

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, NOVEMBER, 1856—
Volume 6—No. 11

A PERPLEXING THEME.

Brother Thomas:—Please set forth your views touching the Jerusalems presented in the Scriptures. If I apprehend your views from reading, you seem to regard the Scriptures as teaching but two Jerusalems, both literal cities built upon the same site. This theme has been somewhat perplexing to me. Please reply to this soon, and oblige one searching for “the truth as it is in Jesus.”

Looking for the kingdom, I remain,
Yours respectfully,

* * *

February 14, 1856.

JERUSALEM THE HOLY CITY.

“Jerusalem which is above is free, and is the mother of us all.”—Paul.

The Jerusalems of the Bible are first, one city in different states, and under divers constitutions; and secondly, the Glorified Body Corporate of the city in its glory, under its future Melchizedec Constitution.

In studying this subject, the following classification, we think, will greatly assist the reader in obtaining the mastery over it. We remark, then,

1. That Jerusalem is first referred to in Scripture as Salem, which signifies peace. An individual supposed to be Shem, the second son of Noah, an ancestor of Jesus of Nazareth, and a righteous man, was then residing there as King and Priest of the Most High God, possessor of heaven and earth. He was, therefore, styled “Melchizedec, melek salem,” or, king of righteousness, king of peace; that is, King of Jerusalem reigning in righteousness, priest of the Most High God. This was a typical order of priesthood. He who officiated in it was greater than Abraham, who paid tithes to him, and received his blessing. These facts are suggestive in a high degree, especially in the light of the following testimonies. —Genesis 14: 18; Isaiah 22: 1; Psalm 110: 4; Hebrews 5: 5-10; 6: 20; and the whole chapter 7.

Jerusalem, the throne of God's High Priest, contemporary with Abraham, was to him a representation, or type, of the same city, when it should be prepared of God—Hebrews 11: 16, 10 for his seed, the Christ, to reign there, as Melchizedec's successor, after the resurrection of the Saints. So that Abraham will then be at once contemporary with his ancestor Melchizedec the First; and his descendant, Melchizedec the Second.

2. That Jerusalem is next brought before us ecclesiastically, as under the Mosaic Law. In the reign of David she was chosen to be Jehovah's Habitation. —Deuteronomy 12: 5; 2 Samuel 24: 16, 18; 1 Kings 8: 29; 2 Chronicles 7: 12; Psalm 132: 13-17. She continued under the Mosaic Constitution till about 74 years after the birth of Jesus; when the State was abolished by the Roman, or Little Horn of the Goat, power. —Daniel 8: 11, 24. This was a period of 1,094 years from the foundation of the Temple. During this millennium of war and disaster, iniquity and crime, she is scripturally regarded as in bondage with her children, or citizens, by virtue of the Law; and is allegorically styled Hagar. —Galatians 4: 25. These children she was to lose; and after their loss, she was to be left alone. —Isaiah 49: 20-21; Matthew 23: 37, 39. The children of the bondwoman, or of Hagar, Jerusalem, were "shut up unto the faith" under the schoolmaster of Sinai, who could give them no title to the inheritance covenanted to Abraham and his seed. The sentence against them was, "Cast out the bondwoman and her son." This the Roman power accomplished politically; and the Law and the Prophets spiritually: for "Cursed," saith the former, "is every one that continueth not in all things written in the book of the law to do them;" and the latter saith, "The just shall live by faith." Hence, the law, because of the weakness of the flesh, gendered only to bondage, shutting up its children under the curse. Such was Jerusalem, the Harlot, which killed the prophets and built their sepulchres—the persecutor of Him that was of the Spirit. —Isaiah 1: 21, 24.
3. We remark, thirdly, that there is a period in Scripture styled "the Times of the Gentiles,"—Luke 21: 24; and answering to the symbol in Revelation 11: 2, termed "the Court of the Gentiles." The times of this court extend to the resurrection of the Saints, and reappearing of the King of Israel. During this long period, Jerusalem is scripturally regarded as in her widowhood, or as a woman forsaken of her husband and children, a captive sitting upon the ground bewailing her desolate condition. —Isaiah 54: 4-8; 49: 14-17; 3: 6.

While the city is in her widowhood, and termed "Forsaken,"—Isaiah 62: 4 as at the present time, a community exists styled symbolically, "the Holy City;"—Revelation 11: 2 the woman a fugitive, but nourished in the wilderness, "Jews," &c. —Revelation 12: 6, 14; 2: 9; 3: 9; Ephesians 5: 23. This city is trodden under foot of the Gentiles, and will so continue to be, until the time shall arrive for Jerusalem in Palestine to arise and shine; because her light is come, and the glory of Jehovah is risen upon her. —Isaiah 60: 1. The symbolical "Holy City" consists of those who are "sealed in their foreheads;" who "keep the commandments of God, and have the testimony of Jesus Christ," "which is the spirit of prophecy;" and are of "the faith of Jesus."—Revelation 7: 3; 12: 17; 14: 12; 19: 10. They are those who cannot endure impostors—Revelation 2: 1; who hate Nicolaitanism—verse 6; "who," says Jesus, "have not denied my faith"—verse 13; whose good works increase—verse 19; who are watchful—Revelation 3: 2-3; who keep the word of Jesus, and deny not his name—verse 8; and who are not lukewarm—verse 15. These are children of the Free Woman—"the children of the promise as Isaac was;" who BY FAITH—by belief of

what is promised in relation to Jerusalem in her future glory—“are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem.”—Hebrews 12: 22. It is because they are come to these things by faith, and thereby lay hold of them, as the hope set before them in the gospel, that they are styled, “the Holy City;” which, after the resurrection and transfiguration of its citizens, becomes “The holy city, new Jerusalem, prepared as a bride set in order for her husband—the Lamb’s Woman, that great city, the holy Jerusalem.”—Revelation 21: 2, 9-10; 19: 7. Then, but not till then, upon every one of the citizens of the new down-trodden holy city, who shall be presented holy, and unblameable, and unprovable in God’s sight—Colossians 1: 22-23, “will Jesus write upon him the name of his God, and the name of the city of his God, new Jerusalem, which cometh down out of heaven from his God; and he will write upon him his new name, which no man knoweth saving he that receiveth it. — Revelation 3: 12; 2: 17. So that the present apocalyptic holy city, cleansed from all that now defiles it, will be transformed into a city in which there shall in nowise be found any one that defileth, or worketh abomination, or invents a lie; but they only who are written in the Lamb’s book of life. —Revelation 21: 27.

4. But to return to the widowed, and momentarily-forsaken Jerusalem, oppressed by the Euphrateans, or Turks. We remark, then, in the fourth place, that when the times of the Gentiles, or the forty-two months of their oppression, shall be fulfilled, Jerusalem will be redeemed. When that time, now so near at hand, shall have come, it will be said to her, by her Redeemer, “Awake, awake, stand up, O Jerusalem, which has drunk at the hands of Jehovah the cup of his fury: awake, awake, put on thy strength, O Zion; put on thy beautiful garments, O Jerusalem, the holy city: for henceforth there shall no more come into thee the uncircumcised and the unclean. Shake thyself from the dust; arise and sit down, O Jerusalem; loose thyself from the bands of thy neck, O captive daughter of Zion.”—Isaiah 51: 17; 52: 1-2.

Here we have presented to us, ἡ ἀνω Ἱερουσαλήμ, the Exalted Jerusalem, rendered in the English version, “Jerusalem which is above.”—Galatians 4: 26. It is sufficient to remark here, that it is stated in Parkhurst, that “the adverb ἀνω with the article, is used as a noun denoting what is above, high, exalted.”—Lex. When the present Jerusalem awakes, arises, stands up, and sits down in peace and glory, her position in rank and dignity among the cities of the world compared with what it is now, will be above, high, exalted. She will then correspond to the hope of those who now believe “the gospel of the kingdom.” As under the Law of Moses, which went forth from Sinai, she was allegorically the bondwoman Hagar; so under the law which is hereafter to go forth from Zion—Isaiah 2: 3 she will be allegorically the Free Woman, Sarah, the princess or Queen, which shall be for Nations; of whom also shall be kings of peoples. —Genesis 17: 16. She is then “the Mother of us all,” both Jews and Gentiles, who now believe the promises, or “glorious things spoken,” of her by the prophets and apostles. —Psalm 87: 3.

In a certain sense, the Exalted Jerusalem, though not yet in being, “is” the mother of us all. Jerusalem is now “barren and beareth not,” yet she hath now in dispersion many more children for the Age to Come, than she could reckon before she became a widow, and was forsaken of her husband, God. The obedient believers of the gospel of the kingdom, who shall be pronounced the “blessed of the father,” when Jerusalem is exalted, will be the ROYAL MUNICIPALITY of the city—the New Jerusalem enthroned in the exalted Jerusalem, when “they shall call her the throne of

Jehovah; and all the nations shall be gathered unto it, to the Name of Jehovah, to Jerusalem.”—Jeremiah 3: 17. The exalted Jerusalem would be deficient of a principal element of her glory and power, if the New Jerusalem, or Christ and his glorified brethren and associates, Israel’s Elohim were not enthroned there as “the Administration of the fulness of times.”—Ephesians 1: 10. The “heirs of the kingdom” do not claim Hagar, who gendered to bondage, for their mother. She was mother only to Jews, who became such by circumcision of the flesh. Neither do they claim the widow and God-forsaken Jerusalem for their mother; they abandon her to Turks, papists, protestants, Greeks, and non-Christian Jews. These are her lovers while divorced from Jehovah—paramours, with whom “the sons of the free woman” have no sympathy in faith, hope, or practice. Now, if Jerusalem in the past, nor Jerusalem in the present, be their mother, it is manifest that, if Jerusalem is to be their mother at all, it can only be in the future. This is the truth. Hence it is, Jerusalem as she shall be is the mother of us all, the Mother City of the Heirs of the Kingdom—the Metropolis of the Kingdom, when the time comes that the Saints possess it, and the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom, under the whole heaven. —Daniel 7: 22, 27.

In those glorious days, Jerusalem will be the Married Wife, and the free and joyful mother of the free born. —Isaiah 54: 1. Abraham, Sarah, and their seed, will be there among the free—free from the bondage of sin and death. Her husband will be her builder and maker, even God—Isaiah 54: 5; Hebrews 11: 10: and “all nations shall flow unto it”—Isaiah 2: 2; and bring their glory and honour to its princes, who shall reign for the ages of the ages. —Revelation 21: 26; 22: 5.

5. We may remark, lastly, at this time, that the Palestine Jerusalem, in her future relation to Jesus of Nazareth, the Great King of the Jews; his ancestors, Abraham, Sarah and David; and his brethren, the Saints in general—as the “Married Wife”—will be under a constitution growing out of the covenants made with Abraham and David, and “the Word of the Oath;” and styled “the Law from Zion”: for “Out of Zion shall go forth the Law”—the law which proceeds from the Holy One of Israel for that nation—Isaiah 51: 4; Jeremiah 31: 33 and for which also the Gentiles shall wait.—Isaiah 42: 4. Thus the King of Israel is revealed in the Scriptures as the “LAWGIVER,” not of Judah only, but of all nations. These things being admitted, the following proposition is evident, namely, that the existing laws and constitutions of the nations are all to be superseded by a Divine Law which is hereafter to be proclaimed from Zion. Hence, the establishment of this truth will be fatal to all the superstitions and imperial, monarchical, and republican politics of the world. Many direct testimonies can be adduced from the prophets and apostles to prove this. It is, however, in this place, sufficient to present the truth in this form.

Under the “Law from Zion,” Jerusalem will be the Mother City of all nations; for “all nations shall flow unto it.” Rome is now the Mother of Papal-dom; and Mecca of Mohammedom: but in the age, or world, that is coming, Jerusalem will be the Mother of all, both Jews and Gentiles; for “they shall no more walk after the imagination of their evil heart”—Jeremiah 3: 17; “and shall all call upon the Name of Jehovah, to serve him with one consent”—Zephaniah 3: 9: inasmuch as “from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, Jehovah’s Name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto his name, and a pure offering: for my name shall be great among the nations, saith Jehovah of armies.”—Malachi 1: 11.

