

Correspondence.

LETTERS FROM THE HOLY LAND. IX.

BY REV. EDWARD PAYSON HAMMOND.

Monday morning December 3d, Mr. Paschal called to take us to the Mosque of Omar, situated, as everybody knows, on the site of Solomon's temple. By paying one pound, our party of four were able to gain admission to this sacred spot, which, but a few years ago, was closed to all but Moslems. It was a charming morning, and as Mr. Paschal, whom we met in quarantine at Beyrout was a wealthy resident in Jerusalem, we felt quite at home. He was himself a Moslem, and thus able to gain for us special favors from the keepers of the Mosque. We took with us the slippers which we bought in Damascus, with which to enter the "Grand Mosque" in that city, for no one is allowed to tread upon the sacred floors of a Mohammedan place of worship with shoes contaminated by contact with the common earth. But is difficult to attempt a description of what we saw after the yellow pointed slippers were on our feet, and we within the grounds where once stood the proud temple of Solomon. The great size of the temple Area or Haram, as it is called, was what first attracted our attention. It is about a quarter of a mile in length and 1000 feet in width, and surrounded on all sides by a high wall. Near the centre of this Area rose majestically the Mosque El Sakah, "Dome of the rock"—called so, I suppose, from the fact that one great object of this imposing building seems to be to render, or keep sacred an immense rock which is situated immediately under the centre of the dome. We found it protected by a high screen, but we managed to find a place where we could at least lay our hands upon it. It rose about five feet above the floor on which we stood. Mr. Paschal said to us, very seriously, "that is the top of Moriah—the threshing floor of Araunah the Jebusite." It was very large, not less I should think, than 50 feet square. It seemed at first, very strange to us that when the top of Moriah was cleared away this rock was left.

We found numerous references in our Bible to this rock. The word to David was "Go up, rear an altar unto the Lord in the threshing floor of Araunah the Jebusite"—"and David built there an altar unto the Lord, and offered burnt-offerings and peace-offerings. So the Lord was entreated for the land, and the plague was stayed from Israel." (2 Sam. xxiv.) "And the Lord commanded the angel; and he put his sword again into the sheath thereof. When David saw that the Lord had answered him in the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite, then he sacrificed there. Then David said, this is the house of the Lord God, and this is the altar of the burnt-offering for Israel." (1 Chron. xxi and xxii.) That was the site therefore fixed for the temple. And of Solomon it is written, "Then Solomon began to build the house of the Lord at Jerusalem in Mount Moriah, where the Lord appeared unto David his father, in the place that David had prepared in the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite." (2 Chron. iii. 1.)

It appears that this rock must have been used for an altar in the temple of Solomon. It must have been upon it, therefore that the holy fire descended at the dedication of the temple. We read therefore, "When Solomon had made an end of praying, the fire came down from heaven, and consumed the burnt-offering and the sacrifices; and the glory of the Lord filled the house." (2 Chron. 7: 1.) After the destruction of the temple its very site was covered with rubbish in contempt of the Jews, but when the city was captured by Omar, about the beginning of the seventh century, he was led to the great rock which marked the site of the temple of Solomon, over which he resolved to build a Mosque "the fairest and the largest of the fourteen hundred which he erected during his khalfate."

After walking around the rock, and gazing upon the brilliant dome which appeared like one hemisphere of stained glass, we descended, by a short flight of steps, into a cavity beneath the rock, and we saw there what appeared like marble capitals, beautifully adorned with spiral work. Very likely they once belonged to the temple. We were told there was a secret entrance from this cavity to some underground rooms, where tradition says that some of the vessels of the temple and the tables of the law were secreted. The Mohammedans have called the four corners of this apartment, "the praying places of Abraham, David, Solomon, and Jesus;" but this cavity beneath the great rock, it is believed, was only the cesspool of the altar of burnt-offering, by which the blood of the animals slain in the temple above, was drawn off to the vale of Kedron. As we saw the veneration in which the Moslems professed to hold those places which are dear to all readers of the Bible, we were reminded of Mahomet's policy, to incorporate in his religious system as much as possible attractive, both to the Jews and Christians of his day.

We tried to talk with our Moslem friend, who was with us in the Mosque of Omar, and with whom we had become well acquainted in Quarantine, of the Saviour who taught in the temple which stood upon that spot, but he seemed to think no more of Him than of the prophets; his answer was, "yes, I love Jesus Christ, the same

as I love Moses and Abraham, but I love Mahomet better than either; he was the great prophet, even the comforter whom Christ promised to send into the world."

