

HERALD  
OF THE  
KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME:  
A Periodical,  
DEVOTED TO THE INTERPRETATION  
OF  
“THE LAW AND THE TESTIMONY,”  
AND TO THE DEFENCE OF  
“THE FAITH ONCE DELIVERED TO THE  
SAINTS.”



This is the Olde  
Armys of France

**“I, John, saw that out of the Mouth of the Dragon, and out of the Mouth of the Beast, and out of the Mouth of the False Prophet, three unclean effluences like Frogs (for they are agencies of DEMONS—ambassadors of the political aerial—producing sign-events,) issued forth to the Kings of the earth and of the whole habitable to bring them together for the war of that great day of God the Almighty.”** This sign complete, and then “Behold, I, Jesus, come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth.”

—Revelation 16: 13-15.

NEW YORK:  
PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR.  
1859.

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. Mott Haven, Westchester, N.Y., JANUARY, 1859  
Volume 9—No. 1.

---

Sabbatarianism.

Brother Thomas: —There are several in this neighborhood patiently waiting to see your answer to Bro. Dunn's letter respecting the Law and the Sabbath, thinking you may throw some light upon our benighted minds.

We believe The Herald is what its prospectus proclaims it to be, "a trumpet of no uncertain sound." May the Lord bless your labors and strengthen you to labor on.

I should like to see your exposition of the first thirteen verses of Matt. xxv. I shall endeavor to be a life subscriber to the Herald of the Kingdom, notwithstanding the hardness of the times. In haste.

Yours in the hope of eternal life,

GEORGE R. HALL.

Chatfield, Minnesota, Sept. 2, 1858.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.

The letter to which Bro. Hall refers is contained in the March No. of '58. Our extensive and long-continued travel has prevented us from attending to many subjects concerning which information has been sought by correspondents from different points of the compass. We must still trespass upon their patience a little longer. Health and time permitting we shall attend to all their inquiries. We expect to be able to treat of "The Historic Evidence of the Authorship and Transmission of the Books of the New Testament," in reply to certain sceptical friends in our Feb. or March issues. In the meantime we produce here for the information of our Sabbatarian friends the following article we wrote some ten years ago, on

The Sabbath Day and the Lord's Day.

On the seventh day, which was neither longer nor shorter than the days which preceded it, "God ended his work which he had made;" and because of this notable event, "he blessed and sanctified it." A day is blessed, because of what is or will be, imparted to those who are commanded to observe it. The sanctification of the day implies the setting of it apart that it might be kept in some way different from other days. The manner of its original observance may be inferred from the law concerning it when it was enjoined upon the

Israelites. To them it was said, "remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." If it be asked, how was it to be kept holy? the answer is, "in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor any one or thing belonging to thee;" and the reason for this total abstinence from work is referred to the Lord's own example in that "he rested the seventh day." The nature of its observance in the ages and generations, and the recompense thereof, is well expressed in the words of Isaiah;—"if thou turn away thy foot from the sabbath from doing thy pleasure on my holy day: and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honorable; and shalt honor him not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord, and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."—(Isaiah lviii. 13, 14). In this passage the conditions are stated upon which faithful Israelites might inherit the blessing typified by the rest of the seventh day. They were joyfully to devote themselves to the way of the Lord. They were not simply to abstain from work, yawning and grumbling over the tediousness of the day, and wishing it were gone, that they might return to their ordinary course of life; but they were to esteem it as a delightful, holy, and honorable day. Their pleasure» was to consist in doing what the Lord required, and in talking of "the exceeding great and precious promises" he had made. To do this was "not speaking their own words," but the Lord's words. Such an observance as this, however, of the sabbath day, implies a faithful mind and a gracious disposition as the result of knowing the truth. Neither antediluvian nor postdiluvian could "call the sabbath a delight," who was either ignorant or faithless of the import of the promise "thou shalt delight thyself in the Lord, and ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed with the heritage of Jacob." A man who simply looked at the seventh day as a sabbath in which he was interdicted from pleasures and conversation agreeable to him, and from the moneymaking pursuits in which he delighted, would regard the day more as a weekly punishment, than as joyous and honorable. Though he might mechanically abstain from work, he did not keep it so as to be entitled to the blessing which belonged to the observance of the day to the Lord. It was irksome to him, because being faithless he perceived no reward in keeping it; and "without faith it is impossible to please God."

The reward to antediluvian and postdiluvian patriarchs and Israelites for a faithful observance or commemoration of Jehovah's rest from his creation-work was, "delight in the Lord, riding upon the high places of the earth, and feeding with the heritage of Jacob." This was neither more nor less than a promise of inheriting the kingdom of God, which is a summary of "the things hoped for and the things unseen," or the subject matter of the faith that pleases God. When that kingdom is established, all who are accounted worthy of it will "delight or joy in the Lord;" and occupy "the high places of the earth," ruling over the nations as his associate kings and priests; and share in the "new heavens and earth," in which dwells righteousness, when Jerusalem shall be made a rejoicing, and her people Israel a joy. (Matt. xxv. 23, 34; Rev. ii. 26, 27; iii. 21; v. 9,10; xx. 4; Dan. vii. 18, 22, 27; Isaiah lxv. 17,18.) The knowledge and belief of these things was the powerful and transforming motive which caused Abel, Abraham, Moses, Jesus, &c, to "call the sabbath a delight, holy of the Lord, and honorable;" and to observe it as the sons of Belial cannot possibly do. But while this was the motive, even faith, which actuated the sons of God in their keeping holy the seventh day, Jehovah did not permit the faithless to transgress or desecrate it with impunity. We know not what penalty, if any, was attached to its violation before the flood; but its desecration under the Mosaic constitution was attended with signal and summary vengeance, as will appear from the following testimonies:—

1. "And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Speak thou unto the children of Israel, saying, verily my sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you. Ye shall keep the sabbath therefore: for it is holy unto you. Every one that defileth it shall surely be put to death: for whosoever doeth any work therein, that soul shall be cut off from among his people. Six days may work be done, but in the seventh is the sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord; whosoever doeth any work on the sabbath day shall surely be put to death. Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the sabbath to observe. the sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed." (Exodus xxxi. 12-17.)

2. "Remember, O Israel, that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath day." (Deut. v.15.)

3. "Six days shall work be done, but on the seventh day there shall be to you a holy day, a sabbath of rest to the Lord; whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death. Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the sabbath day." (Exodus xxxv. 2-3.)

4. "And while the children of Israel were in the wilderness, they found a man that gathered sticks upon the sabbath day. And they that found him gathering sticks brought him unto Moses and Aaron, and unto all the congregation. And they put him in ward, because it was not declared what should be done to him. And the Lord said unto Moses, the man shall be surely put to death: all the congregation shall stone him with stones without the camp. And all the congregation brought him without the camp, and stoned him with stones, and he died; as the Lord commanded Moses."(Numb. xv. 32-36.)

5. "Thus saith the Lord, take heed to yourselves, and bear no burden on the sabbath day, nor bring it in by the gates of Jerusalem: neither carry forth a burden out of your houses on the sabbath day, neither do ye any work, but hallow ye the sabbath day, as I commanded your fathers. And it shall come to pass if ye diligently hearken unto me, saith the Lord, to bring in no burden through the gates of this city on the sabbath day, to do no work therein: then shall there enter into the gates of this city kings and princes sitting upon the throne of David, riding in chariots and upon horses, they, and their princes, the men of Judah, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem: and this city shall remain for ever. And they shall come from the cities of Judah, and from the places about Jerusalem, and from the land of Benjamin, and from the plain, and from the mountains, and from the south, bringing burnt offerings, and sacrifices, and meat offerings, and incense, and bringing sacrifices of praise unto the temple of the Lord. But if ye will not hearken unto me to hallow the sabbath day, and not to bear a burden, even entering in at the gates of Jerusalem on the sabbath day; then will I kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it shall not be quenched." (Jer. xvii. 21-27.)

6. "Abide ye every man in his tent, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day." (Exodus xvi. 29.)

From these testimonies it is clear that it was unlawful for servants in the families of Israel to light fires, cook dinners, harness horses, drive out families to the synagogues, or priests to the temple to officiate in the service of the Lord. The visiting of families on the

sabbath day, the taking of excursions for health or for preaching, and conversing about worldly, or family, or any kind of secular affairs, was also illegal, and punishable with death. The law, it will be observed also, had regard to the seventh, and to no other day of the week. It was lawful to do all these things on the first or eighth day (some particular ones however excepted), but not on the seventh. On this day, however, it was "lawful to do good;" but then this good was not arbitrary. Neither the priests nor the people were the judges of the good or evil, but the law only which defined it. "On the sabbath days the priests in the temple profaned the sabbath, and were blameless;"(Matt. xii. 5.) for the law enjoined them to offer "two lambs of the first year without spot as the burnt-offering of every sabbath."(Numb. xxviii. 9-10.) This was a profanation of the seventh-day law, which prohibited "any work" from being done; and had not God commanded it they would have been "guilty of death." It was upon this ground that Jesus was "guiltless;" for he did the work of God on that day in healing the sick as the Father had commanded him.

"The sabbath was made for man and not man for the sabbath: therefore," said Jesus, "the Son of Man is Lord also of the sabbath day."(Mark ii. 27.) It was a wise and beneficent institution. It prevented the Israelites from wearing out themselves and their dependants by incessant toil; and revived in them a weekly remembrance of the law and promises of God. It was, however, only "a SHADOW of things to come" the substance of which is found in the things which pertain to the Anointed One of God. (Col. ii. 16-17; and 14.) It was a part of "the rudiments of the world" inscribed on "the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us," and which the Lord Jesus "took out of the way, nailing it to his cross." When he lay entombed he rested from his labors, abiding in his place all the seventh day. Having ended his work, he arose on the eighth day, "and was refreshed." The shadowy sabbath disappeared before the brightness of the rising of the Sun of Righteousness; who, having become the accursed of the law, delivered his brethren from its sentence upon all.

