

HERALD
OF THE
KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.

“*And in their days, even of those kings, the Eloah of the heavens shall set up A KINGDOM that shall not be abolished FOR AGES, 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 THE AGES.*”—DANIEL.

JOHN THOMAS, Editor. Mott Haven, Westchester, N.Y., JUNE, 1859
Volume 9—No. 6.

Burning of the World.

DEAR BROTHER: —I have been thinking of late, a great deal of that passage in Peter where he predicts *the Burning of the World*; and the further I reflect upon it, the more am I compelled to differ from the interpretation of the text, given by you at the tea-table, when here, to Mr. Elliot. Surely it cannot all have passed!

"The heavens and the earth which *are now*," are so pointedly contrasted with the heavens which were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water—the fire to the one, what the water was to the other—that I humbly conceive, all the known laws of language would be harshly violated by placing this portion of "the prophetic word most sure" on the list of fulfilled scripture; if it be so, history has been strangely silent of the fact.

But, inasmuch as the truth never clashes, and the Bible, when rightly interpreted, is found to be one harmonious whole, no interpretation of Peter's words (or rather of the Spirit, through him) can be admitted, which would invalidate the promises made to Abraham, or those who become heirs with him by adoption.

Instead, therefore, of placing this great change on our terraqueous globe in the past, or vulgarly asserting (as do the Millerites) that it will be adventual and annihilative, may we not, with greater truth and propriety, understand this renovation to be *post-millennial*; thus giving us, agreeably to Peter, the "new heavens and new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness," purged by fire, even as the waters of Genesis submerged the wickedness of the antediluvian world—the word of God holding true alike throughout all time that "the earth abideth forever." This merely by way of suggestion or query. I know the subject is a stumbling-block to some, in accepting the gospel of the kingdom: and to such and many others, your views hereon, at some length, would be gratefully received and read.

With great esteem, believe me,

Yours very respectfully,

JOHN COOMBE.

Toronto, C. W., Feb. 18th, 1857.

The Last Days of Judah's Commonwealth.

“*The end of all things has approached*”—Peter.

In treating of the subject to which our attention has been invited by our friend, Dr. Barbes, of Memphis, in vol. 7, p.249, and by Brother Coombe in the present number, we propose to distribute what we may say, under the following principal heads. We shall consider,

1. Some things concerning Peter;
2. To whom he wrote his epistles, and certain other things concerning them;
3. The subject about which he wrote of special interest to them;
4. The times to which he referred.

* * * * *

1. SOME THINGS CONCERNING PETER

First, then we shall treat of *some things concerning* Peter. And a very important consideration under this head is Paul's testimony, that the Spirit wrought effectually in Peter to the Apostleship of the circumcision; and that the preaching of the Gospel to the Jews was committed to him and the other members of that apostleship, of whom he mentions John, and James the Lord's brother (Gal. 2:7-9; 1:19). “James, Cephas, and John,” says he, “who seemed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship; that we should go to the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision,” or the Jews.

From this time, doubtless, the Twelve Apostles confined their labours, principally, to their own nation in Judea; while Paul, Barnabas, Timothy, Titus, and so forth, ran to and fro among the idolaters of the nations. There was wisdom in this arrangement. The Jews resident in the Holy Land, had an intense disrelish for anything like fellowship with men of other nations. Even those of them who became christians very reluctantly admitted Gentile believers to equality with themselves. Many instances can be adduced of this: Nay, the old prejudice, of which we read in the New Testament, still exists. The Jews of our time always express themselves with more bitterness against Paul, than they do against Peter, though both were ring-leaders of the same obnoxious sect. They regard Peter as a more respectable citizen than Paul; because Paul taught that Jews and Gentiles were under one common condemnation, and obtained mercy in one and the same way; whereas Peter, although he believed the same thing, yet his operations being confined to circumcised persons (and there were many circumcised Gentiles in Judea) did not bear down upon their prejudices with the same force, having less to say and do with idolaters from the circumstances of the case.

The Apostleship of the Circumcision consisted of the Twelve Apostles. Peter was the Foreman, so to speak, of the jury, having been constituted such when the Lord and Master, the King of the Jews, committed to him “the keys of the Kingdom of the Heavens”; by which he was authorised to bind and loose upon the earth, with the assurance that it shall be ratified in “the heavens” to which the kingdom belongs.

Now, as Peter was specially sent to circumcised persons, though occasionally found among the uncircumcised, he would treat of things specially interesting to them. When speaking and writing to these children of the prophets and of the covenant made with

Abraham, he treated of things concerning Israel; and referred them to what Moses and Samuel, and all the prophets had testified concerning sin, and righteousness, and *judgment*. This was the mission of the Apostleship of the Circumcision, when it should be “guided unto all the truth” by holy spirit from the Eternal Power, or Father. *That coming*, as on the day of Pentecost, Jesus said should “convince the world (*kosmos*) respecting sin, and respecting righteousness, and *respecting judgment*.” He then stated the ground upon which this should be done—“respecting sin, *because they believe not on me*; respecting righteousness, because I go away to my Father, and ye behold me no longer; and respecting judgment, *because the ruling* (ho archon—the ruling power) *of this world* (*kosmos*) *has been condemned*.” (John 16:7-11)

Our conclusion then, concerning Peter, as constituted of the Apostleship of the Jews, is, that holy spirit in him had specially to do in the matter of judgment *with those calamities which were then soon to be poured out upon the ruling power of the then existing kosmos*.

2. TO WHOM PETER WROTE

In regard to those to whom Peter wrote, we remark that they were Christian Hebrews residing in certain provinces of Anatolia, and therefore styled, “Chosen sojourners of a dispersion of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia.” They were Jews residing in these countries, who had been ecclesiastically separated from their countrymen by a separation, or sanctification (which is the same thing) of spirit. Many of them had, doubtless, heard Peter on the Day of Pentecost, when the Spirit descended upon the Apostleship of the Circumcision so copiously and visibly. We have reason to believe this, because Luke, in Acts 2:9, says that there were Jews in Jerusalem who witnessed the outpouring of spirit and power, “from Cappadocia, Pontus, and Asia.” Peter and the rest of the apostles, filled with the spirit, spoke to them of sin, of righteousness, and of *judgment*; and urged them to save themselves from the last. The result of *this Spirit-manifestation in word and gifts*, was the separation of them from the *sacrificial* worship of the temple *into a submissive hearkening to*, or “obedience”; and unto “a sprinkling of Jesus Christ’s blood,” in their doing what is prescribed in Acts 2:38—“*Be ye mentally changed; and let every one of you be baptised to* (in the sense of being *added to*) the name of the Anointed Jesus into remission of sins.” This was the “*separation of spirit*” they were subject of. The spirit-discourse which issued from Peter’s mouth, *opened the eyes* of their understandings; *dispelled the darkness* which overshadowed them; and *disposed* them to child-like submission to “the law of faith,” expressed in the words before us. This work of spirit was evinced in what followed; for they that gladly received the word were baptised, verse 41. They were baptised “unto the name of the Father, and the son, and the Holy Spirit”; and so were *added to the name* of the Anointed Jesus; by which addition they henceforth constituted a part of that name, or of the “*One Body*”—“ONE in God the Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ”; “one as the Father and Jesus are” (John 17:11).

Having thus become *Jews in Christ*, or “Israelites indeed,” they did not therefore lose all interest in their nation and country. When they returned to Cappadocia, Pontus, and Asia, they would diffuse the knowledge they acquired among the Jews who had not gone up to Jerusalem to keep the feast of Pentecost; and in doing so, would tell them of *the vengeance that was impending* over the Commonwealth of Judah. Though they had ceased from offering sacrifices for themselves, they would still go to Jerusalem to celebrate the national festivals of Pentecost and Tabernacles (Acts 20:16). Being now in Christ, their Passover and Sin-covering, they did not keep the Mosaic Passover and Atonement (verse 5); nevertheless, they were Jewish patriots, and loved their country; and desired its prosperity as their own good.

But, though patriotic in the truest sense, their patriotism did not preserve them from persecution by those Jews who did not believe; whose conduct, received by tradition from their Fathers, was vain; and who spoke evil of them as a strange people, who, though previously fond of what the world calls “good-fellowship,” would no longer, since they had identified themselves with the Nazarenes, run with them to the old excess of riot. These profligates spoke evil of Christ; and having the power of all hostile to the truth on their side, whether Jew or Gentile, they subjected their Christian fellow-countrymen to “a fiery trial.” Collectively, the unbelieving Jews were then a formidable and dangerous power; for though they were but foreigners in Anatolia, yet they were ever ready to excite the idolatrous Greeks against those of their own nation who acknowledged the Messiahship of Jesus (Acts 17:5-8, 13). Peter refers to these in the activity of their enmity against Christian Jews, as “their *diabolos*, or opponent-at-law, the seducer, as a roaring lion, who walks about seeking whom he may devour” (1 Peter 5:8). A conspiracy of one class of Jews against another, is styled by Ezekiel, “a roaring lion.” In Ch. 22:25, Jehovah says to him, “Son of man, say unto Jerusalem, there is a conspiracy of her prophets in the midst thereof, like a roaring lion ravening the prey; they have devoured souls.” So in Peter’s day, the prophets and princes, or chiefs, of Israel, both in the Holy Land and in all other parts of the Goat-Dominion, conspired against the Nazarenes, “like a roaring lion ravening the prey.”

Many of these conspirators were apostates from Christianity—dogs, who had returned to their vomit; washed hogs, who had gone back to their wallowing in the mire (2 Peter 2:22). These were they who, says Peter, “cannot see afar off, and have forgotten that they were purged from their old sins” (Ch. 1:9).

But besides apostates, there were Jews who still maintained a profession of Christianity, and even set up for teachers in the churches of Anatolia. These teachers, “who would pervert the gospel of Christ,” as Paul says (Gal. 1:7), are styled by Peter in 2 Peter 2:1, “false teachers.” These false teachers were the Judaizers, who sought to blend the Mosaic Law and the Gospel for the justification of Jews and Gentiles. They first appear upon the page of gospel history in Acts 15:1-5. Of these perverters of the gospel, fabricators of another gospel, Paul writes to the Galatians, saying, “As many as desire to make a fair show in the flesh, they constrain you to be circumcised, only lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ. For neither they themselves who are circumcised keep the law; but they desire to have you circumcised, that they may glory in your flesh” (6:12). These teachers wished to be popular with both parties; with disobedient Israelites on the one hand, and the Christian Jews and Gentiles on the other. But Paul put a logical extinguisher upon their teaching, by telling those who were bewitched by them, that—“If they were circumcised, Christ would profit them nothing. For I testify again,” says he, “to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect to you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace” (Ch. 5:2).

These false teachers in the churches of christian Hebrews were rapidly becoming a power, even in the lifetime of the Apostles, which was designed to subvert the gospel they taught, and to set up instead thereof, the superstitions of the Apostasy. They were corrupters of the brethren from “the simplicity which is in Christ.” They claimed to be Hebrews, Israelites, the Seed of Abraham, and the ministers of Christ (2 Cor. 11:22); and as much to be deferred to as Peter, Paul, or any others of the apostles. But Paul declared they were “false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into apostles of Christ.” Ministers of Satan under the garb of ministers of righteousness (ver. 13-15). Let the reader mark this well,

that in the days of Peter and Paul, an order of men had arisen in the christian community, composed of christian Jews, who appeared as sheep, or ministers of righteousness; but who were really wolves in sheep's clothing, or ministers of Satan, or the adversary to the faith. They were very pious, very zealous for God, and great lovers of the souls of men; but notwithstanding all their appearances, they were "*deceitful workers.*" Their zeal, piety, and love, were their stock in the trade of making merchandise of souls; and all reacted to the present, or temporal advantage of themselves and their spiritual order. Their doctrine was as the poison of serpents, undoing all the apostles did, wherever it was inserted; and inflicting death upon all who received it. Paul was intolerant of it; and pronounced its teachers, though an angel from heaven might be of their number, accursed (Gal. 1:7-9).

