

**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 AGES.”—DANIEL.*

---

JOHN THOMAS, Editor. West Hoboken, Hudson Co., N.J., APRIL, 1861  
Volume 11—No. 4.

---

**“The Last Words of David.”**

THE above words compose a formula which is found in the English version, 2 Sam. xxiii. 1. Some of our readers will remember that we published a new translation of these "*Last Words*" in the *Herald* for February, 1855, under the caption of "*An Oracle of David*" which was suggested by the words neum *Dawid*. In that article we stated,

1. That 2 Sam. xxiii. is a register of David's thirty-seven heroes, over whom he was chief, and mightier than all;
2. That to this roll or register are prefixed "the Last Words of David;"
3. That the subject, or theme, of this document styled "the Last Words," is THE MIGHTIEST HERO of David's house, commonly called "*Christ*;"
4. That in this document, David affirms his own prophetic character;
5. That they were the last prophecy of the Spirit in David;
6. That they announced the ruling of mankind in righteousness by a JUST ONE of David's house; who should be pierced with a spear, but should nevertheless destroy his enemies as utterly as a thornbush consumed by the burning flame;
7. That these words were delivered at some time subsequently to a certain covenant confirmed to David—the covenant of his salvation—which in the oracle he styles *berith Olahm*, the Covenant of the Hidden Period, or Age to Come, commonly styled "*the Millennium*;"
8. That three distinct words, *Elohim*, YAHWEH, and *Ail*, in five different places are used in the original, which are incorrectly rendered in the Common Version by *Lord* and *God*; and that two of the three being in the singular, and one in the plural, they ought to be so translated for the benefit of the English readers and this we did partially in our translation by rendering *Elohim* by "gods," *Yahweh* by "Jehovah," and *Ail* by "Mighty One;"
9. That *Christ* is one and the chief of the future gods of Jacob, who will be all equal to the angels, and associated with them; which angels were gods to Israel, but not objects of worship, under the law; and that David refers to both these classes of *Elohim* in his oracle;
10. That *Yirath Elohim*, instead of "*fear of God*," in the vulgar sense, signified, *metonymically*, "the precepts of righteousness;" in this sense we rendered it, and showed its harmony with other texts.

Such were the principal points set forth in the article referred to. We did not elaborate them to the extent of which they were susceptible; but in passing along illustrated them so far as to make our new translation intelligible to the most ordinary capacity, as we thought, and that convincingly so. Six years have now elapsed since we published it; and if we had thought of it, we might have supposed that our readers had all forgotten that such a translation existed. But in this, we are happy to say, we should have been mistaken; our labor was still fresh, if not in the memory of our friends, at least in that of our adversaries, who are determined that the recollection of it shall not subside into oblivion; and that it shall be more extensively circulated than hitherto. For all of which we are exceedingly obliged; and as we have published other emendations of the Common Version that have nonplussed some of the best Hebraists, if they will republish these, our obligation will be increased. Nor will our indebtedness be diminished by their exercising all their craftiness, philological and theological, whereby they lie in wait to deceive; as this will only afford us an interesting opportunity (if they will be kind enough to send us a copy of their critical experiments) of contemplating their erudition, of criticizing their criticisms, of refuting their errors, and of amending our own; so that, having passed through the ordeal, our improved translations may be still more improved.

At the present time we are indebted to the modest champion of *Christianity from the historic Hebrew point of view*," yclept "THE ISRAELITE INDEED," the guileless Nathanael, as its editor would have his readers believe, and who may believe it who know him not as we do—to this same son of Abraham, who has such special distaste for the leeks and onions and steaming flesh-pots of the spiritual Egypt (Rev. xi. 8) we are indebted for the resuscitation of our translation of "the Oracle of David." He was in frequent personal communication with us for nearly two years after its publication, but in all that time, though in possession of it, (for we furnished him the *Herald* gratuitously, besides presenting him with a copy of *Elpis Israel*; yet, like our loving contemporary, the President of Bethany College, has he never, as the result of his impletion with "historic Hebrew Christianity," been guilty of the editorial courtesy of exchange,)—in all that two years he gave no sign that our translation was incorrect. But now, though an editor for nearly four years since he turned back in his heart to Egypt, if indeed it had ever left it, by a mere accident we learned that he was parading it before his readers with all the reprobation at his command. "Have you seen," said a friend, "the last number of *The Israelite Indeed*?" "No," said we; "we were not aware that the periodical was in life. But why?" "The editor is out upon your translation of "The Last Words of David," in terms having as little sweetness in them as you might expect." "Indeed! I should very much like to see it; for I am curious to know what he may have to say."

By this accident we came to be furnished with the number of *The Israelite Indeed*, now before us. The sight of it was not pleasant to the eyes; nor was it on inspection good for food; nor to be desired to make one wise. It revived in us all the unpleasant recollections of the past; and as we cannot contemplate "humbug" without exemplifying the Spirit's course in the case of the Laodiceans, (Rev. iii. 10,) we determined not only to cut up our reviewer's philology for the simples, but to make a whole burnt-offering of his Egyptian crotchet, misnamed "Hebrew Christianity from an historic point of view." Hence our previous article, and this in preparation.

1. "Nathanael" introduces his criticism under the head of "*The Latter Words of David*," and says, "We copy part of an article published in the "*Herald of the Kingdom*," Feb., 1855, in which the learned author, after having explained his peculiar views on the word

"Elohim," and given a critical investigation of the translation as found in our English Bible, gives his readers a translation of his own. We will give our readers that part of the article which we deem necessary to the understanding of the passage. We give it verbally, with the only exception, that wherever the word "Elohim" is translated *gods*, we shall omit this expression, so obnoxious to Jew and Christian, and to ourselves. Then we shall endeavor to show, that although the common version contains several mistakes, the new one contains many more."

Then follow four pages of our article, including the new translation of 2 Samuel, xxiii. 1-7. This extract being before his readers, "Nathanael" exclaims, "Mercy, mercy for the old Bible, and the people who read it for their instruction, should it ever happen to receive a new translation, in the manner in which the learned doctor gives a specimen in the foregoing article. All originality of that sacred record would soon be lost entirely, and the door wide open for every man to put any sense on the text to suit his views, even worse than it already is. Before we enter upon particulars, we are free to say, that the doctor is wrong in the outset *in viewing this passage as a Messianic oracle*, for which there is not the slightest ground. That proving too much is equal to proving nothing, is an established principle; and the extraction of Messianic evidences from Old Testament passages, the authors of which never intended to mean anything of the kind, has done more harm to Christianity, at least among the Jews, than Tom Paine's work ever did. 'How readest thou in the Scriptures?' said Jesus to a young man who inquired what he should do to have everlasting life. We must be able to find the truth as it is in Jesus, in Moses and the prophets, without pressing and modelling it like potters' clay."

We are unable to say whether the above was written by Mr. Lederer, or by some Laodicean Jew in his employ. If by Mr. L., we would remind him that he testifies that Dr. Thomas, the translator of the passage, "is the only one that teaches the truth in New York city." Of course, then, he who learned from him what he knows correctly, be that much or little, must not presume to set up his opinion in the matter. We tell him that we are *not* "wrong in the outset, in viewing this passage as a Messianic oracle;" and in opposition, we affirm, that there is ground for no other conclusion; and that our translation is not therefore "consequently erroneous." We will prove this by-and-by. In the meantime we exhort Mr. L. to that modesty and diffidence that become one in his unenviable position. He has got upon what the carnal Jews around him call "*the historic point of view*;" so that they can see little in Moses and the Prophets connected with the "Christianity" they call the true Judaism thereof, but history. They confess an historical Jesus, the New Testament reformer of Judaism; but in reading the older scriptures, he is veiled from their eyes. A Christian Jew, with these historicals, is one who assents that Jesus the Nazarene is the Messiah, although he may be as ignorant of the teaching of Jesus as a Mohammedan. Mr. Lederer is now lost among these; and prepared to publish any absurdity in his organ of Historical Hebrewism they may concoct for his insertion, as the number before us plainly shows.

But if it be not Mr. Lederer, but a Hebrew minister of the Laodicean Apostasy who is the writer, we need only remind our readers of the fact to satisfy them that the opinion of such a "divine" upon "the last words of David," or of any other prophet of the old time, is infinitely less worthy of respect than Mr. Lederer's. Their eyes are dazzled with the historic glory of Moses, which as a veil prevents them from looking to the prophetic end of that which is abolished. "Their minds are blinded; for until this day remaineth the same veil untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament; which veil is done away in Christ"—2 Cor. iii. 7, 13, 14. It is these, to whom "blindness hath happened UNTIL *the fullness of the Gentiles be come in*,"

who presume to affirm, that there is not the slightest ground for viewing David's last words as a Messianic oracle. The simple fact, that an opinion upon any passage of Old Testament prophecy was the conception of a Jew, rabbinical, Romish, or Protestant, would be a strong argument against its correctness with all intelligent Christians. In Paul's time there was "*a remnant of Jews according, to the election of grace.*" These were known by their believing "the things of the kingdom of the Deity and the name of Jesus Anointed;" by their being immersed; and by their walking in the light of the gospel, or "patiently continuing in well-doing," which Mr. Lederer is not. There are a few such Jews even now. We know only one such, however. If there be fifty in this generation, and we very much doubt it, they constitute "the remnant according to the election of grace." "The election hath obtained what it seeketh for; and THE REST WERE BLINDED." This "rest" is a motley crew, whose principles and tenets are like Joseph's coat—of many colors. They are historical and infidels, and, with the exception named, impervious to "the things of the Spirit of God," "who hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear. This has come upon them in judgment for their iniquity, according to the petition of David, who saith, "Let their table be made a snare, and a trap, and a stumbling-block, and a recompense unto them; let their eyes be darkened that they may not see, and bow down their back always."—Rom. xi. 5-10. Now the individuals of this blinded "rest" may be able to read, write, and speak Hebrew with the eloquence and learning of the Jew of Alexandria; nevertheless, their opinion of what is contained in the Hebrew of the prophets they translated is worth no more than the opinion of the blind in respect of color, or of the deaf of the melodies of sound.

2. It is amusing to read, from the pen of a sectarian Jew, that he omits the word *gods* as the representative of "*Elohim,*" because it is "so obnoxious to Jew and Christian!" Now, this is mere affectation of veneration for "the name of God," and sheer ignorance of the law. That it is not particularly obnoxious to Jews is evident from the fact, that seventy of them, in translating *kailohim*, in Gen. iii. 5, into Greek, at a time when all the world was worshipping *false gods*, rendered it by *ὡς θεοί, as gods*. They made a sort of compromise in this verse, where *Elohim* occurs twice, by rendering it in the first place *God*, and in the last, *gods*. The Masorites marked *Elohim* is a profane word; that is, that it does not mean God; accordingly, Onkelos renders it by *mighty men* in this place; but Messrs. de Sola, Lindenthal, and Raphall, all Jews of the synagogue, render it *God* in both instances.

As to *gods* being obnoxious to what Nathanael and his historicals call "Christian," the conceit is refuted by the fact, that the English Version was made by just such Christians, who, in an immense number of places, render *Elohim* by the word *gods*. But the truth is, that these historicals, who do not understand doctrine, are hampered by the old rabbinical superstition about pronouncing the sacred name. You cannot induce a superstitious Jew, be he *Rav* or *amhaaretz*, to utter the name *Yahweh*. It is like attempting to drive a pig along a single plank over a ditch, to get him to do it; when you have coaxed him to the edge, and think he is just about to step upon it, he dodges, and scampering off to an opposite point, squeaks out *Adonai*! It is the superstition, then, in a modified form. Like their predecessors, these historical Hebrewists strain out gnats and swallow camels. "They strain out "*gods*" from our translation, while Nathanael turns his back upon the truth; and embraces all sorts of baby-sprinklers who blaspheme "Yahweh" by pretending to baptize them in his name, as his "dear brethren and Christians." Thus he swallows a whole herd of unsightly camels for his temporal behoof!

