

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, OCTOBER, 1856—
Volume 6—No. 10

NEW TESTAMENT EVIDENCE OF THE RESTORATION OF THE JEWS TO THE
LAND OF ISRAEL.

By Alexander McCaul, D.D., Trinity College, Dublin.

The Old Testament abounds in passages which, if taken literally, plainly predict the restoration of the Jews to the land of their forefathers. There are, however, many students of Scripture who reject the literal interpretation, on the professed ground that this rule of interpretation is contrary to the spirit of the gospel dispensation. It therefore becomes necessary to examine the New Testament, with reference to this subject, both as to the spirit and the letter of its declaration, respecting the national distinctions and privileges of the Jews. This examination will, (as appears to me,) lead to the same result as a grammatical exposition of the Old Testament predictions. It will prove that Israel still remains a peculiar people, and that they are to be restored to their own land. The reasons which lead me to entertain this opinion, or rather to adopt this article of faith, are as follow:

1. That the New Testament preserves the distinctive appellations of “Israel” and “Gentiles” in their Old Testament sense.
 2. That the New Testament asserts the perpetuity of the Jewish national privileges.
 3. The New Testament expounds literally certain passages of the prophecies, the literal interpretation of which necessarily implies the literal restoration of the Jews.
 4. The New Testament itself contains original passages leading to the same conclusion.
-
1. The Old Testament sense was, that Israel meant the twelve tribes, the descendants of the twelve patriarchs. This is at least plainly the sense of the word in the historical books of Scripture. Gentile or heathen, or nations, included all those nations not thus descended. The New Testament, both in the historic books and epistles, retains both these expressions in their original signification. Thus our Lord says, “Go, not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not; but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.”—Matthew 10: 5-6. By the name of Israel the apostles generally address the Jews. Thus Peter says, “Ye men of Israel, why marvel ye at this?”—Acts 3: 12. And again, “Ye rulers of the people, and elders of Israel.”—Acts 4: 8. And here it is to be noted, that Peter thus addressed them by immediate inspiration—“Peter, filled with the Holy Ghost, said unto them.” Again—verse 27, we have this same word connected with Gentiles—“For of a truth against thy holy child

Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles, and the people of Israel, were gathered together.” Again our blessed Lord, speaking to Ananias, uses the words in the same sense: “He is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel.”—Acts 9: 15. In the 13th chapter of the Acts we have Paul’s sermon to the Jews, where he employs the same language in the same way; it begins, “Men of Israel and ye that fear God, give audience. The God of this people Israel chose our fathers,” &c., and at the end of that address we read, “When the Jews were gone out of the synagogue, the Gentiles besought that these words might be preached to them,” &c. To quote all the passages where the words “Israel” and “Gentiles” occur in the Gospels and Acts, would be as tedious as it is unnecessary; we therefore proceed to give a few specimens from the Epistles. In Romans 9: 4, St. Paul, speaking of the unconverted Jews, says, “For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh, who are Israelites.” In the same chapter—verses 30-31 he says, “What shall we say then? That the Gentiles, which followed not after righteousness have attained to righteousness, even the righteousness of faith. But Israel, which followed after the law of righteousness, hath not attained to the law of righteousness.” “Brethren, my heart’s desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved.”—Romans 10: 1. “But to Israel he saith, All day long I have stretched forth my hands unto a disobedient and gainsaying people.”—Verse 21. “I speak to you Gentiles, inasmuch as I am an apostle of the Gentiles.”—11: 13. “Blindness in part is happened unto Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in, and so all Israel shall be saved”—11: 25. I have selected these passages, because we have in them all one striking feature, and that is, that the Jews, though unbelievers, are still called by the favourite name Israel, and believers from amongst other nations are still called “Gentiles.” But this is not peculiar to this epistle; it is the general style of the apostle. Thus in 2 Corinthians 3: 13, the unbelieving Jews are still called “children of Israel.” In Galatians 2 the epithet Gentiles is applied to believers—“Why compellest the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?” And again—Ephesians 3: 1, “For this cause I Paul, the prisoner of Jesus Christ for you Gentiles.” In the whole New Testament, so far as I know, there is but one passage in which there can be any reasonable doubt as to the meaning of the word Israel. In Galatians 6: 16, St. Paul says, “As many as walk according to this rule, peace be on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God.” This has been commonly received as signifying the spiritual Israel as it is called. But is it agreeable to sound criticism to assign to a word in one solitary passage a sense which it never has in all the numerous passages where it occurs in the New Testament? St. Paul universally, in every other passage of his writings where the word occurs, uses it to signify his people according to the flesh, even where he speaks of those in a state of unbelief. What reason, then, is there for asserting that this word here has not the same signification? Is it because this sense would destroy the beauty or force of the whole passage? This cannot be pretended. Is it that a prayer for the literal Israel would be at variance with St. Paul’s known feelings? By no means; for he tells us that his heart’s desire and prayer is that they may be saved. On the contrary, there is a peculiar propriety in his praying for Israel in this passage. He had just asserted that in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision availeth anything, but a new creature, i.e., that the national privileges could do nothing for their salvation. When, therefore, he prays for peace and mercy on those that are renewed creatures, he naturally adds a petition for the same mercy and peace, without which all national blessings are nothing, upon the Israel of God.

The result in every case remains the same. Even conceding this passage to the spiritual interpreters, it cannot be denied that the New Testament preserves the distinctive appellations of Israel and the Gentiles in their Old Testament sense. I infer from this New Testament usage two things—1st, that a national distinction is intended. If it had been the will of God to amalgamate the Israelites with other nations in the Christian Church, there could have been no more distinct intimation of this than the transfer of their national name to the Church generally, and the non-application of the word “Gentile” to believers. But if we find it to be the uniform practice of our Lord and his apostles, who spoke and wrote by inspiration, to appropriate the word Israel to the literal Israel, and the word Gentiles to the other nations, even though believers, must we not infer that this is done, not by chance, but by design? And if by design, what other design can there be, than that which was manifestly the design of the Holy Spirit in using the same phraseology in the Old Testament—to assert a national distinction, and to prevent a national amalgamation. If this be admitted, then I ask, if the Jews are not to be amalgamated amongst the nations, what is to become of them? —are they to remain a distinct people in the dispersion, or are they to be restored? I ask, secondly, if Israel in the historical parts and in the fulfilled prophecies of the Old Testament always signifies the literal Israel, and in the New Testament has the same signification, by what rule is it that in the unfulfilled prophecies this same word Israel has a signification contrary to the usage both of Old and New Testaments?

2. I do not mean to rest the belief in the restoration of Israel on this appellative distinction. I think it conveys a strong intimation of God’s purpose. But the New Testament furnishes other and stronger evidence.

It expressly asserts the perpetuity of the Jewish national privileges.

Those who deny the restoration of Israel affirm, that in the Gospel dispensation all national distinction has ceased, and that the Gentiles and Jews stand on an equality as to privileges. In one respect I admit that Jew and Gentile are on a perfect equality, and that is, as sinners, to be saved only by the grace of God in Christ Jesus. Here there is no difference—the Gentile is nothing inferior to the Jew, and the Jew is as well off as the Gentile. Neither Jew nor Gentile will be accepted or rejected simply because he is a Jew or a Gentile, “for God is no respecter of persons.” But from this admission, it will not follow that there is no national distinction between them, particularly when it is remembered that the New Testament expressly asserts the continuance of the distinction. Before I produce passages in support of this assertion, it is necessary to consider two passages on which the asserters of amalgamation principally rest. One is Colossians 3: 11: “Where there is neither Greek nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbarian, Scythian, bond nor free; but Christ is all and in all.” The other is found in Galatians 3: 28: “There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus.” Here, it is said, the apostle declares that all distinction between Jew and Gentile is at an end. No doubt he does. But in these same passages he asserts, 1st, that all distinction between Greek and Scythian had also ceased. Do you then mean to say that a believer born a Greek ceased to be a Greek? that a believer born a Scythian ceased to be a Scythian? and that now there is no national distinction between them? He asserts 2^{ndly}, that all distinction had ceased between slaves and freemen: do you infer that a slave by becoming a Christian ceased to be a slave, and that a freeman becoming a Christian ceased to be a freeman? He asserts 3^{rdly}, that all distinction had ceased between circumcision and uncircumcision: do you believe, then, that a believing Jew ceases to be circumcised, and a believing Gentile ceases to be uncircumcised? He asserts, 4^{thly}, that all distinction hath ceased between male and female: is it true, then, that by faith

the distinction of the sexes is done away? You believe none of these things; you believe that in Christ Jesus, before God, with reference to eternity, all these distinctions have ceased, but that in time, and in this world, the difference between Greek and Scythian as to nationality—the difference between bond and free as to liberty—the difference between circumcised and uncircumcised as to state—the difference between male and female as to sex, all may and do continue. You therefore prove that the national distinction between Jew and Gentile in this world is not affected by either of these passages. We may therefore, according to the true sense of the apostle's words, be all one in Christ Jesus, and yet national distinction between Jew and Gentile may continue. That it does really continue will appear from the following passages, in which the New Testament asserts the perpetuity of Israel's privileges.

First, from Romans 3: 1, &c., "What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision? Much every way." Here the apostle positively declares that the Jew has much advantage, and circumcision much profit. And it is to be noted, that the declaration was drawn forth in order to guard against a false conclusion from premises very similar to those which we have just considered. He had asserted that "he is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God." Inaccurate reasoners might conclude, Then a Jew has no advantage, and circumcision is of no use—yea, and that it never was of any use, for the above-cited words were as true the first day that circumcision was instituted as now, 1800 years after the introduction of the Gospel dispensation. Gentile Christians especially might infer, and have actually inferred from these words, that all Jewish privileges have ceased. The apostle therefore endeavours to guard against such false conclusions, and says "What advantage then hath the Jew? or, what profit is there of circumcision?" and answers, not in the language of the amalgamators, None at all, but "Much every way;" and immediately gives an instance in the oracles of God. But the apostle is not content with this declaration—he foresaw how it might be, and actually has been, evaded; he knew that Gentile Christians might, and would say; "Very true; the Jews once had great privileges by virtue of the covenant of circumcision, but they have lost them all by unbelief." Wrong again, says the apostle; you say that the Jews have not believed: I grant that some have not believed. Well, what then?—"what if some did not believe? shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect? GOD FORBID; yea, let God be true, but every man a liar." The unbelief of individuals has nothing to do with Jewish privileges, nor with the profit of circumcision. These things rest on the fidelity of God, which is not to be shaken by the folly or the wickedness of men. Whatsoever, therefore, was the profit of circumcision, it still remains, because the faith of God cannot be made without effect. But one profit of circumcision was the grant of the land of Israel: that grant, therefore still continues in force. Men may work at the wording of the original covenant, and make out, by dint of twisting, that everlasting covenant means a temporary covenant, and everlasting possession a temporary possession; but they cannot shake the force of the apostle's language, "Shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect? God forbid." Whatsoever was promised by circumcision remains secure. That the land was promised in the covenant of circumcision may be seen by referring to Genesis 17: 7-8, &c., where God says, "I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God." If it be asked, how then is it that the Jews have not had possession of this land for 1700 years? I answer, just as their forefathers, to whom the land was promised at the Exodus, never possessed it, but died in the wilderness through unbelief. Though that particular generation

died, yet the land remained the property of the nation, which is not limited to a generation, and was in due time given to them. Thus at present the unbelievers are excluded from the land, which still belongs to the nation. The unbelief of some does not render ineffectual the faith of God to the whole nation.