In Jerusalem, under the Law from Zion, the Name of Jehovah will reside; that is, Jehovah's King will reign there as priest of the Most High God after the order of Melchizedec. "Art thou greater than our father Abraham?" inquired the Jews of Jesus. The answer is "Yes." Abraham paid tithes to the King of Salem, who blessed the holder of the promises: and it is the less that is blessed of the greater. When Abraham beholds the priestly King of Salem on David's throne in Zion, the king will bless "the Friend of God," saying, "Come thou blessed of my Father, inherit the city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God; and for which thou didst look when thou didst sojourn in this then promised land, as in a foreign country, dwelling in tents with Isaac and Jacob, the heirs with thee of the same promise." Will not Abraham, then, who, being heir of the world then enters upon his inheritance for the first time, give him tithes of all? Will he not be as liberal to Melchizedec the Son, as to Melchizedec the Father? And not to him only, but to all his seed? Yea to all; for Abraham refused to be made rich at the expense of his companions. —Genesis 14: 23.

But of the Melchizedec constitution of things in Jerusalem, there are many things to be said, hard to be uttered, seeing that the ear of the Nineteenth Century is dull of hearing. For when for the time it ought to teach, it needs to be taught the first principles of the oracles of God; being unskilled in the Word of Righteousness. We have laboured, however, to be intelligible to babes. We trust we shall have succeeded to some extent. If difficulties still exist, let us know, and we will do the best we can to remove them. For the present we conclude, wishing the reader much success in his endeavours to understand the Truth, to the end that he may obey it.

EDITOR.

* * *

THEIOPOLITICAL.

THE PRO-JEWISH POLICY OF BRITAIN. *

"At the annual meeting of the London Society for promoting Christianity among the Jews, the Earl of Shaftesbury stated that being no longer under the seal of secrecy, he might declare, that as long as two years ago, a dispatch from the Foreign Office, written with Lord Clarendon's own hand, had been sent to Constantinople, urging upon the representative of the British Empire to do all that lay in his power to effect the emancipation of the Jews, allowing them to hold land, and to enjoy every civil privilege in Palestine.

* (THEIOPOLITICAL, the word at the head of this department of our periodical, is derived from θειος, divine, and πολιτικός, relating to public affairs; and signifies, that the articles inserted under it relate to those current national affairs, whose tendency is to develop the great political catastrophe God hath revealed in the Scriptures of truth. There are no politics equal to this, whose wire-pulling is by the hand of God, which the student of His word can alone discern.)

So far as the Ottoman power is concerned this emancipation has been effected—and the facts in the case suggest to our mind two highly important considerations, namely, that Great Britain is the nation designated in prophecy to take the lead in, if not the entire work

of the emancipation of God's ancient people; and secondly, that the time has arrived for this work to be commenced.

If these things are indeed so—and absolute facts would seem to prove that they are—it necessarily follows that instead of God now watching over the Jews, “to pluck up, and break down, and to throw down, and to destroy, and to afflict”—he has remembered them and the land in great mercy, and is now watching over them “to plant,” or restore to their own land and promised privileges and blessings. See Jeremiah 31: 28. Who can be unbelieving or remiss in the great work of preparation for the kingdom, when such overwhelming evidence as this of its near approach, is clearly presented before us.”

The above is extracted from “The Expositor” published at Rochester, but by whom written does not appear. The italics (bold substituted) are ours to render more noticeable certain expressions in the article. The Earl's statement that he was “no longer under the seal of secrecy,” implies, that he is one of her Majesty's privy council, whose members are all sworn not to divulge the secrets of State until they receive a royal dispensation to speak, as in the case before us. The Earl's revelation of the State secret with respect to the Jews, shows that there is a party in her Majesty's Council interested in the future destiny of the Hebrew nation and country; and influential enough to make its future welfare an element of the foreign policy of Great Britain. Lord Clarendon and Viscount Palmerston (both possessors of Elpis Israel) are of that party; and have given a pro-Jewish expression to the policy of Britain in the Eastern question. They have spoken to the hereditary desolator of the Holy Land in behalf of Israel, and in the name of the Majesty of England, and their intervention has been favourably received. The pouring out of that determined upon the desolator—Daniel 9: 27 thus far, has superinduced a liberal and merciful policy towards the conquered races of the Ottoman empire, and among them towards the Jews. Hebrew affairs (and whatever pertains to the Holy Land is an Israelitish affair) are now part and parcel of British enterprise and policy, springing from a desire for the independence and regeneration of Turkey: not that the British love Mahommed and his disciples; or that they wish the Ottoman to regain his old ascendancy, and to become as formerly the terror of “Christendom.” They do not design such an independence and regeneration for the Turk. They desire his independence of Russia and subordination to their own policy. They wish to make him a respectable anti-Russian power; and with John Bull “respectability” consists in being “well to do”—a respectable English gentleman in Oriental costume is the independence and regeneration contemplated for Turkey in the wisdom of British enterprise and policy.

Egypt and the Holy Land are so geographically situated with respect to BRITISH INDIA as to make their destiny the Alpha and Omega of England's policy with regard to the East. The sovereignty over those countries was conquered by the ancestors of the Sultan, who as Mohammedan princes have misruled them for ages. In the beginning of their dominion, England had no more interest in Egypt and the Holy Land than what the superstition of the Papacy infused into the heart of its people. This involved her in the disasters of the Crusades, which drained her coffers and population in common with the rest of Europe. But within the last century things have wonderfully changed with respect to Britain and the East. The establishment and extension of British dominion over Hindostan, the Oriental Tarshish; the geographical position of the Turkish Empire in relation to India; the necessity of the maintenance of that Oriental dominion to the existence of the British power in Europe—are considerations that make the destiny of the Turkish empire, in whole or in part, of more vital importance to Britain than to any other power in the world. Russia, Austria, and France, can only desire Turkey as an extension of their several dominions. The existence of neither of

these powers would be jeopardised by either of them being sovereign of Turkey. Not so with Britain. Turkey under Russia, Austria, or France, would be fatal to the manufacturing, commercial, and political, well-being of Protestant and Constitutional England. England is detested by all the governments, and her government distrusted by all the oppressed nations of the earth. Russia hates her, Austria and Rome hate her, and Louis Napoleon hates her, as they all hate liberty civil and religious, representative government, and freedom of the press. Therefore place either of them on the throne of Constantinople, and the imperial policy would be to blot out the British power from the political geography of the world.

As they are military and not maritime powers, Britain can successfully defend herself in her island-home against the world. To destroy Britain her factories must be stopped, and the commerce of the sea dried up. The continental despots understand this perfectly well. They know, and British statesmen know, that if the factories were closed there would be a revolution in a week that would shatter the "British Constitution" into fragments, and make the commercial world in all its provinces reel to and fro like a drunken man. But while Britain commands the sea, they cannot invade her and turn her half-fed and scantily-clothed population into the streets; but a Continental Despotism enthroned in Constantinople, possessed of Egypt and the Holy Land, and in confederacy with Persia and the Tartar myriads of Central Asia, might bring her to the verge of such a crisis. By invading British India from thence, (and what Alexander the Great accomplished some three hundred years before Christ, another Alexander may aim to effect some eighteen hundred years after) England's dominion might be overthrown there. Her subject millions might be stirred up against her, and her handful of Europeans be eaten up like bread. All access to India by the Mediterranean and Red Sea being cut off by the Constantinopolitan power, her reinforcement could only be conveyed to India by the long and tedious navigation round the Cape of Good Hope. This would be an element of weakness, and inevitably ensure disaster and defeat. Under such eventualities England could not maintain her position in the East, and the fate of Portugal and Holland would be hers—states which since the loss of their ascendancy in the Indian Ocean, are of no weight or consideration among the powers of the earth.

While these things were transpiring in the East, it would greatly facilitate the policy of the Continental Despotism if it could involve England in a quarrel with the United States. Such an event would be calamitous and ruinous to both parties, though England would of necessity fare the worse, being beset both in the East and West at the same time. Shut out from the continent and India, and at war with her best customer in the West, her factories would then be necessarily closed, for having no customers she would create no supplies. What would be the condition of Britain at war with all the world, and with an expenditure of perhaps a hundred and fifty millions sterling per annum, with her factories closed, and her commercial marine rotting in her docks without employ? How long would her constitution in Queen, Lords, and Commons, hold together? What would become of her rich men and merchant princes? Without employment, without bread to eat, what could stay the violence of her famished myriads? Truly "the burden of Tyre," would become the burden of Britain, Tyre's daughter of "the latter day."

Such is the hypothetical fate of Britain should the Turkish empire as a whole be occupied by an European Despotism inimical to England, before she could establish herself or her influence in such a position that she could dispute the advance toward India of a power enthroned in Constantinople. But Turkey is not to be swallowed up entire at a single mouthful by Lion, Bear, or Eagle. She is to dry up—to evaporate. This is a gradual process, and will

afford time for the creation of a situation in which the pro-Jewish policy of Great Britain will be fully developed.

From the hypothetical result above stated (which, however, will never come to pass, God having revealed a different consummation of affairs) it is evident that Britain in battle for the integrity and independence of the Ottoman empire is fighting for her own existence; and that Louis Napoleon's resisting her, is really, though he meaneth not so, doing good service for "perfidious Albion;" for which he will obtain no more substantial recompense than he can extract from the Parliamentary eulogia of his aristocratic and gentlemanly allies. The time to begin to favor Zion having arrived as we have often shown, that power whose policy is pro-Jewish will gain the ascendancy in Turkish counsels; and by that ascendancy promote such enterprises and policy as will conduce to the agricultural and commercial prosperity of its provinces, especially of Egypt and the Holy Land. The manifestation of this is a notable sign of the times, and may be observed in the announcement of "a line of railway through Asia Minor, and along the banks of the Euphrates, and the shores of the Persian sea to the capital of the Bombay Presidency." This is called "The Euphrates Valley Railway," and will communicate with Seleucia, a port of the Mediterranean Sea. Now in this country we are familiar with the speedy beneficial influence of railways through the wilderness even where there is no great and wealthy empire to be reached beyond. What then may not be reasonably anticipated for those countries traversed by such a railway as that of "the Euphrates Valley," with Europe at one end and British India at the other? Depots must be established and protected, and being made safe, they will become the centres of modern Assyrian towns and villages, and of new agricultural districts. The property being British the protectorate will be British in all its route; for Turkey has not the ability, and Persia has not the will, to guarantee the security of life and property against the hostility of the natives to the enterprises of the Giaour.

Things, then, which are already initiated will in their development necessitate an intimate and practical union between England and Turkey. We do not say that Britain will occupy Turkey as the sovereign power; but, that their interests will be so identical with respect to Austria and Russia and the internal economy of the empire that their policy will be the same—the legislation of the Divan will give expression to the views and wishes of the British government. Turkey will favor the Anglo-Indian policy of Britain; and Britain will throw the shield of her power over Turkey to quench the darts of any Greek or Latin machinations for her overthrow. This will be the result of the late war. Alone in the contest, Turkey must in the end have fallen under the dominion of the Jew-hating Prince of Rosh, in which case Egypt, Palestine, and Israel, would have experienced no favor. The legislation of the Russian Autocrat from Constantinople would have been anti-Jewish and anti-Indian, and therefore anti-British. The extinction of the Turkish dominion is therefore a formidable blow at the commercial and industrial prosperity and stability of the British empire in all parts of the world. Hence the true policy of England is to maintain the integrity and independence of Turkey at all hazards. Turkey has no policy but to struggle for her existence; which makes that power her most intimate and necessary ally that would suffer most by her fall. This power is the British. Her fall would not directly or materially affect any other; for there is no other than the British that has any stake in the countries beyond the Euphrates and Red Sea.

