BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. IX. NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 1, 1854. NO. 19.

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 MONCRIEF, SCOTLAND.

[Continued from page 245.]

Pneuma.— *Greek Term.*

There are a number of passages, some of them involving not a little difficulty in their exposition, which we will introduce here, and, as briefly as possible, endeavor to aid the reader in coming to an understanding of them.

Matt. 14: 26, "And when the disciples saw him walking on the sea, they were troubled, saying, it is a spirit (phantasma, not pneuma) and they cried out for fear." See also Mark 6 : 49.

The meaning of *phantasma* is an apparition, spectre; the Greek word is incorporated with our language now, and its form is phantasm. What the Disciples mean by a *phantasma* we are unable accurately to determine.

On apparitions generally, we would advise the reader to peruse the calm work of Hibbert; also let him examine in reference to *ghosts*, Reichenbach's Researches, edited and translated by Prof. Gregory, p. 123 to p. 127, where he will find interesting and useful information. Science is making havoc among ghosts and apparitions, just as enlightenment has happily relieved us of witches, and many other bugbears of our ancestors.

Luke 24: 39, "a spirit (pneuma) hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have."

According to the 37th verse of this chapter, we learn that, when the resurrected Jesus suddeny stood in the midst of his disciples, "they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed they had seen a spirit" (pneuma). To remove their fears our Lord addressed them in the words given in verse 39th, which have been already quoted.

It is enough to remark on this passage that, like Job 4 : 15, it says nothing about *human* spirits, much less about human disembodied spirits. They thought they had seen a spirit, but what kind of spirit we are not told; neither are we informed what order of being the Saviour referrred to in his address, "a spirit hath not flesh and bones." That there are living creature spirits, and it may be different kinds of them, we are far from disputing; with such we are not, in this treatise, concerning ourselves, our simple object is to determine what the Bible means by the human spirit.

Let it also be noted, the Apostles seem to have thought the "spirit," whoever or whatever he may have been, had not the property of *invisibility;* "they supposed" they had "seen a spirit," and how an immaterial being could ever be visible, is beyond our apprehension. The fact that they supposed a spirit could be visible, shows distinctly that the doctrine now common about spirits, was not held by them; at any rate it would appear they did not consider invisibility a necessary property of "spirit."

Jesus said, on another occasion, "God is a spirit," and because we know that he is "invisible", hasty reasoners leap to the conclusion that every being called a spirit must think, and be immortal and invisible also. To such persons it is necessary to say in a friendly tone, pause and consider. The apostle tells us in the 15th chapter of 1 Cor. that there are different kinds of flesh, or fleshly beings, and surely we may suppose there are diverse sorts of spirits, or spiritual beings. Nay, even essentially diverse things or beings may carry the same name, because to a contemplator there may be discoverable, from his stand-point, some line, perhaps a very narrow one, of resemblance between them. An angel and the wind may both be *pneuma*, spirit, and however widely different otherwise, they may resemble each other in their invisibility; so God is called *pneuma*, and the wind is also *pneuma*, or spirit, and one obvious mark of likeness is in their invisibility to our eye. Because the wind, like the galvanic fluid, is not an object of sight to us, it follows not, however, that it is invisible to every creature; because angels are usually invisible to mortals, no more does it result that they are equally concealed from all other eyes; and it would be as unwarranted to infer that, because all created spirits are capable of being made visible to intelligent creature eyes, whether fleshly or fleshless, that God, since he has been revealed as "spirit," can become in any circumstance an object of sight to his offspring as we see each other, or as angels behold angels. From this very omnipresence that seems to be impossible, though, as we judge, nothing save ignorance could discover this from the fact that he is called a "spirit". What the nature of the Divine Being is, appears to transcend the grasp of all-created intellect; "who by searching can find out God"? Deity may be spirit after his own kind, that is, *Divine* Spirit; just as creatures may be spirits of their own order, that is, *creature* spirits; and

surely we may safely affirm that there must be, in essential nature, or in the kind of spiritual substance, an infinite difference between them all and God, and that there may be a vast disparity between creature spirits among themselves.

In connection with the passage from Luke, we may specify another remarkable instance of hasty reasoning, it is this:—because Jesus pronounces such a spirit as he was referring to, not to have "flesh and bones," must we leap to immateriality? Is there no matter in the great universe but "*flesh and bones*"? What is carbonic acid gas? what is oxygen? what is electricity? what is nervous influence? what is light? what is the perfume of a rose? How varied, how subtile, how imponderable even, the forms *matter* assumes? Is there no possibility of a creature being material and yet not "flesh and bones"? Who shall say so without folly? So far from being necessarily immaterial, the writer of the 15th chapter of 1 Cor. makes mention of a "spiritual *body*;" and, indeed, an immaterial being, appears to our judgment, simply an absurdity. Every being must be a something occupying space,—he must have an essence, and that essence located, in all space or a portion of it. There may be inconceivable differences between the essences, substances, or *material* of beings; we may, without danger of presumption, affirm there must be such a difference absolutely between the Divine Agent and all his creatures. To say that God is immaterial, or that spirits are immaterial, is very like an assertion that there is no God—no spirit in the universe. The uncreated Being can be spirit and yet matter,—eternal, unchangeable, and all-pervading, of an order peculiar to himself; for to be spiritual is not to be absolutely immaterial; and intelligences formed by his hand can be spirit and essentially material, though they may not be "flesh and bones," but organizations or structures of a more ethereal cast.

John 6 : 63,—"the words that I speak unto you they are spirit (pneuma) and they are life."

"They (the words that I spake unto you) are not to be understood literally, as if you were really to eat my flesh; but they are to be understood as denoting the need of that provision for the soul which God has made by my coming into the world."—*Barnes in lo.*

Acts 23 : 9, "but if a spirit (pneuma) or an angel hath spoken to him, let us not fight against God."

So spake the "scribes that were of the Pharisees' part," about Paul, but as the words contain nothing about human spirit, the passage is excluded from consideration at this time. See remarks on Luke 24 : 39.

Rom. 8 : 10, "And if Christ be in you the body is dead because of sin; but the spirit (pneuma) is life because of righteousness."

In the first work we published on this momentous controversy regarding man and futurity, we expressed our opinion that this verse intimated a conditional hereafter to the spirits of pious men, understanding as we then did, that the spirit of man imported what it is generally supposed to do. A more careful examination of the Scripture teaching about man's spirit, and a prolonged consideration of the verse, has convinced us that we formerly misunderstood it; if this confession be deemed humiliating, we are perfectly willing to bear the shame, since we are conscious of a desire to advance in a better knowledge of the Word, and are, at the same time, alive to our own ignorance and fallibility. God is the only being who requires neither to learn nor unlearn; these are the unavoidable conditions of finite intelligence.

The verse before us has been employed lately by Prof. John Brown, of Edinburgh, in his work, "The dead in Christ," to support the opinion that the dead (dead?) are conscious, having his argument, as usual, based on the word "spirit," and, after quoting his remarks, we shall presume to offer a few critical observations upon them. He says, "The following declaration of the apostle Paul, in the epistle to the Romans, fairly interpreted, seems clearly to assert that the state between death and the resurrection is one of conscious activity and happiness:—'If Christ be in you,' if you be true Christians, united to Christ as dying and rising, 'the body is dead,' and must die, 'because of sin,' the first sin of the first man, and the sin, too, that dwells in us; 'but the spirit,' the soul, as contrasted with the body, 'is life,' shall live, 'because of righteousness,' or of justification,—shall live while the body is dead: 'and if the spirit of him that raised up Christ from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall' not only preserve the spirit alive, but shall 'also quicken your mortal,' your dead, 'bodies by,' (or rather as it is in the margin) because of, 'his spirit that dwelleth in you.'"

In our work, already alluded to, we employed this passage from Romans to carry out the idea of conditional immortality, having then a strong subcurrent in our mind, of the abounding notions concerning human spirits, but, when properly interpreted, the text neither supports our previous statements nor those of the learned and venerable Professor. Nothing but assumptions stand out from the extract we have quoted above.

1. One assumption is that the human spirit and soul *are one*;—he says "the spirit," "the soul," as if the two terms were mutually explanatory. It may be fashionable in creeds and sermons to employ phraseology like this, "the soul, that is, the spirit of man," "the spirit or the soul," but the usage is unsanctioned by the authority of inspiration. Indeed, the soul of a man is just the organized being man himself, and if at any time a contrast is drawn between his soul and body, life is assuredly the import of "soul" in all such instances, as we have tried to manifest in our work "Soul." The common idea attached to soul is that of human self, or personality, but it must be kept in mind that "soul" in the Bible it essentially different from "soul" in the creeds and pulpits, and, instead of contrasting the human soul or life, and the body, we should have expected a repeated contrast between the soul and the man—the being himself, and his physical dwelling-place, yet that is never once discoverable in the sacred volume. Without doubt it speaks of soul and body, but not so as to teach us that the soul was the man apart from, and residing in, his material abode.

So far from the soul and spirit being synonymous, it becomes us to speak of them as very distinct. Instead of writing soul *or* spirit, thereby expressing unity, we should say *a* soul and his spirit; "soul" designating the man whom the Lord God formed of the dust of the ground, and spirit being the breath of life inhaled by his lungs. We have said so much on these points already, that we may be excused any enlargement at this stage.