From the Mosque of Omar we proceeded south to the Mosque of El-Aksa, which also stands on the site of Solomon's temple, and within the Area of the Haram. It was built about the seventh century by Justinian, in honor of the Virgin Mary, afterwards converted into a Mohammedan Mosque. It resembles many of the churches seen on the continent of Europe. Its lofty roof is supported by numerous pillars, between which the Mohammedans say, all who pass are sure of Paradise. But we were most interested with the sub-structures of El-Aksa, for there we saw the vaulted remains of Solomon's temple. They were most massive and solid in their appearance. Numbers of the stones were fifteen feet in length, and eight feet deep, all of the finest limestone rock.

The sight of these massive foundations impressed us more than the stately Mosque of Omar, for they spoke to us of the temple of the Lord, where His special presence was annually seen by the High Priest, "when making reconciliation for the sins of the people." We were then taken where we could get a sight of the great reservoir that stretched beneath the temple. Dr. Barclay says it is seven hundred and fifty feet in circumference, and fifty feet deep. I was the only one of our party who ventured to explore it, but my wife became alarmed for my safety, and at her earnest entreaties, I soon emerged into the light of day.

We greatly admired the golden gate of Solomon. We had before seen the outside of this on our way to the Mount of Olives—it projects several feet from the wall, and rises some distance above it. It is now built up, but in Jerusalem's palmy days it must have been a splendid gateway. Once inside of it, it has the appearance of a somewhat dilapidated building; but it is something like the other double-arched gateways which are still to be seen in the walls of Jerusalem. Its stones are, many of them, as large as those we saw in the vaults of El-Aksa. We noticed a beautiful monolith with a massive capital embedded in a corner of the wall. Through that arch-way, we thought, the Saviour had no doubt often passed, with His heart yearning with love toward those who were willing to offer those sacrifices which can never take away sin, but who were unwilling to believe that He was to be the great atoning sacrifice for the sins of the world. We have not time for a longer letter concerning our visit to the Mosque of Omar. We are aware that we have given a very imperfect idea of what may be seen on the site of Solomon's temple, but we may have time to refer to it again.

MILLENARIANISM.

BY REV. W. T. EVA.

A brief rejoinder to Rev. D. G. Mallery's "Reply to Mr. Eva" on this subject, is all that is necessary.

1. Mr. Eva disclaims altogether the using of *bad names*, as applied to Millenarians in whole or in general. We did designate the wild vagaries of the Anabaptists, the Mormons, and the Millerites, as "fungus outgrowths" of Millenarianism, and we cited them as illustrations of the "tendency" of Millenarianism, toward "fanciful interpretations" of the word of God, etc. And Mr. Mallery has by no means shown the statement to be erroneous, or the illustrations to be destitute of truth. He labors, indeed, with the aid of Professor Duffield, to draw a line of distinction between the doctrines of Millenarianism and those of the Millerites. But it will be observed that he has not made good his case, for the points of difference are only such as relate to matters subordinate and secondary, and do not touch the *fundamentals* of Millenarianism—viz: the pre-Millennial advent of Christ; the first resurrection (of the righteous dead); the thousand years' reign on the earth; and the second resurrection at the close of that period. These are the points that we laid down as distinctively Millenarian; these are about the only points, we suppose, in reference to which there is a common agreement among Millenarians, for in reference to minor details almost every one of them has his own theory; and if our information and impressions are not erroneous, all these points were held by Mr. Miller and his followers.

2. Mr. Mallery has a special antipathy to Dr. Shedd, whose statements, in his History of Christian Doctrine, we quoted as authority, and makes himself merry over that work, as a book of "wide margins and large type," classing it with "Beadle's Dime Novels," etc. Now, we enter into no defence of Dr. Shedd's book—that, like every other book, must stand upon its own merits; but we respectfully suggest that such attempted irony does not show that the work is not a reliable history. Nor, indeed, do the citations which are made from the Nicene Creed, the Augsburg Confession, or the Catechism of Edward VI.; for those citations are, after all, of parts of those *formule*, which are quite obscure and ambiguous, and worth very little, or nothing, in settling the question as to what is the theory which they really teach on this subject. And the same remark may be made in regard to the passages quoted from the writings of Luther, to show what he "thought about it." As between Dr. Shedd

and D. G. Mallery, or even Shimeall, there can be but one choice of authority, and with all due deference to the learning and piety of our beloved co-presbyter, we presume to award it to the former. But what has brother Mallery to say of Gibbon, and Mosheim, and Neander? Among the unfortunate habits of Millenarians, is that one into which they almost invariably fall, (is it one of the *tendencies* of their system to foster a feeling of self-esteem and pride of personal judgment in a question of Bible Hermeneutics?) of thinking and speaking contemptuously, not only of "dignities," but also, and especially, of the great lights of learning and piety in the Church, whose opinions and teachings may be against them; a habit in reference to which we feel ever inclined to offer the prayer of the Liturgy, "Good Lord deliver us!"

