

BIBLE EXAMINER
Jan. 1, 1849 ---- Dec. 1851

M. V. Lyons

Whitby

C. W.

Property of
Clyde Randall

BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. XI.

NEW YORK, JANUARY 1, 1856.

NO. 1.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 141 Fulton-street.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year :

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

The Resurrection from the Dead Opposed to the Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul.

(Continued from volume x, page 350.)

ESSAY VI.—INTERMEDIATE STATE.

"As to the consequences of the present question, it appears, that, on the one side, (that of materialism) there is nothing more than a temporary cessation of thought, which can hurt nobody, except the self-interested Papist, or the self-sufficient Deist, whose high claim to an inherent principle of immortality, is shown to be vain and groundless; but on the other side, (that of immaterialism) there is a manifest derogation *from*, if not a total subversion *of*, that positive covenant, which professes to entitle us to everlasting life; all proper and consistent notions of death, resurrection and a future judgment are confounded; in fine, all the great sanctions of the gospel are rendered unintelligible or useless."—*Bishop Law's Theory of Religion, Postscript, 437, 438, &c.*

AN INTERMEDIATE STATE of *conscious and active existence*, which is said to be entered upon immediately at our death, and to continue until the resurrection, will form the subject to be examined in the present paper; and, before we enter upon the arguments by which this doctrine is advocated, we would premise, that the scriptures are most clear and distinct in what they communicate relative to man's future condition, uniformly setting forth that that state is to *commence* at the resurrection—that we shall not live again until the resurrection—that mankind will not be judged before the resurrection—that the faith, labors, and suffering of believers are unprofitable and perish if there be no resurrection. [See Law's Theory, Appendix.] Such being, unequivocally, the doctrines of the scriptures; the supporters of immaterialism, have naturally felt them to be incompatible with their hypothesis; for if an immortal soul be an essential part of man, such soul being, in its own nature, indestructible, then, of necessity, future existence *does* commence *before* the resurrection, and the faith, labors, and sufferings of believers do not, nor can they perish even if a resurrection never takes place: thus situated in regard to doctrines so opposed as those of immaterialism, and a resurrection from the dead, their supporters

have had recourse to heathen sources, and from thence, and not from the scriptures, have deduced an hypothesis, which is thus described—"In the interval between death and the resurrection, there is an intermediate state, in which the departed souls of the good are supposed to have an imperfect reward, and the souls of the wicked an imperfect punishment:" [Rees's Cyclopædia, volume 33.—"Sleep of the soul."] and while we in vain look to the scriptures for a description of this "*interval* between death and the resurrection," we readily discover its origin among the comparatively consistent immaterialists of the heathen nations, whom we have shewn in our former Essays, believed souls to be an emanation of that intellectual fire by which the universe is animated; and that when they are released from the body they returned to God; but that, previously to such return, they have "an interval," by being placed in an "*intermediate state*," for the purpose of being purified from the consequences of their late pollution. So early as the second century, Origen, and other "Fathers," incorporated this system with the Christian doctrine of future existence, and from thence the catholic "Purgatory" was immediately derived: so that this essential branch of the doctrine of immaterialism became one of great influence and profit to the Romish Church, into which it was introduced by Gregory in the sixth century, being honored with an infallible affirmation in the year 1140, and so continued until the Reformation, when most of the reformers being content with a small degree of refinement upon Catholicism merely prohibited prayers for the souls of the deceased. To such general belief in the truth of immaterialism Luther, in the early part of his life, was a singular exception. In his defence, (published in 1520) which was condemned by Leo X, he states, "I permit the Pope to make articles of faith for himself and his faithful, such as that he is Emperor of the world, King of heaven, and God upon earth—that the *soul is immortal*, with all those monstrous opinions to be found in the Roman dunghill of decretals." [Luther's Defence, Proposition xxviii.] On the latter point, however, Luther seems to have stood nearly alone: neither does it appear that he evinced much perseverance in its defence, opposed as it was to the decrees of the church of Rome, on the one hand, and to the prejudices of his brother reformers on the other; and, indeed, the latter announced that, "Faith requires that we should think, that the dead are not nothing, but that they truly live before God; the pious happily in Christ, the wicked in a horrible expectation of the revelation of divine judgment." [Harmou. Conf. p. 14, 1 Mea Portis.] But it will be found that anything rather than uniformity

of opinion, as to the condition of souls in this "intermediate state," has prevailed and does prevail among its supporters; and that while the decree above quoted appertains to the wicked—"an horrible expectation of the revelation of divine judgment"—Calvin is content to deal only with the souls of "the faithful;" for "it is nothing to me," he observes, "what becomes of *their souls*," (the wicked) "I will only be responsible for the faithful," in an intermediate state; [Psychopon. fol. 50. Edit. 1545.] the more modern defenders of the doctrine abound also with contentions with each other; first, as to the place and condition of the souls, whether virtuous or vicious; secondly, as to the union of the same soul with the same body at the resurrection; and thirdly, as to those passages of scripture which expressly reserve all hopes of future life, of punishment, and of reward, until the resurrection—out of these difficulties and contentions, have arisen a sect of semi-immaterialists, who, while they succeed in proving that neither reward nor punishment can take place *until* the resurrection, yet they most inconsistently contend that a man is animated by a soul; and, for the purpose of reconciling all parties and every inconsistency, they assert that this quality of man, immortal and self-existent as it is, becomes, at the dissolution of the body, partially non-existent, being until the resurrection in a state of sleep, or insensibility. To this absurd position Bishop Warburton, who, it will be seen, was at least *consistent* in his immaterialism, makes a reply possessed of much force. "Their sleep of the soul is mere cant; and this brings me to consider the sense and consistency of so ridiculous a notion. Now sleep is a modification of existence, not of non-existence, so that a sleep of a *substance* hath a meaning—the sleep of a *quality* is nonsense." [Bishop Warburton's *Strictures on the Doctrine of the sleep of the soul*.] We have thought it well thus to refer to the contradictory theories of our opponents, and that for two reasons; first, because in fairness they might claim to be represented in their own words; and secondly, because it is the best mode of aiding our object; as we feel confident of successfully effecting in the present what we have already done in the previous department of our inquiry; namely, proving not merely a want of scriptural evidence in *support* of immaterialism, but that the doctrines of the scriptures are in unequivocal opposition to it in all its parts. With this strong conviction upon our minds, produced by a careful attention to the arguments on both sides of the question, we shall proceed at once to an examination of such passages in the scriptures as are deemed either directly or inferentially to support the doctrine of an intermediate state; premising, that if the immortality of the soul be true, there is and must be a state of conscious existence, and that enjoyed too by all indiscriminately, prior to the "*judgment of the great day*"—and also, that if there be such a state, it is of the first importance that the fact should have been distinctly communicated; for, if the doctrine be scriptural, we are entitled to ask for the law and the testimony, and in fairness to require that the passages shall be as clear and as

decided, because equally required to be so (and from being an essential part of the doctrine of futurity, they would and must be so,) as the declarations of Jesus and his apostles relative to a resurrection from the dead and future judgment: as a proof of the entire want of such evidence, we have upon record a candid, but certainly a very extraordinary confession of one of the ablest defenders of this doctrine, in which, so conscious is the writer of the want of scripture authority, that he is compelled to admit, that "the intermediate state between death and the resurrection is a subject upon which the scriptures *have not said so much as one could wish*." [Dr. Jortin's *Sermons*.] From such an admission, then, and from such an authority too in this controversy, it will be allowed, that, in fairness of argument, the discussion might, as it regards the scriptural evidence nearly terminate; but that there are other defenders of the same doctrine, who while their arguments prove that they are not in a better condition than the reverend author above quoted, yet seem to have either more faith or less ingenuousness than he possessed; and who contend, that there are "many expressions of scripture, in the natural and obvious sense, which imply that an intermediate and separate state is actually to succeed death." [Dr. Campbell's *Preliminary Dissertations*, part 2.] With such materials before us, therefore, we propose examining not merely the "expressions" which are assumed to "imply" such a state, but also the strong cases which it is contended, directly and unequivocally reveal such a state. To the latter class of arguments we shall first direct our attention, and it will be found to embrace several difficult portions of the scriptures, and among the number, the one which is the most confidently relied upon by our opponents shall take the precedence. On account of its assumed importance to their theory, as well as to give effect to the subjoined refutation, we shall quote the whole of the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, as recorded by Luke, who thus represents Jesus as addressing his disciples as well as the Scribes and Pharisees:—"There was a certain rich man which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day: and there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate full of sores, and desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table; the beggar died, and was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom: the rich man also died and was buried. And in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom: and he said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus that he may dip the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue, for I am tormented in this flame. But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy life-time receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things; but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented: and besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulph fixed, so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us that would come from thence." (Luke xvi.) Here we have to remark that this parable can admit of but one of two modes of interpretation—either figurative or literal:

if the former, then the connexion in which it occurs; the circumstances which gave rise to it; the definite object for which it was delivered; and the admitted character of allegorical instruction, are all essential to its being correctly understood: if the latter, then every circumstance enumerated must be taken *literally* as they are related; and, indeed, so necessary do some of the defenders of an intermediate state esteem a literal interpretation, that, in an answer to Priestley, published in 1778, we are apprised that "we should never presume to stray from the express, "obvious, literal meaning." Bound then by such conditions, we look at this parable, and bear in our minds, that the soul of man is described by its advocates to be spiritual—not visible to the sight, and that it takes its flight, immediately upon the dissolution of the body, to inhabit a state which is thus described by an author before referred to: that "whilst the good enter into a state of peace and comfort, the wicked are properly condemned to an *insensible condition* till the last day calls them forth." [Dr. Jortin's Sermons.] *Literally*, then, it appears that Lazarus, not an immortal soul, but that the "beggar" Lazarus, "full of sores," was immediately upon his death, carried by angels and deposited in the bosom of Abraham—that the rich man at his death was placed not in an "intermediate state;" not in Dr. Jortin's "insensible condition till the last day;" but was in hell "tormented in flame"—that the receptacle for the virtuous is so immediately in the neighborhood of that for the wicked, that the parties can see each other, that they can hold familiar conversation together—that Abraham, though on the other "side of the gulph," and in heaven, is still the "Father" of the wicked in hell; and that the aforesaid wicked are acknowledged by Abraham to be his *Sons*; and that, finally, if it be contended, that it was the immortal soul of Lazarus that was in Abraham's bosom, and the immortal soul of the rich man that required a drop of water to cool its immortal tongue, then *immaterial* spirits can be burned by *material* fire; and though not visible to the sight, nor tangible to the touch, could go to the rich man's "father's house," to his five brethren, and could "testify unto them," lest they also came to the like place of torment. This, we submit, to take it *literally*, is the fair interpretation of this parable, teaching, as it is said to do, the "immediate transition of the soul into one or other of these two different states, which is observable in the narration or parable itself, from their death to their succeeding state of happiness or misery." [Bulkley's Discourses on the Parables of the New Testament.] And we might, perhaps, leave to our adversaries the solution of their own difficulties, and the reconciling of such direct contradictions in their system, as flow from applying this parable to the support of the doctrine of an intermediate state of existence. One, indeed, among their number, has felt it judicious not to hazard too large a portion of his faith upon the present parable, and admits, that it is "not a representation of an intermediate state, but of the final state of the righteous and the wicked." [Bishop Warburton,] "This admission of the reverend immaterialist is, we contend, completely and to the

fullest extent, giving up the point in debate: but still, we shall proceed to shew, that it is not even a representation of "the final state of the righteous and the wicked," much less that for which Macknight put in his claim, "that it teaches us that the souls of men are immortal; that they subsist in a separate state after the dissolution of the body; and that they" (in such state, we presume) "are rewarded or punished, according to their actions in this life." [Macknight, vol. ii. p. 294.] With this object we look to the preceding chapter, and from thence learn, that the "*pharisees and scribes murmured*" at the teaching of Jesus; and that he "*spoke parables unto them.*" This teaching by parables being "that kind of allegory which consists of a continued narration of a fictitious event, applied by way of a simile to the illustration of some important truth." [Bishop Lowth's Lectures on the Sacred Poetry of the Hebrews.] The objects of Jesus in the several parables in the present connexion would appear to be, to shew that his attention to "*publicans and sinners*" was agreeable to the will of God; to expose the self-righteous Jews, who "*justified themselves before men*;" to correct avaricious dispositions—"for the pharisees, who were covetous, heard all these things and they derided him;" and wisely and by gradual steps to exhibit to his disciples and others, the true character of God, and develop a knowledge of the divine dispensations in fulfilling the covenant with Abraham, by the calling in of the Gentiles. To these objects, the present parable, and that of the Prodigal Son, with which it is connected, are especially directed:—in the latter, the eldest son; in the former, the "*certain rich man, clothed in purple and fine linen,*" are the representatives of the proud and privileged Jew; exactly those characters, some of whom were then near Jesus, and who, though "highly esteemed among men, were an abomination in the sight of God;"—in the one case, the outcast son; in the other, the despised beggar, are the representatives of the gentiles, hitherto excluded from the kingdom of God. But "the law and the prophets were until John; since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." (Verse 16.) The kingdom being, since the time of John, thrown open to the Gentiles as well as to the Jews, such as entered into it were carried by angels*—by messengers—such messengers being Jesus and his apostles—into Abraham's bosom—into the kingdom of God; that kingdom or church which originated with Abraham, and the enlargement of which at the time of Jesus being misunderstood by the Jews, they in their turn became the outcasts. They had received their "*good things,*" and the

* "The word *angel*, is not properly a denomination of nature, but of office; denoting as much as *nuncius, messenger*, a person employed to carry one's orders, or to declare his will."—*Rees's Cyclopaedia, Angel.* "The Greek word we render *angel*, does, in its primitive sense, signify nothing more than messengers; and, accordingly, in James ii. 25, it is the same Greek word that is rendered *angels* in other passages that is there rendered *messengers.*"—See *Gouaby*, vol. iv. p. 210.

Gentiles their "evil ones;" but now they were comforted, and the Jews were tormented; because they would not hear Moses and the prophets: neither were they persuaded when one *did* rise from the dead. This interpretation, we submit, is not a strained one, but a fair and rational explanation of the parable we have been examining; and one which, while it makes it harmonize with the connexion in which it occurs, and to be suitable to the circumstances under which, and the parties to whom, it was delivered, must shew, on the one hand, the gross absurdity of attempting to make it teach popish and heathen doctrines; and on the other, the pitiable condition in which a correct knowledge of the scriptures must ever place the defenders of immaterialism.

(To be continued.)

THE JUDGMENT.

BY THE EDITOR.

Much has been said and written on this subject; but we fear a large portion has been "words without knowledge," and that no really definite and practical ideas have been the result. The general notion of the judgment is that of a great assize or court, at which the entire race of Adam are to be assembled in one vast concourse, and that each individual case is *then* and *there* to be examined, and all the thoughts of his heart, actions of his life, words of his lips, as well as the *motives* which have governed him, are to pass in review, and his case be decided upon the evidence then appearing, after which the sentence is to be pronounced, and the execution to follow.

Against this view there are great and (with present light) insuperable objections. In presenting them, however, we are aware, we shall have to encounter an almost impassable barrier in the minds of many sincere souls who have had the common notion interwoven in all their religious thoughts and instructions.

Far be it from us to approach such time-honored sentiments with rude hands, and far from us be the wish to unsettle any mind in such a cherished idea, unless we can offer them a more scriptural one, and one that shall be more practical in its influence upon their hearts and lives. Believing, however, that it is possible the popular view may be erroneous, if not pernicious, in its influence, we shall proceed to state some objections to it, and then see if the Scriptures do not warrant and require a different view of the subject.

To the correctness of the view generally entertained, we suggest, first, an objection as to the time necessary to such a procedure. We are not to rush upon a conclusion blindly; and it is doubtless true that not one in a thousand, ministers or people, ever have exercised their thoughts on the time that must be occupied to *conclude* the judgment, if the popular theory be the true one.

The position we are to occupy on this subject, is not that of a *dogmatist*—or positiveness—but of *investigation*, to find, if possible, the truth on a subject of such absorbing interest to every serious and reflecting mind.

THE TIME necessary to an examination of each individual case, in the formal manner expressed or implied in the common theory, is an insuperable objection to it.

As to the number of the human family, it is impossible to arrive at any thing like certainty; yet we are not of those who suppose the number has been so great that they could not all stand upon the globe at one time, as some have affirmed. For a basis of calculation, we will suppose that one generation of the world lasts thirty years. This would give 200 generations in 6000 years. We will now take the present number of the inhabitants of the globe (eight or nine hundred millions) as the number to represent each generation; though it will be seen that this most likely gives us too many. Eight hundred millions multiplied by 200, (the number of generations from Adam to the end of 6000 years), will give us *one hundred and sixty thousand millions* (160,000,000,000!) as the sum total of the human family to be judged, provided the judgment is to occur at the close of the 6000 years. Now, let us allot some specific time to the examination and decision of each individual case, on the supposition they are to be judged in succession—that is, one after another.

1. Allow *one second* to each individual, and *six thousand years* must be taken up in the process.

2. Allow *one minute* to each case, and *three hundred and sixty thousand years* are necessary.

3. Give *one hour* to each, and *twenty-one millions six hundred thousand years* are required. (21,600,000 years!)

4. Let *one day* be the time for each case, and near *eight thousand millions of years* will be necessary to complete the judgment. (8,000,000,000 of years!)

We do not affirm such a period will not be occupied in the judgment, but it certainly looks doubtful when the Scriptures seem every where to speak of the speedy *execution* of the sentence of the judgment on the *return* of Christ. There seems only one way to avoid this protraction of the judgment, and that is to suppose that the examination of all, or of large numbers, is proceeding at one and the same time. This indeed is possible, but then it breaks in upon the notion that each individual case is to be examined before all and exposed to all the race of men.

If we reduce the number to be examined and judged to one-half of our estimate, as likely we may in truth, and then allow only *one hour* to each case, at least *ten millions of years* would be necessary to complete the judgment, and before sentence could be executed; or a period about *sixteen hundred times* as long as it has been since Adam was created.

Notwithstanding this seemingly insurmountable difficulty to the common theory, if the Scripture positively affirmed such to be the process of judgment, we would bow to its testimony; but we may find it does not, and we are therefore at liberty to search to see if some other view of the judgment is not the true one.

In addition to the foregoing objection, we urge another on the attention of those who believe the righteous will have a *priority, in time*, in the re-

urrection, whether that time be one hour, one day, one year, or a thousand years.

How is it to be known who are to have part in this favored class, if all in their graves have not been judged *before* the resurrection *begins*? Are the righteous to be raised and then the process of judgment to be instituted, to see whether the Searcher of hearts has made a mistake? Or, are they to be tried, undergo an examination after their resurrection, as if *suspected* characters? Can we adopt either of these positions? If not, must it not be manifest that they had been judged *before* being raised? And why are they raised, and not the wicked at the same instant, except the wicked also have been judged, and found not worthy to have part in this prior, or "first resurrection?" If these things are so, then we are brought to the inevitable conclusion that the judgment, in which *character and doom* is decided, is at some period *prior* to the resurrection. This, let it be remembered, is not saying there is not a judgment—yea, "a great day of judgment," at, or immediately upon, the resurrection; but the *nature* of that judgment will be a subject of inquiry as we proceed.

Before going farther, we will endeavor to find out the meaning of the terms judged and judgment. They are variously applied in the Scriptures.

Judgment, in its most simple form, signifies the act of judging, or, the process of examining facts and arguments, to ascertain truth, propriety and justice. It also signifies the determination of the mind, or the conclusion the mind has arrived at from an examination of things presented to its consideration. It is sometimes put for the spirit of wisdom with which a person is endowed. Sometimes it signifies the statutes, or laws and testimony of God. This is often the case, as in Psa. 119. It is applied to remarkable calamities inflicted upon communities and nations. Also, to judicial decisions, and to the *execution* of the sentence following trial and conviction, or acquittal.

These are the general ideas contained in the terms judge and judgment. There are judicial judgments on individuals, communities and nations. The Lord told Abraham He would "judge that nation," who were to "afflict" his seed "four hundred years." The process of judgment is definitely recorded in Exodus. Not a personal appearance of Jehovah to the persons judged; but he tested them,—that is, the *rulers* of Egypt, by his servant Moses, and gave them sufficient evidence to have led them to regard his demand, to "let Israel go," if they had not persisted, through their covetousness, to hold those whom they had enslaved. The demands of Moses, and the evidence he exhibited, in the name of the God of the Hebrews, was the judgment process that was to decide the doom of Egypt, or her Princes. Then follows the *executive* judgment, or the judgment carried into execution; and the Lord said, as the *deciding* judgment was drawing to a close, "I will pass through the land of Egypt this night, and smite all the first-born in the land of Egypt,....and against all the gods [princes] of Egypt I will execute judgment." The *executive* judgment commenced that night, and terminated, or was concluded at the Red Sea

when Pharaoh and all his princes were destroyed. This was judging a nation, or rather her *body of rulers*. The principle, we apprehend, is here brought out, that the judgment is constituted or made up of two parts, viz: the *investigating* judgment, and the *executive* judgment. The one precedes the other. The first goes on while in a *state of trial*, and when the trial closes, and the evidence or testimony is all elicited, the sentence is passed: the executive judgment follows after at some fixed period. We might illustrate this view with several other examples from Scripture, but we judge this is sufficient for the present.

We now come to the question, *Is the Judgment at the end of the world—end of the age—or at the resurrection—the INVESTIGATING judgment, or the EXECUTIVE one?*

This question is an important and interesting one; involving much more than may at first appear; we must therefore examine it with care, and see that we do not come to hasty conclusions. If it should prove to be the investigating judgment, we are thrown back on the difficulties before suggested. On the other hand, if it be found to be the executive judgment, we shall inquire at what period or time does the judgment of investigation take place? which will open a field for many solemn and heart-searching thoughts.

1. IS THE JUDGMENT AT THE RESURRECTION THE EXECUTIVE ONE?

With present light, we are inclined to the opinion that it is, and that the investigating judgment terminates before the executive one commences, so far as relates to all men who are the subjects of this executive judgment.

1. *Christ is specially the executive Judge.* In this respect "the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son, * * * and hath given him authority to execute judgment." John v.

2. *The judgment at the resurrection is by Christ.* The examination of a few texts will show us that it is clearly an *executive* one; or if an investigating one at all, it is but faintly expressed, and is *inferred* rather than clearly affirmed.

1. "The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his holy angels: and then he shall reward every man according to his works." Matt. 16 : 27.

No other idea of judgment is *expressed* here than that of an executive one. We do not affirm, no other is implied: but the simple expression is that of execution.

2. That which seems more to express an investigating judgment is Matthew 25 : 31. But if that portion of Scripture is carefully examined, we shall, perhaps, see little cause to conclude it is an account of anything more than an executive judgment. Christ, on the throne of his glory, proceeds at once to "separate one from another," the whole account of which is embraced in two verses, 32, 33; and then he proceeds directly to the *executive* judgment, commencing with the righteous, v. 34. The whole is, apparently, a proclamation of the result of a previous investigation, the sentence, or judgment of which is now to be *executed*; the whole transaction seemingly occupying no very protracted period.

3. "We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." 2 Cor. 5 : 10.

Here is a clear statement of what men are to stand before Christ for. It is to receive the reward of their deeds : in other words, that the "judgment written" may be *executed* upon them. There is certainly no clear announcement that an *investigating* judgment then takes place.

4. Rev. 20 : 11, 15, next demands our attention, as clearly affirming an *investigating* judgment at the last day, if any text in the Bible does. If that does not, it will be difficult to find one that does. At first view, and coming to it with the prejudices of our entire religious education, this text seems to teach that there is an *investigation* at that time, as well as an *execution*. But a close examination may serve to lessen our confidence in the idea of an *investigating* judgment on the occasion. Mark : "The dead, small and great"—the lowly and the illustrious—"stand before God ; and the books were opened." The language "books" is of course figurative. But what books are they? Not *blank* ones, now to be filled up, for they are already "*written*," or filled up ; which was the case at the time they were *opened* ; so that the writing must have been done prior to that time. The natural conclusion is, they are books of *record*, and had been filled up with *testimony* given at some previous period. Where there is a court of investigation, in order to a decision, the testimony is written down or recorded. At the *opening* of such court or seat of justice, no books of recorded testimony, relating to the individual to be tried, are *opened*. The books of law may then be opened, but it is manifest in Rev. 20 : 12, that if the book of law was included, the books of testimony are especially noted : for "the dead were judged out of"—*ek*—or, on account of—"those things written in the books ;" which judgment is expressly said to be "*according* to their works," or according to that testimony "written in the books ;" and the language repeated in verse 13, "they were judged every man according to their works," carries the idea, in connection with the context, that this judgment was an executive judgment : that is, it was the time in which, and transaction by which, the "judgment *written*" was *executed* ; for, "whosoever was *not found written* in the book of life, was cast into the lake of fire." So then some names were written in the book of life when "the books" were opened ; others were not found there ; which seems conclusive evidence that the judgment of investigation—or receiving testimony for and against, and deciding what should be the reward of every man—was a previous transaction : and the assembling now before God is in order to the *execution*, or to inflict the punishment and bestow the reward as found written in the books.

It cannot be denied, we think, but that those whose names were found written in the book of life, at the very time the books were opened, must have been judged at some period previously, and their case determined, else their names had not been found there on opening the books ; and if they had previously been judged and acquitted, so it is reasonable to suppose the others had been judged and

condemned. Thus it would seem the judgment (Rev. 20 : 12) is not the *investigating* judgment, but the executive one, or the one of *execution*. The several texts now examined may be enlarged upon at another time, and others of like character considered.

If the judgment, at the resurrection, or at the last day, is executive, and not the judgment of investigation, *when* and *where* is the *INVESTIGATING* judgment?—and on what *principles* is it conducted?

This is a solemn inquiry ; and may the Father of light shed His divine rays of truth on our minds, that we may be so led into an understanding of His word that we may be sanctified through the truth, and be able to spread truth in the path of our fellow-men, that they may see how holy it becomes us all to live, whose every word, every work, and "every secret thing" is to come into judgment ; or be *investigated* before God, or pass in His view for His decision or judgment upon it.

In answer to the first part of the question before us, one word—though not exactly scriptural in its *form*, yet expressing truth, and universally employed in theology—expresses the fact we wish to develop : that word is "*Probation*." The very idea of the word is *trial—examination—any proceeding designed to ascertain truth*. Webster says : "in general, trial for proof, or satisfactory evidence, or the time of trial."

In this definition the idea is fully brought out, on which we wish to fix attention, viz : As all theologians maintain this present life, or a man's lifetime, is his time of probation, then he is *now on trial*, or the *investigating* judgment is in actual session at this moment, and every individual during his life, is on trial before God the righteous "Judge of all the earth ;" and each one is, day by day, not only at the bar of the investigating judgment, but is himself the *witness* for or against himself, and is every hour giving *testimony* on which the judge decides the case. Solemn thought ! And here let it be remembered, that "God will bring every work into judgment, with every *secret thing*, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." How solemn the consideration, that each one of us, is, every hour, testifying before Jehovah's court for or against ourselves ! Every word we utter is a part of our testimony ; every act of our lives is but our own testimony in our case ; every temper of mind indulged or cultivated, goes to make up the chain of testimony ; and all our *motives* in life are so many links in the chain. What a life are we then living ! Always in court—always on trial—always giving evidence by which the Judge is to decide our doom ! Here is a practical influence flowing out from this view of the subject. Men cannot say "judgment will never begin," as most in fact do on the popular theory. No, they are now in the "judgment of this world"—they are now arraigned at Jehovah's bar, and this judgment has proceeded so far, and so much testimony has already been elicited, that every impenitent unbeliever "*is condemned already*"—is this moment under *sentence of death*, and the day of *executive* judgment is hastening on, though the judge offers to all men a free pardon through Jesus Christ, if they will accept it before the day, the

great day, of executive judgment arrives. He is long-suffering in the execution of the sentence. If men abuse and slight the forbearance of the Lord, the justice of their execution will be more apparent and their guilt terribly increased.

The matter stands thus. Men are now passing through the investigating judgment: and for their sins, on their own testimony—out of their own mouths, and by their lives they are now condemned to death, and the day of executive judgment approacheth. During the interval, God promises to blot out the sins of those who, with a broken heart for sin, and true faith in, or reliance upon his mercy in Christ, seek to him for pardon; and he has promised to such life—eternal life. Those who embrace this gracious offer are actually pardoned—the sentence of the investigating judgment is revoked—their sins are remembered no more: and enduring in allegiance to God to the end of their trial the testimony is in favor of their acquittal; and when the Executive Judge, viz. Jesus Christ, comes to “execute judgment upon all,” those “in Christ” are first acquitted by him. This is the first act of executive judgment: “the dead in Christ rise,” not to be examined to see if they may live, or to have their sins which have been blotted out exposed to the gaze of men and angels! No. They rise to life—eternal life—to immortality. Such is “the judgment of the great day” with respect to them.

On the other hand, Christ executes the judgment of death—perdition—“everlasting destruction” on them that know not God and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ—which was the Gospel of life eternal in the kingdom of God.

“Because sentence against an evil work was not speedily executed, therefore the hearts of the sons of men were fully set in them to do evil.” It seems Solomon understood the “sentence” had passed on evil doers; and yet wicked men took advantage of the delay in its execution to persist in sin. Could evil-doers have been persuaded that the sentence itself was still in the uncertain future, they might have persuaded themselves that somehow they would altogether escape that also, as multitudes do now. Let them know they are now passing through the judicial trial, and that their own testimony of themselves is such that the judge has already pronounced the death sentence upon them, and their only hope is to fly at once to him, while He holds out the sceptre of mercy by Christ, and seek earnestly through God's beloved Son, pardon, not delaying till the day of execution; for then no pardons will be granted. But while the day of execution is unknown, let the condemned seek God's mercy, through the true Advocate, and pardon is certain: and enduring steadfast in obedience thereafter to God, eternal life will be given.

The foregoing article on “The Judgment” is one that we first published six or seven years since. We now republish it by special request.

“THE ADVENT REVIEW, and Sabbath Herald” has been removed from Rochester, N. Y., to Battle Creek, Mich.. U. SMITH is “Resident Editor.”

From EDIT. J. B. COOK.

Rochester, Nov. 21st, 1855.

DEAR BROTHER:—I find in my travels an increasing interest in the Life question. It is indeed of absorbing interest to all mankind; though this is covered up from the view of the great mass by a false education. I have had quite a tour of five weeks in Canada. Not a believer in the Advent—not one who is willing to rise above sectarianism and hear the word of the Lord on all subjects—do I find who was against the doctrine of “Life and Immortality” through “Jesus and the resurrection.” It is possible there may be exceptions; but I do not recollect them. I am much interested in the overwhelming evidence that the seventh,—“the last,” or Resurrection trump is about to be sounded.

Surely the “Gogue” power, Ez. 38, does not come into the series of the four kingdoms, Dan. 7: 8. As I have gone to the depths of that investigation, (so far as able,) it is certain that those who have adopted the theory of “Anatolia,” are dreadfully misled. But as I am from present appearances to be allowed to speak and be heard, soon, I will not anticipate your reader's decision. All I claim is a fair investigation. Let each one use his own best manner, till he is impeached. Plainness of speech and distinctiveness of statement is not a sin, but a virtue in any writer who keeps in the channel of truth—God's word and fact.

“CHAPMAN'S PRINCIPIA; or, Nature's First Principles,” which we noticed in the EXAMINER Nov. 15th, has been received. We have had time yet only to glance over it; but have no doubt it must be deeply interesting to the scientific, and those who wish to obtain knowledge of the “electrical action pervading the solar system.”

“THE CROSS AND CROWN” is published at Machias Port, Me., by H. L. HASTINGS and J. LENFEST. It is a monthly of 16 pages, “sent to all who desire it, with or without price.” Those who choose to pay can send 50 cents. We fear our Brethren will find a lack of support on their accommodating terms; but we wish them success in trying to do good; and presume they will do their best to that end.

“THE ANTI-PANTHEIST.”—Such is the title of a work to be published in numbers, by STEPHEN DEUEL, Dayton, Ohio. Twelve numbers of 50 pages each at \$1. It is designed to “Expose the errors of false metaphysics, give a full history, reveal the character and falsity of modern Pantheistic Spiritualism, and prove the incapacity of the Harmonial Philosophy to meet the wants of the human soul,” &c. We may notice it more fully after awhile.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, JANUARY 1, 1856.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—The price of this paper has been increased to \$2 for 24 numbers. Until the past two years it was issued *monthly* at \$1, per year. Some said if we would issue *semi-monthly*, at the same price, it would much increase our subscribers; but two years' experience has taught us those persons were mistaken. Our list has not materially changed; and the amount on subscription has no more than paid the *printer*, allowing us nothing for all our labor and toil; and but for *donations*, for our personal benefit, we know not in what way we should have supported our family. Thanks to those kind *Donors*. A few friends in Philadelphia made us up more than a hundred dollars to close the past year; which, in connection with donations from individuals elsewhere, has enabled us to finish the past year without serious personal embarrassment; yet as to funds for publishing *books*, we have, absolutely, *none*; and we have exhausted every copy of "*Bible vs. Tradition*," we had on hand, in giving *premiums* to those who have paid \$2 for 1856, before this date; and also the largest part of our "*Revised Six Sermons*." More must be printed soon.

Nothing short of either putting the price of the EXAMINER up to \$2 for 24 numbers or returning to a *monthly* issue could have kept the paper *alive*. As it is, the EXAMINER will go on with its regular *semi-monthly* issue. We thank our friends, who, so many of them, have promptly responded, and remitted the \$2.

We have some *ninety* sets of the EXAMINER, in *sheets*, from Feb. 15 to Dec. 15, of last year (21 numbers;) of which we will give one set to any subscriber who shall hereafter send us \$2 for *this year*, till the 90 sets are exhausted; or, we will give them a copy of the "*Discussion*" with Prof. Mattison, *bound*, or two copies in paper covers. In either case we will send them free of postage. We will continue, during *this month*, if desired, to send a copy of the "*Revised Six Sermons*" as a premium to those who send us \$2 for the 24 numbers of the EXAMINER for 1856; but the subscriber must pay the postage on it, *viz*: ten cents, if pre-paid. If the Sermons are taken the other works named will not be given, as above stated.

DONATIONS.—We shall acknowledge donations for our personal benefit by letter or personally, hereafter, and *not* in the EXAMINER. Some of our

friends are not willing to have their names appear; and all, we presume, will like it quite as well to have our *private* acknowledgment. If any have not received our acknowledgment, privately, it is because our letter has miscarried, or it has been overlooked by some means. They may be sure it has not been from a lack of a sense of obligation to them for their kindness. May the Lord abundantly bless you all, "according to the riches of His grace in glory, by Jesus Christ" our Lord and *Life-Giver*.

"AN OLD HEATHEN."—So the Rev. ABEL STEVENS calls Plato, in one of his letters from Europe, which are being published in the *Christian Advocate* of this city. And what has this "old heathen" done? According to Mr. Stevens, he has done what *Christianity* could not do. No wonder Mr. S. calls this a "*strange fact!*" Mr. Stevens seems to glory that "*Plato always had a similar influence in the church!*"

The truth is, the so called "*Church*" has attempted to establish the dogma of an "immortal soul" in man, which is unsustained by a single text in the volume of inspiration. But this immortal soul theory has compelled its advocates to adopt the mystical system of explanation, which has led thinking minds to the conclusion that there is nothing *rational* in the Book professing to be a revelation. The consequence has been a grievous departure of many men, of investigating minds, into what is called "*Rationalism*." From that position, Christianity, as it is *doctrinally* maintained by the immortal soul advocates, cannot reclaim them; so Christ and his teaching must be abandoned for "*PLATO!*" Not till this "old heathen" has done his delusive work can immortal soul christianity be made to bear on a man of mind and fit him for the mystical system of "*spiritualism*," which from the Bible *alone* can never be taught, because not there. There is indeed a Bible "*spiritualism*;" but it is just as different from the *Platonistic christianity* as a *resurrection* from the dead is different from an immortal soul. But we give our readers Mr. Stevens' remarks and leave them to make their own conclusions. He says:—

"I showed in my last that a great change came over the theological mind of Germany under the influence of Schleiermacher. He was led back from German scepticism by the help of an old heathen—this is one of the strange facts above alluded to. Plato made Schleiermacher ashamed of the crude, materialistic, heartless unbelief of Rationalistic theologians around him. Plato has

always had a similar influence in the Church. Some of the 'Fathers' believed that many christian truths had been revealed to him by inspiration. A Platonist in philosophy, Schleiermacher soon was in a mood to receive the purer spiritualism of Christianity itself. He published Plato, and began to preach Christ. His students felt his influence. A corps of excellent scholars and really spiritual men rose up around him; yet while he sent forth from his lecture-room the great and good Neander, who at his Christian baptism renounced his old Jewish name, (for he was a Jew,) and assumed the Greek one of Neander, (the 'new man,') Strauss also, the champion of the Mythic theory of Christianity, went forth from it—so uncertain is the influence of what is called philosophy. Strauss was an exception, however, to the great Platonist's usefulness."

J. P. M. PECK in forwarding money for the EXAMINER, from Oswego, N. Y., writes as follows; which, to us, is of so much interest that we will excuse us for giving it to our readers.

"One of our most faithful and close readers of the Bible, and believers in the doctrine your EXAMINER advocates, has lately fallen asleep in death. It was Judge HART of this place: an old resident, and formerly a Judge. He has purchased, through others, many of your works on the sleep of the dead and destruction of the wicked, and scattered them among his friends. He died suddenly, the 30th of Nov.; in perfect health, while reading your EXAMINER. Some have said, that God's displeasure was manifested in this manner, because of the evil tendency of your paper, &c. The Judge had no fears in that direction. Instead of the Angel of death smiting him, I suppose it was apoplexy. It would have done you good to have conversed with him, as he was a man, every inch of him, and possessed a good memory, a good mind, and a good reasoning faculty, with much candor. We, and you, have lost a good friend."

NOTE BY EDITOR.—The manner or mode of a man's death is no evidence for or against him, usually. Some who have been most esteemed in the churches have been instantly killed or fallen down dead, without a moment's warning. Ministers have done this when in their pulpits. The idea that it is a special judgment of God has no better foundation than any other superstition; and the person who suggests it shows himself a narrow minded bigot, who has little or no understanding of the moral government of God. Job's friends were just such men; and JENOVAH rebuked them, and sent them back to Job for that afflicted man to pray for them. May the Lord show such bigots their folly.

Books Published at this Office.

1. "BIBLE VS. TRADITION, in which the True Teachings of the Bible is Manifested, the Corruptions of Theologians Detected, and the Traditions of Men Exposed."

This work contains 312 pages, neatly bound, and is the most full exhibition of the whole subject relating to man's constitution, nature, and destiny, of anything that has appeared. Those who wish to possess one of the best helps to the understanding of Scripture language should have a copy of the work. Price 75 cents.

2. SIX SERMONS on the Inquiry, Is there Immortality in Sin and Suffering? Also, a Sermon on Christ The Life-Giver, or the Faith of the Gospel, by GEO. STORRS, Editor of the Bible Examiner." To which is prefixed a Portrait of the Author, from a steel plate engraving, and likewise "A Biographical Sketch," or brief notice of him. The price, in neat and good binding, is 63 cents; full bound in gilt, \$1.

3. "THE DISCUSSION of the Question,—'Does the Bible teach that the Creature Man—which the Lord God formed of the dust of the ground—has a superadded entity called the soul?'—between PROF. H. MATTISON, of the Methodist E. Church, and GEO. STORRS, Editor of the Bible Examiner," with the "CONCLUSION," in a Pamphlet, 166 pages, 12mo. Price, in paper covers, 25 cents. On extra paper and bound in muslin, 50 cents.

4. "UNITY OF MAN; or, A Reply to Rev. Luther Lee," on the immortality question, "by Anthropolos." 120 pages, 18mo. Price 12 cents; \$7 by the 100.

5. THE ORIGINAL "SIX SERMONS," 18mo., including the tract on the "Rich Man and Lazarus," the whole making 96 pages. We have issued a small edition of these in pamphlet, and reduced the price to 12 cents: \$7 by the 100.

The foregoing works are the only ones we have on hand, published by ourself. None of our other works—which we had previous to the fire in Feb. last—have been republished, and we cannot supply them if called for. We make this explicit statement that none need trouble themselves or us by sending for what we cannot furnish. Any of the foregoing works will be sent free of postage to those who send us the retail price, when sent within 3000 miles. One-third discount will be made when \$3 worth are taken at once: in that case they are sent at the expense of the purchaser. A few works we have "on sale" we will give a list of in a short time.

Is there Positive Testimony that the Wicked Dead will be made Alive?

H. Grew's Fifth Rejoinder to Respondent.

Dear Br. Storrs:—A very few remarks shall close what I have to offer on the first question.

1. Respondent's admission "that the wicked dead will have a resurrection 'in some sense,'" certainly nullifies one of his main proofs: Isa. 26 : 14, "They shall not rise." Indeed it appears to me to be, *substantially*, a renunciation of his theory. He will, I presume, admit that it will be a "resurrection (to) *condemnation*," to which it appears common sense requires us to attach life or consciousness.

2. I submit, dear brother, that I *proved* from our Lord's testimony respecting the few and many stripes, and other passages, teaching that men are to receive hereafter according to the deeds done in the body, that "divine justice requires a resurrection to temporary life," &c., and that I have not merely "*assumed*" it.

3. Permit me to ask, if the declaration concerning a certain class of men, that they "shall not be hurt of the second death," does not imply that the opposite class will be "hurt" or "*suffer*," by it? Rev. 2 : 11.

4. Far be it that I should hang upon Rev. 20 : 5, if it is "spurious." The 12th verse stands in a connection which appears to prove the same as verse 5 seems to imply.

5. Truly Respondent remarks, the question is what God will "do with *the entire man*" hereafter; but the question at issue is, do not our Lord's words, "Fear him, which *after* he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell," Luke 12 : 5, clearly teach that wicked men have something to fear *after* the first death? Can they not be "hurt by the second death?" Rev. 2 : 11. Does not Matt. 13 : 42, teach that when, "after he hath killed," Luke 12 : 5, he casts into hell, that "there shall be *wailing*," &c., which certainly implies *life*?

6. I freely admit that the infliction of punishment which justice requires is connected with the moral order of the universe and is for the general good. The question is, can it be proved that "the second death" with its attendant suffering, is not of this character?

QUESTION II. "IS THERE TESTIMONY AS TO THE MEANS OR POWER BY WHICH THEY (they wicked dead,) ARE TO RECEIVE LIFE?"

I answer in the affirmative.

1. We have the testimony of "the faithful Witnesses," that they "shall hear his voice and come forth—to the resurrection of condemnation." John 5 : 28, 29. You see, my brother, my sword is a

two-edged one. As the Spirit of God is given to his Son without measure, John 3 : 34; his voice, in this case, is the same as the Spirit or power of God.

2. If Rom. 8 : 11, was the only passage relating to the subject of the resurrection, it might indeed be improper to allow a resurrection "both of the just and the unjust." Respondent's own rule of interpretation requires him to compare and harmonize the passage with others relating to the same subject. The indwelling of the Spirit may be a *special* evidence to the saints of their resurrection, in perfect consistency with the fact that the wicked also will be quickened by the power of God. Respondent admits that the passage does not disprove their resurrection in some sense.

QUESTION III. "IF THE WICKED DEAD ARE MADE ALIVE, BY WHAT MEANS IS THAT LIFE SUSTAINED DURING THE JUDGMENT, OR ANY PERIOD ALLOTTED TO TORMENT AFTER?"

"This is a question that it will take a little 'common sense' to solve," Respondent observes. Precious little common sense, brother, is required to solve all difficulties which may be supposed to attend the subject. Infinite wisdom and power can easily furnish the means.

Truly yours,

HENRY GREW.

Response to H. Grew's Fifth Rejoinder.

"1." We do not perceive how our "admission," that the wicked dead will have a resurrection, *in some sense*, "nullifies one of" our "main proofs," *viz* : "Isa. 26 : 14," for that text not only saith, "They shall not rise," but it explicitly declares, "They are dead, they shall not live:" and the language is used in *contrast* with the Lord's people, of whom it is said, verse 19, "They dead men shall live," &c.

The "*sense*," in which the wicked dead may have a resurrection, we may illustrate by a remark in one of our city papers, on the late trial of BAKER for the murder of POOLE. The latter's character had been made a subject of investigation during the trial, by Baker's counsel. The city paper thus speaks:—

"The censure of the Judge upon the prisoner's counsel, for stripping the shroud as it were from the *dead Poole*, or rather for *recalling him to life such as he actually had been while among us*, appears to us to have been entirely unjust and uncalled for."

This remark shows that the idea of "a resurrection in *some sense*," short of actual *life*, is an admissible one; and until there is *positive* evidence

to the contrary—which we have not yet seen in this discussion—we must repeat what we said at the outset, we *doubt* if the wicked dead will ever have a revival into *actual life*. In the sense in which “the dead Poole” had a “recalling to life,” we see no objection to admitting their resurrection.

“2.” If Br. Grew has “*proved*” that the “few” or “many stripes” are to be received *after* the resurrection, we must have overlooked it. See our remarks again on this point, Vol. 10, pp. 331–2. What men will receive “*hereafter*” proves nothing, unless it is shown to be *after* death and in another life.

“3.” As Br. G. can find no “second death” spoken of except in the *Apocalypse*, we are willing he should have the full benefit of that reference. The reader may look at our remarks on this phrase, Vol. 10, pp. 301, 331. We may add now, that we regard the expression, at the most, as no more than our Lord’s assurance, Luke 20 : 36, that “they who are accounted worthy to attain that world, even a resurrection from the dead,” &c., “*Neither can they die ANY MORE,*” &c. The subjects of the resurrection, into actual life, are “immortal, incorruptible;” so saith our Lord, and so saith Paul, 1 Corth. 15. No man, that we can find, is to experience a second death in the sense of being *twice* deprived of life. Neither the *law* nor the *gospel* has announced any such *penalty*, that we see.

“4.” The “12th verse,” is a different matter entirely; but we cannot dwell upon it now, except to say, it is “*the dead*” that are spoken of, and who are judged as *dead*, and not alive. But we pass it for the present.

“5.” Br. G.’s reference to Matt. 13 : 42, does not help the *affirmative*, in our mind, at all; for nothing is there said of *the dead*; it is those wicked persons who are alive at the “end of the age.” The subject has no connection with Lk. 12 : 5, nor Rev. 2 : 11, in our judgment. On Luke 12 : 5, we beg the reader to look again at our remarks, Vol. 10, pp. 300, 331–2. The wicked who “*wail*” are *alive*, of course; but that has nothing to do with those who have died previous to the time spoken of.

“6.” “The question is,” Has God said He will make the wicked dead *alive*, and kill them again? Is that the *penalty* of any *revealed law*? If not, we may rest assured “justice requires” no such course, and “moral order” could not be promoted by it. So it seems to us.

RESPONSE TO II. GREW ON QUESTION 2.

“1.” Br. G. thinks his “sword is a *two-edged*

one.” But one edge has no “*life*” to it. The “good, to the resurrection of *life*,” but there is *no life*, on the other “edge” of the “sword,” for those who have “done evil”—“*condemnation*” is the extent of that edge of his sword. No *life* then, only by *inference*; the truth of which inference, we judge, should be established by at least some plain and positive testimony.

“2.” We supposed Br. G. would have to admit the wicked dead are to be made alive, if at all, by the *Spirit* of God : no other view can be taken, as we can see. But Rom. 8 : 11 is a plain, and, to our mind, unequivocal statement of the fact, that the resurrection from the dead to *life* is the *peculiar* and *exclusive privilege* of those who “*are led by the Spirit.*” We will now examine this text with its connection.

At the outset, let it be remembered, there were two principal classes of teachers among the Jews—the Pharisees and the Sadducees. The latter maintained that *death* was an *eternal cessation of life* to all the race, good and evil. The Pharisees maintained a *rē-embodiment*, in some form, which they called a resurrection. Paul was converted from among the Pharisees; he well knew that the Sadducees held death to be cessation of life to all, without a revival. With this knowledge Paul saith in Rom. 8, “If ye live after the flesh *ye shall die.*” We perceive no reason for supposing that Paul used this language in any other sense than that understood by the Sadducees; and this is the more probable from the fact that he adds, “But if ye through the *Spirit* do mortify the deeds of the body *ye shall live.*” Thus he seems to maintain the Sadducee doctrine in relation to all those who are governed by their animal nature, or who live after the flesh; while he affirms a living from the dead of those who come under the government of the *Spirit*; thus far agreeing with the Pharisees: hence his position, “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.”

That the apostle makes the *quickenings* by the *Spirit* to depend on its indwelling, seems perfectly evident; and it seems equally evident, if the person had lived after the flesh he would not be a subject of this quickening. To avoid the conclusion, Br. G. says, “The indwelling of the *Spirit* may be a *special evidence* to the saints of their resurrection.” How can that be a “*special evidence*” when *all* are *equally* sure of being made alive by the same *Spirit*?

This, taken in connection with the same apostle's saying, that he labored and suffered for Christ, "if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead," or "out from among the dead," Phil. 3: 11, seems to put it beyond a reasonable doubt, that Paul believed in the doctrine of the Sadducees, so far as the incorrigibly wicked are concerned; and hence regarded the re-enslaving from the dead as a *conditional Gospel benefit*, or *privilege*, to be obtained only by self-denial, and being "led by the Spirit of God," thus becoming "the sons of God" and "joint heirs with Christ" in the *quickening* into life by the same Spirit "that raised up Christ from the dead." But we may speak more fully on this point when the *fifth* question is up for discussion.

RESPONSE TO H. GREW ON THIRD QUESTION.

"Infinite wisdom and power can easily furnish the means," says our brother; and why not add, "infinite" *goodness* will not suffer them to go *hungry and starve*? Then it might have been said, "the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance;" and so Bishop NEWTON'S supposition, of "repentance in hell," leading to heaven, might not be an improbable conjecture. Our "common sense" must be "*precious little*," if such a response, to the 3d question would satisfy it. But we wish not to press the question. We were aware that the statement of it would open some eyes, without arguing at all.

The way is now prepared, we believe, for *Question 4*, viz: "Do the Scriptures *distinctly* teach that any who are made alive by a resurrection, at the last day, are *mortal*?" We wait for the affirmative.

OUR FRIENDS AND PATRONS.

We have thought best to give, at the opening of the new year, a few specimens of the language and feelings of our Patrons. We do not in general, think best to deal largely, in the EXAMINER, with the kind expressions of our friends; which, while they are comforting to us personally, may not be so interesting to general readers. Some of the following, however, must be interesting to all.

From A. G. Merwin, Suffolk Co., N. Y.

BR. STORRS.—I am not yet ready to say "farewell" either to the EXAMINER or its Editor, though they may hold for truth what I honestly believe is error; and for this reason, if no other, that the pages of the EXAMINER are open to free discussion. Not such free discussion as dare not overstep the line of a certain creed, but freedom that will ex-

clude no honest man who sincerely desires the truth.

It is surprising that those who advocate discussion as a means of arriving at truth, should find cause for censure when they meet with opinions at variance with their own. This variance is a necessary consequence, of allowing discussion at all. And if your paper is open to one side of a question and closed to the other, for any thing that I can see, you have nothing to boast over the most sectarian print of the country; even though you do not carry exclusion to the same extent, you admit the principle: give one side a hearing and deny it to the other.

Had you presented your views of the resurrection and refused to open the EXAMINER to us who believe that the whole, or a part of the wicked will live again, then there might have been good reason to say "farewell;" but, it is not so; you have allowed your opponents the same freedom you have taken yourself; and if others wish to be heard I believe they need not fear an exclusion. It is indeed to be regretted that we cannot all, at once, step into the full blaze of truth, but the *fact* is unquestionable—we cannot. Yet so long as all can speak, I see no cause of complaint. On the contrary, a paper open to free discussion is just what we cannot do without. If I will not have the EXAMINER because you believe there is 'no life out of Christ, I in effect say, "you must believe as I do;" and I act upon the same sectarian principle that lead the Catholics to torture and burn heretics—the Puritans to hang and banish Quakers, and that leads sectarians of the present day to cast odium on those who dare to oppose their errors.

"But it is loading our system with a weight it is poorly qualified to bear,"—"what will people say now?"—"denying the resurrection of almost all the human race!" "Just as we expected—the next step will be avowed infidelity!" Surely, "now we know thou hast a devil!"—"we suspected it long ago,"—"and what shall we say for ourselves now?"

I shall say, both sides are presented: and on either many new thoughts; and it is not my business to enquire what people say, but *what is truth?* I am, individually, responsible to God; and the united voice of all the world cannot remove that responsibility. With me it is an axiom, that truth only can benefit me or the world. Truth can only be gained by discussion where error previously exists; and if we have discussion, I must have no opinion at all, or else meet with

those at variance with my own. I see no half-way ground between free discussion and exclusive sectarianism.

I do not know that it will interest you to tell the effect the discussion of the resurrection question has had upon my mind. Still I cannot refrain from expressing the unfeigned pleasure I have felt in observing the spirit of love—of Christ—which seems to spring spontaneously from the heart of each. It has been no religious quarrel, but a contention for the truth in love: not to see who shall utter the most cutting sayings, and gain the most applause; but to learn whose opinion is supported by the word of truth.

There is hope yet. The bond of union is not in opinions, but in love. Surely, if we would learn, the experience of the past eighteen centuries is sufficient to teach us that the cause of Christ can be forwarded by no union the bond of which is not love. The Catholic church was a union cemented and maintained by a *creed*; and the history of its horrors needs no comment; all because they were united in the bonds of *opinion*; and the same may be said of all the reformed churches. At the first they were united in love; but soon they neglected the *true bond* and substituted a *creed*. While secular prosperity has resulted, a universal consequence has been, an almost entire neglect of love to God and to one another. Indeed, it appears to me that the very moment a church organization is formed, on the basis of similarity in religious opinions, the seeds of irreligion are sown; and sooner or later they will spring up and bear much fruit. For if the organization is cemented by opinion, love is not necessarily an element. It is true, love may exist in such an organization; but it holds a secondary place; it is not essential—it is not the vital principle; and without it organizations, claiming to be christian, have been sufficiently powerful to control the destinies of nations.

Thus where opinion is the bond of union, love may or may not exist, and in so far as it does not exist, all will agree, that pure religion is absent. I think the present tendency among us is toward an organization on other principles than that of love; and the plea is surely plausible. "It will render our efforts more effectual." So it has rendered the efforts of Mahomedans, Catholics, Mormons, and all sectarians effectual; but not for good, except where love held a controlling influence. Exclude it, and organization can only produce evil. Let us be united *in love*, and let that love flow out to God and to all his creatures, and

our influence must, it *will* be felt. Love moved the Almighty—it moved our Saviour; and if men will not be moved by the truth, *in love*, their case is hopeless. And in my view, if love will not serve as a sufficient bond of organization, among christians, they had better be *dis-organized* to the end of time.

No, I cannot say "*farewell*." Why should I? If love is the current, we may all move on in union, though difference of opinion produce many an eddy on the surface. Let us have *no test* but *love*: no union without love as the bond: and, though we do not become an *influential sect*, we shall have the friendship of the great God our Father, which is infinitely better than all worldly renown.

Yours in the Bonds of Love.

—
From Randolph E. Ladd.

Springfield, Mass., Dec. 1855.

BR. STORRS.—I am determined—under whatever discouragement I may be laboring, and at whatever sacrifice within my power to overcome—to sustain the BIBLE EXAMINER in any way that it may be deemed best to conduct it—monthly, semi-monthly, or weekly; though it would please me best to be the last. I do welcome its pleasant and truthful face like that of an old friend. I love its kind spirit; and approve most heartily the courtesy with which discussions are usually conducted in its columns. The manly defence of the "Faith once delivered to the saints," amid the cloud of error and folly extant, is truly refreshing to the christian's heart. You may count on my support to the extent of my ability while time continues or I live.

I am greatly indebted to your labors (under God's blessing) for the present joyful looking for of Everlasting Life through Jesus Christ our Lord. The Six Sermons, kindly given me by you in Oct., 1842, completely revolutionized my faith; and comparing that work with the Scriptures of Truth, together with the BIBLE EXAMINER, and other kindred works, since received, convinced me beyond a doubt of man's *entire mortality*; and that his *only* hope for a future life was by a resurrection from the grave.

Thanks be to God that I ever saw you and your writings. My means are limited, but what I can spare I shall devote to the spread of these glorious truths, *viz*: The near coming of the Everlasting Kingdom and its rightful King—the resurrection of the dead in Christ, at his second coming—and no future life but by a resurrection.

I will not bid you "*farewell*" as one of your

patrons has done, because you have admitted into your columns the discussion of the non-resurrection of the wicked. I am examining the subject without prejudice, and with an earnest desire to know what the *Scriptures* teach, and whatever that is, I will most devoutly believe. My views have always been in the affirmative of that question, but I am prepared and desire to change if I have been wrong. May the good Spirit direct the hearts and pens of the brethren engaged in that discussion to its conclusion. I am deeply interested in it, and am surprised at the amount of evidence presented in opposition to my belief. I promise you *one* new subscriber at least for the sister who has bid you *farewell*. —

From the "Sister in Christ."

Our subscribers of last year will recollect several extracts of letters from a young lady who had recently embraced the *Life* views. We gave them without her name, from "A Sister in Christ." She now comes forward with the nobleness and self-sacrifice which may well put us, *old* believers, to shame for our want of zeal in spreading the truth of "*Life and Immortality through Christ*." Read the following letter from her, received Dec. 15th.

"Dear Brother Storrs.—I suppose I ought to have sent you my name for the *EXAMINER* before, and probably should have, but I was not fully settled what to do; but now I have made up my mind, that you may put my name down for *thirty* copies of the volume for 1856, if for thirty dollars you will send them where I shall desire; but you must trust me; and depend on my health and ability to work for security; that holding good, I will promise to pay a third before the first of January; a third in three months and the other third in six months. If I should get many to whom I send the papers to pay for them, I will also pay you for your extra expense in sending them to different places. If my prospects were not better than they were last year, at this time, I could not take the responsibility of such a debt; but, thank the Lord, they are; and I can pay you with ease if nothing unseen arises. I presume I could get a large number of subscribers here, but that would not fulfill my design; I wish to send the light to those who are strangers to "the Faith once delivered to the saints." I will remit the first payment as soon as I know you accept my proposal.

Yours in Christian love."

Certainly we "accept" her "*proposal*," and only wish it was in our power to *give* her *without* charge all the papers she is disposed to scatter; but, alas, our funds are all exhausted, and we have been compelled to "*receive*" instead of *giving* for the last ten or twelve years. We gave by hundreds or thousands while we had it, and we shall still do all we can. This dear sister makes

us feel ashamed that we have done so little. Depending on her personal efforts—*labor and health*—she takes hold in earnest. Verily, she seems to be doing more than *we* "*all*." Some, "of their *abundance*," have done much; but rare are the cases of such effort as that presented by this sister. May the Lord abundantly bless and prosper her, and bring her to *Life Eternal* through Jesus, our *Life-Giver* and Lord.

P. S. Since the foregoing remarks were written this sister has sent us \$15, or *one half* the amount for 30 subscribers.

From Wm. B. Wade, Oswego, Ind.

Br. Storrs.—As the time has come for me to renew my subscription for your valuable paper, I herewith enclose two dollars for 24 numbers for 1856; and you will send me "*Bible vs. Tradition*." I consider that the very best work I have seen on the subject of our faith; as it covers the whole ground of difference between us and the (so called, orthodox) sects; and I do not see how any man can evade or set aside the arguments adduced in that work. There is more divinity, more real Bible truth in that one book than there is in a whole library of many of our Reverend D.D.'s.

The cause is slowly progressing here, although we have very little preaching on the truths that we cherish. Brother CHAPLIN visits us occasionally. The brethren here are well united, and generally intelligent, and well able to defend the truth against the traditions and errors of the age. The preachers of the different sects can traduce us behind our backs—can ridicule our views in their pulpits—but there are very few of them that are willing with their Bibles in their hands, to meet us in open and manly discussion on any of the points on which we differ. I feel encouraged, and believe the truth will ultimately prevail. I can already see a different tone in the preaching of the different sects. We do not hear near as much about fire and brimstone as we used to hear from their pulpits; although their faith may be the same, they are much more cautious how they express it.

I hope your paper will be sustained. It was never more needed than at this time; and I think if the brethren would all do their duty it might well be sustained if it were published *weekly*; which would be very desirable. If it could be so, I will do what I can to obtain subscribers. If every old subscriber would obtain one new one you would have a respectable list. Can it not be done? I will try; will not all others do the same?

From M. C. Allen, Black Rock.

Br. Storrs.—I have read carefully the discussion in the EXAMINER for, and against the wicked dead being raised again to *life*; and while doing so, have endeavored to ascertain more clearly, what the Scriptures say on this subject; although, perhaps, not sufficiently to express an opinion, which as yet I cannot hold, as not being by further scrutiny, subject to change. At present I am inclined in part, to indorse your sentiments expressed in the Oct. 15th number of the EXAMINER, relating to the dispensations prior to our Savior's advent. Previous to the proclamation of the gospel, we find in the Old Testament, that to those who adhered to and obeyed God's laws, were promised temporal blessings; and those who transgressed, were threatened with their deprivation; and we find those promises and threatenings were fulfilled. After the establishment of the gospel dispensation, we read no special promises or threatenings regarding the giving, or withholding worldly blessings; but attention is directed to the future life. When I come to the gospel dispensation, I find, as I peruse the New Testament, that my reason and judgment, indorses Br. GREW's opinion expressed in the EXAMINER. And, I do understand from its contents, that for those who *hear* the gospel, whether they obey or not, there awaits "a resurrection of the just and unjust." What is the "sorer punishment," Heb. 10: 29?

I regret you do not find sufficient encouragement to publish the EXAMINER *weekly*.

From Prof. J. F. Huber, Conn.

Br. Storrs.—I should like, of course, if you could publish the EXAMINER *weekly*; but certainly you ought not to be required to labor for naught, or to make brick without mortar. I feel ashamed and grieved that so many professing to believe and love the doctrines so luminously set forth and defended in the EXAMINER, yet are so unwilling to contribute the least towards the support of your excellent paper; while they are not at all scrupulous to spend lavishly for that which is not bread.

The Lord bless, comfort and sustain you, and your dear family—direct and aid you in all your christian labors and efforts; and finally bring you to the enjoyment of Eternal Life, through Christ our blessed Savior.

From the aged Sister Catharine Colver, Mass.

Br. Storrs.—I thought I would send you a little money, thinking it will do you some good. I would send you more if I could; but the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof, so he that feeds the

revers can send ravens to feed his children; hence we need not fear if we trust in him. I wish I could get more subscribers. There is some talk of clubbing; but whether they will or not is rather doubtful. The work is the Lord's, and he can turn the hearts of men as the rivers are turned. There seems to be something moving in some minds; whether it is for good or for evil the Lord only knows; but, be that as it may, our course must be straight forward; whether cloudy or sun shining, it matters not; or if we travel all alone, it is all the same; we shall soon come to our resting place, where we shall rest in peace till Jesus comes to take us home. Is it not heart-cheering to think of the glory that will be revealed when Jesus comes with his heavenly host to take his children home? With what majesty will he command the grave to deliver up its victims. Then we shall sing, "Glory to God in the highest." Well did John say, "Come Lord Jesus, come quickly;" even so let it be. Yours, in hope of Eternal Life.

WHAT NEXT?

In the *Ch. Adv. and Jour.*, of the 29th inst., is a communication from "H. Mattison," of whose fame the readers of the EXAMINER have heard. The article commences thus:

"*Mr. Editor.*—I perceive by a late number of the Advocate, that our mutual friend, sister Palmer, is reviving her theory of sanctification. With this, certainly, I am well pleased; as nothing could be more necessary, unless it were that she leave the subject, with theology in general, where it properly belongs,—in the pulpits of the M. E. Church, and with the authorized teachers of religion."

The writer concludes his piece with what he terms, "a few pertinent questions;" the fourth one begins as follows:

"Would it not be as well for the Church for our sister to leave the teaching of Christ's flock where God has left it—with the CHRISTIAN MINISTRY?"

I would like to inquire of the EDITOR of the BIBLE EXAMINER, what warrant there is in the New Testament for the proscriptive counsel volunteered in the foregoing extracts. Surely it will not be claimed that the Scriptures so much as mention "The M. E. Church," or its "pulpits," though I can readily believe that the *priestly assumptions* put forth by Prof. Mattison have their origin in "the mystery of iniquity," of which the Apostle Paul speaks. If we have not in the few sentences here cited a development of *Protestant Papacy*, I fail to see any meaning in them. How does it strike you, Br. STORRS? *Who are the*

"authorized teachers" of "Christ's flock?" Amid the jargon and conflicting sentiments of the various sectarian parties all about us, it is important to know the truth on this point. Give us the light you have, and oblige,

Nov. 30, 1855.

QUERIST.

Dec. 14. BR. STORRS:—The foregoing, as its date shows, was written a fortnight ago, I omitted to send it, thinking the Prof.'s remarkable claims in behalf of "authorized teachers" might have attracted your eye, and that possibly you would give them some Editorial attention. Number 24 of the Examiner comes, however, without any allusion to the matter. Still, I am glad I deferred sending what I had written, for now I am able to shield myself, in the view I have taken of Prof. M.'s language, under the indorsement of a distinguished Methodist preacher. In the *Nor. Ch. Adv.* of the 12th inst., which I have just received, Dr. ELIAS BOWEN calls attention to "the attack of Rev. Mr. Mattison upon Mrs. Dr. Palmer in the *Christian Advocate & Journal*," and mentions some things in the article which he "particularly disliked." He expresses the opinion that Mr. Mattison "wrested her [Mrs. P.'s] language, putting a construction upon it which misrepresented the sentiment of the author." Then—after charging Prof. M. with "treating with* contemptuous rudeness a respectable and pious lady"—Dr. B. rebukes in the following manner the language your "*Querist*" has quoted from the Professor:

"But what chiefly concerns me to notice in the article of Mr. Mattison is, that he should base his orthodoxy upon the consideration of *rank* or *order*. It would seem from the drift and tenor of his article that the teaching of a woman is not only out of place, but, of necessity, *erroneous* likewise; and that while it belongs *exclusively* to the *regular* ministry to give instruction, they only are capable of teaching the truth.

And has it come to this, in the *Methodist Episcopal Church*, that nothing 'irregular,' nothing 'uncanonical,' nothing out of 'the succession' is to be tolerated?—Such doctrine might be well suited to the meridian of judaism, of popery, of high-churchism. But what then would have become of the Apostles? of Luther? of Wesley? If these should hold their peace, the stones would cry out: Lifeless formality, and heartless despotism, are always very *canonical* in their doings.

The crisis may have come in our history, when the Head of the Church sees it necessary to 'forbid the madness of the prophets,' if not by the mouth of an ass, yet by the mouth of a woman."

If Dr. B.'s strictures fail to open the Prof.'s eyes, I would recommend that he read with care

* The italicising is Dr. B.'s.

the extracts you are giving from Dr. McCulloh in the EXAMINER.

Yours, believing in the right of all men to obey the injunctions of our Lord and the Apostle. "Search the Scriptures,"—"Prove all things."

RUFUS WENDELL.

In addition to what Br. WENDELL has said, it may be interesting to some of our readers to know, that while we were refused even a temperate reply in the *Christian Advocate*, last year, to Prof. M.'s scandalous and unprincipled misrepresentations, of us and our position, he is now being handled rather unceremoniously in that paper for his recent attacks on a pious Sister of the Methodist E. Church. In a late number of the *Advocate* a writer concludes an article on this redoubtable personage as follows:—

"As the gallant professor has condescended to make some unkind personal allusions, we trust he will take it kindly if we inform him that there are a host of his brethren who think his own position for the last few years has been a false one. He stands in his own conference a superannuated man. That is, one who is so far worn out as not to be able to take any work from the conference. This is his relation. Is it a true one? Is he so completely enfeebled as not to be able to do any work? Nay; he can fill a laborious station, build a church, dedicate churches, make numerous addresses, edit books, and also pursue, with a bitter pen, a plain little sister, who is trying to love the Lord with all her heart, and persuade others to do likewise.* This last employment indicates that his gallantry (if he ever had any) is superannuated, but in every other respect he seems to be a man who is able to take an effective relation in his conference, instead of standing as a worn-out old man in the Black River region, when he can do the work of two or three men in New York city. This course has been regarded as dangerous in its tendency, and hence the New York Conference at its last session passed a resolution requesting the bishop to put a stop to this kind of procedure. The resolution, however, was not regarded, and so the learned professor remains, but has given his promise (I am told) to return to his conference next year, if his brethren would leave him in his present (false position) one year more. We mention these things to let the world know who this accuser of the sister is."

* With what a "bitter pen" and tongue has he, also, pursued us; and, as we learn, while this "superannuated" Preacher is traveling far and near, he still carries on the work of misrepresenting us and our views, and striving to make some believe we were expelled from the M. E. Church! "The Lord rebuke thee."—ED. EX.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. XI.

NEW YORK, JANUARY 15, 1856.

NO. 2.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 141 Fulton-street.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year :

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

Prayer of Jesus on the Cross.

Then said Jesus, Father, forgive them ; for they know not what they do.—*Luke xxiii, 34.*

WE have just done contemplating the agony of Jesus in the garden, and those "prayers and supplications, with strong cryings and tears," unto Him who alone was able to help. Consequent upon these, and, doubtless, in answer to them, there seems to have been a remission of his sufferings. But that remission was but temporary, only sufficient for the powers of nature to rally, and for faith and fortitude to acquire further needful strength. Such was the tenderness of the Redeemer's spirit ; such his keen sensibility to suffering, that had he not been favored with some alleviation, the lamp of life would, probably, have been extinguished ere the purposes of Infinite Wisdom had been accomplished.

That unknown and amazing agony ceased. But the tragical scenes of that eventful night went on ; each one contributing to, and urging forward, the momentous catastrophe which was to follow. Jesus is betrayed—mocked—arraigned—scourged—crowned with thorns, and condemned to the death of the cross.

To that cross he is, at length, nailed ; and there, on the accursed tree, the Savior of the world now hangs. * * *

While the measure of his sufferings was fast filling up, and it would seem impossible that he should not be wholly absorbed in his own intense pangs, his eye fell upon one—she was a spectator of the scene ; she was poor—homeless—friendless—wretched—forlorn. For the moment, he forgot his own agony ; and, with all the tenderness and sympathy of an affectionate son, he commended her to the care and kindness of the "beloved disciple," who was also near. "Woman," said he, "behold thy son?" "Disciple, behold thy mother!"

When or where, in the annals of filial love, was there a parallel to this? And, yet, in that bosom whence proceeded that filial love, there was a deeper, holier current ; a tide flowing forth, and having for its object those who were now mocking his agonies, and thirsting for his blood. "Father!" said he—though that Father's face was hid from him, and he might no longer pray for himself, nor

for a mitigation of his own personal sufferings—yet he might pray for his murderers—for the mockers of his pangs—and he does pray : "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

Hark, how he prays ! The charming sound
Dwells on his dying lips,
And every groan and gaping wound
Cries : "Father ! let the rebels live !"

The "Evangelical Prophet" had, seven hundred years before, foretold that he would "make intercession for the transgressors," (*Isa. 53 : 12 ;*) and here that prophecy is fulfilled. He had himself inculcated the love of enemies—the forgiveness of injuries—and prayer for those who should despitefully use and persecute ; and the rule which he had prescribed for others, he now illustrates by his own noble and sublime example.

The question has been raised : Whom did Jesus embrace in his supplication for forgiveness? Two distinct classes were necessary to his crucifixion—Romans and Jews. The former were the immediate agents ; the latter, the instigators. Both, however, were ignorant of the enormity of their guilt. Paul says, "that had they known it, they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory." This ignorance Jesus urges as a *reason* why God should pardon them. In respect to the Romans, they were really ignorant that he was the Son of God ; nor had they, perhaps, any means of distinguishing between him and the malefactors who were crucified with him. But the Jews were better informed ; at least, they knew that he was *innocent*, and they might have learned his true character. The prejudices, under the influence of which they regarded him, had the effect to render them incapable of fairly estimating the evidence which he adduced, that he was the true Son of God. They were, therefore, guilty, especially the rulers, who were better situated to inform themselves as to his true character. All, indeed, might have arrived at the truth—for the light shone bright and glorious, but they loved darkness better than light, because their deeds were evil.

It was, however, a time of love and compassion when Jesus was on the cross. It was right that this "morn of mercy" should be signalized by the voice of prayer, ascending from Him who was expiating human guilt. It was a glorious act—thus to antedate, if we may so speak—the application of his blood, to wash out the deep moral stains of those who were about to shed it. It was a pledge and presage of the efficacy of the atoning work of Jesus. If he could ask blessings on the heads of murderers amid the agonies of crucifixion—how might he not be supposed to intercede when the bitterness of death should have passed, and the

glorious work of expiation should have been accomplished!

To the men of the world, such kindness and compassion may seem inexplicable. They are governed by no such motives: are influenced by no such love; can feel no such duty. But here they may learn, from the example of Jesus, what his religion inculcates. Is it difficult so to act? That may well be granted. It is difficult. To bear reproaches and persecutions with patience; to bless those who are seeking our ruin; and, more than all, to pray in kindness and sincerity for them, is difficult. But Jesus did it: Stephen did it: Paul did it; and thousands, governed by the same love, have thus honored the sublime and glorious inculcations of the gospel.

What a different world had this proved, had the example of Jesus been strictly followed, since he presented it on the cross! Ah! those fires of revenge—intense and consuming—had never burned; those persecutions—those murders—those midnight assassinations, had never polluted the pages of our history. Those wars which have made wives widows, and children orphans, had never been waged. The walls of a thousand dungeons had not reverberated with the clanking of the chains of the incarcerated victims of revenge; nor had they started at their curses upon the guilty authors of their sufferings.

Well, disciples of Jesus! let the world pass on, and continue its revengeful fires, if it please. Let passion rage; let anger burn; but let us, taking a lesson from the precepts and example of Jesus—like him pity; like him pray; like him forgive. Is this difficult? Yes; difficult, but not impossible. By grace we can accomplish it: by grace we can do all duty and practice all self-denial. Let this prayer daily, hourly ascend to Him who has set a sublime and glorious example, and he will help us to follow it.

Make us, by thy transforming grace,
Dear Savior, daily more like thee!
Thy fair example may we trace,
To teach us what we ought to be!

Oh, how benevolent and kind!
How mild!—how ready to forgive!
Be this the temper of our mind,
And these the rules by which we live.

{Bible History of Prayer.

The Resurrection from the Dead Opposed to the Doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul.

(Continued from page 4.)

THE ANGELS WHICH KEPT NOT THEIR FIRST ESTATE, spoken of in Jude, we notice merely because it has been adduced in this controversy; though, as being evidently unconnected with it, that notice will be necessarily brief. "And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, he has reserved in everlasting chains, under darkness unto the judgment of the great day." (Verse 6.) We submit, that whatever opinions the phraseology of this passage may have given rise to, that of authorizing the doctrine of an intermediate state for the souls of

men, it is not chargeable with; for it speaks *not* of men, *not* of souls, *not* of a state of darkness for the souls of men; nor does it give the slightest countenance to Bishop Bull's general theory, that "the souls of all the wicked are presently after death in a state of very great misery, and yet dreading a far greater misery at the day of judgment."

From this passage we proceed to one in Peter, where mention is made of Christ as *preaching to the spirits in prison*. "By which also, he" (Jesus) "went and preached to the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient: when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing, wherein few, that is eight souls, were saved by water." (1 Peter iii. 19, 20.) From these verses it has been contended, that the apostle assumes an intermediate state of conscious existence; but in attending to this passage we have to remind our readers, that as it regards the term "spirits," we have already amply proved that it has not only various significations, but that in a connection like the present, the translator should most unequivocally have placed in its stead either the term "persons," or "minds," and then the true meaning of the apostle could not well have been controverted. We shall now proceed to the examination of the passage, by continuing the same principles of inquiry which we have previously adopted—that of looking at the connexion, and the general scope and object of the writer: from whence we feel confident of proving, that it gives no support to the doctrine of immaterial spirits, and that it has no reference to an intermediate, or indeed, to any state of *future* existence. Peter commences his letter by addressing it to the believers "scattered abroad;" exhorting them to withstand persecution, such being "the trial of their faith;" (which faith was "more precious than that of gold, which perisheth.") and as an example to them, the sufferings of Jesus are referred to, "that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit;" that is, raised from the dead by the spirit of God—"by the power of God." The same idea we find expressed by Paul, though in somewhat different language: "though he was crucified, yet he liveth by the power of God;" (2 Cor. xiii. 4.) by which (power or authority) "he went and preached unto the spirits," (persons) "in prison;" or in other language, to those whose "*minds*" were imprisoned; being in that state of darkness, which in the succeeding chapter is represented as one of death: "for the gospel was preached also to them that are dead;" (1 Peter iv. 1, &c.) that is, "dead in trespasses and sins." And thus, such persons—spirits—being morally and mentally in prison, to them Jesus, by preaching and proclaiming the gospel, broke their fetters, and released them from prison, in the sense in which moral delivery is spoken of in Isaiah. "The spirit of the Lord is upon me, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound." (Isa. lxi. 1.) So that an attention to the connection becomes essential, as also a correct understanding of the phraseology peculiar to the scriptures. This will be more fully seen in Isaiah's prophecy of

shall all—the righteous—be made alive; but every—righteous—man in his own order, or company.”

No. II.

“You know, Br. STORRS, how difficult it is to get Christians to examine the unpopular doctrine of annihilation, disconnected from any thing else that would prejudice the mind. How much more difficult, then, will it be, if it is understood that we hold, and especially that *you* hold and advocate the non-resurrection of the wicked. I tremble at what I think may be the results of this conduct in prejudicing the mind against the glorious doctrine of immortality through Jesus Christ alone. Perhaps I am more fearful for the results than I would be if I could believe the *doctrine*; and yet if I did believe it, it would not alter the facts in the case; for this doctrine must necessarily add much to the prejudices of those who do or do not investigate the subject of life and death. I know there are many very plausible arguments in favor of the view, and some passages of Scripture appear plainer, and have more force with this view; but after all that has been said and written, I firmly believe that the great preponderance of testimony and argument is decidedly in favor of the resurrection of all men. The apostle hath said—“For as in Adam ALL die,” [both the righteous and the wicked,] “even so in Christ shall ALL [righteous and wicked] “be made alive. But every man” [shall be made alive] “in” [or with] “his own order:” [here then is the order of the resurrection:] “Christ, the first fruits,” [was raised first] “afterward they that are Christ’s” [all true Christians] “at his coming.” This constitutes the first resurrection; “for the dead in Christ shall rise *first*:” “and blessed and holy is he that hath part in the *first* resurrection—in such the *second death* hath no power.” “Then cometh the end,” &c., when the wicked will be raised, or made alive under their own banner. To understand this Scripture differently is, it seems to me, to do violence to the language. This passage then, to say nothing about John 5 : 28, 29, furnishes, in my estimation, positive proof of the resurrection of all men; but add to this John 5 : 28, 29, and the many other passages of like import, and I cannot see how any man can, with such positive testimony, believe in the non-resurrection of the wicked. But I did not intend to argue the question, nor indeed to say half what I have, when I commenced.”

It will be seen, as we said, that these brethren take the same view of 1 Corth. 15 : 22; and if their view is the *true one* it settles the question: but from their view Br. Grew dissents. In this “dissent” Respondent agrees; and Br. G. and ourselves are united in the belief that Paul, in that discourse, saith not one word of the resurrection of the wicked dead: to suppose he does is to suppose he was a teacher of *universal salvation*, as it seems to us. Paul does teach that “*the dead*,” of whose resurrection he speaks in this chapter, are “*raised in incorruption*,” and “*in glory*:”—that

“*the dead*” spoken of, “*shall be raised incorruptible*,” and “*shall put on immortality*:” verses 42, 43, 52, 54. If then we admit verse 22 is proof “*positive*” of the resurrection of the *wicked dead*, the verses we have spoken of are equally “*positive proof*” of their rising in *glory, incorruptibility, and immortality*; and such is precisely the argument of Universalists.

Whether the wicked dead are made alive again or not, we have, for years, been settled in the belief that Paul was speaking *only* of the resurrection of those *in Christ* throughout 1 Corth. 15. If the wicked dead are referred to in that chapter, it is our opinion, it is in the 18th verse. We are not prepared to express a positive opinion on the term “*also*” in that verse. He based the doctrine of the resurrection on the fact that *Christ* rose from the dead, and thus makes the resurrection one of the *benefits or blessings* of Christ’s death and resurrection. To the wicked dead, we presume, our brethren will not contend being made *alive again* is a *benefit or blessing*.

The apostle establishes first, *the fact* of Christ’s resurrection by the testimony of witnesses who saw him *after* that event. He then asks—“How say some among you that there is *no* resurrection of *the dead*?” He affirms, “If there be *no* resurrection of *the dead*, then is Christ not risen.”—From this point he proceeds to enforce the fact of Christ’s resurrection, and to show the consequences of the contrary supposition, and says—“Then they *also* which are fallen asleep *in Christ* are *perished*.” The word “*also*,” in this verse, distinguished those who had “fallen asleep *in Christ*” from somebody else. It refers either to Christ himself, or to those *not in Christ*, *viz*: the *wicked dead*. We incline to the *opinion*, it refers to the wicked dead. If so, it amounts to a clear declaration of the apostle that the wicked dead *have “perished;”* and “if Christ be not raised, then they *also* which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished.” Such seems to be the sense of the apostle’s language. It shows that he regarded those who had died *out* of Christ as *hopelessly dead*: dead past revival into *life*, in any event; and those asleep *in Christ* equally *hopelessly dead*, *i. e.* *perished*, if Christ be not raised. He immediately adds—“If in this life only *we* have *hope* in Christ, we are of *all men* most miserable:” verse 19. The “*hope*” is in the resurrection. Is that hope to be realized by those “*in Christ*,” or are they “*also*” to perish as “*all*” those other “*men*” with whom the “*we*” are contrasted in verse 19? To settle this point Paul triumphantly adds—“But now is Christ risen

from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that *slept*." Who are "them that *slept*," of whom the apostle speaks? Clearly, to our mind, it is to them that "are fallen asleep *in Christ*:" v. 18.—Christ can by no means be said to be the "first-fruits" of the *wicked* dead: for the *first-fruits* must be in character and kind the same as the harvest, else it would not represent the harvest crop, which was the design of the first fruits. But Christ was neither in character nor kind the first-fruits of the wicked dead; and therefore his revival into life is *no pledge* of their revival: but "if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, *even so* them *also* that *sleep in Jesus* will God bring *with him*:" 1 Thess. 5: 14. If Christ rose from the dead to life, "them also that sleep in him" are sure of a revival into life; and those who dispute *their* resurrection are ignorant of the fact of Christ's revival from the dead, and deny it. "But now is Christ risen from the dead and become the first-fruits of them that slept; for since by man came death, by man also came the resurrection of the dead." What "dead?" Surely "the dead *in Christ*," of which he "became the first-fruits."—"For as *in Adam* all die, *even so in Christ* shall all be made alive."

Let the question now be candidly looked at—What is the import of the words "*even so*?"—How came men to die? Was it not by being *in Adam*? or, in consequence of a *union* with him? Truly, say you. Very well: then does not "*even so*" import a *union* with Christ in order to being "made alive?" So it seems to us; and the entire argument of the apostle seems to shut us up to this conclusion. As though he had said—"I have taught you that the resurrection, or revival into life, of those who have fallen asleep *in Christ*, depends on the revival of Christ; and now I further tell you as truly, and *even so*, as all are mortal, and die by having been *in Adam*, so *in Christ*, or *all in Christ*, shall just as certainly be made alive: Adam was no more effectual to bring *death* and *corruption* on all those *in him*, than Christ is to bring *life* and *incorruptibility* to all those *in him*. The one Adam brought death to *all in him*: the other Adam, *even so*, brings life to *all in him*."

Such we regard as the true teaching of 1 Cor. 15: 22; and the apostle carries on this contrast to the close of the chapter, as we will endeavor to show after noticing one quotation in "No. 11" of the foregoing articles, *viz*: "The dead *in Christ* shall rise *first*:" 1 Thess. 4: 16. Does the term "*first*" here have any reference to another class to

be raised *afterwards*? We think not: and we are sure if the brother looks at the connection he will see that it refers to what the apostle had said in verse 15, *viz*: "We which are *alive* and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not *prevent*"—literally, *go before*—"them which are asleep:" he then adds—"For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven * * * and the dead *in Christ* shall rise *first*: *THEN* we which are alive and remain shall be caught up *together with them*," &c. The word *first* here is seen to have reference only to the fact that the living saints would not go to meet the Lord, on his return from heaven, till the dead *in Christ* were *first* raised, so that all should go "together." Here is no idea of a "*first resurrection*:" and Paul, we humbly believe, never speaks of *two* resurrections, except of "Christ the first-fruits: afterwards *they* that are *Christ's at his coming*." "Then cometh the *end*:" not, *then* cometh another resurrection. No, he speaks of no other resurrection of men except that which takes place "*at*" Christ's coming. The expression, "every man in his own *order*;" *cohort*, or *band*, we are of opinion, has reference only to the same thing he speaks of verse 41 and 42, "a difference" among "them that are Christ's," arising from the different capacities and circumstances in which they had lived and had their personal trial, under the various dispensations: or if we adhere to the most strict interpretation of the words, "every man in his own order," the apostle states what he means, *viz*: "Christ the *first-fruits*; afterwards they that are Christ's *at his coming*." Thus he speaks of only two seasons of resurrection: the first embraces Christ himself; and the next his people.

But we proceed with the apostle's argument on the resurrection, as more fully opened from verso 42—"So also in the resurrection of the dead.—*They* are sown in corruption, they arise *without* corruption: *they* are sown in dishonor, they arise *in glory*: they are sown in weakness, they arise in power: it is sown an animal body, it ariseth a spiritual body. For there is a body of the animal life, and there is a body of the spirit: so also it is written—'Adam, the first man, became a living soul: the second Adam [became] a quickening spirit. And the spiritual was not first; but the *animal*, and then the spiritual. The first man was of the dust, from the earth; the second man was the Lord from heaven.'" Thus far we have followed Prof. Munro's translation from the Syriac. We now proceed with the common English version.

"As is the earthly such are they also that are earthly: and as is the heavenly such are [shall be] they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthly, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly."

Thus the apostle carries out the idea that death and corruption came by the *animal* man, Adam the first; and that there is no life, or revival principle, in him: hence going down to the *earth* in him, no revival into life is to be looked for in their case. But such as "are heavenly" shall "bear the image of the heavenly"—be "raised in glory"—"in incorruption"—"put on immortality." Thus, the apostle affirms, "the dead shall be raised;" verses 42, 43, 52-54. And he gives us no account of any other revival into life except of the "heavenly," or those "in Christ:" all these will as certainly be "made alive" as all men came to die by a union with the earthly Adam.

It is at the "last trump" that those "in Christ" are "made alive." Then "death is swallowed up in victory;" verse 54. It is then "the last enemy shall be destroyed, death;" verse 26. Here is no teaching of the revival into life of the wicked dead in this chapter. It must be found somewhere else, if found at all, in our judgment. When it can be demonstrated that the wicked dead, who are *not* in Christ, shall be made *alive*, from 1 Corth. 15, we think universal salvation needs no other demonstration; and then our beloved brother, of "No. 1," will "have the sin of the world" taken "away" in *reality*: and Christ will be "the Saviour of all men" in the Universalist sense. We understand Christ to be the Saviour of all men as an offered gift of God to all: and as the *only* Saviour any man can have; while he is *actually*, or "*specially* the Saviour" from sin and death, *only* "of those who believe;" and that Jesus "taketh away the *sin* of the world" only by a personal deliverance from sin, so far as individuals are concerned; and that he will destroy the devil, and his dominion over the world, by himself, in due time, taking possession of earth, with his saints; thus restoring the world to order, by putting the devil and his children eternally under that death which sin introduced. To suppose any other taking away the sin of the world, or any other salvation of all men, seems to us, must lead to universal salvation from sin and death: or *Restorationism*. For such a view we find no authority in scripture: for "all the wicked will God destroy;" and "the soul that sinneth it *shall* die." Psa. 145: 20; Ezk. 18: 4, 20.

Our brethren will see that we have not given

them an answer item by item; but have taken a *general* view of Paul's argument and conclusions in 1 Corth. 15. In conclusion, we may add that many eminent expositors of the Scriptures hold the view that Paul is speaking *only* of the resurrection of the righteous, in this chapter; and such was our settled view before we had a "*doubt*" of the revival of the wicked into life. Our view, therefore, on 1 Corth. 15: 22, is not the result of a doubt on the question under discussion with Br. Grew, but was previously formed: yet we confess, it was preaching on Paul's contrast of the first and second Adam, and the result to the *earthly* and the *heavenly* that first led us to doubt the revival, from death, of the wicked dead.—Every effort to use that chapter in support of such revival has only served to confirm us that no such doctrine is found there; but, on the contrary, it does seem to teach that none but such as "have fallen asleep *in Christ*" shall ever be revived into life.

These remarks are submitted to the reader with the most sincere respect and love for the dear brethren whose arguments have been the occasion of them. If they cannot see as we do on 1 Corth. 15, we shall love them none the less. We know they both have the cause of God and truth near their hearts.

They have each introduced some other texts which we have not inserted in their communications, simply because Br. Grew has previously used them, and our response would have compelled us to refer to our replies to him in last year's volume—which some of our present subscribers have not—or else we must travel over the same ground again, which we do not think best to do so soon. If, however, they wish, after Br. G. is through, to go over any part of the ground again they shall have place in our columns. They are at liberty to reply now to our remarks on 1 Corth. 15: 22, if either of them wish to do so.

BR. JACOB GRIM.—This brother was a resident of *Philadelphia*. The past year he has removed to *Plymouth*, about sixteen miles north of his former residence. At a meeting in a school house, near his present residence, some weeks since, a congregation were disappointed in their minister not coming on Sunday evening. Rather than have them go home without any instruction, Br. GRIM volunteered to give them a little. It seems the congregation were so well entertained they wished to hear him again. He had spoken to them two or three times prior to our visit to Phil-

adelphia, Dec. 23d. He came into the city to hear us in the day time, but returned home to speak to the people in the evening. The minister had given out word he should be there to oppose him. The following note from him gives an account of that evening and subsequent movements :

"I had quite a congregation the evening you were in the city. The school house was full : more outside than in. I suppose there were three hundred persons inside and out. I spoke on Man's Creation, and gave an opportunity to any person to reply ; but their gun, that raised the crowd, was not there. I spoke again the next Sunday evening, on Man's Fall and Redemption, and gave the same opportunity to reply ; but no opposition. The only opposition I have met with is the cry of "Infidel," and the "Board of Managers" calling a meeting to shut the school house against me. But there was a majority of *one* in favor of my speaking. I have another hall offered, rent free, warmed and lighted, as soon as they close the school house. Next Sunday evening I am to speak in Penn Square—a village about two miles above here—in a hall that will seat two hundred. One of the School Directors says it will not do for me to cross the old beaten tracks of the people in the neighborhood. I showed up the church and clergy two weeks ago, and some of the good members do not like to hear it. I never have had more attentive audiences than I have here. I shall speak as long as a door is open, and the people are willing to hear ; and if the clergy don't like it, all they have to do is to come and show me that I am in error."

