

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



This is the Olde
Armys of France

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

—Revelation 16: 13-15.

NEW YORK:
PUBLISHED BY THE EDITOR.
1860.

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., JANUARY, 1860
Volume 10—No. 1

Man in Life and in Death.

Dedicated to Supervisor Campbell, President of Bethany College, Virginia, and author of the
"Extra" entitled "Life and Death."

BY THE EDITOR.

MAN is either in life or in death. He must be the subject of the one or of the other; for there is, if we may coin a phrase for the occasion, *no betweenity*.

By *man* we understand that formation termed "*dust out of the ground*" and therefore called "*the Adam*" —ADAM-ah signifying "*ground*;" and *Adam*, that which is translated "*man*" in Gen. ii. 7; or *the thing taken out of the ground*. This is the import of the word *Adam*—a thing *ex humo*, "out of the ground;" and therefore styled *human*, from *humus*, which signifies *ground*.

This formation, called *hah-Adam*, "the Adam," differs from all other formations from the ground, in that it was made "*in the image after the likeness of the Elohim*," or angels. The signification of this phrase is found in the use of it in Gen. v. 3, where, in speaking of Seth, it says, "Adam begat *in his likeness after his image*, and called his name Shaith." Hence, in the same sense that Seth was in the image after the likeness of the Adam, so was the Adam in the image after the likeness of the Elohim, or Mighty Ones, when the SPIRIT formed him through their instrumentality. The other formations from the ground had no resemblance in *form* or *capacity* to the Elohal Model. The Elohim are not in the form of lions, elephants, cattle, or reptiles. These are not their *image*; neither are such creatures *capable* of developing mental phenomena like theirs. The images, or forms, of the lower animals are after other models, and their mental manifestations according to the limited capacity of their own cerebral specialties.

All exhuman formations, including man, have, then, one common origin. They are all dust; but each species differing in image and likeness; the only one among them having the Elohal form and Cerebral similitude, being "the Adam."

Having cut, carved, sculptured, or created (*bara*) the Adam, after the Elohal model, YAHWEH *Elohim* "breathed into his nostrils;" that is, the RUACH *Elohim*, first mentioned in the Bible in Gen. i. 2., who afterwards imposed upon himself the name "*Yahweh*" at the bush, caused an expanding of the lungs and nostrils he had formed, by which an inrush of *the air* was induced. The expansion was produced by the electrical action of his own will upon the brain and nervous system of the Adam in concert with the inrush. Thus he was caused to inhale through his nostrils; and by virtue of the stimulant inhaled, to open his eyes in life upon the by-standing Elohim and their wondrous works. Had Job been the Adam he would have said, "*Spirit of AIL (ruach-AIL) hath made ME; and breath of MIGHTY ONES (nishmath-SHADDAI) hath given ME life*"—Job xxxiii. 4. The "*me*," the reader will observe, existed *before the "life" was imparted*. What else could that unvitalized "*me*" have been, but dust in form and organization? The "*me*," Job says, was "made by *spirit of Ail*;" but the "*me*" had no life until the *nishmath-Shaddai*, or breath of the Mighty Ones, entered therein.

Here then, Job and the "divines" and metaphysicians of this Aion are in antagonism, he affirming one thing, and they contradicting him in affirming the contrary. They agree with Job, however, in this, that whatever *essence* may be intended by the pronouns I, thou, he, she, they, me, you, him, her, them, there can be no doubt that the *real thinking being*, man, woman, or child, is signified; that "*I*" represents *myself who am thinking*; and who, if saved, am the subject of the salvation; that "*thou*" is the same "*I*" in the second person; and "*he*" the same "*I*" in the third person. Thus we have "the thinking I," and "the thinking thou," and "the thinking he"—the real thinking being called the Adam, Abraham, David, Job, and so forth. There is no issue, I say, upon this point between Job and the "divines" and "philosophers" of the world. But here their agreement ceases; for as soon as they come to define the essence, or substance, of the "*thinking I*" they contradict one another in the plainest terms, and in language that cannot be misunderstood.

Job, as a champion of divine wisdom, and valiant for the truth upon the earth, stands forth and declares, that HE *had unbreathing existence before the breath of life entered into HIM*. He tells us how this "*he*" and "*him*" was developed from conception. Addressing his Creator he says, "Didst thou not make ME flow as milk, and thicken like the curd; clothe me with skin and flesh, with bones and sinews interweave me?" Ch. x. 10. This was his origin, as all physiologists well understand. When the "*me*" was thus interwoven, it was ready for "the breath of the Shaddai," which being received, the Job previously existing began a life independent of the mother in whom he was developed.

But here the "reverend divines" and learned metaphysicians interpose, and come down upon Job with great wrath and indignation; and tell him that he is nothing else than a *gross materialist*. That his doctrine reduces man to mere milk and curds; skin, flesh, and bones! "Can milk and curds' think? *Matter*," say they, "cannot think; therefore, milk and curds cannot think; it is only that which is immaterial can think, therefore the thinking I is not milk and curds, but spirit; and because immaterial spirit, therefore an *immortal I* in mortal flesh." Such is the "wisdom" of Job's opponents! But Job is not dismayed; for he has a host on his side to confute these "foolish talkers."

The reader will perceive that Job and Moses stand side by side in this controversy. In Gen. ii. 7, the latter plainly shows that his friend Job is correct; and that *the real man* exists before the breath of life is received. The clergy and philosophers admit, that it was the real man who sinned. Moses accepts the admission, and from it argues, that the real thinking being who sinned is a material substance; for he says, YAHWEH *Elohim* said to the thinking and

criminal "thou" "In the sweat of thy face THOU shalt eat bread, till THOU return unto the ground; for out of it wast THOU taken; for *dust* THOU art, and unto dust shalt *thou* return"—ch. iii. 19.

But, in effect, the "divines" and their faction say that Moses is altogether as far out of the way as Job. They teach that the "thou" under condemnation was the "essence"—*divinae particula aurae* — "the particle of divine exhalation"—contained in the *nishmath khaiyim*, or breath of lives, breathed into the nostrils. According to them, the "*thinking I*" is in the nose; for, according to Moses, the breath of lives was still there at the time of the flood—ch. vii. 22.

Well, the proposition of the Old Adam, *alias* the Devil, is, that "*the Breath of Life*" in Gen. ii. 7, is a spark from the essence of Deity; that it is capable of evolving all divine attributes; that it is a thinking, free, and responsible agent; that it is the real man; that in the article of death, and at the last sigh, it leaves the body; that in this disembodied, or naked condition, it exists as the real man in heaven, or in burning and flaming brimstone; that, like the Deity from which it originally scintillated, it is undying, but nevertheless susceptible of intense torment; that this is "THE SOUL," and, being deathless, consequently, "THE IMMORTAL SOUL."

Look at it, O reader! There it is, the concentrated essence of the wisdom of all the "reverend divines," "philosophers," and metaphysicians of "the Synagogue of the Satan." Put all the volumes of their learned twaddle into reason's crucible together, and you can extract little else than the above. "The Soul," and "the Immortal Soul" in their technic are phrases that represent the ideas indicated in what we call *the Devil's Proposition*; and, we hesitate not to say, that it is blasphemy, falsehood, and absurdity of the baldest type, from beginning to end. The scriptures of the Old and New Testament teach nothing of the kind. The immortal soul of the Devil's proposition is the silly invention of "the carnal mind;" and the sandy foundation and rotten frame of all the forms of heathenism, be they denominated Pantheism, Popery, Protestantism, or by any other name. Destroy this invention, blot it from the minds of men, and all the world's "religions" vanish into the weakest of all inventions of the flesh. It is upon this flimsy conceit of Sin's flesh rest the traditions of all its spirituals. Infant sprinkling, infant salvation, the worship of saints, purgatory, "the intermediate state," sky-kingdomism, necromancy, spiritualism, the apotheosis of the dead, and innumerable other fooleries, would have had no existence but for the invention of the fabulous immortal soul of the Devil's proposition. These "holy" speculations of the flesh all take root in this. Demonstrate its unscripturality and absurdity, and the abandonment of the traditions will necessarily ensue.

In opposition to, and subversive of all these conceits flowing from the clerical assumption that the "breath of life" breathed into the Adam's nostrils is an immortal soul—is the teaching of Moses, that all animals have this *nishmath khaiyim* as well as man. For this reason it is that it is styled by the Spirit, "*breath of lives*"—it gives life to, and sustains it in, *all* the formations from the ground; deprive them of it, and they all return to dust.

In Gen. vii. 21, 22, Moses groups all that came out of the ground together, man included, and denominates them as "*all flesh*;" and then informs us, that in the nostrils of this "all" is the *nishmath ruach khaiyim*, or "breath of the spirit of lives." The same is repeated in chs. vi. 17, and vii. 15; but with this diversity, that the word *nishmath*, "breath," is omitted; and the phrase stands as *ruach khaiyim*, "spirit of lives," which is in the nostrils of all formations.

Now, if we accept the traditions of Sin's spirituals, as expressed in the proposition of their master the Devil, we are logically forced upon the conclusion, that "all flesh," cattle, beasts of prey, and reptiles, with all the fowls of the air, and men, are individually possessed of indwelling immortal souls. Admit their definition of "the breath," or spirit "of life," and this conclusion is inevitable; for Solomon, who was wiser than they, declares that men and beasts "have all *ruach echad* ONE SPIRIT; so that," saith he, "man hath no pre-eminence above a beast"—Eccl. iii. 18,19. Whatever, therefore, is affirmed of man psychologically, be it high or low, the beasts must be allowed to come in and share with him in his pretensions. If they be not immortal, then is not man; but if he be, then also are they. The Devil's "divines" must accept this demonstration, or stultify themselves.

Heigh O! then, upon clerical principles, all snakes and toads, all hyenas and ladies' lap-dogs; in short, all *ex humo* formations that have a nose, or the rudiments of one, possess indwelling immortality; because they have therein the "breath of the spirit of lives," which in their verbiage is immortality. Admitting their definition, I say, this is very logical; but at the same time very inconvenient. Upon their premises they have now upon their "holy hands" immense multitudes of disembodied ghosts of all species of four-footed beasts, and winged and creeping things! Where are all these "immortal souls" to be sent to? Is there no "hell" for the souls of those wild beasts which devoured the bodies of the saints in the Roman amphitheatres, thrown to them by men more ferocious than themselves? And is there no sky-heaven for the souls of those noble-hearted lions, who refused to crunch the bones of Daniel, their companion in the den? In view of the teaching of Solomon, and their own traditions, they are bound to send them to one and the same habitation with men; for, saith Solomon, speaking of men and beasts, "*All go unto one place.*"

Now we think that the clergy with their foolishness have got themselves into a pretty mess! Here are immortal snake-souls, and toad-souls, and souls of all other species of immortality, in "the spirit-world!" Some in one department, and some in 'the other.' But, we would ask their reverences, if it be fair, if it be just and equal, that they should take so much pains, and make so much effort to save immortal man-souls, and not institute a mission, both home and foreign, for the salvation of immortal quadrupedal and creeping, yea, and flying, souls likewise! We protest, that many of these souls, or at least the formations to which they belong, are naturally more estimable than multitudes of men they seek to save. Or, do they send immortal souls of beasts and creeping things to sky-heaven *ex necessitate rei* without any risk of missing it; while immortal man-souls can hardly squeeze in with the most careful vigilance and self-denial? If so, were those things which Peter saw in the sheet descending from heaven the immortal souls of emancipated beasts, who had slipped off and left their "mortal coil" below? We have read of certain saints of the Romish calendar who preached to fishes; and if to these, why may not the clergy invent religions suitable to all other species of animated nature? They are equal to any absurdity, or piece of fantastic piety; and might possibly, if not "turn an *honest* penny," at least make it profitable in the way. We do not see any serious objection to it on the ground of its being ridiculous; their reverences are accustomed to playing the fool. Their lord the Pope blesses mules, horses, and donkeys in Rome; why should not they preach blessedness to the same elsewhere? Surely, it would be as rational a pastime, and as efficacious, and we are certain it would be as scriptural, as the sprinkling of an infant immortal soul's face with holy water in the name of their trinity!

