BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, JULY 15, 1854. NO. 14.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 140 Fulton-street.

TERMS---One Dollar for the Year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

STATE OF THE DEAD.

We take the following extract from an article by J. PANTON HAM, in his *Christian Examiner* for April. It is from his remarks on Prof. Maurice's views of the "State, or Place of the Dead." Br. Ham speaks thus :—

Hades is a compound term, signifying *unseen* or *unknown*, and is thus a negative word, expressing ignorance of the state or place which it is used to denote. Both the words, *Sheol* and *Hades*, have a common representative value, and are invariably and exclusively used in their respective Testaments to denote the state or place of deceased persons. They do not express *an actual locality*, nor *an actual personal condition;* they are the suitable words which the scripture writers employ in speaking of the mysterious change which occurs in death. *Death*, like *life*, is a profound mystery. We speak of *life* as a *coming*, a being; and of *death* as a *going*, and *not being*. The nature of this being, and not being, this coming and going, we do not understand, and therefore do not philosophically describe in our current terminology. We speak not with philosophical accuracy, but in a *figure*, when we speak of the dead as *departed*, as *gone*. They are no longer *with us*, from *us* they have gone,—departed. . . .

1. The Bible informs us that the dead go to *Sheol* or *Hades*, and Hence Sheol or Hades are the Scripture names of the Intermediate State.

Psalm lxxxix. 48.—"What man is he that liveth and shall not see death? *Shall he deliver his* SOUL *from the hand of Sheol*?" (English version, "Grave.") Eccles. ix. 10.—"There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in Sheol (grave,) whither *thou* goest."

Sheol, translated in our English version sometimes the *grave*, and sometimes *hell*, is in the Old Testament the word which designates the common dormitory of the dead.

2. Sheol is described in emphatic contrast to heaven.

Psalm cxxxix. 8.—"If I ascend up into heaven thou art there; if I make my bed in Sheol (Hell English ver.) behold thou art there." Amos ix. 2.—"Though they dig into Sheol (Hell, Eng. ver.) thence shall my hand take them; though they climb up to heaven, thence will I bring them down." Job xi. 8.—"It is high as heaven; what canst thou do? Deeper than Sheol (Hell, Eng. ver.) what canst thou know?" Luke x. 15.—"Thou Capernaum which art exalted unto heaven shalt be thrust down to Hades." (Hell, Eng. ver.)

Heaven and *Sheol* or *Hades*, therefore, are widely different places, as widely different as direct contrasts and opposites can be.

3. *Sheol* is represented in the Scripture as *deep in the bowels of the earth.*

Isaiah v. 14.—"Therefore *Sheol* (Hell, Eng. ver.) hath enlarged herself, and opened her mouth without measure, and their glory, and their multitude, and their pomp, and he that rejoiceth shall descend into it." Amos ix. 2—"Though they dig into Sheol," &c, Job xi. 8.—"Deeper than Sheol," &c.

4. Sheol or Hades is spoken of in the Bible *as an evil to be dreaded and deprecated.*

Psalm xvi. 10.—"Thou wilt not leave my soul in Sheol." (Hell, Eng. ver.) Also in Acts ii. 27.—"Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades." (Hell, Eng. ver.) Matt. xvi. 18.—"The gates of Hades (Hell, Eng. ver.) shall not prevail against my Church." 1. Cor. xv. 55.—"O Hades (O Grave, Eng. ver.) where is thy victory."

5. *Sheol* or *Hades* is associated with *death*, and is represented by personification, as sharing the same end, which is, to be destroyed.

Rev. i. 18.—"I have the keys of Hades (Hell, Eng. ver.) and of death." xx. 13.—"Death and Hades (Hell, Eng.ver.) delivered up the dead which were in them." xx. 14.—"Death and Hades(Hell, Eng. ver.) were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death."

6. *All* persons, *irrespective of character*, are represented as going into *Sheol* or *Hades* at the time of death.

Psalm lxxxix. 48.—"What man is he that liveth and shall not see death? Shall he deliver his soul from the hand of Sheol? Eccles. ix. 2, 3. —"*All things come alike to all; there is one event to the righteous, and to the wicked*; to the good, and to the clean, and to the unclean: to him that sacrificeth, and to him that sacrificeth not; as is the good so is the sinner, and he that sweareth, as he that feareth an oath. This is an evil among all things that are done under the sun, that there is one event unto all." iii. 20.—"*All* go unto *one place.*" ix. 10.—"There is no work, nor device, nor wisdom in Sheol (Eng. ver., the Grave,) *whither thou goest.*"

Here, then, we have the Scripture terms and the characteristics of the intermediate State. *Sheol* or *Hades* according to the Bible is the inter-

mediate dwelling-place of the dead. Now all so-called Evangelical Christians believe in an *intermediate state*, both for the righteous and the wicked. They do not consider that the righteous either enter upon the *full* fruition of their bliss, nor that the wicked undergo the *full* severity of their torment until after the decisions of the Judgment. But they maintain that both classes have the full possession of their consciousness and all their characteristic qualities as human beings, and that to deny that the dead are conscious, is both repulsive and unscriptural. The doctrine of *un*-consciousness in death is pronounced repulsive and unscriptural; let us see whether the doctrine of *consciousness in death* is more attractive and scriptural.

The dead, we have seen, go to Sheol or Hades; and Sheol or Hades we have seen is *not heaven*, but the very *contrast* and *opposite* of heaven. The intermediate state, then, is as unlike heaven as an opposite or contrast can make it. If the righteous dead have consciousness in death, they dwell in a place or state the very *reverse* of heaven.

Sheol or *Hades* is *deep down in the bowels of the earth*, into which "they dig"—where a dying man says, "I make my bed"—whither persons "descend," and are "thrust down," and than which no place is "deeper." Here, then, is the dwelling-place of the righteous dead. If they have consciousness,—if they enter as living separate souls into their intermediate abode, then are they conscious of their deep descent, and their embowelled residence in the womb of the earth.

Again; if the righteous dead go *consciously* into Sheol or Hades, they go and remain where David and David's Lord rejoiced that they should not be left (Psalm xvi. 10); they enter within "gates" which presume to "prevail against the Church," as the Church's enemy (Matt. xvi. 18); they come within a power which struggles for the "victory" over the saints of the Most High, and which after the resurrection from the dead shall be hailed with the derisive and triumphant shout, "O *Hades*, where is thy victory?" (1 Cor. xv. 55.)

If the righteous go *consciously* into Sheol or Hades, they go into a state of association with *death* rather than *life*, for we have seen that Death is associated with Sheol or Hades, and both, as personified companions, are figuratively represented as hereafter destroyed together.

Finally, if the righteous go *consciously* into Sheol or Hades, then are they in *personal* companionship with the dead, bad as well as good, for "all go unto one place." The society they hate and dread there they commingle with, and must be the sad spectators and auditors of their woe. Weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth add their woeful notes of discord to distract the harmony of the saints' praises. To sing the songs of Zion in such society, and under such circumstances! Who does not deprecate this?

If there is a state of conscious life for mankind *in* death, then that conscious life must be possessed IN SHEOL OR HADES; and we have seen what are the characteristics of this Intermediate State or Place. If we live in death as separate bodiless souls, we live in this *dreaded Sheol*, which is the very contrast of heaven; which is not *above*, but *deep down, below;* where is not the one loved society of the faithful, but the mixed society of the condemned wicked and the righteous awaiting their full redemption. Will the candid and intelligent reader say that consciousness in death is a good, and to be desired? Will he not rather concur in the opinion that if the Bible declares that *in* death there is *no conscious life* for any man, whether righteous or wicked, it should be hailed as glad tidings of joy, and as a motive for devoutest gratitude to God, who has saved us from the consciousness of that gloomy condition into which sin has plunged us? To have consciousness *in* death, since all the dead go to Sheol or Hades, is to have a prospect more revolting than any it is possible to conceive on earth. The intermediate state, as it is exhibited in Scripture, if a conscious one, is a dismal purgatory, the anticipation of which invests the season of death with unspeakable gloominess. Let the believer in a state of life for the bodiless soul in an intermediate state, be apprized of this fact, that the intermediate state of the Bible is Sheol or Hades. He is accustomed, we know, to conceive of this state as one of purest and most felicitous enjoyment, and to describe it by the most glowing and beautiful imagery. Poetry has lent her creative imagination to portray its veiled glories, and by her fascinating genius has transformed the messenger of death into an angel of light, and corruption into the beauty and perpetuity of immortal being. But uninspired poetry must not be permitted to dictate our creed. *The Bible exhibits another picture.* It may, in the opinion of some, be a gloomier picture, but it is the *true* picture, of the state of the dead. The light which the Bible emits is the light of life and immortality *beyond*, not *in* death—a light whose glory shines even unto us on this side the grave, and cheers us in the view of the darkness of "the shadow of death," through which we must pass ere the full splendor of its brightness dazzles our waking vision. And is this a gloomier picture? Is it better that we should be *conscious* of the darkness of *Sheol*—of its distance from heaven—of its pit-like prison—of its resemblance to death—of its mixed society? Who will affirm this? Surely none? If I must die, let me not know what death is! Let the moment of its temporary victory be the moment when my consciousness shall expire, and my sleep be most perfectly sealed! If I must pass through "the valley of the *shadow* of death," let me not descend consciously into the gloom of its impenetrable *darkness*. Let the *approach* of death be the nearest point of concious contact with it; let its *grasp* seize on inanimation and unconsciousness! Is not this the craving of instinct? Does not the personal history of Christ exemplify it? See the Divine Jesus on his way to the grave of Lazarus,—twice does he "groan in himself," and express that he is "troubled." See him in Gethsemane, "in the days of his flesh offering up prayers with strong crying and tears to Him that was able to *save him from death.*" . . .