3. In regard to the Westminster Confession, it remains true, as, not Dr. Shedd, but the writer of the articles to which Mr. Mallery replies ventures to affirm, "the Westminster Confession ignores" the Millenarian hypothesis utterly. Mr. M. asserts, after Robert Baillie, that "most of the chief divines" in the Westminster Assembly "were Chilists." Strange, if such were the fact—especially when we consider that they were, as is said, very "troublesome" in the Assembly—that they did not succeed in securing for their favorite theory a "local habitation or a name" in the Confession. Surely, they must have been more docile and pliant than such Chilists as brother Mallery, or this result would never have been reached. He says the Confession is a "compromise, so that a full statement of a disputed point is not to be expected." Why, there is no statement at all of any thing that is distinctively Millenarian, or even like it, but just the reverse, as any one, by reading the last article, may see! Strange "compromise," this! And as to the passages cited from the Catechisms, we who are not Millenarians, can and do adopt their sentiments and use their petitions, with just as much sincerity and consistency as Millenarians themselves. We believe in and pray for the "hastening of the kingdom of glory—the second coming of Christ, and our reigning with him forever." The questions between us are only as to the *when* and *how*.

4. Mr. Mallery asserts that Millenarians do believe that the preaching of the Gospel will be successful in accomplishing that whereunto it is sent, etc., but maintains that it is not sent for the conversion of the world, but only to be "a witness," and to "call out of the nations a people for His name." Now, on this subject, what is the teaching of the inspired Record? Mark the phraseology of the Great Commission: "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." Note the declaration of Paul: "For after that in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." The Gospel is to be preached to all; none can be saved who do not believe; and all who do believe are to be saved through the foolishness of preaching. Ergo, it is by this instrumentality that all who are ever saved, will be saved—and by this instrumentality, therefore, that that blessed state will be brought about in the world, when "wasting and violence" shall cease out of the land; when truth and justice and piety shall triumph among men, and every one shall "know the Lord, from the least to the greatest!"

And if Millenarians—not all of course, but as a general thing—are not hampered and crippled by their theory in the prosecution of earnest, zealous, aggressive missionary work, we confess that, to a large extent, we have misunderstood their views and their feelings. We do not say, indeed, with *Layman* in his pertinent article of a few weeks ago, that "we have never known" a Millenarian to be an earnest revivalist, for we have known some who were such; or that no Millenarians have entered, or do enter the missionary field. But we do say, from what we have seen and think we know, that if revivals of religion and the prosecution of the missionary work were left to Millenarians, we should seldom witness the one, and rarely hear of the other. How could it be otherwise with those who believe that the world is ever growing *worse* instead of *better*, and will continue to do so, until the coming of Christ? To us, it would seem that you might as well attempt to persuade the farmer to sow his seed and cultivate his field when he believed there could follow no harvest, as that one should labor for the conversion of the world, when he did not believe that the world could be converted. And, in fact, brother Mallery confesses that Millenarians do not labor for the conversion of the world, but only for the *witness* to the nations, and the salvation of the *elect*.

5. In reply to our remark that "the weight of learning, opinion, and piety in the Church, both of the ages past, and of the present day, is against the Millenarian theory," Mr. Mallery replies that it "proves nothing for either side," and refers to the assumed "fluctuations" of opinion in the Church in different ages, on this subject, as nullifying its force. But we did not advance the proposition as in itself proving anything. We distinctly allowed that the "suffrage of numbers," or the weight of authority, could not determine a question of Revelation. At the same time we affirmed, and we now repeat the affirmation, that the fact furnishes a *presumption against* the Millenarian theory; for if that be the Bible theory, it is very strange that, since the days

when the Church became entirely emancipated from Judaizing opinions and influences, now about sixteen hundred years ago, it has been so almost unanimously rejected. Where, Millenarians, were the commentators, the theologians, the preachers, whose learning, and eloquence, and piety, have blessed the Church and the world, who were believers in your doctrine? And "Echo answers, where?" for though we allow that there have been a few, yet it must be confessed few indeed and "far between!" And as to the "fluctuations" spoken of, ecclesiastical history will bear out the assertion, that during the period now mentioned, there have been, to any extent at any rate, no such "fluctuations" in regard to Millenarianism. The voice of the Church was nearly a unit, even before the days of Whittby, as that author, in his learned Treatise, abundantly shows, while since, according to brother Mallery's own allowing, it has been so. Nor do we at all see that the tide is "now turning back once more." Millenarianism not being so prevalent at this hour as it was twenty-five years ago, when, under the teachings of such men as Bickersteth, Cunningham, Brooks, and Noel, in the pages of by far the ablest work ever published in the interest of that theory, the *Lit-eralist*, it did attain sufficient prominence to attract considerable attention.