But the idea of the word *gods* being obnoxious to Jews pretending to be Hebrew critics, is exceedingly ridiculous. The Eternal Spirit did not say to Moses at the Bush, "My name is God." Nor did Abraham know him by the name of *God*, but by *AIL-shaddai*. God or

gods are not Hebrew words; but words merely of a language that had no existence when the Spirit uttered oracles through the prophets and apostles. They are of that class of "words that man's wisdom teacheth;" and in which he does not condescend to speak—1 Cor. ii. 13. *God* is a contraction for *good*; and *gods* for *goods*, or good ones; and, etymologically, do not express the signification of *Ail*, *Elohim*, or *Eloah*. Conventionally, however, they serve a purpose. It is agreed that *God* refers to the original cause of all things; and that *gods* refers to angels, to the sons of the Eternal Spirit in the mortal state, and to rulers. It is true, that the sort of "Christians" Nathanael delights in use it synonymously also with *idols*, and the imaginary existences they are supposed to represent; and having these *idol-gods* in their heads more than the true ones, when they see the word *gods* in print, they become piously lack-adaisical, and strain it out with all the parade and fussiness of the hypocrites of old.

In our translation we used the word conventionally, and not as an exact representation of the idea contained in the word *Elohim*, or etymologically. We used it in the sense exhibited in Deut. x. 17, where YAHWEH *Elohim* is styled "God of gods, and Lord of lords;" in Psal. lxxxii. 1, 6, "God judgeth among the gods;" and "I said, Ye are gods;" in xcvi. 7, "Worship Him, all ye gods;" and in Dan. iv. 8, "In whom is the spirit of the holy gods." As a monosyllable, it expressed the idea of plurality, which we were anxious to express. We have no objection to render *Elohim* by "mighty ones," "powerful ones," or by any more appropriate word, provided that it combines the ideas of *plurality* and *power* which are radical in *Elohim*. But, in a criticism upon translation, we do object to the critics rejecting what they consider an obnoxious rendering, and, instead of giving a better, or one that is unexceptionable, restoring the Hebrew word without translation at all. They keep their readers in the dark about our "peculiar views on the word 'Elohim;'" and, ignoring all reason, magisterially pronounce the word *gods* "obnoxious to Jew and Christian, and to themselves," (who perhaps are neither the one nor the other!) and foist it into our translation untranslated.

3. But if we had concluded to transfer the word *Elohim* instead of translating it, we should not have done so in the bungling manner of the historicals of *The Israelite Indeed*. The word occurs three times in the Oracle; twice in the construct state, and once in the absolute. In the former, it is *elohai*, "gods of;" in the latter, *elohim*, "Gods." The critic has noticed this distinction of state; and as a critic he ought to have known that in transferring a word into English the state should be changed from the construct to the absolute. If he had transferred the phrases instead of a word of the phrases, he might have written ELOHAI *Yaakov* and ELOHAI *Yisraail*; but to write *Elohai of Jacob* and *Elohai of Israel*, indicates a weak point in the Hebrew grammar of Historical Christianity. "Elohai of Jacob" is the same as *Elohim of of Jacob*; and "Elohai of Israel," *Elohim of of Israel*; which are very unsightly formulae to come from a critic's pen. If he was determined to strain out the obnoxious *gods*, he ought to have been contented with *Elohim of Jacob* and *Elohim of Israel*; and not to have sputtered forth so many "of-ofs" like the hiccoughs of a man in his cups. In these points we do not think that Nathanael and his critical historicals have amended our translation in the least. If he does not do better than this, we shall begin to think that he is about as good a judge of translations as an acquaintance of ours, who, the other day, publicly disapproved of a translation we had made, though he did not know even the alphabet of any other than his mother tongue!

4. Having disposed of the critic's competency as a historical Hebrewist judicially blinded to pronounce upon Messianic evidences; and having found reason to question his grammatical infallibility, we proceed to quote his proof that the words of David all terminated, or were fulfilled, in himself, and that consequently we are altogether out of our reckoning. He says:

"In order to show that the premises of the learned doctor are entirely wrong, and that, consequently, his translation is erroneous, we will give a brief review of the passage and its context." In other words, our translation is not to be tried so much by Lexicon and grammar, as by Jewish theology "from the historic point of view." Well, let us see.

"The compiler of the books of Samuel introduces a piece of poetry, which David sang at the time when God had delivered him out of the hand of Saul *and other enemies*. All commentators agree, that David composed it *before he actually became king* over Israel, though he had been anointed to that high office long since, and that he spoke the last verse of the 22nd chapter *in the spirit of prophecy*: ' He is the tower of salvation for his king, (whom God had appointed king,) and showeth mercy to his anointed, unto David and his seed for ever more.'"

Let us look at this a little. The "piece of poetry" referred to occupies the whole of the twenty-second chapter, and stands among the Psalms as the eighteenth. But Nathanael is not without guile in stating the compiler's words. He has left out a very important little word, which, when supplied, indicates that he and all his commentators are wrong in supposing that David wrote it before he ascended the throne. This word is *kol*, "ALL," or every one. He composed the "song" in the day Yahweh delivered him out of the hand of ALL his enemies;" and surely it will not be denied that David had to contend with enemies after becoming actually king! Nathanael saw the force of this, no doubt, and therefore, to sustain "the historical point of view," had to substitute "and other enemies," for "all his enemies," presuming that we should never see the little piece of cunning craftiness; or if we did, that we should be so overpowered by the authority of "all commentators," that we should let it pass. The agreement of these commentators proves nothing. Nevertheless, we are not tenacious upon this point. For the sake of the argument, we will grant that David wrote it before he ascended the throne. It was, doubtless, written before or afterwards; we care not which. We look at the song itself, and do not hesitate to affirm that it was not fulfilled in David. Nathanael admits that "he spake *the last verse* in the spirit of prophecy;" and afterwards says, "that which he uttered prophetically—to be king according to Jehovah's word—was really fulfilled in him." But how this could be in view of the verse itself, would have puzzled his son Solomon to imagine; for it speaks not only of David, but of David's Seed *ad-olahm*, "during the Hidden Period," or Millennium. "If the historicals say this refers only to David's seed to the time of Zedekiah who was the last that sat on his throne, then the prophecy is falsified; for he withdrew his mercy from David's house many centuries before the Mosaic constitution was abolished by the Romans.

We grant that David's deliverance from all his enemies might be the *occasion* of the song being composed; but "David being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins according to the flesh (*'his seed'*) he would raise up the Christ to sit on his throne;" he seeing this before he spoke of the deliverance YAHWEH would grant to the King, His Anointed, then in his loins, (as Levi was in Abraham's, when, being there, he paid tithes to Melchizedec,) in the great day of Jacob's approaching trouble, out of which he is to be delivered. At this crisis David's Seed, the Messiah, will have to contend with enemies infinitely more powerful than any his father David ever fought. He will have to contend with a world in arms. But "Yahweh's Name, the tower of the deliverances of his king," will enable him to gain the victory, and to establish "peace over the earth" during the Olahm of a thousand years.

Nathanael, then, admits that this last verse is prophetic; and we have seen that, from the very terms of the prophecy, it could not be fulfilled in David. We might now adduce many arguments from the song itself to show that it remains yet an unfulfilled Messianic oracle. This, however, would occupy too much time and space just now. We have said enough on the point to put to silence the ignorance of the historical Hebrew Christianites; we shall therefore pause, and hear what more they have to say.

5. "After David had advanced in age," says Nathanael, "and saw that his trust in God's promises was not in vain; that that which he uttered prophetically—to be king according to Jehovah's word—was really fulfilled in him, he composed *another song*, in which he expresses his conviction that when he sang "He is the tower of salvation for his king," it was the Spirit of Jehovah which spake in him. The compiler introduces the latter (not "*the last*") words of David in the first verse of the 23rd chapter.

In this extract the writer admits that David was old when he wrote "the Last Words" of 2 Samuel, xxiii. But if he wrote the "piece of poetry" before he was king *de facto*, he wrote it when a young man; there would be therefore a long interval between the two, although in Samuel they are immediately consecutive. When speaking of these two compositions, then, the first might be styled "the former;" and the second, "the latter," as Nathanael's critic would prefer to have it.

But in this long interval between the two documents David composed many songs for Israel to sing in the temple worship. These are collected, with some by other hands, in the Book of Psalms, which have been declared to be MESSIANIC ORACLES by the highest authority; not by common consent of "all commentators," but by Jesus and his Apostles. "All things must be fulfilled," said he, "which are written concerning me in the Psalms." They are not, therefore, the mere histories and experiences of Israel, David, and others, as our Hebrew historical Christianites and Laodicean Gentiles imagine. A prophetic psalmody is above the grovelling conception of these historicals, who believe only what has been and what is, with an exception too inconsiderable for recognition. The last words extant were these of 2 Samuel, xxiii. 1-7; at least, we must accept them as such until later can be produced and proved.

But Nathanael objects to their being termed "*the last*." He would have them styled "*the latter*." He may style them which he pleases, for they are both; of the two documents in Samuel they are *the latter*; and of all David's songs, they are *the last*. The word *haha-charonim*, according to Gesenius, signifies both *latter* and *last*; and was rendered *οι ἔσχατοι*, *the last*, by seventy Jews, about 300 years before the birth of Jesus.

We have no objection to the assertion that when David said, "the Spirit of Yahweh spake by me," he had reference to the words, "His Name the tower of the deliverances of his king." No doubt he had; and not to these few words only, but to the whole song in ch. xxii.; and not to that only, but to all the Messianic oracles from his pen in the Book of Psalms. "The spirit in David" oracularized them all.

6. Having arrived at ch. xxiii., Nathanael remarks, "here the translation, as we have it in the common version, is nearly correct." He then proceeds to make it quite correct in his own imagination; so that when he has finished his patchwork, it may speak nothing but history!

"The word *neum*, here does not mean an *oracle*, but a *saying*; and the literal translation of this verse differs but slightly from that of the common version. It reads thus: "And these *are* the words of David, the latter;" (or the latter words of David, as the song in the foregoing chapter was his former words,) "The saying of David, son of Jesse, and the saying of the man."

In reply to this we remark, that *an oracle is a saying*. "Oracle" comes from the Latin *oraculum*, "a remarkable saying," which is from *oro*, "I speak." All the *sayings* of the Deity by his prophets are *oracles*; and therefore their writings are styled by Paul and Peter, "the oracles of the Deity"—1 Peter iv. 2; Romans iii. 2. "To the Jews were committed the Oracles of the Deity," says Paul; and "if any man speak," says Peter, "let him speak as the Oracles of the Deity." Inasmuch as the Spirit spake by David, as Nathanael admits, David's sayings were oracles, and divine oracles too. Now in the first three verses there are two different words in the Hebrew, which are rendered by the same word in the English. These are *neum*, which occurs twice, and *amar*, once; and in each instance translated "*said*." But alas for poor historical Nathanael, who would have his readers suppose that we were altogether wrong in translating *neum* by "oracle"! Hear what Gesenius, a greater Hebrew than Nathanael, says upon this word: "*declaration, revelation, oracle, of God; rarely spoken of men. Very frequently in the phrases, neum Yahweh, 'the oracle of Jehovah; so is it revealed from Jehovah; usually inserted in the words of the prophets themselves, as in English, saith Jehovah.*" It is rarely spoken of men, because men do not often speak by inspiration. But where they do, it is spoken of them. Illustrative of this, Gesenius refers to Numb. xxiv. 3, *neum Bilaam*, "the saying (oracle) of Balaam;" and to 2 Sam. xxiii. 1; and remarks, "in all these instances this genitive is to be taken passively, q. d., *a revelation to Balaam*, which he received by inspiration."

From these premises we may conclude that *neum* means nothing else than *an oracular saying of one inspired*, and that historical Nathanael is a very shallow critic. The word *amar* is not like *naam*; this is "to whisper oracles in the ear of a prophet," while *amar* is to speak forth words of any kind. We conclude, then, that *neum Dawid* is correctly rendered, as in our translation, *an oracle of David*, in the sense of a revelation to David, which he received by inspiration. This is proved by authority which Nathanael, presumptuous as he is, will not venture to dispute, as well as by scripture. "The learned doctor," then, as he sarcastically styles us, is not "wrong in the outset in viewing this passage as a Messianic oracle." The wrong is entirely on Nathanael's side, who is convicted of total misunderstanding of the whole matter. The Hebrew text declares "the last words" to be a prophecy, in styling them *neum Dawid*; which Nathanael, in consequence of "his eyes being darkened that he may not see," has completely mistaken for a poetical fragment of history!

