BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, AUGUST 1, 1854. NO. 15.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 140 Fulton-street.

TERMS---One Dollar for the Year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

SPIRIT:

OR, THE HEBREW TERMS "RUACH" AND 'NESHAMAH," AND THE GREEK TERM "PNEUMA."

BY REV. WM. GLEN MONCRIEFF, SCOTLAND.

[Continued from page 214.]

NESHAMAH—*Second Hebrew Term.*

SEC. I. NESHAMAH, (constructive form *nishmath*) is a noun: the verb is *nasham*, to *breathe*. Gesenius says the verb is not found in the Hebrew Bible. *Neshamah* is the synonym for *Ruach*. See Professor Lees' Lexicon: *ruach* II. It should also be mentioned that *neshamah* occurs but seldom in the Hebrew Bible.

SEC. II. NESHAMAH is rendered *breath*.

Gen. 2: 7, "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath (nishmath) of life, and man became a living soul."

Concerning this text, which has already been explained by us at some length in "Soul" pp. 4, 5, 6, we would further remark here.

a. That what in this verse is called the *nishmath* of life, is, in the following passages, styled the *ruach* of life. Gen. 6: 17, "I do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh, wherein is the breath (ruach) of life, from under heaven, and everything that is in the earth shall die:"—Gen. 7: 15, "and they went unto Noah in the ark, two and two of all flesh, wherein is the breath (ruach) of life." The *nishmath* and the *ruach* of life are the same thing;—the breath of life, or the breath that preserves alive all animals on the globe's surface.

b. This breath was not a living being; it was not Adam; by its influence the man Adam was simply made alive. According to the text before us he was completely formed of the dust of the ground: not a part essential to him as a human being needed to be added: the only thing required was that the dust-formed man should be made alive—awakened to consciousness, and the performance of all the other functions peculiar to the human order of created beings. The breath was not an addition to the man already formed; it merely introduced him into a new condition, or it animated the being. "The Lord God formed MAN of the *dust* of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul," or person. God breathed, we are informed, into his nostrils the breath of life,—thereby inflated his lungs; in the act of their expansion with the vital air, the heart would begin to beat, and henceforth the breathing would proceed by the God-imparted and God-sustained energy of the organization itself. The origin of man cannot be too carefully noted, and the record is so plain that a child may easily understand it. Adam was formed "of the dust of the ground," or of world-matter; and EVE was no less material in her entire being, for it is said, "The Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept, and he (God) took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; and the *rib*, which the Lord God had taken from man, MADE HE A WOMAN, and brought her unto man. And Adam said, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called woman because SHE WAS TAKEN OUT OF MAN," Gen. 2: 21, 22, 23. We have no mention of how she was made alive; but the record concerning Adam furnishes us with all requisite information to guide us to an understanding of the mode; the Lord God would also breathe into her nostrils the breath of life, and she would become a living soul, or person, likewise.

c. There is not one word in the narrative of man's creation, that gives the smallest countenance to the popular idea regarding the *spirit* of man. At his creation he received from the Almighty the breath of life; but so far from teaching us that the material organization was merely to be the fleshly dwelling of an immaterial and deathless spirit,—indeed of the man himself, for *personality* is now invariably associated with the spirit of man, or the man considered as a spirit—the narrative of the creation inculcates the *very reverse*. Personality is there connected with the organization, not with its *neshamah* or *ruach*, The organization is the first idea; what was imparted after the building up of the organization is subordinate. The breath, as already stated, was not a part of him, it merely made him a living agent. Now, on the supposition that the common notions about man are true, let us candidly ask, whether should we expect the organization of man, or the immensely important point his spirit—in fact *himself*—to be urged conspicuously before our view in the creation-history? Surely what is called the house is less important than its inhabitant,—the instrument than the agent to employ it,—the feeble shadow than the actual and momentous reality? Moreover, it seems reasonable to expect that what is not within the reach

of vision and, if we may so say, of experiment, will be more likely to constitute the subject of Divine narration than what is sensible and most easily discoverable. That the organization in man was of dust, or matter, could be easily detected and that unerringly too; but the spirit: how shall man learn that he has that, indeed that he himself is spirit, and that the fleshly structure is only his dwelling, and his instrument for thought and action? This spirit is invisible, impalpable, immortal; and confessedly beyond the sphere of sensible observation and experiment. Was it not of importance that the fact of his being spirit should be known to man? Was it not necessary that this should be chiefly impressed upon him? Shall he be told of his organization and left ignorant of his spirit, in fact of himself? Shall the building of the house be described, and the tenant be utterly forgotten?

These questions, if considered for a moment, will suggest to any mind, their appropriate and natural response. Let the reader, after pondering them for a little, turn and calmly read the account of the creation of Adam and Eve, and see how very different it is from what the popular theory about the being man would certainly lead us to expect. How simple, and yet how sublime withal! Man is formed of dust, and then he is made alive in the manner described by the pen of inspiration. The whole of the volume harmonizes with this account of man; he is of *dust*, and at death returns to his kindred element. "His breath goeth forth, *he* returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts *perish*," Ps. 146 : 4.

Gen. 7 : 22, "All in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died."

In this verse the two Hebrew words with which we are dealing occur. This fact is not noted in the English text, though it is discoverable in the *marginal* reading, which runs thus—"the breath of the spirit of life" (nishmath—ruach). The breath of the spirit of life, is literally, the breath of the breath of life; and for a creature to have this, is to have a portion of the breath of life, or a portion of that *ruach* or *neshamah* that preserves all organized beings alive. All who had this perished,—died, in the flood; and undoubtedly each in the *same sense*, as in the same manner and circumstances.

1 Kings 17: 17, "There was no breath (neshamah) left in him."

The child had ceased to breathe, he was dead, or on the very brink of dying.

Job 33 : 4, "The breath (nishmath) of the Almighty hath given me life."

The breath of life is called the "breath of the Almighty," because he is its author.

We may observe that the same language occurs in the Hebrew Bible, in Job 32 : 8, "the *inspiration* (nishmath) of the Almighty giveth them (men) understanding." The inspiration is, the in-breathing of the Almighty. The meaning is, God gives breath to men, or he preserves men breathing the vital air, the consequence of which is they live, and exercise understanding, one of the many functions of the animated being man. As we judge, the passage has no reference to inspiration theologically understood,—that inspiration given to prophets and apostles; it describes how it is that man, as man, exercises the thinking powers common to each member of the race. It brings him, as a living creature, very near to the Almighty. It represents him as immediately dependent on his Creator for the prolongation of life and its phenomena, and is thus parallel to the declaration, "He is not far from every one of us, for in him we live and move and have our being." Acts 17 : 27, 28.

Job 34 : 14, "If he set his heart upon man, if he gather unto himself his spirit" (ruchu), that is, the spirit God had given him, "and his breath" (venishmathi), i. e. the breath God had given. What would be the consequence to men? Would they depart to exist in consciousness somewhere else in space? No; the next verse proceeds, "all flesh SHALL PERISH together; and MAN SHALL TURN AGAIN UNTO DUST."

Job 27 : 3, "all the while my breath (nishmathi) is in me; and the spirit of God (margin, 'the *breath* which God gave him') in my nostrils."

His breath was also God's, inasmuch as it came from the Creator. What is here called "my breath," and "the spirit" or breath "of God" is, in Gen. 2 : 7, denominated the "breath of life."

Job 37 : 10, "By the breath (nishmath) of God frost is given." "The breath of God" here means, *the cold wind*. Ps. 150 : 6, "Let every thing that hath breath (*neshamah*) praise the Lord;" i. e., let every living creature praise the Lord. Isa. 2 : 22, "Cease ye from man, whose breath (*neshamah*) is in his nostrils; for wherein is he to be accounted of?"

For man to have his breath in his nostrils, is to have an existence frail and fleeting. "As for man his days are as the grass." Ps. 103 : 15; and Ps. 39 : 4. His days, not on earth, but his days as man, are as grass.

Isa. 30 : 33, "The breath" (nishmath), or the anger "of the Lord, like a stream of brimstone, doth kindle it" (Tophet). Isa. 42 : 5, "He giveth breath (neshamah) unto the people upon it (the earth); and spirit (ruach) to them that walk therein." Compare Job 27 : 3, and 34 : 14, quoted above. Here, probably, "spirit" stands for *life*, the result of breathing. Dan. 5 : 23, "The God in whom thy breath" (*nishmah*)—thy life "is,—hast thou not glorified." Dan. 10 : 17, "Straightway there remained no strength in me, neither is their breath (neshamah) left in me."

Sec. III. NESHAMAH, like *ruach*, is rendered *blast*.

2 Sam. 22 : 16, "At the blast (nishmath) of the breath (*ruach*) of his nostrils." Job 4 : 9, "By the blast" (nishmath) or anger "of God they perish." Ps. 18 : 15, "O Lord, at the blast (nishmath) of the breath of thy nostrils."

Sec. IV. NESHAMAH, in constructive form, is once translated "spirit."