But irony aside, and to turn from the *reductio ad absurdum*—to the teaching of the Word. This clearly shows, that the "*me*" is the flesh, and that it is vitalized by the "breath of the spirit of lives," which is common to men and other animals; that these have all one spirit;

that they have no pre-eminence over one another; that at death, they all go to one place, and that that place is the ground from whence they originally came; for Solomon saith, "all go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again." In all this there is not the least intimation of inherent immortality.

It is not, then, "the breath of lives" that thinks and is immortal, and the real man, as the heathen imagine. On the contrary, it is the flesh that thinks after life is given to it by respiration of the air. Metaphysicians deny that matter can, or rather does, think; but Paul, under the inspiration of the same Spirit of Wisdom that moved Job and Moses, convicts them of ignorance and untruth. He says that matter does think; for flesh is matter; and he affirms, that "*the thinking of the flesh* (*το φροντημα τον σαρ κος*) is enmity to Deity; for to the law of the Deity it is not subordinated, nor indeed can be"—Rom. viii. 7. Now, the reason of this perverseness of thought is found in the nature of the "*me* " which thinks. This "me," or *thinking* I in the objective case, has in it *no good thing*: "IN ME (that is," says Paul, "in MY FLESH) dwelleth no good thing"—Rom. vii. 18: no wonder, then, that left to its native ignorance, it always thinks in the wrong direction when treating of divine things. The cerebral flesh is the thought elaborating organization of the Adam—the "I" which is fleshly, "sold under sin." Its thoughts are therefore Sin's thoughts, which *are* in constant and direct antagonism to the teaching of the Word.

Such, then, is the thinking of the world's "divines" and philosophers. It is the thinking of Sin's flesh which is too proud and self-conceited to be "taught of God." There is no good thing in it. It is all redolent of flesh; and, therefore, those who walk in the flesh and after its lusts, hear it with delight. "They are of the world," says John; "therefore speak they of the world, and the world hears them." The thinking of Sin's flesh is the popular thinking of the day. On the subject of immortality the world and its spirituals are all agreed; and in their concord all give the lie to God.

But, driven from one refuge of falsehood, they fly to another. If the phrase "*breath of life*" is found to be an argument good for nothing because it proves too much, they then pounce with their talons upon "*man became a living soul*" and rend it with all the torments of clerical inquisition into a confession that man is inherently immortal. There now, they cry, "do ye not see that as soon as 'the breath of life' was breathed into him, man became a living, that is, an immortal soul?" The "*living soul*" of the English version is equivalent with them to "immortal soul" or "never-dying soul;" so that their "divinities" read Gen. i. 26, 27; ii. 7, as if they had been written, "And God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost, three persons in one God, said, Let us make an immortal soul in our image after our likeness: so the Holy Trinity created an immortal soul in his image, in the image of the Holy Trinity created he the soul; male and female created he them after this wise: —The Holy Trinity formed a corporeal soul-casket of the dust of the ground, and breathed into its nostrils a particle of his own divine, incorruptible and undying essence or breath of life; and it became for the casket an immortal soul." After this fashion the Devil reads scripture. "God," says he, "is without body or parts, therefore the man made in the image and likeness of the Holy Trinity must be the immortal soul, and not the material casket of the soul. The soul is in the image and likeness of the Deity; consequently the soul is without body or parts; in other words, "*thinking is the essence of the soul* "—*ergo*, upon this Cartesian principle of the Devil's theory, all beasts have immortal souls in the image and likeness of the Deity; for they think as well as man!

But Moses says, "male and female created he them." Hence according to the Devil's logic, "The breath of life " is male and female; for he says, that the breath of life is the immortal soul; and that the immortal soul is the real thinking man. But we read nothing about breath of life being breathed into Eve; are we then to conclude with Mohammed, that "women have no souls;" and that John might truly say he saw a wonder in heaven, when he saw a woman there? We are simply informed that a woman was builded from one of the Adam's ribs; and that when she was presented to what the Devil regards as the Immortal Thinking I in the corporeal casket, that same thinker said not a word about his immortal self. He only recognized in the woman a creature of bone and flesh. He did not say, "This is now spirit of my spirit, and soul of my immortal soul," as one might suppose he would had it been a fact. But, the Devil had not as yet taught the Adam to lie; therefore he did not make such a declaration; but contented himself with stating the simple truth, that she, like himself, out of whom she was taken, was simply *living flesh and bones*, and the future mother of mankind.

But, leaving the Devil and his foolishness to themselves, we turn to Moses, and inquire of him the import of the phrase "man became a living soul." In regard to this, we find Moses very communicative. In the text before us his words are *wa-yehi hah-adam le-nephesh khaiyah*, which signifies literally, "*and the groundling was for a body of life.*" This is a very simple and intelligible statement. He had told us before that he came out of the ground; and hence the propriety of translating *Adam* by "groundling." Then Job says, "the breath of Shaddai gave me life," which is also according to Moses, so that the groundling became "a body of life," which it was not before the breath, or air, entered into it.

Were Moses, then, now among us, and we were to request him to express our phrase "living soul" in Hebrew, he would utter the words *nephesh khaiya*; and were we to ask him to bring it back into English, he would, we doubt not, write "*a body of life.*" "It is to be noted," says Gesenius "that *khaiyah* is the genitive of the substantive *life*, and not feminine of the adjective *khai* "living." Hence "of life" is the proper rendering, and not "living," as in the English version.

As to *nehphesh* from *nahphash*, which signifies to *breathe*, to *respire*, several meanings are attached to it in Scripture. It answers to $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ in the Greek, and *anima* in the Latin; and is variously rendered in English by breath, air, odor, perfume, life, animal, body, soul, etc. Of all these "animal" or "body" is the word to be used in Gen. ii. 7. In Numb. vi. 6, it is so used. —There the phrase is *nephesh maith*, literally, *a body of death*, which is equivalent to a *dead body*; and is so rendered in the English Version. The groundling becomes a *nephesh maith* when it ceases to breathe the *nishmath khaiyim*, or air of lives, or "the vital air." Thus, then, the *nephesh khaiyah* and the *nephesh maith* are expressive of the groundling in two states—the *breathing* and the *non-breathing*. Before YAHWEH ELOHIM had breathed into the nostrils of the groundling he had formed it was *nephesh maith*, "a body of death," in the non-breathing state; but after that operation was completed, it was *nephesh khaiyah*, "a body of life" in the breathing state.

Now the groundling, or ground soul, is styled a *nephesh* in Hebrew, because it is *a thing that lives by breathing*. It is a piece of mechanism which cannot work if the breathing be stopped. Put a permanent stop to respiration, and the blood itself becomes destructive of life in extinguishing the action of the nervous system. As the vitality, therefore, of the blood depends upon respiration, *nephesh* is used to signify *life*. Thus in Lev. xvii, the Spirit saith, "the *nephesh* or life, of the flesh is in the blood itself;" and in verse 14, "the *nephesh*, or life,

of ALL flesh is in the blood thereof;" and because the *nephesh* is in the blood, therefore in Gen. ix. 4, the blood itself is styled the *nephesh* of the flesh.

The breath, or *nishmah*, becomes *life* to the groundling by chemical action in the pulmonary air-cells. The groundling is not continued in life by a solitary principle, called "the vital principle" by physiologists; and the "immortal soul" by the heathen "divines" of the apostasy. It is by a combination of principles, as the result of their action and reaction upon each other in and through the air-cells. The *nishmah* of Moses answers to the oxygen and nitrogen, which in combination we term *atmospheric air*, and his *ruach*, to what we call *electricity*, which, as a whole, the air and the electricity, he styles *nishmath ruach khaiyim*, or "air of spirit of lives."

The reader will therefore bear in mind that the life of the groundling is not oxygen alone, nor nitrogen alone, nor electricity alone, nor blood alone, nor the mere act of breathing alone; but a union of oxygen of the air with carbon and hydrogen of the blood, set free by elective affinity, and in their combination setting at liberty electrical currents, which course along the nerves in all the closed circuits of the body; and thereby setting into *motion* all its organs, which process, in the aggregate, we call LIFE.

A corporeal development of such life as this, constitutes the physical, the natural, or animal. The development is according to certain laws to which the Creator has subjected the body; and which, in scientific language, are styled "the physical laws," and "the laws of nature," or "the natural laws;" but in the language of the Spirit, "the law of sin and death," or "the law in the members." The flesh serves this law; for by it the flesh is *what it is*. The law of sin is the law of Sin's flesh, which works in it death and corruption unto a resolution into dust. It is for this reason styled "the law of sin and death;" and because this law reigns in the flesh, Paul styles the flesh "*the body of this death*;" from which there is no deliverance except by the Deity through Jesus Christ the Lord—Rom. vii.

A body developing life is "*a body of life*;" and a body developing life according to the natural laws, is a natural, physical, or animal body; and a body which has either not developed life (as the groundling before respiration) or having developed it in breathing, ceases to do so, is "a body of death." A body of life may be natural or animal, and it may not. Mankind in general have no experience of any other. In the present state, we all belong to "*this death*;" and as far as the conceptions of "the natural man," or *breathing groundling*, are able to reach, the idea of any other "body of life" elaborated from *the body of this death state*, has never invaded the horizon of his crazy thinking. He assumes that the higher manifestations of life are developed independently of body. Hence, God, angels, and "saints in heaven" are with him *lives without body or parts*! Things through which you can wave your hand as through the air. Such is his immortal soul as well as his immortal gods, in corporeal or bodiless entities floating on seas of heavenly rest!"

But the Spirit in Paul reveals the great truth, that there are in relation to man *two bodies of life*—one the *natural*; and the other the *spiritual*. "There is," saith he, "*a natural BODY* (*σωμα ψυχικον*) and there is *a spiritual BODY* (*σωμα πνευματικον*)." Here are two bodies whose existence is affirmed, or made the subjects of a logical thesis. This requires proof; and the proof is immediately adduced. In answer to the question, *What proof is there that there is a natural body?*—the apostle answers, "And so it has been written, "the first man Adam was for *ψυχην ζωσαν*, *a living soul*," according to the English version. Here is the proof. Now, whatever dispute may exist about the propriety of the rendering "*living soul*"

amounts to nothing. Paul's proof of a natural body existing, is the writing recorded in Gen. ii. 7. He calls upon Moses to prove it; and if we admit the proof, we are bound to admit also, that Paul's "*natural body*" and Moses' "living soul," are the same thing. If on the other hand, they are not identical, then Paul failed to prove the position he affirmed.

But Paul did prove it by Moses most satisfactorily; so that we may boldly affirm in defiance of the Devil and all his spirituals and their inventions, that the "living soul" of the English version, is not "the immortal soul" about which the clergy are everlastingly twaddling and mouthing in "holy tone," with eyes upturned heavenward, and sanctimonious grimace. It is not this, but the "natural body," or "body of life," after "the law of sin and death;" and, therefore, "the body of this death." The very reverse of the clerical speculation; being a soul without a spark of immortality to boast of.