But we perceive his grammar again at fault in the words, "the saying of the man who was raised up." He has inserted "of " as a word not in the original. He does not therefore perceive that *neum* is in the construct state, and signifies *oracle of*. It only occurs once in the state absolute, and that not here. To insert *of* is therefore unnecessary and superfluous, and equivalent to the form "the saying *of of* the man," a stuttering enunciation after the old sort.

7. He proceeds, "The saying of David, son of Jesse, and the saying of the man who was raised up on high, (exalted to the throne,) the anointed of the God of Jacob, and the pleasant *author* of the songs of Israel."

Presuming that the reader will take it for granted that this is all right, he goes on to say, "By this the reader will perceive, that king James' translators were correct in ascribing this verse to the compiler of the books of Samuel, and not to David himself." This amounts to nothing. The probability is that the compilation was made by the king's scribe, under his supervision, which was equivalent to David doing it himself. He goes on to say, "and that they gave a correct account of the word "ol" in translating in "on high:" and that the only mistake, if it can be called a mistake at all, is the word *now* instead of *and*, and *psalmist* instead of *psalms*."

"The doctor, however, against all grammatical rules, translates the '*gever*,' a man, 'a mighty man,' and *ol*, 'concerning,' and connecting it with the 'anointed of the God of Jacob,' *in spite of the semicolon on it*, which distinctly connects it with the foregoing word, 'huckam,' 'raised up.' "

In this portion of Nathanael's criticism we have a flourish about "grammatical rules," which our readers by this time will be able to appreciate at its proper value. Our first alleged violation of these rules is in translating *haggever*, by "the mighty man" instead of by "a man." Is this a violation indeed, or is the allegation another blunder of the guileless Nathanael, perpetrated in his excessive zeal for "the historical point of view?" Let us see.

*Gever* is a noun masculine derived from the root *gavar*, "to be or become strong, powerful, mighty." It certainly means *a man*; but a man because of his strength, power, might; an idea not contained in the English word *man*, who is naturally weak. The word *ish*, also signifies *a man* as opposed to a female; but without the idea of power or might: *adam* also means *a man*, or human being, male or female; but neither is the idea of power or might in this root. Now, why did the writer, whether David or David's scribe, use *gever* in preference to *ish* or *adam*? The answer is, because while *gever* signifies a man and not a woman, it also signifies "*a warlike man, a soldier, a warrior*," as any one may see by consulting Parkhurst, Gesenius, Davidson, and so forth. We have, therefore, not violated any rule in translating *gever* by "mighty man," in the sense of a military man of distinguished heroism and success in war. The seventy Jews, who translated the passage for Ptolemy Philadelphus, represent the word in Greek by *άνής*, which Homer mostly uses of princes, leaders, etc.; "*άνής*, alone, (as it is in the Septuagint Version,) always means a man in the prime of life (when strong) especially *a warrior*"—Liddel. Here then are seventy Jews against the historical Nathanael, who, in translating *gever* by *άνής*, and not by *αθηωπος*, tell him that he has failed to grasp the true import of the word.

The next offence with which we are charged is, in effect, with not treating the inventions of men with respect. He says that we are wrong in translating "ol" by *concerning*, instead of "on high," as in the common version; and that our error is in consequence of paying no attention to *zakaiph katon*, or the semicolon over the word, which shows that it does not belong to the following word *m'shiach*, anointed" with which we have construed it; but to *hakkam*, "raised up," which immediately precedes it. If the punctuation of the Hebrew text were of the same authority as the text itself, we should have to acknowledge that Nathanael was right for this time at least. But it so happens that his "*semicolon*" had no existence in the time of David and "the compiler;" and that it is a mere invention of a much later date. The ancient manuscripts of the Hebrew (and this is true also of the Greek) are not only unpunctuated, but not divided as to their words, by the intervention of any space. Hence the meaning of the original is not determinate by "semicolons," or any other points whatever, but by the *norma loquendi* peculiar to the tongue.

We affirm, then, that those who imposed the punctuation upon the text, erred in placing a semicolon over ׁל. Gesenius has misled Nathanael in this, if he has consulted him. He treats it as an adverb, instead of a preposition, upon no other ground than the punctuation of the Masorites; and translates *hakkam ol*, "who was highly exalted." In translating the Hebrew we have to do with words, not with commentaries upon words; and the punctuation, however useful in its way, is only expressive of the opinions of its inventors, who were as ignorant of the true meaning of the text, as any of "the rest who were blinded" until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. We affirm, therefore in opposition to Gesenius, to say nothing of Nathanael in his presence, that ׁל is a preposition in construction with *m'shiach*; and that it was so regarded 300 years before the birth of Jesus, which was anterior to the invention of semicolons. Seventy Jews at that time pronounced it to be a preposition, and paid no regard to semicolonism; but rendered *al m'shiach*, by *επι χριστον*. The ׁל then is *επι* upon the authority of the Septuagint. Satisfied that this is correct, we consult Gesenius upon the word as a preposition, and he informs us, under letter "e" of the second class of uses of the word, that "it marks the *object* of discourse," and then gives *concerning* as one of its meanings, as *yada al*, "to know *concerning* anything"—Job xxxvii. 16. Our translation then, "*concerning an Anointed One*," we hold to be the correct reading of the passage; and clearly teaches, that David's saying did not terminate in himself; but is an oracle of which Messiah is the subject or theme.

But in converting David's oracle into a fragment of history, Nathanael assumes that David is the Messiah, "or anointed one of the God of Jacob;" and that, consequently, he is "the pleasant of the songs of Israel." But we have shown that though David had been anointed by Samuel, he was not the anointed one of the text before us; but that he uttered an oracle concerning him. This being so the noun to be supplied after "pleasant" is not *author*, but a word in agreement with the anointed about whom the Spirit discoursed to him. Hence, *subject* or *theme* is the proper word to be italicised after "pleasant."

The anointed one of the text was not David; but "an anointed one of the *Elohim* of Jacob." To keep this dark is one reason why the historicals either leave *Elohim* untranslated, or render it by *God*, which is a false substitute for the word. *One anointed of God* might be twisted to fit David; but "an anointed one of the gods," would be unsuitable to him. "*I, Yahweh, am the Elohim of Jacob.*" This is a proposition the historicals cannot comprehend. "The pleasant *theme* of the songs of Israel" is one of these *Elohim*; and concerning this anointed one the Rock of Israel discoursed to him; or, as the Septuagint has it, "*the Protector of Israel spoke to me a PARABLE*," which is certainly anything but history.

8. Nathanael goes on to say, "The saying of David commences with verse 2. 'The Spirit of Jehovah spake within me; and his words *were* upon my tongue.' David acknowledges here, that when he sang many years previously, 'he is the tower of salvation for his king,' he was moved by the Spirit of Jehovah; that he then uttered a prophecy, *the fulfilment of which had soon after taken place.*"

We have shown sufficiently already that this is mere twaddle, and shall not, therefore, multiply words,

9. Nathanael proceeds: "verse 3. 'The God of Israel said to me, spake the Rock of Israel, the just (or righteous) *shall be* ruler over men, the fear of God *shall be* ruler.' Here again we find the common version in the nearest possible harmony with the original; while

that new translation contains words entirely strange to the original, as, "there shall be," and "righteous precepts," are nowhere in the text."

We admit that "*there shall be*" is not in the text; but why he should object to this supplement while he supplies "*shall be*" twice, is not easy to tell, unless we suppose that it is for the sake of objecting. We contend, however, that it is a very proper supplement. The Rock of Israel declared a thing to David, and it was this in literal terms—"Ruling over mankind a just one, ruling the fear of mighty ones" (*Elohim*, "gods.") When? At some future time. Then "*there shall be*" is a very proper supplement.

But he says that "*righteous precepts*" are nowhere in the text. This is another blunder of Nathanael's. The word in the text is *yirath* in the construct state. By turning to Gesenius under the word, No. 3, he will find "reverence, holy fear;" and the phrase in the text quoted. He will also find that, "*metonymically*," it signifies "precepts of piety, precepts of religion," which are synonymous with *righteous precepts*. The Septuagint renders *yirath Elohim* by *φοβον χριστου*, *fear of Christ*. Poor Nathanael! The seventy Jews understood the parable as relating to the Messiah; they had no idea of its being a history manifested in David. They regarded "*Elohim*" here as THE CHRIST MANIFESTATION, and therefore rendered *Elohim* by *Christos*; and as *Elohim* is plural, they would regard the Christ, not as a manifestation of one person only, but of a body of persons—a plurality constituting the "*One Body*" of which "the Seed of David" would be head or Chief. They styled this Elohistic Body "Christ," or anointed, doubtless because they regarded it as a manifestation of the Anointing Spirit—an anointing of the "One Spirit" manifested in a great multitude of *Elohim* which no man can number—Rev. vii. 9. When there is a "Just One ruling the fear of Mighty Ones" over mankind, the nations will be ruled in righteousness; for the Elohistic Ones are the righteous; and their "fear"—*yira*—the revered and preceptive righteousness of the ruling; in other words, "the law gone forth from Zion, and the word from Jerusalem," in the day of their ruling there—Isaiah ii. 3; Mic. iv. 2. The Just One, who is their Chief, will rule in *the precepts of this law of Zion*, which collectively make up "the fear." The phrase "*ruling the fear of Elohim*" signifies, enforcing and causing to be respected the precepts of Mighty Ones; and as these are righteous as well as powerful in their day, their precepts are "*righteous precepts*." These are "the fear" metonymically contained in "*yirath*;" which, of course, Nathanael's mind, being blinded by his historical crotchet, is too dark to perceive and comprehend.

10. Having, then, disposed of this blunder, let us listen again to Nathanael. "David then describes the condition of the country where the just rule in the fear of God: '*It shall be as the morning light, the shining sun; a morning without clouds, as grass springeth forth from the earth by the rays (of the sun) after a rain.*' The common version has the phrase, '*he shall be*;' and the new translation has, '*he shall arise*;' both phrases cannot, without violation, be interpolated in the text."

Upon this we may remark, that *tzaddik*, is an adjective masculine singular, and agrees with a noun substantive masculine singular understood. It signifies 1. "*Just, equitable* in the administration of justice;" 2. "*Just, righteous* in character and general conduct." The phrase "the country where *the just rule*" indicates that Nathanael reads *tzaddik* in the plural, as, "*just ones they rule*;" as if the word were *tzaddikim*. He does this in order to get quit of the idea of an individual just ruler, or Christ, from the text. But every effort he makes only reveals his cunning craftiness more distinctly. The adjective *tzaddik* must be added to a masculine singular, such as *man, one, or person*, to complete the sense. *Tzaddik moshail* is "a just man

ruling," "a just one ruling," or " a just person ruling," and nothing else; and is the proper antecedent to the fourth verse.

It is evident, therefore, that the words to be supplied are not "*it shall be*" as Nathanael has it. The supplement of the common version, "*he shall be*," is far preferable. For it is a masculine person, and not a mere thing, or neuter, that is the theme. In fact, the Hebrew has no neuter gender; and therefore, grammatically, or strictly literally, the supplement should be "*he shall be*" or "*she shall be*," not "*it*." It is rather strange, however, that Nathanael will admit "*shall be*" at all; for that is prophecy. Reading it from "the historic point of view," he should have interpolated "*are*," "*is*" and "*it is*:" as "the *just are* ruler over men, the fear of God *is* ruler;" and *it is* as the morning light, the country over which they rule! The supplied words in the third verse of our translation are "*there shall be*;" but "*he shall arise*" is no supplement at all in the fourth, as Nathanael erroneously imagines.