The ordinances of the law of Moses are styled by Paul "the rudiments," or "elements of the world," which, in Galatians, he also terms "weak and beggarly elements, whereunto they desired again to be in bondage." They evinced this desire by "observing days, and months, and times, and years;"(Gal. iv. 3, 5, 9, 10.) not being satisfied with the things of Christ, but seeking to combine the Mosaic institutions with the gospel. This was Judaizing, and the first step to that awful apostasy by which the world has been cursed for so many ages. When the Mosaic constitution, as "the representation of the knowledge and the truth," had "waxed old" by the manifestation of the substance to a sufficient extent to nullify it, it "vanished away" by being "cast down to the ground" by the Roman power, and with it the law of the seventh day. Even before its abolition, Paul expressed his fear of the Galatians "lest he should have bestowed labor upon them in vain," seeing that they were becoming zealous of the ordinances of the law. They seemed not to understand that the Mosaic economy was only a temporary constitution of things, "added because of transgressions, till the Seed should come;" that when he came he redeemed them from the curse of the law, being made a curse for them;" and that therefore they had nothing to fear, nor to hope for from keeping, or transgressing its commands. They had got it into their heads that "except they were circumcised and kept the law of Moses, as well as believed and obeyed the gospel of the kingdom, they could not be saved." (Acts xv. 1-5.) Therefore they "desired to be under the law," and began to busy themselves about "keeping the sabbath," and doing other works which Moses had enjoined upon Israel. Paul was very much distressed at this, and describes himself as "travailing in birth again until Christ be formed in them." They had been delivered from "the yoke of bondage" by putting on Christ; but by seeking to renew their connexion with Moses' law, they were selling their birth-right for a mess of pottage. "I say unto you,"

saith Paul, "that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." A partial observance of the law can do no one any good. If he kept the sabbath in the most approved manner, but neglected the sacrifices, or eat swine's flesh, he was as accursed as a thief or a robber; for to one under the law it saith, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them;" hence even the sinless Jesus was cursed by it, because he was crucified; for it is written, "Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." (Gal. iii., iv., v. 4.) What hope then is there for Jew or Gentile of escaping the curse of the law, seeing that from the very nature of things connected with the present state of Jerusalem it is impossible to observe it, save in the few particulars of "meat and drink, or in respect of the sabbath partially," &c. The observance of the seventh day was regulated by the Mosaic law, and the penalties due to its "desecration," or "profanation," are pronounced by it alone; but, it is clear, that the law being taken out of the way, or abolished, by Jesus who nailed it to his cross, there remain no more retributions for the non-observance of its appointments; and therefore there is no transgression in working or pleasure-taking, or in speaking one's own words on the seventh day.

On the first day of the creation-week God said, "Let there be light, and there was light;" so on the first day of the week "THE TRUE LIGHT" came forth from the darkness of the tomb, "like dew from the womb of the morning." This event constituted the day after the sabbath, or eighth day, the day of the Lord's resurrection; and therefore styled by his disciples "THE LORD'S DAY." It is a day to be much remembered by them, because it assures them of their justification "in him," of their own resurrection to life, and of the certainty of his ruling or "judging the world in righteousness" as Jehovah's king, when they also shall reign with him as kings and priests to God. (Rom. iv. 25; viii. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 14, 20; Acts xvii, 31; Rev. v. 9, 10.) This day is also notable on account of the special interviews which occurred between Jesus and his disciples after his resurrection. (John xx. 19, 26.) He ascended to heaven on this day, even the forty-third from his crucifixion; and seven days after, that is the fiftieth, being that Lord's day styled "the day of Pentecost," the gift of the Holy Spirit was poured out upon the apostles, and the gospel of the kingdom preached for the first time in his name.

Power being in the hands of their enemies, the Christians of the Hebrew nation still continued to observe the seventh day according to the custom. Hence we find the apostles frequenting the synagogues on the sabbath days, and reasoning with the people out of the scriptures. (Acts xvii. 2, 17; xviii 4; xix 8.) To have done otherwise would have been to create an unnecessary prejudice, and to let slip one of the best opportunities of introducing the gospel to the attention of the Jewish public. They did not forsake the synagogues until they were expelled. While they frequented these, however, on the seventh day, they assembled themselves together with the disciples whose assemblies constituted the churches of the saints and of God. They ordained elders over these societies, and "taught them to observe all things whatsoever Jesus had commanded them." (Matt xxviii. 20; Acts ii. 42; xiv. 22-23.) In his letter to the Hebrew Christians he exhorts them "not to forsake the assembling of themselves together." (Heb. x. 25.) Such an exhortation as this implies a stated time and place of assembly. On what day, then, did the churches of the saints meet to exhort one another so as to provoke to love and to good works? Certainly not on the seventh day, for then the apostles were in the synagogues. What day then more appropriate than the Lord's day, or first day of the week? Now it cannot be affirmed that the saints were commanded to meet on this day, because there is no testimony to that effect in the New Testament. But it is beyond dispute that they did assemble themselves together on the first day of the week, and the most

reasonable inference is that they did so in obedience to the instruction of the apostles from whose teaching they derived all their faith and practice, which constituted them the disciples of Jesus.

To keep the first day of the week to the Lord is possible only for the saints. There is no law, except the emperor Constantine's, that commands sinners to keep holy the first, or eighth day, or Sunday as the Gentiles term it. For a sinner to keep this day unto the Lord he must become one of the Lord's people. He must believe the gospel of the kingdom and name of Christ, and become obedient to it, before any religious service he can offer will be accepted. He must come under law to Christ by putting on Christ before he can keep the Lord's day. Having become a Christian, if he would keep the day to the Lord, he must assemble with a congregation of New Testament saints, and assist in edifying and provoking them to love and good works, in showing forth the death of Jesus, in giving thanks to the Father, in celebrating the resurrection of Christ, and in praising and blessing God. Under the gospel, or "law of liberty," he is subjected to no "yoke of bondage" concerning a sabbath day. It is his delight when an opportunity presents, to celebrate in this way, the Day of the Resurrection. He requires no penal statutes to compel him to a formal and disagreeable self-denial or "duty;" for it is his meat and drink to do the will of his Father who is in heaven.

The law of Moses was delivered to the Israelites and not to the Gentiles, who were therefore "without the law." "What things soever the law saith, it says to them who are under the law;" consequently the nations were not amenable to it; and though they obtained not the blessings of Mount Gerizim (unless they became faithful Jews by adoption), neither were they obnoxious to the curses of Mount Ebal. (Deut. xxvii. 13-26.) The faithless Jews and Gentiles are equally aliens from the precepts of Christ and his apostles. What these prescribe is enjoined upon the disciples of Jesus. They only are "under law to Christ." "What have I," says Paul, "to do to judge them that are without? God judgeth them." (1 Cor. v. 12-13.) He has caused the gospel of the kingdom to be preached to sinners "for the obedience of faith." When they are judged, it will be for "not obeying the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ," (2 Thess. i. 7-10.) and not because they do not "go to church," or do not keep a sabbath instituted by a semi-pagan emperor of the fourth century. The sabbath God requires sinful men to observe is, to cease from the works of the flesh, as completely as he rested from the work of creation on the seventh day, that they may enter into the millennial rest that remaineth for the people of God. (Heb. iv. 9-11.)

Men frequently err in their speculations, from inattention to the marked distinction which subsists in the scriptures between those classes of mankind termed "saints" and "sinners." They confound what is said to, or concerning the one, with what is said in relation to the other. Relatively to the institutions of God they are as near or afar off as are "citizens" and "foreigners" to the laws and constitution of the United States. "What the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law." This is a principle laid down by Paul concerning the law of Moses, which is equally true of the codes of all nations. "Citizens" are the saints, or separated ones, of the particular code by which they are insulated from all other people; while "foreigners" or "aliens" from their commonwealth are sinners in relation to it; for they live in other countries in total disregard of its institutions, and doing contrary to its laws, and yet are blameless: so that if they were to visit the country of that commonwealth, they would not be punished for their former course, because they were not under law to it. Let them, however, while sojourning there, continue their native customs, and they would become guilty and worthy of the punishment made and provided for such offenders. It is a fact, that "God blessed and sanctified," or set apart, "the seventh day;" and doubtless, Adam and his wife rested, or

intermitted, their horticultural tendance upon that day. Yea, we may go further and say, that it is extremely probable that "the Sons of God" before the flood, worshiped God according to "his way" upon that day; but in all the history of that long period which intervned from the sanctification of the seventh day to the raining down bread from heaven for the Israelites in the wilderness, (Exodus xvi.) there is not the least hint of any punishment for breaking the sabbath day. Guiltiness before God cannot therefore be argued against the Gentiles so as to entitle them to death or reprobation, predicated on the threatenings of the patriarchal code. Whatever the appointment might be, it was no doubt significative of the blessings to be obtained through observing it; not alone, but in connexion with the other matters which made up "the way of God."

As I have shown, the observance of the seventh day was obligatory only upon the Israelites so long as the Mosaic code was in force, being "a sign" between God and them. The sabbaths belong to the land and people of Israel, and can be only kept according to the law while they reside in the country. This will appear from the fact that the law requires that "two lambs of; the first year without spot" should be offered with other things "as the burnt-offering of every sabbath;" an offering which, like all the offerings, etc., must be offered in a temple in Jerusalem where the Lord has placed his name, and not in the dwelling-places of Jacob. Israel must therefore be restored to their own country before even they can keep the sabbath. Then, when "the throne is established in mercy; and he (the Lord Jesus) shall sit upon it in truth in the tabernacle of David, judging, and seeking judgment, and hasting righteousness," (Isaiah xvi. 5.) then, I say, "shall the priests, the Levites, the sons of Zadok, that kept the charge of my sanctuary when the children of Israel went astray from me, come near to me to minister unto me, and they shall stand before me to offer unto me the fat and the blood, saith the Lord God: and they shall hallow my sabbaths." (Ezek. xlv. 15, 24.)

But these sabbaths will be no longer celebrated on the seventh day. They will be changed from the seventh to the eighth, or first day of the week, which are the same. The "dispensation of the fullness of times," (Ephes. i. 10.) popularly styled the Millennium, will be the antitype, or substance, of the Mosaic feast of tabernacles which was "a shadow of things to come." In this type, or pattern, Israel were to rejoice before the Lord for seven days, beginning "on the fifteenth day of the seventh month, when they had gathered the fruit of the land." In relation to the first day of the seven, the law says, "it shall be a holy convocation: ye shall do no servile work therein." This was what we call Sunday. The statute then continues, "on the eighth day," also Sunday, "shall be a holy convocation unto you, and ye shall offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord: it is a solemn assembly; and ye shall do no servile work therein." Again, "on the first day shall be a sabbath, and on the eighth day shall be a sabbath." (Lev. xxiii. 34-43.) Thus, in this "pattern of things in the heavens," the first and eighth days are constituted holy days in which no work was to be done. It also represents the palm-bearing or victorious in-gathering of the twelve tribes of Israel from their present dispersion to the land of their fathers, "when the Lord shall set his hand a second time to recover the remnant of his people." (Isaiah xi. 11.) Three times in four verses does Zechariah style the yearly going up of the Gentiles to Jerusalem to worship the king, the Lord of Hosts, there, the keeping of the feast of tabernacles; (Zech. xiv. 16-19.) an event which is consequent upon the destruction of the dominion represented by Nebuchadnezzar's image, and the reestablishment of the kingdom and throne of David. This national confluence of the Gentiles to Jerusalem is characteristic of Messiah's times; and of the true or real festival of tabernacles when he will "confess to God among the Gentiles, and sing unto his name," and "they shall rejoice with his people," Israel. (Rom. xv. 9-10.) Referring to this time, the Lord says, "the place of my throne, and the place of the soles of my feet, where I will dwell in the midst of

the children of Israel for ever, and my holy name shall the House of Israel no more defile, neither they, nor their kings, by their whoredom, nor by the carcasses of their kings in their high places. \* \* \* They have even defiled my holy name by their abominations that they have committed: wherefore I have consumed them in mine anger. Now let them put away their whoredom, and the carcasses of their kings, far from me, and I will dwell in the midst of them forever." (Ezek. xliii. 7-9.) This is clearly a prophecy of what shall be hereafter, because the House of Israel still continues to defile God's holy name by their abominations; but when this comes to pass they shall defile it "no more."