And they who are most like Christ in spirit most participate in his estimate of death. "*Not* that we would be *unclothed*, but *clothed upon*," is

the universal desire of the intelligent Church. Let corruption *put on* incorruption, and mortality *put on* immortality. Let me be "absent from the body"—my present mortal and corruptible constitution—which holds *me*—my personal self—in bondage, even in the grave, and let me be reproduced in a new spiritual and immortal nature, that I may be "present with the Lord" *when* "mortality shall be swallowed up of life." This is the desire both of instinct and religion, and the mercy of God has granted this desire. "Man giveth up the ghost (expires) and where is he? *As* the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up, so MAN [not the *body* of man, but *man*] lieth down and riseth not; *till the heavens be no more they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep.*" Job xiv. 10—12. Sound and uninterrupted is the sleep of death. "There the wicked cease from troubling and the weary are *at rest*," During the sleeping time death reigns over all that constitutes the living, thinking being called man. But this reign over the saints of God shall be, once and forever, destroyed. . . .

We will conclude by requesting attention to a Scriptural exemplification of the soundness of the argument here set forth. In the 28th chapter of the first book of Samuel we have the account of King Saul's interview at Endor with a woman that had a familiar spirit. This monarch's repeated impieties induced the Lord finally to withdraw from and refuse any counsel to him at a time of eminent personal and national danger. Forsaken by the Lord, he had recourse as a last hope of deliverance to this reputed necromancer, by whose aid he hoped to communicate with his old counsellor and friend, the prophet Samuel, who was then dead. Now mark the phraseology of the narration, and observe how it agrees with the representation of the dead, which has been given above. Having come to the woman by night, Saul said, "I pray thee divine unto me by the familiar spirit, and *bring me* HIM UP whom I shall name unto thee,"—verse 8. "Then said the woman, Whom shall *I bring up* unto thee? And he said unto her, *bring me up* Samuel," verse 11. "And the woman said unto Saul, I saw gods *ascending out of the earth.*" "And he said unto her, What form is he of? And she said, *An old man* COMETH UP," 13, 14. "And Samuel said to Saul, why hast thou DISQUIETED ME, *to bring me* UP?" verse 15. "To-morrow *shalt thou and thy sons* BE WITH ME,"—verse 19.

Here, then, the reader will observe, that we have an historical illustration of the state of the dead agreeing in all the chief particulars with the description of the place or state called Sheol or Hades, whither the dead are Scripturally described as going. We have remarked that the state or place of the dead is *below, in the earth*, not above, in the heavens, and hence Samuel is represented as "*ascending out of the earth*,"—as being *brought up* and *coming up*. Sheol or Hades is described as a place or state of profound silence and unconsciousnes,—stillness and repose reign there in undisturbed quietude; hence the appropriateness of the prophet's question—"Why hast thou *disquieted me*, to bring me up? Sheol or Hades, the intermediate state or place of the dead, comprehends all the dead in one *mixed society*. There the righteous and the wicked dwell without distinction and separation; hence the consistency of the prophets language when he pronounced the solemn sentence of God upon the abandoned monarch—"To-morrow *shalt thou and thy sons* BE WITH ME." The wicked Saul and the righteous Samuel are here described as dwelling together in the intermediate state. The prophet Samuel was not in heaven when dead, he was below in the earth; he was not in the holy and active society of angelic beings; he was lying in stillness and quiet in the ground beneath; he was not yet gathered into the garner of God—separated as a sheep from the goats, he was in the one common dormitory of the dead, there awaiting in common with the righteous that potent voice which should bid him arise and enter into life.

We repeat, then, that if there is consciousness for mankind in death—if they go as personal existences in a disembodied form into an intermediate state,—they go into sheol or hades, for *this* is the Intermediate State or Place which the Bible only recognizes; and then so far from consciousness being desirable, it is most to be deplored and deprecated. The intelligent and candid reader will perceive that the terms sheol and hades, and the descriptions which the Bible gives of them are poetical or figurative,—they are images of the region of death. They suitably describe our return in death to our parent earth. "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."

The following passages contain the Bible doctrine concerning the dead:

"The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence."—Ps. 115 : 17. "His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth: in that very day his thoughts perish."—Ps. 146 : 4. "The living know that they shall die, but the dead know not anything."—Eccl. 9 : 5. "There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave (Hebrew, Sheol,] whither thou goest."—Eccl. 9 : 10. "They that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth. The living, the living, HE shall praise thee as I do this day."—Isa. 38 : 19. See also Ps. 6 : 5; 88 : 10–12; Dan. 12; 2 : Ezek. 37 : 12–14, &c. &c.

Let believers in Christ, then, rejoice that they shall rest in unconscious repose in death, as it is written, "Blessed are the dead which died in the Lord, *for they rest* from their labor and their works do follow them." Soon shall their Lord, as the Resurrection and the Life, come with "the keys of Hades and of Death," to unlock their dark prison house, and set the captives free. "Behold I come quickly." Then will be the fulfillment of his gracious promise, "I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go and prepare a place for you I will come again and receive you to myself, that where I am there ye may be also."—John 14 : 3. "When Christ who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory."—Colos. 3 : 3.

He is a great simpleton who imagines that the chief power of wealth is to supply wants. In a majority of cases it creates more wants than it supplies.

SPIRIT:

Or, the Hebrew Terms "Ruach" and "Neshamah," and the Greek Term "Pneuma."

BY REV. WM. GLEN MONCRIEFF, SCOTLAND.

[Continued from page 196.]

Sec. V. Ruach is rendered *vain*.

Job 15 : 2, "Should a wise man utter vain (ruach) knowledge," margin, "knowledge of wind." 16 : 3, "Shall vain (ruach) words (margin, "words of wind") have an end?"

Sec. VI. Ruach is rendered *spirit*.

Every time, with very few exceptions, the word spirit occurs in the Old Testament it is the translation of *ruach*. Our present design requires us only to view it as applied to man, and to attempt a settlement of its import when so used. For the sake of perspicuity we shall endeavor to classify the senses or modes in which it seems to be employed when the discourse is concerning human beings.

1st. Sometimes it imports *life*; meaning by this the animal life, common to man with all the breathing tribes.

Numbers 16 : 22, "O God, the God of the spirits (haruchoth) of all flesh," or men. See also chap. 27 : v. 16. In Ps. 104 : 29 we read, "Thou takest away their breath (rucham) they die and return to their dust," and putting these two verses together, it is not difficult to discover that the import of "spirits" in the first one is just *lives*. Instead of "spirits" the Hebrew term might have been rendered breaths, as in the passage from Psalms, where the singular form of the Hebrew word stands; but lives is clearly its meaning,—lives resulting from breathing, as the radical meaning of *ruach* suggests.

Job 6 : 4, "The arrows of the almighty are within me, the poison whereof drinketh up my spirit" (ruchi,) or *life*. See Gesenius' Lexicon. 10 : 12, "Thou hast granted me life, and favor, and thy visitation hath preserved my spirit" (ruchi,) or life. See Gesenius' Lexicon. 27 : 3, "All the while my breath is in me, and the spirit (ruchi) of God is in my nostrils." "Once," says Gesenius, "the human spirit, or *life*, is called the 'spirit of God,' as being breathed into man by God, and again returning to God. Gen. 2 : 7, Eccles. 12 : 7, Ps. 104 : 29." The word "spirit" here might with perfect propriety have been exchanged for "breath," as in other places, having under it the idea of resulting life from the respiration of air. The verse might have stood thus, making the second clause a repetition and an expansion of the first—"all the while my breath is in me; and (or even) the breath of God is in my nostrils." His breath was God's breath, inasmuch as it came to him from the Creator, and by its agency he was preserved alive. The margin of the Bible explains the "spirit of God" in the text thus, "the breath which God gave him."

Ps. 76 : 12, "He shall cut off the spirit" (ruach,) or life, "of princes, he is terrible to the kings of the earth." To see that "spirit" here means life, we have only to refer to such expressions as these—Ps. 146 : 4, "His breath (ruchu) goeth forth, *he* returneth to his earth, in that very day his thoughts perish;" and Ezk. 37 : 5, "I will cause breath (ruach) to enter into you, and ye shall live," or, I will make you alive by causing you to breathe; and v. 8th of the same chapter—"There was no breath (ruach) in them;" i. e. they were still dead. To cut off the breath, or the "spirit" of princes is to destroy them; and when their life is cut off, their breathing is of course suspended.

Ps. 104 : 4, "Who maketh his angels spirits" (ruchoth.) Who maketh his angels winds, that is, like winds—in rapidity of motion. This seems to us the best interpretation, and the succeeding clause of the verse makes a parallel with it—"his ministers a flame of fire;" i. e. swift as the lightning.