"As brightness of morning *yizrach-shamesh*, he shall rise Sun; a morning without clouds," or an unclouded dawn. In this text, *yizrach* is the third person singular masculine future of *zarach*, "to rise as the sun." It is not, as Nathanael supposes, an adjective, or "*shining*;" but what we have stated; and therefore to be rendered, "he shall rise," or "*he shall arise*." There is neither "violation" nor "interpolation" in this, as he conceives. The Septuagint, also, has it *ανατειλαι ήλιος*. When He, the Sun of Righteousness, shall arise, his brightness will be as the brightness of an unclouded morning. He will be the Sun of that dawning day when all nations shall walk in the light of his glory.

"*A morning without clouds, as grass springeth forth from the earth by the rays after a rain*" is nonsense. Can any one imagine what sort of a country that is (and Nathanael says, that verse 4 is a description of the country where the righteous shall rule)—a country like a morning without clouds, as grass springing forth? What likeness is there between a country and a cloudless morning; or what between a cloudless morning and grass growing or not growing! May we not, with propriety, use Nathanael's exclamation in view of such a "translation," and say, "Mercy, mercy for the old Bible, and the people who read it for their instruction, should it ever happen to receive a new translation in the manner in which the learned historical Nathanael gives a specimen in the foregoing?!" He is evidently completely lost in the fog of the country he describes. The literal rendering is, "*a morning without clouds forth shining after rain, as tender grass-shoots out of the earth*." That which *shines forth minnogahh*, is the sun, which rises as morning brightness. He shines after the grass has been mown, and the rain has descended upon it, and the luxuriance of growth is the result. "He shall come down," saith David, "like rain upon the mown grass; as showers that water the earth:" for "in his days shall the righteous flourish; and abundance of peace as long as the moon." Psal. lxxii. 6, 7: "All flesh is grass; surely the people is grass." Isai. xl. 6, 7. Nathanael has been befogged by the words "grass," "earth," and "rain," which he imagines must mean country! Only knowing history, and that not too well, he cannot see that verse 4 is a prophetic comparison; or, as the Septuagint says, "*a parable*:" that it is illustrative of the Just One's ruling in the righteous precepts of the Mighty Ones, of whose glory He will shine forth as the Sun, or Day-Star of Zion's new heavens. Isai. lx. 20.

11. But, let us hear Nathanael again. "In the next, the fifth verse," saith he, "the common version is again far more correct and in harmony with the original, than the new translation. The words 'perfect,' 'ordained,' 'truly,' in the latter, are not in the text, and cannot fairly be brought into it. Both, however, agree in mistranslating the last sentence; namely, 'that it should not grow,' instead of which the common version has, 'although he make it not to

grow;' and the new translation, 'though he cause it not to spring forth;' either of these translations can be brought in harmony with the foregoing part of the verse."

Such is the opinion of Nathanael. He thinks the common version more correct; but, as we have hitherto proved him to be incorrect in every criticism he has ventured upon, his opinion can have no weight with any one in the premises. He has proved himself incompetent to detect or amend the errors of the old or new—to do any thing in fact but to bury himself head over in the mire of Hebrew Christianity from an historical point of view.

Nathanael has not favored his readers with a translation of verse 5. As he commends the common version, we may fairly regard it as his. He conveniently slips over it with a slight notice of the last sentence. The fact is that there are nuts upon the tree his rotten stumps cannot crack. His historical fangs are too carious and ulcerous to endure the pressure. They would crumble under the touch of "the covenant," and the "salvation" of which it treats. Nathanael is obliged, therefore, to content himself with saying, that certain words are not there; and then to vamoose into another locality as fast as may be.

He says that "*perfect*" is not in the text. That depends upon the pointing. The question is, Should the word in the text be read *kain*, as an adverb, or an adjective? If as an adverb, then *so, thus, after this manner*, would do; but if as an adjective, *upright, true, perfect, honest*, might be used correctly. The inventors of the points regarded it as an adverb, and so does the Septuagint; but it really is not important; for whether it be rendered *so, thus, or after this manner*, it amounts to the same. David said, "*my house not so with the Mighty One:*" not how? The answer is, Not as represented in the third and fourth verses. In these an upright, true, or perfect house is represented — a house of Elohim to which the Just One stands related, as David did to his house. The Elohistic house is perfect; "mine," said David, "*not so*"—is not perfect, which was the fact; and therefore did not rule, *yirath elohim*, in the righteous precepts delivered from Sinai through angels.

Again, he says, that "*ordained*" is not in the text. True, but *sam*, from *soom*, "to constitute, appoint, establish ordain" is there. Cannot Nathanael be right once if it be by accident only! Will the public expect us to regard him any more as a scholar and a critic? We think not; nevertheless, we will make a finish of him this time, before we dismiss him into the bottomless oblivion he so richly deserves.

Thirdly, then, he says "truly" is not in the text. We reply, however, that *ki*, is there; and that among the meanings, Gesenius gives "for surely, for certainly, for indeed, *but truly*," and so forth. Any of these phrases will do. They express the firm conviction of the speaker that there was no other salvation for him than that set forth in the covenant of the Olahm ordained for him.

Lastly, "*though it should not grow*" is Nathanael's proposed amendment. "*It should grow*" is his translation of *yatzmiach*. But we object to this, that it is not in the right conjugation, which is *hiphil*, future, third person singular, masculine. The *hiphil* signification is active, and expresses *causation*; "he shall cause to" do this or that. The verb before us signifies "to cause to spring up, make to grow." Hence, *he shall cause to spring up* is the correct translation of the word. But in the text it is modified by the particles *ki-lo*, "though not." The sentence, therefore, reads correctly, "*though he shall not cause to spring up.*" Who shall not cause? "THE MIGHTY ONE." Not cause what to spring up? "The Covenant of the Hidden Period, all my salvation and delight," says David. Nathanael's "though it should not

grow" is doctrinally absurd. Would it have been rational for David to delight in that which should not grow, or come to pass? If he had thought this possible, the covenant would not have been all his salvation and delight. The intelligent believing mind delights not in the doubtful; but in that only which is certain and true.

12. One more effort, and then the historical Nathanael dies into oblivion. He adds the following by way of winding up his profound and scholarly criticisms! "The last two verses, the remainder of the passage under consideration, which the learned doctor endeavors to bring into connection with 'Michael, the Prince of princes,' and Gog, the last Assyrian power, is as plain as any passage of scripture can be. It reads thus: 'But the wicked *are* like thorns *to be* thrust away all of them, that are not taken with (bare) hands; and the man who touches them is filled with iron, and the wood (or shaft) of a spear, and when resting, burn like burning with fire."

This is darkness visible! If the reader can understand it, we confess that it is above, or beyond our comprehension. We are satisfied that Nathanael himself cannot grasp its meaning, and has a misgiving too, that it is above, or beyond, or beneath our comprehension. We are satisfied that Nathanael himself cannot grasp its meaning, and has a misgiving, too, that it is not self-interpreting. This appears by his haste to tell the reader what it means. "That means," he exclaims, "if a man touches thorns with his bare hand, it is filled with iron; it is as if he had worked with iron; or handled for a time a spear, and worked with it, when afterwards, resting from the labor, his hands burn like fire." Well, well, that is as clear as the Laodicean mud in which wallows the historical Nathanael so congenially! It may be questioned which is the darker, the translation or the interpretation. But it matters not which, for they are both equally demonstrative that Nathanael is unquestionably one of that Israelitish "*rest*" whom God has judicially blinded until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in. Having darkened counsel by words without knowledge, he falls to moralizing, and concludes his critique in saying, that "the moral application is, that we shall have nothing to do with the Belial, who are not worthy to be touched; and if any one does associate with them, he will not remain unhurt, but shall feel like one who touches thorns with the bare hand, who consequently feels a burning in his hand." Miserable twaddle this! "In conclusion," he continues, "we will only remark, that this passage is in no connection whatever with the following roll of the heroes in the army of Israel under David, which has been correctly marked by the translators of King James; and that we agree with the most learned Hebrew commentators, who say that this 'latter words of David' are but a fragment of a whole poem, the greater part of which was lost; and therefore it ends so abruptly, without leaving any full sense of the intentions of the royal author." All of which is mere moonshine! It is no "fragment," but complete in itself; and plainly indicative of the theme.

In conclusion, we present the following translations by different hands, which the reader can compare with each other, and the original, and choose for himself that one which appears to him most in conformity with the Hebrew text interpreted in harmony with the testimony and the law.

#### DR. BOOTHROYD'S TRANSLATION AND NOTES.

1. "Now these, though later, are the words of David.  
Thus saith David, the son of Jesse;  
The man who was highly exalted saith:  
The anointed of the God of Jacob;

2. The pleasant psalmist of Israel.  
The Spirit of Jehovah speaketh by me,  
And his word is on my tongue.
3. The God of Israel hath said *to me*;  
To me the Rock of Israel hath promised,  
A just ruler over mankind,  
Who will rule in the fear of God.
4. As the morning light when the sun ariseth;  
A morning cloudless and resplendent;  
As the grass from the earth after rain; —
5. Is not my house thus with God!  
For with me he hath made an everlasting covenant,  
Wisely ordered in all points and sure.  
Truly *in this* is all my salvation;  
And mine every desire will he not accomplish?
6. But lawless men all of them,  
Are like thorns to be thrust away,  
(For they cannot be taken with the hand,
7. But the man who would cut them up  
Must have an axe and a spear shaft,)  
And to be burned, in the place with fire."

1. *Now these, though later.* —It is not improbable that this short prophetic ode might be the last which David wrote. 1 Kings ii.

2. *The pleasant psalmist.* — Literally, "pleasant in the psalms of Israel."

3. *A just ruler over.* —These words contain the substance of what God had promised; and they cannot be applied with propriety to Solomon. For how could he be said to be *a ruler over mankind*? The Just Ruler then must signify the future Messiah, who sprang from David, and whose kingdom was to be universal.

6. *But lawless men.* —Is there not here a reference, not only to the punishment of the wicked in general, but to the lawless, wicked Israelites, who, when the *Just King* should come, would not submit to his law?

#### THOMPSON'S TRANSLATION OF THE SEPTUAGINT VERSION OF THE HEBREW.

1. "Now these *were* the last words *of* David.  
Faithful *is* David the son of Jesse;  
And faithful the man whom the Lord hath set  
Over the anointed of the God of Jacob.  
And sweet *are* the psalms of Israel.
2. The Spirit of the Lord hath spoken by me,  
And his word was upon my tongue.
3. The God of Israel saith to me,  
A watchman of Israel hath spoken a proverb.  
I said *as* a man,  
*David.* How can you strengthen the fear *of* an Anointed?
4. *Prophet.* With the light of the God of the morning.

- David.* Let the sun rise in the morning betimes.  
*Prophet.* Is not the Lord gone forth with splendor?  
*David.* Yes, like the spring of grass on the earth after rain;
5. For *is* not my house thus with the Almighty?  
 For he hath made with me an everlasting covenant,  
 Kept ready for every occasion;  
 Because *this is* all my safety, and all my desire,
  6. That the transgressor may not flourish.  
*Prophet.* All such *are* like rejected thorns  
 Because they cannot be handled,
  7. Nor can a man labor among them:  
 Therefore pure iron, and the staff of a spear,  
 Shall cause *them* to burn with fire,  
 And they shall burn to their shame."
- 

The punctuation of the Greek differs from that of the Hebrew; and in both cases has been departed from by Dr. Boothroyd and Thompson. It is evident that the sense of the passage has to be found as readers obtained it before the punctuation was applied. This we have endeavored to do, and the following is the result.

\* \* \* \*

#### TRANSLATION OF THE SEPTUAGINT VERSION.

BY THE EDITOR.