After the declaration of these things, Ezekiel is commanded to show them the description of the temple which is destined to be "the house of prayer for all nations," with the ordinances, forms, and laws thereof. The Lord God then declares, "the ordinances of the altar in the day when they shall make it" and when the Levites of the seed of Zadok shall approach unto him. The "cleansing of the altar," and the consecration of the priests, is then effected by the offerings of seven days. " And when these days are expired, it shall be, that upon the eighth day, and so FORWARD, the priests shall make your burnt offerings upon the altar, and your peace offerings; and I will accept you, O Israel, saith the Lord."(verse 27.) Thus the Lord's day, the day of his resurrection from his seventh-day incarceration in the tomb, becomes the sabbath day of the future age which shall be hallowed by the priests of Israel, and be observed by all nations as a day of holy convocation in which they shall rejoice, and do no manner of servile work at all.

This change of the sabbath from the seventh to the eighth, or first day of the week, is the full development and establishment of the observance of the Lord's day by the disciples of Jesus since the times of the apostles. Constantine, though not a christian himself, paid homage to the truth so far as to compel the world to respect the day on which Christ Jesus rose from the dead. Hence, in 328, he ordained that the day should be kept religiously, which a judaizing clergy construed into a sabbatical observance according to the Mosaic law concerning the seventh day. This is the origin of that sabbatarianism which so ludicrously, yet mischievously, illustrates the Blue Laws of Connecticut, (By these a woman was forbidden to kiss her child on the sabbath!) the zeal of the Agnews and Plumptres of the House of Commons, and the rhapsodies of the pietists of the passing day. These well-meaning persons, whose zeal outruns their knowledge, seem not to be aware that Christ and his apostles did not promulge a civil and ecclesiastical code for the nations, when they preached the gospel of the kingdom. Their object was not to give them laws and constitutions; but to separate a peculiar people from the nations who should afterwards rule them justly and in the fear of the Lord, when the dispensation of the fulness of times should be introduced. (Acts xv. 14; 1 Cor. vi. 2; 2 Sam. xxiii. 3-4; Titus ii. 11.) To be able to do this, these peculiars were required to be "holy, unblameable, and unreprouvable before God."(Col. i. 22-23; 1 Thess. ii. 19; iii. 13.) To this end instructions were delivered to them, that under the divine tuition "they might be renewed in the spirit of their mind; and put on the new man which after God's image: is created in righteousness and true holiness." As for "those without" "who receive not the love of the truth, that they might be saved, God sent them a strong delusion, that they should believe a lie,"(2 Thess. ii. 10-12.) as a punishment. They are left to govern themselves by their own laws until the time arrives for Christ to take away their dominion and assume the sovereignty over them conjointly with "the people of the saints." If they please to impose upon themselves yokes of bondage, binding themselves to keep the first day of the week according to the Mosaic law of the seventh day, they are left at liberty to do so. But for this act of "voluntary humility" they are entitled to no recompense from God, seeing that he has not required it of them. The rewards due for observing a judaized Lord's day voluntarily inflicted upon

themselves; or, the pains and penalties to which they may be entitled for its "profanation," are such, and such only, as result from the will and pleasure of the unenlightened lawgivers of the nations. It is a wise regulation to decree a cessation from labor and toil for man and beast during one day in seven; but it betrays egregious misunderstanding of the scriptures, and singular superstition, to proclaim perdition to men's souls in flaming brimstone if they do not keep it according to the Mosaic law of the seventh day. All I need say in conclusion is, that if it be necessary to keep Sunday as the Jews were required to keep Saturday by the law of Moses, then those who make so much ado about sabbath-breaking are themselves as guilty as those they denounce for the unholy and profane. "He that offendeth in one point is guilty of the whole." If they do not keep open shop, or perambulate the parks and fields, or take excursions, or go to places of public resort and amusement on the Lord's day—yet, they light fires in their dwellings and meeting-houses, they entertain their friends at comfortable, warm dinners, drive to church in splendid equipages, annoy the sick and distract the sober-minded with noisy bells, bury the dead, speak their own words, &c, —all of which is a violation of the divine law which saith, "thou shalt not do any work, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle;" and "thou shalt not speak thine own words." This would certainly put to silence nearly all the preachers of the day; whose "sermons," when made by themselves, are emphatically their own in thoughts and words without dispute. It is not only ridiculous, but down-right pharisaism, the fuss that is made about breaking the sabbath. Let the zealots "first cast the beam out of their own eyes; and then will they see clearly to cast out the mote from the eyes of others." If they would "keep the day to the Lord," let them believe and obey the gospel of the kingdom in the name of Jesus; and then "continue stedfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers"(Acts ii. 42.) on the Lord's day; and cease from the works of sinful flesh (Gal. v. 19.) every day of the week; and they will doubtless "delight in the Lord, and ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed with the heritage of Jacob in the kingdom of God," as the mouth of the Lord hath spoken.

Of the things, then, which have been written under this head, this is the sum.

1. The six creation-days were each as long as the seventh, whose duration is defined by the Mosaic law; and consequently the geological notion of their being six several periods of many centuries each, falls to the ground as a mere conceit of infidel philosophy.

2. The Lord God ended his work on the seventh day, "and was refreshed" by the songs of the Morning Stars, and the joyous shouts of the Sons of God.

3. To celebrate his rest he constituted it holy and a day of blessing. Hence it was commemorative of the past, and "a shadow of things to come."

4. The seventh day was observed by Adam and Eve as a day of delight, before they became sinners. The immediate cause of their joyousness on the day of rest is not testified. It is certain it was not a burdensome day; for sin had not yet marred their enjoyments. It was probably because of the gracious interviews granted them by the Lord God on that day; and of the revelations made to them of the things contained in the blessing pronounced upon it when he "blessed and sanctified it."

5. There is no record or hint of the existence of a penal statute for not observing the seventh day, from the sanctification of it till the raining down bread from heaven for the Israelites in the wilderness of Egypt.

6. The observance of the seventh day by absolute rest from every kind of work and pleasure-taking, accompanied by a peculiar sacrifice on the brazen altar of the temple, and spiritual delight in its blessedness, was its Mosaic celebration enjoined upon the Israelites, and their dependents in Palestine, and upon them alone.

7. Its profanation by citizens of the commonwealth of Israel was punishable with death by stoning.

8. Israel was especially commanded to remember the seventh day and keep it as appointed by the law; because God in creating their world brought them out of Egypt, and rested from the work of its creation when he gave them a temporary and typical rest under Joshua in the land of Canaan.

9. For an Israelite to remember the seventh day to keep it holy, spiritually as well as ceremonially, so as to obtain the blessing which it shadowed forth, he must have had an Abrahamic faith (Rom. iv. 12, 18-22.) in the promised blessing, and have ceased or rested from the works of "sinful flesh."

10. The blessing promised to Israelites, who were Abraham's sons by faith as well as by fleshly descent, for a spiritual observance of the seventh day (and which, until "the handwriting," or Mosaic law, was blotted out and nailed to the cross, could not be spiritually observed and ceremonially profaned) was, that they should "delight in the Lord, ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed with the heritage of Jacob their father," when the time to fulfil the promises made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, should arrive.

11. The blessing pronounced on a national observance of the seventh day was, the uninterrupted continuance of the throne of David and great national prosperity. Its desecration to be punished by the breaking up of the commonwealth of Israel and desolation of their country.

12. The Mosaic observance of the seventh day was appointed as "a sign" between God and the twelve tribes of Israel. It was a holy day to them, and to be observed perpetually throughout their generations. (Matt. i. 17—the forty-two generations from Abraham to Christ. Col. i.26.)

13. It was lawful for Israelites to do good on the seventh day; but they were not permitted to be the judges of the good or evil. This was defined by the law. The priests profaned the sabbath by hard work in slaying and burning the seventh day sacrifices on the altar, yet they were blameless; because this was a good work which the Lord of the sabbath commanded them to do.

14. Having finished the work the Father had given him to do, (John xvii. 4.) on the sixth day of the week, Jesus, while suspended on the accursed tree, cried with a loud voice, "It is finished!" (John xix. 28-30.) "All things were now accomplished," so that the Mosaic handwriting was blotted out, being nailed with him to the cross, and taken out of the way as a rule of life. The Lord Jesus "rested from his labors" on the seventh day in the silent tomb, and "his disciples rested according to the commandment." (Luke xxiii. 56.) He abode in his place, and did not go out of it until the sabbath was at an end. (Mark xxviii. 2.) But, on the eighth day, styled also the first day, God gave him liberty, (Matt. xxviii. 2.) he left the tomb and "was refreshed." Having "spoiled the principalities and the powers" constituted by the handwriting,

he made the spoliation manifest, "triumphing over them in himself" (ἐναντῶ) that is, in his resurrection; thus forever delivering men from the bondage of the law, which Peter says, "was a yoke which neither our fathers nor we were able bear."(Acts xv. 10.) With the abolition of the Mosaic handwriting the obligation to keep the seventh day as a rule of spiritual life was cancelled as a matter of course.

15. The apostles and Christians (Acts xxi. 20.) of the Hebrew nation in Palestine continued a ceremonial observance of the Mosaic festivals (verse 24-26.) (the annual atonement for sin excepted) and of the seventh day, until the destruction of the commonwealth by the Romans, on the same principle that New Testament Christians among the nations now observe Sunday and the laws; not as a means of justification before God, but as mere national customs for the regulation of society.

16. Hebrew Christians who proposed to blend the law of Moses with that of Jesus as a spiritual rule, or means of justification, and consequently to keep holy the seventh day, were severely reproved by the apostles, who stigmatized it as "Judaizing." (Gal. ii. 14.) (Ἰουδαΐζειν).

17. The judaizing Christians endeavored to impose the observance of the law upon the Gentile converts, which would have compelled them to keep holy the seventh day. But the apostles and elders of the Christian community at Jerusalem positively forbid it, and wrote to them saying, "we have heard that certain who went out from us have troubled you with words subverting your souls, saying, 'be circumcised and keep the law:' to whom we gave no such commandment." On the contrary, "it seems good to the Holy Spirit, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things: that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well."(Acts xv. 24-29.)

18. The Lord's day is the first day of the week, or day after the seventh, and therefore sometimes styled the eighth day. It is termed his day because it is the week-day of his resurrection. Upon this day the disciples of Christ assembled to show forth his death, and to celebrate his resurrection; which, with an enduring rest from the works of "sinful flesh," was all the sabbatizing they practised on the Lord's day.

19. There is no law in the scriptures requiring the nations to keep the Lord's day in any manner whatever during his absence at the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens. So long as they continue faithless and disobedient to the gospel of the kingdom, neither nations nor individuals can present an acceptable observance of the day before the Lord: on the principle that "Jehovah is far from the wicked, whose way and sacrifice are an abomination to the Lord:"(Prov. xv. 8-9, 26-29.)—and,

20. The Lord's day was judaized by Constantine, the man-child of sin, (Rev. xii. 2-5.) and his clergy. His present representative is the Italian high priest of papal Christendom. When his power, and that of his kings, is finally destroyed in "the burning flame;" when Israel is engrafted into their own olive again, and the nations are subdued to the glorious sceptre of the king of saints—then will the Lord's day become the holy sabbath, "blessed and sanctified" of God instead of the shadowy seventh day, which was merely "a sign" of the things which will then have come to pass.