Prov. 20 : 27, "The spirit (nishmath) of man is the candle of the Lord, searching all the inward parts of the belly."

The word *nishmath* here appears to designate

the powers of conscience and self-consciousness which are essential characteristics of a human being. A God-produced discernment of inward and outward right and wrong belongs to men. God as it were in the man, teaches him right and wrong; or what is right and wrong in the sight of the Creator is, by the human moral and intellectual capacities, revealed to each member of our race. With us conscience is popularly called "the voice of God;" and Solomon here styles it "the candle of the Lord," and both forms of speech embody a universally understood and universally acknowledged fact in the human constitution.

What is here ascribed to the "spirit of man," inasmuch as it is by the respiration of *nishmath chayim* (Gen. 2.: 7), i. e. "the breath of life," or vital air, that every operation belonging to man is performed, is, in other parallel passages, connected with his "HEART." For instance, 1 John 3: 20, 21, "If our *heart* condemn us, God is greater than our heart, and knoweth all things: beloved if our *heart* condemn us not, then have we confidence toward God." (See also, Judges 5: 16; 1 Sam. 24: 5; and Rom. 2: 15.) Now, who really believes the heart in his bosom condemns or approves his conduct? What man on earth believes his heart to be himself, a distinct living entity, capable of existing after death? And why believe these things of the *nishmath*, the breath or spirit? The inspired writers employed current phraseology in using the words "spirit" and "heart," and are no more to be understood as teaching us that the mental functions, obviously imported by them in such cases, are executed either by the "heart" or the "spirit," than they are to be held as really declaring God himself to be possessed of a "heart," or "bowels," or "nostrils," or "feet," or "hands," which are freely ascribed to him in the sacred volume. The fundamental idea is that THE BEING MAN has these mental attributes, or performs the acts of condemnation and approval of himself and his neighbors; and it matters not what part of him they are immediately connected with, or by the name of what physical organ belonging to him they are called, like the "heart" for example, or should it even be the very breath itself which gives animation and energy to all.

Sec. V. NESHAMAH is used in several instances to express *a living human being*.

Deut. 20: 16, "thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth," literally, 'not shalt thou save alive all breath' (neshamah), i. e. thou shalt save no living being, or man. The same idea is expressed differently at the commencement of the succeeding verse:—"But thou shalt utterly destroy them," &c.

Josh. 10: 40, "utterly destroyed all that breathed"—literally, 'all the breath' (neshamah); i. e. every living being. 11: 11, "There was not left any to breathe" (*neshamah*), margin, "any breath," i. e., any living being. 11: 14, "neither left he any to breathe" (neshamah), or any man alive. 1 Kings 15: 29, "he left not to Jeroboam any that breathed" (neshamah); or *any breath;* any breathing being.

Sec. VI. NESHAMOTH, the plural form of *neshamah*, is once rendered "*souls*."

Isa. 57: 16, "For I will not contend for ever, neither will I be always wroth, for the spirit (ruach) should fail before me, and the souls (neshamoth) which I have made."

"The exact sense of the Hebrew" (neshamoth), says Prof. Alexander on this verse, "is *breaths;*" here it stands, as in the examples given in the last section, for human beings. There are two parallels in the whole verse, the first couple are these,

"For I will not contend for ever,
Neither will I be always wroth;"

and they express the same idea. The second couple are,

"For the spirit should fail before me,
And the souls"—breaths—"which I have made;"

and they also embody the same thought, viz., that men would utterly perish, were God to act as indicated by the first two lines. To bear the Divine wrath, then, for ever is beyond the endurance of any human being. Does not this, by the way, contradict very explicitly the hideous dogma of eternal torments?

"The learned," says Dr. Clarke, "have taken a great deal of pains to little purpose on the latter part of this verse, which they suppose to be very obscure. After all their labors upon it, I think the best and easiest explication of it is given in the two following elegant passages of the Psalms, which, I presume, are exactly parallel to it, and very clearly express the same sentiment.

"But he in his tender mercy will forgive their sin,
And will not *destroy* them;
Yea, oftentimes will he turn away his wrath,
And will not rouse up his indignation:
For he remembereth that they are BUT FLESH,
A *breath* that *passeth*, and returneth not.
Ps. 78: 38, 39.

"He will not always contend,
Neither will he for ever hold his wrath;
As a father yearneth toward his children,
So is Jehovah tenderly compassionate towards them that fear him;
For he knoweth our frame;
He remembereth that WE ARE BUT DUST."
Ps. 103: 9, 13, 14.

Will the reader believe it, that this good and learned man, immediately after presenting the above passages as a development of the sense of the verse before us, proceeds immediately to explain "the souls" (neshamoth—'breaths'), as meaning "immortal spirits!" The pious Commentator's creed spake about "immortal spirits" to him; but neither is the phrase "immortal spirit," nor the idea it embodies, contained within the boards of the Book. The language of Dr. C. about "immortal spirits," as being referred to in the text, contradicts in the most palpable manner his own words. He says the passages from the Psalms are "*exactly parallel*" to the verse under examination, and no language could be better chosen to utter the ideas that man, as a being, is *flesh*, and not *spirit;* that he is *mortal*, and not *deathless*. "He remembereth that *they* are *but flesh*, a *breath* that passeth and returneth not"—"He knoweth our frame, he remembereth that WE ARE BUT DUST.

UNCONSCIOUSNESS IN DEATH.

By Dr. John Fondey, Philadelphia.

Br. Storrs:—In reference to the subject of the unconscious state of the dead, it strikes me that if one point was explained, it would give men a clearer view of the matter, and I will simply throw out the hint for consideration. It is this: We know that when man is alive he is conscious—this, we have been taught, is owing to the presence of a distinct thinking principle in him. When he dies we have been told this principle, which gave him consciousness, has departed, and still retains the power of knowing. *You* maintain that no such principle was imparted to man; that the breath of life, or a *living principle*, was put into him, which has no consciousness in itself; that when this union takes place, then consciousness follows, and when this union is dissolved consciousness ceases. Now the opponents of this truth know what your views are—but they know also that God is a Spirit—they consider man to have been created in his image—this image, they consider not only a moral but a mental image, that is, a capacity of thinking. Now these views of theirs they cannot reconcile with your own; they cannot understand how the simple union of the breath of life with the body produces thought, and of course *cannot see* how unconsciousness can be the result of its abstraction. Men want to know the *reasons* of things! the *cause*—how can such a result be produced by the union of the principle of life with a bodily organization? Why, very easily, if God has so arranged matters. And has not God so ordered many things in the natural world, that results almost as wonderful are witnessed? Why do flint and steel, when struck together, produce sparks? Why do small bodies gravitate towards larger ones? Why does light, when admitted to a healthy eye, where the brain is also healthy, disclose to us the beauties of creation? Simply because God has so arranged matters, that when two or more things are brought into contact, certain phenomena are the result. Take the lowest orders of animals, and how far removed from man? Take those which approach the nearest to man, and in how many respects, perhaps not in outward form, but in mental manifestation, do they resemble man; and why the difference? Because in the lowest orders of animals there is the least, and in the higher order of animals the greatest approach to the organization of man. The principal point of difference, and the cause of the difference, is to be found in the nervous structure. The lowest animals have a low order and small amount of nervous structure, the higher animals a higher order of nervous structure, with a larger amount of it. Hence the higher order of animals seem to think and reason. Now if the soul be a distinct thinking principle, then these animals have souls also. The reason why these animals differ so much, I conceive to depend altogether on their structure. And the reason that man differs so much from them, arises, I conceive, from the higher organization he possesses. He has a higher order of brain and more of it, in those parts which phrenology shows are appropriated to the exhibition of the higher manifestations. His body is full of organs, which vary in their organization, and are acted upon by the same principle of life, and yet owing to their peculiar structure they produce dissimilar results. The liver forms bile, the glands of the eye tears, and so on with the different organs; but with respect to the brain, its organization is peculiar, and God has so arranged it that *when this brain is healthy and is acted upon by the principle of life*, it SHALL PRODUCE THOUGHT. How much the infant resembles the lower order of animals, but as it grows and its brain enlarges and acquires consistency, its mental and moral powers develop. If its brain is of an unhealthy character, or deficient, there is weakness of mind or idiocy. As the old man becomes diseased, his brain partakes of disorder and he returns to a state of childhood. If God had put into man a distinct thinking principle, would it thus be fettered by the organization?—No. When disease clogs up and obstructs the organs, the principle of life is withdrawn. It goes to God—he takes back the energy that while united with the organization produced such wonderful results. The brain has nothing now to stimulate it to action—*it cannot produce thought*. That is its duty, and office, while the living principle acts upon it; when that departs, its work is done—it ceases to think—his body comes under the same laws that govern vegetable matter—decomposition results. Hence he cannot be conscious in *the arrangement* of things until the resurrection—then his organization is restored, and also the principle of life—then he will think and feel and act. To my mind the subject of the intermediate and unconscious state of the dead is as plain a truth as any other in God's word. One thing, perhaps, that makes it much clearer to my mind, is, that I can, without violation of the rules of man's organization, understand how it is that man can thus become conscious or unconscious from the presence or absence of the principle of life. And there is a glory about the resurrection that I never before realized.