Zech. 12 : 1, "The Lord—which formeth the spirit (ruach) of man within him," literally, in his inwards, or in his belly. On this text we would observe,

a. Since there is no adjective such as living, rational, thinking, mortal, or immortal, prefixed to the *ruach* here, which observe, is not said to be man, but to be in his inwards, we must learn from the radical meaning of the Hebrew term itself, and from other passages, the idea which in a text like this it is employed to express.

b. In itself the word radically means *breath*, and in this sense the passage will run "the Lord formeth the breath of man within him."

c. But as the breath is vitalizing breath, and as whenever it is respired by the lungs, the man through its influence is maintained in life, we apprehend that the import of the term *ruach* in this case is *life*, and perhaps the prophet may have associated with this central thought, the mental and other internal and external phenomena which necessarily result from the respiration of *ruach*, or the life-causing atmosphere. When we find a verse such as this, Ps. 104 : 29, "Thou takest away their breath (rucham) they die and return to the dust," we need not experience difficulty in determining the meaning of the one before us, for it is the same word *ruach*, without the shadow of a discriminating qualification that stands in both texts, and if the removing of the ruach produces death to a man, then by its preservation within him, or by his being preserved breathing it, his life and all its functions and experiences are maintained, and prolonged. This is the *ruach*—life and its wonders—that the Creator forms in man; in other words, putting the secondary cause for the effect, the passage intimates that God makes living men by the simple process of their breathing, and thus also he preserves them manifesting all the various phenomena of animated, conscious existence.

d. Thus, manifestly, the *ruach* of a man is not the man himself, and, though necessary to his life, it has *no life in itself*, though sometimes, on the principle of putting the secondary cause for the effect, life is obviously designated by it. Moreover, were it removed he would remain a perfect man, though without a *ruach*, or spirit, just as the man Adam, who had been formed entirely of dust, was a complete human being before God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and so made him

a living being, or an animated human soul. Gen. 2 : 7.

e. To show the utter recklessness, and we can call it nothing else, which has characterized the common exposition of verses like the one before us, let us for an instant consider Ps. 33 : 15, "He fashioneth their hearts alike." Who would infer from this that his heart lives of itself,—that it is a distinct living entity—and is capable of surviving death in consciousness? And why not? Is not thought, purpose, reason, joy, and the like, ascribed to the heart of men? yes, a thousand times and more in the Bible, and no one deals with the term "heart" of man as the *ruach*, "breath" or "spirit" of man has been treated. What is more astonishing, all this exaltation, and sometimes almost deification, of the *ruach* of man, has been done to what is actually *no part even of a human being*, no more than the steam is a part of the engine, or the atmosphere is a part of the furnace it keeps blazing.

2nd. Sometimes "spirit," as the rendering of *ruach*, imports *physical strength*; inasmuch as physical strength results from breathing.

Gen 45 : 27. "The spirit (ruach) of Jacob their father revived." Judges 15 : 19, "When he had drunk, his spirit (ruchu) came again and he revived." 1 Sam. 30 : 12, "And when he had eaten his spirit (ruchu) came again to him, for he had eaten no bread, nor drunk any water, three days and three nights.

3rd. Often it designates *mental* or *moral qualities* or *states*, good or bad, in a man.

Gen. 26 : 35, "Which were a grief of mind" (ruchu)—or they caused grief—"unto Isaac and to Rebekah." The margin has, "bitterness of spirit." 41 : 8, "His spirit (ruchu) was troubled" his mind was agitated." Deut. 2 : 30, "God hardened his spirit (ruchu) and made his *heart* obstinate." The second clause here explains the first; under God's dealings the Egyptian monarch grew obstinate. Josh. 5 : 1, "neither was there spirit (ruach) in them any more"—they lost heart, or *courage*. Ps. 51 : 17, "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit" (ruach,) i. e. genuine humiliation and contrition. The parallel in the verse is "a broken and a contrite *heart*, O God thou wilt not despise." Prov. 14 : 29, "He that is hasty of spirit (ruach) exalteth folly," i. e. he that is quick-tempered, or irrascible, does this. 17 : 22, "A merry heart doeth good like a medicine, but a broken spirit (ruach) drieth the bones;" i. e. excessive sorrow and care withers and emaciates the frame. 18 : 14, "The spirit (ruach) of a man will sustain his infirmity; but a wounded spirit (ruach) who can bear?" On this verse we shall quote a few words from Dr. Clarke—"a man sustains the ills of his body, and the trials of life, by the strength and energy of his mind. But if the mind be wounded, if this be cast down, if slow consuming care and grief have shot the dagger into the soul, what can then sustain the man? Nothing but the unseen God."

Prov. 25 : 28, "He that hath no rule over his own spirit (ruchu) is like a city that is broken down," i. e. he who does not command his temper. 29 : 11, "a fool uttereth all his mind" (ruach;) i. e., all his thoughts. Ecc. 1 : 14, "all is vanity and vexation of spirit" (ruach) or all produce vanity and vexation. Isa. 19 : 3, "The spirit" (ruach)—the courage—"of Egypt"—or the Egyptians—"shall fail." 61 : 3, "the spirit (ruach) of heaviness;" i. e., great depression and care. Ezek. 3 : 14, "in the heat of my spirit" (ruchi) or in my rage. Compare Judges 8 : 3, below. 20 : 32, "That which cometh into your mind" (rucachem,) meaning that which you think. Habak. 1 : 11, "Then shall his mind (ruach) change"—i. e. his purpose shall change. In a few instances the *ruach* is not translated as in the above passages, but the mental quality it expresses in the particular instances is given in its stead. Thus, Josh. 2 : 11, "Neither did there remain any more courage (ruach) in any man, because of you." Judges 8 : 3, "Then their anger (rucham—margin 'spirit') was abated toward him, when he had said that."

Note.—The process by which *ruach* came to express *mental qualities* or *states*, appears to be the following. The entrance of the *ruach*, the "breath of life," into the lungs causes vitality in the organized being man, or makes him alive, and the different mental phenomena evolved by his brain, or which the being man manifests when alive, receive the designation *ruach*, since it is by the influence of the *ruach* that all his essential functions, physical and mental, are performed. For instance, living men have passions and affections, and these are, in Prov. 25 : 28, quoted above, collectively called a man's *ruch* (same word as ruach,) inasmuch as it is by the constant reception of the *ruach* of life that these are excited and preserved in activity; or, as already stated, the secondary cause *ruach* becomes in these verses the designation of some of its sublimest effects.

4th. In many instances *ruach* translated "spirit" is obviously used like "Soul" and "Heart" to express the idea of *self* or personality. Some verses already quoted really belong to this classification, and for the sake of giving as much clearness as possible to this work, they will just be repeated under this head.

Gen, 41 : 8, "In the morning his spirit was troubled," or, *he* was troubled. Other forms are, Ps. 25 : 17, "The troubles of my *heart* are enlarged. John 12 : 27, "Now is my *soul* troubled;" i. e. now am I troubled. Gen. 45 : 27, "The spirit of Jacob their Father revived. Other forms are, Is. 57 : 15, "To revive the *heart* of the contrite ones;" i. e. to revive the contrite ones. Lam. 1 : 16, "The comforter that should relieve my *soul*," or me. Deut. 2 : 30, "God hardened his spirit" or him. Another form is, Exod. 7 : 13, "and he hardened Pharaoh's *heart*;" or made him obstinate. The opposite state of mind is thus expressed. Ps. 35 : 13, "I humbled my *soul*;" or myself. 1 Kings 21 : 5, "Why is thy spirit so sad?" i. e. why art *thou* so sad? 1 Chron. 5 : 26, "Stirred up the spirit of Pul," or simply stirred up Pul. 2 Chron. 21 : 16, "The spirit of the Philistines," or the Philistines, simply. Job. 7 : 11 "I will speak in the anguish of my spirit," or I will speak in *my* anguish. The parallel to this member immediately follows in the verse,

—"I will complain in the bitterness of my *soul*," or I will complain in my bitterness, 10 : 12, "thy visitation hath preserved my spirit," or *me*. 15 : 13, "turnest thy spirit," or turnest *thyself*, "against God." 32 : 18, "I am full of matter, the spirit within me (margin, 'of my belly,') constraineth me." The second clause is explained in this instance by the first, and the passage simply means, I am full of matter;—I am constrained from within, or I am constrained, i. e. to speak, as he says in verse 20, "I will speak," &c. Ps. 31 : 5, "Into thine hand I commit my spirit," or I commit *myself*, "thou hast redeemed me, O Lord." The "me" in the second clause is parallel to "my spirit" in the first. Ps. 32 : 2, "in whose spirit," in whom, "there is no guile." 51 : 10, "renew a right (margin, "constant") "spirit within me."

A right spirit is a right state of spirit, and a prayer for a right state of spirit is a desire to be made as a man right, or constant in the exercise of religion. The parallel to "spirit" here is "heart" in the first clause of the verse, "create in me a clean heart, O God renew," &c. The whole verse is a prayer from David that God would make him a morally pure and perseveringly religious man.

Ps. 76 : 12, "He shall cut off the spirit of princes," i. e., he shall cut off princes. 77 : 3, "my spirit," or I, "was overwhelmed." The parallel to this clause is in the first part of the verse, "I remembered God and was troubled; I complained and my spirit," &c. 77 : 6, "My spirit," or I, "made diligent search." 106 : 33, "They provoked his (Moses') spirit;" i. e. they provoked *him*. 142 : 3, "When my spirit," or when I "was overwhelmed." 143 : 7, "My spirit faileth," or I fail. Prov. 11 : 13, "He that is of a faithful spirit concealeth the matter," i. e. a faithful person concealeth the matter. 16 : 2, "The Lord weigheth the spirits," i. e. the Lord weigheth men. The same truth is sometimes expressed by another form, thus—"the Lord searcheth all HEARTS," 1 Chron. 28 : 9. Ecc. 7 : 8, "the patient in spirit"—or *the patient*—"is better than the proud in spirit," or *the proud*. 10 : 4, "If the spirit of the ruler"—i. e, if *the ruler*—"rise up against thee, leave not thy place." Isa. 38 : 16, "In all these things is the life of my spirit," or *of me*; or, In all these things is my life. Gesen. Lex. 54 : 6, "a woman forsaken and grieved in spirit,"—a forsaken and grieved woman. Dan. 2 : 1, wherewith his spirit"—or *he*—"was troubled." 7 : 15, "I Daniel was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body," or, I Daniel was inwardly grieved; or just, I Daniel was grieved. Hag. 1 : 14, "The Lord stirred up the spirit of Zerubbabel"—or simply, Zerubbabel—"the son of Shealtiel, governor of Judah, and the spirit of Joshua," or simply, Joshua. Mal. 2 : 16, "take heed to your spirit," or to *yourselves*. Instead of "spirit" we have "mind" used to express personality in Dan. 5 : 20, "But when his heart"—or when *he*—"was lifted up; and his mind (ruch) hardened in pride," i. e. when *he* was hardened in pride.