---

THE following clear and well-written article from the pen of Bro. Nicholas Dabb, of Elizabeth Port, N. J., we republish from the Gospel Banner of Dec, '58. Bro. Dabb was formerly a Methodist Preacher in London, England. He had then evidently mistaken his calling. God, in his providence, has since called him to a better and higher destiny, to his kingdom and glory; and, as every honest man would do, on believing the truth, he put off Methodism in putting on Christ, and abandoned soul-quacking for a living, and turned his hand to the more honorable craft of car-painting for the New Jersey Central. We presume that Bro. Dabb is doing what he can to enlighten his friends and neighbors, who are as truly "sitting in the region and shadow of death" as the Galileans of old time; for New Jersey and New York are verily a Zabulon and Naphthalim of the western world. One who can write so well can certainly speak to the instruction and edification of all interested in the truth.

The following is the article referred to:

"Observations on the Sabbath."

If the observance of the Sabbath be a matter of so much importance as our Sabbatarian friends contend for, is it not incomprehensibly strange, that neither our Lord nor any of his Apostles ever said a word about it? The New Testament is perfectly silent on the subject. Trace our Lord's teachings, as contained in the four gospels. Did he ever utter a word, from which even a fair inference might be drawn, that he intended his followers should observe the Sabbath? Not one such word. But on the contrary, he does teach that his followers are no longer placed under the obligations of the Sabbath law, Matt. xii. 1-8. The hypocritical Pharisees had found fault with Jesus' disciples, because they had rubbed the ears of corn in their hands, and eaten it on the Sabbath day. What did our Lord say about it? "The Son of Man is Lord even of the Sabbath day," evidently implying that he had the power to abrogate the Sabbath law, and that he would do it. I would especially commend the entire story to the Pharisees of this generation. They may derive a great deal of instruction from it.

Not only has Christ given no command to his followers to observe the Sabbath; — but Paul, —the voluminous writer Paul, —is also equally silent. More than one-fourth of the New Testament is from his pen. Fourteen epistles were written by him, to various churches and persons. Every doctrine and duty connected with Christianity, is commented upon in one part or another of his writings. If anything be omitted, surely it must be a matter of very small importance indeed. How then is it to be accounted for, that Paul says nothing whatever about the keeping the Sabbath? On the other hand, he does tell us that the Sabbath law is abrogated. See Col. ii. 14-17. But there is one part of the new Testament, to which I would especially call the attention of our Sabbatarian friends, —viz. the xv. chap, of the Acts. From the history recorded in this chapter, it appears that serious disturbance had occurred in the infant church at Antioch, in regard to Circumcision, and keeping the Law of Moses. The dissensions arising therefrom became so violent, that, in order to settle the question, it was deemed advisable to send Paul, Barnabas, and other brethren, as a delegation from the church, to the Apostles and Elders at Jerusalem, to take their opinions and instructions in the matter. In this extremely interesting history there are several very noteworthy particulars. 1st. The Council convened at Jerusalem to discuss this subject, constituted the highest authority which then existed in the Christian Church. This is evident from the deference paid to their decisions; as well as from the authority, with which these decisions were promulgated. It was not composed of ordinary men. Its members were Apostles: —divinely inspired men: —and that their deliberations were guided by the Holy Spirit, is evident from the 28<sup>th</sup> verse. "It seemed good to the HOLY SPIRIT, and to us, &c." 2nd. The 5<sup>th</sup> verse, tells us distinctly the business for which the

Council was convened. "There rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees, which believed, saying, That it was needful to circumcise them, (the Gentile converts) and to command them to keep THE LAW OF MOSES." This was the sum and substance of the whole matter. In the 6th verse we read, "And the Apostles and Elders came together, for to consider of THIS MATTER." From this it is impossible for us to mistake the subject of their discussions. It was simply this, —is the Law of Moses, or any part of it, to be imposed on Gentile believers? Now, then, follow the minutes of the Council to the close, —and what was the result of their deliberations? "For it seemed good to the Holy Spirit, and to us, to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things; That ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; from which if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well. Fare ye well." Now it must be evident to the merest child in intelligence, that, if ever God, or his Christ, or the Holy Apostles, ever designed or intended that Christians should keep a Sabbath, this was, of all others, the proper time and place to make the announcement. And yet the record is silent as the grave on the subject. 3rd. This was undoubtedly intended to be a final settlement of the question, whether any of the Mosaic law is still in force under the Christian dispensation? That must be a bold man indeed, who will dare to affirm, that these men, acting under such inspiration, overlooked, or neglected to notice, any part of the law of Moses, which it was necessary or desirable for Christians to observe.

In reviewing the history of this council, I would ask the advocates of Sabbatarianism, how they can account for such perfect silence on the subject. If keeping the Sabbath be a matter of such immense importance as is contended for in these days, how can it be accounted for that the Apostles neglected to inform the infant Church at Antioch of the fact?

Having thus far confessed ourselves to the argument against keeping a Sabbath, let us now consider the principal arguments used by Sabbatarians in favor of it. It must be conceded, that there is not in the New Testament any direct command to keep a Sabbath, either on the seventh or on the first day of the week: but it is claimed that the practice of the early Christians is alluded to with sufficient clearness to determine the question. Let us see. After careful research, I can find but two places where any such allusions are made. In Acts xx. 7, we read: "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, —ready to depart on the morrow, —and continued his speech until midnight; and there were many lights in the upper chamber where they were gathered together." Now, observe, this was an evening meeting. In 1 Cor. xvi. 2, we read: —Upon the first day of the week, let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." From these passages it is evident that the primitive Christians were in the habit of assembling together on the first day of the week. They met to break bread in remembrance of Jesus; because on that day he had risen from the dead. But what of this? There is not in these texts, neither do we find in Ecclesiastical history, the least particle of evidence that these early Christians regarded the day in the light of a Sabbath; or that they discontinued their ordinary avocations on this day. Besides, the thing in thousands of instances would be an impossibility. It must be borne in mind that the early Christians were generally poor; —thousands of them were servants; many of them were slaves. Suppose one of them were a servant to a Jew. His Jewish master could not allow him to work on the seventh day; and is it probable, that he would allow him to keep the first day also, thereby losing two days of his servant's labor in one week? The idea is preposterous. Suppose the Christian were a servant to a heathen; is it likely that his master would consent to lose his services on that day, just to gratify what he would regard as a superstitious whim? Certainly not. All we can gather from these passages is just this; —that the early Christians

were in the habit of assembling together, on the evening of the first day of the week, after their ordinary avocations were concluded.

I therefore repeat it again; —There is not the least particle of evidence, or even the least shadow of a hint, that they met to celebrate a sabbath; or that they imagined for one moment that the obligations of the Jewish Sabbath, either wholly or in part, were transferred to the followers of Christ.

Another passage, on which great reliance is placed by our Sabbatarian friends, is Rev. i. 10, in which the Revelator says, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." Not to dwell on the acknowledged fact, that this is a difficult and mysterious book from beginning to end; and also, that its language, style, and matter, are widely different from that of any other book in the Sacred Canon; I would ask our opponents, Are you sure that the "Lord's day" in this text means the first day of the week, or our Sunday? May not the text warrant another and widely different interpretation? This is not the only passage of Scripture in which this kind of language occurs. In 1 Thess. v. 2, and 2 Pet. iii. 10, we read, "The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night." In 2 Cor. i. 14. "Ye also are (will be) ours in the day of the Lord Jesus." Similar language occurs in 2 Thess. ii. 2; 1 Cor. v. 5; Mal. iv. 5; Zech. xiv. 1, and other places. In all these passages the Day of the Lord undoubtedly means the Day of Christ's second coming. May not the passage now under consideration refer to the same period? Might not John have designed to teach us, that, while in the Isle of Patmos, at one particular period, he was in a trance or ecstasy, produced by the Spirit of God; and that, while in this condition, his mind was divinely directed to a consideration of the events which should precede, usher in, and characterize the Day of the Lord? —the day, "when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe," 2 Thess. i. 10. I do not dogmatically affirm that this is the true meaning of the text, although I am inclined to believe it is: but I have adduced this argument to show that it is susceptible of another interpretation than the one usually applied to it. But, even were we to concede that the usual interpretation is correct; it utterly fails to establish the Sabbatarian position. All that could be gathered from it would be this: That the early Christians called one day of the week, by pre-eminence, "The Lord's Day," because on that day he had risen from the dead. The text fails to prove that they ceased from their ordinary employments on that day, and still more signally does it fail to prove that they celebrated it as a Sabbath.

A standing argument with our opponents is, that the Decalogue has never been repealed. To this I would reply by asking, — Was the Decalogue a part of the Mosaic code? —If it was, (and surely none will deny this,) then the passages quoted by "Z," in his articles, prove to a demonstration, that the whole law has been abrogated, Eph. ii. 15; Col. ii. 14-17. I would here venture to lay down an axiom; and I fearlessly challenge the entire fraternity of Priests and Preachers to impugn or overthrow it. Every part of the Mosaic code has been abrogated, and is no longer binding on men, except any of its requisitions have been reaffirmed by Jesus or his apostles; and have thereby become incorporated into the Christian system. Knowing this axiom to be inexpugnable, I would ask, —Where is the law of the Sabbath, or any part of it, so reaffirmed? It seems to me that there was something more than mere chance, in the fact, that all the other nine are so reaffirmed, but of this one, not a word is said, except to oppose it. If the reader desire proof of the re-enactment of the other nine, let him open his New Testament at the following places: For the 1st & 2nd Commandments, see 1 John v. 21. For the 3rd see 1 Tim. vi. 1. For the 5th see Eph. vi. 1; Col. iii. 20. For the 6<sup>th</sup> see 1 John iii. 15. For the 7th see Matt. v. 28; Heb. xiii. 4. For the 8th see Eph. iv. 28. For the 9th see Titus iii. 2; 2 Tim. iii. 3. For the 10th see Luke xii. 15; Eph. v. 3. There are a multitude

of passages, in which the nine commandments are directly, or indirectly, reaffirmed, but not a syllable to sustain the fourth. Let the Sabbatarian account for this if he can.

Another argument is sometimes used by the Sabbatarians, although it is so weak and futile as scarcely to be worth the trouble of confutation. It is this. From the Acts of the Apostles we find that they were often found in the Synagogues on the Sabbath day, disputing the Jews, and preaching the Gospel. This is true; but you must observe, This was on the Jewish Sabbath day, therefore this argument is more to your detriment than to your advantage. The reason why they attended these places was simply this: they could always find a congregation there on that day. The Jews would of course always attend the synagogues, and the Apostles availed themselves of these favorable opportunities for bringing before them the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ.