1. "And these the words of David *are* the last.  
 David son of Jesse believed,  
 Even the man believed whom the Lord exalted,  
 Concerning an anointed of Jacob's God,  
 And *the theme of* beautiful songs of Israel.
  2. The Lord's Spirit spake by me,  
 And his word *was* upon my tongue;
  3. The God of Israel said;  
 The Protector of Israel spoke a parable to me:  
 I said, how may ye make strong in man the Anointed's fear,
  4. Even in the light of God's morning!  
 Cause thou to arise a sun in the morning,  
 From the splendor of which the Lord appears,  
 Even as tender grass from the earth after rain.
  5. For *shall* not my house *be* thus with the Mighty One!  
 Because he hath appointed for me the covenant of the cycle,  
 Prepared in every right proportion, having been secured:  
 Therefore *it is* all my salvation and all *my* desire,  
 Seeing that he hath not caused *it* to spring forth.
  6. The lawless one *is* like a prickly plant about to be thrust away;  
*Even* all these, because they shall not be taken by hand;
  7. And the man shall not wax weary among them;  
 Though filled with iron and the shaft of a spear,  
 Even he shall cause *them* to burn in fire,  
 And they shall be consumed in their shame."
-

HISTORICAL NATHANAEL'S ATTEMPT UPON THE HEBREW TEXT.

COMPILED FROM HIS CRITIQUE.

1. And these *are* the words of David the latter. The saying of David the son of Jesse, and the saying of the man who was raised up on high, the anointed of the God of Jacob, and the pleasant *author* of the songs of Israel.
2. The Spirit of Jehovah spake within me, and his words *were* upon my tongue.
3. The God of Israel said; to me spake the Rock of Israel, the just *shall be* ruler over men, the fear of God *shall be* ruler.
4. *It* (the country where they shall rule) *shall be* as the morning light, the shining sun; a morning without clouds, *as* grass *springeth forth* from the earth by the rays after rain.
5. Although my house *be* not so with God; yet he hath made with me an everlasting covenant, ordered in all *things* and sure; for *this is* all my salvation, and all *my* desire; that it should not grow.
6. But the wicked *are* like thorns *to be* thrust away all of them, that are not taken with *bare* hands;
7. And the man who touches them *is* filled with iron and the wood of a spear, and when resting, burn like burning with fire."

\* \* \*

5. *That it should not grow.* In this rendering he makes David say, that all his desire is that the covenant of his salvation might not grow, or be realized!

---

THE ROYAL ENGLISH VERSION.

1. Now these *be* the last words of David. David the son of Jesse said, and the man *who was* raised up on high, the anointed of the God of Jacob, and the sweet psalmist of Israel, said,
  2. The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and his word *was* in my tongue.
  3. The God of Israel said, the Rock of Israel spake to me, He that ruleth over men *must be* just, ruling in the fear of God.
  4. And *he shall be* as the light of the morning, *when* the sun riseth, *even* a morning without clouds; *as* the tender grass *springing* out of the earth by clear shining after rain.
  5. Although my house *be* not so with God; yet he hath made with me an everlasting covenant, ordered in all *things*, and sure; for *this is* all my salvation, and all *my* desire, although he make *it* not to grow.
  6. But *the sons* of Belial *shall be* all of them as thorns thrust away, because they cannot be taken with hands;
  7. But the man *that* shall touch them must be fenced with iron and the staff of a spear; and they shall be utterly burned with fire in the *same* place."
- 

TRANSLATION FROM THE HEBREW.

BY THE EDITOR.

1. Now these words of David *are* the last.  
An oracle of David son of Jesse,  
Even an oracle of the warrior *who* had been exalted,  
Concerning an anointed one (MESSIAH) of the MIGHTY ONES # of Jacob,  
And the delightful *theme* of Israel's songs.

2. HE WHO SHALL BE's \*\* Spirit spake by me,  
And his word *was* upon my tongue;
3. Israel's MIGHTY ONES \* said;  
Israel's Rock discoursed to me *saying*,  
*There shall be* ruling over mankind a Just One. (MESSIAH)  
Ruling in the righteous precepts of MIGHTY ONES; \*
4. And as brightness of morning he shall arise the sun;  
As a morning without clouds forth shining after rain,  
As grass shoots from the earth.
5. For shall not my house be thus with the MIGHTY ONE? +  
Because he hath ordained for me the covenant of the hidden period,  
Ordered in all and secured!  
*This is* truly all my salvation and all *my* delight,  
Although he shall not cause *it* to spring forth.
6. But the wicked *shall be* all of them as a thornbush caused to be thrust away;  
Though not with hand shall they take possession of *them*.
7. But the man shall smite upon them;  
He shall be filled with iron and the shaft of a spear;  
Yet with fire to burn, they shall be consumed in *their* habitation.

# ELOHIM, or “gods”—the saints

\*\* YAHWEH, or “Jehovah;” in English, “*He shall be.*”

\* ELOHIM, or messenger-gods; angels—a plural manifestation of spirit

+ AIL, the Invisible Deity.

### **On the Nature and Constitution of Man.**

(Concluded from page 52.)

IN directing first our consideration to the so-called inorganic world, we see electricity manifested as producing combination and decomposition of bodies, *i.e.*, motion. This might be called the simplest phenomenon of life. The same phenomenon recurs in all other bodies, diversified however in accordance to the peculiarity of structure in different kinds of bodies. Sometimes other phenomena appear, which seem to be of an entirely different character, yet they may be traced as depending upon this first and fundamental one. There is no well-defined line of demarcation between the several grand divisions of bodies, neither between the mineral and vegetable, nor between the vegetable and animal kingdom. The lichen, which entwines the stone, presents but little difference from the stone itself, and the sensitive *Dionoea muscipula*, or Venus' flytrap, which has the power to catch insects that light on it, and the coral, are fair specimens of connecting links between these kingdoms. The same observation we make also in regard to the different species of inorganic bodies and the organized, and even this distinction is merely an arbitrary one. There is not a single class or species that is entirely and in every respect distinct from all others in form and quality; but the one bears always a similarity to the class next above it in organization, as well as to the one next below, establishing in this manner an intermediate connecting link between the two classes. So the whole mass of bodies presents phenomena which, like to the steps of a scale, ascend by degrees from the simplest form appearing in the class of beings with the lowest organization, to that endowed with the highest. Man stands at the top of this scale, and is therefore fitted to hold sway over all that is inferior to him. Now the phenomena of life are

modified *pari passu*, and exactly in accordance with the degree of organization of the respective being. The black charcoal presents phenomena very different from those of the brilliant diamond. Does the difference depend on a difference in the nature of the two bodies? No, but it depends upon their texture and organization, the one being an amorphous powder, and the other a beautiful crystal, formed under peculiar circumstances from the same element—carbon. Common phosphorus resembles white wax in appearance and consistency, and is readily oxidizable, but after having been heated to a temperature of 482°, it changes into a body of a scarlet or carmine color, which does not alter in the air. Here the change in the temperature and electric condition has arranged the atoms of phosphorus in such a manner as to make it appear a new body, although nothing is added to or taken away from it. Based upon this analogy and numerous others, chemists suppose Chlorine, Bromine, and Iodine, which are derived from a common source, to be really one and the same substance in an allotropic condition.

The vegetable kingdom presents an abundance of analogous parts. The tall fir-tree, which in Virginia raises its towering top toward the sky, dwindles down to the dwarfish stature of seven inches in the arctic regions, where the scarcity of heat and the solar light prevent it from attaining its full growth. The Belladonna and cabbage plant stand side by side in the same garden bed, drawing their nourishment from the same soil, growing and flourishing under the influence of the same dew and sunshine. Here again it is the different organization of the two plants which explains it; why the one elaborates its juices to make it fit for wholesome food, while the other is a virulent poison.

In the animal kingdom there cannot be found a single exception to the general law, according to which vital phenomena or functions coincide with the organization of the respective creatures. In some of the infusorial animalcula, which consist of a simple membrane studded with cilia, and enclosing a central cavity, the functions of life during the ephemeral existence of the animal are limited to the process of endosmosis and exosmosis, and therefore of a mere vegetative character. With every additional organ given to a higher class of animals, that class acquires an additional function; every higher perfection of organ or organs develops a greater variety and perfection of functions. Some of the animal organs, as for instance the hair and membranes, resemble in their functions others from the vegetable kingdom, viz: absorption of fluid and gaseous substances. The contractility of the animal fibre finds its analogy in the elasticity of bodies from the organic and inorganic world. The fluids which enter into the composition of animal bodies bear a striking resemblance to those of vegetables, and, like unto them, they are organized for the purpose that they are required to subserve, and are complicated in composition according to the variety of functions they perform. Sensibility and irritability have been supposed to be functions exclusively peculiar to animals; but comparative physiology has already pointed the analogy existing between them and certain classes of plants, which possess these properties in a degree surpassing even the lower order of animals. The higher order of animals, commencing with the radiates, are provided with an arrangement by which the different parts and organs of a body are connected and associated in a peculiar and perfect manner, so as to perform their functions quickly and harmoniously with each other. This is the nervous system. Its organization is more delicate, and its relation to the universal vivifying agent, electricity, more intimate, than that of any other organ or tissue. So delicate is its structure, that by means of it an impression is effected upon the living organism with substances which from their inappreciable minuteness have eluded all chemical and microscopic researches, as the vehicle of zymotic and exanthematous diseases. It is indeed more than probable, that attenuated homeopathic medicines owe their astonishing power, and quickness to affect the animal organism, to the circumstance that by

the art of trituration the latent electricity is set free and made to envelop every finely subdivided particle of medicine, whereby their polaric relation to the nervous tissue is increased a thousand-fold.

That electric currents travel through the nerves in a normal condition, has been demonstrated by careful and repeated experiments. If into the motor nerve of one of the muscles of the forearm a steel needle be introduced, and this be connected with an electrometer by means of a thin copper wire attached to the needle, the electrometer will give evidence of the passage of an electric current each time, when the muscle to which the said nerve is distributed contracts according to an effort of the will. Wilkinson instituted an experiment by severing the gastric portion of the tenth pair of cranial nerves while the stomach was in full activity. The digestive function ceased immediately; but as soon as the severed portion of the nerve was brought in contact with the pole of a galvanic battery and a current passed to the stomach, that organ resumed its action at once, gastric juice was again poured out, and digestion and absorption completed as quickly and perfectly as if the integrity of the nerve had not been interrupted at all. If the sympathetic nerve is divided in the neck of a rabbit, the temperature of that side of the head on which the operation was done will soon after rise considerably. As soon, however, as the current of a galvanic battery is applied to the severed end of the nerve, the temperature will begin to decrease again, and become even lower than on the opposite side, provided the current be sufficiently strong and continue for a longer period. The explanation of this remarkable fact is this: by means of the sympathetic nerve the muscular tissue of the middle coat of the artery is supplied with electric force, and kept in a condition of contraction. As soon as the nerve is severed, this stimulus ceases, and the arteries consequently relax. Unable to resist the impulse of the blood any longer, they dilute and receive a greater quantity of blood than they do in their normal condition the metamorphosis in the tissues is accelerated, and the temperature rises. If now the nerve is irritated by a galvanic current, i.e., if the electricity which pervaded the nerve in its normal condition is replaced by electricity from an artificial source, the arteries contract again, the quantity of blood circulating in them is diminished, and the temperature reduced to a normal standard. Electricity is transmitted through a nerve by conduction. The manner in which it is done differs however, in this respect, from the conduction of electricity through instruments of artificial contrivance, that the nerve substance takes an actual part in the process. The living nerve loses this property, when it is by any mechanical or chemical means injured, and then it conducts electricity only passively, like any other substance. Another peculiarity of the nerve substance is, that it conducts electricity slower than other substances do, so that its velocity becomes measurable

If a nerve-fibre—either of a nerve of sensation or motion—is irritated in any way, a material change is produced in the whole length of the nerve-fibre, which has been put into action, and sensation or motion will be the result. In sensation, for example, an impression is made by any irritation upon the periphery of a sensitive nerve, whereby a material change is produced in it, which is propagated through the whole length of the nerve-fibre to the nervous centre presiding over and receiving the insertion of the terminal end of that special nerve. The nervous centre is made to undergo the same material change as the nerve-fibre, and it is this change which is perceived as a sensation. In this manner a perfect connection is effected between the nervous centres of the animal organism on the one side, and the external world on the other, and *vice versa*.