Before concluding this section of our work, we may refer briefly to two passages in which *ruach* occurs, as they have sometimes been supposed to look in favor of the prevailing opinion about the human spirit.

1. The first is Job 4 : 15, "Then ('when deep sleep falleth on men,' v. 13) a spirit passed before my face, the hair of my flesh stood up." On which we remark,

a. That, as this forms part, not of Job's words but of a speech by "Eliphaz the Temanite" (v. 1) whom we have no reason to view as an inspired man, his words, whatever they may express, are not to be held as bringing with them divine authority, no more than those of any other uninspired person.

b. But then, when Eliphaz declares he saw in vision "a spirit," he does not say it was a *human* spirit, and who would affirm that "a spirit" and "a *human* spirit" are the same thing?

c. The passage then contains nothing for the common idea about human spirits. That there are creatures called "spirits" in the universe we do not deny; but we assert, on extended scriptural authority, that man is not a spirit, for he is "flesh;" the *ruach* he possesses is only the spirit, or breath, of life from God. No wonder, then, we never read of *disembodied* human spirits in the Book. This language, with its kindred phraseology "deathless spirit of man," "immortal soul," &c., is common almost everywhere but in the Word of God! Even Eliphaz rebukes the idea, when he tells us that the voice he heard inquired, "Shall MORTAL MAN be more just than God? shall a man be more pure than his maker? Behold, he put no trust in his servants; and his angels he charged with folly: How much less in them that dwell in houses of clay, whose foundation is in the dust, which are crushed before the moth." Job 4 : 17, 18, 19.

2. Isa. 31 : 3, "Now the Egyptians are men and not God, and their horses flesh and not spirit (ruach.) When the Lord shall stretch out his hand, both he that helpeth shall fall, and he that is holpen shall fall down, and they all shall fail together" (or be destroyed.)

This passage draws no contrast between flesh, and everything that bears the name of *ruach*; but between the creatures mentioned in it,—"the Egyptians" and "their horses"—and the eternal God who is "a Spirit,"—whose nature is spiritual; who also is possessed of infinite power to aid his friends, and crush his enemies. Man is here represented as frail, for he is no less flesh than horses, "all flesh" being common scriptural designation of the whole terrestrial animal creation. God is a spirit, of unbounded, changeless, resistless energy. "This verse," says Professor Alexander, in his commentary on Isaiah, "repeats the contrast between human and divine aid, and the threatening, that the unbelievers and their foreign helpers should be involved in the same destruction. The antithesis of *flesh* and *spirit*, like that of *God* and *man*, is not metaphysical but rhetorical, and it is intended simply to express extreme dissimilitude or inequality."

[To be Continued.]

Vice stings us even in our pleasures, but virtue consoles us even in our pains.

The just man will flourish in spite of envy.

From A. L. Hunt, Carbondale City, Pa.

Br. Storrs.—For some time past I have been favored with the perusal of your invaluable paper, by a good brother here, but wishing to identify myself more closely with the friends and advocates of the cause of truth, and the Bible, hoping thereby to be instrumental in doing something, by the blessing of God, towards overthrowing the Babelistic utopian paradrome, by which theologians vainly attempt to span the period of time which comprehends eternity, by assuming that man is inherently immortal—that the creature man is unconditionally and unqualifiedly destined to live on throughout the countless ages of eternity, although with the same breath they aver, that if God should withhold his sustaining hand for a moment, that moment we should be annihilated. The Book distinctly informs us that the wicked will "be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power." Does not the Almighty pervade the immensity of space? Is he not an everywhere present God? Can he not with one glance of his eye, so to speak, survey the universe? Where then are the wicked when destroyed? Why, doubtless, "beyond the bounds of time and space." That is—nowhere. I rejoice to say the cause of truth is advancing, although slowly, here. Men are beginning to dare to read and think for themselves on this all-important subject. Too long already have men blindly submitted to the supposed infallible teachings of their *human* spiritual advisers. Some features of the Gospel of Christ are in danger of being subverted by the manifold traditions of men. If the light that is in us become darkness, how great is that darkness. The principle objection urged against this doctrine by immortal soulists is, that if men gave universal credence to it, they will be content to live in sin, and never repent and give their hearts to God. This looks a little plausible, but men are not driven into Heaven by fright, either by preaching the terrors of the law or otherwise. It is not in accordance with God's dealings with men to coerce obedience. His subjects are volunteer subjects. His worship must be purely a free-will worship. The objector says, that man would be less concerned about his future destiny. Would it be possible for the generality of mankind to be apparently less concerned about what awaits them in the future than now? Furthermore, most men suppose that they shall in some way escape punishment, or if punished for a time, that they will eventually be restored; and some would prefer to live in misery rather than die, *i. e.*, be destroyed. Here life and death are set before us by the great head of the church: the one contrasted with the other, and in opposition to it something tangible, zeal-inspiring. Life, life through Christ, is the heaven-appointed stimulus to Christian effort—a life of happiness unspeakable in the new Jerusalem, at his second coming.

By taking this view of the subject, a hundred vexed questions are immediately solved; whereas, the old Pagan notion rendered the interpretation contradictory in many instances, besides outraging reason and common sense. Now the mist is cleared away, and I can read the Bible understandingly, without the aid of a commentary and the traditions of the Fathers. Now, God appears as He is represented in his word, a God of love, mercy, and justice; who willeth not the death of any, but rather that all would come unto him that they might have life.

The objector says, he would throw away the Bible entirely, ere he would believe in man's mortality. Yes, throw away the holy Book of God in a rage, rather than give up the Popish notion of inherent immortality. Strange, indeed, must be their views of the attributes of the Creator. If it is God's will, and he declares it is, that the wicked shall be destroyed, ought we not rather to rejoice at it? If our hope of life and happiness is based on native immortality, as many suppose, then with the apostle, we are of all men most miserable. Then Christ died and rose again, in a great measure, in vain; for the resurrection in that case is of minor importance, and a secondary consideration. Is it a virtue in man to delight in the sufferings of a fellow-creature, bone of our bone, and flesh of our flesh; especially when no benefit is derived to him or his fellow? How delightful and transporting the sight, from the Eden of bliss, to behold near and dear friends, a beloved father or mother, or peradventure a brother or sister, wailing in woe unutterable, without hope of mercy, and without end! And how much more entrancing, to view a husband or wife, son or daughter, vainly calling for help, and with outstretched arms imploring your aid!

From Jesse Broderick, St. Catherines, C. W.

Dear Friend:—Some months ago, your Six Sermons fell into my hands rather in a singular way. One of the clerks where I was at work was sweeping out the store. Amongst the leaves and papers I saw one with these words on the cover, "Are the Wicked Immortal?" Instead of throwing *it* in the stove along with the rest, I thought I would give it a reading. Accordingly I took it home, but it lay for some time before I read it, thinking it might not be well to spend my time on Sunday reading such a book as that. However, I am thankful that at last I spent time on a *Monday;* and from that day, neither Sunday nor any other day passed away, for some time, without spending a portion thereof in reading that valuable book; and, as M. Bachelor says, they (the Six Sermons,) have opened the eyes of thousands. I thank the good Lord that I am *one* of the number led to see that man is *mortal;* and an unholy mortal; and that Immortality can only be found in Christ.

A few week since, I had two numbers of the "Bible Examiner," for the month of May last, put into my hands, and from what I have read therein, I feel desirous to become a subscriber, and I enclose one dollar for payment, in advance. In case you should issue the Examiner weekly, I shall be glad to pay whatever more may be required.

Yours, in hope of immortality through Christ.

"The Discussion."—Owing to sickness in Prof. Mattison's family, he has not been able to furnish an article for this number of the Examiner.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, JULY 15, 1854.

"Going to Heaven at Death."

The *Louisville Journal* gives the following account of a transaction which occurred ten miles from that city. The lad spoken of was thirteen years old. His name was Henry Merriman. The Journal says:

"This is one of the most mysterious as well as one of the most extraordinary cases of suicide ever committed in this country. Henry was a devout Christian. He had lost a little sister who belonged to the church. This sister had given him a prayer-book on her death-bed, and desired him to use it. He had become so interested in the book, and on the subject of meeting with a dear sister, that it was a subject of daily conversation and prayer with him. He appeared desirous to be with her. His mother had told him that he would meet his sister in heaven after death. He prayed nightly and daily to see her, and in his fit of religious insanity, he, upon his knees, cut his throat from ear to ear, severing both jugular veins. This was truly a sorry sight to look upon—a heart-broken mother, afflicted father, and distressed relatives—this was a scene to dissolve a heart of stone. Every one present was in tears; every man became as it were a child. The verdict of the jury was, that the child came to his death from the influence of the above facts, causing religious insanity."

The child was, no doubt, "insane;" but his desire to be with his sister in heaven—where his "mother told him he would meet her after death"—was perfectly natural from the love he had to her; and no wonder, with such instruction as he had, from the common theology, he should be anxious to go to her loved society; and as "insanity" can be plead for the suicidal act, why stands his mother there "heart-broken," and his father "afflicted?" Had not Henry and his sister met in that glorious heaven where his mother had told him they would meet after death? Why then is she heart-broken? Tell us, ye Philosophers, ye Divines! Summons all the priests of natural immortality, and of going to heaven at death, and before the resurrection at the last day, and see if you can all solve the mystery that a mother, full in your views, stands heart-broken that her two loved and loving ones were now enjoying their happy meeting in heaven!