CHINESE BARBARITY.

"O HORRIBLE! O HORRIBLE! MOST HORRIBLE!"

The following case of judicial vengeance was lately reported from the empire of China, and published in our magazines and newspapers:—

"A Chinese merchant named Hiamly, convicted of having killed his wife, was sentenced to die by the total deprivation of sleep. The execution took place at Amoy. The condemned was placed in prison, under the charge of three guardians, who relieved each other every alternate hour, and who prevented him from taking any sleep, night or day. He lived thus for nineteen days, without having slept for a single minute. At the commencement of the eighth day his sufferings were so cruel, that he begged as a great favor that they would kill him by strangulation."

Here is a criminal (and we would be the last to reduce the enormity of his guilt) sentenced to die, but the manner of his execution is awfully revolting. There was in it a refinement of barbarity, that was at least fully equal to the devices of the atrocious misnamed christian inquisitors of Rome, who

slaughtered thousands for the extirpation of heresy. Who does not, in his heart, loathe the tribunal that could pronounce such a doom, and the hireling monsters who could carry it into execution? As for the poor wretch himself, how dreadful must his sufferings have been,—day after day with a burning, swimming brain, and boiling blood. Not a moment of repose, himself compelled to be his own tormentor. One sees the wild blood-shot eyes, the emaciated trembling form, the imploring look for some kind hand to end, however violently, his intolerable woe. "He begged as a great favor that they would kill him by strangulation," after he had undergone seven days of the agony. And can we wonder at it? He asked it as a favor,—he would have given thousands of gold for that release—he longed for death more intensely than he had ever pled for the preservation of his days. What his barbarian attendants refused, by and bye was granted by the last friend of the wretched in this world. It is consolation—a wild one, no doubt—that the anguish in his case must have an end; there is a limit beyond which cruelty may not pass, and the grave sooner or later opens its portals for the exhausted child of pain. He expired at length, and found the couch "where the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest."

How would the reader have felt had he passed the prison, say on the tenth day, and been informed of the tragedy of barbarism that was performing within? It would have haunted his sensitive heart and his midnight dreams, if it did not banish repose from his eyelids. The supposition is only human; to imagine anything else would be to fancy that men had been converted into relentless fiends, or into walking images of stone. How does the reader, we again demand, conceive he would have felt, had he been told, on a day, that the weary hours of the culprit were concluded, that he was now beyond the reach of pain? Would he not have experienced an indescribable relief to his heart? cried out, in the instinctive overflowing of his humanity, God be praised!

It is in cases like these that we feel kindly toward Death, otherwise abhorrent as the King of Terrors. We look forward to his approach with ardent desire, and when he has performed his emancipating and composing service on behalf of the agonized, even though they are dishonored by acts of blackest criminality, we cannot but be thankful that his arm has been extended with resistless power.

And what shall we think of the dogma of endless torments beyond the grave—torments to be imposed by him who reveals himself as the God of love? We revolt at the contemplation of the Chinese barbarity,—shall we feel otherwise toward cruelty in another realm, inflicted by a greater power? Eighteen days' torments on earth harrows our nature, shall we imagine hell's perpetual agonies, and continue insensible, yea, be expected to approve? No; the better feelings of man rise up in arms against the imposition. We denounce the infliction as inexpressibly savage. But when we utter against it our unqualified anathema, we are set against no Divine arrangement. On the contrary, we are merely scorning a wild fiction of the human brain, baptized by the appellation of a Scriptural doctrine. "The wages of sin is death," and not those agonies that a cruel theology has invented, alike to the dishonor of God, and the alienation of man from his service.

You abhor the Chinese cruelty,—can you laud a sleepless infliction for unending ages?

You could scarcely have sunk to rest had you been told, in passing along the prison wall, of the agonies on the other side of it, supposing even the man to have been to you a stranger, and one confessedly dyed in blood. Can you sleep now, when you probably believe that myriads are tossing somewhere in uninterrupted misery, and among them is, may be, your father or your child? What kind of place would heaven be to you were the tremendous thought to brood over your heart, that, in some distant realm, your former associates and relatives,—multitudes of your fellow-creatures,—were tossing on the red billows of scorching, but unconsuming wrath?

> "The thought that any should have endless woe,
> Would cast a shadow on the throne of God
> And darken heaven."

The death of the Chinese criminal was longed for by you, and also by himself; you felt a deliverance when his bitter agonies were closed. Is it possible you could think of hell's sorrows and have no desire to see them terminated,—no wish that death would come with his cold, yet soothing hand, and lay the victim to rest? Is death better than God? Are you kinder than the Almighty? You would find comfort if these tempestuous woes were ended. Can you imagine that He will have satisfaction in prolonging their duration and giving them augmenting intensity? You abhor, then, the dogma of ceaseless torments for man or devil. See that you defend the character of God from the black aspersions that are—we doubt not by mistake—thrown upon it. Tell the world that He is the righteous, and not the relentless, Governor of the universe,—that he holds out immortality to the pure and pious, and has written it on the judgment-book, that "the soul that sinneth, it shall die."—*Moncrieff's Expositor*, Scotland.

WITH GOD.

"While I was musing, the fire burned, then spake I with my tongue."—Ps. 39: 3.

This afternoon the sun went down to his rest enveloped in robes of crimson and gold; he quickly disappeared, as if weary of looking down on a world like this; and yet the manner of his departing was expressive of hope and encouragement, rather than of scorn and disgust. I watched till the last beam expired, and was saddened by the vision. I felt as if a great friend of humanity had gone. How awful had been the feeling, if no assurance had been possessed, that the great orb would again appear, and dispense his cheering illumination. To bid farewell to the sun—to know that one had witnessed his glory for the last time,—what a thought! Henceforth darkness, sterility, and death; the conception is enough. Dark as it is now, and the night is as yet moonless and star-

less, the gloom will rise like a veil from the face of nature; and, in a few hours, the stream of splendor from the orient fountain, will be flooding all with brightness, as fresh as on that morning when the voice of heaven approved the production of Omnipotent energy and skill. How majestic and stupendous the machinery of nature. How awful the constancy; and yet how varied; how startling, how ravishing at times, the changes that occur. God is here; my Father,—the Universal Parent,—presides over all these movements, and carries them on with untiring might. This afternoon, I saw Him guide the blazing luminary along its course; I saw him gather around it at last, all the splendor of imperial state; I saw him lead out the shades of evening from their mysterious chambers; and I heard him, as it were, say, "Fear not, I remain, though the sun departs; and even it will by and by return." Thou art here, O my Father, and I see Thee not; this room is full of Thee; the great palace of creation, on which I look out from my window, is full of thy glory. I do not see Thee! I do see Thee! Thou art invisible to the eye: visible to the thought, the discernment. I am exposed to Thy view, as a watch when opened is disclosed to the eye. May the order of my being be Thine! May my faithfulness in Thy service meet Thy approval.

God is silent: He speaks; He is at rest; He rushes on; He is near; He is far away. How wonderful art Thou, O God! O *my* God! When the forces the Almighty has generated, for instance, the storm, the earthquake, the lightning, the volcano, are so tremendous, how vast the immeasurable power in His arm. Were He merely intelligence and power, His presence would be terrible; but He is love,—He is a Father, and He may be regarded with perfect confidence and joy. Let the universe even shake, His servants need fear no more than the child when his mother rocks the cradle. Infinite God come near me, and pour Thy love into my heart; I am Thy child, and I wish to be shielded by Thy might; I would draw nearer Thee, I would seize the skirt of Thy gargarment, yea, I would hold Thy hand, I would hear the beating of Thy most tender heart. Say to me, "My child," I say to Thee, "O my Father."

God kindles the stars; all eyes see them, many see beyond them,—and they are blest. Above, all is clear and serene; no storms reach yon distant realms; the home of the eternal stars is unruffled, like the clime of the immortals. Below there is gloom and storm, sometimes light and calm. The greatest darkness, however, is that which is found in the minds of men; the most awful storms are those which agitate the hearts of guilty sinners. Darkness there, and few to give light! storms there, and few to say, "Peace, be still!" Alas! my brethren, my kinsmen, according to the flesh, ye are dear to me, and I would speak of the darkness that prevails, and of the few stars—the gleams of truth and hope,—not yet eclipsed; and of the morning that is coming,—when a day of preternatural glory will dawn upon our world. God is love, He loves you; and though legions of men and demons should affirm the contrary, believe them not. He sent His Son to save *you*. I would proclaim to each child of man, and encourage him to receive the sin-dispelling and death-conquering Redeemer as his friend, and the pledge of the divine compassion. No wanderer need despair,—no sinner need die, for the voice from heaven is the voice of mercy; and the gift from heaven is "eternal life." God wishes to conquer man by love.—to gain human hearts as His prize and His joy.

"Nor gold, nor silver seek I; but above
All gifts, the heart, and buy it with my love.
God spurns the riches of a thousand coffers.
And says, "My chosen is he, his heart who offers."—

The Exp. of Life, &c.