2. If it be the spirit of man that is here mentioned, another assumption is that *it was ever conscious before death*, that it was ever the thinking agent man, properly speaking, at all. Man has a spirit, and if it is an axiom that spirit must be alive, and must think, and must think on forever, all that Dr. B. asserts, and all that was ever affirmed on the same subject by myriads before him, may be admitted without a moment's hesitation. But are these things self-evident? It is here said "the spirit is life," may a spirit not be so described, because it is essential to life, without being itself alive? Food is life to man, and so is breath, or the spirit of life that comes from God. Enough has been shown in the preceding pages to manifest what the spirit of man is, that has been so long mistaken for man himself. What an humbling thought that, along with others, we mistook the breath for the breather!

3. It is another assumption that the spirit spoken of by the Apostle, is the spirit of man. We feel a growing assurance that it is God's Spirit and not man's. The writer does not say, if Christ be in you, your body is dead because of sin, but *your* spirit is life, because of righteousness, he merely asserts, the body is dead, but THE SPIRIT is life. Who, or what is this "Spirit?" Much is said about a spirit in the context, and, as far as we can determine it is exclusively of God's Spirit that mention is made. In verse 9th, we read, "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his," and then, after introducing the verse under discussion, the Apostle goes on at verse 11, thus, "But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." At the close of verse 10th, the writer declares "the spirit is life because of righteousness," and he continues to speak about the *same* Spirit in the 11th verse as just quoted, "but if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you," &c. A case could hardly be clearer, as we humbly think, against Dr. B.'s interpretation of Spirit here, as being the spirit of man instead of that of Christ; and, if the thoughtful reader will study the point with his Bible open before him, we feel persuaded he will agree with us. Let it be also noted, that the interpretation we give of "spirit" here is obviously the one approved by our Translators, as is evinced by their printing Spirit with a capital S, and not a small one, as we think would have been the case, had they supposed the reference to be the spirit of man.

4. The meaning of verses 10 and 11 seems to be the following, which we give in the paraphrastic form:—and if Christ be in you, if ye are true Christians, the body, or ye yourselves, are condemned to die, and must die in consequence of sin, (compare Rom. 5: 12, &c.); but the Spirit of Christ who dwells in you at present, is giving you life, opening up to you, as justified and pious men, the hope of a glorious future life through a resurrection from the dead; and if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead—as the first fruits of them that slept—dwell in you, as you are well aware he does, by the peace and light, the love and hope which are your great possession, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall ere long quicken your mortal bodies, or give you an immortal and incorruptible resurrection by, or rather because of the Spirit that now resides in you. Still the old doctrine comes up in new and vigorous forms, that the human spirit is not the man; and that saints have no hope of everlasting life except through a resurrection from the dust. No passing from death unto life; only from the grave to immortality.

5. We are only required now to meet an objection that may probably arise in some minds, it is this:—why make "body" in the phrase "the body is dead," equivalent to the ENTIRE MAN? We answer, because we find this done in a variety of ways all over the Book; personality is there connected with the organization, not with anything like that undefined and incomprehensible conception, a human soul, or spirit, as it looms forth a cloud-enveloped popular creation. In proof of the propriety of our interpretation, we refer to such examples as these—Gen. 2: 7, "God formed man of the dust of the ground;" 3: 19, "Dust thou art;" 6: 3, "he (man) also is flesh;" Ps. 103: 14, "He remembereth that we are dust;" Ps. 139: 15, "my substance," (*margin*, 'my body') or I, "was not hid from thee when I was made in secret;" Matt. 6: 22, "the light of the body (of the human being) is the eye;" Rom. 12: 1, "Present your bodies (yourselves) a living sacrifice," &c.; Heb. 10: 10, "through the offering of the body of Jesus," i.e., the offering up of Jesus; James 3: 6, "it (the tongue) defileth the whole body," i.e., the entire being.

1 Cor. 5: 3, "For I verily, as absent in body, but present in spirit (pneumati), have judged already as though I were present," &c. Regarding the phrase "present in spirit," Barnes on the text has these remarks:—"my heart is with you; my feelings are with you; I have a deep and tender interest in the case, and I judge *as if* I were personally present. . . . Paul meant, probably, that though he was absent, yet his mind and attention had been given to this subject."

1 Cor. 5: 4, "when ye are called together, and my spirit (pneumatos,) with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ."

"The passage,' says Bloomfield, "may be rendered thus:—I do hereby direct that ye (being assembled together, and I being spiritually and virtually present with you, by the signification of this my opinion) do, in the name and in behalf of our Lord Jesus Christ, and acting by the power of our Lord Jesus Christ, deliver the person so described." &c

1 Cor. 5 : 5, "deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit (pneuma) may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus."

The "spirit" is either *life* here, or it is used as a periphrasis for the man himself. The end of the disciplinary excommunication was for the destruction of the offender's flesh, that the spirit, or that he himself, might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.

Using the word "soul" as synonymous with "spirit," Bloomfield paraphrases the clause thus: —"that his soul, corrected, humbled, and reformed by these sufferings may be saved," &c. "His soul" being a periphrasis for himself, and this being employed, though without the warrant of Scripture, for "the spirit" in the text, shows the commentator, whose words we have quoted, understood the verse in the sense we have assigned it. Better, is the force of the passage, to have the flesh, or the animalism destroyed now under a severe judicial visitation,—better to lose even the present life itself than to remain unwarned and untroubled in the midst of sin, which has such a deadly influence on every moral being; as a result of a true humiliation and thorough purgation in the fiery furnace, one may ultimately phœnix-like, spring from the dust incorruptible and deathless.

1 Cor. 6 : 20, "glorify God in your body and in your spirit, (pneumati) which are God's."

Here, as we have remarked on other occasions, there is nothing about a rational, thinking, immaterial, deathless spirit. The command to glorify God "in your spirit," it may be affirmed, intimates that the spirit thinks and wills and loves. Then, would we answer, O friend of the popular systems, observe that your own reasoning lands you in the conclusion that the material frame must think also, and that is a horrible idea to one instructed as you have been. Are we not commanded to glorify God in our body as well as spirit? And if the command proves the spirit thinks, it must show that the body performs intellectual operations also; and if a spirit must survive death because thought is ascribed to it, the same fact would seem to compel us to infer that the physical and organic associate of the more ethereal division of human nature should escape dissolution likewise, which being a great absurdity, as is established by observation, however logical and congruous it may appear in the region of abstraction and speculation, warns us from concluding that, because any part of man happens in the Book to have thought connected with it,—be it called "heart, reins, bowels, or spirit,"—the author of inspiration does thereby teach us, that the said part actually performs the given function, and will elude the grasp of death. It is the BEING MAN who thinks. Sometimes the thought process, or mentalization, is conjoined with one part, sometimes with another, and sometimes it is even associated with its breath, or life-spirit, inasmuch as it is by the vital spirit every human function is generated and sustained. And what is man. "The Lord God formed MAN of the DUST of the ground." Gen. 2 : 7.

In a verse like the one we are considering, it is sometimes affirmed that there is a statement given of the two parts that compose each human being, the body and the spirit, meaning, of course, his rational and indestructible spirit. These two parts compose a man—then how happens it that after death the man remains as perfect as ever? He thinks as well, joys or suffers as completely; in a word, is equally perfect as prior to the disunion of these two parts. When the compound agent thinks, does it not seem to be a dictate of common sense that, if the parts are taken asunder, all the results of their union, such as thought, love, pain, pleasure, and voluntary action must terminate? Take away the silver plate from the galvanic battery, or the acid from its trough, will the flash be seen? will the message run along the wires? Is a part, in a word, equal to a whole?

On the supposition that this passage teaches the existence of two parts in man, will not the text in which "spirit—soul—body" occur, reveal three parts; and the words of our Master "thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength," announce the existence of many; and what must be astounding to every one wedded to common notions, the Great Teacher in these terms makes no mention of a spirit whatever. A most vital part, nay, the part, compared to which all besides is unworthy of being taken into calculation,—this very vital part ignored!

Without controversy, the text under discussion is simply a mode of expressing ENTIRE MAN, like the words of Jesus we have transcribed a few lines above. Body and spirit, being and breath, being and life, being and all its powers, visible and invisible, mental or physical,—let them all be consecrated to him who is their Creator and Redeemer. In the words of *Barnes*, "Let your entire person be subservient to the glory of God." Who has difficulty in understanding the force of these texts, "The Lord direct your *hearts* into the love of God," "Sanctify the Lord God in your *hearts*?" When glorifying God in our hearts is so readily understood, on what ground shall we make a mystery of glorifying him in our spirits? Give him all outward and inward reverence is the substance of the exhortation. Would that it were universally done.

[To be Continued.]

IDOLATRY.

BY DR. S. B. BARLOW, NEW YORK.

Mr. Editor.—Will the great problem of "Man's Nature and Destiny," ever get itself settled? Who could believe that that, the greatest of all moral problems, was yet a debateable question? Especially, who could believe that the Church, the orthodox Church, claiming almost to be infallible, whose Grand Muftis and learned Bishops, High Priests, and titled Dignitaries, blessed with the Gospel, a light which is capable of out-shining all darkness, should still be groping in heathenish and worse than Egyptian darkness on that great question which above all others is of the most paramount importance to every living son and daughter of Adam? And yet such seems to be

the fact. We see it everywhere in the Church from the highest to the lowest of its members, and in churches of all manner of names; they have adopted the heathen philosophy and theory of man's nature and destiny in point-blank and Heaven-defying contradiction to God's word in relation to it; and that too where that word is so plain that a way-faring man though a fool need not err therein. It is the *idolatry* of the Church! It is their idol, and it is questionable whether they will ever give it up and settle down upon the plain truth of God's word until the great day whose light shall blaze and burn the truth into every man's mind and conscience.