Secondly, the apostle asserts in Romans 9: 4, that the Jewish privileges still belong to the Jews in spite of their unbelief. Speaking of those on whose account he had great heaviness and continual sorrow, i.e., the unbelieving Jews, he says, “Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and THE COVENANTS, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the PROMISES.” In this long enumeration of privileges there are two which call for immediate attention. He says that to Israel belong the covenants, and the promises. Christians will grant them the Sinai covenant, but the apostle is more liberal: he says that theirs are the covenants, and that without any limitation. Theirs is therefore the New Covenant. To my mind the language of this single verse is sufficiently clear to establish the fact. But a certain vague opinion that the New Covenant is not Jewish, makes it necessary to confirm this interpretation by a few more remarks. 1st, The Mediator of the New Covenant was a Jew: “for it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Judah.”—Hebrews 7. 2nd, His appearance is hailed as the salvation of Israel. “He hath holpen his servant Israel, in remembrance of his mercy; as he spake to our fathers, Abraham, and his seed for ever.”—Luke 2: 54-55. Again, “Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he hath visited and redeemed his people—to perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant—the oath which he sware to our father Abraham.” 3rd, For Jews primarily the blood of the New Testament was shed. “Being high priest for that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation, and not for that nation only, but also that he should gather in one the children of God that were scattered abroad.”—John 11: 51-52. 4th, With Jews exclusively for some years the New Covenant was confirmed. 5th, By Jews it was communicated to the other nations of the world. 6th, It is only by being grafted into the Jewish olive-tree that the Gentiles participate in the blessings. —Romans 11: 17. 7th, They do not inherit these blessings independently of the Jews, but are only admitted to be “fellow-heirs, and of the same body,” they being the original heirs as well as the natural branches. The Jews, therefore, have not lost their privileges by the New Covenant—on the contrary, it is one of them.

But the apostle says also, that to them belong “the promises.” What promises? No doubt the promises contained in the Old Testament. But some of these are promises of restoration and national glory. With what right, then, can the Gentile believers say that these promises do not belong to Israel, but to the Church, and that they will never be fulfilled to those to whom they belong?

Thirdly, the apostle asserts that God hath not cast away his people—“I say, then, hath God cast away his people? God forbid.”—Romans 11: 1. Now the only sense in which Israel were God’s people was national. They were not elected, as the rabbis suppose, to eternal life, but to be his “peculiar treasure, above all people—a kingdom of priests, and an holy nation.” The rabbis, and with them many Christians, have altogether mistaken the relation in which Israel stood to God. The grand feature was that it was temporal, first, as the family of Abraham, and secondly as the nation of Israel—both of which relations exist only in time. The societies of men, greater or smaller, are distinguished according to their families and their nations. Many are the families into which the descendants of Adam are divided. There is but one with which God has condescended to enter into a public and solemn covenant, and that one is the family of Abraham—“You only have I known of all the families of the earth.”—Amos 3: 2. Many are the kindreds, and tongues, and peoples, and nations, but to Israel alone

He hath said, “Thou art an holy people unto the Lord thy God: the Lord thy God hath chosen thee to be a special people unto himself, above all people that are on the face of the earth.”—Deuteronomy 7: 6. The descendants of Abraham are a family like other families; their privilege is, that, as such, God has entered into covenant with them. The nation of Israel is a special people or nation unto the Lord, but still a nation “on the face of the earth.” And hence it is that the blessings and the curses are temporal—the blessing, prosperity in a particular country—the curse, temporal affliction in a state of dispersion. The doctrine of existence after death, and eternal life, may be plainly and satisfactorily inferred from many passages of the Law of Moses. But eternal life could not be promised to a whole nation. It is one of the sanctions of the divine law as respects individuals whose existence is eternal, but could not be a sanction of a national law, inasmuch as the national existence is only temporal. And thus it is that individual Israelites may, by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, become heirs of everlasting life, though their nation at large still remains under the national curse of temporal affliction. Their individual faith saves themselves, but nothing short of national faith can deliver the nation. And hence also the believing Israelites, at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, were involved in the national calamity. Safe for eternity by their personal faith, they were exiled from their native land because of the national disobedience. As the relation, then, in which the literal Israel stands to God is national, and therefore temporal, we infer that the blessing attendant upon Israel’s national repentance will be temporal also. And as the curse inflicted upon the nation for their rejection of the Gospel was not amalgamation, but the destruction of their city and exile from their land, we naturally infer that the blessing consequent upon their reception of the Gospel will be analogous, that is, that they will be gathered from their dispersion, and restored to their own land.

Fourthly, The Apostle, when asserting that the Jews are still beloved for the fathers’ sakes, lays down as a general principle “that the gifts and callings of God are without repentance.” Now one of God’s gifts to the fathers, and through them to the nation, was the land of Canaan. Nothing ever bestowed upon them was more freely an act of God’s grace, or more solemnly confirmed by covenant, than the land of Israel. “In the same day the Lord made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land.”—Genesis 15: 18. This grant was confirmed by a second covenant in circumcision—“I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession.”—Genesis 17: 7-8. The grant was renewed to Isaac with a solemn reference to the oath of God: “Sojourn in this land, and I will be with thee, and will bless thee; for unto thee and thy seed I will give all these countries, and I will perform the oath which I sware unto Abraham thy father.”—Genesis 26: 3. To Jacob the same promise was made. “I am the Lord God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac: the land whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed.”—Genesis 28: 13. Now here is a threefold promise made in the most solemn manner to Israel—made not through the law, but through grace—made without any limitation or condition—though temporal as referring to a land, yet nowhere said to be temporary; but, on the contrary, called “an everlasting covenant” to the seed of Abraham “in their generations.” And here is an apostolic declaration, “that the gifts and callings of God are without repentance.” What else, then, can we conclude, but that the gift of the land is without repentance also, and that therefore when Abraham’s children have his faith, they shall have his land also.

I confess that to my own mind these assertions of the apostle amount to demonstration, but the New Testament furnishes another argument equally strong.

3. It expounds literally certain passages of the prophecies, the literal interpretation of which necessarily implies the literal restoration of the Jews.

To examine all the passages quoted in the New Testament, and where literal exposition would lead to this conclusion, would far exceed the limits which I have proposed to myself. I select three as quite sufficient to prove my assertion.

First, in Romans 11: 26-27, the apostle proves the future national conversion of Israel by a citation from the 59th chapter of Isaiah—“And so all Israel shall be saved; as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: for this is my covenant unto them when I shall take away their sins.” Now the manner and object of this citation prove two things—1st, that this passage of the prophet refers to the literal Israel. 2nd, that it refers to a time yet to come. But what is the immediate context. “Arise, shine: for thy light is come. . . . Surely the isles shall wait for me, and the ships of Tarshish first, to bring thy sons from far, their silver and their gold with them, unto the name of the Lord thy God, and to the Holy One of Israel, because he hath glorified thee. . . . Violence shall no more be heard within thy land, wasting nor destruction within thy borders.” To separate this whole 60th chapter from the two preceding verses is impossible; but, if it be connected with them, then it refers, according to the apostle, to some future period of the literal Israel’ history, and predicts their restoration to their own land. I do not enter into the chapter itself, because I wish to confine myself to arguments furnished by the New Testament.

Secondly, the apostle proves, in Romans 15: 10, the call of the Gentiles, by a citation from the 32nd chapter of Deuteronomy: “And again he saith, Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people.” This citation also proves two things—1st, that Gentiles means Gentiles, and “his people,” with whom they rejoice, means the literal Israel. 2nd, That this rejoicing of the Gentiles with his people was to take place after the giving of the Gospel dispensation. With these apostolic principles of interpretation, then, let us turn to the passage itself: “Rejoice, O ye nations, with his people; for he will avenge the blood of his servants, and will render vengeance to his adversaries, and will be merciful unto his land, and to his people”—Deuteronomy 32: 43, and we have it at once proved, that, after the calling of the Gentiles, God will yet be merciful to his land and to his people. What else can this mean but a restoration of his people to his land?

Thirdly, The apostle—15:12 quotes the 11th of Isaiah also to prove the call of the Gentiles: “And again Esaias saith, There shall be a root of Jesse, and he that shall rise to reign over the Gentiles, in him shall the Gentiles trust.” Here we have again a literal exposition: the root of Jesse is taken literally—believers from amongst the nations are called Gentiles. But when we turn to the passage in the prophet, we find immediately after the call of the Gentiles another prophecy relating to his people—“And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people, which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea. And he shall set up an ensign for the nations, and shall assemble the outcasts of Israel, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth.”—Isaiah 11: 11-12. Who are meant by his people cannot be doubtful. They are not the believing Gentiles, for of them, according to the apostle, the prophet had already spoken. And the words “his people,” according to the same apostle’s preceding citation, signifies the literal Israel. Here, then, after the appearance

of the Messiah and the call of the Gentiles, we have a gathering together of all Israel from the four corners of the earth. These three passages, therefore, according to the apostle's inspired interpretation, refer to a future period, and predict the restoration of the literal Israel to their own land.

4. But besides this application of Old Testament prophecies, there are original passages in the New Testament which imply the restoration of the Jews.

First, Zechariah, the father of John the Baptist, foretells the redemption of Israel from the power of all his enemies—"Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he hath visited and redeemed his people, and hath raised up an horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David; as he spake by the mouth of his holy prophets, which have been since the world began: that we should be saved from the hands of our enemies, and from the hand of all that hate us; to perform the mercy promised to our fathers, and to remember his holy covenant; the oath which he swore to our father Abraham, that he would grant us, that we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, might serve him without fear in holiness and righteousness all the days of our life."—Luke 1: 68, &c. Here a temporal deliverance of Israel is plainly predicted. I do not mean to deny that the spiritual deliverance is included, but I am quite sure that a temporal deliverance in this life is predicted. The concluding words of the citation put this beyond all doubt—"That we being delivered out of the hands of our enemies, might serve him without fear in holiness and righteousness all the days of our life." "All the days of our life," do not and cannot refer to eternity, but to our life in this world. Has this prediction, then, ever yet been fulfilled? Is not Israel still in the hands of his enemies? Has he ever, since the coming of our Lord, been saved from the hands of them that hate him? Has he ever served God in holiness and righteousness all the days of his life? The plain and only answer is, No. Then these blessings are yet in store, and the prophecy is still to be accomplished. It is vain to urge that the enemies here spoken of are spiritual enemies, for even if this be admitted, Israel is not delivered from them until the punishment of his sin be removed. But the punishment of Israel's sin was dispersion. Until Israel's dispersion cease, he is still unredeemed as a nation, and except as a nation Israel has no existence.

2ndly, The angel Gabriel promises to our Lord the throne of David; "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end."—Luke 1: 32-33. As to the place or nature of David's throne no one can doubt: David's throne was in Jerusalem—"over Israel and over Judah, from Dan even to Beersheba."—2 Samuel 3: 10. If, therefore, our Lord is to have the throne or kingdom of David, the kingdom itself must first be restored—the twelve tribes must be reunited in the land of Israel. It cannot be pretended that David ever reigned in heaven, or over any other kingdom than that of the literal Israel. Neither can it be said that the language of the angel is ambiguous; he specifies not only the throne, but also the people—"the house of Jacob." The expression Jacob, or house of Jacob, is never applied, either in the Old or the New Testament, to gentile converts; and taken in connection with the "throne of David," it must be interpreted literally. If so, this prophecy has never been fulfilled. We must therefore expect its accomplishment by the gathering together of the twelve tribes, and the re-establishment of the kingdom of Israel.

