

The Sabbath Recorder

Published by GEORGE B. UTTER.

THE SEVENTH DAY IS THE SABBATH OF THE LORD THY GOD.

TERMS—\$2 00 a Year, in Advance.

VOLUME XX.—NO. 32.

WESTERLY, R. I. FIFTH-DAY, AUGUST 11, 1864.

WHOLE NO. 1020.

The Sabbath Recorder.

SEEK TRUTH.

Have faith in truth,
And in the True One trust!
Though bright with fancy's brightest hues,
Abhor the lie that must.

Make sure of truth,
And truth will make thee sure;
It will not shift, nor fade, nor die,
But like the heavens endure.

Great truths are great,
Not once, but forever;
There is an ever-lasting truth,
A spring-bloom never o'er.

The stars that shine
To-night, in those calm skies,
Are the same stars that shone of old,
In primal Paradise.

The sun that once
At a man's voice stood still,
Is the same sun that nightly sets
Beyond your western hill.

Man and this earth
Are various days;
Truth cannot change, nor ever grow
Feeble and old and gray.

—Horatius Bonar.

THE KORAN.

THE TURKISH GOVERNMENT HAS FOUNDED UPON IT
PART I.—SECTION II.
Doctrine of the Koran.

The Moslems divide their religion, which they call *Islam*, or resignation, into two distinct parts: *Iman*, faith; and *Deen*, religion, or practice; and teach that it is built upon five fundamental points, one belonging to faith, and the other four to practice.

The first is that confession of faith, of which mention has so often been made: There is no God but the true God, and Mahomet is the prophet of God. These are, in fact, the only two articles of faith insisted on by the Moslems, and he who repeats them, says the Koran, shall enter paradise. But there are other articles of belief held by the Moslems. These may be divided into six distinct branches: 1. Belief in God; 2. in his angels; 3. in his Scriptures; 4. in his prophets; 5. in the resurrection and day of judgement; 6. in God's absolute decree, and predetermination both of good and evil.

The four points relating to practice, are: 1. prayer, and the necessary ablutions; 2. alms; 3. fasting; 4. pilgrimage to Mecca.

L. GON.

It is now proposed to examine the first division, viz. the articles relating to God. The Moslems have ninety-nine names or attributes of God, which they repeat continually. In order to assist the memory, they use a string consisting of ninety-nine beads, which they move as each attribute is mentioned. Every Moslem carries a string of these beads. They are made of precious stones, of amber, of perfumed wood, or of common wood or shells, according to the means of the owner.

The power of God is beautifully described in the 67th chapter of the Koran: "Whate'er is in heaven and earth singeth praise unto God; and he is mighty and wise. His is the kingdom of heaven, and of earth; he giveth life, and he putteth to death; and he is Almighty. He is the first and the last; the manifest and the hidden; and he knoweth all things. It is he who created the heavens and the earth in six days; and that which iseth out of the same; and that which descendeth from heaven, and that which ascendeth thereunto. And he is with you, wheresoever ye be; for God seeth that which ye do. His is the kingdom of heaven and earth; and unto him shall all things return."

And in the 69th chapter, the omniscience of God: "Didst thou not perceive that God knoweth whatever is in heaven, and in the earth? There is no private discourse among two persons, but he is the third with them; nor among a larger number than this; but he is with them, wheresoever they be; and he will declare unto them that which they have done, on the day of resurrection; for God knoweth all things."

In the 60th chapter, of the signs to the existence of God: "Of his signs one is that he hath created you from dust; and behold, ye are some flesh, spread over the face of the earth; and the creation of the heavens, and of the earth; and of every creature that is therein, and of every completion, and of his signs, which ye do not see, and which he abseverth you the lightning, and that he sendeth down rain from heaven, and quickeneth thereby the earth, after it hath been dead. Unto him are obedient whosoever are in the heavens, or on earth; all are obedient to him. He seeth, challengeth the most exalted challenge; he is the Mighty, the Glorious."

In chapter 26th, the mercy of God: "And do thou trust in him, the merciful, who loveth and the faithful, who is kind unto the unbelievers. Adore the merciful, they ask. And who is the merciful, are those who walk meekly on the earth, and answer ignorant speech, when they are called to prayer, and who invoke no other God but the true God. These shall be rewarded with the highest reward, because they have persevered to the end with constancy; and they shall remain in the same forever. It shall be an excellent abode, and a delightful station. Fear God; he is the most merciful."

