and taking up reproaches. Speaking of these evil tongues, he says, “I would that they were even cut off who trouble you.” They professed great zeal concerning a certain constitution, which placed them in opposition to him who brought them to what understanding of the truth (which appears to have been little, or superficial, enough) they had acquired. They were opposed to that constitution of things he had introduced among them. They wanted something more gratifying to the flesh, which would exalt them to place and power, and either exclude the apostles from the Galatians, or subject him to their Diotrephetic control. Speaking of these perverse men, he says, “They zealously affect you, but not well; yea, they would exclude you, that ye might earnestly desire them.” This restraining of the Galatians from the apostle only be the result of backbiting, hypocrisy, and calumny. The doctrine he taught, and the customs he established, afforded no scope for the gratification of personal ambition and democratic turbulence. He required that all things should be done decently and in order; and to the edification, or building up of the body of Christ in its most holy faith. All this was very displeasing to men of vain and conceited minds, whose propensity was for talk and egotistical display. Unmindful, therefore, of their obligation to the apostle, they resorted to the usual policy of the mean and superficial, and strove to depreciate him that they might exalt and popularise themselves. But the apostle saw through their pretended zeal, whose fruit was only evil, and that continually. They preached to them liberty, while they were themselves the slaves of sin; and made themselves felt in all their doings by the contentions they caused between their

brethren, and their much-ado about trifles; while they disregarded the honour and interests of the truth.

Such characters are not likely long to impose themselves undetected upon an enlightened community honestly devoted to the truth. No fountain pours forth at the same time sweet water and bitter. What matters their profession of faith in the gospel of the Kingdom, if that faith do not develop “righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit?” Will the wordy prayers of some, or the pharisaism, and the gnat-straining of others, atone for that world of iniquity that flames forth from their fiery tongues? “They whet their tongue like a sword, and bow their arrows, even like bitter words; that they may shoot in secret places at the blameless.” Against such ambushes the honest have no defence but their integrity, and uniform consistency in the right. Compare such with the backbiters, and it will always be found that the latter are only conspicuous when there is evil occurrent. Mark them well, and you will find them “treacherous, heady, devils (diabolo), incontinent, fierce, enemies of good men; and among them silly women laden with sins, led away with divers lusts.” Follow them into their daily walk, and you will find them on the best of terms with the world, which is emphatically the enemy of God. They crucify the Lord afresh by the contempt their unchristian conduct brings upon the truth. They profess to know God, but in their works they deny him; so that by reason of their pernicious ways the way of truth is evil spoken of. Where the table of the Lord is there you find them not; but where the enemy of his truth encamps, there you find them striving to make themselves agreeable! Is the truth they pretend has made them free, contending amid discouragement to maintain a position in the enemy’s camp? Do you find them, like Aaron and Hur, upstaying Moses’ hands against Amalek, occupying a position where they can respond, “Amen?” Illiterate, and but little practised in the art of thinking correctly; their time, too, almost wholly absorbed in earning their daily bread; with but small ability to dig out for themselves the deep things of God; do you find them adding to their newly begotten faith, knowledge for its increase, where alone, upon the principles they have professed, it can be obtained? Do you not rather find them frequenting the conventicles of Satan where neither can be heard; or places where the soil is so unproductive, that, if the incorruptible seed may have sprouted, it has not strength enough to enable it to attain the stature of a perfect plant? Can such professors be believed when they say they love the truth; seeing that they wander off to conventicles where the truth has no place; or to places where it is so little understood that it cannot be scripturally stated, illustrated and proved? Ask them why they act thus treacherously? You will find their gnat-straining excuses a real cause they endeavour to conceal. They will pretend that they were sick, or that they were too far off from the meeting, —but, it is useless to particularise, their pretences are countless as they are crotchety and shallow; and such as people make for not doing a thing they have no mind for. Their self-love has been wounded; their petty ambition controlled; their looseness of manners discountenanced; their business prosperity endangered; their popularity jeopardised; their respectability imperilled; their worldly repute hazarded—in short, their adorable self, to which they are habituated to burn incense in ministering to the lusts thereof, is too much crucified by the testimony of God faithfully expounded; and therefore they flee from it under divers pretences, into the by-ways of the surrounding wilderness. There in the dark recesses of the earth, the voice of truth reaches them not. Their consciences there obtain a searing which gives them rest. They are gone; and you see their faces no more at the table of the Lord, having sold themselves to self and its natural perverseness.