Perhaps some one may by this time be ready to ask, Why are you so anxious to do away with what is usually called the Christian Sabbath? Friend Sabbatarian, listen to me for one moment. I am not at all anxious to do anything of the kind; but since you, and the professed Christian world generally, have agreed to denounce as a flagrant sinner every man who does not keep a Sabbath after your own fashion, I have felt constrained to ask, —What authority have you for so doing? This is just what I have been trying to do in this article. I have been examining the Law, and the bearing which that Law has upon Christians, —and I think, that, in connection with Friend "Z," I have succeeded in showing that you and your friends are making "Much ado about nothing." In conclusion, let me ask as a favor, that, before you denounce me as a sinner again, have the goodness to show your authority for it. —  
NICHOLAS DABB,  
Elizabeth Port, N. J.

---

### The Sinning Soul Shall Die.

#### OBJECTIONS CONSIDERED AND EXPLAINED. BY JOHN MILTON.

ON the other hand, those who assert that the soul is exempt from death, and that when divested of the body it wings its way, or is conducted by angels, directly to its appointed place of reward or punishment, where it remains in a separate state of existence to the end of the world, found their belief principally on the following passages of Scripture. Psal. xlix. 15, "God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave." But this proves rather that the soul enters the grave with the body, as was shown above, from whence it needs to be redeemed, namely, at the resurrection, when "God shall receive it," as follows in the same verse. As for the remainder, "their redemption ceaseth forever," verse 8, and they are like the beasts that perish, verse 12, 14.

The second text is Eccl. xii. 7, "the spirit shall return unto God that gave it." But neither does this prove what is required; for the phrase the spirit returning to God, must be understood with considerable latitude; since the wicked do not return to God at death, but depart from him. The Preacher had moreover said before, Eccl. iii. 20, "all go unto one place;" and God is said to have given and to gather to Himself the spirit of every living thing, whilst the body returns to dust. Job xxxiv. 14, 15, "if he gather unto himself his spirit and his breath, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again unto dust. See also Psal. civ. 29, 30. Euripides, in the Suppliants, has, without being aware of it, given a far better interpretation of this passage than the commentators in question.

Each various part  
That constitutes the frame of man, returns  
Whence it was taken; to th' ethereal sky  
The spirit, the body to its earth.

Line 599 Potter's Transl.

That is, every constituent part returns at dissolution to its elementary principle. This is confirmed by Ezek. xxxvii. 9, "Come from the four winds, O breath;" it is certain, therefore, that the spirit of man must have previously departed thither from whence it is now summoned to return. Hence perhaps originates the expression in Matt. xxiv. 31, "they shall gather together the elect from the four winds." For why should not the spirits of the elect be as easily gathered together as the smallest particles of their bodies, sometimes most widely dispersed through different countries. In the same manner is to be understood 1 Kings xvii. 21, "Let this child's soul come into him again." This, however, is a form of speech applied to fainting in general: Judges xv. 19, "his spirit came again, and he revived." See also 1 Sam. xxx. 12. For there are many passages of Scripture, some of which undoubtedly represent the dead as devoid of all vital existence; but what was advanced above, respecting the death of the spirit, affords a sufficient answer to the objection.

The third passage is Matt. x. 28, "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul." It may be answered that properly speaking, the body cannot be killed, as being in itself a thing inanimate: the body therefore, as is common in Scripture, must be taken for the whole human compound, or for the animal and temporal life; the soul for that spiritual life with which we shall be clothed after the end of the world, as appears from the remainder of the verse and from 1 Cor. xv. 44.

The fourth text is Philip i. 23, "having a desire to depart (cupiens dissolvi, having a desire for dissolution) and to be with Christ." But, to say nothing of the uncertain and disputed sense of the word ἀναλυσαι αἰα-lusia, which signifies anything rather than dissolution, it may be answered, that although Paul desired to obtain immediate possession of heavenly perfection and glory, in like manner as every one is desirous of attaining as soon as possible to that, whatever it may be, which he regards as the ultimate object of his being, it by no means follows that, when the soul of each individual leaves the body, it is received immediately into heaven or hell. For he had "a desire to be with Christ;" that is, at his appearing, which all the believers hoped and expected was then at hand. In the same manner one who is going on a voyage desires to set sail and to arrive at the destined port (such is the order in which his wishes arrange themselves), omitting all notice of the intermediate passage. If, however, it be true that there is no time without motion, which Aristotle illustrates by the example of those who were fabled to have slept in the temple of the heroes, and who, on awaking, imagined that the moment in which they awoke had succeeded without an interval to that in which they fell asleep; how much more must intervening time be annihilated to the departed, so that to them to die and to be with Christ will seem to take place at the same moment? Christ himself, however, expressly indicates the time at which we shall be with him; John xiv. 3, "if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." (See Colossians iii. 4.)

The fifth text evidently favors my view of the subject: 1 Pet. iii. 19, "by which also he went and preached to the spirits that are in prison," literally, in guard, or as the Syriac version renders it, in sepulchro, in the grave, which means the same; for the grave is the common guardian of all till the day of judgment. What therefore the apostle says more fully, chap. iv.

5, 6, "who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and the dead ; for, for this cause was the Gospel preached also to them that are dead;" he expresses it in this place by a metaphor, "the spirits that are in guard;" it follows, therefore, that the spirits are dead.

The sixth text is Rev. vi. 9, "I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain." I answer, that in the Scripture idiom the soul is generally often put for the whole animate body, and that in this passage it is used for the souls of those who were not yet born; unless indeed the fifth seal was already opened in the time of John; in the same manner as in the parable of Dives and Lazarus, Luke xvi., though Christ, for the sake of the lesson to be conveyed, speaks of that as present which was not to take place till after the day of judgment, and describes the dead as placed in two distinct states, he by no means intimates any separation of the soul from the body.

The seventh text is Luke xxiii. 43, Jesus said unto him, "verily I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." This passage has on various accounts occasioned so much trouble, that some have not hesitated to alter the punctuation, as if it had been written, "I say unto thee to-day;" that is, although I seem to-day the most despised and miserable of all men, yet I declare to thee and assure thee, that thou shalt hereafter be with me in paradise, that is, in some pleasant place (for properly speaking paradise is not heaven), or in the spiritual state allotted to the soul and body... Nor is it necessary to take the word to-day in its strict acceptation, but rather for a short time, as in 2 Sam. xvi. 3; Heb. iii. 7. However this may be, so much clear evidence should not be rejected on account of a single passage, of which it is not easy to give a satisfactory interpretation.

The eighth text is Luke xxiii. 46, "Into thy hands I commend my spirit." But the spirit is not therefore separated from the body, or incapable of death; for David uses the same language. Psal. xxxi. 5, although he was not then about to die: "into thine hand I commit my spirit while it was yet abiding in, and with the body." So Stephen, Acts. vii. 59, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit . . . and when he had said this, he fell asleep." It was not the bare spirit divested of the body that he commended to Christ, but "the whole spirit and soul and body," as it is expressed, 1 Thess. v. 23. Thus the spirit of Christ was to be raised again with the body on the third day, while that of Stephen was to be reserved unto the appearing of the Lord. So 1 Pet. iv. 19, "let them commit the keeping of their souls to him in well-doing."

The ninth passage is 2 Cor. v. 1-20. It is sufficiently apparent, however, that the object of this passage is not to inculcate the separation of the soul from the body, but to contrast the animal and terrestrial life of the whole man with the spiritual and heavenly. Hence in the first verse, "the house of this tabernacle," is opposed not to the soul, but to "a building of God, an house not made with hands," that is, to the final renewal of the whole man, as Beza also explains it, whereby "we are clothed upon" in the heavens, being clothed, not naked. This distinctly appears from the fourth verse: "not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life." See also verse 5, "now he that hath wrought us for the self-same thing is God;" not for the separating of the soul from the body, but for the perfecting of both. Wherefore the clause in the eighth verse, "to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord," must be understood of the consummation of our happiness; and "the body" must be taken for this frail life as is common in the sacred writers, and the absence spoken of, for our eternal departure to an heavenly world; or perhaps to be "at home in the body and to be absent from the Lord," may mean nothing more than to be entangled in worldly affairs, and to have little leisure for heavenly things; the reason of which is given "for we walk by faith, not by sight;" whence it follows "we are confident and willing

rather to be absent from the body, and to be present with the Lord;" that is, to renounce worldly things as much as possible, and to be occupied with things heavenly. The ninth verse proves still more clearly that the expressions "to be present" and "to be absent" both refer to this life: "Wherefore we labor that whether present or absent, we may be accepted of God:" for no one supposes that the souls of men are occupied from the time of death to that of the resurrection, in endeavors to render themselves acceptable to God in heaven; that is the employment of the present life, and its reward is not to be looked for till the second coming of Christ. For the Apostle says "we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ that every one may receive the things in body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." There is, consequently, no recompense of good or bad after death, previous to the day of judgment. Compare 1 Cor. xv., the whole of which chapter throws no small light on this passage. The same sense is to be ascribed to 2 Pet. i. 13-15, "as long as I am in this tabernacle," &c, that is, in this life. It is, however, unnecessary to prolong this discussion, as there is scarcely one of the remaining passages of Scripture which has not been already explained by anticipation.

---

### What the True Gospel Is.

(From the Gospel Banner.)

THE word "Gospel," as is pretty well known—signifies "good news" or "glad tidings." It is derived from the Saxon god, good; and spel, speech or news. In the Greek its equivalent is euangelion; from eu, good, and angelion, a message—a good message. When the definite article the is placed before the word, it is used to denote, by way of pre-eminence, that particular "good news" which concerns the best interests of the human race as revealed in the Bible, viz., salvation. So far, then, all agree; but the common idea stops short here, dealing only in generalities, and cannot enter into particulars, nor give a clear, consistent definition, except some vague theory that it is "the good news of forgiveness of sins through Christ's death on the cross to save men from eternal woe." Take, for instance, Spurgeon's sum and substance of it, expressed as follows:—"If any man here should be in doubt on account of ignorance, let me, as plainly as I can, state the gospel. I believe it to be wrapped up in one word—Substitution—Christ standing in the stead of man. If I understand the gospel, it is this: I deserve to be lost and ruined; the only reason why I should not be damned is this, that Christ was punished in my stead, and there is no need to execute sentence twice for sin. Christ took the cup in both his hands, and

"At one tremendous draught of love,  
He drank damnation dry!"

Of a like nature is another sentiment, that "one drop of Christ's blood is able to save ten thousand worlds." But as we have already proved these to be very unscriptural definitions, we leave them to their folly and pass on to our theme.