But what will the Frog-Power capitalized in Louis Napoleon say to British ascendancy in Turkey? He may not like it; but it will not be in his power to prevent it. His mission is by his policy to create such a situation of affairs on "the earth" and "habitable" as shall result in the ascendancy of Russian imperialism in Germany and Italy, and of British ascendancy in

Turkey. This is not his intention; but it will be the result of his policy. His intention is to found a Bonapartian Dynasty in France, that Frenchmen may be ruled through all time by his descendants! But this is impracticable. It is an enterprise in which he is doomed to failure and disgrace. To succeed in his scheme would be to falsify the truth of God, and to convert the gospel of the kingdom into a cunningly devised fable. He will accomplish the mission assigned to him, the real nature of which he is entirely ignorant of, and then his power and dynasty will disappear from the ærial as his uncle's did before him, never, however, to be revived. What real or substantial gain has he acquired in the late war? He may have delayed a coalition of the Northern Powers for the restoration of the Bourbons by diverting their attention to the Holy Shrines of Jerusalem; but beyond this and the capture of the Malakoff, he has accomplished nothing for himself or France. The real gainers by the war have been Turkey, Britain, and the Jews. Turkey, in the delay of its overthrow by the King of the North; Britain, in her increased influence over Turkish counsels, and the opening of its provinces to her commercial enterprises; and the Jews, in their emancipation and liberty of settlement in the Holy Land. France, indeed, has its eye upon Egypt, where it is promoting a scheme, that excites the jealousy of England, to wit, the cutting of a grand maritime Canal across the Isthmus of Suez, "to remain at all times open as a neutral passage to every merchant ship crossing from one sea to another, without any distinction, exclusion, or difference of persons or nationalities." It is an undertaking on the part of the Vice-King of Egypt, who answers also for his successors; while "the works are to be carried out by a French Company, with an international proprietary; and the Company is to be named, registered, seated, and governed in Paris." A neutrality in the heart of Turkey under a Franco-Egyptian guarantee is by no means satisfactory to British capitalists, nor to the British and Turkish governments, neither of which have as yet assented to the practical development of the scheme. Now without their recognition the project must continue in abeyance. And there appears to be some good reasons for their reserve. The following citation from *The Leader* expresses these reasons in brief.

"But suppose," says an editorial in that paper, "England and France at war, would the neutrality of the channel close it to the hostile armaments of both nations, or open it to both, or allow one to guard it against the other? Or, supposing England at war with France, and, at the same time, with Burmah, would France enjoy the advantage, by virtue of the neutrality act, of shutting up the Indian waters, and forcing England to despatch men and stores round the Cape? If the canal is only to be a commercial channel, an immense proportion of the benefits promised to England fall to the ground, since it would be of the utmost importance to her to be enabled to send troops and military provisions by the direct route to India. If, on the other hand, the canal be open to ships of war as well as traders, the first chance of an European conflict would send a squadron to Pelusium to blockade the Eastern passage.

"We do not see any permanent or insuperable objections to the cutting through of the Isthmus, if it be practicable; but we are convinced that the project must be opposed unless the new Eastern highway is to be placed under the united guarantee of the European powers, with just and reasonable provisions for the event of a war. An act of simple neutrality, construed as closing it to all but merchant vessels, would not meet the case. We have an empire on the Indian coasts, and facilities of military communication with that empire are as important as the commercial interests involved. But for no other powers do similar necessities exist. Great Britain, it must be remembered, would to a great extent, sacrifice her South African colonies by diverting the Indian trade from the Cape to the Red Sea route. She would also, in all probability, be compelled to increase her fortifications and naval establishments at Aden to preserve her predominance on the Eastern Ocean."

Palestine to fight for her deliverance out of the hand of the Saracens; and though many ages have elapsed since then, the zeal for Jerusalem has only slumbered to awake with renewed activity in the latter days. The City of Christ is the goal of Antichrist's ambition, and the tomb of his impiety. It is there the King of Babylon is to fall; for, saith Jehovah, "I will break the Assyrian in my land, and upon my mountains tread him under foot"—Isaiah xiv. 25; Mic. v. 5, 6. The shadow of this event is cast before in the following speculation concerning the removal of the throne of the Pope to Jerusalem; who, though antichristian enough in all his characteristics, is not the Man of Sin-Power to be broken at Jerusalem "when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed in flaming fire." Italy, and not Judea, is the place of the judgment of the Papacy and the Pope, who is not the King," but the High Priest, of Babylon. We extract the following in connexion with this subject from The Leader of July 19, 1856, under the head of the

REMOVAL OF THE POPEDOM TO JERUSALEM.

"The suggestion for separating the spiritual from the temporal power of the Pope gains ground, especially in Italy, and men continue to talk and write about the transference of the chair of St. Peter from Rome to Jerusalem. The question is one of such singular interest, and, if settled in accordance with the wish recently expressed, might have so important an effect upon the state of Italy, and the complications arising from foreign occupation, that we are induced to make some further quotations from the pamphlet of the Abbe Michon.

"He remarks that the idea of removing the Popedom to Jerusalem, has "so advanced at Rome, that last year the question of the separation of the temporal power was formally mooted in full consistory by one of the most eminent men of the Roman Church, Cardinal Marini, who in a remarkable address, to which no contradiction was given, declared that the temporal power attached to the spiritual sovereignty of the Pope was the great obstacle to the welfare of the Church. The Cardinal examined the question from every point of view. He dwelt particularly on the fact that Rome, being the first power of the world in its spiritual character, had become by its connexion with the temporal authority a paltry state of the fourth or fifth rank, that consequently this power only diminished its spiritual and moral greatness, and that the spiritual power did not in any degree exalt the petty sovereignty of which it supported the burden. Indeed the Sovereign Pontiff is himself so much imbued with these ideas, that in December 1854, during the Convocation of the Bishops for the proclamation of the Immaculate Conception, and in a secret meeting at the Vatican, at which only the French Bishops were present, he expressed a wish to know from them, if, in the event of being forced by political causes to quit his States, he could count on a friendly reception in France. It is hardly necessary to say what the answer was. "France, where so many sincere Catholics are still found, would be too happy to realize the engagement accepted in her name by our venerable Bishops."

"Further on the Abbe states:—"In the course of the year 1855, while the war in the East was in all its force, and when a complication of affairs might be dreaded in Europe, this solution was proposed to the Pontifical Government. Complete liberty of action was guaranteed to the Sovereign Pontiff at Jerusalem, the means of maintaining in an honorable manner his high dignity were secured to him; while a railroad from Jerusalem to Jaffa, would render the communication of the Papacy with Europe as rapid as from Rome itself.

"Several high authorities in the Catholic Church are quoted to show that the Pope is at perfect liberty to transfer the throne of his spiritual government wheresoever he pleases. It is remarkable that none of the Ultramontane papers have noticed the Abbe's pamphlet."

It is not at all improbable that the temporal power of the Pope may be separated from the spiritual, in which event he will cease to be "the Image of the Beast" even in his present faint resemblance, and become purely and simply "The False Prophet" wholly restricted to the spiritual functions of the Pontificate. Should this come to pass, it would leave the present Kingdom of the Pope, commonly called "The States of the Church," lying between Tuscany, Naples, and Austrian Italy, without a temporal ruler. It is not to be supposed however, that such a territory with Rome, "the Eternal City," upon it, could remain without a master. The words put into the mouth of the Roman Harlot by the spirit as uttered by her before her final overthrow, are "I SIT A QUEEN; AND AM NO WIDOW;" by which we understand, that the city will be IMPERIAL in the judgment—the throne of a civil and military power, which shall imperialize the West; and which is represented by "a Scarlet-colored Beast," with an eighth head, and ten horns. —Rev. xxvii. 3, 11, 12. But this territory and city even now, while the Pope is king as well as high priest of the States of the Church, are in the occupation of foreign powers—of Austria in the Legations; and of France in Rome. Should the Pope cease to be king, which of these imperialities would become heir of his temporalities; or would they fall to the king of Sardinia as chief of "a united Italy"; or would they become part and parcel of a Roman Republic? Here is a question resulting from the separation of the Pope's spiritual and temporal power, which is inevitable; and all the parties to its settlement are hostile to its solution in favor of either of them. France, Austria, Naples, Sardinia, and the Republicans of all Italy, are the parties who claim to be heard in the matter. The question, however is a Gordian knot which will require an Alexander to cut; for it cannot be untied. To our mind the more than probable solution is, that though contrary to present indications, Austria in coalition with Russia will decide the fate of Italy. In other words, that Russia and Austria, as the Iron and clay feet of Nebuchadnezzar's Image, and the feet and Brass Nails of Daniels' fourth beast, will imperially divide the Roman Habitable between them. That is, there will be ONE HOLY ROMAN EMPIRE called "Babylon the Great," represented by Nebuchadnezzar's Image, to which will appertain, when perfected, Ten Toe Kingdoms, and Two Imperial Feet, the Clay of which is the uniting element of the Iron parts thereof. Toes and parts of the Feet which are of Iron are representative of the Roman, or Greek and Latin constituents, of the Image-Dominion in its Latter-day form, while the Clay is representative of the Russo-Greek element, or Gog-Power, which establishes itself upon the Roman Habitable, and with brittle union binds the iron parts into one. This divine arrangement gives the political ascendancy to the Clay-Power or the one Ferro-Brazen dominion; that is, to the "Prince of Rosh," or Autocrat of all the Russias, the throne of whose ascendancy will then be Constantinople, by which the power of which he is the chief becomes "Leviathan the piercing Serpent, even leviathan the crooked serpent; the Dragon that is in the sea."—Isa. xxvii. 1; Rev. xx. 1. 2.

Two emperors, one Prophet, and ten kings are the constitution of Babylon the Great when Nebuchadnezzar's Image is smitten upon the Feet. Two emperors the imperial pillars of one Image-dominion, of which the Eastern Emperor, as in the days of Augustulus, is the acknowledged sovereign chief.

Hence the Russo-Austrian Imperiality to the exclusion of France and the Republicans, will fall heir to the temporalities of the Pope in Italy, while in spirituals he will be Prophet of the West. But before this settlement is effected a terrible struggle must ensue; in which

Russia, Austria, and their allies, —the Beast and ten Horns—will "hate the Harlot, and make her desolate, and naked, and eat her flesh and burn her with fire."—Rev. xxvii. 16, 17. The reason of which is obvious. France and the republicans with their allies will certainly not allow the Northern Despots to swallow up Italy without resistance. A determined stand will therefore be made in the States of the Church against Russia and Austria—Russia aiding Austria in Italy; and Austria assisting Russia afterwards in acquiring Constantinople and the provinces of the East: so that in the Italian conflict the struggle for the Papal temporalities ultimates in the separation of them from the Pontificate, and in the fulfilment of "the words of God."

As to the removal of the Italian Popedom to Jerusalem, our conviction is that it will never come to pass. We see by the quotation from the Abbe Michon's pamphlet that it has been agitated in high places. Apprehending that Austria might declare for Russia, which would have brought France, which has possession of the Pope, into collision with Austria in the States of the Church, the Pope began to inquire of France where he could be safe from war's alarms? The answer reveals the policy of the Frog-Power, which continues of the same character as that which caused the war. The war originated in the policy of Louis Napoleon with respect to things in Jerusalem. He desired to give the Latin division of the Catholic Apostasy the ascendancy in Jerusalem; now after the war had began he proposed to transfer the Pope himself to Jerusalem; and consequently to make that city the ecclesiastical centre, the Mother City, of all Christendom. "Complete liberty of action was guaranteed to the Sovereign Pontiff, &c." The only powers that could guarantee this at that time were France, England, and Turkey. England and Turkey having no interest in the Italian Impostor would, of course, only guarantee liberty of action to him under the inspiration of French policy. The guarantee must therefore have been of Louis Napoleon origin; and prompted, doubtless, by a desire to get the Pope out of Italy and from under the influence of Austria, that he might establish his uncle's purpose of finally incorporating the Roman States in the French Empire; and confining the Pope to the position of Chief Bishop of the Latin Church. Louis Napoleon, however, in preparing a coup d'etat against the Pope's Roman temporalities, in proposing Jerusalem instead of Fontainebleau for his abode, would appear to be animated with pious zeal for the extension of the Pope's spiritual dominion. The displeasure of Russia was not then regarded; and he, doubtless, felt free to give the Pope a throne where he would seem to rule over the whole Catholic world, Latin and Greek.