But, another member of Paul's thesis affirms that "*there is a SPIRITUAL BODY.*" He points to the resurrected and ascended Lord in proof of this. He styles him "the last Adam for a life-imparting spirit." This is the scriptural idea of an immortal soul. The first Adam was the figure, or type, of the second Adam; so that the living soul, or natural body, was only the type of the ever-living soul, or spiritual body. The former is to the latter as the acorn to the oak; for without the seed, no tree will be produced.

What sad havoc the clergy have made of "the Deep Things of God." They have resolved, or rather dissipated, all things into gas; so that nothing substantial, or material, remains. In fact, of materiality they have the greatest horror. A spirit constituted of body and parts is a monstrosity—a conception of the grossest kind. The Devil hates materialism, because he has nothing to fear from any other source than this. It is the Material Son of the Deity, whom Paul styles "THE SPIRIT," who is to destroy the Devil and his works. —Heb. ii. 14; 1 Jno. iii. 8. He has no fear of "*immaterial immortal ghosts*;" for, if what the "divines" tell us is to be received, he has been so long roasting them upon his gridiron, that he knows precisely all they are capable of doing against him; for he is said to have billions piled upon billions within his gates! But for material spirits he has no relish; for by their power, he is to be hurled like lightning from his throne.

If any additional evidence were needed in proof of *nephesh khaiyah*, "a body of life," in Gen. ii. 7, having reference merely to the animal, and not to the spiritual body, we might direct attention to Moses' use of the phrase in other parts. In Gen. i. 20, the creatures engendered in the waters are *collectively* styled *sheretz nephesh khaiyah*, "a moving body of life:" and in verse 24, all kinds of cattle, reptiles, and beasts, are styled *collectively nephesh khaiyah*. In Gen. ix. 10, 12, 15, 16, *nephesh khaiyah* is used four times, and in all cases applied to fowl, cattle, and beasts of all flesh; and in Rev. xvi. 3, we have the phrase, "*every living soul in the sea died.*" Had "living souls" in unfigurative language been immortal, they would not have been used as symbolical of things to die.

Thus then, dear reader, a little exercise of your rational faculties enlightened by scripture will enable you readily to perceive the foolishness of the wisdom of this Aion of the Gentiles. It is a wisdom from beneath, relatively to God's. It is dusty, psychical, and daimoniodal. It is dusty, or *of the earth*, because it is the vain speculation of the groundling; it is psychical, because it has no higher origin than the thinking of the soul flesh, or body of this death; and it is *daimoniodal*, or demoniacal, because it is that thinking of the flesh which proceeds from the demons of "the synagogue of the Satan"—Paul's *daimonia*, or demons, who "forbid to marry, and command to abstain from meats" — "false apostles," and those

who claim falsely to be "the successors of the apostles," and the "ambassadors of Jesus Christ." Consult the Greek New Testament at James iii. 15; 1 Tim. iv. 1; and 2 Cor. xi. 13, and you will see the appropriateness of these remarks.

This wisdom is the crazy thinking of pagan, metaphysical, and clerical flesh and blood. In its ludicrous and pious gravity, it oracularizes its nonsense to its unfledged and gaping nestlings, from the "chairs" of its professorships, and "sacred desks" of its "divinities." A "living soul," say these reverend wiseacres, in their blandest and holiest tone, and their longest facial grimace, is "an immortal soul"—"that vital, immaterial, active substance, or principle in man, whereby he perceives, remembers, reasons, and wills." *Epicureanly*, "it is a subtle air composed of atoms, or primitive corpuscles;" *Stoically*, "it is a flame, or portion of heavenly light;" *Cartesianly*, "it is thinking that is the essence of the soul;" and *Clerico-psychologically*, "it is simple, uncompounded, and immaterial, not composed of matter and form, for matter can never think and move of itself as the soul does"—*Bucks' Theol. Dict. Art. SOUL*. Thus, their reverences of 1860 have made no advance in soulology from the days of the old Epicureans and Stoics, who mocked at the doctrine of the wandering Jew, who taught that there was *no life without body*; and that the *post mortem* life of the dead, depended entirely upon a *corporeal resurrection*. The Satan's divines, true to the heathenism with which they have been indoctrinated, join in the mockery of the old fools of Athens, and while they profess to revere Paul, contemptuously repudiate his teaching as "Thomasism," and "gross materialism."

But, if "living soul" be granted to signify what they theologically affirm, then all fish, flesh, and fowl of the air, earth, and sea, must of necessity be immortal souls; for we have seen from the Mosaic use of the phrase, that *nephesh khaiyah*, rendered "living soul" in the E.V., which they use as authority when it is supposed to favor their speculations—is applied by him to all such. But this *reductio ad absurdum* they do not like. They do not like their absurdities carried out to their logical results; very well, then their absurdity must be abandoned as untenable. This we have proved it to be, as all must be convinced, who have more regard for scripture and reason than for the authority and "depths of the Satan as they (the divines) speak."

MAN, then, is either alive or dead; and the subject of no betweenity. The breathing thing called man, is either "a body of life," or "a body of death;" or nothing but dust. If after becoming dust, in which he is reduced to what the unbreathing formation was before its forming was commenced; if after resolution into dust, it were desired that "nothing," or *nobody*, should become something, it is indispensable that said dust and ashes should be caused to assume *form*, —to become *body again*. Then *nobody* would have become *somebody*. This can only be accomplished by the *formative energy* of YAHWEH ELOHIM; or "the spirit who is the resurrection and the life." When this operation is perfected—when the Lord the Spirit has given life to the body raised; when, in other words, the free electric spirit of the Deity, which is seen in the forked lightning, and heard in the thunder, is embodied in the original ashes of a man—he becomes a *Boanerges*, or Son of Thunder; he becomes a *body of life*—a spirit body—an *Eloah*, *ισαγγελος*, "equal to an angel"—a god.

Compare this "*New Man in Christ Jesus*" when perfected and bearing the image of the heavenly Adam, the Lord from heaven, with that miserable abortion of the Devil's called "an immortal soul;" and the reader will have God's conception of an immortal man, in contrast with the Devil's. When understood, who can hesitate which conception to embrace? The

clergy and the world's philosophers, diabolonians all, prefer the Devil's, which neither he nor they can demonstrate from the word; we prefer God's, which is both wise, rational, and grand.

In the time, then, between these two bodies of life, man has no existence. There is nobody called man. In this dust-and-ashes condition, with nothing left of him but his name or character engraven on the memory of God, the scriptures testify concerning him, saying, "the dead know not anything; their love, and their hatred, and their envy, is now perished; neither have they any more a portion for the Olahm in any thing done under the sun." "There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in Sheol, whither thou goest."—Eccl. ix. 5, 6, 10. The reason of this is, because "the dust returns to the earth as it was; and the spirit (that contained in the *nishmath ruach khaiyim*) returns to the Elohim who gave it"—ch. xii. 7.

Again it is written, "*In death* there is no remembrance of thee, O Yahweh."—Ps. vi. 5; "Lighten mine eyes lest I sleep *the sleep of death*"—xiii. 3; *Sheol*, in lxxxviii. 3, is termed in verse 6, "the lowest pit, darkness, the deeps;" in verse 11, "destruction;" and in verse 12, "the dark," and "the land of forgetfulness." In Ps. cxliii. 3, it is said of Messiah, "The Enemy hath persecuted my soul; he hath smitten my life down to the ground; he hath made me to dwell in darkness *as those who have been long dead.*" Speaking of man in general, it says, "His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; *in that very day his thoughts perish*"—cxlvi. 4; if the *thoughts* perish in that very day, there is an end of all thinking; consequently, the "Thinking I" is dead; and the Cartesian soul-essence is destroyed.

All the prophets agree with the teaching of these texts. They represent the dead as "*dwelling in the dust*" and shut up in the earth—Isaiah. xxvi. 19; and putting *Sheol* and *Death* for the subjects of them, Hezekiah saith, "*Sheol* cannot praise thee nor death celebrate thee; they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth," or the fulfilment of the promises—Isaiah. xxxviii. 18: and Daniel testifies that the dead are *sleeping in the dust*—ch. xii. 2. The New Testament also is in harmony with these. "Lazarus sleeps, and I go to awake him," said Jesus; who afterwards said plainly, "Lazarus is dead." And by Paul it is said, "they who have *fallen asleep*, the Deity through Jesus will bring out with him; and in the next verse but one, he styles these sleepers "the *dead* in Christ"—1 Thess. iv. 14,16.

But here we must leave the matter for the present, wishing the reader good speed in his study of the word; and happy deliverance from all the puerilities, traditions, and old wives' fables, of the sincere, pious, *dolce far niente* reverend respectabilities of that "Angel of Light" at whom Paul glances in 2 Cor. xi. 14; whose synagogue of righteousness, disowned of God, is coextensive with the "thinking of the flesh."

"What is Thomasism?"

IN the *Christian Messenger*, the organ or an organ of BAPTISTISM in Toronto, C.W., published Dec. 4, 1859, is an editorial under the question "*What is Thomasism?*" which the writer undertakes to answer as follows:

"THOMASISM is a set of notions revived from among the long exploded errors of the past by a certain John Thomas, of Virginia, and taken up by a few ignorant and conceited followers in Canada. Thomasism is gross materialism. It denies the immortality and separate existence of the soul, because it cannot conceive of a soul aside from a body. For the same reason it should deny the existence of God and of angels; and probably it will do so ere long, for it is on the direct logical track to this conclusion. If man has no soul, as the Thomasites

teach, he has nothing to lose, and nothing that can be 'converted.' Thomasism denies salvation through faith in the atonement of Christ alone—teaching that any one who should cling to the text 'the blood of Jesus Christ His Son cleanseth us from all sin,' and die without any other ground of hope than is here furnished, would be lost. It maintains that all the Christians who have ever lived since Christ was upon earth, and who did not believe the notions of the Thomasites, are lost! Thomasism denies the perfect sinlessness of Christ, and denies that the dead are either happy or miserable till after the judgment. It maintains that the wicked will be annihilated at the judgment; that Christ is coming to reign personally at Jerusalem; and that people must believe and be baptized into this dogma, else be damned! Such is a brief outline of Thomasism. *It is in our view baptized infidelity.* We make this brief statement because we have been told that one John Williams, a teacher of Thomasism, claims to have converted Dr. Fyfe. If he has ever made any such claim, he has no foundation whatever for doing so, and his averments on this point are no more to be relied on than his religious teachings."

The writer of the above asserts that we teach that "*man has no soul!*" By soul he means a something having no body, essentially immortal, and separately existing. This is his conception of "a soul," an incorporeal abstraction, which he says we affirm man does not possess. In opposition to this, he affirms that man does possess it, and that to deny it is "gross materialism;" that is, in *his opinion*. So let it be. We do deny the existence of such a soul in man; and as the clergy are on the affirmative of the proposition, *the burden of proof* rests upon them. We therefore demand of them the proof. We call upon them, as the self-constituted conservators of orthodoxy and truth, to demonstrate from the teachings of Moses and the Prophets in harmony with that of Jesus and the Apostles, the existence in men or angels of such a soul as they have invented. We teach that man consists of "body, soul, and spirit, the whole person;" but we deny that either of them hath intellectual moral and deathless existence when separated the one from the others. The writer mistakes. We can "*conceive of a soul*" a clerical soul, "*aside from a body.*" We have seen many such in our dreams. We have talked with them, and heard them talk. We have seen the clerical souls of snakes and ferocious beasts; and have been terribly scared by them; so that we have uttered loud cries, to the great alarm of those that heard us. Dreamland is peopled with multitudes of such things; and it is in this fairy land of shades and fantastic shapes, "divines" have studied their "divinity;" and obtained the *immaterial quintessence* they style the inestimably precious immortal soul! A dream—and nothing more.