3dly. Our blessed Lord made a similar promise to the twelve disciples that they should judge the twelve tribes of Israel. "And Jesus said unto them, verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me in the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."—Matthew 19: 28. This promise is given also on

another occasion in St. Luke's Gospel—"I appoint unto you a kingdom, as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."—Luke 22: 29-30. In these two promises we have first to inquire who are intended by the twelve tribes, and then what is meant by the office of judging. Doddridge understands by the twelve tribes of Israel the Jewish nation and the professed members of the Christian Church, who will appear before the throne of Christ after the resurrection; and by judgment he understands the final doom to eternal happiness or misery. He says, "In the great renovation of all things, when all the children of God shall, as it were, be born anew from their graves; when created nature shall put on its fairest forms to receive them, and the Son of Man, presiding over that august assembly, shall sit on the throne of his glory, exalted above the highest angels of God, you also, my faithful apostles, shall sit around me upon twelve radiant thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel; concurring joyfully with me in the sentence which shall then be passed on the Jewish nation, and on all the professed members of my Church, as they have been sincere or faithless in their profession, and in the observance of those laws which you, by authority from me, their exalted Sovereign, shall have given them."—Sec. 137. Here Doddridge acknowledges that twelve tribes do at least include the literal descendants of Israel; and this he could not well avoid, for it is the uniform sense in the New Testament. I do not refer to the Revelation of St. John, because it is a prophetic book, and I wish to avoid passages which are commonly considered obscure. But I reject his interpretation of the judgment here spoken of—1st. Because it appears to me inconsistent with the circumstances of the last judgment. The twelve tribes of Israel will not then be judged, and no sentence will be passed on the Jewish nation. The individuals, of which the tribes were composed, will then appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, and be judged; but it can hardly be said that the nation will be judged, when the nation has ceased to exist. A national judgment can only be in time. 2^{ndly}. This interpretation is utterly inconsistent with the opinions of those whom our Lord addressed. The apostles, from their previous Jewish notions, could never have understood it in this sense. When they heard of sitting on twelve thrones, and judging the twelve tribes of Israel, they would naturally think of Jephthah, Samson, Samuel, and others who had judged Israel, and expect that in themselves should be fulfilled the prophetic promise, "I will restore thy judges as at the first."—Isaiah 1: 26. That they did understand these words in the Jewish sense appears clear from the next chapter of Matthew's Gospel, where the mother of Zebedee's children asks that her two sons may sit, the one on his right hand and the other on his left in his kingdom. —Matthew 20: 21. Now I cannot believe that our Lord, who well knew the hearts of his apostles, would employ language directly calculated to confirm them in error, or that he would intentionally give them a promise which he knew they would understand in one sense and he in another. It would certainly be considered as inconsistent with common worldly integrity to make a promise to a servant, which might lead him to suppose that the warmest wish and fondest expectation of his heart were to be gratified, when no such thing was intended, and the master understood the words in an entirely different sense. The language of a promise should be precise, sacred, and free from all equivocation. 3^{rdly}. This interpretation of Doddridge is at variance with our Lord's own interpretation of the words. He makes the promise of sitting on twelve thrones, and judging the twelve tribes of Israel, parallel with the appointment to a kingdom—"I appoint unto you a kingdom as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." The appointment to a kingdom certainly implies the idea of rule and government, and that for a continuance. This brings us therefore to the Jewish idea of judging Israel. And when we remember that the throne which the angel promised to our Lord was the throne of his father David, over the house of Jacob, it seems a natural consequence that the apostolic appointment to judgment over the twelve tribes of Israel should be considered as a portion of that royalty.

4thly. Our Lord, when the question concerning the restoration of Israel was directly put to him, intimated in his answer that in due time Israel should be restored. The apostles looked upon our Lord as the Messiah; they therefore “trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel;” and this hope must have been much confirmed by our Lord’s promises to them that they should judge the twelve tribes of Israel. After our Lord’s resurrection, “he expounded to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself”—“He opened their understandings that they might understand the Scriptures”—for forty days he continued “speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.” And yet with an opened understanding, and with all this instruction, we still find that they hold the same Jewish opinions, and ask, “Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?”—Acts 1: 6. We may fairly infer, then, that during all this forty days’ instruction our Lord had not said anything to show that their expectations were erroneous. He evidently did teach them that their ideas of a merely glorious Messiah were false. Their hopes concerning the restoration of Israel were intimately connected with their idea of the Messiah. Why, then, did our Lord not set them right here if they were wrong? But why, above all, when they came to put the last question that ever they could put upon earth, and this last question was still concerning the restoration of the kingdom of Israel, why did he not then explain to them the baselessness of their hope? Our blessed Lord gives an answer calculated to confirm them in their expectations—“It is not for you to know the times and the seasons which the Father has put in his own power.” Now if he meant that the kingdom was never to be restored, he could not have used this language, for then there are no times nor seasons which the Father could put in his power. The plain meaning of our Lord’s answer is—Israel is to be restored, but I cannot make known to you the time. Such at least would be the meaning conveyed to those who expected to see our Lord on the throne of David, and hoped themselves to sit on twelve thrones judging the tribes of Israel; and we cannot suppose that our Lord would condescend to that most base and cowardly breach of good faith, equivocation, or mental reservation.

5thly. After the out-pouring of the Holy Spirit, the apostle Peter still uses similar language. Addressing the Jews he says, “Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up the Christ to sit on his throne.”—Acts 2: 30. Here Peter is speaking of the resurrection, and proving that Jesus is Christ, but he still holds out to the Jews the promise and oath that the Messiah was to sit on the throne of David. When speaking by the Holy Ghost, he does not show them the erroneousness of their general expectations, but only of their mistake as to the person. He proves that Jesus is the Christ, but still refers to the hope of Israel as to the kingdom of David.

Again, in chapter 3: 21, he refers to the Jewish hope of the restitution of all things. That the apostle refers to the Jewish hope, is fully admitted by Lightfoot, who was no Chiliast. He first proposes that the passage should be thus translated—“Repent, therefore, and be converted, that (not when) the times of refreshing may come, and God may send Jesus Christ to you,” and then gives a paraphrase containing his reasons, and showing how Peter met the objection that would naturally occur to a Jewish mind, namely, if Jesus be the Messiah, then all our hopes of refreshment by him are vanished. No, says St. Peter, “Repent that the times of refreshment may come from the presence of the Lord.” Jesus has ascended into the heavens until the time of the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began. In what sense his audience would understand this restitution ἀποκατάστασις cannot be doubtful. It is the same word which the apostles employed when asking, “Wilt thou at this time restore ἀποκαθιστάνεις to Israel?”

In what sense his audience would understand the prophets to whom Peter refers is equally certain. There can be no doubt about their interpreting them literally. The minds of the Jewish people were at this time full of the hope of the restoration of the theocracy. Peter well knew the state of their minds: is it to be conceived then that he would buoy them up with a false hope, or use language directly calculated to confirm in error? Upon what principle, then, can we explain this fact that the New Testament nowhere, not even in the epistles to the Gentile Churches, declares that the Jewish hope of the restoration of the kingdom of Israel is fallacious, and that wherever it does speak on the subject it speaks in language adapted to strengthen them in that hope? Zechariah the priest speaks of a national redemption. The angel promises to our Lord the throne of David over the house of Jacob. Our Lord himself twice promises the apostles dominion over the twelve tribes of Israel. He intimates in his last words that there is a time and season in which the kingdom of Israel shall be restored. The apostle Peter still holds out the hope of a restitution of all things. How is it, I say, that this language is adopted, and no one warning against mistake vouchsafed, if the Jews are not to be restored to the land of Israel?

* * *

BELIEVER'S BAPTISM.

The writer of the following pages, having been one of a large congregation who listened to the exposition of the question of Infant Church Membership, by one of the clergymen of Charlottesville, Virginia, in an address recently delivered, in pursuance of previous public notice, it seemed to him and to others who were present that the importance of the subject no less than obedience to the Divine injunction to “contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the Saints,” required a brief and candid notice of the discourse, by way of replication and defence.

It was the object of the speaker to prove that Infants are proper scriptural subjects for admission, by baptism, into the Church of Christ. As the foundation of the discourse he selected the text—Mark 10: 13—“Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God.” To sustain his proposition he argued:

1. That in Scripture the kingdom of God and the Church mean the same thing—that “such” as children being in the one, they must belong to the other also.
2. That the Jewish and Christian Church being essentially one, infants being members of the first must necessarily be entitled to membership in the second.
3. That baptism stands in the place of circumcision, which last being the indispensable rite for the admission of infants into the Jewish Church, the former is also indispensable to Christian Church membership to the same class of subjects.
4. Cases of household baptism in Scripture.
5. The traditions of the Church, the testimony of ancient writers, “the fathers,” in its favour.

These conclusions the speaker urged with a zeal and earnestness which no doubt spring from conviction. Let us briefly try them by fair logic, and by the only infallible standard of truth—the Holy Scriptures.

1. If the kingdom and the church be only different names to represent the same thing, you may, by a well known rule of construction, properly substitute the one for the

other and the sense will be preserved. Applying this simple rule to a few familiar passages of Scripture in which the word “kingdom” occurs and reading its substitute “church” for it, we have the following results:

“Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the church prepared for you from the foundation of the world.”

“Among those that are born of women there is not a greater prophet than John the Baptist, but he that is least in the church of God is greater than he.” Is it really intended to be urged that an infant in the church is greater than John the Baptist?

“It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the church of God!!” Is this consistent with our daily observations and experience?

If we reverse the use of the terms we do not help the argument—thus:

“Paul and Silvanus and Timotheus unto the kingdom of the Thessalonians.”

“Paul, an apostle, &c., unto the kingdoms of Galatia.”

“John, to the seven kingdoms which are in Asia,” &c.

Surely it is unnecessary to press the illustration further to show the fallacy which underlies the first proposition above. How stands the second?

2. If the Jewish and Christian Church be essentially one, it seems difficult, if not impossible, to escape the conclusion that the rejection of the Jews, the evident displeasure of God with them, the afflictions and persecutions of Christians, and even the sufferings and death of Christ have been in vain and for nought! Why reproach the Jew with unbelief and hardness of heart? Why seek to detach him from the Law of Moses if his church and yours are essentially one? But were all infants introduced into the (so called) Jewish Church? This leads us to consider the third point above, viz.:
3. That, as baptism is in the room of circumcision, infants who were entitled to the latter must also submit to the former rite in order to be admitted into the church. But the intelligent preacher seems to have wholly overlooked one stubborn fact in his path which is fatal to his argument. It is that, on his premises, female church membership among the Jews was impossible, and, by consequence (as baptism stands in the room of circumcision as the initiatory ordinance to the church), females cannot be members of the christian church! Is he prepared for this result?

Again, if baptism be in the room of circumcision and is intended to answer the same purpose, why was baptism administered by John and the Apostles to Jews at all, seeing they had all been circumcised? And why was Timothy, a Gentile convert, both circumcised and baptised?

4. The household baptisms mentioned in Scripture, those of Lydia, the jailor, and Stephanas, cited by the speaker, did not include infants, as the context of the narrative shows. To make Lydia’s household available for that purpose, it is incumbent on the affirmative to show:

1. That Lydia was a married woman.
2. That she had children.
3. That some of them were Infants.
4. That they were with her in Philippi, where the narrative shows—Acts 16: 15—she was only a sojourner, her residence being in another city, Thyatira. Besides, verse 40th presents a strong implication against Infants being included in her household. “And the Apostles went out of the prison and entered into the house of Lydia, and when they had seen the brethren they comforted them and departed.” Query? Did they comfort Infants by their discourse?

As to the jailor, it is said in verse 32, “the Apostles spoke the word to all that were in his house,” and in verse 34, that “he rejoiced believing in God with all his house”—clearly then, the Infants were believers! or there were none in his house.

The remaining citation is that of “Stephanas and his household.” This is equally inconclusive, for, of them, it is testified—1 Corinthians 16: 15—“they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the Saints,” which can hardly be truly affirmed of Infants.

5. On the fifth and last point, the testimony of the fathers, it is hardly necessary to dwell, for the speaker very properly and candidly placed the success of his argument exclusively on the Bible testimony. Having already tested the strength of the four main pillars of the edifice, we may regard the last like the fifth wheel to a coach, as useless either to sustain the weight or to speed the motion of the vehicle. “The fathers,” indeed! what follies have they not invented? If Protestants allow to Romanists the testimony of the fathers, the traditions of the church, who shall fix the limit to the abominations they can fasten on the pure religion of the Bible.