In muscular motion the first impulse comes from the nervous centres, whence it is transmitted to the periphery of the motor nerves, and from thence to the muscle where

contraction is produced. Muscular contraction may also be produced by electricity from an artificial source. If a muscle is brought into contact with the wires of a galvanic battery, a contraction ensues in the same moment when the circle is formed. As long as the current continues in the same intensity, the muscle remains quiet, but if the circle is interrupted, a new contraction ensues. The same occurs also with every change in the strength of the current applied, if it be either increased or diminished. This proves that every change in the electrical tension of a muscle produces contraction. An irritation applied to a motor nerve in any part of its course to a muscle, results in contraction according to the same law as if the irritation be applied directly to muscle. Based upon this fact electrical apparatus have been constructed, by which the most complicated muscular motions are produced by artificial electric currents, as shown by Durhenne and others.

According to the observations of Matteuri and Du Bois Reymond, electric currents pass between the different parts of a muscle, and also between those of a nerve, if a conduction is established between them. Du Bois Reymond called the longitudinal surface of a muscle the natural longitudinal section, and the tendinous ends attached to the bone the natural transverse section. The plane obtained by cutting a muscle in a vertical direction to its fibres he called the artificial transverse section, and the plane obtained by cutting the muscle in the direction parallel with its fibres, the artificial longitudinal section. The same appellation he applied also to the nerves, with exception of the natural transverse section, which does not exist there. Du Bois Reymond discovered by his experiments, that the natural and artificial longitudinal section stands always in a positive relation to the natural and artificial transverse section. The centre of the natural and artificial transverse section holds a negative relation to all the distant parts of the muscle, while the centre of the natural and artificial longitudinal section holds a positive relation to all parts of the longitudinal section distant from this point. Between the two points, which are equally distant from the transverse and longitudinal section, there is no electric current. The presence of electric currents between the different parts of a muscle was demonstrated by Du Bois Reymond, not only in whole muscles, but also in smaller portions and even in a primitive fasciculus of a muscle. From these observations, it is evident that the muscular substance in its normal condition is always in a certain degree of electric tension. This obtains, however, only as long as the muscle is at rest. For it is incontrovertibly proved, that as soon as under the influence of the will or any other stimulus the muscle contracts, the electric current which it gives off becomes weaker and weaker, until at last it ceases entirely. During contraction of the muscle the electric tension decreases, i.e., the equilibrium of the electric condition is restored. It follows, therefore, that the free electricity existing in the muscle during the period of repose, is efficient in producing contraction of the muscle. The most recent microscopic observations coincide with and confirm the observations of Du Bois Reymond. The primitive muscular fibres consist, according to the observations of Amiri, of minute circular discs, which are connected by very fine white fibres. While the muscle is at rest, these discs are separated a little distance from each other. During a contraction they approach each other more closely, and when contraction ceases they return again to their original position. The contraction of the different parts of a muscle does not take place at the same moment; but it consists in an indefinite number of partial and momentary contractions, which change their position continually, and distribute themselves to other parts of the muscular substance. The attraction and repulsion taking place between the microscopic parts of a muscular fibre are governed by the same laws, according to which a glass rod attracts and repels small particles of paper and silk, after being subjected to friction, and there is no doubt but that the effective agent is the same in both cases, viz., electricity.

In proceeding to examine the effect which artificial electricity produces upon the nerves of common sensation and special sense, we shall find a further confirmation of the above statement. Electricity causes, in this division of the nervous system, the same sensations which are perceived by these nerves in their normal state. An electric current sent through the optic nerve produces a sensation of light; in the auditory nerve the same current causes a sensation of sound. In the same manner sensations of smell and taste are perceived, if electricity is passed through the olfactory and gustatory nerves. In the nerves of common sensation electricity produces the sensation of pain, and by transferring the stimulus upon the motor nerves, motion is the result. This is known under the name of reflex action; it may occur without the animal being conscious of it, and in the classes of animals where the nervous system exists merely in a rudimentary form it is the only way by which nervous action is manifested. When a nerve of common sensation is irritated in any part of its course from the periphery to the nervous centre, the pain is referred to the peripheral distribution. This is proved by the following well authenticated fact, which occurred at a time when the physiology of the nervous system was not fully understood. A young girl suffered constant pain in the calf and knee of one leg, which could not be allayed by any remedial agent. As the pain was excruciating, one resorted at last to the amputation of the leg above the knee, yet the pain continued unabated and was felt in the same spot as before. Another amputation was performed at the middle of the thigh, and another at the hip joint, but with no better result as regards the pain. The patient died finally from the effect of her suffering, and the section revealed an exostosis at one of the anterior sacral foramina, which give exit to nerves forming the nervous ischiatum major, and which by compression of the nerve had caused it to become inflamed and painful. As now the physical changes which electricity produces in the nerves must be the same in the different nerves, and as this change can be nothing else but of an electric nature, we are justified to conclude, that the changes in the electric condition of the nerves and their nervous centres are the final causes of sensation and perception.

Electric currents do not only exist in the substance of the muscular and nervous tissue, but in all other tissues, and between the different organs of the animal and human body. The secretions of the mouth being alkaline, and those of the stomach acid, this fact necessitates the existence of an electric current between those two organs while they are in an active state.

The same applies to the stomach and liver, the stomach and pancreas, the stomach and intestines, the small and large intestines, the skin and intestines, the kidneys and intestinal canal. The investigations of Reichenbach led him to the conclusion that the right and left sides of a person stand in a polaric relation to each other; when therefore innervation is feeble during intrauterine life, this polaric relation of the two halves is partly interrupted and the infant bears the signs of arrested development in the shape of spina bifida, hair-lip, fissures of the abdomen, nonocclusion of the foramen ovale between the right and left auricle of the heart, etc., all these defects being at or very near the median line of the body.

Reichenbach found that such a relation exists also between the right side of one and the left side of another person. As a proof of this fact we need only adduce the so-called double monstrosities, which never present themselves with equal sides grown together, but they are always connected with their opposite sides, as the Siamese twins, or at the median line.

This polarity exists also between the venous and arterial blood, and this is to be regarded as the principal cause of the circulation of their vital fluid while the heart performs the office of regulating this important part of the animal economy.

We have seen that a sensation was effected by an electric change in the particular nervous centre, in which it had been induced by a similar change in a nerve taking its origin in one of the peripheral parts of the human body. Now, as the different nervous centres are all intimately connected with each other in the brain by means of nerve fibres, the electric changes which occur in one nervous centre will be communicable to the other, and this process is called thinking. This is the special function of the brain, which is to be regarded as a conglomeration of nervous centres or organs, each of which exists as independently for itself as any other organ of the body, but communicating with each other most perfectly by intermediate nerve fibres, all of them permeated with electricity. The rule that every organ is preserved in its integrity, and even acquires increased vigor by a persistent judicious use, is applicable equally to the brain. Its function is also in exact proportion to the degree of perfection of its organization. In the foetus, where it is of a soft, pulpy consistency, no intellectual faculties or functions of the mind do exist. As the period of birth approaches, muscular movements appear as the first signs of animal life; but they are yet of the reflex character, as the nervous centres and their connections are not developed. In a measure as these organs gradually progress in development from infantile unto mature age, so do the perceptive and intellectual faculties also appear, and with the retrograde movement which commences after the meridian of adult life is passed, and continues unto senility, they decline likewise. According to the discovery of Gall and Spurzheim, the size of the cerebral organs may be determined by examining the conformation of the cranium, and the degree of their development is in exact proportion to the size. From these propositions those investigators drew the conclusion, that by taking into account the condition of the general organism they could estimate how the individual organs of the brain would perform their functions, and how the brain would act as a whole. When our knowledge by careful investigations is so far advanced that those statements can be accepted as indisputable facts, then we have gained an important step in our knowledge of man, and phrenology as a science, in conjunction with anatomy and physiology, will then substitute metaphysics, as modern chemistry became a substitute for alchemy, which we inherited from antiquity and mediaeval times.

However this may be, this is true, that the function of thinking is just as natural to the brain, and a faculty inherent to it, as the function of contraction is to the muscular organs, or that of secretion is to the glandular organs. As it is impossible for the latter functions to take place separately of the respective organs, it is equally impossible for the process of thinking to take place separately from the brain. Both are inseparably connected.

No physiologist ever dared to assert, that the muscles, glands and other organs are first developed, and that afterwards the function gets into and takes possession of the organs, in order to use them as its instrument.

The inconsistency of such an idea was so evident, that nobody had even the courage to think of it in relation to these organs. Yet what was rejected as inconsistent in regard to the one group of organs, the same was, in consequence of metaphysical speculations which have always impeded the progress of science, considered quite reasonable in regard to the brain. It was considered perfectly natural to suppose that an immaterial something, which nobody was able clearly to define, used the brain as an instrument to play tunes upon according as it was stringed, and that to this immateriality all manifestations were due. To this fanciful being several names were given, as soul, spirit, nature, etc.; and it was endowed with equally fanciful properties, as a separate individuality and immortality. This idea led also to most strange discussions as to the manner and time, how and when, this immaterial being entered

into the body of the foetus, in which particular place in the body it had its residence, when and how it left the body again, and what became of it afterwards. In times past some busied themselves to calculate how many of these beings could dance upon the point of a needle, a question which, however, remains yet a problem.

It is not necessary to say, that a sound physiology discards all such ideas as inconsistent—"the baseless fabric of a vision, which leaves not a wreck behind." For if this idea were true, then we ought also to admit that the function of every man not only, but of every tissue and organ in his body, is an immaterial being. And not only that, but the same would have to be applied to every animal and every organ of the animal, to every plant and every particle of matter in the whole universe. To all of these beings a separate individuality and immortality had to be ascribed. This cannot be true.

In the light of true science, man is a living entity, "a living soul," as he is called by Moses. The actions of the mind are the functions of the substance of the brain, which develop themselves with it and in death cease with it.

Man is, however, destined for a future existence. Eternal life is a free gift of God. In order to obtain it, man must be made the subject of a second birth, and the conditions under which he can attain to it are laid down in the revealed word.

B. LASIUS.

---

### **"The Religious World."**

BY A CLERGYMAN.

"WOE unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outwardly, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye also outwardly appear to men as righteous, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity."

It was the custom among the Jews, and is, as travellers inform us, at this day the custom in the East, to whitewash the outside of the wall which surrounds their sepulchres, both for the end of making them more beautiful, and for guarding against impurity by coming too near to any thing which had touched a dead body. These, as they shone in the light of the sun, would, no doubt, present a very beautiful appearance to the beholder; so, saith Jesus, did the Pharisees, upon whom any one looking would readily have pronounced them most excellent and worthy men, adorned with all outward grace, and rectitude, and piety. But as the traveller, upon drawing near to one of these whited sepulchres, thinking to find within it some shelter, some pleasure or entertainment worthy of its outward appearance, would have been woefully disappointed, and even horrified, when he found it to contain only rottenness and corruption, and to communicate only disgust and defilement; so signified the Lord, that any one coming near these Pharisees in hope of friendship, consolation help, or instruction, would find them hollow as the tomb, and dead to the voice of sympathy as its mouldering tenant.

Another figure by which he sets them forth in the corresponding passage of Luke xxi. 44, is this: "Ye are as graves which appear not, and men that walk over them are not aware of them." This alludes to another custom in the East, likewise derived from the defilement communicated by the dead, which was, to mark with chalk upon the ground the extent of the vaults under which the dead lay entombed. But, ye Pharisees, saith the Lord, are as if a man,

walking, as he thought, upon unpolluted ground, should be treading upon the dead, and deriving pollution and defilement to himself, when he knew not of it. So, saith the Lord, ye Pharisees appear like honest, true, and uncontaminated men, in order to mislead men, who, stumbling upon you, do find you to be like an open sepulchre, breathing forth the foul damps and exhalations of the charnel house. Fearful words! Most fearful words to apply to a body of men who carried texts of scripture written upon their foreheads, who prayed, and fasted, and gave alms, and kept the Sabbath with scrupulous exactness, and passed even beyond the bounds of the divine law, to lay upon themselves traditionary burdens of the elders. But so, verily, it was. They were the most highly esteemed and reputable of the church in those days. They were "the Religious World" of that time. There was, indeed, an opposite party, who believed little, and obeyed less, and took the scope of their reason and their will. These were the Sadducees, the liberals of the time, and were out of the estimation of the common people, amongst whom the principle of faith and the fear of God survive and linger long. The common people, indeed, were so much under the influence of the scribes and Pharisees, that our Lord was constrained to open the short-comings, the wickedness, the deceitfulness, the arrogance, and the utter blindness of these Pharisees, in order, if it were possible, to deliver them out of their hands. They had made Moses void by the traditions of the elders; they had sealed the book of the prophets, and said unto the people, "We cannot read it because it is sealed." They had the key of doctrine in the Holy Scriptures, but they would neither receive the truth themselves, nor suffer others to do so, if they could prevent it; so that every one who obtained a right to enter into the kingdom, obtained it, as it were, by force.

