

ss which e direct of God's ss upon life, the and the for eter- logswell, ion, and roceeded orpse.— e father-

number ened to- pathize pel, and Abraham commu- d years. i society, ger than my have like the pressure brought shed ser- , greatly o to as wards of trimony person, appiness rt in his waiting l devoted

Nine of n to the ad pray, ay, they unbroken

ent, with d to the r of the rst Wes- ces. At lethodist cientious octrines, nexion, nd inva- i estab- and end l to im- ource,— 8 v.— ost, and and full eople." pourtray racter of e Most nd their ple were of them Cogswell l seemed

Every n Father ind, and home for last fifty e him, or frequent the com- rs of the s attach- s he ap- grimage, ripening aith was his pros- left the nd anti- eople in deposited

I at Dear nter the og, I was in con- e remains h Potter, ble die- tried to d to im- ose who ive, that

within five days we have attended three funerals—the aged—the middle-aged—and the young. How necessary it is, at every period of life, to stand ready for death. Not long ago, Mrs. Captain Davis, a person of sterling worth, of sincere devotedness to her Saviour, manifesting great patience in her affliction, died in hope of a blessed immortality. Also Mrs. Michael Gilliat, whose funeral was attended by our esteemed Bro. McNutt, died, giving ample proof that her soul was happy in Jesus, and that she was about to enter into glory. Also Mrs. Sarah Pomp, Granville, who departed this life rejoicing in the God of her salvation.

A few weeks ago, I was urgently requested in two hours to attend the funeral of an infant, three weeks old, who had died very suddenly, without being baptized, and we were informed afterwards, on that account, the Minister of the Church of England refused to bury it. The parents of the child, therefore, had a grave dug in the open field opposite their own house, and, after exhortation and prayer, we read the usual service, and committed the body to the ground in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life through our Lord Jesus Christ.

Yours, &c., M. PICKLES.  
Annapolis, May 6th, 1852.

Literary.

Mental Science.

THE EXISTENCE OF THE HUMAN MIND.

The rich man and Lazarus are both in the world of spirits: the one in heaven; the other in hell. They both died; and their bodies returned to dust, from which they were originally taken. (Luke xvi. 22-25.) Both their souls survived death! Death reduced their bodies to corruption; but their spirits, when disentangled of the material vehicles, passed into states immensely different! One was conducted "by angels, into Abraham's bosom"; the other, "in hell lifted up his eyes, being in torments." In order to evade the force of this passage, some say, it is only a parable. But, we should ever remember, that the parables of Scripture are founded upon facts,—facts which have either taken place, or which may take place, and in either case, the parable before us, proves the doctrine in question.

When Stephen, the first martyr, was stoned by the Jews, we are informed, he prayed, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." (Acts vii. 59.) How could he do that, if his spirit died with his body? This phrase, then, affords us another decisive proof of the future existence of the human soul, as well as its immortality. He could not have recommended his spirit to the Lord Jesus, had he not believed that he was in the possession of a soul, or that his body and spirit were different,—the one material, and the other spiritual. This eminent servant of God knew that his body must die, and being full of the Holy Ghost, he could not be deceived, on the important subject of the soul's immortality; therefore he commended it to Jesus, his divine Saviour.

The spirits of just men made perfect constitute a part of the general assembly and Church of the first born, which are written in heaven; but their bodies are in the dust, and so they will remain till the resurrection of the dead. (Heb. xii. 23.) Their immortal natures are now in the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem. They are mingling with an innumerable company of angels, in the duties and enjoyments of Mount Zion. Their bodies, however, must continue in the cold grave, until the trump of God shall awake their sleeping dust, and the slumbering nations underground, by the fiat of Omnipotence, shall come again into existence! Are they extinct? Or have they not a living principle, which has survived death, which is now in the presence of God, and to which their resurrection-bodies will ultimately be united? The latter must be evident!

Again, there are the spirits "in prison, which sometimes were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing." (1 Pet. iii. 19, 20.) At the gen-

eral deluge their bodies perished, and returned to dust, where they remain to this day. But their spirits live, and are in prison, a positive proof that the human spirit survives the dissolution of the body.