But the war is interrupted or suspended for the present, and the Pope is still in Rome in fear and trembling. But though he may take refuge in a foreign land from the storm impending over Italy, we are satisfied he will never be enthroned in Jerusalem. Austria would hardly consent to it unless she were to inherit the Roman States, which France and Italy would protest against. This question would find Russia side by side with Austria, for if she was incensed at Napoleon's policy in respect of "the Holy Shrines," much more indignant would she be at the installation of a Latin Pope where alone she conceives the head of the Greek faith, the Autocrat himself, ought to be. No, it is Gog, not the Italian Prophet, that is enthroned in Jerusalem when the Image is smitten upon the Feet. Ezekiel shows this to the confusion of all other theories and policies. It is interesting, however, to see how the powers are burdening themselves with Jerusalem—the Continental for purposes of superstition and state-craft; and Britain for the extension of her commerce, the defence of her Indian possessions, and the benefit of Israel. The originator of the Jerusalem policy is the Frog-Power; and though hitherto it has gained nothing in that direction, yet its designs upon Italy may cause it still to adhere to it until it has set all Christendom by the ears, and Louis Napoleon finds himself in a fatality from which he cannot escape.

The peculiar sign, then, of the present time is the relation of things Jewish to the policy of the powers. Latin interests in Jerusalem originated the late war; Latin difficulties in the States of the Church seeking a solution in Jerusalem, may lead to its renewal; and British defensive policy prompts it to seek the good of Israel and the Holy City. This sign of the time is revealed in the prophecy of the drying up of the Euphrates or Turkish power. It is drying up "that the way of the kings from the rising of a sun may be prepared." The kings at the present time are mostly dead and buried; but "a Sun of righteousness is to arise with healing in his beams; and they" are to "go forth" from their graves. The kings from these risings are the heirs of the kingdom which is to be restored to Israel; on the throne of which "the King of the Jews" that was crucified, "the Root and the Offspring of David, the Bright and the Morning Star," is to reign in righteousness with his royal associates. Would it not be singular if the drying up of the political Euphrates, preliminary to the preparation of the way for them, were unaccompanied with any political movement bearing upon Palestine and Jerusalem the City of the Great King? You see, then, reader why the policy of the powers is becoming Judaized. It is significant of what is coming when the harvest of the earth now ripening apace, shall be fully matured.

The writer of the extract from *The Expositor* says, that present facts suggests to him that Great Britain is to take the lead in, if not to do the entire work of, emancipating Israel. Facts are insufficient premises to reason from in relation to the future. We have shown before the facts existed, that the British was the power whose policy and interest would identify it with the Jews. See *Herald* Vol. 3 p. 107, col. 1. And so it has come to pass according to the testimony of the Earl of Shaftesbury. The "entire work," however, is not assigned to Britain. Neither "facts" nor prophecy indicate this. The King of Israel is to emancipate Israel. He is to come from heaven for this purpose; and until he come, Britain can only use its good offices in co-operation with the Ottoman in behalf of Israel and their land. Britain will have no power to emancipate the Jews in Russia, Austria, &c. It is for Jesus to command the North to give up, and the South to keep not back. Anglo-Turkish policy will make a beginning "in the midst of the land," which will progress to the consummation we have shown before: but the restoration of all Israel by Gentile powers is impossible; for the tribes are not to re-possess the land until the rebels shall be purged out; and the remnant shall acknowledge that Jesus is Lord and Christ to the glory of God the Father. This is a work which he alone can do; a work that must be done before Israel can occupy Canaan by virtue of the Covenant made with Abraham and his Seed.

The writer of the extract speaks about "the great work of preparation for the kingdom," but he tells us not in what the work consists. It does not consist in patching an old rotten garment with new cloth, which only makes the rent worse than it was before. It consists in procuring an entirely new suit of "fine linen clean and white." A man must throw away his Babylonish garments, and being cleansed by the word of the kingdom, have his body washed with pure water (Heb. x. 22) in the name of Jesus, and so put on the spotless robe. In brief, he must "believe the gospel of the kingdom and be baptized"; and thenceforth "live soberly, and righteously, and godly in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the appearing of the glory of the great God, and of our Savior Jesus Christ." Such a man is prepared for the kingdom and the glory of God.

Sept. 10, 1856.

EDITOR.

VISIT TO CANADA WEST.

The Suspension Bridge; Hamilton; Toronto; The Issue Accepted; Satan's Ministers; Attacked in the Globe; Defended in the Colonist; Put to the Question; Queen Victoria a Usurper.

On July 11th, at 12 M., we were in place "aboard" the Hudson River Railway train for Albany. Our destination was Toronto, Canada West, to which we had been invited by a friend, who was desirous that we should lay before the Upper Canadians the great and important truths in which he had become interested by reading Elpis Israel, Anatolia, and the Herald! He, now "obedient to the faith," and another residing in Paris, but formerly of Dundee, Scotland, and while there a member of the Scotch Baptist Church though now also of "the Household of Faith," having laid hold of the hope preached to every creature by the Apostles—these two brethren, at their own particular expense, undertook that their fellow-citizens should hear the word of the kingdom, and be invited to its life and glory. In this way the ball was put in motion; and we were bowled out of Rowdydom into Rebeldom, 530 miles apart, in twenty-seven hours and a half. This was slow travelling, being only about nineteen miles an hour. But we were not in motion all the time. There were delays at Albany, Syracuse, Rochester, Niagara Falls, and Hamilton, besides the ordinary stoppages at the numerous stations at which even an express train "brings up." We changed cars at each of the above cities, the Hudson River road bringing us to Albany; the New York Central to Syracuse; the Rochester to Niagara Falls; and the Great Western to Hamilton, Canada West. The last contrived to bring us to Hamilton, on Lake Ontario, an hour after the train had left for Toronto; by which we were compelled to remain at Hamilton over four hours.

On our way hither we breakfasted at Elgin, a village at the eastern terminus of the Great Western Railway, and so named in honor of the late Governor-General of the Province; but more worthy of note as the place at which the Suspension-bridge spans the Niagara, two miles below the Falls. We crossed the bridge in the cars at a slow pace, which afforded time for an up-stream view of the Falls. "Its span is 822 feet, yet an engine, tender and passenger car, loaded with men, and weighing about 47 tons, depressed the long floor in the centre but 5½ inches. The bridge, with a loaded freight train covering its whole length, and weighing 326 tons, is deflected in the middle only 10 inches. This extreme depression is perceptible only to practised eyes. Delicate as lacework, and seemingly light and airy, it hangs there high between heaven and the boiling flood below, more solid than the earth-beds of the adjacent railways. The concussions of fast moving trains are sensibly felt miles off through solid rocky soil. In cities, locomotives shake entire blocks of dwellings. The waters of the Cayuga Lake tremble under the wheels of the express trains, a mile away from the bridge. But a freight train traversing this superstructure at the speed of five miles an hour, communicates no jar to passengers walking upon the carriage way below.

"There are in the bridge 624 'suspenders,' each capable of sustaining 30 tons, and all of them sustaining 18,720 tons. The weight they have ordinarily to support is only 1,000 tons. But the engineer has skilfully distributed the weight of the burthens by the means of 'girders and trusses.' These spread the 34 tons heft of a locomotive and tender over a length of 200 feet.

"The anchor chains are composed of nine links, each seven feet long, save the last, which is ten feet. The lowest link is made of seven bars of iron, seven inches by one and a half. It is secured to a cast iron anchor plate three and a half inches thick, and six feet six inches square. The other links are equally strong. The central portions of the anchor plates,

through which the links pass is 12 inches thick. The excavations in the solid rock were not vertical; they incline from the river. The rock on which the works may rely on the New York side of the chasm is 100 feet long, 70 feet wide, and 20 feet deep. It weighs 160 lbs. to the cubic foot, and presents a resistance of 14,000, exclusive of the weight of the super-incumbent masonry and embankment.

"The towers are each 15 feet square at the base, 60 feet high above the arch, and 8 feet square at the top. The limestone of which they are built will support a pressure of 500 tons on each square foot without crushing. While the greatest weight that can fall upon the tower will rarely exceed 600 tons, a pressure of 32,000 tons will be required to crush the top course. There are 4,000 tons weight in each of the towers on the New York side.

"The cables are four in number, 10 inches in diameter, and composed of 3,640 small No. 9 wires. Sixty wires form one square inch of solid section, making the solid section of the entire cable 60.40 square inches, wrapping not included. These immense masses of wire are put together so that each individual wire performs its duty, and in a strain all work together.

"So solid is this bridge in its weight, its stiffness and its staying, that not the slightest motion is communicated to it by the severest gales of wind that blow up through the narrow gorge which it spans.

"Next to violent winds, suspension bridge builders dread the trotting of cattle across their structures. A heavy train running 20 miles an hour across this bridge, would do less injury than would twenty steers passing on a trot. It is the severest test next to that of troops marching in time, to which bridges, iron or wooden, suspension or tubular, can be subjected."

One mile below the bridge is the whirlpool, said to resemble in its appearance the celebrated Maelstrom, on the coast of Norway. It is occasioned by the river making a complete angle, and the current running with such velocity as to cause a heaving of the waters in the middle to a height of ten feet. Another mile below, and the Devil's Hole is reached. This is a deep, dark cave; and is memorable as the scene of a bloody massacre of the whites by a band of Indians; the latter driving their victims into the yawning abyss.

Having several times visited the Falls, and penetrated all the mysteries of the place (at least so far as they are open to the intrusion of the presumptuous; for we went behind the Canadian Fall 150 feet), we did not on this occasion visit it; but pushed on to Hamilton. Here, as we have said, we were detained four hours and a half. However, we did not so much regret it, as we remembered that there was one of the household of faith, and a subscriber to the Herald, there, who had invited us to give him a call. We accordingly sallied forth in search of him, and found him at the city gas-works engaged on the Company's books. Not being the busy time, he was enabled to bestow a little attention upon a friend. He had seen us before in Edinburgh, having attended our lectures there, while he resided at Dalkeith, a distance of six miles, which he used to walk for the purpose. We only knew him by correspondence; but had now the pleasure of making his personal acquaintance, and of partaking of his hospitality, and ciceronian services.

Our health being infirm, and having travelled all night, with but little sleep, we were not very peripatetically inclined. But having well washed out the train dust and ashes from head, neck and beard, we felt so much refreshed as to accept his invitation to see the city, and to "ascend the mountain."

Hamilton is forty-three miles from the Suspension Bridge, and since the opening of the Great Western Railway to Detroit, has increased with a rapidity characteristic of the West; and bids fair, it is thought, to outstrip her sister cities of the Province in the race for population and wealth. It was laid out in 1813, and now has a population of about 25,000. It is built on an acclivity at the head of Lake Ontario, and extends back to the base of the mountain, which rises to a considerable eminence, probably over two hundred feet, from the summit of which a beautiful and varied prospect is afforded. The streets cross each other at right angles, and many of them are quite pleasant. The principal street is King street, and extends the entire length of the city. There are some fine buildings, constructed of freestone, which is obtained from quarries in the rear of the town, which are said to be inexhaustible. After a fatiguing ascent we reached the upper level of the country, styled there the top of the mountain. This is a mountain only on the side facing the lake; the upper level corresponding to the upper Niagara; the lower to the lake shore. The view from the top impresses the spectator with the conviction that it was remotely the almost perpendicular margin of the lake, which then covered deeply the site of the town below. The view is extremely fine, embracing the bright waters of Burlington Bay, and the Lake, the banks of which are studded with elegant residences and groves. Upon the whole, the exterior of Hamilton is pleasing, and fair as a whited sepulchre. Its inhabitants are intensely loyal, both to Mammon and the Queen, both of whom can be served without detriment to either. Provincial Queendom is no longer the rebeldom of former days. A change has come over the spirit of the people, who congratulate themselves on being provincials of the British empire, rather than citizens of the Model Republic. We were surprised at this; but found the feeling general. The country is prosperous, taxes light, British capital flows in, and everything is looking up. They want no more. Hence annexation to the Union, especially with the political troubles now looming in the future, is deemed neither possible nor desirable. In spirituals, the very light of Hamilton is pitchy darkness. It has plenty of temples, but no house of God. The gospel of the kingdom is unknown even by name, as far as we could ascertain; nor is there at present any opening for it in Hamilton. Our friend is there alone, like Lot in the midst of Sodom. If he can save himself and his house it will be well; could he rescue others it would be better. He will, doubtless, try; for when the truth gets possession of one's inner man, it will not permit him to hide his talent in a napkin, and to return it to his Lord without increase.