And can they benefit by the truth then communicated? I fear not. We are commanded to know the truth, to believe it, to live in it. To all men is given understanding that they may know it, and if men will cleave to error when the truth is so plainly revealed to them in the word of Jehovah, how will they answer for it in a day of accounts? Alas! I dare not answer how. Bishop Newton said of Lord Bolingbroke: "the Lord gave him splendid talents, but the Devil gave him the application of them." Are not many of our talented men and Professors fearfully linked in the same category with his Lordship? I was led to these reflections by an article in the Christian Advocate and Journal of July 13, 1854, signed G. P. D., in which he gives long extracts from Cicero on the immortality of the soul, extolling him and Plato and Aristotle to the skies as the great expounders of the truth on that great subject, without once hinting, or seeming to know that the philosophy of God's Book was opposed totally to those heathen theories, (devices of Satan) and contradicted them *in limine et extenso* as much and as plainly as any known truth contradicts its opposing error. Did G. P. D. know the fact that God's word entirely, directly, and pointedly opposed those very heathen notions? If not let me beg him to go once through the Bible, carefully sifting and collating every passage in it which has any even the slightest bearing upon that point—the soul's immortality, and the great question of man's nature and destiny; and see if he cannot come to a truthful understanding of the matter. What is to be the final result of the Church's error on these more than vital questions? Can men live in, and deal in, error of the most deadly and destructive nature all their days, when the truth lies open, world-wide before them, and come out of it at last unscathed? If so, what is truth for and what is it worth? "Ephraim is joined to idols." "The soul that sinneth it shall die."

Yours affectionately.

Henry Ward Beecher.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., Sept. 9, 1854.

Dear Br. Storrs.—This being Commencement week of Brown University, we have been favored with some superior emanations of gifted minds. On Tuesday evening our respected christian brother, Henry W. Beecher, gave, to a very crowded audience, an interesting discourse on the subject of Gospel missions, in his own original style. Our Boanerges commended himself, to every pious heart, by an impressive delineation of the absolute importance of vital godliness, as the grand effective element in this holy enterprise. Alas! the sacred pleasure of the occasion was diminished by the perception, that the expansive and independent mind of our brother has not emerged from the ignoble bondage of a traditional theology. Under the influence of human tradition, in the presentation of supposed barriers to the prosperity of the missionary enterprise, the eloquent speaker was pleased to class with the national sin of Slavery, (which elicited a faithful and scorching rebuke,) the prevalence of the belief, that DEATH, as an extinction OF VITAL BEING, will ultimately be the doom of impenitent men! In direct opposition to the pious intention of the speaker, here was the impious anomaly, of placing the very truth of "the faithful Witness," in the category of obstacles to the advancement of his own cause! If the words of Jesus Christ, Matt. 10: 28; teaching men to fear a destruction of "SOUL AND BODY," in *Gehenna, subsequent to the first death,* do not plainly declare the truth we preach, and for which we are charged with hindering the Gospel our inmost powers love to promote; if the numerous declarations of the Bible, that God will *destroy the wicked* do not teach the sentiment Mr. B. repudiates, we ask him to inform us what words can teach it? If our brother believes that he can advance the cause of the Redeemer, whom we mutually serve, by teaching the heathen philosophy of natural immortality, and consequent eternal life of those who die in their sins; let him, at least, cease accusing us for teaching the testimony of the Eternal Spirit that "the wages of sin is DEATH." "The second death," as well as the first. Let him solemnly consider whom he is opposing, when he opposes the sentiment that in the "very day" of death, the "thoughts" of man "perish;" "also his love," &c. Do *we* persuade men to believe these things, or *God?*

What, we ask, is the objection of the talented preacher to these plain testimonies of the only reliable revelation? Did he adduce from the living oracles any counter testimony? Not a word. The sentiment does not chime with our brother's views and fancies of the dignity of human nature, or with his respect for it! This reminds us of the means adopted by another personage, to persuade the sinner to disbelieve the truth we preach, by flattering him with attaining to the high dignity of being "as Gods." Gen. 3: 5. Suppose a man charges our brother with lowering the dignity of human nature, because he denies that the human soul is really a part of the eternal and immutable essence of God: or because he denies that man was made higher than the angels. His answer to such a change, will be an answer to himself.

Finally, if Mr. B's. regard for humanity, or for the justice and mercy of God, is such as induces him to prefer the contemplation of innumerable intelligent beings existing to endless duration in sin and misery, to the contemplation of their annihilation, we must dissent from the horrible philosophy.

Yours, for the truth, HENRY GREW.

Dr. Clarke Again.

Br. Storrs:—That Dr. Adam Clarke should find himself "in a dilemma" when he attempts to explain a passage which is hostile to the *going-to-heaven-at-death* theory, is natural enough; and that he should at any time completely nullify this theory by his own express teaching, may well excite surprise. Has he done so? Let us see. The Doctor proposes to read 1 Cor. 15: 32 thus: "If after the manner of men, I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what doth it advantange me? If the dead rise not, let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die." His comment on the place is as follows:

"What the apostle says here, is a regular and legitimate conclusion from the doctrine, that *there is no resurrection;* for, if there be no *resurrection*, then there can be no *judgment;* no *future state* of *rewards* and *punishments;* why, therefore, should we bear crosses, and keep ourselves under continual discipline! Let us eat and drink, take all the pleasure we can, for to-morrow we die: and there is an *end* of us forever."

That the Doctor in this exposition faithfully echoes Paul's meaning, does not, it appears to me, admit of a reasonable doubt; but in doing so, who does not see that he subverts the *immortal soul* hypothesis, and thus becomes a co-worker with those who hold and advocate what *he* elsewhere calls *"the vile doctrine of Materialism!"* Possibly he had not recovered from the shock which the popular notion receives at the 18th verse, which declares that "if the dead rise not," "Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are PERISHED." Indeed, he appears to have been deeply imbued with the drift of the inspired Apostle's reasoning, and by making *future life* depend on the "resurrection," he establishes the fact that *"the dead know not anything."* In the light of this truth it is easy to explain another remark of the Doctor, in his concluding notes on this chapter. He says, speaking of the *resurrection*, "The Apostles were continually insisting on it, and exciting the followers of God to diligence, obedience, and cheerfulness through it." He also says, "There is not a doctrine in the Gospel on which more stress is laid." All this is very plain, if the *no-resurrection* hypothesis involves the fearful consequence affirmed in the comment I have quoted, namely, that at *death* "there is an END OF US FOREVER." Had the Doctor seen this truth when he penned his note on Acts 9: 40, he would have escaped the "dilemma" which you remark upon in the EXAMINER for August.

Very truly yours,

Canajoharie, N. Y. RUFUS WENDELL.

DARK DAYS.—In the year 358, before the earthquake of Nicomedia, the darkness was very dense from two to three hours. Two years afterwards, in all the provinces of the Roman Empire, there was obscurity from early dawn to noon. The stars were visible; and its duration precludes the idea of a solar eclipse. At the return of light, the sun appeared first in a crescent form, then half its face was seen, and was gradually restored to its whole visible disk. In 409, the stars were seen by day at Rome. About 536, the sun was obscured for fourteen months, so that very little of his light was seen. In 567, such darkness prevailed from 3 P. M. till night that nothing could be seen. In 626, half the sun's disk was obscured for eight months. In 733 he was again darkened, and people were generally terrified.

In 934, Portugal was in darkness for two months, the sun having lost its brightness. The heavens were then opened in fissures by strong flashes of lightning, when there was suddenly bright sunlight. September 21, 1091, the sun was darkened for three hours. February 28, 1206, for six hours complete darkness turned the day into night. In 1241, on Michaelmas day, the stars were visible at 3 P. M. In 1647, April 23–25, three days, the sun was so obscured that many stars were visible at once. Thus says HUMBOLDT in Cosmos.

If we come almost to our own time, to May 19, 1780, history and tradition assert the occurrence of a remarkable day prevailing over New England at least, and considerably in some other places. It came on between 10 and 11 A. M., and continued until midnight, growing gradually darker and darker, even till 11 at night. Candles and lamps were lighted for the people to see to dine, and to perform work about the house. These became requisite before 12 o'clock M. In the evening, so dense was it, that farmers could scarcely, even with the aid of a lantern, grope their way to the barn to take care of the cattle. The birds retired to their roosts at 11, A. M., and the day was converted into night.—*N. O. True Delta.*

FAMILY PRAYER.—Nothing, I think, is more useful in a family than prayer. For a man to call his family around him, and, on his bended knees, with sincere devotion, implore Almighty aid for himself and his household, is productive of the most beneficial results. And O, my God, how few families in my neighborhood even erect a family altar in their houses! Arouse us, sweet Saviour, and help us to feel and appreciate this glorious privilege! It not only instructs the younger members, by the godly example set before them, but it leads on and confirms the older ones in the way of piety and holiness. It teaches them a sense of their duty, to be thankful to the great Jehovah for his aid and support, which they daily receive, instead of returning to rest without thinking from whence they obtain their protection. When they pour out their thanks to God, who will never forsake those who pray in a right manner, then their prayers come from the heart, and not from the lips only. Then, too, they obtain that inward consolation and spiritual comfort which God is pleased to bestow on his followers when they breathe forth their desires in humble supplication. The man who never prays in his family, who retires to rest like the beasts of the field, without thinking that he is dependent on God for everything that he receives, is bringing up his children and family strangers to God; he is making them blind in their own evil ways, and hence double guilt will fall upon him. I would entreat all heads of families to pray by all means; to never forget the duty they owe to their

families and their God, and to keep in mind that holy precept, "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it."—*Ch. Ad. and Jour.*

Prof. Mattison vs. Prof. Mattison!