From *Wm. Ridgeway, Paterson.*

Dear Brother,—In reading the last number of the EXAMINER I was much pleased with your remarks on "An Old Heathen." If you were disposed to illustrate your subjects in the manner of some of our popular publications, I might recommend you to have a plate in front of your remarks representing PLATO leading SCHLEIERMACHER to the cross of Christ, while John the Baptist and the Beloved Disciple were standing in the background. Br. Stevens is a bold man : it is not every preacher that would dare to represent the influence of Plato as superior to the Popes, Bishops, and divinely-called preachers of Orthodoxy. But the truth will out, and must finally prevail. Here we have one of the most popular writers in the church representing what he calls a great change in the theological mind of Germany, as having been started, in the first place, by the influence of Plato on Schleiermacher ; who, it would seem, was not in the mood to receive the pure spiritualism of Christianity until he became a Pla-

toist in philosophy. "Plato," Br. Stevens says, "has always had a similar influence in the church." There is no doubt that Plato has always had too much influence in the church. To the influence of heathenism we owe the unchristian theory of immortal soulism, which lies at the root of most of the errors of Orthodoxy : and until Jesus, Paul, and John take the place of Plato those errors will continue in the church.

The letter of A. G. MERWIN gave me great pleasure. I like its tone. It has the ring of the true metal in it. With him, "I see no half-way ground between free discussion and exclusive sectarianism." Although I am not convinced that the wicked will not rise again, yet I have read the controversy with great interest, and have been particularly pleased with the manly and christian spirit in which it has been thus far conducted. It is too often the case that parties engaged in religious controversy are more eager to hold up themselves and put down their opponent than to hold up truth and put down error. We want the *subject* dissected—not the person. "Prove all things : hold fast that which is good," ought to be our motto. Had the Editor of the *National Magazine* observed this advice he would not have published in that excellent paper the silly poem called "*Baby Bell*:" a poem as false in sentiment as it is silly in expression. I give you a few lines as a specimen :

"Have you not heard the Poet tell
How came the dainty Baby Bell
Into this world of ours?
The gates of Heaven were left ajar !
With folded hands and dreamy eyes
She wandered out of Paradise !
She saw this planet, like a star,
Hang in the depths of purple even—
Its bridges, running to and fro,
O'er which the white-winged seraphs go,
Bearing the holy dead to Heaven !
She touched a bridge of flowers—those feet,
So light, they did not bend the bells
Of the Celestial Asphodels !
They fell like dew upon the flowers !
And all the air grew strangely sweet !
And thus came dainty Baby Bell
Into this world of ours."

The above lines form only a part of the poem. And now what think you of such teaching from a preacher of the gospel? Here the idea is held out to the young mind that souls live before they come into this world. Let us strip the foregoing lines of their poetic garb and dress the ideas in plain prose, and they will read something like the following : "Once upon a time there was a little girl named Baby Bell ; and before she came here she lived in Paradise. One day, it seems, she was wandering about, with her hands folded and her eyes half shut, between dreaming and waking, when she came to the gates of Heaven—for Heaven and Paradise you know are the same—and, as it happened, the gates were ajar, and she peeped out and saw this world of ours, like a star, a great way off. It seems that she took a notion to go there ; and, looking about, she saw a great many bridges

cause" is wiser than you, and the presumption is that he is "just" and right! Mark! It is only a presumption; and God's rule is to let the neighbor "search"—a denial of which shuts out that "light" which "doth make manifest." When the effort has once been made then it should be left, as a good judgment would dictate. But *no one* has a right to hinder the effort.

PERSONALITIES are often mis-conceived, or in a bad sense oft do not exist. That is *not* personal in a bad or objectionable sense, which exposes error; and is designed to turn back a "brother" from his error. When a "new and startling" position is taken of universal concern, it needs (if wrong) to be exposed. But this cannot be done without naming the error, its *origin*, and its antagonism to the truth of God. *Personal* references for such purposes are commendable—the "light" thus "shines." But when the personal history and trials, and temptations (that are *not* embraced in the subject) are *lugged in*, to forestall conviction—when "mad dog" is unjustly cried, and *he* pointed out with scorn to set all against *him*; then it is *personal* in a wrong, an unchristian sense; such personalities no one should indulge or allow. If I have done this it is wrong. My care is to avoid every thing of this nature.

Every editor has a right and is bound to judge for his own work, subject however, to the highest law of the christian life—"Let your light shine"—"convert the sinner," (leading off from God's truth) "from the error of his way"—"search him," who only at first "*seems* just," &c. Truth if told must expose its opposite.

"*Plainness of speech*" is Apostolic: 2 Cor. 3. It is not a sin; but a high, Christian virtue. If any poor mortal gets in *its* way, or is exposed by *it*, then it is "the light" of God shining on "the way." It should be allowed to shine. Only *tell the truth*, and then the shorter and plainer, the better.

"*Be courteous*" is a command; but this command toward our neighbor can not crowd aside "the *first* and *great* command," to love God supremely: that is, to make God and truth *first*. But many suppress God's truth and God's authority from human sympathy—from a *false* courtesy.

My aim is to give "no offence." But in whatever community as soon as it shall appear that I may not "*obey God* rather than man," my duty there is done. But patience must have its perfect work.

"THE TRUTH" is divine. It is God revealed by his word and providence. Every adverse idea; every diverse theory must perish. "EVERY PLANT which my Heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up. Thus saith the Lord." "DAGON set up" by the Ark of God, must be thrown down! If they "set him up again"; then he must be *broken to pieces*, that no one may "go into the temple of Dagon any more!" 1 Sam. 5: 2, 3. This applies to *me* and to all alike. If I get out a theory or plan of prophetic fulfillment that crosses (or to an intelligent, honest mind seems to cross) the facts of history and positive statements of prophecy, it must be open to correction. No man offends against God or good men by calling

attention to such matters. If it were only a matter of opinion it might pass; or be met by a counter opinion.

The Lord said "*Prove me!*" Mal. 3: 10. Jesus said to Thomas "reach hither thy finger and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side; and be not faithless but believing," John 20: 25, 27. Paul commended the Bereans who searched the Scriptures to see whether his preaching was true. "THE WORD" unsustained by fact—not justified by the event; *proved* the author a false prophet. Deut. 18: 20, 22.

Now as God Almighty, Jesus Christ, and the Living Word of the Holy Ghost, may be tested and *proved* for the purpose of securing a ground of justifying faith—who among mortals, shall be above examination? The truth is above all—exposes all as helpless and hopeless, ignorant and guilty—and is adapted to bring us to Christ, for "*wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption*;" that "when we glory, we should glory in the Lord." J. B. Cook.

From Ursula Eaton, Ohio.

Br. Storrs.—With a feeling of thankfulness I "take my pen," but not "to bid you '*Farewell!*' " "I have read" the "EXAMINER" for many years with great comfort and satisfaction; for which I feel truly grateful: and when the discussion commenced, on the subject of the resurrection of the wicked dead, I expected Br. Storrs would take scripture ground, and defend" the truth, as *he* understood it, laid down in the Bible. What if "your enemies" do "say, your next change will be to embrace universal salvation"?

Now, there are many kinds of "*enemies*." Some may be like Jeremiah's "familiar" watching for the halting of the Lord's servants. But yours, it appears, are not of that class; nevertheless, they are "*enemies*." May be they are "wolves in sheeps' clothing," and when they get into the fold they scatter the sheep. Ah, yes, they scatter the sheep that are not fully weaned from the pasture wherein grows sectarianism, bigotry, and in a word, the bias of early education. What a mercy it is to have grace given, and moral courage sufficient, to strive to *grow* in the knowledge of the truth, unawed by enemies, or unswayed by friends.

Perhaps on some points I should differ with Br. Storrs. But shall I bid him "*Farewell!*" on that account? By no means. Discussion in a christian spirit, I think, is beneficial. May the Lord reclaim all his erring children, and guide them into all truth, is the prayer of

Your constant Reader.

~~It~~ It is our work to *cast* care; God's work to *take* care. Distrustful care is a canker that doth waste and dispirit. Care adds much to our grief, nothing to our comfort.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, JANUARY 15, 1856.

From W. H. Barnes, Montezuma, Iowa.

Br. Storrs.—I have the pleasure to see our number of subscribers for the BIBLE EXAMINER more than doubled, for the year 1856. I find that rigid opposition to the doctrine of “*Life only through Jesus Christ*,” is in a great measure subsiding, and people are becoming willing to examine the subject. This is all that we can ask in order to the establishment of the truth; i. e., candid investigation. We had a Discussion here on the 23—26th of Oct. last, with an Orthodox minister, on the present and intermediate state of man; and the final destiny of the wicked. We found it hard work to keep our opponent in sight of the written rules agreed upon for the discussion; and not until he was decided out of order, by the moderators, could he be kept to the question at all. I have, however, no time or room now to give anything farther, than to say, that since the discussion, it seems to be much easier to introduce the BIBLE EXAMINER, and other books in defence of the same doctrine held by it, than it was before; and in a word, we believe the cause is onward henceforward with us here; but more anon.

We have strong hopes of seeing the EXAMINER weekly for 1856; and rather than it shall fail to be issued weekly, I will pledge \$10 more than the amount already sent, within thirty days after I receive the first number for 1856. Will others do likewise? In hope of heaven through Jesus Christ alone.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—BR. BARNES has done nobly for the EXAMINER; and is entitled to the palm in the amount sent us for the EXAMINER for this year, viz: \$32. Considering the far off region where he is located, and the success he has met with in obtaining subscribers, we do not wonder he had “strong hopes” that the EXAMINER would be issued “weekly.” The fact is, it ought to be done; yet we court not the labor of such a work; and it is impossible with present prospects to accomplish it this year. Not more than one-fourth of the necessary number of subscribers have yet been received; but a semi-monthly will be continued, if our life and health are preserved through the year, and nothing unforeseen befalls us. For such an issue our prospects were never more encouraging than at this time; for which we thank all our friends: and we are

the professed believers in “*Life only through Christ*” are in favor of a free paper. Sectarian we hope and pray we may never become, having once escaped from that corruption. We do not mean by a “free paper,” one that is free for the Editor but for no others. We know such a paper is free in nothing but its profession. We do not, indeed, suppose a paper must discuss every topic any person might wish, to make it free: but if the Editor introduces a topic he is bound to give the opponents of that topic a fair and candid hearing, or his paper is not free. To vex and perplex those who differ from him with rules, which are of his own manufacture, or with quibbling about the writer’s want of *humility*, &c., is clear evidence that the Editor is sectarian: his views must not be controverted! He is wise enough for himself and every body else! So, on the other hand, those who withhold support to a free paper because the Editor differs from them, on some topics, show themselves sectarian, and all their professions of being free are mere pretence—they deceive themselves. They know not what true freedom is any more than those sectarian Editors of whom we have just spoken—they are free to utter their own views, but wish the Editor not to utter his, unless they agree with theirs!

BR. BARNES has been a Methodist minister; but he has become a free man, and seems determined to maintain his freedom. May the Lord bless and guide him.

Is there Positive Testimony that the Wicked Dead will be made Alive?

H. Grew’s Sixth Rejoinder to Respondent.

Dear Brother.—If I am not taxing your patience and that of your readers too much, I will offer a few more suggestions before the subject of the resurrection of the wicked dead, is dismissed from your valued periodical. It appears to me that Respondent overlooks the validity of inferential reasoning. If the inference is necessarily involved in the premises, it is conclusive. If the wicked dead cannot hear the voice of the Savior and come forth to the resurrection of condemnation without being made alive, the testimony of Jesus in John 5: 28, 29, is conclusive proof of that fact. So of Rom. 2d chap., and other passages which I have quoted. If “in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ.” (i. e. “judge the world,” Acts 17: 31.) “every man”; Rom. 2: 6; “every soul of man that doth evil,” “Jew” and “Gentile,” v. 9, is to suffer “tribulation and anguish,” it necessarily follows that they must be made alive to suffer it.

I submit that the terms used in this chapter, clearly teach that the apostle is not referring to the judgment of any particular nation, or to those only who will be alive on the earth at the coming of the Lord Jesus, but to "THE day" of general judgment "of men," which the sacred scriptures abundantly reveal. The apostle not only uses the terms "every man"; "every soul of man that doth evil," "the Jew first and also the Gentile," but he includes those who have "sinned (past tense) without law," and those who have sinned in the law," which expressions, include those who had sinned previous to the Gospel day. It is indeed true that the terms, "the world," "all the world," &c., may sometimes be used in reference only to the living, as the connection plainly teaches; but surely, this is no proof that the same terms may not be used in the more comprehensive sense, including both the living and the dead. That persons who are destroyed in one general ruin by earthquakes, &c.; do not receive the "few" and "many stripes," "according to the deeds done in the body," appears to me to be a palpable fact needing no proof.

In respect to the Almighty having pleasure in the punishment of the impenitent, I supposed the simple quotation, "It pleased the Lord to bruise him (his Son) he hath put him to grief," would be sufficient for my intelligent brother; clearly proving, that if he was pleased to put his Son to such suffering, that he might be just and the justifier of sinful men, he may be pleased to put the impenitent to suffering for the display of his justice. However, as my respected brother acknowledges that the wicked *will actually die forever*, although the Almighty, has no pleasure in their death, he may as well acknowledge that they may actually endure antecedent; "tribulation," &c., although the Lord has no pleasure therein.

The literal import of the term "second death," necessarily implies a "second deprivation of life." I cannot admit my brother's authority to reject that import.

Some persons may wonder that I have not adduced, 1 Cor. 15: 22, "as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." I have not adduced it, because I think that the phrase in Christ, and indeed the apostle's description of the raised, limits this verse to the righteous. I am not a Universalist. I believe that the wicked will be raised by Christ, but not in him.

Respectfully submitted, HENRY GREW.

Respondent's Reply to the Foregoing.

As Br. Grew has brought forward no new argument, in the foregoing remarks, we might pass

it without any response. A protracted examination would only compel us to travel the ground over again already passed, which we do not think would be edifying to our readers. Those who have read can tell what has been done in this discussion on either side. We might go into the question of the "inference," Br. G. *supposes* to be "involved" in certain texts, and deny it. But this, as we said, is but to travel the ground over again. We have shown that "dry bones" have heard "the word of the Lord," and were not "alive"; Ezk. 37. We have shown the *probability* that Acts 17; 31, has reference to Christ's "ruling the world," and not to judging it in Br. G.'s sense of the term. We have shown that if the phrase "every man," Rom. 2: 6, embraces the whole of Adam's posterity—living and dead—that, by the same rule, the apostles must *hereafter* preach the gospel to all that posterity who have not heard it; because Christ commanded *them* to "preach the Gospel to every creature": Mark. 16: 15. We have shown that "the tribulation and anguish," which "the law" threatened *did* "come upon the Jew first," just as Rom. 2d saith it should; and that "all things written," of "wrath," were "fulfilled" in "these days of vengeance"; as Jesus saith Luke 21: 20-24; and as Paul said, "wrath is come upon them" [the Jews] "to the uttermost": 1 Thes. 2: 16. We have shown that the "few and many stripes" are probably visited on the class of men spoken of in *this life*; and that there is no evidence that it relates to any other men than the *professed* "servants" of the Lord. And now, we are of *opinion*, it is superfluous for us to travel over the same ground again, at present; or till our readers have had time for reflection and personal searching the scriptures.

We "submit" that the phrase "of the Jew first," Rom. 2d, is, seemingly, irreconcilable with Br. G.'s idea that the "tribulation" comes upon them at the *same time* it does on Gentile sinners; and that his idea of a "general judgment," of the race of Adam, at one and the same time, made *alive*, seems totally at variance with many passages of scripture, and with Rom. 2d, as we have shown. The phrase "general judgment" no where occurs in the Bible; and in the *sense* usually employed, we "submit," that it has insurmountable obstacles to its reception; at least, it has in our mind. And once more, we "submit," that if all the wicked dead are to be made *alive* again, it is one of the most singular and strange things about *revelation* that such a doctrine must be *inferred*, and not have *one solitary* text, in all the *Book*, that

plainly affirms it, as Br. G. now admits by giving up 1 Corth. 15; 22. Are we to suppose that such a doctrine, if true, is to be left to *inference*?

As to any parallel between the Lord's "bruising His Son" and raising dead sinners to life to *torment* them we see none. In the one case the scriptures affirm, "it pleased the Lord to bruise" His Son; first, that as the Captain of our Salvation he might be made "*perfect*" through suffering, Heb. 5: 7-9; and that God might, by the work and sufferings of His Son, bless dying men by giving them *life*. An object worthy of God and bringing "glory to God and the Lamb." But the making alive dead sinners to *torture* them, with no design to benefit them, or any other part of the human family, does not appear to be an object worthy of God, and does not *seem* likely to bring glory to God or the Lamb. There is therefore, we "*submit*," no ground for comparison between the sufferings of Christ and making alive to torment and kill sinners after they have met the appointment "*once to die*": Heb. 9: 27; and in their death, we have shown, that God has said, He has "*no pleasure, at all*": and hence cannot be supposed to repeat that death for the sake of multiplying tortures and "*tribulation*": and we cannot "*acknowledge*" any conviction either of the utility or probability of such an event; or that it will occur, unless we shall see more explicit evidence, than we have yet seen, that God has "*pleasure*" in such an exhibition of unmitigated torture and woe.

While our mind seems to be *forced* to a different conclusion from Br. GREW's, we rejoice to know that he is just as sincere and filled with the spirit of love as we claim to be; and our love for him is uninterrupted, as we believe his also is for us. We sincerely pray that this investigation may, to the end, be kept clear of any spirit opposed to the spirit of Christ and love. If we have all knowledge and have not love we are nothing. So Paul speaks 1 Corth. 13. May we all be able to exhibit it in our lives; and manifest that the honor of God and His Son is above all personal considerations.

Will the Wicked Dead be made Alive?

Among several excellent brethren who have written us on the above inquiry are two in different parts of the country, who have presented 1 Corth. 15: 21-23 as *positive* proof of the *affirmative*. We deferred giving their arguments on that scripture till we could know if Br. GREW intended to use it, as we did not wish to have him forestalled if he chose to bring it forward. In our

late visit to Philadelphia, his residence, we asked Br. GREW if he intended to use the text—"As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive?" He replied, unhesitatingly—"I cannot *conscientiously*; for the resurrection of the *righteous only* is there spoken of;" and now he has expressed himself on that text in this number of the EXAMINER.

After this frank response from Br. GREW we feel at liberty, and are glad to give the argument of the two brethren spoken of. Their arguments are substantially the same; but we will give both in their own words, on 1 Corth. 15: 21-23. We omit the names of these brethren, for the present, giving only their initials: but they are both men worthy of all respect. Their names shall be given if they desire it, hereafter. The first of the following, numbered *one*, is by "C. W. L." The next, numbered *two*, is by "H. H. H." We give them in this order for convenience of reference.

No. I.

Br. Storrs.—There seems to be considerable said of late in the BIBLE EXAMINER on the resurrection and non-resurrection of the wicked. I admire the spirit in which each opposing brother writes. They seem to write in *love* and forbearance; and with a desire to know and defend the truth. To such I would say, in the spirit of my Master, "Do not err, my beloved brethren." I believe your heart is right, my beloved brother, who oppose the resurrection of the wicked dead; but I think you are wrong in judgment.

The question is asked—"Is there *positive* testimony that the wicked dead will be made alive?" I answer *yes*. 1st Cor. 15: 21-23: "For since by man came death," (to all) "by man came also the resurrection of" (all) "the dead. For as in Adam *all*" (good and bad) "die, even so in Christ *shall all*" (good and bad) "be made alive; but every man in his own order," &c.; (or in his own company.) I regard this text as "*positive testimony*" that the wicked dead will be made alive again, by a resurrection from the dead, *in* Christ, or *through* Christ, or *by* Christ; and I do not see how any one can possibly set it aside. The simple facts in the case are these: If *all* are *not* made alive in or by Christ, then it follows, as a matter of course, that *all* did *not* die in Adam. Now I apprehend no one will deny the fact that all die in Adam. Why then deny that all will be made alive in Christ? I will here venture an assertion, and that is this: If the wicked dead *are not* made alive from that death which they have died in Adam, then it follows as a fact, which cannot be denied, that God is *not* the "Saviour of *all* men," and Christ also is *not* the "Saviour of the world, nor "the Lamb of God that taketh away the *sin* of the world." Now in order to suit the theory of no resurrection of the wicked dead, the text in first Cor. 15, &c., should read thus: "For as in Adam *all*—mankind—die, even so in Christ

the mission of him who, in Peter's language, *preached to the spirits in prison*. "I, the Lord, have called thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the gentiles, to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison house." (Isa. xlii. 6, &c.) Looking, therefore, at the phraseology of corresponding passages as to what state they were in, and who the spirits were to whom Jesus "*preached*," this passage ceases to be of difficult solution: but had not Isaiah thus furnished an easy illustration, the connexion of the apostle's argument in the after verses would have effected that object; the intention of the writer being to draw a parallel between those persons in a state of mental darkness, in the days of Noah, and in the apostolic age; which intention would have been rendered more obvious if our translators had introduced a single supplemental word, as they have so frequently done in other instances, to express the sense of the original: the passage would then have stood thus—"By which he went and preached to the spirits in prison, which sometime"—or, as the original imports, in former time—"were disobedient: as when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah," &c. And, to complete his parallel, it will be seen the apostle proceeds to show that the ark was then the means of saving the believers of the antediluvian world, as *baptism*, or a public acknowledgment of the messiahship of Jesus, was the means of saving the believers in the Jewish world. Such then clearly being the scriptural import of "*preaching to the spirits in prison*," we submit, that the hypothesis relative to immaterial spirits, and their residence in an intermediate state, has most distinctly, in this connexion, no countenance; and while we differ with Law, Priestley, and others, in some particulars upon this passage, that difference affords no aid to our opponents; for although these writers apply it to the gentiles only, our application of it to both Jews and gentiles, to all in fact whose minds were "*in prison*," is only a more extensive use of the same principles of argument; and should an exception be taken to these views from the fact, that Jesus did *not* preach to the gentiles, we should reply, that his authorizing the apostles to do so will be seen, in scriptural language, to be the same thing—thus Paul, in his letter to the Ephesians, "for he" (Jesus) "is our peace, who hath made both one; and came and preached peace to you" (gentiles) "which were afar off, and to them that were nigh." (Ephes. ii. 17, &c.)

The "*spirits of just men made perfect*," (Heb. xii. 23) and "*the souls of them that were slain for the word of God*," (Rev. vi. 9) are the passages which next claim our attention. Commencing with the former, we shall first state the value of the passage in the estimation of our opponents; that it "signifies the best state to which an unembodied spirit can come;" but that after the day of judgment, spirits will then be embodied; that "as soon as good Christians depart out of this life, they will join the company of them"—(unembodied spirits.) The passage, however, will be seen to fail as completely in proving the point for

which it is adduced, as those upon which we previously have been remarking; for it relates to believers in the present state of existence only, and to the distinguished honors and privileges to which they are called, and has no reference to immaterial spirits, or to a state prior to the resurrection, in which such spirits will be "*made perfect*." It will be found that the writer, in figurative and bold language, exhorts those whom he addresses "to follow peace with all men, without which no man shall see the Lord; looking diligently lest any man fail of the grace of God; for you are come to the general assembly and church of the first-born," (i. e. the Christian church); "to God, the judge of all—to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus, the mediator of the new covenant." (Heb. xii. 15, 23, &c.) In a corrected translation, however, of this passage, it reads thus: "Ye are come to the general assembly and congregation of the first born, and to God, the judge of all, and to just men made perfect." But if this translation be questioned, and the word "*spirits*" still retained, we should contend, from what has been clearly shown to be the meaning of that term, that there is not any thing in the passage expressive of immaterial existence, distinct and separate from the entire living man, in the present life. Mr. Belsham, however, defends his omission of "*spirits*," both by a reference to the original, and the use of the term in parallel passages; from which he contends, "The spirit of man, is a man himself; the spirit of God, is God himself;" (see 1 Cor. ii. 11) "the spirit of Timothy, is Timothy himself:" (see 2 Tim. iv. 22) "the spirits of just men, therefore, are just men themselves. By this interpretation the author appears to be intelligible and consistent; but if by the '*spirits of just men made perfect*,' we understand separate souls in an intermediate state, the observation is not only irrelevant, but it is not true; for in what sense can believers in Christ be said to be *now* introduced into the society of spirits in heaven? or what privilege have they in this respect above good men under the law?" And the perfection here spoken of is clearly that which as members of the "assembly of the first-born," they ought to attain to, because of the superior privileges the gospel confers upon them, and can have no reference, as Dr. Priestley has observed in his notes on this passage, to any condition of good men, or of spirits, in a future world.

In the Revelations, the passage in which the writer states, "I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held," (Rev. vi. 9) though adduced by our opponents with much confidence, has not what perhaps might be conceded to some of the preceding passages, even the semblance of an argument in their favor; for, as we have previously proved relative to the word *soul*, it is clear that in the present instance it should have been rendered by the term "*lives*;" then, in that case, the representation of such being under the altar, will be seen to be perfectly appropriate; forming as the verso does, part of a most highly figurative representation of the opening of the six seals; in which the stars from heaven are said to

be falling, and the mountains and islands moving out of their places; and the particular allusion in the sixth verse, appears to be borrowed from the practice at the altar of victims in the temple; at the foot of which altar the *blood* (*the life—the soul*) was poured out, which blood, being in the sight of the sanctuary, it was supposed that it apprised God of the sacrifice that had been offered to him, and that he saw it; thus the lives of those who had sacrificed themselves in the cause of a religion, are here in bold and figurative language, described as being under the altar, in the sight of God.

From these passages we turn to one which chronologically ought to have preceded them, but because of its minor importance in our view of the argument, we have reserved it to the last—it is that of *Saul and the witch of Endor*, (1 Sam. xxviii.) which some of our opponents deem to prove both the existence of immortal souls, and also an intermediate state for their reception:—thus Causin, as quoted by Coward, contends that the return of souls, as in the case of the prophet Samuel, is appointed by God to prove their immortality. A modern writer also, of some celebrity, asserts that “we have one remarkable instance of a *phantom*, or appearance, in the form of Samuel the prophet; and it is not improbable that it was the departed spirit of Samuel himself, appearing, not by the incantation of the witch, but by the will of God, to denounce his awful vengeance against Israel.” [The case of Saul, by Granville Sharpe, p. 155–157.] Patrick, on this chapter, maintains that it was an evil spirit in the likeness of Samuel that appeared before Saul: and others have supposed that the appearance of Samuel to Saul, was a divine miracle. [See Dr. Waterland’s Sermons, vol. ii. p. 267.] In forming a judgment of this case, apart from the uses to which it has been applied, it may be well to glance at the characters who are represented as acting in it:—first, The king of Israel, who upon disobeying the commands of Deity, was told, that “*the Lord had rejected him from being king over Israel*,” and who in all his subsequent engagements with the enemies of Israel, was defeated by them; the cause too of such defeats was known by the whole people to be, that the God of Israel had rejected him to reign over them; in consequence of which he was oppressed with melancholy: (or, in Old Testament language, “an evil spirit came upon him;”) and “when he saw the host of the Philistines, he was afraid, and his heart greatly troubled him; and he inquired of the Lord, and the Lord answered him not. Then said Saul unto his servants, Seek me a woman that hath a familiar spirit, that I may inquire of her.” The second personage in this representation, is the woman so selected; one, whose occupation agreed with the necromancers of the heathen nations, “who summoned the spirits of the dead to appear before them; and who carried on their trade in subterranean caverns, which were well calculated to ensure successful imposition.” [See Michene’s Commentaries on the Laws of Moses, vol. iv. p. 83–92. 8vo. edit. 1814.] But the God of Israel had prohibited the exercise of such arts; commanding his people, that “When thou art come into the land which the Lord thy

God giveth thee, there shall not be one who maketh his son nor his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divination, or an observance of times; or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer; for all that do these things are an abomination to the Lord, and because of these abominations, the Lord thy God doth drive them out from before thee.” (Deut. xix.) The third character, assumes to be that of Samuel, whom “all Israel, from Dan even to Bersheba, knew to be a prophet of the Lord,” and who, when he “died, all the Israelites were gathered together, and lamented him, and buried him in his house at Ramah.” With these facts before us, we come to the chapter under examination, in which the defenders of immaterialism would fain make God to sanction that which he had solemnly denounced, as an abomination in his sight; which is supposed to confer upon one whom he had commanded to be “cast out of the land,” the power to raise from the dead even a prophet of God, and through whose instrumentality, although Jehovah would not answer Saul, “*neither by dreams, nor by vision, nor by prophets*,” yet he is made to answer him by the power of one that had “a familiar spirit;” for it is in vain for Mr. Granville Sharpe to attempt to get over this difficulty by asserting, that the communication was not made “by the incantations of the witch, but by some respectable agent of the divine will,”—the text being, “Then said the woman” (to Saul) “Whom shall I bring up unto thee? and he said, Bring me up Samuel: and when the woman saw Samuel, she cried with a loud voice,” &c. (verse 11 and 12.) So that we may well leave to the doctrine of our opponents whatever benefit the immaterial system can derive from such serious imputations, which their hypothesis casts upon the divine government; and we would beside put it to these parties, how immaterialism can be reconciled with the present relation, and how that which is spiritual and not visible to the sight, can be *seen* to be “an old man covered with a mantle;” but the whole case is clearly one of imposition dexterously practiced upon the weak, desponding, and superstitious mind of Saul, and that effected clearly by the practice of the art of ventriloquy—an art, of which not only the effects, but the causes which produce them are now so well understood. “The term *ventriloquus*” is compounded of *ventor*, belly, and *loquor*, to speak; and is applied to persons who speak inwardly, so that the voice proceeding out of the thorax seems to come from some distance, and in any direction,” (see Rees’s Cyclopædia—in which is quoted the work of M. de la Chapelle, published in 1772, entitled “Le Ventriloque;” who shows, that in the case of Saul, the speech supposed to be addressed to him by Samuel, proceeded from the mouth of the sorceress of Endor, and that the ancient oracles derived their influence from the exercise of this art;) and upon looking at the whole of this case we cannot better express our views than in the following brief summary:—Firstly, that the whole was a mere juggle; Secondly, that the Hebrew of the “*familiar spirit*,” which the witch had, is “*ob*,” and the plural “*obets*;

and such persons were afterwards denominated "Pythoneses," which implies a pretence to divination; accordingly, in the vulgate version of 1 Sam. xxviii. 7, 8, the word used is "Pythion;" Thirdly, that the witch must have necessarily known Saul, who "from his head and shoulders was taller than any man" in Israel; and Fourthly, that Saul throughout the whole performance did not of himself see Samuel; the relation being—"When the woman saw Samuel, she cried with a loud voice," &c. (verse 12) and Saul said to her "what sawest thou;" (verse 13) "and he said unto her, What form is he of?" (verse 14) and, in the same verse, when she had answered the foregoing question, Saul "perceived," or acknowledged from the representation of the witch, that it was Samuel. So that the deception upon Saul completely succeeded; and he "stooped with his face upon the ground and bowed himself." And it is especially deserving of remark, that the whole of the after relation made to Saul, while thus prostrate before the sorceress, consists in a repetition of what had been long previously announced concerning his rejection by God and of the triumph of the Philistines over him, and which was known to the Jewish people at large. And the whole case is clearly one of dexterous imposition; and, consequently, not ill-suited to support the immaterial and intermediate doctrines by the enlightened aid of necromancy and juggling.

We have now but very briefly to notice those expressions of scripture which, in the view of our opponents, imply an intermediate state. The first and chief of such expressions being the scriptural use of the term "sleep;" which is thus argued—"Death you say is sleep. What is sleep? is the mind, during this torpor of the body utterly and always void of thought? Death, if it reduces the mind to a total insensibility, must be something more than sleep; for in sleep there is often a strong consciousness at least, if not a kind of separate existence." And it is contended that 'to sleep,' or 'to sleep with the fathers,' is only "a state of inaction, or kind of insensibility, during which we still exist." To which we reply that we do not say sleep is death, but that, in the scriptures, as in other writings, it is often used in a figurative sense, to express death; in proof of which, we are quite willing to rest upon two of the cases that are brought to prove an opposite hypothesis: first, that of Stephen; of whom, when he was put to death, it is said he "fell asleep;" and, secondly, that of Lazarus, when raised from the dead by Jesus, who thus addresses his disciples—"Our friend Lazarus sleepeth; but I go that I may awake him out of his sleep; then said his disciples, if he sleep he shall do well; howbeit, Jesus spake of his death: but they thought that he had spoken of taking rest in sleep: then said Jesus unto them plainly, Lazarus is dead." (John xi.) So that to be play upon the word "sleep" will not avail the argument of our opponents; for, most clearly in the passages in debate, "death" is not merely something more than the word "sleep," but the latter is figuratively used to express the former; and the apostle Paul sets this matter completely

at rest in his argument to prove the resurrection; (which will be entered into at large in our next number) in which there is no evidence to countenance an immediate entrance upon futurity at the moment of death; in which there is no hint given of an intermediate state; but, in which, the fact of the resurrection of Jesus being admitted, then the reasoning is—not that there *was*, not that there *is* at death, but that there *will be* a future life, which is made to rest solely on the resurrection from the dead; if there be no resurrection "then they also that are fallen asleep" (i. e. that are dead—that are non-existent) "in Christ are perished." (1 Cor. xv., 8.)

It will also be found that the state of death besides, being represented in the scriptures by the idea of sleep, is also said to place man in that condition in which he is at rest; that it is a "resting place," a house, a state of "silence," of oblivion, of destruction and corruption; [See Bishop Law's Theory, p. 358.] and thus the following passages have fairly no difficulty or equivocation attached to them—"Thou shalt go to thy father's in peace;" (Gen. xv. 15.) "Going to the grave mourning;" (Gen. xxxvii. 35.) "Going down to the pit;" (Isaiah xxxviii. 18.) and numerous parallel passages; the whole of which, however, will be found to be simply and easily explained by the following instances in which the same expressions are used and for the same object:—thus Bathsheba addresses David for the purpose of getting his appointment, in the event of his own death, of her son Solomon to reign over Israel; "otherwise, it shall come to pass, when he shall sleep with his fathers, that I and my son Solomon shall be counted as offenders." (1 Kings i. 20, 21.) And, in the following chapter, the death of David is recorded in corresponding terms—"So David slept with his fathers, and was buried in the city of David." (ii. 10.) Again in Job—"As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up, so man lieth down and riseth not: till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep." (Job xiv. 10, 11.)

Having now gone through, in the first place, every case which has been, or, we believe, can be, advanced by our various opponents, in support of their theory; and, in the second, having examined the "many expressions that imply an intermediate and separate state," we are placed in a condition to estimate the grounds of Dr. Jortin's confession, that of such a state "the scriptures have not said so much as one could wish;" though in truth, the Doctor ought to have acknowledged that the scriptures say not any thing of such a state, that the futurity which they promise is not one which we commence upon immediately at the dissolution of the body and by virtue of a never-dying principle within us; but is one far removed from that period: "When all that are in their graves" (not in an intermediate state) "shall hear the voice of the son of man, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of condemnation." (John v. 28, &c.)

(To be continued.)

From Eld. J. B. Cook, Rochester.

Dear Br. Storrs:—We are entering on a new year that will I am quite sure be a most eventful one to Israel, the Gentiles in power, and the world. The evidence of a crisis near has greatly increased; though we do not "know" precisely how near.

All the scripture evidence that we have had, we have still; and it has been gradually accumulating, till we "know he is nigh—even at the doors." Matt. 24.

The assertion of an opposite theory—"original throughout—which no writer has ever" seen or stated before, is founded in utter mistake. But the mistake as to history, Geography and Prophecy, is not allowed to appear. The only review, known to have been written has been rejected; though written with the greatest care, and based on the facts of the case. Thus those journals practically deny all the freedom for truth they have professed. More I shall not now say. The brotherhood have a right to know this cause of my silence. Adieu.

Yours, J. B. Cook.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—The foregoing letter from Br. Cook was received a few day since. The following article was received from him a short time previous, and we give it place as due to him for having been excluded from other papers where sentiments on prophecy are countenanced which he feels it his duty to oppose; but is not permitted a reply, because somebody thinks he is "too personal." To those periodicals he alludes in the foregoing letter, and the following is his defence.

PERSONALITIES.

Several have spoken of my *personalities* in controversy. Very well. But it may be allowed that I speak also; seeing that I am interested, and that the subject lies in my mind, in a form that it does not at all in the mind of the complainant. I would give *no* cause for complaint—but I humbly submit, that it is a question of principle with me.

1. No one should complain, I conceive, who has not been as cordial and earnest in sustaining the truth, which I was striving to maintain, or who has not been more in sympathy with the truth than with the person objected to. God and truth are first.

2. This consideration, though not plead as a justification, should perhaps abate, or modify the complaint. "Respect of persons" seems to sway almost every body. This is human weakness. The fact may be seen now, in all directions, as at the 1st Advent, "One was for Paul; another for Apollos." But the rest may be for nobody in earth or heaven—save themselves!

Again there are a precious few who realize that

"their life" is at stake in handling the word of life. "My words (saith Jesus) are spirit and they are life." It is then for our life that we get and "eat the word,"—and well digest it. This should be the great end of life to get and apply aright, the Gospel's saving message. Therefore, "respect for persons"—regard for self (in the usual sense) should be altogether subordinate; though it is too often allowed to rule. The word of God and the corresponding events, in our world's history is our standard of evidence.

What then shall be done,—seeing that all admit the principle in words more or less? I reply, that each cherish the principle,—cultivate the principle, and apply the principle till it becomes the governing principle of life, that is—to love God—God as revealed (as the life giver, in and through Jesus Christ) *supremely*. Business and books, friends and favors, health and life should be always and in all things subordinate. Then I conceive we can not get far away from right.

It is I think our mutual imperfections in regard to the first principles of piety (that is our failure to make Divine truth—God as made known in his word—*supreme*) that causes alienation. Misunderstandings are not very material however, I conceive, where truth or God is *FIRST* in all things. Those who are *one* "in spirit"—in principle—in effort, (it should seem) must be not far apart; save in appearance. But what rule can we adopt? Let the mind of each be *free*. But keep before all, the obligation to make "God over all," *FIRST*; and then, men second, and *self, not at all*; for it is by this door that the devil is ever dodging in to scatter his "tares."

THE *FIRST* and greatest and best thing in the world is to tell "the truth." If the world ends, or the heavens fall, tell the "truth." This being the aim of my efforts, I speak plainly and pointedly. To me it seems a *virtue*. But those who go around, thinking what "men" will say, must do the best they can. We must be free to speak the truth. The spirit that restrains the truth out of respect for men is not—can not—be of God. "Brethren, if any of you do *err* (go astray) from the truth (by following a theoretic spirit) and one convert (turn back) him; let him know that he (who turns back such a sinner from a false way) shall save a soul from death," &c. Jas. 5. "He that is *first* in his own cause, seemeth *just*; but his neighbor cometh and searcheth him." Prov. 18: 17. "Whatsoever doth make manifest (or plain) is light." Eph. 5: 13.

Now when one so applies an isolated prophecy—or portion of truth, as to cross history, falsify geography, and contradict the general tenor of prophecy—when we know that this is done—the truth of scripture and the evidence of fact should be allowed to shine on the subject and on those who are so far erring "from the truth." Alas for those who stand in the way of God's purpose—correct error. His counsel will stand—not man.

"But you decide—you judge!" says the objector. No, friend; "not" when the Divine word and the acknowledged history, and the geographical locality embraced, can be so shown as to confirm if not correct the theorist. Still the "first in

running from there to this earth: and on these bridges she saw hosts of white-winged angels carrying the good people, who had died here, to Heaven. It does not appear that the angels took any notice of Baby Bell, but let her find her way herself—it appearing to have been much easier to come down from Heaven than to go up there.—She found a bridge of flowers, and tripped along as lightly as the dew, not even bending the delicate bell flowers in her way, until she got to this world of ours. It seems she made a sad mistake however, in wishing to come to this world; for, after living a few years, she died, and the angels had to carry her back again.”

It seems that the preachers of the gospel are not so careful what they teach as they were in Wesley's days.

Wishing you success in defending the truth, I remain, truly yours.

From Elder J. Blain, Buffalo.

Br. Storrs.—To encourage brethren who are making sacrifices to spread truth, I send, for the EXAMINER, a few extracts of letters, out of many which I am receiving. I do it especially to encourage the circulation of our works on the life and death question.

Chelsea, Mass, Dec. 22d, '55.

Dear Sir.—In the month of October I took a business trip “out West,” and while on board a steamer on Lake Erie I saw a book purporting to be published by you, titled, “Death not Life.” I purchased the work, and since my return have wanted other copies, but have not been able to find any one that has it for sale. Will you please inform me what a few copies—say 30 to 50—can be delivered to me for? I am at present a member of a Baptist Church; but how long I shall continue I cannot say, as I am propagating the doctrines found in your work—a doctrine which has been dimly held by me for some years, but knew not what it was. I never could believe in “endless punishment.” I go a little farther than you do in your work—that is, in regard to the affinity between man and the brute creation—and am now giving my attention very closely to the science of geology. But I want several copies of your work to distribute among my friends. E. J.

The following is from Pickaway Co., Ohio:

Bro. Blain.—Fortunately for me, as I was riding in the cars one day, a passenger by the name of Hunson, a Congregational minister, handed me your book, (Death not Life,) and I bought it. Now I wish you to send me some of your books, and other good works on the subject, and shall send for the BIBLE EXAMINER named in your book. I want all the information I can get on the subject—am alone in this county as far as I know. I am a local Methodist E. Preacher, and intend, when I know enough how to defend myself, to preach the truth to the people, for I am fully satisfied the Bible teaches the destruction of the wicked, and not eternal torment.” T. F. H.

From Asbury University, in Greencastle, Ind., a friend writes:

Mr. Blain.—There is now a great demand here for your work, Death not Life; and if you will send two dozen I will forward the pay,” &c.

On sending the money, he says:

“We have organized an Investigation Society, composed of students and others who are not bound down by the theories of the schoolmen; and among other matters the doctrine of destruction came up, and soon found a vigorous defence. I shall sell the books you sent, and may want another lot for the Bereau Bible Class, of which I have spoken, and others who are now interested in the contest.” T. S.

Another from Newark, Ohio, says:

Mr. Blain.—Please send me ‘Death not Life,’ with other works you may have, that will assist a Bible scholar in searching for the truths of the Bible. Let me know the prices, and I will send pay,” &c. J. W. B.

A Presbyterian minister of Washington County, N. Y., who is at present only preaching as a supply to churches of that order, wrote me in Oct.:

“I enclose \$1, for which I will thank you to send me some of ‘Death not Life’ for distribution. I have read your book with much pleasure, and hope it may be the means of removing prejudice, and causing a careful and prayerful study of God's word, on these all-important subjects.” J. P.

The above are some of the proofs that “we labor not in vain.” The Lord give us more courage and zeal in our sweet work of reform! I propose to remain at home till February.

From Dr. B. B. Seleneck, Plainville.

Br. Storrs.—While waiting to write to you, I have thought of many, many things that I would like to say, if they could but appear in a well-expressed form. Among the things that I want to say are, that I value the EXAMINER above all price for the excellent selection of truth it contains. I like your “farewell” answer to your withdrawn (lady) patron. I like the discussion between Br. “GREW and RESPONDENT:” and, to sum up with, I like it all. I must give my verdict in favor of Respondent in that discussion. My opinion of the resurrection of the wicked, for two years past, has been on the side of Respondent.

SEBASTOPOL AND THE VIRGIN MARY.—The Romish priests in France are endeavoring to persuade the people that they are indebted to the Virgin Mary for the capture of Sebastopol. They allege, in support of this statement, that the great fortress fell on the 8th of September, the day, we believe, assigned as the date of the Virgin's annunciation. It is remarkable that Gen. Pelissier is a French Protestant.—*Londonderry Standard.*

PREMIUMS.

We have concluded to give to any person sending us \$2, at one time, for the 24 numbers of the EXAMINER for this year, either of the following works, as they shall choose, which we will send, free of postage, on the receipt of their money.

1. BIBLE EXAMINER, in sheets for 1855 from number 4, viz: 24 numbers, till the edition is exhausted.

2. *One* bound DISCUSSION, with Prof. Mattison; or *two* in paper covers, as they choose.

3. DOBNEY ABRIDGED—in paper cover—being Part II of H. H. Dobney's work on Future Punishment, containing *all* he has said on the final end of the wicked.

4. BIBLE VS. TRADITION, in paper covers.

Either of the foregoing works will be sent, till further notice, as above stated. Let the subscriber name definitely which he will have, else we shall send none.

The following are the general Terms of the BIBLE EXAMINER, with payment *always in advance*.
To Single Subscribers—for 24 numbers, - \$2.00

" Clubs, for three copies, - - - - -	5.00
" " Five " - - - - -	8.00
" " Ten " - - - - -	15.00
" " Twenty " - - - - -	25.00
" " Thirty " - - - - -	30.00

Money for the EXAMINER may be sent at our risk, provided the following things are attended to. *First*: Seal your letter with a *wafer* firmly, and not trust to "self-sealing" envelopes. *Second*: Keep a record of the *time* you mail it, but do not get the letter "registered." *Third*: Be sure to direct it—'Geo. Stokes, Editor Bible Examiner, New York.'

"ANALYTICAL INVESTIGATION Concerning the Credibility of the Scriptures, and of the Religious Systems inculcated in them: together with an Historical Exhibition of Human Conduct during the several dispensations under which mankind have been placed by the Creator. By J. H. M. Caldwell, M. D. 2 vols. 8vo., [of over 500 pages each.] Baltimore, 1852." Sold at the low sum of \$2.

It is a great and invaluable *help* in the Study of the Scriptures and in the defence of the same. Postage on the two volumes 54 cents. For \$2.50 we will send the work free to the purchaser. We have just received a new supply of it.

BOOKS.—We have received of SHELTON, LAMPOUR & Co., 115 Nassau street, New York, several new works. We can do little more now than give their titles. These works are all published by

JOHN P. JEWETT & Company, Boston: JEWETT, PROCTOR & WORTHINGTON, Cleveland, Ohio: SHELTON, LAMPOUR & BLAKEMAN, of this city.

1. "THE COMMUNION SABBATH: By NEHEMIAH ADAMS, D. D., Pastor of Essex Street Church, Boston."

A neatly executed volume of 208 pages, on most interesting topics. Price \$1.

2. "THE BIBLE HISTORY OF PRAYER: With Practical Reflections. By CHARLES A. GOODRICH."

This is a well arranged work of 384 pages. Judging from a glance at its contents, we think it must be a very instructive and useful volume. Price \$1.

3. "SABBATH TALKS, with the Little Children, about JESUS: By the Author of 'The Mothers of the Bible.'"

This is a beautiful little volume of some 140 pages: for the most part well calculated, we should think, to engage the attention of those for whom it was written. Price 38 cents.

4. "GLANCES AND GLIMPSSES; or Fifty Years Social, including Twenty Years Professional Life: By HARRIOT K. HUNT, M. D."

A volume of over 400 pages. Of its merits we are not prepared to speak, for lack of time to examine it. Price \$1.

THE SCRIPTURE DOCTRINE OF FUTURE PUNISHMENT: By H. H. DOBNEY, Baptist Minister, England. This work was published in this country several years since "By an Association of Gentlemen;" but for some time past there has been none for sale. Br. H. L. HASTINGS, Peace Dale, R. I., has recently issued an edition of it, *entire*, with an Appendix of 24 pages containing JOHN MILTON's views of "The State of the Dead," extracted from his "Treatise on Christian Doctrine;" the whole making a neat volume of over 300 pages, bound. Price 75 cents, sent free of postage. It can be had of Br. HASTINGS, as above. We will obtain it for any who desire us to do so.

ERRATA.—In my piece headed "What Next?"—in Examiner for Jan. 1st—for "reviving" in 7th line read "revizizing;" and for "the" in 10th line read "that." Without the former of these corrections Prof. M.'s meaning is exactly reversed.
R. WENDELL.

Love is happiness: he who grows in love, grows therefore in happiness. God is love; and love is his image within us. If I would resemble him let me strengthen love, never allowing a degrading selfishness to reign in my heart.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. XI.

NEW-YORK, FEBRUARY 1, 1856.

NO. 3.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY

At No. 141 Fulton-street.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year
Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

Annihilation. Rev. Mr. Thompson.

THE following report of this gentleman's late sermon in "Broadway Tabernacle," of this city, has been furnished us by Rev. J. HURLEY, late Editor of the "Irish Evangelist."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BIBLE EXAMINER:—
Dear Sir.—Having read many copies of your valuable paper with interest and profit, I have often felt inclined to write you a few lines declaring my sympathy with the general principles for the advocacy of which you are a proscribed character among the bulk of professing Christians—especially those who are regarded as the preachers of the Gospel; but, seeing you have numerous correspondents whose writings will doubtless contribute more to advance our common cause than mine, I have always resisted these inclinations, knowing that any vacancy in your limited space could be more profitably filled by your own thoughts.

But I cannot resist the temptation of telling you something about a lecture on *Annihilation* which I heard delivered by Rev. J. P. THOMPSON in the Broadway Tabernacle, (December 30th, 1855.) Not that there was anything in the lecture, considered in itself, worthy of special notice, for, in my opinion, and in the opinion of others also who heard it, it was, in regard to matter, arrangement, argumentation and logical accuracy, a total failure—just what the Scotch lawyer said of the blasphemy against God, a thing that could do "neither good nor harm."

What is notice worthy and interesting in the connection is, that Mr. T., and very many of his Theological School, begin to feel that their "craft" of natural immortality and eternal conscious misery of the wicked, is fast falling into disrepute amongst the serious and intelligent masses of our community, and, if they cannot patch it up cleverly, is likely soon to slide into such an abyss as Mr. THOMPSON described hell to be—"A deep, dark pit, having neither bottom nor shore." On this boundless and profound depth, Mr. T. said, "the lost spirits" would be cast; where, as a matter of course, they must eternally keep sinking deeper and deeper, unless

the king of said regions will provide them with immaterial wings, which, however, can avail them nothing, as they can never meet any shore whereupon they may rest their immaterial feet.⁽¹⁾

That the BIBLE EXAMINER mainly contributes to set the thoughtful a thinking on these subjects I have not the least doubt, and on that account it struck me that this item of news might interest your readers.

The question proposed in the public notice given in the *Daily Times* of Saturday, was as follows:—"Do the Scriptures teach the Annihilation of the Wicked?" Having given out a hymn, Mr. T. read a portion of the 25th chapter of Matthew's Gospel, beginning at vs. 31, to the end of the chapter, and took for his text the first clause of vs. 41, and the whole of vs. 46, and made them read as follows:—"Depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire prepared for the Devil and his angels. * * * And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal."

He commenced his lecture by stating that he had thoroughly investigated this subject by reading the works of those men who wrote in support of the doctrine of the annihilation of the wicked, and referring to the passages of Scripture they quoted as proof for their position, but none of them had thus far convinced him. He next attempted, but with ill success, to show that both the love of God, and the justice of his law required that the wicked must suffer eternal conscious misery. After which he proposed to show what the Holy Scriptures taught respecting the condition of the wicked after the judgment. To do this, he said it was necessary for him to state the principles of interpretation by which he must be governed.

He went on to say that, in reference to the punishment of the wicked, the language of the New Testament is highly figurative. When it speaks of fire it does not mean literal or material fire, but a punishment equivalent to the pain material fire would cause. No figurative passage, because it suited the peculiar opinions of any man, is to be read as though it were literal, or all figurative, as that would make a contradiction; but all the figurative expressions must be made to harmonize by clustering them around in support of some literal fact which underlay them all, and to give strength to which they were used. The text, he said, was such as could not be constructed into a figure; it was the positive declaration of a fact which underlay, and must give meaning to all the figurative expressions in the Bible.

He then proceeded with the most silly .. ustra

tions imaginable, by supposing a man to be sentenced at one of our criminal courts, and some one would ask Mr. T., on his return from the court, what the nature of his sentence and punishment was, and Mr. T. would answer, "*Well he is done for—he is in fire—is on a rack—he is in utter darkness—his light is put out—etc.*" And, as the explanation of the whole, he would finally say, "*the man is sentenced to solitary confinement for life.*"

Thus, you see, Mr. T. was making figures and dealing out punishment according to the vanity of his own imagination; and, forsooth, all this was explaining the Bible, and the nature of the punishment which it utters against the wicked.

He next proceeded to, as he said, explain the meaning of the word punishment, as used in the text. Said it occurred only four times in the New-Testament. First, in the text. Secondly, Acts 4: 21. Thirdly, 2 Peter 2: 9. Fourth, and lastly, 1 John 4: 18. The Greek word *Kolasin*, which was rendered punishment in the text, was, in John 4: 18 rendered torment: "*for fear hath torment.*" Therefore, in Mr. T's opinion, the meaning of everlasting punishment must be everlasting torment. Sound logic, brother Thompson. (.)

Thus, you see, he had the Scriptures "*harmonised*" and explained in a nut-shell. And, doubtless, it so appeared to many of his hearers. But bro. T. was not without his own doubts as to the soundness of his conclusions; so to make a deeper impression on his audience, he wandered from his proposition—left the Bible, and went off to the heathen, showing, in eloquent strains and glowing words, what *Plato* said was the meaning of *Kolasin*.

Leaving the classics, he next dived into the *Apocrypha*, and told us what *Wisdom* and *Macabeus* said it meant. And finally to end further controversy on the subject, he told us that *Josephus* also said "*Kolasin*" meant torment—and, as in the text, the *Kolasin* of the wicked had the same word to denote its duration that the *zoen*, or life of the righteous had: therefore Mr. T. concluded in the most profound manner, that when the misery of the wicked had an end, the life of the righteous, and heaven itself, must have an end, also. In conclusion, having, as he supposed, done up the business, he told his hearers that none but bad people believed in the annihilation of the wicked. Those who were living had lives, desired in vain to be annihilated; and closed up by exhorting them to believe all he said as gospel, if they wished to avoid eternal torments!

Now to undertake a refutation of Mr. Thompson's lecture would be a work of pure *supererogation*, as his argument proved nothing, and therefore, refutes itself. But by showing the simple meaning of the texts he quoted in favor of *eternal conscious torment*, all that he said, so far as it is worth anything, goes to strengthen the scriptural truth, that the wicked shall be utterly destroyed, and "*that they shall perish.*"

In reference to the text in 1 John 4: 18, it is but the illustration of a fact which is as common as it is true, that we do not fear a man whom we

love and know that he loves us. The whole strain of the epistle is that if God so manifested his love to us that he gave his Son to die for us, we ought also to love God in return—and not only ought we to love God, but as God loved us all, we ought also, in obedience to his command, to love one another. "*God is love,*" said John, "*and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God. Herein is our love made perfect,*"—or carried to such perfection "*that we may have boldness in the day of judgment: for as he is*" benevolent, "*so are we*" benevolent "*in this world.*" There is no fear of the judgment in those that love God and man: but perfect love to God and man casteth out of man the fear of the judgment: because such fear causeth torment. He, therefore, that feareth the judgment is not made perfect in love to God and man. See 1 John 4: 16, 17, 18. This text teaches nothing as to the condition of the wicked after the judgment, as Mr. T. thinks. It speaks simply of the torment of fear, and the fear is a dread of the judgment.

As regards the text in 2 Peter 2: 9, it is really strange that Mr. T's blindness should be so great as not to see that by quoting it in support of *eternal conscious misery*, he was bringing destruction into his own camp. The apostle is showing that, as there were false prophets among the Jews, so there shall be false teachers among the Christians; who, for the love of money, shall make merchandize of the people, by teaching them falsehoods for the truth of God; and that their conduct should give rise to scoffers who will deny the truth of revelation altogether. He then goes on to show that their punishment is certain, from the fact that God spared not the angels who sinned, but put them inurance, reserved under darkness, unto the judgment day. Then as an example of the punishment that is to be inflicted on the wicked, he refers to the antediluvians, who were all destroyed by the flood, and to the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, who were destroyed by fire. And from the preservation of *Noah* and *Lol*, with their families, he shows that God is able and willing to preserve the godly, and to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished. Peter tells us that in the days of Noah's flood, there were but "*eight souls saved by water;*" all the rest perished in the flood: 1 Peter 3: 20.

In reference to the text in Acts 4: 21, that the punishment of death was what the rulers of the Jewish nation desired to inflict upon the disciples is more than probable: and Mr. T. made a mistake by saying the *Sanhedrim* had not the power of inflicting death. That was the only body that could sentence a man to be stoned to death; but they feared to punish the apostles thus, as all the people glorified God for the miracle they had wrought.

Mr. Thompson made another mistake by saying the word punishment is mentioned only four times in the New-Testament. It is mentioned five times. Paul is showing the Jews that "*He that despised Moses' law, died without mercy, under two or three witnesses;*" he then asks them "*Of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, &c.*" The idea put forth

here would seem to be something like this. The man who violated the law that Moses made, was put to death without mercy. Of how much less mercy is the man worthy, who violates the law which the Son of God has made? Heb. 10 : 29. Perhaps it was easier for Mr. T. to slip over this text than to reconcile its mode of punishment with his idea of *eternal conscious misery*.

Lastly, in reference to the text in Matt. 25 : 46, Mr. Thompson, doubtless, feeling conscious that to offer any explanation of it would only complicate the difficulty of his position, wisely kept clear of it. Enough for him that *Koliasin* was translated *torment* in 1 John 4 : 18; and that *Plato, Wisdom, Judas Macabees, and Josephus* said it meant torment; and as John said the fear of the judgment hath *torment*, therefore *eternal punishment* must be *eternal torment*!

Now the language of the text is endless punishment to the wicked and endless life to the righteous. Thus is the promise to each placed in plain contrast. The words and meaning is, that the punishment of the wicked, as to duration, is as endless as the blessing of the righteous; forasmuch as the blessing conferred on the righteous is *life eternal* and this is placed in contrast to the punishment of the wicked, therefore the punishment of the wicked must be *eternal death*.

Death is the opposite, and only natural contrast to life; and as *eternal death* is the only natural contrast to *eternal life*, therefore we are obliged to interpret the eternal punishment, placed in contrast to eternal life—*eternal death*. Indeed the rewards and punishments promised all through the gospels, are everlasting punishment to the wicked, and everlasting life to the righteous. Now I would like to know if the wicked have existence anywhere how can their punishment be made the antithesis of the life eternal of the righteous: for any being possessing conscious existence, is as truly in possession of *life* as the most favored creature in the universe can possibly be. Hence the promise of life eternal to the righteous as a boon, could have no meaning if the wicked were not deprived of life; for a *miserable life eternal* is as truly a *life eternal, as a happy life eternal*. The text makes no qualifications—does not modify the life of the righteous, nor the punishment of the wicked; but only places the one in opposition to the other; and as death is the opposite to life, the promise of life to the righteous establishes the certainty of death to the wicked. If there was not another text in all the Bible threatening the wicked with *death, destruction, perdition*, this text alone should establish the question in the mind of every candid man. *No one can understand life to be the opposite of life.*

J. H.

The Love of God.

Could I with ink the ocean fill;
Was this whole earth a parchment made—
Was every single stick a quill,
And every man a scribe by trade—
To write the love of God alone,
Would drain the ocean dry;—
Nor would the scroll contain the whole,
Though stretched from sky to sky.

CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH.

[From "Credibility of the Scriptures."]

INVESTIGATION CONCERNING THE CONSTITUTION AND ORGANIZATION OF THE FIRST CHRISTIAN CHURCHES.

BY J. H. McCULLOH, M. D., BALTIMORE.

(Continued from vol. 10, p. 372.)

HAVING stated my own views concerning the original constitution of christian churches, I shall now make an issue on the subject with those who contend that Christ or the apostles constituted a body of ecclesiastics as a divine corporation, in virtue of which they possess an exclusive commission to declare what are the true doctrines of Christianity, to administer sacraments as sanctifying ordinances, and of ordaining other persons to the exercise of the clerical function, so that any one who is not thus lawfully ordained, violates the institutions of Christ by undertaking to perform any of the acts above specified.

The manner in which I think this issue can be best tried, is to first examine in chronological order the historical statements of the Acts of the apostles, wherever the subject of the ministry may be either mentioned or alluded to. Secondly, to examine the Epistles of the several apostles, in the order in which they are commonly supposed to have been written, as bearing on the particulars above mentioned. The evidence being thus brought fairly before the reader, he can draw his own conclusions, and as the best exposition of the advantages of such a mode of proceeding will be seen in the execution of it, I shall commence the investigation without further observation.

A few days after the unauthorized election of Matthias as an apostle, of which I have already spoken, the Jewish feast of Pentecost took place, when the manifestation of the Holy Spirit as had been promised by Christ, rested not upon the apostles exclusively, but as we have inferred at page 31, upon the whole one hundred and twenty disciples of our Saviour. But, be this as it may, the apostles immediately commenced to preach that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah or Christ, and their preaching was accompanied with such evidences of its truth, and of the divine approbation, that in a few days at least five thousand persons became converts to their doctrine, who made a common stock of their wealth and lived together on the contribution. But though they thus associated themselves together, they did not adopt any new form of religious worship, for it is stated (*Acts ii. 46*) "they continued daily with one accord in the temple," which necessarily implies the observance of the Mosaic institutions, and that they did not establish any peculiar form of religious services for themselves as a society of christians.

The phrase (*Acts ii. 46*) of "breaking bread from house to house," has been commonly supposed to imply the celebration of the Lord's supper, but this construction seems to me to be fanciful, the more legitimate sense appears to be that they eat their meals at the various houses into which the new sect were distributed, for there must have been a considerable number of houses thus designated

where five thousand persons lived on a common stock.

But though they did not abandon the observance of the institutions of Moses, yet certainly some regulations concerning their peculiar religious profession and management of their secular concerns must have been adopted among them.—The very distribution of the common funds, out of which they lived, necessarily implies this, as well as that important necessity which required them to meet together to be confirmed or instructed in the principles of the new faith they professed in Jesus of Nazareth as being the Messiah. These considerations I presume induced them to assemble themselves together on the first day of the week, which probably soon became designated as the Lord's day, though that term does not occur in the New Testament but once, and that in the book of Revelations (*chap. i. 10*) which was written about sixty-five years after our Saviour's crucifixion.

But though the necessity that some form of government at this time undoubtedly implies the fact that it did exist, yet nevertheless we have not the smallest information on the subject. We can only conjecture that certain regulations were recognized among them that were sufficient to the general purposes of convenience and edification. We have no reason however to believe that any definite form or peculiar system was established among them upon apostolic authority, for we find two years after the ascension of Christ, (*Acts vi. 1, &c.*) that in consequence of a complaint made by the Greek Jews against the Hebrew Jews, seven Greek Jews were elected to see that "their widows" should not be neglected in the distribution of the common fund. This fact shews the apostles did not consider themselves to have a divine right to legislate for the community, otherwise they would have remedied the complaint by their own authority, instead of appealing to the people as to the unreasonableness of expecting them as apostles to attend to matters which would interfere in their function of "preaching the word of God." It is impossible therefore to suppose that any prescribed form of church organization could have been promulgated at this time, for if so, the disciples could not have expected from the apostles, the most exalted persons in the congregation, the performance of services which could be rendered equally well by any merely upright men among their members.

Though the New Testament does not designate the seven persons chosen on this occasion by any particular appellation, it has been the practice of christians to call them *deacons*, which if understood in the primitive sense of the term as mere *attendants, servants, &c.*, is perfectly correct.*—

* The term deacon, as comprehending the persons, the office, and the verb from whence they are derived, is used ninety-eight times in the New Testament. In every instance they signify either servant, the office of a servant, or the verb to serve, unless it can be proved there is a different meaning implied when the deacons of the church are named. A few instances will be sufficient to shew the use of the Greek word *deacon* as rendered in our English translation.

The function however of these seven persons was local and peculiar, and did not exist in any other community but where men lived on a common fund, which we have no reason to think prevailed elsewhere in the christian world than at Jerusalem.* The deacons mentioned in the epistles to Timothy and Titus were a class of church officers who were to be found in every christian congregation, and whom we suppose exercised functions that comprehended the duties both of the *Chazans* and *Parnasia* of the Jewish synagogue. See Vol. I. 509, &c.

The christian church, some two or three centuries after this time, appear to have generally fallen into the erroneous notion, that the office of deacon arose from the appointment of these seven persons by the apostles, and to this day the sixth chapter of Acts is read when those persons now called deacons are instituted in their office. The ignorance of the primitive christians, after the first century, of synagogue institutions perhaps was the cause of this oversight. I have met with but one instance where church authority has been expressly opposed to the ordinary belief, *viz.* the Synod of Trullo at Constantinople, who, A. D. 692, decreed that the seven persons appointed by the apostles were not of the same order as the deacons of the church.

In consequence of my very imperfect knowledge of the Greek language, I took it for granted that our English translation correctly stated the fact that the seven deacons, as they are called, had been ordained by an imposition of the hands of the apostles. As such a practice was conformable to what was done in the Jewish synagogues on certain occasions, I had no suspicion that the text as ordinarily understood was incorrect, until apprised of the fact by a Catholic friend, whose critical knowledge of the Greek language as respects the classical writings, is surpassed by few if any persons in the United States. He informed me that the grammatical construction of the passage undeniably was, that the GREEK JEWS, and not the

His mother said unto the *servants*, which drew the water, &c.—*John ii. 5, 9.*

Whoever will be great among you let him be your *servant*.—*Matt. xx. 26.*

If any man desire to be first, the same shall be last and *servant*, &c.—*Mark ix. 35.*

If any man *serve me* (*diacone*) let him follow me, and where I am there shall also my *servant* be.—*John xii. 26.*

Jesus Christ was a *minister* of the circumcision.—*Rom. xv. 8.*

Who then is Paul and who Apollos but *ministers* by whom ye believed.—*1 Cor. iii. 5.*

Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light, wherefore it is no great thing if his *servants* be transformed as the *servants* of righteousness.—*2 Cor. xi. 15.*

* In the appointment of the seven persons mentioned in Acts vi. our translation has "for this business," as if an office, whereas the word is *cxrcia*, which properly signifies *need, emergency, exigency, &c.* This word occurs above forty times in the New Testament, and in every other instance but this is uniformly rendered *need* or *necessity*.

apostles, laid their hands on the so-called deacons, and that it was impossible to give the passage any other construction without violating all correct principles of grammar. * * * The impossibility of referring this imposition of hands to the apostles by any construction of the Greek original, was clearly discerned by the writer of Beza's manuscript at Cambridge, who has inserted instead of *kat. and*, the word *otines, who*, by which the imposition of hands on the part of the apostles is very clearly expressed. Griesbach however gives no other manuscript as containing this reading.

The force of our argument is also indirectly acknowledged by Bloomfield, *Recen. Synop.* For to sustain the ordinary interpretation of apostolic ordination, he makes use of the following assumption unwarranted by any construction of the Greek language. "As *kai proscunameno* is to be referred to the apostles, the *kai* (and) has the force of the pronoun relative, as in *Merk* ii. 15.*

But nothing is more unjustifiable than this assertion, it being subversive of every principle of grammar to give a conjunction the sense of a pronoun.

The forced construction of Bloomfield, however, is a direct admission of the correctness of the translation given by my Catholic friend, for Bloomfield thus admits that the imposition of hands was the act of the Greek Jews, and not of the apostles, unless his violation of all grammatical construction can be sustained by making *kai*, the conjunction and, stand for the relative pronoun *who*. This however I presume neither he nor any one else can justify, but at any rate until the opponents of this criticism shall give their authorities for such violent rendering of the words, we shall contend for the accuracy of the translation as I have stated it.†

Furthermore, whatever may be the true interpretation of the passage, it is perfectly clear that this laying on of hands was not an ecclesiastical ordination, if that implies a communication of grace by such imposition, for these seven deacons had been expressly selected for their office in the fact, that they were already qualified as being full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom.—*Acts* vi. 3.

Their ordination therefore was merely a public designation that these individuals were entrusted with the superintendence of the temporal concern of the Greek Jews in the distribution of the common funds.

The circumstance of the people laying their hands on persons who were to exercise an official

* I am wholly at a loss to understand why this reference has been made, for it has no connection whatever with the subject. It may perhaps be a typographical misprint.

† In case any one may be perplexed by the supposition that our argument on the ordination of deacons conflicts with the observation made by the apostles (*Acts* vi. 3,) "*whom we may appoint*," &c. I beg leave to remark that I understand the expression *we*, not to mean the apostles exclusively, but as implying the whole brotherhood. Such a phrase is very common among ourselves; we hear public speakers continually say let us, we will, or we ought to do so and so.

position among them is recognized on a very important occasion in Jewish history. In *Num.* viii: 10, 11, we have these words: "And thou shalt bring the Levites before Jehovah, and the children of Israel shall put their hands on the levites. And Aaron shall offer the levites before Jehovah for an offering of the children of Israel, that they (the levites) may execute the service of Jehovah."

Whether the Greek Jews in selecting the seven persons called deacons, may have been influenced by the Jewish precedent or not we have no means of judging. In our estimate it was not unsuitable which is all we can venture to say on the matter.

The reader in estimating the exposition I have made on this subject, must not allow the prescription of the ordinary interpretation to influence his judgment, for the question is not to be determined by after practices of the christian churches. As the phrase *laying on of hands* occurs in the above instance for the first time in the New Testament, no precedent can be referred to, and hence we can only be governed in making a conclusion by the grammatical construction of the phraseology, which must not be perverted to make it sustain an ecclesiastical hypothesis, and especially so as the whole subject of clerical ordination is an exceedingly controverted subject.

After the appointment of the seven deacons, as they are called, there is nothing said in the Acts that has any bearing on church officers or church government until chap. xi. 30, which simply mentions that a collection in money for the relief of their poor brethren in Judea was paid over to the elders by Barnabas and Paul.

In *Acts* xiv. 23, we find that Paul and Barnabas in the discharge of a particular ministry that had been assigned them by the church at Antioch, are reported to have ordained elders (presbuteroi) in all the churches established by them. As this is the first place in which we read of the ordination of elders or presbyters we will quote the entire passage.

"And when they had preached the gospel to that city (Derbe) and had taught many, they returned again to Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch, confirming the souls of the disciples, and exhorting them to continue in the faith, and that we must through much tribulation enter into the kingdom of God. And when they had ordained them elders (presbuteroi) in every church, and had prayed with fasting, they commended them to the Lord on whom they believed."

By this passage, for the first time since the day of Pentecost, or about seventeen years after that event, we find that at some time during that interval, that churches had been established among the Gentiles, and that certain persons under the name of elders or presbyters had been ordained in every congregation. But what we are to understand by the terms *elder*, or *ordain*, is not signified in the least degree.

Allowing others to make what inferences they please from this passage, I contend that there is nothing here stated that is in any wise inconsistent with my exposition page 184, as to what is done, in the constituting a class-leader among the Methu- dists, viz. that the apostles merely designated 1

men among their converts who exercised a superintendence over their life and morals, and led their religious services when they met together for purposes of edification.

In Acts xv. 1, &c. which relates an occurrence that took place about twenty-three years after Christ's ascension, we find Paul and Barnabas sent to Jerusalem to consult the "apostles and elders," (or presbiteroi) concerning the necessity of observing the rite of circumcision. The 4th and 6th verses of this chapter evidently recognize the apostles and elders as conjointly constituting a tribunal to whose authority the body of Christians at large respectfully submitted the points in controversy. We might have anticipated the concession of such authority to the apostles, but who were these *elders* (presbiteroi) thus expressly associated with them in this ruling council? Were they persons ecclesiastically ordained to this office, or were they merely respectable or influential persons acting in the primitive sense of the term *elders* (*zokonnim*) as wise or experienced laymen of acknowledged piety and influence. (See Vol. I. 136.) It is most probable the last supposition is correct, for the determination of the assembly on the points submitted to them, (Acts xv. 22, 24,) is given in the combined names of "the apostles, and elders, and brethren," i. e. of the whole church at Jerusalem. Such a proceeding has none of the peculiarities of an ecclesiastical council or corporation, for if the brethren or whole membership be thus included in the determination given, then certainly the enumeration of the *elders* in the same act, cannot determine whether they are to be regarded in a civil or ecclesiastical capacity. That the term was used at this time among the Jews in a civil sense, is plainly inferrible from Paul's observation (Acts xxii. 5) that he went to Damascus with authority from the high priest and all the estate of the elders, &c. (presbiterion)—See also Math. xxvi. 59; xxvii. 1.

In the seventeenth verse of Acts xx. we again meet with a fact shewing an organization of christian churches under the direction of elders. This passage, together with verse 28, is of some importance in the controversy concerning Diocesan Episcopacy, for those persons termed in the seventeenth verse *elders*, (presbiteroi,) are the very same individuals that in the 28th verse are called *overseers*, but which ought to have been rendered *bishops*, (episcopoi,) as our translators have done every where else, but as this would have justified the objections made in those days against their episcopal hypothesis, they have evasively employed another word which though literally correct, is not so in a technical sense. In other words, they were guilty of a *suppresso veri*, i. e. they told the truth, but not the honest truth.

It is a further argument against Diocesan Episcopacy that both the seventeenth and twenty-eighth verses of this chapter recognize several *elders*, or *bishops* as attached to the church at Ephesus which is directly contrary to the hypothesis that there was but one bishop to a diocese.

I apprehend we derive a strong objection against the theory that the apostles had established any divine corporation of ecclesiastics as the "church," at this time, from what is communicated to us in

the twenty-ninth and thirty-first verses of Acts xx. Paul there expressly says, that "pervious wolves would hereafter appear among them not sparing the flock. Also of your own selves," (i. e. of the bishops or elders,) "shall men arise speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch and remember that by the space of three years I ceased not to warn every one, night and day with tears."

Yet notwithstanding this announcement, Paul does not make the least reference to any ecclesiastical corporation or church, with whom the truth might be supposed to be found, or to whom they should have recourse amidst the confusion that would hereafter be the result of different elders or bishops preaching "perverse things." It is therefore seemingly incredible that Paul could at this time have recognised any divinely appointed body of clergy to instruct man with authority, for if he had, he never could have omitted to declare the remedy when he foretold the mischief that would surely come.

In Acts xxi. 17, 18, Paul is stated to have arrived at Jerusalem, "and the day following Paul went in with us unto James, and all the elders (presbiteroi) were present." If there is any force in words, these imply that the christian church was not governed by the apostles exclusively, but that a body of *elders* was associated with them. Under what peculiarities of organization this council was constituted, we know not, but they evidently had authority at least to recommend what pertained to religious practice, and it is equally evident they had not yet organized themselves into a society based upon the peculiarities of christian institutions and appointments, though it was now thirty-one years since our Savior's ascension to heaven. They still continued zealous in the observance of the Jewish ceremonial law, and even induced Paul to assist in a Nazarite purification, which I must acknowledge I do not comprehend how he could participate in consistently with his avowed opinions and practice elsewhere.

After this time there is nothing related in the Acts that has any bearing on the subject of church officers or christian ecclesiastical institutions.

(To be continued.)

The Destroyer of Anti-Christ.

THE question is not whether Mr. Barnes is a millenarian or not; but it is simply this: Is the exposition which Mr. Barnes has given us of 2 Th. ss. 2: 8, the correct one or not? If his exposition of the Greek words *Epiphaneia* and *parousia*, rendered *brightness* and *coming*, be not correct, will the Editor of the Christian Observer, or some of his numerous readers be so kind as to show us the fallacy of his reasoning, and the defect of his exegesis? If they cannot do it let them candidly acknowledge the fact. We want honest criticism such as Mr. Barnes has given us in his exposition of this passage, and not the pious wishes or feelings of good men in the case. When we get the true meaning of the spirit in the passage, every one can make his own inferences.

Our design is not to impute to any one, any sentiment that he does not honestly hold to be the truth. All we say is, that Mr. Barnes' exposition of 2 Thess. 2 : 8, is directly opposed to the spiritualizing theory, which teaches that the anti-christian power spoken of in this passage, is to be destroyed by the simple preaching of the word of God. Mr. B. says, the idea is "He (Christ) would appear, and that this anti-christian power would be destroyed by His appearing; that is by *Himself*, when He shall return. The agency in doing it, would not be His brightness, but *Himself*. It would seem to follow from this, that however this enormous power of wickedness might be weakened by the truth, the final triumph over it would be reserved for the Son of man Himself on His *second return to our world*." With this exposition we cordially agree. Will any one make it plain that this is not the correct exposition of the passage. We forewarn him that he has a Herculean work before him.

Holding, as we do, that Mr. B.'s exposition of this passage is the true one, we ask any unprejudiced man to say whether our inference from the passage is not legitimately drawn, viz.: that Anti-christ must exist during the millennial dispensation of the Church, and on to the end of time; or else our Lord must come *personally*, and *before* the millennium, and destroy Anti-christ.

The reasoning is this:

Anti-christ will be destroyed by Christ Himself, on His second return to our world:

But our Lord will not return the second time till the end of the world:

Therefore Anti-christ will exist till the end of the world.

This is a legitimate anti-millenarian inference. Or this;

Anti-christ is to be destroyed by our Lord Himself on his second return to our world;

But Anti-christ cannot exist in the millennial dispensation of the Church; for then all shall know the Lord.

Therefore our Lord will come *before* the millennium and destroy Anti-Christ.

This is the millenarian view of the subject.—Will some one be kind enough to show us that Mr. B.'s exposition is not correct, and that our inference is not legitimately drawn.

On 2 Thess. 2 : 8, Olshausen says—"When the *Anomos*, (the wicked one, referring to the man of sin,) thinks he has attained to all in the possession of his universal monarchy, in which he has united all spiritual and worldly power in his own person.—Christ will annihilate him by His appearance."—"The combination *Epiphaneia tes parousias*, the brightness of His coming which is found here only, is, however, peculiar. Here the apparent *parousia* so is to be explained so that *Epiphaneia*, (brightness) denotes the *subjective*, *parousia*, (coming) the *objective* aspect, that is, this latter expression puts forward the actuality of Christ's appearing, the *former* one the contemplation of it on the part of man, the consciousness of His presence." Thus it appears that Mr. Barnes and Dr. Olshausen agree in the exposition of this passage.

Chris. Observer.]

WM. RAMSEY.

From T. J. Harris, Harrisburgh, Pa.

Br. Storrs;—I for one would like to have the BIBLE EXAMINER published weekly, if possible; but semi-monthly at least. I am really astonished that out of at least 100,000 believers in the United States, there cannot be obtained enough subscribers to pay for the publishing of a single paper. I know several believers in the doctrine who are not too poor, but fancy themselves unable to pay, but who, at the same time, probably give double the amount to sectarian churches, or who would pay \$3 for a ticket to hear "JENNY" sing. I wish you to continue to send me the EXAMINER, and I will pay you \$5 for the year, and you can send me 1, 2, or 3 copies as you can afford. One copy I *must have*; and if you send me more I will give them away, not to swine, but to the heathen round about, for we need not go to Japan to find them.

From J. W. Dye, Onondaga Co., N. Y.

Br. Storrs;—I am not one that has been contemplating withdrawing my support from the EXAMINER, and, silently or any other way, saying "Farewell" to its *Editor*. I have received through the EXAMINER too much valuable instruction and advice—have been too much benefitted by its truths to do so now, even if I should see something in it that I could not assent to. Once I could not have assented to the so great and fundamental truths which it constantly proclaims, and in which I now, with many others, rejoice.

I am glad to see that you do not manifest any thing like a disposition to surrender your *personal* independence and right to proclaim to the world what your firm conviction of truth is; and may the God of all truth be your support and comfort in all the trying scenes you may have to pass through, and, at last, crown you, with all the lovers of our Lord, with *Endless Life* in his everlasting Kingdom.

I have some friends that I would be glad to have read the EXAMINER, and I think if it was put into their hands, free of cost, their prejudice might be so far overcome that they would read it, and, perhaps, be benefitted by it. Therefore I enclose five dollars for three copies.

If I had the means, I would take pleasure in paying for, and sending it to a great many; but I have not.

If I live, and have my health, you shall have a small donation from me, as I consider it my duty and it is a pleasure to give in support of the Lord's Gospel; and especially to those of his servants who have made great sacrifices of popularity, friends, wealth, and have forsaken all for the honor of being a good minister of Jesus Christ.

Yours, in hope of Life Eternal, through Jesus.

REASONS WHY we should attend to the Lord's Supper.—1. Christ commands it. But suppose he did not. 2. He recommends it. 3. The circumstances under which it was instituted—*Just before his death*. 4. Its uses to ourselves; by calling to mind his love. 5. Because it is an open confession of Christ. There is no other ordinance which is *alone peculiar* to christianity.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, FEBRUARY 1, 1875.

Proof of Immortality.

Dreams are, in some degree, a proof of immortality.—as an evidence that the mind is not so fettered by the body as to be incapable of a separated and higher existence.—*True Wesleyan.*

Dogs and other brutes "dream!" Is that "in some degree, a proof of immortality?" Does it prove "that the dog's mind is not so fettered by the body as to be incapable of a separate and higher existence?" Yes, just as much and as truly as man's dreaming does. *Mind*, in all created beings, is the result of a living organism. Till our *dreams* can show us mind where there is no such organism: they cry in vain "O Baal, save us!" To the law and testimony, if any man speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them. Where is "the law and testimony" that saith man has an *immortal mind*? *No where.* Then "let him who hath a dream tell a dream; but he that hath" God's "word let him speak it plainly: What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the LORD."

QUESTIONS. 1st. In 1 Thes. 5 : 23, are we taught that it takes spirit, soul and body to constitute a man? or, was not Paul speaking of the whole Church?

2d. Does Luke 24 : 37-39, teach that there is such a thing as a spirit that has not flesh and bones? or, is there not a mistranslation in this scripture? W. H. W.

ANSWER. 1st. We think the apostle's language may be understood either way; and then imports no more than a wish that all their *tempers*, or dispositions, and *minds* and *animal nature* might be in subjection to God and consecrated to his service; and he wished and prayed that such might be the state of the whole church.

2d. Luke 24 does not teach, we think, that there is any such thing as a spirit that has not flesh and bones, if by spirit is meant an intelligent created being. The term spirit, Lk. 24 : 37-39, is used, we judge, in the same sense as in Mark 6 : 49, where Jesus came to his disciples walking on the water, and they supposed it to be a *spirit—a phantasma*, a phantom: an unsubstantial appearance, but a terror to superstitious minds. Such appearances had not flesh and bones, nor was there any thing real about them. Still we are not to suppose that there are no real *material* beings who are constituted without flesh and bones, as we have. In what particular form God may cause beings to exist, it is in vain for us to specu-

late: yet so far as known to us, all are connected with matter.

MORE QUESTIONS.—*Br. Storrs* :—I have a few questions to ask you; they puzzle me some. I think it the strongest argument our opponents have for disembodied spirits. The first is in Mark 5, concerning the man in the tombs, who said, "My name is Legion, for we are many." Now, the account says, there was about two thousand swine; and allowing one spirit for each, there must have been truly many in him, as he said.

Also the case of Mary Magdalene, from whom seven were cast out. If I understand you right, you think all spiritual beings have bodily form, and are matter of some kind. Now, how could so many material devils occupy the same space in man at one and the same time? I have no doubt but this has puzzled others beside me. If you can throw any light on the subject, please do it, and oblige your friend and brother.

Yours, in the hope of life through Jesus Christ alone. JOHN B. DODGE.

ANSWER.—A few words is all we can now give to the questions of *Br. Dodge*. The subject of *demoniacal* possessions is one that has "puzzled" wiser heads than ours. We shall not, at present, go into the question whether *Demons* are personal beings or only *imaginary* ones. The condition and actions of some men, in all ages, especially in times of apostasy and superstition, has led some to think there are invisible evil beings that act upon men, producing the phenomenon of madness, etc. Supposing it to be so, there is no evidence from the Bible that they were actually *inside* of men or swine, "occupying space." The term translated "cast out," in the Greek, is *ek-ballo*, from *ek*, which signifies not only *out of*, but also "away from"—"off;" "*ballo*," "to throw, to sling, to hurl, to thrust," etc. The word then signifies not only *cast out*, but "to hurl away from—to send off." Let us look at Matt. 8 : 31, the parallel to Mark 5th : "So the *Damones* besought him, saying if thou *ekballeis*—send us off—suffer us to go *eis*—to the herd of swine."

We will look at a few texts where the word is translated "send forth," etc. Math. 9 : 38, "Pray ye the Lord of the harvest that he will *ekballee*—send forth laborers into his harvest." Math. 12 : 20, "Smoking flax shall he not quench till he *ekballee*—send forth judgment unto victory." Mark 1 : 12, "Immediately the spirit *ekballie*—driveeth him" [Jesus] "into the wilderness." Verse 43, Jesus "charged him, and forthwith *ekballen*—sent him away;" that is, the man he had just healed of leprosy.

These examples are sufficient to show that our

"opponents," as usual, stand on slippery ground when they attempt to prove the demons were literally *inside* of the possessed.

We may obtain further light by comparing Gal. 4 : 30, *Ekballe*—"cast out the bond woman," with Gen. 21 : 14, "And Abraham * * * sent her away." There is no necessity therefore for supposing, if the *demons* were personal beings they were actually *within* the person possessed. God is said to *dwell* IN MEN; see 1 John 4 : 12, 13. We have the nature of this *dwelling* in us explained in Rom. 8 : 9-11. We do not suppose that the Godhead, *personally*, dwells in man; but He does by His Spirit, or divine influence. So neither are we to suppose that any created existence, or being—whether *Satan*, *Diabolos*, or *Demons*, if they have *personality*, dwell *personally* in any man; but men are under their *influence*—they are *mesmerized* by them, so that they talk and act just according to *his*, or *their will*.

We see nothing, therefore, to "puzzle" us at all in the cases Br. DODGE refers to. The *demons*—*devils* might be "legions," or tens of legions, and the texts give no evidence of such an indwelling as some suppose: the most that can be said is, that they exercised an influence on the person's mind, by which he or she was controlled; and when that influence was broken, as it was by Jesus, the demons were *ekballe*—*sent off from*, or *away from* the person, and they came to their senses again, and acted like rational beings—were "in their right mind."

THE EASTERN WAR.

An English writer on prophecy, from whom we quoted in April, 1854, in relation to the "*Projects of France*," still continues to issue *Tracts* on the same subject. In one issued October last he speaks of "*The Eagle*" as the "legionary standard of the Old Roman Empire"; which, after it was overwhelmed by the northern invasions, rose again at the end of fourteen hundred years under the auspices of NAPOLEON I., but was again overwhelmed at Waterloo. Forty years then passed, and the ROMAN EAGLE soared again with wings as firm and youthful as before. After dwelling in few words on the English for having now trusted this new development under NAPOLEON III., he proceeds as follows:—

The Roman Eagle is aloft again, and now let us see the direction of his flight—let us descend to plain matter of fact. The Eagle standards were first concentrated in Paris, around one dark, silent, and impenetrable man—the representative of the First Napoleon. This man has invariably an-

nounced himself as the Man of Destiny—under the influence of some fatal star—predestined to avenge his predecessor, and to revive his empire. With far greater wisdom than the former Napoleon, he proceeds, step by step, and regulates the flight of his eagles by some magic influence. ROME, as the capital of the Roman world, was fixed upon as the first object of his ambition. With profound sagacity, he discerned that Rome is the only starting-point of universal dominion. It is, indeed, most marvellous to observe, that for 2300 years, under all the changes and revolutions of the world, the centre of influence and empire has been connected with Rome. He saw this well; and the first flight of his eagles was directed upon Rome. Before he had been six months President of France he was master of the Seven Hills; he had secured the seat of empire before he seized the title of "Emperor." His eagles rested for awhile on the summit of the Seven Hills, and looked around for another prey. The second capital of the Roman Empire was the most appropriate subject for his next adventure. He got up an artificial excitement, and an *artificial war*; and led England to join him in his aggression. The British Bull awoke from his emerald meadows, and with the most conical evolutions gambolled after the Eagle. A race between an Eagle and a Bull was a novelty in the order of things, and all Europe looked on as much amused as alarmed. The issue of the race was just what might have been expected. While the Bull was floundering in the mire of Balaclava the fiery Eagle soared up on his boldst wing, and steeped at once upon the Russian fortress. He has got it, and he will keep it—for it was the Eagle alone who gained THAT day. The Franco-Roman Eagle sits alone on the towers of Sebastopol, and looks down upon sea and land as subject to himself alone. But in his midway flight from Paris to the Crimea, the Eagle paused awhile at Athens and Constantinople, and fixed his talons deeply in both; and before he proceeded in his northward flight, he had so naimed and overawed the Greek and Turkish capitals, as to be secure of each whenever he may require it for his prey. The Bull stands knee-deep in the mire, and bellows out his approbation! And, however Europe may be alarmed at the fiery vehemence of the Eagle, and the lumbering of the Bull, it cannot but laugh at the inequality of the match, and the certain failure of the four-footed competitor.

To speak in less figurative terms, we have chosen the title of the "Eagle Standard," in order in the first place to express the rapidity and decision of the Imperial progress; and, in the next place to point out the extraordinary circumstance, that the New-Napoleonic empire is assuming all the attributes of the ancient Roman one! It had, long ago, assumed the Roman standard. It is now taking the exact outline of the empire of the CÆSARS. Beginning on the shores of the Western Ocean, and within the *limits* of ancient Gaul; it is so far strictly a part of the old empire of Rome. But when the third Napoleon ascended the throne, his empire, being nearly confined to France, was no more than a *province* of the ancient Roman world. He at once secured Rome itself, and from

that moment he became the representative of the ancient Cæsars. But still he knew well that he was only a shadowy representative—the mere ghost of the Cæsars. It was necessary that the shadowy outline should be filled up with flesh and blood. He had already got Algeria, the ancient Roman Numidia, the classic territory of Marius and of Sallust. He must proceed, step by step, to complete and fill up the whole body of the empire. Having advanced from Paris to Rome, his next most appropriate advance was from Rome to Athens—from the renowned capital of ancient arms to the equally renowned capital of ancient arts. Athens he has seized; and he next advanced to Constantinople—the gateway of the East, and the capital of all the empires of Islamism!—the representative of the whole Mahomedan world. He is thus, this moment, the master of all the sources of influence and power which sway the human mind. The spiritual despotism of Rome—the historic fame of Athens—the superstitious veneration which binds the Eastern world to Constantinople—the elegance, genius, and splendour which attaches the Western world to Paris—all these, at once, are placed at his command, and used as weapons in his conquests; while his alliance with England, and our complete dependence upon his smallest caprice, have made him master of the last and only obstacle which could have retarded his designs—the naval and commercial power of Great Britain.

But he has advanced, and is now advancing much further than this. In the last number it was remarked that he had made a treaty with PERSIA. This has since been confirmed; the treaty has been signed and sealed, and his influence extended directly across the two continents, from Paris to Ispahan. Nor is this all. For the King of Birmanah is about to send an ambassador to the court of the Tuileries, the first embassy that he has ever sent to any European court. Observe! the Burmese have not sent an ambassador to England, although we are their nearest neighbours, in the East. They send their ambassador to the French Emperor, not to us, as if they had discovered (with their well-known sagacity) that the destinies of the East are as much dependent upon France, as the destinies of the West. This is a very significant event in itself; but it may be far more important in its consequences. The Birman Empire closes in upon the Eastern frontier of BARRISN INDIA. Persia approaches the British territory on the North-west. The Affghans, who lie between India and Persia, most justly hate us, because, without the slightest offence or provocation, we most basely invaded their country, and killed (without provocation) 20,000 men! This awful crime, which can never be forgotten before God, is well remembered among men, and the Affghans hate us as we hate the Russians, only that they have some reason for their hatred. Now let us look to the results. Constantinople, Persia, the Birman Empire, all in league with France, the Affghans ready to join the league at the slightest invitation. Look at your map and you will see that British India is threatened in front and flank by this ominous league! North, North-west, and

South-east, the allies of France close in upon British India, and offer both an *auxiliary contingent* and (far worse) a *military road* to a force advancing from the Dardanelles! And the Dardanelles are in possession of France. Truly! we are a sagacious people. For want of a better excuse for killing 200,000 of our fellow creatures, we pretend that we went to war for the preservation of India, lest Russia should make her way to Hindostan across the Turkish and Persian territories. And now we have so bungled the war, that we have handed over Turkey, Persia, and even the Birman empire to the French Emperor, to a man whose very name of "Napoleon" is the exponent and war-cry of Oriental conquest; with whom to conquer the East, and avenge the defeat of Acre is an hereditary principle, a religion more sacred than the Cross. Do you think he does not see his opportunity? Or do you doubt that while you are shedding torrents of blood, to save India from Russia, you are not *by that very bloodshed*, giving India to France? The case is too evident to require proof. Scripture tells us of a woman who betrayed her husband's secret, in order to save herself from being burnt, and the immediate consequence of this treachery was, that the Philistines came up and burnt her and her family with fire. (Judges 14 and 15.) We have shed the blood of myriads in order to save our Indian possessions, and by the very act of shedding that blood we are giving them over to France. Nothing but infatuation sent by God, for our enormous Indian crimes, can account for the idiocy of our conduct. In every case we are doing, by means of war and bloodshed, the very thing which we have gone to war in order to prevent.