It appears from the above, that if the writer were convinced that no clerical ghost existed in man, he would deny the existence of God and angels! His God and angels are like his "soul," unsubstantial, immaterial abstractions—entities and quiddities, without body or parts! Not so with us. We reject the soul-heathenism of clerical dreamers, with all their gods and angels; nevertheless, we have strong faith in the God and angels of the Old and New Testaments. We believe in a *substantial* Deity who is spirit; but not gas, or mere shade—a Deity of whose *ὑπστάσις* or *substance*, the glorified Jesus is the *χαρακτηρ*, or *exact representation*, "who dwells in light, whom no man hath seen or can see." We believe in angels who are bodily existences; substantial and powerful beings; as material as the mountains, and mightier than the sons of men—"public official spirits, sent forth for service on account of those hereafter to inherit salvation;"—celestial potentates, to whom are subjected the "Powers that be," that they may work out the purposes of God. Such are the angels in whom we believe; not in clerical phantasmata, or "little angels" fabricated from the wings of birds, and the "immortal, souls" of squalling babes defunct! The editor of the *Christian Messenger* is desperately afraid of losing his "soul," or ghost, lest he should have "nothing to lose, and nothing to be 'converted!'" The existence of his god, his angels, and his

religion, stands or falls with his imaginary "soul." No "soul," no god, no angels, no religion, or conversion! This is a desperate extremity, indeed. But it is inevitable. Baptism, like Methodism, Campbellism, Presbyterianism, Episcopalianism, Romanism, and all other inventions ending in *ism*, is an ecclesiastical device for the conversion and salvation of this same clerical ghost; but should it be proved that the ghost is a mere fiction—a dreamy conceit of the natural man, then away go all these spiritual imaginations devised to save it, as the mere ill-contrived quackeries of the carnal mind. Their "soul" proved to be a conceit, and their "forms of faith" are vain.

But we are not in this unenviable predicament. Abolish the clergy, their religions and their "*soul*," and we have still *life to lose or gain*. "Whosoever will lose his *life* for my sake," said Jesus, "shall find it." Here is something to lose, and something to find, namely, LIFE: "I will raise him up at the last day." Here is *life by resurrection*; and that necessarily *of body*, for even the clergy are not foolish enough to talk of the resurrection of "the immortal soul." "He that raised up Christ from the dead," says Paul to the saints in Rome, "shall also make alive your MORTAL BODIES by His spirit:" and again he saith, "Our life (*the life of the saints*, not of the clergy and their people) is hid with Christ in Deity, when He who is our life shall appear, then shall we appear with him in glory;" and "be like him," says John, "and see him as he is."

"Nothing that can be 'converted!' " Peter said to the thousands in the temple, "Repent and *be converted*. They were "converted" in intellect, moral sentiments or disposition, and in state; and yet they had no "immortal souls." The editor of the C. M. does not know what "conversion" is. Being ignorant of it in theory, and being unconverted in fact, he cannot write intelligently upon the matter. He knows well enough what baptistic or clerical conversion means. He knows all about that sort of nonsense; but to the conversion resulting from the engrafted word, we can see clearly from his paper before us, that he is a perfect stranger, and knows nothing at all about the matter.

We *do* teach that "the blood of Jesus Christ, the Son of the Deity cleanseth us from all sin;" and we teach further, that he who doth not acknowledge this as the inestimable price paid for his redemption, although he might believe all the promises, and be immersed, could not possibly be saved. But, on the other hand, we do also teach that though men may acknowledge that the blood of Jesus is sin-cleansing; and that it is the procuring cause of man's redemption; still that acknowledgment will not save them unless they conjoin with the hearty acknowledgment of this, belief of "the things of the Kingdom of God and of the Name of Jesus Christ," and were baptized after the example of the Samaritans and others. The isolated and important truth that the blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin, is not the gospel. The gospel was preached and believed, and believers therein were immersed and cleansed, before that great truth was made known to men. This is easily demonstrated.

The "us" in the above text is a pronoun having reference to *a special class*—to John, and all of like precious faith with him. It does not comprehend the clergy and their flocks, because they are ignorant of "the faith originally delivered to the saints." The blood of Jesus does not cleanse men from sin who treat the promises of his Father with contempt; and by their vain traditions make him a liar. We deny that men may believe one truth, and deny or be ignorant of all others, and be saved. Christianity knows no such "*faith alone*" justification as this. We know that it is the very soul of the religion of the Satan's synagogue; but it has no place in "the righteousness of God attested by the Law and the Prophets." "He that believes

the Gospel and is immersed shall be saved; he that believes not shall be condemned." He that conforms not to this must assuredly be lost.

We do not teach that "*all the Christians* who have ever lived since Christ was upon the earth, who did not believe our *notions*, are lost." This is like the editor of the C. M.'s "soul," a dreamy fiction of a wild imagination. A notion is an opinion, or matter of uncertainty. We have opinions upon divers subjects, as well as all others. We do not believe and teach that "Christians" who do not indorse them are or will be lost. If men are Christians, they have believed the gospel and been immersed. These are the only Christians we find in the New Testament recognized as such after the day of Pentecost. We do not recognize the disciples of the clergy as Christians; they are such neither in faith, practice, nor spirit. We say of them, not what the editor of the C. M. says for us; but that they cannot be saved unless they renounce the fabulous traditions of the clergy or "divines;" and with the disposition of little children, believe the gospel of the kingdom and be baptized. This is not our, "notion;" but "the wholesome words of the Lord Jesus," which we believe "with true hearts and full assurance of faith."

We do not deny "the perfect sinlessness of Christ." This is another fiction of the baptistic editorial brain. We believe and teach that he was "holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners;" and that "he was in all points tried as we, yet without sin." This was his intellectual and moral status; yet was he not perfect. This he says of himself, and therefore we may safely affirm it with him. He tells us that he was not perfected until the third day; when he was perfected in recompense for his obedience unto death. That which was imperfect was *the nature* with which the Logos, that came down from heaven *to* do the Father's will, clothed himself. That nature was flesh of the stock of Abraham, compared in Zech. iii. 3, to "filthy garments," typical of "the infirmity with which he was compassed." For this "infirmity" called "*himself*," and for all of the same infirmity associated with him by faith in the covenants made with Abraham and David; and in Him as the Mediator thereof; he poured out his blood as a covering for sin. Upon this principle "his own self bare our sins *in his own body* to the tree." Sins borne in a body prove that body to be imperfect; and characterize it as *σαρξ ἁμαρτίας sin's flesh*. Sin's flesh is imperfect, and well adapted for the condemnation of sin therein. Sin could not have been condemned in the flesh of angels; and therefore the LOGOS did not assume it, but clothed himself with that of the seed of Abraham. Hence, "the Deity sent his own Son in the identity of *Sin's flesh*, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." This condemnation accomplished, the body slain was made alive again, and perfected, so that it now lives for the Aion of the Aions, as "the Lord the Spirit."

Yea, verily, neither happiness nor misery for the dead till after resurrection, and sentence passed at the tribunal of the Christ, where we must all appear.

Nay, the wicked pass through war, pestilence, and famine, before they arrive at the consummation of the sentence written, that "*they shall not be*."

Yea, verily, Christ is coming to reign in Jerusalem in person; and to sit there upon the throne of his father David; and to rule over the House of Jacob for the Aion. Yea, verily ye must believe this, for it is the truth of God; and ye cannot overturn it. You may style it contemptuously "*this dogma*" and in so doing proclaim your infidelity, but nevertheless, God's truth will stand; and all you editors and ministers of the Satan will be proclaimed "liars" and the inventors of lies, before the assembled universe of God; who has declared that "*unto*

them that look for him Christ will appear the second time without sin unto salvation." This we believe and teach.

"*In our view*" says this editor of baptism, "*Thomasism is baptized infidelity.*" If baptism be the true faith, then truly are we infidels; for we have no faith in it at all. Between us and all immortal-soulists and sky-kingdomers, there is a great gulf. We know that we have the truth, and are able and willing to defend it against all assailant lay and clerical. "To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." This word condemns them, and convicts them of deceiving and being deceived. We are sorry for them, but much more for the unhappy peoples who barter their eternal interests for their trashy wares. It is, however, encouraging to know that the Lord's advent is at hand. His power will crush the clergy and emancipate the people. Glorious deliverance for an evil world; for so long as its spiritual guidance is with them, no folly will be too absurd to find currency in the public mind. God speed the day when the kingdom of the clergy falls, and all their foolishness shall be destroyed. EDITOR.
Dec. 10, 1859.

THE righteousness of the law of Moses is fulfilled in those who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit—Rom. viii. 4.

Analecta Epistolaria.

"But Trash."

Dear Brother—Having five dollars in my possession, I herewith send it to you; I consider it but trash in comparison to your valuable expositions of prophecy, and so forth.

With best wishes for your prosperity in spiritual and temporal furtherance,

I remain

Yours in the One Hope,

JAMES STEPHENS.

Minnesota, Nov. 23, 1859.

We are much obliged to Bro. S. for his kind remembrance of our labors, and for his good wishes so practically expressed. We would have no objection to some additional "*trash*" from all our subscribers for 1860; especially from those tenderly conscientious patrons of the truth (which has for years past been struggling for a precarious existence on the earth) who have not remitted us a solitary picayune for many years! We hope they will pardon our dullness in not having attained to the high and dexterous proficiency of fabricating books of instruction out of mere thinking, or Cartesian soul essence, without the material aid of something to eat, and something to wear, and wherewithal to pay the printer! We acknowledge, that we have not yet become skilled in this art and mystery; nevertheless, the Herald exists; but by whose aid? Not, we opine, by theirs, who year by year leave us in the lurch. To such the Herald comes *Cartesianly*. EDITOR.

Theiopolitical.

“Comfort for Italy.”

UNDER the caption of "*Comfort for Italy*" there appeared in the *New York Times* certain editorial remarks elicited by a perusal of our recent publication entitled the "*Italian Crisis*," sent to the editor by a friend. They are as follows:

"Some very rational person who has evidently been dabbling with that Book of Revelations, which Dr. SOUTH declared invariably 'found its commentators mad and left them so,' has just solved the Italian question in a manner which can hardly fail to delight all our Anti-Napoleonic friends on both sides of the sea. According to this luminary, the result of the Italian war will be the 'roaring blast which uproots the giants of the forest and lays towers in the dust.' France has been at all and more than all the mischief which some of our astute contemporaries snuffed up in the first moments of the Italian crisis; but her punishment will be as summary as her crimes have been subtle. 'Napoleon will fall, Sardinia will be plucked up by the roots, and the Mother of Harlots sit Queen of the nations.' This is a dark prospect, it must be admitted, for all concerned; and nobody need expect any better immediate fruits of the war, excepting England, who will enjoy the pleasure which perhaps Lord John Russell will fail to appreciate, 'of opening the way for *Russia*, who is to be brought into position as the Gog of the land of the Magog.' Nevertheless we are bidden not 'weep over the disappointments of Italy,' since one gleam of hope remains to us in the confessed improbability of Napoleon's being 'at once the Frog-Power, a Tenth Horn, and the Beast.' We do sincerely trust that the Emperor of the French may prove unequal to sustaining the complex honors of so fearful a trinity."