The great Apostle of the Gentiles expressly states, "To be absent from the body, is to be present with the Lord;" and "whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord." (2 Cor. v. 8, 9.) Again, he declares, "To depart, and to be with Christ, is far better." (Phil. i. 23.) And he, undoubtedly, knew more respecting the heavenly world, than any other mere man; for he was caught up to the third heavens, where he heard unspeakable words, which were unlawful for a man to utter. (2 Cor. xii. 4.) But whether he was in the body, or out of the body, he could not possibly determine. Here we have decisive proof that he, who spake under the inspiration of God, considered the soul's immortality not only possible, but positively believed in the existence of the human spirit, both here, and when it was separated from the body.

John the divine, in the isle of Patmos, "saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held; and they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth." (Rev. vi. 9, 10.) It is here unequivocally demonstrated that the souls of these martyrs survived the death of their bodies; and while these bodies were mouldering in the dust, their spirits were before the throne of God; and they evinced their actual existence, spirituality, rationality, and activity in their disembodied state, by calling upon the Lord.

We may, therefore, affirm, that when our earthly tabernacle is dissolved, "we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." (2 Cor. v. 1.) The natural inference is, that our spirits will be with God when our clay tenements are taken down. Our outward man will perish, but our inner man will survive. The one will go to dust, there to remain till the resurrection of the dead; the other shall mingle with those who are to us now unseen spirits. "The souls of the pious will be eternally happy, the souls of the wicked eternally miserable!"

Man then is a compound being, possessed of body and mind. The body is material, or wholly composed of matter, and consequently, in its present state, mortal; the mind is immaterial, or wholly spiritual, therefore, by the fiat of God, it is rendered immortal. The particles of which the body is composed being matter, compounded and perishable, man must have, in his physical nature, a natural tendency to corruption; but the soul being uncompounded, has no natural tendency to dissolution. The physical nature of man requires constant support, or the particles of matter, which are separated from the material mass, require to be continually supplied by the addition of others. This is true with respect to the human body in general, though not to every particle in particular; because the body may exist, and be in perfect health, when it does not possess the same amount of particles. We have demonstrative proof of this in persons who, at different periods of their lives, have more or less of these particles, or are sometimes more gross than others. This hypothesis, though not strictly true with respect to every particle of matter, is certainly correct when applied to the particles in general. The soul, on the other hand, being an uncompounded substance, possesses nothing in its nature which can have any tendency to decay, or annihilation. It is wholly spiritual; the body wholly material. The one cannot, as to its nature, or existence, be injured or destroyed; the other, from its very nature, and the materials of which it is composed, may be mutilated, cease to exist, and the particles of which it is composed, may be separated. Such is the difference between the body and the soul. They must, therefore, be contrary the one to the other; that is, they cannot be one and the same. The power of thought with which our souls are endued, proves them to be immaterial substances; consequently, in their own nature, they are capable of immortality; and that they are immortal, or will live forever, the sacred Scriptures abundantly testify.

From the reasons which have been ad-

vanced, the scripture quotations enumerated, and the arguments deduced therefrom, every one who is willing to believe the Scriptures, and what is as evident as his own existence, must believe that there is an inward, living principle in man, termed the SOUL, which does exist, and which can exist, independently of the body, and which will exist, in all its mental vigour and activity, after the body is consigned to the grave. This conclusion is inevitable! MAN, THEN, IS IN THE POSSESSION OF AN IMMATERIAL AND IMMORTAL SPIRIT!!  
GEORGE JOHNSON.  
Point de Bute, N. B., April 26, 1852.

Biblical Criticism.

Isaiah lii. 16.

MR. EDITOR.—The Christian Messenger of the 23rd of April, has just fallen into my hands, in which I see a Criticism by the Rev. A. Martell, Baptist Minister, on Isaiah lii. 16: "So shall he sprinkle many nations." As this Criticism is truly an attack upon Pedo-Baptists of every name, and seems designed to show their impotency or their inconsistency, I trust the following strictures will not be deemed unnecessary, and that you will afford them a place in your excellent Periodical.