But we must not linger longer in Hamilton. Having dined with our friend, the time drew near for us to resume our way to Toronto. At 2.10 P. M., having accompanied us to the station, he saw us safely in the cars for the capital of the province, a distance of 38 miles, which is performed in an hour and twenty minutes. On arriving at this place, we found our friend waiting to convey us to his house, at the corner of Yonge and Richmond streets. We found the city keeping holiday, to some extent. Orangism was glorifying its political protestantism, in processioning and pistoling the air. "Put your trust in God and keep your powder dry," is the faith and practice of the protestant ascendancy-men, from the days of William, Prince of Orange, to July 12th, 1856. It was a wholesome political faith in the 17th century, when the bloodthirsty Papists of Ireland and the Continent were plotting the destruction of the Witnesses throughout Europe. It is a faith not yet to be abandoned by the earthborns, who would not be extinguished by a ferocious and degrading superstition. Romanism is making great efforts in Canada for the acquisition of place and power. It may be well, therefore, to keep it in remembrance, that it is watched; and that the powder of the free is still dry, and ready for use, as occasion may require. The Orange celebration of the 12th was a practical hint in this direction.

Toronto is in advance of Hamilton in wealth, magnitude and population. It is situated on an arm of Lake Ontario, 36 miles from the mouth of the Niagara river. It was originally called York, which in 1834, when it was incorporated as a city, was changed to the more euphonious Indian name which it now bears. It contains about 50,000 inhabitants, and has many handsome and substantial buildings. The site of the city is low, but rises gradually from the water's edge. The streets generally cross each other at right angles, the principal ones running east and west in the denser portion of the city. King and Yonge streets are the thoroughfares, and contain the largest number of stores. As New York is the capital of Rowdyism, so Toronto may be termed the capital of Rebeldom: for rowdyism and rebellion are enthroned in each. Rebellion, however, in Canada is quite respectable; for it has been justified by the British Commissioners, and Mr. Mackenzie, the victim of Van Buren subserviency to colonial tyranny, is now a loyal subject of the Queen. The issue is not now between royalty and republicanism; but between Lower Canadian popery and Upper Canadian protestantism, as to which shall rule the country: or, in other words, devour the loaves and fishes; for this is the practical issue in politics throughout the world. Whether Toronto shall continue to be the capital of the united provinces, remains to be seen. The removal of the government to some other city, will doubtless affect its material prosperity; but should it be decreed, it is to be hoped a city will be chosen where the popish element is weak and uninfluential; for no country is safe where that diabolism inspires the administration of its affairs. But we do not believe that Upper Canadian British Protestants will allow their civil and religious interests to be controlled, and, therefore, jeopardized, by Lower Canadian French Papists. It is phrenologically impossible that French imbecility and superstition should prescribe the rule of action to the strong-minded and intelligent Anglo-Saxon. The nobler brain must rule the baser.

But the great question with our readers is, Hath the Lord any people among the 50,000 of Toronto? He had much people in Corinth; hath he any, many, or few, in the Canadian capital, of the like faith and practice with them? They heard Paul's proclamation of the kingdom and name of Jesus, believed it, and were baptized—Acts xviii, 8—11; 1 Cor. i, 6, 7; ii, 1, 2, 7, 9—13; iii, 11, 21—23; xv. 1—4, 22—28, 50—54, —have any there become obedient to the same? How can we answer this question, being only a stranger in Toronto? The Lord knows; but we do not. If, however, what we believe, and advocate by word of mouth and pen, be the system of truth set forth in the Bible (and we have yet to meet the first man who can show the contrary), our honest and candid answer must be, that though we found a city full of temples, dedicated to Mahuzzim—the ghosts of saints and angel-spirits—regiments of clerical and ministerial officials; and armies of professing sentimentalists yclept "Christians,"—we found not one who could satisfy us that he had obeyed the truth as it is in the Jesus preached of Paul. This was the result of a week's observation there—the condition of things as we found them; not the state in which we left them.

Before we visited the city, the Baptist preacher was sounded as to the feasibility of procuring his "church" for us to speak in? "Well," said he, "to be candid, I don't think it can be had. Dr. Thomas is evidently mad, which, of course, makes it impossible." But, it was suggested, is it an evidence of madness for a man to devote his whole time and talents to the study of the Bible; and to the teaching of what he believes to be its truth? "Well," he replied, "perhaps I am too fast in saying that he is mad; at all events, he preaches 'another gospel;' that is certain, and cannot, therefore, have the house." Now this gentleman, formerly of Milwaukie, is the oracle of Baptistism in Toronto. His flock, formerly restive under the more scriptural teaching of his predecessor, Dr. Pyper, is now stagnantly tranquil under his. This fact indicates that his judgment of matters and things is approved by them, so that we may

say, that they agree with him that we set forth a gospel different from that approved by the Baptist church in Toronto. We accept the issue. If the gospel they approve be the true gospel, we then do preach another; for there is no identity of faith and hope between theirs and that we exhibit to the world. One of these gospels, then, or both (on the supposition that neither was preached by Paul), and the believers and preachers of them, are accursed. If the Baptist gospel be Paul's, then those preached by us and all others contrary thereto, are false, and we accursed—Gal. i, 6—9. There is no middle ground between error and "the truth." We are either right or wrong; and there are certain criteria by which the two may be easily distinguished; the following are—

Rules whereby Satan's Ministers may be Known.

1. If the preacher of a gospel please men who do not understand the Scriptures, he preaches a gospel "after man;" and is not a servant of Christ. —Proof; Gal. i. 10,11.
2. If any man teach otherwise than Paul indicated, and consent not to the wholesome words of the Lord Jesus Christ, who preached the gospel of the kingdom; and to the teaching which is according to the mystery of godliness—he is proud, KNOWING NOTHING. Proof; 1 Tim. vi. 3, 4; Heb. ii. 3; Mat. iv. 23; Mark xvi. 15,16; 1 Tim, iii. 16.
3. If a preacher do not "hold fast the form of sound words," he is not an apostolic teacher. Proof; 2 Tim. i. 13; ii. 2; iii. 10,14—17; Tit. i. 9,12—15; 1 Pet. iv. 11.
4. If a preacher speak in accordance with the principles approbated by the world, he is of that world, and not of God; for the world is at enmity with God and his truth. Proof; 1 John iv. 5; Rom. viii. 7; 1 John ii. 16.
5. If a preacher speak not according to the testimony of Moses, the prophets, and the apostles, his teaching is infallibly wrong, and himself accursed. Proof; 1 John iv. 6; Isaiah viii. 20; 2 Pet. iii. 2; 2 John 9,10.

Here are five rules by which, not we, but the sword of the Spirit, the Word of God, "which is living and powerful, and abides forever," (Eph. vi. 17; Heb. iv. 12; 1 Pet. i. 23) slays the pretensions of all the orders of priests, clergy and ministers of "Christendom" to be the servants of God, and the preachers of the truth. Their gospels are "after man"—after "the Fathers," Luther, Calvin, Arminius, Knox, Bunyan, Wesley, Swedenborg, Campbell, Joe Smith, Miller, Andrew Jackson Davis, the inventors of the Thirty-Nine Articles, and such like. The disciples of these heresiarchs, unscripturally denominated "the church," make up the great bulk of "the world" they call "Christendom." As may be seen by the "Characteristics of the Apostasy" on page 204 of this periodical, their errors assume pretty much the same doctrinal form; so that the condemnation of one sect is the conviction of the whole. They none of them "consent to the wholesome words of the Lord Jesus;" neither do they hear the Apostles; nor speak according to the prophets: therefore saith the word, they are Know-Nothings, their spirit is the spirit of error, and there is no light in them. From all we could ascertain, the Toronto Ministry in all its members belongs to this learned Know-Nothing Ecclesiastical Association; whose fellows, like the frogs of Egypt, fill the chambers, and are found in the very bread-baskets and wallets of the meanest of the people. There is a certain Know-Nothing fellowship among them that prevents the papist authorities from treating the Torontonians to an Irish or French massacre of Protestants; and the Anglo-Hibernians of the

State Church from startling them with a foray upon the chattels and effects of dissenters for rates and Easter dues; still it is only a fellowship of forbearance in deference to a public opinion, which forbids the murder and imprisonment and ruin of families, because of their religious sentiments, as in former times. There is no real love among them, save that of the loaves and fishes, which is the measure of their affection for the people's souls. This being the nature of their love for them, it is not to be supposed they have any for us, by whom they not only make no profit; but by whom their craft is destroyed wherever our teaching is received. This is the case with the Baptist preacher; and an ex-reverend Congregationalist bookseller in Toronto, who, over the signature of Veritas in "The Globe," warned the Queen's subjects not to listen to our discourse.

Our friend, the Jason with whom we sojourned, had provided the St. Lawrence Hall for Sunday afternoon, and the Temperance Hall for that and every night in the week, except Saturday, which afforded us seven opportunities of addressing the public on the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ. The audiences were better than we expected; but would have doubtless, been even larger, but for the warning in the Globe; which being in brevier, contained composition enough to fill two pages and a half of the Herald. The nature of this twaddle was enough to deter all from coming to hear, who are accustomed to allow their spiritual craftsmen to judge for them, instead of being noble-minded and independent enough to hear and think for themselves. The writer, we are informed, was a Mr. Geikie, styled in the letter before us, "your old friend of Halifax, Nova Scotia—the ex-Rev. J. C. Geikie." He was the Congregationalist pastor there, who entertained his flock with some speechifications against our teaching in that city after we had left. This gentleman is one of that class of professionals who pretend that they are called of God, as Aaron was, to be his servants and ambassadors to the world, and to sprinkle babes and sucklings in His name! But according to the five rules already recited, the Word pronounces them accursed impostors, and blasphemers; and it is notorious to every student of any proficiency in that Word, that God has never called them to any such mission. On the supposition, however, that this gentleman really was called, he seems to have turned renegade, after the example of Jonah; for he has fled from his mission and opened a bookseller's store in Toronto! He is, no doubt, more honorably, and more usefully employed, both for his own and the public benefit, in selling books and stationery, than in preaching the traditions of Congregationalism; but then what becomes of his divine call and mission—what account is he prepared to give of playing the truant from these; and of leaving "precious immortal souls" to perish while he is selling "Tom Thumb and Jack the Giant-killer," Don Quixote, and Robinson Crusoe! This is the pious and faithful divine who has published two feet five inches of misrepresentation in The Toronto Globe, under the caption of "Dr. Thomas Reviewed." If Mr. Geikie would review himself, he would be more profitably employed; for in reviewing us he shows clearly that he ridicules what he does not understand.

For our own part, being so much accustomed to misrepresentation, we were disposed to pass by Mr. Geikie's penograph with the contempt it deserved; but in this we were overruled by another. In order, therefore to correct Mr. Geikie's perversions by a statement of what we believed and taught from our own pen, the articles which appear in the September Herald under the captions of "Heaven's Message to the World," "Sentiments characteristic of the Apostasy," and "Teachings of the oracles of God"—were cut out, and forwarded to The Globe with a respectful note requesting their insertion. But does the reader expect that such impartial justice would be accorded by the leading Protestant paper of Toronto? If he does, our experience of newspaper and periodical justice prevented us from indulging so visionary an expectation. The editor in his reply said, "I must decline publishing the document. The

letter of 'Veritas' was published as a criticism on a public lecture; and I cannot admit that the fact of the publication entitles Mr. Thomas to space in the Globe for the inculcation of his (in my opinion) false sentiments. Yours, truly—Geo. Brown."