But this is not all. There are other points to be considered in the Oriental question. If you look at the map you will find that there is a wide interval between the Dardanelles and Persia, and so wide an interval would be a serious military defect without some intermediate point of connexion. In all great military operations, there must be connecting points between the extreme ends of the line; strong positions and reserves to fall back upon; magazines and stores at practicable distances. To an army advancing from the West, SYRIA and PALESTINE present these requisites in perfection. Syria, the Euphrates, and Persia, form an unbroken line of military communication. A better line, at least, than Russia ever could have found, in advancing from the Crimea. Syria runs up to the Euphrates, the Euphrates falls into the Persian Gulf, and Persia borders upon Afghanistan. Palestine is remarkably strong, full of military positions, and in fact *Palestine is the key of the East*, as Constantinople is the key of the *North-East*.

Fully alive to these considerations, our beloved Ally, who longs to embrace his friends in every part of the world, is now manoeuvring to get immediate possession of Jerusalem and Palestine. Not satisfied that he has already got the key of the Dardanelles, he is determined likewise to secure the keys of the East. A French ambassador is, at this moment, in Rome, in consultation with Pius the Ninth, for the purpose of completing an ar-

rangement with reference to the KEYS OF THE HOLY PLACES OF JERUSALEM. The French envoy is next to proceed from Rome to Jerusalem, in order to carry the measure into effect. Having thus secured the keys of the Holy Places, it will be necessary, and even laudable, to send a French force to Palestine, since very serious collisions have lately occurred between the holy men of the Greek and Roman Churches in Jerusalem. With the praiseworthy design of preventing this in future, our benevolent Ally will dispatch a few regiments to Palestine—by and by, a few more—until he has got complete possession of the Holy Land. And having secured the Holy Land, nothing will be more natural than to restore the Jews, for the Jews can fight stoutly in their own territory, and will serve as a reinforcement to the French army of occupation; while the wealthy Jews, who are on the most intimate terms with Napoleon, will furnish millions of money to support the man who restores them to their native country. Indeed the seizure of Palestine, and the restoration of the Jews, would be the wisest course which the Emperor could pursue, not only politically but financially; for his wars are unusually expensive, and the Jews have more disposable capital than any other people in the world.

One thing, however, is certain, that after the fall of Sebastopol, the French envoy was sent at once to secure the keys of the Holy Places. Rome itself was the first position secured—Rome was the first act of the GREAT DRAMA; Athens was the second; Constantinople was the third; Sebastopol the fourth; and now, Jerusalem is the fifth! What will be the next act of this many-scened tragedy?

Nor has a single measure been overlooked which could strengthen his hold upon the East. Wherever we look everything is provided for with unerring sagacity. ABDEL KADER, the greatest hero of the age, the chieftain of the Saracen race, has been attached to the Emperor by every act of liberality and munificence. For life or death the Arabian Emir is the vassal of Napoleon. Terrified by the earthquake at Broussa, the Emir could find no place of security but one; no place was secure from earthquakes but Damascus, which was a strange discovery, as Syria is most particularly liable to earthquakes. But though strange, it was convenient. Damascus is the heart of Syria, and the very best position for a military vassal of the French Emperor. And now Abdel-Kader is on his way to the renowned city of the White Caliphs, to assemble to his standard all the warlike tribes of Mount Libanus and Syria, and to make their innumerable cavalry tributaries to France. Nothing can be better planned than the transmitting of Abdel-Kader to Damascus. It is neither more nor less than placing a French Marshal at the head of fifty thousand cavalry and half a million of infantry, in the most central position of Western Asia—and its results will appear in due time.

But this is not all. The last Turkish loan has been most dexterously secured upon the revenues of Syria and of Egypt. The Turks are insolvent, they cannot pay the interest upon the loan beyond the first year. The French government has guaranteed the loan; when the interest cannot be paid,

the French government will come down upon Syria and Egypt; the mortgage will be foreclosed! and Syria and Egypt, or one of them, at least, will become the property of France! But the Turkish loan will be taken by the Jews, and the Jews, being the creditors, will be repaid by getting possession of the Syrian territory or of Palestine, which is part of Syria; so that, in the most natural manner in the world, Syria, Palestine, Egypt, Abdel-Kader, and the Jews, will slide into the hands of Napoleon the Third; and all without the slightest moral obliquity—all in defiance of the slavery—we mean the liberties of Europe, which being threatened by the approach of Russia to the Danube, will now be happily defended by the occupation of the Turkish empire by France. Virtue is its own reward! * * *

So far the French Emperor has advanced, or is advancing, in the direct route to India. And while we are guilty of the most atrocious bloodshed in order to secure India from Russia, Almighty God has, most righteously, decreed that we should sell our lives and colonies to France! The justice of God is unmistakable—the sagacity of our enemy is miraculous. Observe how he is acting: He does not waste his time in getting possession of the intermediate and subordinate points; he leaves them to themselves, and passes on to the vital positions, the command of which gives him the command of the intervening territory. Having first secured France, he then passes on, at once, to Rome. From Rome to Athens, from Athens to Constantinople, from Constantinople to Damascus, from Damascus to Jerusalem. These positions command the intervening territory, and make him master of the whole line of march, without any necessity of intermediate conquest; just as a man who had got possession of London, Chatham, and Dover, would be virtually master of the whole intervening district. This economy of conquest shews how well he understands his trade, and will add greatly to the rapidity of his progress. * * *

We ventured to remark in February, 1854, on the the dexterity of France in producing an eternal enmity between you and Russia. Russia was *your only ally*. You had alienated the rest of Europe, by exciting the people to insurrection. You had alienated the "people" themselves by leaving them in the hands of the executioner, without one effort to save them after you yourselves had excited them to revolt! You had no ally upon earth but Russia, and now you have lost her for ever; and all the world will look on well-pleased should your pride and self-conceit be brought down by France. Do you think that America would help you? America would join in alliance against you to-morrow, for the sake of your West Indian Islands—and is, in fact, waiting, this moment, the first opportunity for seizing them! You have not *now* one friend left upon earth: and do you dare to hope for aid from God, whose holy name you have defiled by hypocrisy and blood?

The Franco-Roman Eagle has now spread his wings for a bolder flight than he ever essayed even under the first Napoleon. From the towers of

Notre Dame to Rome, from Rome to Athens, from Athens to the Hellespont, from the Hellespont to Damascus, from Damascus to Jerusalem. There appear to be no limits to his flight until he have reached the Euphrates or the Indus—and he seems to realize the words of Scripture:—"Wheresoever the carcass is, thither will the Eagles be gathered together." (Luke 7.) One thing is certain—that you yourselves have carried the French eagles much nearer to India, at the expense of your own blood, than ever the Russians could have reached in the same time, had you completely abstained from going to war. And though your mock-preachers have told you that slaughter is the duty of a Christian, not one of them has had penetration enough to discover that you were fighting against yourselves. "Like people, like priest," says Hosea; and so it is now. Priests and people alike, are blundering on in the mire of ruin, as much as in the mire of national crime.

CORRECTION.—*Dear Brother*:—You will do me the justice to correct a mistake of no little consequence. Respondent represents me as admitting that there is "not one solitary text, in all the Book, that *plainly affirms*" that the wicked dead will be made alive in order to be judged. Now, I admit no such thing. I understand John 5: 28 and 29, and other passages, as "*plainly affirming*" the fact.

To set aside the literal import of a word in a literal passage because the same word is used figuratively in a figurative passage, as in Ezek. 37, is inconsistent with all just rules of biblical interpretation.

Yours truly, HENRY GREW.

RESPONSE TO THE FOREGOING.—We are sorry that Bro. GREW should feel himself under the necessity of making a "*correction*" where we really see nothing to correct. He did give up 1 Corth. 15: 22, as having no reference to the revival into life of the wicked. Respondent regarded that text, if there is any, the "*one solitary text that plainly affirms it*;" and added that, in Respondent's opinion, "Br. G. now admits" there is none "*by giving up 1 Corth. 15: 22.*" If Respondent had closed his remark after the word "admits," then there would have been cause for correction: because Br. G. contends other texts do plainly affirm the living again of the wicked dead; but Respondent does not admit it, and hence expressed his opinion that Br. G. by "giving up 1 Corth. 15: 22" did, *in fact*, admit that the affirmative is a matter of *opinion*. Respondent is still of opinion John 5: 28, 29 does not "*plainly affirm*," nor affirm at all, that the wicked dead shall be made alive. The righteous dead come "to the resurrec-

tion of life": the wicked dead fall short of it, and come only "to the resurrection of *condemnation*." There is no life in their case; at least, only by *inference*; no plain affirmation.

As Br. G. seems not to approve of Respondent's use of Ezek. 37, in illustrating the subject, we have been led to look more closely at John 5 and Ezek. 37, and we were struck with the fact that our Lord's language in John 5 seems to have been based on Ezek. 37, as his language Mark 9. 44 is based on Isa. 66: 24. In John 5 our Lord had been speaking of himself as God's appointed Messenger to give *life* and to *execute* judgment; and affirmed he had *power* to "*quicken* whom" he would; and he tells his hearers "the hour now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God"; for the Father "hath given to the Son to have life in himself": hence he can make alive "whom he will": and "the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son." Now, the works Christ wrought, in quickening many dead in sins among the Jews, and raising to life literal dead persons during his personal ministry, would be evidence that his claim of having power to quicken whom he would, and of executing judgment on all, was a true claim. And as he was addressing the Jews, who were seeking "to kill him" (verse 18) he goes on to tell the *Jews* it was *himself* the Father had given power to do what is plainly declared in Ezek. 37 God would do, *viz*:—"Behold, *O my people*, I will open your graves, and cause you to come out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel: and ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened your graves, *O my people*, and brought you up out of your graves, and I will put *My Spirit in you and ye shall live*," &c.

Whatever this resurrection is—whether national, spiritual, or literal—it seems to our mind perfectly clear it is the *very same* Jesus speaks of John 5: 28, 29. If one is *national* so is the other: if one is *spiritual* so is the other: if one is *literal* so is the other. They are *the same*, we judge. If any choose to say, it is *literal*; then none but God's "*people*" are made *alive*: none others are embraced in Ezekiel's prophecy; and none others receive *life* in our Lord's declaration of his bringing men from the graves, John 5. We say again, the scenes are one. The Jews certainly understood the fulfillment of the prophecy of Ezek. 37 to be in the future when Jesus spoke in their hearing John 5: 28, 29; and it seems to us perfectly evident it was to that prophecy he referred, and claimed that he would fulfill it. He tells them not to "marvel"

at his statements, that God had given him "life in himself"—"authority to execute judgment"—"to quicken whom he will," &c. "for the hour is coming, in the which" that still more wonderful prophecy of Ezekiel should be fulfilled, and he would open the graves of God's "people" and bring them "to the resurrection of life"; while at the same time the doers of evil—like themselves, who "sought to kill him"—at this resurrection should be noticed, but only "to condemnation": *condemned to what?* "Not see life": John 3: 36. Thus our Lord and Ezekiel harmonize; and one throws light on the other; and neither give any countenance to the idea than any wicked man is to be made alive from literal death. So it looks to us.

Will any Dead be made Alive Mortal?

Dear Brother Storrs.—Respondent proposes for consideration the fourth question, *viz*, "Do the scriptures *distinctly* teach that any who are made alive by a resurrection, at the last day, are *mortal*?"

We are happily agreed that the penalty of the divine law is literal "*death*," or cessation of conscious being, Rom. 6: 23; and that there is no deliverance from this awful doom, but by vital union of penitent man to the Son of God. "The gift of God is eternal Life through Jesus Christ our Lord." "He that hath the Son hath Life and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." 1 John 5: 12. John 3: 36. Consequently, we agree, that if the impenitent and unbelieving are raised to life at all, it must be a "mortal" and not an *immortal* life.

I have presented to our readers numerous divine testimonies, which in my view, teach a universal judgment both of a *judicial* and *executive* character: passages which declare facts relative to the judgment of the wicked, which necessarily imply life and its functions, such as hearing, suffering, &c. Connecting these passages with the class, relative to the penalty of the divine law, the conclusion plainly is, that many who will be made alive by "a resurrection (to) condemnation," will be still "*mortal*" and liable to a "second death." Rev. 20: 14. Therefore, I have no need of adducing any other proof to sustain the affirmative of the fourth question than what I have already presented.

Admitting, as we do, that the condemnation of the wicked is to everlasting death; the Savior, I conceive, *does* "*distinctly*" teach that (many will be) made alive by a resurrection at the last day, who are *mortal*" and will die "the second death." "ALL that are in the graves shall hear his voice and shall come forth, they that have done good to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of condemnation." John 5: 28, 29. I see no authority, dear brother, in all the passages Respondent has quoted, for setting aside the literal sense of our Saviour's words, which sense I think that I have also confirmed by other passages.

The revelation of a "second death" and of persons being "*hurt*" thereby, (clearly implied in Rev. 2: 11.) teaches that some will be "made alive by a resurrection" in a "mortal" state. There can be no *second* death without a resurrection to temporary life from the *first*.

The sacred scriptures "distinctly teach that some will be made alive by a resurrection," in a "mortal" state, by teaching, as our Saviour does, Math. 10: 28, Luke 12: 5, that there is something for men to fear "AFTER (being) killed" in the first death; *viz*: a destruction of soul and body in gehenna, or "lake of fire," which Peter teaches us will be the conflagration of the present earth. 2 Peter 3: 6. Now, brother, if the first death terminates all consciousness forever, then there is nothing more or "after" that to fear. Please observe, it is not merely everlasting destruction, that the Saviour teaches them to fear, but a destruction of a *peculiar kind*, a destruction in gehenna, or lake of fire, Luke 12: 5. "Fear him, which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell," &c. Matt. 5: 29 also. A man need fear no more to be cast into a lake of fire when he is dead than to be cast on a bed of down.

These solemn warnings were addressed to men living in the days of our Lord's first advent, THEY were taught to fear this dreadful doom of being cast into a furnace, or lake of fire where there will be "wailing and gnashing of teeth."

I fully accord with you that no judgment of investigation is necessary to enlighten the omniscient Jehovah concerning the actions or characters of men; but this is no proof that the divine wisdom may not institute a declaratory process concerning "the deeds done in the body," that God's righteousness in judgment may be made manifest to an intelligent universe. This principle is clearly recognized in the inspired account of the judgment at the coming of our Lord, Matt. 25th chapter. If this refers exclusively to those who are alive at his coming, it appears to me to present the *principles* on which all final judgment of men will proceed. These principles clearly involve the consciousness of those who are judged.

Rejoicing in the anticipation of seeing eye to eye "when that which is perfect is come," I am, dear brother, as ever, yours in christian love,

HENRY GREW.

Philadelphia, January 20th, 1856.

Response to H. Crew.

That there will be a "judgment both of a *judicial* and *executive* character," of all men, we have no doubt, nor have we questioned it in anything we have said; but that this will take place *after* all the dead are made *alive* again we are not prepared to admit; nor do we see anything our brother has adduced that satisfies our judgment of such a procedure. We are not convinced that any dead sinner "will be made *alive* by a resurrection (to) condemnation." We are not left to *infer* that those who are to be immortal will be so; though there would be much more ground for such infer-

ence than there is for any being mortal after being made alive from the dead. The righteous are said to have "eternal life": then, they will be *immortal*, is a fair inference; but inspiration has confirmed the fact by "*distinctly*" announcing that they "put on immortality" at the resurrection. Now, harmony, and definiteness, would seem to require, "if the impenitent and unbelieving are raised to *life* at all," it should be as distinctly announced that they are *mortal*. But nothing of the kind occurs in the Bible; and it is only by *inference*, based upon our brother's view of the meaning of certain texts, that the resurrection to *mortality* is to be established, if done at all. "The Saviour" no where states that anybody that is "made *alive* by a resurrection *at the last day*" is "mortal," or that they "will die the second death." He "*distinctly*" teaches the contrary, we think. The text John 5: 28, 29 we do not "conceive" to teach any such doctrine: see our last remarks on this text in reply to "*Correction*," page 44.

We have so often responded to Br. G.'s quotation of Math. 10: 28, and Lk. 12: 5 that we feel a delicacy in pressing the subject; yet as he seems to think those texts an important confirmation of the affirmative, and now tells us "A man need fear no more to be cast into a lake of fire when he is dead than to be cast on a bed of down," we will try to see if Br. G. does not subject his own view to the same apparent inconsistency. What does the text Lk. 12: 5 say? "Fear Him who after *He hath killed* hath power to cast into *gehenna*." Now, is it not when the man "*is dead*" that God casts him into *gehenna*? Or, "after He [God] *hath killed*" a man is he still *alive*? We might say, then, to our brother, according to his own favorite text, the man "*is dead*" before he is "cast into *gehenna*," and will be no more *hurt* by it "than to be cast into a bed of down."

Usually nothing was cast into the literal *gehenna* that had life. But whatever was the state it was in, at the time, it was so dissolved that its reconstruction was impossible: hence to cast into *gehenna* became a figure of speech to denote destruction without recovery. Jesus taught his "*friends*" not to fear men who might deprive them of the present life but could not prevent their living again—*men* could not cast them into *gehenna*; or prevent their reorganization; but God could, for He only had that power: therefore, fear Him and not men. The *fear* commanded was to be exercised *now*, not *after* death: and the fear was that God would so fix the seal of death upon

them that they should not live again—*i. e.*, seal their disorganization so that a future life would be impossible. Men could not do this, but God could; therefore "my friends," fear not men but God. "These solemn warnings were addressed to" Christ's "*friends*," and to them alone; see Lk. 12: 4; and that to preserve them from apostatizing under their persecutions from men. The fear of not attaining to the *resurrection life*, that Christ promised to give his followers "at the last day," is the *fear* inculcated in Math. 10: 28 and Lk. 12: 5. Of this fact we have no "*doubt*"; and it relates not to a fear to be realized after death, but in the present time and life.

That the living wicked, who remain unto the coming of the Lord, will be "cast into a furnace or lake of fire where there will be 'wailing and gnashing of teeth'" we do not question, any more than we question the fact that the living wicked were submerged in a lake, or flood of water in Noah's day, and that "there was weeping and gnashing of teeth." That was "the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men"; but none were the actual partakers of that lake of water but the then living wicked, whom Peter calls "*the world of the ungodly*"; and he says, "The world that *then was* perished"; and he adds, "The heavens and the earth which are now by" [or according to] "the same word" [or, testimony of God] "are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of" [these] "ungodly men," of whom he had spoken in the previous verses, *viz.*, the "seoffers" of "*the last days*," who seoffingly inquired, "Where is the promise of his coming?" and who, despising the idea of Christ's return from heaven would, at that time, be "walking after their own lust." These will meet with an awful perdition or destruction by the fire of that day, as the sinners of the old world did by water in the days of Noah.

Such we regard as the true teaching of Peter, and he never utters one word, in all he saith, of the ungodly, who are dead, being made *alive*, to come under the fire of that day; but he does state that God "is long suffering to usward, not willing that any should perish"; and that "He knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptation," or trial, as Noah, Lot, and others were, while the wicked should not be suffered to escape, as "they escaped not" who mocked in Noah's and Lot's days; for while God delivers His faithful people His knowledge is fully equal to His power to reserve the unjust to the day of judgment to be punished; and the day of judgment spoken of is that

judgment in which God executes whatever he has threatened to those living in any age, or under any particular dispensation. This *punishment*, Peter saith, came on the old world of the ungodly and on Sodom; and that it will come especially on those worst of all sinners—the scoffers of the last days. They may think to escape, but God by the judgments on Sodom and the old world has shown that he knows how to reserve them to the day of their judgment to be punished. They may scoff when the “promise of his coming” is declared, but they shall know, as certainly as the ungodly world of old were made to know, that “God is not mocked,” though He “is long-suffering”; for “the day will come as a thief in the night, in the which” these ungodly scoffers will find God’s word is no more to be trifled with now than in the days of Noah, or of Lot. But whom does all this concern? We answer, in our *opinion*, and from the best judgment we can form from the word of truth, it concerns the ungodly of “the last days,” who are alive at the time: and has nothing to do with the ungodly dead, except as it seals their doom to eternal night and death.

To remove our “*doubts*” of the revival into *life* of the wicked dead, we must see argument more potent than any we have yet seen. In other words, the evidence on the affirmative, of the questions involved in this discussion, must be more clear to our understanding before we can believe the coming of Jesus Christ into this world was to bring the greatest *curse* upon a large portion of Adam’s posterity that it is possible to conceive, short of eternal sin and suffering. And it may well be a matter of doubt, if the affirmative has the truth, if Adam the *second* did not entail a heavier curse, on a very large part of men, than Adam the *first*. But “God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should *not perish* but have *everlasting life*.” No other *life* comes by the Son of God. So the word of truth seems to teach us.

From F. A. Rew, Wayne Co., N. Y.

Dear Brother.—I have read your “BIBLE EXAMINER” for the past year with *interest* and *instruction*; and have got others to read it, which has produced conviction upon a few good minds, so that they begin to see the increasing darkness overspreading Gentile christendom, and the many fables producing great blindness, and the great danger into which the Church and world are brought by the bigoted ignorance of the “false teachers” of these “last days.” You understand God’s word *too well*, to be surprised at the trials through which those who cling to God’s word, in

truth are brought, when especially you consider the age in which we live, and the desperate wickedness into which the world *must* be brought to become vessels of wrath fitted for *destruction*.

In every age, in the past, God’s true people have been the forsaken and persecuted few, and are we to be more favored than they? Space would fail me to mention “the great cloud of witnesses,” but we see this fact developed, they are among the ones who alone have the promise of eternal life.

I like to read discussions when they are conducted with a proper spirit. It is a good way to obtain light, and without them we should not have been where we are, and been able to see the signs of the times, betokening so plainly the near approach of the kingdom of God, and the Christian’s great reward. The sufferings of this present time are not to be thought of, when contrasted with the things to be revealed and enjoyed by those who endure to the end. God has always employed men as instruments to make known his purposes to the world, and upon their acceptance or rejection of *His truth* depends their *justification* or condemnation in the day of the Lord Jesus. We ought to be thankful that God has, in this age, raised up some *noble minds*, able to investigate, and willing to defend His word; and there are ever men fitted for the emergency; and they cannot say more than Paul did, that “bonds and afflictions abide me.” In consideration of the foregoing I am not yet prepared to bid you “Farewell.”

From Corsina Wood, Potter Co., Pa.

Dr. Storrs.—It is a little more than two years since I first embraced the doctrine of no immortality nor endless life except through Jesus Christ alone; it was by reading your Six Sermons that I was led to search the scriptures on that important subject. Believe me when I tell you, that I was very much surprised to find the Bible taught no such doctrine as our being immortal in this life, but must seek for immortality if we ever have it. Truly, I thought it to be one of the most prominent teachings of the Bible: not because I had read it in the scriptures, but because I had so often heard it declaimed from the pulpit; and like too many others believed all the preachers said to be true. O how thankful I am, that I ever was led to read the Bible for myself. I now see a beauty in the scriptures that I never saw until of late. I would, if it were the will of God, that all others should go and do likewise; and not put so much confidence in popular theology. That teaches that the saints go to heaven at death; the Bible teaches the saints shall inherit the earth: that teaches the wicked will be kept alive in endless misery; the Bible teaches that all the wicked will God destroy: that teaches the dead know more than the living; the Bible teaches that the dead know not anything.

O! let us adhere to the teachings of the Bible in preference to all things else.

Yours in the hope of immortality at the revelation of our Saviour from heaven. —

From Joseph W. Merrill, Boston.

Be Strong.—May the Lord bless you for your labor to spread the truth of the gospel as it is in Jesus Christ, of that salvation which shall be brought unto us at his appearing and kingdom. May the Lord grant you strength for the time to come, that you may show yourself a workman that needeth not to be reproved, rightly dividing the word of the Lord and giving to each his portion in due season.

I have to thank the Lord for the light which I have received through your paper, on the subject of the soul's immortality. Now all is plain.—Without *life from the dead* there can be no enjoyment of the promise made to the fathers. For he said, *not unto thee and thy seeds, as of many; but unto thee, and thy seed which is Christ.* So that it being by grace it is made sure to all of us, if so be that we are Christ's. Oh, may we do his will; that we may be found of him in peace at his appearing and *Kingdom.* So, Brother, labor on, and may the Lord bless you; amen.

“Six Sermons,” *Revised and Enlarged.*—Those who have read this work, have found very much matter not in the *Original*; besides an entire new sermon on “*Christ, the Life-Giver.*” In addition to this, it is printed with a large, clear type, thus affording much more satisfaction in reading. Price in plain binding, 63 cents; in gilt \$1.

The *Original Six Sermons* are out of print, and we have not a copy left; probably no more of them will be issued. We will put *eight* copies of the *Revised* at \$3, for cash. We are of opinion that this work is vastly more valuable to circulate than the *Original.*

DOBNEY ABRIDGED.—This is part 2d of Dobney's work on “*Future Punishment,*” and contains his *entire* argument on the *nature* of that punishment; showing it to be *literal death,* and *not endless torment.* We have printed a few, and put them up in paper covers, which we offer as a *premium* to subscribers for the *EXAMINER* who pay \$2. If any wish to purchase them, the price is 38 cents. By the quantity, we put *five* copies for \$1, cash.

“*BIBLE vs. TRADITION,*”—This invaluable work should have a wider circulation. Price 75 cents, bound; 50 cents in paper covers. By the dozen, bound, \$5; in paper covers, *ten* copies for \$3, cash.

For any of the foregoing works, when the *retail* price is sent, we will send them free of postage. When ordered by the quantity, the purchaser pays the freight, or postage, himself.

At these prices why should thousands not be circulated? We have no funds to send out works on commission or credit, and we must do our work *for cash,* or it must go undone. We have don.

all we can on the *credit* system: and we have now put the works extremely low to induce all to buy for cash. Such purchases are for their own benefit, whether they buy to sell or give away. Money for *books,* at wholesale price, must be sent at the purchaser's *risk.* Address in all cases, “*Geo. Sroons, Editor Bible Examiner, New York.*”

“*TAKE* no thought for your life” what ye shall eat, &c. Can this mean that Christians are to be utterly regardless of making provision for themselves and families? Must they provide no clothing because God “*clothes the grass of the field?*” Must they neither sow, nor reap, because the birds are fed without storehouse or barn? Our Lord certainly meant no such thing! He only meant to chide that unreasonable anxiety which grows out of an overestimate of worldly good, and an underestimate of God's providence. He was inculcating a principle not prescribing practice.—*Ch. Ad.*

God made for some of the martyrs a prison sweet as a garden of flowers: what then will be heaven? If afflictive mercy be so great what will be crowning mercy?

JAMES BATTERSBY'S *Post Office* Address is Fort Smith, Ark.

THE TIME OF REWARD.

“Behold I come quickly; and my reward is with me.”
Rev. 22: 12.

When did our Lord and Master
Promise his own their reward?
When he cometh in glory,
Speaks the unfailling record.

When in his *Father's* glory,
With an angel train all bright,
A cloud his golden chariot,
Encircled with the light.

The word declares 't is quickly,
He'll come to his own again;
Then by his quickening spirit,
New life we shall attain.

He comes—he calls his faithful,
All, out from among the dead;
And then the life-crown places,
Upon every joyful head.

Soon they shall hear the plaudit,
Bless'd servant of mine, “well done;”
Then will ring the hallelujahs,
Throughout that heavenly home.

The eye of sense ne'er beheld,
Nor the heart of man conceived,
The joys God hath prepared.
For those who have believed.

M. C. A.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. XI.

NEW-YORK, MARCH 15, 1856.

NO. 6.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year:

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

"IMMORTALITY OF THE WICKED."

REV. S. COMFORT, of the Methodist E. Church, has an article of some three columns in the *North-ern Christian Advocate*, of Jan. 2d, on this subject. His article is interesting as one of many, which are appearing about this time, which go to show that notwithstanding they all talk about the weakness of the question, on our part, they have their fears it may spread, unless they put forth their power to suppress it. They are quite sure it can't live long—it never has, they tell us, and they are sure it never can. Very well, gentlemen; if it *can't live*, let it die; the sooner the better. Mr. Comfort opens as follows:

Nearly all important questions respecting the human soul may be comprehended under these three: Its *origin*, its *nature*, and its *duration*. We propose to cast a hasty glance at each of these respectively.

A tolerable beginning; but before he attempted the work here laid out, we think, he would have done well to have established the fact—if it be a fact—that there is any such *existence* as he and his school call "the human soul." To undertake to show the *origin*, *nature*, and *duration* of that which has no existence, except in men's imaginations, may be a splendid fancy exhibition, but it is building on the sand. Such an effort may dazzle superstitious minds but cannot convince a thinking one. Our friend proceeds to take up his subject as he has laid it out, as follows:

1. The *origin* of the soul. On this point three hypotheses have been advocated. First, that of *pre-existence*. Those who maintain this hypothesis, denominated *pre-existioni*, claim that God at the beginning of the world created the souls of all men; but they urge the soul is not united to the body till after each individual is born into the world. This theory was advocated by several Grecian philosophers, some of the ancient Jews, and was endorsed by some of the primitive Chris-

tians, and by Christian mystics in both ancient and modern times. The last and only treatise within our knowledge based upon it, is a late work by Rev. Dr. Beecher. It is a theory, however, which in spite of this talented but fanciful writer, is destined to keep its place among other equally mistaken notions of antiquity, which in all probability, would never have constituted any part of the dreamy speculations of modern times, had they not floated down the stream of time from a cruder age, and thus first suggested themselves to modern, but not always original thinkers.

2. A second hypothesis is, that the soul is created when the body is born or begotten. The advocates of this theory have been called *Creationi*. Some Christian fathers, both Greek and Latin, are said to have maintained this doctrine. It was adopted by Pelagius, and pressed into service in support of his favorite doctrine respecting depravity, in the support of which it seemed to lend important aid. It has had advocates in the Romish Church; and while Luther chose to leave the question undecided, Melancthon is said to have accorded to it his suffrage.

3. The third and last hypothesis assumes the propagation of the soul. This theory makes the soul as well as the body of the offspring to be derived from the parent. Those who have held this doctrine have been called *Traduciani*. This theory has had the suffrage of the Church in the West or Occidental regions more than in the Oriental. It affords the most ready solution of the doctrine of depravity; and has consequently been more generally held by modern orthodox theologians. Richard Watson favors it, and thinks it best accords with the teachings of Scripture which represent Adam as "begetting a son in his own likeness." All we shall stop to say is, that while each of these hypotheses is open to objection on one ground or another, that of *traduction* is probably encumbered by fewer than either of the two preceding. Indeed we do not see how the above statement of Moses can be made to harmonize with the *pre-existent* or the *creation* hypothesis.

We have here given all that friend Comfort has said on this topic; and he has shown one thing conclusively, *viz*: That neither he nor his fellow-theologians know anything about the fancy soul whose *origin* they labor in vain to find, because it has *no origin* nor existence. If he had undertaken to find the *origin* of the "*living soul*," which the Lord God made, Moses could have answered him in few words, *viz*: "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into

his nostrils the breath of life and *man* became a living *soul*." Gen. 2 : 7. This living soul God gave power to propagate his likeness : and all the living souls of Adam's race proceeded from the first pair that God made. But as friend Comfort has, with his fellow-laborers, become lost in a theological speculation, it is no wonder they are all "encumbered" with "objections," so that he is left to take the theory that has the "*fewer*," instead of submitting to the solid basis found in the Mosaic account of the living soul. Mr. Comfort next speaks of the nature of the fancy soul. He says :

The *nature* of the soul has been resolved on the two following hypotheses. First, that it is material—not indeed in the grosser sense of the term ; but in a sense the most refined and restricted. Next, that the soul is *immaterial*, a *pure spirit*, having none of the properties of matter. Which of these views is most entitled to our suffrage, is the question to be decided. But in coming to a decision it must be remembered that we are totally ignorant as to the essence of both matter and spirit. We know matter only by its sensible properties. But having no senses to discern the properties of spirit, we are compelled to proceed by a sort of negative process, separating from it these several properties which our reason teaches us, from our conceptions of its nature, are incompatible with that nature. We describe matter by asserting some of those properties which we have ascertained it possesses. In describing spirit we proceed differently, and describe certain properties which we conceive incongruous with its nature, and which it cannot possess.

Left to choose between these two alternatives, we cannot hesitate to pronounce the soul a pure spirit. And as all known subsistences must be classified with material objects, pure spirits, or a class of existences which combine the nature of both, we are reduced to the *trilemma* of placing the soul in one of the three classes. For our own part we cannot hesitate to assign it a place with purely spiritual existences. We see no reason why the soul does not rank with angels in nature, who the Psalmist declares are "spirits." Hence the celestial and the terrestrial meet in man's compound nature. In his soul he is identified with angelic natures, in his body with animal natures. Hence he forms the connecting link between the celestial and the purely terrestrial.

If his identification with angels is conceded, it will furnish a clue to the right answer to our second and third main questions. It will help us to determine as to both the nature and duration of the human soul. If the soul identifies with angels and they are spirits, it follows that being a spirit it is consequently placed at a vast remove from all the properties, and at an equal remove from all the accidents of matter. It is not subject to dissolution—cannot be reduced to its elements, because it has none ; it is a simple substance and is not composed like matter of a certain aggregate of elements in combination. It is subject to none of the laws of matter. In this, then, it differs from all material subsistences ; they contain the seeds of their own

dissolution : whereas the soul is essentially indestructible and imperishable.

One truth, we judge, our friend has uttered, *viz* ; "We are totally ignorant as to the essence of both matter and spirit." If he had added, "We are totally ignorant" of man's possessing such a soul as he wished to describe, he would have uttered another truth which would have saved him all his labor, and he would not had to own that he was "compelled to proceed by a sort of *negative* process," under the teachings of his "*reason*," without one ray of light from revelation ; no, not a solitary text from the Book of God has our friend produced in support of his imaginary *soul*. He does not see "why the soul does not rank with angels in nature, who the Psalmist declares are *spirits*." He might as well have said, he did see why it does not rank with God in nature ! It is all a pure *assumption* without one item of proof. Suppose angels are *spirits*, what does he know of their *nature* ? Just nothing at all. Besides, it is not till "that world" is "attained" by a "resurrection of the dead," that those who are "accounted worthy" of that honor, are to be "as the angels of God." See Math. 22 : 30 ; and Luke 20 : 35, 36.

Saith our friend C., "If his [man's] identification with angels is *conceded*, it will furnish a clue to the right answer to our second and third main questions : it will help us to determine as to both the *nature* and *duration* of the human soul."

The "identification" is *not* "conceded" by us ; and we affirm it is an unscriptural, and an unauthorized assumption. It is begging the whole question. First prove that *the man* the Lord God formed of the dust of the ground has any such *entity* as you call the soul—that any such *addition* was made to the dust formed man. When you have accomplished that task then it will be time enough to talk about its identification with angels : till then all your assumptions pass unheeded as the idle wind, and baseless as any other phantoms.

We must commend our friend for one frank acknowledgment. His fancy soul "cannot be reduced to its elements, *because it has none*." That is a truth, friend C ; and "*it has none*" because it is nothing—it is a phantasma—a mere creature of the imagination ; and we hardly know as it is idolatry to worship it, as its advocates seem to ; for it is not the likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath—it is *nothing*—has "no elements." There we might leave it, but we mean to give our friend a fair chance to speak in the EXAMINER ; hence we let him proceed. He says :

This brings us to the last, and which is the main question in this inquiry—the *duration* of the soul. Our position is this, that while the soul remains in nature what it is, *it cannot but exist*. In its very nature it is *immortal*. God has made it immaterial. It is thus placed at an infinite remove from the possibility of impairment, destruction, or decay. By its Maker's own hand it is conditioned as far from the possibility of destruction, as non-existence is from existence. It could not bring itself into existence: so neither can it extinguish the unquenchable flame of its own being. An act of Omnipotence originally gave it being, and nothing short of the same Omnipotence can abridge or terminate that being. Hence, it must first be shown that God will do this under given contingencies; or, in the absence of such evidence, the fact remains undisturbed that the soul must still trace on and on the endless line of its deathless being.

Here is a string of assertions and assumptions, without one particle of proof; and those who have been in the habit of taking declamation for argument will doubtless take it all for sound logic. However, as "Omnipotence gave it" (this fancy soul) "being," Mr. C. has to admit that "Omnipotence can abridge or terminate that being!" Our friend need not suppose we shall attempt to set Omnipotence to work to destroy nothing; *alias*, C.'s fancy soul. He goes on:—

This brings us to the specific point in the theme under discussion—"The Immortality of the Wicked." Our first remark is, that the *onus probandi* in the discussion of this question rests upon those who assert their destruction, who are denominated "destructionists," or perhaps more properly *annihilationists*.

It is refreshing to hear one expression that has tangibility to it—"The Immortality of the Wicked." That looks like coming to the point. But our friend says, "The *onus probandi* in the discussion of this question rests upon those who assert their destruction!" We dissent from this conclusion. C. maintains the wicked are immortal, if there is any meaning to his remarks. He then has the *affirmative*, and is bound to establish it from revelation or his position falls to the ground; and he proceeds in his herculean task as follows:

Our next remark is that the immortality of the soul is *eminently* a doctrine of Revelation; not, however, that any of the inspired writers offer a single argument to prove the doctrine. They all, with one consent, *assume* its truth as they do the being of God and the eternity of future rewards and punishments, and hence proceed to build the system of faith and practice upon the basis of those and other doctrines. It is in this sense alone, as we conceive, that the immortality of the soul is a doctrine of Revelation. Hence the appeal for its truth to the Divine teaching must be made with the understanding of its assumption by

the inspired writers, as setting their seal to sound metaphysical deduction. And before their testimony can be made to sustain the contrary doctrine, it must be shown from their teachings, under the due application of the essential canons of interpretation contrary to this assumption.

As we expected. Not a solitary text can be produced, from Revelation, either that man has a superadded entity called *the soul*, or of its *immortality*. No—"The inspired writers all with one consent *assume* its truth as they do the being of a God," &c., Now, if we were not an "*infidel*," we should be shocked at this double blasphemy. How many such statements would it take to convert a sinner from the error of his ways, that "a soul" might be saved "from death?" "*The soul that sinneth it shall die*," saith Jehovah. "No," saith modern divinity, "*it can't die*!" It is true the "inspired writers offer" not "a single argument to prove the immortality of the soul," but "they all with one consent *assume*" it! Thus Ezekiel was not *inspired*, though he declares "The word of the Lord came unto me saying" * * * "*the soul that sinneth it shall die!*" Ezk. 18: 4, 20. And when Ezekiel uttered this language he only "*assumed* the being of a God!" But, unfortunately for our friend C., Ezekiel did *not* "*assume* the soul is immortal," but gave utterance to the truth, from the mouth of JEHOVAH, that "the soul"—whatever it is—"under given contingencies," *viz*, if it "*sinneth it shall die.*"

The idea that "the being of God" is *assumed*, by the inspired writers, without "a single argument to prove the doctrine" would answer well in the mouth of an *Atheist*; but for a professed Minister of the Gospel to utter such a sentiment is truly lamentable. Nothing is more clearly set forth, and that in the most explicit declarations. "*I am God*, and there is none else." "Hear, O Israel, the Lord your God is one Lord." "Say unto them as I *live* saith the Lord God." "To us there is *one God*, the Father," with a multitude of similar texts. God explicitly revealed his being and attributes, and proclaimed them in language not to be misunderstood; yet Mr. C. tells us, all the inspired writers *assumed* the being of God, and in the same way they *assumed* the immortality of the soul! Here then is a theologian who stakes the being of God on the truth of an immortal soul in man: the one stands on the same evidence, or by the same argument, as the other; or rather upon *no* "*argument*" at all! It is all *assumed*. If one doctrine falls the other falls! If the soul is not immortal, *there is no God!* And has it come to this? Is this fancy soul to be thrown in the

balance to decide the existence of Jehovah? So it seems; but before we have done with this latest Goliath we shall try a few smooth stones from the brook of truth. Our friend C. will understand that we do not take *assumptions* as any weight, or of any force; he cannot be permitted to cast such dust in our eyes. We affirm, in opposition to him, there is not one of the "inspired writers" that ever "*assumes* the immortality of the soul": it is a pure *fiction* to assert they do; and to insinuate, such doctrine stands on the same basis as the "being of God" is to "handle the word of the Lord deceitfully." Whether the deception is *intended* or not we judge not; but that it is a deception we have no doubt; and it forcibly brings to mind the apostle's saying, that "in the last days" certain men would be "*deceiving and being deceived.*" What greater deception than, after having admitted that not "any of the inspired writers offer a single argument to prove the" immortality of the soul, to assert that they *assumed* it? and that "the being of God" stands upon the same ground! So far from any inspired writer ever *assuming* the immortality of the soul, they speak expressly of the *death* of the soul: not indeed of that "immaterial" *nothing* which theologians call the soul; for no inspired writer ever heard of *such a soul*; or, if they had, they considered it quite too fanciful ever to mention it. Mr. C. next says:—

If we understand the advocates of annihilation, their doctrine includes these two essential points, that the soul was created neither immaterial nor immortal, but that immortality will be conferred as a reward upon the righteous. This is one main point. The other is, that, as a punishment upon the wicked they will be left, after suffering conscious retributive punishment for a limited period, to fall back into their original nonentity. This being their doctrine, the chief scriptural argument on which they rely for its demonstration, if we comprehend them, is this: They take those declarations of the inspired writers, in which they use the term "destruction," as meaning that the soul will be utterly *destroyed*. Whereas, were no favorite system of doctrine in question to be sustained by giving the term destruction this application, it would be easy to convince the intelligent and reasonable student of the Scriptures that the *analogy of faith*, to say nothing of the immateriality and consequent essential immortality of the soul, would require that this term, when applied to the future state of the wicked, must be taken in a qualified and restricted or figurative sense. The figure of speech employed in such cases, as when the sacred writers speak of the wicked being "punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and the glory of his power," is what is called *hyperbole*. This figure either "magnifies or diminishes objects or

things beyond or below their proper limits." Hence it is obvious that to represent that which is indestructible as being destroyed, must be a hyperbolical expression in which the soul is reduced *below* its proper limits, than which nothing need be plainer.

If Mr. C. "understands" us, he would understand that we demonstrate that "the living soul" was "formed of the dust of the ground"; made *alive* by "the breath of life," which gave life to all other "living souls" that swim in the sea, fly in the air, or creep upon the ground. See Gen. 1: 20, 21, 24, 30; 2: 7, 19; 7: 22, 23, and examine the margin and the original text. Here is demonstration that all C.'s talk about the "immateriality and immortality of the soul" is "*assumed*," and that too in the plainest contradiction of the Mosaic account of creation. Man's creation was an *organism*, such as God was pleased to make; not immaterial; but *material, tangible, alive*. Man's "punishment" for sin, or "the wages of sin, is death." Gen. 2: 17; 3: 19; Ezk. 18; 4, 20; Rom. 6: 21—23. This *death* is neither a "*hyperbole*" nor a "*figure*": it is an awful *reality*; a dissolution of man's organism—a deprivation of life; and when final it is *eternal*; and hence is his "eternal punishment;" not eternal sin and suffering, but an eternal cessation of life. We are not of the number "to represent that which is indestructible, as being destroyed;" but we deny that any soul of man, by his creation or generation, is "indestructible;" and friend C. has produced nothing but *assumptions* to the contrary; of that fact, "nothing need be plainer." Again he says:

The following rule is also violated in giving those passages which speak of the destruction of the wicked a literal interpretation, which is this: "The literal meaning of words is to be given up if the predicate, being literally taken, is contrary to the subject." The soul is the subject, destruction the predicate. But the soul is indestructible. Hence destruction, the predicate, taken literally, is contrary to the nature of the soul, the subject of the proposition. Therefore destruction is only used to describe the awfulness of future punishment; and when it is construed into literal annihilation, it is in the most palpable violation of this canon of Scripture interpretation.

C.'s predilections for *assumption* are apparent. There is no argument in this paragraph unless he can *prove* "the soul is indestructible;" which he has not yet begun to do. As he builds on sand his house falls. He might as well say, God is not omnipotent as to say "the soul is indestructible": the one sentiment is just as true as the other. Hear C. again:

The following canon is also trampled in the dust by this *constructive* application of "destruction." "Where the literal meaning of words is contrary, either to common sense, the context, to parallel passages, or to the scope of the passage, it must be given up." Want of space precludes the citation of examples in illustration of this rule. But still another canon is violated by the literal application of the term destruction to the wicked. It is this: "The literal meaning of words is to be given up, if it be either improper, or involve an impossibility." Hence this rule rescues all those passages in question from the forced service which destructionists compel them to yield in favor of annihilation: as the tyrant master compels the imbruted slave to do deeds in violation of all virtue and conscience.

We do not object to either of the "canons" our friend has here introduced; but it is a mere *assumption* that they apply as he supposes. The *literal* destruction of the wicked is neither opposed "to common sense" nor "an impossibility." But it is opposed "to common sense," and "an impossibility," that an "immaterial, immortal, and indestructible" being can *suffer* in any way, or by any means, "Hence" such beings need not fear the *theological* hell; for if it were "seven times" hotter than Nebuchadnezzar's furnace, it could not hurt a hair of their head, nor make the least impression on them in ten thousand millions of ages.

But friend C. warms up as he proceeds; and makes up for his barrenness in argument by strong assumptions. See the following:

But this forced and constructive interpretation is fatal to the *analogy of faith*. This has been explained to be "the constant and perpetual harmony of Scripture in the fundamental points of faith and practice." Several canons grow out of this definition—all which are violated by the interpretation in question. We can mention only the following:—"Wherever any doctrine is manifest, either from the whole tenor of Divine revelation or from its scope, it must not be weakened or set aside by a few obscure passages." See Horne's *Introduc.*, Part II., &c. Now what "doctrine is manifest from the whole tenor and scope" of Revelation, if it is not that of the immortality of the soul? The eternity of the Supreme Being himself is scarcely more so. Nor would greater violation be done to the above canons, and the others which are essential to the sober and consistent interpretation of the Scripture, in deducing from them so abhorrent a doctrine as would be the destruction of the Divine Nature! This, it is true, could only be done by a forced construction of a few passages in the face of all the rest—the very process by which the destruction of the soul is deduced from Revelation by Annihilationists.

"The constant and perpetual" testimony of "Scripture" is that "the Lord God formed man

of the dust of the ground": Gen. 2: 7—that his "foundation is in the dust": Job. 4: 19—that he is "*mortal*:" Job. 4: 17—that he is "*corruptible*," as the "birds, and four-footed beasts": Rom. 1: 23—that "the wicked shall perish forever *like his own dung*:" Job. 20: 7—that "he shall not be:" Psa. 37: 10—that "the wicked—the enemies of the Lord shall consume; into smoke shall they consume away": Psa. 37: 20—"they shall be as nothing; thou shalt seek them and shalt not find them": Isa. 41: 11, 12—"and they shall be as though they had not been": Obadiah 16. But we need not multiply texts; for our friend C. will find that when he once gets out of the fog of sectarianism the "*analogy of faith*" is entirely on our side of the question.

We accept, and do it gladly, the "canon" C. has introduced from Horne's *Introduc.*, Part II. C. then asks "what doctrine is manifest from the whole tenor and scope of Revelation, if it is not the immortality of the soul?" He adds—"The eternity of the Supreme Being himself is scarcely more so."

Really, friend C. must be sincere and in earnest in the support of his theory to stake the eternity of God on the immortality of the soul: but we must tell him, in all candor, his sincerity and earnestness stamp his effort with the character of *monomania*. Without one solitary testimony in the Bible that the soul is immortal, and on a bare *assumption*, he stakes "the eternity of the Supreme Being" on the truth of his assumption! "Thus saith the high and holy One that inhabiteth *eternity*, whose name is lofty," &c. Isa. 57: 15; "But the Lord is the true God, he is the living God, and *King of Eternity*": Jer. 10: 10, text and margin. Now tell us where is the text that saith "*the soul is immortal*"? It is *nowhere* to be found in the English translation, nor in the Greek, Hebrew, or Syriac Scriptures! Friend C. may yet come out an *atheist*: nay, we do not see but such a result is inevitable, if his *pet* immortal soul should prove to be a fancy, as we have no doubt it is.

As to the charge of our putting a forced construction" on "a few passages in the face of all the rest" to sustain the doctrine of the literal destruction of the wicked, we will say, it comes with a bad grace from one who has not one text asserting the immortality of the soul, and who has to *assume* it, and contend the "inspired writers assumed it." C. proceeds to say:

The apostle, it is true, says of God, "Who only hath immortality." But his meaning obviously

is, that God alone has *underived* immortality. Because to take this passage literally, would be to negative the immortality of angels, good as well as bad, along with that of all good as well as bad men. And when the same apostle declares that God will "render eternal life" to them who "seek for glory, honor, and immortality," we are manifestly to understand a *blessed* immortality, in order to perfect the antithesis to that "indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish" which will as certainly be "rendered" to the "contentious who do not obey the truth." This is what the above canons require in the exposition of these passages, and what destructionism in its glaring violation of them repudiate.

The first member of the foregoing paragraph we do not object to. God alone hath immortality independent of all other beings, is doubtless the apostle's meaning; but to the second member of this paragraph we do object. There is no authority for adding "*blessed*" to immortality. The Bible knows of no other immortality than that of a *blessed* one, and it never speaks of any other; and no other is possible in the very nature of the case. The very idea of immortality excludes all suffering: suffering is the sure and certain indication of mortality. "Tribulation and anguish" is evidence of exclusion from immortality, and indicative of a state of dissolution. No problem is plainer than this to our mind; and the apostle marks the fact that "*death*" is the result of the "tribulation and anguish" inflicted upon those "who do not obey the truth": comp. Rom. 1: 32; 2: 12; 6: 21, 23. Again C. says:

But if the soul is immaterial, consequently immortal and imperishable, its moral character with which it goes into eternity, can have no possible effect upon any of its natural attributes. Of these, immateriality is one; immortality another; and intelligence and consciousness another. Hence, with as good reason may we conclude that the souls of the wicked will be divested of their consciousness in a future state as their immortality. This once lost, there would be of course at that moment an end of their misery. And would not the same consequence follow from their annihilation? For with the soul all its attributes and faculties must perish.

Our friend's conclusions here turn on the truth of his "if; if" and "if"; and as he has given nothing but *assumptions* for his "if" we let this paragraph pass for its value. Next our friend C. jumps at conclusions as follows:

But the final doom of the wicked is, to be with the "devil and his angels." The terms of duration of the punishment of both will be the same, i. e. "eternal," or "forever and ever." They will be associated together while it continues. But on the annihilation hypothesis, at some point in eternity more or less remote devils will lose their

late partners in woe; their companions in "anguish" and "wrath" will find a refuge from the fiery storm which had beat upon them, in the utter extinction of their being! On this bold and baseless hypothesis *despair* can never be an ingredient in this cup of trembling. Because, however distant from the commencement of their limited, so called, retributive punishment, their annihilation may be, it is certain, at length to arrive. But on the contrary, just as soon will holy angels, after listening for uncounted ages to the songs of the redeemed, see them in a moment drop their golden harps, and whole choirs, and adoring circles vanish into nought, while the last note of their chorus dies away and ceases to reverberate in the lofty dome of heaven's high temple, as the songsters perish from their vacant seats. This we say would be no more in violation of the whole tenor and scope of Scripture teaching, because the destruction of the immortal, that is the deathless soul, whether of the wicked or holy, is alike impossible—except by an uncreating act as omnific as that which originally gave the soul its being. For God made the soul in the image of his own eternity; hence, no hand but his own can mar or efface that image.

"The term and duration of the punishment" of the devil and his angels, and wicked men will be "eternal" or "forever and ever"; that we have never questioned. But what is that *punishment*? C. and his school say it is to be in a state of endless sin and suffering: we affirm its *death—deprivation of life*, and that "forever and ever." "The Son of God was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil:" 1 John 3: 8; and friend C. will not question that "He that committeth *sin* is of the devil," and doeth "the works of the devil." Now if the devil and his *sin workers* are to carry on their trade of *sinning eternally*, the Son of God has failed in his mission and the devil is victorious. But thanks be to God, "the inspired writers" neither "assume," nor leave it for us to *assume*, that Christ will "destroy *him* who had the power of death, that is, *the devil*," Heb. 2: 14; and with him all his brood; for "*all the wicked* will God destroy": Psa. 145: 20. "And every creature which is in heaven and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne; and unto the Lamb forever and ever": Rev. 5: 13.

Here "an inspired writer" has placed before our mind the glorious fact that a period will arrive when every intelligent, conscious being, in all the creation of God, and in every possible location, will praise God, and the Lamb. At that time the devil and his children will either have been con-

verted or annihilated. Be it which it may, they no longer exist as wicked suffering beings; and our friend's "bold and baseless hypothesis," of immortality in sin and suffering, is destroyed.

C.'s "bold and baseless" *assumption* that "God made the soul in the image of his own eternity," may pass, as the falsehood of it is too apparent to need or merit a reply. Our friend C. goes on in the following very cool strain:

The fact indisputably is, destructionism holds a sort of middle ground between eternal punishment and the fanciful speculation of final restoration of the wicked to future happiness. It seems to have been originally adopted by Christians to escape both extremes. It seems first to have obtained a little more than a century since in England, and to have been advocated by a few men who, in their day, attracted some passing attention. But in the Christian Church we find no traces of its existence at a higher date. Though, says Mr. Adams in his work entitled, "The Religious world Displayed," "This doctrine is of long standing in the world, and has been maintained by Pagans and Jews, as well as by Christians." It must however be regarded as one of those excrescent blemishes which have so strikingly marred the beauty of the fair face of sound Christianity. It is, however, only an excrescence which the judicious application of the caustic of sober and intelligent exegesis will suffice ultimately to remove. Or, like those disagreeable and superfluous appendages which sometimes appear upon the surface, but which form no part of the vitality or perfection of the body, and which after a brief existence, at length disappear of their own accord. So it may with this empty speculation, which though for the time being fastened upon Christianity without constituting any part of the system, and having thus on the credit of that system, sustained its morbid existence during its day, will at length disappear and fall into merited oblivion, without leaving so much as a scar behind to attest its former being.

Very philosophical! Very conclusive! What an easy matter to dispose of this "excrescent" notion, that "all the wicked will God destroy"! "We find no traces of its existences at a higher date" than "a little more than a century since in England"! No, not "in the Christian Church"! True, "Mr. Adams says in his work entitled, 'The Religious World Displayed,' this doctrine is of long standing in the world, and has been maintained by Pagans and Jews, as well as Christians": but, "It must be regarded as one of those excrescent blemishes which have so strikingly marred the beauty of the fair face of sound Christianity"!

Thus talks our friend Comfort; and it is some *comfort* that he has produced no other weapons than *assumptions* and *assertions*, all of which

will doubtless pass for proof with those who swallow whatever a divine puts into their mouth, forgetting that priest may be as ignorant as themselves.

The Jews held no other doctrine, till corrupted by their intercourse with the heathen, than that of the destruction, or annihilation of the wicked. Jesus Christ nor his apostles never taught any other doctrine; and they proclaimed a future life—a life from the dead—only through "Jesus and the resurrection"—which resurrection was *peculiar* to the Church of Christ, as members of his body; and to obtain which, Paul said he labored and suffered, "If," saith he, "*by any means* I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead," Phil. 3: 11.—"Christ, who is *our life*," is appointed of God to give life to dying men; yet many "will not come to me that ye might have life," saith the Saviour. "He that believeth not God, hath made Him a liar, because he believeth not the *record* that God gave of His Son." But what is the *record*, which if a man believe not he makes God a liar? "*This is the record*, that God hath given to us eternal life, and *this life* is in His Son: he that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life"; 1 John, 5: 10-12. Such is *God's* testimony; but the whole race of *assumers* give God *the lie*; and affirm that man has an endless life *in himself*, independent of, and without any regard to a union with the Son of God! These are the men to talk about the doctrine of life eternal and immortality only in and through Christ being an "*excrescence*"!—No, it is their own theory that is the *excrescence*, that has blackened and darkened the "fair face of sound Christianity," till they have driven their hearers, who never think, into a rejection of Christianity altogether, considering it much more honorable to God to reject the Bible than to credit such blasphemy against Him and His attributes as that which the advocates of endless sin and suffering attribute to Him. Mr. Comfort, in his work against Universalism, page 91, says—"If *eternal life* was procured for the world by the mission of Christ, it follows that *to perish* is to suffer *eternal death*,—or, the soul being deathless,—*eternal misery*." Here he spoke truth till he "changed the truth of God into a lie" by *assuming* the soul to be "*deathless*." Thus it is that the immortal soul advocates corrupt the word of God. See Rom. 1: 23, 25.

When we say the advocates of inherent immortality "give God *the lie*," we do not wish to be understood as saying they do so knowingly. We

presume most of them would no more do this than ourself: but that does not alter the fact in itself; God is charged with falsehood by the *assumption*; and His "record" made to be false; for if men have endless life in themselves then it is not "in His Son," as God declares it to be. We know well the advocates of natural immortality undertake to say, "eternal life," in the text, "does not mean eternal existence but eternal happiness;" and we know this is adding *sin to sin*: it is saying God did not utter in the *record* what he meant. May the Lord "forgive them; they know not what they do." Early education and sectarian trammels have blinded their minds. May the veil soon be removed from their hearts: then will they see that they have "robbed God." Mr. C. goes on as follows:

The destruction of the wicked is as gratuitous in sound philosophy as it is unsupported by fair and intelligent Scriptural interpretation. Philosophy asserts that under the laws which govern matter, not one particle can perish, except by an act of Omnipotence. All its known phenomena consists only in an endless succession of accretions, dissolutions, and recombinations. Hence, if the material world itself is ever destroyed, it must be by an act of the same Omnipotence which gave it being. That this event will transpire at some juncture indefinitely future, rests for its certainty upon inspired authority alone. How much more should the annihilation of the immortal spirit, which the floods cannot drown, which the conflagration of the universe cannot burn, nor the concussion of the mightiest orbs crush! The proof of both should therefore be alike *valid*, to make the two events alike inevitable. But the annihilation of the wicked can be proved only by a *constructive* application of a few passages of Scripture in the most glaring opposition to the scope and tenor of inspired teaching as to their future condition and final doom under retributive punishment.

C.'s "philosophy" may pass for its value. It amounts to just about this—"One particle of matter cannot perish—therefore a fish, a fowl, a horse, a man cannot perish!" "The material world," however, he admits will be "destroyed at some juncture indefinitely future"; but this fact "rests upon inspired authority alone." But the immortality or immateriality of the soul, friend C., "rests upon" uninspired "authority alone," and is purely an *assumption* without proof; and hence for C. to talk about the impossibility of "the annihilation of the immaterial spirit," is to talk in a dream, and out of his own heart. The "proof" is a thousand times more clear, from revelation, that the wicked shall be "utterly consumed," Psa. 73: 19; "shall be *utterly exterminated*." Acts 3: 23, (see Bloomfield's notes on Acts 3: 23, p. 100.)

more," Psa. 104: 35, than it is that this material world will ever be destroyed. Yet C. can believe the latter while he rejects the former.

We come now to the conclusion of this essay on the immortality of the soul. It winds up thus:

There is another point towards which we would glance a thought or two in conclusion. A writer on the nature of the soul, in a late number of the Free Will Baptist Quarterly, maintaining its pure immateriality, says in effect, that as it has no dimensions, shape, or any of the properties of matter whatsoever, *it can have no locality*. This we strongly doubt. Such a consequence does not follow. For all finite spirits, angels as well as men must either fill immensity and thus be omnipresent or they must be limited to some portion of space and thus be undeniably local. This, however, is only saying that they must be either finite or infinite—between which there is a boundless disparity. Hence, no finite spirit can occupy more than one point in space, any more than one moment in duration at the same time, because they are neither omnipotent nor eternal. All finite subsistences, as we conceived, must at a given time be limited to a given locality somewhere in immensity, or in that same given time be in the act of transition between one point and another in immensity. Angels are not present in heaven and on earth at the same time—pure spirits though they are. So must it be with human spirits. Time and space are terms which have no legitimate application to the Infinite and the Eternal. But all finite beings, from their limited natures, whether material or spiritual, of necessity hold inseparable relations to both.

As this last paragraph relates only to differences among the advocates of natural immortality we may pass it with a single remark, *viz.*: that the Free Will Baptist gives a pretty fair account of this fancy soul—"It has no dimensions, shape, or any of the properties of matter," hence, "*it can have no locality*." That is a fair statement of these fancy souls—they are *nothing*, and dwell *nowhere!* Just about the truth, and we do not see why C. need "doubt" it.

We have thus given C. a fair hearing, as we have given every word of his long essay. Our readers can judge as to the force there is in such *assumptions* and *assertions*. We record it as a *curiosity* in the immortality controversy.

THE OFFICE OF THE BIBLE EXAMINER is, at our Residence, No. 62 Hicks Street, Brooklyn; a short distance from Fulton Ferry: but let none forget that our address is, "GEO. STORRS, Editor Bible Examiner, New York."

Usually we can be found at home at all hours except between nine and eleven o'clock in the morning, when we visit New York and call at Dr. McALLISTER'S 141 Fulton St., where orders may be left for us by persons calling in the city, and not

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, MARCH 15, 1856.

Man's Origin and Nature.

THE notion that man, by creation, is possessed of an immortal entity, called *soul*; and that he was created *holy*, originally, we think, is the foundation of nearly all the theological errors and superstitions that have bewildered, blinded, and made infidels of a large part of Christendom, or those where this corrupt theology has been promulgated.

The account of man's creation, as given by Moses, is very simple and easy of comprehension; and when duly considered commends itself as the only rational account of man's origin and nature: especially when we gaze on the facts in man's death, or *disorganization*.

Man's *origin* is the same as that of any other of the *animal* creation. Compare Gen. 2: 7 and 19. "The Lord God *formed man* of the *dust of the ground*." * * * "And out of the *ground* the Lord God *formed every beast* of the field, and every *fowl* of the air."

Thus it appears the *origin* of man is precisely the same as that of other living creatures on the earth. The only real difference is this—Man's *organization* made him capable of a higher *intellectual* development than any other of the animal creation; and for this reason, he was placed at the head of all the others, and to have "*dominion over*" them.

As to *holiness*, there is no evidence in the Mosaic account that man was in possession of any such quality more than other animals. "God saw *every thing* that he had made, and behold it was *very good*": Gen. 1: 31. All were alike *good*, but not a word of the holiness of any of them. Holiness is not a *creation*—it cannot be created—but it is a *development*. As such it can only be produced in a created being by *trial*. In order to its development there must be *law* to which the creature is required to yield obedience; and there must be *intelligence* sufficient to comprehend that law, without which no law can have any claim to *active* obedience. Where such intellectual capacity does not exist—whatever the nature of the life in possession—there can be no claim for moral obedience, and hence neither holiness nor sin has any existence in that being—the thing is impossible.

Man, of all the animal creation, alone—so far as we know—had intellectual capacity sufficient to understand law—requirement or prohibition—ad-

dressed to mind; or a capacity to determine from words addressed to his understanding what his course of conduct should be. This capacity was the basis, or foundation, for the development of a moral character above that of a mere animal. But such development could not be made without a law addressed to man's intellect; and that law must be adapted to his understanding or comprehension. As yet he is but an *animal* and can only be approached as an animal man. Hence the law must relate to the action of his animal nature. In harmony with this fact we find his CREATOR thus approaching him, having provided for the new formed creature "every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food," He placed man in the midst of these delights and bid him regale himself without restriction with one exception. That one exception constituted the *law*—a law the highest of which man's nature was then capable, and yet the most trifling that it was possible to give. This law was addressed to man's intelligence, and related to the regulation of his animal appetites; or was addressed to him as an animal, such as he really was.

Hence he was tested, or tried as an *animal* for the development of a moral character; which trial if man obeyed his CREATOR would have raised him above a mere animal—or above the government of animal appetites—and would have constituted him *holy*. It would have developed a mind having a supreme regard to his MAKER's *will*. This is *holiness*. Such a development would have—if persevered in—proved him worthy of continued *life*; hence would have secured him access to the "*tree of life*," and he would have "*lived forever*."

But a contrary development would unfit him for life, by making him out of harmony with the CREATOR, preferring his *own will* to that of God's; hence the propriety of its being distinctly stated to the man, that if he did show himself determined to make his own will supreme he should "*surely die*": discord under the government of God could not be tolerated. Every thing that has life must come into harmony with God or discord be eternal. Hence when Adam developed the fact that he chose to give the supremacy to himself, or to his animal being, rather than to his CREATOR, he, in fact, chose *death* rather than renounce animal gratification. Thus, Adam had "*Life and Death* set before" him. He chose the latter—fell under his animal nature, and shared the fate of all other animals, but death was just as much more to be dreaded by him as his intellect was greater than

theirs. Not, however, because he had any *sufferings* to endure "beyond the grave," for his CREATOR made no such communication to him: it was, "*Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.*" So far as we have any inspired authority, such was the end of the animal Adam. In unbroken and eternal death and silence he is to remain.

In the whole account man is spoken of, treated as, and his destiny decided, as a unit: not as part mortal and part immortal. Such a position is a pure, unfounded, unscriptural, and mischievous assumption; and has filled Christendom with superstition, notions about purgatory, ghost worshippers, worshipping the dead, spirit-rappers, doctrines of demons, and infidelity; all the natural result and offspring of corrupting the word of God in relation to man's origin, nature, and destiny.

Adam's posterity are on trial as animal beings, like as he was. They are indeed, under another and different dispensation. His failure was final by one transgression, and the penalty certain to follow; admitting of the remission: His posterity have been subjected to death "in hope." That is—though they die their death may be abrogated, or abolished, by a union with the second Adam, Jesus the Messiah. The animal nature must be subjected, or brought under "subjection" to an intellect purified by the Spirit and word, or will of God. The dispensation we are under admits of repentance towards God, for past failures, and remission of sins past, through union with the second Adam—the *Life Giver*—so that death may be abrogated, or annulled. By this union with the second Adam, the Spirit of God is received, the intellect, or mind, becomes in harmony with God, and is subjected to His will, denying the animal nature, keeping it under and bringing it into subjection to the will, or word of God. See Rom. 8: 9-15; 1 Cor. 9: 26, 27. Thus living—thus dying—death cannot hold them; it cannot prevail to keep them under its power; they are members of the second Adam, and must share in his revival into life, clothed with incorruptibility and immortality.

It will be seen that men are still dealt with as units, and as animal beings; naturally subject to mortality, corruption, and death; and that in order to escape these, the animal, or flesh, is to be mortified—made to keep its place, as a servant—while the will of God is to be supreme, and the animal be made to give way wherever it acts up a plea opposed to the will of God, as revealed in His word of truth. Those who thus act, during

their probationary state, continue to be temples of the Holy Spirit, which dwelleth in them, and whereby they are sealed unto the day of redemption. See 1 Cor. 6: 19; 2 Tim. 1: 14; Eph. 4: 30. "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." Rom. 8: 11.

The great work of redemption is to redeem, or deliver, men from sin—the dominion of the flesh, or animal nature—and from corruption or death. To puzzle men with metaphysical and theological notions about immaterialism—immortal souls—undying souls—half alive and half dead—part in the grave and a part in heaven, or hell, or purgatory, and all such anti-scriptural fancies, is to shut up the kingdom of heaven against men," by bewildering their minds, and making the impression that religion is all fancy, about which the priest alone has any concern; and in the final result to land men in utter indifference to all religion. Shall men continue to be thus deceived by traditions?

Death not a Translation.

"Thou art not dead, my Rosa, though no more
Inhabitant of this tempestuous shore."

[Bland's Greek Anthology.]

In reply to the address presented to Mrs. Stowe at Leeds, England, this amiable and distinguished lady, among other things, said,—

"I have visited, in my pilgrimage, the home of Clarkson. I passed a night in the chamber that for years was consecrated by his prayers, and from which he ascended to heaven."

On reading these words, the question involuntarily came into our mind, was the benevolent and heroic Clarkson translated, like Enoch, so that he did not taste of death? That this was possible, no one who believes in the Divine power will deny. But, then, the whole of the facts run the other way, and the good lady has simply misinterpreted them, and the plainest teaching of the Word of Truth. Clarkson was not exempted from the ordinary lot of men; many carried him to the grave and made great lamentation: had he been translated actually, no such service would have been required, no such feelings would have been expressed. We may say of him what the apostle Peter uttered about the Psalmist, who fell beneath the stroke of death—"After he had served his generation, by the will of God he fell asleep, and was laid unto his fathers, and saw corruption,"—"he is not ascended into the heavens,"—"he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day!" The speaker of these sentences had no such faith as that expressed by Mrs. Stowe,—his language is explicit on the point he handles, and is perfectly opposed to the sentiment she utters. Clarkson died, not apparently, but really:

Clarkson was carried to the tomb, and the man Clarkson sleeps there, in hope of a resurrection to immortality. Very likely he had the hope concerning himself that the reply of Mrs. Stowe expressed concerning him, but, like many other hopes, it was doomed to destruction; believing we shall survive death will not create the fact. She spoke nothing peculiar to herself, in regard to his destiny, but the anti-scriptural opinions concerning the state of the godly, posterior to what is most improperly denominated death. Her words sound fine,—they rise into the sublime; their great defect is they are *not* true. Were they true, to hold that Clarkson died—lost his life, would be exceedingly absurd. *Dead and alive*—life lost and yet retained,—activity destroyed, and activity intensified,—sleep inflicted, and the highest wakefulness preserved,—the man in corruption, and corruption an impossibility,—the silence of death, and the songs of heaven! No, no, error is fortunately encompassed with glaring contradictions; but the truth stands forth in simple power, though sometimes in majestic sadness. There is an eternal and most intelligible distinction between death and translation; between tasting death and escaping the draught. There were no groans, no sighs, no prostration, no speechlessness, no corruption, no burial, in Enoch's case; he rose on the wings of power, and passed to the angelic shores.—leaving death and the grave behind him. There was a chamber, a garden, or a field, whence he was sweetly elevated to the bosom of his God; and whoever saw him ascend would gaze up after him with excess of astonishment, and instead of waiting over his triumph and honor, would go home to recite them with feelings of rapture. Death is another scene, and awakens other emotions. It requires no painting,—for who has not seen it? The emotions need not be described,—for who has not felt them? We may, in the language of orthodoxy, be told, that the friend who has just expired has “ascended to heaven”; nature, however, as it were, battles with the delusion, and the mournful silence of the widow, and the tears of sisters and brothers, tell that the dogma has the marks of suspicion stamped on its forehead. Better believe with Peter, than with those who are, unconsciously to some extent, heathenized in their theology; better, oh! ten thousand times rather learn of Jesus, who said, “I am the resurrection and the life,” than of the most eloquent pen that ever was moved.

The writer of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* is, in her theology, exceedingly orthodox, and, we regret to add, on some points, as on the one we have adverted to, exceedingly unscriptural. So we think, and so we affirm. The very popularity of a work, in which there is so much religion, would, in a time like this, excite our suspicion; and our expectations, on reading it, were more than fulfilled. Had the religion been more scriptural, it never would have had the fame it has got. We admire her genius and her sterling efforts to enforce the benevolence of Christianity, and the claims of the Negro on the justice and sympathy of mankind; but when she delivers what is opposed to the teaching of the Bible concerning man, his position and des-

tiny, or any kindred point, we deem it proper to expose her errors for the benefit of the world.

M.

DR. PYE SMITH

AND THE SEPARATE STATE OF THE SOUL.

BY REV. J. PANTON HAM, ENGLAND.

THE biography of a great and good man is at all times a seasonable contribution to our literature, in which, when executed, with discrimination and rigid impartiality, it is allowed, by common consent to take a prominent place. It is not often that he whose personal intimacy, and literary qualifications, best entitle him to fulfil the duties of a biographer, can hold so entirely in obedience his own partialities as to present a *bona fide* portraiture of his subject; what is least acceptable to him in the characteristics, tendencies, and experience of his friend, he will be tempted altogether to omit, or at least to present in so subdued a light as to scarcely arrest the attention of the reader. More particularly is this the case in a theological biography, such as that necessarily must be, which would familiarize us with the late Dr. Pye Smith, who, for so many years, fulfilled the important duties of a theological Professor in the Old College, at Homerton, and with a distinction which gave him a first place not only among Congregational Dissenters, to whose communion he belonged, but also among theological literati of every denomination, and of every country. A brief biographical notice of this eminent man, appears in the current number of the *British Quarterly Review*, suggested by the biography recently published by Mr. John Medway,* one of Dr. Smith's students, to whom the family of the deceased Doctor intrusted the delicate and difficult task which he has essayed to execute. The *British Quarterly Reviewer* indulges in reminiscences of his own; and from his contribution to the biography of the late Tutor of Homerton College, we shall extract a paragraph or two which will be interesting to most of our readers. In the following remarks of the Reviewer, we have an example of that rare quality in biographers to which we have adverted. Dr. Pye Smith, like all great thinkers, deviated in some particulars from the ordinary pathway of thought and conviction, and unlike many he possessed the candor to acknowledge his deviations. Even when they merely took the negative form of doubts, if those doubts were deeply established in his mind, and just in proportion to the importance of their subject, he would confess them, believing that truth was a gainer by the acknowledgment of his doubts, as well as by the declaration of his convictions. From what follows our readers will learn that Dr. Pye Smith could not subscribe *ex animo* the popular faith of the *separate State of the Soul, and a State of Consciousness* between the time of Death and Resurrection.

* *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of John Pye Smith, D. D., L. L. D., F. R. S., F. G. S., late Theological Tutor of the Old College, Homerton.*

"Speaking of Dr. Smith's metaphysical tendencies, we approach a subject of some difficulty. We refer to the painful and harrassing doubts which he suffered in relation to the separate state of the soul in conscious existence between death and the resurrection of the body. How much distress he brought upon himself, and how much anxiety upon the supporters of the College, is known only to the few surviving friends who were then intimately associated with him. It was in itself the severest mental conflict he ever experienced, and in its results threatened to be the most disastrous. In a letter to his intimate friend, Mr. Alers Hankey, he says, 'I have had some similar seasons of distress on the great points of Christian doctrine, but never so long continued nor so equally balanced as in the present instance.' His conduct at that time shows not only the candor and integrity of his disposition, but the awful doubt and perplexity in which he was involved. In the course of his regular Sabbath morning exposition, he came to the 5th chapter of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, which thus commences,—'For we know, that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. For in this we groan, earnestly desiring to be clothed upon with our house which is from heaven: if so be that being clothed we shall not be found naked. For we that are in this tabernacle do groan, being burdened: not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life.' To omit this paragraph from his Sabbath exposition was an evasion which his honorable mind would not allow him to practice. It should be observed, that whatever were the difficulties with which he was embarrassed, these verses are favorable to the popular belief. In any arrangement of texts distributed into two columns, one for, and the other against the received doctrine, this text would occupy a chief place in the former column. Had he felt that there was a considerable preponderance of evidence in favor of his early faith, his proper course would have been to have stated the argument supplied by the figurative language of this passage in favor of the separate state: and the utmost which even his scrupulous candor could have required, was to have said that there were some difficulties which he could not reconcile with the natural interpretation of these verses. But evidently his doubts were too serious to allow him to adopt the more obvious interpretation of the text. He knew how to deal with objections when he was satisfied with the truth; but here he could not ascertain the truth, and therefore he would not preach upon the subject. Under the circumstances he saw but one course; and though he knew it might endanger his influence, his usefulness, and his position as a pastor and tutor, he candidly stated in the pulpit the extreme difficulty with which he was embarrassed."—pp. 198, 199.

From this extract we gather the following facts. That Dr. Pye Smith entertained very decided doubts in relation to the commonly received doctrine of the separate state of the soul, and a state of consciousness during the season of death,—that these doubts occasioned him very deep distress, and excited considerable anxiety in the supporters of the College. That during the time he was the

subject of these doubts, he was engaged in expounding to the congregation of which he was pastor, the 2nd Epistle to the Corinthians, and that with the candor for which he was distinguished, he confessed the difficulty he experienced in expounding the opening verses of the 5th chapter of that Epistle, and in consequence, declined to preach on the subject. Such candor is the more exemplary, because, as the Reviewer says, "he knew it might endanger his influence, his usefulness, and his position as a pastor and tutor." On this we shall offer a remark or two as we proceed, but in the first place we have a word to say in reply to the conjectures of the Reviewer, who tells us, that

"For some years afterwards his reception of the doctrine of the separate state, was an act of faith to which his reasoning, after many a hard struggle, had been reduced to meek subordination. His faith was the purer and stronger for the conflict."—p. 199.

We have said that these statements are "conjectures," and we say on the authority of the Reviewer himself, who writes, "we cannot adduce positive evidence of these views." Let it then be understood that this last paragraph does not state a fact, but only a conjecture. Dr. Pye Smith appears to have confined his doubts to the secrecy of his own bosom during the latter years of his life, but because he said little or nothing on the subject, it does not surely follow, as the Reviewer, somewhat positively, as we think, after his own admission, tells us that "for many years afterwards, his (Dr. Smith's) reception of the doctrine of the separate state was *an act of faith*." If, as the Reviewer says, he "cannot adduce positive evidence" of this change in the Doctor's mind, why does he write as if recording a historical fact in the doctor's theological experience? He tells us in the above quotation, with all the positiveness due to the record of an unquestionable fact, that Dr. Smith's "reasoning, after many a hard struggle, had been reduced to meek subordination," and that "his faith was the purer and stronger for the conflict." What we complain of here, is, the want of qualification after the acknowledgment that the writer "cannot adduce positive evidence" of what he nevertheless, so positively asserts. The following quotation from the Reviewer's own pen, seems to us to supply evidence, at least presumptive, if not positive, that the doubts of the Doctor gathered strength with his years, and settled down at last into actual conviction *against* the commonly received doctrine. The peculiar "distress" which these doubts at first occasioned him, gradually subsided, not, as the Reviewer conjectures, because his doubts gave place to "an act of faith," but because he had discovered in the sun-light of Scripture truth, that the denial of the immortality, and separate state of the soul, did not involve the denial of the Future Life, while the glorious doctrines of the Resurrection of the Dead was a chief topic of the Scripture revelation. This it was no doubt, that

spoke his soul to rest,
 'And bade the turmoil of his troubled breast
 Cease its sad strife.

The Reviewer apparently unconscious that he was drawing aside the veil, and discovering to his readers the actual consciousness of the Doctor's mind, informs us that

"Many of the students remember the fervor and animation with which he was accustomed to speak of the resurrection of the body, the development of the future glorious man from the grave, the indestructible atom sown in corruption, but raised in incorruption; sown in weakness, but raised in power; sown a natural body, but raised a spiritual body. Here his faith luxurated in the sunshine of his philosophy. No glorious combination or development of matter was a mystery to him who saw the most beautiful flowers growing from insignificant seeds."—p. 199

Here is the true cause of that calm of mind which the Reviewer mistakenly supposes indicated a relapse to the old suspected faith. Dr. Pye Smith was not the man to halt in the pursuit of any important and legitimate inquiry from the fear of unsettling old convictions. As a true philosopher, he could not do such a violence to his intelligent nature, as the Reviewer strangely supposes, when he represents him as subjecting his "reasoning" to "meek subordination," where "reasoning," as in this case, was the *only* means of arriving at *necessary* knowledge. The learned Doctor knew well that the Scriptures nowhere speaks of the immortality and separate state of the soul. In the article "Adam," which he contributed to Kitto's Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature, he translated the words "living soul" in Genesis, ii, 7, "living animal," and added, "some of our readers may be surprised at our having translated *nepshesh khaya* by *living animal*. There are good interpreters and preachers, who, confiding in the common translation, *living soul*, have maintained that there is insinuated the distinctive pre-eminence of man above the inferior animals, as possessed of an *immaterial and immortal spirit*. . . . *We should be acting unfaithfully if we were to affirm its being contained or implied in this passage.*" The popular doctrine, he knew, had no formal foundation in the Bible, and therefore his philosophical mind sought information on a topic so interesting as the psychology of human nature in the realms of human science. Our own decided conviction is, that Dr. Smith was not so far in the rear of our modern philosophy as to doubt the propriety of regarding physiology as the true and only rational basis of a scientific psychology. We believe that his science, as careful as it was profound, first awoke his doubts relative to the doctrine of disembodied existence, and that gradually he gave up, without any mental reserve, a system of theological metaphysics, so obviously irrational as that which virtually denies the relation of function and organ in the human constitution, by asserting an unknown, unsubstantial something, called the immortal soul or spirit, as the ultimate organ of all the functions.

We can well conceive the deep anxiety and distress which such convictions would at first bring upon even such a man as Dr. Pye Smith, whose opinion, like that of other men, learned as

well as unlearned, had been, that the denial of the immortality and separate state of the soul necessarily involved the denial of a Future Life. But when he discovered that this blessed hope depended on no psychological theory, but was solely contingent on the doctrine of a *resurrection*, his distress subsided, and was succeeded by enthusiastic delight. With the Psalmist he could say, "the entrance of *thy* word giveth light," as he dwelt with increasing satisfaction and joy on the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead—a doctrine which at once complemented and established the scientific correctness of his opinion, that the soul, or, more properly speaking, that *man* is not immortal by natural constitution, and that he is incapable of any disembodied and immaterial existence.

The remarks of the Reviewer on this passage in the mental and religious history of Dr. Pye Smith demand some notice. Referring to the embarrassment experienced by the Doctor in offering his exposition of the passage in the 5th chapter of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, he says, "It should be observed that whatever were the difficulties with which he was embarrassed, these verses are favorable to the popular belief. In any arrangement of texts, distributed into two columns, one for, and the other against the received doctrine, this text would occupy a chief place in the former column;" and he proceeds to suggest the course which the Doctor ought to have pursued under the circumstances. As this Reviewer merely asserts his opinions, we shall content ourselves, at present, with meeting him with a counter assertion. *We do not think that the passage under notice is capable of being expounded on the commonly received opinions about the soul, and evidently Dr. Smith did not think so, and therefore he declined to preach on the subject.* The Doctor, it can scarcely be doubted, pursued the right course under the circumstances, and said what it was necessary he should say. To him the common interpretation of this much disputed text was neither the "natural" nor the "obvious interpretation," and if he had drawn up, in columnar form, the texts pro and con, he would have placed this supposed stronghold of the popular doctrine in the column opposed to the commonly received opinions. So would Luther, Tyndale, Milton, Bishop Law, Archbishop Whately, and Professor Maurice, as well as not a few other earnest and intelligent Scripture students, both in Great Britain and America.

One word in conclusion, in reference to the consequences which the Reviewer says, threatened to follow the Doctor's departure from the professed faith, in this particular. Having alluded to the great "anxiety" which it occasioned "the supporters of the College," we presume, when he says that "in its results it threatened to be the most disastrous," he means "disastrous" to the Doctor's official relation to the college and his repute and usefulness in the denomination to which he belonged. That his change of opinion was not "disastrous" to his personal intelligence and piety is evidenced by the fact, by the aid of this new light he had discovered the real value and Scrip-

tural prominence of the doctrine of *resurrection*, whereon, in the decline of his years, he so fervently and thankfully reposed, as the true solace to one of strong faith in the promise of a future life, for which he had lived and labored, and of which he was soon about to fall asleep in hope. The Reviewer may possibly be of opinion that the Doctor's change of sentiment threatened "disastrous" consequence to his faith and piety,—not perceiving with the Doctor, the complementary value of the belief in the resurrection of the deceased humanity. However this may be, he refers particularly to the danger threatened to the Doctor's *official* position as a Pastor and Tutor, by the adoption of his new views. Would the Royal Society, or the Geological Society, of both which the Doctor was a highly esteemed Fellow, have considered his Fellowship jeopardized by the diligence of his researches, and the novelty of his communications? Would the students of any science, except theological science, frown upon the intelligent and independent exertions of one of their number, threaten him with official deposition, and deny him the rights of fraternity? Are we to understand that theological science is perfect,—that scientific theology is that abnormality, which, unlike any other science, is non-progressive? It is this monstrous folly on the part of religious bodies that so effectually and mischievously clogs the wheels of their progress, degrades them in the eyes of the intelligent, and denudes them of moral power in their influence on the masses. Intelligent independence, which takes the lead in all true progress, is strangled in the birth among the sects. Its presence is the signal first of general suspicion, and then of violent and unreasoning opposition. Its manly protest is met by revilings and reprobation, and its calm and dignified decision is recompensed with a writ of excommunication, not the less effectual because wanting a form. By this insane process of extradition, the timid and time-serving sects preserve their tame uniformity, with gradually diminishing numbers and influence, while a band of religious free-men receives constant accession, and perhaps, ere long will be sufficiently numerous to have a common unsectarian recognition. The outcasts of the sects will become the real religious operatives, and the openers of the door of salvation to an enslaved world. The sects are perpetrating the silliest suicide. Soon, if not already, shorn of their strength, they will stand before the world as the monuments of that folly which seeks the reformation and salvation of men by their trampling on their rational natures, and with blinded eyes leading them blindfold in search of the realms of light and life. "Can the blind lead the blind? shall they not both fall into the ditch?"

❖ ❖ ❖

Scripture Expositions.

BY CATHARINE C. WILLIAMS.

Rom. 14 : 10, 12. "For we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. So then every one must give account of himself to God."

2 Cor. 5 : 10. "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ: that every one

may receive the things done in the body according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad."

From these passages, and others of like import that might be named, two things seem certain, which the past history of the world, as well as individual experience, to some extent, has proved true; *viz*: that our good or bad course is noted—and in accordance with our course of conduct, will the result be. If we bear in mind that the wages of sin is death; and that death is the result of a life-consecration of our members as instruments of unrighteousness, we shall not be so much at a loss to decide upon the import of these and kindred declarations. We must be either good or bad—and in heart a lover of Truth and righteousness, or an enemy, however much we may dissemble: and it is not if we are bad *some*, or a little, we shall die a *little*, or a *great deal*, as the case may be; and if we are good a *little*, or otherwise, live accordingly; but to which course, independent of personal considerations, or advantages, are our affections given? sin or righteousness? Which are we trying by example and precept, to help along? If sin—and we do not confess, and forsake it—death is the end; which will be according to his deeds. If righteousness, and we cleave to it through life, "we have our fruit unto holiness, and the end everlasting life"; which will be according to such course.

True, there are various kinds of suffering attending a course of sin, differing as the course differs. Some ways tending to death swifter than others; but all sure—none miss their wages, which is neither more nor less than *death*. "Tis not—how *much* bad have you done? but are you *bad*? If you are, you are not a lover of law and order; and will never make a good subject; and God can have "none that offend or do iniquity"—"no drunkard, or reviler, or extortioner, or *unclean*" person in his kingdom—only such as "are a law to themselves." The great Law Giver deems *death* a meet punishment for the *greatest*, as well as the *least* offence; as in both cases it deprives them of the power of harming either themselves or others more. What is suffered by the offender before receiving his wages depends on the *kind* of work done, and the way it is done.—But a little reflection will convince one, I think, that this has nothing to do with the wages; so that there seems to be no chance for *degrees* of punishment, as seems generally understood—this idea arising, I conceive, from not properly construing the passages under consideration.

The next thing to be considered is *the time when* our acts are to be re-viewed, judgment passed, and sentence executed thereon. Let us study ourselves—study the history of the past—look at children. Who has instituted the secret tribunal at which we feel ourselves arraigned on committing an unworthy act? Why did one misfortune, or judgment after another befall those in ancient times, accordingly as they departed from or kept the laws of God? And why all the calamities now in the world? What, but the result of a long train of causes, showing forth the righteous judgments of God, on nations as on indivi-

duals? Why do children feel ashamed of what they know is wrong, and try to hide faults? In answering these questions, can we not decide at what *time* "we must stand before the judgment seat of Christ" and "give account of ourselves to God"? And is there danger of learning too soon that every one must give an account of himself, and that our Maker is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart?—that no secret thing escapes his notice? And when we feel self-condemned, or approved, what is this but the result of having given an account of ourselves to God?

'Tis true, however, in all time, that "because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily" (in many instances), "therefore the hearts of the children of men are fully set in them to do evil"; but if any one will carefully note the *threatenings* against evil doers, and the *nature* of them, and facts of their fulfilment, according as the evils committed are of a physical or moral nature, they can scarce fail to see where their fears should concentrate: that it is not an indefinite—far off—future, they should fear, but the curses written in the law—written in the history of the world—written in our experience. Never should it be said by nation, or individual, I am my own master, and have a right to do as I please, unless they please to do right; for no one has any right to injure either himself or others—which he must do if he sins in any way: therefore it must put everything in connection with the thing done in disorder, which disorder must, sooner or later, appear: not disconnected with the chain of events, but in connection with the wrong done: which disorders, if not remedied by a timely righting, and forsaking, will, and must eventuate in ruin. Thus every one will give account of himself to God, who cannot err in regard to our real character; and whose verdict in the case of every enlightened man, or woman, will be so clearly and definitely understood, I have no doubt, that no rejected one will have the confidence to say, in the day of death, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit"; but on the contrary, must feel, if sensible, *hope expire*, and that he is about to "receive according to his deeds."

Shell-Rock, Iowa, Jan. 16th, '56.

SPIRIT RAPPING.—Rapping sounds, ascribed to unseen spiritual beings, have attracted the attention of a great number of persons in America within the last few years, and are now beginning to attract some attention here.

It is pretended that tapping, rapping or pecking sounds are made by departed spirits, who favor the living inhabitants of this world with their presence and their communications, to please certain among us who are styled *Mediums*, and are in fact *go-betweeners* to the spirits and those of us who wish to witness the proofs of the presence of the spirits and gain information from these people of another world. The Medium causes the visit of the spirits, and induces them to answer questions proposed by individuals of the company, by rapping or not rapping, in order to signify yes or no; and by rapping when the inquiring individual, in passing his finger over the several letters of the

alphabet, passes it over those which make up the word signifying the information, or over the numerals which represent the number of numerical matters about which an inquiry is made.