Of these Achans, the accursed patrons of the Babylonish Garment, and worshippers of the Golden Wedge (Josh. 6:21). Peter says in 2 Peter 2:1, "There were false prophets among the people (Israel after the flesh); as also there will be false teachers among you (the Israel of God), who will craftily introduce heresies of destruction; and denying the Master who bought them, *bringing upon themselves swift destruction.* And many will follow in their destructions, on account of whom the Way of the Truth will be blasphemed." Now these words of Peter did not refer exclusively to what would happen at some remote period of ecclesiastical history; they referred also to what was in actual and baneful operation in "*the heritages*" of the circumcision, or Christian Hebrew societies, at the time he wrote. Still speaking of these false teachers in the ecclesias, he goes on to say, "And through an inordinate desire of gain, they will make merchandise of you with deceitful words. As irrational natural animals who have been *appointed to capture and corruption*, these, blaspheming in things which they understand not, *shall be caused to perish in their own corruption*; who are going to be recompensed with (fut. Part. pass.) a reward of unrighteousness, as taking the lead in sensuality, the luxury of the day. They were spots and blemishes, revelling in their own deceivings, *while they feast with you*, having eyes filled with an adulteress, and cannot cease from sin; deluding unstable souls; having a heart that has been trained to inordinate desires; *cursed children*, having forsaken the right way, they have gone astray, having followed in the way of Balaam, son of Bosor, who loved the wages of unrighteousness. These are wells without water, clouds driven by a hurricane, for whom the gloom of the dark place for the aion, or cycle, has been reserved. For, sounding forth pompous words of foolishness, they entice through lusts of the flesh and lewdness, those truly escaping from them who live in error; promising them liberty, while they are themselves slaves of the corruption; for by whom any one has been overcome, to this same also he has been enslaved. For, if escaping the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, being entangled by these again, they are overcome, *the last things have become to them worse than the first.* For it was better for them not to have known the way of justification, than, having known, to turn from the holy commandment delivered to them."

These false teachers were "children," who once walked in the way of truth, into which they had been introduced by obedience to "the holy commandment," or law of faith, delivered to them on the Day of Pentecost. They knew "the way of justification," and had been purged from their old sins. How came it then, that so great a change was wrought in the heritages while the apostles were yet living? All things had had a fair beginning; the holy commandment was delivered by inspiration, and all learned the faith from infallible teachers; how, then, came things into so sad a case in all the churches of the circumcision, whether out of Palestine or not? These questions are answered in the parable of the Tares. Jesus, styled the Son of Man, came to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, and to them only—Matt. 15:24. They, in their Mosaical organization, constituted the field, or kosmos in which he sowed the

seed, or gospel of the kingdom (Matt. 13:18-23), which, received into honest and good hearts, became the good seed of verse 38. “The good seed are (or represent) the children of the kingdom.” There are two classes of “children of the kingdom”—“*Israel after the flesh*,” who reject Jesus (see Matt. 8:12); and Israel, native and adopted, who receive him, *and his teaching*, styled by Paul, “*the Israel of God*.” “The tares are the children of the evil thing”—those “*cursed children*” of whom Peter speaks. “The enemy that sowed them is the seducer”; or, as Peter and James define it, “the lusts of the flesh,” by, or through which men are enticed (2 Peter 2:18; James 1:14-15). The flesh, which is Sin’s flesh, is “the enemy,” or enmity against God and His law (Rom. 8:7), and the Seducer which causes men to transgress, or put themselves across the line, or on the wrong side of things forbidden. When Jesus said to the Jews, in the words of the English version, “Ye are of your father, the devil, and *the lusts* of your father ye will do,” it was equivalent to saying, “Ye are born of the flesh, and the lusts of the flesh ye will do.” The flesh is “*the evil thing*,” in the English version of the parable of the tares, styled “*the wicked one*.” It is that by which all offences come; as is clear from the world’s history, and the words of Jesus, who exclaimed—“Woe to the world because of the enticements: for necessity is that enticements arise; but woe to *that man* by whom the enticement (or scandal) is introduced!” The false teachers Peter so severely, but justly denounces, were those who placed stumbling-blocks in the way of the saints, being thus “the scandalisers” of the apostolic age, “who walked after the flesh in the lust of uncleanness,” and laid their enticements before their brethren, many of whom, being unstable, were ensnared. They were the tares—the development of the flesh; and therefore, contrary to, or impatient of, the truth.

From the premises before us, it is evident that the Christian Church, in apostolic times, was not all gold, and silver, and precious stones. There was much wood, hay, and stubble, mixed up with these. The false teachers and their unstable followers were of the combustible sort. They were unable to “endure to the end.” The Jewish power was persecuting the heritages in Judea with great inveteracy; and the Jews in Anatolia were doing the same to the full extent of their ability (1 Peter 5:9): yet the predicted deliverance in the manifestation of “*the end*” had not come, and no signs were discerned by “unstable souls” of its approach. It was a trying time in Israel to all who loved the truth. The crisis was favourable to the growth of tares. As Jesus had predicted, many were caused to fall, and betrayed one another, and hated one another. Many false prophets had shown themselves in the church, and had deceived many; and because iniquity abounded, the love of many had become cold (Matt. 24:10-12).

The false teachers, styled by Jesus and John false prophets, seemed for a time to have the advantage of the situation. Evil servants that they were, they said in their hearts, Our Lord delayeth to come; and came practically to the conclusion that he would not come. Having relieved themselves of this apprehension, they commenced the merchandise of souls, and smote those of their fellow-servants who would not be sold to work iniquity. Thus they became lords of the heritages, and devoted themselves to eating and drinking with the drunken, in all the luxury of the day. But, though they found it convenient to ignore all but their own imaginations, their Divine Master was not unobservant of their abominations. Still he bore with them for a time, “not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to a change of mind.” As he waited in the days of Noah, so he waited with them. But his long suffering and forbearance were ineffectual; so he came upon them in a day and hour they were not aware of, and cut them off, appointing them a portion with the hypocrites, where was weeping and gnashing of teeth (Matt. 24:48-51).

3. THE SUBJECT ABOUT WHICH PETER WROTE

We come now to consider more particularly the subject about which Peter wrote, of special interest to the faithful, who were suffering under the oppression of the Jews, infidel, apostate, and perverted.

When Paul reasoned with Felix, who had been for many years a judge in the Jewish nation, he urged upon him among other things “*the judgment being about to happen.*” In writing to the Christian Jews in Rome on this subject, he said, “To them who are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, there shall be indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil, OF THE JEW FIRST, then of the Greek”—Ch. 2:8-10. According to God’s arrangement, the Jew takes the lead in the rewards and punishments of his administration. “SALVATION IS OF THE JEWS,” said Jesus: therefore Paul teaches, “glory, honour, and peace, TO the JEW FIRST, then to the Greek.” Hence, there is no salvation for the Greek, or Gentile, till the Jew is saved; and as God has been so good and bountiful to Israel, and they have repaid Him with such monstrous and base ingratitude, their punishment is necessitated before the development of salvation; and consequently, before the punishment and salvation of the Gentiles, which salvation comes to these through Abraham and his seed. This, then is *the order of the judgment*, which, when Paul pleaded before Felix and wrote to Rome, was all in the future.

The subject in hand, then, has to do with *judgment upon the Jew first*. Peter, in the temple court of Israel, told all the Jews assembled there, that Moses and all the prophets from Samuel had foretold of *these days* (Acts 3:21-24): that is, of these days in which the Holy Spirit in Jesus and the apostles would speak of sin, righteousness, and judgment; in which Messiah would be manifested as a suffering person, and in which that terrible work should begin of destroying every soul from among the Jewish people, that would not hear him.

Moses speaks of the judgment upon Israel in Deut. 28:15 to the end. The punishment threatened is tremendous, and may be resolved into the following general points.

1. Agricultural, domestic and public calamities, while resident in the Holy Land—*verses 15-24.*
2. A REMOVAL, as of the Ten Tribes, into all the kingdoms of the earth, with all its attendant evils and consequents—*verses 25-35.*
3. The BABYLONISH CAPTIVITY in which the King of Judah is involved—*verse 36.*
4. Subjection to the Gentiles subsequent to restoration from that captivity—*verses 37-47.*
5. Subjection to the Gentiles to continue *to the Age*; that is, of Messiah’s Administration—*verse 46.*
6. CONQUEST BY *the Greco-Latin Horn of the Goat*, commonly styled, THE ROMAN POWER—*verses 48-52.*
7. The siege and DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM—*verses 53-57.*
8. Expulsion from the Holy Land after destruction of the Capital and the Temple—*verses 58-64.*
9. General condition and distress of the nation while in dispersion in the lands of its enemies—*verses 28, 29, 64-68.*
10. The reason of so terrible a judgment befalling the nation—*verses 15, 58, 62; 29:25-28.*

11. The condition of the land while the nation is in dispersion—*verses 22-23.*

Under these points are comprehended the calamities that constitute the judgment upon the Jew first. The punishment of the nation extends over the period of its history from the death of the Elders who outlived Joshua, or the eleventh generation from Abraham, to the apocalypse of Jesus in power and great glory; that is, *ad-olahm*: a period of about 3,350 years, as far as it has already progressed.

Moses' prediction of the Babylonish captivity as distinguished from the Roman is discerned by the declaration, that Jehovah should bring the nation *and its king* unto a nation unknown to Moses and his generation and their fathers—*verse 36.* At the time of the Roman destruction of Jerusalem they had "no other king than Caesar," according to their own saying; their rightful king, whom they had crucified, being "at the right hand of power," where no enemy could reach him. But, in the days of Babylon, they had kings of the house of David on the throne of Judah, the last three of whom, namely: Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin, and Zedekiah, were all carried off to Babylon, with the princes and nobles of the state. This conquering and destroying nation was unknown to Moses and his contemporaries; for although Babylon existed in his day, it was not then a "nation" or power nationally organised; and Israel, consequently, had not known it as one nation knows another in commerce and war.

As to the Roman Power, Moses treats of that as "*a Yoke of Iron*"; a nation far off from Palestine, and at "the end of the earth"—not of the globe; but at the end of the Oriental System of Powers of which the Holy Land would then be a part; a nation, *whose ensign would be THE EAGLE*, speaking a language not of Hebrew relationship, and of great fierceness. This was one of those "*Fowls of the air*" and "*Beasts of the Earth*" that Moses predicted should devour Israel's carcass. "*Thy carcass,*" says he to the Tribes, "shall be meat unto all fowls of the air, and unto beasts of the earth, and no man shall fray them away"—*verse 26.* This has been notably fulfilled in the blood-stained history of the Commonwealth of Israel to this day. The body politic, or "*carcass,*" of the people has been devoured by the most ferocious beasts. In the words of Jeremiah, "Israel is a scattered sheep; the Lions have driven him away; first the King of Assyria hath devoured him; and last, this Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, hath broken his bones"—*Ch. 50:17:* and since then, the Bear, the Leopard, and the Eagle, have ravaged upon the lifeless carcass of the nation—a corpse, destitute of spiritual, ecclesiastical, and civil existence in Moses or in Christ—dead in trespasses and sins; and cursed by the law: not because they do not continue in all things written in its book, but because they violate it in all its points.

The Spirit in Moses declared he would put *a Yoke of Iron* upon Israel's neck until he had destroyed their power. The same Spirit a thousand years afterwards, in *Dan. 2:40,* explains that that Iron Power was "a fourth kingdom strong as iron, because that iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things; and as iron that breaketh all, it shall break in pieces and shatter these"—the three dominions preceding it to which Israel was subject. History has proved this Iron-Power incorporated in Nebuchadnezzar's Image, the Band around the stump of the Babylonian tree, and the Fourth Beast with Great Iron Teeth, to be the Italian Power, whose legions bore aloft the Eagle as their military ensign. As Moses and Daniel agree, it was "dreadful, and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth; it devoured and broke in pieces, and stamped the residue with its feet; which had Claws of Brass"—*Dan. 7:7 & 19.*

This Ferro-Brazen, or Iron-and-Brass Power is introduced by the Spirit into the prophecy of the Ram and Rough-Goat in *Dan. 8:* as the Little Horn of the latter. This Little

Horn represents that power known in history as that of the combined Italian and Greek; having Rome for its capital, and afterwards, Constantinople, originally styled Byzantium, and hence the origin of its designation as the Byzantine Empire. This Greco-Italian Little Horn is introduced into this prophecy, because of the part it was destined to enact in relation to the cutting off of Messiah, the Prince of the host of Israel; the destruction of Jerusalem and the Temple; the taking away of the Daily Sacrifice; the abolition of the Mosaic Commonwealth; the destruction of the Jewish power; and its still future contest with the Prince it crucified, for the possession of Jerusalem, and the Holy Land; when it shall be utterly broken upon the mountains of Israel, by the crucified Michael, without the possibility of recovery from its fatal and terrible defeat. This Little Horn, the prophet says, “waxed exceeding great toward the south (or Egypt), and toward the east (or Euphrates), and toward the pleasant land (or Judea). And it waxed great (or powerful) against the host of the heavens; and it cast down of the host and of the stars (or nobles) to the ground, and stamped upon them (for the Little Horn wielded all the power of the Goat). Yea, he magnified himself against the Prince of the Host (Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews,) and by him the Daily (Sacrifice) was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary (the Temple) was cast down. And an army was appointed against the Daily BECAUSE OF SIN, and it cast down the Truth (‘the form of the knowledge and of the truth in the Law’) to the ground: and it practised and prospered.”—Dan.8: 9 & 12.