Seriously—Had such a case of suicide occurred, which could as distinctly have been traced to the influence of the doctrine of no eternal life except through Jesus Christ, and by a resurrection at the last day, would not our theological opponents have shouted—"Behold the fruit of your doctrine!—that's just what might have been expected!" However, we judge not the tendency of the common theory by an isolated case like that before us. We believe the notion of going to heaven at death is clearly subversive of the whole gospel scheme of redemption, is a practical denial of the resurrection of the dead, and the return of the Son of God "*from* heaven;" and is just as truly a fable as the Roman purgatory, and quite as pernicious in its effects. Saith Paul—"Ye turned to God from idols, to serve the living and true God; and to wait for His Son *from heaven*, whom He raised from the dead," &c. 1 Thes. 1: 9, 10. The true Christian is here characterised not as waiting to "*go* to heaven," but waiting for Christ to come *from* heaven, when the "Lord himself shall decend from heaven with a shout, and with the voice of the arch-angel and the trump of God;" then "the dead in Christ shall rise." See 1 Thess. 4: 16, 17.

The Bible hope—the gospel hope—is entirely a different matter from the fancy hope so pathetically urged upon our attention by the advocates of "going to heaven at death." Let these things be pondered well; and let us all see that our hope has for its foundation the words of God and not the words of man.

Intermediate State of the Dead.

Under the above head the "Rev. D. W. Clark, D.D.," of the Methodist Episcopal Church, is writing for the *Christian Advocate* of this city. Some of his statements and remarks we shall notice. He opens by saying:

"Job, speaking of the place of the dead, calls it 'a land of darkness, as darkness itself; and of the shadow of death, without any order, and where the light is darkness.'"

From this starting point, Mr. Clark proceeds to speak as follows:

"In the early ages of the world, and even now in some heathen lands, the place of the dead is conceived of as a dark, indistinct, and dreamy region, situated somewhere beneath the earth. This was the first expression of the instinctive longing of the soul after immortality—the first rational or natural denial of the extinction of our being in death. It was natural that in the infantile state in which the human mind existed in the early ages of the world, that this childish conception should spring into existence, and exert a controlling influence over the imaginations of men. Their friends died, and their bodies were deposited in subterranean vaults and caves; hence arose the idea of the dark, underground region where they were supposed to live. This region was called among the Hebrews *Sheol*, and among the Greeks *Hades*—which terms mean a place of darkness, where nothing is seen, or, specifically, the place of departed spirits. In this land

of darkness and silence the dead retained their living personality in the form of mysterious shadows, and hence, were called *manes*, or shades. This land of shadows was to them desirable, because they expected there to meet again their departed friends, and to enjoy their companionship for ever. This was the dawning twilight of the glorious doctrine of the soul's immortality, now so clearly defined and so fully demonstrated."

Here we have the origin of the doctrine of the soul's immortality distinctly stated by an orthodox minister, "D.D." It is *heathenism*, or heathenish in its birth. The Doctor however affirms, in that "land of darkness and silence the dead retained their living personality," and "this land of shadows was to them desirable, because they expected there to meet again their departed friends," &c. A curious meeting that in darkness, "where nothing is seen." How "desirable" such a place must be! Again the doctor says:

"An offshoot, as it were, of this early conception of the state of the departed spirits has traveled down and been manifested in some instances in our own time. We refer to the idea that the spirits of the dead linger about the places where their bodies were buried. * * * Dr Knapp says 'that many of the ancients believed that the departed souls remain in or about the graves or dwellings of the dead, either for ever or for a long time.' He also says that the opinion widely prevailed that departed spirits sometimes return from the kingdom of the dead, and linger aronnd the dead body or the place of burial. These ideas also prevailed, to some extent, among the Jews and early Christians; and thus it was forbidden, in the year 313, to kindle a light in the places of burial, lest the spirits of the saints should be disturbed."

Thus heathenism corrupted the Jews and Christians away from the simplicity of the Bible doctrine of a future life by a *resurrection* from the dead. It is a great pity that some one could not "kindle a light" that should not only "disturb" the heathen fable but drive the ghostly doctrine of life when dead from the minds of men, that they might see and feel the importance of the resurrection at the last day. The Doctor next says:

"A similar feeling still exists among the less intelligent people even in Christian countries. Hence the half-defined, the half-believed idea of the ghost of the murdered man or of the suicide haunting the place where the crime was perpetrated. Hence also that feeling when we approach the place where the bodies of our departed friends slumber as though they themselves were there. 'Hence it is common for persons, of all grades of cultivation, to seek beneath the willow where they lie a kind of lonely fellowship with their beloved dead. There is a sweet hope, at least, that there they are nearer to them than in all the world besides; and he is regarded as a cold and heartless intruder who would argue away from them the cherished dream. 'She goeth to the grave to weep there.' Sweet mourner! Though we would not rudely drive her away from the spot which has embalmed all she held dear on earth, or forbid her to water with her tears, the earth which she expects will some day yield her back her own again, yet we would whisper softly and tenderly, 'He is not here. Why seek ye the living among the dead?'"

The most remarkable part of the preceeding extract is, that the "Rev. D.D." should give countenance to such a perverson of Scripture. To prove that the dead are not dead, or that their spirits are alive, the words of the angel at the tomb of Jesus are garbled. Why did the angel say, "*He is not here?*" and why did he seem to upbraid them with the question, "Why seek ye the living among the dead?" The Doctor seems to wish to make the impression that this language is appropriate to use to all persons who think their friends are dead because they are laid in the grave.

Let us look at the facts withheld by Mr. Clark. What are they? Jesus was dead—for "*Christ died*—and *he was buried*," so saith the Scriptures; and not till "the *third day*" did he *live* again, and then he "*rose from the dead:*" now he is alive for ever more. When the angel said, "He is not here," he spoke truth, because Jesus had arisen from the dead. But would it have been truth if he had spoken in this manner the day previous? Certainly not: it would have been untrue. Jesus, before his resurrection was "among the dead."—Such is the testimony of the Bible; and to say the contrary is to be "infidel." The question of the angel to the woman at the sepulchre shows the fact beyond reasonable controversy, that had it not been for Christ's resurrection, he would still have been "among the dead;" and that consequently without a resurrection men remain among the dead, and are *not* among the living. A most fatal text this for the learned divine who garbled it to make it speak in favor of the heathen offspring, the "soul's immortality."

And then, who should his garbled extract have been "whispered softly" to? Only think, gentle reader, to Mary, the sister of Lazarus! for, "She goeth unto the grave to weep there." She however met Jesus, and said to him, "If thou hadst been here my brother had not died." She is on her way to the grave, is she, Doctor, to weep there over Lazarus? "Sweet mourner!" Why did not Jesus "whisper softly and tenderly" to mourning Mary and Martha, and say of Lazarus, "He is not here. Why seek ye the living among the dead?" What *soft* words these would have been! How consoling, but for the fact that they would have

been words of *falsehood!* Lazarus *was there;* and he was "among the dead." Jesus comforted these sisters with the only true words of comfort concerning "meeting again" those who had died in Christ—"Thy brother shall rise again:" *not,* "Thy brother has gone to heaven—he is alive:" No, such words would have been words palpably false. "Lazarus *is dead,*" said Jesus to his disciples, and when he cried, "Lazarus *come forth,*" he did not "whisper softly—'*He is not here,* why seek ye the living among the dead?'" No; he really seemed to think Lazarus was there! and he spoke accordingly! and, strange to tell, "*he* that *was dead* came forth, bound hand and foot with *grave clothes*!" etc.

This whole transaction, together with the events at Jesus' own tomb, stamp for ever the whole fable, of a conscious entity surviving in death, as an enormous error. Are not the abettors of such an error the *real* "infidels?" They have substituted the traditions of men for the truth of God, and virtually deny the "resurrection of the dead"—the great cardinal doctrine of revelation. The Scriptures are garbled by them; the context, and the general teachings of the Bible are set at naught to sustain their theory of the "soul's immortality."

Mr. Clark proceeds as follows:

"While we cherish the spot where the dear departed lie as something sacred and holy in the heart's affections, and though we often go there to commune in our thoughts and feelings with them, yet it is well to dislodge from our minds so gloomy a thought as that their spirits are evermore hovering around the sad, mournful spot. Ah, who could cherish such an idea without a sensible augmentation of sorrow and of deep concern? The place is so cold and lonely. The night winds sigh so dolefully there. How dreadful, in the dead of night, is that dreary and dreamless silence! The snow lies so cold upon the grave; and fiercer than even the cutting anguish of your bereaved heart are the wintry storms that rave, and drift, and whirl around the monumental marble. Can any one, then wish the sainted dead to be there? No, no. We would not *wish* them to be there. They are *not* there; it is only inanimate mortality. It feels not its loneliness, and is not chilled by the coldness of the place. Banish, then, the thought from your mind; for they are not there. In happier society than that in the city of the dead they live; to sweeter sounds they listen; to the music of angelic choirs they bend an enraptured ear. In genial and stormless climes they have found a home."

This is such *poetry* that we feel almost inclined to pass it in silence. It is true the "spirits" of the dead are not "hovering around the sad, mournful spot"—the grave. That would be "mournful" indeed! No wonder such a thought is "dreadful"—dreadful to think the spirits are where "the snow lies so cold upon the grave!" and then, for them to stay out there "in the dead of night!"—and through "the wintry storms that rave, and drift, and whirl around the monumental marble!" Surely, "we would not wish for them to be there," for it must be fearful to think what those "immaterial immortals" must suffer from such "wintry storms!" What a penetrating *material* these storms must be charged with to make the *immaterials* feel that such a place is "dreadful!"—They are *not* there," cries out the Doctor. Truly, for once, he is right; but where are they, Br. C? He answers—"In happier society * * * to sweeter sounds they listen; to the music of angel choirs they bend an enraptured ear," &c. Here is enough of untruth, and we are glad he did not add, "They are praising the Lord," for that would be so palpable a falsehood that no mask could cover it: because the divine Spirit of God hath declared, by the mouth of the prophet, "*The dead praise not the Lord,* neither any that go down to *silence.*" Psa. 115: 17.