ANGELS.

The existence of angels, and their powers, are insisted on in many passages of the Koran. They are believed to be pure and invisible bodies, (invisible to mortals,) to be created of light, and that they are not subject to the necessities and infirmities of men. They have various forms and duties; some adoring God, others interceding for mankind. Some are employed in recording the actions of men, others in attending upon God.

The four angels who are believed to be especially favored by God, are Gabriel, to whom they give several titles, particularly those of the *Holy Spirit*, and the *Angel of Revelations*. He is supposed to be honored with the especial confidence of God, and is employed by him in writing down the divine decrees; Michael, the friend and protector of the Jews; Azrael, the angel of death, who separates men's souls from their bodies; and Israfil, who will sound the last trumpet at the resurrection. The Moslems also believe that every one is attended by two angels, to observe and to record his actions. The devil, whom the Moslems have named *Iblis*, from his *despair*, was once one of the angels who were nearest to God's presence, and was called *Azazel*; but he refused to pay homage to Adam at the command of God, and was, consequently, expelled from paradise, and still wanders to and fro on the earth, tempting man, whom he hates, to destruction.

The following are some of the passages in the Koran relating to angels. The appearance of Gabriel to Mahomet is thus related in the 53d chapter: "One night in power taught this revelation to Mahomet. He approached the prophet until he was at the distance of two bows-lengths from him; and he revealed unto his servant that which he revealed. He also saw him at another time; by the lot-tree, beyond which there is no passing; near it is the garden of eternal abode. When the lot-tree covered that which is covered, he beheld some of the greatest signs of his Lord."

The lot-tree here spoken of, say the commentators, stands in the seventh heaven, on the right hand of the throne of God; and is the utmost bounds, beyond which the angels themselves must not pass; or, as some say, beyond which no creature's knowledge can extend. When the lot-tree covered that which it covered, is an ambiguous method of leaving the glories of the sight to the imagination, equivalent to saying that what was under that tree exceeded all power of description. Some suppose that the whole host of angels were worshipping beneath it.

It is related that the Jews asked what angel it was who brought the divine commands to Mahomet; and being told that he was their enemy, and replied that he was their punishment, the messenger of wrath and punishment. If it had been Michael, they said, we would have believed in him, because he was their friend, and plenty. On this occasion, the following passage was revealed: "Whoever is an enemy to Gabriel, (for he hath caused the Koran to descend on thy heart; by the permission of God, confirming that which was before revealed,) whosoever is an enemy to God, or to his angels, or to Michael, verily God will be an enemy to him." It must be remarked, that in this passage, the Koran expressly states that the Koran confirms that which was revealed before; to the prophets, and to Jesus Christ.

That Michael was really the protector, or guardian angel of the Jews, we know from Daniel 12: 1, where he is called "the great prince who standeth for the people." And it appears from the same book, that Gabriel was the angel of revelation, as he revealed messages from God to Daniel.

The following passage from the 50th chapter describes the recording angels: "We created man, and we know what his soul whispereth within him; and we are nearer to him than his jugular vein. When the two angels deputed to take account of a man's conduct, take an account thereof, one sitting on the right hand, and the other on the left, he uttereth not a word, but there is with him a watcher ready to note it."

The Moslems have a beautiful tradition, that the angel who records a man's good actions has command over the one who notes his evil actions; and that when a man performs a good action, the angel on the right hand writes it down ten times; and when he commits a bad action, the same angel says to the one on the left hand, Do not set it down for seven hours; perhaps in that time he may pray, or may ask pardon."

The following passage is an oath sworn by the different orders of angels: "By the angels who tear forth the souls with violence; and by those who draw them out with gentleness; by those who glide through the air with the commands of God; by those who precede, and usher the righteous to paradise; and by those who subordinate govern the affairs of this world; on a certain day the blast of a trumpet shall disturb the universe, and the subsequent blast shall follow it." On that day men's hearts shall tremble.