This is the very condition of what is called our "Religious World." Outwardly it is a whited sepulchre; inwardly it is full of dead men's bones. Their professions are most fair; their account of themselves most flattering; their report of their own works most magnificent. Come into the heart of their operations, and you find disguise, concealment, fabrication, extortion, and many things beside of the like kind. Outwardly there is the profession of godliness, the salvation of all mankind, Christ's own boundless love. There are solemnity, gravity, and other deeply imposing appearances; but within there is no prayer, no spirit of love, levity, quarrel, haste, misconstruction, chiding, and other fruits of the flesh. I say this of the system; all reputable as it is, I believe it to be rotten to the core. It may startle and amaze you to hear me say so: so did it startle and amaze the Jewish church to hear our Lord speak so of the scribes and Pharisees. It may enrage you to hear me say so: so did it enrage them that he should so speak; and his temerity, as they would say, his unmeasurable censure, and open exposure of them, brought him to the cross, from which Pilate, and the people also, had they not been stirred up by the Pharisees, would have made him a way of escape. Therefore let not this system, which I endeavor to expose, triumph in like manner over those who would speak to you the truth.

If, from the system, I turn to speak of the men, why, they are like lambs for the *profession* of meekness, but, oh! their tender mercies are cruel. There is not a drop of comfort, not a cupful of cold water; **THEIR GOSPEL IS EITHER FALSEHOOD, or it is uncertainty;** either error, or doubt. Their law is iron obligation, not holy love. Their rule and modes are sectarian, and not general. Their zeal the zeal of proselytism, and not of salvation. Their burdens, of one kind or another, intolerable; their doctrine as thin as the gossamer web, false in most points, and insufficient in all.

Their morals are the morals of expediency; their charity narrow as their own party; their judgments of all within, most flattering and delusive; of all without, most censorious and unjust. They have shut up four-fifths, or rather nine-tenths, of the sacred volume. All the

prophecies they have spiritualized away. They have robbed the Jews of what God gave them to be their consolation. They have seared their consciences from the fear of the judgments of which God would have them stand in awe. They have taken arms against the hope of the coming of the Lord; they have scoffed at it, and at judgment; and in truth, there seems to me hardly a feature of the scribes and Pharisees which has not reappeared in the "Religious World" and its chiefs of the present day. They are the whited sepulchres and concealed graves of a hypocritical and spiritual sham.

This is corroborated in the experience of many. Finding the flimsiness of the doctrines, the cant, the whine, the slang, the hypocrisy, or at least, the want of plain, honest, straightforward, manly conduct among the leaders of the "Religious World," they are led to perceive that all is not gold that glitters there, as everywhere else; and consequently it has been found impossible to induce them to join or to encourage any of their societies or schemes.

I could say much more, but that I hasten to be done with a subject so painful to my heart; yet one from which I will not flinch until I have performed my task unto the Lord. O that I could shake this empire of man over the mind of his fellow-man, and rear, in its stead, the mastership of Christ, and the fatherhood of God! O that I could make religion to rest in the word and ordinances of Christ, and not in the opinions of men; then, indeed, I should have accomplished something to recompense the pain and travail of these unpleasant inquiries.

---

### Palestine.

THE bitter spirit of religious controversy has diverted men's minds far away from the text of the sacred books; they have been annotated upon, it is true, by writers of all degrees of capacity and obtuseness; but, for the most part, what men have seen in them has not been the simple teachings of the Christian faith, the poetic literature of the most ideal of the Eastern races, or the oldest chronicles of human history; all this has been passed over, and they have been looked upon merely as quarries, from which missiles might be extracted for use in controversy misnamed religious. What has resulted from such a system all who are interested in Semitic literature are painfully aware: while every thing that could be brought to aid in sectarian bitterness has been sought after with the utmost care, the historical and literary merits of the Holy Scriptures, the history of the times to which they relate, and the men by whom they were produced, is, except among a very few scholars, almost unknown. We say this advisedly; not that we would be understood to assert that there is not widely diffused a mechanical knowledge of the events recorded. The children in National Schools, and the graduates of Oxford and Cambridge, are each examined in Scripture history; they are alike expected to recite tables of the Kings of Israel and Judah, and required to tell, at a moment's notice, by what acts Ehad or Bathsheba were rendered famous; geographically, too, they might pass muster fairly; yet the amount of ignorance of all that constitutes the real history—civil, literary, and religious—of the Jewish people, is something almost past belief. The want of interest that such a theme inspires is evident from the absence in our literature of any trustworthy guides to the subject. . . .

To all those who have ever wandered among the ruined cities of Palestine, who have encamped beneath the shadow of her date trees, and drunk of the mountain streams where the soldiers of Joshua may have refreshed themselves, this work will be valued for other than its literary and archaeological merits. To all such the history of the East, and of Judea and Jerusalem especially, has attractions such as do not exist elsewhere. Whatever our religious

creed, our credulity, or want of faith, still, to all of us the instinct of the soul points not to Rome, the capital of empire; not to the republics of ancient Hellas, where mankind first learned to love liberty and art; but to that land where alone the Creator has revealed himself to his creatures; where only, from the earliest historic times, mankind has worshipped the Divine Unity; whence the voice of inspiration has been granted and has issued forth to mould the human race. We Europeans, the children of yesterday, roamed wild savages in the forests of Scandinavia when the cities of the East were rejoicing in the blessings of civilization. The lands that produced Jerusalem and Damascus, Nineveh and Antioch—the pastures where Sheikh Abraham fed his flocks and where Jacob saw visions—the desert where Moses legislated, and the mountain slopes where Joshua routed the armies of the Gentiles—are landmarks in the history, not of the Jews only, but of the human race: —spots consecrated to religious feeling—call it poetic instinct if you will—such as no pomp of material splendor, no relics even of the most glorious art, will ever efface from memory. Races have changed. The wild, freedom-loving Teuton has become the world's master. The islands of the West, where the servants of Hiram, king of Tyre, the master-builder of Solomon, bartered with painted savages for tin, are now far greater than was Tyre in all her glory. But the East is still the same. Of her cities some have crumbled into "ruinous heaps," some shrunk into mere villages, and those that remain have felt the changes of time and dynasty. Still, to the European wanderer, they are the same. Far otherwise is it with any Northern city. London and Paris stand on the remains of Roman towns; yet what connection have they with the far off past? Who thinks of the Romans, when he passes down the Strand, whose villas once lined the way on either side of him? Their connection with the past is broken. Two or three sculptured stones alone are left to tell that here, too, the world's conquerors once planted their eagles. With the cities of the East, and with Jerusalem pre-eminently, it is not so. That which is most especially memorable in their history ends before ours has a beginning. The traveller sees around him the very objects, both of nature and of man's works, that were existing when David ruled in Israel. The walls may still be traced that were encompassed by the chariots and horsemen of the king of Assyria—that so long resisted the concentrated power of Imperial Rome. The surrounding hills were the same as now: many of the buildings, even, were hoar with antiquity when the last of the Hebrew bards closed the book of prophecy. The Pool of Bethesda, the Mount of Olives, and the Street of Grief, bring before us a time, a being, and a sacrifice, before which every other human memory fades.

Such is Palestine; such is Jerusalem; such is the mystic East.

Quacumque ingredimur in aliquam historiam vestigium ponibus. —*Lond. Leader.*

---

## **Analecta Epistolaria.**

### **From an Israelite Indeed.**

*Dear Brother Thomas:* — In view of abounding iniquities, we may calculate that the love of many will be cooled, and will become cold. This was true in the days of the first disciples, and, as a principle, it is true now; yet it is gratifying to think and believe that some will continue faithful, and will consequently be saved.

I am truly gratified that the *Herald* is still sustained in the midst of these clouds, and storms, and dark times. It is also cheering to consider that its advocacy of the truth has testimony of its beneficial influence, as is manifest in epistles from so many, and some widely separated regions of our globe. I am really glad to see the third annual address of our beloved

brethren of Halifax, England. It is encouraging to have proof that their faith, and hope, and love reach across the broad Atlantic, even to us. They remind me of what Paul testifies in behalf of the Thessalonians: "Ye were ensamples to all that believe in Macedonia and Achaia. For from you sounded out the word of the Lord, not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but also in every place your faith toward God is spread abroad." This is certainly some proof that the truth in its purity is beginning to work, even in the close of the Gentile times, as it did before its corruption. Every genuine disciple is a student of the Holy Scriptures, and is continually growing in the knowledge and wisdom with which they abound. In this way he holds intercourse with patriarchs and prophets and apostles, and through them with the one only true God, and Jesus, the Anointed, his only begotten and well-beloved Son. As a consequence, he receives joyfully the truth, in the belief and love of it. Of course, he sees and appreciates, and is not ashamed to acknowledge its paramount importance. For the sake of practical benefit, allow me, Brother Thomas, to cite some few testimonies, illustrative of the paramount or surpassing importance of the truth. To his disciples, Jesus said, "Seek ye first (above all other things) the kingdom of God and his righteousness." This is found in his discourse, as recorded in Matt., chaps, v., vi., and vii. In the same he says, "Not every one who saith Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of the heavens, but he who doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven." In his exposition (Matt, xiii.) of the parable of the sower, he teaches that the seeds sown in good ground, represent those who hear or give heed to the Word, and understand it, and bear fruit, and bring forth, some a hundred, some sixty, and some thirty-fold. From Luke, we learn that such receive the truth in good and honest hearts. This shows that the truth is of paramount importance with those who understand it. It enlightens and warms and vivifies them, and makes them bring forth love, and joy, and peace, and long-suffering, and gentleness, and goodness, and faith, and meekness, and temperance, and manifests them as good trees of the Lord's planting; they are watered and nurtured of the Lord himself, and they are known by the good fruit. Again, Jesus teaches that the kingdom of the heavens is like treasure hid in a field, which a man finds, and with joy he sells all that he has and buys: again, he likens it to a merchantman seeking goodly pearls, who, when he had found one pearl of great price, sold all and bought it. (See Matt, xiii.) Again, the kingdom and the righteousness of God constituted the great, and rich, and enriching theme or subject, in the preaching and teaching of Jesus and his apostles, in harmony with Moses and the prophets. It was the pure, unmixed truth, as taught by divine inspiration, which caused its first and genuine disciples to give all for it. Some forsook all their temporal possessions for the sake of it. Some sold their estates, and laid the price at the feet of the apostles. And when the disciples, on account of persecution, had been scattered from Jerusalem, they went away—whither, it does not say—seeking silver and gold, etc., but it says preaching the word, and doubtless this word was to them of importance, —far superior to that of silver and gold, lands and homes, and all the *et cetera* of temporal possessions. They took up their time in this all-absorbing work. The truth brought them, and all they possessed, under its absorbing influences. They discharged all their duties under its faith, and hope, and love-working energies. It caused them to see clearly the worth of the world that is to be, in contrast with this present evil world, characterized as it truly is, by the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of this life. They desired to be accounted worthy of the good things which God has in reserve for all who love him. It may be well to endeavor to be prepared for all the changes and for all the trying scenes through which we may have to pass. We can hardly suppose that this old, long-established sin-period is to pass away quietly; we might reasonably calculate on some indications of storm, and earthquake, and famine, and pestilence. Let us rejoice at the indications, in the hope of Jehovah's prophet, priest, and king, as the restorer of all things. With best wishes for your welfare, and that of all genuine disciples, believe me, as ever,

Yours, for the truth's sake,

March 6, 1861.