Br. Storrs.—In the EXAMINER for Oct. 1st, Prof. Mattison called "your special attention" to the "case" of MOSES at the transfiguration, which he urged "as an incontrovertible instance, in which a human spirit has manifested itself as having a conscious existence while the body it once occupied lay in the grave."

It may interest your readers to learn that the Prof. himself quite recently advanced an altogether different opinion on this matter! He published a work last year entitled "SPIRIT RAPPING UNVEILED," in which (on p. 36,) after stating what was "supposed" to have occasioned "the 'dispute' between Michael the archangel and Satan 'about the body of Moses,'" recorded by Jude, he says:—"If this explanation is correct (and to say the least, it is highly probable), it affords much ground for the belief that God had settled the 'dispute' by raising the body of Moses from the dead, and that he appeared on the Mount of transfiguration precisely as Elias appeared. As the saints are to appear with Christ hereafter 'in glory,' and the bodies of the just are to be 'raised in glory,' so of Moses and Elias it is said 'they appeared in glory,' which, WE THINK, implies the full redemption of both soul and body."

Thus, reader, it is evident the Prof. "is in a strait betwixt two." In "unveiling" the "rappings" he saw no necessity for allowing the presence of a *ghost* at the transfiguration—indeed, he argues well against that notion; but when his "superadded entity" theory is in danger of being "unveiled," he does not hesitate to affirm that "the *spirit* of Moses met Elijah and Christ on the top of Tabor near fifteen centuries after his body died, and while it yet slumbered in the valley of Moab!"

Oct. 16, 1854. R. WENDELL.

From J. W. Dye, Jordan, New York.

Oct. 9, 1854.

Br. Storrs.—It is now several years since I first read your Six Sermons, by which I became interested and fully convinced of the truth of the Bible doctrine, "No immortality or endless life except through Jesus Christ alone."

For two or three years past I have been a reader of the BIBLE EXAMINER, and am well pleased with it, and the manner in which it is conducted.

My interest in the immortality question suffers no abatement. It is my ground of hope. Jesus the great Life Giver came that those who would believe on Him—take the Cross and obey His commands—might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.

I hope yet to see the truth of this most interesting subject prevail, and the Examiner shed its light into every town and locality, until men shall throw off those yokes of bondage—those creeds and confessions of faith which conflict with each other and with the Bible—and take the Holy Scriptures for the only authoritative rule of faith and practice, and there learn, that if ever mortal man shall obtain immortality, they must seek for it, by patient continuance in well doing—endure hardness as good soldiers for Christ—overcome the world as he overcame; then, when he shall come from Heaven, the second time without sin unto salvation, we shall, if sleeping, be raised; if living, be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye; then this mortal shall put on Immortality, and we be caught up to meet the Lord, and so be forever with the Lord.

I am glad that Prof. Mattison came forward to discuss the question now under examination by yourself and the Prof. in the Examiner. I think it must do great good; it has, and it will show the sandy foundation, the no foundation at all, upon which immortal soulism rests.

I have been sorry to learn that the Examiner has not been better supported—that you should be shut up to the cares of the office without compensation. But I am now glad to see that some friends have taken a good step, and you are likely to be relieved from those cares with which you have been burdened. As for myself I can do but little (having to labor with my hands from day to day, pay rent and support a family) but that little is done cheerfully. I hope all others will do what they can afford to do in this matter; then the truth will advance; we be benefitted and blessed in doing our duty, and you go on in the good work without embarrasment.

Enclosed you will please find $2, which I forward to help you for this year.

I hope you will be able to publish the Examiner at least semi-monthly next year; and I had rather pay $3, and have it weekly, than pay $1, and have it once in two weeks.

Spicy Words.

"MATERIALISM ANTI-SCRIPTURAL: or the Doctrines of George Storrs refuted, by Rev. N. D. George, N. E. Conference.

This work is published in Tract form, 48 pages—price 3 cts. Being so cheap it should be extensively circulated wherever *this miserable delusion* prevails. Thousands have already been disposed of, and we hope to send out many more."

We clipt the foregoing notice from *Zion's Herald.* When our friends have read it we hope they will not fail to order "thousands" of the *Reply* of Eld. Z. Campbell, which is now ready for delivery. The Reply is properly headed—"MATERIALISM SCRIPTURAL; or, *the Doctrine of Rev. N. D. George Exploded.*" Br. Campbell was the principal object of Mr. George's attack, though professing to refute the "Doctrines of Geo. Storrs." Br. C. has left "Rev. N. D. G." in a "*miserable*" condition; not having even the "skin of his teeth" remaining. Send us your orders and scatter them by tens of thousands: it will always keep ahead of Mr. G.'s. Price $3 per hundred.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 1, 1854.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—One more number will complete our issue for this year. Shall it be published *semi-monthly* in 1855? To insure this we must have nine hundred dollars paid, on subscription or otherwise, before the January issue. This sum can be easily raised if our present subscribers will send us *one dollar* each, which may be done at our risk. It is just as easy to pay $1 within the next two months as at any future period. "*Payment always in advance,*" are our terms; and we are sure it is best for all parties. The subscriber reads his paper with more satisfaction, and we publish with less embarrassment. Shall we hear from you all immediately? We promise to issue only *monthly;* but if the $900 is received by Dec. 25th we shall go forward with the *semi-monthly.* Some have already paid $2 for next year; others, we know, intend to do so; yet we do not ask it; and should much prefer that we might be able to say the EXAMINER is sustained from the payment of $1 from each subscriber. Some will not renew their subscriptions, but if our real friends will exert themselves, we doubt not, the $900 will be paid by the time specified.

Any person in the states collecting and sending us $5, current money, shall have *six* copies sent to his order for 1855. Any one in Canada doing it shall have *five.* Direct, in all cases, "GEO STORRS, *Bible Examiner Office, New York.*"

WE give the following from a *Preacher:* but he wishes us to withhold his name. He is one whose face we have never seen, that we recollect; but he seems in good earnest.

A PROPOSITION.

The BIBLE EXAMINER must, and will live. But it should do more than this; it should be some help to its EDITOR; and in order to have it do so, its friends must make an effort.

I observe by the Sept. issue, that some have proposed to pledge themselves for $2; this is an excellent idea, and I readily agree to do the same; that is, to continue my present subscription, and get two new subscribers, or pay over the $2 myself; and I hope every subscriber will do the same, and then BR. STORRS will have sufficient funds to employ some help, and thereby be able to bestow more labor upon the paper and in the field, and be saved from that very unpleasant position which he must now occupy, that of being cramped in financial affairs.

O! ye men who have this world's goods, stop for a moment and think of a man who has spent his substance and given his time to feed you and other starving souls with the bread of life, then lend a helping hand.

But I have another proposition to make,—Namely, that we learn the expense of publishing 1000 extra copies of the last number of this year's EXAMINER, and divide it in shares of 25 cents each, and those individuals who wish to take one, two, or more shares, do so, and take his worth of the papers, and scatter them in places where it is not now circulated; or perhaps where we cannot go to obtain subscribers; for by this means undoubtedly many will be led to subscribe for it who would under no other circumstances. Come, Brethren, what say you to this? let us hear from you.

Once more.—Br. Storrs must have 1000 subscribers to commence Vol. 10 with. He has now 900; out of these 900 subscribers there ought to be enough to get 100 more. I will pledge myself to put forth every effort to obtain 25 of them, and who will take the rest?

A SUBSCRIBER.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—We will furnish the "*extra* thousand" copies of the last number of the EXAMINER for this year, for $1, 50 per hundred, provided, the cash for them is received before that number goes to press. That price only covers the cost of paper and press work, without charging anything for composition.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.—If any of you have failed to receive either number for this year we will send it to you on the receipt of the notice. *No charge* will be made for the odd numbers.

Any subscriber who thinks we have wronged him by not issuing 24 numbers this year, if he will give us notice, we will allow him 17 cents in any books or pamphlets we issue, that he shall name.

BOUND EXAMINER.—Immediately after the issue of the December EXAMINER we shall have the numbers for this year bound in one volume. This volume, if we may judge, contains a greater amount of important matter connected with the *Life Theme* than any two previous volumes. The articles by Br. Moncrieff, on *Soul* and *Spirit* are worth the price of the volume. They embrace an amount of information on the question which ought to be in the hands of all who wish to understand the question; and they could not be printed and sold, alone, at much less price than we charge for the EXAMINER, which has an addition of a vast amount of other matter. The EXAMINER for this year *bound* will be sold at the low price of $1, if sent us free of expense in current money. The postage on the volume will be about 27 cents, if *pre-paid,* which

amount might be remitted in Post Office *stamps*. If any wish the numbers for this year in *sheets*, we will put them at 75 cts.

"God Died." So said *Henry Ward Beecher* of Brooklyn, N. Y. Will he please inform us who sustained the Universe when the *ever*-living God was dead? and who restored His vitality and infinite powers?

Henry Grew.

—

This expression seems to be a favorite one with Mr. Beecher, as we have heard of his using it more than once. We hope he will meditate on Br. Grew's questions, and if he cannot give both a rational and scriptural answer, cease to employ it. The Examiner is open for his reply. Ed. Ex.

Pick's Bible Student's Concordance is not to be had in this city or country, that we can learn. We sent to England for some last spring, but could not procure them at a price that would answer for us. If we can find any, we will give notice, and the first applicants will first be supplied. *Five* dollars will be the price, if we procure any.