A philosopher would be justified in rejecting all this doctrine at once. We have no proof of the existence of any spirit* as distinct being in nature; they are merely imaginary beings,—"bottomless fancies,"—the offspring of by-gone times,—of ignorance, when men personified every power in nature, and fancied that power could exist alone, detached, inherent in nothing. We have no proof of the existence of any thing in nature but matter and its properties; and to regard the existence of power without matter, however fine and subtle, in which it is inherent, and of which it in truth forms a part, according to the actual compositions, &c., of the substance, is impossible to a strong, deep-thinking mind. We have no proof, or ground of belief, of anything else. These spirits, fancied, bottomless, unproved and unprovable, may inconceivable, a philosopher is justified in at once rejecting as arrant nonsense. Of God, who must be supernatural and above all nature,—beyond nature, we can conceive and comprehend nothing, and therefore we exclude him from our consideration of his works. If the philosopher should be a Christian, he would be justified in rejecting this doctrine, because he not only sees clearly that we, bodies with properties as we are, perish into complete disintegration and dispersion, like all other organization, when we die, but looks forward on the promises of the New Testament, and on them only, to a future existence—to future life and immortality, as a miracle, as a gift, superadded to us, and revealed by the gospel; and believes that we shall exist again as bodies—rise with bodies—but not till the judgment day. Even if he believes in these inconceivable spirits, already existing before the last trump, he cannot believe that they can be called up from their abodes of bliss, where God had placed them, or from any abodes, at the pleasure of a public exhibitor making money of them whenever an audience will collect and pay. The idea is outrageous and revolting.—*Zoist, April 1853, pp. 86, 87.*

* When the writer mentions "spirits," we are obviously to understand him to use the word in its popular sense of *immaterial* beings, those imaginary creation, human and angelic, of which we hear so much. For the existence of angels, called "ministering spirits," we must repair to the Bible; and from the same source learn also the difference between a being like man and an angel. The common notion about the constitution of spirits, certainly represents them as "bottomless fancies;" existences whose powers, as our author justly observes in a few lines forward, are inherent in "nothing."—*Editor.*

THE FINAL REGENERATION.—"Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, in the Regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." Math. xix. 28. So I read the text. For it is

evident enough, our translators have mispointed it, referring the words "in the Regeneration," to that which went before, thus: "ye which have followed me in the Regeneration;" whereas they should be joined to the following words, thus: "ye which have followed me, in the Regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory," &c. "In the Regeneration"—what is that? Not in baptism, nor in the regeneration or renewing of the Spirit, as some have fancied; for neither of these significations will make good sense in this place; but in the Resurrection, which will be indeed a regeneration, or second generation of men to life, after that life which they had in their first generation was extinguished. Which second generation, or production of men to life, is more properly the work of God, as being effected solely by his Divine power, without the concurrence of any second causes; whereas, in our first generation into the world, our parents were instruments. Hence those words of the Psalmist concerning Christ, Psal. ii. "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," are said by St. Paul to be fulfilled in him, when God raised him from the dead, Acts xiii. ver. 32, 33, "The promise which was made unto the Fathers, God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again, as it is also written in the second Psalm, "Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee." And hence also, all the godly are said at the Resurrection to become the children of God, upon the very account of their being then raised by God to a blessed immortal life, Luke xx. 36, "They are called the children of God, being the children of the Resurrection."
—*Bishop Bull.*

ASSERT YOUR RIGHT.—*Maintain your right to form your own opinions inviolate!* Sign no creeds; subscribe no articles; bow to no council. If your minister asks you as a condition of his acknowledgment of your religious character, what opinions you hold, tell him that is a matter between you and God, and with which you must forbid him or anybody to interfere. If a Church says, "You must believe this or that, or we must expel you;" say boldly to them, "You shall not expel me,—I withdraw." Be ever mindful that your spiritual safety and honor do not depend upon any ecclesiastical association. Ever be courteous, but be ever faithful. Be ready to co-operate with any for God's and for man's sake; but never sacrifice your freedom. "Let no man take thy crown." To pursue this course may require more nerve, may entail some sacrifices, and will provoke much ill opinion, but be easy on these matters. Courage will come to the devout. Self-denial is the highest form of self-indulgence. Public opinion cannot control destiny. Goodness will be loved. Greatness—even though it be only of temper—will be respected. Fidelity will bring peace. Hard names will be uttered with the very hoarseness of malice; but hard names mean nothing and cannot hurt you. Take these things smoothly in good temper, and with much fear of God, and you will put your denouncers to shame.

"Latitudinarianism," they will say. Ask them "What then?" "Infidelity," they will shout. Smile, and say "What then." "Damnation!" they will growl. Still smile, and say, "Very well, what then?" Poor things, they can go no further!—*The Youthful Enquirer Councelled and Encouraged.*

BIBLE EXAMINER FOR 1855.—We have about ten bound copies of last year's EXAMINER perfect or entire. Price \$1.50, sent free of postage, under 3000 miles. We have also some 40 sets in sheets which are imperfect, lacking numbers 1, 2 and 3: these we will send gratuitously to any who will pay the postage. Any who are new subscribers, this year, may specially desire a set of these, as the latter part of last year contains a large part of the Discussion which has been continued into this year.

For the Examiner.

BIBLE vs. TRADITION.

BY T. P. LEWIS.

Tune—"Rose of Allendale."

They tell us of a spirit land
Beyond the bounds of space
Where undressed spirits ever stand
Before Jehovah's face:—

But inspiration teaches plain,
The Kingdom shall be given
To saints, when Christ on earth shall reign—
This is the reign of Heaven.

They tell us of a happy home,—
A mansion in the air—
They tell us wait till death shall come,
And bid us enter there.

But Scripture says when Christ appears,
The graves shall then be riven,
And life shall swallow up our tears—
This is the reign of Heaven.

They tell us that the vile shall live,
In anguish, pain and grief;
Eternity no hope can give,
Nor death shall bring relief—

The Bible saith—good is the Lord,
His ways are just and even,—
Destruction is the sure reward,
Of all refusing Heaven.

Blest is the man who in his youth,
The yoke of Christ doth bear—
Blest are the souls who seek the truth,
And in its glories share.

Blest are the men both young and old,
Who for the truth have striven—
The Lord shall garner up the gold,
'Twill brightly shine in Heaven.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. XI.

NEW-YORK, AUGUST, 1856.

NO. 18.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year :

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORES, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

Will the Wicked Dead be made Alive ?

FOURTH REJOINDER OF H. H. HALL.

Dear Bro. Storrs:—I do not know as I ought to trouble you again, and I feel a delicacy in doing so after reading your last response, especially the closing paragraph. I have however decided to reply to a few points, and thus bring the discussion, so far as I am concerned, to a close. I do so because you have intimated very plainly that it is not agreeable to you to have it protracted further on my part.

I am very sorry that I have overstepped the mark so far that my brother deems the discussion unprofitable on account of its going over "much of the ground of Bro. Grew," and consequently "compelled" some "repetition," and has not therefore "been so much prized by the readers who had the EXAMINER last year, and more difficult to understand by those who had it not."

I should not have been led into what my brother now deems objectionable, had it not been for his very kind invitation in language as follows,—“If, however, they” (another brother and myself) “wish after Bro. Grew is through, to go over any part of the ground again they shall have place in our columns.” I trust *this*, with the fact that Bro. G. had closed his discussion with “Respondent,” will be deemed a sufficient apology for my having so far trespassed upon the columns, and what *may* be the true interest of the EXAMINER. I was not aware however that I had gone over *much* of the same ground of Bro. G., not having referred to a single article of his since our friendly discussion commenced. And it would be very difficult to “elicit all the light that can be had on the subject” that my brother desired at the start, or, the *little* that I have been able to shed, without referring to, and noticing some of the passages presented by Bro. G. But letting this all pass, I proceed.

(1.) If my brother is content to let pass without notice, my last argument on 1 Cor. 15: 22, in regard to the *two classes* of passages wherein the expression “in Christ” occurs, showing as I conceive, such a difference of construction as to settle forever the point that “in Christ,” &c., verse

22, means *through* Christ shall *all* be made alive”

—I am of course willing to submit it to the candid consideration of the reader, requesting him however to refer to my argument which will be found on page 162 of No. 10. I also wish to refer to the following remark of my brother—he says, “our brother mistakes our meaning if he supposes we acknowledge the changing of *in* to *by* is not critically wrong in verse 22. If our language would bear that construction, it certainly was not the sense we intended to convey.” His language will not only “bear that construction,” but I cannot see that it will bear *any other* construction. But he now says, “We believe it is ‘critically wrong’ to translate it *by*,” i. e., “unless *positive testimony* of the living again of the wicked dead can be found in other portions of inspiration,” which as yet he thinks has not been done; but if it *should* be done, *then* according to his *language* as quoted above, the change would be critically right.

(2.) I here wish, by the way, to refer to a peculiar way my brother has had during the discussion of this subject, of disposing of what *we* and what *he* formally deemed to be positive testimony in favor of the resurrection of the wicked. It is this—when a text, however positive in its character, has been presented, he has labored (honestly I have no doubt) to render it of doubtful import, and then as a consequence has required his opponent to present some other positive proof text, if one he had, that could not by any process of argumentation be stripped of its plain positive meaning. He must do *this* or fail in sustaining his view. If John 5: 28, 29, is quoted as positive proof of the resurrection of the wicked dead, my brother admits that the wicked will have a resurrection of some kind, but it cannot be, they are made *alive*, for the *word* LIFE does not there occur in reference to *them*. In what “*sense*” they are to have a resurrection we have not yet been informed; but I conclude, as *resurrection* means to be raised up again, (and I do believe *life* is certainly *implied* in a resurrection) that my brother *supposes* that the *skeletons* or *corpses* of the wicked will be raised up,—and this must be at the *voice* and by the power of the Son of God—but having *no life*, how can they *hear his voice*? and yet they *must* and *will* *hear*, though they have *no life* or consciousness, as my brother believes, for, Jesus Christ says, “For the hour is coming, in the which *ALL* that are in the graves shall *hear* his voice and come forth” [how can they “*come forth*” if they have no life?] “they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life” [eternal] “and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation,” [and death eternal.] For *what*, I sincerely ask, are these *lifeless* corpses to be brought,

or rather to "come forth"? Is it to be judged? or to have judgment executed upon them? Nay. My brother believes they were *judged* previous to this, and that judgment was *executed* upon them when they died. For *what* then, I ask again, are they to "come forth" from their graves,—and by what power are they sustained,—and where do they go to after their resurrection?—these and many other questions that might be put, must be fairly answered before there is even a show of doing away the force and positiveness of this passage as proof text on our side of the question. To my mind such a resurrection of corpses without life and consciousness (and those very corpses *hearing* the voice of the Son of God) is not only absurd but ridiculous. In regard to the language, "all that are in the graves shall *hear his voice*"—it may be said that even the saints as they lie destitute of life and consciousness cannot literally *hear* the voice of Christ, and if these cannot, then it is not likely our Lord intended to teach that the wicked dead should literally *hear his voice*. In reply to such an argument I have only to say, that I believe they will in both cases literally hear the voice of the Son of God as the sleeping man hears the voice of another that loudly calls him from his sleep. The very first tone from the powerful voice of Jesus will awaken the sleeping nations, and although they may not distinctly hear its first accents, yet starting in an instant to life and consciousness, that deep toned voice is heard before its cadences have passed away. But I understand if they do *not* hear the first sound of the trumpet, with which they *may* be awakened before Christ speaks and calls them forth, they *will hear* the second blast and the voice of the archangel. As persons who sleep do not always hear the first call, so the many "that sleep in the dust of the earth" may not hear the first call, but they will most certainly hear the voice of the Son of God and "awake, some to everlasting life and some to shame and everlasting contempt." I believe this, and cannot believe otherwise, because Christ himself has unequivocally declared that "ALL shall *hear his voice and come forth*."

(3.) But to return—my brother said that on my theory "Christ is manifested to be the greatest curse to the wicked." I replied—Christ was manifested to be a blessing to all who comply with the terms of the gospel, but not in *any sense* to those who wickedly reject his mercy, &c. My brother replies—"We think Christ is a blessing to all men in *some sense*." He *may* be in the sense of *respite* from punishment, thus giving the sinner an opportunity of obtaining eternal life, but should he finally reject Christ, his golden opportunities would not be a blessing in the end.

But you continue:—"He saith this greatest curse 'does not come upon the sinner in consequence of the resurrection of Christ, but because of their *rejection* of Christ.' Now, the largest portion of sinners never heard of Christ, and consequently never personally rejected him. Hence if *such* are to be raised to life, by Christ's resurrection—as Bro. H. maintains—and never would have been made alive but for Christ—and if that life is only to be tormented and killed again—we

ask, if Christ is not the greatest curse to all such that can be imagined."

The economy of the gospel is, according to Paul, that it proves "a savor of *life unto life*," and therefore a blessing unto those who believe but "a savor of *death unto death*," and therefore a "curse" unto those that reject the gospel.—This leaves my brother at issue with the great apostle. The truth is, wicked men *must* and *ought* to be punished more for rejecting the glorious blazing light of the gospel, than those who were not under the gospel or who never heard the gospel; but if the wicked are never raised up to life, the most incorrigible blasphemer and murderer receives no greater punishment than the comparatively innocent child that merely neglected salvation. I can see no justice in this; perhaps my brother can.

(4.) But you add:—"They *might* and *ought* to have avoided the terrible punishment denounced against them in the Scriptures of truth," saith our brother." And you reply, "The vast majority of sinners never heard of the Scriptures nor their denunciations—they never heard of Christ. Yet according to Br. H. they are 'all to be made alive by Christ'—tormented hopelessly, and burned up in *gehenna's* fire for not *avoiding* that of which they never heard. And all this comes by Christ."

My brother has here ascribed a sentiment to me that I have not asserted and do not believe—that the heathen will be "hopelessly tormented," &c. I believe with Paul that they will be judged and punished by the law they *have*, and *not* by the law they have *not*. "For those without law," he says, "who sin, will also perish without law; and those under the law, who sin, will be judged by the law" * * * "in the day in which God will judge the secret [actions] of men." (Rom. 2.—Murdock.) If the reader will read this chapter he will see that the apostle very plainly teaches a difference in the punishment of those who have heard the gospel, and those who have heard it not—that those "*who obey not the truth and are obstinate*," &c., are to be visited with God's *wrath* and are to endure "*tribulation and anguish*," not when they die, but *in the day of judgment*.—Therefore while I do believe that the heathen, who have not lived up to the light they had will be burned up in *gehenna's* fire, I do not believe they will be "hopelessly tormented for not *avoiding* that of which they never heard." There are pains connected with "the second death," for gospel hardened sinners which the heathen will never experience. This is rational and just. But on your hypothesis, all have one common punishment, and men are *not* judged and punished according to the deeds done in the body.

But my brother thinks with this view even, that the *resurrection* of Christ, if these heathen are to be raised also, is the procuring cause of *such* punishment; as, they have never heard of Christ and could not therefore reject him, and if he had not been raised *they* would have had no other punishment for *personal* transgression, according to my admission, than an eternal sleep in the dust of the earth. To this I reply, that if Christ's resurrection is the *procuring cause*, it is because his re-

urrection is inseparably connected with the gospel plan which was conceived in the infinite Mind, not only before the gospel system was introduced, but before Adam fell. Hence it is absurd in one sense to say, as we frequently do, that *if* Christ had not been manifested, death would have been an eternal sleep to the human race—nay, I might say just as truly that *if* Christ had not been *promised*, the race could not have existed a single day! for Adam was doubtless spared from immediate death on account of the wonderful plan of redemption conceived before Adam was created.—This being the case, no argument founded on these *ifs* is admissible.

(5.) Again you remark:—"Br. H. says, 'the sinner is to be made alive and tormented awhile to satisfy the law of God for *personal* transgression.' Indeed: then the wages of sin is not death but torment, and if the sinner must be made alive and tormented, sometime must elapse for that torment to be accomplished. During that time he will be multiplying his sins; and if God's law is unchangeable it will require an additional period to torment the sinner for the sins he commits while undergoing his first season of torments; and then another, and another, till '*eternal torments*' become inevitable," &c.

I did not say *directly* as you have quoted, that "the sinner is to be made alive and tormented awhile." True, I admitted it indirectly and unintentionally in answering your question—"for what purpose or end is 'the sinner' to be made alive and tormented awhile?" I replied 'to satisfy the law of God for the *personal* transgression of the sinner and not for ADAM'S transgression.' My answer was intended to refer to their resurrection and subsequent punishment of the second death, and not to the *torment*. My opinion is that the wicked will have no "*positive* infliction of pain" aside from the pangs connected with the second death, unless the awful stings of conscience which each one will endure according to their sin against light and knowledge, may be considered a *positive* infliction; and this has usually been understood to be the natural result of sin and not a *positive* punishment by God. Hence, this being the case, gospel rejecters, and God blasphemers, and all gospel enlightened and gospel hardened sinners will have consciences that will cry aloud against them for their folly and madness in stifling the convictions of sin and resisting the blessed influence of God's Spirit: and their poignant grief will be redoubled when as they come up on the breadth of the new earth, and encompass the camp of the saints about and the beloved city—that city which John saw come down from God out of heaven to the new earth—they see the beautiful earth "arrayed in living green" and flowers of varied hue, and rivers of delight clear as crystal flowing out from the throne of God and the Lamb, and

Behold the saints of God with harps of gold,
Safely delivered and all in the fold.

And they will thus keenly realize what durable riches they have lost—what felicity—what surpassing loveliness and glory their *eyes* must forever be closed upon—what entrancing melody

which they *may* be permitted to bear for a little season, as the enraptured host swell out their loud hosannas with harps and voices in praise to God and the Lamb, their ears will be shut against; while the heathen who had not enjoyed gospel privileges would escape those stings of conscience and those *unutterable* horrors of the second death produced by a most lively sense of the tremendous loss attending it, and would only be "*burned up*" or "*devoured*" by the fire that comes down from God out of heaven: and this would not be so horrible and cruel a death as many martyrs have suffered at the hands of the enemies of the cross.—Consequently I cannot think with my brother "that the theory which embraces the living again of all the wicked dead, including Adam—the old world—Sodom and Gomorrah, &c., is a theory unreasonable, inconsistent, unscriptural, horrible, unreconcilable, dishonorable to the character of God, stripping the gospel of its peculiar glory, and making Christ the minister of sin."

Again, even admitting that "the sinner must be made alive and tormented awhile," it does not follow, as my brother says, that "the wages of sin is *not* death but torment," for his assumption that because the sinner "will be multiplying his sins," and that therefore "it will require an additional period to torment him for sins committed while undergoing his first season of torment," does away with the great truth that *death*—deprivation of life—is the punishment for sin. But the second death would be as much the punishment for sins committed while the temporary torment was being inflicted, as it would be, or, as mere natural death without a resurrection would be, for the sins of a whole life time. So I think our brother need have no fears about our being swept away in the *torment* current into our "old belief of *eternal torments*."

(6.) Your reply to the reasons I gave why I believed Isa. 26, a discursive prophecy, is, I am satisfied on examination, correct, though it does not thereby follow that it is not a discursive prophecy. My brother will readily admit that a large portion of the book of Isaiah is discursive in its character; he must also admit that it would not be safe to found an argument on, to say the least, doubtful chronological order, as I think he has done in this chapter. If the reader will examine the 25th and 26th chapters of this prophecy in connection, he will doubtless be convinced that it is *discursive*. Note the fact that the resurrection is brought to view in 25: 8, 9, 10, as follows:—"He will swallow up death in victory," * * * "and it shall be said in that day, lo, this is our God, we have waited for him," &c. Note also the connection of the chapters as follows—"In that day shall this song be sung in Israel; we have a strong city," &c.—then at verse 5,— "For he bringeth down them that dwell on high; the lofty city he layeth it low, even to the ground." This of course has reference to events previous to the resurrection brought to view in the language before quoted. Then remember the resurrection is again introduced in 26: 29, and is followed, if not in the same, in the next chapter with events that precede the resurrection—thus

showing conclusively to my mind that this prophecy is discursive in its character. If so, it follows that my brother's "previous argument on Isa. 26," does not "stand unmoved and immovable."

(7.) Again you say, "Br. H.'s critical remarks on 'destroyed together' fail to produce any conviction on our mind that all wicked men are to be destroyed *at once*, and *yekhad* must have the necessary sense of *at once* to be available to his view: but it has not necessarily that sense." In replying to this it is only necessary to say that *yekhad* means simply *together*, and while this English word *may* have, as in Ps. 14: 3, to which you refer, a secondary or figurative meaning, yet it is strange to me that my brother should so far forget his own rule of interpreting the language of the Bible as to contend that because this word is so used in one or two places, where it is perfectly plain that *no other sense* can be attached, that it therefore has the *same sense* in other places where no such necessity exists for attaching such a figurative meaning, but on the contrary does violence—taking from the passages their peculiar force.

In the Scripture—"But the transgressors shall be destroyed together," according to my brother's view, the word "*together*" is superfluous; for if the Psalmist did not intend to teach that the wicked would be destroyed at the same time, i. e., "in company," he would doubtless have said, as others of the inspired penmen and as God himself has said—"the wicked shall be destroyed." If my brother on reflection should still contend for the liberty of thus disposing of this word *together*, he certainly cannot any more justly find fault with the 'orthodox' for contending that the words *destroy*, *destruction* in these very texts and others also, do not mean that wicked men will be *literally* destroyed: and pardon me when I say, I think *they* have as good ground for so understanding them, with many other of our proof texts, as you have to say that *together* does not, in the passages I presented, mean literally *together*.

But you add, "We will say nothing in defence of our previous illustration of the phrase 'quickened us together with Christ,' &c., which was in answer to my view of Isa. 1: 28; Ps. 37: 38; Job 21: 30. (Will the reader here refer to No. 10, page 164, and read my rejoinder?) Thus it will be seen that my brother now gives up the main and *only* argument he first presented against the idea that "destroyed together" means *at the same time*. And my present answer to his second argument I submit to the candid consideration of my brother and the readers of the EXAMINER. If it shall be found a good one, then my brother's view that the wicked will be destroyed or rather *die one at a time* and *not together*, is proven to be erroneous, and this *alone* would settle the question that the wicked dead must have a resurrection.

(8.) Again you say, "Br. H.'s astonishment at our construction of 2 Peter 2: 9, is reciprocated by ourself at his amazing assumption, that if that text does not refer to a future judgment, when the dead good and bad are to appear, &c., then no text in the Bible does, and Universalists are right." I

still firmly believe, my dear brother, that if you take the liberty to so explain 2 Peter 2: 9, as to make the judgment spoken of, refer to the ordinary death of the wicked, one at a time, as you have done, and not to *the* day of judgment in the future, you cannot consistently object to Universalists explaining away in a similar manner as they *can* and *do* every passage in the Bible that relates to the judgment. If such explanation is allowable in Peter 2: 9, it is also allowable in all similar passages. I do not therefore think my statement was an "amazing assumption."

I did not intend by "throwing brackets into" your "language" to misrepresent you; and I cannot *now* see that I did, only in reference to my expression '*natural death*' as applied to the wicked, which for the first time to my knowledge you state you do not believe takes place in their case; *theirs* being a *penal* death, the righteous *only* dying a *natural* death. I must confess I cannot here see the nice distinction my brother does. I believe *all* die a natural death who do not die by *violence* or *accident*.

But I am glad my brother does not "ignore a future judgment day," for reasons before assigned, and for proof of it, he says, "let him turn to vol. 10, pp. 318, 319, and he will learn what he seems never to have read." I will assure my brother that I read all that he writes in the EXAMINER, for I have been too much interested and instructed by his writings to neglect any portion of them; but I am so unfortunate as not to be able to remember *all* I read. I will therefore refer to his language. * * * * I see by reference that he not only believes in a future judgment day for those who may be living at the time of its occurrence, but he believes in many judgment *days* that are in the past, which view I think I could show, if my limits did not forbid, does not agree with the scriptures of truth.

(9.) I will however say, the Bible everywhere speaks of *one* judgment day and *only one*—it is in language as follows—and cannot by any explanation be referred to the day of a man's death, or to the ordinary judgments of God against the nations of the earth—"the day of judgment—at the judgment—but after death THE judgment—reserved unto the day of judgment to be punished—It shall be more tolerable for the land of "*Sodom and Gomorrah*," in the day of judgment than for that city, &c., &c. What force has the language in the last quotation if the *people* of Sodom and Gomorrah are not to be raised from the dead and appear at the judgment? To my mind, it is inconsistent to suppose that if there will be so many judgment *days*, as my brother thinks, in different ages of the world, that the inspired penman should say so much about *the* day of judgment to take place at the end of the world or gospel age, and nothing about *the* judgment *days* that were to transpire previous to that. My brother thinks I close "with pretty strong language"—not stronger I think, than the Bible warrants:—and in my "concluding affirmation" I only intended to express my *confident* belief of the statement made; I expected to be so understood.

(10.) In answer to my position that *hades*

contrary to your opinion, yield up all that is in it at the word of the Son of God, as he alone 'has the keys of death and *hades*' and has unequivocally declared that "all that are in the graves shall hear his voice and come forth"—you "observe first, the term *hades* is not in this text at all; it is not the word translated *graves*; it is *mnemeions*; which we can hardly suppose Jesus would have used if he meant *hades*." The term here translated *graves*, which literally means grave, tomb, a sepulchre, must by substitution mean all that *hades* means; to suppose it does not, is to suppose that all who are not in a literal grave, tomb, or sepulchre, will not "come forth" or be raised from the dead according to the words of Jesus. My brother will admit that those of the *righteous* who do not in their death occupy a literal grave or tomb, are nevertheless included in the expression "all that are in the graves."—This being true, *observation first* has no force except in my favor. The Revelator says "death and *hades* delivered up the dead which were in them." I wish to ask my brother, and I hope he will not omit to answer,—how can *hades* deliver up all its dead, as it must, unless there be a *resurrection* of all? and how can *death* yield up all its victims as he must, unless *life* be restored so as to enable them to "come forth" from their graves? These are momentous questions, and if not fairly answered, then observation second in reference to John 5: 28, 29, that "no life is spoken of as imparted to those who had done evil"—has no force, for *death cannot* be said to deliver up its victims unless *life* is imparted—*death would continue to hold his grasp*. But the unerring word of God declares that *death and hades shall deliver up its dead*. Rev. 20: 13.

(11.) But my brother observes third, "Br. H.'s construction destroys the force and peculiarity of our Lord's language, Math. 16, where he saith, 'the gates of *hades* shall not prevail against my church.' That is nothing peculiar to his church, according to Br. H.'s construction; for his theory is, that 'the gates of *hades* shall not prevail against' the wicked dead: all that is in it he affirms shall come out." In reply I remark first, that *katiskusousin*, translated *prevail*, means to overcome; (i. e. to conquer, to vanquish, to subdue,) to prevail against—i. e., "to obtain the victory," &c. Now although I am confident that Jesus has plainly taught in John 5: 28, 29, that all will be raised from the dead (and I cannot believe with my brother in a *resurrection from the dead* that excludes *life*) yet I do not understand that he contradicts himself when he says "the gates of *hades* shall not prevail against it," (his church) for he only announces the fact that *hades* shall not prevail, or, that his church shall prevail—conquer, subdue, obtain the victory over *hades*, while the wicked, though compelled "to come forth" from *hades*, do not prevail—conquer or obtain the victory over *hades*—no, my brother, there are no acclamations of the conqueror—no palms of victory—no notes of praise in their case—they "come forth" like felons—guilty—miserable—corruptible—that every one of them may be judged according to his works, and then die "the

second death." Thus my brother can see the "peculiarity" is not in regard to a resurrection simply, but it is in regard to a *victory over death and hades*, it is a resurrection to *eternal life*, which the wicked cannot enjoy—they can never say "death is swallowed up in victory—O death where is thy sting," for *death*, though he temporarily releases his victims, in the end prevails—conquers them—they are destroyed—annihilated.

(12.) My brother says, "Observe once more, Br. H.'s view is adverse to any peculiarity in the revival of Christ from the dead. 'Thou wilt not leave my soul in *hades*,' was the assurance of Christ when he descended there. But what of that? no soul of man is to be left there, according to Br. H.; 'all that is in it, according to his view, *hades* yields up.'" According to *my view*! Is it not according to Rev. 20: 13? "*Hades yields up*,"—yields up *when*?—three days after death and without seeing corruption? as in the case of Christ! No. Can it be possible my brother relies on such an argument as *this* to sustain his position? Does he not know the passage means—"Thou wilt not leave my soul in *hades*" to see corruption?

I cannot think "Br. H.'s view is adverse to any peculiarity in the revival of Christ from the dead," unless he should take the position that *the wicked are raised three days after their death*!

(13.) My brother continues, "We believe it" [that *hades* yields up all] "is equally 'contrary' to the truth of God's word, if the wicked dead are in *hades* proper. We believe, however, that the wicked dead fall below *hades*; i. e., they fall into *gehenna*, from which there is no revival into life." Here is something new, though in rather equivocal language. Do I understand my brother to say the wicked dead do *not* go into *hades* at all, or, that they pass through it in going "below" and so "fall into *gehenna*?" If the former, I reply that as *hades* is the state of death, or state of all the dead, it follows that if the wicked die, they are in *hades* whether they find a sepulchre or not. If my brother means the latter, I wish to know how the wicked dead can "fall below *hades*" into *gehenna*? and whether *gehenna* is a place or a state? if a place, where is it? and if a state, what is the difference between it and *hades*? These are a few of the questions that must be satisfactorily answered before this new position and answer to my argument on the destruction of the wicked in *gehenna*, can have any effect on my mind.—Has my brother no other way of fulfilling the words of Christ that the wicked shall be cast into *gehenna*—where they are to be "burned up root and branch"? He believes they will have a "resurrection in some sense." Is their resurrection to be from *hades* or *gehenna*? or is it from both—passing through *hades* from "below"? In this case, after their resurrection, do they go back to *gehenna* again? If so, where is the proof that *the wicked are cast into gehenna twice*! If not, where do they go? My dear brother, there are too many obstacles in the way of your view, some of which I have presented from time to time, and which have not been in my opinion removed; and until they are removed, would forever prevent my

seeing the subject as you do. Others may look at it in a different light; each one must decide for himself, and I trust it will be done with a view to the advancement of TRUTH and the glory of God. Neither have the proof texts and arguments I have presented been, to my mind, disposed of as favoring the non-resurrection of the wicked dead; others may think differently, and probably *will* just as honestly.

(14.) Having, I am fearful, already trespassed upon the columns of your most excellent periodical, I submit my arguments and rejoinders, and other points that I could not now notice, to the candid consideration of the reader.

There is *one* mistake, among others in my last article, whether of the printer or my own carelessness I cannot tell, as I have not an accurate copy, which I wish to correct; it is in second column, page 161. The language *should* be—If this be true, then “*death doth*” *not* “devour and annihilate all them out of Christ.” for the FIRE that *is to come down* [*not is coming down every day when a wicked man dies, but is to come down*] “from God out of heaven DEVOURS them.”

(15.) My dear brother, I join with you in saying, “we are at the best fallible beings, and may therefore be mistaken in our construction of the scripture”; and we are perhaps too much in the habit of speaking too *positively* in regard to our convictions of truth: if therefore I have done so, and thereby displeased my brother, as it seems I have, I am very sorry; such was not my intention.

And before I close, let me say that I have no idea that my brother would *knowingly* labor to ‘overthrow and render void the *most positive* and most truthful words of our common Master and Redeemer.

Wishing you all prosperity and success in contending earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints, I remain your sincere friend and brother,

H. H. HALL.

Peru, June 24th, 1856.

[See Response page 216.]

DUALISM—Dr. POST. I.

An intelligent friend communicated the following remarks to us, on *dualism*, &c., which are valuable, and would have been inserted in our Review of Dr. Post if they had been received in time; but as the writer “designs at a future day to publish an argument, theological, exegetical, and historical, upon the subject,” it is as well perhaps that we should have his argument complete, and by itself, as to have attached the following to our Review. We hope our friend will furnish his proposed work as early as possible. In speaking of Dr. Post’s argument he says:—

“His first article seemed a development of the Dualism to which I think the common doctrine is reducible—the *Dichotomy*, which is Dr. Tholuck’s great difficulty with the received doctrine. It has

been my special argument for thirty months, that the *eternal necessity* of evil has nothing to boast over an *eternal Principle* of evil,—or that the common view has advantage over that of the Manichaeans and Persians, only in its greater refinement;—a refinement, however, that is shaded with the doctrine of Pythagoras and other philosophers who eternized evil as inseparable from the cosmical system, because they knew no Providence to eliminate it. Accordingly, pursuing the history of Dualism, I found some curious results of the incorporation of philosophic notions with Christianity. TATIAN is the first one who speaks of *penal immortality*. Consistently enough, he was the founder of the sect of Encratites who forbade marriage.—Was it because he thought matter in itself corrupt? or was it because the parental relation was not to be sought, if one’s child might be an immortal fiend? I care not which answer is given. A hundred years later MANES himself appeared, to offer relief to the theology of the church, by fathering the eternal evil now believed, on an evil Deity. And the church found herself in new trouble, because MANES found so many proselytes from among her children. But how to extricate herself from her dilemma?—*Gracious* immortality was getting odious then, as it is now. But the eternity of evil was a felt and galling hardship. In a debate purporting to have been held between Manes and Archelaus, ab. 270, the latter when pressed, broadly hints that evil men will one day cease to be. “If the human race should at length perish from the earth, in such a way that they can sin no more, the substance of this evil tree, bearing no more fruit, would perish.”—“And when will that thing happen that you tell of?”—“I am only a man, and do not know what will come; nevertheless I shall not leave that point without saying something upon it.” And again—“Therefore it (death) has an end, because it began in time; and that was true which was spoken—Death is swallowed up in victory.’ For it was not unbegotten, but is shown to have both beginning and end.”—*Routh’s Reliquia Sacra*, vol. iv., pp. 182, 183, 205. Archelaus’ solution of the End of Evil is, however, restorationist. Thus he explains Matt. xiii: 13, and 2 Cor. iv: 3, 4, with the remark “ut interpretantur nonnulli, horum enim non est illaudabilis oratio.”—p. 280.

Fifty years later LACTANTIUS took up the prevailing Dualism, and adorned it with the form of the old philosophy of an eternal necessity, such as is found in Philo, Plato, and whom not. With him, evil is a fruit of the original plan of the world. (1.) It is necessary, to illustrate the nature of good. (2.) Christ and Satan are respectively the right hand and left hand of God. (3.) Satan is an anti-God, the rival of the true God. (4.) Over and over again he speaks of evil as essential to the existence of good, by a law of contraries, or a polarity of forces, of which neither can subsist without the other. (5.)

This Dualism was so manifest, however, that

(1 to 5.) The references we have omitted.—
ED. EXR.

even in this philosophic form it was not acceptable at a later age. Two of the most objectionable passages were omitted from the later manuscripts and earlier editions of Lactantius. But those editors who have suppressed the passages confess the *style* to be that of Lactantius, and Hagenbach (Hist. of Doc. § 133,) and Dr. Hase, (Ch. Hist. § 88,) regard them as genuine.

This Dualism lived a persecuted life for some centuries, and has slumbered for some centuries more. It showed a galvanic sort of life in the scepticism of Bayle, who maintained for argument's sake, that Manichaeism, with all its absurdities, was better than any other theory of evil, and who brought out the concession of Le Clerc, that those who held the doctrine of life in Christ alone (the Socinians,) could better answer the arguments of the Manichaeans than any other school of theologians.

Dualism has been thought dead. "The world is not likely to see a revival of it," we are told.—[Christian Theism. (The Burnet Prize Essay,) p. 278.] But a more profound writer says, "the theological and philosophical character of the present time can only furnish us with a poor guarantee that perhaps very soon the inclination to a dualistic consideration of the world will not extend itself in a similar manner as a few decennaries ago."—(Muller, Christian Doctrine of Sin, i. 441.) Among various symptoms of this, one of the most palpable is the saying in that wild Procin of Bailey's Festus, so exactly Lactantian, "Evil and good are God's right hand and left."

From this history you need not wonder that on reading Dr. Post's first article, I remarked that on his view, we might say of Satan the same that was said of a creature far more innocent, "the Lord hath need of him." I did rejoice in the progress of the current theology towards what I regard its true goal;—and the sooner it finds itself there, the better.

But this sort of argument, I am aware, is not the best for all readers, though I think it quite as intelligible as the Ciceroian style of Dr. Post. Among the things I have collected are, however, some passages which I do not know whether you have seen. Their bearings on certain facts of the argument are obvious. Here is from *Richard Baxter*, pertinent to the question whether eternal death in the literal sense is eternal punishment: "Would you not be contented to suffer a terrible degree of misery everlastingly rather than die? Whatever men may say, it is certain they would. Though not to live to us, is better than to live in hell, yet men would live in very great misery, than not live at all, if they had their choice."—(The Unreasonableness of Infidelity, Part I. Spirit's Witness, Works. Lond. 1830; vol. xx., p. 31.) And here is found *Hermann Witsius*, whose "Economy of the Covenants" is a towering and lasting monument of unimpeachable orthodoxy. "But whether it be necessary, that God should continue forever the sinful creature in a state of existence, I own I am ignorant. May it not, in its measure, be reckoned an infinite punishment, should God please to doom man, who was by nature a candidate for eternity, to total annihilation, from whence he

should never be suffered to return to life? I know, God has now determined otherwise, and that with the highest justice. But it is queried, whether agreeably to His justice He might not have settled it in this manner: If thou, O man, sinnest, I will frustrate thy desire of eternal happiness, and of a blessed eternity, and on the contrary give thee up to eternal annihilation. Here at least, let us hesitate, and suspend our judgment."—(Econ. of C. Book 1., ch. v., § xlii.) Hear him, also, on the import of *Purairōnios*.—After saying that the words in Jude, v: 7, are "not to be restricted to that fire wherewith those cities were burnt, but to be extended to the flames of hell, with which the lewd inhabitants of those cities are to this very day tormented."—he says—"But it is true of both (the inhabitants and the towns,) that they were burnt with fire; which, with respect to the towns, may in some measure be said to be eternal, they being so consumed as that they never shall or can be restored."—(Bk. I. ch. v.)—But manifestly, if the phrase *eternal fire* has a fair sense when applied to the cities or people as consumed utterly and forever, to extend its meaning *explains* nothing, and of course *proves* nothing. F.

OBITUARY.—Br. Joseph Eaton communicates the intelligence that our aged sister ANNE POTTER, of Leonardsburg, Ohio, has fallen asleep in Jesus, in her 78th year. She was the mother, we suppose, of Br. Eaton's wife. More than thirty years since she became, says Br. E., "the subject of that *good hope through grace*, 2 Thess. 2: 16, and joined the regular Baptists. Some eight weeks before her death she was attacked, 1st by a dropsical affection of the heart; and 2d, with a paralysis of the left side. She was apprehensive from the commencement of the former, that *the days of her appointed time had come*, Job 14: 14; that she 'should go whence she should not return, to the land of darkness as darkness itself,' Job 10: 22; where, 'in death there is *no remembrance of Thee*,' (the Lord,) Psa. 6: 5; but having been 'begotten anew by the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ to the *Hope of Life*,' (Syriac Translation, 1 Peter 1: 3,) and having 'obtained like precious faith,' 2 Peter 1: 1, she viewed her *Redeemer* standing on the *earth in the latter day*, Job 19: 25, and would ransom her from the power of the grave—or state of the dead—and *redeem* her from *death*, Hosea 13: 14, and thus 'be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God,' Rom. 8: 21." Thus writes Br. Eaton. Sister Potter had been long a subscriber to the BIBLE EXAMINER.

ERRATA.—In my "Response to H. Grew's Second Reply," in EXAMINER "No. 17," are the following errors, none of which, I am confident, were in my manuscript. In sec. "4" there should be no comma after the compound word "post-resurrection" in the 37th line; the word is intended as an adjective, qualifying "tribulation and anguish," whereas the comma converts it into a noun and destroys the sense. In the same sec., 41th line, the "&c." should be included in the preceding parenthesis. In sec. "6," 41st line, for "offer"

read "afford." In sec. "S," 6th line, for "*elliptical* and *illipsis*" read *elliptical* and *ellipsis*." In the same sec., 11th line, for "sense" read "verse." In sec. "H," 6th line, for "teaches" read "teach."
 July 17, 1856. MACKNIGHT, JR.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

New York, August, 1856.

Will the Wicked Dead be Made Alive?

The discussion of the above question has been protracted to greater length than we ever anticipated, or than is desirable in the EXAMINER, as it occupies too much space to the exclusion of other matter. Hereafter, for a time at least, we are of opinion that none but short articles should be inserted on this topic. If any are still anxious to speak on the question, and have anything new to offer, let them condense their ideas so that no article shall fill exceeding two or three columns.—As a general rule, such articles, in this stage of the question, will be read with more interest and be better understood than longer ones.

The following letter from DR. HUNTINGTON makes a suggestion worthy of attention; and we publish it, first to say, that we most sincerely hope that no one will ever embrace any doctrine "from over-confidence in a respected teacher." We should deeply regret and deprecate such conversions.—Let sober judgment, based on your own understanding of the teaching of the Bible, be your guide, praying for the aid of the Divine Spirit of God to enlighten your understanding. Then, whatever conclusion you arrive at, you will have the consciousness of sincerity in seeking after truth, and you will not err fatally, if you err at all.—Secondly, we publish this letter that others may express their views of the propriety and desirableness of a "pamphlet" on the question, as suggested by Br. Huntington.

BROOKLYN, Con., July 18th, 1856.

Dear Brother.—I have for some time wished to make a suggestion to you, but have not been fully satisfied that it was yet time. But the short article in your July number, respecting the comparative number of those who had embraced the doctrine of the non-resurrection of the wicked, determined me. I have been more advantaged by the instruction obtained from your publication than from any other one of the many which I take. But while I mean to keep my mind in an attitude open to conviction on any Bible truth, I do not intend, *from over-confidence* in a respected teacher, to take hastily an idea so entirely new. I have been very much interested in the discussion of this subject thus far; and I must say that I have been

benefitted also; but I do not see that *this mode* of warfare is as well calculated to bring the thing to a happy and speedy *conclusion* as another.—What I wish to propose is that you take up the subject in a pamphlet of sufficient size to afford room for the fair and full exhibition of the question, and let us have it in a shape in which we can have a plain view of the whole matter without the breaks and distractions of a protracted controversy. This you did successfully, in your Six Sermons, on that question; and I hope you will think best to do so in this. I express no opinion in the case myself as yet, but I do want to see a different presentation of it, if it can be had. What may be the sentiments of other subscribers, or their wishes I have no means of knowing. I make this suggestion independently, as I stand nearly alone in this community.

Yours truly, in the love of the truth,

THOMAS HUNTINGTON.

Response to Br. Hall's Fourth Rejoinder.

In reference to Br. Hall's introductory remarks, we regret if we gave place to any expression in our last response that seemed unkind or unreasonable. We intended no disrespect to Br. H., whom we highly esteem. It is possible that we "intimated very plainly that it is not agreeable to protract" the discussion on the preposition "in," as there seemed to us to be no probability of either of us enlightening the readers of the EXAMINER any more on that subject; and we are of the same opinion still. That was the point on which our discussion was opened; and we certainly had no idea of its taking the wide range it did, immediately, or we could not have consented to have gone into the subject at all, at *that time*. Br. Grew and his Respondent had hardly completed their discussion when the "preposition" came up; and we did decline going into the general discussion, immediately, with another. We were willing after a while to do so. That Br. H. had not "referred to a single article of" Br. Grew's, does not alter the fact that "much of the same ground" was travelled over, and that such a course made it embarrassing to us, as we did not feel that our readers could be edified by our repeating what the respondent of Br. G. had said on the same texts introduced in this new discussion on 1 Corth. 15: 22.

We will now proceed, as briefly as possible, to reply to Br. H.'s fourth rejoinder. We have numbered the sections of his article to which we reply to save quoting his words, and the reader will please refer back to the corresponding sections, else he will not understand our remarks.

"(1.)" Why Br. H. should wish to press us to disclaim further, meaning what our words seem to

import, we cannot tell. To avoid multiplying words we entered a simple disclaimer in our last reply. We admit we expressed ourself at first without sufficiently guarding our meaning. We afterwards disclaimed intending to convey the idea which the words perhaps naturally imported. We regret we were so unfortunate in our first expression. We now say, that to change *in* to *by*, 1 Corth. 15: 22, is critically wrong, because such a change contradicts the entire argument of the apostle in that chapter, and makes him contradict himself in his testimony. Rom. 8: 11, (see EXAMINER, page 123), and cannot therefore be admitted at all; and furthermore, no argument from 1 Corth. 15, for the living again of the wicked dead, is of any avail to the affirmative; nor are any inferences from that chapter to have any weight in deciding the question in favor of the affirmative, "unless positive testimony of the living again of the wicked dead can be found in other portions of inspiration, which, as yet, has not been done to our mind"; but even if that could be done, the subject and the argument of the apostle in this chapter forbid changing *in* to *by* in verse 22. That was what we meant.

A "Liberal Translation" of the New Testament by E. HARWOOD, published in London in 1768, reads the verse thus—"For as by Adam all the human race was subjected to mortality: so by Christ Jesus shall all the pious dead be entitled to immortality."

"(2.)" This section of Br. H.'s article shows that he either did not read what the Respondent to Br. Grew wrote, or his memory is treacherous; for nearly every point he has introduced here was considered in that discussion. The Respondent of Br. Grew nor ourself ever hinted that the "skeletons or corpses" of the wicked dead were to "be raised up." Br. H. says—"My brother admits the wicked will have a resurrection of some kind"; * * * "in what 'sense' they are to have a resurrection we have not yet been informed." Will Br. H. now blame us for saying, he has "compelled" us to go over much of the same ground that was traveled with Br. Grew?

In the EXAMINER of Dec. 1st of last year the Respondent of Br. Grew said—

"We admitted that the wicked dead will have a resurrection 'in some sense'; but in *what* sense we did not pretend to say, and it is useless to speculate about it: but until they are said to be made *alive*, by at least one text of scripture, we do not feel under obligation to submit to any man's opinion that they will be, while the Bible declares *positively* they 'shall not see life.'"

Respondent being still urged by Br. Grew on this point, in January of this year (see EXAMINER page 10), spoke as follows:—

The "sense," in which the wicked dead may have a resurrection, we may illustrate by a remark in one of our city papers, on the late trial of BAKER for the murder of POOLE. The latter's character had been made a subject of investigation during the trial, by Baker's counsel. The city paper thus speaks:—

"The censure of the Judge upon the prisoner's counsel, for stripping the shroud as it were from the *dead Poole*, or rather for *RECALLING HIM TO LIFE, such as he actually had been while among us*, appears to us to have been entirely unjust and uncalled for."

This remark shows that the idea of "a resurrection in *some sense*," short of actual *life*, is an admissible one; and until there is *positive* evidence to the contrary—which we have not yet seen in this discussion—we must repeat what we said at the outset, we *doubt* if the wicked dead will ever have a revival into *actual life*. In the sense in which "the dead Poole" had a "recalling to life," we see no objection to admitting their resurrection.

On the subject of John 5: 28, 29, and hearing the voice, though dead, let the reader see the EXAMINER of November 1st, of last year; but as some of our subscribers have not that volume we are "compelled" to repeat what was then said on the same topic; and though it occupies near three columns, let it be read again carefully. It is as follows:—

"It seems now, the strength of the affirmative, so far as positive testimony is concerned, is in John 5: 28, 29. On this text Br. Grew *concedes* that the term *resurrection* may not of itself necessarily imply being made alive,' &c.; but he says, the text declares something *more* than a resurrection: it declares that the very same persons who come forth to the resurrection of condemnation shall *HEAR* his voice, the literal sense of which term necessarily implies *life*.' He asks, 'Is it an *inference* that the wicked shall *hear* his (the Saviour's) voice? Can they hear without *life*?' We respond—

"It would be in harmony with other scriptures to say the *dead* must hear *before* they have *life*, or else it is not the voice to the *dead*, but to the living. This point may be illustrated by the direction of God to the prophet Ezekiel:—'O ye dry bones, *hear* the word of the Lord.' Ezk. 37: 4. While the prophet made this proclamation, at God's command, 'There was a noise, and behold a shaking, and the bones came together, bone to his bone; and the sinews and flesh came up on them, and the skin covered them above; but there was *no breath* in them;' Ezk. 37: 7, 8.

"Here then is a clear case in which the *dead*, without *life*, even 'dry bones,' did *HEAR*. Hence the fact that *all* in their graves *hear* the voice of the Saviour does not prove that they *live* or are

read "afford." In sec. "8," 6th line, for "*illiptical* and *ilipsis*" read *elliptical* and *ellipsis*." In the same sec., 11th line, for "sense" read "verse." In sec. "10," 6th line, for "teaches" read "teach."

July 17, 1856.

MACKNIGHT, JR.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

New York, August, 1856.

Will the Wicked Dead be Made Alive?

The discussion of the above question has been protracted to greater length than we ever anticipated, or than is desirable in the EXAMINER, as it occupies too much space to the exclusion of other matter. Hereafter, for a time at least, we are of opinion that none but short articles should be inserted on this topic. If any are still anxious to speak on the question, and have anything new to offer, let them condense their ideas so that no article shall fill exceeding two or three columns.—As a general rule, such articles, in this stage of the question, will be read with more interest and be better understood than longer ones.

The following letter from Dr. HUNTINGTON makes a suggestion worthy of attention; and we publish it, first to say, that we most sincerely hope that no one will ever embrace any doctrine "from over-confidence in a respected teacher." We should deeply regret and deprecate such conversions.—Let sober judgment, based on your own understanding of the teaching of the Bible, be your guide, praying for the aid of the Divine Spirit of God to enlighten your understanding. Then, whatever conclusion you arrive at, you will have the consciousness of sincerity in seeking after truth, and you will not err fatally, if you err at all.—Secondly, we publish this letter that others may express their views of the propriety and desirableness of a "pamphlet" on the question, as suggested by Br. Huntington.

BROOKLYN, CON., July 18th, 1856.

Dear Brother.—I have for some time wished to make a suggestion to you, but have not been fully satisfied that it was yet time. But the short article in your July number, respecting the comparative number of those who had embraced the doctrine of the non-resurrection of the wicked, determined me. I have been more advantaged by the instruction obtained from your publication than from any other one of the many which I take. But while I mean to keep my mind in an attitude open to conviction on any Bible truth, I do not intend, from over-confidence in a respected teacher, to take hastily an idea so entirely new. I have been very much interested in the discussion of this subject thus far; and I must say that I have been

benefitted also; but I do not see that *this mode* of warfare is as well calculated to bring the thing to a happy and speedy conclusion as another.—What I wish to propose is that you take up the subject in a pamphlet of sufficient size to afford room for the fair and full exhibition of the question, and let us have it in a shape in which we can have a plain view of the whole matter without the breaks and distractions of a protracted controversy. This you did successfully, in your Six Sermons, on that question; and I hope you will think best to do so in this. I express no opinion in the case myself as yet, but I do want to see a different presentation of it, if it can be had. What may be the sentiments of other subscribers, or their wishes I have no means of knowing. I make this suggestion independently, as I stand nearly alone in this community.

Yours truly, in the love of the truth,

THOMAS HUNTINGTON.

Response to Br. Hall's Fourth Rejoinder.

In reference to Br. Hall's introductory remarks, we regret if we gave place to any expression in our last response that seemed unkind or unreasonable. We intended no disrespect to Br. H., whom we highly esteem. It is possible that we "intimated very plainly that it is not agreeable to protract" the discussion on the preposition "in," as there seemed to us to be no probability of either of us enlightening the readers of the EXAMINER any more on that subject; and we are of the same opinion still. That was the point on which our discussion was opened; and we certainly had no idea of its taking the wide range it did, immediately, or we could not have consented to have gone into the subject at all, at *that time*. Br. Grew and his Respondent had hardly completed their discussion when the "preposition" came up; and we did decline going into the general discussion, immediately, with another. We were willing after a while to do so. That Br. H. had not "referred to a single article of" Br. Grew's, does not alter the fact that "much of the same ground" was travelled over, and that such a course made it embarrassing to us, as we did not feel that our readers could be edified by our repeating what the respondent of Br. G. had said on the same texts introduced in this new discussion on 1 Corth. 15: 22.

We will now proceed, as briefly as possible, to reply to Br. H.'s fourth rejoinder. We have numbered the sections of his article to which we reply to save quoting his words, and the reader will please refer back to the corresponding sections, else he will not understand our remarks.

"(1.)" Why Br. H. should wish to press us to disclaim further, meaning what our words seem to

import, we cannot tell. To avoid multiplying words we entered a simple disclaimer in our last reply. We admit we expressed ourself at first without sufficiently guarding our meaning. We afterwards disclaimed intending to convey the idea which the words perhaps naturally imported. We regret we were so unfortunate in our first expression. We now say, that to change *in* to *by*, Corth. 15: 22, is critically wrong, because such a change contradicts the entire argument of the apostle in that chapter, and makes him contradict himself in his testimony. Rom. 8: 11, (see EXAMINER, page 123), and cannot therefore be admitted at all; and furthermore, no argument from 1 Corth. 15, for the living again of the wicked dead, is of any avail to the affirmative; nor are any inferences from that chapter to have any weight in deciding the question in favor of the affirmative, "unless positive testimony of the living again of the wicked dead can be found in other portions of inspiration, which, as yet, has not been done to our mind"; but even if that could be done, the subject and the argument of the apostle in this chapter forbid changing *in* to *by* in verse 22. That was what we meant.

A "Liberal Translation" of the New Testament by E. HARWOOD, published in London in 1768, reads the verse thus—"For as by Adam all the human race was subjected to mortality: so by Christ Jesus shall all the pious dead be entitled to immortality."

"(2.) This section of Br. H.'s article shows that he either did not read what the Respondent to Br. Grew wrote, or his memory is treacherous; for nearly every point he has introduced here was considered in that discussion. The Respondent of Br. Grew nor ourself ever hinted that the "skeletons or corpses" of the wicked dead were to "be raised up." Br. H. says—"My brother admits the wicked will have a resurrection of some kind"; * * * "in what 'sense' they are to have a resurrection we have not yet been informed." Will Br. H. now blame us for saying, he has "compelled" us to go over much of the same ground that was traveled with Br. Grew?

In the EXAMINER of Dec. 1st of last year the Respondent of Br. Grew said—

"We admitted that the wicked dead will have a resurrection 'in some sense'; but in *what* sense we did not pretend to say, and it is useless to speculate about it: but until they are said to be made *alive*, by at least one text of scripture, we do not feel under obligation to submit to any man's opinion that they will be, while the Bible declares *positively* they 'shall not see life.'"

Respondent being still urged by Br. Grew on this point, in January of this year (see EXAMINER page 10), spoke as follows:—

The "sense," in which the wicked dead may have a resurrection, we may illustrate by a remark in one of our city papers, on the late trial of BAKER for the murder of POOLE. The latter's character had been made a subject of investigation during the trial, by Baker's counsel. The city paper thus speaks:—

"The censure of the Judge upon the prisoner's counsel, for stripping the shroud as it were from the *dead Poole*, or rather for RECALLING HIM TO LIFE, such as he actually had been while among us, appears to us to have been entirely unjust and uncalled for."

This remark shows that the idea of "a resurrection in *some sense*," short of actual *life*, is an admissible one; and until there is *positive* evidence to the contrary—which we have not yet seen in this discussion—we must repeat what we said at the outset, we *doubt* if the wicked dead will ever have a revival into *actual life*. In the sense in which "the dead Poole" had a "recalling to life," we see no objection to admitting their resurrection.

On the subject of John 5: 28, 29, and hearing the voice, though dead, let the reader see the EXAMINER of November 1st, of last year; but as some of our subscribers have not that volume we are "compelled" to repeat what was then said on the same topic; and though it occupies near three columns, let it be read again carefully. It is as follows:—

"It seems now, the strength of the affirmative, so far as positive testimony is concerned, is in John 5: 28, 29. On this text Br. Grew *concedes* that the term *resurrection* may not of itself necessarily imply being made alive, &c.; but he says, the 'text declares something *more* than a resurrection: it declares that the very same persons who come forth to the resurrection of condemnation shall HEAR his voice, the literal sense of which term necessarily implies *life*.' He asks, 'Is it an *inference* that the wicked shall hear his (the Saviour's) voice? Can they hear without *life*?' We respond—

"It would be in harmony with other scriptures to say the *dead* must hear *before* they have *life*, or else it is not the voice to the *dead*, but to the living. This point may be illustrated by the direction of God to the prophet Ezekiel—'O ye dry bones, *hear* the word of the Lord.' Ezk. 37: 4. While the prophet made this proclamation, at God's command, 'There was a noise, and behold a shaking, and the bones came together, bone to his bone; and the sinews and flesh came up on them, and the skin covered them above; but there was *no breath* in them;' Ezk. 37: 7, 8.

"Here then is a clear case in which the *dead*, without *life*, even 'dry bones,' did HEAR. Hence the fact that *all* in their graves *hear* the voice of the Saviour does not prove that they *live* or are

made *alive*; and the text John 5: 28, 29 seems to fail of being *positive* testimony that those who have done evil are made alive at the resurrection; and if this text is not *positive* testimony there surely seems to be none in the Bible on the affirmative side.

"No matter how *literal* the main part of a text is, there may be a word in it which we are compelled to take in a figurative sense. 'Let the dead bury their dead, but go thou and preach the Kingdom of God;' Lk. 9: 60. Every part of this text is literal with the exception of one word, and that word is the same as another in the text that is literal; 'Let the *dead* bury their *dead*.'—The latter death is literal, but the former, Br. G. will not doubt, is figurative. The term *dead* does not mean the same thing in both instances, though in a very literal text. Why then may not the same be true in John 5: 28, 29? If the good and evil are both said to have a *resurrection*, the *first* resurrection, *viz*: of the good, may embrace being made *alive*, nay, must embrace life, because it is expressly said it is a resurrection to *life*, while the other differs in its character, and is not to the extent of a revival into life? Such we think may be the case, unless some other text expressly declares the wicked dead shall *live again*. We confess we are ignorant of any such text; while we have presented several which declare they shall *not live*—*nor see life*, but the wrath of God abideth on them. Br. G. has endeavored to harmonize these *positive* declarations—that the wicked shall not see life, and shall not live, from the dead—with what he supposes to be the sense of John 5: 28, 29. He thinks there is no 'necessity for qualifying' the terms in this text, while there must be in such as say the wicked 'shall not see life,' &c. He may be correct, but we doubt it.

"We see no necessity for qualifying the term *life*' in the text 'He that believeth not the Son shall not see life,' John 3: 36. We have shown that 'no necessity' exists for it on the score of *hearing*; for 'dry bones,' in scripture language, *hear*. 'No necessity' exists to our mind from the language our brother quotes to illustrate, *viz*: 'except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you,' &c., on which he remarks—"Now as these persons had *life* in their unbelief, the phrase 'ye have no life in you' must mean ye have no *eternal* life." But, 'it is *manifest*' that the life they had 'in unbelief'—*i. e.*, animal, or Adamic life—is excepted,' as Paul said of another matter, 1 Corth. 15: 27; but it is *not* manifest that 'life, after the first death,' is excepted in the phrase 'shall not see life'; but the wrath of God abideth on them.—We see no grounds for any other construction of this language than its plain and obvious import, unless it can be shown by positive testimony that unbelievers shall live again. Besides, the text quoted by our brother, from John 6: 53, 54—as an illustration of the 'necessity' for qualifying the term *life*—makes against his view. Look at it. 'Ye have no life in you,' but he that 'drinketh my blood hath *life*;' and I will raise HIM up at the last day.' This last clause seems entirely superfluous unless the unbelievers are *excluded* from be-

ing raised up, or from being made alive. That the Jews, of our Saviour's time, did not believe their fathers, who died in the wilderness, would have a resurrection, is attested by Dr. ADAM CLARKE; and our Saviour seems to confirm that idea by saying in this very connection, 'Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness and *are dead*;' and adds, 'This is the bread which cometh down from heaven that a man may eat thereof and *not die*.' And why *not die*? Because, 'I will raise *him* up at the last day,' but 'your fathers *are dead*;' *i. e.*—as seems probable—'I will *not* raise *them* up at the last day;' *they* 'shall not see life;' but it is not true of them alone who died in the wilderness, 'Verily, I say unto *you*, except *ye* eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, *ye* have no life in *you*' any more than your fathers who died in the wilderness. Such may be the true import of this discourse, and it tends to confirm the idea that the wicked dead shall not be made alive again.

"The scriptures give us no account of but two literal lives. The first is derived from mortal Adam, and continues till death, both, in the righteous and wicked. That life is *then extinct*; there is no power of revival from the dead by that life. There is one other life, and that is derived from the *immortal* Adam, or Christ. This latter life is like its author's, *eternal*; and *all* who are partakers of it live from the dead, and live forever. As they have borne the image of the earthly, or first Adam, so shall they bear the image of the heavenly, or second Adam; and as is the earthly such are they also that are earthly. So Paul talks 1 Corth. 15. If man is made *alive* from the dead by the second Adam, he is made alive by a *life* that is *eternal*; and puts on immortality and incorruption.' So Paul seems to reason. That life is a life from the dead; and it would seem as if no idea of the living again of any but those *in Christ* entered into Paul's theology, as set forth in 1 Corth. 15. Any life subsequent to death is *by* and from Christ, 'at the last day.' No such life, it would seem, can ever become extinct; therefore the wicked '*shall not see life*.' Indeed, Paul declares those who are made *alive* by Christ, in the resurrection, were 'sown in corruption' and 'raised in *incorruption*;' and that '*the dead* shall be raised *incorruptible*;' hence there can be no dying again of those who are made *alive* by the resurrection; and the Saviour does not tell us, John 5: 28, 29, that any are made alive by the resurrection except 'they that have done *good*;' and he further tells us, Lk. 20: 36, that those who are 'accounted worthy to obtain that world, (*but*) *even* the resurrection *from the dead*, cannot 'die any more.' Thus it seems the idea that the wicked dead will be made alive again is contradicted by the plain teaching of our Lord and the apostle Paul. All that are made *alive* are declared to be beyond the reach of dying again, are incorruptible and immortal. We know of no text that says any who are in a resurrection state are *mortal* or capable of dying again."

We need add nothing to the foregoing extract in response to Br. H.'s section "(2)," except to say, the scriptures do not, that we remember, speak

of a "second blast" of the last trumpet; and as he seems to admit the wicked dead may not hear the first so as to awake, we rather think "*they shall not see life*, but the wrath of God abideth on them." John 3: 36.

"(3.)" Dr. H. here admits that Christ is a blessing to all men "in the sense of respite from punishment," &c. Very well. But he says, if the sinner does not improve this "respite" it "would not be a blessing in the end." Indeed! Nor will Christ's coming be a "curse in the end." If dying, famishing men refuse to eat food kindly offered them, and choose to die rather than receive the bounty of the kind donor, does the donor or his offered bounty prove a curse in the end? Not at all. They would have died if no provision had been made for them; their rejection or neglect of it does not convert it into a curse; but they manifest their folly and madness by their course, and fall under the curse of death notwithstanding the kind provision offered; but the provision was not a curse in any sense. But Br. H. makes an attempt to convict us of being "at issue with" Paul. How does he do this? He says, "The economy of the gospel is, that it proves" * * * "a savor of death unto death, and therefore a 'curse' unto those that reject the gospel."

Now such a construction of the apostle's language, we conclude, is a simple misunderstanding of the apostle's object in what he says. The text and context shows that it was a simple expression of apostolic gratitude that he had not labored in vain: that "unto God" the apostle was "a sweet savor of Christ" in that he had so fully proclaimed God's love in Christ. If some who were dying did not profit by the good news and died after all, nevertheless, "unto God," Paul was still "a sweet savor," by having diffused, or made "manifest the savor of His knowledge in every place"; verse 14. Some believed and would have life; others disbelieved and would die; but in either case Paul lost not his "sweet savor unto God."

When Br. H. proves that the proper and final wages of sin is anything more or different from "death" it will be time enough to talk about one sinner having "greater punishment than" another. That in this present life "the way of the transgressor is hard," Prov. 13: 15, and the more light and knowledge a man has and sins against it the harder his way is, and the more "stripes" he receives, is an undoubted truth; but that transgressors are to be made alive from the dead that some may receive "greater punishment" than others is what the scriptures nowhere assert. "*The wages*

of sin is DEATH," Rom. 6: 23. All talk about "degrees of punishment"—when relating to punishment as final—is but the traditions of men.—While in this present state the matter is entirely different: here, men suffer, in some form, in various degrees; often, however, known only to God and themselves; or it may be they now suffer as a warning and admonition to others of the race to avoid sin; as for example, the old world, Sodom, the Canaanites, and Jerusalem at its destruction: but the scriptures give us no information that such will be the case in another life. Confirmed and "incurable" sinners, of every class and degree, have one common destiny, *viz*: DEATH: and we "see" the most perfect "justice in this," whether Br. H. can, or not.

(4.) That the "sentiment ascribed" to Br. H. was legitimate, from his words, no one will deny who reads his remarks in his previous article; but as he disclaims the sentiment we have no disposition to press it.

Br. H.'s remarks on Rom. 2 are all met by the Respondent of Br. Grew: see EXAMINER Oct. 15, 1855, page 315 to 319. We do not choose to travel over that ground at this time, so soon after the thorough sifting the subject then had. What Br. H. says about "*pangs* connected with the second death," for some sinners more than others, being entirely a matter of his *opinion*, we shall say nothing in reply till he presents proof of it, which as yet we have never seen. His phraseology that men are to be "punished according to the deeds done in the body" is a very common one, and as unscriptural as it is common. The good and the bad are to "*receive* the things in body, according to that" they have "*done*, whether good or bad." The good "*receive*" *life*; the bad "*receive*" death. But the terms good and bad, here, may possibly be used only relatively, or comparatively of believers; so that while they all receive life some may receive the perquisites of that life in a less degree than others; because, though they built on Christ they built also "wood, hay, and stubble"; or brought in useless matter which cannot stand the test of that day: hence they "suffer loss" though they are "saved, yet so as by fire." See 1 Cor. iii: 11-15. This is "according to that" each has done. The justice and equity of God are thus fully manifested. Men might as well talk about degrees in *hanging*—where the crime is punishable with death—as about degrees of punishment in "the wages of sin," which "*is death*." Br. H. is, as well as others, still entangled in "torment" doctrine. They seem to fear, as much as endless misery believers do,

that death is too easy a punishment; and they must superadd more or less torment; but for what conceivable end, unless to gratify revenge, we cannot see, as the sinner is not to be benefitted by it, and there are none of Adam's race, at that time, that can be benefitted by it, as all the good are made immortal, and all the wicked are hopelessly lost.

Br. H. attempts to escape the result of his theory's making Christ's resurrection a great curse to the heathen, or those who never heard of Christ, because but for it such would never have lived again—as he had previously admitted. But his attempt, though creditable to his heart, involves him in still deeper mazes or perplexities; for, according to his new version of the matter, infinite wisdom could not devise a "plan" for man's redemption without its being "inseparably connected" with the resurrection of these heathen "because his" (Christ's) "resurrection is inseparably connected with the gospel plan which was conceived in the infinite Mind" * * * "before the fall of Adam."

This caps the climax of all the arguments we have yet seen to prove the wicked dead are to be revived into a "temporary life." God "conceived this plan before the fall of Adam." Really we would like to know where revelation makes known such an idea. Paul tells us, "God, that cannot lie, promised eternal life before the world began"—*pro chronon aionion*, before the ages began, or a long time ago; Titus 1: 2. But where the scriptures tell us of God's "plan before the fall of Adam" for a "temporary life" after death for any one we have yet to learn. The fact is, revival from the dead is a gospel benefit; and, so far as we have scripture to guide us, such re-living is to eternal life and immortality; and no "temporary life" is ever brought to light, by the gospel, as the result of "Christ's resurrection."

Br. H. now discards his admission, of March 1st, page 65, where he spoke as follows—

"The apostle was doubtless showing that if Christ was not resurrected, then there would be no resurrection of the dead—righteous or wicked."

This admission has been very troublesome to Br. H., in this discussion. This idea is now abandoned by him, at least, "in one sense," as "absurd." We trust he will yet see it is far more absurd to affirm a part of the human family have a temporary life inflicted upon them, by being made alive from the dead, just to kill them again; for there is where his present course is drifting him, as the next section will show.

"(5.)" We beg the reader to turn back and read this section of Br. H.'s article over again: do not fail to do so. We have half a mind not to say one word by way of comment upon it. It is a rich contrast to Br. Grew's views on the subject; but we sincerely hope the latter will not be stirred up to an attack on Br. H. for it: it would be "out of order" to do so just now. After "patience" has had its "perfect work," if he wishes to take his colleague in hand for giving up the "positive infliction of pain," and "positive punishment by God," and leaving the "stings of conscience," in a "natural result," to punish the sinner, &c., he may have a chance to do so.

But how Br. H. gets all the wicked dead not only alive but to "come up on the breadth of the new earth," and "see the beautiful earth arrayed in living green," &c., we cannot tell, as the "new earth" does not appear till *after* death and hell, and all whose names are not written in the book of life are cast into the lake of fire. He must have been thinking of Mr. Miller's theory and not of the Bible testimony. But we will not discuss that point in this place.

Br. H. is easing off the revived wicked from torment; for in speaking of their being "devoured, burned up," he says—

"This would not be so horrible and cruel a death as many martyrs have suffered at the hands of the enemies of the cross."

Thus Br. H. would let off the cruel murderers of Christ and his followers with a less horrible and cruel death than they inflicted on the martyrs. Truly Br. H.'s heart is beginning to be touched with a sense of the injustice of torturing men just for the sake of tormenting them; and we have hope that he may yet see that the revival of the wicked dead into life, to show them the new earth—to have their consciences sting them more, and kill them again an easier death than the martyrs died, is without any scripture authority, and is repugnant to the whole letter and spirit of Christ's mission into the world, and subversive of that gracious design of God's love in giving His Son that "whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life."

"(6.)" We pass this section without comment.

"(7.)" To travel over the ground of this section again would be only to repeat and multiply words. Let the reader see our previous response. Our mind is unchanged; and we have given "up" nothing of our first or second "argument" on the term "together." We are satisfied it does not mean what Br. H. contends for. Before passing

the topic entirely, however, we will add, that Br. H.'s theory of all the wicked being destroyed at *one and the same time* is utterly irreconcilable with his idea that the wicked are all raised to life after the creation of the new earth, on which he says they are to come up. The word of truth declares *positively*, that "when the Lord Jesus is revealed from heaven, with his mighty angels," * * * "them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel" * * * "shall be punished with *everlasting* destruction," and that this is to be "when he"—Jesus—"shall come to be glorified in his saints," &c. Now if after this "everlasting destruction" they are to be made alive—as Br. H.'s theory necessarily implies—in order that all the wicked, who have ever lived on the earth, may be destroyed "together," in his sense of that term, then have we no assurance that any destruction of the wicked is "everlasting"; for after having been "destroyed together" they may be made alive again to die no more. If the everlasting destruction of the wicked at the coming of Christ "from heaven" can be reversed, so can any other everlasting destruction.

"(8.)" We beseech the reader to look at our remarks on the subject of this section, page 171; and also to examine our references on that page to vol. 10, pp. 318-319—and not leave Br. H. to do it alone—and see if there is any just ground for Br. H.'s reiterating the idea that we hold "the judgment spoken of, refers to the ordinary death of the wicked, one at a time." We hold no such sentiment, and have never promulgated any such sentiment. If any one wishes to know our views of the judgment day, they can see them in the places referred to and in the present vol. pp. 4 to 7.

"(9.)" We have no wish to draw Br. H. into a controversy on his assumption of "one judgment day and one only"; for we fear our readers may think we have entirely lost sight of the first grand question—"Is there positive testimony that the wicked dead will be made *alive*?"

Because the phrase "the day of judgment" occurs several times, in different places in the Bible, does any one believe it always refers to a particular day for all men that have ever lived on earth? We do not if Br. H. does; and we are of opinion that some of the best scripture expositors will be found to take the same view we do of those texts on which Br. H. has here placed the greatest reliance. Take his text about Sodom, &c. What is the subject? It is the judgment of certain cities. "Thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven,

shalt be brought down to hell"—*hades*—"for if the mighty works which have been done in thee, had been done in Sodom, it would have remained until this day: but I say unto you," (Capernaum) "that it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee"—Capernaum. Now observe, the day of judgment here spoken of is the day of Capernaum's visitation for its disregard of Jesus' works. Sodom was judged, overthrown, and did *not* "remain until this day" in which Christ spoke; therefore judgment had been executed on that city. Now what? The day of Capernaum's judgment was at hand, and it was to be more intolerable than that inflicted on Sodom. The day of judgment on Sodom was sudden and entire, at once. Capernaum's was protracted and covered a length of time; but, says KITTO, in his *Biblical Literature*, "The denunciation *has been* so completely accomplished, that even the site of Capernaum is quite uncertain." That Jerusalem's overthrow by the Romans was its judgment day, is clear from the fact that Jesus declares explicitly—"These be the days of vengeance, that *all things* which are written may be fulfilled," Lk. 21: 22 and connection, and Paul declares, "Wrath is come upon them to the *utmost*," 1 Thes. 2: 16. Jesus saith, "Now is the judgment of this world," John 12: 31. And Peter saith, "The time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God," &c., 1 Pet. 4: 17. That the "inspired penmen should" also speak "about the day of judgment to take place at the end of" * * * "the gospel age," is not incompatible with "many days of judgment." Not to admit this, is to deny facts, and launch into inextricable confusion. So it appears to us; but we cannot suffer ourself to be led out any further on this subject, at present.

"(10.)" We have little disposition to open another controversy on a single word. We stated the fact that *mneemeiois* is the word translated graves, John 5: 28, and *not* *hades*; and that Jesus would hardly have used that word if he meant *hades*, and we are of the same opinion still.

We now tell Bro. H. and all others, that to build the doctrine of the *re-living* of all the literal dead upon John 5: 28, 29, is, in our opinion, to build on a slender foundation. The term *mneemeiois*, is used for the places from whence the demons issued. Thus, Math. 8: 28, it is said, "Then met Jesus two possessed with devils, coming out of the tombs"—*mneemeion*. They had not been in *hades*, neither had they been *dead*. On this word Dr. BLOOMFIELD says—"Tombs"

* * * "often served as places of shelter to the houseless wanderer: and WM. RAMSEY, D. D., in his "Spiritualism a Satanic Delusion," p. 34, says:

"The tombs (*mnemeia*) are very abundant in some parts of the Eastern world unto this day.—They are houses built over the graves of distinguished or wealthy persons by the governments of which they were honored members, or their relatives. They are of different sizes and shapes.—Some are built square, others round, and from ten to thirty feet high. The most of those that are yet to be found in India were built by the Mohammedans. They are now used as dwellings or as stopping-places for travellers, being fitted up for these purposes. But formerly, no one dwelt in them—the friends of the deceased only visited them for prayer. I have often lodged in these tombs while on missionary tours. We found them comfortable lodgings; and to those who are fond of retirement, they afford an agreeable resting place."

Here also we may as well insert again the remarks of C. C. FRENCH, in the EXAMINER of Dec. 1st last year, on John 5: 28, 29. He says—

"The original word translated "graves" here, is not *hades*, from which the dead are to be raised in the literal resurrection, but it is "*tois mnemeiois*," the graves dug into the earth. Josephus informs us, (War, Bk. 6, chap. 9, sect 4, and in other places,) that many of the Jews had made graves for themselves in the city of Jerusalem, and were brought forth to be slain, and led captive at the destruction. (See Heb. 11: 38; Isa. 2: 19; Ezek. 33: 27.) About three millions of the Jews were assembled in Jerusalem, at the passover, when the Roman army surrounded the city, (Joseph. 2, 14, 3, note, and 6, 9, 3, and note :) the necessity of making graves to retire into is apparent. The resurrection (*anastasin*) was a standing upon the feet again. When the *literal* resurrection is referred to, the expression is not *anastasin* simply, but *hee anastasin*. (That Greek article "*hee*" is of some importance in a discussion relative to the "resurrection of the wicked dead.") The word "*anastasin*," in the text rendered *resurrection*, simply signifies the act of rising from a sitting or reclining posture; from a seat on the ground; a rising up; a starting up, &c. See Donnegan's Lexicon. It is not a "resurrection from the dead."

Mr. Fisk, in his Greek Grammar, says—"When no article is expressed in Greek, the English, indefinite article *a* is signified." Then, should we not read of a "day of judgment" oftener than we do? Should we not read of *a* resurrection in John 5: 29?

After all that has been said on this text, it is not absolutely certain that it relates to the living again from literal death at all; and in the absence of any other text affirming that all dead men, good and bad, are made *alive*, we think the affirmative of the question, so long under discussion, have very little ground to stand on, though they

fought bravely, and have seemed as determined to hold on as the advocates of endless misery are to their few texts; and we now say, in our judgment, one has just as much real proof of their positions as the other. Life from the dead—whether spiritual or literal—is only through and by a union with Christ the *Life-Giver*. All others die in their sins, and under the curse of the law; which law holds them eternally back from life, so that they "shall not see life." If the wicked dead are in hades, at the final disposal of all men, that state shall not prevent their character—and of course does not prevent them, from a judicial investigation and decision, though dead; and as "dead" they "stand before God." So saith the text to which Br. H. refers, Rev. 20: 12, 13, but not as actually alive; for, clearly, it is only those whose names were written in the *book of life* that are made alive; all "whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." Hades, or the covered state, that state of the dead preceding the final result to the race, is destroyed as having no farther use, and *gehenna* alone remains to all whose names were not written for life. "Death and hades delivered up the dead," be it remembered, to be "*judged*;" and not one word is said of any being made *alive* except those whose names were "found written in the book of life."

If Br. H. will solve Isa. 14: 9—16, we think he will get an answer to his inquiries on Rev. 20: 13. The terms hell and grave, in Isa. 14, are both *sheol* in the original, answering to *hades* Rev. 20. If *sheol* can "stir up the dead" in it and set them to *talking*, without their being *alive*, so can *hades* "deliver up the dead" in it in the same way; and the advocates of the immortal-soul theory have just as much evidence from Isa. 14 that dead men are alive as Br. H. has from Rev. 20, that the wicked dead will be made alive.

"(11.)" It is almost cruel to make any reply to this section of Br. H.'s article. He had said all that are in hades shall come out. We showed that deliverance from hades was *peculiar* to the church, and that his affirmation destroyed that peculiarity. Now he says, the wicked are "compelled" to come out, but they do not obtain the victory over hades. Indeed! then hades still holds them; *i. e.*, they come out and they do not come out, because they do not shout when they get out.

We maintain our Lord speaks, Math. 16, of the deliverance of his followers from hades as a victory over hades, and of that *only*. That it is a revival to life eternal is no doubt true; but such as are to live eternally are the only persons that ever do

live from hades, or it would be no peculiarity to be delivered from it; the peculiarity would be in something else, according to Br. H., while our Lord makes it to consist in that, and that alone.

Here it may be proper we should notice our Lord's commission to his disciples, as recorded Mark 16. Jesus rose from the dead. He came out of hades—he was "alive." Some saw him and told others "he was alive," verse 11. They thought it was too much to be believed. Shortly Jesus appeared to the eleven and upbraided them for not believing those who had seen him since he was made alive. Now, saith he, "Go into all the world and preach the gospel"—[*the good news of LIFE from the dead*, of which Jesus was "the first fruits,"]—"to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved" ["*liveth*"]; Syriac: *i. e.*, shall be restored to life as I have been: hades shall not hold him forever;] "but he that believeth not shall be condemned": *i. e.*, "shall not see life"—condemned to live no more forever. Such is the peculiarity of the gospel.—It comes with the good news that Jesus is alive from the dead, and that all who will believe this truth and obey him shall also be made alive from the dead; but those who reject this truth and will not obey him "shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on them." Glorious tidings. But how obscured by the doctrine of a future life to all men, whether they obey or not: a life, too, of torment and torture; and in principle it matters not whether that torment be temporary or eternal; it is without hope, and with no design to benefit any one in either case.

We do not admit Br. H.'s hypothesis in section "11." It is too far fetched and overstrained to commend itself to our understanding; but we will not press the point further, at present.

"(12.)" This section is sufficiently answered in our foregoing remarks, except Br. H.'s question to us—"Does he not know the passage means—"Thou wilt not leave my soul in hades' to see corruption?" We answer—No: we do not know that to be its meaning; and we are satisfied it is not. Look at it—

"Thou wilt not leave my soul in hades;

"Neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption."

The first line expresseth the confidence of Messiah that he would not be left in hades. The second line expresses his confidence of an early deliverance from it, and is distinguished from the deliverance itself by the conjunction "neither." Our argument, therefore, is unshaken by Br. H.'s at-

tempt to put it aside; and our "position" is fully "sustained," in our judgment.

"(13.)" So much of our remarks, here referred to by Br. H., as is contained in the following words, we recall, *viz.*, "We believe the wicked dead fall below hades; *i. e.*, they fall into gehenna." This recall saves multiplying words, and this remark was not necessary to our argument. Br. H. means by the expression, "hades yields up," that all men therein are to be made alive; and this, he said, is "contrary to your opinion." We replied, that we believed it "equally contrary to the truth of God's word": and so we still believe, so far as the sense Br. H. affixes to that delivering up is concerned, *viz.*, to be made *alive*: "they are dead, they shall *not* live; they are deceased, they shall not rise"—"they shall not see life"; such is inspired testimony.

"(14.)" The error was in Br. H.'s manuscript.

"(15.)" Br. Hall may be assured he has not "displeased" us, as he seems to think. He is just as dear to our heart to-day as before this controversy commenced. We have ever esteemed him as a beloved brother; and we trust we shall continue to do so still notwithstanding our differences of opinion. We know that we sometimes speak too "positively," and we deeply regret it, and hope we may be able to mend in that matter. The last ten months has been a severe tax on our nervous system. We have not only had Br. Grew, Br. Hall, and Dr. Post on our hauds, but some underground workers who have not added to our quietness: so, if we have sometimes not manifested all the meekness we ought, please forgive us. May the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ guide us all with heavenly wisdom, and bring us to his eternal kingdom of glory.

A NEW IDEA FOR THE POPE.—A French ecclesiastic, the Abbé J. H. Michon, has just published a pamphlet of sixty-two pages, entitled *La Papauté à Jerusalem*, (The Papacy at Jerusalem,) and he supports the proposition implied in that title with much good reasoning, and at the same time with the greatest respect for the Holy See. He thinks that, the influence of modern ideas having produced no effect on the Roman administration, the progressive element of the nations has become a formidable enemy to the stationary element of the pontifical government; that the old machine may, it is true, go on, well or ill, so long as it is aided by foreign diplomacy or foreign occupation; but that the moment these are withdrawn, the papacy will be exposed, helpless, to revolution, and that the danger is imminent. The solution of that difficult question is not to be found, the Abbé Michon thinks, in political, administrative, or civil reform, nor in secularization of power, which would cu-

counter innumerable obstacles in the clerical organization and the prejudices which control the papacy. It is to be found only in the abdication of temporal power. He is *not* of opinion that, in such case, the capital of what may be termed the Spiritual Papacy *could be Rome*. It would lose in dignity, and would still suffer from political complications. He believes that there is but one city which, out of Italy, and, indeed, out of Europe, presents conditions indispensable to its independence and grandeur, and where a new era for the mission of a true apostle would open, *and that city is Jerusalem.—Ch. Ade.*

From John Lindsey, Maine.

Br. Storrs.—I find that the light and knowledge to be gained from the pages of the EXAMINER are a great help in directing my mind towards the subject of eternal life only through Christ; and this is my darling theme—on it I love to contemplate and call to mind the beauties of God's plans connected with it. This is all the joy that I can speak of in this lone meditation of those truths; for it is seldom that I have the pleasure of speaking to one of kindred views. Yet I am stronger in the faith the more I see the falsity of different Protestant theories, and foreign semblance to Divine revelation.

I will repeat what I have written to you before that I thank God that I was permitted ever to hear you preach in Boston; for it was there I heard from your lips teaching that was new to me, and what I could not gainsay, although I had been schooled in Calvinism, and being strenuous on that point of belief—as it is characteristic of that sect so to be—yet I was forced to give up to your arguments. I said I had been strenuous in the belief of Calvinism. I never was at rest in that belief, but after comparing your arguments with the teachings of the Bible I found rest from all doubts; and now I intend to abide by the word of God rather than give heed to man's sayings. In conversing with others I often hear the remark—"Well, you have abundance of Scripture to prove your premises, but can it be that man has not an immortal soul? This has always been preached by men of all sects and popular denominations." Thus, you see, they make no pretence of its being taught by the Bible; but it is the Doctrine of men. Now what saith the Bible in reference to such? "Woe unto you blind guides, who teach for doctrines the commandments of men."

SPIRITUALISM is the angel that John saw "come down from heaven, having great power, and the earth was lightened with his glory."—*Spir. Telegraph.*

We admit that the angel spoken of in Rev. xviii. 1, 2, has something to do with Spiritualism; for it is only when great spiritual Babylon, the confused sects of the day, becomes the "hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird," that that angel descends and cries

mightily "Babylon is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils." Then will be heard that other voice, which says, "Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."

There is an agency which is to work with "all power, and signs, and lying wonders," [2 Thess. i: 9; Rev. xiii: 13, 14,] but it comes from anywhere but heaven.—*Review and Herald.*

"MAN'S DESTINY.—Immortality: Arguments from Nature and Scripture. By Rev. T. M. Post, D. D., St. Louis, Mo.; Reviewed by Geo. Storrs, Editor of Bible Examiner."

The foregoing work is now ready for sale in any quantity that may be desired. Price 38 cents per copy; or three copies for \$1. In either case we will send free of postage. Five copies will be sent for \$1 if the purchaser takes the postage on himself.

We have had a portion of the work bound and lettered: Price, bound, 50 cents. Two copies will be sent free of postage for \$1.

Our visit to Philadelphia and vicinity was protracted to ten days, during which time we spoke publicly five times, and talked much with friends at their houses. We rejoice to find our friends, there, still maintain the principle to "hear, then judge;" and of Christian fellowship on the basis of love to God and His Son, and not on human creeds. May they ever preserve the liberty wherewith Christ has made them free; "growing in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ!"

THE PERFECT WORK.

The mariner home bound,
Though dark the wave,
Is brave,
While storms his barque surround.
The husbandman must wait,
The promise sure,
Endure,
And he shall reap, though late.
Do weary travelers fail,
When home is nigh?
Then why
Not we life's conflict hail?
Time's ocean ebb, the signs
Of home appear,
So near,
Shall we our watch resign?
Beside all waters sow,
Though now in tears,
And fears;
The end ye may not know.
To the upright shall rise,
In darkness, light;
Then light,
"Till thou obtain the prize.

S. BACHELOR.

THE NEXT EXAMINER will be issued about the middle of September.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. XI.

NEW-YORK, SEPTEMBER, 1856.

NO. 19.

PUBLISHED SENI-MONTHLY.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year.

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

LAZARUS IN ABRAHAM'S BOSOM.

BY ELD. Z. CAMPBELL.

Continued from page 142.

It is indeed a great error to consider the Jews under the gospel covenant. There never has been but one covenant made with that people as a people. The Lord made a covenant with Abraham while in uncircumcision, and four hundred and thirty years before the law. This was not a Jewish covenant, for it was long before the Jews existed as a nation, and even before the birth of Judah from whom the term Jew is derived. It was the law which created the national distinction between Jew and Gentile; and it is evident therefore that this distinction cannot exist longer than the life-time of the law; which of itself, was not a means of salvation, for it could not give life; but was added to the Abrahamic economy, as a means of keeping alive the Abrahamic faith, by its ceremonies pointing on to the Lamb of God. And now, since this covenant was made with Abraham while in uncircumcision, it is evidently designed to effect equally all the uncircumcised of all nations of like precious faith; so that it did not relate to the literal seed more than to any others. This should not be confounded with the one made with the literal seed which contained no promise of any thing beyond this life; but the Abrahamic covenant is the only one made with Jew or Gentile, holding in it the promise of future life, future inheritance and kingdom.

Not so with the Sinai covenant, which was a political thing, made with a nation as a nation, and all the blessings and curses of the nation were made to hang on the obedience or disobedience to it. But obedience to the law, with an understanding of its design, would have kept the people steadfast in the Abrahamic faith. So salvation was "by grace, through faith," even under the law.

But there must be an end to the plan of salvation, through faith: for faith is the confidence of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. But when seen, faith is no longer in exercise.—Salvation *then* must depend on obedience, as before the fall.

We are too apt to forget that God's ways are

not like our ways. It seemed impossible to the short sighted Jews that one could be saved without obedience to the law: and so it was during the life-time of the law, and they knew of no probation after the law. And so it seems impossible to the shorter sighted Christians that one can be saved without faith; and so it is under the dispensation of grace, through faith. The apostle tells us, that without faith it is impossible to please God; but he does not tell us it always will be.

Time was when it was impossible to please him without obedience to the law; but now he has no pleasure in them that do keep it.

There is a new covenant to be made with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah, "after those days," the days in which the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid, &c., the days when the Lord will set his hand the second time to recover the remnant of his people.

This new covenant so frequently referred to by the apostles, is everywhere said to be *in*, or *after*, those days, in *that* day, at that time, in the day of the Lord, at the gathering of Israel, &c.; terms used to denote the personal reign of Messiah: and to attempt to prove it already made, and in force, is equivalent to an attempt to prove the Messianic reign has already commenced and is now progressing. By consulting Eph. iii: 1 to 6, it will be seen, that no gospel covenant with Gentiles was revealed to the old prophets; but that the gospel to the Gentiles was a mystery, "Which in other ages was not made known to the sons of men."—The new covenant of Jer. xxxi: 31 was made known to the sons of men in former ages, consequently it cannot be the gospel covenant, the mystery which Paul was made a minister of.

Again, the law and the prophets should never be confounded; they are often spoken of together, but never as one. The law was of Sinai, or Hagarine origin, and gendereth to bondage. But prophecy is of that Jerusalem origin which is above, and free, and the mother of us all. Therefore, the promise, the blessings and the curses under the law, live with the law and die with the law, this side of the world to come. The eyes of the law look no farther ahead than the reign of Messiah. What there is beyond the commencement of that is seen only by the eye of the prophet, and is as unconditional as the ordinances of the sun, moon and stars; and as permanently established as the foundations of the earth. See Jeremiah xxxi: 35, to the end of the chapter.

Care should also be taken not to confound the law and the gospel, nor the people with whom each is made. The law was not given to the Gen-

files, as such; nor was the gospel given to the Jews, as such: yet the Gentiles had the privilege, and it was their duty to come in individually under the law: and so the Jews have the privilege, and it is their duty to come in under the gospel. But collectively and nationally, the Jews have nothing more to do with the gospel than the Gentiles had with the law: "they have Moses and the prophets, let them hear them."

It is therefore as great an error to attempt to convert the Jews to Gentileism as to attempt to convert Gentiles to Judaism by grafting them into the bosom of Moses. They are two out of Christ, and ever will be; but in Christ they are both one, and that one neither Jew or Gentile; but one in Christ.

Now there is no way for Jew or Gentile ever to be saved but by obedience to God. But because the former do not now obey, it does not follow that they never will. It is folly for puny man to set bounds to the mercy of God, saying, he may show mercy to Jews, or Gentiles so far, but no farther. During the law dispensation the Gentiles did not believe, and the Jews thought they never could if they did not do it under the law; but God, more merciful than the Jews, gave them a dispensation beyond the law. So, likewise, God more merciful than the Gentiles, has promised to make a new covenant with the house of Judah and Israel, beyond the gospel age, and to set his hand the second time to restore them. They are the clay which Jeremiah saw the potter to work at on the wheel: the first time he put his hand to it, it was marred in his hand; but he did not throw it away and take another lump; but he took the same lump and made it over again into a vessel that suited him. So the second time the Lord sets his hand to the rebellious house of Israel, he would mould them over again into a vessel that suits him. And this he can and will do without changing his original plan of salvation, which is based on his unbounded mercy and infinite love. Nor is there any fore-ordination or irrevocable decree in all this. Moses prophesied that the children of Israel would depart from the Lord and do evil. There was no condition in the case: it was not *if* they did evil they would sin; nor was there any decree that they *should* sin, whether they would or not, but it was a simple statement of what the Lord foresaw they would do, of their own free-will.

Again by the mouth of Zeph., and other prophets, it is said of his ancient people, Israel and Judah, that they will all call on his name and serve him with one consent. Neither is there a decree that they *shall* serve him whether they will or not; but it is a simple prophecy of what they will yet do of their own accord. The fact is, salvation is, everywhere, in the scriptures, made to hang on obedience to God, and destruction and judgment, on disobedience. So when God says he will destroy or afflict a people or nation, we know they will first become disobedient of their own accord: and when he says he will save or bless a people or nation, we know they will first become obedient of their own accord.

Yet God has promised to turn away threatened

judgment on condition of repentance and obedience; and to withhold promised blessings on condition of disobedience, else he would sometimes reward the wicked and destroy the righteous.

