

HERALD
OF THE
KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.

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

JOHN THOMAS, Editor. NEW YORK, AUGUST, 1857
Volume 7—No. 8.

The Gospel in Macedonia.

“The Jailor and other untaught Gentiles heard, believed, and obeyed the Gospel in the short time of an hour. Therefore, a correct understanding of the Gospel must have been obtained by them in that brief space of time.”—Proph. Expositor, p. 104.

Luke informs us in Acts xvi. that in a vision Paul had, there stood before him a man of Macedonia, who entreated him to come over to that country, and help them. This was regarded by Paul and his companions as a vision from the Lord, calling upon them to announce the glad tidings (*εὐαγγελισασθαί euaggeliassthai*) in Macedonia. They had essayed to "preach the Word" to the idolators in the provinces of Anatolia, called Asia and Bithynia, but had been forbidden by the Holy Spirit. The cause of this interdict is not stated. The province of Asia contained the seven apocalyptic churches which were, doubtless, already existing there; (Acts ii.9) and Bithynia, also, was not destitute of the truth. But the time and circumstances were not yet quite appropriate for the annunciation of "The Fellowship of the Mystery" among them; importing "that the Gentiles (or pagans) should be fellow heirs (of the kingdom with the saints of Israel), and of the same body (that is, of the 'One Body'), and partakers of God's promise concerning the Anointed (*εν το Χριστώ, en to Christo*) through the glad tidings." Having proclaimed the Christian fellowship of Jew and Gentile in the Syrian Antioch, Seleucia, Cyprus, Perga, Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, Derbe, and Attalia, they were directed to visit the country west of Constantinople, and north of the Ægean Sea, where, it is probable, Christian-Jewish prejudices were not so strong as in Asia and Bithynia.

In the region of country indicated, and not far from the sea, stood the City of Philippi, so called after Philip, King of Macedon, and father of Alexander the Great, "the great horn of the rough goat" of Dan. viii. 21. This region was Macedonia Prima, and Philippi was a Roman colony; so that the Philippians, though Macedonian born, were Roman citizens as they declared. — Verse 21.

In his letter to the Philippians, Paul styles his labors among them, at this time, "the beginning of the Gospel" (ch. iv., 15), that is, that the glad tidings of the Fellowship began to be proclaimed to the "untaught Gentiles," of Macedonia when he responded to the prayer, "Come over to Macedonia and help us!" Now, Macedonia contained many cities, among which were Amphipolis, Apollonia, Thessalonica, and Berea. All these Paul visited as well as

Philippi, announcing in one the same glad tidings as in all the rest. No one, we presume, will dispute this. Thus, when he visited Thessalonica, he gave them to understand that he was the bearer of an invitation to them from the living and true God of Israel, who had commanded him to invite them to his kingdom and glory. (1Thess. ii. 12.) Many of the idolatrous Macedonians there accepted the invitation joyfully (1 Thess. i. 6.) when they discovered that it was genuine—that it was no fiction, but a word sent to them from heaven, and therefore styled "the Word of God," in deed and in truth, being confirmed by the power of God. (1 Thess. i. 5.) This created in them a hope which was the "one hope of the calling " or invitation; so that he could address them as he could not address their idolatrous friends, saying, "be not as the others, who have no hope."

The hope formed in them by the apostle's preaching looked forward to the coming of the day of the Lord in which Jesus should re-appear upon the earth. But so well had he instructed them, that they did not expect that day to arrive until there had first been an APOSTASY FROM THE FAITH, acuminating in a power styled "the Man of Sin," whose revelation would be preceded by the removal of the power then existing. "Remember ye not" says he, "that when I was yet with you, I told you these things? And what withholds now for his being revealed in his appointed time, ye know." Yea, so conspicuous a place had these things in his preaching, that an outcry was soon raised against him, accusing him, in the city of the Philippian jailer, of "teaching precepts which were not lawful for them to receive, neither to observe, being Romans;" and in Thessalonica, of "doing contrary to the decrees of Caesar, saying there is another king—one Jesus."

Referring to "the beginning of the Gospel," the apostle says to the Thessalonians, "God hath from the beginning chosen you for deliverance by a separation of spirit and belief of truth; for which (*εις δ, sc. σωτηριον*, salvation) he called you through our glad tidings for the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ." (2 Thess. ii. 13, 14.) In this he tells them, that by a separation of spirit and faith, that is, by a holy disposition created in them through the truth believed, (Col. iii. 10.) they had been chosen of God for deliverance from the wrath to come upon those who know not God, and hearken not to the glad tidings of the Lord Jesus Christ, and for sharing with him in the things covered by the phrase, "his kingdom and glory." They were separated or sanctified by faith, and "called," or invited, to their high destiny through the glad tidings they believed. The sanctification of spirit, or heart-purification, referred to by Paul, was "righteousness, and peace, and joy, in the Holy Spirit," resulting from belief of the glad tidings of the kingdom; wherefore he saith, that "the kingdom of God is not meat and drink," that is, the doctrine concerning it does not teach believers to concern themselves about distinctions of meats and drinks, saying, "touch not, taste not, handle not;" but it inculcates and develops in them who embrace it with honest and good hearts, righteousness, and peace, and joy in a Holy Spirit. This fruit of faith is the "Divine Nature" and essentially diverse from the nature common to pagans and all others ignorant of the truth. It is only produceable by "the exceeding great and precious promises believed." Belief that Jesus is the Son of God, in the modern Gentile sense, neither hath nor will produce it. The fruit of this believed is not righteousness, peace, and joy in a holy spirit; but, on the contrary, resistance to the righteousness of God, doubts and fears, and despondency in a faithless, perverse, and sordid spirit. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

Having indoctrinated the Macedonians in Thessalonica with the glad tidings he announced to them, in writing to them he informs the reader, that they "received the word with joy of a holy spirit;" and that in consequence they "turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God; and to wait for his Son from the heavens, whom he raised from among

the dead, even Jesus delivering us from the wrath to come." Before Paul went over to help them, they knew nothing about the God, and the Son of the God, and the kingdom and glory of that God, whom Paul preached; they knew not that there was any wrath to come upon the world, nor of any deliverance from it through a resurrected man, coming from the heavens; nor did they know that those delivered from it would share in the glory and dominion of the Deliverer. Will any reasonable man, then, pretend to impose upon us the notion, that all that was submitted to these "untaught Gentiles," to turn them from their vanities, was that a certain Jew, who had been crucified as a malefactor about 1100 miles off, was the son of the God of the Jews, and raised from the dead by his power? What moral power is there in such a statement as this to cause a Macedonian idolator to cast his idols to the moles and the bats? None. It had no more power to produce this result than it now has to cause papists to turn from their image worship, and the adoration of dead men's bones; or sectarian devotees to renounce the systems of foolishness and impiety they profess. It is evident from the nature of the case, that the first thing Paul essayed to do was to reason the Macedonians out of their idolatry, as he did the Athenians; then to acquaint them with the living and true God; after that to announce to them the purpose of God, or "secret of his will which he had purposed in himself according to his own good pleasure;" then, that "one Jesus" was he by whom he intended to execute that purpose, whereof he had given assurance in raising him from the dead; that he was to return from the heavens to perform the work assigned him; and lastly, that whosoever believed these things, and became obedient, should receive repentance and forgiveness of sins, and a right to eternal glory in the kingdom, "through His name." To instruct them in these things, was for Paul to fulfil his mission, which was, "to open their eyes, to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they might receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them (of Judah) who are sanctified by faith that leads into Jesus," εἰς ε ε. The Macedonians were in darkness, and in Satan's power, and unable to help themselves. They were "Gentiles in the flesh," whose moral destitution is well described by the apostle who went over to help them. "At that time," says he, "ye were without Christ, being aliens from the Commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of the promise, having no hope, and atheists (ἀθεοί, atheoi) in the world;"—"walking in the vanity of your mind, having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that was in you, because of the blindness of your heart." But from this state they were happily delivered by Paul's preaching; so that he could say to them, "Ye who were formerly afar off are now in the anointed Jesus, made nigh by the blood of the anointed one." They were "made nigh" by the blood of the anointed one; that is, instead of being "aliens from Israel's commonwealth, and strangers from the covenants of the promise," they had become "fellow-citizens of the saints (of Israel), and of the household of God;" instead of "having no hope," they hoped in the kingdom and glory of God, of which they were invited to become "HEIRS" by the preaching of Paul; and instead of being "without Christ," and "atheists," they were "IN the anointed Jesus," and worshipers of his Father, the God of the Jews, for the return of whose Son from the heavens they were patiently waiting. (2 Thess. iii. 5.) These originally "untaught," but now instructed, "Gentiles" had become "light in the Lord;" "the sons of God without rebuke, shining as lights in the world;" "children of light and of the day," and "not of the night, nor of darkness;" (1 Thess. v. 5.) invested with "the armor of light;" so that, "the eyes of their understanding being enlightened," the apostle could now say to them, "Ye are all the sons of God in the anointed Jesus through the faith: because as many as are baptised into the Anointed have put on the Anointed: and if ye be the Anointed's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

What soul-stirring tidings must they have been which constituted the subject matter of Paul's preaching and that could have effected so wonderful a change on the understandings, affections, and conduct of the idolators of Macedonia Prima, and of "untaught Gentiles" in sundry other places! In what did the power of his preaching consist? In the teaching of God, called "the truth in Jesus"—"the light of the glad tidings of the glory of the Anointed, who is the image of God"—εναγγελιον της δοξηξ του Χριστου. "Of his own will," says James, "the Father of lights begat us by the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures," of whom it is written in the prophets, "They shall be all taught of God. Every man, therefore, that hath heard and learned of the Father," says Jesus, "cometh unto me." Paul, as God's messenger, taught the word of God, which he did not handle deceitfully; "but, by manifestation of the truth, commended himself to every man's conscience in the sight of God." (2 Cor. iv. 2-4; 1 Cor. iii. 4-5; Eph. i. 5.) This was the secret of his power—his doctrine was God's teaching, confirmed by God's power, through the mighty deeds with which he astonished the world. Who need wonder at the results with such an instrumentality? "We," said Paul, "are ambassadors in the Anointed's stead (ὕπεξ Χριστου), as if God did invite you by us;" which invitation was expressed in the glad tidings of the kingdom and glory he preached. The joyous character of the tidings miraculously confirmed, commended them to the hearts of the people, and kindled a joyousness in them, that energized them to accept the divine invitation in the face of ruin, imprisonment, torture, and death; so that, in writing to the Macedonians, he says, "Ye became followers of us and of the Lord, having received the word in much affliction with joy of a holy spirit."