Smokers Beware!—A leading medical practitioner in Brighton, England, has lately given a list of sixteen cases of paralysis, produced by smoking, which came under his own knowledge within the last six months.—*Phrenological Almanac for* 1855.

Is the Soul a Distinct Entity?

AFFIRMATIVE BY C. F. HUDSON.

Bro. Storrs:—I must still complain a little that Bro. Grew does not *recognize* the sense in which I have spoken of the soul as immortal. I do not ask him to adopt my expression, or even to allow it. Though I am sure our common argument would gain an advantage by allowing this use of terms, provided it be understood. For the phrase has been so used. To say nothing of its occurrence in the epistle to Diognetus, and in the Apostolic Constitutions, apparently in this sense, it is a fact which may mean something that Athanasius, the so-called father of Orthodoxy, in one instance speaks of the soul as immortal, while in the same treatise, (his 'Oratio contra Gentes,') he seems to speak as though, if men wish to be *actually* immortal, they must try for it. And his language on this subject generally accords with our view of conditional immortality. Neither the received doctrine of endless evil, nor of universal salvation, can be made out from his genuine works. Dr. Hamilton quotes him in one instance, but the book, (Quæstiones ad Antiochum,) is spurious. See Fabricus Bibliatheca.

In several of the Jewish writings, also, the soul seems to be called immortal in the same sense. The later Rabbis I cannot cite here, but an instance occurs in point in the Book of Wisdom, 2 : 23. "God made man incorruptible," (Greek, *ep aphtharsia*,) i. e., on the basis of incorruption, or such that his immortality was to be expected in the natural course of things.

Now Bro. Grew may censure this use of language if he pleases; still the fact of its use is historically important, and that he should *recognize* my use of terms, is simple justice. The question whether the soul *is* naturally mortal or immortal, I have all along held as unimportant. Whately says the same, and I find that others, learned men, holding to Life in Christ, have taken the same view. Whether the death of the soul shall be effected by forces from within or from without, by natural decay or by special judgment and infliction, we cannot tell.

Our respective comments on Mat. 10 : 28, I am willing to submit to the reader.

Upon Gen. 3 : 19, I might reply further, showing how the predicate is often anticipated in the subject, especially when a certain class of verbs is used. When we say, "A house is built," do we mean that the house exists before it is built? Grammatically, we do *say* it,—and by Bro. G.'s philology, we should *mean* it. I submit this point to those who have studied the laws of our imperfect human speech.

Bro. G. speaks of "the principle of life;" "the vital breath" returning to God who gave it; and "that mysterious principle." If he does not explain and solve this mystery, how shall I know but that it may be an "entity?" How could he dare even to call it a "principle?"

I now return to the list of texts proposed July 1, p. 197.

Job 10 : 19, 22, it will be seen at once, just as much proves the utter and eternal annihilation of Job himself, as it proves anything.

Ps. 6 : 5. Either David held the firm hope of a resurrection when he uttered this prayer, or he did not. If he did not, the Psalm simply proves that life and immortality were not yet brought to light. If he did hope in a resurrection, he did wrong to deprecate the gloom of the intermediate state. In fact, David is praying that his enemies may not have occasion for triumph in his untimely death. The Psalm proves nothing respecting the nature of the soul.

Ps. 30 : 3. Here "sheol" is translated "grave," but without warrant. The body was never buried in sheol. Nor was the pit named in the latter clause of the verse, a place of burial. Sheol was the place or state of the dead, wherever and whatever that be, but in which they were always contemplated as having a proper *existence*, except when the wicked are spoken of, and that without mention of the second death, as in Ps. 9 : 17. The 9th verse of this Psalm might be taken as a proof text of the distinct entity of the self or soul, from the body, if we were to insist upon niceties. "What profit is there in my blood, when I go down to the pit? Shall the dust praise thee?" As much as to say, What is the body good for, when the soul returns to God who gave it? The true sense of the word *shahath*, translated pit,

might however be disputed, and I waive it for the present.

Ps, 88 : 11, 12, proves the same as Ps. 6 : 5.

Ps. 146 : 4. "In that very day his thoughts perish." This at the most would only prove the *unconsciousness* of the dead. The text does not kill the soul. But the word here translated "thoughts," is unusual, and seems to denote, not thoughts in the general sense, but *counsels, plans, devices, schemes,* or *fine speculations.* The verb from which it is taken is *hashath,* "to shine," "to be bright." The splendid hopes of the rich man, as told in Luke 12 : 16, 19, are a case in point. And the context would refer the thoughts here named to the devices which men found for their mutual aid, when they forget that their help is in God. The passage proves nothing in the matter of psychology.

Eccl. 9 : 5, 6. "The dead know not any thing." Your readers are all familiar with this text. The answer to the argument based on it, and also on the 10th verse, is very simple. We need only appeal from Solomon foolish to Solomon wise. No one, who regards not only *what* he reads, but *where* he reads in the Bible, will look for a "Thus saith the Lord" in the first part of this chapter. And if these famous verses are allowed to prove any thing whatever, then we are shut up to the Epicurean faith, that "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." v. 2.

Isa. 26 : 19. If this passage proves that the soul is an attribute of body, or a result of bodily organism, it must also prove that the present and future *organization* is identical, or else our identical dust inherits the kingdom. The readiest way to lead men to deny the resurrection, is to burden the doctrine with such difficulties.

Isa. 38 : 18. Are the doubt and gloom of Hezekiah in his sickness to be taken as a Thus saith the Lord, and a revelation of things to come?

Isa. 53 : 12. "He hath poured out his soul unto death." We may discuss this passage without deciding the question whether Christ had a human soul. I do not interpret the incarnation as proving that Christ had such a soul, nor shall I quarrel with those who do. I refer to Dr. Bushnell those who wish to know what is to be said on this subject, and commend his "Christ in Theology" to all who love to think.

"His soul unto death." And what was it that died? It could hardly be his *breath,* for we do not say that a man's breath dies. Nor his *blood,* for the same reason. The death was evidently that of the body, and the question remains, was the soul some "mysterious principle," neither an attribute nor an entity, or was it so much of Christ as was not body, withdrawing from the "body prepared," (Heb. 10 : 5.) until on the third day it should be quickened by him who had power to lay down his life, and to take it again? Respecting the divine nature of Christ I do not know but Bro. G. and myself will differ. Be that as it may, he will hardly say that the divine soul, as named in Psa. 11 : 5, is a mere "mysterious principle," and no entity. The proper meaning of the term soul, as indicated by this and similar passages, will come up again.

1 Cor. 15 : 18. This text has been discussed in your paper for Aug. 1., p. 234.

vs. 44 and 47. We know the adjective "natural" is from the word *psuche,* and might be technically translated soul-ual. And "spiritual" is that which is suited or corresponds to the *pneuma.* This *pneuma* is called the "quickening spirit" in verse 45, and "the Lord from Heaven" in verse 47, and "Christ in us, the hope of glory," in Col. 1 : 27. Is this a "distinct entity," or only an attribute of the spiritual body? Now if the incorruptible body is quickened by *pneuma* as a distinct entity, is not the corruptible body also, by the terms of the comparison, enlivened by the *psuche,* as a distinct entity? The earthly body and its soul are each alike perishable. The heavenly body and its spirit, are alike imperishable. The relation of the soul to the spirit, and the redemption and preservation of the soul from death by the spirit, are matters I may treat of hereafter.

Thus, I have considered a series of proof-texts on each side of our question. Out of so many, my exegesis of some may have been faulty and erroneous; still I think that in the main I have been correct. It is clear, however, that we are not much nearer an agreement than we were at the outset. Our definitions of the "mysterious principle" would probably differ still. And it is also clear that we must come to definitions, and even to some theory, before we can understand each other, or even ourselves. This is what I call philosophizing, that painful necessity we are under in this world, of using our reason as well as we can for lack of angelic intuition. Our philosophy, of course, is concerned with the non-essentials of Christian faith. But non-essentials are very apt to grow in our estimation until they become an actual burden to our own faith, and a stumbling block to the faith of other men. It is because I fear this has happened in the present case, that I have written. And in your next number, after giving my definition of 'soul,' such as I think will meet the use of the term in the Bible, I shall try to show what I regard as the bearings and dangers of what seems to be Bro. G.'s view of the case. Meanwhile, with the highest esteem, I am

Yours in Christ,

C. F. Hudson.

Cincinnati, Oct. 9, 1854.

Response by Henry Grew.

Dear Br. Storrs.—When our respected brother H. uses the term "conditional immortality" I understand him to "recognize" it as the scriptural doctrine. But I cannot allow him to represent "the soul as immortal," *previous to the fulfillment of the condition.* If Athanasius teaches, that "if men wish to be *actually* immortal, they must try for it," and also "speaks of the soul as immortal" antecedent to such trial, I ask Bro. H. to inform

us how he proves the necessity of a man trying to get what he already possesses. This is as intelligible as the proposition that three distinct intelligent persons constitute but one intelligent being." To be the reputed "father of (such) orthodoxy as this, is an honor no one need to envy.

I dissent from the opinion that "the question whether the soul is naturally mortal or immortal," is "unimportant." If immortality, or eternal life, is the gift of God *by nature*, then it is not the gift of God "*through Jesus Christ*," as the Scriptures of truth declare. Rom. 6 : 23. If man is immortal *by nature*, he is not dependent on a resurrection from death for eternal life, and the importance and magnitude of that doctrine is destroyed. The soul, which is supposed to be immortal, and never dies, being considered the essential and main part of man. If immortality comes by *nature*, it comes by the *first* Adam, not by the *second*, by whom alone man has life everlasting. 1 John 5 : 11, 12. Is it "unimportant" to rob the Saviour of this honor? He it is who "hath brought life and immortality to light *through the gospel*;" 2 Tim. 1 : 10. This glorious attribute pertains, *not to nature*, but to our Father's rich grace in the gospel. It is the crown of that marvellous system of redeeming love.