It is said that the angel of death, and his assistants, will tear the souls of the wicked from the bodies in a rough and cruel manner; but that they will draw out the souls of the good from their mouths, in a gentle and easy manner.

subject to death, and to the necessities of human nature. There are good and bad Genii; and they are capable of salvation and damnation. Mahomet says that he was commissioned to these Genii, as well as to mankind. They are divided into different ranks, like the angels. Some are called *Peri*, or fairies, some *Div*, or giants, and others *Tacwin*, or fates. The ideas of the Moslems concerning Genii are very similar to those which the Jews entertain concerning a class of beings called *Schim*.

The 72d chapter of the Koran is entitled the Genii, and gives an account of their receiving the Moslem religion: "It hath been revealed to me," (Mahomet is speaking by the command of Gabriel,) "that a company of Genii attentively listened to me while I was reading the Koran; and they said, Verily, we have heard an admirable discourse, which directeth us aright; wherefore we believe therein; and we will by no means associate any other with our Lord. We formerly attempted to pry into heaven," (the Genii are now speaking,) "but we found it guarded by a strong company of angels, with flaming darts." (When a star appears to shoot, or fall, the Moslems suppose that the angels who keep guard in paradise dart them at the Genii, or devils, who approach too near.) "There are some among us who are upright; and there are some among us who are otherwise; we are of different ways. There are some Moslems among us, and there are some who swerve from righteousness. Those of the latter class are called *Shaytans*, or devils, of whom *Iblis*, or Satan, is the chief. Of both the classes of Genii, good and evil, the Arabs stand in great awe; for the former they entertain a high respect: Genies are believed often to assume, or to constantly wear, the shapes of cats, dogs, or other animals.

Lane, in his *Modern Egyptians*, relates the following story, as told to him by one of the most learned men in Egypt. He had, he said, a favorite black cat, which always slept at the foot of his bed. Once, at midnight, he heard a knocking at the door of his house; and he saw his cat go and open the window, and heard it call out, Who is there? A voice replied, I am so and so, (mentioning a strange name,) the Genie; open the door. I cannot open the door, said the cat, for it has had the name of God pronounced upon it. (It is a universal custom among the Arabs to pronounce the words, "In the name of God; the Compassionate, the Merciful," when they lock a door, put by bread, lay down their clothes at night, &c., believing that it protects their property from genii.) Then throw me down, said the other, two cakes of bread. I cannot, said the cat, for it has had the name pronounced upon it. Well, said the stranger, at least give me a draught of water. But the cat answered, that the water jar was secured in like manner. The stranger asked what he was to do, as he was likely to die of hunger and thirst. The Sheikh's cat told him to go to the next house, and went himself and opened the door, and soon after returned. Next morning, the Sheikh said to his cat, Oh my cat, thou knowest that I am a poor man; bring me, I beseech thee, a little gold; upon hearing these words, the cat immediately disappeared, and he never saw eyes on it again.

THE WOODEN END OF THE PLANK.

BY THE REV. JOHN TOWN.

One of our distinguished generals was once a poor boy, among the lofty mountains of New England. He was a common workman in a factory. He has since held some of the highest offices in the gift of the people, and has won imperishable honors in the army.

He tells us, that one morning, as the factory was lighted up, before light in the early dawn, and just as objects could be seen out of the door, he was looking out of the window, and saw an object moving along slowly on the ice that covered the river. While watching it, suddenly the ice broke, and the object disappeared. He was an instant in doubt, whether it must be a man. So, calling to a companion, he ran down the stairs, and out toward the object. He had the thought to snatch up a plank which he carried on his shoulder. When they had reached the place, they found that it was a colored man, who had broken through the ice and was struggling for his life.

They thrust out the plank. The poor fellow seized it with both hands. "Now hold on, Tim, and we'll pull you out."

So they pulled and got him almost out, when, all at once, the plank went down again. "Oh, my coming up, they pushed the end of the plank to him again, and cried, 'Now, Tim, hold on with all your might.'"

Indeed I will, he said, and he held on almost out, when all at once the plank went down. They did not push it up again, but they pushed the end of the plank to him again, and cried, 'Now, Tim, hold on with all your might.'"