6. Our cautions to Millenarians in reference to their speculations on the chronological prophecies, etc., it is attempted in the paper to which we are now rejoicing, to turn against Anti-Millenarians; and brother Mallery, reiterating that caution, asks the question: "But why caution Millenarians only? Are they the only sinners in this regard?" In reply to which we answer that perhaps they are not; but they surely are the *chief* sinners—"sinners above all other men"—on this point. For where—to give but a single illustration—where is a writer or a preacher who has made himself so absolutely ridiculous in this matter, as the really eloquent and pious John Cumming, of London? So often has he fixed the time of the winding up of the present dispensation, and so often has he failed to realize his predictions, that his name has actually, among worldly men, become a by-word, and he himself a laughing stock. Only this moment did we pick up one of the secular papers of today's issue, and find this paragraph:—"The Last Woe, is Cumming's last work. It ought to be his last woe, and the last from him imposed upon the public." We would not, of course, hold all Millenarians responsible for the indiscretions of Dr. Cumming or any body else; nor do we view this matter with concern as it may affect him or any other man *personally*, but only, for the honor of religion; but we do protest against this tampering with the "hidden things that belong unto God" in any quarter, and most of all among Millenarians, because, more than others—far more, according to my reading and observation—they are apt to be given to it. Too much occasion to unbelievers to blaspheme, and too many infidels, as from our personal knowledge we can testify, have been made in this way, for us to regard this thing as a matter of indifference and unconcern.

7. Finally, Mr. Mallery confesses that he can bring from the Scriptures no single passage which clearly and indisputably teaches Millenarianism. At least he attempts to bring none; and makes the strange and wild—so it seems to us—assertion: "Nor is *any* other doctrine so to be found there." What, brother Mallery, is not the doctrine that man is a sinner so to be found there? Look at Eccl. vii. 20. Is not the doctrine of justification by faith so found there? Look at Rom. vi. 1, and that of a future judgment, too, as in Acts xvii. 31? These doctrines and others may, indeed, be *disputed*—not, however, because they are not clearly and indisputably taught in the Bible, but because those who dispute them do not acknowledge the authority of the Bible, or at least, the sole and sufficient authority thereof. Infidels dispute them; Universalists, Unitarians, Roman Catholics, and some of the Friends also may, but in all these cases there is wanting a full and unreserved faith in the "plenary inspiration" of the Bible, or in the Protestant principle that it is the "only and sufficient rule of faith and manners." But by all who acknowledge these, the passages now cited are, with not a single exception, held as clearly and indisputably teaching the doctrines referred to. But how different with Millenarianism! The question here is not between believers, and Infidels, or Unitarians, or Romanists; it is among those who are of one mind in regard to the inspiration and authority of the word of God; and occupying, as we do, this common platform, we say, Show your doctrine clearly and explicitly taught in the Bible. Give us a single passage where it is positively and unmistakably found!—one single one, in reference to which you can say, "Here is my doctrine—dispute it if you can!" And brother Mallery gives up the whole question by candidly saying, *No, we cannot do it!*

Well, that is right, that is honest, that is Christian-like. And as no clear and indisputable Scripture can be brought in favor of the theory that at the coming of Christ the righteous dead only shall rise, and they shall reign a thousand years with Christ personally, at the close of which time the wicked dead shall rise, and that the kingdom of God or the kingdom of Christ somewhat after the form of a literal, worldly, sensual kingdom is to be set up and prevail upon the earth during that period, I will, with one or two Scriptures which are clearly, positively, unmistakably, and indisputably against this theory, bring this article to a close and dismiss the whole matter:—John vi. 40: "And this is the will of Him that sent me, that every one that seeth the Son and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day."—not a thousand years before the last day, but at the last day; a declaration four times by Christ repeated in that single chapter. Again says Jesus: "My kingdom is not of this world." "The king-

dom of God cometh not with observation, neither shall they say Lo here! or Lo there! for behold the kingdom of God is within you!" And the Apostle Paul:—"The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Ghost."