SIMPLICITY OF FAITH.

The simplicity of faith was once illustrated by a pastor thus:—

"I was preaching," he said, "my ordinary weekly lecture in the evening, when I was sent for in great haste, to visit a woman who was said to be dying, and who very much desired to see me. I closed the service as soon as I could, and went immediately to her house. She was a member of my church, whom I had known very well for years, with whom I had been acquainted ever since her first serious impressions, before she became a communicant. As I entered the room where she lay, I found it filled with her friends who had gathered around to see her die. Making my way through the midst of them, I reached the side of her bed, and found her apparently in the last agonies of death. She was bolstered up in her bed, gasping for breath, almost suffocated by the asthma; and the whole bed shook by a palpitation of her heart, which seemed to be shaking her to pieces. It appeared to me that she could not live a quarter of an hour. I said to her—

"Mrs. M., you appear to be very sick."

"Yes," said she, "I am dying."

"And are you ready to die?"

She lifted her eyes upon me with a solemn and fixed gaze, and speaking with great difficulty, she replied—

"Sir, God knows—I have taken him—at his word—and—I am not afraid to die."

It was a new definition of faith. "I have taken him at his word." It struck me in an instant as a triumph of faith. "God knows I have taken him at his word, and I am not afraid to die." It was just the thing for her to say. I have often tried to think what else she could have said that would have expressed so much in so few words.

I prayed some four minutes by her bedside; recited to her some passages of God's word, and was about to leave her for a moment to her friends, whom she seemed anxious to address. She held me by the hand, and uttering a word at a time, as she gasped for breath, she said to me—

"I want to tell you—that I can—trust—in God—while—I am dying. You have—often told me—he would not—forsake me—and now I find—it true. I am—at peace. I die willingly—and happy."

In a few minutes I left her, uttering to her such

promises of the Saviour as I deemed most appropriate. However, she did not die.

She still lives. But that expression of her faith has been of great benefit to me. It has aided me in preaching, and in conversation with inquiring sinners very often. It gave me a more simple idea of faith than I ever had before. It put aside all the mists of metaphysics, speculation, and philosophizing. It made the whole nature of faith plain. Everybody could understand it: "God knows I have taken him at his word."—*Pastor's Sketches.*

On the State of Man in Death.

On the best consideration I have been able at various times to give the subject, having as evidence nothing more than the information which Scripture affords, but taking the whole of that information, I come to the satisfied conclusion that the interval between death and the resurrection is to the individual *a period of unconscious rest;*—that, consequently, to *him* death will be followed by the solemn summons to life, when that which is sown in weakness, dishonor and corruption, shall be raised in power, and glory, and immortality, and instead of perishing bodies we shall be clothed with those which shall be incorruptible, being fashioned like the glorious body of him to whom the Almighty Father hath given the power to subdue all things unto himself; that, consequently, the eye that closes one instant on the night of death, opens the next instant at the morning of an eternal day. —Dr. Lant Carpenter, *from an unpublished MS. in the possession of Mrs. Carpenter.*

HOW TO SPEAK TO CHILDREN.

It is usual to attempt the management of children either by corporeal punishment, or by rewards addressed to the senses, and by words alone. There is one other means of government, the power and importance of which are seldom regarded. I refer to the human voice. A blow may be inflicted, and accompanied with words so uttered, as to counteract entirely its intended effect; or the parent may use language, in the correction of the child, not objectionable in itself, yet spoken in a tone which more than defeats its influence. Let any one endeavor to recall the image of a fond mother long since at rest. Her sweet smile and ever clear countenance are brought vividly to recollection; so also is her voice; and blessed is that parent who is endowed with a pleasing utterance. What is it which lulls the infant to repose? It is not an array of mere words. There is no charm, to the untaught one, in letters, syllables, and sentences. It is the sound that strikes its little ear that soothes and comforts it to sleep. A few notes, however unskilfully arranged, if uttered in a soft tone, are found to possess a magic influence. Think we that this influence is confined to the cradle? No; it is diffused over age, and ceases not while the child remains under the parental roof. Is the boy growing rude in manner and boisterous in speech? I know of no instrument so sure to control these tendencies as the gentle tones of a mother. She who speaks to her son harshly does but give to his conduct the sanction of her own example. She pours oil on the already raging flame. In the pressure of duty, we are liable to utter ourselves hastily to children. Perhaps a threat is expressed in a loud and irritating tone; instead of allaying the passions of the child, it serves directly to increase them. Every fretful expression awakens in him the same spirit which produced it. So does a pleasant voice call up agreeable feelings. Whatever disposition, therefore, we would encourage in a child, the same should we manifest in the tone in which we address it.—*Chris. Reg.*

Heavenly Contemplation.—As Daniel, in his captivity, did three times a day open his window towards Jerusalem, though so far out of sight, when he went to God in his devotions; so may the believing soul in his captivity to the flesh, look towards Jerusalem which is above. As the pretty lark doth sing sweetly, and never cease her pleasant ditty while she hovereth aloft, as if she were there gazing into the glory of the sun, but is suddenly silenced when she falleth to the earth, so is the frame of the soul most delectable and divine, while it keepeth in the view of God by contemplation; but alas! we make there too short a stay; down again we fall, and lay by our music.—*Baxter.*

The Christian's Solace.

BY MRS. A. C. JUDSON.

"The triumphing of the wicked is short."—Job 20: 5.

In this day and time of evil, while "iniquity abounds, and the love of many waxes cold," the wicked bear rule, and their nefarious plots are fully consummated,—how comforting to the lover of righteousness is this divine assurance: that their triumph *is short.*

Truly, they *have* triumphed, in spite of all the efforts of good men. Most emphatically, on every side, the "wicked bear rule." But, thanks be to God! His purposes will not fail. He hath "appointed a day in the which he will judge the world in righteousness," and then will the scales be turned. The wicked will be driven away in his wickedness," and truth and holiness will prevail. Delightful hope! Heart-cheering consolation! Not one feeling of revenge or animosity dwells in the bosom of the true Christian—the holy God knoweth no such feelings. Yet we do rejoice to know that iniquity will be done away, and that the time will come when the whole earth shall be *full of the glory of the Lord.* And not one vestige of wickedness be found in all God's universe. The earth may now be convulsed, and tossed to and fro, as it were, with the earthquakes and volcanoes of evil; but by and bye the Prince of peace will wave his sceptre, and to the warring elements will cry, "Peace, be still!"

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, AUGUST 1, 1854.

Intermediate State of the Dead.

"The intermediate state of the dead is a state of conscious existence." So saith "*Rev. D. W. Clark, D.D.,*" of the Methodist E. Church.

We proceed in our notice of his articles in the Christian Advocate, which, it seems, were copied from the *Ladies' Repository.* The Doctor says—

"Philosophy has found itself able to solve but few of the subtle mysteries of the soul even in its present state. No wonder, then, that it is still less able to solve the mysteries of its separate state. Here it is blended with an organic, material body, and manifests its being, power, and condition in a thousand ways; and yet it must be confessed that, as to the modes of its existence—its peculiar relation to the body, its dependence upon it or control over it—we know comparatively little. How, then, can we expect to unravel all the mysteries of its separate state?"

Philosophy has never "found itself able to" show that man is possessed of such an entity as Theologians call "the soul." No wonder, then, that both Philosophers and Theologians "know comparatively little" about that which has no existence except in their imaginations. "The mysteries of the separate state" of such a soul it will take long for them to "unravel." But saith the Doctor—

"We are not left in any necessary darkness in relation to the great facts of that mysterious state. And perhaps the most important of all those facts—as it is fundamental to all the rest—is that which we have just announced; namely, THAT THE INTERMEDIATE STATE OF THE DEAD IS A STATE OF CONSCIOUS EXISTENCE."

Was there ever a more palpable contradiction than is apparent in this "announced fundamental!" "The most important of all those facts" is, that "the state of the *dead* is" that they are *alive!* or, which is the same thing, they are in "conscious existence"! "Thou shalt surely die," Adam.—That is, "You shall go into another state of conscious existence!"