Doth then Jehovah delight in such as these? In people who lay not hold heartily upon his truth, but are ever ready to embarrass it? If that truth were committed to their fostering care, what would become of it? It would perish miserably, and vanish from the earth! From

such professors may we be defended, and effectually delivered by the coming of the Lord.  
EDITOR.

\* \* \*

### THE ROMAN POPULACE.

The Roman populace, ever turbulent, ever fickle and sanguinary, have preserved their traditional character unimpaired from the earliest dawn of their history to the present time. "Rome of the Popes," wanting a strong civil government, was more licentious than the Rome of the Republic or of the Emperors. St. Bernard, writing in the twelfth century to an exiled Pope, describes the Romans in terms which will apply to them at this day. After remarking their notorious perverseness for centuries, he says: "They are a people unused to peace, fond of tumults, intractable, and remorseless, not knowing how to obey unless they can no longer oppose resistance." The contest between the Emperor Leo, called the Isaurian, and the Italian clergy, at the opening of the eighth century, severed the bonds which feebly bound Rome to the Eastern Empire. From that time, when the temporal power of the Popes began to take form and consistency, until the final consolidation of the Papal States, some four centuries later (1278), anarchy, war, and bloodshed prevailed at Rome almost without intermission. The chair of St. Peter was repeatedly contested by armed force, many Popes died violent deaths, and many were deposed and driven into exile. We select some of the most remarkable instances:—In the year 767, the Governor of Passi, on the death of Paul I, compelled the bishops to consecrate and elect his brother Constantine, a layman, to the papal chair: next year Constantine was torn to pieces by the populace, and many of his adherents perished with him. Leo III was assaulted in the year 799 by a band of armed men, headed by two Roman chiefs, who stabbed him in several places and attempted to pull out his eyes and cut out his tongue; the Pope was with difficulty rescued. Many civil contests succeeded, and in 867, Lambert, Duke of Spoleta, sacked the city of Rome, as a retaliation for the election of Adrian II. Thirty years later, Stephen VII, who had disinterred the body of his predecessor, Formosus, was seized by the revolted Romans, thrown into a dungeon and strangled. Leo V was deposed in 902, two months after his election, by his chaplain, Christopher, who was in his turn deposed, two years later, by another faction. John X died in a dungeon, and it was said that he was smothered. His successor, Leo VI, is also said to have been murdered. From 963 to 965 there was a civil war for the papal chair. Tranquillity was restored, and maintained for a few years by the power of the Emperor Otho I, but on his death, in 973, fresh disturbances broke out. Benedict VI was seized and strangled by the partisans of Francone, a cardinal, who then caused himself to be elected Pope, as Boniface VII. He was expelled by Otho II, and Benedict VII was elected, and was succeeded by John XIV. But on the death of the Emperor, in 983, Francone returned, again usurped the papal chair, and put John XIV to death. At the close of the tenth century there were fresh contests for the papal chair. Gregory V was expelled by a revolt, and one John, Bishop of Piacenza, was put in his place. Otho III, then Emperor of the West, marched on Rome with an army, 998, bringing Gregory with him. The treacherous Romans, in alarm, seized John, the Pope of their own creation, pulled out his eyes, cut off his nose and tongue, and threw him into a dungeon. Gregory ordered the unfortunate man to be ignominiously dragged through the whole city. In 1012, and again in 1038, the election to the popedom was disputed, and caused the usual disorders. In 1047 there were three rival Popes, but a council deposed them all. On the death of Stephen IX, in 1058, fresh disturbances broke out. The troublous period which followed was marked by the pontificate of Gregory VII, which we pass over, as we are not writing a history of the popedom. The next Pope who died in exile was Paschal II, who expired (1118) as he was leading a hostile army against Rome.