Our attention having been called to this by a friend, we considered that this very complimentary notice of our "rational," "dabbling," and "crazy" self, styled by this enlightened Raymondian writer "*this luminary*," was entitled to some little consideration in passing along. It seemed a pity that the editor's sweetness should be wasted on the desert air, as wasted it would be, if we allowed it to pass without note or comment; for he was careful enough to suppress even the title of this "luminary's" exposition of the Divine solution of the Italian Question; and all reference to where it might be obtained. This is the editorial policy, both of the spiritual and temporal or secular exponents of the darkness and wickedness in the heavenlies. These editors, lay and clerical, publish papers not for the enlightenment of the people and the development of truth, but as printing speculations for the pecuniary and potential profit of the speculators, and consequently, of the political and religious sects by which they are enabled to live and, glorify themselves. Hence they are careful to give the people no chance of satisfying themselves as to the correctness or justness of their notices of obnoxious writers. True, they will insert an advertisement in a crowd of others, where it has little or no chance of being seen, if you will pay them fifty per cent, more than it is worth; otherwise they will take especial care that their readers shall have no help from them for verifying their critiques. We know their policy well, for we have been its victim for twenty-five years. It is the policy of Satan; and this they know right well, as evinced by the epithets they bestow upon each other. They are the mere organs of what exists. They talk about progress, and human rights, and higher law, conscience, and duty to God; but the talk all concentrates in their fleshly lusts—"the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life" which it is the business of their lives to gratify. Their own personal and vested interests, not the truth or anything pertaining to it, are the highest law to which they can attain.

Whatever directly or indirectly jeopardizes these, is proscribed or ignored by all politicals, secular and "divine."

Understanding, then, the craft of these gentlemen well, we determined in the case of the *N. Y. Times*, that their policy should not entirely succeed. Though "the saints are prevailed against" by the clergy and their allies, we have a little power left in the press we control, whose mission is to aid the truth and to destroy their influence to the utmost of our ability, however humble it may be. Accordingly, we penned the following letter to the editor of the *Times*, without the least expectation that he would publish it, but that we might read his notice and our reply at a public meeting about to ensue; and afterwards, give it further currency in England, Scotland, Canada, and the United States, through our own periodical. We read it to about a hundred people in New York City, a good deal to their amusement at the "Little Villain's" expense; to whom it was afterwards forwarded through a friend. But, as we predicted in the method of our alleged madness, he has been careful to exclude it from his columns, and to ignore it altogether. This was our prophecy, and it has duly come to pass. The following is a copy of the letter sent:

LETTER TO THE EDITOR OF THE N. Y. TIMES.

Mr. RAYMOND:

Dear Sir, —In your paper of yesterday you have a few remarks upon the pamphlet I did not send you, entitled "The Italian Crisis." The remarks, I presume, are peculiarly after your own taste, which has been evidently not formed by the study of the scriptures, but by that of such superficial and silly writers and "divines" as Dr. South, whose pious infidelity has manifestly more weight with you than the heaven-descended testimony of the Eternal Spirit.

I have no complaint to make of your sarcasm. It is, doubtless, the best you are capable of. You felt it necessary to say something; and as you had neither knowledge nor argument in the premises, you could only be sarcastic in the wake of "the witty" but weak and silly Dr. South, whose impiety you endorse. In view of this "a very rational person" is a madman; and "a luminary" is a dark body; and to expound any part of the Apocalypse is to "dabble!" This, however, with sensible men is all mere verbiage, used to mislead the thoughts and to veil a total ignorance of the subject in all its premises and conclusions. It is a great pity that it is so, for if you were intelligent in the things you condemn without understanding them, you would not as an honest man write such foolish editorials—political prophecies—concerning the future of Europe and Asia, and the important questions by which their civil and ecclesiastical fabric is stirred and shaken to its foundations. But what can we expect of editors whose divine luminaries and spiritual guides are Dr. South and the clergy, who (rare exceptions only excepted) have a mortal enmity to the Apocalypse because it baffles their "ripe scholarship" (!!!) and denounces them as "Nicolaitans," "holders of the doctrine of Balaam," the prophetess Jezebel and her children, "false apostles," "spurious Jews," "the synagogue of the Satan," and "liars." The clergy have a *traditional* dislike to this book; and have succeeded in transfusing their own hatred into the hearts of the foolish multitude who look to them for spiritual direction. According to the Apocalypse, all the nations or inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk—(ch. xvii. 2; xviii. 4;) such are its words, the traditions of the clergy of all the Names and denominations have intoxicated the people—and you, Mr. Editor, being one of those who endorse their traditions, must necessarily be spiritually intoxicated likewise. This is how the Book of Revelations finds you and them when you undertake to comment upon it, or to deliver an opinion concerning it—it finds you drunk and leaves you mad—mad-drunk!

You can easily imagine how the Apocalypse, reduced to canvas by the painter's brush would affect the mind of a spectator befuddled and bewildered by the fumes of intoxication. When Dr. South *looked at* (for it was beyond his ability to *look into*) the Apocalypse, he was thus affected. He found the little intellect or brains he had all in a whirl, and every thing in his philosophy, which was his "theology," topsy-turvy. He felt either that he was actually mad or was becoming so; and it is presumable that when you read "The Italian Crisis," your feelings were *en rapport* with his; and hence your refuge in his blasphemy.

Well, sir, you have given us Dr. South's opinion, endorsed by your own sapiency, respecting myself and others untraditionized by the clergy and the politicians who worship them and their folly; let us now "hear what the Spirit saith to the seven Churches of Asia Minor," and through them to all of the true Christian faith in all ages who have ears to hear what he saith. Hear him, O thou disciple of Dr. South! "Blessed," saith he, "*he that readeth and they that understand* the words of this prophecy, and *keep* those things which are written therein." In effect Dr. South and you, say that this is false; that there is no blessedness to be found in any such reading, understanding and observance; but only madness! Are you not ashamed of yourself? Is not the *N. Y. Herald* justified in denouncing you for "a Little Villain," seeing that in effect you proclaim in your columns that the Eternal Wisdom is a liar? Shame upon your impiety and ignorance!

Well, you say I am mad. If you are sane I prefer my madness. Now there is said to be method in some madness; perhaps there may be a little in mine. Allow me then to prophesy, and to say with tolerable assurance of its fulfilment, that you will not venture to permit this communication to appear unmutilated in your columns; but that you will either ignore it altogether, or simply say you have received it, and under the irritation of it (though it is by no means intended to irritate, or to be received with any other feeling than that which actuates the writer, which is deferential respect for you in all other known relations than those of politician and theologian)—express some contemptuous opinion of the writer and its contents, taking special care that the public shall have no chance of judging for themselves. This is clerical policy secularized by political editors. But you can, and of course will, do as you please. If it does not appear in the *Times*, it will elsewhere. Do with it as you like, only be assured that Italy and her comforters are proved by the Apocalypse to be liars; that the policy of Napoleon can settle nothing; and that Italy, in Church and State, the murderess of the saints in past ages, and the fell destroyer of liberty, intelligence and all moral worth, will be finally blotted out from the political geography of the earth—not, however by Red Republicans or the Powers; but—and hear it, O ye pious infidels of the Kingdom of the Clergy—by Jesus Christ, the resurrected and living Saints, and the Jews, then obedient to their behests in all the word.

Wishing you, dear sir, a happy deliverance from all your clerical delusions, illusions and hallucinations, with all due respect I subscribe myself,

Yours, etc.,

Nov. 24, 1859.

JOHN THOMAS, M. D.

"The Hour at Hand."

"Prepare war, wake up the mighty men."—JOEL.

"A CHANGE is now coming over the dream of nations; and it may be that the hour is at hand when their many wrongs may meet with redress. THE TIME IS FULL OF WARNING AND PREPARATION: scarcely a day passes, but some new phase of events is

developed, and every such phase is an instalment of the debt which despotism owes, and must pay, to the cause of humanity."—LONDON LEADER.

"*The Hour*" alluded to above is doubtless "at hand." It is that fearful "*hour of God's judgment*" proclaimed in Rev. xiv. 7, in which the power of the oppressor will be broken; nations will be subjected to the will of heaven; and the many wrongs which the truth and its advocates and adherents have endured, and are suffering, shall be redressed. Even political writers, without any reference to Revelation, perceive that the present is no ordinary or common time: "IT IS A TIME," say they, "FULL OF WARNING AND PREPARATION;" while, on the other hand, the reverend sin-spirituals of the day are preaching "peace and safety;" and dreaming of a millennium of gospel influences, as the result of their ministry! Be warned, then, reader, that the hour of judgment is at hand; and that the "*preparation*" now advancing is for its development; and that none shall escape who do not acknowledge God according to the "Great Mystery of Godliness;" and obey not the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

EDITOR.

Nov. 25, 1859.

Miscellanea.

On the Text of the New Testament.

BY S. P. TREGELLES, LL. D.

THOSE who wish to cast doubt or distrust upon the records of Revelation, have habitually represented the text of the New Testament to be such as is involved in entire uncertainty; so that, in fact, we are told that we have no evidence by which we can show what is the true text of the New Testament books.

Those who are unacquainted with the subject have not unfrequently been at a loss how to answer the strong statements that have been made on this point; and, on the other hand, defenders have sometimes taken a very imperfect view of the facts of the case; so that a brief statement of the whole matter will not be, I believe, unsuitable in this place; for this will show that the question of the *true text* does not in the least affect the evidence to the books themselves as to their general character and texture; and, also, it may make it clear to Christians, that so far from the subject being one from which they ought to shrink, it is that which they should regard as peculiarly their own, and that if they reverence the word of God, so far from fearing textual criticism, they ought (if possessed of the needed requirements and abilities,) to understand and use it, in order to uphold the existence of the New Testament against those who would envelop everything relating to it in a cloud of negations.

Every ancient work has been transmitted to us by means of MSS. We possess the original autographs of none; so that we are indebted to copyists for the exemplars that have been handed down. The process of transcription is always one by which errors naturally creep in; and thus, the oftener an ancient writing was copied, the more danger was there of departure from what the author originally wrote. Similar words and phrases would be substituted for others; copyists would accidentally omit words or sentences, or they would insert in the text something which had been noted in the margin, or they would try to correct what they thought to be wrong: so that, while the general texture of a work continued the same, it might abound in *slight* alterations; such, for the most part, as would but little affect the actual sense.

Now, this has been the case with regard to the New Testament, in exactly the same manner as other books. Some have thought that such an idea would cast a kind of reflection upon God—as if He would permit the perfection of Scripture to be impaired. All we need say is, that the fact *is such*; Scripture has been subject to just the same casualties as other books; copyists have made mistakes (just as compositors in printing may do) in transcribing Scripture, exactly the same as if they had been engaged on secular writings. As things are so, we know that God *has permitted* this to take place.

After the invention of printing, ancient works were multiplied by means of the press instead of the pen: the early printers (just as the transcribers to whom they succeeded) took whatever copy of a work came first to hand; and this, whether correct in its readings or not, became the basis of the first printed text. But when the increase in the number of books caused a similar increase of thought and attention to be paid to literature, the business of critical editors gradually arose. It was found that copies of the same work differed in many respects; and hence they were compared throughout, and the variations were noted, —a process to which the term *collation* is applied. The earlier the MSS. of an author, the more closely do they approach, in general, to what he wrote; since each successive transcriber was sure to add something (however little) to the amount of mistakes. The comparison, then, of the more ancient MSS. together shows how much or how little of the text of an author can be considered as uncertain, and also how great or little (as a balance of probabilities) the uncertainty may be, and also how far the *sense* is affected by such variations.

So far from a recurrence to ancient readings being considered to cast doubt on ancient authors, which were at first printed from later MSS., the reverse is notoriously the fact; for it is thus that critical editors have rejected erroneous readings which were found in early editions, and hence they are able to give forth the authors of antiquity far more genuine in condition.