Mr. George Brown's statement is inaccurate. The letter of "Veritas" was not published by the writer as a criticism on a public lecture, not a word being said about any of the lectures; but as an attack upon our views in *Elpis Israel*, in language designed to prevent our lectures being heard. The first paragraph shows this. "Dear sir," says Mr. Geikie to the editor of the *Globe*, "an advertisement in your columns informs the public that a John Thomas, M.D., is to deliver a series of lectures in Toronto this week, in the St. Lawrence Hall, and the Temperance Hall, on what he calls *The Kingdom of God*.' As very few of your readers are, perhaps, aware of the character of this gentleman's teachings, it may be well to let his views be a little known, that those who countenance him by attending his meetings may be made aware of what it is to which they are lending themselves." He then proceeds to direct attention to *Elpis Israel*, and to give his views of the views he alleges it contains. He undertakes, most incompetently to give the character of our teaching, for the information of the public. Mr. Brown is informed that Mr. Geikie's views of it are incorrect; and an authentic statement is furnished for the said public; which Mr. Brown will not permit them to see. Hence Mr. Brown makes himself a party to practicing an imposition upon the public. This is his sense of fairness, impartiality, and honesty! Unhappy is that public whose principles are fabricated by the Browns and Geikies of Toronto! Neither its morals nor its purse are safe from depredation, when they are trumpeting justice and integrity in the wind!

But the enemy was not permitted to have the exclusive privilege of the public ear. "A Subscriber" to *The Colonist* had influence enough with that paper to obtain the insertion of the following letter; though not sufficiently early to counteract the article in *The Globe*. It did not appear until several days after we had left the city. Thus it reads—

To the Editor of the *Colonist*.

SIR, —In the *Globe* of yesterday is an attack upon Dr. Thomas, who is now lecturing in the Temperance Hall, upon the Christianity of the Bible, by an anonymous writer, over the very inappropriate signature, in his case, of "Veritas." The attack called "Dr. Thomas Reviewed" is evidently from the pen of one who, if he have read the particular work he refers to as he pretends, is manifestly a very dull and incapable Reviewer—dull, from his evident inability to understand the book, and, therefore notably incapable of conveying to others its contents. The object of the attack is confessedly to prevent the public from hearing what Dr. Thomas has to say; which, in itself, is evidence that "Veritas" (who is too cowardly to appear without disguise) belongs to that ancient class of "respectables" who will not come to the light lest it should be made manifest that their deeds are evil. But, Sir, I do not notice the chirography of this nameless Scribe because of any weight or worth that characterizes it; for against Dr. Thomas' interpretation of Scripture it has literally none; and is deemed by him a mere tissue of malevolent misrepresentation, undeserving of his slightest regard; but to call your attention to the little sense of justice that directs the policy of the *Globe* in its treatment of those who differ from it. Its low conscientiousness is illustrated in the attack of this mendacious "Veritas" upon Dr. Thomas. "Veritas" writes an absurd parody, based on a few isolated sentences craftily selected from Dr. Thomas' book "*Elpis Israel*" purporting to be "the ridiculous maggots of his brain," to which he is said to be inviting the attention of our fellow citizens, and the *Globe* conspicuously publishes them. Dr. Thomas' attention being called to them, he caused a summary of his sentiments, as published by himself in his own paper, *The*

Herald of the Kingdom, to be sent to the Globe for insertion, that the public might judge for itself when it had read his views in his own words. But such fair play was too honorable a procedure for the Globe. "Veritas" could readily be permitted to occupy a column in abusing Dr. Thomas (for to misrepresent a man's teaching is scandalously abusive) and in extorting an ex parte sentence against him; but Dr. T. is prohibited the freeman's right of showing through the channel of attack, why sentence should not be pronounced against him! Is this the freedom, and justice, and morality of Toronto? Will its citizens consent that the Globe shall prostitute its columns to the malevolence of anonymous scribblers, by which their stupidity and falsehood becomes its own, and that it shall use them against the reputation of honorable men who fear not to speak out their convictions in the face of day, judge them and condemn them unheard. The sooner such a Globe is eclipsed or blotted out of the social heavens the better for the intellectual and moral health of those who dwell therein.

I have, Sir, thus presumed to say a word in the interests of Truth and Justice, because I have both read "Elpis Israel" and attended all the lectures of Dr. Thomas in this city. I can, therefore, testify, as also can many others in Canada, Britain and the United States, that the attack of "Veritas" upon the Doctor is a tissue of misrepresentations and perversions of his sentiments, which no one has yet ventured fairly and openly to dispute, Bible in hand, before the public and Dr. Thomas himself.

Yours respectfully,

A SUBSCRIBER.

Yonge Street, Toronto,
July 18th, 1856.

At the last lecture certain questions were put to us concerning the nature possessed by Jesus at and before the time of his crucifixion. It was the old heresy prompted the questions, against which the apostles write so explicitly when speaking of those who denied that Jesus came in the flesh. The questioners imagined that the flesh of Jesus was a purer flesh than that which was common to all the Jews—that it was immaculate, and therefore not *σαρξ α αρτίας*, *sarx hamartias*, "flesh of sin," as it is styled in Rom. viii. 3. They considered that Jesus might have been "in likeness of flesh of sin," and yet his flesh not be "flesh of sin." They quoted various passages which testified to the sinlessness of his character, and applied them as testimony to the physical purity of his flesh, by which they made his flesh to be different from "the flesh" of all mankind.

We fully admitted all that could be said about the sinlessness of his character; but rejected in toto their heresy about the immaculateness of his flesh. They did not seem to be able to discern the difference. The Jesus of their imaginations was immaculate in flesh and character; and therefore, in the words of Paul, "another Jesus" than the Jesus preached of him. They appeared to think that they were conferring the highest honor upon him by making his flesh as little like that of his brethren as possible. One of our questioners was exceedingly voluble. He said all that he was able to say in two or three sentences; but, as if a stream of repetitions reiterating his opinion, were demonstration of the truth, he inflicted upon the meeting a perfect flood of verbiage. From existing indications, he might have swept on without exhaustion till midnight, filling the air with a volume of sound. We had, therefore, to shut off the inundation by closing the door of his mouth. We reminded him that instead of asking a question, he was extemporizing an interminable speech. The audience was there to hear and inquire from us; we to speak and explain to them, not for disputation, but for their information and consideration. Therefore, having said all he was able to say, he would be so good as to resume his seat, that others, if any, might inquire.

Having disposed of him, a preacher rose and asked if we considered the nature of Jesus were peccable? By "peccable" we supposed he meant able to sin? "Yes." Perceiving that this would have involved us in a "labyrinth, which at that late hour we could not have extricated ourselves from satisfactorily, we replied evasively that the Scripture not having proposed such a question, did not furnish a direct answer thereto. Under other circumstances we might have said, that Jesus was capable of doing many things which he did not do. That he did not sin, and would not sin, "because God's seed remained in him": but, on the supposition of that seed, the truth, not being in him, his nature was as capable of sinning as the first Adam's; else would not the temptation in the wilderness have been a farce? What merit would there be in a man not sinning, who was unable to sin? The excellence of the character of Jesus consisted in being able to sin, but refusing so to do—"Obedient to the death of the cross, wherefore God highly exalted him."

We were visited by several while sojourning in Toronto. Among these was a very worthy and pious relative of "Veritas," who had attended our lectures. He called to express his dissent from an expression applied by us to Queen Victoria, in common with "the powers that be." In defining the inheritance of the Christ as revealed by the Spirit, through his father David, in the Second Psalm, we had styled all who now possess the nations and the Holy Land "usurpers of his inheritance." He thought that this was inapplicable to Queen Victoria. She was a very pious and excellent lady, and in no way, he thought, to be regarded as an "usurper." We replied that comparing her Majesty with the other world, rulers of the day, who were all pious in their way, and professing great admiration and devotion to Jesus, she was, probably, the best among them—quite a decent and respectable lady. As an individual we had nothing to say for or against her, having no certain information concerning her; we suppose, however, that common report is correct, and that she is as estimable as he declared. But this aside. Our argument had to do with her as the constitutional chief of one of the Sin-Powers of the world. As such, she claims to be the Head of the Church of England and Ireland, absurdly styled the Church of Christ, and acknowledged as a branch thereof even by Dissenters. She legislates in spirituals, and decrees dogmas utterly subversive of the truth; for quod facit per alios, facit per se. Besides making the word of God of none effect by her legislation, she allies herself with the basest of powers, "full of the names of blasphemy"; and is found aiding and abetting "the destroyers of the earth." She is the patron of Juggernaut; and endower of Maynooth for the manufacture of Jesuits, the enemies of God and man. She is sovereign over 200,000,000 of people, and will not surrender that sovereignty unless compelled by force of arms. She cannot be a Christian, and occupy such a position. She is of the world, and an incarnation of its principles. She is one of its friends, and a principal hierophant of its "poms and vanities"; which, however, by proxy, she promised to renounce at her rhanism; and by confirmation, when she professed to relieve her sponsors of the obligations they had assumed for her, she vowed to do in her own behalf. Now, of such the scripture saith, they are the enemies of God. Therefore it is written, "Love not the world, nor the things in the world: if any one love the world, the love of the Father is not in him"—1 John ii. 15: and again, "The friendship of the world is enmity with God; whosoever therefore will be a friend of the world is the enemy of God"—James iv. 4. These testimonies are condemnatory of the Queen, the Church of which she is the head, and of all its bishops, priests, and deacons—of the whole system called British. It is a power, like all others constituted of "the enemies of God." Now God's enemies in possession of the nations, be they monarchists or republicans, are possessors of what belongs to Christ; for it is written concerning him, "I will give thee the nations for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession." If a man occupy the possession of another, and build a house upon it, without being able to produce any other title-deed than successful violence, he is a usurper of the real owner's rights. This is the case of the

Queen-Power represented in the person of Lady Victoria Guelph. If Christ were to appear in Jerusalem to-morrow, she would not voluntarily surrender the sovereignty of the British Empire into his hands. If she were so disposed to do as an individual, her ministers, nobility, clergy, gentry and rich men, would not consent to it; and if she persisted, they would compel her to abdicate, and would set up another, less scrupulous, in her stead: for they would know that he would "send the rich empty away." Because, therefore, this will be the policy of all the powers, it is decreed, that Jesus shall break them with a rod of iron; and dash them in pieces as a potter's vessel. Would he do this if the powers were not resistant usurpers of his rights and the rights of all his brethren? The fact of his having to take possession of his own by violence is proof that his rights are usurped and abeyed by his enemies, of whom the "pious and excellent" Lady Victoria is by birth, education, and position, one. If she would become a Christian, she must believe the gospel of the kingdom and name of Jesus Christ, and be immersed. There is but one way of salvation, for prince and beggar. She would then have practically to "renounce the pomps and vanities of this vain and wicked world," as it reads in the prayer-book of her church; which would involve her abdication, and retirement into private and unfashionable life. She could no longer occupy the throne of Britain and Ireland; for the coronation oath requires her to maintain the existence and ascendancy of the Anglo-Hibernian Church "as by law established," which no Bible-Christian could possibly do. A Christian on the British throne would decree the abolition of the establishment forthwith; and confiscate all its revenues to the improvement and benefit of the poor and needy. He would discountenance impostors, banish knaves and fools from his presence, and honor only the wise and good. There would consequently be found among his courtiers no incarnations of articles thirty-nine, or of the Westminster Confession of Faith; for they only would rejoice in the beams of his beneficence "who walked uprightly, and worked righteousness, spake the truth from their hearts, and did not violate their word." Such an one upon the throne of Britain could only be maintained there by Omnipotence; for those who surround that throne being the enemies of God, would rebel and seek the destruction of the ruler that should undertake to govern in His fear. The world may deem this doctrine uncharitable, and even insulting to majesty and its satellites. May be so; but what is that to us, who are not of the world? God's word is the truth, and has no consolation for the disobedient, nor flatteries for the great. We came not to Toronto to do either; but to show the doctrine of the kingdom of God, which is to "break in pieces and subdue all other kingdoms, and itself to stand for ever." The British is a great dominion; but its destiny, like all others, is to perish for ever, when "He shall come whose right it is to reign," and "put down the mighty from their thrones." Let majesty and its satellites take care of themselves; be it ours to believe and obey the truth, leaving loyalty to those "who mind earthly things."