In the prophetic interpretation of this, the Spirit’s words are very analogous to those in Moses. Speaking of the time when this Iron Power should invade the Holy Land, to cause Judah to pass under “the yoke,” the Spirit says, it should be in the latter time of the Greek kingdoms of Egypt and Syria. He styles the power “a King of fierce countenance and causing to understand an obscure speech”; who he says, “shall stand up. And his power shall become strong, but not through his own prowess; and shall cause to destroy wonderfully; and he shall cause to prosper and execute, and to destroy multitudes, and the people of the Holy Ones. And through his policy he shall cause fraud to prosper by his power; and in his heart he shall make himself great; and in prosperity shall cause to destroy many; and he shall stand up against the Prince of princes; but without hand he shall be broken in pieces.”—Dan. 8:23 & 25.

This same Iron and Brass Power is further particularised in Dan. 11:36 &39. In this place it is written concerning it, that “The King shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every power, and concerning a Power of powers he will speak marvellous things; and he shall cause to prosper until the indignation (against Israel) be accomplished; (for the determined upon the Desolator of their land shall be done) v. 37. And he shall not regard the gods of his fathers, nor the desire of wives; nor shall he defer to any power; for he shall magnify himself above all v. 38. And in his estate he shall do honour to a God of guardians, (*‘Guardian Saints and Angels’*) even to a god which his fathers knew not shall he do honour with gold, and with silver, and with precious stones, and with desirable things v. 39. Thus shall he do to the Bazaars of the Guardians (churches dedicated to Saints where the clergy do their trading) with a god of a foreign land, which shall acknowledge and increase with glory: and he shall cause them to rule over multitudes; and he shall partition the land for a price.”

(To be continued.)

The Birth of Messiah.

SPEAKING of the commemoration of the birth of Jesus by the Gentiles at Christmas time, Dr. McCaul remarks: "But amongst the followers of the Oral Law not a sound of sympathy will be heard. Not a single heart will beat with joy, not a tongue offer up the tribute of praise." Here is a striking difference between Israel and Gentile believers in Jesus, that should naturally lead both Jew and Christian to inquire, *Who is in the right?* Those who believe that Messiah is born, and joy in the remembrance of his nativity; or, refuse to join in the general rejoicing, and deny that the Redeemer has appeared?

The question is, Whether there is reason to believe that the Messiah was born eighteen hundred years ago? And there are several ways in which it can be satisfactorily answered. An appeal may be made to the predictions contained in the Old Testament, or to the evidence for the truth of the Christian Scriptures—or, it may be shown that the Jewish Rabbies have plainly confessed that the time for the birth and appearance of the Messiah is long since past; and this is the mode which we shall adopt at present

The Jews now deny that Messiah is come, and consequently believe that Christians are mistaken as to the time of His appearance. If they had always said so—if they had always assigned a time for the coming of Messiah different from that in which Christians think Messiah was born, their present assertion would have at least the merit of consistency, and the Jews of the present day might urge that their present belief has been inherited from their fathers, and that Christians have adopted a notion unknown to the nation at large. But if it should appear that the ancient Jews expected the coming of Messiah at the very time when, as Christians say, he did actually come, then the ancient Jews testify that Christians are in the right, and that modern Jews are in the wrong, and this is really the state of the case.

In the first place, the Talmud* contains a general declaration that the time is long since past. That is, "Rav says, The appointed times are long since past (Sanhedrin, fol. 97, col. 2), where it is to be noted that the word קץ is taken from Daniel, and literally signifies 'End' "—xii. 6,13. Rav was, therefore, of opinion that the period appointed in Daniel was past.

* From the same source as that from which the Five Books of Moses came, the Jews say they receive, as sacred and authentic, a large number of traditions not committed to writing, but transmitted by word of mouth down to later times; without which, they say, many enactments in the Holy Bible could not have been understood and acted upon; these termed traditional or oral laws, were collected and formed into a volume called the "Mishna," by Rabbi Jehudah Hakodesh, Anno Mundi 4150. In addition to this, they are guided by the explications of the later schools of pious and learned rabbies, constituting what is now known by the name of the *Talmud* or Gemara.

But is it possible to believe that the God of truth would suffer the time which He had appointed, to pass away without accomplishing what He had promised? When the time that God had fixed for the deliverance from Egypt had arrived, not a single day was lost. "It came to pass at the end קץ of the four hundred and thirty years, even *the selfsame day*, it came to pass, that all the hosts of Jehovah went out from the land of Egypt"—Exod. xii. 41. When the period fixed for the return from Babylon was come, we read, " In the first year of Cyrus, king of Persia (that the word of Jehovah by the mouth of Jeremiah might be accomplished), Jehovah stirred up the spirit of Cyrus, king of Persia, that he made a proclamation through all his kingdom"—2 Chron. xxxvi. 22. And can we think that the Lord God, who so graciously

fulfilled His word upon these occasions, should break it with reference to the coming of Messiah? Rav is either right or wrong. If he be right, then the time fixed by God is long since past, and as God cannot break his word, the Messiah must have come long since. But if, to get out of the difficulty, the Rabbinites say, that Rav was wrong, then we have another proof that no reliance is to be placed on the doctors of the Oral Law; indeed, we have a proof that the Rabbinites themselves do not believe it, except when they like; and that, therefore, they are not thoroughly in earnest about their religion.

But secondly, the ancient Jews not only believed that the time for the coming of Messiah was past; they also fixed the exact period. Thus,

"Tradition of the school of Elijah. The world is to stand six thousand years. Two thousand, confusion. Two thousand, the Law. Two thousand, the Days of Messiah"—Sanhedrin, fol. 97, col. 1.

Upon this tradition Rashi remarks: "After the two thousand years of the law, according to the decree, Messiah ought to have come, and the wicked kingdom should have been destroyed, and Israel's state of servitude should have been ended." Here, then, it is expressly stated, that Messiah ought to have come at the end of the fourth thousand years, that is, according to the Jewish reckoning 1618 years ago; or according to the Gentile reckoning about 1857 years ago—that is, at the very time when Jesus of Nazareth did appear.

We do not quote this tradition because we believe that it is really a tradition of the school of Elijah, but to show what was the opinion of the more ancient Jews, and this it certainly does. If the general expectation of the Jews at that time had not been that Messiah was to appear at the end of the four thousand years, this tradition, whether genuine or forged, could never have obtained currency for belief. If it be a genuine tradition from Elijah, then Messiah is certainly come. But if it be fictitious, then it shows the general belief of the Jews at the time, and in every case proves that the modern Jews do not hold the doctrine of their forefathers, but have got a new doctrine of their own. And it further shows, that Christians do not hold any new or peculiar opinion about the time of Messiah's coming, but that they believe, as the ancient Jews believed, that the end of the fourth thousand years is the right time of Messiah's coming.

The only answer that the Jews have, is, that the promise of Messiah's coming was conditional upon their repentance; but that evasion has been long since refuted in the Talmud as contrary to Scripture.

"Rabbi Eliezer," says the Talmud, "said, If Israel do repentance they will be redeemed; but if not, they will not be redeemed."

Rabbi Joshua replied, "If they do not repent they will not be redeemed; but God will raise up to them a king whose decrees shall be as dreadful as Haman, and then Israel will repent, and thus he will bring them back to what is good."

Another tradition.

Rabbi Eliezer said, If Israel do repentance, they shall be redeemed, for it is said. "Turn, O backsliding children; I will heal your backsliding."

Rab. Joshua replied, "But was it not said long since, 'Ye have sold yourselves for nought; and ye shall be redeemed without money'—Isai. lii. 3. Where the words, 'sold for nought' mean for idolatry; and the words, 'redeemed without money' signify, not for money and good works."

Rab. Eliezer then said to Rab. Joshua, But has it not been said long since, "Return unto me, and I will return unto you"—Mal. iii. 7.

Rab. Joshua replied, But has it not been said long since, "I am married unto you, and will take you one of a city, and two of a family, and I will bring you to Zion"—Jer. iii. 14.

Rabbi Eliezer said, But has it not been written long since, "In returning and rest ye shall be saved"—Isai. xxx. 15.

Rabbi Joshua replied to Rabbi Eliezer, But has it not been said long since, "Thus saith Jehovah the Redeemer of Israel, and his Holy One, to him whom man despiseth, to him whom the Nation abhorreth, to a Servant of Rulers, kings shall see and arise, princes also shall worship"—Isai. xlix. 7.

Rabbi Eliezer said to him again, But has it not been said long since, "If thou wilt return, O Israel, return unto me"—Jer. iv. 1.

Rabbi Joshua replied to this, But has it not been written long since, "I heard the man clothed in linen who was upon the waters of the river, when he held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven, and swore by him that liveth for ever, that it shall be for a time and times and half a time; and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished." Whereupon Rabbi Eliezer was silent.

Here then, on the showing of the Talmud itself, the opinion that the coming of Messiah is dependant on Israel's repentance, is false; and consequently it is true, that Messiah was to come unconditionally at the time appointed; and therefore, as the time is long since past, the Messiah must have come. But the ancient rabbies do not leave us to reason upon their words; on the contrary, they tell us expressly that Messiah was born about the time that the temple was destroyed. In the Jerusalem Talmud, Rabbi Judan tells us a story of a Jew who actually went and saw him.

"It happened once to a certain Jew," says that Talmud, "who was standing ploughing, that his cow lowed before him. A certain Arab was passing and heard its voice;" he said, "O Jew, O Jew! Unyoke thine ox, and loose thy ploughshare, for the temple has been laid waste." It lowed a second time, and he said, "O Jew, O Jew, yoke thine oxen, and bind on thy ploughshare, for King Messiah is born!" The Jew said, "What is his name?" "Menachem." He asked further, "What is the name of his father?" The other replied, "Hezekiah." He asked again, "Whence is he?" The other said, "From the royal residence of Bethlehem of Judah"—Berachoth, fol. 5, col. 1.

The story then goes on to tell how he went and saw the child; but when he called the second time, the mother told him that the winds had carried the child away. We are quite willing to grant that this story is a fable. We do not quote it because we give it the slightest degree of credit; but simply to show that the more ancient Jews were so fully persuaded that

the right time of Messiah's advent was past, that they readily believed also that he was actually born.

The Babylonian Talmud, also, evidently takes for granted that Messiah is born, as appears from the following legend:

"Rabbi Joshua, the son of Levi, found Elijah standing by the door of the cave of Rab. Simeon ben Jochai," and said to him, "Shall I arrive at the world to come?" He replied, "If the Lord will." Rabbi Joshua, the son of Levi, said, "I see two, but I hear the voice of three." He also asked, "When will Messiah come?" Elijah replied, "Go, and ask himself." Rabbi Joshua then said, "Where does he sit?" "At the gate of Rome." "And how is he to be known?" "He is sitting among the poor and sick, and they open their wounds, and bind them up again all at once; but he opens only one, and then he opens another, for he thinks, perhaps I may be wanted, and then I must not be delayed." Rab. Joshua went to him, and said, "Peace be upon thee, my Master and my Lord." He replied, "Peace be upon thee, son of Levi." The rabbi then asked him, "When will my Lord come?" He replied, "Today"—alluding to the words of the Psalm, "To-day, if ye will hear his voice"—Sanhedrin, fol. 98, col. 1.

This is evidently a fiction, and a proof how little those doctors regarded truth; but it shows that he who invented it, and those who received it, all equally believed that Messiah was born, and ready waiting to come forth for the redemption of Israel. It does, indeed, confirm the common idea, that Messiah's advent depends upon the repentance of Israel; for it makes the Messiah say that he would come this very day, if Israel would only hear his voice. But if the Messiah may any day, when they repent, come and save Israel; then it is plain that he must have been born long since.