But, in opening the eyes of Macedonian Jews his method was somewhat different. He had not to turn them from idols, nor to bring them to wait for the Son of Israel's God; nor yet to instruct them in the purpose of God to rule the habitable in righteousness by him, for they were not idolaters; and they were waiting for the appearing of the Son promised them in Isaiah ix. 6, 7; and were fully in the belief of his sitting upon the throne of his father David, and reigning over Israel and the nations for ever. All that was necessary in their case was to convince them that Jesus was that Son of David and of God, Jehovah had covenanted to resurrect for them in the house of David. (2 Chron. xvii. 11-14; Acts ii. 30.) Thus in his preaching to "the Jews he became as a Jew, that he might gain the Jews;" in other words, "to them that are under the law, he became as under the law, that he might gain them that are under the law." If he had gone to the Macedonian idolators "as a Jew," he would not have gained them; he therefore went to them as a Roman, which is evident from his reply to the magistrates at Philippi, saying, "They have beaten us openly uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast us into prison, and now do they thrust us out privily? Nay, verily; but let them come themselves and fetch us out." Now, Romans were not under the Law of Moses; so that in relation to that law they were "without law;" therefore in approaching the Romans as a Roman citizen, he says, that "to them without law, he became as without law, that he might gain them that are without law." He addressed the Greeks, Romans and barbarians, as an ambassador, sent to them direct from a God whom they knew not, but who had made the universe, and continued to uphold all things by his power. It was not necessary for such a person to do more before such an audience, ignorant of all things pertaining to the God, prophets, and hope, of the Jews, than to state the truth confirmed by divine power, and to persuade them to receive it. Thus, as he says, "My word and my preaching was by indubitable proof of Spirit and power, that your faith might not stand in men's wisdom, but in God's power." And again, "Our glad tidings came not to you in word only, but also in power, and in holy spirit, and in much assurance." This course, however, would not answer with believers in the prophets. He could not approach Jews as a Gentile citizen of Rome, and expect them to believe on authority without appeal to the prophets. Idolators might be built upon apostles, but

a Jew required to be built upon the prophets; for they would receive no testimony of apostles, though confirmed by miracle, unless it could be shown to be in accordance with the Oracles of God, read in their synagogues every sabbath day. When, therefore, idolators built upon the apostles, testifying the same things as the prophets, and Jews built upon the prophets illustrated by the apostles, came together into the "one body," Paul could say to them, "Ye are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets. Jesus the Anointed himself being the chief corner stone." They were all, both Jews and Gentiles, brought to acquiesce joyously in the "One Faith;" the method only of bringing them to that acquiescence so as to prepare them for the "One Baptism," differed.

The reader, then, will readily perceive that the apostolic preaching was very much simplified in regard to the Jews. All that was necessary was to show them what their prophets taught, and then to prove that to a certain extent their predictions were accomplished in Jesus, as an earnest, that what remained would be fulfilled in and by him likewise. This was the course pursued by Paul in Thessalonica. He went into their synagogue, and reasoned with them out of the Scriptures of the prophets, opening and alleging, firstly, that the Messiah they were looking for must needs have suffered, and secondly, that he must needs stand up from among the dead. These were among the first things (εν πρώτοις, 1 Cor. xv. 3), he delivered to the Jews; how that their Messiah was to die for their sins, according to the prophets; be buried, or "make his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death," and arise on the third day, according to the scriptures. If he could convince them of these things, their minds were then prepared for his third proposition, which was, "that this is the Messiah, even Jesus, whom I announce to you."

They err greatly who imagine that one method of preaching "the glad tidings of the glory of Christ," would have been suitable for idol-worshippers, and the members, of the synagogue. The proposition, that "Jesus is the Anointed, the Son of the living God," would have been meaningless and unintelligible to idolators. To have comprehended it they must have been made previously acquainted with the existence of that living God, and with the doctrine concerning the Anointed One. And this the apostle set himself to do in laying before them the glad tidings of the kingdom, as exhibited in the revelation of his will, which God had purposed to himself. When they came to understand this part of the subject, they would very naturally desire to know, Who should be the King by whom the world should be ruled in righteousness, when the appointed time for the manifestation of the divine purpose should arrive? Paul told them that it was a certain Jew, named Jesus, who was dead, but came to life again, and is alive for evermore, who is to be king of the whole earth. This answer to the question very naturally prompted another, namely, "If the Jesus he proclaimed were to be king of all nations, what would become of Caesar's throne?" Nor did Paul hesitate to answer this inquiry, as we have seen in the second epistle to the Macedonians of Thessalonica. "He shall be taken out of the way," and then a power, embodying the Mystery of Iniquity already working, shall take his place, which shall also be utterly abolished by the manifestation of the Lord's presence from the heavens." Such questions and answers as these created a great stir among the multitude, many of whom renounced their idols, and declared themselves, not only willing, but earnestly desirous to become heirs of that kingdom and glory, that they might reign with Jesus when he should receive the dominion, glory, and kingdom at his return from the right hand of power. But the Jews who rejected the claims of Jesus to the Davidian throne of universal empire on earth, were moved with envy at this revolution in the pagan mind, and determined to put a stop to it, if possible. They excited the lowest of the people against Paul and his friends, both in Thessalonica and Berea. As Paul was preaching politics, which had been forbidden by the emperor, they assailed him as a transgressor of the imperial decrees,

saying, that there is another king than Caesar, one Jesus. The same outcry was raised in Philippi with the same result—proclaiming principles unlawful for loyal Romans to receive and do, and thereby exceedingly troubling the cities of Macedonia Prima.

Philippi, Thessalonica, Berea, &c, were thrown into an uproar by Paul's preaching the glad tidings of the glory and kingdom of God. Let not this fact be overlooked. Was it done by a sixty minutes' discourse, the burden of which was that Jesus, whom perhaps no Macedonian pagan had ever heard of before, was the Son of the unknown God of the despised Jews, and sacrificed for sin? What would they have thought of the doctrine that the blood of a murdered Jew, in some mysterious way, was to save them from wrath to come, of which they knew nothing? Instead of such preaching as this (of which the world has a surfeiting in these superficial times) exceedingly troubling cities, and turning the community upside down, the apostles would not have obtained a second hearing. No; they might have preached the divine sonship of Jesus in the modern Gentile sense of it, not for an hour only, but until this day, and have never made a Christian, or agitated a single family. That Jesus is the Son of the God of Israel, and not the Son of Mary's husband, is most true, and a very important truth in its proper place; it is a genealogical truth upon which all his claims are founded; but in the Gentile sense of it, there is no good news in it. His blood cleansed from all sin; true, but what then? If that be all it leaves without hope, and the future is a blank. Such a Gospel never came from heaven to Jew, Macedonian, or Italian, or to any other Gentile family of man.

Paul's preaching was the same in all the cities of Macedonia. It planted the same hope in the hearts of the people at Philippi, as at Thessalonica. Here it taught them to turn from idols to serve the God of Israel, and to wait for his Son from the heavens, when they should receive the kingdom of God, for which they suffered persecution (2 Thess. i. 5.); there, it taught them to be like-minded with the apostle in pressing toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God by the anointed Jesus. This "mark" was the resurrection that Paul desired by any means to attain to, because the prize could not be obtained until that mark were reached. The prize was the subject of the glad tidings he preached to them. It was for the obtaining of this prize that they entered the lists by being "baptized, that they might from that time start in the race, and press onward to the goal. Did they begin to run without knowing what they were running for? No indeed. When men, as in Paul's day, entered upon a race which exposed to torment, imprisonment, and death, they were very careful to know what they were to gain by the risks they encountered. "I so run, not so uncertainly," saith the apostle, "so run, that ye may obtain:" obtain what? That which God sent Jesus to invite men to in the glad tidings of the kingdom which he preached, and therefore styled "the high calling of God by the anointed Jesus." An everlasting kingdom is the prize set before us as "untaught Gentiles," connected with which are glory, honor, riches, and life eternal. Hence, James says to them who are taught of God, "he has chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith, as heirs of the kingdom which he has promised to them that love him;" and Jesus saith, "Fear not, little flock, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom," and when they that love him stand in his presence after rising from the dead, he saith to them, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, possess the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the State." Were these blessed ones baptized in ignorance of the kingdom and glory they were called to? In darkness plunged into water, not dreaming that the God of Israel purposed to set up a glorious kingdom in Palestine for Jesus and his brethren, which was to rule over all? Was their faith so meagre, so death-stricken in its birth, that it could only faintly whisper an assent to a leading question about the genealogy of Jesus, before they descended into water? Were their eyes so blind that they could see nothing in the future? No, no; before they were baptized they took care to know what they were baptized for. They were baptized that they might become Abraham's

seed, and heirs according to the promise, which they understood and believed with joyous and faithful hearts. Hence, the apostle could write to the Roman citizens of Philippi, who believed, and the jailor and his house among their number, saying, "Brethren, be followers together of me and mark them who walk, so as ye have, Paul and Timotheus, servants of Jesus Christ, for an example, for our citizenship begins in the heavens; out of which also we earnestly expect the Saviour, the anointed Lord Jesus; who shall transform the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of his glory, through the power whereby he is able to subdue all things to himself." And afterwards he adds, "Those things which ye have both learned, and received, and heard, and seen with me, do." This covered the whole ground of his teaching, which was effective to their illumination as lights in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation.

EDITOR.

Sept. 1, 1855.

Open Council.

IN THIS DEPARTMENT OF THE HERALD ALL THAT IS PRINTED IS NOT THEREFORE APPROVED. THE EDITOR IS ONLY RESPONSIBLE FOR WHAT APPEARS OVER HIS OWN SIGNATURE.

"The Four Great Kings of Babylon."

[Abridged by J. R. Lithgow, from the "Light of Prophecy," by Thomas Lumsden Strange, London, 1852.]

"The visions recorded in the book of Daniel of the great image exhibited to Nebuchadnezzar, and of the four great beasts shown to the prophet, have evident relation to one and the same subject. The image was composed of four parts, each figuring a kingdom; and the beasts also were four in number, and were significant of four kings; and both the image and the beasts were seen to come to a common end. The image was broken to pieces, and ground to dust, by a stone cut out without hands, and which 'became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth,' denoting, as we are told, 'a kingdom' which 'the God of heaven' should 'set up,' and which should 'never be destroyed,' but should 'stand for ever.' This stone, and the dominion thereof, none can doubt, mark the reign of Jesus and of his saints. . . . The beasts of the other vision, in like manner, in line, have 'their dominion taken away,' and in lieu thereof, 'one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, . . . and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom,' &c.

"The visions are thus in each instance of four kingships, which are to be overthrown by Jesus, when he takes to himself his great power and reigns; and as they relate in this manner to similar objects coming to a similar termination at one and the same time, and by the same agency, their identity, one with the other, is made manifest. . . .