But this does not furnish us with the first stone for a foundation for *conditional prophecy*, which, strictly speaking is no prophecy at all: for true prophecy is of some certain event in the future, in the same sense that true history is of some certain event of the past; and so all true prophecy will eventually become history of the past: and there is no possible condition about it more than there is—that the sun rose yesterday, which is past history; and had it been predicted by divine revelation it would have been prophecy, as unconditional as "A virgin shall conceive and bear a son."

If God says he will bring a judgment on a nation or a people with the understanding that they may escape it, and that he will not do it if they repent, it is not a prophecy; but it slides out of the sphere of prophecy into the sphere of promises, threatenings or covenants. The understanding of the conditions is the very thing which distinguishes it from prophecy, from which nothing can be more different; for prophecy is what *will* come to pass; not what *may*, or *may not*: else there is no prophecy in the scripture. Conditional prophecy is, therefore, a twin pseudo to the never-dying soul; they are both traditions of men.

Care should be taken to distinguish between the sure word of prophecy, and what God says he will do to a people with the understanding that he will do or not do as a people are obedient or disobedient.

Nor are the prophecies concerning Israel under any circumstances more conditional than those to the Gentiles. The sure mercies of David are unconditional, or the Gentile has no sure hope.

Had the promised heir to David's throne been on condition of obedience of the rebellious house of Israel, Christ never would have been born, and had it depended on Gentile obedience, he surely never would.

So much for conditional prophecy; a thing of very modern date, invented as a prop to a favorite theory. It is in vain for Gentiles to attempt to fasten a curse on Israel. Balaam tried to curse the literal seed; but he said he could not, because God had blessed them; and as Paul says, concerning things to come. And it is equally as absurd to attempt to force the Almighty to limit the time of their probation to the time of gospel probation. It is not till the fullness of the Gentiles be come in, (the end of gospel probation,) the apostle says, Rom. xi: 25, 26, that "ALL ISRAEL SHALL BE SAVED: as it is written, There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and he shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob." The ungodliness of the Gentile Christian is turned away in being a Christian, and while the gospel is doing its work among the Gentiles: so Jacob cannot be the converts of Christianity, because his ungodliness is to be turned away after the happy state of the Christian is secured. "For this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins." Jer. xxxi: 31. So reasons Paul, and he is among the best of commentators: he places the coming of the

Deliverer, and the covenant of Jeremiah at the end of the gospel dispensation.

We come now to speak of the two people, Jews and Gentiles, in relation to the two covenants, the Abrahamic and the *new covenant* of Jeremiah.—And first, it must be borne in mind that a covenant is an agreement between parties; and that one party cannot make a covenant. The Jews agreed to do all that God commanded them by the mouth of Moses: Ex. xix: 8, and xxiv: 3-7; but they never agreed to do anything which Christ commanded them; therefore, the Lord, through Moses, made a covenant with them, but Christ did not. This has an important bearing on the new covenant of Jeremiah, in which the Jews have never yet been a party; nor can they be “until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in”: and if it could be proved that Christ offered it to them, as he did the gospel, it would be the best proof that it was not *made with them*; because they despised both it and him, and between him and them there was no agreement, consequently no covenant.

We have shown that the Jew died with his law, and was buried at the time the Gentile was carried to Abraham's bosom, and that he still continues to “have Moses and the prophets,” and whenever he will hear *them*, he will live again, and come up out of his grave and be planted in the land promised to Jacob. Ezek. xxxvii. His present condition is not a living one; his next living is under the new covenant of Jeremiah, which cannot hang on any conditions of any people; for in this particular case, God has given his own conditions on which he will fulfil his promise to the house of Jacob and to the house of Judah. See Jer. xxxi: 35-37. The Lord himself has nailed this covenant to the ordinances of the sun, moon and stars, and to the foundations of the earth; and we have no right to invent a condition and crowd it in here to crowd out the one the Lord himself has given.

Now whether there are future blessings or curses for Israel or not, does not depend at all on the conditions of the obsolete law, but on an independent train of prophecy. This declares that Israel will turn to the Lord and serve him with one consent: and be saved with an everlasting salvation. Zeph. iii: 9, and Isa. xlv: 17.

The Sinaic covenant is of no force under the reign of Messiah, where the weal or wo of Israel depends on whether he obeys him or not. The prophets say he will, and David says, “All the kings of the earth shall praise thee, O Lord, when they hear the words of thy mouth.”

Having shown that the new covenant of Jeremiah is not yet made with Israel and Judah, we will next show that the gospel covenant cannot be made with any nation as a nation; for it is, in all its essential elements the Abrahamic covenant of grace, through faith, and cannot be established by law, or at all regulated by legislation, like the Mosaic covenant which was enforced by Jewish legislation. The folly of men for thirteen hundred years, in attempting to establish religion by law has proved unavailing to make men embrace the Abrahamic faith, and in the wisdom of God it was never designed to. But Jewish legislation

did make men Jews by enforcing the observance of “*THE LAW*,” but even this failed to keep them in the Abrahamic faith. Therefore, no *covenant, mode or system of faith*, can be made with a nation as such; but must be left to commend itself to the consciences of individuals.

The Sinaic covenant was therefore the only covenant ever made between God and a nation, and while the Jews were under it they were his people: Deut. xxix: 12-13; but the Gentiles, before the introduction of the gospel, were not a people: Deut. xxxii: 21; Rom. x: 19, but coming under the gospel covenant made them a people: 1 Pet. ii: 9. “But ye (believing Gentiles) are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people, which in times past were not a people, but are now the people of God.”

We are now prepared to demonstrate the fact and settle the question once for all, that the new covenant of Jer. xxxi: 31, has not yet been made with Israel. And first, it has been shown that under the law, the Jews were a people by virtue of the Sinaic covenant, and the Gentiles, at the same time, were no people; but by virtue of the gospel covenant which they are now under, as individuals, they *are* a people, while the Jews, in unbelief, as they are, are not a people. And secondly, since the Gentiles, coming under the gospel, become a people; the Jews, if under it, would also be a people: but as they are not *now* a people, they are not under the gospel. And finally, it is through faith on the Son of God by which alone the Gentiles come under the gospel, and become the people of God: so the Jews, in unbelief, cannot be under the gospel, nor can they be the people of God, as the Gentiles were not before *they* believed. It is still further certain that the new covenant is not made with Israel and Judah, for one of the stipulations of it is:—“I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a people.” By virtue of the new covenant, they become the people of God, and as they are not now a people, they are not now under the new covenant.

We admit that here and there a Jew has believed on the Lord Jesus, and has been incorporated with the people of God; but these isolated cases have no general bearing on the subject.—This principle of exegesis will not do, though often resorted to to serve a by-end, while the same principle would be revolting in other cases; for instance, Daniel says—“But the saints of the Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom forever, even forever and ever. Now if only here and there one of the saints possess the kingdom, the word will be broken. In like manner the new covenant will be made “with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah, or the word will be broken; and it must be “After those days,” and not before them.

The two houses, as a whole, are broken off, through unbelief, but not forever. This is represented in the first chapter of Hosea, in the son of Gomer, the daughter of Diblaim—“Then said God—Call his name Lo-ammi: for ye are not my people, and I will not be your God. Yet the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea—and

it shall come to pass that in the place where it was said unto them, ye are not my people, there it shall be said unto them, ye are the sons of the living God. Then shall the children of Judah and the children of Israel be gathered together, and appoint themselves one head (Ezek. xxxvii : 24-26,) and they shall come up out of the land : for great shall be the day of Jezreel."

The time of their being the people of God is fixed at the time the two houses, Israel and Judah, are gathered together, "one king being over them all." They are Lo-ammi now; but with divine assurance that they will yet be gathered together, and appoint unto themselves one head, and become the sons of the living God : and Jeremiah puts this down under the new covenant,

Now there is no promise that God will ever make a new covenant with Abraham's seed by faith. There is no need of that seed having a new one; for the old one, made with Abraham, is faultless, it genders to life, and is the embodiment of the Christian's hope, and everything desirable in the future. But not so with the Sinaic covenant, the first one with Israel and Judah : that was faulty, it could not give life, but gendered to bondage; consequently a place was sought for the second, or new one; and—"In that he saith a new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old, is ready to vanish away." The one here called *old*, is the faulty one, and therefore could not relate to the one made with Abraham.

Here lies the great and prevalent error. The Gentiles adopting the Abrahamic faith, as shown by Lazarus being carried by angels to Abraham's bosom, is too often taken for a new covenant; but it is nowhere so called in the scriptures; nor was it new in any sense of the word, but was actually four hundred and thirty years older than the first one made with Israel and Judah. So the gospel, instead of being anything new under the sun, was preached to Abraham more than two thousand years before Christ.

The objection, sometimes raised against the new covenant being future, because it would necessarily require that Christ should die again, has no force in it. Paul to the Hebrews, went on to show them the two orders of priesthood, the Aaronic, and the Melchizedec. He showed them that their Aaronic high priest offered blood once a year, and it was necessary that this man (Christ) should have something to offer: but this signified that the way into the holiest of all was not made manifest, and not that he should offer himself often, but *once* in the end of the world to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. So to make it necessary for him to die again at the introduction of the new covenant, would make him a high priest of the Aaronic order, and subvert the whole argument of Paul, who gives for a reason why he does not die often, that he is not a high priest of the Aaronic order.

The circumstance that he is the mediator of a better covenant, does not prove that covenant was introduced at the first advent, more than the circumstance that he is heir to David's throne proves that he is now reigning on it. Nor does the cir-

cumstance that a covenant or testament is of force after the death of the testator, avail anything in this argument: for Paul shows us that one offering of the Melchizedec high priest is sufficient in all cases. And we know that by virtue of the Abrahamic covenant, men were saved before the death of the testator, else Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets are lost.

WANDERING THOUGHTS.

The existence of "Wandering Thoughts," as they are popularly designated, constitutes one striking feature in the action of mind, which it is useful to understand, for our own satisfaction, as well as for the comfort of others. There is a confessed tendency in the mind to wander from the subject of meditation,—a tendency especially observed by *pious* men, during their hallowed exercises. They feel their minds liable to shift to another topic, or, in other words, foreign ideas thrust themselves on their notice, and the contrast between these and the selected topics of reflection, along with an exemplary fear of sin, attracts the attention, and excites many painful emotions.

The leading and distinguishing characteristic element in these ideas is, they are *involuntary*.—The result of self-reflection is, they come unsought, and in many cases remain unmasked, at least when no conscious effort is made to retain them. Were the mind only capable of voluntary thought, it might wander just as we know it does, still it then would be intentional aberration, and not such as is experienced and lamented in its present constitution and mode of action. So far are these specific thoughts from being intentionally conceived, that the complaint is, they spring into being independent of the will, and, for a time, cannot be ejected or forgotten. If the will had full authority over them, they would never be admitted, or rather, considering our ignorance of the next idea that will appear, we should affirm, their entrance and exit would be almost simultaneous.

Now, it may be said, are not the greater number of thoughts involuntary? Yes, we admit they are. When walking abroad, or musing at home, the mind generally receives silent permission to roam where it pleases; we have formed no purpose to think on any particular subject, and, of course, are in our thoughts entirely guided by association, or ideas excited by present sensations. In these circumstances, we are not, however, irresponsible, nor are we free from danger; the thoughts may be foolish, absurd,—they may be even positively sinful. They have undoubtedly entered the mind not by express command, so to speak, but we have permitted the mind to enter into circumstances where they have been formed or suggested, which could certainly have been avoided. Might we not, for example, have restrained ourselves, and directed our faculties to useful, at least innocent subjects, or immediately have withdrawn them from vain and criminal contemplations? If, in the course of these lawless excursions, evil passions and desires happen to be kindled, by their objects being painted on the imagination, it is demonstrably certain,

that we are accountable for their present activity, and every item of resulting conduct.

Wandering thoughts, *directly so called*, are quite of a different character, as they enter in totally different circumstances; they occur, not when the mind is luxuriating at ease, on the contrary, they come when it is actively engaged;—not when efforts are employed to avoid them, but when there is a resolution to have all the faculties and emotions absorbed, if possible, by one theme; not merely when it is purposely occupied with moral and religious subjects, but on any one that may engage our attention.

To cast some light on this perplexing subject, let us, in the meantime, consider the *spontaneous action* of the mental faculties and emotions.

The human mind has not unfrequently been compared to an engine, over which we have perfect control, with more apparent than real truth and propriety. No doubt, we can set the mind agoing, in other words, choose to think on any particular subject, but we are conscious that it often begins of its own accord, and that we can seldom or never bring it to rest when we please. Certain feelings unexpectedly come into existence, certain faculties start into action, we cannot tell how or why; and instantly to subdue these emotions, or change the topic of thought, is completely beyond our power. Let the occasion be the most solemn, these internal movements, nevertheless, take place, and we are compelled to attend to them, even though at the expense, for a time, of nobler thoughts and feelings. Were we to consult general experience, we would soon find ample and curious illustration of this singular fact in our constitution. The predominant faculty and passion would, in all likelihood, be most commonly specific, as furnishing examples of involuntary action. On a sudden, the mind was filled with a craving for music, and strange notes were heard within—or for calculation, and figures entered, forthwith, into the various combinations—or places, long since visited came back in all their original freshness—or scenes of surpassing loveliness and grandeur were wrought by the imagination—or fantastic and ludicrous exhibitions presented themselves, causing a momentary irrepressible smile to play on the countenance—or some passion arose in all its energy and absorbed the thinking powers, and obliged them for a while to minister to its existence and gratification. We are persuaded these experiences are more common than is generally supposed, or perhaps admitted, and it is high time they should be openly and frankly confessed.—They will be more common, especially with those who are of a nervous and sanguine temperament, these being most subject to mental activity and excitement.

A very singular and striking example of the unwillful activity of the faculties, is seen in the phenomena of dreaming. During the hours of sleep, it frequently happens that thoughts and emotions are vividly excited—thoughts solid and futile, serious and comical, emotions fierce and revengeful, gentle and compassionate. Who has not had such recollections, as he awoke to consciousness during the watches of the night, or at

the morning dawn? Need we bring back to any the reminiscences of those days, when they lay in the burning arms of a fever, and scenes and sounds horrible beyond description, occupied, oppressed, nay, even tortured their faculties.

Such are a few instances of spontaneous or unwillful activity; but how they take place, is a difficult inquiry. Sometimes the associating principle may furnish an explanation, but not always. There seems to be some unknown influence of the blood, perhaps also some unknown electric influence, upon the brain, exciting a part, and leaving the rest of that vital organ in a quiescent state. That, at least, both the quantity, quality, and rate of motion in the blood, has an influence on the mind, is a truth fast gaining upon public conviction. Let us glance at some of its more prominent effects.—Fainting, that image of death, is occasioned, at any rate attended, by the descent of the blood from the brain, when thought and consciousness cease till it returns. The use of powerful stimulants is well known not merely to excite the sentiments and propensities of our common nature, but to give an impulse, and often a wonderful elevation, to thought and imagination, as when opium is employed. During these moments, the pulse beats with increased speed, and, of course, the blood is propelled through the body with unusual velocity. Moreover, the very act of voluntary thinking and feeling, causes it, in an augmented stream, to enter the brain; for parts of this organ have been seen to expand and subside, with the commencement and cessation of thought and emotion. From these facts, we gather evidence, that the mind by night and by day is often forced, by some internal influence, into the different states of which we know it to be susceptible. Whether it is by the blood that these involuntary movements are produced, it may be difficult exactly to determine, though there is great probability that in the majority of instances, it is the existing physical cause, account for the facts as you may, their existence cannot be denied, and every one can judge, if ever, how often, and in what forms they are presented to himself.

When these spontaneous movements take place, the thoughts will wander, or leave the topic of present meditation. It may be solemn and awfully momentous, but from it we are imperiously attracted, and some time may elapse before we can renew former contemplations. These revolutions will occur in spite of every exertion we vainly employ to the contrary.

THE CHRISTIAN RACE.

“Looking unto Jesus.”—HEB. XII: 1-13.

Under the similitude of men running in a race we are here advised by the apostle Paul to lay aside every weight, or encumbrance, and the sin which does so easily beset us, to run with patience, “Looking unto Jesus, the author and finisher of our faith.” This common sense advice is given also by Peter (1st Epist. i: 13.) “Gird up the loins of your mind, and hope to the end.” We run for *life*, and we should run unencumbered.

The sin which most easily besets us,—the parent

sin it may be called,—is that ever-recurring desire to do our own will rather than the will of God.—We know that our own ways are not as God's ways, nor his thoughts as our thoughts, yet, in despite of this conviction, and it may be of experience also, we are constantly beset with this sin, springing not so much from obstinacy as from pride, ignorance, or self-sufficiency. It is *natural* to like our own way; but this way, unless it is also God's—which can be learned chiefly from his word—is sure to lead us into evil. Self-conceit has the effect of obscuring the designs of God, and rendering us oblivious both of his promises and threatenings: it weakens us for his service, so that we run without spirit: it is, moreover, subversive of that faith by which we have “fled away from the corruption that is in the world.” (2 Pet. 1-4.) As seekers after immortality we must, then, have no will but God's will.

“Lay aside every weight.” One heavy clog upon our movements consists of the cares and anxieties of life, and one pressing form of these is the necessity of providing for the future wants of ourselves and families. Well as we know theoretically, and perhaps experimentally, that God is the preserver of his people, and that he is always at hand, so that we need be careful for nothing, yet will a natural instinct, or distrust of God, or perhaps custom and bad example, draw us aside after what the world calls the “main chance”—in other words, *mammon*. Somehow or other we contrive, like Martha, to be careful and troubled about many things. We see daily proofs of the truth of the Lord's saying, “The children of this world are wiser in their generation than the children of light,” and we should endeavor to imitate these wise ones so far as to strive with our whole soul and strength, in order to the attainment of the “true riches,” which we profess to seek after. Not that it is wrong to have a little forethought and provide for one's own; but an over-anxiety and carefulness, a half repressed wish and thought, that all things around us shall remain stable and secure, tend grievously to confine our energies to this perishing state, and constitute the “weight” which we are to cast aside. They create doubts in the mind, which, like exhalations, render our way obscure, and hide from our eyes the “sun of righteousness,” to whom we should look.

Another weight, which impedes us in our course, is the undue indulgence of our appetites,—that is, excess in eating, drinking, slumbering. This weight adjusts itself so nicely to our natural strength that we are scarcely conscious of its existence. But we all carry it, more or less. The indulgence of these appetites tend to foster a dull sluggish habit of body and mind, whereby our energies are cramped, our conceptions are rendered poor and fruitless, and the hope set before us is obscured. By intemperance in any shape, the thoughts are forced into a worldly, fleshy channel; soon the inert spirit finds pleasure in the ignoble ease of captivity—captivity to sin! Temperance in all things best preserves the vigor of the man, and will help to keep him in the best possible condition for hearing and understanding what is the

will of God. “He who striveth for the mastery is temperate in all things.” (1 Cor. ix: 25.)

We are also fearfully obstructed in our Christian course by the improper exercise of our passions. He is strong who has them under due control: “he who has no rule over his spirit is like a city without bars or gates.” As for the man “who is hasty in his spirit,” the melancholy truth appears on the page of Scripture, “there is more hope of a fool than of him.” What self-condemnation! What misery! What remorse! do many suffer through yielding to envy, anger, or malice. What burning blushes of shame will mantle the cheek of many, when they bring to recollection some past actions of their history, when their passions led sober reason captive. If it were possible, would they not restore, at almost any price, the time now gone forever, that their course might be amended? The indulgence of the passions darkens and perplexes a man's way, and too often leaves him in such a position that he must either renounce the hope of immortality, or recommence the Christian race with diminished strength and hope. O what tyrants these passions become!—Is the reader one of their slaves?

There is yet another weight—a burdensome one no doubt—one, however, that must be laid aside. It is this:—Impatience at the vexations we meet with at every turn in this changeful world; or rather, it is a want of due submission to the divine operations and oversight. Could we get rid of this weight, we would esteem others light in comparison and easily parted with. But we must lay it aside and become patient, watchful and prayerful. Patience and perseverance are twin sisters. It is here that Paul, after having cited a cloud of witnesses, who were all eminent examples of suffering patience, quits the line of direct precept and points to Jesus; Heb. xii: 1. He says, verse, 3, “Consider him who endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your minds.” He tells them, moreover, that their troubles are intended as chastisements, and are proofs of the love of their heavenly Father. Now, as we know that “all things work together for good to those who love God,” it will be our wisdom to look upon such things as cause grief and vexation—which tend to abate our pride and self love,—to expose our ignorance to our own eyes—as being only the gentle and merciful dealings of our great Parent. “No chastisement for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous; nevertheless afterward, it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them that are exercised thereby,” verse 11. If, then, we should be visited with the undeserved scorn or ridicule of our fellows, or with the loss of worldly goods; if sickness should attack and waste our frames, making us desire death rather than life; if through calumny old friends turn cold and forsake us; or if beloved relatives are untimely removed from our side;—if any events such as these do come upon us, undoubtedly we must grieve; not to do so would indicate an unnatural and unamiable disposition, alien from the spirit of Christ, who wept over both the griefs and the follies of men; but we ought to learn cheerful submission

to God's pleasure and arrangements, trusting that, with infinite wisdom and goodness, he knows better than ourselves what is good and profitable for us. He was a shrewd observer who made the road to heaven pass through the valley of humiliation.

If the trials and crosses of this life are received—as they too often are—in a repining spirit, as if we were hardly used, then, indeed, our discontent and impatience as before stated, become a weight, threatening to stop us entirely in our onward progress. We must consider, *first*, that we are chastised in measure, as medicine is very carefully dealt out by a skilful physician; and, *secondly*, that we are so constituted, that affliction has a direct tendency to bring into exercise the virtues which most adorn the doctrine of Christ, and make man pleasing to God—namely, patience, perseverance, hope, joy, peace, confidence, and love.—There are few of our readers, probably, but can call to mind some illustration of the wholesome effects of this divine discipline, and can bear witness that out of deep suffering and sorrow there has been brought forth the quickly sympathizing spirit, ever seeking to pour into the wounded breast the wine and oil of consolation. And of such we may affirm, the spirit has been tamed and taught by adversity—rendered sensibly alive to the claims of all who stand in need of its ministrations.

In a cheerful submission to the events of God's providence, and in a patient endurance of all that his chastening and fatherly hand may inflict upon us, Jesus, the only begotten of the Father, is our exemplar. "Looking unto Jesus" will bear us up and on in every trial.

As the Captain of our Salvation, it was necessary that he should be perfected in the school of obedience; Heb. x: 7. Hence he passed through the deep waters of affliction. He became a scold and a jest! Brutal and unfeeling men surrounded and mocked him. As it is written, "They compassed me about with words of hatred, and fought against me without a cause. For my love they are mine enemies. I am poor and needy, and my heart is wounded within me: my knees are weak through fasting, and my flesh faileth of fatness. I became also a reproach unto them." Ps. cix: 2, 4, 22, 25. "Reproach hath broken my heart." lxxix: 20. Jesus bore uncomplainingly a mighty load of grief, keeping in view "the joy that was set before him;" to attain which joy, and that he might be fitted for his Headship, he was subjected to this trying ordeal.

S. H. M.

Will the Wicked Dead be made Alive?

The following remarks on the above subject are in a private letter to us, and the writer did not intend them for the public; but there is so much that is deeply interesting to our mind, and worthy to be pondered that he must excuse us for letting others see an extract from his letter; but we will withhold his name. He says:

"There is one leading objection which presents itself to every one, and that must be ob-

viated, if it can be, before you can bring a certain class to look at the subject with attention. I refer to the objection that the doctrine in question supersedes all idea of a retribution. I do not bring this forward as a formidable obstacle in my own mind, for I have my views of the matter; but it is the argument which does trouble most minds, and one the honest enquirers do not seem able to get over.

One reason why I wish to see the subject taken up is that, I do not think the death of Christ is correctly understood. I do not know that I can give you, on paper, a definite idea of my difficulty, but I am satisfied the common view of that subject is not what the word of God presents to us. If *death* entered and passed upon mankind in the first Adam, then *Life* must come in the second? If the disobedience of the first brings *death*: then the obedience of the second (obedience unto death) brings *life*. But *how* can this be done, and mankind be left free agents? I answer, (and I can see no other consistent solution) that the disobedience of the first Adam was the *acting out of a frail nature*, and was a perfect trial, in the person of the first pair, of that nature. Man was *proved, in the mass*, by a single experiment, and the matter was settled—he could not stand the trial *in the flesh*. Well, man *in the flesh*, is condemned; and in the person of the second Adam, we have the human and the Divine united, and in that shape obedience has been rendered to the demands of the law, and a *principle* manifested which every true believer possesses, by his very divine relation. This principle of obedience in Christ is *essentially* in all his people; and what *he done they have the heart to do*—bow submissively to the mind and will of God. What is this, but pure and implicit *faith*? Did the first Adam show more than a *want* of faith? And did Adam the second do more than exhibit that *grace in its perfection*? Now *why* are the wicked to be destroyed. It seems to me, it is because they are good for nothing, and can do nothing in the government of God.—If they would set themselves as helpless and worthless, and apply to Christ for a new nature, he would impart to them his life-giving Spirit, and *then* they would be "raised up at the last day."

Perhaps you may get my idea, and if it is correct then there is really no need of a retribution in the world to come. The soul that sinneth, *dies*.

WASTED TIME.—Coming hastily into a chamber, I had almost thrown down a crystal hour-glass. Fear, lest I had, made me grieve as if I had broken it. But alas, how much precious time have I cast away without any regret! the hour-glass was but crystal, each hour a pearl; that but like to be broken, this lost outright: that but casually, this done wilfully. A better hour-glass might be bought; but time lost once, lost ever. Thus we grieve more for toys than for treasure. Lord, give me an hour-glass, not to be by me, but to be in me. Teach me to number my days. An hour-glass to turn *me*, that I may apply my heart unto wisdom.—*Dr. T. Fuller.*

BIBLE EXAMINER.

New York, September, 1856.

THE POPE GOING TO JERUSALEM.

We gave some time since an account of a recent French papal book, in favor of the transfer of the papacy to Jerusalem. The proposition looks like a phantasy, but the *New York Observer* says that "it is now declared that this question has already been most seriously examined; even so far back as the time when the bishops met to determine on the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin, a large number of the members, and Pius IX. himself, were favorable to the project. A person, whose opinion is relied upon, adds that he will soon give more substantial reasons for the 'translation of the Holy See to the cradle of Jesus Christ.' He forgets to say rather, 'which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified.' What light would such an event throw upon prophecy? and how many apparent disagreeing points would it reconcile?"

It would be a happy idea to shut the pope up in Jerusalem. Popery is out of date, and it might well be left to sleep or snore in the Orient; but we doubt the hope.

The foregoing we cut from the *Christian Advocate* of this city, Aug. 28th. We gave a short item on the same subject, from the same paper, in our last. The *Advocate* treats the subject very lightly, as the concluding remark shows; but the quotation from the *New York Observer* struck our mind entirely different from what seems to have been the feeling of the *Advocate*. We are persuaded if popery goes to Jerusalem it is not to be "shut up" there. Truly did the *Observer* say, Jerusalem, "which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified." But what does the prophecy, from which the *Observer* quotes, say is to happen at the end of the "thousand two hundred and three score days" that God's "two witnesses" are to "prophecy clothed in sackcloth"? In that city "spiritually called Sodom," &c., those witnesses are to be slain, by "the beast that cometh up out of the bottomless pit"; he "shall make war against them, and shall overcome them, and kill them: and their dead bodies shall lie in the street of the great city, which spiritually is called Sodom," &c.

Will the *Observer* or *Advocate* please tell us, whether, in their opinion, this prophecy has ever been fulfilled? and if not, may not the removal of the Popedom to Jerusalem be the first act in the drama towards its accomplishment? May it not be true, that the final contest between corrupt and

pure Christianity is to be witnessed at Jerusalem, "where our Lord was crucified"! And may it not be a fact, that the corrupt is to have a fearful triumph there, by the help of "the beast," using his sword to overcome and slay God's two witnesses? so that, for a short time, there shall be rejoicing among "the people and kindreds and tongues and nations" over the witnesses of God, "slain"? We affirm nothing on the subject; but we confess, that the idea of "the translation of the Holy See" to Jerusalem is, to us, the most startling announcement; and if carried out, we think it will open up a page in prophecy that will make even the ears of the *Advocate* tingle. We shall watch the prospect of such a movement with very different feelings than those which seem to be in the bosom of the *Advocate* or *Observer*. Jerusalem has been trodden down by a "daily," or continual, desolator for twelve hundred years or more. Is that desolator now to be "taken away," and in its stead "the abomination that astonisheth set up"? see Dan. 12: 11; and compare it with Rev. 11.

"What I say unto you, I say unto all—*watch*." Thus spake Jesus, Mark 13: 37; and we shall all do well to heed the warning.

"Wisdom Shall Die With You." 1.

A friend writing us from the west says—"In talking with a stiff *Oberlinite* he said, 'The immortality of the soul is not questioned in the Bible, but is an assented fact that needs no proof.' Our friend adds—"Such reasoning had no convincing effect on me."

It is not the first time the advocates of error have hid their nakedness with "fig-leaves." When men attempt to satisfy inquiring minds by such a baseless *assumption* it is proof positive they have built their faith on the sand. Archbishop WHATELY says—

"To believe as others believe, is a compendious creed, taxing neither a man's intellect, nor his industry;—a creed resulting from the indolence—the spiritual carelessness,—the weakness and the dishonest ambition of human nature."

But such, alas, is the "creed" of most men on theological questions. Prof. FINNEY, of the Oberlin Institute, preached a sermon, several years since, on "The Loss when a Soul is Lost." At the outset he "assumed" that "the soul is immortal;" and told his hearers—"You admit that the Bible teaches this, and I shall not therefore attempt to prove it."

A minister from that theological school, not many months since, said, in one of his "revival" sermons,

—“The damned in hell would offer up a prayer that they might be *annihilated*: but for God to comply with their desire would be showing mercy; therefore, he would not, or could not do it.”

We suppose, as he offered no proof of his fraud on common sense, that his “creed” was “to believe as” Prof. Finney “believes:” and the “Oberlinite,” of whom our friend writes us, it seems, has the same *creed*. It is easy to learn, for it “taxes no man’s industry or intellect;” he needs no *searching the* “Scriptures;” that tiresome work he can leave to such “fools” as believe Jesus really meant what he said, and who believe no *proxy* faith will pass for true coin with the “Searcher of hearts.” Woe to the “dishonest ambition of human nature” which would encourage men to receive for truth any doctrine which arises not from personal searching the scriptures, unbiased by any human authority. The Bible commands no man’s faith to an *assumption*; it forbids us to let our “faith stand in the wisdom of men:” and Jesus declared—“If I had not come and spoken unto them they had not had sin;” and “if I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin.” It is no sin to reject any man’s assumptions; but the testimony which God gives us must be our guide in all matters of faith. Not what any man or body of men pronounce that testimony to be, but that which comes to us with a “*Thus saith the Lord*.” Now we challenge all the theological world to produce one text in the Bible that saith, “man hath an immortal soul;” or, that “the soul is immortal.” There is no such utterance there. And the Bible never demands faith in anything without “proof.” To say, therefore, that, “The immortality of the soul is an assented fact, in the Bible, that needs no proof,” is to utter an untruth: and demonstrates the utterer to be destitute of any Bible proof of his position: it is an unwilling acknowledgment that he has no *proof* in the Bible for his assumption.

LIFE FROM THE DEAD:

Or, *The Righteous Only will Live Again.*

Since the issue of the last EXAMINER we have applied ourself diligently in writing and arranging the Work suggested by Dr. HUNTINGTON, on the non-living again of the wicked dead. We have endeavored to condense and simplify the subject as far as possible. The reader will find much that is new inserted, while he will recognise some of the old arguments which have been presented in the EXAMINER. We have thus endeavored to bring “forth out of the treasury things new and

old,” and to place them before the mind in a way that the value and importance of the subject can be seen without the confusion of a protracted discussion. All the prominent texts relied on by the adverse theory are taken up and examined as briefly as could be done consistently.

The work will make from 75 to 100 pages of the same size as the Review of Dr. Post; but unless we have aid, by way of funds, we dare not venture on its publication. If any friends are disposed to furnish the means, we will issue it immediately after our return from the west.

The work will be entitled “LIFE FROM THE DEAD: or *The Righteous only will Live again.*” About \$160 will be needed to issue it without embarrassing us: but each person contributing towards that sum shall have refunded to him the amount of his contribution at the wholesale price as soon as it is issued, if he desires it. Please state definitely on this point, when money is sent us, what your wish is.

—♦♦♦—
VISIT TO MICHIGAN.—We expect to commence a course of Lectures at *Reading Village*, Mich., near Hillsdale, Thursday evening, Sept. 18th, to continue about one week. After that spend two or three days in *Hillsdale*, lecturing there till after Sunday the 28th inst.

We do not design to go farther west, but shall return east, or visit some places in Ohio, before we come back to New York.

If any friends wish to communicate with us, while in Michigan, please direct to *Hillsdale*, care of A. N. SEYMOUR.

We may be absent from New York some four weeks; but we shall arrange to have orders for Books attended to during that time.

—♦♦♦—
“MAN’S DESTINY.—Immortality: Arguments from Nature and Scripture, by Rev. T. M. POST, D. D., St. Louis, Mo.; Reviewed by GEO. STORRS, Editor of *Bible Examiner*.”

The foregoing work is now ready for sale in any quantity that may be desired. Price 38 cents per copy; or three copies for \$1. In either case we will send free of postage. Five copies will be sent for \$1 if the purchaser takes the postage on himself.

We have had a portion of the work bound and lettered: Price, bound, 50 cents. Two copies will be sent free of postage for \$1.

Any of our paying subscribers who have not received a copy of the foregoing work should inform us without delay. We sent to all when the work was issued; but a few, we have learned, did not receive it: we have sent to such again.

Reply No. 3 to Macknight, Jr.

BY HENRY GREW.

I deem it necessary to reply but briefly to our brother's last article. I humbly consider the plain and positive testimony of Jesus Christ and his apostle, that "they that have done evil" "shall hear his voice and shall come forth unto the resurrection of *condemnation*," and that "there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the *unjust*," to outweigh volumes of such reasoning on Luke 20 : 37, 38, as our ingenious friend has presented us.

He will permit me however, to ask him to review the manner in which he has endeavored "to expose" the "fallacy" of my argumentation and affirmations. He has, for this purpose, made three assertions without proof of their verity; the incorrectness of each I shall endeavor to show.

1. He remarks, "If (in keeping with Br. G.'s position) the *common* relationship secures the revival of all men from the dead, it must secure 'the resurrection of life' mentioned in John 5 : 29—in which case the peculiar relationship, being unnecessary, could not exist." I ask, *why* must it? I deny this necessity, and affirm that, for the purpose of righteous judgment, God may raise the wicked to *temporary* and not *eternal* life as John 5 : 29 imports.

2. "Any relationship of our heavenly Father to his sleeping saints which brings them to life (which Bro. G. declares the *common* relationship does) must make them *immortal* and *incorruptible*," &c. No, brother, not *any* relation. The relation of *Lawgiver* and *Judge* does not accomplish this, but the peculiar relationship of *REDEEMER*. This glorious result is not "made certain by the '*common*'" relationship. You see therefore that "the *peculiar* relationship" is no "meaningless affair."

3. "If Bro. G. is correct in saying that, in case of the righteous, 'the *peculiar* relationship' is necessary to *perpetuate* the life which a '*common* relationship' secures, it follows inevitably that there must also be a '*peculiar* relationship' to the wicked to accomplish the post-resurrection 'tribulation, anguish' and subsequent destruction Bro. G. believes awaits them." Indeed! What sort of logic is this, brother? Because the '*peculiar* relationship' of *Redeemer* is necessary to perpetuate the conscious existence of the saints in glory, *ergo*, "a *peculiar* relationship to the wicked" is necessary to secure their temporary life for the purpose of actual suffering, according to the different degrees of their guilt, antecedent to their destruction! For the truth's sake, which I doubt not my brother is seeking, I ask him to inform us how he harmonizes such reasoning with our Lord's declaration of a "resurrection of *condemnation*."

In my view, it is of little importance to our controversy, whether the peculiar relationship *alone* is, or is not referred to in Luke 20 : 37, 38. It is undeniable that the subject of consideration in that passage is, not the *final judgment* of men, but the resurrection. It is to the passages which refer to the latter awful subject we must especially refer to ascertain the destinies of accountable men, although it is true that in John 5 : 28, 29 our Lord

connects eternal life and condemnation with the revelation of the doctrine of the resurrection. So in Luke 20 : 36 he teaches the immortality of the resurrected righteous; but this is no proof of my brother's opinion in his paraphrase, that the wicked, who are to "come forth to the resurrection of *condemnation*" will have no consciousness "before the judgment seat;" a supposition which with all due respect for my opponents, I must consider neither more or less than a ridiculous absurdity. Will our brethren inform us, for what purpose they are to be raised at all if they are to have no consciousness of the judgment.

I have only one more consideration at present to submit to the candid consideration of my esteemed brother. Suppose we should admit that our Lord in Luke 20th, considers the righteous dead as eternally living to God, and, (as the "antithesis" to this,) the wicked dead as *eternally* dead; how would this prove that the latter may not have a temporary life for the purpose of judgment, &c., any more than it proves that the righteous are not at present actually dead? If the righteous dead may now be considered as living to God on the ground of their resurrection to eternal life notwithstanding they are actually temporarily dead, the wicked may be considered as eternally dead on the ground of their condemnation to eternal death, notwithstanding they may be raised to a temporary life. Grace be with all who love our Lord Jesus in sincerity. O that we may "abide in him" in all holiness, "that we may not be ashamed before him at his coming."

HENRY GREW.

Response to H. Grew's Third Reply.

BY MACKNIGHT, JR.

The *first* of the "three assertions" quoted from my last response by Bro. Grew was not designed to convey the sense he seems to have given it.—My meaning was *not*—"must secure [to *all* the dead,] 'the resurrection of life' mentioned in John 5 : 29," but—"must secure [to the *righteous*] 'the resurrection,'" &c. With this explanation I pass to the *second* of the "three assertions" the "verity" of which my brother questions, and affirm (what I would also affirm of the *first*) that it is, every word of it, perfectly true. This statement shall be made good in few words, and that, I trust, to the satisfaction of even my respondent himself.—To begin, I observe that there is no future life except by means of a resurrection from the dead; (this Br. G. believes and teaches;) and it follows from this fact that "any relationship of our Heavenly Father to his sleeping saints which brings them to life," must bring them to life *by a resurrection*. Now as the word of God reveals *no resurrection* as awaiting "sleeping saints" except the one by which they are to "put on incorruption" and "immortality," (see 1 Cor. 15 : 52-54,) it follows that there can be *no "incorrectness"* in the *second* of the "three assertions" commented upon by Br. Grew. This I am confident the unprejudiced reader will see whether Br. G. does or not. "The ["*common*"] relation of *Lawgiver* and *Judge*," if it require the revival of "sleeping

saints" *at all*, demands that they shall come up either *mortal* or *immortal*. If it be the former, where have we a Scriptural intimation of the fact? If the latter, what more could "the peculiar relationship of REDEEMER" do? And if it could not do more, would it not be a "meaningless affair?" I might dwell at some length on this point, but I trust it is not necessary.

A few words upon the *third* assertion cited.—What I meant by it was simply this: if the "common relationship" will bring a dead saint to life but cannot suitably reward him with *endless* life and happiness afterwards, so neither can it, having brought a dead sinner to life, afterwards torment and destroy him. "What" could be more conclusive than this "sort of logic," which by the way takes Br. G. upon his own *illogical* and *indefensible* ground? The simple fact is, "the 'peculiar relationship' of Redeemer is" just as "necessary" to transform a dead saint to a "SPIRITUAL BODY," (which is the very thing he becomes when "made alive,") as it can be "to perpetuate the conscious existence of the saints in glory." Make a being *immortal* and the *perpetuity* of his "conscious existence" is put beyond all contingency. Remember, Br. G., our blessed Lord said, "neither can they die any more."

On Br. G.'s next paragraph I remark that it cannot be "of little importance to" *his side* of "our controversy, whether the peculiar relationship alone is, or is not referred to in Luke 20 : 37, 38;" for if he can find a *common* relationship in those passages, the "controversy" is settled in his favor. Can it be that Br. G. did not see this after all that had been said? The relationship our Lord referred to, if *common*, shows that by "the dead" (who "are [to be] raised," Luke 20 : 37) he intended "the dead *in general*."

The concluding "consideration" of the reply before us has received my most careful and "candid" attention. The reader will discover in it an effort to reconcile the theory of "a temporary life" for the deceased wicked with the supposition that *they*, as a class, are designated by "THE DEAD" in Luke 20 : 38. My respondent does not in so many words tell us that he indorses this supposition, but it is evident that he at least regards it with some favor. He seems to be cautiously *feeling* his way along, constantly receding from the view he gave of Luke 20 : 37, 38 in his first reply, but as constantly affirming that my "reasoning" on these passages is as nothing in his mind compared with "the plain and positive testimony" of such passages as John 5 : 29 and Acts 24 : 15, against the view he opposes. It is obvious enough that Br. G. has lost confidence in Luke 20 : 37, 38 as proving the re-living of the wicked dead—a circumstance which derives some *significance* from the fact that he omits to inform us, by any direct statement, that his views on these texts have changed or are changing. Whatever other brethren may think of it, I expect yet to see Br. Grew abandon the doctrine of the revival of the wicked dead, though I have no idea that my expectation of such a change of sentiment will hasten its consummation. My confidence is in the potency of truth and in Br. G.'s determination to act upon his honest convictions.

In his first reply to me he affirmed, without qualification, that by "THE DEAD" in Luke 20 : 37 was meant "the dead *in general*." Who that reads his second and third replies will suspect him of adhering to that opinion now? No one. In my last article I undertook to show that Br. G. had "virtually admitted that the 'peculiar relationship' alone is referred to in Luke 20 : 37," and, by consequence, that by "THE DEAD" in that verse our Lord meant "only the deceased *righteous*." As he now makes no allusion to that section of my article, I conclude it was "a nail in a sure place." He would hardly fail to have charged me, in his present reply, with a misconstruction of his words, if I had made one.

But to the point. Br. Grew, in seeking to save his theory while supposing that the phrase "*the dead*" in Luke 20 : 38 applies to the deceased wicked as a class, is driven to a false interpretation of the phrase "*the living*" in the same verse. This latter phrase signifies, (as I will cheerfully undertake to prove if Br. G. denies it,) *THE TEMPORARILY DEAD*, and is hence applied to the *present* condition of deceased saints. Thus applied, it necessarily involves the idea of their revival into life—which was *the* thing, and the *only* thing, to be proved. The *perpetuity* of such life was *not* the point in dispute, nor the thing to be demonstrated by an appeal to "the book of Moses;" nor was it the ground of the declaration, "for all live unto him." The *deathlessness* of the resurrected saints had been *previously* affirmed in the blissful assurance of the Redeemer, "neither can they die any more." The declaration, "for all live unto him," [*i. e.*, they live in God's *purpose* and *covenant*.] was, I apprehend, designed by our Lord to *explain* why he employed the words "THE LIVING" to express the idea which we express by such phrases as, "the *temporarily* dead," or "those who shall live again."

Assuming, then, as an indisputable fact, that the words "*the living*," (Luke 20 : 38) mean "*the temporarily* dead, and that they therefore describe the condition of the righteous while "actually dead," I observe that the phrase "*the dead*" in the same verse—denoting (as the proper antithesis of "*the temporarily* dead") *the eternally* dead—must be understood to designate the *present* condition of the deceased wicked. *If it does*—"they are dead, they shall not live." Isa. 26 : 14. The idea that our Saviour would base the revival into life of dead saints, whose God the Lord is, upon the fact that God is *not* a God of the wicked dead, *if* the latter class are also to be "made *alive*"—is, in my judgment, "neither more nor less than a ridiculous absurdity." But such an absurdity must Br. G. embrace if he admits that the wicked dead are referred to in Luke 20 : 38, and at the same time contends that "divine justice" requires that they shall have "a temporary life." One observation more, and I have done.—The supposition is not allowable that our Lord would, for the purpose of proving the resurrection of the righteous, have designated the wicked dead by words which *presuppose* their revival into life, while he left *their* revival unproved by himself and denied by his opponents. I trust Br. G. will see

the bearing of this remark upon the drift of his last paragraph.

If my beloved brother has no more to say on Luke 20 : 37, 38, I may wish to notice some of the passages he has so frequently referred to. If he replies to this, I do wish he would inform us what he believes to be the true import of the two verses we have been discussing ; I am anxious to know.

Respectfully submitted, with an unabated desire to know the truth.

MACKNIGHT, JR.

P. S.—Will Bro. Grew reply in the EXAMINER to the paragraph on 2 Tim. 1 : 10, from my pen, in No. 10, p. 151, of the current volume ? With present light, I regard that text as irreconcilable with the theory of "a temporary life" for the wicked dead. If Br. G. can harmonize them I would be glad to see how he does it.

August 19, 1856.

CONCERNING EDITORS. — *The Evangelical Magazine* has an article suggesting the propriety of "Prayer on behalf of the Editors of Christian Journals." Mere human reason is an enemy of religion ; but true philanthropy goes hand in hand with the Christianity of the Bible. As philosophers, let us look at this subject with the seriousness which becomes it. If there is a single doctrine in the Bible reiterated in multifold forms, it is this, *That the blessings of the Almighty must be looked for authoritatively in the performance of duty* ; that is to say, in the rational employment of those means which are calculated to accomplish the end. We need not pray to be fed, unless we use means to procure food. The Church must first get a suitable man to be an editor ; to be such, he must be pious, educated, healthy ; neither of these three requisites has just precedence of the others. A man may be an educated infidel ; he may be a pious fool ; he may have piety and education, and yet dyspepsia may make him a ranting fanatic, a raving madman or a dogmatic driveller. Many an editor needs a pill more than a prayer. A worn out preacher is not fit for an editor ; no sick man is. There are editors of religious newspapers, whose piety we dare not question—on the contrary, we feel this moment, as if we would gladly exchange it for our own—and whose mental culture far exceeds ours, but whose intolerance of opinion, whose forwardness to publish the fallings and the failings of those of a different sect, whose impatient un-courteousness in editorial controversies, whose free dealings in ungentlemanly personalties, we would not possess for all creation. In fact, a most observable difference between the secular and the religious press, is this—that too many of the latter seem to riot in the freedom they feel, of security against being *called out*, to answer for the application of epithets, which men of the world would meet with a bullet.

It is a notorious fact, that the principal editor of one of the largest and most extensively circulated religious weeklies, is personally, in private life, one of the most amiable of men ; but as an editor,

hurls against his antagonist, whether a public man or of private station, epithets so hard, so severe, so unfeeling, so unforbearing, so vindictive, that we all see he needs only the power, to make him an inquisitor. Taking this man's piety for granted, in connection with his known previous amiability of temper, the only solution of the incongruity is, that severe application has made him dyspeptic ; and this it is, that has vinegarized the whole man, which has made him a lost pleiad among the delightful characters of his time. Many men, who are so fortunate as to have no taste for liquor, have no difficulty in declaring, that any man who takes daily a glass of wine or brandy can have no religion ; and yet these same men will over-eat themselves three times a day, until the stomach, constitution, temper, health, all are ruined, and the remainder of their days are spent in scribbling sickly sentimentalities for other people. To make then, the religious press of this country what it ought to be—the handmaid of the Pastor and the Missionary—supply each paper with an editor who has the most vigorous health ; who has the learning of an Anthon, the piety of a Payson, and the bonhomie of a Sydney Smith—with a salary, prompt and unconditional, of five thousand a year. Such a man is well worth it, and one of the best economics of the Church would be, to supply such an one to every religious newspaper in the country. *Hall's N. Y. Journal of Health.*

“Rap Him again, Sharply.”

It was near sunset when I found myself at no great distance from a cottage, which had attached to it a piece of waste ground, partly surrounded with a fence of high boards. While looking up at the many colored clouds in the direction where the sun was declining in the sky, my attention was arrested by the sound of repeated blows, which appeared to be struck on a soft substance. Blow followed blow in such a regular manner, that they reminded me of men threshing in a barn with a couple of flails, only the sound was much duller than that made by threshers.

All at once the blows ceased, and then I heard a man cry out, “*Rap him again, sharply, for he has a deal of dust in him yet.*” The moment I came to the end of the high fence, I saw a large carpet, stretched on a rope, between two poles, and two men beating it with all their might. The mystery was now made plain, and I no longer wondered at the words, “*Rap him again, sharply, for he has a deal of dust in him yet.*”

Now the thought may be considered a little fanciful, but it did occur to me that most of us have required, in our time, as hearty a drubbing as the carpet had received. “*Yes,*” said I, “*we all need to be tried, and chastised, and humbled, for we are proud, and selfish, and worldly-minded ; we think much of earth, and little of heaven ; much of ourselves, and little of our heavenly Father ; and beating is not more necessary to a dusty carpet, than trial is to those whose hearts are cleaving to the dust.*”

Now, considering the matter in this light, the wonder is not that we are beaten, but that we are

not always being beaten. Not that we should have affliction, but that we should ever be free from affliction, for we bring it upon ourselves by our transgressions.

"No earthly power can ward the coming blow, Sorrow and sin through life together go."

Truly, we have all been dealt with very tenderly; what mercy is mingled with the seeming severity of the words of the Holy one, when speaking of his people: "If they break my statutes, and keep not my commandments, then will I visit their transgression with the rod, and their iniquity with stripes. Nevertheless my loving kindness will I not utterly take from him, nor suffer my faithfulness to fail."—Psa. lxxxix, 31-33.

As I returned from my pleasant walk, at the very moment that I repassed the cottage and the high fence, the same voice which I had heard before cried out, "*There, let us take him down now, for he looks all the better for his beating!*"

"Well," thought I, "the beaten carpet was not at all likely to be forgotten by me before, but now it is pretty sure to be retained in my memory.—That it looks the better for being beaten, I have no doubt at all. My evening walk has not been in vain, for I have at least obtained a subject for reflection."

If we all more steadily believed that the rod is meant to purify us, or, in other words, to get the dust out of us, we might then sit more quietly under the merciful corrections of our heavenly Father? How does this apply to you, my readers? Have you been beaten, and are you the better for it? Have any of you been visited with trouble, and can you say, "Before I was afflicted I went astray; but now have I kept thy word. . . . It is good for me that I have been afflicted: that I might learn thy statutes?"—Psalm cxix, 67, 71.

"Look up! look up! when troubles frown,
That God may send a blessing down."

Hardly do I think that any of us reflect sufficiently on the value of our daily cares, which are, perhaps, after all, as necessary as our daily bread. When they draw us to our heavenly Father, we have indeed reason to be thankful for them. Sweet it is in the day of calamity and the hour of trial, to be able to cast all our cares on him who careth for us.

"Sweet in the confidence of faith,
To trust his firm decrees;
Sweet to lie passive in his hands,
And know no will but his."

O, the buffetings and beatings through which many of God's people have passed! Look over a small part of the "bill of fare," if I may so call it, of St. Paul's afflictions: "Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day have I been in the deep; in journeyings often, in perils of waters, in perils of robbers, in perils by mine own countrymen, in perils by the heathen, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren; in weariness and pain-

fulness, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness." Yet all these were blessed to him!

You might think over this subject, and see if you cannot turn it to more advantage than I have done. The words of holy writ are very encouraging: "My son, despise not thou the chastening of the Lord, nor faint when thou art rebuked of him; for whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth."—Heb. xii, 5, 6. And again: "No chastening for the present seemeth to be joyous, but grievous; nevertheless, afterward it yieldeth the peaceable fruit of righteousness unto them which are exercised thereby."

This little adventure of the beaten carpet often occurs to my remembrance, and especially so when my expected evil is overruled for good, or when my heart is humbled by any passing trouble. Again and again do the words appear to sound in my ears, at one time producing a smile, and at another an emotion of a much deeper kind: "*Rap him again, sharply, for he has a deal of dust in him yet;*" and "*There! let us take him down now, for he looks all the better for his beating.*"—Ch. Ad. and Jour.

TRUE PRAYER.—Would you see true prayer—would you know what prayer really is? Step into this Egyptian palace where Benjamin stands bound—his amazing and trembling brothers grouped around the lad. Judah advances. He bows himself before Joseph. His heart is full. His lip trembles. The tear glistens in his manly eye; and now, with tenderness thrilling in every tone, he pours forth his plea of surpassing pathos:—"Oh, my lord, let thy servant, I pray thee, speak a word in my lord's ears, and let not thine anger burn against thy servant: my lord asked his servants, saying, have ye a father or a brother? And we said unto my lord, We have a father, an old man, and a child of his old age, a little one; and his brother is dead; and he alone is left of his mother, and his father loveth him." Thus on he goes; and every sentence goes like a knife into Joseph's heart. And then he closes and crowns his appeal with this most brave and generous proposal: "Now therefore, I pray thee, let thy servant abide instead of the lad, as bondsman to my lord; for how shall I go to my father, and the lad not with me, lest I see the evil that shall come upon my father."—Joseph's heart, which has been swelling with emotion, is now ready to burst. He can stand it no longer; nor any wonder. This is prayer; and could we bring such earnestness to Jesus, oh, how would his tender, much more tender heart, melt like wax before it. Did we approach him with the fervor that glowed and burnt in Judah's speech: did we plead for our own souls or those of others, with such tears, in such tones, as Judah's when he plead for Benjamin, how would a divine brother discover himself to us? Now turn from that Egyptian to this Hebrew palace. There also is prayer. Two women stand before King Solomon. In the darkness of the night, one has crept with noiseless step to her neighbor's bed, and while the mother

slept, and the babe slept in her bosom, softly, cautiously, she steals the living child, and leaves her own cold, dead infant in its place. They carry the dispute to Solomon,—each claiming the living, and each repudiating the dead. With a skill that earned him his world-wide fame, the wise monarch summons nature as a witness. Horrible to hear, he orders the living child to be divided. The sword is raised,—another moment, and each mother gets a quivering half,—another moment, and interference comes too late. One stands calm, firm, collected, looking on with a cruel eye. With a bound that carries her to his feet, and a shriek that rings wild and high over all the palace, the other—the true mother—clasps her hands in agony, and cries, “Oh, my lord, give her the living child, in no wise slay it.” That is prayer. That cry, that spring, that look of anguish,—all these proclaim the mother,—how different from the cold, callous, unimpassioned frame in which, alas, the best too often present themselves at the throne of grace, as if, when we are seeking pardon, it were a matter of supreme indifference, whether our prayers were or were not answered. Oh, how should we pray that God would help us to pray, and touch our icy lips with a live coal from off the altar.—*Dr. Guthrie.*

Trust for Daily Bread.

Half the world are in distress about their temporal support. Society is full of men who are disheartened by want of success, and fear of poverty. Their schemes have failed; disappointment makes them sad and dejected, and they think that they shall come to want. But a pious man must not yield to this despondency, nor cease from exertion. Let him still labor patiently, and hope for better days. Though he may not be able to see behind the setting sun, or know how he shall obtain bread on the morrow, still let him work on as long as he finds work to do, and God will provide. The promise is absolute: “Trust in the Lord, and do good, so shalt thou dwell in the land and verily thou shalt be fed.”

Christians are guilty of criminal unbelief when they doubt the oversight and sympathy of God.—Poor, faint disciples! Have they not read that their “Heavenly Father knoweth that they have need of these things?” Let them yield up their hearts to a feeling of perfect trust, and they will find a happiness which no wealth can give. This sweet confidence in God takes away all the weakness into joy. Because of this child-like trust, many of the poor of this world, who were rich in faith—like the shepherd of Salisbury Plain—have been the happiest of men.

It is instructive to see how the poor saints are provided for. Yonder lives a widow who seems to have hardly the necessaries of life. Yet he who feeds the young ravens when they cry, feedeth her. He awakens sympathy; he creates a feeling of kindness in many hearts, so that her bread and water do not fail. One who had a long experience of life, declared, “I have been young and now am old, yet have I not seen the righteous forsaken nor his seed begging bread.”—*Review and Her.*

THE LAST WILL.—Said a Roman Catholic priest to a little boy whom he met by the way,—“What book is that under your arm?”

“It is a will, sir,” said the boy.

“What will?” asked the priest.

“The last will and testament that Jesus Christ left to me, and to all who wish to claim a title to the property therein left,” said the boy.

“What did Christ leave you in that will?”

“A kingdom, sir.”

“Where does that kingdom lie?”

“It is the kingdom of heaven, sir.”

“And do you expect to reign as a king there?”

“Yes, sir, as a joint heir with Christ.”

“And will not every person get there as well as you?”

“No, sir: none can get there but those that claim their title to that kingdom upon the ground of the will.”

THOUGHTS AND APOTHEGMS.

FROM ARCHBISHOP WHATELY.

Truth,—The Distinguishing Characteristic of Christianity.

THE question, “What is true?” ought to stand on the threshold of every religious enquiry.

If the question, “What is true,” be asked only in the second place, it is likely to receive a very different answer from what it would, if it had been asked in the first place.

That which is true and right loses, incalculably, its beneficial influence on the mind, when received on any ground than *because* it is true and right.

Truth is, in such an especial manner, the characteristic of the religion of Christ, that, in our Lord’s reply to Pilate, He points it out as defining the very nature of His kingdom, of His objects, and His claims:—“For this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth.” And when, on other occasions, asserting His claims, He says, “If ye continue in My word, then are ye My disciples indeed, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.”—“When the Spirit of Truth is come, He will guide you into all truth.”—“Sanctify them through thy Truth; thy word is Truth.” Thus, too, the Apostles repeatedly use the words “Truth” and “Faith” to designate the Christian religion. It is Truth resting on evidence, requiring Faith in it, on the ground of its truth.

The Christian religion made its appearance as the common disturber of the peace of the world, because it put an end to the tranquil influence of custom, authority, credulity, sentiment and imagination; forced men upon the disagreeable task of examining evidence, searching records, and proving all things; and arrayed in opposite opinions, children against their parents, subjects against their princes, and the people against the priest.

Christianity, contrasted with the Jewish system of emblemis, is Truth in the sense of reality, as substance is opposed to shadows; and, contrasted with the Heathen Mythology, is Truth as opposed to falsehood. “The truth as it is in Jesus” was

to supersede the heathen idolatry, by destroying it; and "the Law and the Prophets," not by destroying indeed, but by fulfilling them.

The Heathen Mythology not only was not true, but was not even supported as true; it not only *deserved* no faith, but it *demand*ed none. The very pretensions to truth—the very demand of faith—were characteristic distinctions of Christianity.

To believe in Christianity, without knowing why we believe it, is not Christian faith but blind credulity.

The word knowledge, strictly employed, implies three things; viz., Truth, Proof, and Conviction.

To say that there is the more virtue in Christian Faith, the less it is founded on evidence, is to forget that the Lord Jesus Himself—He who "taught as one having authority and not as the Scribes"—He who said not, as the Prophets of old, men *sent* from God, "Thus saith the Lord"—but, as Immanuel, God dwelling with his people, "I say unto you,"—appealed to his works as bearing witness of Him; and claimed the Divine "power to forgive sins," on the ground that He had the no less Divine power to bid the palsied cripple "take up his bed and walk."

The Apostles came forward rather in the character of witnesses, than as authoritative guides; and they work miracles and appeal to Scripture, not so much for the purpose of establishing their own right to deliver doctrines, as to *prove* the doctrines which they teach. And as with their first teaching, so also is it with the subsequent propagation of their religion. Though the Authors of the Gospels wrote, under the extraordinary superintendence of the Holy Spirit, those four distinct statements of evidence of matters of fact, yet it is not as the organs of inspiration they come forward, Their language is not, "Thus saith the Lord;" but, "He that *saw* it bare record." These things were "delivered unto us by those who, from the beginning, were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word." They have so shaped their writings as to avoid what the method of authority would require, and force forward what the method of examination would demand; and have thus shown pretty clearly their intention, that the religion which they preached upon the ground of evidence, should be maintained and propagated also upon the same ground. "These things"—says the Evangelist John, speaking of Christ's miracles, wrought in the presence of his disciples—"were written that ye might believe . . . and . . . believing ye might have life through His name."

It has been said by a modern writer, that "the poor ignorant uneducated peasant who says, 'I believe my religion because I have been told so by those who are wiser and better than myself; my parents told me so, and the clergyman of the parish told me so,' comes nearest to the answer of the Gospel,"—to that answer which the apostle Peter directs us to be ready to give "to every one that asketh a reason for the hope that is in us." And yet it is manifest this answer could have been

given, when the Gospel was first preached, by no *Christian*; but might be, and *was*, given by every one of his Pagan neighbors.

This is to represent the Apostles of Christ as saying to those of whom they would make converts, "Let every succeeding generation receive quietly the religion handed down by its fathers but let *this* generation act otherwise. Take up *novelty* for this once to oblige us, and ever after adhere to antiquity."

He who professes adherence to the national religion of England, on the ground that "it is the religion of his fathers," forgets, as do the hearer who applaud the sentiment, that, on this principle the worship of Thor and Woden would claim precedence.

In these our days, there are an immense number of persons, who, professing faith in the Gospel, and zeal for its support, yet assure us that enquiries into its evidences, are likely to lead to infidelity. What would such a person say of some professed friend coming forward as his advocate and saying, "My friend here, is a veracious and worthy man, and there is no foundation for any of the charges brought against him; and his integrity is fully believed in by persons who thoroughly trust him, and who have never thought of reasoning or enquiring about his character at all; but of all things, *do not make any investigation*, for the more you enquire and examine, the less likely most people will be to believe in his integrity!" Surely a man so defended would exclaim, "Deliver me from my friends, and I fear not my enemies."

Those who boldly stand out and court enquiry, and bring forward cogent reasons for their conviction, are reproached, by a certain modern writer, with infirm faith and timidity. Timidity of all things! One is reminded of the story of some Indian savages serving as allies to the British in America, who, when the allied force was attacked by the enemy, ran and took shelter in the woods, while the British troops stood firm under a heavy fire, and repulsed the assailants. It was expected that their Indian friends would have been full of admiration at this display of superior valor; but, on the contrary, their interpretation of it was, that the British soldiers were such cowards that they were *too much frightened to run away*. Almost every chapter of the New Testament convicts the Lord Jesus and his followers of that "timidity," in appealing to the evidence of miracles and prophecies, which is censured and derided.

The danger of decrying all appeal to evidence is not confined to a mere want of adequate evidence for the truth of the Christian religion, but something distinct from, and beyond, this; the danger, namely, of a contrary presumption arising. It is not merely, that men, to whom sufficient evidence has not been furnished, will be likely, themselves, to reject what has not been proved to them; but that men of all classes—the learned as well as the unlearned—will be likely to regard it as a positive evidence against the religion, that it professes to be calculated for mankind in general, and designed to claim their rational belief,

while its defenders themselves confess that the object can not be accomplished.

To labor to prove a truth, is to imply the possibility of doubt, and to challenge inquiry; therefore an appeal to truth, as resting on evidence, is the characteristic of a true religion, which alone can satisfy doubts, or stand the test of enquiry.

The kingdom of truth the Lord came to establish, is a kingdom whose subjects should have been admitted as such, in consequence of their being "of the truth;" that is, not mere adherents of truth by accident; but votaries of truth. "Every one that is of the truth heareth My voice."

He only is "of the truth" who, with reverential love, is seeking, in candor and simplicity, to learn God's truth, and, in earnest self-devotion, to obey it at all seeming hazards; after the example of Him who "came into the world to bear witness unto the truth."

—♦—♦—♦—

"I have Lived too Fast."

Such was the exclamation of the young man, Caldwell, who was convicted of embezzling money while acting as a Conductor on the Burlington Railroad, when he was arrested and told that he had been detected. There are volumes in that sentence, and it reveals the secret of his fall. He is a man of fine address, was one of the most popular of Conductors, had once a good character and good habits, was readily trusted, and had occupied positions of considerable responsibility. But he indulged his appetites and passions too freely; he was extravagant, associated with worthless and dissipated companions, and if he did not gamble, was compelled to exceed his income in his expenditure, to preserve appearances and defray his share of the expenses of the company he kept; and alas, in an evil hour, to meet these drafts upon his purse, he ventured upon the experiment of appropriating to himself a portion of the funds of the Company which were entrusted to him, and as the result, was discovered, arrested, tried, convicted and sentenced to the penitentiary. Disgrace and ruin followed hard upon his sin. His case is but another illustration of the text of Scripture, "The way of transgressors is hard."

Alluding to the phrase we have quoted, the eloquent counsel for the prosecution, in his concluding plea, said to the Jury:

"Ah, gentlemen, the pivot on which this sad drama turns is condensed into that single expression, "I have lived too fast!"—Pregnant words! they should fall from this Court Room like a tocsin, on the giddy whirl of young men below; the multitude that has watched, with varied emotions, but all with intense interest, the progress of this trial, should carry it forth and spread it in the saloons and in all the popular resorts of youth. "I have lived too fast." It is the most forcible, as it is the most graphic expression of the unhealthy life that characterizes—I shall be allowed to say—a multitude of young men in this beautiful city. In no town in the world do the centres of al-

lurement and temptation bear such a proportion to the population. Extravagance in dress, extravagance in living, dangerous extravagance everywhere is apparent to the observer, nor need that observer wear Puritanical glasses to see what I allude to. Perhaps it is the inseparable incident to the marvellous growth of this great city, and that when things become more settled, and the more conservative institutions of society become established, then their superior moral force will cause all other elements and tendencies to revolve around the true central influences of society."

Will not young men take warning from this melancholy case and avoid the rock on which Caldwell made shipwreck? They should realize that pleasure purchased at the sacrifice of morals and honor, are bought too dear. Let those who would escape the danger of dishonesty avoid saloons and gambling houses, and the company of those whose ways take hold on hell. Let clerks and others who are entrusted with money, never yield for a moment to the temptation to fraud, for one dishonest act paves the way for another, and no one who takes the first step knows where his career will end, what disgrace and suffering he will bring on himself, what anguish he will cause to friends who are deeply interested in his welfare. "He," and he only, "that walketh uprightly, walketh surely." The dangers of a city life for young men are appalling; but he who acknowledges God in all his ways, will find the promise fulfilled, that He will direct his paths.—*Congregational Herald, Chicago, Ill.*

—♦—♦—♦—

"Judge not according to appearance, but judge righteous judgment." John 7: 24. Because a man seems to die without being punished for his sins, is he therefore to be made alive again for punishment? "The judgment of God" is, that, he is "worthy of death." See Rom. 1: 32.

"Every eye shall see him," saith one. Yes: but, Whose eyes are intended? Not the eyes of "the world," for Jesus said, "The world seeth me no more," John 14: 19, 20.

—♦—♦—♦—

NEXT EXAMINER.—Our next paper will be issued between the middle and last of October.—We ask the indulgence of our subscribers, this once, if it should not appear till late, as we expect to be absent from home for the next four weeks. After that the regular issue will be twice each month.

THE OFFICE OF THE BIBLE EXAMINER is at our Residence, 61 Hicks street, Brooklyn; a short distance from Fulton Ferry: but in all cases address us as follows:

GEO. STORRS,
Box 4658, New York.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. XI.

NEW-YORK. OCTOBER, 1856.

NO. 20.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year.

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

WANDERING THOUGHTS.

In the last EXAMINER this subject was presented to our readers, and to the observations then made we add a few more. In this article attention is called to the ASSOCIATING PRINCIPLE, in the mind itself, as a chief cause of "wandering thoughts."

By the principle or power of association, we mean that law whereby every idea suggests or awakens a successor, the result of which is, that an infinite series of thoughts pass through the mind during our waking hours. A word, an object, a movement, calls up a crowd of ideas, and these of the most heterogeneous kind. Let the reader, though he never attentively considered the subject before, pronounce, as an experiment, any word, for instance book, heaven, blood, and watch the diversified thoughts that will instantly, as if by magic, appear and vanish in his intellectual firmament. How many persons he beholds! What lands he visits; what strange acts he sees performed, deeds of mercy and deeds of crime! What serious and fantastic, secular and sacred thoughts rise into view; in fact, a very universe of ideas moves before his inward eye, apparently without rule and without order, yet each succeeding idea is linked to its predecessor by an influence, which acts with a beauty and regularity as invariable as the forces that keep systems revolving round their suns. A man may as soon attempt to flee from himself, as to escape the law of association, to which his thoughts are subjected. Each new idea he forms or acquires is immediately brought under its control, as a drop of water falling into a river must yield to the influence of the advancing current.

To ignorance of this beautiful law, and the phenomena resulting from it, is chiefly to be traced the groundless sorrow of many, on account of their "wandering thoughts," and the only rational cure for this malady is to persuade them to stop and observe the unalterable functions appointed to their intellectual powers. In a pious man, thoughts flowing from this source are not, as has often been imagined, indications of depravity or of spiritual declension; they enter his mind, whatever be their character, by an unerring necessity.

That the principle we are illustrating may be

still better understood, as well as the folly of repining at those thoughts, continually stirred up by its agency, even when we wish to indulge in the exclusive contemplation of one theme, let us glance over some of the leading advantages derived from this arrangement in the mental economy.

One obvious advantage is, that knowledge is thereby impressed and retained on the mind; it is kept in perpetual motion, and is neither allowed to stagnate nor sink into the depths of memory, whence perhaps it could never be recalled. With what velocity do all our ideas, at least, the more prominent among them, pass in review before us at our command, and often without any formal call! Now it is a well known fact, that we cannot give permanency to an idea more successfully than by making it frequently the subject of attention, and this is effected by the associating law.—It must at times ascend into the broad day light of the mind, however rapid its flight across the vision, and speedy its descent to the crowded shades.—The oftener it thus comes into view, the more confident we may feel that it has taken up with us a permanent abode. It has now become a link in the grand revolving chain of thought and imagery. If an idea entered and never appeared, but by a special exercise of authority over it, thousands of facts and conceptions would be lost for ever; having not been engraven on the memory, by frequent presentation to our consciousness, they would early pass into hopeless oblivion. We lose much of our knowledge even with our most admirable mental economy; but if we were otherwise constituted, it seems impossible to conceive how man could ever have become wise and intelligent,—his life must have been consumed in tantalizing efforts to reacquire what he had often learned, and as often lost.

It may be irksome, when occupied in serious meditation, to have extraneous thoughts pressed upon our notice, still it must be evident, that though they are useless at present, they probably have intrinsic value, and it may be very important that they should be often seen, and thereby indelibly impressed on the mind. The oftener they appear, the better they are known, and if not needed on all occasions, when they happen to be suggested, it would be a grievous misfortune were they to vanish from our store of information.

One benefit accruing from this law is, it gives us command of our knowledge, and enables us to make selections from it as occasion requires. During the day our ideas are in company upon myriads pass through were we to attempt to arrest the would only increase their number.

while its defenders themselves confess that the object can not be accomplished.

To labor to prove a truth, is to imply the possibility of doubt, and to challenge inquiry; therefore an appeal to truth, as resting on evidence, is the characteristic of a true religion, which alone can satisfy doubts, or stand the test of enquiry.

The kingdom of truth the Lord came to establish, is a kingdom whose subjects should have been admitted *as such*, in consequence of their being "of the truth;" that is, not mere adherents of truth by accident; but *voluntaries* of truth. "Every one that is of the truth heareth My voice."

He only is "of the truth" who, with reverential love, is seeking, in candor and simplicity, to learn God's truth, and, in earnest self-devotion, to obey it at all seeming hazards; after the example of Him who "came into the world to bear witness unto the truth."

—♦—
"I have Lived too Fast."

Such was the exclamation of the young man, Caldwell, who was convicted of embezzling money while acting as a Conductor on the Burlington Railroad, when he was arrested and told that he had been detected. There are volumes in that sentence, and it reveals the secret of his fall. He is a man of fine address, was one of the most popular of Conductors, had once a good character and good habits, was readily trusted, and had occupied positions of considerable responsibility. But he indulged his appetites and passions too freely; he was extravagant, associated with worthless and dissipated companions, and if he did not gamble, was compelled to exceed his income in his expenditure, to preserve appearances and defray his share of the expenses of the company he kept; and alas, in an evil hour, to meet these drafts upon his purse, he ventured upon the experiment of appropriating to himself a portion of the funds of the Company which were entrusted to him, and as the result, was discovered, arrested, tried, convicted and sentenced to the penitentiary. Disgrace and ruin followed hard upon his sin. His case is but another illustration of the text of Scripture, "The way of transgressors is hard."

Alluding to the phrase we have quoted, the eloquent counsel for the prosecution, in his concluding plea, said to the Jury:

"Ah, gentlemen, the pivot on which this sad drama turns is condensed into that single expression, "I have lived too fast!"—Pregnant words! they should fall from this Court Room like a tocsin, on the giddy whirl of young men below; the multitude that has watched, with varied emotions, but all with intense interest; the progress of this trial, should carry it forth and spread it in the saloons and in all the popular resorts of youth. 'I have lived too fast.' It is the most forcible, as it is the most graphic expression of the unhealthy life that characterizes—I shall be allowed to say—a multitude of young men in this beautiful city. In no town in the world do the centres of al-

lurement and temptation bear such a proportion to the population. Extravagance in dress, extravagance in living, dangerous extravagance everywhere is apparent to the observer, nor need that observer wear Puritanical glasses to see what I allude to. Perhaps it is the inseparable incident to the marvelous growth of this great city, and that when things become more settled, and the more conservative institutions of society become established, then their superior moral force will cause all other elements and tendencies to revolve around the true central influences of society."

Will not young men take warning from this melancholy case and avoid the rock on which Caldwell made shipwreck? They should realize that pleasure purchased at the sacrifice of morals and honor, are bought too dear. Let those who would escape the danger of dishonesty avoid saloons and gambling houses, and the company of those whose ways take hold on hell. Let clerks and others who are entrusted with money, never yield for a moment to the temptation to fraud, for one dishonest act paves the way for another, and no one who takes the first step knows where his career will end, what disgrace and suffering he will bring on himself, what anguish he will cause to friends who are deeply interested in his welfare. "He," and he only, "that walketh uprightly, walketh surely." The dangers of a city life for young men are appalling; but he who acknowledges God in all his ways, will find the promise fulfilled, that He will direct his paths.—*Congregational Herald, Chicago, Ill.*

—♦—

"Judge not according to appearance, but judge righteous judgment." John 7: 24. Because a man seems to die without being punished for his sins, is he therefore to be made alive again *for punishment*? "The judgment of God" is, that, he is "worthy of death." See Rom. 1: 32.

"Every eye shall see him," saith one. Yes: but, Whose eyes are intended? Not the eyes of "the world," for Jesus said, "The world seeth me no more," John 14: 19, 20.

—♦—

NEXT EXAMINER.—Our next paper will be issued between the middle and last of October.—We ask the indulgence of our subscribers, this once, if it should not appear till late, as we expect to be absent from home for the next four weeks. After that the regular issue will be *twice* each month.

THE OFFICE OF THE BIBLE EXAMINER is at our Residence, 61 Hicks street, Brooklyn; a short distance from *Fulton Ferry*: but in all cases *address* us as follows:

GEO. STORRS,

Box 4658, New York.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. XI.

NEW-YORK, OCTOBER, 1856.

NO. 20.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year :

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

WANDERING THOUGHTS.

In the last EXAMINER this subject was presented to our readers, and to the observations then made we add a few more. In this article attention is called to the ASSOCIATING PRINCIPLE, in the mind itself, as a chief cause of "wandering thoughts."

By the principle or power of association, we mean that law whereby every idea suggests or awakens a successor, the result of which is, that an infinite series of thoughts pass through the mind during our waking hours. A word, an object, a movement, calls up a crowd of ideas, and these of the most heterogeneous kind. Let the reader, though he never attentively considered the subject before, pronounce, as an experiment, any word, for instance book, heaven, blood, and watch the diversified thoughts that will instantly, as if by magic, appear and vanish in his intellectual firmament. How many persons he beholds! What lands he visits; what strange acts he sees performed, deeds of mercy and deeds of crime! What serious and fantastic, secular and sacred thoughts rise into view; in fact, a very universe of ideas moves before his inward eye, apparently without rule and without order, yet each succeeding idea is linked to its predecessor by an influence, which acts with a beauty and regularity as invariable as the forces that keep systems revolving round their suns. A man may as soon attempt to flee from himself, as to escape the law of association, to which his thoughts are subjected. Each new idea he forms or acquires is immediately brought under its control, as a drop of water falling into a river must yield to the influence of the advancing current.

To ignorance of this beautiful law, and the phenomena resulting from it, is chiefly to be traced the groundless sorrow of many, on account of their "wandering thoughts," and the only rational cure for this malady is to persuade them to stop and observe the unalterable functions appointed to their intellectual powers. In a pious man, thoughts flowing from this source are not, as has often been imagined, indications of depravity or of spiritual declension; they enter his mind, whatever be their character, by an unerring necessity.

That the principle we are illustrating may be

still better understood, as well as the folly of repining at those thoughts, continually stirred up by its agency, even when we wish to indulge in the exclusive contemplation of one theme, let us glance over some of the leading advantages derived from this arrangement in the mental economy.

One obvious advantage is, that knowledge is thereby impressed and retained on the mind; it is kept in perpetual motion, and is neither allowed to stagnate nor sink into the depths of memory, whence perhaps it could never be recalled. With what velocity do all our ideas, at least, the more prominent among them, pass in review before us at our command, and often without any formal call! Now it is a well known fact, that we cannot give permanency to an idea more successfully than by making it frequently the subject of attention, and this is effected by the associating law.—It must at times ascend into the broad day light of the mind, however rapid its flight across the vision, and speedy its descent to the crowded shades.—The oftener it thus comes into view, the more confident we may feel that it has taken up with us a permanent abode. It has now become a link in the grand revolving chain of thought and imagery. If an idea entered and never appeared, but by a special exercise of authority over it, thousands of facts and conceptions would be lost for ever; having not been engraven on the memory, by frequent presentation to our consciousness, they would early pass into hopeless oblivion. We lose much of our knowledge even with our most admirable mental economy; but if we were otherwise constituted, it seems impossible to conceive how man could ever have become wise and intelligent,—his life must have been consumed in tantalizing efforts to reacquire what he had often learned, and as often lost.

It may be irksome, when occupied in serious meditation, to have extraneous thoughts pressed upon our notice, still it must be evident, that though they are useless at present, they probably have intrinsic value, and it may be very important that they should be often seen, and thereby indelibly impressed on the mind. The oftener they appear, the better they are known, and if not needed on all occasions, when they happen to be suggested, it would be a grievous misfortune were they to vanish from our store of information.

One benefit accruing from this law is, it gives us command of our knowledge, and enables us to make selections from it as occasion requires. During the day our ideas are in constant motion, myriads upon myriads pass through the mind, and were we to attempt to arrest their progress, we would only increase their number and accelerate

their speed. How useful this remarkable arrangement! Are we thinking on any particular subject, we can summon before us the facts and principles having any relation to it, with which we are acquainted; we have only to begin the work of reflection, and the associating principle, in a great measure, carries it on, and furnishes numerous cross-lights and illustrations from other departments of our knowledge. Each new idea is awakened by the one that preceded it; the will in this case, having set the train in motion. If ideas, when once imparted, returned not to consciousness, except as it were by accident, a fruitless task it would be to learn, or to attempt to propound wisdom. Every motive and encouragement, to store up information relating to the past, present, or future, would be enfeebled, if not annihilated, since no assurance could be rationally entertained, that it would ever be of any avail. Ideas, however laboriously got, or highly prized, might return to us, and they might not. Thus, after gathering knowledge, we would be obliged to rest satisfied with a vague impression, if happily, even that could be retained, that we were acquainted with certain subjects, if we only had power to bring forth our information, and in looking for its re-appearance, as for comets, we might need to spend months and years. In a mind thus organized, there could be no aberrations of thought, such as are usually complained of, but, assurdly at the expense of all continuous reflection, and all the advantages of knowledge. Again, suppose we had power over our ideas, with this proviso, that only one shall come and remain with us, during our pleasure, but that it shall introduce no companion and no successor. This appears to be a very simple and excellent arrangement; it would effectually exclude all "wandering thoughts," yet it would be miserably defective for the purposes of reflection and conduct. You observe, that in order to will the presence of an idea, there must be an impression that it is in the mind. In some cases we might be successful, but in how many, where no such impression existed, would our knowledge be irrevocably lost? Those who have been accustomed to much studious thought are well aware, that often, with no small astonishment, they have found themselves possessed of facts and arguments, of which they supposed they were entirely ignorant. These ideas, for time unknown, had lain dormant in their memory, and were unexpectedly quickened by the vivifying influence that streams from one idea to another. The utility of the associating law is strikingly manifested in those cases when we are wishing to recollect particular facts or sentiments, but find every effort directly to recall them utterly abortive. We are perfectly certain that they are in our possession, but they stand connected in the mind, with the particular circumstances in which they transpired, without a reminiscence of which they cannot be restored. Now experience teaches us, that if we can remember one of these events, the whole scene usually follows as a matter of course. We, therefore, endeavor to recollect the place, the time, the company, or the occasion when the facts occurred, or the observations were made, and having discovered one or more of these circumstances, the other events associated

with it successively make their appearance. Our ideas, thus put under our control, become practically useful, and by the rapidity with which they advance, we are enabled to select what is found suitable for our purpose on any occasion.

By the associating principle, the sincere worshipper has the sublime doctrines that kindle and nourish his religious feelings, hopes, and joys, continually and collectively brought to remembrance; the name of Jesus, for example, suggests his whole life, sufferings, and death. The believer sees him in the past, the present, and the future, and he is indebted to that law, which intersperses his meditations with foreign, and in the mean time, useless ideas for the boundless exhibition of sacred truth. Conducted, with immeasurable speed, over the vast field of religion, he can select the topic best fitted for his meditation, the promise best suited to his case, and the counsel best adapted to his peculiar situation.

From the preceding observations it will be evident, that the law we are considering may be successfully employed to furnish subjects of religious thought, of pure and tranquil joy to the genuine believer, whether he be at home or abroad. He has only to conjoin particular statements of revelation with surrounding natural objects and appearances. This, from the style of scripture, is easily accomplished. Figurative language is so abundant in the sacred volume, and generally drawn from objects and scenes as familiar to us as to the eastern nations, that these objects and scenes when beheld may, with a little care and exertion, be compelled invariably to suggest those passages of scripture where they occur either metaphorically or by way of illustration. For instance, with the mountains may be associated that sublime statement, "Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting thou art God."—With the rivers, the comforting assurance, "There is a river, the streams whereof shall make glad the city of God." With the green fields, the solemn memento, "All flesh is grass, and the glory of man is as the flower of the grass." And with the stars, the glorious reward, "They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever." Thus universal nature is clothed with inspiration. A voice is heard from every rock and glen, every mountain and forest, from the earth below and the sky above, discouraging to the christian, of sin and salvation, death and eternity, hell and heaven.

Before leaving this branch of the discussion, it is proper to give a word of caution and advice to the faithful, relating to the expulsion of these foreign and unfriendly ideas, that are suggested during serious meditation and sacred exercise; the advice is briefly, *when they come, let them go*. The horror and even disgust which they often create, tends to produce reflections about them, which only give the ideas a present and more permanent hold. To look at them is to retain them. In the majority of instances they would instantly pass on with the crowd, but the act of turning the eye toward them is an unconscious signal inviting them to remain.

The only resource is to compel the mind to return to the original train of reflection, and though it may struggle to be free, the effort must be continued till a triumph is accomplished.

Never let it be forgotten, also, that the voluntary retention of such ideas, impart to them the quality of crime, arising from the nature of the conceptions themselves, or the circumstances in which a disciple may be placed. The mere fact of their presence does not constitute guilt, for we cannot hinder them from entering our mind; but they may be of a character, that it is impossible to cherish them in any situation, without committing inward sin, or they may be lawful at other times, though most improper when their author is engaged in the solemnities of religion. We can never, without becoming criminal, voluntarily entertain malicious, covetous, invidious, or impure desires, which may be awakened by their relative ideas being suggested and dwelt on by the mind; and it would be no less profane to indulge in thoughts concerning worldly possessions and business, even when they are suggested during the worship of God. Here is danger which must be carefully avoided, and to be avoided successfully, we need to exercise unremitting vigilance and prayer. "Keep thy heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life." G.

NEANDER'S HYPOTHESIS

OF THE

PAULINE DOCTRINE OF THE FUTURE LIFE.

BY J. PANTON HAM, ENGLAND.

The eminent German theologian, Dr. Augustus Neander, through the enterprising labors of the popular publishers, Messrs. Clark and Bohn, has taken a distinguished place among our English theological literati, and no doubt is exercising some considerable influence on the religious sentiments of English society. Besides the scholastic repute of Neander, there is an air of ingenuousness, and the absence of polemical acerbity in his writings, which cannot fail to recommend them to that happily increasing class of readers, who refuse to hold parley with any author in whom candor and courtesy are not conspicuous qualities. Dr. Neander has, in addition to other important works, written a "History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church by the Apostles," a book which, as it is now within the reach of all English readers, may be profitably read by all. In this work the author discusses Christian doctrine in all its details, and as it is presented through the differing mental media of the first Apostles of Christianity. From many of the learned doctor's views, we are conscientiously obliged to dissent. Catholic as his mind was, and well furnished with all the apparatus of a thoroughly Biblical student, he does not appear to us to have escaped, any more than other men, those warping theological predilections, which give the aspect and coloring to our several views of Scripture teaching, and identify us with separate theological parties. We do not hesitate, therefore, to canvass the opinions of even such a man as Neander, whose piety and learning, while

they claim our reverence and modesty, cannot forbid the dissentient expression of our conscientious judgment.

Writing of the peculiarities of the Pauline doctrine, our author remarks, that Paul

"usually connects the doctrine of the eternal life of the individual with the doctrine of the resurrection, and says nothing of the life of the soul in an intermediate state after death, till the end of all things. The designation of death as a sleep in relation to the resurrection that is to follow, may favor the opinion that he considered the state after death to be one of suppressed consciousness like sleep, and admitted that the soul would first be awakened at the resurrection of the body, though in every other reference to death, he could describe it under the image of sleep as a transition to a higher existence. When in the Church at Thessalonica, the anxieties of many were excited respecting the fate of the believers who had already died, he only intimates to them that at the time of Christ's second coming, the believers then alive would not anticipate those who were already dead. But it might be supposed that had he admitted a continuance of consciousness in a more exalted and intimate communion with the Lord as taking place immediately after death, he would have reminded the persons whose minds were disturbed on the subject, that those for whom they mourned had already been admitted to a higher and blessed communion with their Lord, as the later Fathers of the Church would not have failed to have done."—*History of the Planting, etc.*, page 524.

The above is a very candid statement of the objection, on Scriptural grounds, to a condition of disembodied life in death for the human being.—But, strange as it may appear to some of our readers, Neander does not feel its force. He thinks he can furnish a satisfactory solution of the difficulties of this objection, by asserting that "in every other reference to death he (Paul) could describe it under the image of sleep as a transition to a higher existence." But it remains to be proved that Paul so described death, and until such proof is supplied, the assertion is merely gratuitous.

The chief stress of Neander's argument in support of a state of uninterrupted life even by death, is laid on what he calls "a progressive development of the divine life in communion with the Redeemer," by which we presume he means, that connection with Christ is the bond on which immortality or deathlessness depends, a doctrine which we cordially subscribe as, in our judgment, a clearly established Scripture doctrine; but, if in addition to this, we are to understand that the principle of immortal life is in some mysterious manner imparted to the believer at the time of his first spiritual union with Christ, which gradually develops the strength and perfection of its vitality, and which progressive development is not interrupted, but rather advanced by the dissolution of death, then our simple reply is, that we cannot find any scripture authority for such doctrine. To our apprehension there is nothing very intelligible in the phrase, "a progressive development of the divine life." Does our author use this term "life," in a literal or figurative sense? If the latter,

then it expresses a sense wholly apart from the subject under discussion, which is the alleged continuance, not of a figurative, but a *literal* life, during the season of death. To be pertinent to the matter in hand, we must understand the word "life" literally, and we repeat that we cannot understand what the learned author means when he talks about believers receiving "a progressive development of the divine life (existence) in communion with the Redeemer." This is a doctrine of regeneration which, however it may accord with German modes of thought, is to us neither intelligible nor Scriptural.

But of what avail is this theory of Neander's to the general doctrine of human immortality? Evidently none. The argument by which he would vindicate the doctrine of a continued life for the believer in Christ, during death, even were it a sound argument, involves the denial of a continued life, or essential immortality of men constitutionally considered. This "progressive development of the divine life," let it be observed, is only "in communion with the Redeemer." If therefore, it is begotten and perfected by the Christian doctrine and spirit it demonstrates, not the natural immortality of the soul, but a *communicated immortality through Christ*. This "progressive development" is described, by our author, *not* as a *natural*, but a *Gospel* or *Christian* development, and compels the inference, that, if there is a condition of disembodied existence and life in death, it is exclusively for believers in Christ, all others have no "progressive," and therefore no intermediate life, but cease to have any conscious existence in death. It is obvious that this theory is not broad enough to furnish a platform for the popular doctrine.

Neander has a plausible but a very unsatisfactory mode of accounting for the acknowledged fact that the Apostle Paul never makes any mention of the disembodied soul, and a state of existence between death and resurrection.

"The thought of the resurrection and everlasting life were in his mind so closely connected, that he would be induced to leave the interval between the death of believers and their resurrection as an empty space."—p. 526.

How they came to be "so closely connected" he explains thus :

"As long as he expected the Second Coming of Christ, and the final resurrection as near at hand, he had little occasion to separate from one another the ideas of an eternal life after death and of a resurrection; and in accordance with the Jewish habits of thinking, he blended them together in a manner that led to the idea of a certain sleep of the soul after death."—p. 527.

This explanation appears to us neither natural nor scriptural. It certainly is not natural to our life-loving race to take no account of so solemnly affecting an interval, however short it may be, as that between death and resurrection, and leave it as "an empty space," deserving neither our personal regard, nor even a mention. Nature, our nature, undoubtedly abhors such a vacuum as this. Our instincts will not suffer us to treat with indifference this mortal interval. If revelation makes

no authoritative deliverance on the subject, conjecture will labor to supply its place. The Platonic notion of the soul and its inherent immortality originated in the natural anxiety to fill up this unknown void in the best way possible. But it is conclusive against the hypothesis of Neander, that we have Paul's own declaration of the importance of being informed of this "interval." In his epistle to the Thessalonian believers, (who, it should be borne in mind, were so anticipating the *immediate* coming of Christ as to need a second epistle, to assure them that "the day of Christ" was not so nigh "at hand" as they expected,) the Apostle expressly says, "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep," etc. So far from describing the "sleep" of these believers "as a transition to a higher existence," as Neander asserts, the Apostle speaks of them as "the dead in Christ," who in order to a future life need to "rise" from the dead. Their state is contrasted with that of himself and those to whom he was writing, whom he describes as "we which are *alive* and remain." Now had these deceased believers been known to be then alive enjoying a higher "progressive development of the divine life," their surviving relatives would not have expressed such affectionate anxiety about their participation in the blessings of Christ's second coming; and supposing they were ignorant of this condition of progressive life, the Apostle would have comforted them by revealing it "as the later Fathers of the Church would not have failed to have done," and not by assuring them, as he does, their deceased friends would "rise first" from their graves, and be brought along with Christ to welcome and be united for ever with them who should be "alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord." But our author is not baffled even by this apparent insurmountable difficulty. He surmises, not indeed without some misgivings, that when Paul wrote his first epistles to the Corinthians and Thessalonians, he was not sufficiently enlightened on the state of believers after death :—

"It might happen that he was led to a more perfect understanding of the truth exactly at that point of time when it was required for his own religious necessities, and those of future generations."—p. 527.