But our friend Clark proceeds to argue the case, and speaks thus—

"Does not God reveal to us this great fact—a fact that constitutes a broad platform upon which rest our most glorious hopes in relation to our intermediate state? If such be not the case, why did St. Paul 'desire to depart,' that he might 'be with Christ?' If the soul sleeps with the body till the resurrection of the dead, he would be no nearer to the accomplishment of his wish in dying than he was while he lived. Indeed, if the doctrine that the intermediate state is one of annihilation or of unconscious existence be true, St. Paul is no nearer heaven than he would be had he lived to the present hour. Neither is he so near the attainment of his desire now as he was during his life; for while he lived he enjoyed communion with Christ; but, being dead, even the communion he did enjoy is cut off, if the spirit sleeps with the body in unconscious repose. All intercourse with the Deity, with heaven, with the saints of God on earth, and even with the glorious truths of the gospel, is utterly broken off, and in one long, oblivious sleep have that intellect so vigorous, those affections so pure and so ardent, and those aspirations so glorious and sustaining, been pent for nearly eighteen centuries; and altogether unconscious of the history of the Church and of the fate of the gospel, of the glory of Christ or the bliss of heaven, while he still continue to slumber on till the trump of God shall arouse the unconscious dead at the resurrection morning. Call you this 'being with Christ?' Alas! then, what is it to be separated from him? If, between death and the resurrection, '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,' how fearfully mistaken was the great apostle when he desired to depart, in order that he might 'be with Christ!' Better, indeed, were it to return to life, for here we may see, even though it be only as through a glass darkly; but there we see not at all! It is, truly, *a land of darkness as darkness itself!*"

We love to be generous to an opponent, and we can afford to be; so we have given Br. Clark the benefit of his entire argument on this case of Paul. In the first place, Paul does not say that he wished to *die* to be with Christ. In the second place, Paul saith not one word about his *soul* in the text or context: and in the context he does say that he labored and suffered, "If," says he, "by any means I might attain unto the *resurrection of the dead;*" and he adds, "Our conversation is in heaven; FROM WHENCE also we *look* for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall *change* our *vile body*, that it may be fashioned like to his glorious body," &c.

Thus, in this very epistle, we see what was Paul's real *desire* and expectation: not that of departing and being with Christ as a *dis*embodied soul, but to have his "vile body" changed, and made like Christ's; not by death, nor at death, but by a *resurrection* when Christ shall *return from* heaven.

Paul's desire then to depart and be with Christ can have no reference to the state between death and the resurrection. It was not a *hope* of being with Christ at death; for hope is made up of desire and *expectation.* Paul expresses a desire to depart and be with Christ, but saith nothing of an expectation of being with Christ till the "vile *body*" is changed and made like to Christ's.—Hence Paul's desire to depart and be with Christ

was not a desire to have a *dis*embodied presence with Christ, but must have been a desire for *translation*, like Enoch and Elijah, which was better than either to live in this state or to die. If he could have a translation, that he should "not see death," he would prefer that to death; and thus to depart and be with Christ was a matter of innocent "desire;" but he expresses no expectation that his desire would be granted. Indeed, what follows shows he did not expect his desire to be granted; hence he labors to have part in the "resurrection," and looks for his change when Christ shall come *from* heaven.

The Apostle then was not "mistaken" about his "soul" being with Christ, in a conscious existence, between death and the resurrection, for he had no such expectation, and expresses no such desire:—that is a pure assumption, to which the universal teaching of Paul, in relation to the hope for the dead, is in complete and perfect hostility.

The Doctor concludes this case, by saying, if death is a state of unconsciousness, "It is truly a land of darkness as darkness itself!" That is—It is just what inspiration testifies it is, Job 10: 22. We marvel that our friend Clark should thus stumble into the truth. It is just as if he had said "If the dead are not in a conscious state, then the Spirit of God inspired a true sentiment when it caused Job to say, when a man is dead he is in a 'land of darkness as darkness itself.'" Truly, Br. Clark, your case is not quite hopeless if you have conscience left, and will not obstinately persist in "infidelity." The Doctor next brings up the case of the thief, and says—

"To the penitent thief upon the cross our Saviour said, 'To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.' On that very day both our Saviour and the penitent thief expired. Did he mean that the penitent thief would with him that day cease from all conscious existence? What mockery to make such a promise as an antidote to the agonies of the dying man!"

Here our friend makes short work, and decides the whole with a very brief assumption, which is false in fact. He says, "On that very day both our Saviour and the thief expired." Now it is a fact that the thief did *not* expire on the *very* day the Saviour did. And any one by comparing the Evangelists will see, that while Christ expired on that very day the thief was alive at the commencement of the *next* day, and had his legs broken to hasten his death. Let it be remembered the day always commenced at evening among the Jews.—Now read the Evangelists and see if the two deaths occurred in the "very day" the address was made to the thief. The thief's prayer is the clue to our Lord's answer. What was that prayer?—"Remember me when thou comest *into* thy kingdom." Archbishop Whately says, "*into* is a mistranslation; it should be *in* thy kingdom. The meaning is, at thy second coming in triumphant glory."—Bishop Whately on *Future States*, p. 324.

Thus understood the promise is, "This day, of which you have spoken, thou shalt be with me in Paradise." Three days after this, Jesus expressly said to Mary, "I am not yet ascended to my Father," John 20: 17. Now if Paradise and heaven are one, as the Doctor holds, here is evidence positive that Jesus did *not* go to it the "very day" of his death, and had not been there for three days after. Our friend next leads on Moses and Elias. He says—

"Upon the mount of transfiguration Moses and Elias, though the one had been dead nearly fifteen hundred years, and the other had been translated over a thousand years before, not only appeared in the form of living men, though with bodies glorious—emblematic of the glorious resurrection state—but they also conversed; thus demonstrating that they were not only alive, but conscious. And if Moses has a conscious existence in the intermediate state, why may not all others?"

Here the Doctor admits that Moses appeared in a "glorious" *body:* then he must have had a resurrection from the dead; for they tell us the soul is *dis*embodied at death; but saith our friend these two men "appeared with *bodies* glorious." If then Moses was raised from the dead, for this occasion, it is proof against the Doctor's theory, and is no evidence of a living conscious existence in the intermediate state. But Doctor Clark adds, that these bodies were "*emblematic* of the glorious resurrection state." If then, they were emblematic they were not the real bodies of Moses and Elias; and hence the evidence is, that Moses was not really there, but only emblematically so, or it was a *visionary* representation of the future glory of Christ and his saints after the resurrection, and so affords not the slightest proof of a conscious intermediate state of dead men.

The Doctor proceeds in the following strains—

"While reasoning with the Sadducees, one of whose doctrines was that there is no spirit, no conscious existence independent of the body, our Saviour says, 'God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.' And yet God said to Moses, 'I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and God of Jacob,' two hundred years after the dust of the last had been consigned to the cave purchased by Abraham in the field of Machpelah. Hence, it must follow, if there be any *verity* in God, that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, though dead, still had a conscious life. The same conclusion will be

reached with an equally invincible force, when we remember our Saviour himself declared, 'Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad.'"

We confess ourself shocked at this paragraph for two reasons: *First*—It is a total misrepresentation of the case in hand. Though the Sadducees, as a matter of fact, denied the existence of spirits, neither that nor the conscious existence of dead men was at all the matter in hand in the discourse of our Saviour with them on the occasion here brought to view. Why then did my friend Clark state *two* things that were not the subject of discourse, and entirely hide, and not mention the real matter at issue, which was the "*resurrection of the dead?*" The very sound of the true issue would have opened the eyes of some of his readers to see that he evaded the doctrine of our Saviour's discourse, which was not about the conscious state of the dead, but of the rising from the dead; and it goes to show conclusively that if there is no resurrection there is no future life, and God could not be their God; but if they are alive *now*, as the Doctor affirms, then God can be their God whether there ever be a resurrection or not; and thus our Lord's argument for the resurrection is made "void through your tradition" of a living conscious state in death. But what particularly shocked us is, that the Doctor should affirm, "If there be any *verity*" [*truth*] "in God, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, though dead, still had a conscious life!"

Now we would rather confess that we might be a thousand times *mistaken* than thus to stake the *veracity* of God. Look at it. "If I am not right in maintaining that the dead are in a state of conscious life there is not *any truth* in God; His word can in *no instance* be trusted."

We cannot but hope that Br. Clark will feel it a duty and privilege to modify this expression of his, or withdraw it entirely. Will he not do it for truth's sake, and the honor of God?

IS THE SOUL A DISTINCT ENTITY?

Affirmative by C. F. Hudson.

Dear Examiner:—My last closed with Acts 7: 59. The next passage in my list is—

1 Cor. 15: 17, 18. This is the passage which, I said, is claimed on both sides in this question. And it is claimed by my opponents upon what seems to me a marvelous misapprehension of Paul's hypothetical reasoning. IF Christ be not raised, says Paul, THEN they which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished. And hereupon, Mr. Ham asks, "How have they perished?" ("Man in death," chap. vi.) Why, my dear friend Ham, that deceased Christians have not perished is the very thing that Paul proposes to prove. There would be no hope in their case if Christ had not risen. But Christ HAS risen. What then? THEREFORE they have not perished, is what every Corinthian child must infer. And this hypothetical mode of stating a case is well known among logicians, as one of the most conclusive methods of argument. "Except those days should be shortened," said Christ, "there should no flesh be saved." And even if Christ had not added another word, every one would confidently infer that some flesh will be saved.

In the same way, when Bro. Storrs remarks, "IF there be no resurrection, then, at death, man *ceases to have existence*, and will live no more forever," ["Intermediate state," page 20,]—we can only infer, that at death man does *not* cease to have existence, for there *is* a resurrection. But the body has perished, as Mr. Ham admits. "Surely," he says, "Paul could not have meant by this expression mere *dead bodies!* Dead bodies are not they which have fallen asleep in Christ." Hence, we are forced to conclude, that Christians, at least, have souls that can survive their bodies, awaiting the resurrection. If they have not such souls, then they have actually perished, and a resurrection of one who has perished is absurd.