Vows of celibacy, perpetual poverty, and unlimited obedience to priestly rule, indulgences, auricular confession, the invocation of saints, masses for the dead, clerical absolution from sins and the blasphemous pretension of papal infallibility are all fruits of a blind and superstitious reverence for the authority of the uninspired, ignorant and often bad men—known as “the fathers” of the church. If “the mystery of iniquity already wrought” in the days of the Apostles, if “men arose even among themselves, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them,” if John, the last of the Apostles, wrote to the seven churches of Asia to warn them against the dogmas of the Gnostics and “the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which thing I hate,” surely we need not be surprised that very soon after their day, errors and heresies the most fundamental were preached and practised by “the fathers,” themselves.

That Infant baptism is to be ranked among the errors of this early period, the writer will not undertake to affirm. It is altogether probable it is an invention of a later day. It is difficult to find any trace of it until the third century. It is not pretended that the earliest “fathers” say anything about it. Barnabas, Clemens, Romanus, Ignatius, Polycarp and Justin Martyr, all flourished previous to the second century. Neither of them gives any account of it. Yet their very silence has been skilfully cited to sustain the authority of the practice.

It was urged in the discourse referred to, that its authority was not disputed in the early ages of Christianity—that of all the early writers, immediately succeeding the apostolic

age, none ever upbraided the church with baptising Infants as an innovation, as if they could complain of a practice which, at that early day, had no existence.

Of the early ecclesiastical writers within three hundred years after the Apostles, ten can be produced who never mention Infant baptism for every one who alludes to it. But what of this? If the Bible is to be our guide, if all the fathers pronounced it absurd and unscriptural, and we can find a scripture warrant for it, we should practise it in spite of their opinions or authority, and on the other hand, if they all approved and the Bible no where enjoined it, we should reject it. So we are shut up to scripture at last for not only our faith but our practice in religion is to be regulated by the word of God and by it only. Tried by this infallible touchstone of truth how can a practice be sustained and approved which is plainly inconsistent with such passages of Holy Writ as these:

“Without faith it is impossible to please God. He that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them who diligently seek him.”

“Go, teach all nations, baptising them.”

“He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved.”

“Repent and be baptised every one of you, &c.

“What hinders me to be baptised? If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest.”

“Many of the Corinthians hearing, believed and were baptised.”

“When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptised, both men and women.”

How natural and appropriate this place to have added “children,” so as to read, “men, women and children,” had such a practice as infant baptism prevailed among the Apostles? Can the candid reader doubt, for a moment, that it would have been so written in the narrative, had such a practice been in use?

Take such testimony from the Bible as this, which might easily be accumulated by large additions, and remember that the most zealous champion of the opposite creed cannot produce from the Holy Scriptures one single instance or example of baby baptism, and surely a reader of ordinary intelligence and candor ought not to pause as to the conclusion that the authority for the practice must be sought, not in the word of God, but in the traditions of men.

Reader, whosoever thou art, if not yet on the Bible foundation on this question, pause, examine, and so decide, that the reproach addressed by the Great Teacher to the Pharisees may not fall upon you. “Full well ye reject the commandment of God that you may keep your own traditions: Howbeit in vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.”—Mark 6: 9.

CEPHAS.

* * *

VISIT TO THE SOUTH-WEST.

At 5 P.M., May 27th, we set out from New York City for Henderson, Kentucky, a distance of 1080 miles. We purchased a “through ticket” to Terre Haute, Indiana, the far western terminus of our route, whence we wheeled south to the Ohio River, which we touched at Evansville. This brought us to within about twelve miles of Henderson city on the

left bank of La Belle River. From New York to Evansville is one continuous line of rail, which is traversable in 48 or 50 hours, provided the vitality of the iron horses is not suspended or impaired. Thus it happened to ours east of Cattaraugus, N.Y. The locomotive of the New York and Erie night express having become exceedingly asthmatical, gave out, and with much difficulty brought us to the station. The time lost was fatal to our connexion with the Erie train at Dunkirk, where we were in consequence detained twelve hours. This interruption threw us out at Terre Haute, where we were delayed sixteen hours; and making our arrival at Evansville 9.30 P.M., which necessitated a halt there also till next morning. At 8 A.M. the Louisville packet, "Alvin Adams," received us on board, and in about an hour after discharged us upon the wharf-boat at Henderson, where we were kindly welcomed by one of the few in that region who are "waiting for the consolation of Israel." Eighty-seven hours were thus consumed in a journey which in return we accomplished in fifty-two.

Modern travel presents few incidents worthy of note in the absence of a concussion and smash of trains, and dashing over an embankment into an abyss. We have nothing approaching such a catastrophe to relate for the gratification of any love of the horrible there may be in our readers' phrenologies. All was common-place and in place. We shot through countries upon the wings of the wind, and seemed to have but little more to do with them, or they with us, than as phantasmagoria vanishing at sight. Our world was in train—a miniature of that without, with its passions in repose. Even Kansas, and slavery, and presidential nominations, and legislative barbarians, did not disturb it. It rushed on from station to station as though these were the "unconsidered trifles" of another sphere. Yet many were on their way to the Cincinnati Convention, which has since nominated Mr. Buchanan for that thorn without a crown, THE PRESIDENCY. Even they were in repose; and though politicians, (which is but another word for prospectors of the spoils,) they abstained from troubling the waters with their vain janglings and questions in which there is no profit to any but themselves. It is remarkable in these "excited times," as they are considered, how little excitement there is among the people. One from Kansas direct told our informant that the greatest excitement about events there was beyond the limits of that territory. The real agitation is in the newspapers and speeches of professional spoilsmen. The people are busy as bees subduing the earth and replenishing it. They care very little who is president, who capture the spoils, being convinced from experience that all party-leaders are alike corrupt and untrustworthy when in office; let their fields produce abundantly and themselves grow fat, and "the Union" has nothing to fear. The real enemies of the country are not abroad; they are the filibuster-spoilsmen at home.

Dunkirk is an uninviting town on Lake Erie, of considerable railroad business. Our twelve hours' detention there was very tedious. We inquired for the best hotel in the place, and were directed to a large wooden building near the station. It was pretty fair to behold, but it was like the generality of such places, without comfort within. Two large rooms on a level with the street were provided with wooden chairs, as though that were as much as travellers had any need of. In one of them was a large rusty stove incrustated with inspissated ambier; and at the end a "bar" at which were dispensed cheap liquors and bad segars to its thirsty worshippers. The other room was without fire, though the weather was damp and chilly, and destitute of all furniture but a few seats and a table. Beyond a few papers of no value or interest, nothing was provided for the inner man. All who were expected to darken the doors were regarded as having need only of tobacco and liquor until meal times, when they would be gonged into another room for a bolting match against time! It was in such a "Traveller's Home" as this we were condemned to spend half a day, doing homage to custom and an old stove in fumes of vile tobacco, in a liquor-temple of Dunkirk. But there was no help for it;

therefore we had “to make the best of it.” The apprehension of a Londoner for picking pockets, and the transit of some 400 Mormons, part of a recent importation from England, on their way to the harems and seraglios of Utah, relieved the monotony of things for a few minutes; but the variety soon passed away, and the old clock over the bar became again the chief attraction of the place.

At Terre Haute things were a little more comfortable, for the weather was warmer; and in the midst of misery where there is warmth, misery, if not more comfortable, is less miserable. This is “The Prairie City” of the West, situate upon the Wabash, 109 miles by rail from the Ohio. It was formerly a French settlement when that semi-barbarous people could boast of their forts from Louisiana to Montreal. In the hands of the Anglo-American race the city and country has attained a prosperous condition. The christened paganism of Rome having preceded all other forms of abomination has taken deep root among the people. In our walk about the town we met two of its demons in priestly garb, whose corpulencies abstinence from meats and fastings seemed to have roundly developed! The spiritual intelligence of peoples must be microscopically small where such creatures can perambulate the highways in sunshine without shame. “Forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats” removes all doubt of their system being a departure from the faith, and themselves consequently sons of the apostasy. What fools are modern protestants to cherish such a viper in their midst. In Henderson they are about to erect a cathedral and Protestants are aiding in the same. Then the priest must have a manse, and then a harem, which must be supplied with concubines by local conversions or importations. To accommodate these a nunnery must be established, and to supply the waste of life in these seraglios of the priests, girls’ and orphan schools and asylums must be organised under worn-out duennas called “Sisters of Charity,” “Sisters of Mercy,” or “Sisters of the Sacred Heart!” this is the blighting curse preparing for Henderson under the patronage of his right reverend godship, Spaulding, Nuncio of the Italian High Priest for Kentucky, and to be fed by protestant victims and their funds! But what folly will not a people be guilty of who take their religion on credit—who become professors in ignorance of the Bible! The study of this book never made a papist or sectarian; for it condemns them all as deceiving and being deceived. It opens a man’s eyes, turns him from darkness to light, and from the power of the adversary to God. Such an one can never become a papist or sectarian, nor be brought to sympathise with their unhallowed schemes, unless he first become an apostate. Apostates have all their price. They will turn anything, and promote anything, for profit. On this principle christened paganism is patronised in Henderson. “It will add buildings to the city and increase its population;” and by consequence cause more goods to be sold at the stores, and the price of lots to be increased. But this bartering of the interests of posterity for vile pelf is not peculiar to Henderson, whose citizens are of the average goodness of sinners in other parts of the earth. It is a vice common to society at large. God’s principles are at a discount with mankind, who love evil better than good, because they are themselves evil. Hence in all their cities they would rather abound in temples dedicated to the idolatry of Peter and Mary, the Queen of Heaven, with all the sacerdotal orgies and abominations thereunto pertaining, than to have one scriptural house of God, which is the pillar and support of the truth, and a standing protest against every invention of the carnal mind. Men love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil. This is an old saying, but characteristically true of all past and present times. Popish establishments never put men to shame because of the shamefulness of their deeds; hence it is, that the foulest sinks of iniquity to be found reeking under the sun are the countries where Rome’s diabolism is the exclusive and triumphant abomination. It either finds men brutish, and therefore ready for its fiendism; or it makes them worse than wolves and tigers, and ready to rend and devour whom it pleases to point out for destruction. The history of its past proves

this to be no fiction; and human nature being as much “flesh of sin” as in Paul’s day, Romanism, which is Sin’s Mystery, is as unchanged as flesh, and prepared for any villainy it may find profitable and convenient to practise. Henderson, like other places, will find this to its cost. If it will warm the Serpent into life, let it not cry out when its daughters are perishing in its coils, and its fangs striking its sons with death. Its outcries will then be “too late;” and they will fall, unwept and unpitied, the victims of their own selfishness and unbelief.

While in Henderson county and city, we spoke about thirty hours at different places, known as Zion, the Barrens, Pleasant Valley, and “The Christian Church.” The last is in town, the others in the country parts. On the three Sundays of our course the congregations were inconveniently large; for they contained many who came not to hear, but to see others and to be seen; so that having no sympathy in common with those who did, they became a disturbing element, and an unmannerly annoyance to the more civilised. During the week-meetings in the country, these aboriginals were happily absent, and we had the satisfaction of speaking to those who came to hear. We boast of our civilisation and the progress of the age! If the conduct of the masses in their public meetings be an evidence of their progress and civility it is an exceedingly crawfish affair. The gravity and decorum of the Red Man in public assembly is an historical rebuke of the civilised turbulence of whites in a like position, whose unfurnished heads are too volatile to think, and too obtuse to learn. The city, however, which professes to be more polished and civilised than the country-side, is less decorous than the country. They will sit until the business of the meeting begin, and a portion of the scripture is being read; but before it is finished, they will start up and noisily evacuate the house to the diverting of the attention of the others, and the no little discomfort of the reader; who judges that if such are a type of those that remain, and they treat the word of God with so much contempt, he had better close the book at once, and dismiss them to their homes as unworthy of the words of eternal life, which invites men to God’s kingdom and glory. If they treat the word of God with so little respect, what need he expect but to find that he is “throwing pearls before swine, and giving things holy unto dogs?” Such an impression is anything but promotive of a right frame of mind for reasoning with men of temperance, and righteousness, and judgment to come. Another class there is that will seem to listen with apparent interest to an argumentative interpretation of the word, when suddenly, while you are labouring to conduct them to the conclusion in accordance with the word and premises, they will hasten away, virtually declaring that they care neither for God nor his testimony, whether they mean this, that, or anything else. What’s the Bible to them? They got religion without it; their preachers don’t understand it; nor is it necessary to piety; why then should they perplex their brains with its mysteries! “He knows too much for me,” say they; and away they go to misrepresent what they cannot, or will not, comprehend.