With regard to the New Testament, it is in vain for an objector to say, "Such a MS. reads such a passage differently," or, "Such copies omit or add such and such words:" for unless the objector has some knowledge of ordinary textual criticism, and unless those whom he addresses have at least some apprehension of what are the grounds of difficulty, the whole argument, as bearing on the authenticity of Scripture, * has as little meaning as if one sought to prove that one of the heavenly bodies *does not exist*, because of some observed variation in its orbit. The true readings of any ancient book must always be discussed as an inquiry wholly distinct from that of the external evidence to its genuineness. Because a planet exists, an astronomer may calculate its orbit; because we have evidence that St. Paul wrote an Epistle to the Romans, and that Epistle has come down to us in ancient copies, we may examine the copies in order to learn what is the true text.

* No uncertainties to the reading of *present copies*, can affect the *original authority* of a document: it is not customary to confound such things. Thus we know that the authority of an Act of Parliament is derived from the Legislature which enacts it, and that this is not impaired even if such an Act be copied inaccurately: we use proper means for knowing that we have correct copies. It is true, that for convenience sake, the Law declares that the copy of an Act, as printed by the Queen's printer, shall be taken as possessing the same authority as the original Act engrossed on parchment; but even this does not prevent examination in case of error. Thus, a year or two ago, in the "Health of Towns Act," it was found that, *by a single erratum*, the Queen's printers had excluded graduates of the University of Edinburgh from

being appointed as medical officers under it; the mistake was soon discovered, and the Queen's printers issued a reimpression of the Act. This is just a case in which a judgment would have to be formed as to the *true reading* of a document whose authority was not at all in question.

The New Testament, like all other books, was first printed from such MSS. as came first to hand; they were modern copies, and from these the common text has proceeded. Now, while other ancient works in general have been for many years published in texts far more correct than those that proceeded from the first printers, the Greek New Testament long remained (and as far as England is concerned may be said still to remain) almost unimproved. And repeatedly have attempts to show how it might be rendered more critically correct, called forth denunciations on the part of those whose defence of revealed truth was characterized by more of zeal than knowledge. If such defenders had interfered with *Bible printing*, and if they had denounced the press-correctors, who were engaged in rectifying the errors of the compositors, their proceedings would have shown an equal amount of intelligence.

And it was the inconsiderate zeal of these defenders, who attacked textual criticism in order to uphold the New Testament, that put this weapon into the hands of objectors. Such were able to say, "The text of your sacred books *is* rendered utterly doubtful by various readings:" and they were able to cite the language which had been applied to critics, by those who little thought what use might be made of their words. If the objectors really used this argument as supposing that it was forcible, then they must have been as unacquainted with the whole subject of the readings of ancient works, as were the too zealous defenders from whom they borrowed it.

It is difficult to explain the subject of the text of the New Testament in such a manner as not to be misunderstood. On the one hand, it may seem as if the variation of copies is so great, that it can hardly be overstated; on the other hand, this variation is often spoken of as though it were of comparatively little importance; —as though, in fact, it were some theoretic point, rather than one of any practical value. * I wish, if possible, to guard against *both* these errors. As to the *first*, it may, I believe, be plainly said that the New Testament has come down to us with about the same amount of transcriptural injury as other ancient works; and as to the *second*, I shall not be supposed to regard the textual criticism of the New Testament as of small moment by those who are aware, that for years the business of my life has been (and still is) the collation of ancient MSS. and versions of the New Testament, in order to publish a critical edition.

* This tendency has often exhibited itself in English minds. Writers have spoken of MSS. as if they were in general pretty correct, and as if no doctrinal statement, and no fact stood differently in any MS. whatever: this misapprehension is indeed most strange: it is applying the *general* evidence to the *general text* to all the *particular parts* of which that evidence is composed. We might as well confound the arch with the single stones of which it is formed, and thus affirm that *each* of them safely spans the stream. The "Edinburgh Review," No. 191 (page 5 *note*), goes so far as to say, "In point of fact, the doctrines of the English Church would not be affected even if the worst readings of the worst MS. were in every case to be purposely adopted." To this strong statement, I briefly reply that MSS. contain mistakes of quite as much doctrinal importance as that in the printed Bible, which omitted "not" in the seventh Commandment; or that which read in 1 Cor. vi. 9, "Know ye not that the unrighteous shall inherit the kingdom of God?"

If, then, it be said that transcribers have so altered the books of the New Testament that they are wholly different from what they once were—if it be alleged that the doctrines laid down in it have been changed by design or by ignorance—the assertion may be met with a direct negative. We may point to the ancient MSS. of different countries in proof that the substantial texture of the books has not been tampered with by any fraud; we may turn to the ancient versions as witnesses of the same facts. And, as to the observed various readings, we may show that they *commonly* relate to the order of words, to synonymous expressions, and the like. When greater variations, such as the insertion or the non-insertion of sentences, are objected, then we must say, "Well, it is a question to be determined, not by previously formed opinions, but by evidence; let us consult the MSS. and versions; let us see if any light is thrown on the point from the citations of early writers." If, then, we find that the words are not found in the oldest MSS., if they are equally excluded from the versions, and if the early writers do not cite them, then of course we must know that this is not a debatable point, but that we possess that certainty which clear lines of distinct evidence can give. An objector cannot say that he has thus extruded a doctrine from the New Testament, for there is not a single point of dogmatic teaching which rests merely on any one passage of doubtful authenticity, or such as is infirm as to evidence.

In cases in which authorities differ, their testimony must be balanced; and if we cannot arrive at absolute *certainty*, we shall probably be able to say that all the range of doubt lies within somewhat narrow limits. We shall thus learn not to *magnify* the importance of New Testament variations.

We must not forget that even works written since the invention of printing are not necessarily certain as to their text: —how remarkably is this the case as to much of the English poetry of two centuries and a half ago! and yet who would say that this affected the general complexion of the poems? One might have thought that doctrinal statements would have been guarded with peculiar care, and yet it is not particularly easy to determine the genuine text of the Augsburg Confession, of the Thirty-nine Articles, or of the Documents of the Council of Trent. It is not that there is any uncertainty as to the *doctrines* laid down. As to the Augsburg Confession, it cannot be said that the *true text* had ever been published till a very few years ago; while, as to its definitions of doctrine, there had not been the slightest doubt or uncertainty.

Those who exaggerate the magnitude of various readings in the New Testament, commonly attach a vast importance to a few passages: they have, perhaps, heard that 1 John v. 7, is spurious; * they therefore imagine that the rejection of this passage impugns the doctrine of the Trinity—as if that doctrine had not been maintained by those that never heard of this verse, absent as it is from every Greek MS. older than the 16th century, and from every *ancient* MS. of every ancient version: or, perhaps, they charge the maintainers of orthodox truth with fraud; because the passage acquired a place in the printed text, not knowing (or else concealing the fact) that its place there was objected to from the first.

* It is, in fact, most of the 7th, and a few words of the 8th verse that are not supported by any evidence: "For there are three that bear record [in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one. And there are three that bear witness in earth], the Spirit, and the water, and the blood, and these three agree in one." The words in brackets have no ancient authority whatever; and they were equally rejected by Luther, and by our reformers in this country. They seem to have originated in a marginal note in some Latin copies.

It is thus by resting on a few points, that an effect is produced, as though something wide-spread and universal could be brought forward, which would cast doubt or uncertainty over the whole of Scripture. This has, I believe, produced a contrary tone of mind in this country on the part of upholders of Christian truth: they have often either shunned the subject, or else they have reduced its magnitude and importance as much as possible. Instead of this, they ought to have taken the facts as they are; the question is not whether the various readings in the New Testament are many and great, but whether (knowing their existence) we will weigh the evidence, as if we had to do with any other ancient work, and see what the honest result may be.

The consequence of the subject having been avoided in this country, has been that passages have been *habitually quoted* for what they do not contain, if read properly; * difficulties have been *explained* which only exist in the reading of later copies; # and if a writer spoke of the critical reasons for not believing in the genuineness of a passage, he was sure (unless he had veiled his words in Latin) to be charged by some with want of reverence for the word of God; —a charge which only showed the well-intentioned ignorance of those who made it. +

* Thus, in discussions on baptism, we still, sometimes, find those who cite the words of Philip and the Ethiopian, Acts viii. 37, "And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered, and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." This appears to be done in entire unconsciousness that no part of this verse is given in critical texts.

In Acts xiii. 19, 20, in our version, St. Paul says, "And when he had destroyed seven nations in the land of Chanaan, he divided their land to them by lot: and after that, he gave unto them judges, about the space of four hundred and fifty years, until Samuel the prophet." All kinds of endeavors have been made to reconcile this term of *four hundred and fifty years* with other Scripture dates; it has furnished enough material for whole volumes, and this period is still called "*the computation of St. Paul,*" in the title of Sir Henry Ellis's new edition of "Blair's Chronological and Historical Tables." Now, in the most ancient copies, the period of four hundred and fifty years stands in quite a different connection: "He destroyed seven nations in the land of Chanaan, and gave them their land by lot about four hundred and fifty years; and afterwards he gave unto them judges," etc. Attention ought to have been paid to *this* reading, instead of its being wasted on one more recent.

+ Dr. Routh ("Reliquæ Sacrae," i. p. 89) discusses the question, whether the narration contained in the common text of John viii. 1-12, is the same as the history of a woman accused before our Lord of many crimes; and he concludes thus: —"Evidenter constat, etiamsi suspecta haec evangelii pericope eadem, esse censeatur atque historia Papiana, nondum eam codici Novi Testamenti tempore Eusebii insertam fuisse." This remark, *in English*, that John viii. 1-11, was not *yet* inserted in the New Testament in the time of Eusebius, though perfectly true, would have been sure to have called forth severe remark. Critics who *state* evidence, are treated as if they ought to have invented counter-evidence.

Some have shunned textual criticism as though it were opposed, in some mysterious manner, to orthodox truth; in this way they have given a vantage-ground to heterodoxy. It is quite true that some few passages which bear on the proper Godhead of Christ, are read differently in the best critical documents; but what then? These passages are not the *only proofs* of that cardinal doctrine; and, further, they were not *at all* the grounds on which it was held fast in the midst of the early controversies; for there are quite enough passages free from

all difference of reading in which it is set forth. It might also be well for those who shun textual criticism on such grounds, to know that MS. authorities will *give* quite as much as they *take away*; so that if any fear the application of sound principles, it should be those who disapprove of the *doctrines* taught in the New Testament *in its common text*; for they will find the same doctrines supported, not by a mere traditional text bearing date since the introduction of printing, but by MSS., versions, and ancient citations, which lead us back to the early centuries.

In defending the common printed text, as such, against the just demands of criticism, advocates have so acted as would weaken all Christian evidence, if the defence were accepted as legitimate; for they have confounded the proofs in favor of that which is infirm with the evidence which is absolute in upholding that which is certainly genuine: in bringing all to the same level, it has been impossible really to elevate what rests on no just basis, and thus all has been lowered to the same ground of uncertainty, or even worse. And, then, when attempts have been made to use the condition of the text as an argument against Revelation, dogmatic assertions have been made, such as would not really meet the difficulty; and there has been no firm footing against those who would represent the text as wholly precarious and uncertain, and who therefore would select whatever readings they chose, and give the sacred documents whatever complexion they could, so far as they were supported by *any* evidence, either good or bad.

And yet this country was once the locality in which Biblical scholars paid particular attention to textual criticism. In the latter half of the seventeenth century, and the former half of the eighteenth, much was done amongst us; but the remembrance of this seemed to be the only thing left, while a kind of dogmatic ignorance usurped the place which ought to have been held by intelligent and sober criticism. It is not my present concern to detail the history of the application of criticism to the New Testament; suffice it to say, that such labors were carried on in other countries, while but few amongst us—such as Principal Campbell, of Aberdeen, and Professor White, of Oxford—understood or valued what was accomplished.