[To be Continued]

The Gospel of the Kingdom.

We perceive from the following excellent letter, which we transfer from the Tri-Weekly Commercial of Aug. 20, that brethren Anderson and Magruder of Virginia have been lecturing in Henderson, Ky., on the Kingdom of God. Perhaps they will inform our readers of some particulars. They will, doubtless, be glad to know. The letter referred to is as follows:

MESSRS. EDITORS: —As one of the parties, referred to in your respectful notice of the mission of Mr. Anderson and myself to Kentucky, inserted in a late number of the Commercial, I ask leave to suggest some correction of the views and sentiments you attributed to us.

We do not announce in our "preaching" or lectures, as we prefer to call them, (for neither of us belongs to the clerical order,) "the dawn of the millennium" in the sense of its being already begun, nor that Christ will be "a second time incarnated;" neither do we maintain that the resurrection and judgment of all mankind will take place at the same time, nor that Christ, when he comes, will reign over the resurrected saints. On these points our faith is somewhat different from your version of it. We hold that the Millennium is the personal reign of Christ on earth for one thousand years, and consequently that it is yet future—that he will appear a "second time," not incarnated—or, in the flesh—but as the Lord from Heaven in great power and glory, attended by the holy angels—will subdue the world under him and then establish his reign—not over the saints, but over the nations of the earth, whom he will rule in righteousness and with an omnipotent sceptre. His kingdom will then be "come" and consequently, "God's will will be done on earth as it is in heaven:"—i.e. perfectly. Thus, the Lord's prayer will have been answered, for "thine (his) is the kingdom and the power and the glory." Thus "the heathen (nations) will become his inheritance and the uttermost parts of the earth his possession." Then "they that dwell in the wilderness shall bow before him and his enemies shall lick the dust—all kings shall bow down before him—all nations shall serve him. His name shall endure forever. Men shall be blessed in him and all nations shall call him blessed. The kingdoms of this world will have become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ, and the promise long ago made to Abraham "that in his seed (the Christ) all the nations of the earth shall be blessed," which Paul calls the gospel preached to Abraham, (see Galatians, 3d chapter and 8th verse) will be accomplished.

In regard to the part that the saints or redeemed Christians are to bear in this drama in human affairs, we maintain that the scriptures teach that contemporaneously with the coming of the Lord from Heaven, the saints of all ages now sleeping in their graves, will rise from the dead in new, glorious, powerful, immortal bodies, and with the living Christians, who are changed and immortalized in the twinkling of an eye, will be caught up to meet the Lord in the air, (see 1 Thess. 4c. 13,18,) will descend with him to the Mount of Olives, near Jerusalem, and will become, not the subjects, but the associate kings and rulers, over the nations with Him whom God has appointed "King of Kings and Lord of Lords—that this is the first resurrection (Rev. 20 chap.) in which the righteous and holy have part. That the period of the reign of Christ and the immortalized saints is the Millennium, or one thousand years. That at the end of this period he will summon the wicked dead to judgment, who have slumbered in the grave during the millennial glory—will judge and punish them according to their deeds, which punishment will terminate in their destruction—that the devil himself and all his works, including wicked men, sin and death, shall be destroyed together—the kingdom will then be delivered up to the Father, who will then be All in All—that thenceforth the tabernacle of God shall be with men. He will dwell with them (instead of the orthodox but unscriptural theory of their going to Heaven to live with him) (Rev. 20 chap.,) and the earth thus redeemed from sin and every curse and fitted up as a glorious and magnificent dwelling place, shall become the eternal abode of a race of immortal and glorious beings, chosen out from among the various generations of men who have in preceding ages peopled its vast surface.

It is the offer of this glorious and sublime destiny to all men freely who are willing to accept it on the terms our Great Creator has disclosed and defined in his Word, that constitutes the Gospel and makes it emphatically "glad tidings of great joy which shall be to all people." God invites all to the dignity and honor of his Kingdom and glory, and however heretical such sentiments may sound in orthodox ears, we are prepared to show, by a fair,

candid and common sense, as well as exegetical interpretation of the sacred oracles, that the above is the only consistent and harmonious system propounded in the bible.

It is not to add any force to arguments drawn from the Highest source, but to propitiate your readers, if possible, to a more respectful and considerate examination of a subject so imposing, that I venture to cite, in conclusion, the testimony on the premises before us (from many) of those whom the world delights to dignify with its respect and confidence. T. B. Macaulay, the great essayist and historian of the age, says, —Essays, p. 688:

"The Christian believes, as well as the Jew that at some future period the present order of things will come to an end; nay, many Christians believe that the Messiah will shortly establish his kingdom on earth and reign visibly over all the inhabitants. The number of people who hold this doctrine is very much greater than the number of Jews in England. Many of those who hold it are distinguished by rank, wealth and ability. It is preached from the pulpits of both the Scottish and English churches. Noblemen and members of Parliament have written in defence of it."

Respectfully submitted,

ALLAN B. MAGRUDER.

Henderson co., Aug. 18, 1856.

Intellectual Independence.

We regret to say that there are but few, comparatively, who are independent in their thoughts. That class who make it a virtue to differ with every one else, are the slaves of caprice and vanity, instead of intellectual freemen.

True intellectual independence no more disregards historic facts, scientific truths and reason's gems, than political liberty defies law, order and justice.

Children generally regard the opinions and theories of their parents as being as precious as their birthrights. It is true that the opinions of the aged, experienced and wise should have their proper influence; but is it proper that intellectual identity should be given up? To the Great Teacher we are responsible for our faith and opinions. Can we transfer those responsibilities to another, or must we stand for ourselves, approved or condemned?

How can we determine how we would have others do unto us, and the consequent duties we owe to them; unless we think for ourselves?

Intellectual slavery prevents the free exercise of the intellect, and of course the mental improvement resulting from such exercise.

Another evil resulting from this mental servitude is, that it regards hoary-headed doctrines, however erroneous, and long established usages, laws and institutions, however bad, as sacred relics of the past, not to be changed or even questioned. By it demagogues control parties, and lead them to the support of measures inexpedient or positively wrong.

It forbids the Bible to the common people, or imposes the opinions of councils, priests, doctors or reverends on them as possessing almost if not equal claims on their minds and consciences. The reverend divine stands before the people and saith, "thus meaneth the Lord," and they answer, yea. The son believes what the father does, the father believes what

his pastor does, and the pastor has made it his business for years to believe what the fathers thought the Apostles believed.

When this tyranny enters the moral world it exalts human notions and human laws above divine authority and divine law. It suppresses the verdict of reason, and stifles the convictions of conscience.

How ignoble to yield to slavery that intellect which kind heaven gave thee to improve. Let us listen to advice, revere the opinions of the wise, examine evidence, keep both ears wide open to the voice of reason, and carefully avoid a stubborn spirit, and yet be independent. Let us examine the ground on which we stand, even if it hath the landmarks of the fathers upon it. Give us a little originality of thought, shake off the yoke of mental bondage, and be a man—an intelligent, thinking man. You owe this to yourself, to the author of your being, and to the cause of mental progress and mental liberty. —Chris. Tet.

Extravagance in Dress.

The Philadelphia Ledger has an article on this subject very much to the point. It says, "A fashionable dry goods dealer advertises a lace scarf, worth fifteen hundred dollars. — Another has a bridal dress for which he asks twelve hundred dollars. Bonnets at two hundred dollars are not unfrequently sold. Cashmeres for three hundred dollars and upwards are seen by dozens in a walk along Broadway. A hundred is quite a common price for a silk gown. In a word, extravagance in dress has reached a height which would have "frightened our prudent grandmothers, and appalled their husbands. A fashionable lady spends annually on her milliner, mantua-maker and lace dealer, a sum that would have supported an entire household, even in her own rank of life, in the days of Mrs. Washington. A thousand dollars a year is considered, we are told, quite a narrow income for such purposes, among those pretending to be "in society," in some of our cities. Add to this the expenditure for opera tickets, for a trip to the Springs, and for a score of little inevitable et ceteras, and the reader will get some idea of the comparatively wanton waste of money, carried on year after year, by thousands, if not tens of thousands, of American women."

The Ledger continues: "Do these human butterflies improve their intellect, enlarge their culture, or elevate their characters by this spendthrift system! On the contrary, they deteriorate all. Do they bestow additional happiness on their husbands and fathers? The very reverse; for to sustain these extravagances, the father or husband, as the case may be, toils late and early, consumes his health, and often is driven into wild speculations that end in utter ruin. Do they win the approval of the other sex? Never was the esteem of any worthy man secured by a costly, reckless style of dress. All that this perilous extravagance effects, is to gratify a miserable, personal vanity. The fostering of one of the most petty of human vices is the only result of these spendthrift habits. Mrs. Potiphar plumes herself on having outshone her rival in laces, at some grand soiree, or in having worn more jewels; and that is the single, barren harvest which she reaps by an expenditure of thousands. Can the pampering of such vanity benefit her or others? Alas! the women who live for such triumphs as these, whose whole souls are given to diamonds and dress, are little fitted to be wives or mothers, or educators of children. When the Roman matrons sunk to a similar condition, Rome began, from that hour, to decline.

"Fortunately for our country, however, such painted triflers form but a small minority of the women of America. Unfortunately, however, their influence on society is greater than

their numbers, for to their extravagance and vanity is united a presumption, which asserts for themselves socially a superiority over the rest of their country-women; and this superiority, so undeserved, is conceded to them, partly because of their claim to it, and partly because of their apparent wealth. They are thus enabled practically to give a tone to society at large. In city circles less ostentatious, in country villages, and even in western farm houses, their extravagance and vanity is copied, till in half the families in the land, females spend upon their dress more than they can afford. With too many, happily we need not say with all, adorning the person takes the place of mental culture. To be showily dressed, is often considered of more moment than to be graceful, amiable and intelligent. Where will all this end? If this continues for another generation, where will we be?"—Boston Herald.

The Samaritans.

Mr. E. T. Rogers, H. B. M., Vice-Consul at Caiffa, in Palestine, writes; "The exact number of the Samaritan community in Nablous, (that is, the Nablous district,) is 195, including men, women and children. They are thus far diminished and impoverished by many unfortunate circumstances—namely, first by oppression, by fines, imprisonment, and even, in some cases, by persecution unto death from the Mohammedans of Nablous. Secondly, by their unexpected intermarriages; and thirdly, by the famine so severely felt in the year 1853. Having been obliged to sell or pledge many valuables belonging to their place of worship, they at last determined to send a messenger to England for the collection of alms; and intrusted Jacob esh Shelalz with two petitions, one addressed to Her Majesty and the other to the British public. In answer to the former, the Government has been pleased to instruct Mr. Consul Finn, of Jerusalem, to interfere to prevent any future persecution, and who (according to the further tenor of his instructions,) has made a grant of £50 towards their relief. Upon the question being mooted by the Earl of Shaftesbury as to the amount required for the assistance of this, community, their agent, Jacob esh Shelalz, said that he had not been commissioned to collect any definite sum, but thought that about £600 would be sufficient to meet their present emergencies, though £2,000 would not restore them to their former state. Were it not for the extreme reverence attached by the Samaritans to their books, especially to the unique Pentateuch, they need not, be in so much poverty; for travellers have offered enormous sums for very small MSS. in the Samaritan character. These books are, however, jealously kept by the community, and it is only by very great favor and influence that I have been able from time to time to purchase a few for Mr. Consul Finn, for the British Museum. The MS. roll of the law alluded to, is preserved with the most religious care—is only taken out of its case twice a year, on certain holy festivals; after which it is returned to its case with many coverings. The Samaritans believe that this MS. was written by Abishai, the grandson of Eleazar, the High Priest, who was one of the sons of Aaron. It is a remarkable fact that the priesthood, which is strictly hereditary, is likely to become extinct, seeing that the present priest, Amran, has no children. Should that contingency happen, the community must either—according to the confident hope expressed by Bishop Gobat—embrace the Christian faith, * or they will after an uninterrupted worship of nearly 4,000 years, be at last left without a sacrifice, as the Jews are at the present day. The fact of the continued sacrifices amongst the Samaritans has been denied; but I have been an eye-witness to their passover sacrifice on mount Gerizim, which was in strict conformance with the law of Moses. # It was to me one of the most interesting scenes connected with Biblical history."