2 Cor. 5: 4. "Not for that we would be unclothed." Here and in the context, the body seems to be spoken of as the tabernacle or vesture of the soul. In the interim, between death and the resurrection, the soul is untented and unclad; which could not be, if it had no separate existence. Some interesting facts, that have nothing to do with our modern "spiritual manifestations," but which do seem to indicate the precise advantages of *embodiment* to the soul, I reserve for a future letter.

2 Cor. 12: 2. "Whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell; God knoweth." But my good friends would have told Paul at once, that this could not have been out of his body, for aside from his body he could not have existed. Paul's doubt is a marked dissent from their theory.

1 Thes. 5: 23. Did the preservation of the "spirit and soul," depend, either physically or morally, on the preservation of the "body," until Christ's coming? Now if the soul cannot exist without the body, the physical dependence must have been utter and complete. And as for the moral dependence, I should shrink from a combat with the materialist, upon the theory held by my good friends. I must leave that point of courage to "Anthropos," who is so ready to carry out the doctrines of Phrenology consistently, and fearless of all consequences. (See his "Unity of Man," page 26.) For my own part, I recognize the facts of Anthropology as an important half of truth, relating to our compound being. But I cannot take any mere Natural History of Man as the rational basis or rule of truth, or as defining the Future History of Man, until Gal. 5: 17, and several like passages are expunged, and certain facts of consciousness are forgotten.

Heb. 12: 23. Are not the "spirits of just men made perfect" by passing from the "unclothed" state to that in which they are "clothed upon"

with immortality? What need of supposing, as my friends must suppose, that these spirits are perfected by passing from a state of temporary non-existence?

1 Pet. 3 : 19. Are the "spirits in prison" embodied? What is meant by the "preaching," or rather "heralding" here spoken of, is no part of our argument. If the spirits of the just are intended, Heb. 12 : 23 and 2 Cor. 5 : 4, are parallel passages. If the spirits of the unjust then I must refer to 2 Pet. 2 : 9, and ask, Does God reserve [Gk. *Terein*, to keep watch of; to hold in custody] the unjust in non-existence until the judgment?

Rev. 6 : 9. Here I need only remark that the souls of martyrs are spoken of *just as if* they had survived their bodies, and had now a separate and actual existence before the resurrection. See v. 11. The force of the passage can be evaded, it seems to me, only by quoting those hyperboles in which God is said to employ "things that are not" to bring to nought things that are, and the like.

I have now gone over the first list of passages which I gave in the Examiner for July 1. The reader will judge whether they prove that the soul is a distinct entity, capable of a separate or disembodied existence. I might adduce other Scriptural proofs, but need not do so at present. Upon the second list of passages it behooves me not to comment until the list shall have been accepted or corrected by Br. Grew.

Hoping to pursue this discussion in due time, in its rational, historical, and practical bearings, I am yours in the love of Christ,

C. F. HUDSON.

Response by Henry Grew.

Dear Br. Storrs:—On 1 Cor. 15 : 17, 18, Br. Hudson remarks, "Why, my dear friend Ham, that deceased Christians have not perished, is the very thing that Paul proposes to prove." "Christ has risen—THEREFORE they have not perished, is what every Corinthian child must infer." This is true; but the question is, does the apostle's declaration imply that the dead had not perished *at all*, or that they had not perished *forever*? What is the argument of the inspired writer? Is it that dead Christians had not perished, because they "have souls that can survive their bodies?" Not a word of this. I ask Br. H. candidly to consider, ought not this to have been, and would not this have been the argument of the apostle, if such was the fact? But he predicates this blessed hope, that the dead saints had not perished for ever, on the fact of Christ's resurrection, and the consequent resurrection of his saints. He became "the first fruits of them which slept," by his own resurrection.

The representation is, yea, the positive plain declaration, not that *man* survived the dissolution of an outward material tenement, but that THE MEN, the "*brethren*," v. 6, "they," *the persons*, had fallen asleep in death; v. 18. Now, instead of relying altogether on the fact of the resurrection, to prove that they had not perished for ever, if Br. H. is correct, such an argument would have been entirely inappropriate and superfluous. If their souls "survive their bodies," the apostle had only to declare the fact to prove that the saints had not perished. There was no need to refer to any resurrection. *Man* had not died; he had only escaped as a bird from a cage. Suppose a man to strike the bird-cage and break it to pieces. The bird flies away. Who, in his senses, would argue that the bird had not perished, because the cage could be mended? The entire argument, throughout the glorious chapter is adverse to the popular sentiment, and in perfect harmony with the declaration of the inspired psalmist, That in the day of death the "thoughts (of man) perish;" which Br. H.'s views deny. The resurrection of men, who have temporarily perished in death, involves no absurdity, and is perfectly competent for the Almighty to accomplish, who of stones can raise up children to Abraham.

2 Cor. 5 : 4, "Not for that we would be unclothed." "Here," Br. H. remarks, "the body seems to be spoken of as the tabernacle or vesture of the soul." The passages teaches that in death, men (*we*) not a part of men, or of *us*, are unclothed of *something*; but that an immortal soul is unclothed of anything is a mere assumption. Br. H. must prove by the divine testimony that man possesses such a soul. The unclothing—according to fact and Scripture testimony, that man's thoughts, knowledge and affections perish at death—must refer to the cessation of life and all these powers. The context requires this construction. "Not for that we would be unclothed but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of LIFE." His desire was not to be unclothed of life, but to be clothed upon with immortal life. Now, it is undeniable that the apostle had his mind *on the resurrection*, and not on any intermediate state of felicity for a surviving soul. He clearly teaches that it is at the resurrection, and not before, that mortality will be swallowed up of life. See 1 Cor. 15 : 54; and this was the object of his desire. If Br. H. is correct, he should have desired to be unclothed that he might "*immediataly* enter into glory," or, if it is said, that he meant, he did not desire the pains of death, by the expression of being unclothed; still he ought to have expressed his desire of the felicity which, according to Br. H., immediately follows. His desire was for that for

which God had "wrought" the saints, v. 5, which was, "that mortality might be swallowed of life," v. 4; *i. e.*, by the resurrected body or house from heaven, v. 2. Until that period, the apostle, so far from expecting felicity, represents the saints as *groaning*, "waiting," not for happiness *at death*, but "for the adoption, to wit, THE REDEMPTION OF OUR BODY;" Rom. 8: 23. This plainly proves that when he desired to depart and be with Christ, it was, that he might be with him at his coming at the resurrection. Our dear Lord plainly teaches, John 14: 3, that we shall not be with him until he comes again. See also Col. 3: 4.

2 Cor. 12: 2. This refers to a miraculous vision, the *modus* of which the apostle could not define. To adduce such a passage in opposition to plain scriptural declarations, is totally inadmissible. But our opponents ask, "Does not the passage imply, necessarily, that the apostle supposed that there might be such a thing or state as being out of the body?" Certainly it does imply that he supposed that he might have been out of the body *in some sense*. There is, however, no necessity for supposing that a distinct entity, called the soul, was separated from the body. He might mean that he did not know whether he was caught up bodily, or whether it was a mere mental vision.

1 Thess. 5: 23. In reply to our brother's question on the passage, I remark that, in manifest opposition to his theory, the apostle represents the perfection of spirit, soul, and body to be inseparably connected. There is not the least intimation that the spirit or soul would be perfected before the body, nor any thing which warrants an idea that they are not mutually dependent. If we understand, with some, that the pious prayer refers to our perfection in the present state, body, soul, and spirit are connected. I apprehend, however, that the reference is to our perfection *at* "the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Gal. 5: 17, needs no expunging for us. It implies no immortal soul, or any essence, distinct from the material organism capable of surviving it. It simply represents the warfare of the same mind which is sometimes fleshly or carnal, and sometimes spiritual or holy. Thus in connection with this very passage, the works of the flesh are declared to be "envyings, emulations," &c., which are exercises of the mind, in connection with the physical organism. As for "certain facts of consciousness," referred to by our brother, we ask him to explain. We are conscious of possessing knowledge, thought, and affections, but not of immortal existence, or of any distinct entity independent of the body. Our friend's view of this subject is a matter of belief, not of consciousness. Whether his faith is true or false, must be determined by the oracles of God.

Heb. 12: 23. I do not certainly know whether our brother means that we are clothed upon with immortality at death, or at the resurrection. If the latter, as it rather appears, then the departed are not *now* perfect, and, consequently, the passage affords no proof of their present conscious existence. I reply in the affirmative to his question. They are made perfect by passing from the unclothed state (*i. e.*, unclothed of all vitality, thought, affection, &c., as the Scriptures plainly declare them to be in the hour of death,) to that in which they are clothed upon with immortality.—Our "need of supposing" this, is the word which abideth for ever. The evidence that "the spirits of just men" are not made perfect until the resurrection, is so clear that even the advocates of a conscious intermediate state admit it. Mr. G. Campbell, who believed *sheol*, or *hades*, to be a state of consciousness, admits it as being a state of "silence" and "darkness;" and "that it is not a state of activity adapted for exertion, or indeed for the accomplishment of any important purpose, good or bad." If they are conscious so far from being perfect, they must be groaning, "waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of their bodies," Rom. 8: 23. Paul never dreamed of perfection until immortality is put on at the resurrection. Phil. 3d chap. he plainly teaches that he would not be perfect until he should "attain unto the resurrection of the dead." This was the glorious fact for which he was "apprehended of Christ Jesus," and the prize for which he labored.