Paschal's successor, Gelasius II, was not approved of by the partisans of the Emperor, and we are told that one Cencio Frangipane broke upon the gates of the Lateran, seized the Pope-elect, an old man, kicked him, and took him prisoner to his own house. The people rose and released the Pope; but the Emperor, Henry V, approached with a military force, and the Pope fled to Gaeta, taking the same route as was recently followed by Pius IX. Gelasius took refuge in France, and an anti-Pope was elected at the instance of the Emperor. The schism which followed, and belongs to church history, lasted twenty years. In 1143 an insurrection broke out in Rome, and a republic was established in defiance of the Pope's authority. Eugenius III carried on a long contest with the republican senate, in the course of which he several times departed from Rome, and returned on conditions. Nicholas Breakspeare, an Englishman, was elected Pope in 1154, and took the name of Adrian IV. He endeavoured to bring his rebellious subjects to obedience by withdrawing from Rome and placing the city under an interdict. He died at Anagni, having resided very little at Rome during his pontificate. The republic was finally subdued (1179), after a long civil war, by Pope Alexander III, whose death followed quickly on his success. In 1278 the authority of the Pope over the Roman States was fully established and recognised by the Emperor, and from that time we find in the history of the popedom, with enough of civil strife, none of the sanguinary atrocities sketched above.

From 1305 to 1366, the Popes resided at Avignon, to the great grief of the Romans, who frequently prayed for their return. During this period the well-known insurrection of Rienzi broke out. It commenced in 1347, and history, romance, and poetry have united to impress the rise and fall of the enthusiast on the world's memory. The circumstances of his life are most interesting, and his character remains one of the riddles of history; he was elevated by raising the people against their nobles, who administered the government, and he was massacred by the populace, when he endeavoured to bring them back to order with the strong hand. On the death of Rienzi, the power of the Popes was restored, and in 1367 Urban V came to Rome from Avignon.

From this period to the accession of Nicholas V the history of the popedom is but a record of schism and civil war. Nicholas died in 1455, after having firmly established the hierarchical form of government, which continued until the accession of Pius IX. The government and succession of the Popes proceeded from this period without interruption or war until the breaking out of the French Revolution. The occupation of Rome by the French republican armies, the captivity of Pius VII, and Bonaparte's treaty with the church are within living memory.

The contest which the Roman Radicals waged against Pius IX was no more than a renewal of the struggles commenced in the twelfth century, for the establishment of a civil government independent of the Pope's authority. It terminated as the former had done; the transfer of the holy see to any other city would deprive Rome of her importance, and gravely affect her material interests. The consternation caused by the flight of the Pope was great amongst the Romans. Hitherto Pius IX has not shown much resolution, and resembles Pope Eugenius III, above mentioned, who spent his life in negotiating with his Republicans. — Selected.

\* \* \*

## THE WICKED.

“The righteous shall be recompensed in the earth: much more the wicked and the sinner.”—Proverbs 11: 31.

“The wicked shall not inhabit the earth.”—Proverbs 10: 30.

“The Lord hath made the wicked for the day of evil.”—Proverbs 16: 4.

“The man that wandereth out of the way of understanding shall remain in the congregation of the dead.”—Proverbs 21: 16.

“The lamp of the wicked shall be put out.”—Proverbs 24: 20.

“The dead know not anything.”—Ecclesiastes 9: 5.

“Upon the wicked Jehovah shall rain burning coals, fire, and brimstone, and a flaming tempest; this shall be the portion of their cup.”—Psalm 9: 6.

“The wicked shall perish; into smoke shall they consume away.”  
—Psalm 37: 20.

\* \* \*