It is with pleasure that we are able to report an act of liberality on the part of the Bethanians in Henderson. They have a roomy and comfortable meeting-house in that city, which they placed at our disposal for every night in the week. It was quite a surprise to find ourselves contending for “the faith once for all delivered to the saints” on the same platform a few days before occupied by that celebrated anecdotist and dispenser of traditions, J. T. Johnson, the “great western recruiting officer” of what is technically styled “this reformation.” He was careful to tell the people that “his Saviour was not a fighting Saviour!” This is doubtless true; for no one intelligent in the word of prophecy would ever suppose that the Saviour confessed by the advocates of Campbellism is the Saviour who is to come to Zion, and to strike through kings in the day of his wrath; to judge among the nations and fill their countries with dead bodies; and to bruise the chief of an extensive region, after the types of Moses, Joshua, and David. —Psalm 110. Theirs is “another Jesus,” of whom Moses and

the prophets testify not; and their gospel “another gospel” to which those holy men of old bear no witness. The Bethanian Jesus is a man of peace and colleges; who came to save ghosts from eternal life in molten and flaming brimstone, and to translate all who believe that he is the Christ of God to kingdoms beyond the skies! The Jesus of prophecy is not such as he. He came to bring a sword and fire upon the earth; and by his doctrine to stir up foes at the domestic hearth. He comes to save bodies, not ghosts; to destroy the devil and his works; to redeem Jerusalem and Israel; to punish the kings and princes of the earth upon the earth; to subjugate the nations; to give them laws; to found the kingdom and age; to conquer peace, and to bless all nations in Abraham for a thousand years. This is the work that is before him; and the fruit of his labours is the reward that is with him for his brethren and friends. What a different Jesus is he whose testimony is the spirit of prophecy! The “great western” knows nothing of him, being profoundly ignorant of the sure prophetic word. “Jehovah is a man of war,” says Moses, and the Christ of the Bible is that same Jehovah manifested in flesh; if Jesus therefore be Christ, then is Jesus “a man of war,” whose mission is to rebuke the nations, and to dash their power in pieces as a potter’s vessel.

Five discourses delivered by the proscribed of Bethany in a Bethanian meeting-house. That is surely one of the marvels of the day! And the principal man, too, admitting that he could say yea and amen to all he heard on these occasions! We spoke of the purpose of God as the subject-matter of the gospel which was preached to Abraham, who in believing it, rejoiced to see Messiah’s day which is yet to come; we showed that the church and the kingdom of Christ are in no sense identical, unless it can be shown that the heir of an estate is the estate itself! We denied the setting up of a kingdom on Pentecost; and proved that it was the Mystery concealed from the prophets, and not the gospel, that was preached for the first time on that occasion. We showed that the gospel is not defined or declared in 1 Corinthians 15: 3-4, but in the whole chapter. We expounded the case of the twelve at Ephesus, showing that immersion is not the “one baptism” unless predicated upon the “one faith.” And many more things we submitted there, which, if admitted, destroy root and branch the system glorified by Bethany and its friends.

“Union,” said a highly esteemed citizen of the place, “is what the reformation wants, and you preach union: why then can you not cooperate with it?” We preach union to the Christ of the prophets upon the basis of the one faith and the one baptism. If the reformation will embrace that faith and baptism we will unite with it; but upon no other terms. We cannot go over to it; it must come to us, and we will receive it with open arms. Its Jesus, its gospel, its spirit, its baptism, its hope, are not those of “the Unity of the Spirit;” they are not ours: so that if we were to consent to “union,” it would only be in appearance. No. We occupy an impregnable position. One that cannot be turned by any or all the powers of Christendom combined. There can be no compromise. Victory or death is the motto of our enterprise. We may be prevailed against as the saints have been prevailed against by the Little Horn; but we die fighting in the harness in hope of victory through our Lord Jesus Christ. Campbellism has no temptations—nay, the world itself has none, that can shake our allegiance to what we advocate. We embrace it with full assurance of faith and hope, firmly believing that it is as true as God himself. We read our faith in the book. We see it in Moses, in Samuel, in David, in Isaiah, in Jeremiah, in Ezekiel, in Daniel, in all the prophets; in the discourses of Jesus, in the Acts, the Epistles, and in the Apocalypse. But where are Campbellism and the “sentiments of all Christendom?” In none of them! Shall we then hold our faith in abeyance for union with them? Nay, nay! Let our friend, and we sincerely esteem him as such, let him come out and take his stand with us. We have no worldly inducements to offer him, it is true; but what of that? The glory of a soldier is his sufferings in his country’s cause. We can promise him

fellowship in these, in reproaches for the truth; and if he suffer with that in righteousness, he shall reign with Christ in glory evermore. But we need not write these things that he may know them; but because he knows them, and to stir up his mind to decision in the case. Let us save ourselves from this untoward generation, and others if we can; ourselves at all events.

In conclusion, if the reader inquire, what good was done by this visit? We reply that we do not know. We immersed an old Campbellite friend in the Ohio; formerly of Old Virginia, but for several years a resident of the State of Mississippi. He was on his return thither from the Cincinnati Convention, to which he had been sent to assist in selecting a candidate for the Presidency. The wire-pullers of the party having dispensed with the attendance of many, he vacated the arena, and in returning called at Henderson by the way. Bro. J. G. Jeffries, for that is his name, has been a reader of the Herald for some time; and therefore was prepared to understand and appreciate what was laid before him. He heard several discourses, and of his own accord inquired, "What doth hinder me to be baptised?" We knew of nothing, seeing that he believed "the things of the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ." He was accordingly immersed.

Besides this, the brethren who at our last visit had obeyed the truth, were strengthened in the faith; and others heard it more fully exhibited in the interpretation of portions of the word not expounded to them before. But what of our labour shall be manifested as good in the presence of the Lord, it is not for us to say. Much depends on those who have confessed the hope. If they are saved in the kingdom there will be so much good done; but if they fall short of it, then our labour will have been in vain, and our reward will be diminished.

Our work being done, nothing remained but to leave the result to God, and to return. We had sowed and planted, and the increase will be of him in his own way. All who are of the truth will hear its voice, and respond. We have no anxieties about results.

June 17th. We set out towards the rising of the sun. Arrived in Evansville we were again in train for New York by way of Terre Haute, Indianapolis, Crestline, Pittsburgh, Harrisburg and Philadelphia. Here we failed to connect, owing to locomotive infirmity beyond Harrisburg. Finding that our ticket would take us on the next day, we accepted the invitation of some friends to partake of their hospitality till then. We passed a pleasant evening with them, which we concluded in expounding the highly suggestive prophecy of David contained in the second psalm.

In the days of our profound ignorance we were to the Campbellites a very acceptable preacher of the Bethanian Jesus in the same "City of Brotherly Love." We resided there eleven months, from May 1833 to April 1834, having an office at 90 Arch Street, and practising medicine for a support. The Reformers then met in Bank Street, and were gratuitously instructed in Scotto-Campbellite traditions by the septuagenarian named Ballantine and myself. We published the first number of the Apostolic Advocate there, to which most of the members subscribed. But we concluded that there was a better opening in Richmond, Virginia, for our practice, and what in our ignorance of the prophets we regarded as, the truth; we announced therefore our intention to the friends of removing to that city, which no little displeased them. Our determination, however, could not be changed, whereupon they inflicted upon us the only punishment in their power—the withdrawal of their names from the subscription list to the Advocate. This was our recompense for eleven months service in the cause of Campbellism! It shows, however, that the fraternity did not wish to get rid of us; but punished us because it could not induce us to remain.

Those were the healthiest times of “this reformation” in the Quaker City. In after times they became more numerous and richer, but with their numbers and riches they became vain and corrupt. They procured an orator, and placed him in a pulpit of their own at so many hundreds per annum, that they might have a position and a name among the Zions of Christendom. But their hireling proved to be a great vagabond, and their speculation failed.

Their body ecclesiastic, however is not extinct. It has since rallied, and hired another orator. This is one whom we used to know four and twenty years ago. His name is James Challen, formerly a dentist and Campbellite preacher in Cincinnati; but now it would seem a bookseller and publisher in Philadelphia. He is also editor of the Ladies’ Christian Annual, which is in its fifth volume. His brethren inform us that his ministrations in Campbellism cost them a thousand dollars a year, for which he does all the talking necessary, and they do all the hearing. This is the finality of Campbellism in Philadelphia. It began upon the principle of the church edifying itself, and it has ended in paying a thousand a year to a hireling for the purpose; thereby proclaiming, that after twenty-five years profession of “Ancient Gospelism,” it has become a dumb dog that cannot bark; a sleepy dog, lying down, and loving to slumber! Scotto-Campbellism in its beginning proposed a return to primeval Christianity—to the ancient gospel and order of things. That was a truly reformation-idea, and entitled it to the epithet, “this reformation.” But look at it now! Behold what a miserable abortion it presents! Look at Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Louisville, Richmond, Baltimore, and New York, for illustrations—flocks of the hireling teaching for doctrine the commandments of men! A primitive Christianity ignoring Moses and the prophets! Primitive Christianity ending in weekly orations at a thousand a year! Campbellism indeed lives, energetically fleecing the flocks and milking the goats of thousands for “shepherds that cannot understand, and who all look to their own way, every one for his gain, from his quarter;” and for the endowment of colleges and chairs to the immortalisation of their founders throughout eternity; this speculation flourishes in all the exuberance and vigour of the rankest weeds; but “reformation” as expressive of a return to the first principles of the oracles of God, is, in the hands of Alexander Campbell and his hireling coadjutors, “twice dead and plucked up by the roots,” and only to be found with them who reject their traditions; and out of Moses and the prophets preach the gospel of the kingdom in the name of that Jesus whom Paul and the apostles preached as its sovereign lord, the King.

As a man Mr. Challen is estimable; and as a preacher of Gentilism superior to many. At least this was the impression made upon our mind when we were a fool, and preaching gratuitously the folly now so profitable to him and our successors in Richmond, Virginia. He seemed then to be a sensible man; and may be so now for anything we have heard to the contrary. May he prosper in seeing the error of his present way, and become obedient to the truth.

At present, as far as we are informed, Philadelphia contains not even a Noachic number of true believers. There are sectarians of every grade and colour; but of believers in “the great salvation BEGAN TO BE SPOKEN by the Lord” before his crucifixion, there are almost none. There are many one-idea-gospelists who reject the immortality of the human ghost, and its eternal conflagration in brimstone smoke; and even believe that the Jesus of Christendom will appear on earth; but they do not believe the word or message of Jehovah delivered to Israel by the Jesus whom Paul preached. They rejoice in Millerism, Storrism, Plymouth-Brotherism, and other forms of Adventism; but to believe that the God of heaven intends to re-establish the kingdom and throne of David in Jerusalem and the Holy Land, with

Judah and Israel a regenerated, independent, and powerful nation there, as its subjects; and all other nations for its imperial dominion; to believe this, and that this is the kingdom of God promised to the heirs of salvation with eternal life and glory—covenanted to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David, and their heirs forever; to believe this, and that these covenants were brought into force by the death and resurrection of Jesus as their Mediator and not till then; and that it is by these covenants dedicated by his blood, that believers of the covenanted promises “are washed, sanctified, and justified,” in being immersed into the one name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit—to the belief and practice of these things they have not attained; and never will so long as they surrender themselves to the teaching of the blind guides who at present lead them by the nose, and indoctrinate them in the foolish speculations of men, who understand not the spirit of prophecy in its “testimony for Jesus.”