Gen. 3 : 19. I submit that our friend's remarks on this passage are entirely inadequate to set aside its obvious import. The declaration of "the Lord God," "dust THOU art, and unto dust shalt THOU return," is to *the entire man*, and not to an inferior part of man. It is a complete refutation of the opinion that man possesses "a distinct entity" not subject to death. The phrase "a house is built," is unmistakeable. The declaration that an *immortal* soul, or being, is dust and will return to dust, is a gross violation of truth.

I have spoken of life as a "mysterious principle." Br. H. asks, "If he does not explain and solve this mystery, how shall I know but that it may be an entity?" I reply, because the divine testimony most clearly teaches, that the organic man, formed "of the dust of the ground, became a living soul," or person, by the simple addition of the breath of life in his nostrils. Gen. 2 : 7. Is the breath of the nostrils such a distinct entity; such an immortal soul as reputed orthodoxy supposes man to possess? Such an opinion may well teach us to "cease from man *whose breath is in his nostrils*." In view of this latter passage, the theory of an immortal soul in man by creation falls like Dragon before the Ark of God.

I ask our brother to inform me why he objects to my calling animal life, common to man and all inferior living creatures, a "principle."

Job 10 : 19, 22, it is affirmed, "just as much proves the utter and eternal annihilation of Job himself, as it proves anything. In the absence of all counter testimony we might suppose this, although Job does not affirm that the state of "darkness" and "death" would be *eternal*. He describes *the nature and consequences of death*, so long as it reigns, whether temporally or eternally. What he affirms of the subject he affirms of *himself as a man*, and not of some inferior part of himself. He uses the personal pronoun, *I*, throughout his description, which utterly excludes the idea of any distinct surviving entity. Job indeed had hope concerning the future. On what was that hope founded? On the belief that he possessed a distinct entity which had escaped the power of death? Let us hear him. "MAN dieth (not an inferior part of man)—MAN lieth down, and riseth not till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep. Oh that thou wouldst hide me in the grave—that thou wouldst appoint me a set time, and remember me! If a MAN die, shall he live again? All the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come. Thou shalt call and I will answer thee: thou wilt have a desire to the work of thine hands." Job 14 : 12–15. The glorious doctrine of the Resurrection was THE hope of Job, as it was "the hope of Israel." Acts 28 : 20. "Moved by the Holy Ghost," (2 Peter 1 : 21,) he spoke of seeing his God, *not at death*, but when his Redeemer should "stand at the latter day upon the earth." Job 19 : 25–27. Christians of the nineteenth century of Messiah's era should learn of Job.

Ps. 6 : 5. "For in death there is no remembrance of thee." We have offered the common sense argument, that is David, Hezekiah, &c., desired recovery from sickness, because, in case of dying, they could not praise the Lord or have any remembrance of him, they never sang as the moderns do,

> "And when my voice is lost in death
> Praise shall employ my nobler powers."

They had no faith in the survivance of "a distinct entity" which would praise God. In reply to our brother's remarks on the passage, I observe, —It must certainly be admitted that David "held the firm hope of a resurrection," for he declared that God would guide him by his counsel and "afterward receive (him) to glory." Ps. 73 : 24. Br. H. affirms "if he did hope in a resurrection, he did wrong to deprecate the gloom of the intermediate state." The fair question in the case is, did he do wrong in desiring, (in submission to the divine will,) to remain longer in the land of the living where he could praise God, which the dead cannot do? Supposing he did do wrong in this matter, what does it prove relative to the question at issue? Nothing at all. Br. H. affirms also, that "In fact, David is praying that his enemies may not have occasion for triumph in his untimely death." The Psalmist uses no such plea in his prayer. His plea is, "For in death there is no remembrance of thee," &c. If, however, Br. H. is correct on this point, it has no relevancy to the question at issue. It is easy to *assert* that "the Psalm proves nothing respecting the nature of the soul." I submit the question to the intelligent reader; whether the declaration that "in death there is no remembrance of God," is no proof at all, that death destroys the memory, and, by parity of reason, other mental powers of man.

Ps. 30 : 3. It is *asserted* that "Here '*sheol*' is translated grave, but without warrant." That "the body was never buried in sheol. Nor was the pit named in the latter clause of the verse, a place of burial." Here are three *assertions*, but where is the *proof*? "Sheol was the place or state of the dead," it is said. I ask, is not the *grave*

the place of the dead? But, it is added, "in which they were always contemplated as having a proper *existence*, except when the wicked are spoken of, and that without mention of the second death." "Contemplated" by whom? Why does not our brother refer us to the testimony of the Holy Spirit involving such contemplation? Because some fallible men have so "contemplated," is no more proof of its truth, than the contemplations of the Papists, relative to purgatory, is proof of the truth of that dogma. I affirm now that *sheol* is properly translated 'grave,' that the body *is* buried in sheol, and that 'the pit' in the verse *does* refer to the "place of burial."

One testimony of the Eternal Spirit annihilates all these assertions of our brother relative to *sheol*. He will find it in Eccles. 9 : 10. "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is NO WORK, NOR DEVICE, NOR KNOWLEDGE, NOR WISDOM in *sheol* whither thou goest." In the name of truth, I ask Br. Hudson what sort of "proper existence" is this for an intelligent being? The learned George Campbell who, in direct opposition to Eccles. 9 : 10, supposed the term *sheol* to denote "the state or place of conscious departed souls," not only admits that it often means *grave*, or sepulchre, but that in his time it was "the prevailing opinion among critics, that the term, at least in the Old Testament, means no more than *keber*, *grave* or *sepulchre*." Moreover, he even represents this state of the departed, which Br. H. contemplates as a state of "proper existence" for disembodied saints, as "not a state of activity adapted for exertion, or indeed for the accomplishment of any important purpose, good or bad." The reader will please judge between our different camments on Ps. 30 : 9. "What profit," &c. As much as to say, "O Lord," if I die, I must cease to "praise thee" and to "declare thy truth." David's plea that if he died he should cease to praise God "a proof text of the distinct entity of the self or soul from the body," capable of surviving it to praise God with nobler powers! Alas! for the cause.

"Ps. 88 : 11, 12, proves the same as Ps. 6 : 5," our friend remarks. True, and both prove that death terminates all consciousness.

Ps. 146 : 4. "In that very day his thoughts perish." This, at the most (it is remarked), would only prove the unconsciousness of the dead. The text does not kill the soul. What kind of "a distinct entity," or soul is it, Bro. H., which is destitute of thought and consciousness? If the terms "*counsels, plans*," &c., is a better translation, it is essentially the same; all these imply "thoughts." Besides, your theory, so far from admitting that the "bright" "counsels," &c., of the saints perish in death, implies that they become brighter.

Eccles. 9 : 5, 6. I must express my surprise at the unwarrantable manner in which our brother disposes of this plain and positive refutation of the natural immortal soul theory. "We need only appeal from Solomon foolish to Solomon wise."—On what authority does he attribute the words to "Solomon foolish?" Why, forsooth, because we do not find the words, "Thus saith the Lord," in the first part of this chapter. If this is good authority, then may we reject a great portion of the Bible. If we meet with any proposition in the writings of David, or Paul, or Peter, we do not approve, in the immediate connection of which, we do not find the words, "Thus saith the Lord," we have only to appeal from David, &c., foolish tn David, &c., wise! To the general principle of inspiration, there are indeed exceptions; but of these the Bible itself informs us. Job 42 : 7; 1 Cor. 7 : 6, 12. We have noright to make others. If we begin to do so, where shall we end? This is perverting God's word to harmonize with our own fallible opinions, instead of subjecting those opinions to the word which abideth forever. Eccles. 9th contains no "Epicurean faith." The word "all" is frequently used in the holy Scriptures in a limited sense. "All things come alike to all," (understood in a qualified sense perfectly warrantable,) is in accordance with fact. The reference is to similar providential events in the present state, happening "to the righteous and to the wicked." To the former, God overrules them for good. Rom. 8 : 28. This solves the mystery.

Isa. 26 : 19. All I contend for is, that the passage clearly implies that death is a destruction of *all life*, and that, for all future life, we are dependent on the divine promise, that "the earth shall cast out the dead." No absolute identity of the material particles is involved in the doctrine of the resurrection. Paul teaches otherwise. 1 Cor. 15 : 35, 44. We shall know ourselves to be the same intelligent persons. Carnal philosophy, not knowing the power of God, will "deny the resurrection," whatever view may be taken of the subject.

Isa. 38 : 18. "Gloom" is appropriate to death. Hezekiah knew better than to invest it with that halo of glory (as our poets do) which pertains only to the doctrine of the resurrection. His testimony accords with that of prophets and Apostles. Job 10 : 19–22. Ps. 6 : 5; 30 : 9; 1 Cor. 15 : 18; Isa. 53 : 12. Our friend commends Br. Bushnell's "Christ in Theology" to "all who love to think." I commend such to the Bible, as far more clear and definite. If any man can ascertain definitely Br. B.'s views of the nature and origin of the Son of God, from his writings, he can do more than I can.