They pulled and got him almost out, when, all at once, the plank went down again. "Oh, my coming up, they pushed the end of the plank to him again, and cried, 'Now, Tim, hold on with all your might.'"

on end," and drew him out in safety! When we see parents who have nothing but a hard way toward their children, who are always finding fault, but never commending them, even when they do well; who never seem to see when the child tries to do well, and when he longs for words of kindness, we have great pity for such children. We wish these parents would remember, that children cannot have the judgment, the forethought, and the sobriety of many years. They are children. Don't give them the *icy end of the plank!* They love your approbation. They rejoice to have you give them deserved commendation. O, give them the *wooden end of the plank!*"

S. S. TIMES.

SOMEBODY'S DARLING.

Into a word of the whitewashed halls,
Where the dead and dying lay,
Wounded by bayonets, shells and balls,
Somebody's Darling was borne one day—
Somebody's Darling, and so brave,
Wearing yet his pale west face,
Soon to be hid by the dust of the grave,
The lingering light of his boyhood's grace.

Matted and damp are the curls of gold,
Which the dawn on his fair young brow
Pales are the lips of delicate mould—
Somebody's Darling is dying now.
Back from his beautiful blue-veined brow,
Somebody's Darling, and so brave,
Cross his hands on his bosom now.
Somebody's Darling is still and cold:
Kiss him once for somebody's sake,
Murmur a prayer soft and low;
One bright word from the fair maid's talk,
They were somebody's pride, you know.
Somebody's hand hath rested there;
Wait a mother's soft and sad look,
And somebody's darling is fair,
Been hushed in their way of light!

God knows best; he was somebody's love;
Somebody's heart enshrined him there;
Somebody washed his same above;
Somebody's hand held him in prayer.
Somebody wept when he marched away,
Looking so handsome, brave and grand;
Somebody kissed on his forehead lay,
Somebody clung to his parting hand.

Somebody's waiting and watching for him—
Yearning to hold him again to her heart;
And there he lies with his blue eyes dim,
And the smiling child-like lips apart.
Somebody's hand is on his forehead lay,
Somebody's hand is on his forehead lay,
Somebody's hand is on his forehead lay,
Somebody's hand is on his forehead lay.

For the Sabbath Recorder.

NATURE AND DESTINY OF MAN.

BY THE REV. JOHN TOWN.

You admit that I make a fair argument on Matt. 10: 28, and to those who choose such sentiments, it may be sufficient. Shall I understand you, then, to say, that it is not "eat-infernal" to you, because your "prepossessions" and "prejudices" distinguish you therefrom? Ah! I fear so!

But those who can bring their minds to a thorough and impartial investigation of the whole tenor of the Bible teaching on this subject, (how like the talk of the Spiritualist,) will find that your exposition of this text is out of harmony with the Scriptures. Your effort to free yourself from the force of my argument on this important verse, is confined to the meaning of the term *soul*. Of course I am glad to see this, as it is a clear yielding to the force of the logic employed, so that if I can sustain myself here, I may consider the question settled. My reason for regarding the term *soul* in the light in which I have considered it in this text, is that the ideas involved in the passage demand it. I have in another place given the rule for determining the meaning of words, namely, it is to be obtained from the connections in which they are found. This rule has, so far as I am informed, forced all commentators to the same view I have taken of the passage. Any other sense makes it meaningless. You refer to what Dr. Clark says on the translation of the word *psuche* by the term *soul*, in Matt. 16: 26, when in the 25th verse it is translated *life*, whereas the doctor says that in both instances it means *life*. But how does the doctor come to such a conclusion, seeing that in both instances the word is *psuche* (soul), and not *zoe*, the Greek word for *life*? Simply by translating the word by the sense of the passage, according to the rule I have in opinion above. But what is his opinion on Matt. 10: 28? Does he here give the sense of *zoe to psuche*? Not at all! Hear him. "Verse 28. Fear them not which kill the body, those who slay with acts of cruelty, allowing probably to the cruelities themselves should exercise on his followers in their martyrdom. But they cannot do to kill the soul. Hence we find that the body and the soul are distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see that the doctor is strongly against you on this important verse. And if his testimony is a translator and commentator is good in one instance, why not in the other, especially when he follows the same rule of translation in both instances? For certainly, if he is right in the first case, he is also in the latter. Mr. Barnes says of this text, "That is, men who have no power to injure the soul; the soul and the body are clearly proved to be distinct principles; for the body may be slain, and the soul escape; and, secondly, that the soul is immortal; for the murderers of the body are not able—have if not in their power—to figure it." Thus you see