But if the Lord have any people in Philadelphia he will open a door for the gospel of the kingdom to enter there; otherwise not. The time, however, is short, and the people generally dull of hearing, and the means in operation for their illumination very feeble, and the opposition well organised and strong, with all the sympathies of sinful flesh in full activity on its side. Still it is not by might, nor by power, but by the Spirit of Jehovah! The spirit-words of Jesus which are life, though feebly ministered, will tell with all who are of the truth. “I came into the world,” says he, “that I might bear witness to the truth; and every one that is of the truth heareth my voice.” That truth he witnessed before Pontius Pilate, and sealed it by his blood, testifying, “I am Jesus of Nazareth the King of the Jews; and that I might establish my claim to the throne and kingdom of my ancestors, came I into the world as the Christ of God.” Reject this royalty of Jesus, or be ignorant of it, though you may have been immersed professing that the Jesus of Christendom is Son of God, you reject, or are faithless of the truth confessed by Jesus, and for which he forfeited his life. No man dies with him who confesses not the truth for which He died, before he is buried in the baptismal grave.

But we must linger no longer in the slow, self-righteous, and self-satisfied, city of Quaker thrift and worldly love. New York is said to be the brains and Philadelphia the heart of the Union. At present, neither the brains nor the heart are to be envied by the man whose eyes are open, and who has ears to hear the words of God. The brains are addled and the heart corrupt. May the Lord come quickly and purify them both; for they are tending rapidly to rottenness and putrefaction.

At 10 A.M., June 20, we left Philadelphia in the steamer for the railway terminus on the Delaware, some miles above the city. In four hours we were in New York, and shortly after at Mott Haven, after an absence of twenty-four days, and a journey exceeding two thousand miles.

EDITOR.

* * *

“SEEK FIRST THE KINGDOM OF GOD.”

“Jesus is the first, the chief element of the kingdom and He should, therefore, be first and foremost in the proclamation of the everlasting Gospel.”—Expositor, p. 519.

The only place where the phrase “Everlasting Gospel” occurs is in Revelation 14: 6. “I saw,” says John, “another messenger flying in mid-heaven, having εναγγελιον αιωνιον (dispensational good news) to proclaim to the dwellers upon the earth, and to every nation,

and tribe, and tongue, and people.” In the Common Version, aion “good news,” or “good news concerning the age, or economy of the fulness of times,” is rendered “the everlasting Gospel.” In the next verse we are informed what the good tidings are in these words, “Saying, with a great voice, fear God, and give glory to him, because the hour of his judgment comes, and render homage to him who made the heaven and the earth, and sea, and fountains of waters.”

Such is the testimony. Is Jesus “the first and the foremost in this proclamation?” God, a certain hour, and the approaching judgment, are the chief elements of it. The name “Jesus,” does not appear in the record. The writer, therefore, of the passage at the head of the column must review his premises, and amend his conclusion.

But perhaps he does not mean the “Everlasting Gospel,” but some other proclamation. If he did not mean it, he should not have written contrary to his meaning. The “Everlasting Gospel,” proclaimed by the messenger John saw, is not an invitation to God’s Kingdom and Glory, but a command to do homage to him, under pain of approaching judgment. The “Gospel of the Kingdom” is an invitation to his Kingdom and Glory, as appears from the apostle’s words, who says to the subjects of the “one baptism,” “We exhort, and comfort, and charge every one of you, as a father doth his children, that ye walk worthy of God, who hath called you to his kingdom and glory,” and “that ye may be counted worthy of the kingdom of God, for which ye suffer.”—1 Thessalonians 2: 12; 2 Thessalonians 1: 5. They were “called,” or invited, to certain things which became their hope; styled, therefore, by Paul, the “one hope of the invitation,” or calling; and elsewhere, “the Hope of the Gospel.” The kingdom and glory of God were the hope of all new converts in Paul’s day, that he had to do with. For this “and” the resurrection he was called in question—Acts 23: 6, and suffered the loss of all things that he might win them, for in winning them he won Christ. The kingdom and glory being the hope of the Gospel, is the reason why so much is said in the New Testament about them. All Christians in those days looked for the kingdom and glory, which constituted “the excellency of the knowledge of Jesus, the anointed one and Lord.”—Philippians 3: 8.

When Paul went to a city, it was to tell them about the kingdom of God, and to make them an offer of possessing it, on certain conditions, at the appointed time. Thus, we are told, that Paul and Barnabas preached the Gospel at Lystra and Derbe, cities of Lycaonia. —Acts 14: 6-7, 21; and that when they returned from Derbe to Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch, they exhorted the disciples they had made to “continue in the faith,” saying that “we must, through much tribulation, enter into the kingdom of God”—verse 22. Continue in the faith of that for which they suffered. Would they have endured “much tribulation” without faith in a well-defined hope? Could they have continued in the faith of that hope if Paul had not preached it to them in the Gospel? Nay, verily. They were exhorted to continue in the faith of the kingdom he preached to them in the gospel of the kingdom. They believed this gospel and obeyed it, but did not therefore consider themselves already in it; but they hoped to enter into it as a reward for patient continuance in well-doing through much tribulation.

The “Everlasting Gospel” is preached hereafter. The advent of Jesus will have occurred before its proclamation. I say, then, the apocalyptic “Everlasting Gospel” has never yet been announced. In Revelation 14: 6, it is only prophesied that it will be preached just before the inauguration of the judgment; so that if there be any nations, or persons, like the contemporaries of John the Immerser, desirous of escaping the impending vengeance, they may do so by transferring their homage from “the powers that be,” to the theocracy that sends forth the proclamation. This is very different from Paul’s message, inviting people to

become “heirs of the kingdom.” Paul’s gospel will not then be proclaimed. Ours, we believe, is the last effort to bring men back to his gospel. In a few more years it will become like the proclamation of John the Baptist after Pentecost, an affair of the past, which, having answered the purpose designed, had fallen into desuetude. Does the reader imagine that the gospel of the kingdom will be preached after the kingdom has come? The gospel was designed to take out of the nations a people for that kingdom; but when the kingdom is come, all that remains is for that invited people to “take the kingdom, and to possess the kingdom, ad alma we-ad alam almaiya, during the Age, even during the Age of ages.”—Daniel 7: 18.

Jesus, though “the truth,” was not this gospel, but the Apostle of God, sent to preach it. In his teaching he did not say, “Make me first and foremost in the proclamation of the everlasting gospel,” but what he said was, “Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness, and tell no man that Jesus is the Christ.”—Matthew 6: 33; 16: 20. When one said, “Lord, before I follow thee, suffer me first to go and bury my father;” Jesus said, “Let the dead bury their dead; but go thou and preach the kingdom of God.”—Luke 9: 60. But had the Expositor been present, we may suppose he would have spoken what he has written, and have said, “Not so, Lord, tell him rather as thou art the first, the chief element of the kingdom, that first and foremost he go and preach that thou art the Son of God.” Our friend will see that he has a weak standing here. He had better look to it, lest his foundation slip from beneath his feet.

Jesus preached the gospel of the kingdom for three years and a half to the Jews, and to them only. When his ministry was drawing to a close, he delivered his celebrated prophecy on Mount Olivet, and therein, referring to the gospel he was preaching, he said, “This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the habitable, for a testimony to all the nations.”—Matthew 24: 14. Hence it was the same gospel he preached before he became a sacrifice for sin that was to be preached to the Gentiles of the Roman habitable. It follows, then, that on and from the day of Pentecost, the same gospel of the kingdom, preached by Jesus, was still preached by his apostles, with something additional, which he only darkly hinted at, and his apostles, till after his resurrection, did not understand. See our article on “The Pentecostians,” on last page of the March number. There is proof there in print. Besides this, turn to Luke 18: 31-34, “Behold,” said he to the twelve, “we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written by the prophets concerning the Son of Man (before he becomes Son of God with power—Romans 1: 4, and de facto, King.”—Matthew 25: 34), shall be accomplished. For he shall be delivered unto the Gentiles, and shall be marked, and spitefully entreated, and spitted on, and they shall scourge him, and put him to death; and the third day he shall rise again. And they understood none of these things; and this saying was hid from them, neither understood they the things which were spoken.”

It was the gospel of the kingdom, then, together with the things the apostles did not understand concerning the sufferings of the Christ, that Jesus commended them to go and preach to Judah and the nations, when he said, “Go ye unto all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature.”—Mark 16: 15. There is no sophistry can over-ride this. Now, we pray the reader to mark well, that salvation is predicated on the belief of these two classes of things which constitute the one gospel, namely, the things concerning the kingdom the apostles did understand—Matthew 13: 11, and the things concerning the sufferings of the King, which we have seen they did not understand till just before Pentecost, because God purposely concealed them from them, as he had done from the prophets and angels of old time. —1 Peter 1: 10-12: “He that believes the good news of the kingdom, and is immersed, shall be saved; and he that believes not the good news of the kingdom shall be condemned.”

This is the teaching in Mark 16: 15-16. They are “the wholesome words of the Lord Jesus,” and neither more nor less can be made of them.

Again, the divine order in which things are to be presented to men for faith, is laid down in the example of the Great Teacher himself, and upon whose method we deny that any one can improve. Take the method he adopted in teaching the twelve:

1. He first instructed them in the secrets of the kingdom.
 2. He convinced them that he was the King, or Anointed, and Son of God, and demanded their confession of it.
 3. He then began to talk to them about his sufferings enigmatically; and
 4. He explained the enigma after he rose from the dead, and breathed upon them.
-
1. He began his work in Galilee, by preaching the gospel of the kingdom. —Matthew 4: 23. The discourse on the mount is a specimen of his preaching to the children of the prophets. —Matthew 5, 6, and 7. He then worked great miracles, confirming it as the doctrine of God. —Matthew 8 & 9. After this introduction, he selected from the body of his disciples, twelve for a special purpose—Matthew 10. He continued to preach the kingdom (for that he was sent to do—Luke 4: 43) enigmatically to the people at large, but explaining his parables to the twelve in private. —Matthew 13.
 2. His doctrine and miracles convinced them that he was the Christ, or King; and Son of God; and when he considered the time had come, he demanded of them their conviction concerning him. Peter, for himself and the rest, declared that they accepted him as “The Anointed, the Son of the Living God.”—Matthew 16: 16.
 3. In the twentieth verse of the chapter last quoted, Matthew says, “Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he is Jehovah, Shua, the Messiah,” or in English, I shall be the Mighty, the Anointed; and in Greek, Jesus the Christ. He then goes on to say, “From that time forth began Jesus to show unto his disciples how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders, and chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day.” “But they understood not that saying, and were afraid to ask him.”—Mark 9: 32. Still ignorant of what our friend of the Expositor thinks of more importance than the things of the kingdom (p. 519), three of the twelve were favoured with a view of how Jesus will appear when he shall stand and feed Israel in the majesty of the name of Jehovah, his God. —Micah 5: 4; Matthew 17. After this, he talks to them about Elijah coming to “restore all things.”—“the Regeneration,” in which he declares they shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. —Matthew 19. All this time they were in the dark about the sufferings, death, burial, and resurrection of “the Wonderful.”

After promising them royalty with himself, he represents his future, or premillennial entrance into his capital, amid the acclamations of his subjects, by riding into Jerusalem on the foal of an ass. This future entrance, he afterwards informed them, would come to pass when “the times of the Gentiles should be fulfilled,” and Jerusalem should be free. Compare Matthew 21: 9, with 23: 39; Luke 21: 24.