Mr. Clark next gives us some account of the doctrine of the "transmigration of souls," traveling through various bodies of animals, beasts, birds and fishes, till they reach the "pure world of blessed spirits." Possibly he had Pres. Beecher's "*Conflict of Ages*" in his mind; but he calls this doctrine a "Dark and gloomy speculation," yet he admits it was "prevalent in the theology of the ancient Egyptians, in the philosophy of Pythagoras and of Plato, and has found advocates in nearly every age." So it must be true, if the advocates of the soul's immortality are correct in arguing the truth of their theory by telling us, "it must be true that the soul is immortal, because all nations have believed it so;" and Plato has especially been appealed to in proof of the truth of their theory. Let them take the whole dose which Plato and his brother Philosophers have mixed for them, and not shrink from it because its dregs are bitter. We boldly assert the darling doctrine of the natural immortality of the soul has no higher origin than heathen philosophy: not one word of it in the Bible. Mr. Clark next speaks at follows:

"As science advanced and knowledge increased the old theory of an under-world region, where the dead were gathered, gave place to the more distinct theory of an *intermediate abode.* The poet thus describes this separate, intermediate abode:—

"O see! an awful world is this
Where spirits are detain'd. 'Tis half a heaven
And half a hell! What horrid mixture here!
I see before me, and along the edge
Of rayless night, on either side the shades
Of spirits move; as yet unjudged, undoom'd,

Or unrewarded. Some do seem to hope;
Some sit in gloom; some walk in dark suspense;
Some agonize to change their state. O, say,
Is all this real, or but a monstrous dream?"

Having received the first indication of this doctrine from heathen philosophy, it was subsequently evolved in Christian light. It first became a part of Christian philosophy, and then a part of Christian faith. The Council of Florence, in 1439, established it as a doctrine of the Papal Church, and it was afterward reaffirmed by the Council of Trent. It is also recognised in the forms of the Episcopal Church. In the Papal Church this intermediate abode is connected with the idea of purgatory and the extension of man's probation to this middle abode. This privilege, however, does not extend to those who have not believed and been baptized into the Church; for all such, they believe, go immediately and without hope to hell. In the Episcopal Church this intermediate abode is regarded as a place where the spirit is detained till the resurrection of the body and its final glorification; and for these events they believe it to be undergoing a preparatory training while in its separate abode.

The special and insurmountable objections to this theory of an intermediate abode will more distinctly appear in our subsequent discussion; but we cannot fail here to remark, that, so far as it is connected with the idea of probation subsequent to this life, it is palpably opposed to the clearest teachings of divine revelation.

Here again Mr. Clark gives us a pretty fair account of the origin of the intermediate conscious state of the dead; and "the Poet's" description differs nothing essentially from the "orthodox" account of the same state; but he objects to the Papal part of the conscious state of the *dead-alive* ones.

We come at last to the hated doctrine Mr. Clark has evidently been seeking to approach, and he pounces upon it as follows:

"Another error relating to the intermediate state, and one that is more revolting to all the instincts of our nature than any of those we have considered, is that THE SOUL DIES WITH THE BODY. IT IS STRANGE THAT SUCH A DOCTRINE SHOULD EVER HAVE FOUND PLACE WITH THOSE WHO BELIEVE IN THE RESURRECTION AND IN EVERLASTING LIFE AFTER DEATH. Yet such is actually the case. This theory is thus stated by some of its modern advocates: 'The whole man, whatever are his component parts, suffers privation of life, in what we call death.' And again, 'The period which elapses between the time of death and the resurrection is spent in unconsciousness and inactivity; the soul is either extinct or in a profound and dreamless sleep, forgetful of all that is past, ignorant of all that is around it, and regardless of all that is to come.' The philosophical basis of this doctrine is the assumption that the soul is only the result of the physical organization, and, therefore, can have no separate existence. But all reason and all philosophy demonstrate the falseness of this assumption. The premises being taken away, the conclusion is of no force. THE SCRIPTURAL ARGUMENT IS ABSURD AND UNSUSTAINED. THE ASSUMPTION THAT THE BIBLE TEACHES SUCH A DOCTRINE IS A MONSTROUS FRAUD UPON ALL REVELATION.—Quickened and revived as this doctrine has been repeatedly amid the delusions and heresies of the present day, it has so little to give it countenance, either in reason or revelation, and is in itself so repugnant to all the instincts of the soul, that no degree of fanaticism can give to it more than a brief and sickly existence. A sufficient refutation of the assumption will be found in the Scripture doctrines we shall develop in the subsequent discussion of this subject. But we may inquire here, How can this state of unconscious sleep or of ABSOLUTE extinction be consistent with the living union of the believer in Christ? 'Because I live, ye shall live also.' This is the great pledge of our uninterrupted life. He that believeth hath eternal life; he that liveth and believeth on Him shall never die; and he that hath the Son hath life.—CHRIST IS THE SOURCE OF OUR LIFE; AND AS THE SOUCE CANNOT BECOME EXTINCT, NEITHER CAN THE LIFE THAT FLOWS FROM IT. DEATH HAS NO POWER HERE. Instead of locking our faculties up in unconsciousness, and isolating us from our union with Christ, it can only break down some of the obstructions to that intercourse that have heretofore existed.

'It gives us more than was in Eden lost.'"

We have put in small caps those parts of the foregoing to which we wished to call special attention. If the *soul* does not "die with the body" then it can have no resurrection; hence on Mr. Clark's theory there is no resurrection of *the man*, because the resurrection is of "*the dead*." "How say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?" "But some will say, How are *the dead* raised up? and with *what body* do THEY come?" 1 Cor. 15: 12, 35. "*They*" is spoken of the dead. If the soul is not dead it shares not in the resurrection, and the body only is the subject of it: and Paul saith—"Thou fool! that which thou sowest is not quickened except it die: and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that *body* that shall be, but bare grain" [i. e., *mere* grain] "it may chance of wheat or some other: but God giveth it *a body* as it hath pleased him, and to every seed its own body." Here the apostle seems to affirm, that the body given the resurrection dead is *not* the identical one that was sown; but the resurrection *man* must be the identical or it is no resurrection but an entire new creation: hence it follows that whatever constituted the essential man was dead. Whatever the soul may be, therefore, it was dead and is the proper resurrection subject. We give here the Para-

phrase of John Locke, Esq., on Paul's words, 1 Cor. 15 : 36–38.

"Thou fool! does not daily experience teach thee, that the seed which thou sowest corrupts and dies, before it springs up and lives again? that which thou sowest is the bare grain of wheat, or barley, or the like; but the body which it has, when it rises up is different from the seed that is sown. For it is not the seed that rises up again, but quite a different body, such as God has thought fit to give it, viz., a plant of a particular shape and size, which God has appointed to each sort of seed."

We pass this paraphrase without endorsing it, but leaving it to its own weight. But if the body only dies, the body only can be the subject of resurrection, and it must be identical or it is no resurrection. We believe the same particles of matter may enter into the body with which the dead come in the resurrection or they may not.—We regard that point as entirely unessential; but the same identical *man* who died must be the subject of the resurrection; and whatever constitutes his identity must therefore have been dead. And "it is strange that such a doctrine" as the denial of the death of the man proper "should ever have found place with those who" profess "to believe in the resurrection, and in everlasting life," *not* "after death," but after the resurrection at the last day.

Mr. Clark says—"The scriptural argument," to sustain the unconscious state of the dead, "is absurd and unsustained." That is, of course, in his mind: but whether it is so in *fact* we may possibly see before we have done with our review of him. He adds—"The assumption that the Bible teaches such a doctrine is a monstrous fraud upon all revelation." We reply—The doctrine that "THOU *shalt not surely die*" appears to be the great "*fraud*;" and if age can make it true it is as old as could be desired. What side of that controversy our friend Clark has adopted is quite apparent, and will doubtless be still more so before long. He talks of the view we advocate being that of the "*absolute* extinction" of man in death, even "of the believer in Christ." We will not say, Br. C. is guilty of "a monstrous fraud" in this insinuation; but we will say, he is sadly mistaken in our views. "The dead in Christ" are "*asleep*;" hence are unconscious. What that state of sleep is, except that it is one of "*no knowledge*," we do not pretend to say; but it is not one of "*absolute* extinction:" they will awake at the voice of Christ—"at the last day"—as did Lazarus at Bethany, when he was dead and Christ called him forth. He "had been dead," saith the record; but Jesus said, "I go that I may *awake him* out of his sleep," and he did awake him; and he will awake all his followers when he shall "himself descend from heaven, with the voice of the archangel, and the trump of God;" then "the dead in Christ shall rise;" and our friend C. will find it difficult to produce a promise of Christ, because "I live ye shall live also," that embraces any period "after death" till "*the last day*" resurrection.

In the sentiment that "Christ is our life" we heartily concur; therefore the life principle is not of ourselves: "the source" is in Christ, who is alive for evermore. "Death has no power" to deprive the believer of this life, though such believer sleep in utter unconsciousness one year, or a thousand: he will surely awake at the voice of Christ: but as to substituting the sentiment—"Death gives us more than was in Eden lost"—for the promise of Christ—"*I* will raise *him* up at the last day"—we wish not to share in such blasphemy.