Bro. H. asks, "What was it that died?" and answers, "The death was evidently that of the body," &c. Was this *all* that died, brother? If so, it follows that God never gave His Son, (who was with him before the world was, and who took the body prepared for him,) to die for us. The Spirit of truth answers the question in a manner more worthy of the divine wisdom and love. God made "his *soul* an offering for sin;" i. e., the life of His own Son, and not merely the life of a human body. "He (*the Son of God*) poured out *his* soul (or life) unto death." The Son of God said, "*I* lay down MY life for my sheep." "*I* am he that was dead." He did not say, I lay down my human body, or, my human body was dead. My soul laments that the transcendent wisdom and love of God, in the gift of HIS OWN SON, ("made so much better than the angels,") to DIE for the sins of the world, should be so egregiously disparaged by the substitution of the death of a mere human body!

1 Cor. 15 : 44, 47. "The adjective 'natural,'

from the word *psuche*," our friend remarks, "might be technically translated soul-ual." He will please remember this, as it proves the impropriety of those who imagine the term to signify an immortal distinct entity from the body. It is opposed to spiritual. It is asked if *pneuma*, called the "quickening spirit" in verse 45, and "the Lord from heaven," in verse 47, is a distinct entity, or only an attribute of the spiritual body? Certainly, "the Lord from heaven," is a distinct entity from his saints. Bro. H. appears to suppose that the "quickening spirit" refers to man. This is an error. The quickening spirit is *Christ*, who will quicken our mortal bodies by *his* spirit (not ours) which dwelleth in us. Rom. 8: 11. God "raiseth the dead" by His Son, "BY whom are all things," whom he hath "made a quickening spirit." The apostle presents no distinction between the body and the spirit of man. The contrast is between the "*natural* body" and the "*spiritual* body." It is raised a spiritual body, not by a reunion with any distinct human entity, but by the power of the second Adam, the quickening spirit, who is "the Lord from heaven." The entire absence of any intimation in the chapter of a re-union of "a distinct entity" with the body, or that such a reunion has any thing to do with our resurrection, goes far, of itself, to prove it a fallacy of vain philosophy. Not a word does the inspired writer give us of "the incorruptible body (being) quickened by *pneuma* as a distinct entity" of man. On this subject our brother has entirely mistaken the apostle. Respectfully and humbly submitted for the truth's sake in Christian love,

HENRY GREW.

Will the Russian Dynasty be Bound.?

Near three months since we wrote the following article for the EXAMINER, but delayed its publication for want of room. We are not sorry it was delayed, because we have had time to think more on the subject and to hear of the increasing probability that the Russian Dynasty is the Dragon power of Rev. 16 and 20, and will be bound; soon after which, as we think, will come the "battle of Armageddon" and Messiah's reign on the "Throne of his father David." But we shall still wait the developments of providence in the great and tremendous scenes just before us.

—

THINGS IN THE EAST.—We have at different times given our *opinion* in relation to the governments of Europe. What we have said relative to the *Napoleon Dynasty* being the "scarlet colored beast," of Rev. 17, and the *Russian* being the "Dragon" of Rev. 16 and 20, we have, as yet, seen nothing to cause us to waver for a moment; and no argument we have seen begins to balance, in our mind, the weight of evidence which we see in favor of the position we occupy. Still we intend to keep open to the conviction of *facts* as they shall occur in this matter.

It is our opinion still that the Russian Dynasty is the *dragon*, and that it will be "bound" before the final conclusion of this eastern struggle. We clip the following remarks from a letter writer from Berlin, found in the *New York Tribune* some time since. He says:—

I have had a conversation of the most interesting kind, with a person who has just arrived from St. Petersburgh, where he remained a considerable time, and where he was enabled to judge of the impression produced on Russian society by the events which are now passing. The Emperor Nicholas is more than ever under the influence of the old Russian party. He will not make the sacrifice of one of his ideas, and he persists in believing in spite of the checks experienced by his troops, that the moment has arrived for the accomplishment of his designs. * * * It is now quite evident that the military resources of Russia had been much exaggerated, in the same way as its other resources had been. The truth is, that Russia is in want of men and money, and that the immensity of the territory of which she is so proud, and for the extension of which she has made so many sacrifices, and so indefatigably intrigued, opposes the most serious material obstacles to her defense. Russia is punished by her very sin. Those same material obstacles have not allowed her to maintain an effective force of more than 120,000 or 130,000 men in the Principalities, notwithstanding all assertions to the contrary; and those obstacles also prevent her, in spite of her exertions and her successive appeals, from lining her coasts, along the Baltic and in Finland, with a force sufficient to defend them. You may regard this intelligence as positive. Every day Russia loses part of her *prestige*. The Emperor Nicholas had foretold the dissolution of Turkey. He has been too hasty, or rather he had deceived himself. It was the destruction of his own influence that was at hand. Many political men, even among the most enlightened, were, it is true, deceived like himself; but it is no longer permitted to-day to be blind to the result of passing events, and not to see that the influence of Russia has received a shock from which it can never recover. Russian society appears to be aware of it. Reasonable men in Russia are terrified at the situation in which the obstinacy of their master has placed their country; and the rest of the population, the small portion which reflects, is beginning to waver in their high opinion of the Emperor, and cease to consider him as a demigod since the signal defeats experienced by his armies. There is at bottom a latent but general discontent, which may sooner or later manifest itself by an insurrection, and bring about a catastrophe."

In whatever way the binding of this Russian power may be accomplished, we cannot, with present light, but regard the event as almost certain and at hand; still we wait for a further development of facts. To us, however, the prophecies appear clearly to point in that direction; though

we do not feel the importance of perpetually dwelling upon the subject, as if we feared our readers had no understanding or discernment themselves, and needed us to affirm and reaffirm our views on prophecies which cannot be fully comprehended till their final accomplishment. We doubt not that *all* prophetic expositors will ultimately find there is enough of error in their expositions to make it true, that "the Lord *alone* shall be exalted in that day."

Relative to the Napoleon Dynasty, and the *Projects* of the French Emperor, we are quite sure that neither *the man* nor his projects are at all understood: and we feel confident he has a part to act that will make them "that dwell on the earth" to "*wonder*" when they shall see it accomplished. Thus far he has been the most wonderful and mysterious of all the Princes of earth; what his designs really are, none can tell, but time will develope. That he has designs to accomplish abroad, or among the other nations of Europe, which are little thought of now, we fully believe. We copy the following from the *New York Daily Times*, for August 4th, as giving a little light on the subject. The Times speaks thus:—

"We said in January, that there are two parties in the diplomatic council of European Sovereigns, one for peace and one for war. We pointed out England, Austria and Prussia as the powers anxious to avoid war at any price, while we gave our reasons why Russia, Turkey and France may be considered as those constituting the war party. It is for our readers to judge whether events have verified these views. We say, now, only this much, that NAPOLEON III., at least *will not make peace*. Our private advices from Paris are of an interesting nature. 'The Emperor,' writes a friend of his Majesty to an eminent statesman in London, 'is as impenetrable as ever. No one knows what he aims at, but still he says now and then a word that creates hosts of suggestive ideas. His favorite *mot*, one which he often repeats to his confidential friends, is, for the moment, the following: "*Je ferai un coup d'etat a l'exterieur*,"—"I will make a coup d'etat ABROAD." And he adds that he will do it with less difficulty than the one at home cost him. He repeats these words to all the representations made to him about the eagerness of the nationalities—in Italy and Hungary—to respond to a call from France. He exhorts them to patience, until "*Je ferai mon coup d'etat a l'exterieur*." In the meantime you may be assured that he will not neglect any means, he will submit to every trial, he will be humble, obsequious, menacing, promising and flattering, by turns, in order to gain over Austria. But—this is the opinion of all the inmates of the Tuilleries—he is working at the destruction of Austria. He exerts himself to gain her *from* Russia, to beat the Czar with *her* armies, and then to destroy her, when she shall no longer have the Russian protection to back and to help her.'

"The French Emperor, it is written to us, anticipates a coalition against himself, for the Spring, and so he works to counteract it. The camps at Boulogne and St. Omer were a key to his anticipation, the spots being well adapted to throw the troops in all directions, to the West as well as to the East. To assemble such a body of warlike troops and so many ships of all dimensions, at such places would have been impossible at any other moment without waking the strongest suspicions about invasion. Now there is no suspicion; on the contrary, people are exulting over the energy of his Majesty the Emperor of the French, who is just now a perfectly honest man with the English. Now, to use this favorable occasion is the aim—say the suspicious—of NAPOLEON III., who is to make his *coup d'etat abroad* next year."

That the French Emperor designs the overthrow of Austria, we have long thought. How he would accomplish it we did not know; it seems, however, that he would be glad first to get her weakened by a war with Russia; which most likely, Austria will avoid; but if Napoleon III. fails to draw her into a war in that direction, he may crowd her to join Russia; then we may expect Italy and Hungary, if not Poland, will be called to Napoleon's aid, or rather, he will offer them his aid to crush Austria; and in such a coalition there can be little doubt Austria must fall, if not Russia also. We simply throw out these thoughts for consideration, and add, it is to this last view, it seems to us, the prophecies point; but we wait further developments.

DEATH-BED CONVERSION.—Under this head we find an article in the *Christian Advocate*, of this city, from which we give an extract below. It is *editorial*, and we presume by DR. BOND himself. We long ago lost all confidence in death-bed conversions. The holding out such a possibility to a sinner has no better foundation, in our mind, than Restorationism; and in principle is the same. Men neglect repentance till they see they *must* die, in expectation that then they shall find mercy, and others think they shall find the same mercy just *after* death. Neither class have any Scripture authority for such presumption. Dr. Bond speaks as follows:—

That the religion of a great number of the hearers of the gospel consists in a hope of being saved from punishment through the efficacy of a death-bed repentance, is a fact of common observation. This "religion" is the great barrier to the progress of true piety. It is the most comfortable refuge from Jesus and his gospel. It furnishes the most satisfactory view of God which the impenitent can entertain. It opposes the gospel with its own provisions. It wars against Christ with his own mercy. It claims license for transgression because of the awful suffering of our Lord for sin.