Having preached judgment against Jerusalem and the Commonwealth, he directed their attention to the end of the Gentiles’ times, when he should come in power and

great glory, to put them into possession of the kingdom, and punish the unjust in the judgment of the devil and his angels. —Matthew 25. The last three chapters contain the history of the sufferings and resurrection he predicted, the meaning of which they could not comprehend.

4. After he rose from the dead, “Jesus breathed upon them, and said to them, Receive ye the Holy Spirit: whose sins soever ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose sins soever ye retain they are retained.”—John 20: 23. We believe that from this time they understood the meaning of the sufferings of the Christ, and how believers in the gospel of the kingdom might obtain repentance, forgiveness, and eternal life, through his name. On the day of Pentecost, they were qualified to speak what they had learned in the forty days—Acts 1: 3, in divers languages, and to confirm their doctrine by miracles. The spirit the Lord Jesus breathed into them called all things to their remembrance, and its Pentecostian descent endued them “with power from on high.”

Such is the Divine Method which our friend of the Expositor is unwittingly seeking to subvert, in his articles on “Valid Immersion.” He divides the preaching into important and “less important” things. But waving the question just now of our friend’s right to impose this diversion upon the gospel elements, we would ask, in the face of what is before us, is it not manifest that what he styles “the less important things concerning the kingdom,” had the precedence in the preaching of Jesus? He illustrated his own words, “Seek first the kingdom of God, &c.,” in teaching it first to the disciples of his school. We like Christ’s order better than the Expositor’s. We are contented with it, and have neither respect nor fellowship for any other. His method made disciples of the genuine type. The Expositor’s method is that endorsed by all the schools of the Gentiles, from the Roman Propaganda, to the Divinity Class at Bethany: and according to the method, so are the disciples—all faiths by turns, according to the breeze. The heirs of the kingdom come from better seed than this.

EDITOR.

* * *

ANALECTA EPISTOLARIA.

HOW LONG TO ATTAIN TO A SCRIPTURAL FAITH.

Dear Brother: —It gives me great pleasure to inform you that the seed of the good “word of the kingdom,” sown by you, while you were with us in Washington, has taken root in a good many honest hearts. Last First Day we immersed four, of whom three were Campbellites, and one a Methodist. We expect to immerse two or three more on next First Day. Our number at present is twenty. We have a very intelligent little society. All seem to be in love with the truth. We still occupy Anacosta Hall, near the Navy Yard, and meet there once every Lord’s Day. Our meetings are interesting, and when they are concluded, it seems difficult for us to separate. The gospel is the power of God, and a power of attraction, when it is understood and heartily believed.

On of our brethren came to a knowledge of the truth under peculiar and interesting circumstances. He was a teacher in a Sunday-school, belonging to the Methodist granddaughter of Mistress Babylon the great. A son of one of our brethren was in his class;

but so soon as brother R. came to an acknowledgment of the truth, he perceived that it was his duty to remove him from the influence of that peculiar form of ecclesiastical animal magnetism. The teacher, feeling an interest in the boy, visited his father, to make inquiry after him. His father explained the cause of his removal, and also embraced the opportunity of laying the truth before him. The teacher had very little to say, and when about to go away, brother R. gave him two little pamphlets, with a request to read them. One of them was the "Summary of the Christianity taught in the Bible," and the other on "The Kingdom of God." He devoted that week to the study of them and the Scriptures. He then went to his minister, and told him to erase his name from the Methodist Church book, and asked him, among other things, "What is the faith?" but the question remains clerically unanswered.

Lord's Day after brother R. brought him to our meeting. That afternoon he applied to us to assist him in putting on the name of the Lord. On making the discovery that he was deceived by Methodism, he followed the example of the disciples in Ephesus—Acts 19: 19, and made a bonfire of the books of spiritual sorcery, which he used to read in preference to the Bible. You would be greatly surprised to see so intelligent a disciple in so short a time.

We have now a good opening for the gospel of the kingdom, and I believe a good hearing awaits you when you shall visit us again.

Yours affectionately in the one hope,

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

Washington, D.C., July 1, 1856.

* * *

We would commend the above-recited case to the candid consideration of the ingenuous. It is one among many others that might be adduced. Some are "ever learning, but never able to come to the knowledge of the truth;" while others, with some one or some thing to guide them, come to the understanding and belief of it in a week! There must be a reason for this. What is it? Here was an indoctrinator of youth into the sorcery of Methodism, brought by the study of the Scriptures, under the guidance of a little book, to renounce the delusion, and obey the truth, in a little over a week; while there are those that might be named, who profess to have been studying the Bible for twenty years, and stand before the world as "guides of the blind," and yet are manifestly as far from understanding it as though they had never beheld it. Whence comes this diversity? Hear what Jesus saith:

"I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine." Then addressing certain Jews, he continued, "Ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep. My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me; and I give unto them dispensational life—ζωην αιωνιον, and they shall by no means perish in the age, and no one shall wrest them out of my hands. My Father, who gave them to me, is greater than all; and no one is able to wrest out of my Father's hand. I and the Father are one."—John 10.

And again, "Thou givest to the Son dominion over all flesh, that all which thou has given to him, to them he should give dispensational life." "I have given to them the words which thou gavest to me, and they received them." And, "For this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness of the truth. Every one who is of the truth hears my voice."

Speaking of the truth in relation to Israel, Paul says, "The election has obtained it, and the rest were blinded (according as it is written in Isaiah, God hath given them the spirit of

slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear), until this day;” and there has been no change for the better in their moral sense since Paul’s day.

Now hear what is testified of the “ever learning.” And Jesus said, “I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things (he preached the gospel of the kingdom) from the wise and prudent (that is, in their own conceit) and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father, for so it seemed good to thee.”

And Paul, also speaking of the same “heady high-minded” class in the “last days” of the Mosaic dispensation, in which he ministered the gospel of the kingdom, says, that men, lovers of themselves, and covetous, having a form of godliness, but denying the power of it, and having great influence over silly women, would, like Jannes and Jambres, who withstood Moses, themselves also resist the truth. He was much harassed by them, who spoiled much of the work he had done, and styles them “men of corrupt minds, reprobate concerning the faith.” Men love themselves and are covetous when they will not risk their present interests and social position for the naked truth. The minds of such are in a corrupt state, deceived by the deceitfulness of sin, and so long as this influence reigns they are reprobate, and cannot see the truth. Minds so unhappily beclouded will ever resist it. The study of the Bible for a lifetime will be of little benefit to them; while to those of an opposite or different mind, who become as little children, the Christianity of the Bible may be learned in a week, for it is therein “revealed unto babes.”

EDITOR.

* * *

THINGS IN NEW ZEALAND.

Dear Brother Thomas: —I had almost despaired of hearing from you, when, on last September 25, I was gratified by the receipt of your kind and interesting letter of March 29.

I am much obliged to you for sending the twelve copies of *Elpis Israel*, and still more for your reply to queries, which are quite satisfactory. I have disposed of nine copies of the work, and have no doubt the remainder will soon find purchasers even in this mammon-worshipping colony.

The list of subscribers I have been able to procure to your valuable periodical is, I regret to say, particularly small. Some of those who did subscribe, decline anything further at present. I find it very difficult to get people to take an abiding interest in Christian matters. Hot at first, they soon become lukewarm, and sink into indifferentism. A purchaser of a copy of *Anatolia* is offended at your quoting from the books of Maccabees! Moreover he conceives that such a pamphlet as *Anatolia* should not be written, because the Bible is itself sufficient. Doubtless it is, when understood; but I fear there are but few who really do understand it, and as the authorised version was not the work of inspiration, and consequently not faultless, it appears to me that we should avail ourselves of all the assistance we can obtain through the press or any other channel. Viewing your publications in this light, I am anxious not only to read them myself, but desire that others should do so likewise; and, acting upon this principle, I have endeavoured to promote the sale of your works, in which I regret I have not been more successful. A friend, now on his way to Nova Scotia, and who intends returning to New Zealand, has undertaken to procure a hundred copies of the pamphlet entitled, “The Wisdom

of the Clergy proved to be Folly,” republished in Halifax, by brother James R. Lithgow; so I hope they will find their way here in due course.

Your idea that “it must be monotony itself for a Christian so far removed from the stirring scenes of the prophetic world,” is indeed most true, and is one chief reason why I am desirous of turning my back on New Zealand, and of living in a country where I should not have to wait five or six months for intelligence from Europe. I have no desire to take up my abode again in England. The particulars you have been kind enough to furnish as to expenses in New York, are very satisfactory. The prices do indeed seem cheap to us.

No ships sail from this port for New York, and but few for England; the latter generally during the first three or four months of the year. If all things favour, we might leave this island in three months, otherwise we must probably wait another year, and cannot, of course, make certain then. We shall hold ourselves in readiness for the first opportunity that offers, with a view to pitching our tent in the “Empire City.” But whether or not we shall be able to carry our plan into execution, remains with the Great Disposer of all, into whose hands, after doing what we can, we must leave it. Once in New York, we should not be likely to leave it hastily, unless something very unforeseen occurred.

The church which is in my house numbers only seven members, one of whom I recently baptised. He was about ten years ago a deist, glorying in his unbelief. About that time he married, his wife being a consistent member of the Church of England. After much solicitation, she induced him to read Butler’s Analogy, which convinced him that it required a greater amount of credulity, which is the basis of scepticism, to reject the Bible than to believe it. Some time afterwards, Dr. Cumming’s works fell into his hands, the reading of which first interested him in the study of prophecy. He then read the Bible with attention, which he confessed he had never done before. A spirit of inquiry being in this way awakened, he sought information from the clergy, but got little that was satisfactory. Some of his letters to these gentry, with their answers, I have seen. The latter are of the usual character, evasive and Jesuitical. Having heard of our little association, he expressed a desire to come among us, which, of course, was readily granted, and he is now, I have every reason to believe, a firm and consistent believer. His wife, though considerably shaken in her notions, still holds on to Anglo-Hibernianism, giving at times good hopes of better things.

Last month I ventured into public as a lecturer. I endeavoured to show the connection between the events of our times and the prophetic word. The plan of the lecture was very similar to that by Mr. Magruder, which appeared in the Herald. I addressed about three hundred people, for about an hour and a half. A few were interested, and would like to hear more. Some evidently came for the express purpose of scoffing, and creating a disturbance; and, I fear, a large number were far too ignorant of Scripture to understand an argument based upon the prophetic word. Having thus shown my willingness to come forward and face an audience, I now leave it to those who wish to hear more to open the way.

Just about a year ago this settlement was visited by a tremendous shock of earthquake, some of the effects of which still remain in various places. I wrote an account of the catastrophe, which my father published in his paper, the Jersey Times, which probably you have seen, as a copy was sent across the Atlantic by my sister. It has terribly shaken our confidence in the stability of this place, which indeed we did not think very highly of before.

This so-called city! of Wellington does not contain more than 8,500 inhabitants, and the Hut District about 1,500 more. The native population is about treble that of the European. The great bulk of the former are located on the north end of the north island, and many of them drive a thriving trade with the whites in fish, corn, and vegetables.

There is little here that would interest you. We have what are called “free institutions,” but, to my thinking, the government of this province is a contemptible oligarchy.

I take no interest in local politics, and never attend any political gatherings. The Bishop of New Zealand, named Selwyn, has been lately “starring it,” in the different provinces, “confirming” sundry lots of “pious” young folks in their sins, and making speeches about church government, and the religious education of the natives, which I rejoice there is no act of the Provincial Council compelling me either to hear or to read. Morally, the missionaries have certainly achieved something among the natives, but beyond it they are, of course, powerless. It is amusing to compare the clap-trap of Exeter Hall eloquence with actual results, as witnessed on the spot. A protégé of the bishop’s, one of his own flock, is the bosom friend of a man convicted of murder, and who, if he had been a white, would some time ago have expiated his crime on the gallows. The murderer is still at large, and the bishop protects his accomplice, because, forsooth, he belongs to the Church of England.