The testimony of the ancient Jews then goes to confirm these points:

1. That the time for Messiah's advent has been long past;
2. That the end of the fourth thousand years was the time when he ought to have come;
3. That at that time he did really come; for about that time, they say, he was born in Bethlehem of Judah;
- 4 That he was taken into Paradise, as Rashi explains the Gate of Rome to signify the Gate of Paradise opposite to Rome; and,
5. That he is waiting to return to this earth for the redemption of his people.

Now who is there that does not see at once, that this agrees in the main with the Christian doctrine? We believe that at the end of the fourth thousand years, the Messiah was born, and at this Christmas season of the year we rejoice at the remembrance of his birth. The Jews refuse to join with us, but who has the greatest show of right? Not now to speak of the prophecies, and of the historical evidence which we have, we have the testimony even of our opponents to show that we are in the right. The most ancient rabbinical writings unanimously confess, that the time is past, and that the Messiah has been long since born; and thus testify the correctness of our faith respecting the time of Messiah's advent. Christians, however, go on, and constantly believe further, that God did not break his word, but performed his promise, and therefore we rejoice. The Jews do not believe, because they are so engrossed with the temporal deliverance of the nation, that they cannot see that redemption through his blood necessarily preliminary to it. We do not by any means deny that Israel is to be restored to the land of promise, and to inherit all the blessings promised in the prophets. On the contrary, we fully believe that the Messiah, who visited this earth for a short season, will

return and re-establish the Theocracy which was once the glory of Israel, and that in a much more glorious form than Israel ever saw under any of their kings. We heartily wish Israel the enjoyment of every blessing promised; but we cannot help remembering that Messiah has another and more ample work to perform than that of merely restoring the kingdom to Israel, and that is the redemption of the human race. The highest pitch of national glory and earthly prosperity would be as nothing, and less than nothing, unless the children of men were delivered from the effects of Adam's transgression, and made partakers of a good hope of everlasting life. Even the gathering of Israel from all the ends of the earth would appear but a very insignificant business, if it did not stand in immediate connection with the eternal welfare of all nations. Many of the sons of men have appeared as conquerors and heroes, and have raised their country to a high degree of glory, and conferred upon them much temporal prosperity; but if Messiah were to be nothing more, we confess we should not think him worth the having. We think of the Messiah as the Being in whom all the families of the earth shall be blessed; as the restorer indeed of Israel, but also God's salvation to the end of the earth. This is the doctrine which Christianity teaches, and which is confirmed by the Law and the Prophets; and therefore we rejoice that this Great Deliverer hath been born—that He came at first in great humility to be heel-bruised of the Serpent, in laying down his life a ransom for many. * We remember that this blessed news, these glad tidings of great joy, were brought to us by Jews; and therefore, feeling our deep obligations, we desire to show our gratitude by inviting Israel to come and partake in our joy. We feel assured that our joy is no illusion. Even the rabbies themselves bear witness that the Messiah ought to have been born, and was born at the very time in which we believe the Messiah to have been born.

* We have altered the writer's words in this place. His words are, "He came at first in great humility to bruise the serpent's head, and to lay down his life a ransom for many." Jesus did not bruise the serpent-power, but was bruised by it: he comes again to bruise and bind him—Rev. xx. 1, 2. —EDITOR.

But if he was born, who was he? What other person can make any claim to the Messiahship, but he whom we acknowledge? Is it reasonable to believe, as the rabbies do, that God actually sent the Great Deliverer down into this wretched world, and then took him away again without permitting him to accomplish anything? No; if ever he visited this earth—and that he did visit it, both the ancient Jews and Christians assert—he could not have left it again without bestowing upon its inhabitants a remedy for their woes. The ancient rabbies and the Christians both agree as to the time of Messiah's birth, and the fact of his birth in Bethlehem. Indeed, the whole nation practically showed their agreement with Christians as to the time of Messiah's advent, by readily following every military adventurer who laid claim to the character of Redeemer. Even before the destruction of the temple, multitudes had suffered by their credulity; but immediately after the desolation, the people and the rabbies with one accord followed Bar Cochba, and thereby showed the reality of their belief, that that was about the time when Messiah ought to appear. Judaism therefore teaches this doctrine—*that God promised the Messiah; that God fixed a time; that that time is past; and yet that God did not keep his promise.* Christianity, on the contrary, acknowledges the promise, recognizes the time, believes that Messiah was born, but believes further that God fulfilled his word—that Messiah does not appear in Paradise until he accomplish the work that is to be done at his first and second advents. Having risen from the dead, we acknowledge that He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at Gods right hand, from whence he will come again for the final redemption of his people, and the establishment of the reign of righteousness. The only real difference between us is, as to THE VERACITY of God. We believe that God did not, and could not, break his word. *Modern Judaism teaches that God broke his promise.* It is for

rational beings to decide which doctrine is most agreeable to the Divine character. For our own parts, we will rejoice in God's unchangeableness, and say, in the remembrance, that "His truth endureth for ever."

Analecta Epistolaria.

A Few Words from Oregon.

Dear Sir; —Enclosed is our order upon our agent in New York, for \$10,00, for Herald, and any other good matter on hand.

I have no good news to send you from this point of the compass, for here, as else and everywhere, the people are steeped in ignorance of "the word." They are as stupidly devoted to "the powers that be" as the veriest heathen under the sun. My feelings often find vent in the exclamation that, like Ephraim, "They are joined to their idols, let them alone!" The greatest inducement to live on this side the world to me, is climate, which is pacific in character; secondly, I can easier get the wherewith to avail myself of the Herald, and other such matter; so that, thirdly, living comes easier, and with a fullness. But there is nothing here like what little obtains, in the Atlantic States, as to the light of an unadulterated Gospel.

I am anxiously waiting your exposition of the Apocalypse; and as preparatory for its reception, I am paying due respect in a review of the book itself, with any and all help within my reach.

I herewith desire to join with others in hoping that due success will attend your every effort; and as to means I only wish that, like a brother Lemmon, I could contribute an \$100,00 for the support of your advocacy of the truth. With all my choice and approval of this more genial climate, I cannot say that I am pecuniarily much better off. With all the frugality and economy I can use, I do not much more than keep even pace with the world; but *I will anyhow keep good my subscription to the Herald.* It would be a mere barren formality to iterate the fact that I prize it highly; by my sending *and paying for it* from this remote region, the proof is manifest, that I greatly esteem it, and am not willing to be minus a number; therefore, please send me the August for '58, which failed to reach me. I remain,

Yours in the One Hope of the Calling,

ALBERT H. OTIS.

*Oregon City, O. T.,
Feb. 28, 1859.*

In the Millennium, the saints will possess all things and dispose all things as God. Nevertheless, they will then pay the printer for all they publish; for they will do justly, and recompense all their subjects in the flesh, according to their works; for under their reign, labor will have its due, adequate and fair remuneration. If printing and publishing must be paid for then, how much more necessary that the saints now be furnished with currency to pay the Devil for printing proclamations, and protests, and testimonies against his principles and rule; while, but for the profit he makes by them, he would readily counsel their extermination or suppression. The Devil will not print for the saints without pay; therefore, all who are interested in their teaching, would do well to imitate our honest friend in Oregon, as an efficient way of proving their appreciation of the Herald, in its advocacy of the faith once for all delivered to the saints. —*Editor.*

Inviting Sinners to Sing and Pray.

Brother Thomas—Is it right for a brother to assemble the sinners of the world by public proclamations placarded through the streets, to hear him lecture on the Great Salvation; and with them to sing songs of praise, and also pray, brethren in attendance, a mixed multitude?

A word from your pen, because it speaketh as the oracles of God, will remove many doubts, and set many good minds to right on this great and important subject.

You are aware that the oracle "man," hath no place in the sheepfold of the Good Shepherd; but as you belong to the right fold, and one whose exposition of the Volume of Eternal Love, written by the finger of Jehovah, and with the pen of omniscience, we can, from experience, well confide in; because the word of Christ dwelleth in you richly in all spiritual understanding.

Yours in hope of Incorruptibility and Life,

*Owen Sound, C. W.,
Feb. 12, 1859.*

JOHN BLYTHE,

Answer to the Above.

It is only right to invite sinners of the world to come and hear the truth, and to obey it. "God heareth not sinners; but if any man be a worshipper of God, and doeth his will, him he heareth,"—Jno. ix, 31. Hence, sinners must become saints "by the obedience of faith," before they can obtain any regard in the Most Holy, where Jesus is.

The whole teaching of the Scriptures declares the same thing—*Acceptable worship can only be offered by the children of the covenant*. Thus it is written, "The sacrifice of the wicked (such as the clergy and their dupes) is an abomination to Jehovah; but the prayer of the upright (his saints) is his delight;" and, the "thoughts of the wicked are an abomination to Jehovah; but the words of the pure are pleasant words:" "Jehovah is far from the wicked; but he heareth the prayer of the righteous"—Prov. xv, 8, 26, 29. "*The wicked*" in this testimony, are the *reshahyim*, a class of men opposed to the *tzeddikim*—the *unjustified* in contrast to the *justified*. The scribes, Pharisees and hypocrites, under the law; and all orders of clergy in the times of the Gentiles; with all, both under the times of Israel and the Gentiles, who are led by them, are *reshahyim*, or outside barbarians, in relation to Jehovah, and his truth. And in speaking thus, we do them no injustice, and offer no violence to "charity;" for, in their prayers, they all acknowledge themselves to be "miserable sinners" and "offenders." In proof that they do, read the liturgies of Rome and Canterbury; and listen to the random outpourings of all conventicles where "the sentiments of all Christendom" are expressed.

Praise, thanksgiving and prayer are spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ, which can only be offered acceptably by God's own priests. These are not "miserable sinners," or worldlings; but people whom Jesus has purchased for God by his own blood, and made kings and priests—Rev. v, 9, 10; 1 Pet, ii, 2, 5, 9—those who have believed and obeyed the Gospel of the kingdom; a family after the numeral type of Noah's. These sacrifices belong to the Altar and Holy Place, where no sinners can be found, except on pain of death; that is, of the Second.

God hates the praises of those who do not perform his will. What greater insult can be offered to God than praise out of the throat of blasphemers, drunkards, sensualists and liars? Even a good man would feel disgraced by the commendation of such; how much more God? And where are to be found greater blasphemers, lovers and inventors of lies, than the clergy? And "like priest like people;" "there is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all," as Paul saith of Jew and Gentile, "gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips; whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness; their feet are swift to shed blood; destruction and misery are in their ways; and the way of peace have they not known; the fear of God is not before their eyes"—Rom. iii, 10-18. In a scriptural sense, this is literally true of the clergy, and those who follow in their ways. If the Scriptures are to be accepted as the standard by which "the righteousness of God, witnessed by the law and the prophets and fulfilled in them who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit," (Rom. iii, 21; viii, 4) is to be defined, "there is none that understand," among them; and consequently, "there is none righteous, no, not one" among them; and "the fear of God," which is his way and precepts, "is not before their eyes." Now, "the eyes of the Lord are over the righteous, and *his ears are open to their prayers*; but the face of the Lord is against them that do evil."—1 Pet. iii, 12.

Is it not, then, preposterous to invite the clergy and their followers, or the sinners of the world to sing songs of praise, and to pray—to offer up personally, or by proxy, their "abominations?" We do not deny their piety and sincerity; they are, doubtless, very pious and sincere in the ignorance of their ways, which are so specious, apart from the word, as easily to mislead "the man of the earth," who judges only by his blind feelings and sentiments, and the exterior of things, having no spiritual discernment. Prayer and praise, and thanksgiving are spiritual worship, when offered "in spirit and in truth;" and can only be so offered by those who are intelligent on the truth. Under any other circumstances they are the mere mutterings of unreasoning animals, which none of the saints, who are saints indeed, do anything to develop.

The presence, however, of pious "miserable sinners," or of those they regard as "impious," but who are oftentimes more worthy than themselves, need not prevent the saints, if they so judge, singing songs of praise, and praying and giving thanks. The assembly is indeed "*a mixed multitude*," but if the saints in that multitude are the directors of the proceedings, and scripturally define their position, they can do as they please. This is authorized by the case of Paul just preceding his shipwreck. He advised all his fellow voyagers, who were a "mixed multitude" of Pagan soldiers and sailors, malefactors and Christians—Paul and his brethren—to refresh themselves with the comforting assurance that they should all get safely to shore: "and when he had thus spoken, he took bread, *and gave thanks to God in presence of them all*—Acts xxvii, 35. This was a very different affair to inviting the miserable sinners to join him in thanksgiving; or saying to them in clerical phrase, "Let us all pray!"