It makes him the minister of all evil; the precious bounty of God to the godless, and sensual, and devilish, that they, through him, may sin with impunity, neglect the great salvation with safety, and reach the glorious rest of the righteous by walking in the broad road to destruction.

Tried by human reason, this theory of salvation seems utterly absurd. If the purpose of God be to bring back the human race to holiness; if his moral government be directed to the eradication of evil and the development of good, surely he cannot sanction a mode of life by which the obstinately rebellious shall be accepted in death, and that conduct against which the most frightful threatenings are officially proclaimed, escape punishment in this world and find reward in the next.

To sanction a system like this would be to confound the consequences of virtue and vice, and to represent the Almighty as weaker even than earthly rulers, who have sufficient firmness to resist the importunities of the condemned, and inflict punishment upon the violators of law.

Two men begin active life together. One has faith in God, and fears him. He considers his threatenings; he ponders his promises. He decides to obey God. To do so costs him fearful sacrifices. He not only abandons habitual indulgences which it is so hard to relinquish, but he becomes an outcast from his family, and an object of vengeance to government. He serves God long, in wanderings, in want, in peril, in pain. He counts all things but loss that he may win the approbation of Christ, and secure the reward of the righteous. His life is a sublime spectacle of benevolence and self-denial: his history a continuous triumph of love over selfishness, of grace over sin. No visible benefit inures to him from this costly service to his Maker. Though he lives only for God, the Almighty does not interfere to screen him from the suffering and loss incident to his piety. He is left in the hands of a hostile community, and to the cruelties of a ferocious government. In his old age he is apprehended, imprisoned, and publicly executed. He goes to the tribunal of the righteous Judge eternal. He is judged according to his works. All intelligent creation assents to the commendation of his life, and the reward of his faithfulness.

The other man, upon a view of the good and evil of God's service, shrinks from the sacrifice required from the righteous. He loves this present world, and he determines to enjoy it. He devises a scheme by which he may do evil and reap good; sow to the flesh and reap the fruits of the Spirit; serve the devil and yet contrive to extort a reward from Christ. Hugely pleased with his ingenuity, he acts upon this scheme. He makes no dangerous profession of Christianity. He avoids all suspicion of Christ. He enjoys his estate; secures worldly comforts; gets honor from men; lives without restraint from the law of God; quiets conscience with his chloroform of death repentance; dies in his bed, with professions of contrition and confession of faith, and appears also at the bar of the righteous Judge to be judged by the deeds done in the body. In every respect his conduct presents a violent contrast to that of the other man. In every respect it has been such a life as God hates, and as he has sworn to punish. Yet, while the angelic hosts, and the spirits of the martyrs wait to hear the vindication of God's righteousness in the terrible sentence of eternal death, a voice of welcome comes from the throne: "Well done, good and faithful servant," is pronounced by the Searcher of hearts to the man who all his life has faithfully served the devil! What would be the effect upon the angelic hosts of such a sentence as this? How could they understand it? Would they be satisfied to learn that ingenious man had found a flaw in the plan of salvation, and by a technical quibble contrived to make the gospel a charter privileging sin, and offering the highest premiums for persevering iniquity? What would be the effect upon a wicked world, could a spirit thus saved come back to earth and give us the benefit of his experience? Would he turn many to righteousness, or *from* it?"

It is unnecessary to reason further upon this theory. It yields before the first summons of logic. If sustained, it must be by that faith in the word of God which removes the subject from the court below, and transfers it beyond the jurisdiction of human reason.

And, indeed, this is the defence relied on by the multitudes who have "fled for refuge to this hope set before them" by the devil, rather than to that set before them by God. They say that if the gospel does not advise this course to heaven; if, in fact, it earnestly dissuades from it, yet nevertheless it has admitted the safety of it, and left two roads open to glory—the one narrow, difficult, yet straight and sure; the other broad, easy, circuitous, and not altogether so certain, yet upon the whole preferable.

If this be so we must endeavor to reconcile our rebellious intellect to submission; we may not gainsay the gospel. But surely we may require to be well satisfied that the Bible does teach this extraordinary inconsistency, and does offer a Janus-headed salvation,—one face looking to war with sin and the other to peace with it.

Dr. Bond then takes up the case of what is called the "*penitent thief*," and concludes he was not the wicked person generally supposed, but an honest, though fanatical, Jew, who had been betrayed into some act of opposition to the Roman government which led to his execution. The Doctor's concluding remarks are as follows:—

Our conclusion is, that with no positive knowledge upon the matter, the probabilities deduced from the imperfect information afforded us, favors the supposition that the individual in question was not a ruffian—a hardened profligate, thief, and robber—convicted of sin upon the cross, and converted to God, sanctified in spirit, and prepared for heaven in his death agony; but that he was an honest and devout, though fanatical Jew, who had probably endeavored to serve God as his fathers did, and who received Christ when presented to him, though he was presented in the very agonies of his dying human nature.

The case certainly affords no example of what is

ordinarily called death-bed conversion. The man to whom Jesus is preached every day in his glory, as the ascended Lord, and who rejects him every day, is certainly not a parallel case to the man who, having brought upon himself the horrors of crucifixion by adhesion to the faith of God as preached to his fathers, in these agonies immediately receives the further revelation of Christ—though a Christ forsaken of men, and apparently of God.

That many serious people, sincere servants of God, and seekers of religion, known of him, though unnoticed by men, do, as probably this insurgent did, receive light and hope from God in their last hours, we believe; but that men who deliberately refuse the offers of salvation in order that they may live in sin, shall at last be accommodated with salvation and glory upon their own terms, is a notion sustained neither by the Bible nor common sense.

In the general view of this subject by Dr. Bond we most heartily concur. We wish, however, he, or some one else who has the means of information, would investigate the genuineness of the text, in Luke, that states one of the malefactors acknowledged Christ. Two of other Evangelists affirm *both "reviled"* Christ. And each of the other three Evangelists state the fact of their crucifixion, but neither mention any repentance in one. There is some ground to doubt the genuineness of the account as found in Luke. There is nothing like it in all the Bible; and the account is the root of all presumption in sinners.

The Discussion.

Syracuse, Oct. 18, 1854.

Mr. Editor:—An imperative call to the western part of the State renders it difficult, if not impossible, for me to proceed with our discussion in your next number. Should I return to New York in time, I may do so yet; but if not, please do me the favor to insert this in your columns, that our readers may understand the cause of my seeming neglect. Very respectfully,

H. Mattison.

Donations.—A friend, $1; Catharine Colver, $2; friends in Philadelphia, on their pledge, $12; Henry Grew, $5; Lawrence Taylor, $3; Levi Boughton, $2; Cephas Boughton, $2; Franklin Morehouse, $1; Harriet E. Arnold, $1; Wm. Webster, $3; R. G. B. Woodward, $2; Lady in Philadelphia, $2.50; J. W. Dye, $2; J. S. Eckles, $1; Geo. T. Adams, $2.

"The State of the Dead, by John Milton, author of Paradise Lost."—The chapters in Milton's prose works on this subject have been printed in a Tract of 24 pages, by H. L. Hastings, Peace Dale, R. I. We do not endorse every sentiment of this Tract, but it should be widely circulated. For the most part it is excellent, and will do much good. We are glad Br. Hastings has issued it. Price $3 per 100: 5 cents single. For sale at our Office: also by Walter Pratt, Windsor, Conn.: H. H. Dickinson, Hartford, Conn.: Dr. C. O. Towne, Providence, R. I.: and Ira Allen, Junior, Honeoye, N. Y.

—

"The Three Worlds: or, *Earth's Past, Present, and Future.* By H. L. Hastings."—This is a Tract of 24 pages. Price $3 per 100. We have not had time to examine it, but presume it is good.

—

"Life Illustrated."—This is a new *weekly* paper, commenced this month by Fowler & Wells. Terms $2 a year in advance. It is a handsome folio of 28 columns, devoted to "*News, Literature, Science,* the *Arts,* to Entertainment, Improvement, Progress." It is designed to be the "*Best Family Newspaper in the World.*"

—

"The Illustrated Phrenological Almanac," *also,* "The Illustrated Water-Cure Almanac, for 1855,"—Published by Fowler & Wells, 208 Broadway, New-York—have been received. These works contain much valuable and interesting information. Price 6 cents per copy; 25 copies for $1.

Frailties.—All men have their frailties. "As I grow older," said Goethe, I become more lenient to the sins of frail humanity. The man who loudly denounces I always suspect. He knows too much of crime who denounces a fellow creature unheard—a knowledge can only be obtained by criminality itself. The hypocrite always strives to divert attention from his own wickedness, by denouncing unsparingly that of others. He thinks he shall seem good in exact ratio as he makes others seem bad."

—

The mere knowledge of spiritual truths and doctrine can save no man, let him be possessed of ever so great a degree of such knowledge; for it is only the life of love they are capable of that saves, and that only in the proportion it is formed into the man and vitally united with the truth.

—

Gentle Words.

Use gentle words, for who can tell
The blessings they impart?
How oft they fall (as manna fell)
On some nigh fainting heart!

In lonely wilds by light wing'd birds
Rare seeds have oft been sown;
And hope has sprung from gentle words
Where only griefs had grown.