A. ANDERSON.

---

**A Word in Season.**

*Dear Brother:* —Notwithstanding your rather complimentary distinction made (unnecessarily, I think) between your subscribers in these dominions of her Britannic Majesty, and those of the sovereign *dis*United States, in your parting notice in December, I am on hand again for the "Herald" for another year. I esteem yourself and prize your writings too highly to part company yet. I expressed my opinion of the "Herald" in a letter to you many years ago, and my acknowledgment of its instrumentality. under God, in bringing me to a knowledge of the gospel of the kingdom of God. That opinion and sense of obligation remain unchanged. I deeply regret to find that others, who, to my personal knowledge, have been under similar obligations, have lifted up the heel against you. In doing so they have incurred a deep responsibility, not simply in the shape of ingratitude toward you, but in reference to their position as regards the truth. I am no man-worshipper: perhaps in trivial matters of a private or personal nature I might differ from you; but what becomes of the virtues of Christian forbearance and brotherly love, the spirit of meekness and patience so frequently and so strongly enjoined in the word of God, if, upon every petty occasion of difference of opinion, professing followers of the Lord Jesus Christ are to fall out and to sever those ties of fraternal regard and affection, and abruptly terminate that sweet intercourse, and those mutual labors on behalf of the truth, and that contention for the faith, which constitute not only the sign, but the bond of union and Christian fellowship? I would not judge harshly; at the same time it is clear, that "*by their fruits shall ye know them.*" The best are fallible, and liable to take a false position; but let them reflect seriously, and certain it is, that no one having the "spirit of Christ" will knowingly and wilfully maintain a false position, nor continue in a course calculated to injure the truth in the eyes of the world. You have, no doubt, much to contend against. We all know what you have suffered, and may expect to suffer, from the world at large. That battle, of course, you are prepared for, and suitable, special armor has been supplied for the contest, —but ingratitude is a very different thing; and the desertion of one, by those who were looked upon and regarded as friends, to say nothing of the active and virulent opposition into which such desertion generally shapes itself, is hard indeed to bear, and presses with peculiar force upon the wounded spirit. This seems to be one of the most bitter ingredients in the cup of affliction. See Psalm xli. 9. Through Christ, however, the believer can do valiantly; and the effect of this, as well as of all other afflictions, should be to knit the believer more closely to him who sticketh closer than a brother. "Cease ye from man, whose breath is in his nostrils, for wherein is he to be accounted of." "Blessed is the man who trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is."

Dear Brother, your mission is a glorious one, that of an enlightener in this dark day; and your privilege is great, that of testifying for the truth in the midst of a perverse generation. The responsibilities are equally great and solemn. You know the result if you "hold the beginning of your confidence steadfast unto the end." May the Most High direct and sustain you, and may you stand in the "lot" of the righteous at the end of the days.

The last time brother McAdam was here, I requested him to ask you to republish your "Exposition of the 18<sup>th</sup> chapter of Isaiah," and I think he wrote me that you would do so. If you promised, it may have slipped your mind. Will you do so, and confer a great favor upon me, as I have it not in any of your writings. By the way, I should think Dr. Cumming has been making extensive use of it in his public lectures lately.

I took the liberty lately of writing to Mr. B. Wilson, of Geneva, a letter anent the term "Thomasite" used by a correspondent of his. As a term of reproach from unwashed sectarians, I have had it applied often enough; but I stated to him that I was curious to ascertain wherein consisted its peculiarity when applied by one professing believer to another professing believer.

Our numbers do not increase here, neither, thank God, have they diminished. We meet regularly and publicly, but few, however, bestow their presence upon us. They keep at a respectable distance.

I have not heard of Williams for some time back, when I was in Hamilton. What a miserable course has this unfortunate man followed, and what an unholy temper does he carry about with him. I suppose brother Coombe keeps you apprised of things in Toronto. I have not heard from him for some time. He has his own troubles too. This was new to him at first, and he found it hard to bear. Trouble and affliction are wonderful agencies, however, for modifying and purifying the naturally rebellious spirit of man. I have had a little experience in that line, and can testify to its efficacy.

With best wishes for your best interests, I am, dear brother,  
Yours, in the one hope,

WILLIAM DUNN,

*Inver Huron, C. W., March 3, 1861.*

---

**"Avoid Crotchets."**

*Dear Friend:* —How thankful ought we to be for the "glorious gospel of the blessed God" to enlighten our minds that we may know him, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent. It is worthy of congratulation, that there are any of moral courage enough to repudiate the teachings of the day, and to take the Bible and read, and understand it, and use it as a lamp to our feet, and light to our path; for it is able to make us wise unto salvation through faith that is in Christ Jesus. I esteem it more than treasures of gold and silver, for it is the pearl of great price.

As a watchman and editor, watch the signs of the times, and chronicle them faithfully; for the Lord cometh, and the day is at hand; and blessed is that servant whom, when his Lord cometh, he shall find so doing.

The criers of "Lo, here!" or "Lo, there," are of name "legion," for they are many; from the Roman Catholic that counts his beads and says mass, and the Methodist that erects a mourner's bench, and proclaims, "Come and get religion," to the teacher of universal salvation; they have all their "Shibboleths" to hold forth to the people; those that can't cry shibboleth, chime in clerically, and "so they wrap it up."

Be not partaker of other men's sins, and avoid crotchets, for many are in the world.

With due respect,

Yours,

W. P. CHAPLIN.

*Indiana, Dec. 29, 1860.*

I feel much obliged for the truth and light afforded by the "Herald," and the favor of your sending it.

---

W. P. C.

**We Hope so Indeed.**

*Dear Sir:* —I still like to read the "Herald" on account of the depth of thought, and mind, and strong common sense with which you handle all subjects you treat upon. Your pen always makes a mark that tells. I must say, however, that I have not been fully convinced of your position, that Christ is to reign personally in Jerusalem. Albeit, I am open to conviction, and hope to arrive at the truth, and to embrace it.

Very truly, yours.

G. F. HENDRICKSON.

*McDonaugh Co., Ill.*

---

**A Strange Thing Truly.**

*Brother Thomas:* —There is some interest manifested in these parts, and there may be some honest hearts that will yet obey the truth. But it takes no little toil to get a few to obey the gospel.

I admire your bold and unflinching integrity for the truth, and your uncompromising spirit in contending with the darkness, though identified with those who pass for the friends of the truth, and brethren. It is strange that such cannot be satisfied with "the simplicity of Christ," but are continually trying to burden the gospel with Gentile crotchets. O that men and women professing godliness would shun the very appearance of evil, and walk worthy of their calling!

We meet every first day to break bread, and worship the Father through Jesus, the Apostle and High Priest of the divine household: so, you see, I have ceased to be a Sabbatarian.

Your brother in Israel's hope,

T. H. DUNN.

*Crawford Co., Pa., Dec. 24, 1860.*

---

**No Peace for the Wicked.**

*Dear Brother Thomas:* —I wish you a happy new year notwithstanding the shadows, clouds, and darkness that veil the future, that is, the immediate future. The powers of darkness are now in great tribulation, and are anxiously looking for a remedy that will give them *peace in iniquity*. They do not appear to know that God has ordained that there is "no peace for the wicked," but that sin must bring forth evil. If men could appreciate this, they would naturally inquire if there were any remedy for sin, which might bring them to Him that taketh away the sin of the world. Many pervert his word to serve their politics, and blaspheme his name and doctrine in so doing; they don't understand the declaration of our Lord, "my kingdom is not of this world," or constitution of things, which is to come to nought; but a divine government unto which only those can attain who are born of water and the spirit; although this kingdom is to be established on the earth, and fill the earth, we nevertheless repeat the declaration of our sovereign Lord, "my kingdom is not of this world," and therefore we will not fight.

I am yours most truly in faith and hope of the kingdom,

WM. P. LEMMON.

*Baltimore, Jan. 9, 1861.*

---

**Thanks.**

*Dear Brother:* —Your articles on *the signs of the political Aerial*, and on the Prophecy of *Mount Olivet*, have been a source of instruction to me. Although you have substantially taught the same things before, yet I could not comprehend them in their plainness as I do now. Thanks be to God for raising up such a man as you are; and thanks to you for your indefatigable efforts to make your contemporaries wise unto salvation.

My neighbors here profess to respect me very much for my honesty and peaceable disposition; but they dread my influence as dangerous in matters of religion; and the more I try to reason with them, the more I am convinced of the truth of a remark you made in the *Herald* some years ago, namely, that "in America there is a 'devil-may-care' indifference to everything that does not tend to money-making and self-glorification." The minds of the people are enveloped in the gross darkness spoken of by Isaiah the prophet.

Very truly, yours,  
*Ohio, Jan. 19, 1861.*

JOHN SWAN.

---

**Herald not altogether worthless.**

*Dear Brother:* —We feel very grateful to you for your independent advocacy of "the truth as it is in Jesus." May our Heavenly Father increase your ability in the fearless and courageous defence of his holy word against the traditions of men. But for you, those of us who believe with you in the glorious gospel of the kingdom to be established at the appearing of our Lord and Saviour, would be now in Egyptian darkness. We owe you a debt of gratitude we can never pay; but our Heavenly Father will. He is able to give you all things, with life eternal. Blessed be his holy name for his great mercy to us ward.

I subscribe myself, yours sincerely in hope of the kingdom and all its glory,

MARGARET WALKER.

*Kansas, Jan. 13, 1861.*

---

**From the Wilderness.**

*Dearly beloved Brother:* —My name is known all over this county by report, on account of the doctrine I hold forth. At one time, when I was speaking in a schoolhouse, about eight miles from my place, two ministers, one of the Methodist and the other of the Winebernarian denominations were present. And what I had to say gave offence to them, which resulted in a debate on the death and life question, or rather, on the immortality of the soul. The debate was held in the Winebernarian chapel in that neighborhood. A Baptist minister assisted me in the warfare.

I did not need him, but as "there were two on the other side, I gave him a chance in the debate. He had read *Elpis Israel* and the *Herald*. He is a very intelligent man, with a clear understanding, and does not preach the immortality of the soul.

A few weeks ago, I had an invitation to speak in a school-house about four miles from home; and when I was done I gave liberty to speak, as I always do. A man arose and said, Mr. Besack, I would like to be a Christian, but I cannot. I asked him why. He said, I cannot hate my wife and children, my father and mother; and Jesus says, If any man will follow me, and hate not his father and mother, wife and children; yea, even his own flesh, he cannot become my disciple. I then told him that the word had to be understood just the opposite to hate—namely, to love less.

Yours truly, in looking for the hope of the delivering of Israel,

NICHOLAS BESACK.

*Whitley Co., Ind., Feb. 2, 1861.*

---

## **Miscellanea.**

### **Queries.**

1. Against whom did the holy prophets of the Jews, the Saviour of the world, and his apostles inveigh with the utmost severity?

*Ans.* The popular clergy. Never were any things spoken by the Lord Jesus, or by the holy apostles, with so much keenness, with so much severity, as their reproofs of, as their denunciations against, the popular clergy.

2. Who were the popular clergy in those days?

*Ans.* Those who pleased the people, taught for hire, and established themselves into an order distinct from the people.

3. Who are the popular clergy now?

*Ans.* Those who are trained for the precise purpose of teaching religion as their calling, please the mass of the people, establish themselves into a distinct order, from which they exclude all that are not so trained, and, for hire, affect to be the only legitimate interpreters of revelation.

4. What are the most effectual means to diminish the power and dominion of the clergy?

*Ans.* The same means which the Lord and the apostles used in their day against those of that time; chiefly to persuade the people to hold fast the holy commandments of the apostles, and to build themselves up in the Christian faith.

*Chr. Bapt.*

---

### **Socrates.**

THIS man flourished four hundred years before Christ. He left no writings, but is said by his scholars to have taught that " The soul of man is immortal because immaterial; that there is but one supreme God; that there are demons that superintend the affairs of this world; that men ought not to pursue riches or worldly honors, but to cultivate their minds and to practice virtue." He is supposed to have borrowed some of his notions from the Jews.