In hope that these remarks will meet the inquiry, in all its bearings, we submit them to the brethren with the best wishes for their spiritual prosperity in all things. —*Editor*.

Is the Lord's Table a Sacrificial Altar?

Brother Thomas: —Will you please to bear with me a few minutes while I make inquiry respecting a subject on which I confess my inability to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion? For a number of years I supposed that, if a believer committed sin, he received remission thereof by confession of the same, and partaking of the bread and wine, viewing it as a sacrificial altar to which we were commanded to come for that purpose as well as for a remembrance of Him who hath loved us, and given himself for us: and when I became a believer in the kingdom I had some conversation with others on the subject and found we thought alike. But since then I have heard of others holding a contrary opinion. If you can spare the time I should like to have your view of the matter, as I very much desire to be led into all truth.

Yours in the One Hope,

ELIZABETH P. FISH.

Kossuth, Ill., Jan. 5, 1859.

Sacramentalism.

A *sacrament* (from the Latin *sacramentum*, an oath) is defined by ecclesiastical speculators to be "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace." The Roman Mother has "Seven Sacraments;" but her Protestant Daughters and their Abominations, recognize only two of them, which they style Baptism and Eucharist. Their sacrament of baptism consists in sprinkling the face of a babe at any time from its first breath, and making upon its forehead the sign of a cross with the finger of an ordained administrator, dipped in water, either previously "consecrated," or consecrated in the act of using it for the sprinkling. This is "*the outward and visible sign*" which ought to be styled *Rhantism*, or Sprinkling; for there is no baptism or dipping in the case, the fingers of the clerical sorcerer excepted.

But, of what is this rhantism the sign? It is said to be "*the sign of an inward and spiritual grace*" operated upon the immortal soul of the babe, which in the process is regenerated, cleansed from all sin, and ingrafted into the body of Christ! This marvellous work is *sacramentalism*, the hypostasis or basis of which is, abstract spirit without, operating upon concrete spirit within, the babe! Hence faith is not necessary to sacramentalism, either in clergyman or subject: water, the form, and abstract spirit are all that are necessary; even an ordained administrator may be dispensed with, if it be thought the babe would die before the parson could arrive. Hence nurses and doctors' apprentices often administer "the outward and visible sign."

In all this theological sorcery and spiritual legerdemain the spirit is supposed to be *subvenient*, or in the water. That is, when the words "I baptise thee, &c.," are uttering or uttered, Holy Spirit strikes into the water, as it were, and makes it holy water. Hence, what the spiritual sorcerers call "holy water," may be styled *spirit suspended in water*. The Devil is said to hate this very much, so that it has become proverbial to signify intense hatred, as "he hates virtue as the Devil hates holy water." But the contrary is true. The Devil is very fond of holy water, for he uses it abundantly in all his lustrations. When a pagan, he used it freely; and when he became a Catholic, and filled his wardrobe with popish, protestant, and sectarian vestments for public occasions, according to the community he found himself among, he has always called for the pint basin, or "font," with "the outward and visible sign."

But, how doth this water regenerate? How is the “*spiritual grace*” it contains made “*inward*,” and blended with “the soul?” Not by any mental or moral process assuredly, because the subject of “the sign” is incapable of thought, being simply a new born animal. The mental and moral being excluded, the physical alone remains. The “*spiritual grace*” strikes “*inward*” upon physical or mesmeric principles. We have seen the mesmerized drink pure water, and vomit at the unexpressed will of the operator; after the same example, therefore, we may suppose, that the clerical sorcerer mesmerizes the little animal by his manipulations, and wills the regeneration of its “*immortal soul*;” by which will, the “*spiritual grace*” in the water being *en rapport* with his spirit, strikes “*inward*,” and blending itself with “the particle of the Divine Essence”—*divinæ particula auræ*—“the soul,” washes, sanctifies, justifies, and saves it: so that being thus generated or born again, its body may be buried in consecrated ground with “*Christian burial*,” and itself become “a little angel with wings,” flying about with its companions like clouds of gnats on a summer’s eve, “beyond the realms of time and space”—somewhere “beyond the skies!!!”

But what has all this about clerical rhanism to do with our correspondent's difficulty? Much every way. Her difficulty relates to the subject of the remission of sins. “For a number of years,” says she, “I supposed, that if a believer committed sin, he received remission thereof by confession of the same, and partaking of the bread and wine, viewing it as a sacrificial altar, to which we were commanded to come for the purpose.” This supposition is *sacramentalism*—REMISSION OF SIN BY A SACRAMENT; the foundation corner of the Apostasy, of whose wine all peoples, and nations, and tongues, have drunk to intoxication, so that when the Lord Jesus Christ returns to earth, he finds them “drunk” and wallowing in the mire—Rev. xvii, 2, 6; xviii, 3. We have dwelt upon *the Sacrament of Rhantism* as a familiar example of sacramentalism—“an outward and visible sign of the inward and spiritual grace” of remission of sin from “the soul” of a new born animal. Only think of it, reader; the sin of a part of Deity, called the “*immortal soul*,” purged away by subvenient spirit suspended in a few drops of water trickling from the fingers of an old wife, parson, or apothecary's apprentice! Are you not astounded at the magical effects of “*holy water*?” But look at the absurdity—Satan will have it that “the soul” is immortal, or deathless; and yet the sin cleansed out is said to be of that deathless soul: but the scripture saith, “*the wages of sin is death*;” how, then, can there, be sin in the soul, and that soul deathless or immortal?

Again, Satan admits that God is sinless, and that his parts partake of the nature of his whole. Now Satan teaches that the human soul is a particle of God's essence; how, then, can that soul just born, innocent of all action whatever, be sinful, and “in danger of the pains of hell for ever?”

The fact is, that Satan is a deceiver and deceived. He is lost in “*his depths as they teach*”—Rev. ii, 24. His sacramentalism has bewildered him; and he is stultified by “the sentiments of all Christendom,” in which he piously and clerically ministers to the admiration of the Devil in all his manifestations of the flesh.

Now as to *Eucharistic Sacramentalism*, or the remission of sin by confession and partaking of the bread and wine, the eating of the bread and wine is the “outward and visible sign;” and the remission of sin is the “inward and spiritual grace;” or abstract spirit, communicated. This sacrament of the Eucharist, or of Thanksgiving, differs from the sacrament of Rhantism, or Sprinkling, not in the theory of its *opus operatum*, or work operated, but in the form and subject. The vehicle through which the “*grace*” is transmitted, is bread and wine instead of water; and the subject one that has been satanically rhanized or

aspersed. An unsprinkled animal cannot be admitted to "the altar." The unsprinkled are brought to the conventicle pint-basin, or to the parochial font, and no further towards the clerical sanctum; but the besprinkled, Satan's own newborns, are admitted to the altar-rail, and permitted to eat a "wafer;" or if they belong to the reformed synagogue, to eat bread and drink wine for the heal of their immortal souls; that is, for the remission of any sin or defilement the incorruptible and deathless soul may have contracted, since it was cleansed by "grace" in the water, or by a previous eating. In Satan's papistical synagogue, the ministers keep the decanter to themselves; while they give the wafer to their dupes. Satan's ministers love good cheer above all things, and always take good care of number one. They persuaded the foolish people that there was such virtue in their ministry that by repeating the words of Jesus over a wafer, they call the "host," and over a tankard, or cup, of wine, they could convert the wafer into the flesh, and the wine into the blood, of Christ; so that, when these elements were before the people, they beheld Christ really present—sacrificially. The process developing this result, they call "the Sacrifice of the Mass"; and the thing itself, "the Real Presence." Only think of the sorcery! A devil of a priest, the very antitype of Judas, whom Jesus styled a devil (John vi. 70) takes a little flour, water, and salt, makes it into a paste, and then mutters over it in Latin, *Hoc est corpus meum* ("This is my body"), and instantly the words pass from his lying lips, the wafer-dough becomes the actual flesh that was crucified! By this sorcery, the cannibal makes his god, and eats him! But the process does not stop here. He takes a cup of wine (the best, doubtless, he can find in the market, as he intends, selfish tippler that he is, to drink it all himself,) and mumbles over it, *Hoc est sanguis mea* ("This is my blood"), and instanter the wine becomes the real blood that poured from the heart of Jesus when "filled with iron, and the shaft of a spear." But, behold the creature's "depth," or subtlety! He says, to the people, this blood was poured out for you; but it is not lawful for you to drink it; but for the priest only. You may eat of the wafer; and in eating of this, you, in effect, take also of the blood, for the blood pervades all the flesh. Oh! ye knaves, ye children of the Devil, enemies of all God's righteousness, witnessed by the law and the prophets! Ye say that ye have turned wine into real blood? Suppose ye had, why do ye not pour it upon the ground, and cover it with dust? — Lev. xvii. 13, 14. Who gave you a dispensation to do as worship what it was not lawful for Peter and the other apostles, nor for any Gentile Christians to do? Ye hypocrites, ye generation of vipers, ye deceivers and destroyers of the people, hear what the apostles say to you, and to all who profess the faith of Jesus—"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—Acts xv. 28,29. Hear this, ye blood-drinking priests of Satan—"It is a necessary thing that ye abstain from blood": but ye pretend to make it, and to drink it too! But what is the use of talking to you about what the scripture teacheth, except, indeed, for the benefit of your dupes, who perchance may read it. Your "wisdom" is from beneath, and your mission therefrom to deceive the world, and to make the Word of God of none effect by your traditions.

But Luther, a sorcerer himself, taught his contemporaries that his brother priests did not effect what they pretended—that they did not convert the substance of the dough and wine into the real blood, flesh, and bones of Christ; but that the words uttered over them brought Christ down into a mystical union with the dough and wine; which were *consubstantial* with them, as caloric is not the iron, but consubstantial with the iron, when heated to redness. This was only a modification of the original absurdity; the absurdity essentially remained. The bread and wine were eaten sacramentally by all sorts of ignoramuses, whose "immortal souls" were healed by the *con*, or "grace," while the *substance*, or bread and wine, were digested in the usual way.

After Luther, Zwinglius and Calvin, two other sons of the Sorceress, declared that the Monk of Wittenburg, though a little more rational than most of his order, was still very wide of the true exposition. They admitted that the Eucharist was "a sacrament," but taught that the bread and wine were only emblems of the body and blood of Jesus, and to be eaten as such for the reception, in some way or other, of "an inward and spiritual grace." This dogma of Zurich and Geneva is the sacramentalism of the Parliamentary Superstition of Britain, and of American Sectarianism. Until quite recently, "infidels" and "deists" used to take the Sacrament of the Eucharist as a qualification for a seat in Parliament, to which they had been elected. People of all sorts of opinions, and of no opinion (we say nothing of "faith" in their case), take the sacrament at the parochial altar rails from the hands of the ministers duly authorized to administer ordinances by Satan. Being ignorant of Bible Christianity, any "grace" they are supposed to obtain, gets into their "immortal souls" sacramentally; and the bread and the wine become to them "a sacrificial altar."

Men's opinions on the nature of the Eucharist used to define their position, in the beginning of the controversy with Rome. If they confessed the Real Presence in the Sacrament, they passed for good Catholics; but if they denied it, they were deemed to be Protestants, and worthy of the stake. The question was put to the Princess Elizabeth, while under surveillance in the reign of her sister, "the bloody Queen," what she thought of the bread and wine in the Eucharist? But she, perceiving the snare, replied, saying,

Christ was the word that spake it;
He took the bread and brake it;
What he did make it,
That I believe, —and take it.

But what he did make it, she pretended not to say.

But the truth is, the institution is not a "sacrament" at all. Apart from an enlightened mind, the bread and the wine are of no more benefit to the eater, than immersion to the person dipped. Immersion is a sign; and the eating of the bread and wine is a sign. The former is a burial and a rising again from the water, in which the believer was put out of sight. It is memorial of his death to sin, and his resurrection to a new moral existence; and a sign of his resurrection from the grave of earth, to live and reign with Christ on earth a thousand years. But it is a memorial and sign of these things only to him who is the possessor of the "One Faith"; to all others, it is neither—Rom. vi. 2-11; 1 Cor. xv. 29; Col. ii. 12; Gal. iii. 26-29).