* An impossible thing under existing circumstances. They might embrace Protestantism or Popery, or some other heresy in their country; but not the Christian faith, for that is beyond their reach. —Editor.

That cannot be; for that law requires the Passover to be observed in the place Jehovah should choose for his name: that place was Jerusalem, and not on Mount Gerizim. —Editor.

Pleasures of Contentment.

I have a rich neighbor that is always so busy that he has no leisure to laugh; the whole business of his life is to get money, and more money, that he may still get more and more money. He is still drudging on, saying what Solomon says, "The diligent hand maketh rich." And it is true, indeed; but he considers not that it is not in the power of riches to make a man happy; for it was wisely said by a man of great observation, "that there be as many miseries beyond riches as on this side of them." And yet Heaven deliver us from pinching poverty, and grant that, having a competency, we may be content and thankful. Let us not repine, or so much as think the gifts of God unequally dealt, if we see another abound with riches, when, as God knows, the cares that are the keys that keep those riches hang often so heavily at the rich man's girdle, that they clog him with weary days and restless nights, even when others sleep quietly. We see but the outside of the rich man's happiness; few consider him to be like the silkworm, that, when she seems to play, is at the same time spinning her own bowels, and consuming herself. And this many rich men do, loading themselves with corroding cares to keep what they have already got. Let us, therefore, be thankful for health and competency, and above all for a quiet conscience. —Izaak Walton.

Has Man an Immortal Soul?

The doctrine of the immortality of the soul has been taught and believed for ages. It has universally obtained assent: —Protestant, Catholic, Mahomedan, Jew, and Pagan, have all given in their adherence to the doctrine, and made it a prominent feature of their religious belief. Philosophers maintain that the light of nature alone is sufficient to prove the immortality of the soul; while ministers of religion (the religious guides of the people) teach that it has been revealed to man in the Divine record. And poets, taking that for truth which is sanctioned by the philosophy and religion of the age, have interwoven the doctrine in their verse, and with rapture have sung of the godlike character of man as imparted by it. One of them (Montgomery) has expressed the sentiment beautifully and emphatically in the following stanza: —

" The sun is but a spark of fire,
A transient meteor in the sky,
The soul immortal as its sire,
Shall never die."

All this may be very pleasing to the fancy, and very congenial to the pride of man's unregenerate nature, —but is it true? Is man possessed of this inherent immortality? We know of no way to decide this point except by an appeal to the Scriptures. They alone can safely direct in this matter; and their decision must be final.

In the investigation of this subject we shall endeavour to write so as to be easily understood. We shall not inquire at the shrine of philosophy, nor make Socrates or Plato our standard of appeal. The Bible alone is our text book, and by its decision we shall abide.

1. We would remark, in the first place, that there is presumptive evidence to believe that man is not possessed of an immortal soul, from the fact, that nowhere in the Bible,

from the first chapter of Genesis to the last of Revelations, is the word immortal prefixed to the word soul, or in any way connected with it. Yet from the universal belief on this point, we should suppose it could be found on every page. Is it not strange that in the absence of such a term in God's book, that it should continually be made use of by those who profess to be God's ministers?

2. Further, the word immortal is found only once in the Scriptures, and then it is applied to God. The following is the passage—"Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory forever and ever," 1 Tim. i. 17. The word immortality occurs only five times, and is never used by inspired men in connection with soul. The word is found in the following quotations: "Who will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who, by patient continuance in well-doing, SEEK for glory, honor, and immortality, eternal life," Rom. ii. 6-7. The word here translated immortality in the original is *aphtharsian*, rendered in other places incorruption; hence it ought to be so in this passage. However, it matters little which word we take, for if a man attain to incorruptibility, he will necessarily be immortal. But mark this, the apostle Paul makes the obtaining of eternal life, to depend upon the seeking for immortality by persevering in well-doing. Now, it would be absolute folly to seek for that which we possess inherently. For what a man has, why does he yet seek for? Therefore, we infer from this doctrine of the apostle that man has not an immortal soul. In 1 Cor. xv. 53, 54, we read, — "This mortal must put on immortality," etc. The word immortality occurs twice in these two verses. But it refers to the body, not the soul. By examining the whole chapter the reader will find that the writer was proving that there should be a resurrection of the dead—a change from a state of corruption to a state of incorruption; from dishonor to glory; from weakness to power. He makes no mention of the soul whatever, in connection with immortality—it is the body of the sleeping saint he writes about. 1 Tim. i. 17—"Who ONLY hath immortality." This is applied to the invisible God; who is in reality the only immortal spirit in the universe. Where, then, are the immortal souls spoken of by the priests of religion? It would seem nowhere. 2 Tim. i. 16—"And hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." Here also the word is incorruptibility according to the Greek text. The Gospel is the grand medium by which this immortality is made known, and through which it is to be obtained.

We have now quoted every passage in which the word immortality occurs, and have found nothing to support the popular theory, but rather positive evidence to the contrary. Now, where will the advocates of immortal soulism get evidence to support their doctrine? Direct testimony there is none. The Bible is silent on the subject, so far as we have examined. Let us look a little further.

3. Does the creation of man furnish any proof that he has an immortal soul? Let us examine. In Job xxxiii. 4, it is said, "The Spirit of God hath made me, and the breath of the Almighty hath given me life;" and Moses, in his account of the formation of man, says—"And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul," Gen. ii. 7. Mark this, "A LIVING soul"—not an immortal one. And what is this breath of life which makes a man of organized clay into a living soul? It is nothing more nor less than atmospheric air as it exists around us. We prove this every day by our experience and observation. If inhaling this breath or air confers immortality on man, then it does also on all animals that breathe it; for they are also called "living souls." See margin of

Gen. i. 20, 30. There is no difference between man and animals as to their origin, and the modus operandi of sustaining life. Hear what the wisest of men has written—"As the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath; so that a man hath no pre-eminence (in this respect) above a beast: all go unto one place: all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again," Eccles. iii. 19, 20. And Job also asserts the same doctrine—"If God sets his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath; all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again into dust," Job. xxxiv. 14, 15. These passages afford no proof for the immortality of man.

4. Can we find anything connected with the fall and condemnation of man to favor immortal soulism? We think not. Man was placed at the head of creation, but under law to his Maker. That law he disobeyed, and incurred its penalty. The law was this—"Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," Gen. ii. 16, 17. The tempter came and said, "Ye shall not surely die." iii. 4; unbelief was engendered; the fruit was partaken of, and thus the law was broken. Then followed the sentence of condemnation—"In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; for out of it wast thou taken; for dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return," v. 19. This sentence resolves Adam, the living soul, back to his kindred dust. "The wages of sin is death;" "the soul that sinneth, it shall die." This is the law of Jehovah.

But says an objector, "it is the body only that is spoken of here." Produce your authority, sir. God said it of the living soul which he had made—"THOU (Adam) shalt surely die." Your doctrine inculcates that the mind, soul, or spirit is the real person—the jewel within the casket—and that it can exist without the body. If so, then it was the soul of Adam which was addressed. You say, the mind is immaterial, and therefore immortal; now that which is immortal cannot die; but you make God to say that it shall surely die. No, it was Adam, as a person—composed of body, soul, and spirit—who was to be deprived of existence, and to mingle ultimately with the dust from which he was taken. "The dust shall return to the earth as it was, and the spirit (or breath of life) to God who gave it," Eccles. xii. 7. The Psalmist, referring to the end of man, says—"His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish" Psa. cxlvi. 4. Ponder this passage, ye believers in immortal souls! for if man's thoughts perish, there surely is not, cannot be immortal existence.

But there is another point worthy of notice. There was a tree in Eden called "the tree of life." This tree it appears had the property of imparting immortality. Hear what the Lord Elohim says—"And now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever. So he drove out the man," Gen. iii. 22. Adam had eaten of one tree, which was to him the tree of death—but had not partaken of the life-giving tree. If Adam had immortality there was no need for this tree, or of guarding the way to it, in order to prevent him from becoming immortal in his rebellion against God. Hence man was shut out from eternal life; and would have become extinct as though he had never been, unless God had offered life through Jesus Christ.

Let us now recapitulate. We have seen that the terms immortal soul and immortality of the soul were unknown to the sacred writers—that the words immortal and immortality occur only four times in the Bible, and are applied to God and the resurrected bodies of the saints—that the creation of man affords no evidence of his immortality—that his sentence of condemnation proves his mortality and that his expulsion from Eden in which was the tree of

life, secured the full execution of the sentence, and cut off all hope of his living forever. Thus, so far as we have examined, no evidence has been found to prove that man has an immortal soul.

There is another class of Scripture passages which we propose to bring forward, which will conclusively prove that "Eternal Life is the GIFT of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord."—Gospel Banner.

The Strength of Popery in North America.

Says a Catholic writer: —"Whoever undervalues the spiritual power of the Church; in the United States, wanders in a fearful labyrinth. We have not only seven archbishops, thirty-three bishops, and seventeen hundred and four priests, all in the service of the Pope and Church, but we have also thirty-one colleges, thirty-seven seminaries, and a hundred and seventeen female academies, all founded by the Jesuits, bringing danger and death to unbelief and misbelief to American Know Nothingism and un-American Radicalism.

"And the hierarchical bands, which, like a golden thread, surround forty-one dioceses and two apostolic vicariates, and stretches from the Atlantic Ocean to the Pacific, and maintains an invisible, secret, magnetic connection with Rome—this hierarchy is to us a sure guarantee that the Church, perhaps after severe struggles and suffering, will one day come off victorious over all the sects of America. It is computed that there are at present more than two millions of Catholic inhabitants in the United States, who are baptized and confirmed Catholic soldiers of the Lord, and who, at the first summons, will assemble in rank and file; then will men not undervalue the power of the Catholic Church in the United States."

The Restoration of Israel.

Ye people of Israel remember the days,
When God for your fathers so wondrously wrought;
He still is a God who His glory displays,
And gladness shall yet to his people be brought

Divided and peel'd as a people are ye:
The darkness of night is the noon of your day:
But gladsome and glorious your gathering shall be,
And sorrow and sighing shall far away flee.

Already the Highest outstretches his hand,
Already He calls from the height of the Heaven:
"Ye captives of Israel, return to your land,
"The land which to you by my cov'nant is given.

"O why are ye slow to possess it again;
"For your's never land of the stranger must be?
"Am I not Eternal, your cause to maintain,
"And bring you again from the deeps of the sea?"

The sign of the highest is red in the sky,
And pestilence and war go before Him, and burn;
But freedom shall be, and salvation is nigh,
Return, O ye captives of Israel, return!

"THE PROTESTANT FAITH." —One of our Church contemporaries, we observe, uses the preposterous phrase, Protestant faith. We had hoped that Catholic Churchmen were discarding such absurdities. How, in the name of common sense, is it possible that there can be such a thing as Protestant faith? Why, faith is a positive thing; but Protestant is a negative, —it is to deny a doctrine, not to affirm it; to protest against it, not to profess it. The term, therefore, is merely one of negation. If one says he is a Protestant, he means he is not a Romanist; but he may be a Socinian, a Mormon, a Jew, for they are not Romanists. All the Sects, Socinians and Mormons included, unite in protesting against not only Popery, but Episcopacy, and therefore are all Protestant. But a faith must be something that is believed in, not something that is protested against. And so of the Christian religion. It is quite absurd to speak of it as the Protestant religion, since a religion must of course be distinguished, not by what it renounces, but by what it professes. Surely it is better to be right than wrong in such expressions. —Churchman.

AN ARAB PROVERB says: By six qualities may a fool be known—Anger without cause, speech without profit, change without motive, inquiry without an object, putting trust in a stranger, and wanting capacity to discriminate between friend and foe.