To say nothing of what this mode of evading the difficulty implies in respect of the absolute value of the earlier Pauline writings, which are obviously reduced to a chronological and relative worth, it is quite sufficient to reply that the illumination of Paul's mind, as the apostle to the Gentiles, was not, we should think, mainly in the view of "*his own* religious necessities and those of *future* generations," without any regard for the *existing* generation; whom he was especially sent to serve. There is something very selfish in the view that Paul's illumination was specially "required for his own religious necessities," and moreover something singularly strange in the notion that such personal illumination should be needed for "*future* generations," to the entire disregard of the religious necessities of the apostle's own generation. The Thessalonian and Corinthian be-

lievers of Paul's own times needed as much apostolic light as their successors, and we should think would not fail to have all the light which their "religious necessities" required, especially as Paul had been officially set apart by the Head of the Church for their special service.

But Neander himself thinks, although he has ventured on this supposition, that it is weakened by the fact, that Paul wrote his first Epistle to the Corinthians about five years after that to the Thessalonians, in which he gives even greater prominence to the doctrine of resurrection, and the future life apparently dependent on that event. Only a few months elapsed between writing the first and second epistles to the Corinthians, and he thinks it unreasonable to suppose that Paul should have remained in ignorance of the doctrine of a continued and conscious life between death and resurrection during so long and important a period of his apostolical career.

"It is not probable," he writes, "that in the few months between the time of his writing the first and second epistle to the Corinthians, such a revolution had taken place in his mode of thinking on this subject."—p. 528.

Surely "it is not probable," nor is it probable that in his second epistle to the Corinthians the apostle should flatly contradict what he had written in his first epistle only a few months previously, and without explaining that his own mind had passed through a considerable change since he last wrote. We say "flatly contradict," because, if the 5th chap. of the second epistle is understood to teach a condition of conscious life during death, then it appears to us to be absolutely irreconcilable with the very emphatic teaching of the 15th chap. of the first epistle. It will at least be conceded that Paul *seems* to teach the state of unconsciousness during death in his first epistle; indeed our author, as we have seen, candidly admits this, as it is also admitted in the very effort he makes to reconcile the doctrine of the two epistles. If then Paul *only seemed* to teach such a doctrine in his first epistle, and made use of language, "that lead to the idea of a certain sleep of the soul after death," as Neander affirms, it was surely important for him to guard his Corinthian converts against such a misapprehension in his second epistle, especially as it is maintained that he there teaches in a very detailed and particular manner the opposite doctrine. But no cautionary or explanatory remark is made, and therefore, in our judgment, it is far more reasonable to conclude that the second epistle, instead of being supposed to contradict or even to qualify the contents of the first on this important doctrine, ought to be read and interpreted in the clearer and more positive light of the first. We cannot, therefore, accept the following conclusion of our learned and excellent author, which we are constrained to regard as both unscriptural and mischievous.

"From a comparison of the first and second epistle to the Corinthians, we may therefore conclude that Paul, even when in his earlier statements respecting the resurrection, he said nothing of the state of the souls of individual believers in

the interval between death and the resurrection, still admitted the uninterrupted development of a higher life after death, though he did not particularly bring it forward, as he was accustomed to sound all the hopes of believers on the resurrection of Christ, and to connect them with the doctrine of the resurrection; perhaps, also, he thought that last great event so nigh, and was so constantly turning his attention to it, that his mind was not directed towards the other fact. But as he became aware that the period of the consummation of the kingdom of God was not so nigh as he had formerly anticipated, he was induced to bring forward more distinctly a subject which had hitherto been kept in the background."—p. 529.

The reader cannot fail to be struck with the obvious *indecision* of the above language. We are told in the very same paragraph that Paul "admitted the uninterrupted development of a higher life after death," and yet he was probably so occupied with some other aspect of doctrine "that his mind was not directed towards" this "fact!" This "fact" was "kept," we are told, "in the background," not designedly, but because the apostle had made a mistake, during a large portion of the time of his apostolic ministry, in reference to the time of Christ's second advent!! When he was better informed on the subject of the second advent, "he was induced to bring forward more distinctly" this doctrine of conscious life in death, "which had hitherto been kept in the background!!" Such is our author's conclusion: whether the reader is content to receive it, must be left to himself to decide; for our own part, we unhesitatingly reject it, as we do the premises from which it is deduced.

It is somewhat remarkable that so enlightened and independent a writer as Neander should think it necessary to accept the popular construction of two or three disputed passages of Paul's epistles, and for the sake of that construction remain content with an hypothesis at once so questionable and unsettled as that which he consents to adopt. We cannot withhold the expression of our belief that the author's confidence in his own psychological system, has been even greater than his confidence in the authority of the apostle. Neander seems to assume that, on the doctrine of the soul, Platonism and Christianity are at one, and hence he approaches the New Testament as some of the earlier Christian Fathers did, many of whom were Platonic philosophers, and who received Christianity not so much as a religious revelation, as a system of the most perfect philosophy, and who "retained with their philosophical mantle, their philosophical turn of mind also."* We would not be disrespectful to our German brethren, to whom we feel ourselves under great obligation in most departments of literature, and especially in the department of Biblical literature; but in our judgment, their excessively speculative tendency, their apparent fondness of the vague and obscure, and their somewhat licentious phraseology, are against any distinguished success in the department of Scripture exegesis. The very simplicity

* Gieseler's Compend. of Eccles. Hist.

of the Bible is likely to prove the greatest stumbling-block to German expositors. The sacred writers were simpler men than modern scholastics commonly allow them to be. We question much whether they themselves were conscious of so many subtle sublimities as have been imputed to their writings. Their mission was to set the world right in matters of religious faith and practice, and it is no compliment to them when they are hailed as co-partners in the world's philosophies, and treated as co-equals with modern doctors of divinity. This kind of treatment the sacred writers have too commonly received. Neander himself has recorded this fact in the first ages of Christianity, and we believe that it has always been more or less true in the historic progress of Christian doctrine, down to our own time. "The new Platonism," he writes, "could not bring itself to acquiesce, particularly in that *humility of knowledge*, and that *renunciation of self* which Christianity required. The religious eclecticism of this direction of the spirit could do no otherwise than *resist the exclusive and sole supremacy* of the religion that suffered no other at its side, but would subject all to itself."* This intolerance of an unqualified submission to the authority of Scriptural Christianity has so successfully prevailed in the earlier periods of the Church's history, that purely human and speculative notions have become as thoroughly established Christian doctrines, as the traditions of the Jewish elders became incorporated with Scriptural Judaism.—Men hold these doctrinal innovations now, not because they are proudly intolerant of Scripture authority, but because a pious submission to that authority seems to them to require it. A knowledge of Church and Doctrine history would open the eyes of many of our Christian brethren to the unsoundness of their so-called orthodoxy, by revealing to them the circumstances and influences which have contributed to the rise and modification of religious doctrines. And a more thorough acquaintance with the Scriptures, and exclusive deference to their authority, would bring about a Reformation even more extensive and important than that in the 16th century, in which so much confidence unfortunately reposes, as though that were *par excellence* "the Reformation," and its conclusions ultimate and complete.

* "General History of the Christian Religion and Church." Vol. 1, p. 46.

STRICTURES ON BISHOP BULL.

Br. STORRS: *Dear Sir*—In the last number of March, page 95, a piece appears, headed, "On the Final Regeneration," in which we think the writer, (Bishop Bull) has quite mistaken the subject he treats on, and greatly mangled and misinterpreted the scriptures. This we say, with all deference for the writer of the piece, towards you, and towards the readers of the BIBLE EXAMINER.

Indeed, the writer of the following annotations, may be mistaken on his part; we claim no infallibility, or exegesis, beyond that which is common to all men, viz., to determine the sense of all writ-

ten language by a strict adherence to common sense, the propriety of things, the context in which the matter is involved, the sense of the writer, and the concurring sense, and ideas, expressed by writers of the same age.

Should you consider the following remarks of sufficient value to entitle them to a place in your paper, you will confer a favor on the writer, and possibly also, on your general readers.

1. The writer of the piece "On Final Regeneration," first finds fault with the 'pointing' of the present translation in Mat. 19, in which the subject occurs; and in the second place to affect and to seek to make the Evangelist, or rather Jesus, (who is the speaker) to teach that the word, 'Regeneration,' refers not to this life, but to the future—not to time, but to eternity; and in truth to merge the word itself into the resurrection, and as if the word, regeneration, was only consummated at, and in, the resurrection.

This is the representation of the matter wherein Bishop Bull, and the writer, stands at direct issue.

This discussion has its source, from Peter saying to his Master, "Behold we have forsaken all and followed thee;"—to which comes the reply, "Verily I say unto you, That ye which have followed me, in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." So I read the text.

Now how any one can seek a different 'pointing' and rendering of the text we are at a loss to understand. Our friend, and opponent, renders the passage thus: "Ye who have followed me, in the regeneration when the son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory," &c., by which 'mis-pointing,' as we call it, the speaker, (Jesus) is said, or caused to say, that the Regeneration refers not to a *state of being, here, and now present*, but prospective, and consequent on the resurrection from the dead! That such an idea should enter into the head of any one, is to us, totally unimaginal.

Most true it is that the apostles cannot be said to sit upon the twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel, until the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory; by which we understand his coming with the trumpet of God to raise the dead. Now, allowing this to be true, we ask is there no intermediate state consequent on believing Jesus to be the Messiah and the resurrection? We say there is, and called by the Lord Jesus, a state of Regeneration. This glorious state of being, this heaven-born state of bliss, our friend and opponent seems to be a stranger to, or at least virtually fritters it away by merging it in the resurrection, or making it consequent only in the resurrection. How unwise, how irreverent, how defective of the Holy Spirit to ask with a flourish, "What is regeneration?" thus, "In the Regeneration—what is that?" then instantly comes a disjointed, though self-applauding, reply, "Not in baptism, nor in the regeneration or renewing of the Spirit, as some have fancied, for neither of these significations will make good sense in this place; but in the Resurrection, which will be indeed a regeneration, or

second generation of men to life, after that life which they had in their first generation was extinguished, &c., &c.

This unsightly and unmeaning quotation is both irrelevant to the point and unscriptural in itself, and is more fitted to create the blush, with sorrow and shame, in its bare recital, than any other feeling.

In treating of the doctrine of regeneration, there is nothing inapposite or wrong in asking what it is, or what the term signifies; but we cannot help thinking that there is something, most wofully uncouth, not to say, indicating unbelief, and disrespect to the subject.

We next object to its caption, title, or style of introduction, viz. "Final Regeneration."

The word, *final*, to our conception, indicates a multiple, or something that stands in numerical order, or, as one of many. The regeneration spoken of in the New Testament, has no such designation, or signification; but is a *unit*, or a state of *one*, and not of many.

The term, "Regeneration," though always of one meaning and signification, is expressed in the N. T. under different words and phraseology. Thus "to be born again;" to be "created of God in Christ Jesus unto good works"; to be "a new creature," now "ye are clean through the word I have spoken unto you," &c., all of which teach and signify *Regeneration*, or that alteration, or changed life, in thought, spirit and action, inseparable from believing Jesus to be the Messiah of God. The opposite of which alteration, or change, or regeneration, being a state of unbelief. That the newness of life, here described, is immediate, present, and consequent of believing, is as certain as the shadow is the reflection of the rays of the sun on an intervening substance; or as the reverberation or echo of a stroke, on a piece of wood or metal. And, as it is said of one of the early churches, "as soon as ye heard of the gospel of your salvation, ye became followers of the churches of God, which in Judea, are in Christ Jesus." And as said on another occasion, "If ye keep in memory that which I preached unto you," &c.

That the whole drift and concurrent testimony of the N. T., or new Covenant, is all in the present, and active tense, thus: "*ye who have followed me*, in the regeneration;" or, as it may be expressed, "followed me, in my reign, kingdom or Messiahship,"—for to enter *this reign*, or kingdom, a man must "be born again." And this of course is immediate and cannot be a matter at, in, or after, the resurrection.

Here we can well afford to bid a final adieu to this controversy; but will simply ask a little farther indulgence, to show in scripture language, how this change is effected; its hope, aim, object or determination. Thus the Apostle Peter,—"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his great mercy has regenerated us to a lively hope, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and unfading, preserved in the heavens for us, who, by the power of God, are guarded through faith to the salvation prepared to be revealed in the last time," &c. Thus

we see 'Regeneration' to be something, 'according to the great mercy of God. (1) That it has for its object, 'a lively hope.' (2.) And that this hope originates, or is based upon the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." (3.) That it has for its ultimatum or consummation, "an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled and unfading, preserved in the heavens," &c. (4.) That this inheritance is attainable, at the 'revelation' of Jesus Christ, i. e., when he comes to raise the dead. (5.) . . . &c., &c. "Wherefore," continues the apostle, "having the reins of your minds girded, being vigilant, constantly hope for the gift to be brought to you, at the revelation of Jesus Christ." Now, my kind reader, attentively consider how apt, how consonant, how admissible, how ready to conceive, of such a 'Regeneration,' of such a renovation, of such a new state of living, and acting under; arising from so strong an evidence, viz., the great mercy of God—and the resurrection of his well beloved Son—and of the inheritance, and gift, to be brought to believers, at the revelation of Jesus Christ.

Also, to the same effect, see Paul to Titus:—saying, "For the favor of God, which brings salvation, has appeared to all men, teaching us that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world—expecting the blessed hope; namely, the appearing of the glory of the great God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who gave himself for us that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify to himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works."

Also, "For even we ourselves were formerly foolish, disobedient, erring, slavishly serving divers inordinate desires and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, and hating one another. But when the goodness and philanthropy of God our Saviour shone forth, he saved us—not on account of works of righteousness which we had done—but according to his own mercy, through the bath of regeneration, and renewing of the holy Spirit which he poured out on us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour, that being justified by his favor, we might be made heirs, according to the hope of eternal life." Thus, then, we learn what it is to be under the influence of regeneration, its mode and manner of action.

But then, mark, the incident is one thing, and the occasion of it, is another.

For the present, I must forbear. Entertaining the best hopes, and kindest wishes, I remain, my dear Sir, yours, in the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ.

JOSEPH ARMORER.

TRIUMPH OF FAITH.—During an earthquake that occurred a few years since, the inhabitants of a small village were generally very much alarmed, and at the same time surprised at the calmness and apparent joy of an old lady whom they all knew. At length one of them, addressing the old lady, said: "Mother—, are you not afraid?" "No," said the mother in Israel; "I rejoice to know that I have a God that can shake the world."

BIBLE EXAMINER.

New York, October, 1856.

AT HOME AGAIN.—Since our last issue we have travelled sixteen hundred miles, and made the acquaintance of several excellent families, which has well paid us for our labor. Those families will ever be remembered with lively interest. Our stay among them was short, but most agreeable; and we trust profitable to them and to us. Our principal labor was at *Reading*, Mich., some ten miles southward from *Hillsdale*. Br. A. N. SEYMOUR, resides there. He and his beloved wife have labored much in Michigan for several years. We trust they have not done so in vain. The Lord has greatly blessed their labors in the vicinity where they now reside. May those beloved families be abundantly blessed of the Lord. We parted with them all with mutual regrets at the necessity; but hope to meet again when our Lord shall return from heaven.

THE BIBLE EXAMINER may hereafter be looked for about the first and fifteenth of each month, as we intend the *semi-monthly* issue shall be regular. The EXAMINER for June 1st was by mistake numbered 10: it should be 11. This will explain to a *new* subscriber why he has "two of No. 10."—Our Office is at our residence, 62 *Hicks Street*, Brooklyn, a short distance from *Fulton Ferry*: but in all cases address us as follows:

Geo. Storrs, Box 4658, New York.

To new subscribers, who send us \$2 for the EXAMINER for 1857, we will send *gratis* the last eight numbers of the present year. Will our friends see what they can do to increase our list of subscribers immediately? We should like to know as early as possible how many we are likely to have for the next volume. Some, we expect, will leave supporting the EXAMINER on account of the "*Life from the Dead*" question. We are sorry, of course, to lose them; but we had rather part with them all than part with our liberty of thought and expression, which we have purchased with the loss of all earthly possessions and prospects.

"LIFE FROM THE DEAD: OR, THE RIGHTEOUS ONLY WILL LIVE AGAIN."—This work, of which we spoke in our last issue, is now ready to be published. Shall the issue take place? If so, funds must be had from some quarter, and we have none. Will all who feel an interest on the subject let us know

what they will do in the matter immediately? If they cannot advance money now, how much will you do when the work is out? Some have spoken already: shall we hear from others soon? About \$150 will be needed to issue the first thousand copies; and those who advance funds immediately shall have the amount returned in the work at the first cost, or the money refunded when the edition is sold, if they prefer it.

P. S.—Since the foregoing was in type we have received a note from "MACKNIGHT JR.," saying, "I have perused your MSS with much interest, and am anxious to have it published. I will take at least ten dollars worth of the work at first cost (or at the wholesale price) immediately on its publication."

If all our friends, who wish the work issued, and who are more able than Macknight Jr., to help, will be as prompt as he, the work would be out within a month.

"MAN'S DESTINY.—*Immortality*: Arguments from Nature and Scripture, by Rev. T. M. Post, D. D., St. Louis, Mo.; Reviewed by Geo. Storrs, Editor of *Bible Examiner*."

To encourage the friends of the cause we advocate to circulate this work, we will put it, *for cash* with the order, at \$15 per hundred. This is less than the first cost; but we hope that several thousands may be called for and then we shall be made whole, otherwise we suffer loss in issuing the work. By the dozen copies \$2. 40. Bound copies 50 cts. each, or \$3.60 per dozen.

THE TEXT BOOK.—We have learned from several quarters, that there are Methodist Preachers, out of the city, who use Prof. Mattison's arguments, in their discourses against our views, taken from his discussion with us, in some cases *verbatim*, actually writing them out and preaching them as their own. In all such cases our friends should be zealous enough to supply their congregations with copies of the "Discussion" itself. Let their hearers see that their ministers have worked with borrowed tools without giving the Prof. credit; and let them know that the originator—the notable Prof.—left the field of controversy in no honorable manner.

Now to help those disposed to work in this matter, we will put the Discussion, a pamphlet of 168 pages with covers, at twelve dollars per hundred copies for cash; or by the dozen, \$1 75. The retail price is 25 cents. Cannot some thousands be

scattered the coming winter in various parts of the country? Let all Methodist Preachers have this "text book" and their congregations be fully supplied with the same. Our friends all know how we were treated, at the close of that discussion, by the Prof., through the *Christian Advocate* of this city. The "*Discussion*" will tell the whole truth in that matter, only let it be scattered.

"SHALL WE VOTE?"—We answer—Yes, if you have common sense and common honesty. If you have neither take care not to. If you are determined to vote simply to sustain "*our party*," you may know yourself to be deficient in sense and honesty. Can you pray "for all in authority," that they "may rule in the fear of God," and "be just men," and at the same time refuse to exercise a right which God has given you to vote for such men? But "Christ and his apostles did not vote." Very true: but they lived under a despotism where no one could vote. Every man having such right, is, in our judgment, just as much bound to use that right in the selection of rulers as he is to pray for them when they are elected. But with *party* quarrels and strife a Christian man has nothing to do; yet peaceably to deposit his vote, under the influence of *principle*, according to his honest judgment of the rights of freemen, is by no means making him a "*meddler* in politics," but is the discharge of a duty towards God and men, without which he mocks God in praying for those "in authority;" because he has *not done* what he could to have "just men" for rulers. "But, Christ is coming to reign soon." Blessed news. We have deposited our vote for him and wish not to change it; but till his *inauguration* we have to be ruled by imperfect men. Let not our vote be wanting to elevate those who, in our judgment, will rule most in the fear of God. "But, I may mistake in a selection of rulers." Yes, and you may mistake in your prayers, or in searching the scriptures, as all have done at times; but that is no reason why we should not try to do better and do all we can.

We shall vote, if the Lord will. If Jesus comes while we are depositing our vote, we shall rejoice because he is our *first* and *only* choice for a *permanent* Ruler and King. But till he does come, having the right to vote for human rulers we shall do so with the same heavenly mind that we can pray for such rulers.

Yet, to all, we say, *Beware* that you do not become drunk with the political excitement of a mere partizan politician. Such a course becometh not a follower of Christ.

THE TRUE CHRISTIAN SPIRIT.—We sincerely pray that the spirit breathed in the following remarks, by DR. TYNG, may abound among all professing christians.

At a missionary Jubilee at Williamtown, Mass., several weeks since, the chairman introduced one of the speakers, Dr. Stephen H. Tyng, with the remark, that they "were most happy to have a representative from that ancient Church, at whose altars our ancestors were baptised."

Dr. Tyng replied: "I am much obliged to you, sir, for your friendly notice of the Episcopal Church as the 'ancient Church.' But I do not appear in any sense before you as a representative of that Church. I much doubt whether I should be generally considered by them as a suitable representative of their body at any time, and particularly now. The Tyngs are rather at a discount there just now. But I trust I may come as a member and representative of that much more ancient Church, the elect, spiritual Church of the Lord Jesus, established in the ancient settlements of his own covenant; that Church which excludes none who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity; that Church which embraces all in every nation who fear God and work righteousness."

BELIEVETH.—Mr. James Ruthven, of N. York, not long before his death recited slowly, emphatically, and with great weakness of voice: "'He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him.' What a contrast!" said he; "there is none in the universe like it. What vast consequences hinge on the question! *Believeth!* I would like to see that word printed in capitals. How simple and easy it is; and yet how many refuse to believe, and perish. Unbelief is the only sin which the Gospel does not meet. For this, it has no cure. 'Ye will not come to me that ye might live.'"—*Ch. Advocate.*

Civil law saith the murderer shall be hung; but he dies before his conviction, or after his conviction before the day fixed for his execution; but he is not made alive on that day to be hung. You say—"No, for the executive officers have not power to restore his life." Well, suppose they had such power, what would be thought of them if they should revive the dead criminal to take away the life they had restored? Could it be looked upon in any other light than as an act of barbarism or revenge?

MINISTERING SPIRITS.

FROM M. C. ALLEN, BLACK ROCK.

Br. Storrs,—I send the enclosed for publication in the "EXAMINER," if after perusal, you should think it might subserve the cause of truth. How many times have we heard it reiterated, that our departed friends are our guardian angels; and belief which has not a particle of truth upon which to rest. Thus I *once* thought, because older and more advanced Christians, advocated it. It was in years past, when *all* the church taught it and believed it was Christ's teaching.—Blessed be His name, He I trust, has taught me now to resort to the law and the testimony, to settle every question of my faith. I confess that in times past, unconsciously almost, I have uttered petitions to the dear departed! and was surprised at the time upon reflection, assured that it was sin, and unscriptural. Two professors, the other evening, were expressing their firm belief, that our departed friends were about our path. I had to combat them, which I did by first asking, what authority they could bring from Scripture? and if our departed were cognizant of us daily, how could it be, but that they must often be pained? Oh! is it not consolation sufficient, to satisfy the Christian, what God has given us in his word? "They are asleep in Jesus." "They shall appear with Him in glory." "It shall be well with the righteous," &c. &c.

Should you give the enclosed (which was taken from the New York Evangelist last week) a place, perhaps it might be more conclusive, or rather influential upon some minds, than if written by an advocate of our doctrines. I can respond to all the sentiments of the writer, excepting of course, the consciousness of those who are asleep; whom our Lord will awaken as He did Lazarus; when He shall call, "they shall hear the voice of the Son of God." That one who appears such a correct thinker, and whose sentiments on this subject, seem to accord with Scripture, should not see clearly the *whole* truth—is to me, most wonderful. Why is it that blindness in part, still rests on so large a portion of Israel? One with whom a short time since I was conversing, relative to our views of truth, observed, "I think all on your side study the Bible most thoroughly, which Christians generally do not." Quite a concession I thought.

Do Departed Saints Become Ministering Spirits?

A writer in a recent number of the *EVANGELIST* maintains the affirmative; and in the June No. of that able and valuable periodical, the *Presby-*

terian Quarterly Review, is a grave article advocating the same view.

But is it true? And what are the tendencies of the doctrine? That angels are employed as ministering spirits, is admitted as a Bible doctrine, abundantly taught, and the practical influence of which is good. But the reasons advanced in support of the doctrine that the spirits of departed saints are also employed as ministering to those yet in this world, appear to the writer of this, weak and unsatisfactory. First, in regard to the argument from "the light of reason," or what is called the reasonableness of the doctrine. While the saints made perfect are in some respects like the angels, in other respects they are essentially unlike them. They are of a different and lower order of beings, and are inferior in respect to their faculties, their manners, their knowledge, and consequently in the ability, to minister to those in this world of trial and temptation, and sin, and affliction, and death, in a way to benefit them. While the very connection which they have had with the affairs of this world from which they have so recently departed, would naturally serve, at least in the great majority of instances, still farther to unfit them for this important work.

Nor do the arguments, drawn from the Bible in support of the doctrine, appear any more valid. It will not be pretended that it is anywhere directly taught, unless the saints are included, according to Scripture usage, under the appellation of angels. But of this there is no good evidence. The distinction would seem to be carefully kept up throughout the Bible, between saints and angels. The Saviour, it is true, speaking of the saints, says, Mat. 22: 30, "In the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels of God in heaven." And again, Luke 20: 36, "Neither can they die any more; for they are equal unto the angels"—literally, "equally angels"—though the meaning evidently is that they are so in the respects mentioned; viz: their not being subject again to death, and their not marrying, or being given in marriage, like the angels. And there is nothing therefore in these passages which either warrants the conclusion that saints are ever included under the appellation of angels, so that what is affirmed of angels may be considered as affirmed also of them; or which implies that saints are endowed with the nature, or elevated to the rank, or called to the peculiar employments of angels.

Of the other passages summoned to the support of this doctrine, two only appear worthy of any notice. One is that where Moses and Elias are represented as visiting this world, conversing with the Saviour, and known to the three Apostles.—"And if," it is asked, "these two departed saints visited our globe, on this errand, why not on another errand? And if this be true in one instance, why may it not be true of the saints in numberless instances?"

The event of this visit of these two distinguished saints from the celestial world, is plainly represented as a peculiar and extraordinary one.—There was much that was miraculous connected

with it. They came not to minister to the disciples, but to converse with the Lord himself of the decease which he should accomplish at Jerusalem, and to furnish in this way a practical demonstration of the truth that between Moses, and the Prophets, and Christ there is no disagreement, that all are in harmonious concurrence.—The occasion on which they came was an extraordinary one; such as never before had been, and never will occur again. And from this visit, in an extraordinary manner, and on an extraordinary occasion, to the Lord himself, but a short time before His death, it cannot be justly inferred that glorified saints generally are accustomed to act as tutelary spirits, to guard and minister to Christ's disciples in the world.

The last, and perhaps the strongest passage in support of this doctrine is that in Rev. 22: 6-9. When John fell down to worship the angel, he was told, "See thou do it not; for I am thy fellow servant and of thy brethren the prophets, and of those that keep the sayings of this book, worship God." This language is only what this exalted being, whom John mistook for a divine being, might naturally and properly have used upon supposition that he was a real angel. When John would have worshipped him, "No," says he, "I am not a proper object of your worship. I am myself only a servant and a worshipper of Jehovah, like yourself, and your brethren the prophets, and those who keep the sayings of this book.—Worship God."

It is only what an angel might have said with as much propriety as any saint redeemed and glorified; and of course affords no evidence that this was an instance of a mortal become an angel, and their coming on an errand to our world; much less that saints are generally accustomed to come as ministering spirits to their friends or others yet in the world. The doctrine then, we must regard as a fiction, unsubstantiated by any evidence either from reason or Scripture.

TENDENCIES OF THE DOCTRINE.

It is seldom safe, often dangerous to adopt as articles of religious belief, doctrines not found in the Bible, or plainly inferable from its teachings. The one before us, we think, is no exception.—The Bible contains enough for the instruction and edification, and comfort, of God's children, without the necessity of resorting to such baseless fictions. It were a higher honor for mortals, and to my mind, much more cheering and encouraging, to be ministered unto by those exalted and glorious beings called angels, than to enjoy merely the ministry of fellow beings of our own comparatively feeble race, who have but recently left their clayey tabernacle, and have not yet had time to attain any great eminence, in knowledge, or wisdom or power. There are no doubt other employments, in which the just made perfect in heaven may be engaged, as honorable, and to which they will be quite as well fitted, as that of ministering to their friends surrounded with the darkness, and temptations, and dangers of this world, from which they have barely escaped through divine grace.

As to any motives to holiness which the doctrine is supposed to present. There are motives sufficient presented in the Bible. And he who does not find in the consideration that he is under the inspection of high and holy angels, whose ministry it is his privilege to enjoy, and especially that the eyes of God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are ever upon him, "a stimulus to high and holy living," would be little likely to feel such a stimulus from the belief that departed Christian friends whom he hath known only in their imperfection, are near, noticing all that he thinks and does.

In regard to its alleged tendency to comfort surviving friends of the pious dead. We are not left to such a doubtful source of comfort. The word of God presents numerous and more substantial sources of comfort to all who are entitled to receive comfort. While some perhaps might derive a kind of satisfaction from the belief that their departed friends are still near, and knowing all about them—to reflecting minds generally, I apprehend, it would minister neither comfort, nor satisfaction. I once heard a ministerial brother remark, over the corpse of his departed companion—how much more comforting to him was the thought that the spirit of the loved one was now in heaven, there to continue, participating in its joys and employments, until his own time should come, to be called home to that abode of the redeemed, than would be the thought that, according to a quite common notion, she was still hovering around, without any definite, or fixed place of abode.

But my last and strongest objection to this doctrine is, its tendency to superstition, with which it is very nearly allied. If it be true, that "departed spirits are about us, conscious of our circumstances, suggesting thoughts to our minds, and seeking our good, though veiled from our sight," then how natural that we should present to them our requests, and invoke their influence in our behalf in heaven, as the Romish Church are accustomed to do. The practice of praying to the saints is neither unscriptural or absurd.—And if they are thus near us, how natural and reasonable also to suppose that they would if possible, devise some method whereby to make known to mortals their presence and hold communication with them. The principles and practices of those who are carried away with the spirit rapping delusion, as well as the superstitious and idolatrous practice of praying to saints adopted by the Romish and other Oriental Churches, are only the natural and legitimate results of a belief in the doctrine we have been considering.

We must therefore consider the doctrine not only as destitute of any support, but as positively evil in its tendency and influence. R. M.

From Wm. M. Ross, Weston, C. W.

Br. Storrs.—As some of your subscribers have expressed their opinion on the question that has been so much discussed (i. e. the resurrection of the wicked dead,) you will I hope not be offended if I also express mine. After paying the greatest

attention to what has been said on both sides of the question, I cannot agree with either; but I think that the truth lies between two extremes.—In the first place, that text in John 5: 28, 29, speaks so positive of “the resurrection of life.” and “the resurrection of damnation” that I feel bound to believe it, especially as Paul confesses that he believed in a “resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust, Acts 24: 15.” Then again, on the other side of the question I do not see any thing in that text, or any other that teaches me to believe that all the wicked dead who have ever lived since Adam must rise in the resurrection of damnation. On the contrary it is clear, that the Lord judged the old world in the days of Noah, and executed judgment upon all the wicked of that age; and surely a just God will not punish twice for one transgression. It is also the same with the inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah; the Lord came down and judged them, and they suffered the vengeance of eternal fire once. Must they suffer it again? I think not; for Jesus said, it should be more tolerable for them than for the cities in which he preached. But how can that be if the Sodomites must rise and suffer again? If the Sodomites do not rise, then we can see how it is more tolerable for *them*, if they have nothing more to suffer, than for those who have to rise and suffer the vengeance due to their crimes. But if both have to rise and to suffer alike, then the reverse must be the case. In short, I think that whenever any of Adam’s race have died under the infliction of any judicial punishment for their sins, as was the case of the Old World, in the days of Noah, the inhabitants of Sodom and the cities of the plain, in the days of Lot, the Egyptians, whom the Lord overthrew in the Red Sea, and Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and all that company whom the Lord caused to be swallowed up by the earth opening her mouth and swallowing them up, and all the wicked in every age who have received *from the Lord* judicial punishment for their sins, *they will not rise*, for the Lord’s anger towards them “has ceased” in their destruction. But the wicked who have fared sumptuously, like Dives, and robbed the poor; and died comfortably in their beds, and were buried perhaps with great pomp; and all who have not received from God’s hand a due recompense for their deeds must arise again, for God will “by no means clear the guilty.”

May the Lord grant that you and I, dear Brother, may receive the forgiveness of all our sins, though Jesus Christ our Lord, in the day of his appearing, together with all his saints. Amen. I remain your Brother in Christ,

WM. M. ROSS.

From M. C. ALLEN.

I am glad the discussion—“Will the wicked dead be made alive?”—has closed; because with you, I think all the arguments on both sides have been exhausted. I have no regret that it has been discussed. It will lead thinking minds to search, that they may know what God the Lord has spoken in relation to the end of sinners. As for myself, I have thought much upon the subject (since

it has been brought forward;) connected it with prayer, that I might not believe an error regarding it. The result is, that I am more confirmed in the belief, that as many of them *enjoy* all that their hearts wish in this life, realizing *no wrath*, “they are reserved for the day of wrath, and righteous indignation;” for they must be made to see, *what* they have lost, and weep and wail, ere their miserable existence becomes extinct.

I cannot close without expressing my regret, and even disappointment, in not receiving an “EXAMINER” the first inst. One was, I thought, as much as your subscribers should expect in August, as we had such an amount of precious reading, in the arguments reviewed of Post’s. I think I have received more sound scriptural instruction from the EXAMINER, since I became a subscriber, than from any other religious periodical to which I have subscribed;—and I believe I may say in truth, any of the books (and they are not a few,) that I have ever read professing biblical teaching. I do want to hear from friends abroad, professing like precious truths. Do you receive any communications from them, these days?

That the Lord may lengthen your days, and strengthen you more and more, to advocate His revealed truth, is the prayer of

Your friend, looking for eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Black Rock, September 9th.

NOTE BY EDITOR.—We thought our friends understood that the *Review* of Dr. Post, which we sent to all our paying subscribers, was in lieu of four regular EXAMINERS. That being our statement, we presumed they would look for only *one* each month for the four months following that issue. We find, however, that several have misunderstood us. The regular *twice* a month issue may be looked for in November and December.

From Samuel Mason, Conn.

Br. Storrs,—It is not to bid you “farewell” that I write. No, the EXAMINER and its Editor are too precious to part with on any such easy terms. I would much rather say, make me a visit *every week*, although you may advance some views which do not exactly coincide with my own; and peradventure you may undermine some theory that is cherished by me as a sweet morsel. But still, I am willing, at any time, to lay down fifty errors for one truth. Truly, dear Brother, I did think I had the truth on my side, when I believed the wicked would have a resurrection from amongst the dead, to LIFE. But I must confess, you have almost persuaded me to believe, that those who have not Christ formed within, the hope of glory, “shall not see life;” and to exclaim with the Psalmist of old, “thou *hast* rebuked the heathen, thou *hast* destroyed the wicked, thou *hast* put out their names for ever and ever,” Ps. 9: 5. Their names are blotted out of the book of remembrance spoken of by Malachi 3: 16; they have passed away, and lo they are not. “Yea, I sought them, but they could not be found.” Or, as Job says,—“The dwelling place of the wicked

shall come to naught;" or as it reads in the margin, "not be." So if the Lord keeps no book of remembrance of the wicked, and they have no place to exist in, how can God find them if they have perished out of existence? Or, where has God promised that he would bring the wicked dead again to life?—Where? The word of God tells me—"The soul that sinneth, it shall die"—"it shall not live."—"The wages of sin is death;" not death and a resurrection to life; for Jesus says, "I am the resurrection and the life,"—"he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live;" John 11: 25: Then they must believe in Jesus, or they cannot live. Do the wicked believe in Jesus?—No. Then how can they live again, if they are once dead? "They shall not live," saith the Lord. But if the wicked should attain a resurrection to life, must it not be through their father the Devil? And I cannot see any possibility of it from that source, for he is a life destroyer, not a life giver. Besides, Jesus will destroy the Devil when he comes. Then they will not get life through the devil; and they cannot get life through Christ. Again, I ask where will they get their life? If they do get their life from Christ, they cannot die any more; for I read—"they that shall be accounted worthy to obtain the resurrection of the dead, shall be equal to the angels"—can "Die no more." Then if the wicked are accounted worthy to obtain unto the resurrection from the dead, they cannot die any more, but are immortal; thus we get "Universal Salvation!" "God says—the soul that sinneth it shall die," Amen.

In conclusion, dear Brother,—I would say, "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good;" and "whatsoever thine hand findeth to do, do it with all thy might," until Jesus shall come, who has said, "Occupy till I come." He has given you his word to guide you, and his Spirit to direct you; and has told you that all his word is profitable—that we must live by every word of God—that he is our Lord and Master. How then can you be circumscribed in your labors to the narrow limits of any human creed, oral or written? I would say to you, Take the whole length and breadth, the height and depth, the center and circumference of the word of God—the Book of Inspiration—as the field of your labors. And in this glorious field, I hope wherever the Lord shall direct, you will be found faithfully and joyfully occupying till Jesus shall come; then may you receive the blessing, "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom," is the prayer of your unworthy patron.

From John Ferree, Lexington, Mo.

Br. Storrs,—I have before me a letter in which you are assailed, which I will send you, and you can answer for yourself. I will give you a brief history of the past, and the cause that brought the letter. It is well known to yourself that I have been a reader and supporter of the BIBLE EXAMINER ever since its first publication, which was before I came to this country. On coming to this place I found the "Christian Church," so called, or otherwise known as followers of Alex. Campbell, at war; two hostile parties, viz., "majority

and minority," arrayed against each other, ready at times to go into a street fight, and finally resulting in a separation, and a new organization "of the minority," which went by the name "of South Street Church." After being strongly solicited to become a member of that party, by laying aside my peculiar views, or holding them as private property, which I refused to do until they were proven wrong. But this they never undertook to do, but concluded to take me in as I was. After a few years this church on account of incessant quarreling fell through. I then became a regular attendant of the "North Street Church, or majority party." At length I was warmly solicited to join the Church by one of the Elders; ("Lords over God's heritage,) after reflecting for some time and again being solicited, I united with the party, without a dissenting voice, although my views were known to many of the Church. After being a member for more than two years, I was called on by another of the Elders, and again by three of them, requiring me to hold my views privately, or nothing but an expulsion from the Church would satisfy them. This was the only argument they could offer to show that I was wrong. The only chance of defence that I had left was, if possible, to secure a withdrawal letter, which was granted without the privilege of making any defence; a copy of which I will send you, as follows:—

"Whereas, John Ferree holds sentiments upon the final destiny of the wicked, and as to the state of the condition of the dead between death and the resurrection, different from the views of this church, and for which it has no fellowship, and to avoid difficulty and save all feelings upon the subject, he asks that his connection with the church be dissolved; which request is hereby granted, without prejudice to his moral character, as in that respect his standing among us is fair.

"A copy of an extract from the minute of the proceeding at a meeting of the Church of Christ, in Lexington, Mo., 3rd Lord's day in January, 1856. JOHN E. BASCOM, Clerk."

By the above letter, it will be seen, that they are as truly sectarian and creedized as any other Church that can be found, notwithstanding their broad profession of taking "the Bible for their rule of faith and practice." A short time after this I sent a copy of the BIBLE EXAMINER, Vol. 8, No. 5, 1853, to Elder Allen Wright, "a Preacher of the Gospel of Christ" in the above named Church, accompanied by a note calling his attention to your article under the head of "the rich man and Lazarus," requesting him to examine the article and say whether it was the true exposition or not; and if not, to give me the true explanation of the figure. The following is the result, which I submit for your consideration.

Yours as ever in the hope of the Gospel,

JOHN FERREE.

LETTER OF ALLEN WRIGHT TO FERREE.

At Home, June 17th, 1856.

"Friend Ferree,—Some months since I received a number of a work styled "BIBLE EXAMINER, accompanied with a note from you requesting me to examine the Examiner; and to report my convictions, &c.

I find several items scored around with a pen, as I suppose to call my attention to those items. Among other items I find an exposition of the case of the rich man and Lazarus, given by the Editor. The rule laid down by Mr. Storrs is a good one in general, *viz.*, to make the context assist in explaining the passage. The 17th verse is regarded by the editor, as the "Key" to unlock this passage. I do not think Mr. Storrs has followed the rule laid down by himself. Why lay hold of the 17th verse as the "Key" and entirely overlook the "context?" unless to support his fanciful and far-fetched interpretation. Why not make the 18th verse the "Key," as it stands in immediate connection?—The "context" to a man with an "eye single" clearly shows that our Lord aimed a blow at the sin of "covetousness," the *end* of which he portrays in the case of the "Rich man and Lazarus." Any other interpretation is a perversion of this deeply interesting passage, and the lesson designed to be taught by our Lord is lost upon Mr. Storrs' hypothesis. Judging from the contents of the work before me, Mr. Storrs' mission is, mainly, to demonstrate that man is but little, if any, superior to an ox, or an ass; and the number before me has about convinced me that he belongs to the latter class. To be candid with you, friend FERREE, the whole work smells of the kind of "wooden nutmegs," "patent bacon hams" and spirit rappings, that it is an unsavory dish to me; it may be suited to the palate of dyspeptics, but will be repudiated by those of healthy minds. Solomon, the King of Israel, lived a long time ago, and may be regarded by many in this age of progress as an old "foggy," but he uttered many plain, home truths? Among others the following, see Prov. 26 : 7. "The legs of the lame are not equal; so is a parable in the mouth of fools." Thus have I briefly but candidly given you my convictions on the premises as you requested me in your note. I have been quite unwell for several days with "bad cold" and I am very nervous. Please excuse this scribble, wishing you health, mercy, and peace. I am respectfully yours,

ALLEN WRIGHT.

The above letter is a true copy of the original.

JOHN FERREE.

NOTE BY ED. EXR.—We do not think Mr. WRIGHT needs any reply from us. That he is a "dyspeptic" is a self-evident truth. No doubt he is "very nervous" and "quite unwell," and that he has a "bad cold" is also clear. He seems afraid he may be thought an "ox or an ass;" and to prove he is not, he is quite disposed to admit the Editor of the EXAMINER is "the latter;" forgetting that such a very modest epithet towards one of Adam's posterity convicts himself of no distant relationship to the despised "animal." How exceeding appropriate for his private meditation and use are the words of one of the lawyers to Jesus—"Master, thus saying thou reproachest us also." See

Luke 11 : 44, 45. If he has any self-respect left, we trust he will not write again till his "nervous" excitement has abated.

The following is Br. Ferree's reply to Mr. Wright's letter.

Reply to Allen Wright. •

BY JOHN FERREE.

Lexington, Mo., July 10, 1856.

Friend Wright.—Your note of the 17th, was received in due time. I was much surprised at receiving it at so late a date, and still more so when I saw the arguments you made use of to convince me of the error into which you think I have fallen. They are so strong I will not attempt to refute them; they are too carnal. I did not think a Preacher of the Gospel of Christ would deal in such stuff; really, I did not think the queries I made needed any such ridicule and burlesque, or that I should be called a fool or pronounced a dyspeptic. Surely, friend Wright, you have forgotten the precepts and examples of your Master and his apostles; one of the precepts is, "Love thy neighbor as thyself," if I have fallen "among thieves and robbers," and you like the "Levite pass by on the other side" and cast contempt and ridicule into the "wounds and bruises," instead of the "wine and oil" of the Gospel—"to the law and testimony, if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."—But mark the words you speak. They are not to be found in "the law" or "the testimony." Again, the testimony says, "if thine enemy hunger feed him, if he thirst give him drink; naked clothe him," by so doing ye shall heap coals of fire on his head. But what is the food you and the church gave me to eat? It is, "fool"—"dyspeptic," "he is crazy, mad, and not fit to talk to." These and such like are the arguments used against me; just such language as the "Scribes and Pharisees" used to Christ and his Apostles. If I am wrong, why revile me? revilers never convinced any man, and never will.—The words of Paul to Timothy, do not say, revile them, but "teach them with sound words and doctrine, that you stop the mouth of gainsayers, that the word of God be not blasphemed." But what is your teaching? If I am capable of judging, it amounts to little less than blasphemy, instead of the words of Christ which are "peace and love." If I am a "dyspeptic" (as you intimate in your letter) it is trying to digest some of the food you have from time to time given me from the pulpit: some of which was so hard I could not even chew it; and of course it brings on "dyspepsia." I will name some of those hard articles of food. 1st.—The idea of God all wise and just casting sinners into "hell," or purgatory, (I cannot call it by any other name) and tormenting them for thousands of years until "the day of judgment," and then taking them out of hell, and judging them, and casting them back again; working an eternal miracle to keep them alive in "endless sin and sufferings," in the face of the positive declaration of his word, "All the wicked will God destroy"—"And the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord

of Hosts, that it shall leave them *neither root nor branch*." How to reconcile the torment of the sinner through innumerable ages, with the character of God and his word is more than I can digest. 2d. You have asserted from the pulpit that "David's Throne was translated to Heaven," without giving one ray of evidence how this great wonder could have been overlooked and no history or record of the fact, and be left for the mere presumption of yourself, is something I am not capable even of chewing. 3rd. You said in a discourse, from the text where Paul says, "we wrestle not with flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers and spiritual wickedness in high places," (I quote from memory,) you stated that this "spiritual wickedness was the wicked spirits of dead men floating about in the air with which we had to contend." This is a hard dose, and cannot be digested except by "*those of healthy minds*." And I think they should not say one word against "spirit rapping," but should join that party; for if they are floating about in the air, and we have to contend with them, I do not see why they may not rap, kick, overturn tables, &c. I do think that my friend Wright, after all this presumption, ought to deal in "wooden nutmegs, patent hams, and spirit rapping." And as you have assailed my much beloved Brother STORRS, with whom I am personally acquainted, and from whom I have taken sweet counsel, as being an "ass," as you have stated, I will hand your letter over to him, and let him answer for himself. And if he cannot bray as loud and long as some of his *brothers*, he can, at least, bray to as good purpose. The above may seem severe, and if it does, I have only followed the example of a (professed) preacher of the Gospel of Christ.

Yours respectfully,

JOHN FERREE.

From W. B. Wade, Indiana.

Br. Storrs.—It will be a pleasure to me at all times to do what I can to sustain your valuable paper, but there is such an amount of prejudice here in the minds of many that they can neither be induced to hear or read any thing on the subject of our blessed hope. One reason for this is, we have so many Isms here, of all kinds, that the people have no desire to know anything else. We have Methodism, Presbyterianism, Baptistism, Universalism, Catholicism, and I do not know how many other Isms, and among all the rest we have a good deal of spiritualism. So you see that in such a community it is hard to do much for the Bible and its truth: nevertheless there are a few even in this place who are willing to take their stand on the Bible, and the Bible alone; and who have moral courage to advocate its truth, and the doctrine it teaches. We are well united and have preaching occasionally by Br. S. A. Chaplin, and Br. French. I thank you for the book you sent me a short time since, *viz.*, your Review of Dr. Post on the Destiny and Immortality of man. I think it is an excellent work, and will do good.

Reply No. 4 to Macknight, Jr.

BY HENRY GREW.

It is necessary for me to correct a misapprehension of my brother M. If he and our readers will please review my articles, it may be perceived, that although I have argued for a reference to "the dead" *in general* in Luke 20 : 37, 38, ("for ALL live unto him,") *this is not the main point of my "confidence."* The subject of that confidence, which is *undiminished*, is that our Lord's conference with the Sadducees on this occasion, gives no sanction to the sentiment of my brother's paraphrase of the non-resurrection of the wicked. The intelligent reader will perceive the difference between the passage "*not proving* the re-living of the wicked dead," and *disproving* it. If this passage proves the resurrection of the righteous only, other passages adduced by me as clearly prove the resurrection of the wicked. It remains for my respected friend to reconcile these divine testimonies with his views. I assure him he has much to accomplish yet before he will realize his expectation of seeing Br. Grew "abandon the doctrine of the revival of the wicked dead." He has, as yet, but entered on the threshold of the subject. As for his "confidence in the potency of truth," this is a two-edged sword, and may yet slay brother M's present opinion. I leave the reader to estimate the value of the representation, that if he happens to agree with Br. Grew he must be *prejudiced*.

Our brother wishes to know what I believe to be the true import of the two verses, Luke 20 : 37, 38. In reply, I remark that to ascertain "the true import" of any passage of divine revelation, it is necessary to compare it with other passages relating to the same subject. Scripture is its own interpreter.

"Now that the dead are raised," &c. *What dead?* The previous verses clearly teach that the *righteous* dead will be raised, and *on this ground*, they now are considered as living to God in the 38th verse; which declares that "ALL live unto him." Now if the true prophet of God had given us no other instruction on the doctrine of the resurrection than we find in this conference with the Sadducees, the word "ALL" in ver. 38 might be considered as limited to the righteous, but as the Saviour has plainly and unequivocally affirmed in John 5 : 29, a resurrection of the wicked, and as it is on the ground of a resurrection that the righteous dead live unto God, I am inclined to consider the word "all" in the 38th ver. and the word "dead" in the 37th as general, referring to both classes. I am not positive however that this is the fact, although I see no impropriety in our Saviour first affirming the resurrection of the righteous and then of *all* the dead. To consider "the true import" as denying his positive testimony in John 5 : 28, 29, and the plain testimony of the inspired apostle, that there shall be "a resurrection both of the just and unjust," and that of innumerable similar passages, I am confident is unwarrantable.

All that remains for me at present is to "harmonize" my views with 2 Tim. 1: 10. The passage affirms the glorious truth that our blessed Lord "hath abolished death and brought life and immortality

to light?" which we mutually believe is the exclusive privilege of the righteous. "If this be so, (our brother remarks) and the wicked are not to be immortal, it follows that death will hold in its grasp all who are not 'asleep in Christ.'" As well might he say, that because the tiger, who is determined on the destruction of his prey, has temporarily let go his hold to "grasp" with increased firmness, will fail of his purpose. The revelation of "the second death" solves the difficulty. Rev. 20 : 14.

HENRY GREW.

Important Questions.

MELTONSVILLE, Anson County, N. C., Sept. 1856.

Dear Brother :—Positive testimony that the wicked dead will be made alive remains unquoted, unannounced. The reason is obvious: it is not in the Bible. The phrase "resurrection of the unjust," and the words "made alive," are, not used synonymously.

The discussion has been carried to considerable length. I have not read one solitary passage from scripture, saying, "*the wicked dead will be made alive.*" Is faith the offspring of evidence—the gift of God? Where is the evidence given by God, that he will raise the wicked dead and make them alive? Will He raise the dead—make them alive and wicked? Will he create wickedness and perpetuate it—eternize it? Is He the creator of sin, or rather, will He create sin? It seems to me that there is something horrible, if not blasphemous, in the idea that God will make the *wicked dead alive—as wicked, living beings—a New Creation!* What meaning is affixed to "*made alive*?" If God had at first created Adam as a *wicked, sinful, corrupt, and polluted being*, would it be less or more a creation of wickedness, than to *make alive* unnumbered wicked beings who are dead—know nothing, have ceased to sin—and have suffered the penalty of the law, *death*—returned to the dust? Will the works of the devil never be destroyed?—Will wicked beings be made out of the ashes of the wicked dead? But, why ask so many questions? Will the resurrection of the unjust be a *revival* of wickedness? What a stupendous *Revival!* And who, in that case, would be the great Revivalist? By whose power would the awful revival be wrought? The power of God? What! The Revivalist of wickedness? Have these queries no immediate connection with the affirmative of the question—"Will the wicked dead be made alive?" Or are they its *sequences*? Some call the conversion of sinners a revival of religion, while the members of the church, to which they may be added, are baptised in avarice, extortion, hatred, malice and evil-speaking,—but, whoever read of the Revival of sin and wickedness as the *sole act* of God? Will any one try their *Logic* or *Hermeneutics* on these questions? Positive testimony is required—not human testimony, for this is, how erroneous soever, too apt to be positive.

Does the wicked dead commit sin? Is sin among the works of the devil? If by the revival of the wicked, sin is revived, whose work is it?—Does the devil raise the dead? Is he the resur-

rection of the wicked dead? It is best neither to go beyond revelation, nor to lead those, who have already transcended its limits, any farther into the regions of fancy.

I have asked many questions which might be comprised in one. But the reason I did so, is quite obvious. Other questions equally pertinent might be asked by the Universalist, who could easily assign weighty reasons to show that whatever God creates is *good*, that whatever he makes alive is holy. Perhaps brethren are approaching Universal Salvation by maintaining that God will revive the wicked dead, and make them alive.—
Nous verrous.

J. F. L.

Extract from a Private Letter.

I have had *two* long discussions on the Immortality question with the new Methodist preacher here. You can guess with what results. He professes to be "posted" in regard to our theory; but the *fact* is, he does not understand its first principles. On Monday evening I kept him in my study till after ten o'clock. Among other absurdities, he took the ground that God was *as well pleased* with the endless misery of the finally impenitent as he was with the salvation of the righteous!!! In vain did I urge against this horrible and blasphemous imputation the thrice-repeated declaration of the Most High, that He has "*no pleasure in the death of the wicked,*" &c. He also declared, over and over again, that if he believed in the destruction of the wicked, he would cease at once to lead a religious life, and would join the ungodly multitude in the pursuit of the pleasures of sin! Oh, my soul! are these the men, and these the sentiments, to save the perishing! I told him it flowed from his assertion, that his *only* motive for serving God was the fear of eternal torment; but this, very inconsistently, he denied.

Our Brother after writing the foregoing, attended a funeral in another town; after mentioning that "not a single word of allusion to the doctrine of the resurrection" was made, adds—

I must tell you of *one* truthful utterance in the funeral sermon. In addressing the mourners, the preacher (Methodist) said that if they had to believe the deceased was among the "lost," the thought would be enough to "*DETHRONE REASON.*" Precisely so. And still they go on proclaiming endless torments for deathless souls. The Methodist preacher here yesterday morning discoursed from—"We know that we have passed from death unto life, because we love the brethren." He said there were *only two kinds of death* mentioned in the Bible. The one was that which the Bible (???) defined as being the "separation of the soul from the body." The other was "*spiritual death,*" which he said was the present, and would be the eternal condition of the sinner. (That is to say, the sin and the punishment are one and the same thing! O, the consistency of orthodoxy!)

BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. XI.

NEW-YORK, NOVEMBER 1, 1856.

NO. 21.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year.

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

“THE COVENANTS.”

BY HENRY GREW.

Dear Brother Storrs.—While I sincerely thank our brother CAMPBELL for many excellent remarks on the Covenants, I am obliged to dissent from him in some particulars.

I do not know what he means by the affirmation that “there must be an end to the plan of salvation, through faith: for faith is the confidence of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. But when seen, faith is no longer in exercise,—Salvation *then* must depend on obedience, as before the fall.” If he had not added the last remark, I should suppose he referred to the glorified state, subsequent to all human probation. During this probation I see no scriptural evidence for salvation for any man but “through faith.”

I understand, with brother C., that “the new covenant of Jerh. 31: 31,” has, *in that place*, exclusive reference to the house of Israel, to be fulfilled at their future gathering. I understand however, that this covenant is “the gospel covenant, the mystery which Paul was made a minister of,” though our brother thinks “it cannot be.” To prove this he refers us to Eph. 3: 1-6, and remarks, that “it will be seen, that no gospel covenant with Gentiles was revealed to the old prophets; but that the Gospel to the Gentiles was a mystery (*i. e.* secret) which in other ages was not made known to the sons of men.” “Now the apostle does not say that no gospel covenant with Gentiles was revealed to the old prophets,” but that “in other ages was not made known to the sons of men as it is now revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit, that the Gentiles should be fellow heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promise in Christ by the Gospel.” The import of which is, that it was not made known to men in general, nor even to the old prophets *in the same full and clear manner*, as at the coming of our blessed Lord.—This construction I will now sustain by scriptural facts.

Gal. 3: 8. “And the scripture foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, *saying*, In thee shall all nations be blessed.” “Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He

saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one and to thy seed, which is CHRIST. And this I say that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law which was four hundred and thirty years after cannot disannul that it should make the promise of none effect.” verses 16, 17.—Here “the gospel covenant” was revealed to Abraham four hundred and thirty years before “the law” or Sinai covenant.

The same glorious covenant of favor to the fallen and guilty children of men was revealed to the prophet Isaiah. “And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious.” 11: 10. See the entire chapter, also chap. 42. “I the Lord have called thee in righteousness, and will hold thy hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles.” See also Dan. 7: 14, Malachi 1: 11, &c. Thus did the prophets, by the Holy Spirit of God, testify the same truth announced by good old Simcon when he took the infant Savior in his arms, declaring him to be Jehovah’s salvation “prepared before the face of all people; a light to lighten the Gentiles and the glory of thy people Israel.” Luke 2: 32. So Peter declared. See 1 Peter 1: 10, 11, 12.

If “no gospel covenant with Gentiles was revealed to the old prophets,” it follows, that no Gentile sinner will ever be saved, for there is no other covenant of eternal life, or salvation from everlasting death, than that revealed to Abraham and “confirmed before of God in Christ,” even four hundred and thirty years before the law. Indeed this covenant of wondrous love and mercy was announced in the presence of Adam in the words to the serpent; “and I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head and thou shalt bruise his heel.” Gen. 3: 15.

I thank my dear brother for maintaining the great and glorious truth that “God, more merciful than the Gentiles, has promised to make a new covenant with the house of Judah and Israel,” “and to set his hand the second time to restore them.” His denial, however, that there is “any fore-ordination or irrevocable decree in all this,” is marvellous indeed! I ask, what is the difference between an *absolute unconditional* declaration that *in the future* God will write in their hearts, &c., and an “*irrevocable decree*” that he will do so? “Conditional prophecy (our brother remarks) is a twin pseudo to the never dying soul; they are both traditions of men.” In the above declaration God foretells, or prophesies, what he will do in the future. It is the unconditional determination to give the disposition to repent and believe the truth,

without which indeed there is no salvation. It is as unconditional as "A virgin shall conceive and bear a son."

Our brother understands by the text "until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in," "the end of gospel probation," *i. e.* of the Gentiles. He distinguishes between "gospel probation" and the probation with which the Jews will be subsequently favored. I do not understand this. Are not the Jews to be saved by the Gospel? To my astonishment he affirms that "Jacob cannot be the converts to Christianity, because his ungodliness is to be turned away after the happy state of the christian is secured." Will he please to inform us then, by what other Name under heaven Jacob can be saved? This is all wrong. When the Jews are grafted into the same olive tree with Gentile christians, they will be "converts to christianity." Ungodliness is to be turned away from Jacob long before "the happy state of (all) christian (Gentiles) is secured." So the inspired apostle plainly teaches. "Now if the fall of them (the Jews) be the riches of the world, and the diminishing of them the riches of the Gentiles, how much more their fulness?" *i. e.*, how much more shall their conversion to God, be the means of the conversion of the Gentiles? This sense is confirmed by the 15th verse. "For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?" *i. e.*, to "the world." Then shall the prophetic word be fulfilled, "ALL NATIONS shall serve him." Ps. 72 : 11. The converted Jew will be instrumental in its glorious accomplishment. "Blindness in part is happened to Israel until" the commencement of this glorious era." until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in," *i. e.*, until the commencement of the period of the fulness of salvation to the Gentile world, when all the kingdoms of this world shall become "the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ."

Paul, brother C. says, "places the coming of the Deliverer, and the covenant of Jeremiah at the end of the gospel dispensation." When, where, or how does the apostle do this? No proof is given. That "the Gospel dispensation" is to end at the second coming of our blessed Lord, is one of the errors of the popular sects. It diminishes the revealed fruits of redeeming love a hundred fold, for it is not until he comes in the clouds of heaven that all nations will bow down before him and serve him. See Dan. 7 : 13, 14. The gospel dispensation will continue in the age to come, triumphing gloriously when Satan is bound. Rev. 20.

If the covenant of Jeremiah is not fulfilled until the end of the gospel dispensation, it will never be fulfilled at all, for it is only by faith in the gospel that perishing men become the children of God, which is the great blessing of that covenant. See Gal. 3 : 26. "One party (it is affirmed) cannot make a covenant." The term covenant is used in the sacred scriptures with considerable latitude of import. The covenant of Jeremiah 31 : 31-34 was the absolute determination, or purpose, or decree of God *alone*. Hence its infallibility. It secures the performance of man's repentance and faith, (which are conditions of salvation, *in a certain sense*), by God's unconditional and absolute deter-

mination to write his law on the heart. To suppose that the promise in that covenant is conditioned on man's previous repentance, is to suppose that God promises to write his law on his heart, after man has written it there himself, and consequently does not need it to be done by the Almighty.

Indeed our brother himself, affirms that this covenant "cannot hang on any conditions of any people." Does it not follow then that it is a decree, and covenant of "one party" only?

Truly it is remarked, that "the gospel covenant is, in all its essential elements the Abrahamic covenant of grace, but I think my brother errs in not considering the covenant of Jeremiah 31 : 31, 34 also essentially the same. He remarks, "that the Gospel covenant cannot be made with any nation as a nation." Why not, if it were the purpose of God? However, Ezekiel 20th chapter plainly teaches, that although this covenant includes a great number of the literal house of Israel, it does not include them *all*, for at the future period when the elect are brought "into the bond of the covenant," v. 37. Some of Jacob's seed will be purged out, who "shall not enter the land of Israel."--vr. 38.

Very correctly our brother considers that there is no need of the God of salvation making any other covenant in the future with the house of Israel, than that which was made essentially with Abraham. Sinners of every age and dispensation are saved from eternal death by ONE covenant *only*, and by the ONE SEED of that one covenant *only*, "which is Christ." "The Gentiles adopting the Abrahamic faith," are saved by the very same covenant which is called "a *new* covenant," in contrast to the *old* Sinaic covenant, not because it had not, *in any manner*, been revealed before to any of the children of men, but because it has not yet been revealed to the house of Israel in general as it will be in the future, as the Sinaic covenant was revealed to them generally when God had brought them by Moses out of Egypt.

For this eternal covenant of infinite wisdom and love, by which a "a multitude which no man could number, of all nations and kindreds and people," shall enter in through the gates into the holy city, let our praises now and forever ascend to Him who sitteth on the throne and unto the Lamb.

A GREAT SECRET—ALWAYS HAPPY.—"Why this constant happy flow of spirits?"

"No secret, doctor," replied the mechanic. "I have got one of the best of wives, and when I go out to work, she always has a kind word of encouragement for me, and when I go home she meets me with a smile, and she is sure to be ready; and she has done many things during the day that will please me, and I cannot find it in my heart to speak unkind to any body." What influence then hath woman over the heart of man, to soften it, and make it the fountain of cheerful emotions! Speak gently, then: a happy smile and a kind word of greeting, after the toils of the day are over cost nothing, and go far towards making a home happy and peaceful.

THE LANGUAGE OF PROPHECY

By GEORGE DUKE OF MANCHESTER, ENGLAND.

One of the principal difficulties in the language of prophecy, is the determination of the true limits of the literal, symbolical, and figurative. Perhaps we ought to commence a little earlier, and define the distinction between these three different styles. I would distinguish them thus:—If the language is used in its proper sense, and the idea is conveyed immediately, this I understand to be literal; but though the language be used in its proper sense, if a mediate idea be conveyed, this I suppose to be symbolical; lastly, if the idea conveyed is immediate, but the language is not used in its proper sense, this I apprehend is figurative.

When the Lord says, "Foxes have holes and birds have nests," "fox" is used in its proper sense, and there is no mediate idea; thus the language is literal. But when He says, "Go and tell that fox," the language is used in its proper sense, but there is a *mediate* idea; the idea of a fox arises in the mind, and then by reflexion the attribute of a fox is made characteristic of Herod. This is symbolical. But when it is said the floods lift up their voice, or the deep utters its voice, the first idea that arises in the mind is of the ocean, but the language is used improperly; this is figurative.

Symbols are not suited for eloquence, being too cumbersome; the ideas are presented too slowly, which is the very reverse of figurative language; the metaphor in the one instance is applied to the noun, in the other to the adjective; the emotions are immediately roused by the figure, the ingenuity is first exercised in the symbol.

As it is admitted on all sides that no language is so literal as to be entirely devoid of figure, and no prophecies so strictly symbolical as to be without some passages purely literal, it might be supposed that the chief difference amongst students of prophecy, is mainly a question of degree as to how much is literal, symbolical, or figurative. This, however, is not at present the state of the case; that which was only a question of degree has diverged into two distinct and essentially different modes of interpretation, which the advocates of each opinion severally denominate literal and spiritual.

The literal or grammatical method is based upon the assumption that there are certain determinate ideas of things attached to certain words, and consequently, that the words are employed as the medium to convey the ideas which usage and custom have fixed and connected with those words. That it is, therefore, the duty of the interpreter to divest his mind of any preconceived ideas which may influence the meaning he would attach to the words, the ideas not being admitted as ingredients in fixing the meaning of the words, but, on the contrary, the words originating in the mind those ideas which usage has connected with them.

Those portions of the Scripture which are not prophetic convey the same definite ideas which usage has fixed in other writings. And when God has been pleased to reveal to man, and through the instrumentality of man, somewhat respecting future facts, why should we not judge of God's meaning

and of the facts which He states, though still future, as we should of man's meaning and of the facts which he states when writing a history of the past? There is no necessary difference as to the mode of conveying the ideas of the future or the past. A history of the past may be sung in numbers, a prediction of the future may be without poetic ornament or figure; the only essential difference between a record of what has been, and a revelation of what shall be, is the divine foreknowledge, "which vieweth things which be not as though they were."

I will give an illustration: When our Lord spake of his rising from the dead, the disciples questioned "one with another what the rising from the dead could mean;" and again, when He had most explicitly declared that He was going to suffer, "they understood none of these things." The literalist contends, that whilst these assertions of our Lord were still prophecies, the disciples ought to have received the words according to their literal and grammatical meaning, just as much as that now they have become matter of history, all christians do receive them; and that no preconceived ideas respecting Messiah's abiding for ever, should have so possessed their minds, as to make the previous idea reflect back upon the meaning of the words, instead of permitting the words in the first instance to impress upon the mind those ideas they were calculated to convey.

This mode of interpretation is no doubt liable to abuse by the extreme of literality;—a man not perceiving the difference between the supernatural and the monstrous, may argue that, because a prediction that a virgin should conceive, has been literally fulfilled, therefore there shall be a beast with seven heads and ten horns; but with the generality of mankind "intuitive consciousness will lead us to decide whether resemblance of properties, or identity of substance be intended."

As to less obvious distinctions between literal symbolical, and figurative, there will be degrees of difference. "Some," says Waterlaud, "will fancy the plain and obvious sense, unreasonable and absurd;" the man that will fancy that which is plain and obvious to be unreasonable and absurd, must be himself deficient, either in reason or in faith; but we must not run into the error of supposing the obvious sense to be necessarily the literal sense; when our Lord calls Herod a fox, the sense is obvious, but not literal; some put a literal sense upon "This is my body," but there are many who deny that to be the obvious sense. Some have attempted rules for deciding between the literal, figurative, and symbolical; I think there is a certain fact and discernment in seizing the spirit of a passage which is superior to any rules that can rigidly be laid down.

The question of spiritual interpretation is more complicated; its advocates should more rigidly define its nature.

Often there is a covert assumption of superiority in the claim for spiritual interpretation, which surely is not correct; for if the literal be the mind of the spirit, that undoubtedly is the most spiritual; our invention is not more free from dress than God's truth. There is also an injustice in the assumption; "spiritual" is ostensibly opposed to

"literal," but the real opposite to "spiritual" is "carnal;" thus the claimant of spiritual views, whilst apparently opposing "literal," does covertly and unconsciously to his opponent, fix the stigma of "carnal" on that which is "literal."

Sometimes "spiritual" appears opposed to "material," upon which I will quote some excellent observations of Mr. Brown; he speaks of "some tincture of that morbid spiritualism which shrinks from the very touch of materialism, as though separation from it in every form would be the consummation of happiness. May not," says he, "the gnostic element—of the essential sinfulness and vanity of matter—be found lurking beneath it? Certainly, the glorified bodies, both of the Redeemer and the redeemed, derive their elements from the dust of this ground." And if it be no degradation for the Son of God to take it into his own person . . . if the dust of this ground is capable of becoming a "spiritual" and "glorious" meet vehicle for the perfected and beatified spirit, the sharer of its bliss in the immediate presence, and the instrument of all its activities in the service of God and the Lamb,"—there can be no essential sinfulness and vanity in matter.

I wish I could always approve as fully of Mr. Brown's sentiments; but among the many fallacies which lurk under the term "spiritual," as describing a peculiar mode of interpretation, one of its most dangerous forms is, as far as I know, peculiar to Mr. Brown. He supposes that the inspired prophets use an expression in one sense, but that the equally infallible apostles apply another meaning to the passage. If this be a sound canon of interpretation, instead of deriving any aid from the New Testament in fixing the direct and immediate scope of the old, it would be calculated to mislead us; instead of the context in the Old assisting us in discovering the recondite sense of the quotation in the New Testament, it would blind us.

Sometimes the "spiritual" amounts to nothing more than the undefined. "A spirit passed before my face" . . . "it stood still, but I could not discern the form thereof: an image [was] before mine eyes." Sometimes the spiritual means the allegorical, analogical, or auagogaetical. The spiritual principle is, in fact, multifarious, for its real intention and object is evasion. If the literal system is adopted, certain interpretations must be admitted; and this constitutes the essential difference between the two modes; in the spiritual method, the preconceived ideas form an ingredient in fixing the meaning of the words, instead of the words being the means of suggesting, or channel for conveying, the ideas.

Thus the real intention of spiritual interpretation, and that which is its essential characteristic, is its real danger, for the same principle may be applied to the setting aside of any truth. There is, in fact, an end put to "the assurance of understanding," for the certainty of interpretation is derived from some necessity of signification, and the necessity of signification in words consists in the connexion between the words and ideas which has been fixed and established by usage and custom.

"There cannot be a doubt," says Dr. Henderson,

"that in proportion as sacred hermeneutics come to be more severely studied, and perversions of the word of God hereditarily kept up under the specious garb of spirituality and a more profound understanding of Scripture, are discovered and exposed, the necessity of abandoning such slippery and untenable ground will be recognised, and the plain, simple, grammatical, and natural interpretation adopted and followed."

THE MILLENNIUM.

DEFINITIONS.

The study of unfulfilled prophecy is divided into two distinct heads. One, the doctrine concerning the future; the other, the order and series of those events which occur during this dispensation, as introductory to the next.

Passing events leave a very different impression upon the mind according to what the expectation of the final issue may be; they receive their hue from the clouds in the distant horizon. Those who expect the prevalence of the Gospel, see in the efforts of Missionary and Bible Societies, as in the rosy streaks of morn, the dawning of a day, lovely and serene; whereas, other who believe the year of the redeemed will be ushered in by the day of vengeance of our God, discern that the sky is not only red but lowering, and they expect "a day of darkness and of gloominess, of clouds and thick darkness, as the morning spread upon the mountains." Hence, as the development expected has so great an influence upon the aspect of events which are in progress, the consideration of the end should be the first in order, as it is in importance.

It would be difficult to state all the different shades of opinion which are entertained respecting the future, but they may be classed under two principal heads:

Some expect a universal spread of the Gospel for a thousand years before the close of this dispensation, at the expiration of which they place the general resurrection and the day of judgment, when Jesus will come and cast the wicked into hell, take the righteous back with Him to heaven, and annihilate the earth.

The opposite opinion is that we are to expect the advent of our Lord at any time; that when He comes, He takes the throne of David, and reigns upon the earth for a thousand years; and the saints rise and reign with Him; during which time the power of Satan is entirely controlled; though at the end of the thousand years, the evil one will be loosed for a short time; after which the wicked shall be raised and judged; the saints removed to heaven, and the earth destroyed.

Before pronouncing any judgment respecting these two opinions, I will define what I understand to be intended in the first opinion by "a universal spread of the Gospel for a thousand years before the close of this dispensation."

The "universal spread of the Gospel" corresponds with the language of the prophet, who says, "The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea." When it is said, this shall be for a thousand years, I do not

believe the advocates of this view insist that it shall be for that exact time, neither more or less; for some make it to mean much more, others perhaps comprise the progress of the Gospel in this period. By saying it will be "before the close of this dispensation," I understand it to be supposed that this state of things will be brought about by means similar to those at present in operation; such as the preaching of the word and the distribution of the Scriptures; but that these efforts will be more enlarged, and probably much more extensively blessed, by an increased outpouring of the Holy Spirit; the change, however, being more or less gradual, not marked by a sudden and defined transition from one state to another, and without the intervention of any miraculous agency.

With regard to the second opinion, I must define what I understand by the expression, "The coming of the Lord;" as also the "expecting," or "looking for," that event; and lastly, the entire expression, "Expecting the coming of the Lord at any time."

By the expression, "the coming of the Lord," I understand the removal of the Lord, in his bodily presence, from the heavens to this earth. When the angel declares that the same Jesus who was taken into heaven, should so come, in like manner as the apostles had seen Him go into heaven, we must understand "going" and "coming" in an analogous sense, namely, the removal of the Lord's bodily presence from one place to another. If then, it undoubtedly sometimes has this meaning, why should not the word "coming," when applied to Christ, be as uniformly understood in its simple meaning as when applied to others? If any other than the common and natural sense of the words be affirmed, that uncommon meaning must be an exception, and it rests with those who maintain the peculiar view, to prove each particular instance.

When it is said, "certain came to Antioch from Judea," it is not thought necessary to prove that this denoted the removal of men in their bodily presence from one place to another. So in saying "we look for Christ from heaven," it is not necessary to prove that this expression implies a removal of his bodily presence from heaven to this earth.

Paul gave directions to Silas and Timotheus to come to him, and he *waited* for them at Athens; it would be unnecessary to set about proving that he expected their bodily presence; so, when it is said we *wait* for God's Son from heaven, we need not prove that we mean the removal of his bodily presence from heaven to this earth.

I must next define what I understand by the expressions "expecting," or "looking for," and "waiting for." They do not only imply loving the appearing, but they embrace something more; we might say, by way of illustration, that Rhoda loved the appearing of Peter, but she did not expect him, therefore she opened not the gate for gladness; but "the people [gladly] received Christ, for they were waiting for him."

That this is the natural and proper meaning of the expressions, may be gathered from their use on

other occasions. The impotent folk around Bethesda were *waiting* for the moving of the waters; doubtless they wished for the appearance of the angel, but had they known that he would not have descended for a thousand years, they would not have been waiting. St. Paul, in like manner, "looked for," or expected Timothy to come with the brethren.

Now are we to suppose the sense of these expressions altered when applied to the advent of Christ. When Simeon *waited* for the consolation of Israel, it is clear that he supposed the advent was possible at any moment. In like manner when "all the people were *in expectation*, and mused in their hearts whether John was the Christ," surely it implies they were in expectation, because they supposed that the advent of Christ drew near.—John sent to ask Jesus whether he was Christ, or whether they should *look* for another; John looked for the Messiah, knowing that the time of his advent was at hand. So I understand, with respect to the second coming, the expressions "waiting for," and "looking for," do not admit of a meaning which would put the possibility of Messiah's return beyond the period of a natural life; but "expecting" implies not only a possibility, but a probability within that time.

When it is said, "We may be expecting the coming of the Lord at any time," I conceive we must distinguish "the coming of the Lord" from expressions denoting the moment of the revelation of Jesus Christ, or of the rapture of the saints; doubtless these events are part of the coming, but they are momentary. The coming, I apprehend, embraces a series of events.

This may be illustrated by the circumstances of the first advent. From what day should we date that event? Either from the annunciation to Zacharias, or to the Virgin; from the birth of John, or the day in which the Saviour was born; from the commencement of John's ministry, or the time when "Jesus himself began, being about thirty years of age?" Some might urge the time of the conception, or, at any rate, of the birth of Christ, and they might quote in support the prophecy of Isaiah, "Behold the Virgin shall conceive and bring forth a son." And surely they would say, when embraced by Simeon in the temple, according to revelation, and worshipped by the magi as true born king of the Jews, it must be acknowledged that the Lord Christ was come. Yet against this it might be advanced that the advent could not be dated before the ministry of John, because John was to "go before him," that is, in his ministry; for it was to be "in the spirit and power of Elias to turn the hearts of the fathers, &c." John therefore, in his ministry, speaks of Christ's advent as yet future. And as to the prophecies, it appears clear when Daniel speaks of Messiah the Prince, he refers to his entrance upon his public ministry.

How are we to reconcile these things? I think the fair answer would be, that the whole series of events must be embraced in "the coming of Christ." The first of them cannot be excluded from that category, yet the advent was not complete before the last. In some instances one event might be re-

ferred to, as when our Lord said, "The law and the prophets were until John;" that I apprehend related to the commencement of John's ministry: on other occasions there seems a delay until after the ministry of John was concluded; as, for example, when it is said, "Now, when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison, he departed into Galilee," in order to fulfil Isa. ix. 1, 2.

In like manner, with respect to the second advent, it need not be limited to the moment in which the Lord shall be revealed as a flash of lightning, but may embrace a series of events issuing inevitably in that awful and glorious result. When that series shall commence is uncertain and contingent, and therefore known to no one but the Father; but this much negative information we may have; until the series does commence, we may know that the brightness of Christ's presence is not impending; and, on the other hand, when the series shall begin, we may expect that all will be quietly accomplished, although the particular hour when the elect shall be caught up to meet the Lord will even then be unknown. When, therefore, it is said that we are to expect the coming of Christ at any time, I conceive the commencement of a series of events, having relation to the progress of the Lord, and terminating in the revelation of Jesus Christ, is intended.

Now to revert to the two opinions as thus defined, the former has the advantage of not militating directly against any article of our creeds; but this arises rather from ambiguity than from correctness; for though probably there is error in both of these statements, the latter appears to be nearer the truth than the former, because the whole difference may be resolved into the order of events; and in this respect I conceive the second view to be correct. The advocates of both opinions expect glorious things in the latter days; they both acknowledge that Jesus Christ will return to this earth some time or other; but the one party are "waiting for the coming of our Lord"—they are, in the first place, "expecting the glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour," and a restitution of all things consequent upon that event; whereas the others are expecting that the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord for a thousand years before the day of the Lord; they, therefore, deny the pre-millennial advent of Christ; for one cannot believe two things which are essentially opposed to each other. It would be an abuse of the rational intellect to suppose a man could be in constant expectation of the Lord's advent, and, at the same time, be looking for a thousand years of blessedness to precede that event. A man could not sincerely contemplate the probability of both hypotheses being correct, for one expectation is utterly destructive of the other. We will then assume, as a matter of course, that one who looks for a spiritual millennium is not waiting for the appearing of Jesus Christ.

There are, therefore, two great heads of inquiry: is a spiritual millennium consistent with the character of this present dispensation?—or, on the other hand, is the speedy coming of our Lord a scriptural expectation?

ROMANISM IN ITALY.

Passing from France to the consideration of the Catholic affairs of Italy, we cannot but be struck with the greatly different appearance of the Roman Church in these two countries. In France, every one agrees that the Catholic Church counts at present more faithful adherents, than 20, 30, or 40 years ago, and that the movement in favor of it is still increasing in strength, notwithstanding some local dissensions; in Italy, not many Romanists will seriously pretend that their Church is still as strong as at the beginning of the present century. It has considerably declined since that time. In France, all the three conservative parties which compromised for the election of Louis Napoleon as president in order to get rid of the republic, and which gave him six millions of votes against one million of republicans, are seeking the alliance of the Church, and the Church appears to stand higher than any one single political power; in Italy, the clergy, with a small portion of the laity, form an insignificant political fraction, which is considered by all the other political parties as the chief obstacle to the political regeneration of the country. Romish writers have always been slow in acknowledging the evidence of historical truth if it was unfavorable to the cause of the church.—Still they begin to feel uneasy about Italy, and speak on the affairs of Italian Catholicism more in an apologetic than eulogistic tone. It is rare to meet now-a-days with a Catholic writer of any note, who persists, like the Bishop of Arras, in France, in a recent circular to his clergy, to praise the people of Rome as the best and happiest of the world. We have, since 1848, followed the development of Roman Catholicism with great attention; we have studied its history carefully, and mostly from Catholic sources, and have come to the firm belief that there is, at present, no other Catholic country in Europe where the Roman Church is so weak and its foundations so undermined as in Italy.

A formidable foe arises to the Roman Church in the progressing organization of a national Italian party. It is, certainly, a singular phenomenon to see popery, which has labored so many centuries for the subjugation of the world to the absolute rule of a few Italians, on the point of being crushed by the rising spirit of this very same nationality. A few years ago, a distinguished priest, statesman, and philosopher, Gioberti, proposed to the pope to accept the leadership in the national movement of the Italians for becoming again one body politic, to expel the Austrians from Italy, and to found an Italian confederacy. The pope declined this bold idea, as some years ago the plan of Lamennais for an alliance of the Church with democracy had been rejected by Gregory XVI. Since that time the hopes of all patriotic Italians concentrate upon the King of Sardinia, who is excommunicated by the pope, and Mazzini, who does not consider himself a Catholic at all. Now every step which is tending to promote the re-establishment of Italian nationality is regarded by the organs of the Church as an act of hostility. But notwithstanding these views of the highest authorities of the Church are well known among the people, and ad

though the governments, except that of Sardinia, are endeavoring to quell all demonstrations of patriotic sentiment and hope, the patriotism of the country manifests itself on every occasion. Thus, but lately, almost all the large cities of the states of the Church petitioned the pope for the removal of the Austrian troops; of course, without success. As among the Italian patriots the question of a political union of Italy stands foremost, the Church will find herself, at a new revolutionary outbreak, in a very isolated position. The clergy, at least, if they remain faithful to their present course of action, will be regarded and treated as enemies of Italy!

A recent fact illustrates in a striking manner the great contrast of the present feelings of Italy on this subject with what they were formerly. A radical paper of Turin proposed lately to open a national subscription, with the view of furnishing a hundred cannons to the fortification of Alessandria, a strong Italian bulwark against Austria.—The proposal was received throughout Italy with the utmost enthusiasm, and the hundred cannons are already secured. One voice dared to protest; it was "L'Armonia," the clerical paper of Turin. Now this Alessandria, whose hundred cannons will be a national testimonial against the present Rome, is the same fortress which was built by the Italian people in honor of Pope Alexander III., when pope and people found themselves united in a combat against the German Emperor, for the supremacy of the Roman Church and the political liberties of the Italian people.

How loose the tie connecting the Italian people with the Church of Rome has become, is clearly shown by the late events in Sardinia. The voice of a large majority of the people speaks in an unmistakable manner. The Chamber of Representatives voted last year, with 95 against 20 votes, the suppression of all convents. Among some twenty political papers of the capital, there are no more than two advocating the claims of the pope and of the Catholic party. Most of the others are resolute adversaries of everything pertaining to the Church of Rome. In the provinces of Sardinia we find the same proportion; and while the number of newspapers and periodicals in general is constantly increasing, the Catholics cannot even, from want of subscribers, maintain the few which are in their service. During the present year Sardinia has fearlessly marched onward for liberty and reform.—The greatest efforts have been secretly made to induce the king to yield to a concordat like that of Austria. Catholic and anti-Catholic papers have several times announced such an event as at hand; but up to this moment the administration of the government is carried on by the same ministers, and in the same spirit, and with the same general applause on the part of the people. In several instances monks and nuns have been deservedly prosecuted and fined, for refusing to obey the laws of the country, or for scattering among their pupils incendiary pamphlets against the government and constitution. A number of town councils have taken their schools out of the hands of ecclesiastical corporations, to which they have formerly been intrusted. The minister of the interior, Ratazzi, has, in a circular of May 9th, enjoining upon all

officers of the state to watch closely the movements of the clergy, and to enforce the law rigidly against them, whenever they transgress it. Several new laws against the privileges of the Roman Church are ready to be laid before the next legislature. It is in vain that the bishops have again unanimously protested against the circular of Ratazzi, and that the clergy are holding large assemblies to concert measures for an effective opposition. They find themselves deserted by the people, and the refusal to shrieve such of their parishioners as are commissioned to execute the laws against the Church, has proved an efficient means of making converts for Protestantism. On the progress of Sardinia during the six years of its constitutional existence, and of its struggle with Rome, very encouraging statements are found in the letters written by the Hon. W. Kinney, United States Minister at Turin, to the New York Daily Advertiser. Where, in 1850, there were 6,000 schools, with 260,000 children, we now find over 9,000 schools, with 400,000 pupils, and there are besides numerous classical institutions and three great universities, with over 6,000 students. Besides numerous daily journals, of every shade of opinion, there are 50 periodicals, including two literary reviews.

All the other governments of Italy are at present on good terms with the pope. The King of Naples who last year quarrelled with Rome, on account of an "ecclesiastical court," established by the King in Sicily, and clothed by him with the highest jurisdiction in all ecclesiastical matters, has at last come to an amicable agreement. The Grand Duke of Tuscany spent some time in Rome, and the clergy of his state expect with certainty a concordat like that of Austria. The same hope is entertained by the clergy of the smaller states. In Lombardy the bishops are making the best possible use of the Austrian concordat, and so immoderate are their hierarchical pretensions, that in several instances the government has had to check them, while the good understanding between the government and the German and Hungarian bishops remains undisturbed.

We have searched in vain for utterances of religious zeal in the files of our Catholic papers.—We have found some in France, but have been unable to discover anything of the kind worth recording in Italy. We do not find that a single new religious order or association has been founded, that the churches have been more largely attended, or that a greater zeal has been displayed for propagandism. The silence of the grave seems to reign among the Catholics of Italy.

It is surprising that Italy remains in this lethargy while in many other parts of the ecclesiastical dominions of the pope his power seems to be steadily and considerably on the increase. We cannot leave Rome before considering it in its capacity as the head of the Catholic Church. This we shall do in our next article. We shall invite our readers to ascend with us the height of the Vatican, and to cast an investigating look on the relation of the pope to his subjects, in foreign countries, and on his government of the papal world. This will give us a survey of the outward structure of Romanism in its present condition.—*Ch. Advocate.*

BIBLE EXAMINER.

New York, November 1, 1851.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—Three numbers more complete the present volume. The expense of *printing* has been paid by our subscribers and near \$300 over for the Editor's personal compensation; which gives us about *one-half* enough to cover the actual expenses of our family. We thank our friends for this much; and exceedingly wish it were so that the price of the EXAMINER could be reduced to one dollar per year. All must see, however, that this cannot be, unless we could have fifteen hundred paying subscribers. The *terms*, therefore, must remain at \$2 per volume, if the *semi-monthly* issue is continued, and we intend to issue no less frequently than that.

To encourage early payments—which are much to our advantage—we make the following offers, to such as forward us the cash before December 25th, where papers are sent to *one address*, in the States.

For *two* copies \$3; for *five* copies \$7; for *ten* copies \$10.

If either of these offers are accepted, let it be distinctly understood, we send the whole number in one envelope, to one individual; and we do not need the names of any other person.

To single subscribers, who pay \$2 before Dec. 25th, we will give *two* copies of either of the following works—the subscriber to pay the postage on them—viz: "MAN'S DESTINY;" "DOBNEY ABRIDGED;" "THE DISCUSSION," with Prof. Mattison; or, we will give one copy of "BIBLE vs. TRADITION," in paper cover, and pay the postage on it ourself. If any prefer, *instead* of either the foregoing offers, a copy of the "*Revised and Enlarged Six Sermons*" we will give them that; but they must pay the postage on it.

Money sent for the BIBLE EXAMINER is at *our risk*, provided the letter is sealed with a wafer and directed as follows—

GEO. STORRS, Box 4658, New York.

Take care to put no other words or figures in the direction, as it will be at *your risk* if you do.

←————→

THE RESURRECTION: ANASTASIS.

We have often had occasion to refer to Dr. BLOOMFIELD'S critical notes on the Greek New Testament, edited by Prof. STUART. Recently in looking at his remarks on the question of the Sadducees, and our Lord's reply, relating to the resurrection, we observed some important statements, or admissions. On Matt. 22 : 23 he says—

There is little doubt but that the phrase *anastasis ton nekron*, or *anastasis*, denoted, in common parlance, and agreeably to the general doctrines of the Pharisees, the resurrection of the *soul* as well as of the body, and the re-union of both in a future state. Though, at the same time, the ideas of the Pharisees *themselves* (and still more the people at large) as to the nature of that future life, were very vague, and occasionally founded on the notions of the heathens. So that our Lord's reply was, in wisdom, so framed as not only to refute the *Sadduceean* doctrines, but remove the misconceptions of the Pharisees; and thus to benefit not only the *unbelievers* of the doctrine of the resurrection, but the *misbelievers*."

On the foregoing statement, of Dr. Bloomfield, we remark, *first*—The resurrection of the dead—*anistasis ton reekon*—"denoted, in common parlance," or discourse, even with the "Pharisees," not a resurrection of "the body," merely, but "of the *soul*." In other words, it embraced whatever constituted *the man—the entire manhood*. Let this fact be remembered; and it follows, that when Christ and his apostles speak of the resurrection of the *dead*, "in common parlance," the *soul* is included, whatever that soul is. No matter what the Pharisees meant by the immortality of the soul, so long as they maintained it must have a resurrection in order to a future life; they clearly had no idea of a future life to disembodied human souls.

Second : The Pharisees, it seems, held to a "re-union" of souls and bodies in a future state; hence it was, that they taught the *transmigration* of souls; *i. e.*, the passing of their fancied immortal souls into other bodies at death; without which, those souls would have no resurrection, and could not live in their estimation. Their notions "as to the *nature* of that life were very vague, and occasionally founded on the notions of the heathens," says Dr. Bloomfield. It is evident from all this, that the Pharisees were ignorant of the true *nature* of the resurrection, though in *words* they held to a resurrection. This Dr. Bloomfield admits by saying, "Our Lord's reply [to the Sadducees] was so framed as" *** "to remove the *misconceptions* of the Pharisees," who were "the *misbelievers*." They professedly believed in "the resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust;" but their views were false and erroneous in several particulars. First,—The resurrection they advocated was a necessary result of the supposed immortality of the soul, which leaving its present tenement behind at death, must have another body to enter in order to its continued life; such was their resurrection of body and soul, and "re-union in another life."

Another error of the Pharisee's doctrine of resurrection was, that it embraced "both the just and

the *unjust*." This error Dr. Bloomfield did not see; but he says—"Our Lord's reply, was, in wisdom, so framed as not only to refute the *Sadducean* doctrines, but to remove the misconceptions of the *Pharisees*; and thus to benefit not only the *unbelievers* of the doctrine of the resurrection, but the *misbelievers*;" that is, those who did not believe aright on the subject. The Sadducees denied that there is to be "any resurrection of the dead," either of the good or bad. Jesus refutes them by showing that there is to be a resurrection of the good, and at the same time refutes the Pharisaic notion of the resurrection of the wicked dead; for, he teaches, distinctly, that the resurrected ones "are as the angels of God in heaven;" which could not be said of the wicked dead, if revived into life. And Jesus gives "Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," as the *samples* of those "which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world" [the future life] "even the resurrection from the dead;" Luke 20.

With the two-edged sword of truth our Lord hews in pieces the Pharisees, false notion of the transmigration of souls and the resurrection of the wicked dead, while he demonstrates to the Sadducees the resurrection of the righteous dead. Thus, truly, did he "refute the *Sadducean* doctrines," and "remove the misconceptions of the *Pharisees*," and correct their *misbelief*. But they were "fools and blind," and did not profit by his teaching. Bound up in their "own traditions"—like thousands in these days—they still adhered to their errors, as we learn from Paul's testimony, Acts 24: 15, where he states that his Jewish accusers "allow there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust," while they found fault with him for maintaining the resurrection of Jesus and of those who "*fall asleep in him*."