"The four parts of the visions are designated, indifferently, kings or kingdoms. 'Thou, O King,' it is said of one of them, 'art a king of kings Thou art this head of gold.' And then the transition is made to kingdoms. 'And after thee' (the individual monarch then addressed) shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee, and another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth. And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron.' So also in the vision of

the beasts. 'These great beasts' it is said, 'which are four, are four kings.' And, again, of 'the fourth beast' it is declared, that it shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth.

"The exigency of the language then requires that there should be FOUR KINGS, and each with his kingdom; and those, we are told, were to be 'diverse one from another.'

"But we learn also that there was to be a unity and indivisibility belonging to them. In the vision of the image, the four parts are built up into one object, which is seen standing in its completeness, thus composed, from the head down to the feet. Each is necessary to the other to form the figure which they all together represent. The head alone could not have constituted it neither the breast and arms; nor the belly and thighs; nor the legs and feet. The presence of all the members was requisite, at one and the same time, to make up the embodied image; and all are in existence together when the blow is struck by the stone cut out without hands; for by that blow, they all fall together. 'Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing floors.'

"The kings could not be amalgamated together. Their individuality must ever, in the nature of things, remain distinct. Their kingdoms, however, could be conjoined together, and the one be made to combine with the other, and the whole might be consolidated into one; and this without forfeiting the distinctiveness, or 'diverseness' of the several portions.

"The vision of the image manifestly calls for such a solution. The component parts whereof are diverse, both as to shape and substance. One is the head, and of gold, another is the breast and the arms, and of silver; a third is the belly and thighs, and of brass; and a fourth is the legs and the feet, and of iron and clay. Each, however, fits on to the other, and in common they constitute, and belong to, one indivisible image.

"The current view taken of the four portions of the visions, is that they represent four distinct and successive empires—the Babylonian, the Persian, the Grecian, and the Roman; and convey thus an account, in outline, of the supremacy exercised on the earth from the times of Nebuchadnezzar to the coming of the Lord Jesus.

"To this there are important objections:

"1st. Though the requirement of the prophecy as to these portions of the visions being four kingdoms would be thereby met, the equally strong one that there should be 'four kings,' and no more than four, would be nullified, in the bringing in of four dynasties, embracing kings.

"2d. The successional order of the kingdoms would be provided, as called for in the prophecy, but the amalgamation and coexistence of the parts, the one with the other, would be wanting. Empires set up, each upon the ruin of that which preceded it, and standing in antagonistic posture without any common center or object upon which to converge, would represent the very opposite of the image of the vision, seen as it is, consolidated and composed of the various parts, all requisite to constitute its whole; and if the one portion had to give way, and to disappear before the other was brought upon the second, the grinding of the whole to dust, by a single crowning act of judgement, in the manner we find the fabric is to be brought to an end, would be impossible. When the feet are struck, the head, and the breast and arms, and the belly and thighs, are all to be present, so that all may fall

simultaneously and be crushed and annihilated together; and in like manner, according to the undoubted exigency of the prophecy, the BABYLONIAN, the Persian, and the Grecian empires should not have passed away, but be subsisting, in their full integrity, at the time when the blow of destruction is struck upon the Roman empire, so that all might be brought down with it in one common overthrow together.

* * * * *

"Four kings are then to be sought for, and the possessor of a kingdom, and yet partakers of one common empire, which each, in his order, serves to construct; so that, in the end, the last monarch may stand as ruler of all that his predecessors may have severally, in turn, produced and added to the common stock. These kings would bring in thus the various materials—the gold, the silver, the brass, and the iron and clay, of which the image is composed, each in his place having served to build it up, and all being in that sense in common headship together.

"Such kings and kingdoms, in effect, there have been, to the extent of three, and the characteristics of the fourth, and the most important one of the whole, are given with an amplitude and plainness that place him also with distinctness before us:

"1. The head of the image, or the first beast.

"In regard to the first king and his kingdom, there can be no room for mistake, as the Scripture has revealed to us that Nebuchadnezzar, the king of Babylon, was the man. 'Thou,' it was told him, 'art this head of gold.' A dynasty was not wanting; but here was no question of one. The individual king, then addressed, supplied in full the first portion of the vision. The long succession of monarchs of the Assyrian line, who had preceded him, from the time of Nimrod onwards, and the four—Evil Merodach, Neriglissor, Laborosoarchad, and Belshazzar, who followed him, had no position in this section of the vision. Nebuchadnezzar singly, and not the Assyrian dynasty, was the sole object thereof. The head was entire in him.

"The subject being an individual personage, individual features, belonging specially to him, and indicative of him, may be expected to characterize it; and such are given.

" 'Thou,' it was said to him, 'O King, art a King of kings; for the God of heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory; and wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field, and the fowls of the heaven, hath he given into thine hand, and made thee ruler over them all. Thou art this head of gold.'

"The symbol of the head of gold is thus found to be significant of the power and glory of Nebuchadnezzar's kingship, exercised over all around him as a king of kings. The metal used in the figure specially indicated the wealth and splendor that attached to his throne. For these, Babylon, the seat thereof, has been celebrated, so as to have been called 'the golden city,' and 'the lady of kingdoms' (Isa. xiv. 4; xlvii. 5); and to Nebuchadnezzar, it appears, she was indebted for her magnificence. 'Is not this,' he could say of her, 'great Babylon, that I have built for the house of the kingdom by the might of my power, and for the honor of my majesty?' —Dan. iv. 30.

"The Scripture uses these figures to be-speak pride of power, and fierceness and swiftness in casting it. —Prov. xix. 12; Amos iii. 8; Ps. vii. 2; Obad. iv. It is as an eagle, 'a great eagle with great wings, long-winged, and full of feathers' (Ezek. xvii., 3), that

Nebuchadnezzar is adverted to in reference to his descent upon Judea. 'Behold, he shall come up like a lion from the swelling of Jordan, against the habitation of the strong Behold, he shall come up, and fly as the eagle, and spread his wings over Bozrah,' &c.—(Jer. xlix., 19, 22).

"Nebuchadnezzar, to fulfil the figure, had so to act. He had to fly swiftly on his prey and to rend so that none should deliver; but, nevertheless, though so powerful to destroy, it was necessary to the position assigned him of 'king of kings,' that he should not remove from their thrones the monarchs over whom he exercised his arms, but should maintain them in their sovereignties, he holding supremacy over them.

"This was just the character of his conquests. He covered the surrounding nations, but did not deprive them of their kings, nor add their countries to his own; but when they rebelled against his authority, he rushed upon them with the swiftness of the eagle, and the power of the lion, and compelled their submission, at times rending them with ungovernable fury.

"It is not now exactly known to what limits the sway of this sovereign extended, save that Judea, Tyre, and Egypt, it is certain, felt the force of his arms, while Nineveh had been destroyed, and Media humbled, in the time of his predecessor, the first who bore his name. These were the surrounding nations, and the greatest of the then known earth, and he held his rule among them in headship, as king of kings, receiving for his individual territories no more than Babylonia, the land of his forefathers. On several occasions he had to put forth his strength to keep their neighbor nations in subjection to him, but he exerted it no further than for the assertion of his empire over them as king of kings, and at no time with the greed of conquest, so as to add their dominions to his own.

* * * * *

"But the power and the pride of Nebuchadnezzar had to meet with a reverse. Mighty as he was, he had to learn that there was one more mighty than himself. Among men, he was placed as king of kings, and no rival mortal was to be exalted over him; but there was the supremacy of the God of heaven, which he had overlooked; and under this he had to be brought to bend. 'When his heart was lifted up, and his mind hardened in pride, he was deposed from his kingly throne, and they took his glory from him: and he was driven from the sons of men, and his heart was made like the beasts, and his dwelling was with the wild asses: they fed him with grass like oxen, and his body was wet with the dew of heaven, till he knew that the Most High God ruled in the kingdom of men, and that he appointeth over it whomsoever he will.'—Dan. v. 20, 21. And after he had received this lesson, thus painfully, the same power that degraded him, restored him to his kingdom. 'At the same time,' as he himself chronicles, 'my reason returned unto me; and for the glory of my kingdom, mine honor and brightness returned unto me; and my counsellors and my lords sought unto me; and I was established in my kingdom, and excellent majesty was added unto me.'—Dan. iv., 36).

"There was a remarkable event in the history of this monarch; and it appears to be shadowed out in the figure of the vision. 'I beheld,' the prophet says, 'till the wings thereof were plucked, and' (or perhaps, 'wherewith' — see marginal reading) 'it was lifted up from the earth, and made to stand upon the feet as a man, and a man's heart was given to it.' The eagle wings, spread out to carry terror and destruction over the world, and which had led him to exalt himself above what was of the earth, were taken from him, and he was made at length

to feel his standing as a mere man—the heart of a man—that he might apprehend that such was his condition, being, in this sense, doubtless given to him.

"The vision is thus marked throughout with strictly personal features, belonging to the individual sovereign to whom the scriptural interpretation confines it. There is the headship over the surrounding kings retained by him (so singularly for a conqueror) upon their thrones, in order that he might be acknowledged by them as king of kings; there is the fierce exertion of his power, put forth like that of the eagle and the lion, crushing and devouring all who ventured to dispute his rule; there is the brilliant magnificence, gathered by him round the seat of his throne, making his a golden headship; and there is his fall, and the striking lesson that this conveyed to him.

"To none other of his line do these particulars belong. Up to the time of Sennacherib, Nineveh was the dominant power, and the rulers of Babylon were in subjection to the Assyrians, and far from being kings of kings. Esarhaddon, the son of Sennacherib, united the two kingdoms into one. He was replaced by his son Nebuchadnezzar the 1st, and during his time the Medians twice invaded the empire, and though they met with repulses on both occasions, the mere act of their aggressions shows that the form and the yoke of the line of Babylon was not yet upon them. Saracus, the son of Nebuchadnezzar the 1st, succeeded to the throne, but was destroyed by Nabopollasar, one of his father's generals, who usurped his kingdom. Nabopollasar turned his arms against Nineveh, and destroyed the city, but it appears that he lacked the strength to accomplish this of himself, and was indebted to the support of Cyaxares, king of Media, who joined him in the expedition; and after this Nabopollasar was himself defeated by the Egyptians, for 'Pharaoh-nechoh, king of Egypt, went up against the king of Assyria to the river Euphrates' (2 Kings xxiii. 29), and gained a victory over him. But at this time the subject of the vision, Nebuchadnezzar the 2d, who was the son of Nabopollasar, appears upon the scene, and the strength of the line becomes immediately manifest, 'and the king of Egypt came not again any more out of his land; for the king of Babylon had taken, from the river of Egypt unto the river Euphrates, all that pertained to the king of Egypt' (2d Kings, xxiv. 1, 7); wresting from him thus what he had torn from the crown of Babylon. On the demise of this king of the vision, his son Evil Merodach succeeded him, but after a short reign of two years was put to death by his subjects. Neriglissor, one of those who had conspired against him, then took the throne, but he held it for no more than four years, when he was slain in battle by Cyrus. His son, Laborosoarchad, followed him, and in nine months he was killed by his subjects. Then came Belshazzar, the grandson of Nebuchadnezzar, and the last of the line, who fell when the city was taken by Cyrus. Not one of these was a 'king of kings;' nor furnished with the wings of conquest; neither did any of them undergo the fall, and reap the lesson, which was brought upon the beast of the visions, when the heart of a man was effectually given unto it. This portion of the vision was, in truth, complete in Nebuchadnezzar. 'Thou' he was told, 'art this head of gold;' and to him, alone, of all his stock, was the figure, in its details, applicable. The dynasty had no part therein.