In this passage and its connection the apostle is contrasting the old and new covenants, the Mosaic and Christian dispensations. In the 23d v. he opens before the believer the higher privileges and blessings, to which the better and everlasting covenant entitles him, at the coming of the Lord Jesus; the glories which will be revealed in the saints at his coming. His meaning is, that we are come, by faith in Christ, into that state where we shall ultimately possess the blessings enumerated in vs. 22, 23, 24. The things are yet future.—"The general assembly and church of the firstborn," consists of the entire elect of God, the whole family of the redeemed. The family is not yet complete. We are not yet come to it. When the Son of man shall come in his glory with his holy angels, and not before, we shall actually come "to Jesus the Mediator of the New Covenant,"

and "to the innumerable company of angels."—Then we shall come "to Mount Zion, the city of the living God." "The pure in heart shall see God," the Judge of all. His tabernacle shall be with men, and he will dwell among them and be their God. Then we shall associate with all the spirits of just men made perfect. The whole family of the redemmed are to be perfected, and presented *together* as a chaste bride unto Jesus Christ: Eph. 5 : 27. This presentation, is not at death, but at the resurrection: 2 Cor. 4 : 14; Jude 24. It is then our Lord will come in his glory. Many indeed have died in faith, but "received not the promise," *i. e.*, have not yet received the great promise of the gospel, which is eternal life; 1 John 2 : 25; "that they without us should not be made perfect;" Heb. 11 : 40.

1 Pet. 3 : 19. "Spirits in prison," Milton says, "literally, *in guard*, or as the Syriac version renders it, *in sepulchers, in the grave.*" The Spirit of Christ in Noah, preached to those who were in the grave when Peter wrote. 2 Peter 2 : 5.—By the term spirits, I understand the persons, as the term souls must be understood Acts 27 : 37. Ps. 33 : 19. So the word "bodies" must be understood, Rom. 12 : 1, as including the entire person.

To the question on 2 Peter 2 : 9 : I reply, the Lord knoweth how—to reserve the unjust (in the grave) to the day of judgment to be punished.

Rev. 6 : 9. It would be absurd to give this passage a literal construction. No one can suppose that the souls of the departed are under an altar in heaven. The blood is the life. In the sacrifices under the law it was poured under the altar. As the blood of Abel cried from the ground for revenge, so the blood of the martyrs cries for vengeance against their persecutors.

In the passages our brother has thus far adduced, I find nothing really inconsistent with the plain declarations of the eternal Spirit that "the dead know not anything," and that "in that very day (the) thoughts perish."

Yours for the truth,

HENRY GREW.

A SHORT DIALOGUE.

L. You ask, in reference to the sentence 'Thou shalt surely die,' 'What part of the man is excepted in this denunciation?' I ask, in turn, what part of the man is excepted from this, 'DUST THOU ART AND UNTO DUST THOU SHALT RETURN?' If you say NONE, then I will leave you to settle it with God's word, which says, 'The spirit returns to God who gave it.' If you say the spirit is excepted; then I reply, so it is excepted from such a death as the body meets."

S. It by no means follows, if the spirit is excepted from returning to dust, that therefore it does not come under the threatening of death, even such a death as the body meets. The Psalmist says, Psa. 8 : 6, "Thou hast put all things under his feet:" but Paul after quoting this language, 1 Cor. 15 : 27, adds—"But it is *manifest* that *he is excepted* that did put all things under him." So I say—when God said, "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return," it is *manifest* that the breath, which made man a *living* being, is excepted. But when God said to the living soul, "In dying thou shalt die," it is *not* manifest that any part is excepted.

L. "Do not evade the point, Br. S.; if the whole man is meant in one case, it is in the other."

S. That is a *mere assumption.* I have shown, and you admit, that the breath or spirit cannot return to dust, and therefore, it is manifest, it is excepted in that denunciation on man. But you have not shown, to my mind, and it is very far from being *manifest* that any part of man was excepted from the penalty of death. And, in my judgment, unless you can show, that what you call the spirit had an independent existence before man stood up a living soul, you can never demonstrate that it will have an independent existence after it leaves the body.

L. "You say death is the PENALTY on the whole man; that death is unconsciousness, utter unconsciousness. Yet unhappiness is a CONSEQUENCE of sin. Can unconsciousness be unhappy? Who most effectually evades the punishment or penalty those who say death separates the spirit from the body, and one returns to God, to be unhappy, and leaves the other in the dust?—or those who say both go to dust and sleep, and evade all unhappiness, the 'CONSEQUENCE of sin?'"

S. To the *whole man*, God said:—"Thou shalt surely die." Or, as the margin reads, '*Dying* THOU *shalt die.*' What part of man is excepted in this denunciation? surely no part. To say, the *mind*, which was principal in the offence, was exempt from death, is an absurdity; or, to make its death to be no more than a state of unhappiness, in my judgmant, is doing violence to the testimony of God. That unhappiness was involved, as a consequence of sin, is admitted; but, that that was *the penalty* for transgression is denied. The penalty is *death.*

Now, let me show your sophistry. The law of man says—If thou kill thy neighbor thou shalt die—That is, says the expositor of the law, He

shall be kept in misery. "No," I reply, "to make death no more than a state of misery, or unhappiness, is doing violence to the law. That unhappiness is involved as a consequence of murder, is admitted, but that that is the *penalty* for murder is denied." The Expositor replies—"You say death is the penalty: that death is unconsciousness. Yet unhappiness is a *consequence of murder*. Can *unconsciousness* be unhappy?" I answer, NO; but a *murderer* can be unhappy, and his unhappiness is not removed by knowing he must die.—Had you, Br. L., put your question fairly, viz., "Can" a *sinner* "be unhappy?" you would not have blinded your own eyes nor the eyes of others. Cannot a sinner be unhappy before the penalty is executed upon him? And is it a small ingredient in his unhappiness that he is to die? be cut off from all hope of life and eternal enjoyment?

If the soul is a distinct being, or existence, residing in the body, and capable of living out of the body, then how does it get into the body?

L. If you will tell me how the soul of the widow's son, I Kings 17: 21, 22, come into him, I will answer your question?"

S. As you try to make much of this case, I will call attention to the fact, that the Hebrew term *nephesh*, translated *soul*, admits of the following renderings, viz: *mind*, *soul*, *breath*, *life*. Our translators have rendered it in all these ways. You fix upon a *word* which has these various significations to prove that there is something in man that exists in consciousness when the man is dead. I think your question is easily answered. The child's soul [breath] came into him just as it came into Adam. The Lord God breathed into his *nostrils* the *breath* of life. And you might just as well infer that Adam's soul had consciousness and existed out of him, before it came into him, as that this child's soul did, from any thing that appears in the text or context.

L. "But I will now tell you where it" [the soul] "comes from. It comes from God, and returns to God who gave it. Eccl. 12: 7."

S. That is the *spirit*, brother; the Hebrew word for which is *ruach*, not *nephesh*, as above. But will you say the soul and spirit are the same thing? You must, to make your statement good for any thing. If they are the same thing, Paul has made a very unnecessary distinction in saying, "your whole *spirit* and *soul* and *body*." 1 Thess. 5: 23. If they are not the same thing, your quoting Eccel. 12: 7, entirely fails you—it does not prove that the *soul* goes to God at death.

THE TRUE POSITION OF A CHURCH.

We have been requested to say something about church order, &c. We offer the following remarks on the subject, on our individual responsibility.

1. Declaration.

All *authoritative* Creeds, Declaration of Sentiments, or Confessions of Faith, as well as Disciplines of human construction, are unwarrantable assumptions of authority over the body of Christ, and should be resisted as an invasion of personal rights and personal accountability; yet a *Church of God* may know, and ought to know, what ground it occupies.

2. Standard of Faith and Practice.

The Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, are the *only* and *sufficient rule* both of Faith and Practice; and each Member of the Church of God has the right to interpret the same according to his personal understanding of what they teach, without liability to censure for so doing, he being responsible to God alone for his faith.

3. Government of the Church.

Jesus Christ, by the appointment of the Father, is "Head over all things to the Church;" therefore no other authority to *legislate* for that body is to be acknowledged. The Members of the Church have authority, in the government thereof, only to *execute* the laws of its Head, and are all equally bound to see this faithfully attended to.—In this view, the body is Congregational in its government; and the church assembling in one place is bound to execute the laws of its Head in that place, without the interference of churches in other places.