The latter is also memorial and significant. It memorializes the breaking of the body of Jesus for his brethren, and the outpouring of his blood for the dedication of the Abrahamic Covenant; by which covenant so dedicated, all the believers of its promises are sanctified in putting on Jesus as its Anointed Mediator. It memorializes the body as the victim and altar on which sin was condemned, and upon which the iniquity of all the faithful was laid. All in Jesus are therefore "*in the altar*"—partakers of the Alter, "of which they had no right to eat who served the tabernacle" —Heb. xiii. 10; and of which they could not possibly eat, being without faith. It is a sign of feeding on Christ, the bread of heaven, "whose flesh is meat indeed, and his blood drink indeed"; for as bread and wine nourish the outward man upon physical principles, so the testimony, or unadulterated milk of the Word, concerning the Christ in his sufferings and glory, understood and believed, is mental and moral nourishment upon which the faithful feed, and grow, and become strong. It is a sign of this spiritual eating,

digesting, and assimilating of the word of Christ, or "the Spirit, which," says John, "is the truth"—1 John v. 6. This is the bread that came down from heaven—"the Spirit-truth"; "If any man eat this bread, he shall live in the age": for it is the spirit that maketh alive; the flesh profits nothing; spirit is, and life is, the words which I speak to you." "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye show the Lord's death *until he come*"—1 Cor. xi. 26. It memorializes the first coming, and reminds the partaker continually that he will certainly appear again, not to suffer, but to conquer and to reign.

It is manifest, then, that without understanding of the truth, it is impossible to eat in the true sense of the institution. It must be eaten in faith with the unleavened (cakes) of purity and truth—1 Cor. v. 8. An ignoramus cannot do this; for "ignorance alienates from the life of God"—Eph. iv. 18; such can only eat unworthily, not discerning the Lord's body, in its scriptural relations.

The bread and wine are no altar at all, but memorials of the altar. That altar, we have seen, is Jesus: and the saints in him, the worshippers thereat. About three or four years after the death of the Apostle John, Ignatius, in one of his letters, says, "Let no one mistake; if any man is not *within the altar*, he is deprived of the bread of God." The altar was the place of sacrifice; therefore, all within it, are in a suffering state. If they offend, they have the privilege of approach to the Father, through their advocate Jesus Christ, the Righteous One, who is the covering for their sins; so that, if they confess them, he is faithful and just to forgive them their sins, and to cleanse them from all unrighteousness—1 John i. 9; ii. 1, 2. They eat bread and drink wine as the memorial of this; not as of a sacrificial altar, sacramentally imparting the remission of sins.

EDITOR.

Preface to the Forthcoming Edition of Elpis Israel.

NEARLY ten years have elapsed since this work was originally published in London, England. A year after, an edition was published in New York; the two editions collectively, consisting of two thousand three hundred copies. These have been all disposed of, so that for the last three years the author has been unable to supply a considerable additional demand for the work. He has been urged by many who have read the book, to publish a new edition; and as a proof that this was not a mere compliment, one of them (Mr. Alex. Packie, of Baltimore, Md.), donates to the author eighty dollars towards the publication; and another, whose liberality towards what he believes is the truth, is well known (Mr. W. P. Lemmon, of the same city), writes, "Apart from all other considerations than the real merit of the book, you have nothing to fear as to its success. I would recommend you to give *at once* a public announcement of your intention to issue a new edition, and invite orders; you may find a larger edition wanted than you anticipate." Encouraged, therefore, by many similar assurances from others, I have published this *third edition of Elpis Israel*.

When this work was written, the times were of a highly exciting and stirring character. Nor have they materially changed to the present hour. During the past ten years, a succession of events has demonstrated that a fixed and predetermined purpose is in process of development, unknown indeed, to "the Powers that be," but known of God, revealed in his word, and guided by his hand. That purpose is, *the gathering together of the hosts of the nation against Jerusalem to war; that the Eternal Spirit, by Jesus the King of kings, may smite them upon the mountains of Israel; and in concert with the resurrected and living saints at the head of the armies of Israel, re-establish the throne and kingdom of David, and subjugate all other kingdoms to this New Power in the earth*. If the reader desire to assure himself of the

verity of this purpose, he may consult the testimonies referred to below, * which the past history of Israel, of Jesus and the Saints, and of the world at large, all proves has never yet been fulfilled; so that he has no alternative but to believe the purpose, or reject the truth of the Bible, and write himself an infidel. There is no neutral ground. Every man in "Christendom," falsely so called, is on the side of this purpose, or against it. Jesus and his apostles preached that "*Salvation is of the Jews*"—a salvation dependant upon the development of the purpose defined. Hence, "when ye see certain things come to pass, then look up, and lift up your heads, for your redemption draweth nigh"—a saying, which intimates that the approach of redemption, whatever it may consist in, may be known by a current fulfilment of predicted things, shortly preceding its manifestation.

* Isaiah xiv. 24-27; xxvii. 1-6; Joel iii. 1, 2, 9-17; Mic. v. 1-6; Zech. xii. 1-9; xiv. 1-11; Dan. xi. 40-45; xii. 1,2; Rev. xix. 11-16, xvii. 14; xi. 15-17; v. 9, 10; ii 26, 27. Acts xv. 16; Amos ix. 11-15; Isaiah ix. 6, 7; Luke i. 31-33—and so forth.

It is this relation between the gospel salvation and political events, that makes the current time so highly interesting; for there is no salvation for Jew or Gentile, until Jerusalem is in the actual possession of the "*Gog of the land of Magog, prince of Rosh, Mosc, and Tobl,*" and he be broken there by THE KING OF THE JEWS, returned from the "far country" where he now is. This is an indispensable necessity, and one that cannot obtain, so long as Europe exists under its present constitution. What is needed there, is *one ruling power, whose ascendancy is above all rivalry, and whose policy will be approved and accepted by all its continental contemporaries as absolute.* To develop this there must be a tempest, in which the countries shall be overflowed by a submerging inundation—Dan. xi. 40, 41; or, as Prince Metternich remarked saying, "*after me the Deluge.*" The statesmen of the old world see that something terrible is looming in the near future; but they confess that they cannot see the end of it. It is true they cannot, though that end has been proclaimed through the Exile of Patmos wherever the New Testament is read. The apostle informs us that "the Ten Horns received power as kings with the Beast (the Eighth Head of the Beast) one hour. These have one mind, and shall give their power and strength unto the Beast," and so forth. "For God hath put in their hearts to fulfil his will, and to agree, and give their kingdoms to the Beast, until the words of God be fulfilled—Rev. xvii. 12, 13, 17. Now this combination of Powers upon the Fourth Beast habitable for "*one hour,*" or thirty years, has never been evinced in all their history. The coming tempest will promote this development, which, when consummated, will produce the "One Mind," or policy, by which all the hosts of the nations may be moved as one man against Egypt and Jerusalem to war against the Power (Britain and her allies) then in possession of them.

In my letter to the late chief of the Power, styled by Ezekiel, *Prince of Rosh, Mosc, and Tobl,*" I referred him to "*the coming conflict between France and Austria, in the case of Italy and the Pope.*" I have been looking for this for the last ten years; and when asked at what time I would revisit England, have invariably replied, when France and Austria fall foul of one another; certainly not before. This collision seems now to be imminent; and whenever it breaks out, then, as I wrote to the Czar, will be Russia's opportunity. Nicholas was a little too soon, calculating more upon the force of his single arm, than upon force seconded by an agreement of other powers. Ezekiel's prophecy seems clearly to require the extinction of Austrian ascendancy. If the empire be not dissipated, its supremacy must yield to Russia; but we shall see. She and France are now antagonists; Austria and Russia are nominally friends.

When Elpis Israel first appeared, France was a republic, under President Napoleon, the self-styled saviour of society from impending anarchy. Since then, in despite of the treaty of Vienna in 1815, which excludes the Bonaparte family from all sovereign power in Europe, he seized upon sovereignty in France, and by a bloody *coup d'etat*, made himself emperor. He has ruled France with scorpions; and encouraged by success, evidently proposes to experiment, after his uncle's fashion, upon Italy, Austria, and the Pope. For our own part, we doubt not, that the uncle's fate also awaits him. France is a Toe of Nebuchadnezzar's Image, and a Horn of the Eighth Head of the Beast; hence her symbolical constitution is regal, *not imperial*. I expect, therefore, the fall of the French empire in and by the same tempest that is about to change the political map of Europe, and to demolish the Ottoman, sustained only from without.

From a review of all that is at work among the Powers, we may truly say that no times are more interesting and important than these. The political situation is that of the "*Three Unclean Spirits like Frogs*" which are "*working miracles*" in the political world of the old prophetic arena of the divine purpose. No ordinary events are about to come to pass; and whatever comes will be promotive of that grand revolution in human affairs by which the kingdom of the clergy shall be disrupted, and the civil power that sustains it in all countries, utterly destroyed. When ye see these things predicted in Rev. xvi. 12, 14, as ye may, for they are characteristic of the times, look up, and lift up your heads; for, in verse 15 of the same chapter, the Spirit saith, "Behold, I come as a thief. Blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame."

Reader, in view of the warning, have you on these "*garments*," are you "*keeping*," them unspotted by the world; or are you "*walking naked*?" If you are not "in Christ," you are in the rags and nakedness of sin. Your sin is uncovered; and he only is "blessed whose transgression is forgiven, whose *sin is covered*;" the man unto whom Jehovah imputeth not iniquity, and in whose spirit there is no guile"—Psal. xxxii. 1, 2; Rom. iv. But you may be ignorant of the whole matter, though you may be as full of denominational pietism as a Romish devotee or a Protestant enthusiast. Ignorance alienates from the life of God; for pious ignorance is only infidelity; and "without faith it is impossible to please God." Now Elpis Israel has been written to dispel the darkness of such as you; to turn you from Satan to God; that you may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among the sanctified through faith that leads into Jesus—that you may be clothed with him as with a pure and spotless robe, "clean and white," that you may not walk naked, and be exposed to shame.

We may remark here that, on p. 125, line 17, we are supposed to say, that "the work of the law was written upon the hearts" of Gentiles, who had heard nothing of it. This was not my meaning. I there endeavor to account for the moral difference between the mere savage and the peoples of the four empires; that the little light they had came from the law through their intercourse with Israel; it came "from without:" but where there was no intercourse with this peculiar people, the darkness was total; and there was no accusing or excusing—no conscience but a blind impulsive instinct, unsentimental as that of the beasts that perish. We agreed entirely with our intelligent friend, whose letter has already been quoted from at the beginning, that "Paul in Rom. ii. 15, is laboring to check the presumption of the Jews who were claiming pre-eminence in the congregation at Rome, because of their superior knowledge of the law of Moses, by showing their pretensions vain, because they had not kept the law; whereas *the Gentiles in the Church*, who never were under the law of Moses, showed that the work of the law was written in their hearts by the word of the truth of the Gospel by faith, and therefore they kept the righteousness of the law and by so doing they proved that

they were the true circumcision, all of which is clearly and beautifully argued out to the close of the chapter."

And now, sending ELPIS ISRAEL for a third time upon his travels to proclaim the kingdom of God and its near approach, we commend him and all he may salute, "to Him who is able to present faultless before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy; to the only wise God our Saviour be glory, and majesty and dominion, and power in all the Aions. Amen."

Theiopolitical.

Behold as a thief I come; blessed is he that watcheth. JESUS.

The Crisis.

AFFAIRS upon the territorial arena of Daniel's Fourth Beast appear to be fast culminating to a terrible crisis. The second stage of the great question to be debated at the cannon's mouth, seems to be opening upon the world; and it is extremely probable that before this number of the *Herald* is received by our subscribers, war will be renewed, presenting in its development the Eastern Question in a new and more interesting phase.