This "joyful sound," Ps. lxxxiv. 15, is known by various names in Scripture. It is called "the Gospel of God," because it comes from him, as its author, Rom. xv. 16, and "the gospel of the grace of God," Acts xx. 24, because it publishes his favor and loving kindness to fallen men, and because all this favor is freely given by him, unbought either by Christ's blood or anything else. Hence the term "grace" in many texts, must be understood as referring to the gospel, though not always specified. Such as—Acts. xiii. 43; Rom. v. 2, 15; 1 Cor. i. 4; 2 Cor. vi. 1; ix. 14; Gal. ii. 14; Eph. iii. 2, 7; Heb. iv. 10. It is called the "gospel of Christ," because it is about him, and sent forth by him, Rom. xv. 19, 29; 1 Cor. iv. 15; 2 Cor. iv. 4; and

is glad tidings concerning the mission of mercy he is working out for men. It is this "grace," kindness or favor of God and of Christ, that brings us salvation, Titus ii. 11; and is bestowed on men without any former merit or purchase on their part. This "gospel of our salvation" is identical with the "Word of Truth," Eph. i. 13; and Jas. i. 18, 21; it is called the "Word of the Truth of the Gospel," Col. i. 6; and had Pilate waited a little to receive an answer to his question, "What is truth," may be he might have received one which would have definitely settled the matter in the plainest terms. Still there is sufficient to show to the candid that "the Truth as it is in Jesus" must be comprehensive of the gospel, Eph. iv. 21. "The Truth" and "the Gospel," are therefore convertible terms, and so is the phrase "the Faith;" and frequently another expression, "the Word of the Lord," or more simply "the Word," is used to denote the gospel enlarged to its fullest extent by the additional testimonies of Jesus and the Apostles, and is applied both to God and Christ. This expression does not always mean the Bible, as many suppose, but is generally restricted in the New Testament to the collection of those grand and saving truths which formed the subject-matter of their preaching. And occasionally it is termed "the Word of Life," 1 John i. 1, and "the words of this life," Acts v. 20; because it reveals Immortality.

We will now present a few things treated of in the true Gospel, and then elucidate them fully.

1. Paul says it was preached to Abraham in these words, "In thee shall all nations be blessed," Gal. iii. 8. The instance he refers to is recorded in Gen. xii.1-3, and yet there is not a word said in any of these about those things which are now said to be the gospel.

2. It was preached to Israel in the wilderness, Heb iv. 2. If we turn to the only cases in which anything like gospel was announced there to the twelve tribes, we shall find that it had reference to "the promised Rest," as stated in Hebrews, Exod. xv. 17, 18; Num. xiv. 21,22, 23.30; Deut. i. 34, 35. This was the goodly promised land which was destined to be their permanent abode if they continued faithful; and it was because they brought a slander on the land, and despised the place where God would place them in peaceful rest, that, as the apostle reasons, "they could not enter in through unbelief," and as some must enter in, the same privilege is yet open to all who chose, and there still remains a Rest for the people of God. Heb iii. 19; iv. 1, 2, 3, 6-11. But more of this anon.

3. The gospel is intimately connected with the Seed of David, 2 Tim. ii. 8. Nay, this forms an integral and very important item thereof. But not so with the popular ones. It makes no real difference to them, beyond the simple fulfilment of a prophecy, whether Christ was born of the Seed of David, or of Caesar. But he who reads the word aright, knows that it was needful that he should spring from David in order to reign on David's throne, in accordance with the covenant made with that poet-king of Israel.

4. The true gospel reveals A JUDGMENTDAY, Rom. ii. 15, 16; Acts xvii. 31.

5. And announces "THE ACCEPTABLE YEAR (or BLESSED ERA) OF THE LORD," Isa. lxi. 2; Luke xiv. 2.

6. And A TIME OF RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS, Acts iii. 21.

7. And A PERIOD OF REGENERATION, Matt, xix. 28.

But what has the sectarian gospel to do with these things? Nothing. Therefore it cannot be the same the apostles preached.

All these are general terms, and need to be connected with something still more definite and earthly before our intellect and faith can lay hold of it. The inquiry is raised: "But what is the Truth? what is the Word of gospel-truth about, tell us its definite topics, but tell us all, keep nothing back, and tell us clearly and intelligibly the way of salvation!" We will. If we could not do this, if we dealt with "everything in general and nothing in particular," and were unable to present anything tangible for faith; we might justly be accused of the same lack that has been complained of against others. Now, then, let us narrow the subject down to a smaller compass. In one place we read of such a thing as the "Word of the Kingdom" being sown in the mind, Matt. xiii. 19, under the figure of "good seed." This is the same as the Gospel, which is often styled simply "the kingdom of God," or "of heaven," and sometimes both are conjoined together as "the gospel of the kingdom," Mat. iv. 23; xxiv. 14; ix. 35; Mark i. 11-15.

Here, then, is the true definition—the gospel is the glad tidings concerning the Kingdom of God, and Salvation in and by it. "But why and how? Why should salvation be connected with the setting up of a Kingdom more than anything else? we always were taught that simple faith in Christ as the person who will save the world is enough." As these inquiries are fair and natural, a proper answer is demanded, and shall be given.

The reason why human redemption is so indissolubly connected with the establishment of this Divine kingdom is, because men bear the relation of revolted subjects from their original allegiance to God, who, as the Governor of the Universe, has a right to the dutiful and loyal service of all his rational creatures. But man used his free agency to break loose from under this kind, paternal restraint, and to yield his submission to a power of Sin, called in the Bible "the Devil and Satan, who deceives the whole world," the great adversary of truth and righteousness" who leads men captive at his will," 2 Tim ii. 25, 27; "the powers of darkness;" the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now works in the children of disobedience," Eph v. 2. Into the controversy whether these names are applied to a real personal being, or only in a figurative manner to the principles of sin in the aggregate, we do not enter; but it amounts to the same thing in either case—that men are subjects to the kingdom of Satan, or the dominion of sin—not to that of God; and the whole object of redemption is to "translate us from this power of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son," Col. i. 13, to re-establish the divine government in the world. Thus, as it is sin and rebellion that separates man from God, and interferes with the regal authority of the Creator, it must be destroyed out of the way, and mankind restored to become obedient and happy subjects again.

---

#### A Request.

HALIFAX, Dec. 3, 1858

DEAR BROTHER THOMAS: —Will you please insert the accompanying epistle in the Jan. No. of "Herald," and oblige the brethren here. We are sending copies to each church in Britain, but can only address our American brethren in a general manner, through the press.

The church here may be said to "dwell where Satan's seat is," i. e. the infidelistic Satan whose emissaries oft-time disturb and oppose, something as did the Jews when they rent the

air, threw dust, and blasphemed. The orthodox take care that we come not into contact with them, or rather they with us. As a congregation, we are only feeble, needing more help, which, however, we have got in a first instalment.

Wishing you every success in your courageous and laborious testifying, I remain your brother in faith,

(On behalf of the church,)

JOHN WILSON, Cor.

---

A New Year's Message.

To the brethren of "like precious faith" scattered throughout America, the church in Halifax, England, send greeting.

May your health and prosperity flourish; may peace and rejoicing abound with you; and may your hearts be filled with all wisdom and knowledge, that you may be honored with an abundant entrance into the kingdom of our Father, when our heavenly Master returns to gather all to himself. It has seemed good to the brethren meeting in this place, to make the present season of kindly salutation an occasion of greeting to the household of faith, that all may be stimulated in the good work of "patient well-doing," and that our hearts may be more closely "knit together in the bonds of love."

Dear brethren, we have rejoiced to see the progress which is being made in truth-sowing in both this island and among you. The growth of many churches in numerical strength, and the founding of others, we hail as tokens of good, inspiring us to more zealous endeavor in our Master's service, and making us desire that all other brethren may be incited to still more efficient activity. Many reasons ought to induce this life in labor. Our beloved Lord was unceasing in his service to us, leaving us in this "an example that we should tread in his steps." When we consider his zeal, we cannot give place to that lukewarmness which in effect says: "I have found; let others seek for themselves." "Even the Christ pleased not himself, but (doubly) gave his life a ransom for many." We cannot sit at ease if we but think of the great salvation to be attained in so short a time.

True, the cares of every-day life, and the influences of this world's pursuits, do oppose themselves; but let us hold in mind the reward for well-doing, and then we cannot but be earnest in our warfare with the world. We are beset with temptations peculiar to this mortal condition, and to this disorganized state of Gentile domination. We have to foster faith and love toward God, while surrounded by influences so essentially adverse to their existence. Business pursuits must have our attention during the greater portion of our time; and the cankering care thereby induced is apt to eat the nerve and muscle of our faith; whilst the moral effect of our contact with, and the invidious scorn of ignorant and unbelieving men is, to dampen our ardor, and to obscure the brightness of that glorious image which has been impressed upon our hearts by faith. The weakness of the flesh is another great difficulty, from its engendering weariness and indifference, if not watched against. Our confidence of hope is also peculiarly assailed in this day. The sectarian scoffer inquires triumphantly: "Where is the promise of his coming, for . . . all things continue as they were from the beginning?" And the subtleties of the sceptic cannot fail to affect our hearts. We fear not the rebuffs of the adversary; still these things do have an insidious and imperceptible tendency to dishearten and stagger. But, beloved brethren, let us "not be weary in well-doing, for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not." Let us give constant heed to the word of Christ, which, if it "dwell in us

richly, in all wisdom," will make us able to overcome the choking cares of this life. Let us keep our minds en rapport with "the oracles of the living God," by daily and unremitting study.

The brethren of the Lord Jesus ought to live as becomes their high calling, using themselves and their substance in the Father's service. For if any pursue their business as do the men of this age, keen in the getting of riches, or expend their good things in their own gratification, they come into that class of whom Jesus says, "the cares of this world, and the deceitfulness of riches, choke the word." But capital and labor devoted to helping the poor of the churches, disseminating the word of truth, &c, we are assured is a most profitable investment.

Beloved brethren, let us be zealous toward God, "working with all diligence to make our calling and election sure." O that each of us would remember that in degree according to our deeds will be our reward. The Son of God declares: "I will give to every one of you according to your works." It is not the enrolment of names on the lists, but the successful running which ensures the victor's chaplet. Then, brothers and sisters, through another year let us strive earnestly and with a high aim, yea, "let us press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling which is in Christ Jesus." Shall we not try to earn high distinction by our works of labor, patience, and love; our enmity to evil; our perseverance; our service; our faith? The promises to those who overcome, are many and great, even all the blessings pertaining to immortality and incorruptibility. Let us then labor to obtain them, by a fervent, earnest, courteous demeanor in life and testimony. "Let us put on the whole armor of God," and gird up our loins to the conflict. Let us fight the good fight of faith, and in one united band advance to victory! O let us never flag! The bright dawn of eternal day approaches; the hour hastens when these corruptible bodies shall put on incorruption, being fashioned after the brightness and perfection of him whose countenance shines like the sun in his strength.

The sum of all the duties of our service is zeal. Not fire and furor; but calm, plodding, persevering zeal. We ought to measure our service by our actions, (daily accounted,) whether these be active witnessing to small and great, exhorting, reproving, counselling, almsgiving; or the passive testimony of a perfect life, the outflowing of love, patience, joy: by these, rather than by the success as regards others which may attend our word. If we bore this in mind, there would ensue less of that downheartedness which so often makes us halt because we see no fruit. Certainly we may all desire that some one shall place on our heads the coronet in the day of redemption, and confess we were the agents of their coming to the knowledge of the truth; but this must not be the aim of our endeavor. If we laid up in mind the thought that the daily pennies of labor make the pounds of reward, we should be incited to persevere "through good report and evil report;" when the other will be almost sure to follow.