"The Scripture affords a solution as to the subjects of the vision, only in respect of the first of the four members thereof. The succeeding portions we are left to make application of by other means than that of direct revelation. The nature of the interpretation, as regards the first portion, must obviously be intended to guide us as to the nature of the interpretation to be resorted to in respect of the others. They are all constituents of the same lineage exhibited in the vision, and the members must have also analogy to the head. They are all likewise represented as beasts, and the one beast must partake of the nature of the others. The first member, or beast, cannot be a man, and the others, systems or dynasties, or chains of rulers.

They, too, must be men, if he be one. Things dissimilar in nature could not be built up together to form an incorporate whole. The co-relativeness of the several portions of the visions, and the revealed interpretation given us of the first of these portions, would afford no instruction, and give no aid towards the discovery of the meanings of the succeeding portions, unless the declared constitution of the one should be taken as indicative of the others.

"But we are not left to the consideration of one solitary action of the vision for the ascertainment of a principle of interpretation. This is what may be deemed a fifth subject of the vision, of which it is clear, as of the first, that the application is to an individual personage. This is 'the stone cut out without hands,' which grinds the image into dust, and which the Scripture undeniably shows us in 'the Son of Man,' the Lord Jesus, who overthrows the empire of the beasts, and consigns them to judgement.

"What is thus true of the nature and constitution of the first and the fifth portions of the vision, must be true also of the nature and the constitution of the three portions that intervene between them. The Scripture interpretations furnished of the two, would serve only to perplex and mislead in respect to the others, for which no interpretations are supplied, if these pointed to one description of objects, and those to another.

"There is, however, in truth, an interpretation as regards all the portions of the visions, so far as that it is told us that all are kings. 'These great beasts,' it is explicitly said, 'which are four, are four kings.' Travel out of the number of the kings, and we travel out of the number of the beasts. The first beast, or king, we see was an individual monarch. He, by whom they are all to be overthrown, will, in like manner, beyond all room for question, be an individual monarch. The three beasts, for which application has to be sought, must hence be three individual kings. There is an end of restriction to that which is written, and an opening for indulgence, without limit, in human ingenuity, unless such be the case. We are to accept, then, most assuredly, the Scripture revelation that the three intermediate subjects are kings, equally with the first who precedes them, and the last who supplants their dominion. The only question to be determined is, who are these kings?

"But beyond the circumstance that individual monarchs make up the several portions of the vision, there is the amalgamation of their kingdoms, the one with the other, so as that one aggregate whole should be formed by them, as taught by the vision of the great image consisting of four distinctive parts, of which the figure is built up, and which thus constitute together one incorporate body. The kings, to whom the visions have reference, must accordingly be such as have acted in this way, and have proved to have been associated with an empire in which all have had a common standing, and which each in turn has served to construct; the one supplying the head, the other the breast and arms, the other the belly and thighs, and the last the legs and the feet.

The Scripture has made it apparent that the empire to which these kings belong is that of Babylon. There was the place of the throne of the first number of the vision, and if the others are to have part with him in a common sovereignty, there also should they reign. The kings to be sought for must thus all be kings of Babylon. . . .

"The deductions then to be made, from what the revealed interpretation as to the first number of the visions has put before us, are, that the other beasts are each individual kings; that there are personal features belonging to them, shadowed out in the visions, which seem to show who they are; that Babylon is the seat of their empire; and that each has a diversity

attaching to him, and also an extent of sovereignty differing from that of the others. And this distinctive territory doubtless it is that each brings in as a contribution to the common empire, which all these have to build up, until it attains the fullness represented by the entire figure of the image, thus made up of its various parts.

"In seeking for the remaining personages of the visions, it is clear that the possession of individual attributes, and not the occurrence of a successional descent, constitutes the title of each to be admitted to a place in the vision; that the Spirit, in effect, has not put forth these visions with the view of giving us an outline of general history, but in order to indicate an especial end, selecting from among the actors on the stage of the universe those fitted to embody that end, and none others. For example, Babylon is the theme of the visions: and objects unassociated with Babylon, have no place therein. But, more than this, Babylon, at certain stages of the construction of the empire, is what is in question, and so a consecutive history of Babylon, and of her kings, is not to be looked for. We may expect, then, lapses between these kings, one being adopted, and others passed over unnoticed, and another king again being stretched, according to the particular purpose of the visions.

"The book of Daniel abounds in instances of such discriminative selections, proving that throughout it, whatever pages of history may have been unfolded therein, it has not been the object of the Spirit to provide us with any thing like an outline of all that was to befall the world, or any region of it.

"For instance, the degradation and restoration of Nebuchadnezzar are recounted, but not his death—the fact of his reformation being followed by a description of Belshazzar's feast, and the intermediate kings, who reigned in the interval, namely, Evil Merodach, Neriglissor, and Laborosoarchod, being passed by unmentioned.

"The remaining members of the visions may consequently be introduced in succession to the first, after the occurrence of lapses, more or less lengthy, without at all violating the order and the method observable in the relations of the prophet. We cannot seek for their antitypes in the immediate descendants of Nebuchadnezzar. These, we see, were altogether insignificant as rulers, and in no way embodied the power and grandeur which it is shown, manifestly, are essential to the subjects of the vision. We must look beyond them, and Cyrus then inevitably arrests the attention; and he, it will in truth be found, fulfils accurately and completely, all the requirements called for in the second number of the visions.

"2. The breast and the arms of silver, or the second beast.

"Cyrus has been commonly accounted a king of Persia; but though he truly was such in one sense, in Persia he never set up his throne, and events show that Babylon was his seat of empire, and that he is to be looked upon strictly as a king of Babylon. Cyrus was a Persian; and in behalf of his uncle Darius (Cyaxarus the 2d), who was king of Media, he besieged and took Babylon, killing Belshazzar. The kingdom of Babylon was not extinguished thereby, but simply changed hands. 'Darius the Median took the kingdom ' (chap. v. 31)—of course the kingdom of Babylon. The Median became king of Babylon; and there, in effect, he had his throne. Cyrus succeeded to him, and, as Darius had done, adopted Babylon as his capital; and there, and there alone, was his kingly state displayed, until he ended his days; for there also he died. Previously, he had been in the field in the capacity of a general, but in Babylon he ruled as king. He is called, consequently, in the Scripture, 'the king of Babylon,' in the same breath that Nebuchadnezzar is referred to under the like appellation (Ezra v. 12, 13); proving thus

that the kingdom of the first portion of the vision had not been obliterated, but that it remained entire in him who may be seen to be the second.

"The material of the first member of the great image was gold. That of the second is silver, making an inferiority thereto; as it is said, 'and after thee shall arise another kingdom, inferior to thee.'

"This inferiority is not said to have been in respect of extent of dominion and power, and Cyrus, in effect, owned a wider border than Nebuchadnezzar, his territories extending beyond Media to the further confines of Persia; and of him it was declared, equally as of Nebuchadnezzar, that 'the Lord God of heaven had given him all the kingdoms of the earth' (Ezra 1, 2). The gold of the first member of the image, denoted, as we have seen, the wealth and the regal splendor of the monarch who was figured thereby. The adoption of silver, as emblematical of infirmity in the second member of the image, must then be in respect of the pomp of royalty being less displayed with him than with his predecessor in the vision. Such was eminently true with regard to Cyrus. Simplicity of habits, and abstemiousness, marked him above all other potentates; and it was not till he had accomplished the part he had in the vision, and taken up his place in membership in the great image as half of Babylon, that he at all indulged in luxury or regal show.

"In the visions of the beasts, a bear is the figure assigned to the number now under contemplation.

"In common with the others made use of in the vision, this animal has ferocity, but it is distinguished from the rest by its powers of endurance, and slow deliberate method of procedure, and also by its facilities for excavation; and the lengthy, patient, siege of Babylon by Cyrus, who invested it for two years, and then effected an entry by trenching and draining the river, through the channel of which he passed in, makes the selection of the form of the bear whereby to designate him, a peculiarly appropriate one.

"Of the bear, it is said that it raised up itself on one side.'

"Persia was the ancestral kingdom of Cyrus, and Media he inherited from his uncle Darius. The conjoint kingdoms are afterwards typified under the figure of a ram with two horns, of which it is mentioned that 'one was higher than the other, and the higher came up last.'—Chap, viii., 3, 20. This just corresponds with the action of the bear, which raises itself up on one side—elevating the one above the other—and is descriptive of Cyrus, by whom Persia, the last of the two to become a kingdom, was exalted above Media. The bear is seen to raise itself up thus, its procedure is noted while in process of completion, and this renders the application of the figure to Cyrus absolute. He alone can have been seen to effect the exaltation of one portion of his dominions over the other. His successors inherited the kingdom after this had been brought about, but the act of the raising of the one side above the

in this way, was to 'devour much flesh,' it being apparent that it was in reference to the three ribs in his mouth that the word was spoken that he was to devour the flesh. By Cyrus this feature in the vision was also accurately realized. He fought three great battles in which multitudes were slain, and in them subdued three kings, who may stand specially for the three ribs in the bear's mouth. The first was with the joint forces of Croesus, king of Lydia, and Neriglissor, king of Babylon, who are said to have brought upwards of 400,000 men into the field. These were defeated by Cyrus with great slaughter, and Neriglissor himself was killed. Croesus gathered another host, whom Cyrus engaged and overthrew at Thymbra, and Croesus then fell into his hands, and was led out for death, but eventually had his life spared to him. This was the second instance of slaughter. The third was at the taking of Babylon, when Belshazzar was slain.

"In point of diversity, both as to himself and as to his kingdom, from the first member of the vision, and his kingdom, Cyrus likewise fulfils the exigency of the prophecy. Nebuchadnezzar was an Assyrian, and Cyrus a Persian, and so of a diverse stock; and whereas Babylonia formed the sum of the possessions of the former, the rule of the latter stretched also over Media and Persia, making the kingdom thus essentially a different one. Cyrus brought in these additional provinces, adding them on to Babylonia, where he set up his throne, and thus he took his place in the stately image, contributing his quota to the materials towards its completion.