It is often asserted that, "Paul said, there shall be a resurrection both of the just and unjust." Paul never said any such thing. Paul's doctrine of the resurrection was one which was an object of "hope;" not of fear or dread. He never speaks of any other resurrection of the dead, to be looked for, but that of such as fall "*asleep in Christ*."—For preaching this, he was accused of the Pharisaic Jews; yet they themselves allowed there would be a more extensive resurrection than Paul contended for; even of "both the just and unjust;" for such an extensive resurrection Paul never said one word in all his preaching or Epistles; but, on the other hand, he proclaimed the resurrection from the dead as an object of "hope," to be sought for most diligently, and to be bestowed only on those *in Christ*; hence he saith, he labored and suffered

"If by *any means* I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." Phil. 3: 11.

HARD TO PLEASE.

Our readers will recollect that we copied into the EXAMINER, last March, the entire article of Rev. S. COMFORT, on the "*Immortality of the Wicked*," from the *Northern Christian Advocate*. After waiting more than six months, Mr. Comfort comes out with two long articles, in said paper, in what he calls a "Review" of our remarks on his previous article. He begins with a complaint that we broke up his article into *parts*, and followed those broken parts with our remarks. He says, we had "a perfect right" to copy his article into the EXAMINER, but he thinks we ought to have given it to our "readers unbroken," &c. If Mr. Comfort had sent his article to the EXAMINER he would have a claim for its insertion in the manner he contends for, and it would have been so inserted; but in reviewing articles from other papers no editor ever does what C. thinks we ought to have done; nor will he find a paper among all those published by his denomination (Episcopal Methodist) that would transfer an entire article of ours to its column in any form. Some of them have taken mangled extracts, just enough to misrepresent us, but would not suffer our arguments against their views to appear even "broken up" into paragraphs. We gave Mr. Comfort's entire argument, every word of it; which is more than any other Reviewer does for his opponent, when copied from the paper where it originally appeared. It is not usual in a review to give anything more than the *points* of the article reviewed. But we can afford to be generous to our opposers, hence we gave all that Mr. C. wrote, and so distinguished from our remarks that any person, wishing to do so, could read his article without noticing our review at all, if that pleased them best; or they could read all he said on one point and then our remarks, as they passed on. If such an arrangement did not satisfy all, we must think them "hard to please." Of this class, it seems, Mr. C. is one; if, indeed, he does not constitute the *whole* class; for we doubt if any other man can be found who will like to be placed in that class. We regard this complaint as a simple acknowledgment that he has no substantial ground of complaint, and so endeavors to cover his baldness with some kind of gauze to escape the scorchings of truth which he found pouring on his defenceless head. That his article and arguments were broken up into fragments may be true, and doubtless is; but that he has any ground

to complain of unfairness or want of courtesy in "the manner in which it was done," we do not believe any man besides himself will affirm. Let him show us a solitary example in all his Church where we can be treated with the fullness and fairness we showed him. Can he do it? He knows he cannot: and his complaint of us comes with evidence on its face that he felt a mortification at the demolition of his famed arguments for the "*Immortality of the Wicked.*"

We shall take very little notice of Mr. C.'s last articles further than to show the reader what seems to be the absolute dishonesty he has practiced in quoting our language. We will be glad to find he did not *intend* dishonesty. We said, EXAMINER page 85,

"The *literal* destruction of the wicked is neither opposed 'to common sense' nor 'an impossibility.' But it is opposed 'to common sense,' and 'an impossibility,' that an 'immaterial, immortal, and indestructible' being can *suffer* in any way or by any means, 'hence' such beings need not fear the *theological hell.*" &c.

How does Mr. Comfort quote this language?—Does he do it truly, or honestly? Read his perversion as follows:—

"The *literal* destruction of the wicked is neither opposed "to common sense" nor "an impossibility." "But it is opposed" [to both, that such a] "being can *suffer* in any way, or by any means;" &c.

Thus, it will be seen, Mr. C. has made us to say, to the readers of the *Northern Christian Advocate*, that, "the wicked" cannot "*suffer* in any way," &c. We said, that an "*immaterial, immortal, and indestructible* being" cannot suffer. Our description of the being that cannot suffer he has boldly excluded from his extract, thus bearing "false witness against" us; for we never said "*the wicked*" cannot suffer. Why this perversion of our words? Let him not talk of "a moral obtuseness" as having "come over" our "spiritual aspirations," while he can thus misrepresent us and our words. We treated Mr. Comfort fairly and gave *all* his words; but he neither gives all ours, nor quotes us truly in his extracts. We had thought him an honorable man, and trusted he was a christian; but we are sorry to say, that our confidence in either his honor or christianity is amazingly shaken; still we hope he may recover himself from falling into the same condemnation of a certain PROFESSOR, who has preceded him in misrepresentation.

Our statement of the impossibility of an "*immaterial, immortal, and indestructible*" being suffering, Mr. C. saw fit to hide by a substitution of his own words in brackets, which it seems he could not

be ignorant was not a truthful representation of us, unless he is of that class of men our Saviour speaks of Matt 23 : 17, first part of the verse. As to the "*theological hell,*" of which we spoke, it is evident Mr. C. considered it annihilated. That hell is thus described by "orthodoxy:"—"A dark and bottomless pit, full of fire and brimstone" *** "where the wicked must drink in everlasting torture," &c, Mr. C. seems to be convinced, that the *bodies* of the wicked cannot be hurt there, if "immortal and indestructible;" so he resolves hell into the "*moral elements;*" a very different matter from the "*theological hell.*" Yet Mr. C. and his school will find themselves in as great difficulty to make out "*moral*" suffering, to hardened sinners, as in making out physical sufferings. Some sinners are "past feeling," Paul saith, while here. No *moral* considerations can affect them when the hardening process is completed; so that Mr. C.'s new fangled hell is as likely to be powerless, for harm, as the old "*theological*" one. But there is a Bible hell which "*devours,*" *consumes,* "*annihilates*" the wicked; and in particular, "*all liars* shall have their part" therein. If men deceive themselves with the idea that falsehood and deception, when uttered or practised for their creeds, is *piety*, let them know "God is not mocked," the doom of all such is fixed by "the Judge of all the earth."

Mr. Comfort's articles throughout, so far as he professes to give a representation of our views, are a tissue of misrepresentation. Had he given our entire words, as we did his, the readers of the *Advocate* could have judged for themselves as to his fairness in reply. As he has presented mangled and altered parts of our words he has set a ball in motion which will be rolled on—by Preachers who read his articles and have not seen ours from which he professes to quote—and will be likely to involve many in false statements, for which he is specially responsible, as he had the means in his own hands of preventing the circulation of such falsehoods.

So far as Mr. C. has brought forward scripture in proof of his positions, relative to the soul, he has presented nothing new, and therefore it needs no notice from us, as we have often shown the utter unavailability of the texts produced to prove that man has a distinct entity called the soul, or that the soul; whatever it is, is immortal.

Failing to find anything in the received canon of scripture in support of the immortality, of "the soul," Mr. C. resorts to the *Apocrypha!* How does he succeed with his *apocryphal-soul*? He calls, like some of old, "O, Baal save us?" "Will not the Apocrypha help us?" Well, we

shall see—Mr. C. said in his Essay, which we reviewed, "God made the soul in the image of his own eternity." Of this assertion we said in reply, it "may pass, as the falsehood of it is too apparent to need or merit a reply." This remark, it seems, stung Mr. C., and he says "If he" [Mr. Storrs] will turn to the 'Wisdom of Solomon,' 2: 23, he will find this passage which suggested the terms of the 'falsehood,' but not the sentiment: 'For God created man to be immortal, and made him to be an image of his own eternity.'

This is an acknowledgment of Mr. C. that he can find nothing in the canonical scriptures even to "suggest the terms" he employed in speaking of *the soul*; and a further acknowledgment, that he does not find "the sentiment" of "the terms" he employed in even the Apocrypha! Why then, in the name of truth, does he go there to bolster up the "falsehood" which we said was "too apparent to need or merit a reply?" What has he gained by this call upon the Apocrypha to convert the "falsehood" into truth? The text he quotes only condemns him the more. What did Mr. C. say? He said—"God made *the soul*"—that is, an "immaterial" entity—"in the image of his own eternity." Such was the "falsehood." What does the apocryphal text say? It saith—"God created *man* to be immortal, and made *him* to be an image of his own eternity."

In this text not one word is said about "*the soul*," and Mr. C. must have been deeply steeped in "immaterialism" to find the theological soul in it, or anything to "suggest the terms" he employed. "*Man*"—not "the soul"—was what "God created to be immortal;" not, He created man immortal; but "to be" so, conditioned on his not committing sin; for adds the "Wisdom of Solomon" next verse, "Nevertheless, through the envy of the devil *came death* into the world; and **THEM THAT DO HOLD OF HIS SIDE DO FIND IT.**"—Then they do not find immortality, nor get "the image of God's own eternity." Thus Mr. Comfort finds as little help in the apocryphal books as in the canonical scriptures; and his only hope to sustain the "falsehood" is to go at once, and direct, to the old heathens; but, alas, for the falsehood, even there he must wander in thick darkness, for, saith Bishop WHATELY, "The ancient heathens did but *conjecture* without proof, respecting a future state."

That God created *man* to be immortal, and to be an image of His own eternity to come, if man would develop holiness, or harmony with his CREATOR, we never doubted; but that He created *man*

in such a state is a "falsehood" to which we would no more assent than to the first great *lie* that was ever uttered, viz:—"Ye shall not surely die."—One statement is just as true as the other; and it is no time to "wink at" such falsehoods any longer. In the "times of ignorance," when the Church was wrapt up in Papal superstitions, or just emerging from them, men might deal in such falsehoods without sin, for ought we know; but that darkness is past, unless men willingly or wilfully remain with the cloud on their minds; and they will find God will hold them responsible if they "receive honor one of another, and seek not the honor that cometh from God only." "How can" such "believe" the truth, when that truth blasts their proud theories and lays in the dust "the loftiness of man!" Mr. C. thinks Mr. Storrs lowers "the dignity of man!" The "serpent" thought man's "dignity" was too low, and gave him information how he might rise higher, and "*be as Gods*," and ever since that advice was taken, proud man has striven to make it out that "God made the soul in the image of His own eternity;" thus adding sin to sin, and pride to pride.

A JUST REBUKE.

The following article appeared in the *Christian Intelligencer*, Aug 14th. It is a just rebuke of the preacher, and shows the manner in which some of the advocates of natural immortality impose on the public, and prop up the spirit rapping delusion.—This spirit manifestation pretention all grows out of, and is based upon such teaching as that spoken of in the following remarks.

SPIRITUALISM AMONG THE BAPTISTS.

On last Lord's Day evening a full house was attracted by the following notice:

Rev. J. Wescott, of Gloversville, N. Y., (formerly of the Lnight street Baptist Church, of this city,) will preach next LORD'S DAY, Aug. 10, at the Berean Baptist Church, (Rev. Dr. Dowling's) corner of Bedford and Downing streets: Subjects—At 10 1-2 A. M., on *The nature of Angels, and their intercourse with men.* In the EVENING at 7 1-2, on the question, *Do the spirits of the departed know what is occurring on earth, and have they the power to influence the mind of the living.*

The writer attended, expecting to hear discussed and exploded this part of the spiritualistic theory, but was very much surprised to hear the speaker maintain the *affirmative* of both propositions. His text was Heb. xii. 1: "We also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses." In favor of the first proposition, he produced the text.—Witnesses of the fact of our Christian race, must he still looking on, *therefore*, those mentioned in the previous chapter, and by consequence all other departed spirits must know what is going on in the earth. Rev. vi. 10, was quoted for the same

purpose, "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 upon the earth!" The inference was, that departed spirits must know what is occurring on earth, otherwise those referred to in the last quotation would not know but that they were already avenged! The scene of the Transfiguration was adduced to prove the same thing.

The second proposition was stilted upon Rev. xxii. 9. When John was about to worship the angel, he forbade him, saying, "I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brethren the prophets." The inference was, that the spirit of an old prophet "had the power to influence the mind of the living," and by consequence, the spirits of our departed friends have this power to influence us. But if this be true, then there is no escape from the assumption of the spiritualist, that angels and the souls of men are of the same nature. The preacher evidently is not acquainted with the original of a wrongly translated passage, or he never would have ventured upon such a statement. The true rendering is this, "I am a fellow servant with thee, and with thy brethren the prophets," of whom John was one.

In maintaining his last proposition, the preacher said that the influence of our departed friends must be looked for in more respectable manifestations than those we now commonly hear of; from which I inferred he was not committed out and out to the cause of spiritualism; but the above principles of spiritualists being granted, we do not see how the preacher can expect that his auditors should not, from his discourse, which as will be seen must have been addressed to the feelings, look very favorably upon our modern *necromancy*. We regard it as beyond the wit of man logically to establish either of these propositions from the Bible. Especially is the last one utterly without foundation. "Clap-trap" is always below the dignity of the pulpit; but when we find it virtually throwing the cause of Christ into the hand of the enemy for the paltry sake of securing a big audience, it ought to be severely rebuked. Spiritualism has much to hope for from such preaching as this, and we should not wonder, if many of those draped in black, who heard this talk, would soon be found among our spiritualistic circles, consulting their departed friends.

W. R. G.

THE PAPAL CONTEST IN FRANCE.—The contest between the *Univers* and the *Correspondant*, alluded to by us lately, has already assumed to itself gigantic dimensions, according to our latest advices from Europe. A war of no ordinary significance is being waged in Paris, and throughout the province of France, with pens sharp as steel, and steeped in religious prejudice and jealousy; on the one side is the *Univers*, the monarch of its species, with Veuillot, its distinguished editor; on the other side stands the equally celebrated name of Montalembert, assisted by De Falloux and De Broglie.—With such antagonism as this, it is no marvel that

the English papal papers should remark that "it is a division occupying the attention of all Roman Catholics, which is evoking from day to day, and from month to month, literary efforts of surpassing interest, and involving consequences of incalculable moment."

The charge brought against the *Univers* is thus summed up by a Roman Catholic journal: "The *Univers* is accused of a servile adhesion to the Emperor Napoleon III.; of advocating arbitrary power and absolutism on principle; of indentifying the Church, and the teachings of the church, with civil despotism and religious persecution; of repelling the sympathies of all who were favorably disposed to religion; and of playing into the hands of infidels and atheists, by admitting as true, and defending as right, calumnious charges and imputed crimes, as to which Catholic apologists have always adopted the line of either denying the facts, or disproving the complicity of the Church."

Popery, in France, is in a very ambiguous and perplexing relation to the state. All its traditional and orthodox ties bind it to the displaced Bourbons, while its temporizing policy allies it to Napoleon; of course the latter cannot fully trust it, and the priests cannot fully sympathize with him. This fact is the key to the above internal disturbances.—*Ch. Advocate.*

MAN'S INHERITANCE.

BY THE EDITOR.

"Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth."
Matt 5: 5.

We shall endeavor to show that *the earth*, and *not heaven*, is the inheritance God has designed for man; conditioned, however, on a moral development in harmony with God. We argue this—

FROM THE ACCOUNT OF MAN'S CREATION, AND
VARIOUS PROPHECIES.

"And God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them; and God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it: and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every LIVING THING that moveth upon the earth." Gen. 1: 26-28.

Here we see that man was made—

1. To have DOMINION over the earth and all things thereon. The Psalmist saith, "The heaven, even the heavens, are the LORD's, but the earth hath he given to the children of men." Psa. 115 : 16.

2. Man was to "replenish the earth," i. e., to fill it with inhabitants; not to provide inhabitants for heaven. This intimation of man's destination is not to be mistaken nor overlooked. Here is no hint that man was designed for any other sphere than that of earth. If he had been, it is remarkable that no hint is anywhere given of it in the account of his creation, or in that of his trial for the development of a moral character. If his destination had been that of a sphere removed from the earth, we have a right to look for a special announcement of it somewhere in these accounts. As none such is made, we conclude the earth was designed as his inheritance.

We further argue that such was his destination from the fact—

3. That man was directed to *cultivate* the earth—"subdue it:"—not to gain heaven, or a higher sphere. This earth seems to have been designed as his home; and he was directed to carry forward the work his CREATOR had laid out for him to a higher perfection; thereby developing his own powers of body and mind, thus continually accumulating happiness and honoring his MAKER who had given him his powers and the earth with its fullness on which to exercise them. The CREATOR did not carry His own work to its highest perfection, but only so far as to furnish the new made being—man—with everything needful for perfecting himself and multiplying his own happiness without limits, except as all was to be conducted in harmony with the will of the CREATOR.

Thus was an ample field opened for man's cultivation, improvement, and continually advancing enjoyment. No wonder it is said, when the CREATOR had thus produced man and spread out his work for him, "And God saw every thing He had made, and behold, it was VERY GOOD." Gen. 1 : 31.

The Psalmist confirms the view of man's DOMINION, we have taken, Psa. 8th. "Thou hast made him" [man] "a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor. Thou *ma-test* him to have DOMINION over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet; all sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field; the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the sea." And he adds—"O LORD our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth!"

Thus we see, the first place assigned to man

was, to have universal DOMINION over this earth and its contents. This dominion man lost, or surrendered up his authority, by compliance with another's wish, instead of cleaving to his MAKER'S will as supreme. Who, or what that tempter was, by which man lost his dominion, we will not now stop to inquire. It is sufficient for our present purpose to know, that man did make the surrender to some power; and that the surrender brought sorrow, pain, and death; whereby it is evident his dominion is gone; for while it remained, in the perfection with which his CREATOR bestowed it, sorrow, pain and death could not be supposed to enter on man's domain; because his dominion was unlimited "over all the earth" and "every living thing." In such universal authority and power, what would harm man while he retained it? But in an unguarded hour he surrendered his dominion, and henceforth is liable to all the evils arising from subjection to the power of evil. This power of evil, or evil power—whatever it is—henceforth holds the dominion man surrendered; and it is, in the nature of the case, a power hostile to God and His government: it was only by man's disobedience to God that this evil power now reigns. This power, then, is a *usurper* in one sense, and in another it reigns by right. It is a usurper in relation to God, and it reigns by right in relation to man. God gave man the dominion to exercise in his own proper personality; but He did not give man the right to transfer that dominion to another power; it was to be held in subjection to God, and used only according to His specified arrangement. But man, contrary to his MAKER'S expressed will, did give his independence or dominion to another power, and thus became subject to that power and to its dominion. Thus the earth came under the government and curse of the evil power.

The question now arises—Will God suffer this usurper to retain his authority forever? We think not. God's wisdom, honor, and power,—to say nothing of His other perfections—are all involved in the matter.

How then is the evil to be remedied? or the usurper's power to be overthrown? Is it by removing the posterity of Adam, who return to their allegiance to God, to another orb, sphere, or to heaven, and at last destroying the territory, or earth, over which the usurper held sway? This would not be a conquest, and would not seem to honor the CREATOR'S wisdom or power. It seems most in accordance with the wisdom and power of God that there should be a conquest of the usurping power on the territory where the usurpation was

committed, and a recovery of the territory itself, and of the lost dominion. But as these were lost by a voluntary giving up, by man, to the evil power, that power must be overcome by man, if rightfully dispossessed.

That a usurper, called the devil and satan, has dominion over the earth is clear from the fact that the "very good," stamped on creation, is marred, most awfully so: "an enemy hath done this."— Besides, *diabolos* claimed the dominion of earth, and said, "all the kingdoms of the world" are "delivered to me:" Luke 4: 5-6. "Liar" though he is, yet, on this occasion, Jesus, the second Adam, did not contradict his claim. It had been "delivered to" him by the first Adam, as we have seen; and yet it was a usurpation so far as God's claim was concerned; but as God had given man the dominion and man had transferred it to *diabolos*, the latter if dispossessed must be treated fairly. He had given no equivalent to man, it is true: yet he did not seize it by violence. If recovered, therefore, it must be done neither by falsehood nor violence; it must be regained by a fair and open contest of manhood against this evil power.

The second Adam comes to the rescue. In fair and open conflict, in manhood, he met the power of evil, or *diabolos*, and most triumphantly "overcame;" thus establishing his right to the earth, and to re-establish man in the dominion, in his own time; which is "the time appointed of the Father," and yet future. The second Adam is the Restorer, and the rightful heir. See the following texts:—

"God, who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by His Son, whom HE HATH APPOINTED HEIR OF ALL THINGS."—"For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world" [*oikoumeneen*, the habitable earth] "to come, whereof we speak." Heb. 1: 1, 2 and 2: 5. Compare this with the following—"Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth as it is heaven." "And the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom UNDER the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the most High." "And in the days of these kings" [the iron and clay divisions of the "fourth," or Roman kingdom,] "the God of heaven shall set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed"*** "it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever."—Matt. 6: 10. Dan. 7: 27, and 2: 44. See also Dan. 7: 13, 14—"One like the Son of man,"*** "and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a

kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him."

Thus we see who is to have the *dominion*, and that it is to be "under the whole heaven" and "on earth"—"the habitable earth." Does all this look as if God had determined to remove his people off the territory, originally given to men, to some other distant and unknown sphere, or place? In connection with the foregoing texts, look at the following: "The righteous shall never be removed: but the wicked shall *not inhabit the earth*." "Behold the righteous shall be recompensed *in the earth*; much more the wicked and the sinner." Prov. 10: 30, and 11: 31.

Here we see that the recompense of both classes of men is to be on the earth. The righteous are never to be removed from it, but the wicked shall not inhabit it. What then is to take place? Let Solomon answer—"The upright shall dwell in the land, and the perfect shall remain in it: but the wicked shall be cut off from the earth, and the transgressors shall be rooted out of it." Prov. 2: 21, 22.

The scriptures represent the wicked as being REMOVED, or rather *destroyed*; but the righteous are "to remain." The wicked are to be gathered out of his kingdom, (see Matt. 13: 41, 42,) not the righteous taken out of the territory, or off the earth. So far from the righteous being removed, we are expressly told, there is to be a "*restitution*;" and at that time, instead of the saints being taken up to heaven, Christ the Lord is to come "*from heaven*," or return to the earth. Let the following texts be read and compared together:—"And He shall send Jesus Christ,"*** "whom the heavens must receive until the times of *restitution* of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all the holy prophets since the world began."—Acts 3: 20, 21. "And when he (Jesus) had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight.—And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? THIS SAME JESUS, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come *in like manner* as ye have seen him go into heaven:" Acts 1: 9-11. "And his feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives, which is before Jerusalem on the east"*** "and the Lord my God shall come, and all the saints with thee,"*** "and the Lord shall be king over all the earth, in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one:" Zech. 14: 4, 5. 9.—

"Behold the days come, saith the LORD, that I will raise unto David a righteous branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth." Jer. 23 : 5. "Say among the heathen, the LORD reigneth; *the world* also shall be established that it shall not be moved: he shall judge the people righteously;" *** "he shall judge the world with righteousness, and the people with his truth;" Psa. 96 : 10, 13. "He shall judge thy people with righteousness, and the poor with judgment," [equity.]*** "In his days shall the righteous flourish; and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth; he shall have dominion also from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth." Psa. 72. See the whole Psalm.

Some men seem to think the earth shall never be rescued from the usurper's power, but that those reconciled to God must be removed and the earth destroyed. Let such not forget that *JEHOVAH* hath declared—"Truly as I live, *all the earth* shall be filled with the glory of the LORD;" Numb. 14 : 21. "All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the LORD: and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee," &c : Psa. 22 : 22-31. "For *the earth* shall be full of the knowledge of the LORD, as the waters cover the sea." Isa. 11 : 9.

We have given a sample, only, of what things "God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets," and which are embraced in the "*restitution*," when "God shall send Jesus" as the RESTORER.

We shall see in "the restitution" that God made this "world to be inhabited," (Isa. 45 : 18,) not to be destroyed. He will claim it from under the dominion of the usurping power; and with the "Son of God," who is the "*Son of man*," in possession of the dominion, which Adam lost, the earth will be renewed, "subdued," and become the Garden of God, or as the Garden of Eden.

Thus restored, renewed, and governed; the power of evil destroyed—sin, sorrow, pain and death annihilated—if the earth is not an inheritance that will fully meet the wants and aspirations of those in harmony with God, heaven itself cannot be supposed to afford the means of their gratification. Indeed, such dissatisfied ones must be of the number not possessed of the *meekness* to whom the "earth inheritance" is promised.

The day of triumph is to be ushered in by exulting "voices in heaven," mighty and "great, saying, The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our LORD, and of his CHRIST; and he shall reign for ever and ever." Rev. 11 : 15.

Such is to be the consummation of the present conflict with the power of evil, or evil power.—

The Christ—the *anointed* of God—the second Adam—is to regain the lost dominion, and to retain it forevermore: and to all the race of Adam who "overcome" the evil power, in their own proper personality, the anointed Restorer hath said—"To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in *my* throne, even as I overcame, and am sit down with my Father in his throne." Rev. 3 : 21. Thus, earth delivered—the dominion restored—Christ on his throne, "the throne of his father David," (Lk. 2 : 22,) which God has "sworn with an oath" to give unto him, (Acts 2 : 30)—the usurper overthrown—the earth reclaimed, and all its arrangements in harmony with the mind of God—war ceased—love everywhere triumphant—peace universal—Paradise revived and enlarged, filling the whole earth, man's *inheritance* will be perfect, complete, and joyous beyond all present human conception. Glory be to God and the Lamb for such a prospect, and such an inheritance. May we be among "the meek" who "shall inherit the earth."

From Mrs. A. C. Judson, Victor, N. Y.

Br. Storrs.—I send you a scrap of poetry which was laid away some time since in the corner of my portfolio, as suggestive of some ideas relative to the *great truth* we so ardently love—*Life only through Christ our Redeemer*.

"I Hear the Passing Bell."

BY PARK BENJAMIN.

I hear the passing bell!
Another soul, it says, has gone from earth,
Another soul has had immortal birth.

This deep and solemn knell
Is dirge and requiem to a dear one dead,
For whom tears, bitter tears are vainly shed.

No more—it speaks—no more
Shall be seen among you; through the gloom
Of these last rites he passes to the tomb.

Upon the silent shore
Of an eternal land, beyond the sea
Of life, his home must henceforth ever be.

He is familiar now
With the grand Mystery,—and he surveys
Truth in the brightness of its perfect blaze.

Then pile upon his brow
The valley clouds, and leave his ruined form
Where the wind wails and beats the wintry storm.

To him will come no harm,
For his immortal part survives and dwells
Beyond the grave's gloom and the toll of bells.

His is the deathless charm;
No pains can ring, no griefs his peace molest.
His is the assurance of perennial rest.

Then strike the passing bell,
As to the tomb, with slowly-measured tread,
Ye reverently bear his honored head.

And say, with thee 'tis well
Forevermore our brother! though we pay
With broken hearts these last rites to thy clay.

This is written, as you will perceive, by one of our most gifted sons of song; and is correct in rhythm, lofty in sentiment, and truly charming in its arrangement. But only a portion of it can we see is *truthful*, which of course greatly lessens our admiration of it. Now I cannot but think that *truth* and *poetry* ought to be united, although the received opinion seems to be that they are opposites. We certainly have an example of the most genuine poetry in the Bible which is truth itself; and where can be found themes so expansive and exalted, and so well worthy the employment of the most highly gifted poetic genius as upon the pages of inspiration? They are almost innumerable—those lofty themes, and the Christian poet need never be under the necessity of having recourse to pagan mythologies or papal absurdities for themes upon which to employ his God-given powers.

Yet, how much of our best written poetry is all wrong; and much of it has been written undoubtedly under the impression that it was Bible truth, while it was only the traditions of men.—The author of these beautiful lines was versifying a theological opinion, which he might have supposed was based upon scripture. It is appropriate, indeed for the spirit-rappers, and all in their wake,—but for us who are looking for the crown of life "when Christ who is our Life and shall appear," such poetry will not answer.

In my own manuscripts of by-gone years, I find many a poem that sings of the saint waded away to paradise, while "the house he lived in," was laid beneath the clods, and I surely supposed at the time that my ideas were in accordance with truth. Yet, I often pondered over the mystery of being *alive and dead at the same time*, but thought it *must be believed* if not in accordance with reason or the dictates of common sense. At times, sceptical thoughts (as I called them) would harass and perplex me. There flashes up in my mind just now one beautifully bright Autumnal afternoon. I stood by the coffin of a lovely child, who was lovely even then with its rigid form, and marble brow, and arrayed for its cheerless tenement. I gazed and gazed until lost in contemplation, and my thoughts were these—"How still! how senseless! no breath, no motion, no life—and where is that which animated the little form and gave action to the intellect? Was there an ethereal something, that has taken wings and gone to be with the angels? And is this merely the tenement of a spiritual and immortal part that is something—we know not what—and has gone somewhere—we know not where? Why is it not more rational to think that this is the *real being itself*—the dear little child who has lain down in its dreamless sleep, to awaken again by and by more bright and beautiful than ever?" But I started from my musings with the thought that this was *infidelity*, and must be banished at once—was even shocked

for having admitted such thoughts for a moment.

My heart is filled with thanksgiving that my eyes have been opened to see the truth upon this subject—"That *God alone hath immortality*—and that those who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory, honor and immortality, shall have eternal life—not at death, but in the glorious morning of the resurrection. O! of what value now appears the Resurrection! Dark indeed would our world be without it.

And now, as I have bid adieu to such poetic imagery, as that of the saint at death *robed in snowy whiteness, and having angelic wings soaring away above the stars* and singing praises to God—is there nothing left for verse when a friend has departed? O yes. There is the peaceful sleep in Jesus—the "life hid with Christ in God"—the glorious resurrection—and the mortal *then* putting on immortality. These, and many more, themes, inexhaustible and noble, worthy a more exalted intellect and pen than those which have fallen to my own humble lot. But, I commenced with the intention of saying a few words only, and have protracted my thoughts to a full letter.

Yours in hope, A. C. JUDSON.

From Rufus Wendell.

Canajoharie, N. Y., Oct. 22, 1856.

DEAR BRO. STORRS:—Having used the *nom de plume* of "MACKNIGHT, JR." as long as my sense of duty will permit me to do so, allow me in the next EXAMINER to inform its readers that the articles over that signature, in the current volume, are from my pen. Relative to the import of our Lord's words to the Sadducees, (Luke 20th) I do not see that farther discussion between Bro. Grew and myself would be profitable—at least for the present. Bro. G.'s "Reply No. 4" in this month's issue contains no *new* idea on the discourse in question, and as it is *his* right to be heard last in the argument, I leave the matter where it stands—commending to our readers' serious and candid consideration *all* that has been presented on *both sides*. The "misapprehension" which my brother thought it "necessary to correct" in his last reply, has at no time existed in my mind. If Bro. G. will read my last response with a little more care, he will readily perceive that it is *one* thing to say that he "has lost confidence in Luke 20: 37, 38 as proving the reliving of the wicked dead," and *another* and *different* thing to intimate that those passages constitute the "*main point* of (his) confidence" in such revival: the former I have done—the latter I have not. In my last response I wrote this sentence—"This I am confident the unprejudiced reader will see, whether Bro. G. does or not." By these words no disrespect to my beloved brother was intended, but as his reference to them in his last reply leads me to consider them improper, I withdraw them. I would not willingly offend against the divine precept, "*Be courteous*." In this connection I should perhaps add that I am unshaken in the conviction that the words of Christ to the Sadducees are "*positive* testimony that the wicked dead will" *not* "*live* again."

Bro. Grew's remarks upon 2 Tim. 1: 10, besides misrepresenting *my* position, are, as I judge, very unfortunate for his cause: but of this more at another time.

RUFUS WENDELL.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. XI.

NEW-YORK, NOVEMBER 15, 1856.

NO. 29.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year,

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

THE CHURCH'S EXPECTATION.

BY GEORGE DUKE OF MANCHESTER.

In a former chapter I stated what appeared to be certain characteristic features of this dispensation; I proceed now to point out what I conceive should be the longing anticipation of the Church with regard to the future.

"The grace of God which bringeth salvation" teacheth us, "that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world." If now, a man denied worldly lusts, and lived soberly and righteously, but yet was not godly—if he fulfilled all the duties of the second table, yet neglected the duties of the first—we should not hesitate to say that such a man was not taught by that grace of God which bringeth salvation: a man truly under the teaching of the Spirit cultivates both godliness and righteousness. But is this all that the grace of God, which bringeth salvation, teacheth? No; it also teaches us to be "expecting . . . the glorious appearance of our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ," and, apparently, the text implies, that this expectation is as certainly and as universally taught, as is the denial of ungodliness and worldly lusts; there seems no difference; the hope respecting Christ's advent appears quite as prominently brought forward as the characteristic life and conduct of the believer,—indeed, I should say more so, for the one is introduced as the end at which the child of grace is aiming; the others are the means towards the attainment.

We may lay it down as a proposition, that only those who deny ungodliness can be expecting Messiah's advent; for if men cast not off the works of darkness, they continue in a state of darkness; they know not that the night is far spent, and that the day is at hand; for the service of God, and the waiting for Christ, St. Paul gives us as the two great characteristics of true conversion:—"How ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God, and to wait for his Son from heaven." But in this waiting, an anxious wish for the event is implied, as well as the belief in the probability of its immediate occurrence.*

* The word in 1 Thess 1: 10 does not occur again in the New Testament; but it is found in

Taken conversely, the proposition is equally true. Those who are expecting Messiah's advent do deny ungodliness and worldly lusts; the expectation has a purifying efficacy: "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God. Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and [or but] it doth not yet appear what we shall be." We are now in possession of this most exalted privilege, although the present is not the season when the sons of God are manifested: the world now knows them not, any more than when Ho was on earth it knew Him. "But," says St. John, "we know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is." I understand the last clause not as assigning the cause, but affirming the proof, of our resemblance; it is not the transforming power of the beatific vision, but the discerning power of the beatified spirit. To see Him as He is, to know Him even as we are known, argues an exaltation of our nature commensurate with the glorified humanity of the Son of God; "and every man that hath this hope in Him, [i. e. in Christ,] purifieth himself even as He is pure." Every one who has this exalting, exhilarating hope of being made like unto Christ at his glorious appearing, does now strive after, and in some measure attain unto, that purity which is in Christ himself. Hence St. Paul urges it, as the great motive to mortification: "When Christ our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory. *Mortify, therefore, your members which are upon earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness which is idolatry.*"

The passage which I have quoted from St. John's epistle, seems to refer rather to the expansion of the intellectual and spiritual capacity of the glorified believer; but there must also be a spiritual body—a body capable of being actuated immediately by the glorified spirit—a body of glory suitable for the perfected spirit. Such was St. Paul's expectation; and in setting forth his walk as an example, in opposition to that which

the septuagint version of Job 7: 2, where the patriarch says, "As a servant earnestly desireth the shadow, and as a hireling looketh for [the reward of] his work, so am I made to possess months of vanity, and wearisome nights are appointed me."

"The compound word here used in the original denotes intensity. We not only await Him, Him, and are persuaded that He will stay patiently and eagerly for his com-
dure, because we long for it, and ar shall not be disappointed."—*Vaug Expectation, p. 11.*

ends in destruction, he implies that this desire of Christ's appearing, and of the consequent transformation into his likeness, was a great impelling motive to heavenly conduct, "for our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall transform our bodies of humiliation, in order that they may be fashioned like unto his body of glory." To attain to the hope, and to live in the expectation of the advent, is, in short, that which characterizes those who are not deficient in any spiritual gift. "I thank my God . . . for the grace of God which is given you by Jesus Christ; that in every thing ye are enriched by Him . . . so that ye come behind in no gift; waiting for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

St. James speaks of patience as being the crowning and completing grace of the Christian, so that however perfect he might be, were he not placed in such circumstances as would elicit and call into exercise the grace of patience, he would be wanting in something; and so great would be the want, that the believer should joyfully exchange a state of peace for one of manifold trials, in order that he might have the opportunity of exercising this grace. "But," adds he, "let patience have her perfect work, that ye may be perfect and entire, wanting nothing." What, however, can fortify the believer, and enable him to endure in the exercise of this perfecting grace, but the expectation of the Lord's speedy return? The same apostle says, "Be patient, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord: behold, the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience for it, until he receive the early and latter rain. Be ye also patient, stablish your hearts, for the coming of the Lord draweth nigh." St. Paul holds out precisely the same motive in support of the same grace: "Ye have need of patience, that after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the promise; for yet a little while, and He that shall come will come, and will not tarry." In both these passages the consideration of the Lord's speedy advent to put an end to suffering and trial, is held out as the support of patience. And in neither of them is there a hint of a period of spiritual peace and triumph prior to the advent.

Precisely the same thought is held out for the consolation of those under bereavement: "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not even as others who have no hope; for if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive [and] remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive [and] remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air: and so shall we be ever with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words." To me it appears evident, that the special ground of comfort here

urged, is the prospect of speedy reunion with the departed brethren; and that, not by our being absent from the body, and so present with the Lord, but by the return of Christ together with those who sleep in Jesus. Here, then, evidently, the whole consolation consists in the probability of Messiah's speedy return.

This language of the apostle seems to have taken such hold of the Thessalonians, that their desire for the Lord's return amounted to an error in the way of excess rather than of defect; for in his second epistle, St. Paul prays that the Lord would direct their hearts into "the patient waiting for Christ." Such, apparently, was their ardent desire for his advent, that it almost trenchanted upon the grace of patience. How very different is the condition of the Church now from what it was then! the Apostle having to rein in their ardor; whereas our sluggishness needs much goading.— But with those who have the assurance of hope, and are living in the sense of God's favor, the Thessalonian would be the more likely state of the two: they would be hoping "for the grace which is to be brought unto us at the revelation of Jesus Christ;" those whose conversation is in heaven are looking from thence "for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ," and in all holy conversation and godliness not only looking for, but "hastening on, the coming of the day of God." * * * *

It is distinctly said that the crown of righteousness "is laid up for . . . all those that love his appearing," and not only so, but apparently it is only for those, for it is "unto them that look for Him," that He will appear "unto salvation." In that day the Church will say, "Lo, this is our God, we have waited for Him, and He will save us; this is Jehovah, we have waited for Him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation." The iteration seems to mark that the waiting was an evidence that his appearing would be to their joy.

I have now stated what I apprehend should be the expectation of the Church, and the blessed effects of that expectation upon the disposition and conduct of the believer. I will now show some of the evil consequences upon the character of those who profess to be followers of the Lord, but yet who do not live in this attitude of expectation.

In the "perilous times" of "the last days," covetousness will be a leading feature among men who have the form of godliness while denying the power, but such men cannot be living upon the contemplation of Christ's speedy return, for nothing can be so effectual against the snare of covetousness as the expectation of Messiah's advent, for it is the thought which enables one to sit loose to the world, and which frees from all anxiety. "Let your moderation be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand, be careful for nothing."

Our Lord also intimates that some of his servants will be fostering a spirit of persecution, and indulging fleshly lusts, just because they say in their hearts, "My Lord delayeth his coming;" upon which He urges watchfulness; for those only who watch and pray always will be accounted worthy to escape; so our Lord says again, "Watch, therefore, for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come." And those who do watch for his advent

are blessed: "Behold, I come as a thief, *blessed is he that watcheth.*" The whole point and force would be taken away from the exhortation to watchfulness, if we admitted that there was to be a spiritual millennium intervening before the second advent; the idea intended to be conveyed seems to be the possibility, if not the probability, of Messiah's return within the period of a natural life.—"The end of all things is at hand, be ye *therefore* sober, and watch unto prayer."

A similar exhortation, "Let us watch and be sober," is grounded just upon the fact of light or darkness upon this point being the distinguishing mark of the believer: "But ye, brethren, are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief;" the "but" here is a particle of opposition by which St. Paul distinguishes the brethren from others. The son of Jonas in like manner makes wilful ignorance the characteristic of the wicked scoffers in the last days, attributing to them this inquiry, "Where is the promise of his coming?" Hence he expressly warns the beloved not to fall into this error of the wicked.

The expectation of the Lord's advent has always been the aspect of the true Church: it was so in the apostolic days; it was so with the fathers for the first three centuries; and it was so with the Reformers. Our Church, therefore, teaches us to say, "I look for the resurrection of the dead and the life of the world to come." We do not merely state our belief that there will be a resurrection of the dead some time or other—a thousand years hence, or even a year hence; but we declare that we are in the attitude of hope and expectation: "I look for it"—I know neither the day nor the hour.

The notion of a spiritual millennium which originated apparently by the *oscillation* into the opposite extreme, from the excesses of the German Anabaptists and English Fifth Monarchy Men, has since been fostered by the expectations raised from the efforts of religious societies, till it has become the deliberate creed of many. Thus we are enabled to understand how it can be used by our Lord and St. Peter as a prophetic feature and sign of the last days. I do not mean to imply that carelessness or indifference alone, upon the subject of the Lord's return, could be considered a prophetic sign—for that, I fear, has been the melancholy feature in most ages of the Church—but the deliberate maintenance of a doctrine which virtually says "My Lord delayeth his coming," is a prognostic of the speedy approach of Messiah. Now, we before observed, that a man who holds the spiritual millennium cannot be expecting the advent of the Lord: is he not, then, saying in his heart, "My Lord delayeth his coming?" And of what is such a belief the forerunner?

Shortly, then, to recapitulate this chapter. We may be confident, that an expectation—which is taught by the grace of God—which is a sign of true conversion—which is purifying in the highest degree—which shows itself in all holy conversation and godliness—which is a mark of the highest spiritual knowledge—which therefore characterises those for whom the crown is laid up, * * * is holy in its tendency—is in accordance with the divine

Mind, and is a point of great practical importance. On the other hand, that ignorance upon this subject—which is wilful—which betokens a child of darkness—which encourages a covetous disposition—which fosters a persecuting spirit—which unbridles the animal desires—and which will end in sudden destruction—is to be reprobated and carefully avoided.

My second conclusion, therefore, is, that the Church ought, according to the Scripture, to be "looking for the glorious appearing of the great God and Saviour," which conclusion being inconsistent with the belief of an antecedent spiritual millennium, confirms our former inference, drawn from the character of the present dispensation.

I have shown, that during this present dispensation, the enemies of Christ and his Church are in the ascendancy; and that the Church is, or ought to be, looking for the return of the Lord.

—♦—

EXPEDIENT FOR LOVING AND FORGIVING.—Man has an unfortunate readiness, in the evil hour, after receiving an affront, to draw together all the moon-spots on the other person into an outline of shadow, and a night piece, and to transform a single deep into a whole life; and this only in order that he may thoroughly relish the pleasure of being angry. In love, he has fortunately the opposite faculty of crowding together all the light parts and rays of its object into one focus, by means of the burning glass of imagination, and letting its sun burn without its spots; but he too generally does this only when the beloved, and often censured, being is already beyond the skies. In order, however, that we should do this sooner and oftener, we ought to act like Winklemason, but only in another way. As he, namely, set aside a particular half hour of each day for the purpose of beholding and meditating on his too happy existence in Rome, so we ought daily or weekly to dedicate and sanctify a solitary hour for the purpose of gumming up the virtues of our families, our wives, our children, and our friends—and viewing them in this beautiful crowded assemblage of their good qualities. And, indeed, we should do so for this reason, that we may not forgive and love too late, when the beloved beings are already departed hence, and are beyond our reach.—*Jean Paul Richter.*

—♦—

RELIGION ABROAD.

There is no country in the world where emissaries of the pope are not at work extending his empire. The aggregate number of his spiritual subjects is estimated at 160,000,000; while the number of Protestants amounts only to 85,000,000, and that of Greek Christians to 70,000,000. All these 160,000,000, mostly belonging to civilized nations, are ordered to believe only what the pope defines; to read only what he permits, and to obey only those spiritual leaders whom he appoints.—When did another mortal man see such an amount of power concentrated in his hand? And what temptation must it be for the newly-elected pope, if, for the first time, the tempter shows to him al-

the kingdoms of the world, prostrated at his feet, and the glory of them, and promises to him, "All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." History bears ample testimony, how great a part in rearing up the colossal edifice of popery is due to the energy of ambition.

When Pius IX. ascended the Papal See, he found the Roman Church in a condition of great weakness. But a few of the smaller Catholic governments and nations respected his authority; the larger ones seemed to care more for preventing encroachments of Rome than for extending its influence. Pius IX. began his career as a reformer; an unusual spectacle on the See of St. Peter, which procured to the Holy Father the unexpected applause of anti-ultramontane statesmen like Thiers, and frightened the "old fogies" in his own Church. The difficulties, however, which soon arose from these attempts, showed that Pius lacked both ability and courage to carry through a reform. The Roman Church would hardly have made considerable progress under this pontificate, if the year 1848 had not proved so powerful an ally. It frightened princes, politicians, and a portion of the European people back into Romanism, or, at least, into an alliance with it. Pius IX. has not known even, how to use the favorable opportunity itself. If the Roman Church is at present somewhat stronger than formerly, it is all due to the force of circumstances, to the patronage of France and Austria, and to the labors of a few eminent men, whom Protestant literature and civilization have helped to educate.

After these few preliminary remarks on the power of popery and the present pope, we invite our readers to cast a glance over the various governments and nations of the world in their present relation to Rome. We endeavor to give on this subject the views entertained by Rome itself. The eye of the pope rests with a particular delight on France and Austria, the two great Catholic powers of Europe. The Emperor of Austria is considered as one of the sincerest Catholic princes; only his youth, and the large Protestant population of his empire, hinder, for the present, the display of his whole zeal for the Catholic cause. High praise is bestowed also on the Emperor of France for his services to the cause of religion; yet in private circles, it is deemed exceedingly strange, that Louis Napoleon refuses to abrogate the obnoxious Ecclesiastical Law of France, and to conclude a new concordat, but persists, on the contrary, in conferring, what he confers, as a personal favor, and in leaving the path open to his successor. The French Church is considered as the most active and useful section of Catholicism. The princes of Italy are doing their best to please the pope, with the exception of the King of Sardinia, who has been to be excommunicated for carrying through a reform to which the pope objected. The Church is weak; everybody sees it. She is just as much afraid as the princes of dispensing with the support of French, Austrian, and Swiss bayonets. In Spain and Portugal, ministry and legislature have been for some years on very ill terms with the pope, although they console him from time to time, by authorizing new persecutions against Protestants.—

The Church is in the deepest lethargy there, but hopes to regain some influence on the government, by stirring up the lower classes of the people, and enlisting in her cause the old landed aristocracy. The Queen of Spain is known to sanction very reluctantly any measure against the Vatican, since, in her obedience to the pope, she is as unwavering as she is in her highly offensive mode of life; the young King of Portugal shows as yet no sympathy with the endeavors of the ultramontane party. In Switzerland, only five among twenty-two cantons are controlled by the Catholic party; the position of the church in general is most unfavorable, and her only trust is in the patronage of France and Austria. Belgium is the only constitutional State whose ministers are members and the organ of the ultramontane party. The Protestant King Leopold will, ere long, be succeeded by a Catholic son, who, it is expected, will equal in zeal the Emperor of Austria. This section of the Church is largely contributing to the propagation of Catholicism abroad. In Holland, whose government is at present conducted by zealous Protestants, Popery has enough to do in frustrating the efforts which numerous and active Protestant societies are making for the conversion of Roman Catholics. Prussia is considered as almost a model Protestant State, because it has made this year new concessions to her Catholic bishops. The Catholic population of Prussia, is, owing to the excellent system of instruction, the best educated people of the Roman Church. Papal affairs in general are in a very prosperous condition. In Bavaria, King Lewis, the most ultramontane, and, at the same time, the most profligate among the European Princes, has been succeeded by Maximilian II., who appoints more Protestant than Catholic professors to the two Catholic universities of the land. He is thought to be secretly a decided enemy to popery. The land, however, continues to be one of the strongholds of Romanism in Germany. The Protestant governments of Baden and Wurtemberg, urged by Austria, and, we have reason to believe, also by Protestant Prussia, are on the point of conceding to the Church almost everything she demands. The conclusion of their new concordat is expected before the close of the present year. Here, as well as in the other parts of Germany, Popery is visibly progressing. No government can be more detested in Rome than that of England, the powerful patron of Protestant interests all over the world. Rome feels deeply that it is England which most successfully opposes her aggrandizement in all the five large divisions of the world. The Roman Church of England has to exhaust her entire strength in a defensive war; she loses thousands of her people by the exertions of Low Church and Dissenting societies, while the number of Puseyists who come over to her, counts, at most, by dozens. Ireland is still the fertile nursery of Romish priests for the colonial territory of England and the United States of America; but a feeling of deep resentment goes through the land, on account of the many insults which her nationality has received from Rome. Sweden, Denmark and Norway, count together but a few thousand Romanists. In Denmark, they enjoy the patronage of the present king; report several conversions, and

have established the first Scandinavian Papal periodical. In Norway they have full religious liberty, while in Sweden they are cruelly persecuted, notwithstanding the queen and the queen dowager belong to their Church. The young *Emperor of Russia* is eulogized for having redressed most of the grievances of the Catholic Church, for having opened negotiations respecting a new concordat, and for being a friend of religious liberty, a quality which Rome is delighted to see in non-Catholic governments, while it detests it in Catholics. In *Turkey*, the influence of Catholic France is at present predominant; no class of Christians there receive so much aid from abroad as the Roman Catholics do from France and Austria. Particular attention is paid to the extension of educational establishments. In the Greek and Armenian Churches, a (not inconsiderable) party desires a union with Rome. *The kingdom of Greece* has a Catholic king, who, however, can do but little for the small number of his Catholic population.

Great fear is entertained at Rome, on account of the growing power and influence of the *United States*, which, it is thought, will be more pernicious to the progress of Rome than even England. Our people are supposed to have innumerable faults, among which, a surplus of backbone is the greatest. The Church is receiving some accession from the Puseyites, but has not priests enough for the spiritual advance of her flock. In *Mexico*, an eminently Catholic and tyrannical sou of the Church, Gen. Santa Anna, has been succeeded by a government which confiscates the ecclesiastical property, which does not respect even the sacred dignity of a bishop, if he enters into a conspiracy against the State, and which shows even a propensity to introduce the most treacherous of all modern heresies, freedom of religion. Of the half Indian States in *Central and South America* the pope complains, that he often does not know whether they still exist; so little is heard of them. The governments of some of them, as Guatemala, Costa Rica, Bolivia and Chili, are very obedient servants of the Church; but in Brazil the government is in the hands of the Liberals and Free Masons, and the emperor is a friend of the American Bible Society, and a protector of Protestant literature. The Legislatures of New Granada and Equador have become so rebellious as to expel the Jesuits, and to praise Luther as the parent of religious liberty.

In *Asia and Africa*, numerous missionaries are laboring for the conversion of pagans and Mohammedans, and thus far, without the prospect of carrying through their work in a single dominion, except, of course, the political dependencies of France, Spain, and Portugal. Thus have we rapidly traced the outlines of Popery as it is, throughout the world.—*Ch. Advocate.*

The Dream of Caleb Edmonds.

"Christianity, indeed!" said Mr. Edmonds, as he looked over his books, in the little back parlor behind the shop. "I am disgusted with such hypocrisy!"

There was a dark frown upon the brow of the man of business as he spoke these words, and an

irritability in his manner of turning over the leaves before him, which spoke of some bad debt troubling his mind, and robbing him of his good temper.

"What is the matter?" asked a cheerful little woman by the fire, at whose side a basket of stockings told of a large family, and a constant demand for stitchery.

"Matter!" echoed the husband, "do you not know that Welsford owes me four pounds, ten and sixpence?"

"Well, he will pay, I suppose?"

"Not he. The goods were purchased more than a year ago, and I have not had a penny yet!"

"What does he say when you see him?" asked Mrs. Edmonds, who evidently loved to look at the bright side.

"Say! he does not say much to me, I can tell you. I told him not to worry me with excuses, but to bring his money; and that he need not cross my door-step again until he could do that."

"I am sorry for his wife," said the little stocking-mender, presently; "she appears to be a truly pious woman."

"Pious!" retorted her husband, "yes, and so is he, 'tis that disgusts me. Religion, indeed! and he owes me four pounds, ten and sixpence. I thought the Bible said, 'Owe no man anything,' Christianity forsooth!"

Mr. Caleb Edmonds was a highly respectable grocer in the town of Marbury; in fact, a man of substance, for business had prospered with him.—He was industrious and obliging, rising early, working hard; and thus from small beginnings, he had risen to the possession of considerable wealth. But although an excellent man of business, Mr. Edmonds was a very ordinary Christian. True, he had begun the race, but he did not press toward the mark; alas for "the cares of this world and the deceitfulness of riches!" And, as it is characteristic of a low standard of piety to be harsh and censorious in our judgment of our fellow Christians, so Mr. Edmonds, when he heard of any defect in the character of professors around him, was always the first to exclaim, "Christianity indeed!"

Is not this too common with us all? Do we not, even if we give no expression to our thoughts, doubt and hesitate much more than we should doubt and hesitate, regarding the reality of the religion of our "Ready-to-halts" and "Feeble-minds?" Do we not set up a standard of perfection for our fellows, which were too lofty, in our view, as a standard for ourselves? And are we not too ready to exclaim against the wanderings of others, even while we turn aside into forbidden paths?

Perhaps such thoughts as these had passed through the mind of Mrs. Edmonds, as she sat over her work, for when she rose to leave her basket for some more active household duty, she bent over her husband for a moment, and said gently, "Caleb, I do not like to hear you say 'Christianity indeed,' as you did just now. Suppose your fellow Christians were to judge of you as harshly as you of them! You often say it," she continued hastily; "you doubted John Watson's religion yesterday, because he lent money to your rival; and Thornton's because he opposes

you in business, and you shook your head about Miss Milwood's piety, because she argued with you against total abstinence! *'Judge not, that ye be not judged.'*"

Long after his wife left him, these words rang in Caleb's ears—" *Judge not.*"

At last, as he sat in the twilight, between sleeping and waking—for business was very dull, and he could spare half an hour for rest—a vision stole upon him, and he passed, in imagination, rapidly through the scenes which follow.

At first he found himself in a very quiet neighborhood, and in the presence of three maiden ladies, whose names he knew very well. They had their feet upon the fender, and, their knitting laid aside, were evidently discussing the affairs of their neighbors.

"Such pride!" said the elder lady, whose name was Rayby; "what will come next I wonder!"

"The most fashionable boarding-school in R., I assure you," said another—Miss Phillip.

"Ah!" said Miss Rayby, "and I can remember the time—of course I was very young then, but still I can remember—when Caleb Edmonds swept out his own shop!"

"Dear me! and now he has the upstart impudence to send his girl to such a school as that!" exclaimed Miss Sophia Milwood, the spinster, who had not yet spoken. "O, the pride of human nature!"

"And he a professor, too!"

"Professor!" said Miss Rayby: "religion does not teach a man such absurd pride as that!"

Miss Phillip shook her head, and began to lament the increase of false professors.

"Well," thought Caleb, "I believed that in spending some of my cash upon the education of my children, I could not go very far wrong; but I find I am misunderstood even here."

The next scene was the drawing-room of John Watson, of whom Mrs. Edmonds had spoken. A lady was making tea behind a silver urn, and a gentleman (her husband) sat beside her.

"Poor Thompson," said Mrs. Watson, for it was she, "I trust he will succeed."

"He shall, if by God's blessing I can compass it."

"He is a very deserving young man," continued the lady; "the manner in which he bore the loss of all his property would win esteem, even if he had no other claim."

Mr. Watson did not reply; his mind had wandered to another branch of the subject. "That Caleb Edmonds," she said at length, "I am surprised at the ill-feeling he displays."

"Toward Thornton?"

"Yes, he is evidently annoyed at the opening of another shop so near his own; whereas, in the principal street of a town like this, he should have expected competition. Besides, he has made a little fortune, and has nothing to fear; yet he will not treat George Thornton with ordinary civility."

"I thought he was a religious man," said Mrs. Watson.

"He pretends to be," replied her husband, "but I have not much faith in a religion which brings forth so little fruit!"

Poor Caleb! his wife's words—the *Master's* words—still sound in his ears as they had never done before, meeting with a responsive echo in his heart.

Again a change, and Mr. Edmonds found himself beside a sickly-looking woman, who, leaning upon her husband's arm, walked slowly toward the house of prayer. It was impossible to look without interest upon her pale and anxious face; a face which once had been beautiful; and equally impossible to disregard the careful tenderness with which her steps were guided by the strong arm at her side. Their conversation, too, was worthy of remark; they were speaking of the consolations of the Gospel.

"Who knows?" exclaimed the invalid, "perhaps there may be words just suited to our case this morning. Words for the poor!"

"Poor as regards this world only, Mary!"

Her eyes brightened as she looked up cheerfully. "Yes, yes, rich in treasure far more costly than earth's gold. God help us to look up, and to trust him for the 'meat that perisheth.'"

They walked on for a while, and then the wife said mournfully: "I sometimes fear that it is pride which makes me shrink from meeting Mr. Edmonds; I do shrink from it. O, if we could pay but him!"

"We shall be able to do so soon, I hope," said Welsford; "it has been a hard struggle, Mary, starvation almost, but I think it is nearly over."

"Ah, it was ail for me! I am sure Mr. Edmonds would be patient, if he knew how much you spent in medicines for me, and how little work you have."

"He is patient, after a fashion; and we have reason to be thankful for that; still he has said some crushing things to me; harsh things, which he may live to repent; things which have made me doubt his Christianity."

"Nay" said Mrs. Welsford, gently, "I would not judge him; how many inconsistent things we do."

"You are right. I may not lift up my voice; alas, but little likeness to my Lord is found in me!"

Again the echoing voice thrilled through the soul of the listener; again he heard the words, "*Judge not!*" and as he dwelt upon them the vision slowly faded, and he, Bunyan-like, awoke, "and behold it was a dream!" But the lesson of the dream was not quite lost upon him, for he awoke to a deeper spirit of Christian charity, a nobler self-denial, a holier humility, a nearer likeness to Jesus. He had been taught in that brief twilight musing, one of the grand old lessons of the Book of God.

The fireside morning worship was just ended, and Charles Welsford was about to go forth to his daily toil, when a gentle knock at the door spoke of a visitor: how great was the surprise of all when Caleb Edmonds entered!

"You come, sir, —"

"I am come," said the grocer, interrupting him, "to express my hope that you are not under any concern about the little amount you owe me.—Take your time, my good sir; take your time."

The poor man's eyes were filled up with tears, as, grasping the outstretched hand, he tried to speak his thanks.

"My wife," said Mr. Edmonds, turning toward Mrs. Welsford, "put something into my hand, just as I left, for you, ma'am."

And forth from his pockets came tea, sugar, biscuits, from the good wife's ample store, till Mary's eyes, too, filled with grateful tears.

"And now," said the visitor, kindly, "don't forsake the shop; get your little parcels there, and pay just when it suits you. By the way, if a sovereign would be of any service to you, I have one which will burn a hole in my pocket, as the saying goes, unless I give it to somebody." And before they could reply, he had laid the coin upon the table and was gone.

"Mary," said Mr. Welsford, "let us thank God for this."

They knelt, and as he breathed forth his heart's gratitude, his wife wept tears of joy, and even the little ones murmured the "Amen."

But Mr. Edmonds did not stop at this; it was to him Charles Welsford owed a situation which soon after placed him far above the reach of want; it was to him he owed a host of kindly deeds, which came like sunshine to his inmost soul.

We hasten on. Not alone in this regard was Caleb Edmonds changed, for two days after his strange dream, he walked into his rival's shop, shook hands, invited him to drink tea at his house, spoke pleasantly about their "opposition," and even hinted at his own retirement at some future day, when his new friend would have a better chance.

And from that time, the charity which "suffereth long and is kind, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil, beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things," held an almost undisputed sway over the heart of Caleb Edmonds; and ever was the maxim of the Bible borne in mind: "*Judge not, that ye be not judged.*"

DEATH-BED TESTIMONIES.—We must turn elsewhere than to the books of New Testament for death-bed scenes. One beautiful record of the first season of the Church, who prayed for his countrymen, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge," is all that we have of martyrology in the Bible. Its warriors fight the good fight. We know that in some battle or other they finish their course.—Where, or how, or under what circumstances of humiliation, or triumph, we are not told. If it pleased God that their lamps should shine out brightly at the last, that was well, for he was glorified in their strength. If it pleased him that the light should sink and go out in its socket, that was well too, for he was glorified in their weakness.—Not by momentary flashes does God bid us judge of our fellow creatures; for he who reads the heart and sees the meaning and purpose of it judges not of them by these. And never be it forgotten, that at the death which has redeemed all other deaths and made them blessed, there was darkness over all the land until the ninth hour, and that a cry came out of the darkness, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?"—*P. D. Maurice.*

A Great Cure-All.

Several gentlemen were talking one evening at the house of a friend, when one of them exclaimed, "Ab! depend upon it, a soft answer is a great cure-all." At this state of the conversation, a boy who sat behind a table began to listen, and repeated, as he thought, quite to himself, "A soft answer is a great cure-all." "Yes, that's it," cried the gentleman, starting and turning round; "yes, that's it; don't you think so, my lad?" The boy blushed a little at finding himself so unexpectedly addressed, but answered, "I don't know that I understand you, sir."

"Well, I will explain then. In the days of my boyhood it so happened that, in the school to which I was sent, my seat was next to a lad named Tom Tucker. When I found he lived in a small house behind the academy, I began to strut a little, and talk about what my father was; but as he was a capital scholar, very much thought of by the boys, we were soon on pretty good terms; and so it went on for some time. After a while, some fellows of my stamp, and I with the rest, got into a difficulty with some of the ushers, and some how or other, we got the notion that Tom Tucker was at the bottom of it.

"'Tom Tucker! who is he?' I cried, angrily. 'I'll let him know who I am!' and I went in a passion to Tom, and said, 'I'll teach you to talk about me in this way!' But he never winced or seemed in the least frightened, but stood still, looking at me mute as a lamb. 'Charles,' he said, 'you may strike me as much as you please; but I shan't strike back again; fighting is a poor way to settle difficulties. I'm thinking when you are Charles Everett, I'll talk to you.'

"O what an answer was that! How it cowed me down! So firm, and yet so mild! I felt there was no fun in having the fight all on one side. I was ashamed of myself, my temper, and everything about me. I longed to get out of his sight. I saw what a poor, foolish way my style of doing things was. I felt that Tom had completely got the better of me; that there was power in his principles superior to anything I had ever seen before; and from that hour Tom Tucker had an influence over me nobody ever had before or since; it has been for good, too. That, you see, is the power, the moral power, of a soft answer."

HOW TO BE HAPPIER.—Said a venerable farmer, some eighty years ago, to a relative who had lately visited him, "I have lived on this farm for more than half a century. I have no desire to change my residence as long as I live on earth. I have no desire to be any richer than I now am. I have worshipped the God of my fathers with the same people for more than forty years. During that time I have rarely been absent from the sanctuary on the Sabbath, and never lost one communion season. I have never been confined to my bed by sickness a single day. The blessings of God have been richly spread around me, and I made up my mind long ago that if I wished to be happier I must have more religion."

BIBLE EXAMINER.

New York, November 15, 1851:

SUBSCRIBERS wishing to pay personally, or sending by private hands, for the EXAMINER for 1857, may do so to GEO. YOUNG, agent for R. T. YOUNG's Letter File, 109 Nassau Street, New York; who is authorized to act for us in the matter.

Our Office and residence is at 62 Hicks Street, Brooklyn, a short distance from Fulton Ferry, where we shall be happy to see any of our friends.

Two numbers more complete the present volume of the BIBLE EXAMINER. We thank our friends for past favors. We very much wish we could have the number of subscribers that would enable us to reduce the subscription price to \$1 for 24 numbers. Nothing short of fifteen hundred paying would do it. Till we obtain that number the terms cannot be less than \$2 to single subscribers, while we issue semi-monthly.

To encourage early payments—which are much to our advantage—we make the following offers, to such as forward us the cash before December 25th: where papers are sent to one address, in the States.

For two copies \$3; for five copies \$7; for ten copies \$10.

If either of these offers are accepted, let it be distinctly understood, we send the whole number in one envelope, to one individual; and we do not need the name of any other person.

To single subscribers, who pay \$2 before Dec. 25th, we will give two copies of either of the following works—the subscriber to pay the postage on them—viz: "MAN'S DESTINY;" "DOBNEY ABRIDGED;" "THE DISCUSSION" with Prof. Mattison; or, we will give one copy of "BIBLE vs. TRADITION," in paper cover, and pay the postage on it ourself. If any prefer, instead of either the foregoing offers, a copy of the "Revised and Enlarged SIX SERMONS" we will give them that; but they must pay the postage on it.

Money sent for the BIBLE EXAMINER is at our risk, provided the letter is sealed with a wafer and directed as follows—

GEO. STORRS, Box 4658, New York.

Take care to put no other words or figures in the direction, as it will be at your risk if you do.

BOUND EXAMINERS FOR 1856.—Persons who wish the BIBLE EXAMINER bound for this year must let us know by Dec. 15th, as we do not cal-

culate on binding many volumes. It will be remembered that four numbers of this year are included in our Review of Dr. Post, or "MAN'S DESTINY." As that cannot be bound with the other numbers, on account of its size, the volume will contain but twenty numbers, or 320 pages. We shall put the bound volume, therefore, at \$1.50. To persons who send us \$2 for the next volume, and do not claim either of the other premiums we have offered, we will give the bound volume of this year for \$1. But let us have your orders immediately, if you intend to accept this offer. Let it be understood, in this case, the postage on the volume is to be paid by the purchaser, which will be about 25 cents, if prepaid.

A few bound volumes for 1855 can still be had of us at \$1.50.

IMPERFECT numbers of the EXAMINER may have been received by some of our subscribers during this year: if so, please let us know it, and we will send you perfect ones in their place, without charge. We endeavor to be careful in this matter, but imperfect ones sometimes, possibly, escape us.

"AMERICAN PRESBYTERIAN."—Such is the name of a new weekly paper issued in Philadelphia; Rev. BENJ. J. WALLACE, Editor, with ALBERT BARNES and several others for Associates. It is a large folio, with seven columns to the page: is a handsome sheet, and appears to bid fair to be a most useful paper for the Presbyterians of America. We wish it all possible success in doing good.

"TRUE WESLEYAN."—This paper has changed its Editor. L. C. MATLACK, its previous Editor, having become "President of the Illinois Institute," at Wheaton, Ill. Success to him in his new vocation. Rev. CYRUS PRINDLE is now Editor of the True Wesleyan. With Br. Prindle we have had a pleasing acquaintance in former years. We entertain for him the most sincere respect, and therefore rejoice that he occupies his present relation to the Wesleyan; though we differ materially on theology. That difference, on our part, shall not prevent our christian regard for him.

CHANGES.—The following remarks close an article in the True Wesleyan, from M. Stow, Weybridge, Vt., on the cry "Never change Politics or Religion." They are worthy to be placed in large characters in every public place. To the sentiments we respond most fully.

"There are two classes in community. The one that say 'we never change,' and leave us to think

they can have little use for their eyes, ears, reason or conscience, and must act the part of the slave to their Church or Party, which may change at pleasure, they will follow in the wake as long as their party adheres to the original name and be satisfied; but in point of fact change, rather are changed by others, as often as the other class, whose changes are the result of reflection and study, and a conviction of wrong. This latter class think, and that justly too, that a change would improve their position, and give them an opportunity to be more useful, rid themselves of error, and in so doing, be enabled better to render service to God and man. May heaven bless this last class, and increase their graces and numbers."

"IN HEAVEN AN HOUR"

The *Northwestern Christian Advocate*, (Methodist Episcopal), speaking of the death of Dr. Watson, says—

"On the evening of the 16th he dictated about half a column of matter found in this issue. On the morning of the 17th he expressed a wish to dictate more in the afternoon, at four o'clock. When that time came he had been in heaven an hour."

The Doctor died, it seems by the account, just before three o'clock; or, as the *Advocate* expresses it, "passed into heaven as gently as the stars of morning go out."

Several thoughts or questions rushed into our mind on reading this article.

1. Where do the Scriptures use such language in recording the death of saints?

2. Did the Doctor "pass into heaven" quicker than David? Peter, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, said, on the day of Pentecost, "David is not ascended into the heavens:" but David died a *thousand years* before. The *Advocate* found Dr. Watson "in heaven" the very moment of his death: he outstript David a long time, it seems.

3. Why are Christians of these days so much wiser than the Bible? That book represents the dead saints as having "fallen asleep;" and never as going to heaven at death.

4. If the representation of the *Advocate* be correct, then the record of the death of saints, or their approach to it, could be amended by the substitution of the phrases which the *Advocate* uses and make sense. Let us try it.

"An evil beast hath devoured him: Joseph is without doubt" [passed into heaven]. "I will go down into" [heaven] "unto my son mourning." Gen. 37: 33, 35. "Then shall ye bring down my gray hairs with sorrow" [into heaven]. Gen. 42: 38. "It shall come to pass, when he seeth the lad" [Benjamin] "is not with us, that he" [Jacob] "will" [pass into heaven:] "and thy

servants shall bring down the gray hairs of thy servant our father with sorrow" [into heaven]. Gen. 43: 31. "So Joseph" [passed into heaven,] "being a hundred and ten years old; and they embalmed him, and he was put in a coffin in Egypt." Gen. 50: 26.

"The days of David drew nigh that he should" [pass into heaven]. 1 Kings 2: 1. Compare this with Acts 2: 34. "David is *not* ascended into the heavens." "In those days Hezekiah was sick unto" [passing into heaven]. "And Isaiah came unto him, and said, Thus saith the LORD:*** "thou shalt" [pass into heaven] "and not live." *** "And Hezekiah wept sore." Isaiah 38: 1-3. "When thou shalt be old, thou shalt stretch forth thine hands, and another shalt gird thee and carry thee whither *thou wouldst not*. This spake Jesus, signifying by what" [passing into heaven] "he should glorify God." John 21: 18, 19. Peter, it seems, "would not" like to go there.

"Manoah said unto his wife, We shall surely" [pass into heaven,] "because we have seen God. But his wife said unto him, If the LORD were pleased to" [pass us into heaven] "he would not have received a burnt-offering and a meat-offering at our hands." Judges 13: 22, 23. "Epaphroditus was sick nigh unto" [passing into heaven]: "but God had *mercy on him*;" &c. Phil. 2: 27.

"Jesus said unto them plainly, Lazarus is" [passed into heaven]. "Then said Martha to Jesus, Lord if thou hadst been here my brother had not" [passed into heaven]. "Jesus saith unto her, Thy brother shall" [come out of heaven] "again." They came to the grave. "Jesus said, Take ye away the stone. Martha, the sister of him that was" [gone into heaven] "saith unto him, Lord by this time he stinketh for he hath been" [in heaven] "four days."**** "Then they took away the stone, where" [he that was gone to heaven] "was laid." Jesus "cried with a loud voice, Lazarus, come forth. And he that was" [in heaven] "came forth bound hand and foot with grave-clothes," &c.

These samples are sufficient to show the unscriptural method some persons have in expressing themselves in relation to those who have "fallen asleep in Christ," and who await "the resurrection, at the last day."

Such language as that employed in the *Advocate*, never occurs in the Scriptures of truth: and the direct tendency of it is to inspire false hopes, and to deceive the living in relation to the dead. Such teaching it is that has made void "the resur-

rection of the dead" in Christ," and led to the spirit-rapping delusion of these last days.

If our voice could be heard, we would entreat all Christians to speak on this subject as "the oracles of God," that they may not any longer discredit the resurrection, nor lend their influence to spirit-rapping. It is not agreeable to us to find fault with those who love the Lord Jesus Christ; but we beg of them to use Scripture language when they speak of death. Death is nothing desirable. It cannot be to any enlightened mind. It is "the last enemy," which is only to be divested of its deadly power by "the resurrection at the last day." Till then it holds "dominion" over those, even, "who have fallen asleep in Christ." At that day, shall the saints arise from the dead victorious and triumphant. They die, or fall asleep, in "hope" of that victory "at the last trump." Till then they do not "ascend into the heavens;" David did not, and there is not a promise in the Bible that any other saint shall "pass into heaven" at death.

We have made the foregoing remarks with no hostile feelings towards those who employ the unscriptural language we have spoken of; nor with any lack of charity towards them. We know too well the power of phraseology with which we have been familiar from our youth; especially as connected with those we love, who have fallen asleep in death. Our love for these slumbering ones leads us, without due consideration, to think them "in heaven," because we dislike to think of them as really in an unconscious state. But an unbiased examination of Scripture will lead us to see that we have no authority to look for "comfort" concerning them except in the "return" of Christ "from heaven," and their "resurrection at the last day:" "for the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord.—Wherefore comfort one another with these words." 1 Thess. 4: 16-18.

Such is Bible ground of comfort; and such is the hope of the Gospel; and no authority from the Scriptures is given for speaking of the saints, who have fallen asleep in Christ, as being "in heaven." No: it is a "tradition of men." Shall this tradition be suffered still to blind our minds to the glories of the resurrection by "the Lord Jesus Christ, our hope?"

The Bible vs. Creeds.

We cut the following remarks from an article in the *Christian Advocate*, of this city, of January last, written by Rev. A. STEVENS, on the "Religion of Germany." We have given the extract to show the importance of the Bible to a right faith and experience. To that Book alone must be all our appeals if we would have our faith founded on the rock, and our experience a *Christian* one. Mr. Stevens says:—

I have given you some details showing the re-suscitation of true faith in several sections of Germany. Wurtemberg has especially shown signs of spiritual life. I am happy to confirm my former references to that garden spot of the new German "evangelism" by the testimony of a Scotchman—of the Free Church, and therefore no "latitudinarian"—the late Rev. Mr. Mackintosh. He says: "I have never known, nor expect to know, a finer developed people than the Christians of Wurtemberg. They have the advantage of learning their Christianity rather from the Bible than confessions, and so it takes a healthy, simple, undoubting form, which, with us, [Scotchmen,] too often, by gentle and simple, is wanting. Not that our folk study the confession for themselves—no, they read their Bibles; but it is the teaching of the school and of the pulpit so unceasingly that colors all their views; and so, in general, reduces the matter to one dead level, where it would be hard to say if asked, which is the cardinal doctrine of Christianity. *The Bible, if read in its own light, leaves one in no doubt about it.* It is Jesus Christ manifest in the flesh, suffering on the cross, received up into glory, and, for the sinner; all others should have weight as they have more or less nearly to do with this.***The awakened sinner does not know at first whither to turn—to election, or to what; and perhaps only after a long searching is Christ himself, he knows not how, presented to his eyes, exhaled, as it were, from this long and artfully-linked catena. How beautiful the confidence of the Christian's approach to God here—*Lieber Vater!* he cannot doubt, for his love sent Jesus—*Der treuer Heiland!* We have still very Jewish, distant, and awful thoughts of God. We see him not enough in the Son, and have very few and imperfect thoughts of the Son, who yet must be *our life*. The other 'doctrines,' as we call them, if they do not shut him out, keep him in the background as effectually as do the 'saints' of the Roman Catholic Church. When will it be otherwise? and our religion become a more simple and a more loving one? This will only be when we adhere to the Bible as the textbook more closely in school and pulpit, and learn our Christianity and theology there, where everything has its due prominence. *I recognize this as the grand result of German experience;* and yet it is but a return to the principle of the Reformation—too soon, however, abandoned. Now, as then, and ever, the Bible must be mighty to the pulling down of strongholds, (be they what they may,) and the building up of a sound and living

piety. There was long, and still is, a tendency, favored by Schleiermacher, and even the Moravians, to detach Christ from the Bible; but the evil consequences of this are seen—and now a Bible, that is, a Christian, theology is the cry."

These are remarkable thoughts for a Calvinist, but they are just such as force themselves upon every mind that looks profoundly into the tendencies of religious opinion in these formerly Calvinistic countries.

PRESENT AND FUTURE KNOWLEDGE.

BY THE EDITOR.

"For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part, but then shall I know even as I also am known."—1 Cor. 13: 12.

The present and future states are here presented. The first as an imperfect one, and the other as "perfect," verse 10. "Now" we occupy the first state, even the best of us; for Paul did not except himself, who surely might have been, if any one.

"That which is perfect" (v. 10) is future—yet to come. If an apostle thus speaks of himself, in contrasting the knowledge of the two states, how much more does it become us—who never had the same means of knowledge—to speak of our present attainments with modesty, and in charity for others. Charity, or love, is the grace which the apostle is specially enforcing in this chapter; and the description he gives of it and its value is worthy of deep consideration by all. Without it, the highest eloquence is but as "sounding brass:" without it, the most perfect knowledge of mysterious subjects would avail us nothing: without it, the most miracle working faith is nothing to our real advantage: without it, the most extensive distribution of our goods to the poor would avail us nothing: without it, zeal for truth, which should lead us to martyrdom, would "profit nothing." This charity is a grace that is "kind"—not "boastful"—not "envious"—does not lead to doing that which "causeth shame"—it is not exclusive, to seek only its "own"—it is "not passionate"—"thinketh no evil" where none appears—it "rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth"—it "beareth all things," *i. e.*, all the weaknesses, &c., of others—it "believeth all things, hopeth all things, and endureth all." It "will never cease," (Syriac) "but prophesyings will end, and tongues be silent."

Such is the character, value, and durability of charity, or love. It is pure and perfect in its nature; and stands first, or chief, in the true Christian character; so that if this be wanting nothing else will avail us. But knowledge now is imper-

fect: *i. e.*, we know but "little of much" that may be known, and that will hereafter be made clear. Our present imperfection, or abridgement of knowledge, forms a claim on us all for the exercise of charity to the full extent the apostle has described and defined.

"Then," in our text, refers to that "perfect" state (v. 10) when our imperfect knowledge shall be succeeded by clearness. Hence that state can be no other than the kingdom of God, yet future. There is to be "no night there:" knowledge will be "perfect." Not that all will be known, immediately on entering there, that ever can be; but, whatever subject we are called to exercise our minds upon, we shall see and understand without liability to error, as we are now: doubt will not disturb us, as now, as to the correctness of our conceptions. "Now," in this present state, "we see through a glass darkly," or but imperfectly. We see and know now as by a mirror—and that an imperfect one—which gives us not the very things themselves, but only a reflection of the realities. So that while we obtain some knowledge, it is more or less imperfect from the imperfection of the medium through which it is received. But "when that which is perfect is come"—the mirror, or glass, dispensed with, so that we see the reality itself—"then" we "shall know even as" we "also are known:" error will cease, and we shall see all things clearly and truly. Such is to be the future state, or the knowledge attained by those who are accounted worthy to obtain that inheritance.

We shall now proceed to notice

I. SOME OF THE THINGS CONNECTED WITH THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE FUTURE STATE, OR THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

1. *We may expect perfect light.* Our Teachers will not be erring and imperfect mortals, but endowed with a clear and purified intellect, grasping by intuition any and every subject presented for contemplation. Under such Instructors there will be no chance for error.

2. *Then we shall have perfect faculties.*—"Now" we are enfeebled in all our faculties. Our understanding is darkened, and our judgment warped, oftentimes, from various and unavoidable causes; causes over which we had no control, and from which—for a time at least—we could not possibly extricate ourselves. Our bodily organization is now more or less deranged, and often has an overpowering and irresistible influence on our mental operations, so that imperfection in knowledge is unavoidable. Sincerely as we may desire

rection of the dead" in Christ," and led to the spirit-rapping delusion of these last days.

If our voice could be heard, we would entreat all Christians to speak on this subject as "the oracles of God," that they may not any longer discredit the resurrection, nor lend their influence to spirit-rapping. It is not agreeable to us to find fault with those who love the Lord Jesus Christ; but we beg of them to use Scripture language when they speak of death. Death is nothing desirable. It cannot be to any enlightened mind. It is "the *last enemy*," which is only to be divested of its deadly power by "the resurrection at the last day." Till then it holds "dominion" over those, even, "who have fallen asleep in Christ." At that day, shall the saints arise from the dead victorious and triumphant. They die, or fall asleep, in "hope" of that victory "at the last trump." Till then they do not "ascend into the heavens:" David did not, and there is not a promise in the Bible that any other saint shall "pass into heaven" at death.

We have made the foregoing remarks with no hostile feelings towards those who employ the unscriptural language we have spoken of; nor with any lack of charity towards them. We know too well the power of phraseology with which we have been familiar from our youth; especially as connected with those we love, who have fallen asleep in death. Our love for these slumbering ones leads us, without due consideration, to think them "in heaven," because we dislike to think of them as really in an unconscious state. But an unbiased examination of Scripture will lead us to see that we have no authority to look for "comfort" concerning them except in the "return" of Christ "from heaven," and their "resurrection at the last day:" "for the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord.— Wherefore comfort one another with these words." 1 Thess. 4: 16-18.

Such is Bible ground of comfort; and such is the hope of the Gospel; and no authority from the Scriptures is given for speaking of the saints, who have fallen asleep in Christ, as being "in heaven." No: it is a "tradition of men." Shall this tradition be suffered still to blind our minds to the glories of the resurrection by "the Lord Jesus Christ, our hope?"

The Bible vs. Creeds.

We cut the following remarks from an article in the *Christian Advocate*, of this city, of January last, written by Rev. A. STEVENS, on the "*Religion of Germany*." We have given the extract to show the importance of the Bible to a right faith and experience. To that Book alone must be all our appeals if we would have our faith founded on the rock, and our experience a *Christian* one. Mr. Stevens says:—

I have given you some details showing the resuscitation of true faith in several sections of Germany. Wurtemberg has especially shown signs of spiritual life. I am happy to confirm my former references to that garden spot of the new German "evangelism" by the testimony of a Scotchman—of the Free Church, and therefore no "latitudinarian"—the late Rev. Mr. Mackintosh. He says: "I have never known, nor expect to know, a finer developed people than the Christians of Wurtemberg. They have the advantage of learning their Christianity rather from the Bible than confessions, and so it takes a healthy, simple, undoubting form, which, with us, [Scotchmen,] too often, by gentle and simple, is wanting. Not that our folk study the confession for themselves—no, they read their Bibles; but it is the teaching of the school and of the pulpit so unceasingly that colors all their views; and so, in general, reduces the matter to one dead level, where it would be hard to say if asked, which is the cardinal doctrine of Christianity. *The Bible, if read in its own light, leaves one in no doubt about it.* It is Jesus Christ manifest in the flesh, suffering on the cross, received up into glory, and, for the sinner; all others should have weight as they have more or less nearly to do with this.***The awakened sinner does not know at first whither to turn—to election, or to what; and perhaps only after a long searching is Christ himself, he knows not how, presented to his eyes, exhuned, as it were, from this long and artfully-linked *catena*. How beautiful the confidence of the Christian's approach to God here—*Lieber Vater!* he cannot doubt, for his love sent Jesus—*Der treuer Heiland!* We have still very Jewish, distant, and awful thoughts of God. We see him not enough in the Son, and have very few and imperfect thoughts of the Son, who yet must be *our life*. The other 'doctrines,' as we call them, if they do not shut him out, keep him in the background as effectually as do the 'saints' of the Roman Catholic Church. When will it be otherwise? and our religion become a more simple and a more *loving* one? This will only be when we adhere to the Bible as the textbook more closely in school and pulpit, and learn our Christianity and theology there, where everything has its due prominence. *I recognize this as the grand result of German experience;* and yet it is but a return to the principle of the Reformation—too soon, however, abandoned. Now, as then, and ever, the Bible must be mighty to the pulling down of strongholds, (be they what they may,) and the building up of a sound and living

piety. There was long, and still is, a tendency, favored by Schleiermacher, and even the Moravians, to detach Christ from the Bible; but the evil consequences of this are seen—and now a Bible, that is, a Christian, theology is the cry.”

These are remarkable thoughts for a Calvinist, but they are just such as force themselves upon every mind that looks profoundly into the tendencies of religious opinion in these formerly Calvinistic countries.

PRESENT AND FUTURE KNOWLEDGE.

BY THE EDITOR.

“For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as I also am known.”—1 Cor. 13: 12

The present and future states are here presented. The first as an imperfect one, and the other as “perfect,” verse 10. “Now” we occupy the first state, even the best of us; for Paul did not except himself, who surely might have been, if any one.

“That which is perfect” (v. 10) is future—yet to come. If an apostle thus speaks of himself, in contrasting the knowledge of the two states, how much more does it become us—who never had the same means of knowledge—to speak of our present attainments with modesty, and in charity for others. Charity, or love, is the grace which the apostle is specially enforcing in this chapter; and the description he gives of it and its value is worthy of deep consideration by all. Without it, the highest eloquence is but as “sounding brass:” without it, the most perfect knowledge of mysterious subjects would avail us nothing: without it, the most miracle working faith is nothing to our real advantage: without it, the most extensive distribution of our goods to the poor would avail us nothing: without it, zeal for truth, which should lead us to martyrdom, would “profit nothing.” This charity is a grace that is “kind”—not “boastful”—not “envious”—does not lead to doing that which “causeth shame”—it is not exclusive, to seek only its “own”—it is “not passionate”—“thinketh no evil” where none appears—it “rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth”—it “beareth all things,” *i. e.*, all the weaknesses, &c., of others—it “believeth all things, hopeth all things, and endureth all.” It “will never cease,” (Syriac) “but prophesyings will end, and tongues be silent.”

Such is the character, value, and durability of charity, or love. It is pure and perfect in its nature; and stands first, or chief, in the true Christian character; so that if this be wanting nothing else will avail us. But knowledge now is imper-

fect: *i. e.*, we know but “little of much” that may be known, and that will hereafter be made clear. Our present imperfection, or abridgement of knowledge, forms a claim on us all for the exercise of charity to the full extent the apostle has described and defined.

“Then,” in our text, refers to that “perfect” state (v. 10) when our imperfect knowledge shall be succeeded by clearness. Hence that state can be no other than the kingdom of God, yet future. There is to be “no night there:” knowledge will be “perfect.” Not that all will be known, immediately on entering there, that ever can be; but, whatever subject we are called to exercise our minds upon, we shall see and understand without liability to error, as we are now: doubt will not disturb us, as now, as to the correctness of our conceptions. “Now,” in this present state, “we see through a glass darkly,” or but imperfectly. We see and know now as by a mirror—and that an imperfect one—which gives us not the very things themselves, but only a reflection of the realities. So that while we obtain some knowledge, it is more or less imperfect from the imperfection of the medium through which it is received. But “when that which is perfect is come”—the mirror, or glass, dispensed with, so that we see the reality itself—“then” we “shall know even as” we “also are known:” error will cease, and we shall see all things clearly and truly. Such is to be the future state, or the knowledge attained by those who are accounted worthy to obtain that inheritance.

We shall now proceed to notice

I. SOME OF THE THINGS CONNECTED WITH THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE FUTURE STATE, OR THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

1. *We may expect perfect light.* Our Teachers will not be erring and imperfect mortals, but endowed with a clear and purified intellect, grasping by intuition any and every subject presented for contemplation. Under such Instructors there will be no chance for error.

2. *Then we shall have perfect faculties.*—“Now” we are enfeebled in all our faculties. Our understanding is darkened, and our judgment warped, oftentimes, from various and unavoidable causes; causes over which we had no control, and from which—for a time at least—we could not possibly extricate ourselves. Our bodily organization is now more or less deranged, and often has an overpowering and irresistible influence on our mental operations, so that imperfection in knowledge is unavoidable. Sincerely as we may desire

freedom from error, and clear conceptions of truth, we cannot always arrive at it; especially in its unmingled form.

But "then," in that "perfect" state, mortality will have been exchanged for immortality: our organization made perfect—all derangement at an end—every faculty will have free and untrammelled exercise; the judgment cannot be turned aside, because the understanding is unclouded and the perception clear and certain. Knowledge will not then be sought by painful means, or tiresome research, but will, probably, arise spontaneously on the presentation of the object or subject for contemplation. But we pass to notice—

II. SOME OF THE SUBJECTS OF FUTURE KNOWLEDGE.

A more clear and full knowledge—

1. *Of God the Father.* That our knowledge on this topic is painfully imperfect now, no one can doubt, who has ever attempted to think. Moses felt this most keenly when, after all previous manifestations, he cried out, "*I beseech thee show me thy glory.*" The answer he received strikingly illustrates the doctrine of our text. He was informed that "now"—in this present state—such knowledge as he desired could not be obtained—"Thou canst not see my face; for there shall no man see me and live." Such knowledge as Moses desired could not be endured in our present condition: we can know God but imperfectly "now." His "back parts" only could Moses see. God is now only known by what He has done or is doing. Enough is seen to satisfy the reflecting mind that "He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him." "But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away:" then shall we "*see His glory,*" and comprehend God as "eye hath not seen, nor ear heard:" then shall our largest desire after the knowledge of God the Father be gratified; for Christ glorified will be our teacher in this grand acquirement; and "no man knoweth who the Father is, but the Son, and he to whom the Son will reveal Him." Luke 10: 22. "Then"—in that future state—we may expect to attain a knowledge of God the Father which shall give us unutterable delight, and be a fountain of inconceivable joy. No more painful inquiries will disturb our bosoms on this glorious theme.

2. "Then"—in that perfect state—shall we have a clearer knowledge of *God's works in creation.* If in our present *dark* state we see enough of them to cause us to exclaim, "How marvelous are Thy works," what may we not expect "then,"

when we shall no longer "see through a glass darkly?" How must our knowledge increase, and with what satisfaction, when instead of the many doubtful speculations, to which we are now subjected, God's works will all be laid open to the inquiring mind, and we shall see and know the harmony and glory of them without mistake and without doubt?

3. Another subject of future and clearer knowledge, will be *God's ways to us, in His providential dealings, while we were in this state.*

Often we have been *bewildered* in looking at the mystery of His dealings with us; but "hereafter" all will be made plain. Our knowledge will then unravel all, and we shall admire the wisdom, which, we shall then see, ordered "all things well." What satisfaction and consolation must such knowledge produce. "What I do," said Jesus to Peter, "thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter."

4. Another theme of knowledge is *our Lord Jesus Christ.* Truly on this subject now, we "see through a glass darkly;" but "that which is perfect" will "come:" "then" our knowledge of the Son of God will be such as to remove all doubt. We shall have a full and clear knowledge of him—

1.) *As the Fountain of our Life.* We know, indeed, now, theoretically, that "Christ is our life"—and the only fountain of life to the perishing children of Adam—but who comprehends, or sees, except "through a glass darkly," the magnitude or importance of this truth? "How all but impossible to conceive that the entire future of our existence, or life, rests on Christ *alone*: that without him there is no future life for any child of Adam! How difficult the conception, and how little we now understand of it: and yet a more amazing fact is connected with it, which is, that Christ will eternally remain the fountain of our life; so that no possible period of eternity to come can ever be reached when Christ will not be just as necessary to our continued existence, or life, as the first hour we entered on immortality! Amazing thought! How little do we know of it "now;" yet we shall know hereafter: "*then* that which is in part shall be done away." "This is the record, that God hath given to us **ETERNAL LIFE**, and this life is in His Son: he that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." Such is the testimony of God. Could the fountain of this life dry up, the streams would cease to flow, and universal death follow. How important, then, is Christ to all who would live forever. We shall

know the truth hereafter with a clearness which enters not into our hearts' contemplation now.

Another fruitful topic of knowledge, which will be seen in a fulness of which we have but a faint conception now, is—

2.) *The Love of Christ in our Redemption.*—

This topic is one which defies all comparison, and to which no illustration can do justice. We can talk of earthly love; we can fancy those who were high in rank, and surrounded with worldly honor and greatness, rolling in unbounded wealth, who have been led by some exterior charm to stoop to raise the object that has attracted their love to be a partner in their inheritance; but who ever saw one divesting himself of rank, standing, and wealth—thus reducing himself to scorn, disgrace, and poverty—to raise up one who was without exterior charms, and had naught but her miseries to attract and command attention? Even if such a case could be found, it would not compare with the love of Christ. The objects of his love were sinful, mortal, corruptible, condemned, and dying beings! For such, "though he was rich, yet for" their "sakes he became poor;" and though he was "the brightness of God's glory, and the express image of his person," yet he "made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." He endured reproach and suffering such as mortal never, besides him, passed through! What prompted him to all this?—*Love*: that love which all the waves of sorrow and anguish that rolled over him, and which he foresaw would overtake him, could not and did not quench. But how little do we now know or understand of all this. When the perfect future shall open up, with its unclouded light, then shall we know—and it will be a fruitful field of knowledge and delight—how much and how great was "the love of Christ."