Our friend Clark says, the doctrine of the unconscious state of the dead, till the resurrection—or, "that the soul dies with the body"—"is more revolting to all the instincts of our nature than any of those errors" he had previously "considered." Now, his "instincts" must be of a very peculiar character; for he had "considered" purgatory, transmigration through beasts, birds, and fishes—the dancing of the soul in bleak winter storms and dark nights over the grave of its dead body, &c.; yet none of these are so "revolting" as the thought of sleeping quietly and soundly till Jesus shall return from heaven to awake us!! Really, we think there are not many "instincts" like our friend Clark's; and we rather *guess* if he was certain he should have to try the beauties of purgatory, transmigration, and dancing in the dark wintry storms about the grave yard, he might think better of a little quiet sleep till Jesus should bid him wake. At any rate, *our* instinct differs entirely from our good brother Clark's: and we doubt not, when he awakes in the resurrection, with all the rest of Christ's family, who slumbered peacefully while so many of earth's storms and trials were howling around its inhabitants, he will rejoice to find he has not to wait for one of the glorious family of Christ to end his trials before enjoying their society.

Honor that which is good, just, and virtuous, in all men, let their form of worship, or outward manner of expression about religion be what it may. To set down mistakes of the head for corruptions of the heart is a great folly.

IS THE SOUL A DISTINCT ENTITY?

Affirmative by C. F. Hudson.

DEAR EXAMINER:—My last letter closed with a discussion of Eccl. 12 : 7. I now proceed with the list of passages I have offered.

Isaiah 10 : 18. In this prophecy the valiant men of the Assyrian army are compared to the mighty trees of a forest. But to express the idea of their complete destruction, the soul (nephesh) is named as well as the body. The Light of Israel "shall consume the glory of his forest, and of his fruitful field, both soul and body," (Heb.) "from the soul even to the flesh." Now it would be unnatural, in such a connection, to speak of *consuming* the *life*, or the *breath*, or the *blood*. The idea plainly suggested is that the soul combined with the body, not as an attribute, but as an entity, makes the man. The bearing of this passage on the chronology of the second death I do not forget, and hope to consider the point in due time.

In Dan. 12 : 2, the dead are spoken of as awaking from sleep. This certainly is not a re-existing from non-entity. If now it is urged that the identical bodies of the dead are raised again, the difficulties of that theory are insuperable. If it is urged that bodies of identical *organization* are raised again, I grant that is possible. But such bodies would not be spiritual bodies; nor could such beings be accountable for any deeds done in certain former bodies, however precisely like they might be. In short, if the *soul* has not survived, all proper identity of the dying and the rising man is impossible. And *because* the soul survives the word "sleep," so often used in speaking of deceased christians, is pertinent and significant.

Matt. 10 : 28. This passage is similar to that in Isa. 10 : 18, but much more clear and decisive. "Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul." But men can kill and destroy the soul if it depends on the body for its existence. If it is not a distinct entity, capable of surviving the body's dissolution, then every manslayer does what is here declared impossible for man. God may re-create the soul, and restore it (?) from temporary non-existence, if Br. Grew will have it so. For argument's sake I am ready to grant even that. But even that could only be, when the soul has been properly killed and destroyed. The re-creation of the soul must *assume*, instead of *disproving* that it had been destroyed.

The whole verse indicates that the first death is but partial. It affects the body only. The second death is utter and complete. The soul survives the first death, either by the law of its nature or by some equivalent law which we do not understand. It is unhurt of the second death, only through grace, by the life-giving spirit.

Matt. 17 : 4. Respecting this appearance of Moses and Elias with Christ, it must be granted that the "vision" was real and not a dream, or a seeming. Now, though Elias was translated, it is quite certain that Moses was not. See Deut. 34 : 6, and Jude v : 9. And that Moses has anticipated the resurrection is without shadow of proof. If then his body was not here, we can only infer that his soul had, and has, a separate existence, and he was now permitted to "appear" with Elias and Christ. If it be argued that the whole was a vision of things yet future, that objection may be met by my remark on the next passage.

Matt. 22 : 32. Is God *now* the God of Abraham? If so, and Abraham in no way survives his body, then God is *now*, at least, the God of the dead; the very thing which Christ denied.

Luke 16 : 22. I cite this passage, not because I wish to rest my argument on a parable or allegory, but to show that whatever be the *meaning* and *application* of it, its scenery reminds the reader most naturally of a proper intermediate state.

That the story of the rich man and Lazarus is found in the Talmud, and represents some gentile nations, is all very true. Just how much of its teachings Christ intended to indorse, I need not now decide. But if I had not believed before that the use of the word *hades* means something, I should suspect so upon reading Br. Storrs' gloss to the effect that *hades* means the grave. "In *the grave* he lifted up his eyes, being in torments?" (Miscellany, Rich Man and Lazarus, p. 1, 2.) Will such exegesis solve the difficulties of the passage? But Br. S. says again (p. 6) that Theophylact, an ancient writer, first applies this parable to the concerns of the next life, and then allegorizes it. Theophylact belongs to the 11th century. Nearly 800 years before it had been applied, not only by Origen, but by Enethodius, the most prominent anti-Origenist, to the concerns of the next state of man. And even Irenæus, martyred in the hope of Life in Christ, in A. D. 202, understood this passage as something more than allegory. He says (Lib. ii cap. lxii.) "Our Lord hath most plainly taught us that our souls not only continue after death, while passing out of one body into another, but also that they keep the character of the body, wherein they are then also adapted, the same which they had before; as likewise, that they remember the actions and omissions of their life past; in that enarration which is written concerning the rich man and Lazarus, who was refreshed in Abraham's bosom." Thus speaks the disciple of Polycarp, and one who held the righteous alone to be immortal.

Again I say, I do not wish, and trust I do not need, to rest any argument on this account of the rich man and Lazarus. How much it fairly proves respecting the state of the soul I do not know. That the received doctrine makes too much of it, is certain. But on the other hand it is not so easily disposed of as mere allegory. For how could the history of the Jews and Gentiles be allegorized by a scene in *hades*, if *hades* is only the abode of dust? Again, the poet Shelley loved to illustrate things physical by things intellectual; the clearer by the more obscure. Now were the Jews so transcendentalized that myths of their theology were, in Christ's mouth, mere illustrative parables of their future history?

Acts 7 : 59. How could Stephen pray, "Lord receive my spirit," if, upon expiring, he became altogether dust? The distinction between *psuche* and *pneuma*, however, which has its subordinate importance in this discussion, will be afterwards treated. Yours in the love of Christ,

C. F. HUDSON.

Response by Henry Grew.

Dear Br. Storrs :—I pray for divine grace to review, with a single eye to truth, the passages of the sacred volume our brother Hudson has adduced to prove that "the soul that sinneth shall (*not*) die," (in the proper sense of that term,) with the body, being a distinct living entity therefrom.

Isa. 10 : 18. It is not a little remarkable that a passage which so fully and so clearly represents an entire destruction both of soul and body (if the reference is to the men of the army) should be adduced to prove the pre-eminent survivance of the former. As utter destruction of the man is the truth presented, why should it be thought "unnatural in such a connection to speak of consuming the life," &c.? It appears perfectly consistent. It may appear otherwise to one who assumes that the soul is a distinct and deathless entity; but this is the very question at issue, and remains to be proved. The term "soul and body" in the passage no more implies that the former is a distinct entity from the body, than the term "spirit and soul and body," 1 Thess. 5 : 23, implies that man has *two* distinct entities besides his body. All combined constitute but one living entity.

Dan. 12 : 2. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake," &c. Br. H. says, "This certainly is not a re-existing from non-entity. The question is, Is it, or is it not, a re-vivification from a state of unconsciousness? Mark, the entire reference is to that which slept "*in the dust.*" Certainly that which *slept in the dust* was *dead*; so that no proof can be drawn from the term "sleep" in favor of any distinct entity that did not die. Not a syllable of intimation is given in the passage that the awaking is to be effected by any re-union of such a distinct entity with the body. This is to be effected by the voice of the archangel. The *modus* of the resurrection, on any theory, transcends our finite comprehension. The divine testimony is simple on the glorious subject, involving no contradiction. It is, that MAN dies (and not some inferior part of man) and that God raises him (i. e. *man*) from the dead. It is perfectly competent for the Almighty to re-animate the sleeping dust, to give it a perfect organism, identical, in respect to all the powers of thought, memory, and affection, *so far as is necessary to accountability for deeds done in the present state.* Are we to deny the positive testimony of the Eternal Spirit, that all these mental powers perish with the bodily functious in the hour of death, Eccles. 9 : 5, 6, 10; Ps. 146 : 4; 6 : 5; 115 : 17; Job 10 : 18, 19; because we cannot solve all difficulties concerning personal identity? All known philosophical and material facts are opposed to the popular theory. These facts identify mental operations with the brain. A man's brain is diseased. Has he any consciousness of any distinct entity which is independent of and unaffected by the physical disorganization? So far from it, every such disorganization of magnitude, is always connected with mental derangement. The brain, on recovery, is not strictly identically the same. Yet the man's memory recognizes those things, the knowledge of which he had entirely lost for a time. The restoration of physical and mental powers, subsequent both to disease and death, will be amply sufficient to constitute that kind of identity which is essential to accountability. This is all the identity which is essential to accountability. This is all the indentity we intend or need to prove. If man's mental powers are independent of a *dead* brain, as Br. H. supposes, must they not be independent of a *diseased* brain? The contrary, however, is the fact.

Matt. 10 : 28. Certainly this passage, *abstractly considered*, appears to teach that man possesses something which can survive the body. But what shall we say when we find not *one* only, but *several* passages, which as plainly declare that man *can* destroy, and, *in fact*, has destroyed the soul. See Josh. 10 : 28, 30, 32, 35, 37, 39. He must reconcile them by considering that man can destroy the soul *in one sense*, but *not in another*. Thus we reconcile the apparent opposite declarations, God tempteth no man, and God tempted Abraham. The true rendering of the passage, I suppose, would be, "not able to kill the *life*," which gives no support to the supposition that man possesses any distinct entity from his material organism. Man can destroy the soul or life *temporarily*, but not *eternally*. If this is not the precise meaning of our Lord's words, we must allow an import, consistent with the numerous divine testimonies, previously adduced, that the *entire* man is subject to death, and that, in that hour, all his mental as well as physical powers perish.

