

One thing we most emphatically repudiate—the charge that we are the founders of a new sect. We are simply endeavoring, by our advocacy of the Identity of the British Nation with the long lost House of Israel, to throw light upon those parts of the infallible word of God which have hitherto appeared dark and mysterious, and by the orthodox method of interpretation are meaningless, incomprehensible and contradictory. We have no desire to come into collision with the churches, but with their spiritualising mania we have no sympathy and cannot agree. We are content to take the plain declarations of Scripture, and understand them as we would any other plain statement made in plain words and unmistakable language.

THE ENGLISH PULPIT.

THE interests of truth, the honour of God, and the highest welfare of the people alike demand, and at all times demand, fidelity on the part of the pulpit. But the intensity of thought which marks the present time gives unusual emphasis to the demand for faithfulness to the divine record in the case of our public teachers. Two remarkable facts, which seem at first sight irreconcilable, characterise the Sunday congregations of England. The first is that, as a rule, places of worship are more largely attended than heretofore. There is a strong desire to hear what the pulpit has to say, springing no doubt from the universal conviction that the world is nearing some extraordinary crisis which, whatever may be its essential character or mode of development, will remove some of the landmarks of our venerable theology, and introduce great changes into human thought on almost every subject.

The second fact is, that this ardent wish to receive light from the accredited leaders of religious thought is not, generally speaking, gratified. The *intelligent* occupants of the pew—and these are far more numerous than the pulpit imagines—are tired of fine essays or eloquent orations on some sentence or half-sentence quoted from psalmist, prophet, or apostle, upon which the essayist or orator builds his argument and shows what *he* can do in elaborating some principle or doctrine which may be both good and true in itself, but which utterly fails to shed light upon the awful and glorious realities of the impending crisis. The people want to hear what God has said concerning these last days; they wish for expositions of the divine word, readings from the inspired prophets of both Testaments, and clear unfoldings of Christ's teachings respecting his return for his Church and to his inheritance—the world. Men are wearied of theological wranglings and hair-splittings; of Calvinistic and Arminian “doctrines,” of creeds and catechisms; and not before time. They want light, food, strength, the air of heaven to breathe, the will of

heaven to guide. There is a deep and a true conviction on many minds that there are truths in the Bible which have not yet been brought before our congregations generally.

The fierce falsehood of eternal torments, is now abandoned by most men as an intolerable horror, which has no place whatever in the Word of God; but some ministers who have done this have unhappily wandered into regions of shoreless speculation about universal or partial restoration, for which in the testimony of Scripture they have no authority. Probably the chief reason which has led to this mistake is still their cherished belief in the pagan fiction of the natural immortality of the soul. Denying everlasting torment, and believing human deathlessness, restoration is of course the logical alternative, so that we have no difficulty in tracing the process of thought in the minds of the brethren to whom reference is made. But to supersede that which is obviously false by that which has no authority is not wise. What is gained by abandoning one huge error to embrace another? The gratification of a mere sentiment is not a sufficient answer, for this matter must be determined not by our wishes but by our Creator's will, and we may rest assured that his will is every way better than our wishes. Of course we expected diversity of speech when eschatology became the subject of discussion. It was inevitable that some degree of doctrinal confusion should arise upon the ruins of an exploded error.

Some men are slow of apprehension, and, with a praiseworthy sense of the sacredness of what they have been taught as religious truth, are reluctant to part with any notion, however incredible or awful in itself, which is supposed to be a part of “the faith.” This conservative feeling springs from a good motive, and is therefore, and so far only, worthy of respect. But it will not bear a moment's criticism; for that which is incredible or awful *in itself* cannot be an integral part of a system which, avowedly and confessedly, had its origin in the love of God to man; and the more valuable a thing is, the more anxious should its friends be to keep it clean from the dust and bright from the rust which are so common in the world. The feeling which will not endure a speck of mildew on the sacred parchment, or a mob of chaffering money-changers in the Father's temple, is intellectually nobler and morally more beautiful than that which timidly shrinks from the removal of a heavy falsehood as if it were a buttress to eternal truth. Among the other false things which have darkened the story of man, a false piety has been none of the least. Intelligent loyalty is not reckless, but it is always fearless, and it does *not* mean to undermine the building when it puts forth a strong hand to tear away the parasites that the marble and gold of the glorious erection may flash back the light of the noon-day sun.

But there are other men who are quick in ap-