Griesbach had, on a system of his own, restored the ancient readings of several passages; this was felt to be an innovation; so that when Professor Scholz of Bonn published the first volume of his Greek Testament, in 1830, it was hailed, in this country, by many, as an important defence of the common, later text. The leading principle of Scholz is to follow the mass of later MSS., instead of the few * very ancient documents which have come down to us. If this principle of following the *many* recent copies, instead of the *few* ancient, be sound, then let us apply it to printed books; and instead of adhering to the readings of the few scarce copies of editions almost coeval with the authors, let us concede all to the *authority* of the mass of modern copies, got out, perhaps, as trade speculations by mere booksellers.

* Few in themselves, but still more numerous, as well as more ancient, than the MSS. of other works of antiquity.

The true principle is surely that of adherence to the ancient copies, irrespective of modern readings, and it is to this that New Testament criticism has now arrived. # Bentley laid it down, and proposed to edit a text thus arranged.

It is worthy of observation, how early this principle was admitted, with regard to the Septuagint Greek version of the Old Testament. This book was first printed from the later MSS., but from the time that Pope Sixtus V. caused it to be published, in 1586, mostly

following the text of the Vatican MS., this Roman edition was tacitly admitted as the received text, and thus this Greek version has, from that time, been read in a text of the *fourth* century, while, as to the Greek Testament, we have followed the readings of *the fifteenth*.

The first who acted on it fully was my late friend, Dr. Lachmann, of Berlin: he published the text of the New Testament, founded on ancient authorities, in 1831. It was accompanied by no preface, and in the explanatory note at the end, he so mentioned *oriental* authorities, as if he had used the term in a sense in which others had previously adopted it. As he only developed his principles in German, a language of which I then knew nothing, and as his text was accompanied by the authorities on which it rested, it is not surprising that it was some years before I understood his general plan.

Meanwhile, I was led to adopt critical principles in some respects very similar. I say this, not as claiming any merit on the ground of originality, but rather, as it may be satisfactory to some, to find that the same (or nearly the same) end has been reached through different paths of study. After the publication of Scholz's first volume, I gave it a pretty thorough examination, and I soon saw, even with the incorrectness and the omissions as to the authorities, that the ancient MSS. were in general a line of witnesses *against* his text. I went all through St. Matthew's Gospel, writing in the margin of a Greek Testament those well-supported readings which Scholz repudiated. This was of course wholly for my own use; but I saw that, as a general principle, the modern MSS. have no authority apart from ancient evidence, and that it is the ancient MSS. alone which show within what limits we have to look as to the real ancient text. A few years after, (in 1838,) I drew up a plan and specimen, the execution of which was the object which I kept before me, though possessed of but little leisure for the purpose.

In 1844, I published the book of Revelation in Greek and English; in this there was a Greek text, conformed as far as then appeared practicable to the ancient copies; the English translation of this volume has since been published separately, so closely following ancient authorities, that *not one word* rests on the modern MSS. This translation will show a mere English reader how far sound criticism will affect the sense of Scripture, and how far the text of the Greek Testament, which I hope to publish, will differ from that which is commonly used in *this* country.

I need not here go into minute details to show wherein I differ from Lachmann, Tischendorf, or others, as to the application of ancient materials, —it may suffice to say, that I rest exclusively on the authority of ancient MSS. and versions, using the important aid of early citations.

Most of the ancient MSS. I have found it needful to re-collate; this, together with the arrangements of the collected materials, has engaged me for years.

A list of the ancient Greek MSS. of the New Testament will give ample proof how the sacred writings have come down to us through this mode of transmission. In mentioning these MSS., I will divide them into two classes; 1st. The more ancient, written from the fourth to the seventh centuries; and 2nd, Those of the three next centuries. Some of these MSS. are but fragments, but that does not render them less important as witnesses to the transmission of the books, nor, in the parts which they contain, are they the less valuable in their evidence to the text.

The more ancient MSS., containing the *Gospels*, are—
The Codex Vaticanus, B, * at Rome.
The Codex Ephraemi, C, at Paris.
The Codex Alexandrianus, A, in the British Museum.
The Codex Bezae, D, at Cambridge.
Fragments of St. Matthew's Gospel, Z, at Dublin.
Fragments P and Q. at Wolfenbittel.
Fragments I, N, and Γ in the British Museum, Vienna and Rome.
Fragments of St. John's Gospel, T, in the Propaganda at Rome.

* Roman letters are used to designate the different MSS., simply for convenience of reference; their order bears no reference to the goodness or importance of the MSS. themselves. The *same letter* is used in *different* parts of the New Testament to designate *different* MSS.

Other ancient MSS. containing the Gospels, are—
E at Basle, F at Utrecht, G in the British Museum, H at Hamburg, K, L, and M, at Paris, S in the Vatican, U at Venice, V at Moscow X at Munich Δ at St Gallen; also the fragments O, R, W, Y, θ, and Λ.

The more ancient which contain the Acts are—
A, B, C, and D, mentioned before.
The Codex Laudianus, E, at Oxford

The other ancient MSS., containing this book, are—

The Codex Passionei, G, in the Augustine Monastery, at Rome.

H at Modena, and the ancient fragments F at Paris.

Of these MSS. A, B, and C contain also the Catholic Epistles, which are also in K, a Moscow MS.

The more ancient MSS. of St. Paul's Epistles, are—
A, B, and C, as before,
The Codex Claramontanus, D, at Paris,
Fragments H, at Paris.
Also of a later date, F at Cambridge, and G at Dresden; E, a copy of D, at St. Petersburg, J at Rome (the MS. marked G in the Acts), and K at Moscow.

In the book of Revelation there are but three ancient MSS., —A and C, mentioned before, and the Codex Basilianus, B, now in the Vatican at Rome. #

[Of these MSS., the text has been published of A, C, and D (of the Gospels and Acts), the fragments I, N, Γ, P, Q, T, Z, Θ, Δ, and the MSS. L, Δ: —of E and, the fragments F of the Acts: —of G, of St. Paul's Epistles, and the fragments H: —and of B of the Apocalypse: —the *readings* of F of the Gospels, and of one or two fragments have also been published; these, therefore, I have been able to collate in the printed editions: —all the others I have collated (at Paris, Rome, London, Basle, Munich, Modena, Venice, Cambridge, and Hamburg), except the

three MSS. in Russia (the readings of which I take from others); S in the Vatican, and B, THE Codex Vaticanus, the most ancient and important of all, from the use of which, alas! critics are excluded: all that I can do as to this MS. is to use the three imperfect collations as far as they go, unless, indeed, Cardinal Mai's edition of this MS., printed but long withheld from the public, should be published in time.

Besides these ancient MSS., I collated one at Paris (33), containing all the New Testament, except the Apocalypse; and the Gospels in one at Basle (1). These, though more modern, are important witnesses to the most ancient text. As to all the MSS., I have uniformly compared the compilations made by others, as well as examining for myself.]

For the Herald of the Future Age.

Proposition Stated and Proved.

LOOKING FOR THE MESSIAH FROM HEAVEN IS A CONDITION OF SALVATION.

Brother Thomas: —If the proposition at the head of this article be true, what must be the condition of those who, so far from believing in the Messiah's Second Advent denounce it as an "unprofitable" or "useless" speculation? Are they not *hopeless*? May God save me from their destiny!

But let us see if we can sustain our proposition by the Scriptures.

Paul, in his letter to the Hebrews, chapter ix. 28, observes that "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; *and to them THAT LOOK FOR HIM he will appear the SECOND TIME, without a sin-offering, in order to salvation.*"

From this quotation we learn,

- 1st. That Messiah was once offered as a sin-offering for the sins of many;
- 2d. That he will appear the second time, but not as a sin-offering;
- 3rd. That the salvation of those who are looking for him will be one object of his coming; and,
- 4th. That NONE but those who look for him will be saved.

Now, if none but those who are found looking, for the Messiah are to be the subjects of this salvation, how few will be saved! The hope of the whole protestant world will be wrecked! Their prospects forever blasted! Let me not be misunderstood; this looking for the Messiah is not the only condition of salvation. Looking for Messiah from heaven, if available to salvation, must be predicated upon a possession of the "Hope of Israel;" for, without this hope, there can be no rational expectation of Messiah's Second Advent. Those, therefore, who make the Second Advent of Jesus their central idea, err egregiously in not "making themselves ready."

"Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, *when he (the Messiah) shall appear, we shall be like him*; for we shall see him as he is. AND EVERY ONE THAT HATH THIS HOPE IN HIM PURIFIETH HIMSELF, even as he (Christ) is pure." 1 John iii. 2, 3. Who are those that shall "see God?" The PURE in heart! Who are those that *purify* themselves? "*Every one that hath this hope—*

the hope of the glorious appearing of Jesus and his Kingdom—in *him*, purifieth himself, or makes himself ready for the marriage supper of the Lamb." Of course, those who deny the doctrine of his "appearing," are not in possession of this hope, do not purify themselves by obeying the truth, and, therefore, will not be saved. "For they themselves show of us what manner of entrance we had to you, and how ye turned to God from idols, to serve the living and true God; *and to WAIT* (or to a waiting) *FOR HIS SON from heaven*, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus who delivered us from the wrath to come." 1 Thess. i, 9, 10.

Here we learn *from* what, and *to* what, these Thessalonians were turned. They were turned from "idols;" and secondly, they were turned to God—the living and true God—*and to A WAITING for his Son from heaven*. This *waiting* for Christ, then, was a cardinal principle in the apostolic proclamation; and upon its apprehension and practice, salvation was predicated.

Now, we can see the reason why the Apostles kept this doctrine so prominently before their hearers; for in all their addresses and epistles they never failed to give it its due weight and importance. They never told their hearers that they should gain kingdoms beyond the skies; they did not preach *ghosts* to heaven or hell at death. These vagaries never entered into their minds. These were the "useless speculations" of Hymeneus & Co., which the Apostles branded as a "damnable heresy!" Instead of alarming their hearers by preaching about "damned ghosts," or comforting them by preaching a *ghostly salvation*, or a translation to heaven on angels' wings at death, they proclaimed the second appearing of Jesus Christ from heaven, the establishment of an everlasting kingdom, and the subjugation of all authority to Israel's King. Immortality, glory, honor, power and majesty, in connection with this kingdom, was the reward offered for their acceptance. All was real, substantial and tangible. Animated by this hope, the ancient worthies, Apostles and Prophets were prepared to endure all things—to suffer all things, and to account all things but dross, if by any means they might attain unto the resurrection of the just. It prompted them to deeds of valor—of heroism—unequaled in the annals of the world!

The moderns, are void of this hope; they are without hope and without God in the world; hence they mind earthly things, are under the dominion of the carnal mind, sow to the flesh, and must reap corruption. This, Brother Thomas, is the destiny of those who are not animated by the "Hope of Israel." What, then, are we to think of those men who, while they profess to advocate ancient Christianity, are found denying the hope of the gospel, and substituting for it their own vain and useless dogmas? Truly did Jesus say, "In vain do you worship me, teaching for doctrine the commandments of men." But their systems will perish with *them* when the Lord comes. That will be the day of their damnation; they will then learn by their own sad catastrophe, that what is highly esteemed among men is an abomination in the sight of God.

Yours in hope of a kingdom that cannot be moved,
Richmond, Va.

JNO. T. WALSH.

REMARKS.

The writer of the above is known to several of our readers; and we wish we could add, "favorably known:" but that is impossible. Better for him that he had never been born than that he should occupy the position he does in relation to the truth. The last we heard concerning him was in 1856, when he was living in Kingston, Lenoir County, N. Car., and

cooperating with E. E. Orvis, G. Plattenburg, W. H. Hughart, and other hired preachers of Campbellism, which he renounced and denounced in 1854, being shortly after re-immersed; but into which, in a few years after he wrote the above, he lapsed again, as "a dog returned to his vomit, and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire." 2 Pet. ii. 22.