At a meeting not long since, his lordship made a speech to the natives, in which he told them he was a man of peace, and had to do with the things of God and heaven. The natives answered (pointing to the skies), “Then go up to heaven, and manage your heavenly things, and leave us to manage our own on the earth!”

So much for the result of clerical teaching on this side of the globe—it is indeed “folly.” A clergyman of the Established Church, since returned to England, actually taught his hearers that in the operation of infant sprinkling, the moment the priest’s finger touched the infant’s forehead, God worked a miracle in order to its conversion! Presentation to the Bishop of Exeter would surely obtain promotion for this gentleman.

Wednesday, March 5, 1856, —I have purposely detained this letter until the present time in the hope of being able to tell you something more definite as to our movements. We have determined to leave this place, and are about to set sail for Geelong, Port Philip, Australia. There we shall probably have to remain some time. I live in hope, however, of seeing you in the flesh, but if not, I trust we shall be found worthy to meet together in the kingdom of God, when the good time comes for restoring it again to Israel. It will give me great pleasure to hear from you, and in that case please direct to me at the post office, Geelong. When there, I shall consider myself half way to England, as indeed we shall be in effect, in comparison with this isolated spot.

No Heralds, I am sorry to say have reached me since those sent in the parcel with the copies of Elpis Israel.

In the southern hemisphere we therefore remain at present *ex necessitate rei*.
Waiting for the kingdom of God, I remain,
Yours affectionately,

SAMUEL GEORGE HAYES.

Wellington, New Zealand.

* * *

THE TRUTH IN HAMILTON, CANADA WEST.

Dear Sir: —Observing on the cover of the Herald an intimation that you propose visiting “Toronto, &c., in Canada West,” it has occurred to me that possibly Hamilton, from its population and convenience, might be reckoned among the “et ceteras.” Should your plans permit a visit, I gladly proffer such humble hospitality as we can afford, and all the aid in my power in making the necessary arrangements for one or more public lectures.

It may not be out of place to mention, that your exposition of the law and testimony has long commended itself to my judgment, and that I took advantage of the first opportunity to “fulfil all righteousness,” by being baptised.

There are a few in Hamilton whose minds are occupied with “the things of the kingdom,” but none that I know of who are fully persuaded to be like-minded. Non-essentialism is the favourite sugared opiate of the age.

Seeking to be accounted worthy of “that world” for which you are labouring, I am, dear Sir, yours faithfully,

WILLIAM SOMERVILLE.

Hamilton, C.W., May 9, 1856.

* * *

A DREARY REGION.

Brother Thomas: —I see you have several visits in contemplation, north and south. I should be glad if you could turn aside into this dreary region, and try to stir up strife among the sister harlots of the old mother, concerning “the faith once for all delivered to the saints.” I am now alone, since my wife fell asleep. I try, however, to present the truth to the people when opportunity presents. I perceive that some effect is produced, but still it is limited, for the truth is antagonistic, and so different to what is dispensed from the “sacred desks” of the Gentiles.

If in your tour you should pass this way, or near, please inform me, that I may have the pleasure of visiting you at some point.

Yours faithfully,

LANCELOT BELL.

South Fork, Christian, Ill., May 25, 1856.

* * *

SECTARIAN APPEAL TO A GRAND JURY.

Dear Brother Thomas: —As I have a few leisure moments, I spend them with great pleasure in writing to you. I truly hope they may reach you safely, finding you in good health, and growing in the knowledge of God, which, being understood, is able, in the hand of faith, to pull down the strongholds of sin’s power, which is very great, according to my experience in this vicinity. Without doubt the time has come that “they will not endure sound doctrine.” It is the case in this part of the country. “They heap to themselves teachers, having itching

ears, and have turned away their ears from the truth, and are turned to fables.” It is even so. I went to hear a Methodist minister of the name of Jones, the third Lord’s day in May, and for foolishness his doctrine exceeded everything I had supposed possible. You will find his text in Zechariah 4: 6: “Not by might, nor by power, but by my spirit, saith the Lord of Hosts.” I leave you to guess what sort of a kingdom he set up! He said the word of God was nothing but “the sword” of the spirit, and is unable to do anything at all unless the spirit comes down (for they say it is above) and takes hold on it, and slays the wicked one—the devil! I was anxious to speak, though I said nothing until he was done, as I thought. I had the Testament in my hand, and told him he had “made the Word of God of none effect by his tradition,” and requested him to read John 1; but this he refused to do, and then said, If I did not like what he had said, I could let it alone. I then said to the people, that he had not preached the truth, and that if they wished to know it to read the Scriptures, and see whether these things are so or not. The few words I spoke excited the people very much; notwithstanding there was no one on the truth’s side but myself, I felt tolerably strong. It is said “large boats can venture more, but little boats must hug the shore.” My boat is small it is true, but I did not feel much afraid to launch it out upon the shallow sea; which I did, and got back without being wrecked. The minister was very much ruffled in temper, and so were all his people. It is still “like priest like people.” Insult the priest and you insult his people. They carried the offence before the grand jury unknown to me, for the purpose of making me suffer. Though I have been told that they laid it aside at that court; whether they will pursue the matter further I cannot tell. If they do, you shall hear from me again. It is with the rich and wise of this world that I contend with in a small way. I am a small thorn in their side, and had I the education that some of them have I should be a very large one there. Dear Brother, come and see me if you can, and if you have a will to speak to the people, there is the Ebenezer Academy, a large house, and free for all. I have no doubt you would have a goodly number, and a part of that number intelligent persons. If you cannot come, tell brother Anderson or brother Passmore to come. I feel very solitary, socially considered, being alone; but I have my Bible, and the Herald, and your other invaluable interpretations of Moses and the prophets and apostles, which teach us the way to the kingdom prepared for all the just, faithful, humble followers of Jesus Christ, which is all my comfort and joy, and where I live in hopes of meeting you and all of the brethren.

Inclosed is my subscription, and a few pence over. It is the best I can do. Accept it freely, for I assure you it is freely given, and had I the wherewithal you should never lack for help in the glorious cause in which you are engaged. I go out sometimes to hear and see; and I hear and see all sorts of doctrines and practices except the doctrine of Christ; but that they are ignorant of, and even if they know anything about it they are afraid to proclaim it, because their craft is thereby endangered. I heard a clergyman say not long ago, that the devil was once a bright shining angel in heaven, and enjoying all the blessings and comforts of that glorious place; but he offended God, and He cast him out into hell; and that ever since that time he has been going about deceiving the people, and doing his best to keep them from that place in which he was once so happy. Upon which the poor ignorant creatures declared that they had never heard a better sermon in their lives! Well, I conclude they are ignorant, and more to be pitied than blamed, for it is the manner in which they are taught; but I cannot forbear to tell them that they are wrong, and blind, and will all fall into the ditch, and there I must leave them. My book, Elpis Israel, is in Amelia, and has been for a good while. I told them when I left it there to keep it as long as it would do any good; and I hope it is doing so, for it has not returned. I hope the people are not so prejudiced there as they are where I live. They call me a great many sort of names, such as no well-bred intelligent person would stoop to do; but I smile, and pity their hard and foolish speeches, and assure them they are ignorant of the truth, and so pass on.

In conclusion, I live in hope of seeing you again within the limits of Old Virginia, and I pray God to bless and preserve you, and all the brethren, and that we may hold out faithful to the end, and obtain the prize. Pray for me, dear brother, for I am alone. I remain, yours truly, in the hope of Israel,

JOHN D. DRAKE.

Sturgeonville, Brunswick, Va., June 15, 1856.

* * *

“VALID IMMERSION.”

Dear Brother, —I am a reader of the “Expositor” and of the “Banner.” With the latter I am well pleased, because it is a trumpet of no uncertain sound, and is blown by one who evidently knows the truth, and is not afraid to speak it. When such a trumpeter utters his voice the true soldier is energised, and fears not to harness up for battle. He delights in such trumpeters, for they do not harass him with all sorts of contradictory blasts which make the christian warrior powerless in fight.

I am, I say, a reader of “The Expositor.” I have entertained the hope that, notwithstanding all the aberrations of its editor, it would at length come out right, and in an ingenuous and independent manner advocate “the gospel of the kingdom first began to be spoken by Jesus” in Galilee, and which was afterwards “confirmed by them who heard him.” This was my hope. But at present it has thrown me all aback. It professes to believe the gospel of the kingdom in one sentence, and to declare the necessity of that belief in order to a “valid immersion;” and in another, it advocates the sufficiency of the belief that Jesus Christ is the Son of God! The demons of Judea believed this more intelligently than nine hundred and ninety-nine ten thousand of modern Gentiles, and trembled as orthodoxically as they, so that, I suppose upon Expositor principles, had they been immersed they would have been validly baptised! They would, no doubt, have been as persistent as our contemporaries who are Christ-ians today, Millerites tomorrow, deniers of it the day after, and nobody can tell what after that. What a “precious cause” is that which such chameleon-like disciples represent! I by no means object to a man abandoning his errors a thousand times; but I do object to such an one placing himself in the teacher’s chair, and throwing stumbling blocks in the way of others. Such a cause may be precious in its way; but it is by no means the cause of that “precious faith” confirmed by the apostles who heard the Lord.

I saw in the last Expositor an excellent letter from brother Magruder with notes by Mr. Marsh. These are anything but satisfactory to one who understands the scriptures. They are sophistical, and may prove injurious to those who have faith in his expositions. He says, that “the first lessons of a disciple of Christ in faith and obedience pertain to the first advent, death and resurrection of the Christ, the Son of God, repentance and baptism.” This is not true, and he has not, and cannot show it from the word. Jesus says, “Seek first the kingdom of God, &c;” and “the first advent, death and resurrection of Christ, &c.,” are not that kingdom: for Jesus elsewhere said, that the kingdom the saints are to possess, was at the first advent in the possession of the Chief Priests and Rulers of the Jews—Matthew 21: 43. Take friend Marsh’s proposition and interpret it by the words of Jesus, and the absurdity will appear self-evident.

He says again, "The first feature of this kingdom on which faith should take hold is its glorious king. So Paul preached, and so the Corinthians believed." This is not correct. Paul did not so preach. He was reasoning several Sabbath days in the synagogue at Corinth without saying one word about Jesus. He preached the Christ, or "the things concerning THE KINGDOM and THE NAME;" but it was not till he was joined by Silas and Timothy, that Jesus and the facts of his history were brought out to view.

The first thing presented to Abraham for faith was not the Seed, but the kingdom, and afterwards the Seed. See Genesis 12: 1-3. Here the gospel preached to Abraham is recorded and stated. "I will make of thee a great nation, &c: and thou shall be a blessing; and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." So Jesus and Paul set forth the gospel first, and the Seed afterwards.

Again, Mr. Marsh says, "The faith that pleases God is the believing 'with all the heart that Jesus Christ is the Son of God,' and all of God's word, as it is revealed in the Bible." This is specious. He begins in Hebrews 11: 6, and slips off to Acts 8: 37, for an illustration of the faith God is pleased with. Why did he not take Hebrews 11: 1, for the definition of the faith Paul was treating of? Because it is evident, Paul's definition did not suit his one-idea theory. There is no belief of "things hoped for" in the belief that Jehovah is the Father of Jesus, and not Joseph.

I conclude, by testifying against friend Marsh's sophistical course. Let us have more honesty of deed, and less profession of honesty and candor: let him meet things fairly, and cease to entrench himself on mere assertion when hard pressed. This will be satisfactory, and promote the discovery of the truth.

VIATOR.

Geneva, Ill.

* * *

Poets fared hard in the time of Henry IV. It was enacted "that no master-rymour, minstrels, or other vagabond, be in any wise sustained in the land of Wales, to make commoiths or gatherings upon the people there." Hence, an old writer says:

"Beggars they are with one consent,
And rogues by act of Parliament."

* * *