"In all these details, personal characteristics are seen to have been exhibited, such as could not belong to a dynasty, or chain of kings, but only to a single individual; and he in whom they are all found to have been realized, must be the man. The abstinence from bravery and stately show, the bear-like qualities in the field, the raising the one side of the kingdom above the other, the three great instances of slaughter affording the three ribs between the teeth, and the diverse stock and differing kingdom, even when the seat of empire was the same, came true of Cyrus, and of none but him, and as Nebuchadnezzar fulfilled, absolutely, in himself, the first portion of the visions, without room being left to conjoin with him in it any of his line, so also has Cyrus, in his person, embodied all that belongs to the second portion of the visions, without there being a possibility that any of his line can have had part therein.

"3. The belly and the thighs of the image or the third beast.

"Among the line of kings having connection with Babylon after the time of Cyrus, none stands so prominent as Alexander the Great. Elsewhere, in this book of Daniel, under the type of the he-goat—'the king of Grecia'—by whom the empire of Media and Persia was to be overthrown—he has been made the subject of prophecy in a way too plain to be mistaken. He is the next of a diverse stock from Cyrus who came upon the scene of the visions, and it will be found, on judging of the details now to be considered, that the exigencies of the third portion of the visions have been fulfilled in him, as completely, and as accurately, as those of

came, they sat down in Babylon, making her the place of their throne, and the capital of their possessions. No where else did they exhibit their kingly state, and there too they severally terminated their course and died.

"Cyrus, as we have seen, has two titles accorded him, in the Scriptures, the one, founded on his patrimonial right, the other on his personal and acquired one. The case of Alexander being precisely a parallel one, he also should have his personal and appropriate title of King of Babylon, independently of his ancestral one of King of Greece. The Scripture warrant in the instance of Cyrus would of itself suffice to establish this position, but the word contains further indication that it is a true and a maintainable one. We find him called therein, 'the King of Grecia,' and also 'the first king.' —Dan. viii., 21. It was not of Grecia that he could be accounted the first king, for on the throne of Macedon, which was his peculiar possession, there a long line of more than twenty kings had preceded him, and on that of the united empire of Greece, his father Philip, who had acquired it, sat before him. He must have been styled the first king in reference to some other kingdom, and it can only have been that which his arms achieved for him. He was, in effect, 'the first (Grecian) king' of Babylon, and to this, undoubtedly, it is that the Scripture points. * * *

"The likeness given of the king we have now before us is that of a 'leopard, which had upon the back of it four wings of a fowl.'

"The Scripture shows that this symbol denotes celerity. —Hab. i., 8. Rapidity of movement was the special characteristic of Alexander's operations, for in twelve years he fought countless battles, and overran and subdued every nation from Greece to the borders of India. The quality of celerity, as attaching to him, is doubtless, what is also signified of him in the symbol of the he-goat, where it is said that he came 'on the face of the whole earth, and touched not the ground.'—(Dan. viii., 5), —flying, as it were, like a winged animal, over it, in the speed of his course.

"The beast had also, it is said of it, 'four heads;' and dominion was given to it.

"The ordinary interpretation of this portion of the vision is, that the four heads relate to the four divisions of Alexander's empire, into which it was divided.

"This event has, however, been distinctly foretold elsewhere in the book of Daniel, (chap, xi., 4); and it is to be looked for that it should appear in repetition in the course of the same chain of prophecies. Neither will the tenor of the language of the prophecy now under consideration support this application thereof. The beast was presented to the eyes of Daniel in its entirety. There was what denoted the rapidity of its movements; there were also there its four heads; and there was finally the dominion given to it. All these features were seen to coexist together, and to form in the aggregate the object portrayed. The rapidity that characterized it, and the dominion conferred upon it, could not belong to one state of its

represent. The beast had its four wings, and also its four heads, and, after this, dominion was given unto it.

"Neither was the dominion spoken of that which attached to the successors of Alexander. Of him it was declared that he should be a mighty king, and that he should 'rule with great dominion;' but weakness of power, and not strength of rule, was what was to characterize his successors in their divided empire; for of them it was said, that they were to stand up, 'but not in his power'—'nor according to his dominion which he ruled.'—Chap, viii., 22; xi., 3, 4. It cannot be that in the parallel representation of the kingdom of brass, of which it was foretold that it was to 'bear rule over all the earth,' the dominion said to be given to it relates, not to the mighty monarchy of the unrivalled founder of the dynasty, but to the enfeebled and petty sway of those who came after him, when this monarchy had been broken up and parted among them. The dominion that was given to the beast with four heads cannot assuredly be this insignificant and divided rule, and so the four heads of the beast which came in antecedently to the bestowal of the dominion upon it, must necessarily relate to the empire in the time of its integrity and its strength, and not to what it was when it was disjointed and shorn of its power.

"The four heads, then, are to be taken as belonging to the empire of Alexander the Great. In what sense they are to be viewed will be best understood by bearing in mind that as a member of the great image, he had to bring in his contribution towards its formation. Nebuchadnezzar furnished the capital, with its attendant territory, and though with the means of incorporating other countries with his possessions, he added none thereto. He left them although prostrate at his feet, their nationalities and their kings, contenting himself with an acknowledgement of his supremacy over them as king of kings. Unity therefore, characterizes his kingdom, and the single head of gold appropriately designated it. To Cyrus duality attached, shown by the advertence to the two sides of the bear, and, in the other vision relating to his kingdom, to the two horns of the ram. What already belonged to the image was not to be counted in estimating the proportion thereof which he supplied. Babylonia was there, before his day, and the vision, as it respected him, notices therefore only the two-fold contribution which he supplied—Media and Persia. He might have added other provinces to the empire; but he did not do so. On the defeat of Croesus, Lydia was in his hands, but, according to Rollin, he continued to Croesus the possession of his sovereignty, 'suffering him to enjoy both the title and authority of king.' Syria was overrun by him, but there is no room to believe that he retained a greater sway there than was held by Nebuchadnezzar; and one important place thereof—Tyre—we find indubitably maintaining its independence till the time of Alexander, who overthrew it. Egypt also felt the force of his arms, but was not deprived of her kings, for one of these, Parmenitus, was engaged in warfare after his death with his son and successor Cambyses. The vision required from Nebuchadnezzar but one province for the empire, and from Cyrus but two, and both obeyed the exigency thereof, and appropriated no more. The third member was, however, to bring in a larger contribution. He was to add four provinces, or kingdoms, to three already existing in the image, as indicated by

Notes on the Above.

1. The reader will bear in mind that ours is not "the current view" of Daniel's predictions; and that consequently we are under no obligation to defend it. We have often shown, that the Four Beasts are representative of FOUR SYSTEMS OF POWERS historically or successively developed; and contemporaneously existing in combination, as the elements of Nebuchadnezzar's Image, in the time of the end; that the Fourth System of Powers is to be utterly destroyed by Messiah and the Saints, while the other three will continue to exist, but without dominion of their own, for "a season and a time," or 1,000 years. Mr. Strange's objections have no bearings against this position.

2. The Fourth Beast is currently styled "Roman," as though it were purely and simply a Latin or Italian dominion. This is an important error. Its "nails of brass" show that it is connected with the dominion of the "brazen-coated Greeks," as they styled themselves; but "iron," which has been taken to signify the Latin element exclusively, is nowhere so used in Scripture. The iron element is banded round the stump of the Babylonian tree, and identified with the legs, feet, and toes of the Image, and therefore with the ten horns of the Fourth Beast, and with its teeth, to indicate THE STRENGTH, not the racial characteristics, of the symbols. This appears from the words of the text, "And a fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron; because that iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all; and, as iron, for the breaking of all these, it shall break in pieces and divide. * * * The kingdom shall be divided; and the strength of iron is to be in it." So it reads in the Chaldee of Dan., ii. 40, 42. That is, there was to be power in the fourth system of states for the breaking, or subduing, or incorporation of the first three; and for dividing without itself falling to pieces, and for continuing to the end.

Now this iron strength of the "fourth kingdom" has been developed through different races, of which the Latin or Italian is but one of several; and at the present time any thing but the iron of the fourth kingdom for strength. The horns, seven of which are iron, are Teutonic, and conquerors of the Romans. The term "Roman," however, is admissible in connection with the beast, if in the use of it, we do not exclude other elements from it which have imparted strength to it, though not racially Roman. We may term it the Roman Beast on the ground that the history of the Roman Empires, "pagan" and "holy," constitutes a large proportion of the history of the beast. But in the prophecy, it is nameless. We have there the lion, the bear, and the Leopard; but that which appeared last is simply termed "the fourth." Its history thus far connects it with Greeks, Italians, Goths, Franks, Germans, Turks, &c, as its racial rulers; and before it shall have been destroyed by the Stone Power, Muscovites will flourish in their day, as an element of its political constitution.

All the oppressors of Israel until the end of the oppressing powers; were styled "a yoke of iron."—Deut. xxviii., 48. "Iron shall break the northern iron and the steel."—Jer. xv., 12. That is, the Stone Power with a rod of iron shall break the kingdom strong as iron in the day

power, strength, and glory." This was why he was "the Head of Gold." Strip him of the kingdom, power, strength, and glory, and though living, he ceases to be "the Head." Not perceiving this, Mr. Strange has elaborated an ingenious piece of sophistry which need not be followed in detail. The foundation being removed, the superstructure is in ruins.

4. The Scripture does not define "the Stone" in the prophecy by "individual personage," but by the phrase, "a kingdom." What smote the Image in the vision? "A stone." What breaks in pieces and consumes the toe-kingdoms? A kingdom. —See Dan. ii., 34, 44. The image is an aggregation of the Babylonian Powers of the time of the end; and the stone is the aggregation of Israel the Saints, and Messiah, constituting the kingdom which the God of Heaven develops as the image-breaker of the crisis. Messiah is the stone of Israel; but, as an individual, or single person, he is not "the stone" of the prophecy. In the seventh chapter, judgement is given to the Saints (of whom Messiah is one) and to their people (see vers. 18, 22, 26, 27); and thus they become the stone of Judgement.

5. In the first year of Darius the Mede, he was confirmed and strengthened as king by the angel-companion of Israel's prince. After him, and before Xerxes, three kings were to stand up. "There shall stand up yet three kings in Persia." Cyrus was the first of these three; yet Mr. Strange says, "in Persia, Cyrus never set up his throne."—Dan. xi., 2. A king reigning in Persia—standing up in Persia—is certainly equivalent to his throne being there. They were Medo-Persian monarchs and Kings of Babylon, but did not restrict the seat of government to the conquered city.

May 10, 1857.

EDITOR.

A Candid Mind.