PHILADELPHIA.  
"So shall he sprinkle many nations."  
The Rev. critic commences: "I apprehend that there are few if any portions of God's word more frequently misunderstood and then necessarily misapplied, than the above."  
Then, Mr. Editor, after reciting the following criticism, we ought to understand the text better,—and have exact or to apply it properly. The light to be cast upon it we shall see presently.

Mr. Martell proceeds:—"How often have we seen it quoted by the press, and heard it from the pulpit in defence and support of the system of sprinkling in lieu of baptism."

Yes, Rev. Sir, and it is an unanswerable argument in favour of "the system of sprinkling." Do you know that *sprinkle* is a *Hebrew* word, while the term *immerse* is not found in the book of God, nor is there any clear case of one human being putting another under water which is the act intended by the term.

But the Rev. gentleman proceeds:—"The *Hebrew* with his *intention*, and the *Hebrew* with his *desiderata* *inferences* have appealed to this text to give tone and authority to his beloved practice of *infant sprinkling*." The illiterate catch the theme and deal out these important words of the Prophet, as though they had been written to give the "thus saith the Lord," and the "Amen" and "Amen" to the *sprinkling system*; and not a little strength has it derived from its mis-application.

The above is a "sort of *underful*" sentence; in which he throws a triangle to his opponents; the angles of which, are "*pedobaptism*," "*Hebrew*," and "*intention*;" in some one of which he seems quite sure he will catch any *sprinkler* who dares to vindicate the common teaching of the above text.

But in despite of the danger of being caught and punished in one of Mr. Martell's *tricks*, the writer of this article will presume to undertake that task.

In the above paragraph the learned gentleman calls the sentence "*so shall he sprinkle many nations*;" these important words of the Prophet, and speaks of their "*misapplication*;" while the very design of his article is to show that the text is "*misapplied*," and that they are not "*misapplied*" at all. It may be "*pedobaptism*," "*Hebrew*," or "*intention*;" but I cannot understand how they can be the important words of the Prophet, if he did not write them.

The Rev. gentleman goes on:—"I must confess I feel a little doubtful about entering into the *spiritual* *inferences*, lest I should get into *traps* by blowing up the study of *pedobaptism*."

Mr. Editor, your readers are fully generally understand that *pedobaptism* is a *Hebrew* word, and therefore will wonder what *kind of trap* the learned gentleman will apply, to make the water explode.

However, he gives his readers to understand that he will explode the whole study of *pedobaptism*; and therefore you, Sir, and your readers had better prepare for the catastrophe. And now comes the blast. "I will give it in full. I find the word in the *Hebrew* rendered *sprinkle* in the text is "*Jazzeh*," which has for its root "*Nazzeh*," which is defined by Dr. Robinson to signify "to leap for joy," "to exult," "to spring." The primary idea is that of "*sparkling*—hence to shine, and to sprinkle, spring from the same root, and great caution is required in the part of translators, so that the one meaning should not interfere with the other."

Well this blast is not so terrific after all; for very *liberally* for the "system of *pedobaptism*," our arizan has by "*so shall he sprinkle*," got into the wrong groove, and I find the wrong word, and the wrong root, "*Nazzeh*," yet stands.

As the Rev. Mr. Martell was to produce a *blast*, he must have a *spark*; and as he could get it no other way, he very adroitly turns "*sparkle*" into "*sprinkle*" and wishes his readers to understand they are the same. But they will surely see that *water* cannot be *fire*.

Our author says above, very correctly, that the word "*Jazzeh*," or as the Hebrew points read it, "*Fazzeh*," "*sprinkle*," is from the root "*Nazzeh*." He next professes to give a quotation from Dr. Robinson, which I do not conceive is to the point, and then asserts "the primary idea" of "*Nazzeh*" "is that of *sparkling*."

Now if Parkhurst is any authority in this case, this assertion is obviously a mistake; for he shows the word for "*sprinkle*," and the word for "*sparkle*" are *different words*; being differently *spelt*; and having different *primary ideas*. The word "*sprinkle*" as said above is "*Nazzeh*," but the word "*sparkle*" is "*Natzech*;" the difference is "z" instead of "s" two very different letters in the Hebrew.