The unclean frog-like spirit proceeded out of the Mouth of the Dragon when the Constantinopolitan Power declared war against Russia in 1853; and we are now waiting to see the second proceed out of the Mouth of the Beast in a declaration of war by Austria against Sardinia, and therefore against France. France has created the present crisis as she did the first, under the inspiration of various collateral influences; but we do not expect the declaration of war from Paris. Come when it will, and from whence it may, it will be pregnant with momentous results. The details leading to those results were not noted in the scriptures of truth, but the results themselves are pretty clearly indicated. The present relative position of powers must be changed. This is absolutely necessary to permit the development of the Eighth Head of the Scarlet-colored Beast in its last form; that is, as an Imperial Power at the head of the Ten Kingdoms, whose mind, power, and strength, shall be one in policy and action—Rev. xvii, 3, 11-13. In the development of this, this Imperio-Regal combination of Powers will lay siege to Rome for the expulsion of a power, the Frog-Power, by which it is at present occupied. "And the Ten Horns which thou sawest upon the (Eighth Head of the) Beast, these shall hate the Harlot, and shall make her desolate, and naked, and shall eat her flesh, and burn her with fire. For God hath put in their hearts to fulfil his will, and to agree, and give their kingdom unto the (Eighth Head of the) Beast, until the words of God shall be fulfilled." When this is consummated, the French Empire will have ceased to exist; and Gogue will be in the ascendant, and prepared to lead the hosts of the nations against Turkey and the Land of Israel. The third stage of affairs will probably witness the fall of Constantinople; and the fourth, the invasion of Palestine and the fall of Jerusalem, which brings us to the solution of the Eastern Question by the thief-like apocalypse or coming of "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews." By this time, Rome will have recovered her disaster at the expulsion of the French, and be saying, "I sit queen and am not a widow, and shall see no sorrow:" but the time will have come for the resurrected saints under the Captain of their salvation, to give her torment and sorrow to the utter dismay of all the popish kings who patronize her superstition. The Lamb and his companions shall conquer them, and destroy the Harlot, with whom they

have conspired against the peace and happiness of the world—Rev. xvii, 14; xviii, 8, 20. May this consummation come quickly, and find us ready!

EDITOR.

April 26, 1859.

The Russo-French Alliance.

WHATEVER may be thought of Russian strategy, it is impossible to dispute the diplomatic skill. During the latter portion of last year the influence of the Czar was used successfully to stimulate French and Sardinian ambition at the expense of Austria. General encouragement was held out to both with a lavish hand, and when some difficulty was made about the matrimonial alliance between the House of Bonaparte and that of Savoy, the Grand Duke Constantine did not disdain to become special attorney in the matrimonial suit, which, under his auspices, was speedily brought to a close. Having once committed the would-be belligerents, however, to a contest with Austria, backed by the German powers, the zeal of Russia gradually waxed cold. Whatever her expectations or secret demands may have been, she was, or affected to be, indifferent about exacting their concession; and during the space of nearly two months the Court of St. Petersburg has assumed a provoking air of placid impartiality between the eager expostulations, on the one hand, against the rupture of treaties, and the still more eager remonstrances that have been heard against abandoning Italy after all the high promises that had been made. Sooner than be stalemated, Louis Napoleon has evidently preferred giving Russia her own terms as the price of active and ostensible cooperation. What they are we know not; but that they have been conceded it is impossible to doubt. While Lord Cowley was at Vienna endeavouring to accommodate matters, unsuspected negotiations were proceeding between Paris and St. Petersburg, the first result of which is already avowed to be a congress on Italian Affairs, in which the five great Powers and all the Italian governments are to be represented. What schemes may be produced when the proposed conference meets, we shall know in due time. But we may be well assured that if a pacific settlement be sincerely contemplated by the confederates, Muscovite interests will not have been overlooked.

Meanwhile, Count Cavour has been in Paris, where he has *been feted* and caressed by the simple-minded monarch who dwells in that capital of fascination. The journals are full of comments on his visit, and his countenance has been watched as though it were an European barometer. On the evening of his arrival, we are told, "the index of the mind within" pointed low, and touched even the point of "stormy," but during his visit the Savoyard quicksilver rose steadily; and when he left, the hand fluctuated gently between "changeable" and "fair." Of course, all sorts of circumstantial-looking conjectures are hazarded, as to assuring tenor of the French Emperor's talk with the Piedmontese minister. We pay no attention to any of them. Both parties to the ominous *tête-à-tête* have too deep an interest in secrecy to render any partial disclosures credible. As for the Congress, the best we can hope for is, that it may turn out a solemn farce, and avowedly accomplish nothing. With the remembrance of what sort of international settlements and rearrangements have been perpetrated by similar assemblages, we can only pray that, as England is to be represented in the one now impending, nothing may come of it that will bind this country to recognise the thralldom and misrule of the Peninsula. We are not answerable for war, should it occur, nor shall we be partakers therein. But a new distribution of territory by the Overbearing Powers of Europe, would only be a re-enactment of the sins of the Congress of Vienna, and from complicity in such sins we desire to be kept free. —*London Leader*.

The Papal States.

THE famous Lord Chesterfield summed up his impressions of a tour through France some four score years ago, by the remark that in that country he had observed all those symptoms which are wont to preface great changes and revolutions. We have often wished that the prophecy had been as explicit as it was correct. We should much like to know what those symptoms were on which that cynic Solomon founded his diagnosis. We presume, however, that *mutatis mutandis*, the symptoms of a nation's dissolution must be much the same as that of an individual's bankruptcy. When customers begin to fall off and bankers to look coldly —when clerks' wages are over due and the office rent is in arrears—when creditors call and are put off from day to day—when cheques are returned and no business is done, and the books are no longer posted, you may conclude, without much danger of error, that the end of that house or business is at hand.

From the moment we entered the Papal State to the hour we left it, this sort of premonitory foretaste of bankruptcy weighed upon us. There was bankruptcy in the half cultivated field—bankruptcy in the tumble-down towns—bankruptcy in the ragged garbs and careworn faces of the people—bankruptcy in the very air you breathe. The road from Siena to Rome is, at the best of times, a dismal one. It is one of the chief, if not the most important, of the Papal post routes, traversed yearly by thousands of wealthy travellers. There is every inducement for that moderate amount of enterprise and speculation which the presence of travellers produces elsewhere, even in the most stationary countries; but the dull, stagnant oppression of Roman misgovernment overpowers all symptoms of life and energy. The road, which, like all the highways of Italy, owes its existence to the rule of the first Napoleon, is good enough in an engineering point of view, but falling into decay from long neglect, and want of repair. The inns are a sort of cross-breed between a hovel and a barrack, combining the native dirt of an Italian Albergo with the discomfort of a German Wirth's Haus, and the exorbitant charges of a German-street hotel. The whole country is bare and dreary. The peasants, whom you meet at rare intervals, have a sort of bandit look; and all alike beg, with a sort of scowl by no means exhilarating to a nervous traveller. Ever and anon you pass by some roadside heap of stones, where the wooden cross on the summit of the pile warns you that on the spot you are treading, some scene of murder and bloodshed occurred, not too long ago for the cross to have fallen into pieces. From time to time, too, a patrol of mounted dragoons comes by and inspires unpleasant recollections of Adelphi melodramas, which are by no means so cheerful on a barren and desolate moor as in the shrine sacred to Wright and Bedford. We know not, however, whether the towns themselves are not more depressing than the open country. We looked in vain along the whole route for any trace of a house having been built, or even repaired, since the last time—more than ten years before—that we had travelled over the same road. The streets seemed, if possible, dirtier, the houses more dilapidated, and the inhabitants more squalid than of old. Indeed, throughout the whole Roman States, we should think the race of masons and carpenters must be extinct. The only trade that flourishes, or rather keeps in existence, is the priesthood. Every man in eight, so statistical authorities inform us, is a priest. For our own part, we should be quite ready to believe that there were more priests than laymen.

It was at Rome especially that this mystery of the priesthood pressed most heavily on our enquiring minds. How can so many priests find means of livelihood? and how can they find any conceivable occupation? were questions to which we could never obtain a satisfactory reply. To our latter query, the only approximate solution we could obtain from one well informed on these matters, was, that in the small convents and churches surrounding

the Eternal City each day was certain to be the "Festa" of some saint or martyr, or other, and that the priests walk out in troops to this particular shrine, whichever it may be, and having said a few prayers, return home again, managing in this way to kill a little time, to gain a small amount of appetite, and to contribute somewhat to their future welfare, killing thus, in fact, three birds with one stone—two temporal and one spiritual. More dull, listless, and unintellectual faces than those of nine-tenths of the Roman priesthood, it is impossible to conceive. You can tell at once the young English proselytes, whom you meet now and then in the streets, by the brightness of their looks, and, let us add, the cleanness of their hands. Any man may become a Roman Catholic, but it takes three generations at least to acquire the proper peculiar Papal dirt which distinguishes the true believers. We were told a story, on good authority, which, whether it be true or not, illustrates that state of bondage to ceremonial rules and clerical etiquette, which forms one of the especial banes of priestcraft in Rome. A cardinal is never to be seen on foot. Like the Queen of Spain, he is not supposed to possess legs. The other day, one of the youngest of the Roman cardinals had to perform early morning service at a church not a minute's walk from his house. The annoyance of having to ascend and descend and wait for his carriage was so great that he at last resolved on the startling innovation of walking to the church in question. Before many days he was summoned by the Pope himself, and rebuked for his breach of decorum. On remonstrating, he was informed by the Holy Father that there was nothing, either in this world or the next he could not grant to his prayer, but that to allow a cardinal to walk on foot, was a power not conceded even to the successor of St. Peter. After all, perhaps the Pope was right. Who knows but the old riddle of Majesty, stripped of its externals, might not apply to a cardinal without his purple stockings?

The most striking sight, however, in all Rome, to our eyes, was the presence of the French troops. You came on them at every turn, in knots of two or three together—seldom alone—never by any chance in company with Italians. Every hour almost you hear the sharp rattatat of the French drums, and the sound of their quick, brisk march. In the Forum, by the Arch of Titus, beneath the Colosseum itself, they were always being exercised and drilled, and as you looked at them, however unclassical your mind might be, you could hardly help recalling the old days when Rome was invaded by the barbarian Gauls. The French army is an anomaly in that dead, silent city. They can hardly, we think, have a pleasant time of it there. The Romans, to do them justice, have manliness enough to show their dislike of the foreign occupation. The French, socially speaking, are tabooed. At the public balls, no Italian lady dances with the French officers. With the exception of the houses of a few of the Roman princes who have married foreigners and become de-nationalized, they are said to be admitted to no native society at all. What, however, struck us most was the extent to which this feeling was shared by the common people. During the Carnival the Corso was crowded with French soldiers. Everywhere there was the greatest good humour and merriment, but the presence of the French was obviously ignored. Nobody insulted them—nobody pelted them. There were no nosegays thrown at them. They were simply passed over with a silence more expressive than the most vehement vituperation.

Indeed, the traces of French violence are too fresh for the Romans to forget. The miserable saplings which replace the fine trees of the Villa Borghese, tell where the invading forces were stationed. The new gateway hard by "San Pietro in Montorio," reminds one of the old gate, that was battered down by the French guns, when the breach was effected. In the walls of the city itself you can still see the imbedded cannon balls.

However, to do the French justice, the outward aspect of Rome has improved beneath their rule—the streets are brighter and cleaner, the shops more luxuriously, and the roads near

the town better kept. Not having the feelings of an Italian, it is impossible not to feel some tranquillity by their presence. It will be an evil day for the shopkeepers and houseowners of Rome when the Imperial legions march out of the city. Nevertheless, the very fact that we observed some hundreds of fresh troops enter the city at the very time when Louis Napoleon was boasting of his desire to withdraw his armies, confirmed us in the belief, which we hold from other reasons, that the evacuation of Rome is likely to be contemporaneous with the Greek Calends. —*London Leader*.

Rome and the Campagna.

THERE is a sort of dead look about Rome which accords well with the memories of the place. With the exception of the English quarter, and the Corso, the streets are at all times solitary. There are few carriages, and not many passers-by on foot. A great portion of the space included within the city walls is unoccupied, and the side streets all seem to end in nothing and lead nowhere. Indeed, upon the whole city there is a dull, sombre look, which never varies. It is at night, however, that the silence and desolation of the Eternal city strikes you most forcibly. After ten o'clock at night, in Rome proper, the town is deserted. The streets are but poorly lit—and to walk alone through the narrow lanes, with their high houses and deep shadows, requires a certain amount of moral courage. Everything is as suggestive of assassins and stilettoes, as the tombstones of a moon-lit graveyard are of ghosts. The Pontifical police, too, is none of the best. We know ourselves a gentleman who in broad daylight was stopped in the middle of a crowded thoroughfare, in one of the transpontine streets, and had his gold pin pulled out of his scarf before he could recover from his astonishment at the audacity of the attempt. The bystanders looked on with indifference, and every attempt to obtain redress, either from the Papal or the Imperial police, was unavailing. In the true spirit, however, of priesthood policy—on that "straining at the gnat and swallowing the camel" system, which from the days of the Pharisees downwards has been distinctive of the class—every precaution is taken to secure outward decorum. If report is not altogether false, the standard of private morality at Rome is certainly not higher than in less favoured cities. But to do the Papal Government justice, the outward show of decorum is preserved intact. There is no city that we know in Europe where the streets are so absolutely free from vice in any form. The theatres are all shut during Lent, and are poorly attended; but, indeed, the whole atmosphere is unfavourable to the drama. The priests are not great patrons of the theatre, and never appear there except in screened boxes. It is only within the last few years that women have been allowed to appear on the stage at Rome—and even now the ballet is interdicted. With the exception of the last night of the Carnival, masked balls are strictly forbidden. Newspapers, you might almost say, are an invention that has not yet penetrated to Rome, for the *Diario Romano* can only be called a paper by a stretch of charity. In truth, a Roman editor would have a pleasant easy time of it; for as nothing is allowed to be done in the way of business, and even the banks and post-office are closed on fast-days, and as saints'-days occur in the most rapid succession, his intervals of repose would be long and frequent. Indeed, as far as the cessation from labour and closing of the shops is concerned, the appearance of Rome on a Sunday would satisfy the most rigid of Sabbatarians. Even the English reading-room is hermetically closed.