NOTHING sheds so fine a light upon the human mind as candor. It was called whiteness by the ancients, for its purity; and it has always won the esteem due to the most admirable of the virtues. However sought for or practiced, all felt the power and charm of its influence. The man whose opinions make the deepest mark upon his fellow-man, whose influence is the most lasting and efficient, whose friendship is instinctively sought where all others have proved faithless, is not the man of brilliant parts, or flattering tongue, or splendid genius, or commanding power; but he whose lucid candor and ingenuous truth transmit the heart's real feelings, pure and without refraction. There are other qualities which are more showy, and other traits that have a higher place in the world's code of honor; but none wear better, or gather less tarnish by use, or claim a deeper homage in that silent reverence which the mind must pay to truth.

Inefficiency of the Pulpit.

From the Southern Literary Messenger.

themselves, contribute (by their manners) no little to create the impression. They are expected to discharge a certain class of duties which are not binding on other Christians. To look solemn and to pray, are thought to be their only legitimate employment. To shun their society, and regard them with a sort of diffident terror, becomes universal. Who is to blame for this? We say the clergy, in no small degree. No barrier ought to be kept up between the clergy and the people. They ought to mingle with them, to concern themselves in their interests, sympathise with their affairs, identify themselves with what affects them. It is towards this end, that we say, let the preacher present himself in this attitude as a speaker. Let him, as the politician, address himself to people of whom he is one, and communicate with them familiarly and plainly. Do not let him fence himself in from those he is speaking to, and, with a professional neck-cloth, read them a lecture as ghostly as he is.

Does any one suppose that some profane vagabond in the congregation feels any sympathy with such a man?

All formality in the pulpit tends to add to that idea of mystical holiness with which the popular mind is disposed to invest the clerical order—or rather, we should say; tends to transform the clerical idea into the priestly one, and to create the impression of the superior sanctity of the ministers of religion. It is, therefore, more the duty of a speaker on religious subjects to avoid all pretension before his audience, than it is even as regards those whose topics are secular.

Turning from the political rostrum and the bar, what in reality (as to its efficiency) do we witness in the pulpit—we mean where written sermons prevail? However untenable our reasonings with regard to the matter may have appeared—and however feasible, to some minds, manuscript speaking, or the memoriter method, may present itself—what in fact do we witness in such pulpits? We do not ask, how does some great and exceptional case manage to speak in spite of his manuscript. Not how Dr. Chalmers used to speak; or how Dr. Mason preached; or how such and such a gentleman or gentlemen may now be preaching with the use of the notes. But we ask, how do the clergy of these denominations, as a class, speak? How A, B, C, D, E, F, &c—the great body of the clergy—succeed in their pulpit ministries? Some way back, we attempted to show that even those who had succeeded so eminently with the manuscript might have done better without it—or we attempted to account for the success on certain occasions of manuscript or memoriter speeches; but this we are not called upon to do; the question is a broader one: it does not refer to a few special individuals; but it embraces the general preaching of the great mass of the clergy. What then are the facts with reference to our inquiries? How do the whole body of the clergy (in question) succeed as a class of speakers? Our experience is, that, as a mass, these ministers are dull: their sermons to us are lifeless: their speaking is idle. We would be careful of our expressions; but such is our conviction. They do not interest their congregations. We are told not to criticize the sermon; but it is hard to maintain silence. Such a writer of sermons falls almost inevitably into a plodding, mechanical train, which deviates entirely from the idea of speaking. Blair's Sermons

discriminating faculty—excited into action—suggests to him the manner and the tone with which he should express himself. We do not see why Addison was not right when he rebuked, in his little *Moralist*, the clergy of his day for presuming to compose their own sermons. There were great repositories, he told them, of pulpit eloquence among the great divines of England; and he did not see how any clergyman, of proper modesty, should venture to lay before his congregation any of his own inferior efforts, when, by selecting from these models, every parish in the kingdom might hear, every Sunday, from Barrow, or Tillotson, or Taylor, or South. The operation is this: a pious, sensible minister feels deeply impressed with the importance of his office; he has a realising sense of the great magnitude of the issues involved in his calling; he sees multitudes of his fellow-creatures perishing around him; and under a deep sensibility of the responsibility upon him, he preaches to the congregation before him the topics which he has so nearly at heart. He tells them, with the eloquence of simplicity and true feeling, of the great peril which besets them. But suppose, now, the same pious, sensible man gets to writing about religion, what will be the manifestations of his pulpit ministrations? They will almost infallibly get to be disquisitions: he will get to dividing his subject into so many heads: he will produce very dull orthodox lucubrations; and the congregation will have about as much sympathy with what is afforded them, as a man has ordinarily when somebody reads to him for about an hour from some grave book. We challenge the comparison between the bar and the pulpit. One is like a living body—the other torpid, barren, dry. That is breathing, active, vital; this does not throb with a human pulsation. How the tide of passion uninterruptedly—spontaneously—flows in those channels: how it stagnates and deadens in this sluggish current!

It is time, perhaps, that we should have remarked what we mean by an *ex tempore* speech. We do not mean, of course, anything involving less labor than is rendered necessary by a written preparation. It will not occur to any one that we propose for any speaker to get up and address a congregation without previous meditation. No man of sense would ever offer such an insult to an assembly. We believe at temperance meetings, &c., such a procedure is frequently attempted, but no one who does it can possess modesty or judgement. It is impossible for a man off-hand to throw off a speech which shall be valuable. To make a good speech, a man must understand his subject. We have no faith, indeed, in *impromptus* of any sort. Unless Theodore Hook were an exception, we do not know of any well-authenticated case on record. We believe every really fine effort of the human mind requires labor. We do not believe that Byron wrote *impromptus*; and we believe that the best portions of Shakespeare were carefully elaborated. Neither do we believe that Patrick Henry was "spontaneous" in the sense we are speaking of. The preparation required for *ex tempore* speaking (so-called) is much greater than that requisite for manuscript speeches. To master the subject thoroughly—to get all the necessary facts and the necessary illustrations—to arrange them in the memory—to comprehend well the principles they involve—and to ingrain the whole so deeply in the mind that it becomes appropriated with it like a natural growth—this is no easy task. When it is once done (and habit greatly facilitates the process) the speech then lives: it is masked from the sense; but it will break forth into manifestation

vividly to the apprehension of every listener. Thinking is a far more serious thing than reading, and it is also a far more serious thing than writing. And an *ex tempore* speaker must think, while a practiced writer of sermons often expends no more labor than he would in writing a letter. There is also this essential difference, that the first speaker must, *ex necessitate*, from the very constitution of his mind, direct his attention in a practical direction, while the second is lured off by the accomplishment of a treatise, whether pertinent or not, and the point aimed at is very apt to escape him. The one has to bear down with his invention on a certain definite purpose; the other sits down to write a sermon; it will probably be some abstract dissertation. * *

There is certainly something in free, natural, spontaneous speech, which engages the attention in a very different manner from anything presented at second-hand as the result of another's, or of one's own previous labor. That subtle principle in the human bosom which inevitably interests every man in his fellow, seems involuntarily to be awakened by every natural expression of feeling. Every spontaneous utterance strikes upon a chord in every other breast. And so long as one speaks freely, without effort, simply, the language of the heart, there is a sympathy elicited from every human soul, which secures and detains the attention of the hearer. The sound of the human voice, when it goes forth truthfully, has something irresistibly attractive to every member of the human family. Even if the speaker is of little importance, even if the subject matter is not very profound, as long as there is the simple expression of genuine feeling, a sympathy is awakened, and an attention bestowed. This seems to be the secret of *ex tempore* speaking. There is no suspicion of deception. There is no impression that anything may be false. As long as the speaker is really interested in what he is saying, he is uttering sentiments that are necessarily human. On the other hand, in the case of a manuscript, it is presumed to be done as a matter of business. The appearance of labor seems to cast a suspicion on the sincerity of the sentiments—that is, as specially entertained at the moment in question. Those feelings may have been experienced—but are they felt now? Is there an emotion—a living feeling—for with the past we have nothing to do—struggling there now? It is with human emotion that this matter has to do; and if that emotion was another's, or if it is dead, it has no spell to lay upon others, except in so far as it can be resuscitated or successfully counterfeited.

On the stage we see this attempted. A fine actor who can reproduce the real feelings of Hamlet by appearing to have them himself elicits rounds of applause. Just so far as he approaches nature, is he successful. So any memoriter speaker, just in so far as he can really revive, or appear to revive, his original feelings, will his address be eloquent, and his appeals be effective. And so with a MS. speaker; his success will be exactly proportioned to the felicity with which he counterfeits actual and real speaking. And let this be well pondered: that even successful MS. speaking owes its success to the approaches it makes to the speaking called *ex tempore*. * * * *

How did they preach in the early church? How did Apollos and Stephen and Paul

Whether this be so, or whether the word implied no more than the usual Latin appellations, tractatus, sermo, or allocutio, (a name applied by Tertullian,)—which mean, substantially, any exposition or handling of Scripture—it is apparent, upon the least observation, that the early preachers had little regard for exact method, and made no show of great learning or argumentative skill in their ordinary discourses. With very few exceptions, there is an entire absence of the divisions, and formal propositions, so common in our own day; and little of labored interpretation and close discussion. There is more of careful exegesis and strong reasoning in the homilies of Chrysostom than in those of any other father; and yet he is far more noted for force of eloquence than for just criticism and sober demonstration. Even where the preacher gave to his sermon the form of an extended address upon some particular text, it appears to have been, nevertheless, discursive, and, if rich in thought, was yet without unity or argument, or the skilful arrangement of the several parts. To this remark there were some exceptions, yet in the main it holds true of all the fathers. Discourses were sometimes previously composed and committed to memory; in rare instances read from the manuscript; but commonly, either delivered after a plan prepared beforehand, or altogether from the suggestions of the moment. Those that have come down to us were not, in the main, preserved by the original manuscripts of the preachers, but by means of short-hand writers, who attained to great perfection in the art, and took down entire discourses at the time of delivery." Thus, we presume, spoke Origen, Tertullian, Cyprian, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, Ambrose, Jerome. Thus, we know, spoke the two great patterns of the Greek and Latin pulpits—Chrysostom and Augustine. Those preachers, who, in three centuries, had completed the overthrow of Paganism—and that mainly through preaching—could have been no ordinary speakers. Their speaking must have been effective—must have been like that which was connected with the great awakening under Luther and Whitfield.

John de Wickliffe—born a century and a half before Luther—was the author of the first great revival of primitive Christianity. * He was indeed—as he has been called—the Father of the Reformation. There scorns no doubt that he was a great preacher. "The number of his disciples," says Knighton, canon of Leicester, "is so great, that a man can scarcely meet two people on the same road but one of them is a disciple of Wickliffe." His method of preaching, says the account of him in the volumes of Mr. Fish, above quoted, "was postulating, in distinction from declaring; that is taking up the various parts of a passage and briefly expounding them, in succession," etc.