But we introduce him at this time not for criticism. His day for that is not yet come; nor will it till "the Great White Throne is set in the heaven." Before that he must appear and give an account of himself to God. This is the criticism to which he is reserved—to the examination of the Judge of the living and the dead; before whom he must answer for publicly confessing the truth, and afterwards, in word and works, denying it. The commendation and patronage of Alex. Campbell and his denomination will avail him nothing in that day. Their mutual flatteries may gild the present, but the end will be the ashes of Sodom and bitterness of mouth.

No; we resurrect him not for criticism, but for the sake of the article to which his name is appended. The truth is still the truth, though written by an apostate. The "Proposition" is true, and this son of Judas has proved it by the Word. It is, therefore, worthy of all reception by those who rejoice in truth for its own sake, without regard to the channel through which it flows. It was written in 1846 or 7, but has not been published till now. It had been stowed away among some long-forgotten manuscript for twelve years past; but on overhauling the pile, it turned up with all its painful reminiscences; and, though written for the "Herald of the Future Age," it will do equally well for the "Herald of the Kingdom and Age to Come."
EDITOR.

Mott Haven, N. Y., Dec. 8, 1859.

Will bro. J. M. Stone, of Henderson, copy that article in the "Apostolic Advocate," written by the present editor of another Campbellite periodical, on the conversation between Christ and the Sadducees, and forward it to us for publication? It is signed "A. B. Walthall," or by his initials; and it is perhaps in the third or fourth volume. He is another who sold the truth to the Dutch for the loaves and fishes. It is well to confound such out of their own mouths, that the unwary may be preserved from their influence, which is only evil, and that continually.

Mohammedan Agitation.

THAT there has been for some time past a considerable degree of agitation among the Mohammedans in all parts of the world where the religion of the Prophet has taken root is apparent to every one who has regarded with attention the nature of the events which have been taking place both in Asia and nearer Europe. There can be but little doubt that the mutiny and rebellion in this country, and the recent plot discovered in the Punjaub, were more or less connected with this unquiet spirit: we believe that we are destined to see more of it before tranquillity is restored. Meantime, anything that throws light on the subject should not be neglected, and at the same time the Government should be on its guard. The following letter will be read with interest:—"Some time since a disturbance took place in Lahore, occasioned by the supposed appearance of the Imam Mehndi. The whole affair seems to have been passed over rather lightly; but a few authentic particulars with regard to the advent of the Imam make the expectations of the Mussulman world respecting him of some importance. 1. I will first refer your readers to the *Friend of India* of June 16th of this year, and in page 554 of that number they will find an article headed, "A Native Leader on the Mutinies." This article contains the substance of several conversations held between one of the late leading rebels

and a European, and the evidence it affords is all the stronger for being undersigned. I quote the following passage from that evidence:—"The minds of the people are still very unsettled, and will remain so for five years, till 1280 Hijree, when *it is predicted there will be great changes.*" What changes? I endeavoured in vain to draw out any explicit information from Mussulmans on this point, until I asked a certain Munshi, "who the Imam Mehndi was?" He replied that "the Imam was lost at the age of four years, and was supposed by the Shiah to be concealed in a cave, whence he would in due time come forth, and first appear on the roof of the Caaba at Mecca. At the same time Christ would come and destroy Antichrist, who should appear as a vast beast, and melt away at Christ's presence. The Shiah believe that the Moolvies deny this. However, all are agreed that when the Imam shall appear there shall be but one Din on the earth." So far the Munshi said. Now turn to the preliminary discourse to Sale's Koran, and in Section IV. you will find the various events mentioned, which all Mussulman regard as the signs of the last day. Of these read No. 16—"The coming of the Mehndi, or director, concerning whom Mahomet prophesied that the world should not have an end till one of his own family should govern the Arabians . . . *who should fill the earth with righteousness.* This person the Shiites believe to be now alive, and concealed in some secret place until the time of his manifestation. For they suppose him to be no other than the last of the twelve Imams, named Mahomed Abu'lkasem, as their prophet was He was born at Termanrai in the 255th Hijree." The inference I would draw from this testimony and from late events is as follows:—1. The Mussulmans are looking for the advent of the Imam Mehndi. 2. They expect he will make their religion universal at his coming. 3. Notwithstanding late events, the Mussulmans of Lahore were violently agitated at a mere report of his appearance. What, then, if some impostor should rise in India or elsewhere and declare himself to be the Imam? The whole Mussulman world would rise as one man to receive him. Ought not Government, then, to put down any impostor at once, and with a strong hand?—*Delhi Gazette.*

Latest American Religious Novelty.

DR. BELLOWES, a leading Unitarian minister of New York, in delivering an address before the graduates at Harvard, in the chapel of the university, chose for his subject lately what he termed the "suspense of faith," or, in other words, the existing religious apathy so prevalent among all classes and creeds, but above all among the members of his own denomination. He declared the right of private judgment, the worship of intellect, to have been pushed to their extreme limits; that the result was, the mass of men were sick of their liberty, and longed for something to rest on, for some "authority" that would deliver them from the tyranny of their own doubts; that he believed the time was come for exalting the church organization, exalting the sacrament, binding marriage and baptism more closely to the altar, and substituting for the lifeless forms of worship and intellectual indifference of the mass of professing Unitarian Christians, a stirring ritual and a living creed. The discourse created immense excitement all over the country. Every one recognized the truth of the picture which the reverend gentleman drew of the actual condition of the religious world, but the nature of the remedy he proposed excited general astonishment and alarm. Great numbers saw in his proposed "broad church" an avowed desertion to Romanism or Swedenborgianism, and the press and the *salons* teemed with remonstrances, reproofs, ridicule, and encouragement accordingly.

A New Year's Salutation from Brethren in England.

To the called Saints in New York and throughout America, their brethren in Halifax, England, wish grace, mercy and peace, from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

Dear Brethren, we offered you our greeting at the opening of the last year. The favor with which that was received emboldens us to repeat the salutation in the spirit of true brotherhood. It is written: "Then those that feared Jehovah spake often one to another; and Jehovah hearkened and heard, and a book of remembrance was written before Him." For the prospect of being enrolled therein would we labor; hoping also that we may be written in your hearts and remembered in your prayers.

Dearly beloved, we wrote to you exhorting to zeal because of the excellence of the hope, and because of the speedy appearing of our Lord. We knew not that that very New Year's day would witness the Prophetic Word made more sure. But as the meteor-flash has the second stage of the in-bringing of the great day of God Almighty come and passed, and the mutterings of the last storm are now distinct. The warning voice is ringing, "Behold, I come as a thief;" shall we not then watch, and keep clean our garments?

Desiring that we may all unitedly "hasten the coming of the day of God," we reiterate the exhortation to earnest effort in setting forth the Truth. We know that without the warmth of love which seeketh not its own—without that ardent desire to spend and be spent for Christ—there is small prospect of fruitful Christian graces. Brotherly love is a propaganda element reacting upon its source in increased love to God, and consequently inciting to a more careful endeavor to keep his commandments. "This we desire—your *perfection*," and, therefore, are always pleased to see any display of that zealous, engrossing love which energized Jesus and his apostles. "He who dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him."

The experience of our own and other churches during the year has added to the proof that the cold and indifferent to the service of God are ready to fall into the snare of the devil; and that a warm, loving faith, and zealous attention to the feeding the flame of love, by prayer, scripture study, diligent attendance at the Lord's table, and the society of the Brethren, are needful to ensure moral purity and perseverance. Can we lay too much stress upon this matter? We think not. We know the painful result of "*taking cold*" in its entailment of disease; let us all then be careful of our spiritual health, and take for our mental diet that which will give us the best nourishment, even the Word of God.

An examination of our Calling will show us that we are beset with duties, and have labors to perform which can only be accomplished with strength from God. We are commanded to "be strong in the Lord; and the power of his might;" this strength can only be obtained in its appointed way. Let us then be diligent in taking God's tonic. Especially let us examine our engagements, so that we may do our utmost to fulfil them, and not be condemned as unprofitable servants.

Being as we are CANDIDATES FOR IMMORTALITY, shall we not do our endeavor to walk worthy of our high calling? Hoping to reap eternal life by the Spirit of God, shall we not diligently sow to the Spirit in holiness of life and conversation? Alas, that so many who have enrolled themselves on the lists, should be careless of the duties of their covenant! Oh, dearly beloved, let us all, remembering that we have entered into a *life for life* covenant with God, the service of this life for the riches of life eternal, do our duty strenuously; for can we

expect Jehovah to reward us for unfaithfulness? One duty there is, which is, alas, too much neglected, yet it is a most important one, being the test of our desire for the society of God and His Christ, —the thermometer of the love we have. Paul's connection of wilful sin with the neglect of "*assembling ourselves together,*" is no chance grouping, but a logical sequence of dangers. Brethren, let us all be more punctual in our observance of the Christian Passover.

We are now serving our APPRENTICESHIP TO THE KINGDOM; or, in the words of Paul, are "co-workers to the Kingdom of God." Whether an easy, quiet, careless service now is a fitting preparation for holding the iron sceptre of the heavenly dominion, judge ye. Christ's co-rulers will have to second him in the suppression of iniquity and in teaching the nations righteousness; what great need there is, therefore, for our constant vigilance against evil in and among ourselves, and for our glorifying God by pure and exemplary lives. With the Apostle we "pray that your (and our) *love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and all judgment; that ye may approve things which are excellent; that ye may be sincere and without offence till the day of Christ; being filled with the fruits of righteousness . . . to the glory and praise of God.*" If we have tasted the Power of the Age to come, let us be as we ought—"guides to the blind, lights to those who are in darkness, instructors of the unwise, having the form of knowledge and the truth in the law."

Already adopted SONS OF GOD, and expecting incorporation into the DIVINE NATURE and the Elohic rank, how ought we to be holy, how much ought we to display the sanctification of the Faith we have! Oh, brothers and sisters, because of this "*add to your faith virtue, to virtue knowledge, to knowledge temperance, to temperance patience, to patience godliness, to godliness brotherly kindness, to brotherly kindness love.*" God is Love; and if we would have the divine nature we must partake of that self-denying, sanctifying love which Jesus displayed as the embodiment of the Divine basis. Let us love one another to provoke to love and good works. Let us show our love to our fellow-men by teaching them the words of eternal life. Let us hate, also, but let it be sin, which we must "resist even to death." He is coming who bringeth salvation; let us strive earnestly to have ready "crowns of rejoicing for the day of Christ."

Kinsmen in Christ, we know not how soon he may come and proclaim the end of all things. Oh, then, let us be watchful. May we not be overtaken by that day unawares, but be found ready, vigilant sentinels in full marching order. Let the summons find us working and waiting; and we shall then enter with joy into the joy of our Lord.

Till then may our God and Father keep you all in His tenderest care, and grant to you every good thing which He sees will purify and strengthen. May we, unknown to each other in the flesh, have a joyful meeting before the face of our coming Brother, Jesus Christ.

Signed on behalf of the Church.
Jan. 1, 1860.

J. WILSON.

The Law.

"THE Moral Law is a transcript of the relationships necessarily subsisting between the Creator and his creatures; and between themselves in the several orders in which he has placed them. With respect to the remainder, it is but another unfolding of the same truth, which is inculcated by all nature and by all God's operations: namely, the possession of the Earth; alienation from that possession; and subsequent resumption of it. In this view, Moses

and his law comes in like a great parenthesis, not altering the sense of the narration, which is complete without it, but only expressing the one great truth in another and insulated form."