4. Test of Fellowship.

No other test is to be used, in receiving to Fellowship, than that the person give evidence that Christ has received him; or that the individual is in a state of reconciliation to God, and is thereby of "the Lord added to the Church." Such persons are entitled to continued fellowship so long as their tempers and practices are in agreement with the precepts of the Head of the Church.

It will be seen by the foregoing that it is not so much the having creeds, &c., that we object to, as it is making them a *test* of Fellowship or Membership. All persons have a system of belief, or their view of what the Bible teaches, whether it is written or unwritten—this is unavoidable: but Christianity requires that we should not separate persons from us, nor suffer them to be separated, by authoritatively assuming that a belief in *our* inter-

pretation of Scripture is essential to salvation, or necessary to Christian fellowship and union.

Such we believe to be the true position of the Church, and any other view seems to us irreconcilable with our Lord's prayer, that his followers might *all be one* Not to be one is to be "carnal."

We mean by the term "*carnal*" the same that we understand the Apostle to mean in 1 Cor. 3: 1, 3, 4; i. e., the opposite to spiritual. "I could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal. For ye are yet carnal: for whereas there is among you envying and strife, and *divisions*, are ye not *carnal*, and walk as men? For while one saith, I am *of Paul*, and another, I am *of Apollos*, are ye not carnal?" Is not the spirit that *divides* the church of God at the present day precisely the same as that here condemned by the Apostle?—For while one says, I am a Methodist, and another, I am a Baptist; and another, I am an Episcopalian; and another, I am an Adventist; and so on, to the end of the sectarian *divisions*, "are ye not carnal, and walk as men" of the world, who divide into parties for purposes of ambition, power, or worldly gain? It seems, to our mind, clear that this is the very spirit which the Apostle condemns, and pronounces a *carnal* disposition. And what is it perpetuates these divisions but the *authoritative* creeds, confessions of faith, and disciplines of human invention? Let them be destroyed, utterly, and the sectarian divisions of the church of God would cease as a matter of course, and no other distinction would be known in that church, except that of *location*. These divisions are *sinful* and opposed to the authority of Christ, and stand in the way of the answer of his most fervent and agonizing prayer for his follows, John 17: 11, 21–23 verses, "Holy Father, keep through thine own name, those whom thou hast given me, that they may be ONE, *as we are*. That they *all* may be *one: as* thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be *one* in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me, I have given them; that they may be ONE, EVEN *as we are one;* I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made PERFECT IN ONE," &c. What can we think of a *plea* for the sectarian divisions, that have *scattered* the church of God, with this most affecting prayer before us? And what is it keeps up these divisions but the *creeds*, &c., which we call *carnal?*

We have many more texts of Scripture against these divisions. Let us call attention to a few of them. 1 Cor. 10: 17. "For we being many are *one body;*" and 12: 12, 13. "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ. For by one spirit are we all baptized into ONE BODY." Eph. 4: 4. "There is *one* body;" also, Col. 3: 14, 15. "Above all these things put on *charity*, which is the BOND of perfectness. And let the peace of God rule in your hearts, to the which also ye are called IN ONE BODY," &c. How is the bond of perfectness to make the children of God one body so long as sectarian partizans keep up their bands of discord, *test creeds?* The question is not, Is the man a child of God? or, at least, this is only a secondary question; but, "is he a Methodist, a Baptist, a Presbyterian?" and so on: and he is judged of, and treated, not according to his relationship to God, but according to his relationship to a particular creed of a sect or party: he is then embraced or slighted as it shall appear he is of our sect or of another; and, his Christian character comes not into the account, in our feelings, on the first knowledge we have of the man! Can here be *oneness?* What makes the discord? *Test creeds—"carnal" arrangements.* Who will show us one text in the Bible *against* the church of God being ONE?

We call those associated together, *the church of God*, not because every child of God is associated with them in the place, but because having renounced authoritative *creeds* they are without a name of man's invention, and the Scriptures apply the name "church of God" to the children of God in any particular place, as, also, to the church universal. See 1 Cor. 1: 2. "The *church of God* which is at Corinth;" and 10: 32. "Give none offence to the *church of God;*" and 11: 22. "Despise ye the *church of God?*" also, 15: 9. "I persecuted *the church of God.*" Acts 20: 28. "Feed the *church of God.*" 2 Cor. 1: 1. "The *church of God* which is at Corinth." Gal. 1: 13. "Beyond measure I persecuted the *church of God.*" 1 Tim. 3: 5. "How shall he take care of the *church of God.*" And lastly, the Apostle uses the plural, and says, 1 Thess. 2: 14, "Ye became the followers of the *churches of God.*" Thus we find the most common appellation given to the church was the CHURCH OF GOD, for this evident reason, it belongs to him. If it belonged to the Methodists, it would be proper to call it the Methodist Church; or if it belonged to the Baptists, it would be proper to call it the Baptist Church; and so with respect to all other names, which make us lose sight of the fact that the true church belongs not to man but to God: and is not distinguished as such except by following Christ, or *imitating* him.

But as the church of God belongs not to any of the sects, as such, nor to any man, or body of men, it is manifestly improper to call it by any name which is calculated to foster divisions; and, in our opinion, all such appellations, voluntarily accepted, and used, by a body professing to be a church, are a renunciation of their connection with the church of God. We, therefore, call them just what they call themselves, viz.: Baptist church, Methodist church, Presbyterian church, &c. They, evidently, feel it more important to be thus designated than to be simply *the church of God:* and they receive persons into their fellowship, in their churches, not because the applicant is a follower of Christ, but because he is a Methodist, a Baptist, a Presbyterian, &c. We do not say they would receive him if they knew the individual *was not* a Christian; but that is not *the* reason why they receive him; he must give them evidence not only that he has given his heart to God, but that he is sound in their creed, or discipline, or whatever it may be that *divides* them from other professing christians: nor does it help those sectarian churches at all, who profess to keep "open communion," inviting "all persons in regular standing in other churches" to commune with them. Look at it. You offer yourself, for example, to the Presbyterian church; you are rejected, because you find some one article in their creed, to which you cannot consent. You now unite with the Methodist church. Next Lord's day you are at the meeting of the Presbyterians and it is "communion:" they invite you, being a "member in regular standing in another church," to *commune* with them! They would not receive you into their church, though they admit you are a christian brother by inviting you to their communion! Is it not thus evident that these sectarian churches have set up a standard or *test* of membership in *their bodies*, which they admit, by their invitations to communion, to be above the standard that God has given?

More "Infidels."—We clip the following from the *Philadelphia Ledger*. It speaks for itself. The spirit of intolerance—which calls men *infidels* who cannot assent to human authority issuing from the dark and corrupt ages of Christianity—stands out in all its hateful habiliments in this transaction.

"Rev. F. M. Haygood was recently put on trial, found guilty of heresy, and expelled from the Baptist Church in Marietta, Ga., because he would neither assert nor deny that *God foreknew all things*. The Rev. gentleman said in his defence that he could find no passage in Scripture which taught the doctrine, and he had no opinion therefore on the subject."

Bishop Newton, in his Works, "*Dissertation No. 60, On the final state of Man,*" speaks as follows:—

"*It is impossible for any creature to live in eternal torments.* Who among us can dwell with the devouring fire? who among us can dwell with everlasting burnings? Nothing can be more contrary to the divine nature and attributes than for a God all-wise, all-powerful, all-good, all-perfect, to bestow existence on any beings, whose destiny, he foresees and foreknows, must terminate in wretchedness and misery, without recovery or remedy, without respite or end. 'God is love,' and he would rather have not given life, than render that life a torment and curse to all eternity. Imagine a creature, nay, imagine numberless creatures produced out of nothing, delivered over to torments of endless ages, without the least hope or possibility of relaxation or redemption. *Imagine it you may, but you can never seriously believe it,* nor reconcile it to God and goodness. God could never make any [creature] whose end he foreknew would be misery everlasting."

"Fruits and Farinacea *the Proper Food for Man;* Being an attempt to prove from history, anatomy, physiology, and chemistry, that the Original, Natural, and Best Diet of Man is derived from the Vegetable Kingdom. By John Smith. With notes and illustrations, by R. T. Trall, M.D. From the Second London Edition. *Fowlers & Wells*, Publishers, New York."

The title of the work sufficiently indicates its importance. We have received only "Part II," from page 97 to 192; and would be pleased to see the entire work.

"The Pauline Chart."—We have received a copy of this *Chart* from the author—J. W. Bonham. It is a chart of the "Travels and Voyages of the Apostle Paul," having a small map of all the countries embraced; then arranged in columns are the Places Visited—Localities of those places—the year of the visit—Principal Occurrences—References to various works from which information is derived; so that the whole history is spread out before the eye at a glance. For those who wish to study the subject in a connected manner it will be found a help. It is got up very neatly. To be had of the author, Newton Centre, Mass.

Prof. Mattison has not furnished an article for this number. We trust he will for the next.

The question under discussion is one of deep interest, and many are anxious that it should go on till it is settled. There is a heaven-wide difference between a *theological soul* and a Bible one.