Then to all the household—young men and maidens, middle-aged, fathers and mothers in Christ, would we say: Companion us in a determination to do the utmost for the testimony of God, by teaching, by preaching, by word, by deed, by every means which we can employ. Young men, upon you depends mostly the force of our congregations; be warm and vigorous. We say with John: "I write to you, young men, because you are strong, and the word of God abideth in you, and you have overcome the wicked one. Love not the world, neither the things in the world." Young sisters, you are the graces of "the family," softening and beautifying the whole. Incite the brotherhood to continuous zeal; win to Christ those who are dear to you. Fathers and mothers, the end of the race is not far distant; you have borne the heat and burden of the day—do not relax your efforts yet, but add a little to your sum of labor.

Brothers and sisters, one and all, we can but say with the Apostle, that "now it is high time to awake out of sleep, for now is our salvation nearer than when we first believed. The night is far spent; the day is at hand; let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armor of light." Now, when all the earth is waking to the struggle, is no time to sit selfishly at ease. If we have any thought for "the recompense of reward," we must "be not conformed to this world." It is, alas! too true a charge brought by outsiders against the believers of God's electing message, that their deportment and conversation differ almost nothing from the world's votaries. There is too little observance of the command, "Let your conversation be as becometh the gospel of Christ." Oh, brethren, be it ours to "let our light shine before men, that they may see our good works," and thus we shall glorify our Father.

"The time is short" in which we can labor. It is the "eleventh hour." "The Lord is at hand," and "redemption draweth nigh." The glad morning of salvation is about to dawn on this sin-stricken world. The grave shall but little longer retain the fettered sons of God; but one long bright morning of freedom shall burst upon the world in the advent of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, "who shall change our vile bodies," and destroy the unrighteous governments which have so long burdened the earth. Let us then be patient in our present tribulation, and continue "seeking for glory, honor, and immortality," by

"LABORS MORE ABUNDANT."

Signed by all the brethren.

---

### Theiopolitical.

Behold, as a thief I come! Blessed is he that watches.

#### Egypt and Syria—Western Influence.

(From the North British Review.)

THIS article is not so much a review of some half-dozen works on Egypt and Syria, as it is an exposition of our status in those unsettled and coveted countries — of our mistakes in policy, together with a powerful elucidation of the rival policy of other European powers. The whole article is well worth attentive perusal, it is eminently suggestive, and though we do not entirely agree with some of the writer's strictures and conclusions, upon the whole, the writer's ability and information have carried us with him, and we especially commend his remarks on our consular appointments in those regions to the notice of the high authorities of the empire. The writer says: —

The whole system of consular government in the East requires amendment. These European representatives are too strong and too weak. They can defy and they can be defied, even in matters of law and justice. They are quite strong enough to oppress the feeble; they are not strong enough to resist the powerful. They would not, perhaps, defile their hands with a bribe, like an Eastern Kadi; but they are accessible to influences which are quite as corrupting; the blandishment or the menace doing effectually the work of the bribe. Stimulated by rivalries, one part of their vocation is to thwart each other. Acting as political delegates from their several governments, their object is to watch each other's movements and countercheck each other's schemes. Ostensibly they come to care for the interests of the men of their own nation; in reality they concern themselves as much about the interests of those

beyond their jurisdiction. Holy Scripture speaks of men who are "busy-bodies in other men's matters," or, as the word is, *αλλοτριεπικόποι* that is, "everybody's bishop but their own;" and, perhaps we might, without injustice to some at least, use the word here, and say that many of these men of authority are everybody's consuls but their own. Espionage becomes the consulate as ill as the embassy; but, in the present jealous condition of Western politics, the consul is compelled to act the part of spy, or at least sentinel.

Nor is one surprised at the large consular establishments of Alexandria; nor the smaller but equally numerous vice-consulates of Cairo; nor at the recent elevation (a few months since) of the French vice-consulate at Suez into a regular consulate. Suez, in deed, is little better than a large khan, a station on the great Haj road to Mecca through the desert; nor can it ever be a port, on account of the shoals of the Red Sea, and the drifting sands on both sides, which are yearly compelling its waters to retreat; but then its importance as an entrepot both for France and England cannot easily be overrated, at least until the Euphrates Railway shall attract into the Persian Gulf the commerce that now passes up the blue strip between the peninsular peaks and the bluffs of Ras Atakah. Cairo, both for size and Oriental celebrity, has some claims upon European notice, though, from its position, it is not likely to be a focus either of enterprise or intrigue. Alexandria, certainly, is the great center where East and West meet, and in it Europe ought to be well represented—England, above all, for she has the most at stake. Yet, if report speak true, the diplomacy, the nerve, and the influence, are monopolized by France, which, always true to its national interests, seeks out men for places, not places for men, and sends talent to courts or consulates where England is content with title.

But it somewhat surprises one to find some six or eight European consuls or vice-consuls at Jerusalem. What can they be doing there?

A first-rate power, like England, might, if it were not so passive and easy-minded, secure a very much larger share of power in Rome than she has at present; but a second rate power, such as Prussia, has little likelihood of success, whatever energy she might throw out. At Jerusalem, however, Prussia has a considerably better chance. She has but to send a tolerably clever consul, not over-scrupulous or modest, with instructions to spare neither chicanery nor violence, in cajoling, menacing, and bullying Pasha, Eliendi, or fellow-consul. And if the supposed Prussian consul can only get himself backed by one or more ambitious ecclesiastics, as tools and cooperatives in the great continental work of humbling England, and edging her gradually out of her position in the East, the cabinet of Potsdam may congratulate itself on being able to drive a tolerable business in the East, and bring on political complications, of which Latins and Greeks will take prompt advantage.

It would be a very shallow mistake to suppose that the capture of Sebastopol ended the quarrel between the Greek and Latin churches in Palestine. The conflict was suspended for a season, till sword and cannon had done their work in the Crimea. Had Russia conquered, the Syrian crisis would have been precipitated, and European influence would have, ere this, been ebbing out of Jerusalem. The church of the Holy Sepulchre would have been in her hands, and the imposture of the Pentecostal fire would have been triumphant. Had she, on the other hand, carried on the contest a little longer, say even for another year, the state of the East would have been entirely altered, and England would by this time have had the whole of Syria at its feet. Russia was exhausted ere her Crimean fortress fell, and would have had to withdraw her pretensions in Jerusalem as head of the Greek Church. But France, too, was no less exhausted; and by the time that another campaign had terminated, England would have been the only

power capable of lifting a sword. The dictatorship of the East would have fallen into her hands without a struggle. But Russia paused in time; and by pausing as she did, in January, 1856, she saved herself from total humiliation, and prevented what, by January, 1857, would have been the inevitable conclusion of the warfare, the establishment of British supremacy both in Syria and Egypt. Our statesmen were terrified at the prospect of having to carry on the war alone against the Northern Emperor, as in a few months longer we should have had to do; but the conflict was one to which our resources were thoroughly equal, and the issue would have been worth all the cost, though the disturbance of the balance of power would have been great indeed.

The warfare having ended in the Crimea before France and Russia were drained of men and gold, it could be revived, after a season, on the spot where the quarrel originally began. Accordingly, it has been so renewed. The church of the Holy Sepulchre is surmounted by a dome, large and somewhat clumsy. In 1853, this dome had fallen somewhat into disrepair. On its south side, some feet from its base, time and weather had worn away the outer covering, and a large rent or hole disfigured the outward aspect of the building, and made it uncomfortable within. It must be repaired. By whom? Greeks or Latins? For to both the church belongs. Let it be remembered that this was not a case in which the parties were desirous of evading the expense of repair, and of casting the burden off their own shoulders. Nor was it a case in which each party was merely claiming the honor of doing such a work. It was not the honor, but the power which the doing of the thing would confer upon the party doing it; for in the East, the man who assists in repairing a house has a claim over the house, almost amounting to actual property. Hence France stepped in, and in the name of the Latin Church, insisted on her right to be the repairer. Russia stepped in, and in the name of the Greek Church, maintained her right in the matter. The Pasha quietly made offer, it is said, to take the cost upon himself. But France would not yield to Russia; Russia would not yield to France; neither would yield to the Pasha. The power at stake was too great to be easily conceded. Hence to this day the dome has remained in miserable disrepair; and the last accounts were, that the rent was getting so wide that the rain poured in.

It was the question, "Who is to repair the dome?" that led to the Crimean war! During that war the question was held in abeyance, in the hope that Crimean victories would settle it. The war ceased, but the question remained unsettled; the dome, of course, remained unpatched. The point has been stirred again. M. de Thouvenel, a French envoy at Constantinople, has revived the Latin claim to the cupola; and Russia is mustering all her diplomatic influence to maintain the rights of the Greek Church. Around the supposed tomb of the Prince of Peace, the battle of the two churches is again renewed. Neither nation is in a condition for war; yet both have sufficient power to fan the ecclesiastical animosities of a thousand years, and to hinder any adjustment of the question. No one can tell when this old cupola may be repaired; for a compromise between the parties seems almost impossible. They will rather allow the edifice to go to wreck. ANOTHER WAR MAY AT ANY TIME BE THE RESULT. The direct interest of Britain in these disputes about sacred edifices is not very obvious; but her indirect interest is great in the extreme. It is of no moment to her who patches the holy dome, or who possesses the "Church of the Resurrection," in so far as the dome and the church are concerned. Why should she then be drawn into the strife; and why should she incline to the side of the Latin rather than the Greek Church? The reason lies close at hand. The preponderance of the Greek Church is the preponderance of Russia in the East; and the first exercise of Russian supremacy in the East would be to bar out England from India. Better, then, that any other power than Russia should have sway in Syria and Egypt.

Foiled in her first attempt to seize Palestine, Russia will be more wary now. Her object is now to gain silent influence, while she avoids open rupture. Nor will any effort, direct or indirect, be spared to accomplish this. As, during the war, she made Prussia her servile tool; and, by means of her, threw daily impediments in the way of the allies; so will she continue to do now. The game that Prussia is playing in Palestine, is as much for Russia as for herself; and while Russia carries on the diplomatic war with France, she, with wily sagacity, confides to Prussia the work of assailing and affronting Protestant England. The Prussian consul at Jerusalem is quite aware of the part that he is expected to play,

After paying a just tribute to the energy of our present consul, the writer goes on to say:

England is the more called on to support her consuls in the East, because at present, as will be seen from Mr. Porter's able letters in the Times, the Turkish authorities are doing their utmost both to bully and to overreach them. The Pashalic of Damascus is in a critical position, and Turkish fanaticism is gathering strength and fury. Strange to say, it is specially against England that this fanaticism is showing itself; probably because continental hatred of our land bands European consuls together, and leads them to unite their influence and intrigues in stimulating against our consuls the smothered bigotry of Islamism. Should our Government show any vacillation in this matter, or any shyness in supporting vigorously the counsels and measures of its representatives, our peril is great and imminent; the Jaffa tragedy will be reenacted at Jerusalem, and Mohammedanism will rush forth, scimitar in hand, from El-Khulil, Nablus, Esh-Sham, to do for the Christians of Syria what it has been doing for the Christians of Oude. A little more trifling and indecision on our part, a few more indications of timidity and submissiveness, and we have irremediably destroyed both our prestige and our power in these Eastern regions.