Under "*Nazzeh*" Parkhurst gives the following meanings: "to leap,—leap out;—to leap or spurt out as blood from a wounded body. Lev. vi. 27. "To cause to leap forth—to sprinkle as blood, or oil, or water."—And under the word "*Natzech*" he says "It signifies in general—To shoot forth, as a Tree with its flowers." "As ruined cities or buildings do with spontaneous vegetation—the plumage of Birds—to break out into strife"—to shoot out or emit *sparks*, to *sparkle*."

Our Author will have to tax his ingenuity a good deal, before he can make it appear that two words so very different in their ideal meaning are identical.

Our learned Critic next refers to two texts of Scripture, but for what purpose it is difficult to tell. He says however, "*Nazzeh*" with its sibilant or hissing sound softened, is a kindred word with "*Naza*," "*splendour*," 1 Chron. xxix. 11. This text reads in English; "Thine O Lord is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty."

Your Readers, Mr. Editor, will perhaps be surprised to learn, that as in the English text they cannot find either *sprinkle* or *sparkle* so neither in the Hebrew can be found, either *Nazzeh*, *Naza*, but the word there rendered *Glory* is *Tiphareth*, a very different word altogether. The other text is Ezek. i. 7. "And they sparkled like the colour of burnished brass." There the word used is *Natzech*, from "*Natzech*," which as Mr. Martell says, signifies to *sprinkle*.

We might here ask what has all this to do with the question at issue, and why does our Critic, when he sets out to show that "*sprinkle*" is not the meaning of the original word in Isaiah lii. 16, introduce the word "*sparkle*," about which there is no dispute.

O, but says our author or the words are *kindred*. Surely the Rev. Gentleman may have a person who is kin to him, who is not much like him.

Mr. Martell next informs his readers that Dr. Robinson and others, *pedobaptists*, render the passage:—"So shall he cause many nations to rejoice in himself."

I know nothing of Dr. Robinson's translation; but I apprehend, the Rev. Mr. Martell will not contend that in the Hebrew, Chen Yazzeh Gaim Raylim; "So shall he sprinkle many nations," the verb "*Yazzeh*," is in the conjugation of Hithpaal; or that there is any word which can be correctly rendered "in himself."

The verb is most certainly either in the conjugation of Kal or of Hiphil; if in Kal, then it has the sense of the indicative future in English, and means exactly as expressed in our version; if in Hiphil, it means, "so shall he cause many nations to be sprinkled."

In either case it is *sprinkle* not *sparkle*.

But our author seems determined to blow up the Citadel of *Pedo-baptism*, and therefore after presenting that the word will receive his dogma that, *sprinkle*, and *sparkle*, are nearly if not quite identical, he proceeds: "I find further that in the Septuagint, or the version of the Seventy, that they translate the *Hebrew* word, *Jazzeh*, by the Greek, *Thaumazō*, the middle voice of the Greek verb *Thaumazo*, which never signifies to *sprinkle*, but means to *wonder*." Now to render *Thaumazo* by the English word *sprinkle* would be preposterous; but this is the word selected by the Seventy to correspond with the Hebrew *Jazzeh* in the text.

Now what kind of logic is this? The Rev. Critic sets out with some pomp (I will not say pedantic, pippant, or illiterate) to blow up the Citadel of *Pedo-baptism*, by showing that *sprinkle* is not the meaning of the Hebrew word *Jazzeh*; but instead of bringing a single proof in defence of his position he seizes on the Greek word "*Thaumazo*," as though he had made a *wonderful discovery* says this word never means to "*sprinkle*."

The learned critic might have saved all this labour, for nobody contends that the Greek word "*Thaumazo*" means to "*sprinkle*." On the contrary we know that is not its meaning; nevertheless we do contend that the Hebrew word "*Jazzeh*" or "*Yazzeh*," the word used in the text, does properly signify to "*sprinkle*;" and that wherever else the same word is used in the Hebrew Bible, the idea of "*sprinkle*" is always included.

But, says our author, the Septuagint translates the word "*sprinkle*," by "*Thaumazo*." It is worth mentioning