Matt. 17 : 4. What is the representation here? Is it that the *disembodied spirit* of Moses appeared? No. It was a *bodily form* which the disciples saw and recognized as Moses. Our friend writes, "If then his body was not here, we can only infer that his soul had, and has a separate existence," &c. Now this miraculous vision must be understood as a literal reality or not. If the former, his body *was* there, and seen by the disci-

ples. If the latter, it affords no evidence relative to the question at issue. If the former, it is more than a "shadow of proof" of the resurrection of Moses, against which, I know of no solid objection.

Matt. 22 : 32. Our brother's argument is ingenious, but it is fallacious. Its fallacy consists in overlooking the true subject of consideration. There is not the least reference to the present state of the patriarchs, excepting that they were dead. Whether or not they were *then* existing, was not the question of the Sadducees, who believed that death terminated human existence. *The doctrine of the resurrection* was the sole subject of consideration. To this, and this only, our Lord's answer and reasoning pertinently applies. Mark, "As touching THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. God is not the God of the dead but of the living." What is the argument here of our blessed Lord? Is it that the patriarchs must be now living, in order that God may be the God of the living. *No, verily.* The argument of the faithful Witness is, that *they must be raised from the dead*, or God would be the God of the dead. Now it is manifest, that if the patriarchs were existing in glory, as our brother seems to suppose, God would be the God of the living, if there is no resurrection of the dead. So by our brother's plausible reasoning, the entire force of our Savior's argument is completely nullified. The passage, so far from sustaining the popular opinion, manifestly subverts it. Our brother may ask, is it not a matter of fact, according to the sentiment we advocate, that "God is *now*, at least, the God of the dead?" I reply that Luke 20 : 37, 38, plainly teaches that, *in view of their resurrection*, they live unto "God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which are not as though they were." Rom. 4 : 17.

Luke 16 : 22. As Bro. H. does not "rest any argument on this account of the rich man and Lazarus, I have only to remark, that, if its parabolic or allegorical character is admitted, it has no application to the question at issue. If it is not admitted, the representation of the rich man's sufferings and Lazarus' joys in an *embodied* state, is fatal to the opinion of the joys and miseries of *dis*embodied spirits in the intermediate state.

Acts 7 : 59. "How could Stephen pray 'Lord receive my spirit,' if, upon expiring, he became altogether dust?" I reply, as the dying martyr had the infallible promise of his Savior that he would "raise him up at the last day," it was perfectly proper for him to commit his spirit or vital breath—his life, into his Redeemer's hand. Stephen is dead—the *entire man* is dead; but his "life is hid, (*concealed*, not manifest, or conscious, any where,) with Christ in God," and when Christ his "Life shall appear," then shall "Stephen appear with him in glory." He had no pre-eminence over David in this respect, who has "not ascended into the heavens." Acts 2 : 34. We assure our respected brother, that the truth of God is, that he must "wait for his Son from heaven," to see him, and to enter into the joy of his Lord. It is this truth which gives significance to the petition, "Even so come Lord Jesus," to which we cordially respond our—Amen. HENRY GREW.

THE DRAGON.

We expressed the opinion in 1849, that the Russion Dynasty is the Dragon Power of Rev. 16th and 20th chapters. A part of the article of 1849 we republished March 1st, of the present year, with further remarks on the probable defeat and binding of the Russian power in the present conflict. We well knew that our views on that subject differed from some persons who had a theory to sustain, and hence could see nothing with favor that crossed their path. Some mocked us, and some pitied us for our folly, and went on their own chosen way, with flaming boasts of "*Russia Triumphant and Europe bound!*" We had however, only stated "*our opinion.*" A positive spirit on these matters of prophecy—especially unfulfilled ones—we feel no sympathy with; and persons who persist in such a spirit, after the experience of the past, we regard as unsafe expositors, because self is evidently magnified above truth in such minds.

The opinions we expressed in relation to Russia, in 1849 and in March last, are unaltered by any thing we have seen written of a contrary character; and the events of the war, so far, go to confirm us in the opinions then expressed. We have been satisfied, for months past, that the Russian power was greatly magnified above the truth, and that the Ottoman power was far too much underrated. We prepared an article last fall on the latter subject, but concluded to lay it aside and wait the developements of the conflict. We believed, and often said last fall, that if France and England had not controlled the Porte and caused him to keep Omar Pasha back from active hostilities, he would have driven the Russians out of the Principalities before the winter set in. The bravery, skill and success of the Turks since, has con-

firmed us in the opinion thus expressed near ten months ago.

We have seen nothing from any quarter that so well corresponds with our views of Russian power and affairs, as an editorial article in the *New York Tribune* of the 11th inst. From that article we give the following extracts, and we hope those who can see nothing but Russia's power and Russia's triumph, will lay these remarks to heart: it may save them from deep mortification, if nothing more. The Emperor of Russia has been inflated by fulsome adulation heaped upon him, till he, fool like, thought he was destined of God to "bind Europe," and ride "triumphant" whither soever he pleased. But the "hook is in his" haughty "jaws," and surely it looks as if "*a great chain*" was fast surrounding his dynasty. Yet we make no positive assertions on that point: we only say—so it looks to us. Time will determine the fact; for that we wait. The *Tribune* speaks as follows:

A certain class of writers have been wont to attribute to the Emperor of Russia the possession of extraordinary powers of mind, and especially of that far-reaching, comprehensive judgment which marks the really great statesman. It is difficult to see how such illusions could be derived from any truthful view of his character, or from any part of his history; but the most obstinate of his admirers must, we think, now question the justice of their conclusions. Russia is now in a most difficult and humiliating position. Her armies are defeated in Turkey, and, after immense losses of men and means, are retreating within her own frontiers; her possessions in Asia, the fruit of many years effort and vast expenditure, are partly lost and wholly imperiled; her foreign commerce is destroyed and her home industry injured by turning the national attention and the people's energies to a useless and disastrous war; her navy is imprisoned and her fortresses menaced; and she must even regard as an advantage an intervention which, whatever its other benefits, interposes an effectual barrier to the realization of her ambitious dreams, and renders impossible a renewal of her attack on Turkey, because that would involve a direct collision with Germany as well as with the Western powers. And all this is the work of this great statesman and wise ruler Nicholas I. Praise of this headstrong imperial blunderer's mental gifts must hereafter be considerably qualified, if indulged in at all. * * * The Russian army, with its enormous numbers and its whole swarms of officers, cannot afford leaders to take the place of Pashkiewitch, Gorchakoff, Schilders, and Luders, who were killed or disabled in the desperate and confused operations against Silistria. Indeed, old as these men are—Pashkiewitch and Gorchakoff being each above 70, and Luders, the youngest, being above 60—and likely as they were to die a natural death any day, such is the narrowness and imbecility of the system on which the Czar has managed his vast military establishment that we can affirm it as a positive and undeniable fact, that there is hardly a single officer who could step into the vacuted place of either of these generals, and carry with him the confidence of the army and the nation. * * * The army is commanded on the average by old valetudinarians or by ignorant corporals, who might manage a platoon, but have not brains and knowledge enough to direct the extensive and complicated movements of a campaign.

The same narrow-mindedness and presumption appear throughout the Czar's whole management of this Eastern question. Every one can now see that he began the war in an unwise and inadequate manner. Indeed, his very first military demonstration was totally absurd and unequal to the purpose in hand. He ought to have known that Europe would not allow the destruction of Turkey, and should, therefore, either have kept quiet, biding his time, or have crossed the Pruth, not with between forty and fifty thousand men, as he did last year, when during the whole winter he had only one army-corps in the Principalities, but should have pounced at once with his most powerful masses upon Turkey, reaching across the Balkan, before the Turks could have gathered together their scattered forces, and before the Western Powers could have combined in their opposition and sent fleets or troops. To strike by surprise and terror, ought to have been his aim, instead of engaging in such an imbecile manner his nation in a gigantic struggle. But Nicholas is growing old, and has all the faults of decrepit age. One of the reasons which prevented him from putting all his resources into action at once, was, that he feared the cost of such an effort. Now he will lose a hundred times more money, and without results. Penny-wisdom in such an affair isno wisdom at all.

When the Russian forces first crossed the Pruth, the Czar had no doubt,—as we happened to know and took occasion to state at the time,—that he could bully all Europe, and reap laurels at small expense. His diplomatic agents, too, encouraged him in this foolish opinion. The most mischevous of these accessories to the great Russian blunder has proved to be the Russian Minister at Paris, M. de Kisseleff, whose dispatches were full of the most satisfactory accounts concerning the friendly and pacific intentions of Louis Napoleon. The Czar, accordingly, who delights to read adulatory and flattering reports from his agents, caught at the bait, and any dispatch smelling of a disagreeable truth from any quarter was discredited, treated with contempt, and did nothing but injury with the Autocrat to the faithful and able diplomatist sending it. Thus nearly all the Russian diplomatic reports were full of encomiums on the imperial sagacity, to which Europe bowed, as they assured his Majesty, with respect and admiration. In one word, we are able to affirm that since 1851, Nicholas has never had laid before him a truthful account of the state of Europe, and of the feelings of the other Governments towards him and Russia; and if his numerous agents misled him in such a manner, the reason was that this was the most, nay, the only, palatable dish for his political appetite. He craved universal adulation; now he tastes its bitter and poisonous fruits.