Were it not for the French and English occupation, we think the whole of Rome would collapse into a state of stagnation. Whatever there is of the life and movement of a great city about Rome, is found in the English quarter. The Ghetto, where the Jews used, till lately, to be locked up at eight every night, is not more decidedly Jewish than the Piazza de Spagna is English. Amidst the Jewish street you can fancy yourself in the Juden-Strasse at Frankfort, or

in St. Mary Axe at home. Strolling along the Via del Babuino, you could almost imagine you were at Brighton or Cheltenham. The shops have English headings. The carriages are English built. English is spoken on every side, and about the whole place there is that indescribable air, which is characteristic of an English watering place. Hard by, too, there stands the English Protestant church, which, with a worthy return for our liberality, is not allowed to pollute the sacred city by standing within its walls. The American and Prussian ambassadors have both chapels within their own embassies; but as we choose to keep up our character for consistency, by ignoring the existence of the Pope, we cannot complain at the price we pay for the absence of an envoy. Fortunately the "Porta del Popolo," outside which the church is placed, lies close to the English quarter. Till very recently, music was not allowed at our church, for fear of Roman orthodoxy being perverted by the sound of Protestant harmony. The character, however, of the English colony would not be complete if had not among us a member of the royal family. The Prince of Wales was a source of never-failing attraction. The church, since the Prince's arrival, used to be thronged, especially by the Americans, whose chapel was, in consequence, deserted. Why, however, people should have gone to church to gaze on royalty, when they could see it any day in the open air, is one of those many mysteries which a philosophical mind does not attempt to solve. Every morning and afternoon you could see the young Prince being taken to some sight or other, always accompanied by Lord Bruce and some other coadjutor. Being a small lad, placed between two tall, elderly men, we confess—without disloyalty—that the impression always produced on us was the strong resemblance to a very small offender being marched along by two big policemen. His Royal Highness, indeed, always looked as if the greatest kindness you could have done him would be to tell him that the sight he was being taken to see was closed; and, indeed, never seemed to enjoy himself, except at the eminently unclassical and unintellectual amusement of bonbon pelting at the carnival. We could not help thinking that, if the Prince read "Dombey and Son," the description of Tozer and his uncle must have struck him with peculiar sympathy.

Another great attraction at Rome were the lectures of the ex-Archdeacon Manning. With the peculiar neatness with which the Roman Catholic priests conduct all their operations, a church was chosen for these sermons close to the Porta del Popolo, and the hour was fixed exactly after the Protestant service was over, so that crowds of English dropped in on their way home. However, as we had never the slightest desire to hear Mr. Manning when he was a good Protestant, we saw no reason for hearing him when he had become an indifferent Catholic; and, putting aside all theological considerations, we have no sympathy with an English gentleman who can lower himself to the company of Italian priests. Indeed, in spite of the *Record* and Exeter Hall, we cannot conceive, as a rule, a greater safeguard against perversion than a sight of Rome and its priesthood. You might as well think to encourage a passion for the stage by taking the aspirant behind the scenes in broad daylight; or try to give your guests an appetite for dinner by showing them the cooking apparatus uncleaned and the cook unwashed.

The exit from Rome, *via* Civita Vecchia, is a worthy termination to a tour to the Papal States. The distance is scarcely forty miles, but we took twelve hours in doing it. There were a string of some seven diligences started on the night we left, and as soon as we got outside the city walls we had an escort of dragoons. If ever one diligence lagged behind, the others waited for the defaulter to come up. At every stage the postilions woke up the passengers, to bully them into giving an extra "buono-mano," as they term it, and this, coupled with the necessity of closing the windows for fear of the malaria in the air, makes the journey anything but a pleasant one. The utter dreariness of the road can hardly be imagined. With the exception of

the post stations, there is not a house along it, and after the endless successions of barren hillocks you ascend and descend, the sight of the blue sea is perfectly delightful.

Challenge to the Sabbatarian Clergy of England.

THE "*National Sunday League*," of Great Britain, has issued a challenge to the Sabbatarians, to prove, in a public discussion, the following points, which they are understood to assume:

1. That the contemplation of beautiful objects of nature and of art has upon Sundays a *worse* effect than upon other days.
2. To explain by what means the people may *distinctly discriminate* between a tune good for Sunday and one good only for Monday and other days of the week.
3. To explain why it is *good* on Sunday to read in the Bible about Nineveh and Egypt, and *bad* to go to the Crystal Palace, or to the British Museum, in order to *see* the objects referred to in the Sacred Book.
4. Why it is good on Sunday to read in the Bible about the *lilies of Judea* and wicked to look upon the *butter cups of England*.
5. To define accurately what *may*, and what *may not*, be done on Sunday.
6. To explain how it is that cooking the hot dinners, and making the *Clergyman's* bed, and driving the *Bishop's* coach on Sunday, are *pious*, or permissible actions; while conducting an excursion train, or driving the *poor man's* vans, are *deadly sins*.
7. To show Divine authority for establishing the *sort of Sabbath* which the Hebrew Christians contend for, on any day or at any period.
8. To show Divine authority for *transferring* the obligation of the Old Testament Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week.
9. To show Divine authority for altering the Old Eastern mode of reckoning the commencement of days, and exactly what change was permitted, so that we may be able to ascertain *the precise hour* at which secular things become sinful, and again become lawful.
10. To prove that what they call "Sabbath-keeping" is a *cause* of the prosperity of nations, or that "Sabbath-breaking" is the *cause* of their decline.
11. To account upon Sabbatarian principles, for *the prosperity* of England; when, (according to the census,) on Sunday investigation was made, 4,105,797 persons were absent from the morning services in churches and chapels "*without cause of inability*;" 5,569,114 were so absent from the afternoon services, and, 5,688,830 so absent from the evening services; when the Archbishop of Dublin sanctions the Sunday opening of the Zoological Gardens in that city; when railways and steamboats are crowded with Sunday excursionists during the fine weather; when the Queen employs a military band to play secular tunes on Sundays, at Windsor, and the people employ similar bands to play similar tunes on Sundays, in the London Parks.
12. To explain, upon Sabbatarian principles, how it is that Holland merits the description of McCulloch—"no *country has so little crime*"—when Dutch newspapers teem with advertisements of Sunday concerts.
13. To explain how it is, if "Sabbath-breaking leads to national ruin," that *Switzerland*, though surrounded by powerful enemies, has preserved her liberties and *grown in prosperity*, although Sunday is the favorite day for rifle-shooting, meeting in pleasure gardens, and other, so-called, "Sabbath-breaking amusements."
14. To explain how it is that *Scotland* (where Sabbatarianism is most in regard,) is *renowned for drunkenness and illegitimacy*—in "Sabbath-breaking *France*," the illegitimate births amounting to seven and one-tenth per cent., and in Sabbath-breaking *Belgium* to six and

seven-tenths, while in the rural districts of "Sabbath-keeping Scotland," the Register General reports them eleven and one-tenth in Peebles, to seventeen and five-tenths in Nairn!

It is not probable that any of the Sabbatarian clergy will venture to accept this challenge. They will most likely pretend not to notice it, as their brethren here ignored the challenge issued, some months since, by the "American Society for the Promotion of Civil and Religious Liberty"—or, they will adopt a resolution similar to that of the late Sabbatarian Convention at Syracuse—that "we will not stoop from our high position to argue with the scoffer and the infidel"—reckoning as "scoffers and infidels" all who materially differ with them on this subject. But this is a mere *trick* to escape defeat, and yet it does *not* escape it, for the simplest can see through the ruse. In London, last spring, a discussion was ventured on in Exeter Hall, and the result, as denoted by the final vote, was strongly in favor of the Anti-Sabbatarian views. This discussion was presided over by the Rev. Professor Powell, of Oxford University, who has recently published a very able work against Sabbatarian views, entitled "Christianity without Judaism." It is having a great sale, and exerting a great influence. —*N. Y. Sunday Dispatch.*

The Admission of Papists.

THE Right Rev. J. T. M. Trevern, D. D., Bishop of Strasburg, a high dignitary of the Romish Church, in 1847, wrote a book in defence of his Church, called "The Discussion Amicale." It was addressed in the form of letters to the clergy of every Protestant communion, but especially to those of the Church of England. The object of the work was to show the inconsistencies of Protestants in proclaiming the Word of God as their only rule, while they followed the traditions of Rome. On page 142, 2d volume, he says:

"The clergy of Elizabeth, in unison with the innovators of the continent, and, like them, in opposition to the sacred books and antiquity, declared accordingly, that the Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, or cannot be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation. But, without going any farther, show us, my Lords, the validity of your baptism, 'by Scripture alone.' Jesus Christ there ordains that it shall be conferred, not by pouring water on the heads of believers, but by believers plunging into water.

"The word *baptizo* employed by the Evangelists, strictly conveys this signification, as the learned are agreed, and at the head of them, Cassubon, of all the Calvinists the best versed in the Greek language. Now, baptism by immersion has ceased for many ages, and you yourselves, as well as we, have only received it by infusion; it would, therefore, be all up with your baptism unless you established it by tradition and the practice of the Church. This being settled, I ask you from whom have you received baptism? Is it not from the Church of Rome? And what do you think of her? Do you not consider her as heretical and even idolatrous? You cannot, then, according to the terms of Scripture, prove the validity of your baptism; and, to produce a plea for it, you are obliged to seek it, with Pope Stevens and the councils of Aries and Nice, in Apostolical tradition."

Prophecy an essential part of a Saint's Religion.

IT was clearly revealed to Adam that the Seed of the Woman was to rise through suffering into a higher and consequently, a future state. There cannot be a more important subject of inquiry than this in the whole range of scriptural theology, because the views of Warburton in his Divine Legation of Moses have been adopted by the most learned "divines," and these views are entirely at variance with the unity of the design of God, and with the unity of the testimony of the Old and New Testaments. He asserts, "that the doctrine of a future state of rewards and punishments is not to be found in, nor did make part of, the Mosaic dispensation." "Mr. Warburton," says Bates, "hath brought the positive assertions of the prophets and inspired men in the Old Testament to affirm (as he thinks) that there was not a future state: the prophets and inspired men of the New Testament, as positively assert there is: is not this making the Old Testament contrary to the New, and destroying the authority of both? To say that Moses hath omitted the doctrine is one thing; to say that he, or any other inspired writer, hath done it, is another. This latter Mr. Warburton hath asserted over and over again, that inspired men have denied there was a future state; which is directly setting prophet against prophet and Testament against Testament." Warburton is a striking instance of the necessity of combining sound Scriptural views with researches into prophetic subjects; and of the inability of mere learning, without a knowledge of the doctrines of the Gospel, to read the word of God aright; and we bring him forward now in order to point out the absurdity of those objections who contend that the study of prophecy has nothing to do with other branches of Revelation: whereas Sherlock's opinion is the sound one, "that prophecy must have been an essential part of a sinner's religion;" more correctly, of the Saints'.

Something Rational.

"It is an argument for the truth of the Bible, that there is nothing else that informs us what God designs by that series of revolution and events that are brought to pass in the world; what end, he asks, and what scheme he has laid out. It is most fit that the intelligent beings of the world should be made acquainted with it. The thing that is God's great design is something concerning them; and the revolutions by which it is to be brought to pass, are revolutions among them, and in their state. The state of the inanimate unperceiving part of the world, is nothing regarded, any otherwise than in a subservience to the perceiving and intelligent part. And it is most rational to suppose, that God should reveal the design he has been carrying on to his rational creatures; that as God hath made them capable of it, they may actively fall in with and promote it, acting herein as the subjects and friends of God."—*Edwards*.