* This is a great mistake. Wickliffe, Luther, Huss, etc., were merely protestors against popish excesses, not revivers of "primitive Christianity," of which they were as ignorant as the clergy of our day. Origen, Cyprian, and the rest above named, were perverters of the primitive faith—the members of the firm of BALAAM, JEZEBEL & Co., which has now the monopoly of the soul-trading of "Christendom"—ecclesiastical politicians, eloquent against the gods in the interest of their own deification. —Ed. Her.

"Owing to this fact, the sermons of Wickliffe which have come down to us, are

But with here and there a solitary exception, the preaching in the middle ages amounted to nothing. The first great revival of the sort took place at the Reformation. Few greater preachers can have ever appeared than Luther. There can be no doubt that he was an extemporaneous speaker. "Daily, and often several times in a day, he was wont to attract crowds by his public discourses; and of his sermons it was said, 'Each word was a thunderbolt.'" In the course of twenty-nine years, also, he published seven hundred and fifteen volumes—or one in a fortnight of his public life——many of which were taken down from his lips by his friends.

For ages the pulpit exercises of the Scotch church wore all *ex tempore*. The rude and overwhelming eloquence of Knox was, it may be safely assumed, of this character; and he was doubtless a speaker of the most extraordinary abilities.

Calvin, we know, was an *ex tempore*-speaker.

What was the method of the early English Reformers we are not prepared to say; but we should infer from the familiarity, the anecdotes, the rude allusions in his sermons, and from the fact that he traversed the country as a kind of itinerant, that Latimer at least spoke without a manuscript, or having memorized his language. Excepting a few names, the pulpit oratory of Scotland is hardly worth noticing between the period we have noticed and the impulse it received from the example of Chalmers.

The latter part of the 17th century, in England, was signalized by the powerful writings and preaching of the great Nonconformist Divines—Baxter, Bunyan, Howe, Bates, Owen, Flavel, Charnock. We can only say in general, that although, perhaps, many of them used notes, still their exhortations from the pulpit must have possessed, in a very great degree, the characteristics of *ex tempore* preaching. "They were accustomed," says a writer in the *Princeton Review*, "to the effusion of thought and feeling in language suggested at the moment of delivery." "Baxter," who was in the habit of using notes, "was great," says Mr. Sylvester, "at extemporate preaching."

It was among the established clergy that the purely written sermon, during this period, was used in England. Tillotson, Barrow, South, Taylor, —then Atterbury, Bull, Waterland—these are the great names that must be marshalled in behalf of the memoriter or manuscript method of preaching in its most rigid form. Their merits are well known. The pure English of Tillotson—the noble passages of Barrow—the caustic wit of South—the many-tinted glory of Taylor—the courtly splendors of Atterbury—have given the Anglican Sermon a place in her noble literature not inferior to that occupied by any other species of writing. But these men were not "great preachers," They are not preachers in the sense that Chalmers was, or Davies, or Mason.

caused him to be spoken of as combining the characteristics of Chatham, of Burke, of Sheridan, of Fox, of Pitt, were delivered ex tempore. * * * * *

* The Apostles were said to have done the same thing. The down side they turned up was the side that ought to have remained up to this day. But Whitfield and others such as he, are also said since then to have turned the world upside down! It therefore follows that they must have reversed the labors of the apostles! The side of the world now up is consequently not apostolic, but antichristian and apostate—Editor Herald.'

Wesleyanism, in the light of the Bible, "a pure form of religion," is a self evident absurdity."—Ed.Her.

We will now dismiss the consideration of this point, so elaborately treated, and hastily enumerate some others in which we conceive there is something requiring a change in the policy or genius of these churches.

We have incidentally spoken of the fact, that these communions fail to reach the masses. This came up naturally in considering their preaching. But the fact lies more broadly. Out of their pulpits, there is no sympathy between an Episcopalian clergyman and a brakeman on a railroad car. The petty shop-keepers, the sewing-women, the tinner, the blacksmith, the overseer's wife, never think of joining the Presbyterian church. In a congregation of either of these churches, how many persons in the inferior grades of society can be found? Of course, there is a great difference between an Episcopal and a Presbyterian congregation; but, even in the latter, how few mechanics of the humbler sort—how few poor people are met with! May not this be rectified? Should not Presbyterianism strike down to those to whom "the Gospel was preached?" Should not Episcopacy send out its voice also to that clattering dray that is thundering over that rough pavement, as well as to those mettlesome bays that are standing beneath those elegant windows? Will one say, "our church suits such people, and that church is adapted to people of that sort?" This is often said; but it is wrong. Has your church no peculiarity but that it is suited to a certain class, and to a certain manifestation of merely the social life? Is this the genius of Christianity—that there is to be in reference to a common Savior, a line of social demarcation between Christians? Is this that feeling which was enforced upon Philemon, with reference to Onesimus, that he was to "receive him"—"not now as a servant, but as a brother beloved?" —or consistent with that spirit, that "God hath chosen the base things of the world, and things which are despised, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are: that no flesh should glory in his presence?" or with the fact, that Jesus, and Paul, and Peter, consorted with the very humblest and poorest of the community? A church which is only adapted to the rich, is essentially wrong. A church merely suited for the humbler class of people, is somewhat defective. If a bishop is essential to a church, why should not a poor man's minister receive consecration at his hands? If Calvinism is important as a doctrine, why should not the shoemaker study the ninth of Romans?

church, that a well-bred young man, with a prayer-book and a surplice, is not going to get to the hearts of the rude million. The well-trained young presbyter, who has just gotten through "Charnock on the Attributes"—we tell Presbyterianism is not a tribune for the people. The teachers of the people must come from the people. The mass must be leavened from within itself. The impulse may originate from above.

* To require the clergy to preach the Gospel that their pulpit may become efficient, is really cruel! You might as well hold a pistol to the head of an uneducated Anglo-Saxon, and threaten to blow out his brains if he did not speak Greek. Poor fellows! How can they preach in ignorance of "THE WORD"? Set them to preach divinityisms, and they we your men! But, in the name of peace and charity, never ask a clergyman—"Do you preach the Gospel to the poor?" They have as little to do with the Gospel, as the groundlings have for them. —Ed. Her.

There is too little social intercourse between the Christians in different circles. That was not the genius of Primitive Christianity. It is a high Christian duty to sympathize with the poorer members of the society; and for this purpose, they should be visited—not condescendingly, but—fraternally by the rich. Their affairs, their wants, their interests, should be known. The influence would then develop itself into the whole circle of their acquaintances. How little do the rich know of the poor—of their way of thinking—their sorrows—their struggles. Their inner life is no more understood by those who employ them, than the manners and habits of a distant people. And this we take to be the great blessing of the colporteur system—that these humble laborers visit the poor in their homes, and sit by their fires, and become acquainted with their sympathies.

Connected with this duty, which we conceive to be neglected by these churches, is the want in their establishments of something like the system of Methodist Itinerancy. They want missionaries for the home population. In the way of supplying the respectable districts in towns, and the settled portions of the country, with pastors, the Presbyterian and Episcopal churches have done their duty. # But what have they done for the frontier? or for the abodes of wretchedness and poverty in the cities? All their churches move "up town" as systematically as the theatres. They want a band of Gospel circuit riders. They are the true pioneers of Christianity—and they, as in a Five Points' mission, go to the very dens of wickedness. + There is no proposition more obvious than that it is not necessary to give every preacher an elaborate education. When Peter left his nets, what did he know of theology? How much do these humble colporteurs know? To go into the mountains—to penetrate our back settlements—to thread the dark alleys of our towns—to stand on our wharves—a well-brushed coat and a white cravat are not necessary. Let these churches then organize a new body of men—an itinerant missionary corps, and let them profit by what they see in the Methodist and Baptist churches. There is a vast amount of material lying perfectly idle in these denominations, that could thus be made available in the most decided manner.

Truly; and because from them are attainable "the loaves and fishes."—Ed. Her.

perhaps more can be done in the social circle, than from the pulpit. If any man should court popularity * —if any one should habitually electioneer—it is the minister.

Clearly all professional peculiarities should be avoided — a clerical dress — a clerical whine. There is something perfectly intolerable to us in that solemn nasal cant so common in the pulpit.

Young theological students should here also be cautioned against an offence against good taste, to which they seem specially liable. A very large proportion of them are conceited.#

Lastly, there is something wrong in the prevailing mode in these churches of preparing young men for the ministry. They learn books; but they know nothing of men. They are students. They know nothing of the great world. Of the currents of society—of the habits of men at large—of the ideas, the opinions, the prejudices of the depraved masses—they are perfectly ignorant. The Methodist preacher learns all this: knocked about from pillar to post, he acquires that rough learning that is given only by experience—that "reading and writing that come by nature." The colporteur also learns this. But at Alexandria or Princeton, those young men are reading Church History, and they come forth into society as an isolated class—only mingling with the world through pastoral visits. We really think a year or two spent in the labors of colportearing would be fully as advantageous as the same period spent in the seminary. For the purposes of speculation or scholarship, the habitues of the closet are wanted, but for influencing the masses of society what is needed is practical men.

So much for what we regard as among the causes of the "inefficiency of the pulpit," among the more cultivated and conservative denominations. They proceed essentially from the very so-called conservatism existing among them. Their whole system wants opening—wants loosening. Its movement is slow, and dropping behind the age.

(To be continued.)

* In manners, but not in doctrine, as they are wont to do. "If I yet pleased men," says Paul, "I should not be the servant of Christ" Gal. i. 10. —Ed. Her.

It is evident that the writer hath not the fear of clergy before his eyes! The clergy, young and old, claim to be "the ambassadors of Christ," sent by him, and "called of God, as Aaron was;" and yet he presumes to style these heavenly dignitaries "Conceited!" Either he is a very impudent scribe, or they are very self-important knaves to indulge in such conceit! —Ed. Herald.

Theiopolitical.

newspapers—those Arguses whose eyes travel to and fro on the face of the earth—and what do we read of?

First, come voices of trouble from the East. Troubles in Arabia—50,000 rebels at Mecca swearing that the Sultan has forsworn the Prophet; troubles in Syria—wild men at Nablous rising because there is no one to keep them down; troubles in Bagdad, smouldering troubles in Smyrna and other places in Anatolia, where the charter we wrung from the Porte is only setting Turk and Christian the faster by the ears; perfect anarchy in Greece—neither men nor goods safe beyond three miles from the coast, where French troops patrol—and the people fiercer than ever against the Ottomans, and more than ever frantic to kiss the feet of the Czar, and subject themselves to an iron despotism which is probably marked out by Providence as the sole effectual cure of Hellenic madness. So much for Turkey, which, our rulers tell us, we have rescued and made strong. Is there a single whole place in it from head to foot?