WHOM DO YOU LOVE BEST?

Every single reader whose eye has fallen upon this caption has instinctively answered to him or herself already. Whether we are willing to utter the name or not, it is sharply defined in our own minds—we have no doubt about it—we know whom we love best, and if the question be put to the little bright eyed one at our feet, who has scarcely yet learned to speak its mother tongue the answer will not long have to be waited for.

There is a large body of men and women in the world, very many of the readers of this paper among that number, who have most solemnly declared, publicly in the presence of witnesses, that they love the Lord Jesus Christ better than all else besides. Better even than themselves. They have deliberately taken Him as their best love who says, "Whosoever he be of you that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple."

Dear friend are you one of that company? Let us talk about our love a few minutes. This Jesus is a real living person—no fiction, no spiritualized mysticism. He is just as truly alive to our love or our neglect as that earthly name which we love best. He is as real as your mother, and loves you much better than she could do. Your mother's love was greatly strengthened by what she suffered for you, and the cares she has had in your behalf. But Jesus has suffered more and done more for you than your mother. Viewed in this light, do you love Him more than you do your mother or the partner of your life? Remember His word in Matt. x: 37. "He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me." He will have no divided heart.

When you are called upon to take your place as a teacher in the Sabbath-school or the Mission-school, do you go promptly and regularly? Or if you have not been invited to go, do you so love Jesus that for the sake of souls you offer yourself to this work? Do you sacrifice your ease, your time for reading, your pleasant hour at home for the wearying but precious work of the school? If you do not, whom do you love best, Christ or your ease?

There is to be a meeting for prayer. The world never makes its arrangements in view of prayer-meetings. Do you? Do you close your store, or arrange your worldly cares on that day with a view to faithfully attending this holy place? Do you refuse all invitations however attractive or promising which would detain you from meeting your best beloved in the place of prayer? Do you make your family affairs bend to this appointment with your loved one? Jesus loves the place of prayer and attends it with faithful regularity. If you do not, whom do you love best?

I tell you except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes, and Pharisees, you shall in no wise enter the kingdom of heaven."

You need to employ a man in your business or a domestic in your family. As a lover of the Lord Jesus, you will certainly feel that here He has given you new opportunity of serving Him. The world has its way of providing for these wants. It scorns any one who has been unsuccessful or who has fallen into poverty or sin. Its philanthropy is confined to the cold cells of the almshouse, the hospital or the asylum. It knows little of the philanthropy of the individual or the family. The world commutes its duty to the unfortunate by its poor tax and its public subscriptions. But Jesus takes the poor sinner by the hand, and leads him or her by kind words and forgiving confidence to a better life. Whose example do you follow? Do you say, I cannot risk my business by employing such an one; he will probably fall again, and bring loss upon me? For whom are you doing business, yourself or Christ? Or do you stand back in holy horror and say I cannot in any way tolerate about me the guilty and grossly fallen man or woman? I prescribe no rule for your conscience my brother, or sister but this. James v: 20. "Let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins."

What would Jesus love to have you do? If Christians will not lift up and trust the fallen who will? Be careful in your decision that you do not put your business gains or family convenience over against doing Christ's will. Do you not dare to trust these minor matters into the hands of Him to whom you have intrusted your immortal soul?

There comes to every Christian young man a time, when he must seek for, or decide upon the business of his life. Do you so seek and so decide that you can clearly feel that it was the love of the Lord Jesus and His plain answer to your prayer that determined your course? Do not commit the sin of Ananias here. Christ demands your entire service and woe to your Christian life if you keep back any part of the price.

If you are a Christian, you have no right to choose a business only because it is lucrative or promises fame or power. You must seek it from a desire to honor and serve the Master or you have departed from the ruling motive of a holy life. Whom do you love best, self or Christ? A Christian man is prospered in worldly wealth and he is seeking an investment for his gains. Stop my brother and see if the only questions you ask about the different purchases you propose are not essentially selfish and worldly. Have you, even once, earnestly on your knees asked your best friend how He would have you invest this surplus? Do you habitually put out your money to please the Lord Jesus? He gave you this money and has given you plain indications what to do with it. And yet I fear you have not looked to or thought of His pleasure in the whole matter.

Oh worldly Christian! In all that gives you power, influence and position among men, you follow worldly maxims and example entirely, and yet you profess to love Jesus best of all!

Can you wonder if your worldly friends doubt the sincerity of your professions? "Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God."