Speaking of the condition of the Jews in Syria, the writer declares that "the Jew is a stranger in Palestine—nowhere can a Jew feel insult and injury more than in his own land, and at no hands can he resent wrong more than at those of a Christian Gentile”:

Among Englishmen, the interest in the Jew is much greater than among other nations. One does not wonder that the men of France, or Spain, or Italy should be so contemptuous towards the Israelite. Romanism has taught them this; and even the Protestants in these nations have imbibed, not perhaps dislike, but at least indifference.

It is among the Christians of Britain that the Jew has ever found his truest, warmest friends. Somehow or other there seems an affinity, or at least a sympathy, between the Israelite and the Englishman, such as does not exist between the Israelite and the German. Among English consuls, too, there is a disposition to protect the Jew such as is not displayed at the consulates of other nations. And it is remarkable, that the greatest friend of Israel in the whole East is the British consul of Jerusalem.

The writer states, we fear with too much truth, that—

England is not loved in the East, any more than in the West. She is great enough to be envied, or perhaps admired, but too great, too strong, to be loved. That she is feared, is obvious enough; and much more feared might she be, were she as punctilious in claiming her position, and insisting on her rights, as some nations are. Her conscious strength makes her too easy and too patient; she lays aside needful vigilance and jealousy; she concedes to

weakness what she would deny to power. The Moslem, indeed, if he does not love her, yet in some measure trusts her; for she is much more honest than others, and little disposed to aggression or cruelty; so that, unlike all others, she would rather suffer wrong than inflict it. But by all there is a recognition of her greatness; and even they that dislike it most, are proud when placed in circumstances which enable or entitle them to wield her power. A Syrian consul or a German ecclesiastic, entrusted with British power, is a proud man indeed. Ten chances to one, however, that he will abuse it. To have the power of such a nation committed to them, even in humble offices, is sufficient to turn some men's minds. Some of the most "fantastic tricks" that have been played in the East, have come about in this peculiar way. The position, which would not for a moment elate an Englishman, would at once upset a foreigner; nor does anything gratify him more than when he can wield English power against some unhappy Englishman that may have fallen under his displeasure by his boldness and independence.

England is by far too remiss in regard to her own interest in Syria; and if our government at home is not more vigilant and energetic, she will find herself gradually edged or elbowed out of the land. France, Russia, Austria, and Prussia have all their schemes of national aggrandizement there. The courts of Paris, Petersburg, Vienna, and Berlin, are quite alive to the importance of securing a strong position in the East. They instruct their consuls on this point, and they warmly back them. There is not one of their officials but knows that he will be vigorously supported by his government in any scheme, however ambitious, or in any blunder, however gross, if only that scheme or that blunder tends to aggrandize his nation, or humble its rival.

---

These remarks are very suggestive; the whole article, we repeat, will repay perusal.

---

"What is Left to Turkey?"

(Manchester Times, Sept. 9, '58.)

We ought perhaps to feel grateful rather than otherwise, that Turkey is an exception, at the present moment, to the almost universal somnolency of the political world. But let us be thankful. If all is quiet elsewhere, there is always something stirring in Turkey. There can be no repose in the "sick man's" bed-chamber. There, in stillest midnight, the lamp is always burning; there we are sure to hear the shrill voices of intriguing nurses, who have taken the patient "by the job," and are resolved to make short work of it, and of doctors whose counter interests lead them to prolong the crisis, with the settled intention of making the patient so ill that he cannot possibly recover, at the same time, by the use of restoratives and anodynes, taking good care that he does not slip out of their hands.

We recently called attention to the dilapidated condition of Turkish finance. The Sultan seems to have comprehended at last the desperate state of his affairs, and to have aroused himself to action. As usual, the entire blame is thrown upon his ministers, who, with a too easy hand, have, at immense sacrifices, never failed to meet the incessant demands made upon them for money. The various members of the Sultan's family have acted on the maxim, "ask and have." They have enjoyed the happiness, known but to few mortals, of an unlimited supply of cash. Not having to find the money themselves, the commonest thrift would have been a bootless virtue. Accordingly, it was nothing to them that court tradesmen charged them for every article they wanted twice as much as it was worth, or that every purchase had to bear the weight of a ruinous discount through the comparatively worthless paper in which the

payments were made. So long as means were forthcoming to cover their extravagance, the sum total of their little bills was merely a question of figures, falling within the province of arithmeticians, not of courtiers. It was, however, quite plain, even to the intellect of Turkish financiers, that matters could not long go on at this rate, and at length the Sultan's ministers undertook to inform their master that he was living too fast. The Sultan, to his credit, has met the emergency by a display of the most virtuous resolves. He is determined in future to cut his coat according to his cloth. He has been sinning in pure ignorance. He had no idea of the prodigality which was being indulged in under the shelter of his name, and he has issued peremptory orders that in future the utmost economy is to be practised in every department of the imperial household. It is even stated that jewellery already purchased, but not paid for, has been sent back to the original owners. In a word, the Sultan, finding that his wives and relatives have been running up rather high accounts in his name, has formally announced that he will not be responsible for their debts. We see such notifications in our columns every week. It is an unpleasant but a prudent step, and we can only hope it will succeed. Unfortunately, to reform a spendthrift is about the hardest task in the world, while it is the easiest thing imaginable to put down virtuous resolves on paper. Prodigals in general are well-meaning men, distinguished for the honesty and rectitude of their intentions, though, by a singular fatality, they don't know "how to do it." When brought to bay by exacting creditors, and forced for the sixth time to melt the heart of some rich old uncle, nothing can exceed the depth and beauty of their penitence. They see at a glance the evil of their ways; they have long been bent upon a change; their own solicitude seconds the good advice which superfluously assails them from without, and they are going decisively to turn over a new leaf. So the tale runs, and we know with what uniform results. The imperial spendthrift at Constantinople may be about to furnish an exception to the ordinary annals of prodigality, but it is too much to expect that he will be able to pause on the fearful decline down which the force of almost uncontrollable circumstances pushes him to ruin.

But these are vulgar matters. When princes have to notify to the world that they will not be responsible for a wife's debts, we begin to believe that they are but ordinary mortals after all. The state of Turkey abounds with more imposing problems than the mere practice of economy. To take the first on the list, a European commission has just been engaged in settling the boundaries of Montenegro. Now, considering that the Sultan claims Montenegro as an integral portion of the Turkish empire, it is rather remarkable that a board of foreign commissioners should be permitted to map out its frontier. The question raised by this frontier topic lies between Montenegro and—not the territory of a foreign state, but—some other portion of Turkish territory. Supposing the claims of Turkey to the sovereignty of Montenegro to be well founded, this proceeding may be compared to a commission appointed by France, Austria, and Prussia, to determine the boundary line between England and Scotland or Wales. By imagining a similar case in reference to ourselves, we can the better appreciate the one we have described. Beyond a doubt, Queen Victoria will have ceased to reign, and London will be in the hands of the Cossacks, before any foreign power will be permitted thus to intermeddle in our domestic concerns. True, the commissioners have been appointed only to institute inquiries and present a report. They will be at liberty to recommend to the Sultan what measures they choose, but their recommendations can take effect only by his authority. This course, while it appears to save the prerogatives of the Sultan, is in reality only adding insult to injury. The governments whose representatives so deferentially recommend, have the power to dictate. They can force the Sultan to do as they think fit, or take the consequences of their hostility. If they were agreed among themselves, the necessity imposed upon him would be sufficiently ignominious; but they are not agreed. The measures recommended by France and Russia are opposed by England and Austria, and the unhappy Sultan has to take his

choice between these two alternatives, with the certain knowledge that he cannot decide either way without making a couple of sworn foes. They thus rob him at once of the dignity of independence and the peacefulness of subjection. He is at once tormented and enslaved.

One great point of difference between the powers who thus hamper Turkey with their protection is, whether or not Montenegro shall be allowed to acquire a seaport on the Adriatic. This question grows out of the weakness of Turkey. As the price of peace in former wars, Austria has wrested from Turkey nearly the whole of the Adriatic seaboard, thus depriving the inland provinces of their natural outlets to the ocean. If we imagine a line drawn from Dover to Cornwall, at the distance of a few miles from the coast, and then from Cornwall up as far as Liverpool, so as to sever the southern and western counties of England from all communication with the sea, we shall be able to form some idea of the predicament in which the Adriatic provinces of Turkey find themselves placed by the impotence of their protectors at Constantinople. Such a strip of seaboard Austria possesses from Fiume to the Gulf of Cattaro, thus completely excluding from the sea the populous provinces adjoining, viz., Croatia, Servia, Bosnia, the Hertzegovine, and Montenegro. The Montenegrins from their mountains can almost see the waters of the Adriatic, but they are not allowed to reach it. By every principle of natural right the seaboard belongs to them, but it has been given up because Turkey had not the power to defend it. France and Russia recommend that Cattaro, or some other port, should be conceded to Montenegro, and thus afford the hardy mountaineers an opportunity of coming in contact with the civilized world. England and Austria object to this proposal, on the ground, forsooth, that they see in it some Russian intrigue. But it is surely obvious that the likeliest way to rescue these provinces from Russian intrigues is to make them contented; and it is, or ought to be, still more obvious, that the welfare of populous provinces is not to be sacrificed to the visionary scarecrows of diplomacy. It would be idle to conjecture what is left of the integrity of the Turkish empire, when the only point of contest seems to be, which of the protecting powers shall be foremost in the work of its dismemberment.

---

#### Why was the New Testament written in Greek?

The Greek language was at that time extended over the whole civilized world. It prevailed even in several cities of Palestine, and was to the Jews of Egypt, and of all other foreign lands, the language of the Bible and of literature. As soon, therefore, as Christianity passed the bounds of Palestine, it was necessarily propagated in this language, although at the outset it was preached first to the Jews. At an early period, however, there were found among the Christians native Greeks or Greek Jews, who preached the Gospel to the Greeks. At Antioch, the point whence proceeded the missions to the Greeks and the Greek Jews, the Greek language and culture prevailed. Barnabas and Paul, who led these missions, were Greek Jews; and the latter was probably the father of the New Testament literature. Ancient tradition claims for but one of the New Testament books a non-Greek original. The supposition of other such originals is inadmissible. And wisely was this so, for from the earliest rise of Christianity to the present time, the spread of the Gospel has waited on extension of commerce. Alexandria was the grand emporium of trade, the resort of the great Jewish merchants, and the seat of their celebrated philosophical school, where the common language was the so-called popular dialect of Greek, or the Macedonia-Alexandrian. Into that dialect the Old Testament had been translated, centuries before the advent of the Saviour, by the Seventy, and but upon especial occasions it is to that translation that Our Lord himself, as well as the Apostles, always refers. The Gospel had been rejected by the unbelieving Jews. It was to be preached to the Gentiles, and Greek was, at that period, pre-eminently the language

of the Gentile world—even that Macedonio-Alexandrian Greek, which had become the vernacular language of commerce throughout all the ports of the Mediterranean.

---

Errata.

There are printer's errors in our last issue which we hope the reader will be able to correct.

---