But "we have checked the southward progress of Russia."

For a moment. But why those cries for help from the Caucasus, that marshalling of Chrulreff's host, those plans now preparing in the bureaux of St. Petersburg for new forts on the east side of the Black Sea, and a war-navy on the Caspian?

Turkey disintegrating, and Russia adhering to her "hereditary policy"—this is but one scene of the diorama. Take another phase of the troubles. Were there ever before so many "armies of occupation" in Europe? Austrians in the Principalities, British and French in Turkey and Greece, French and Austrians in Italy, all most generously keeping the peace in other peoples' territories—the wrong men in the right place!

The sight of those various white, blue, and red-coated soldiers in alien countries, is a significant proof of the disjointed state of affairs. It is like the sight of dragoons in a mob, telling of troubles. Italy is especially the seat of troubles and the object of apprehensions. Geologically the most volcanic of European countries, she is so now also politically. The damp dungeons of Naples teem with victims, and King Bomba overawes his people by means of brigands and lazzaroni. French bayonets around the Vatican alone ward off a new Roman Republic and a second flight of the Pope to Gaeta. Austria, overpassing her own frontiers, has corps of occupation, alike in Parma and the Legations, where they rule like demons—and in her own Italian territories there prevails only a milder form of the same reign of terror.

Radetzky writes to Vienna that either his master must say No at once to the Remonstrances of the Western Powers and Sardinia, or he will resign. Indeed, in the present combustible state of the peninsula, can Austria recede without evoking the flames? It is a duel between Austria and Sardinia, contesting the supremacy of Italy. Sardinia demands—publicly in the face of Europe demands—that the cords which bind Italy shall be slackened. If Austria

there is nothing but batteries and oranges—and would doubtless throw themselves into the sea to swim for Sicily, if they could carry their arms with them.

Is this peace? Cross the Alps and look northward. Poland groaning, and at times hoping", but securely manacled, and perhaps about to be offered by her master a political sop. Hungary, bleeding at the heart, but with no hope on the earth, save in the utter crumbling of the Hapsburg throne, which would only bring a Muscovite, instead of an Austrian bondage. These we count not at present. They figure largely in the speculations of superficial observers, but it is not by them that the troubled sleep of Europe will first be broken; indeed, it seems to us their day cannot come at all, until Germany and Italy have first gone through the fire, and come out greatly changed. But Germany is troubled, and will probably be into the furnace sooner than most people imagine.

Destitute of the mad impulses of the South, less demonstrative even than the French, the Germans do not give tongue much before they act—but there are symptoms that the tranquillity of Central Europe is anything but secure. The policy of the governments towards the people has become most reactionary—in many respects there is less freedom now, than there was before 1848—and even in the free republic of Hamburg, the most cruel measures of oppression are put in force against the press.

The Germans are a slow moving race, and if they had even a promise of better things coming, they would wait on, smoking their pipes, and drinking their beer, with true Teutonic phlegm, for another generation. But at present they have not even a promise of better things—the nobility, worse than the throne, seem only bent upon pushing things backward toward feudalism; and the consequence is, that were revolution to commence in serious form, either at Paris, or in Italy, Germany would speedily catch the flame.

In France itself tranquillity is only secure so long as the firm hand of Napoleon III holds the reins. While he lives France will not throw its rider. But his death would resolve all into chaos; and Bourbonists, Republicans, and Socialists, would be struggling together in the dread maelstrom. For such a convulsion there can be but one issue. Order must be re-established; but around whom is the nation to rally?

Suppose Napoleon III gone, what Saul is there overtopping all the rest by head and shoulders? What name is there but one that is known beyond the limits of Paris and a few leading towns?

Such, it appears to us, is the essential condition of the leading states of the Continent. Troubled they are, all of them. Never was the political state of Europe so full of quicksands. "Distress of nations and perplexity"—such is the exact aspect of the times. One cannot take a bold step any way without plunging into abysses which the future only can fathom. Not to speak of the evidently transition state of the Spanish peninsula, Turkey is disintegrating. Italy

Table of Contemporaries.

The following table will show how easy it was to hand down the story of the Creation and Fall, by tradition, from Adam to Isaac. Adam was contemporary with Methuselah, and Methuselah with Shem, and Shem with Isaac; hence it required but two persons intermediate between Adam and Isaac to recount to the fathers of Israel the history of the world to their own time. Isaac could tell his grandson Levi, and Levi his grandson Moses, and the latter has delivered it unto us, having been guided into all the truth by the Spirit of God.

ADAM		NOAH		SHEM	
was contemporary with	yrs..	was contemporary with	yrs.	was contemporary with	yrs.
Lamech	56	Lamech, . .	595	Lamech	93
Methuselah	243	Methuselah	600	Methuselah	98
Jared	470	Jared	366	Noah	448
Mahalaleel	535	Mahalaleel	234	and after flood with	
Cainan	605	Cainan	179	Abraham	150
Enos	695	Enos	84	Isaac	50
				—Selected	

The Jews.

An intelligent writer in the North American Review, supposes that no class of immigrants has increased more rapidly in this country than the Hebrew.

"Hidden away, as it were, behind the great mass of our Christian inhabitants, there is a very large population of Jews; people shut up almost in themselves, preserving their own customs, practicing their own religion, and keeping up quietly, but faithfully, the ceremonies and traditions that have come down to them from their forefathers. Observing their Sabbath when all the rest of our population is busily engaged in traffic and business, the Jews have but few Christians as visitors to their places of worship; and the synagogues remaining closed upon Sunday, when people, so disposed, generally investigate the religious ceremonies of their neighbors, but a small portion of our citizens, comparatively, know anything about the very interesting Jewish ceremonial law and practices.

"The number of Jews in the United States exceeds a quarter of a million, and in the State of New York, there are about forty-thousand of whom nearly seven eighths reside in the Empire City. This estimate is arrived at not by any census—the taking of which is forbidden by the Jewish law—but by the amount of unleavened bread consumed at the, season of the Passover. At that time, for one week, no Jew is permitted to eat leavened bread. The Passover bread is baked in large public ovens, and dealt out to all applying families, at the rate of five pounds for every man, woman and child. By the law they are obliged to eat it, and we

of New York alone has twenty synagogues, and thirty thousand Jews—about one twentieth part of the population being such. There are synagogues in all the chief cities of the seaboard; two in Boston, five in Baltimore, three in New Orleans, two in Charleston, and four in Cincinnati, &c.

It may not be inappropriate to add to the above statement respecting the progress of the "ancient people" in our country, the annexed historical and statistical particulars from an article in Blackwood's Magazine.

Vast as is the period, and singular as are the changes of European history since the Christian era, Judea still continues to be the most interesting portion of the world. Among other purposes it may be for the purpose of fixing the general eye upon this extraordinary land, that it has been periodically visited by a more striking succession of great public calamities than perhaps any other region. With less to attract an invader than any other conspicuous land of the East, it has been constantly exposed to invasion. Its ruin by the Romans in the first century, did not prevent its being assailed by almost every barbarian, who, in turn assumed the precarious sovereignty of the neighboring Asia. After ages of obscure misery, a new terror came in the Saracen invasion, which, under Amrou, on the conquest of Damascus, rolled on to Palestine. A siege of four months, which we may well conceive to have abounded in horrors gave Jerusalem into the hands of the Caliph Omar. On the death of Omar, who died by the usual fate of Eastern princes—the dagger, the country was left to still heavier misgovernment of the Moslem viceroys—a race of men essentially barbarian, and commuting for their crimes by their zeal in proselytism. The people, of course, were doubly tormented.

A new scourge fell upon them, in the invasion of the Crusaders, at the beginning of the twelfth century, followed by a long succession of bitter hostilities and public weakness. After almost a century of this wretchedness, another invasion from the Desert put Jerusalem into the hands of its old oppressor, the Saracen; and in 1187, the famous Saladin, expelling the last of the Christian sovereigns, took possession of Palestine. After another century of tumult and severe suffering, occasioned by the disputes of the Saracen princes it was visited by a still more formidable evil in the shape of the Turks, then wholly uncivilized—a nation in all the rudeness and violence of mountaineer life, and spreading blood and fire through Western Asia. From this date (1317) it remained under the dominion of the Ottoman until its conquest a few years ago, by that most extraordinary of all Mussulmans, the Pacha of Egypt—a dreary period of 500 years, under the most desolating government in the world. It is equally impossible to read the Scriptural references to the future condition of Palestine, without discovering a crowd of the plainest and most powerful indications that it shall yet exhibit a totally different aspect from that of its present state. Enthusiasm, or even the natural interest which we feel in this memorable nation, may color the future to us too brightly; but unless language of the most solemn kind, uttered on the most solemn occasions, and by men divinely commissioned for its utterance, is wholly unmeaning, we must yet look to some powerful,

which Jerusalem will yet be the scene, if not the center, and the Israelite himself the especial agent of those high transactions which shall make Christianity the religion of all lands, restore the dismantled beauty of all earth, and make man what he was created to be, only "a little lower than the angels."

The statistics of the Jewish population are among the most singular circumstances of this most singular of all people. Under all their calamities and dispersions, they seem to have remained at nearly the same amount as in the days of David and Solomon—never much more in prosperity, very much less after ages of suffering. Nothing like this has occurred in the history of any other race; Europe in general having doubled its population within the last hundred years, and England nearly tripled hers within the last half century; the proportion of America being still more rapid, and the world crowding in a constantly increasing ratio. Yet the Jews seem to stand still in this vast and general movement. The population of Judea, in its most palmy days, probably did not exceed, if it reached, four millions. The numbers who entered Palestine from the wilderness were evidently not much more than three; and their census, according to the German statisticians, who were generally considered to be exact, is now nearly the same as that of the people under Moses—about three millions. They are thus distributed:

In Europe, 1,916,000, of which about 668,000 are in Poland and Russia, and 453,000 are in Austria.

In Asia, 738,000 are in Asiatic Turkey,
In Africa, 504,000 are in Morocco.
In America, North and South, 57,000.

If we add to these about 15,000 Samaritans, the calculation in round numbers will be about 3,180,000.

This was the report in 1825; the numbers probably remain the same. This extraordinary fixedness in the midst of almost universal increase, is doubtless not without a reason, if we are even to look for it among the mysterious operations which have preserved Israel a separate race through eighteen hundred years. May we not naturally conceive that a people thus preserved without advance or retrocession; dispersed, yet combined; broken, yet firm; without a country, yet dwellers in all; everywhere influential; without a nation, yet united as no nation ever was before or since, has not been appointed to offer this extraordinary contradiction to the common laws of society, and even the common progress of nature, without a cause, and that cause one of final benevolence, universal good, and divine grandeur?

In noticing the preceding statistics, the late Major Noah remarked;