3.) *The glory and Exaltation of Christ* will be another glorious theme on which to contemplate, and from which we shall derive knowledge and boundless pleasure. Of this, at present, we see only "through a glass darkly;" but if this dark view was so glorious, as presented to Peter, James and John, on the mount of transfiguration, what will it be when he is seen on the throne of his glory, with all the holy angels for attendants and servants? If a view of his glory, when he appeared, *alone*, to John, on the isle of Patmos, overwhelmed the beloved disciple, still in mortali-

ty, what shall not that glory be when it can be beheld by saints made immortal? Connect this with the perfect knowledge of all the Son of God passed through, in his love to us, to reach that height of glory, and a clear perception that he is "worthy" of the glory, and what a foundation of knowledge and enjoyment must be opened up to our minds therein.

4.) *The Ability of Christ to do for his Followers* will be another theme of contemplation, where knowledge may find stores inexhaustible. It is only by dwelling in that rich store-house that we can ever know its fullness. We perceive now some small outgoings of his power; but they are only as the flashing rays of the early dawn which indicate the approach of the morning sun that is to make glorious the cold earth, and inspire it with heat and life that shall make all animate nature to rejoice. Christ's power to do for his friends has no limit, but is commensurate with their utmost desires and capacities. *To know* this, in the clear light of the "perfect" hereafter! O, what knowledge! and what a fountain of knowledge! "We shall see him as he is, and be like him;" because, "All things are yours, and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's." Truly "such knowledge" will be *then* attained as seems *now* "too wonderful for" us.

5. *The value of LIFE—and the awfulness of DEATH*, from which we are redeemed, will be subjects of a more full and perfect knowledge hereafter. A life never to be interrupted by death, nor any of those nameless casualties to which we are now subjected, and which so often embitter life, filling it with fear, pain, and sorrow, who can now comprehend its value? Such a life belongs to the future, or "perfect" state. Its real value can only be understood by its actual possession. In such a life, what attainments in knowledge may be expected: how boundless and full must it be. A living, intelligent existence will then be seen in its true value, and be the source of uninterrupted and immeasurable delight and enjoyment.

By the contrast we shall then know and understand the awfulness of death, from which we have been redeemed. When rare sights and great enjoyments are realized, even in this present state, how often do those who have enjoyed them say, to others who did not, "You do not know what you have lost." And not unfrequently they add, "I would not have missed it for the world." What then must that death be, which eternally excludes those who remain under its power—unredeemed—from a participation in the wonders of knowledge and joy of such a life as the future shall be? Can

such a death be otherwise than awful? Is it not a fearful penalty for sin? Does it not possess terror sufficient to awaken the most stupid and hardened? And why does it not thus awaken? Is it not to be feared, one grand reason is, men, by their fellows, are assured they shall live forever—that they “*shall not surely die*” though they pass the present state in sin, and luxuriating in sensual gratifications? They do not believe death is certain: they fancy that somehow they shall live forever, though they now live in sin. But death, with its eternal *dominion*, will surely be the portion of all who do not harmonize with God in Christ, the *only Life-Giver*. The awfulness of their fate, however, can only be fully understood and known when the immense value of life is comprehended in the “perfect” state to come. “Then” will all the redeemed know perfectly that which can be known only “in part” now, relating to Life and Death, and that knowledge will be eternally increasing, and the value of the former be ever more and more vivid, while death can never appear less awful, and the folly of those who chose it by living in sin, will continue to be more and more apparent.

6. One other point, suggested by our text, is worthy of attention. It is the more full and perfect knowledge of *The Persons of the Redeemed*. “Then shall I know even as I also am known.”

The thought, “Shall I know friends there?” has often come over some minds. Paul has settled that question. The increased state of knowledge forbids it should be otherwise. From Abel to the last of all the redeemed will our knowledge extend; and it seems likely such will be the intellectual perfection, then enjoyed, that we will not need any one to point out the ancient or modern worthies, but we shall recognize them on sight, by intuition. No sooner will an individual be presented to our attention than we shall know who he is and what is his relation to the redeemed. The apostle’s language seems to import this: imperfect knowledge has passed away, and clear conceptions of men and things have taken its place—“Then shall I know even as I also am known.” If this will be true of Paul, why not equally true of all the redeemed? We think it will be: and what a source of enjoyment will this knowledge be; and how inexhaustable.

After all we have said, “*Now* we see through a glass darkly.” How little can our highest thoughts attain towards that future knowledge. We are, at best, as little children now. How are we admonished to exercise “*charity*,” or love towards

all around us; we know but little and that little mixed with much imperfection. The time for the “perfect” has not yet come; but we trust it is at hand. In the mean time, let all live under the abiding conviction of our present liability to err, and cultivate that patient spirit towards all men which shall make us to resemble the meek and lowly Jesus: for on our likeness to him depends our future life and the boundless knowledge pertaining to that state.

From Eld. Jacob Blain.

Bro. Storrs.—I have just returned to “sweet home,” from a four months’ tour in the west. But my home has greatly changed since I left, as my beloved daughter has married and removed to Chicago, and my only son to Rock Island, Ill. Such changes remind me of the blessed hope of the time when, in the soon coming kingdom of Christ, friends will meet to part no more.

I have spent most of the season in Southern Wisconsin, in country places where our reform had never been preached. As prejudice had not shut ears, the people turned out in masses to hear me, and, by gifts and sales, most families obtained our books to read. A few lonely brethren in each place were much revived by hearing the truth, and seeing some convinced to sympathize with them and aid in advancing our good cause. I was kindly treated and helped by brethren, but as only one or two lived in the towns I visited, I could only obtain a little more than traveling expenses, as my journey out was long. I am thankful to my Master for what I was permitted to see of the fruits of my toilsome labors; but from the anxiety to hear and to obtain books, I hope to learn more fully, when Christ comes, that the seed was not sown in vain—“the harvest” is near, and is certain to come.

One sinner gave his heart to God and found peace on hearing the reasonableness of the penalty, and of the blessedness of “eternal life,” as offered to the “chief of sinners” through faith in Christ. The tears of many told me the truth had reached their hearts as well as their heads. Some Christians on being convinced that misery and sin were not to be eternal, told me it seemed like a *new conversion* to them.

In all my journey, I found not one out of the churches who believed in endless misery, and many more doubt the truth of the Bible than I heretofore have supposed. They own that the torment system, which they suppose it teaches, has driven them thus to doubt. Among those who believe the Bible, or in future rewards, a general belief prevails that men are to be judged, or receive according to their works; and not understanding such texts, and the tenor of the Bible, they overlook the need of *pardon*, by repentance, and through the *sacrifice* of Christ. Such passages are the refuge of Moralists and Universalists, and I regret that their import has not been more fully explained by teachers. “If righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain,” Gal. 2: 21.

Life is not to be obtained by works, or by so much suffering, for so much sin. "By the deeds of the law, there shall no flesh be justified." Rom. 3: 20; Gal. 2: 16—by no law God ever made, since Adam fell, is Paul's meaning: "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them." Gal. 3: 10. Brethren, let us take more time to make plain the way of life to ignorant and death-doomed mortals.

Last year I concluded we should labor more in country places, and less in cities and villages, and experience has confirmed my belief that this should be our practice. In my travels this season I scattered over 2,000 books, pamphlets and tracts, mostly to new readers, and in new and distant regions, so I hope for much more good from them than from my preaching. I lectured one Lord's day in Chicago; and as brethren noticed my subject in six papers, and by hand-bills, the noted Theodore Parker, in his deistical preaching to 3,000 in the evening, referred to my notice and theory, and commended it as infinitely better than the common dogma of endless torment, though he hoped for a doom still better—*progress and final happiness for all*. I was glad to hear our views so publicly noticed; but 3,000 going to hear deistical-universalism shows the sad tendency to error in our land. God grant that brethren may see more clearly the comparative importance of our reform, which seems the only antidote for such delusions.

I should like to say more which is encouraging to our efforts, but time forbids at present. Among other things, I saw two leading ministers, one a President of a College, who told me they believed in *destruction*, but as yet fear to preach it. I heard of others in the same state of mind. The leaven is working in the west, and I am encouraged to labor on, though the lot of pioneers is hard. I was the only one who was traveling to spread our views this season in the great State of Wisconsin, except a few seventh-day brethren; and I could hear of but two or three local ministers in the State, who are with us; yet many private brethren are saying, "Come over and help us." A few missionaries are much needed in that and the State of Iowa.

It is my purpose to return to those States about the middle of December, if I can obtain means to travel and sustain my family while in new fields. Losses on books sent out, by failure to pay, and giving away many to ministers and others, will eat up all profits, and I must depend on other resources for support. I should be happy to hear as soon as possible from brethren who have had books, or may wish for any to sell through the winter. I have a large supply of "*Glad Tidings*," and "*Review of Dr. Beecher*," which I should like to send out for sale.

I hope to be able to visit New York before returning west, and should any wish my works that way, by dropping me a line, I will bring them.

J. BLAIN.

Buffalo, N. Y., Nov. 5, '56.

THE CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE AND ITS EDITOR.—

We feel a sympathy for all good men, however they may differ from us: hence we are sorry for our cotemporary, Dr. STEVENS, the new editor of the *Advocate*, of this city.

It seems the *notable* Prof. Mattison who abused us so heartily, and we must say maliciously, in that paper, some eighteen months since, at the close of our "*Discussion*" with him, has become Editor of a new paper, somewhere in Central New York. We have not seen that new comer, and know nothing in particular of its character. If Dr. Stevens is abused by it, we shall think nothing strange of the matter. By looking into the *Advocate* of April 5th and 26th of last year, he will find his paper was then the channel of the most false and unprincipled "attacks" on us from the same man that is now "pummel"-ing his "back;" and if he will look into the published "*Discussion*," pp. 148 and 158, he will see that we addressed two respectful notes to the *then* EDITOR of the *Ch. Advocate*, asking the simple justice of correcting those misstatements, and that no attention whatever was paid to our requests, but the falsehoods were permitted to pass without a note of dissent by the conductors of that paper.

Wickedly wronged as we knew ourself to be, we were compelled to bear the burden and wait for some other mode in Providence to expose to the readers of the *Advocate* our traducer. We always believed that sooner or later that traducer would meet with the due reward of his wicked deeds; but we are truly sorry that our respected brother editor, Dr. Stevens, should have to bear the sins of those who have preceded him in conducting the *Advocate*. We esteem him, and like the general character of his paper much; but it seems our old *accuser* is laying blows upon his "back," as the following item from the *Advocate* of Nov. 6 indicates.

"Rev. Mr. MATTISON continues to take charge of our personal matters, domestic, financial, and official, in his new paper. He gives the census of our family, the amount of our receipts, &c., &c., only he kills off half our children, exaggerates by one-fifth our salary, and makes desperate work with other matters. As Mr. Mattison is quite 'well off' in this world, we ought perhaps to regret his want of sympathy toward us. In our walks in this city we sometimes pass under the shadow of a single item of his property, which would not only buy out all our financial worth, including our last book and the last shred on the editorial back, which he delights so much to pummel, but leave, we suppose, a handsome surplusage besides. He not only possesses vastly more of such 'good creatures' than we, but more than

we ever would possess if we could, for we have long since made a covenant with our own heart on that point. We refer (for the last time) to these matters, for two reasons: One is, that the Methodist public may know the kind of men and kind of organ that would be the self-constituted leaders of our great interests. What would soon become of the whole *morale*, not only of our Church, but of our families, if such were our habitual guides? Second, We have given (in more senses than one) to the Church a book on the Christian use of property. We have reason to believe it is doing some good. These attacks are a virtual impeachment of our design in that work, and, if credited, would tend to destroy its usefulness. We may be permitted, then, to say that the principles of that volume are drawn from our own experience and practice. We adopted its rules long before we ever thought of writing upon them. We have been determined that the great adversary shall never waylay us on that route, whatever he or his assistants may expect to do with us on any other. May the great Head of the Church save it from these internal and degrading abuses."

Thus, it seems, the notable *Professor* makes use of "the editorial back" of Dr. Stevens "to pummel:" but the Doctor would let "the Methodist public know the kind of men and kind of organ that would be the self-constituted leaders of our great interests." The "attacks" of the Professor are, we presume, justly rebuked by the Doctor; and we do not know but the "attacks" are suffered by a retributive Providence on the *Advocate*, for allowing that scandalous matter in its columns against us, of which we complained in vain; but we are sorry that its present Editor has to bear the burden; and he may be assured we feel a sympathy for him, or any other man who has to bear with unprincipled slanderers. May such slanderers be brought to repentance for the wrongs they inflict on their fellow men; and may that repentance lead to a corresponding confession and reparation. Till this is done their sin remains upon them.

"LIFE FROM THE DEAD: Or, the Righteous only will Live Again."—We have not yet received funds or pledges sufficient to warrant us in issuing this work. Some are anxious we should publish it, and about \$50 have been paid or pledged towards it. Near \$100 more are needed to enable us to go forward with safety. We have nothing of our own to pay the expenses, and we cannot venture in debt to do it. We are willing to give the use of our time and pen, but there our responsibility ends, because we expended long ago all we had, and have distributed gratuitously—when we had funds—thousands of various works.

Now it remains for those who have means to do what they think duty requires. We do not intend to importune nor dun any one in these matters. Each has the same interest in scattering information that we have; and each must make such use of their means as their own convictions prompt them to do. We ask nothing and desire nothing but free-will offerings in scattering truth, even. We have stated now the facts about the work—"Life from the Dead"—and design to say no more on the subject; but if funds are received or pledges made to meet the expense, the work will be put to press with the least possible delay.

"THE LIGHT: A TREATISE ON *Man's Nature when Created, and the Design of his Creation, as Revealed in the Holy Scriptures*.—Showing—that the living man is the living soul—that no soul is of its own nature immortal—that death is not a modification of life, but the destruction of organization and consciousness—that no soul can be both living and dead at the same moment—and therefore, that man's salvation depends on a resurrection from death. Also—a refutation, and reasonable explanation of all the texts commonly quoted to prove that the soul has consciousness in death—the scriptural plan of salvation and the final punishment of the wicked. By JOHN HURLEY."

The foregoing work is in press and will shortly be out. Of it we cannot speak particularly, as we have seen but little of the matter. We presume we shall not agree with all it contains, yet we wish for it a wide circulation, so far as we can judge from the little we know of it. Br. Hurley is an earnest man, and was formerly a Roman Catholic; more recently Editor of the *Irish Evangelist*. He had thought much on the immortality question before our acquaintance with him; and as he thinks more he will find, as we have done, that some of our first impressions, connected with the subject, were influenced more by our old theological training than from the truth itself, as written in the Bible. On these matters Br. Hurley, with his open mind, will, we think, see "the way of the Lord more perfectly" by-and-by. The work as it is, however, will do good to many who could "not bear" more "now." It is to be an 18mo., of about 150 pages. Price 50 cents, probably. For sale at 168 Bowery, and 177 1-2 Eighth Avenue, New York.

"A. Q., of Philadelphia, is informed that his \$5 is received.

S. B. EMMONS, of South Carolina, your \$5 also received.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. XI.

NEW-YORK, DECEMBER 1, 1850.

NO. 23.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year :

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

DIVINE LIFE.

The following article is from the *American Presbyterian*, editorial. We are so much pleased with its general character, and it is so entirely in harmony with our views, that we give it entire. May it be read and laid to heart. However sound any of us may be in our religious theory, *life*, spiritual, future, and external, can only be ours by that divine life dwelling in us of which the *American Presbyterian* speaks.

A Joyful Church.

This is a sad and care-worn world, and one great reason why it is so, is that the right plan for enjoyment is not understood or followed. *Rejoicing*, in Scripture, is connected with *reviving*, and it is remarkable that in one well-known passage, the Hebrew connects the Divine *returning to make us alive again*, with rejoicing. The true sense of words is often preserved in their etymology. If we analyze the word *revival*, we will find that it means, *making alive again*.

Nature abhors death. Wherever there is life there is joy. Our unhappiness springs from the absence of life. Infants are spontaneously happy, their fulness of life is fulness of joy. We would not repress the impulsive happiness of youth, rather we would teach the possibility and the obligation of being happy. The joy of the Lord is your strength. Christians have no right to be dull and stupid. They have no right to extinguish all brightness and enjoyment in themselves, and then set up that dullness in themselves as the standard of excellence. This is not the teaching of Scripture.

We think it certain that men are not very generally happy. It may be said, that all persons cannot secure the animal spirits on which physical happiness so much depends. To which we reply, that while we are not opposing, we are not advocating animal happiness.

We think men miss enjoyment by not seeking for it in the right way. Heaven is a place of happiness. "In thy presence is fulness of joy, and at thy right hand there are pleasures for ever more." God is the Fountain of Being, the infinite and glorious One, an illimitable ocean of

sparkling joy. As light, wherever it strikes the waves, in the pale flush of morn, the brightness of noon, or the richness of evening, elicits beauty, so does every movement of the Infinite Ocean, from its centre to its endless outgoings, produce enjoyment. It is life, rejoicing in its own spontaneous outbursts.

But we have no essential life, and so no essential bliss. It follows that to enjoy, we must be connected with the source of joy. From the overflowing grace of God we must receive grace for grace. We must draw near

The shadow from the Throne—
The shadow without form, that meets
The edges of the crystal sea—
A fuller than light derived,
And red with all those primal heats
Whereby all life hath lived.

The life of Christ is the life of the human soul. This is the central doctrine in theology. If any one asks how, we reply by asking him the nature of life. It is the mystery of mysteries. Look at family likenesses, national likenesses, and explain that mysterious conformity of being, by which the same traits of mind and heart, and the same features and form, reappear after many generations; explain the difference between the Arab and the Anglo-Saxon, the wild Indian and the domestic negro. The life of the parent, the ancestor, passes into the children, and this is all we know.

So it is with the life of Christ. It is not alone that our opinions become the same as His, or our tastes or feelings. It is not alone that there is mutual affection. All these things may exist between friends in this world, but that is not the same thing as being *of the blood* of your father and your brother. Every one knows it is not. The closest relation that can be formed by those not of the same blood, is that between husband and wife, but even the murder of a wife by a husband, is not the fearful thing beyond words that the murder of a mother by her son would be. A gentleman told us that he once, when a boy, knew a German who struck his father a blow which felled him to the earth. Our informant told us that he always had a mysterious feeling about the man, that in some way, he would awfully expiate that sin. Many years passed away, the gentleman grew from a boy to middle life, when he heard that in the same town that German was murdered by his own son.

Men may say what they will of the language of Paul being figurative, but there never were such figures as he uses to express the life of Christ in the soul of the believer. We are members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones. The apostle says it is a great mystery; the Saviour's life per-

the end of the thousand years ; because the end of the co-ordinate reign must be at the end of this dispensation, for we have already seen that during this age Messiah is sitting and reigning co-ordinately upon the Father's throne, where He will remain until his enemies shall be under his feet. But if the subordinate kingdom is to be surrendered, then the time of its resignation may be at the end of the thousand years. Thus we shall determine whether the "then" denotes a *point* or an *interval* of time, which is the real difference between the two interpretations of I Cor. xv. 24.

The reign to be surrendered is that during which Christ's enemies are not under his feet ; "for He must reign *until* He hath put all enemies under his feet." I do not hesitate to say that the apostle refers to Psalm cx. "Sit thou at my right hand *until* I make thine enemies thy footstool ;" for I have already shown, in the preceding chapter, that sitting at God's right hand, is sitting on the throne of God, and is equivalent to reigning. If, then, the reign to be surrendered is that which Messiah is exercising whilst his enemies are in opposition to Him, it cannot be the millennial reign, and the "end" to which the apostle refers is therefore the end of this dispensation, when the last of Christ's enemies shall have been put in subjection.

The object for which Christ holds the power which is to be resigned, is in order to abolish all rule, and authority, and power, that God's decreed subjection of all things under the Son of man may be accomplished. "Then the end . . . when He shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power ; for He must reign until He hath put all enemies under his feet . . . for He hath put all things under his feet ;" which I should paraphrase thus : "for Christ must reign, sharing the supreme dominion with the Father, until with that supreme power and authority Christ shall have subjected all his enemies ; for He (the Father) hath decreed in Psalm viii. put all things under his feet." This corresponds with the force of the Hebrew in Psalm cx. "Sit thou at my right hand, until I *cause* to place thine enemies thy footstool."

Now it appears clear, that the authority which is exercised in bringing *all power*, and even death itself, into subjection to Christ, cannot be the power of David's son as such, but must be the arm of Omnipotence, the throne, then, that is to be surrendered, is not that of David, but the co-ordinate reign.

The apostle, in I Cor. xv. 27, evidently refers to Psalm viii., for the expression, "When he saith all things are put under him," manifestly shows that he alludes to some passage of Scripture, and that passage is in the viiith Psalm. If now we turn to the inspired comment in Heb. ii., we learn that Jesus is now "crowned with glory and honor," "but now we see not yet all things put under him,"—implying that Jesus is now reigning, but that all things are not yet in subjection ; and clearly Psalm viii., which speaks of all things having been brought into subjection, relates to the dominion of the Son of man in the world to come ; all things being in subjection is the characteristic feature of the reign of the Son of man, the bring-

ing of all into subjection is the work of this present dispensation.

The principal characteristic of this kingdom is, that whilst the Son holds it, he is not subject, or subordinate to the Father, for he becomes subordinate upon resigning it. "When all things shall be subdued unto Him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto Him that put all things under him." Christ, therefore, is not subject to the Father until all things are subjected unto Him, and Christ will become subject, when all things are subjected ; but Christ resigns the kingdom when He shall have put down all rule, &c. It seems, therefore, to follow of necessity, that Messiah's resignation of the kingdom, and his becoming subject, are contemporaneous ; indeed, that he becomes subject by the resignation of the kingdom. But we have seen that the co-ordinate reign of Christ, namely, that in which He is not subject to the Father, is during this present dispensation, when "He sits on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens," or whilst He sits upon his Father's throne ; hence the throne to be resigned must be that of God the Father ; and "the end" must be the end of this dispensation.

The reason why the kingdom is to be resigned, "that God may be all in all," manifestly shows the nature of the reign.

The expression, "that God may be all in all," implies that God will then exercise all rule, and authority, and power. This will be upon the sounding of the seventh trumpet, when God takes to himself his great power and reigns. In order to this, it would be necessary for Christ to surrender the co-ordinate throne, and it would not be necessary for Him to surrender the subordinate throne ; for it is clear, that when God's anointed king sits upon the throne of David—upon the throne of a creature—upon that throne which He will share with all who overcome—He will not interfere with God being "all in all." Creature rule cannot interfere with divine authority, unless the creature be in a state of rebellion ; but that cannot be said of Christ.

Whilst there is sin in the world, whilst there are enemies in opposition to Christ, God cannot be "all in all." At present there is rebellion against God's authority, therefore all things are upheld by the word of Christ's power, and therefore Christ is said to be "all in all ;" for whilst there is sin in the world, the world must be in the hands of a mediator, otherwise essential holiness would blaze forth in its necessary opposition to moral evil ; hence absolute Deity will not become the head of sustentation or of rule, until the creature is brought into a state of absolute holiness, or at least is restrained from any overt acts of sin. The kingdom, therefore, will be resigned by the Mediator, at the end of this dispensation.

We have, moreover, an exact note of time to guide us. Christ sits at God's right hand until his enemies are made his footstool ; but when all shall have been subjected unto Him, then shall the Son himself be subject : but how will He become subject, but by resigning that throne on which He is not subject ? He therefore sits at God's right hand *until* he resigns the kingdom ; "the

end," therefore, to which the apostle refers, must be when Christ leaves the right hand of God.

Christ is to reign *until* He hath put all enemies under his feet, but He is to sit at God's right hand *until* his enemies are made his footstool; therefore the subjection of his enemies equally marks the termination of his reign and session at God's right hand; "the end," therefore, when He surrenders the kingdom, must be the end of this dispensation, when He leaves the right hand of the Father.

Another note of time is, that death is the last enemy which shall be subjected before resigning the kingdom. The subjection of death, *inasmuch* as it is an enemy of Christ, will be immediately upon, or I should rather say *by*, the mutation of the living saints; death will be swallowed up in victory, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, when the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and when "we" (i. e. the living saints) "shall be changed;" for this same corruptible (i. e. the dead saints) must put on incorruptibility, and this same mortal (i. e. the living saints) must put on immortality; but *when* this corruptible shall have put on incorruptibility, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, *then* shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, "Death is swallowed up in victory." The "when" and the "then" are clearly marks of time. But we also learn that *when* death shall be swallowed up in victory, that *then* shall Messiah resign the kingdom; for He must resign *until* He shall have put all his enemies under his feet, the last enemy that shall be abolished is death; so Christ will surrender the kingdom at the moment of the resurrection of the dead saints, and mutation of the living ones. If, therefore, "the end," when He surrenders the kingdom, be not till the end of the thousand years, the resurrection of the dead saints, and mutation of the living ones, will not be until the end of the thousand years. This view, therefore, is utterly destructive of the hopes of those who look for the resurrection of the saints at the beginning of the thousand years; it is equally destructive of the expectations of Christ's personal reign upon earth for a thousand years.

Shortly then to recapitulate. "The end" is when Christ shall resign the kingdom in which He is co-ordinate; exercising his divine power to subjugate all his enemies; the close of which will be coincident with the resurrection of the dead saints; and which He surrenders in order that God the Father may be "all in all."

THE FATHER'S ASSUMPTION OF POWER.

The examination of 1 Cor. xv. has led to the conclusion that Messiah will resign the co-ordinate throne to the Father, and leave the right hand of God, at the conclusion of this dispensation, at which time the dead saints will be raised, and the living changed. I shall confirm this view by showing from other passages that at the period of the second advent, and not at the close of the millennium, the Father will take to himself his great power and reign.

In that prayer which our Lord taught his followers, and which we so often have on our lips, we

express the desire to our Father that *his* kingdom may come; it would be strange were we commanded to pray for that which cannot come to pass until a thousand years after this dispensation has ceased, as those who maintain that Christ will surrender the kingdom to the Father at the end of the thousand years must suppose. Surely we are not to be expecting one thing, and praying for another; Christ's kingdom is that for which we are to pray. Are we not therefore, to expect the manifestation of God's kingdom upon the appearance of Messiah? What makes it more striking is, that all look for the following clause in the Lord's Prayer to be fulfilled when Messiah shall return. But if we expect the fulfilment of the clause, "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven," upon the return of our Lord, surely we are equally bound to expect the fulfilment of the preceding clause, at the same time, and not a thousand years after. The glorified spirits in heaven (Rev. v. 10.) are looking forward to their reign upon earth; are we taught to overlook that which they desire, and to pray for that which cannot come to pass until another dispensation of a thousand years has transpired? No: when the glorified spirits shall reign with Christ upon earth, then will God's kingdom be come, as a comparison of passages will show.

By comparing Matt. xvi. 28 with Mark ix. 1, and Luke ix. 27, we learn that "the Son of man coming in *his* kingdom," is the same as "the kingdom of God" coming with power.

Our Lord, when instituting the supper, says to his disciples, "I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom;" the expression is varied by St. Luke to "I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come." But St. Paul, referring to the ordinance, and marking the period of limitation for its observance, says, "Ye do shew the Lord's death till *He* come." It is therefore evident that when the Lord Jesus shall come, that then the kingdom of God the Father shall come.

From the comparison of these texts we see that the Kingdom of God, is the kingdom of Christ's Father; from other passages we also learn that the establishing of the kingdom of God, that is, of God the Father, will be at the return of Messiah.

We are told in Luke xix. 11, that the Lord spake a parable, because the people "thought that the kingdom of God would immediately appear;" they were expecting the kingdom of Messiah, and they did not look for some kingdom which will not be established until a thousand years after the return of Messiah. And certainly the tenor of our Lord's parable would lead us to infer that when He shall return, having received the kingdom, that then the kingdom of God will appear.

When the Pharisees demanded when the kingdom of God should come, they expected the kingdom of Messiah, that kingdom which the God of heaven will set up; but our Lord implies, in what He says to his disciples, that it is the same as "the days of the Son of man."

So when the Son of man shall come "with power and great glory," then "the kingdom of God" shall come.

By comparing the fifth and seventh verses of 2 Thess. i., we gather that the entrance into the kingdom of God will be at the revelation of Jesus Christ. The Thessalonians were counted worthy of the *kingdom of God*, for which they also suffered, and they are to be recompensed *when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed*; the recompense is the rest which they will enjoy in the kingdom of God, and into this they will enter when the Lord Jesus shall return.

Our Lord promises that at the end of this age, when the Son of man shall send forth his angels to gather out of *his kingdom* all things that offend, that "then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the *kingdom of their Father*." So, upon the casting out of Satan, it is said, "Now is come the *kingdom of our God* and the power of his Christ." Now all these passages are in accordance with the fact, that "the kingdom of Christ and of God" are not in succession, one established a thousand years after the other, but that when the Christ, or Anointed, reigns in his own, that is, on the subordinate throne, that then the kingdom of God the Father is come.

If now the Father takes to himself his great power, and commences to reign, at the same time that the kingdoms of this world become the kingdom of the Messiah, it is clear that Messiah will not have that great power to surrender at the end of the thousand years. It is also clear that if the Father takes that great power at the commencement of the thousand years, He had not taken it before that time, but to whom else could it have been entrusted until that time but to the Messiah? "The end" therefore to which the apostle must refer, is the end of this dispensation.

From Henry Grew.

Dear Bro. Storrs.—If our dear brother WENDELL will quote any remarks of mine "misrepresenting (his) position," I will follow his commendable example in another case, and "withdraw them." I hardly need say to him, that if I have done so, it was unintentional.

I pray, dear brother, that the great Captain of our salvation may uphold you in your arduous warfare. I sympathize with you from experience in the treatment you receive from men of perverse minds. Let us remember our dear Master, what contradiction against himself he endured for our sake! O for more of his spirit of holy fortitude and patience. Soon the conflict will end and the everlasting victory be achieved. One smile of welcome to the joy of our Lord will amply compensate for all we are called to endure for his dear namesake. As David, who sometimes thought he should surely fall by the hand of his enemy, "strengthened himself in his God," so may my brother STORRS.

You understand that although the Devil "is a usurper in relation to God,—it (I say *he*) reigns by right in relation to man." Yet you say, God "did not give man the right to transfer that dominion

(over the creatures) to another power." Now if man has no right to confer this right, the Devil cannot receive it *as a right from him*. The devil therefore is a "usurper" both as it respects God and man, though, for wise ends, it is permitted by Him "who worketh all things after to the counsel of his own will."

On your remark concerning angels, permit me to ask—"Are they not all ministering spirits sent forth to ministers for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" Heb. 1:14. It is true indeed that we may err respecting "their intercourse with man," as we may on other scriptural subjects.—Commending you and yours to our Redeemer's all-sufficient grace, I am as ever yours in christian love,

HENRY GREW.

Phila., Nov. 11th, 1856.

N. B. Two dollars enclosed for next year's subscription.

Will the Wicked Dead be made Alive?

BR. STORRS:—The subjoined article from the pen of Bro. Grew I have copied from the *Advent Harbinger* of Feb. 7th, 1852, and sent it to you for insertion in the EXAMINER. Just at this time, when our brother has so earnestly endeavored to sustain the doctrine of a temporary future *life of torment* for the wicked dead, it will be equally gratifying and instructing to many to see how admirably Bro. Grew of 1852, can answer the arguments of Bro. Grew of 1856, by simply planting himself upon the Bible truth that—"The wages of sin is DEATH," and affirming, as he does, that—"Life, in a miserable state, is *no more* DEATH than life in a happy state." To this I say, *Amen*, and reiterate the admonition of our dear brother—"Let no man presume to diminish or add to the word of the Lord." To our truth-seeking brethren I would say, give Bro. G.'s article a careful consideration, and of the latter I would humble beg to be informed how he reconciles his *Harbinger* article with his more recent utterances in relation to "the penalty of the law." When he clears up this matter, I would be glad to invite his attention to other considerations bearing upon the question, "Will the wicked dead be made *alive*?" Yours, hoping for life eternal through God's dear Son.

RUFUS WENDELL.

Canajoharie, N. Y.,
Nov. 6, 1856.

THE PENALTY OF THE LAW.

By HENRY GREW IN 1852.

A law is a requisition, or enactment, enforced by penal sanction. This distinguishes it from mere advice.

Man is an intelligent, moral, and accountable being. He is subject to law, the law of his Creator, which is the law of righteousness, and the law of love.

No law can be violated with impunity, whether natural or moral. 'The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth his handiwork,' because each heavenly body keeps its proper orbit. All move in perfect harmony. Not one can leave its true orbit without disastrous result.

So the physical laws of the human body cannot be disregarded without injurious consequence.—Food, drink, raiment of suitable quality and quantity are essential to health. How dearly does the intemperate man pay for indulging his appetite with the poison of alcohol! No less extensive are the evil effects of excessive and improper eating.—How many have been hurried to a premature grave by adhering to a fashionable and injurious mode of dress!

Our present inquiry, however, has special reference to the penalty which the Judge of all the earth has affixed to the transgression of his law of righteousness and love. Various and diverse are the opinions of fallible and erring men relative to this important subject.

It has been supposed by some that this penalty consists only in the mental and physical evils of the present state, to be terminated by a temporary death; and that the whole human race are destined to eternal life and happiness. They hold, that it is not compatible with infinite goodness, either to sustain any intelligent and moral being in eternal misery, or to destroy him forever.

Others maintain that the penalty of the law consists in all the miseries of the present life, followed by temporary death, which will be succeeded by eternal life in mental and physical agonies, severe and terrible as the Almighty can inflict, and the creature, with ever increasing capacity, can endure.

'What saith the scriptures' of eternal truth?—When the ever blessed God created man, and gave him commandment, with what did he threaten him in case of disobedience? 'In the day thou eatest thereof *dying* thou shalt *die*.' Did the Almighty add to this, subsequent eternal life in torment?—Not a word to indicate any such thing. Let us read again: 'The soul that sinneth it *shall die*.' Again, 'the wages of sin is *death*, but the gift of God, is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord!' This passage is very instructive.

'The wages of sin is *DEATH*.' Death is the cessation of life. It is the opposite of life in all its states and conditions. Life, in a miserable state, is no more death than life in a happy state.

'*Wages*' is that which is justly due for work.—The proposition that 'the *wages* of sin is death,' is equivalent to the proposition that the *just desert* of sin is death. This declaration of divine truth determines what is the just desert of transgression. Let no man presume to diminish or add to the word of the Lord.

Now if the wages, or just desert of sin, is death, it follows that any punishment, which vastly exceeds this, is *unjust*. If the punishment of eternal existence in agonizing torments is not more than what sin justly deserves, it follows, unavoidably, that death, which will terminate all consciousness, is not the just desert of sin. It falls infinitely short of what justice demands, and the divine testimony

consequently falls. 'Let God be true and every man a liar,' that opposes his testimony.

Now let us consider the connected testimony.—'The gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.' Observe the contrast. It is not eternal in different conditions, as self-styled orthodoxy represents the future states of the two characters of men to be. It is *LIFE* and *DEATH*. Other scriptures harmonize with this great truth. 'He that hath the Son hath *LIFE*, he that hath not the Son shall not see *LIFE*.' The declaration is no where to be found in the inspired volume that the finally impenitent are to lose *happy* life, or shall not see *happy* life. The terms used in reference to this awful subject throughout the Bible all harmonize. 'Destruction,' 'perdition,' 'perish,' 'consumed,' 'devoured,' 'burned up,' come to an 'end,' &c., accord perfectly with the literal import of the term death, which is plainly declared to be the penalty of the law.

The scripture doctrine of *Immortality* confirms the same. Is there a single declaration that all men are immortal or ever will be? Not one. An immortal being can never die. 'Mortal man,' is the language of scripture; Job. 4: 17. Immortality is not an attribute of human nature. It is the gift of God through Jesus Christ, and an object to be sought for by faith in the record that God has given of his Son, and by patient continuance in well doing. Rom. 2: 7. 'This is the record, that God has given us eternal life, and this life is *IN HIS SON*.' No eternal life in, or from the first Adam who was of 'the earth, earthy.' It is in the second Adam, who is 'the Lord from Heaven.'

The proposition that 'the wages of sin is death,' plainly imports and teaches, that the cessation of the sinner's life or conscious existence, is a punishment perfectly satisfactory to divine justice and adequately honors the violated law of God. It follows, therefore, that the horrible dogma of eternal existence in agonizing torments is a libel on 'the just God,' as it is on 'the Father of mercies.'

H. GREW.

A SYLLOGISM.

BY THE EDITOR.

"If the wages, or just desert of sin, is death, it follows that any punishment which vastly exceeds this is *unjust*."—H. Grew, in 1852.

A revival into life, from death, to torment awhile and kill again "vastly exceeds death!"

Therefore such revival, torment and killing again "is *unjust*."

ADDENDA.

"If the punishment of" a temporary life from the dead, to be spent "in agonizing torments," and followed by dying a second time, "is not more than what sin justly deserves, it follows, unavoidably, that *death*, which will terminate all consciousness, is not the just desert of sin: it falls short of what justice demands, and the divine testimony consequently falls." "Let God be true and every

man a liar,' that opposes his testimony."—See H. Grew's article on "the Penalty of the Law."

"The proposition that 'the wages of sin is death,' plainly imports and teaches, that the cessation of the sinner's life, or conscious existence, is a punishment perfectly satisfactory to divine justice, and adequately honors the violated law of God. It follows, therefore, that the horrible dogma of a revival of them, when dead, to life, or into a conscious existence in agonizing torments is a libel on the 'just God,' as it is on 'the Father of mercies.'" See H. Grew's article, as aforesaid.

We have seen, for a long time, that the view we maintain of "No life out of Christ," and "The wages of sin is death," must lead to a plain and open confession, ultimately, that the wicked dead will never live again. *Death* is their fate: not *dying*, whether once or twice, nor any torments that may precede that dying, but to be dead, to live no more—death to have unbroken, *dominion* over them. Such dominion it had not over Christ, and it shall not have over any member of his body, the true believers in him; all others are "holden with the cords of their sins" under death's dominion, eternally irrevocable.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

New York, December 1, 1851:

EUROPEAN AFFAIRS.—For years our eyes have been turned to Europe and Asia as the field of prophecy, or the countries where the scenes of prophecy are mainly laid. In our mind there is no doubt but that all the symbolical representations of governments, or dynasties, civil and ecclesiastical, in the Scriptures, are set forth in that field; and that none of them pertain to this country.—The prophecy which speaks of "strong nations afar off" being *rebuked*, we think, does include this country, and will before long be realized.—But the symbolizing "beasts," of all sorts, we are confident pertain to the eastern hemisphere of our globe, and mainly to the old Roman Empire; and that it is there we are to look for the fulfillment of all such prophecies. On the particular application of these prophecies, so far as yet unfulfilled, we think quite too much speculation has been indulged by nearly all writers on the subject; and so much that has proved to be erroneous has been promulgated, and insisted on as undoubted truth, that an influence has gone abroad against all attempts to understand prophecy at all. If men

were content to express an opinion of what is probably true on the subject of unfulfilled prophecy without insisting on implicit credit being given to their theories—as many do—we think good might still be done in the examination. But we seem to be doomed to have a class of expositors, in this generation, who think a positive spirit is commendable in this matter. With such expositors we have no sympathy; and we are satisfied they are preparing the way more and more for a contempt of prophecy altogether, even by those who have heretofore been disposed to follow them.

Our thoughts have been much turned towards the *Napoleon* Dynasty; but we have endeavored to avoid a positive spirit relative to its mission and destiny. From recent accounts from Europe we have been led to think the present Napoleon has nearly run his race. Whether he is to be succeeded by another of the same family, or what will be the result of his death or downfall we cannot at present see. If that Dynasty is symbolized by the "scarlet beast" of Rev. 17th, then it seems likely the Papal Roman Power will fall with Napoleon, or very soon after. But what the order of events, in the matter, is, we cannot pretend to say, and therefore we wait for the development; and we thus wait with as much interest as those who manifest the positive spirit of which we have spoken; yet we think with far less anxiety as to the course of events. God's purposes will stand and He will do all His pleasure, however we mortals may err in our judgment of what is at hand.

On the present state of Europe and its affairs we give our readers an extract from the "English Correspondent" of the *Christian Advocate* of this city. The writer seems to us to take a correct view of the subject. He speaks as follows:—

—

Except in time of actual warfare, European politics have not for a long period presented so gloomy and troubled aspects as at present. Diplomatic relations between the Western Powers and Naples have at last been effectually broken off by the departure of the embassies of Great Britain and France from the territory of the Two Sicilies; but in the presence of what may prove vastly graver matters, the Italian question does not excite anything like the interest it did a month or even a fortnight ago. The peace of Europe is menaced, and the danger draws hourly nearer, from the incurable disease under which I formerly told you I had ascertained from trustworthy authority, altogether apart from newspaper rumors, Louis Napoleon is suffering. His throne, too, is already shaken by

the financial difficulties which surround him. Sedition permeates all classes of society in Paris.— Plots for the overthrow of the government, and conspiracies against the life of the emperor, are formed in every *case*, and, worst sign of all, the police are said to be unusually lax in their efforts to detect the conspirators, influenced by a conviction that the *regime* under which they serve at present is not destined in any case to a protracted existence. Thus assailed by thickening and darkening dangers without, and feeling within the grasp of death steadily and relentlessly contracting on his vitals, it is not wonderful if what muttered whispers now declare be true, that his once clear and powerful intellect has already shown such symptoms of aberration and decay as to create the gravest doubts, even among those most attached to his throne, of his fitness to continue to direct the destinies of France. Certain it is, that the licentious orgies which it was hoped had been terminated for ever by his marriage, have been resumed, perhaps in that spirit of desperate jollity assumed by men who wish to “die game;” perhaps in the wild hope of really prolonging life by banishing gloomy thoughts and evading their depressing influence. It is certain, however, that even in the course of nature the throne of France will shortly become vacant, and it is by no means improbable, that within the lapse of a few days or hours a single pistol-shot may at once create the vacancy and ring the knell of half the dynasties of Europe.

But existing political complications threaten the most serious consequences, even though the reign of Louis Napoleon should be protracted far beyond the present time. The six months assigned for the fulfilment of the condition of the recent treaty of peace have just terminated. The conditions have not been fulfilled, and France exhibits decided tendencies toward the formation of an alliance with Russia, and the termination of the existing one with England. Russia has broken the compact by her retention of the Isle of Serpents, and her omission to withdraw her Bessarabian frontier from the Danube. England has not complied with the condition which required her to withdraw her fleet from the Black Sea, and permit the closing of the Dardanelles, but alleges that her non-compliance is the necessary consequence of the breach of faith by Russia in the instance just specified.— And Austria, who was bound to evacuate the Principalities, retains undisturbed military occupation of them, alleging the conduct of Great Britain and Russia in justification of her own vio-

lation of the treaty when reproached for it by France. Under these circumstances, Great Britain is understood to approve of the Austrian policy, and to find fault with that of France, on the ground that a more resolute determination on the part of the latter to act with Great Britain in compelling the compliance of Russia with the letter of the treaty, would long since have secured that object, and would thereby have obviated the necessity of the continued presence of a British fleet in the Black Sea, and an Austrian army in the Principalities. Whatever be the personal feelings of the French emperor, it is certain that many of the men most in his confidence are the friends of Russia and the enemies of England, and the most powerful efforts are being made to detach him from the British alliance and lead him to substitute for it the friendship of the czar. Austria deems the occasion opportune to cement a closer union with Great Britain, and is believed to have already made most important proposals to our cabinet to that effect.

DESIRING TO BE GIVEN UP TO GOD.

BY REV. A. M. TOPLADY.

O that my heart were right with Thee,
 And loved Thee with a perfect love !
 O that my Lord would dwell in me,
 And never from his seat remove !
 Jesus, remove th' impending load,
 And set my soul on fire for God !

Thou seest I dwell in awful night,
 Until thou in my heart appear ;
 Kindle the flame, O Lord, and light
 Thine everlasting candle there :
 Thy presence puts the shadows by ;
 If thou art gone, how dark am I !

Ah ! Lord, how should thy servant see,
 Unless thou give me seeing eyes ?
 Well may I fall, if out of thee ;
 If out of thee how should I rise ?
 I wander, Lord, without thy aid,
 And lose my way in midnight shade.

Thy bright, uerring light afford,
 A light that gives the sinner hope ;
 And from the house of bondage, Lord,
 O bring the weary captive up ;
 Thine hand alone can set me free,
 And reach my pardon out to me.

O let my prayer acceptance find,
 And bring the mighty blessing down ;
 And eye-salve, Lord, anoint the blind,
 And seal me thine adopted son ;
 A fallen, helpless creature take,
 An heir of thy salvation make.

A PURIFYING HOPE.

BY THE EDITOR.

"Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is. And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure." 1 John 3: 2, 3.

As we have often dwelt on the nature of hope, we shall say no more on that topic than simply to remark, it is made up of desire and expectation; that neither of these alone form hope; nor can expectation rationally exist without a good reason, which must arise from a reliable promise, or an exertion that forms a just ground for hope. That which depends upon the act of another must have a reliable promise to make the object one of expectation; or if it depends in whole or part on our personal exertion, that exertion must be put forth, or there is no ground for rational expectation; hence they cannot be a well grounded hope.

With these preliminary remarks we proceed to notice

I. THE HOPE OF THE TEXT: "This hope." It has several peculiarities—

1. *It is the hope of "sons of God."* "Now are we the sons of God." It is not therefore a hope common to all men, for all men are not in such relation to God. All sustain the relation of creatures to God as their Creator; but the relation of sons is essentially another matter. It pertains to a moral development, and in that view many men are of their "father the devil;" so hath Jesus testified. That development which establishes the relation of sons to God arises only by, and in virtue of, a union with the Son of God, whereby we become "partakers of the Divine nature;" or receive of the Holy Spirit of God, which is shed on those who believe on the name of Jesus, and by which they are "sealed," and "which is the earnest of" their "inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession." See Eph. 1: 13, 14. 2 Peter 1: 2-4. 2 Corth. 1: 21, 22.

2. "This hope" is a hope of "seeing" Jesus Christ; that is, of seeing him personally, or in his proper personality. This sight is not, as some fancy, a spiritual or mere mental sight, but an actual vision of Jesus Christ. As to a spiritual manifestation of Christ, no man can be a son of God without it, but having this, he hopes to see Jesus personally; and that hope is based on many promises. Without the spiritual manifestation, love to Christ does not arise; and yet such manifestation and love is only the prelude to the personal sight of our Lord. "Whom having not seen ye love,"

saith Peter; they had not yet the personal sight of Jesus, but Peter saith, "that your faith might be found unto praise and glory at the appearing of Jesus Christ"—literally, "at the unveiling of Jesus Christ." 1 Pet. 1: 7, 8.

How different is "this, hope" from that of those who think of no other sight of Jesus than a spiritual one? or from the hope of such as talk of seeing him at death? or when they die; for

3. "This hope" is that "we shall see him as he is;" not as he was in the days of humiliation; but in his triumphant glory; when he "shall sit" upon "the throne of his glory." Matt. 19: 28, 29.—That throne of his glory is "the throne of his father David," which God hath promised him with an oath. See Lk. 1: 32, 33. Acts 2: 30. "This hope," therefore, embraces what is called the "second advent" of our Lord Jesus Christ. Thus Paul speaks to Titus, chapter 2, "Looking for that blessed hope, and the manifestation of the glory of the great God, and our Life-giver, Jesus Messiah." (*Syriac*.)

"This hope," is, also, the hope of being made "like him." To "be glorified together" with him: to "put on immortality—incorruptibility"—to be placed in a state where "neither can they die any more"—"death shall have no more dominion over" them, as it has not "over him"—partners in his throne—"I will give to sit with me in my throne," saith Jesus: yea, they "shall shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father." See Rom. 8: 17. 1 Corth. 15: 54. Luke 20: 36. Rom. 6: 9. Rev. 3: 21. Matt. 13: 43.

Truly, "it doth not yet appear what we shall be," but it is none the less true, that when Jesus shall appear we shall be like him. The world "knew him not" when he was here, as it now knows not his followers. Little does the world think—when it is setting about to naught the meek and humble followers of Christ, that it is thus treating those who are hereafter to rule the world as joint heirs with Christ when he shall appear.

II. HOW IS "THIS HOPE" DISTINGUISHED FROM THAT OF THOSE WHO ARE NOT THE "SONS OF GOD?" Answer: *By its effects.* "Every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself," &c. But by what rule is this done? Ans. The rule is Christ—"Even as he is pure."

Here we will examine the rule in some particulars. Christ was—

1. Pure from seeking "honor of men." Thus—"I receive not honor from men. How can ye believe, which receive honor one of another, and seek not the honor that cometh from God only?" John

5 : 41, 44. One of the strongest propensities of human nature is this desire to be thought well of by our fellow creatures. This disposition leads thousands to travel the broad road to death, and shuts them up in the rejection of truth that constantly comes home to their understanding. While this disposition is permitted to hold sway no man can advance, to profit, in divine things. Jesus was pure from such desire, or free from its control; and it is of the first importance that we should be.

In saying Jesus was free from the control of the disposition spoken of, we say, he was pure from *pride*. Some persons have advocated pride as a necessary exercise, and that without it men would not maintain self-respect, or "be decent." Such talk shows ignorance, pride, or folly, in the advocate. Pride is sin. Did Jesus sin? Did he not maintain self-respect? Was he not "decent?" and did he not always conduct himself with propriety in his intercourse with all classes with whom he came in contact? To say that pride is necessary for any purpose, is to affirm that Jesus was a sinner, or that he was defective in the necessary qualities for good society! The fact is, pride is a destroying sin; and it destroys in a thousand ways, and takes a thousand forms, according to the different circumstances of persons in life. It ascends the pulpit; it takes its place in the pews; it walks in the flowing robes, and hides in the meanest attire; it goes to social prayer; and it refuses to pray; it talks against sin, and persists in sin; it goes with the rich, and it travels with the poor. On what side soever we turn, this monster appears openly or crawls secretly; and it always claims to be very innocent and harmless; yea absolutely useful. It shows itself in the desire to "be as Gods;" and it affirms, men are Gods; for it clothes them with attributes which belong to God alone. It is hated by all in others, but is cherished and made a household God for themselves. It makes some men misers, and others spendthrifts; it adorns the "churches," or temples, and strips the widows and fatherless of food and clothing to do it: it hates and is hated: it blinds and is blinded: it destroys the rich and the poor, and is a foul murderer of the peace and repose of all where it dwells; and yet it is the last thing any are willing to part with. There is one example, however, where pride never appeared, *viz.* Jesus—the "*meek and lowly*" Jesus. He was pure from pride. Again,

2. He was pure from the "*love of mammon*." "Though he was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor;" and he said, "No man can serve two masters" "Ye cannot serve God and mammon:" and he also

said, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." See 2 Corth. 8 : 9. Matt. 6 : 24. Acts 20 : 35.

3. He was pure from a *spirit of selfishness*: or, his labor was not for himself alone. He "went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil:" Acts 10 : 38. His was an earnest desire and effort to benefit the children of men; and the most needy and oppressed were sure to share in his benevolence.

4. He was pure from a *murmuring spirit*.—None ever had more occasion to be dissatisfied with his present lot: none were ever in greater straits or trials; yet no murmur ever escaped him. "He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth" to complain. "he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth"—no complaining is ever heard. What submission to his lot, and to his Father's will!

5. His *love to men was pure*:—it was not a hypocritical pretence. His love not only led him to poverty, reproach, and amazing sufferings for men, but to "taste death for every man;" "while we were sinners Christ died for the ungodly."—Here is no mock love, or love rising no higher than *profession*: it stands out in living characters, and may be read of all men. He gave practical proof of its reality.

6. His love to God, his Father, was pure. "I delight to do Thy will," he could say: and again, "I came down from heaven not to do mine own will, but the will of Him that sent me." Such was the love of Christ to God. How unlike some professed worshipers of God, who declare, if it was not for the dread of endless torture they would not serve God at all. If such speak the truth of themselves, they have no love to God, and are mere hypocrites in all their professions of love. They do not at all resemble Christ in his pure love to his Father.

7. Jesus was pure in all his *tempers, words and actions*. So far was he above fault, in these particulars, that he could appeal to his worst enemies, and say—"Which of you convicteth me of sin;" John 8 : 46. (*Syriac*.)

Such was the purity of him whom we are called to imitate—whose example we are called to follow. "He that saith he abideth in him ought himself also to walk even as he walked." 1 John 2 : 6.

"This hope," then, of seeing Jesus as he is and being like him, leads "*every man*," that hath it, to purify himself after this sample of purity. Thus are the "*sons of God*" to know themselves, and to

be known of others; for, "EVERY MAN that hath this hope" thus purifieth himself—by this rule. But—

III. HOW IS THIS PURIFICATION ACCOMPLISHED? It is said "He purifieth himself." A man may be said to do that which he is anxious to accomplish, and uses every possible means to effect.—Thus, Paul said, be once "compelled" Christians "to blaspheme." He was anxious to have them do so, and did all he could to that end. So "he purifieth himself" indicates the will set on the object, and all the means in one's power employed to accomplish the end.

1. *Faith* is the medium through which this purity is accomplished. If there is no faith in its attainment, how can it be had? It will not rain down from heaven upon us. "Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness, for THEY SHALL BE FILLED." And, "He that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is THE REWARDER of them that diligently seek Him."—Matt. 5 : 6. Heb. 11 : 6. And James saith, "Let him ask in faith nothing wavering." Faith, or a sincere belief, that what God has commanded us to be He will enable us to be, if we seek His help without doubting His faithfulness, is a most important exercise of mind. Let us then dwell upon God's faithfulness to His promises, and believe that what He has enjoined on us to attain He will certainly enable us to reach, and we shall find the purity spoken of in our text not that impossible object of attainment our unbelief has so often suggested. Thus coming to God for the aid of His Spirit, we shall find that "what He has promised he is able to perform:" and He has promised, "I will circumcise thine heart that thou mayest love the Lord thy God will all thine heart;" thus circumcised in heart we shall be pure even as Christ is pure. Let none then sink down in sullen unbelief: the prize is too great to let slip without a mighty struggle—to see *Jesus as he is, and be like him*. Up then, every one of us, and so run that we may obtain.

2. *Obedience* equally with faith is essential to attain the purity spoken of. "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit," &c. 1 Pet. 1 : 22. "For as the body without breath is dead, so faith without works is dead also." James 1 : 26. It is vain to expect purity unless faith and obedience are united. Faith is the life principle, but it must *work* or it dies.—Let us see then the importance of obedience in order to purity. Faith and obedience comprehend the whole that is necessary to be said under this head of the subject. We come now, briefly—

III. TO URGE THE DUTY TO SEEK PURITY.

"Follow peace with all men, and holiness without which no man shall see the Lord." Heb. 12 : 14. Without purity, then, we shall be eternally excluded from the sight of the Lord, and we must, hence, "not see life"—future and eternal life cannot be ours. By impurity, or sin, we are unfitted for the society and employments of holy beings. What a loss is this? Who can comprehend its magnitude? No language can describe it. "Be ye holy, for I am holy," is the injunction of God upon us. Harmony with God must exist in us, or to dwell with Him we cannot.—Death—corruption—eternal night must be the portion of the impure and unholy.

Let us study the life of Jesus, and sincerely, and truly repent of all our departures from a likeness to him, seeking the mercy of God to forgive our shortcomings, and help us in time to come that we may become truly Christ-like. Let us not faint because we find ourselves often to fail in the effort, but rather let those failures lead us to greater diligence and more earnest prayer for divine aid, for "in due time we shall reap if we faint not." Never should we allow discouragement to overpower us, as we shall often be tempted to do. Here is our true warfare, and though sometimes wounded and perhaps defeated, let us return to the conflict armed with "the whole armor of God," and ere long we shall be able to say, with the apostle to the Gentiles, "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith: henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me in that day, and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." Yes, if we have fought the good fight and attained a likeness to Christ here, we shall soon "see him as he is and be like him." Happy day—glorious hour, and fast approaching. A little longer struggle and the victory is won and the crown bestowed.

A Scripture. By Henry Grew.

Dear Brother Stearns: You affirm that "Paul never said any such thing" as that "there shall be a resurrection both of the just and unjust." Is it so? Let us see.

Acts 24 : 15. Paul speaking of himself, said, "and have hope toward God, which they themselves ALSO allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead both of the just and unjust." What doth the word *also* import but that Paul himself allowed such a resurrection? Did he allow it because fallible and erring men believed it? No verily. No more than he would allow the worship of the goddess Diana, or the god Jupiter-Ammon by the same authority. The previous

verse shows that what he believed were "things written in the law and the prophets" who "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Now if Paul allowed that there shall be a resurrection both of the just and the unjust, and implicitly said so, how can your affirmation be true? Is not his declaration *some* "such thing?"

HENRY GREW.

RESPONSE BY THE EDITOR.—In the first place, Br. GREW's stress on the term "*also*," in our mind, is unavailing. The original word is *kai*, and is translated variously in the New Testament: its first sense is that of *and*; it has the sense of *even*, *moreover*, *beside*, *further*, &c.. *Even or moreover*, is quite as likely to be the Apostle's meaning as "*also*."

Paul was a believer in the resurrection of Christ and of "the dead in Christ:" for preaching this doctrine he was accused of the Pharisees themselves; not because they were unbelievers in a resurrection of some sort; but they disliked the doctrine of Christ raised from the dead, and of life from the dead only through him. This they called "heresy," (v. 14,) as some do now. Paul professes that in his course of life and preaching he adheres to, and worships the God of the fathers, "believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets." Now, the "law" never speaks of a future life for the wicked, or of their revival from death; and hence Paul did not "allow" it; but the Pharisees did; and yet these same Pharisees charged Paul with "heresy" for preaching a resurrection less extensive than that which they allowed, or *admitted*—for so the original may be translated: they *admitted* a resurrection "both of the just and unjust," which was more than was ever "written in the law or prophets:" holy men of old, who "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," gave utterance to no such sentiments. Now, saith Paul, "I believe all things written in the law and in the prophets: and have hope toward God:"—*hope* of what? Of that which was *common* to all men? Nay, verily, as his language, Phil. 3: 11, clearly shows—"If by *any means* I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." Why this implied *doubt*, if the resurrection of all men was a settled fact, when the apostle "allowed?" Could he fail of that which was certain to all? Paul, then, did not allow the resurrection was universal; but the Pharisees did admit such a resurrection, and yet condemned Paul as guilty of "heresy" for preaching the resurrection of "hope" by Jesus Christ.

Such are the facts in the case; and Paul rebukes these Pharisees for their hypocrisy in con-

demning him for preaching the resurrection, "which they themselves *moreover* allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust." With such an *admission* on their part, why do they condemn him for proclaiming the resurrection of Christ, and of all that fall asleep in Christ? That such, and no other, was Paul's proclamation, concerning the resurrection of the dead, is clear from Phil. 3: 11; 1 Thess. 4: 13-18; and the entire chapter of 1 Corth. 15. "If Paul allowed that there shall be a resurrection both of the just and unjust," we wish Br. Grew to find where he taught such doctrine, and not rest it on a doubtful text.—Where did he ever say, in all his preaching or epistles, *the wicked dead shall live again?* or shall be raised from the dead? We say again, "Paul never said any such thing." Such a plain outspoken preacher as Paul did something more than speak doubtfully: he stated distinctly the grand fact of the resurrection of "the dead in Christ." If the awful doctrine of the wicked dead made alive, tormented, and killed again were true, we may depend Paul would not have left his hearers, and those to whom he wrote, to *infer* it. The great apostle to the Gentiles was not such a man. When taking his final leave of the elders of the church of Ephesus, he saith "I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you, but have showed you, and taught you publicly, and from house to house, testifying both to the Jews and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." Acts 20: 20, 21, To what end was this faith in Christ? To the end that they might have the promise of Christ fulfilled unto them.—"I will raise *him* up at the last day." John 6: 40. Repentance toward God and faith in Christ are essential to being raised up from the dead "at the last day;" and, "he that believeth not shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." John 3: 36.

Paul in writing to the Ephesian church, after he had taken his last personal leave of them, calls their attention specially to the resurrection of Christ, and to the fact that the same power that raised him from the dead would quicken them "together with Christ:" that "through Jesus' blood we have the forgiveness of sins;" and he taught the Corinthians, if our sins are not forgiven, when we die, we "are perished:" 1 Corth. 15: 17, 18. Here we rest the question of Paul's "allowing" the revival of dead sinners into life. He never preached a *penal* resurrection: none such did he ever speak of.

Backsliding in Old Age.

Did it ever occur to you that Christians were more apt to backslide and fall into open sin in the latter part of their religious course, than in its earlier stages? It is a startling announcement, but I think you will find it true. Look at all the cases of backsliding recorded in the Bible. Did they not, every one of them, occur late in life? There was David. In the days of his youth and early manhood, a pattern of faith and devotion. In advanced life, guilty of murder and adultery, and still later of pride and self-conceit, in numbering the people. Look at Moses. The great sin of his life committed when just about to enter the promised land. Look at Hezekiah, the "good king Hezekiah." In his early days, zealous and devout. The last fifteen years of his life (a special gift from his God, and therefore one would think to be specially consecrated to him) bringing "wrath upon himself and upon Jerusalem." So too with Josiah. So too with Jehoshaphat. And look around at the cases of grievous backsliding within your own observation. Have they not, almost every one of them, occurred late in life? I mean, after many years of Christian profession.—This fact (is it not a fact?) seems to me to teach several lessons of deep and solemn importance.

1. It accounts for another fact which has of late forced itself upon my attention, viz., that in the case of very many of God's people, their heaviest and most numerous trials come late in life.—God, in his tender mercy, sends the trials to save them from falling away from their steadfastness, and bringing reproach upon his cause.

2. These cases, recorded in the Bible and confirmed by observation, ought to make Christians, as they advance in life, more and more watchful and distrustful of themselves.—*Parish Visitor.*

The foregoing remarks, on "back-sliding in old age," are worthy of consideration, so far as they admonish us who have advanced in life; yet we think the writer is under a serious mistake in several particulars. It is a melancholy sight to see an aged person backslide, and it is as rare as it is sorrowful. Most back-sliding is in the early stages of a religious life. Multitudes "run well" for a time who are soon "hindered." "Many of his disciples went back and walked no more with" Jesus, when he had taught them of life only through himself. See John 6:66 and connection. This was in the early stage of their discipleship, and not in "old age." Peter denied his master when not more than thirty years of age. Judas betrayed Jesus about the same time of life, probably. We repeat, by far the greatest numbers of back-sliders are found in early life, and from the more recent converts to the religion of the Bible; and it is seldom that a man who in early life devotes himself to the service of God, and advances steadily to "old age" in that service, backslides; yet such events do sometimes occur, and they show us that at no pe-

riod of christian experience can we with safety cease to watch and pray, or indulge the idea that our past devotion to God is any excuse to be remiss in our last days. Some who have been eminent in talents and labor have fallen in "old age" by the flattery they have received for previous services; they have been lifted up with pride and been ensnared to their wounding. But as a general rule, a life truly devoted to God from youth, with a consistent christian walk to "old age," will not be likely to be staided with wickedly departing from the Lord. It is true "that in case of very many of God's people, their heaviest and most numerous trials come late in life;" not however for the reason assigned by the *Visitor*, but because as nature returns towards the helplessness of childhood the veteran pilgrim finds himself unable to maintain that buoyancy of spirit he did in manhood's maturity, so that depression of mind is a natural result, and great trials accompany it. Or, if such is not the cause of their trials, they may be accounted for on the ground that before the ultimate crowning of their graces with glory they are matured by greater trials than they could well have endured in their early christian experience. It is true that the fall or backsliding of an aged christian would attract more attention and bring more reproach on the cause of Christ than that of persons in their early pilgrimage.

The *Parish Visitor* in noticing the cases of old testament saints overlooked the fact, that it is only the shortcomings of eminent men he has noticed; and it is remarkable that they failed no more, considering the partial light of their dispensation. "The great sin of Moses' life" we hardly think was "committed when just about to enter the promised land." It seems to us, we might look back to his *youthful* days, when he slew the Egyptian on his own impulse, and find his zeal for the Lord venting itself in no ordinary sin.

Truly, however, "Christians, as they advance in life," ought to be "more and more watchful and distrustful of themselves." Long experience ought to have taught them, that without the grace and Spirit of God they can no more maintain a christian walk, in "old age," than in the first year of their christian experience. An entire leaning on God in Christ, and an earnest seeking the Holy Spirit's aid should characterise us who are near "old age;" that our "end may be peace."

Christianity in the Chinese Revolution.

In the *North China Herald*, published at Shanghai, June 7th, 1856, we find a very extended

and elaborate letter, addressed by one of the missionaries, Mr. W. A. P. Martin, to the Attorney-General of the United States, setting forth the condition and principles of the great Chinese rebellion. He regards the movement as eminently *Christian* in its inception and progress, and on its success he founds strong hopes of the spread of true religion in China. Mr. Martin says that "latterly it has been hinted that the insurgents are laying aside their profession of Christianity. This is, however, a groundless conjecture, thrown out with a design to disparage the revolution. Such an event is next to impossible in the nature of things. Christianity is so interwoven with the entire constitution of the party, that they cannot exclude it without hazarding its dissolution. The Chief claims the throne by virtue of a commission from the heavenly Father, and publishes to his people that he has achieved his most splendid victories by the help of Jesus. And it is by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost that the Eastern king pretends to guide his counsels. They cannot, therefore, drop these pretensions without forfeiting the semi-idolatrous reverence with which they are regarded by their followers; they cannot abjure Christianity without invalidating every decree issued since the commencement of the revolution, and abrogating their whole political system. Indeed, so zealous have the insurgent leaders been in diffusing a knowledge of the rudiments of Christianity among their own followers, and so successful in imparting their own zeal, that there is not now on the face of the earth any other military body which is so fully pervaded with religious enthusiasm.

"Here on the borders of the contested region, we have frequent opportunities of meeting with those who have been among the rebels. One of my missionary colleagues copied a hymn, which contains a beautiful summary of Christian doctrine, from the recitation of a Ningpo man, who had been for a time detained among them: and I have myself obtained the same from two others, one a native of Nanking, and the other a refugee from Chiu-kiang. The account of the practices of the insurgents given by the latter is so interesting that I shall relate a few particulars. Immediately on entering the city, religious tracts were put into his hands; after reading and approving of which he received the rite of baptism, by kneeling, (in company with others,) repeating the above-mentioned hymn, with a doxology to the Trinity, renouncing his sins, swearing fidelity to the cause, and then washing his bosom with a towel, which they call 'cleansing heart.' The Sabbath, though not strictly observed, owing to the interruptions incidental to a state of war, was still distinguished from other days. On the evening previous, a banner was hoisted, bearing the inscription: 'The morrow is the day of worship: beware of disregarding it.' At daybreak on Sabbath morning the troops were called together for prayer, and at a later hour they assembled in places called 'worshipping halls,' to hear a discourse from some officer, on the righteousness of their cause, the certainty of success, the wickedness of idolatry, and the oppression of the Tartars; or in lieu of such

service, which was always accompanied by prayer, to be examined as to their acquaintance with the religious manuals of the party. Those most esteemed were, the ten commandments with notes; the ode for youth, commencing with a brief but correct statement of Christian doctrine, and concluding with the duties of the social relations; the Trimetrical classic, which, after giving an epitome of the book of Genesis, and a detailed account of the deliverance from Egypt, speaks of the coming of Jesus Christ to save the world, and then proceeds to describe the mission of the 'celestial king' to deliver China from the Tartars. Of these the narrator repeated from memory considerable portions, together with a hymn and prayers, which each soldier is expected to recite daily as a devotional exercise. Those whose hair had grown long in the service were generally the most devout, and were often seen on their knees repeating their morning prayer, while putting on their clothes; but their later adherents who had learned those forms by constraint, would slip away to their breakfast without prayer, unless they were observed by some officer. They were even required to say a separate grace before meat. In times of peculiar danger they were accustomed to fall down, at any time, and in any place, and implore the Divine assistance."

The success of the insurrection, Mr. Martin contends, may be useful to the cause of Christianity, but its suppression cannot be otherwise than pernicious.

The Bishop of Victoria has also publicly stated that "if foreign intervention shall restore the sinking fortunes of the Imperialists, then it may be confidently predicted that the civilization of this vast empire will be hopelessly postponed; and the conversion to Christianity of this people will (to human view,) be indefinitely delayed. . . . The pæns of Manchou triumph will be the melancholy dirge of a vast nation, having her liberties entombed among the dead, and sinking into the lowest depths of political annihilation."

Christianity, in the eye of many of this people, is already identified with the insurgent cause; and while it prejudices them against the revolution, their animosity would, in the event of its failure, (as they mistake for its cause that which is only a concomitant,) recoil against foreigners for causing them to "suffer so many things in vain, if it be yet in vain." Missionaries would be treated as political incendiaries, and the Bible would be proscribed as a dangerous book.—*Christian Advocate*.

CHRYSOSTOM, speaking on the composition of a sermon, says, as in a reverie: I had a vision: I thought I saw the communion-rails crowded with angels listening to the sermon. When a man speaks as in the sight of God, with an open heaven—with Christ and angels before him—he catches the true prophetic fire; he offers a present salvation, from a present Saviour; the Spirit of glory and grace descends, and the flame communicates to his auditory, and accompanies them to their houses.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

SUBSCRIBERS wishing to pay personally, or sending by private hands, for the EXAMINER for 1857, may do so to GEO. YOUNG, partner in R. T. YOUNG'S *Letter File*, 109 Nassau Street, New York; who is authorized to act for us in the matter.

Our Office and residence is at 62 Hicks Street, Brooklyn, a short distance from Fulton Ferry, where we shall be happy to see any of our friends.

One number more completes the present volume of the BIBLE EXAMINER. We thank our friends for past favors.

To encourage early payments—which are much to our advantage—we make the following offers, to such as forward us the cash before December 25th, where papers are sent to *one address*, in the States.

Out of the States we must ask the additional sum of *twelve cents* for each copy ordered.

For *two* copies \$3; for *five* copies \$7; for *ten* copies \$10.

If either of these offers are accepted, let it be distinctly understood, we send the whole number in one envelope, to one individual; and we do not need the name of any other person.

To single subscribers, who pay \$2 before Dec. 25th, we will give *two* copies of either of the following works—the subscriber to pay the postage on them—*viz*: “MAN'S DESTINY;” “DOBNEY ABRIDGED;” “THE DISCUSSION” with Prof. Mattison; or, we will give one copy of “BIBLE vs. TRADITION,” in paper cover, and pay the postage on it ourself. If any prefer, *instead* of either the foregoing offers, a copy of the “*Revised and Enlarged SIX SERMONS*” we will give them that; but they must pay the postage on it. We will, instead of either of these works, give “OUR ISRAELITISH ORIGIN,” bound; the subscriber paying the postage. This is a valuable and interesting work.—In all cases of our sending books or pamphlets into Canada the postage must be *prepaid*; let our friends there remember this.

Money sent for the BIBLE EXAMINER is at *our risk*, provided the letter is sealed with a wafer and directed as follows—

GEO. STORRS, Box 4658, New York.

Take care to put no other words or figures in the direction, as it will be at *your risk* if you do.

On the Witness of the Spirit.

The witness of the Spirit is a thing that we cannot express; a certain inexpressible assurance that we are the children of God; a certain secret man-

ifestation that God hath received us and put away our sins. No one knows it but they that have it. I confess it is a wondrous thing, and if there were not some Christians that did feel it and know it, you might believe there was no such thing; but it is certain there is a generation of men that know what the seal of the Lord is.—*Preston*.

The testimony of the Spirit is immediate by his secret influence upon the heart, quieting and calming all distrust and diffidence concerning ~~his~~ condition, by his own immediate power. Fear is banished by a soft whisper from the Spirit of God in the heart; and this in such a way that, though the spirit of man is calmed by it, yet it cannot tell how it comes to pass.—*Simon Ford*.

God hath been pleased to give us the witness of the Spirit in the way of an immediate impression. The Spirit, as a “Spirit of adoption,” testifies to the believer's soul that he belongs to God. As, by the “sealing of the Spirit,” he stamps his own image on his children for the conviction of others, so, by “the witness of the Spirit,” he testifies to their adoption for the more immediate comfort of their own souls. Do not condemn the witness of the Spirit merely because you cannot comprehend it; rather pray to God that you yourself may be his children. In this way you may hope that the Spirit will testify of your adoption.—*Charles Simon*.

It is the office of the Holy Ghost to assure us of our adoption as sons, to create within us a sense of the paternal love of God toward us, and to give us an earnest of our everlasting inheritance. As, therefore, we are born again by the Spirit, and receive from him our regeneration, so we are also assured by the same Spirit of our adoption; and because, being sons, we are also heirs, heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ by the same Spirit, we have the pledge, or rather the earnest of our inheritance.—*Bishop Pearson*

We may abound in meetings and in movements; enthusiastic gatherings in field or forest may kindle all minds with a common sentiment; great revivals may bear away thousands in a torrent of sympathy; but it is all in vain if men do not retire from the tumult to the silent culture of every right disposition, and the quiet practice of every duty; in vain, unless they patiently engrave the commandments of God on the inward tables; unless they hear a still small voice in the soul, and retain a warmth there, when the noise has ceased, and the flames have died away, as on the mount of ancient revelation.—*Selected*.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. XI.

NEW-YORK, DECEMBER 15, 1856.

NO. 24.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY.

TERMS—Two Dollars for the year :

Always in Advance.

GEO. STORRS, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.

NATURE AND IMMORTALITY.

When we endeavor to explore the future, or discover the character of those things that are unseen, by the light of nature, the first thing that demands our attention is to learn the means by which nature divulges the truths in her keeping. Having learned this, we are at once prepared to enter upon the investigation of any subject that may come under our observation.

How then do we learn of nature touching things future or unseen? Let this point be fixed and then we may advance with safety—with some hope of ultimately arriving at just conclusions.

I conceive the only means by which we can gain any light from nature, upon the unknown, is by fixing general principles by observation, and then following those principles where observation is precluded. When we see a train of cars enter a tunnel we justly conclude that the track within the tunnel is the same as without it, because we have previously established the principle that cars always run upon certain rails beneath them. Just so when we reason from nature upon our future destiny, we must first settle a principle from observation, then follow that principle into the unknown future, and thus we may receive whatever knowledge nature can afford us. It is true that to all principles there may be exceptions, but in reasoning from nature these exceptions can never be allowed, unless there is first shown an evident necessity for them. This possibility of exception will always prevent a demonstration from nature, and such exceptions may even exist in the unknown, where we now see no reason to look for them, but it is still self-evident that to make possible exceptions the basis of an argument is to ignore reason and nature, and launch on the boundless ocean of conjecture. We must reason from what we *know*. Our premises must be positive truths established directly or indirectly by the evidences of the senses, not wild theories that have as little to do with observation as fancy has with fact; and thus reasoning it is possible, nature might give us many lessons.

Having laid down the principle by which I shall be guided, I now propose to enter upon a search for some of the truths made known by nature concerning the constitution of man, and his chances

for a future existence. For the present I shall attempt no demonstration, but having found some facts, and settled some general truths concerning those facts, I shall deduce the conclusions.

In the first hasty survey we take of man, we discover, prominent in his character, the desire of life and of immortality; which is but the desire of life indefinitely extended into the future. To prove that the desire of life is universal, we have only to appeal to the disposition shown to preserve it, and to the united testimony of every sane mind. No man desires non-existence. The suicide may choose it, not because there is in nonentity anything desirable, but because he thereby hopes to escape certain other and greater evils. If life without misery could be retained, or secured, by a simple volition, death would be unknown. So far as I know, the fact that all men desire immortality has never been questioned; and should any man proclaim himself an exception, the world would look upon him as one beside himself. Let this fact then be noted—*All mankind desire immortality.*

Following the plan I have marked out, I now proceed to fix certain general principles concerning human desire, and thus a path will be formed upon which we can enter the future.

I observe in myself and other beings of my nature, a multitude of desires, some operating only under certain circumstances, as hunger, thirst, desire of rest; others more general in their object and continual in their action, as the desire for wealth and knowledge; and still another class, more comprehensive than either of the foregoing, as the desire for happiness, and immortality. To the agency of these desires, operating singly, or in combination, we owe every voluntary action of our lives. From their stimulation arises all the marvelous energy and activity of the human character. A moment's consideration will make this apparent. Take from man the desire for food, and the race would soon be exterminated. Take from him the desire for wealth and knowledge, and all would sink into idleness, or be only active to supply their immediate wants. Commerce and manufacture would be at an end, and a universal lethargy would pervade the world. Let man lose the desire for future life, and who would seek immortality? In short, take from human nature the one ingredient of desire, and it is easy to see our existence would be impossible.

Here then, I think, is fixed one general truth connected with desire—that it is the impelling power which nature uses to urge us to seek some real good.

Again, there is every reason to believe, that under certain circumstances, nature has provided

for the gratification of every desire she has given: for if nature's God is a being of goodness he would not tantalize his creatures with desires for the satisfaction of which he had made no provision. But aside from this, observation shows us that every desire points toward some object. In natural desire the object is real, and, under specified conditions, attainable; as the desire for food, drink, and knowledge. In perverted desire the object is sometimes real and attainable; as in avarice and ambition, and sometimes imaginary, as in the paradise of the Musselman, and the heaven of the spiritualist. Observation, then, teaches this fact, that all natural desires and many perverted ones may be gratified. This is a second general truth.

A third truth is, that desire always implies conditions; or, in other words, that nothing which we desire can be secured but by effort made by ourselves.

If true, this is a most important principle; and that it is true, a little reflection will convince the most skeptical. Hunger and thirst, imply the necessity of procuring something to eat or drink; and unless the soil is tilled, the seed sown, and harvest gathered, all our desires would not save us from famine and death. So of our desire for health; it can only be gratified by obeying the physical laws under which we live.

This is the case with all those desires which recur at regular intervals, or exist only under specified circumstances; they point directly to conditions, without compliance with which not one of them ever has been satisfied, or ever can be. Every desire connected with our animal organization comes to us as active beings, and we must forego its gratification or comply with its demands.

If we look at another class of desires, not necessarily universal, as the desire of wealth, civil or military distinction, we find the same thing true of them. How has it been with every man that has been distinguished for success in his favorite pursuit? Whether in oratory, war, science, or literature, the best years of long lives, or the mightiest efforts of surpassing genius, have been essential to perfect their various designs. Human greatness has always been bought at the price of severe and constant toil.

The desire of fame has always imposed upon its votaries labor as the only condition by which the end could be attained. That "there is nothing worth having that can be had without labor" depends on the truth that desire always implies conditions.

So far then, whether we look at man as an animal or an intellectual being, we find everywhere connected with desire conditions. Let us approach still nearer the desire of immortality, to those of life and happiness. Except the desire of life, that of happiness, in its universality and comprehensiveness, absorbs all other desires that pertain to our present state. And who can doubt that happiness is conditional? Let us gaze for an instant around us. The whole world is in motion—ceaseless activity pervades every community—heartless despotism—the most cruel oppression, murder, robbery, and vice in all its forms, blight the fair

face of the earth. The ocean is whitened with the commerce of all nations; manufactures of almost innumerable variety are to be met with in every quarter of the globe, and agriculture is pursued with an earnestness that shows an object of importance in view. Nor does this busy world lack noble instances of philanthropy and self-sacrifice to the general good. All mankind, by means innumerable, are eagerly, often mostly in pursuit of some end, to attain which all their energies are put in requisition;—that end is happiness. All seek to comply with what they conceive to be the conditions by which the end can be gained. The practical opinion of all the race is, that happiness is conditional; and were there no other reason, the experience of every day would place the question beyond doubt. The desire of life is, perhaps, the strongest feeling of our nature; and it is most intimately connected with that of immortality, which is simply life indefinitely extended in the future. But, that life is conditional none will deny.

This examination might be pursued, but the result would be invariably the same. No sooner would desire develop itself, than conditions for its gratification would immediately follow. This is so obvious to every observing mind as to need no proof. Desire and conditions always go hand in hand, and there is no hazard in saying, that *not one instance* of the unconditional gratification of natural desire can be produced.

I think my third principle is established, and will add, as self-evident, that we never desire to obtain what we now possess, or to retain what we cannot lose.

Here are four principles:—

1. That desire is the impelling power which nature uses to urge man to seek or retain some real good.
2. That nature has under certain circumstances provided for the gratification of every desire she has given.
3. That no desire can be gratified except the individual in whom it exists complies with certain conditions.
4. That we never desire to obtain what we now possess, or to retain what we can by no possibility lose.

The first position was—that all desire immortality; and an examination of natural desire shows the four propositions also to be universally true; thus the premises are complete, and the conclusions are apparent.

1. Desire is the impelling power which nature uses to urge men to seek or retain some real good. Therefore immortality is a real good, which nature, by desire, urges us to seek or retain. We cannot desire to retain it, because we do not know that we are immortal. True, men not seldom say they are conscious of indwelling immortality, when in truth they are *conscious* of exactly the reverse, but hope there is something within of which they are not conscious, that can never die: therefore nature does not urge us to retain immortality. But if this were not the case—(4)—we never desire to retain what we cannot lose; therefore, however durable our natures might be, there would be a

possibility of death. But (4) we never desire to obtain what we now possess : yet we desire to obtain immortality, and consequently do not now possess it.

2. Nature—or rather nature's God—has made provision for the gratification of every desire he has given : he has given the desire of immortality ; and hence has somewhere made provision for its gratification—man may be immortal.

3. The gratification of every natural desire depends on our compliance with conditions ; and it follows that immortality is *conditional*. These conditions are not revealed in nature, and hence the necessity for some other revelation. But desire is a universal energizing force given to urge us to seek out those conditions, or comply with them when known ; and without it we should care as little for the future as the day-fly, whose existence is bounded by the setting sun. But man is made capable of a nobler destiny : he grasps the unending future, and is filled with inexpressible longings for life—eternal life : and these aspirations are the voice of God urging him to seek and use the means by which he may be made immortal.

To reason then from the known to the unknown, so far as desire is concerned, the inevitable conclusion is, conditional immortality. There is no escape, no evasion. Nature never came nearer a mathematical demonstration.

Yet, who has not heard that the longing we feel for endless existence is the "voice of God proclaiming our immortal destiny !" That is, all men desire immortality, therefore all will be immortal ! Let us apply the same logic to other subjects. All men desire happiness, therefore all will be happy ! All desire food and clothing, therefore no one can be hungry or naked ! All desire health, and hence sickness is unknown ! What sane man believes such nonsense ? Still, in the eye of reason, it is just as near truth as the position that all men desire immortality, and hence all will be immortal.

Suppose however my premises are wrong—that all men do not desire immortality, and that the four propositions drawn from the fact of desire are untrue. What then ? Simply this :—Non-existence. Universal immortality, and conditional immortality, would both fall together, unless one or the other could be proved true from other premises ; for though it is true, that if immortality is inherent, we could no more desire it, than we could desire the light of the sun when it is shining upon us in mid-day brilliancy, yet the fact that we do *not* desire immortality would be far enough from proving that we possess it. If we deny the evidence of desire upon this subject, to me, it appears that the strongest, if not the only argument, against universal and eternal nonentity is broken down.—Where does nature clearly indicate even the possibility of eternal life, if not by our desires ? It is said, and with apparent plausibility, that the capabilities of our nature afford presumptive evidence that we shall have a future and eternal existence.

This argument will hardly bear the light ; for however we look on the human organization, it must be granted that physically, intellectually,

and morally, it is imperfect, or in that condition in which surrounding circumstances will inevitably lead to that imperfection. We cannot suppose the God of nature created man with this inherent imperfection, or incapacity to resist those expressive forces which produce that imperfection : hence man must have fallen from some position where his capabilities might have been harmoniously developed ; and when this degeneracy occurred the elements of discord and evil were introduced, though many of his capabilities still remained. Now, when man thus became degenerate the mystery is that he was not destroyed at once and forever—a mystery that *nature* cannot explain ; but Revelation can—"For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not *perish* but have everlasting life."

Aside from this, however, if we can affirm with reason that the God of nature would not create such capacities with a view to their final destruction ; with equal reason we can affirm, that he would not create them with a view to their remaining undeveloped, or in idleness. Yet in the immense majority of our race the development of their capacities has been in obedience to the same law that develops the capacities of the brute—that of necessity : and nearly all those powers which are said to give man right to expect immortality have lain dormant ; and if thus they lie dormant a life time, it cannot be very unreasonable that they should remain so forever. Again, if it is unreasonable that those capacities should be destroyed, it is much more so that they should be perverted and used to blight the earth with crime and woe : but that they are thus used none will deny. Hence, I conclude that the destruction of these capacities is not near so unreasonable as their existence a lifetime in idleness, or their perversion to produce misery ; and no more so than the simple fact of human existence in its present degenerate state : and therefore we are driven back to desire, as the foundation which nature gives for any hope of immortality. Thus if my premises are denied the only result is to take away all hope of an endless existence, and to doom the race to nonentity !

I think I have shown that the utmost that can be proved by human desires is, conditional immortality ; and that the strongest argument presented by nature for endless being is found in desire.

In looking at these conclusions one cannot help observing that the God of nature, who in the gift of desire indicated that he had prepared the means for its gratification, is the same God who has "brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel." Desire gives man reason to hope for future life as something that can be secured by complying with conditions which nature does not reveal. But here, where nature is silent, the God of nature reveals to man the means by which he may become immortal : here, where the wisdom of man and the voice of nature have been alike important to give assurance of life, the Creator, by direct irradiation, illuminates the distant boundless future. The "*Light of Life*" dispels the doubts which nature leaves, and meets us with the

assurance that of all things, that are committed unto him, nothing shall be lost; but he will raise it up at the last day. He has severed the bands of death, and at his command the sepulchre shall vainly desire longer to retain its unconscious inmates.

Only by faith in him can that universal desire for being gratified. He alone holds the keys of death and hell, and he only can unlock the grave, and give life to the sleeping dead; for he only can redeem the soul from the power of the grave.

M.

THE SUBORDINATE REIGN OF CHRIST.

BY GEORGE DUKE OF MANCHESTER.

I shall now endeavor to prove that Messiah will assume a kingdom, immediately upon his second advent; and, in the next place, to shew that this will be the subordinate reign; I shall then inquire into the place, the nature, and the duration of this kingdom.

The first passage which I shall notice is 2 Tim. iv. 1: "I charge thee before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom." That this appearing will be a personal, bodily appearing, I believe all allow, because it is the coming of Christ to judgment; but then his kingdom follows upon his appearing, and the judgment is carried on whilst Christ is in his kingdom.

The next passage which I shall mention is Heb. i. 6-9, in which place the apostle quotes a verse from Ps. civ. 4; but turning to the Psalm, we find that the verse cited by St. Paul is not spoken by God either of the angels, as our version of the epistle to the Hebrews affirms, or unto the angels, as the marginal reading would indicate. I therefore understand the apostle to introduce the citation parenthetically, in acknowledgment of the dignity and duty of angels: "And unto the angels He speaks [even He] who maketh his angels winds, and his ministers a flame of fire." The other verses will then be understood in this manner:

"But when He shall bring again* the first-begotten into the habitable earth, he saith,

"And let all the angels of God worship Him;"

"But unto the Son"—

"Thy throne O God [is] for ever and ever."

Thus there is an opposition between what is *at the same time* said unto the angels and unto the Son; thereby shewing that when He shall come again into the world, He will come to his throne;

* The marginal rendering of Heb. i. 6 is to be preferred, because Psalm xcvi. from which the quotation is taken, refers not to the first advent, but to when Jesus shall come "again into the world." And that "again" cannot be understood in the sense of *another quotation* is evident, because the verse quoted is intended to prove a different clause from the preceding citations; those in verse 6 establish the "excellent name" of Son, but this in verse 6 proves the superiority to angels; it is not, therefore, a *second* quotation, but the first, which is advanced to prove that point.

for the passage must be read with this connexion, "When He brings again the first-begotten into the habitable earth, he saith, 'Thy throne O God is for ever and ever.'"

Our Lord marks precisely the period when He shall sit upon his own throne, saying, "When the Son of man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of his glory." This, I believe, all men acknowledge to be a literal personal advent: those who deny the personal reign, say that it denotes the day of judgment; and the personal millenarians generally, I believe, suppose that it refers to the judgment of the quick at the appearing of Jesus Christ. According to either view, therefore, it must be admitted that at that period of his coming He will sit upon the throne of his glory; for, as I before observed, "when" and "then," standing in relation to each other in this manner, are tantamount to saying, that at that time, and not until that time, will the Son of man sit upon this throne. It will be "the throne of the glory of the Son of man," a glorious throne suitable to the glory of the Son of man.

As our Lord, when upon earth, without any explanation assumes this title, "Son of man," as his general designation, we may take it for granted that He supposed its meaning ought to have been known; and if so, from whence could it have been learned but from the Old Testament? Indeed, upon one occasion, Messiah directly establishes what belongs to his office as Son of man, from the use of that title in the prophets. "And [the Father] hath given Him (the Son of God, ver. 18.) authority to execute judgment also, *because He is the Son of man.*" The Lord affirms, that because He is Son of man, that therefore He has the authority to execute judgment; but we find this authority given to the Son of man only in Dan. vii. 9, 13, 14, to which, therefore, I conceive our Lord must refer.

This prophecy of Daniel is one of exceeding importance and considerable difficulty, but the only points which bear directly upon our immediate inquiry are the succession and subordination of the kingdom here mentioned. "I beheld until the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit;" the time appears to be when Christ "shall have put down all rule and all authority and power," and therefore, "When He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father." Now, as in the vision the beasts symbolize not individual kings, but kingdoms which shall arise out of the earth, so, by congruity of interpretation, I am led to suppose that the session of "the Ancient of days" is not intended to symbolize God, but the reign of God "all in all;" to which, however, will belong some visible and manifested glory upon this earth. Ver. 13: "I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days and they brought Him near before Him, and there was given Him dominion and glory, and a kingdom," &c. This verse I likewise understand to symbolize the establishment of Messiah's throne; having resigned the co-ordinate reign. He receives for himself a

kingdom,* which proves the succession: the subordination is clearly marked by verse 27, for it is that which is shared with the people of God.

Psalm viii. celebrates the subjection of all things to the Son of man. The intimate relation of this passage to the 1st chapter of Genesis is evident. And I think we learn from St. Paul's comment, in Heb. ii., that David applies to the second Adam as the antitype, that which in Genesis is spoken with relation to the first Adam, as the type of Messiah. I will, therefore, first turn to Genesis in order to show in what manner Adam is spoken of as the type of Christ.

"God said, Let us make Adam in our image . . . , so God created Adam in his image: in the image of God created He him." It appears from the passage that God addressed some one respecting the creation of Adam. If it be asked, "With whom took He counsel?" I answer, that He who proposed the creation of Adam was God the Father: but that He who actually created Adam was Christ.

"That the purpose and source of all is to be attributed to the Father, is generally admitted: it is the first article of our creed, that God the Father was maker of heaven and earth: this, however, does not exclude the Son, but, on the contrary, in the order of working, the actual formation is by the Son, while the purpose is attributed to God the Father. This may be rested upon one text: "To us there is but one God the Father, of whom are all things, and we in Him: and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by Him."

I said, in the second place, that He who actually created Adam was Christ; this must be included in the assertion made by Paul to the Ephesians, that "God created all things by Jesus Christ;" that is, the God-man in his office-character—or "assumed relation," as Mr. Vaughan termed it—created all things. So, in Gen. ii. 2, where the completion of creation by God is recorded: "And on the seventh day God ended his work which He had made," President Edwards observes, that the word translated "work" most properly signifies a work done in the execution of some function, to which the workman is appointed as the messenger of another. So "wisdom," in Proverbs viii., which is generally attributed to Jesus Christ, says, "I was set up," or "I was anointed from everlasting;" and the following verses declare that the office to which He was anointed was creation. "When He appointed the foundations of the earth, then," says Wisdom, "I was by Him [as] one brought up with Him." So it is translated in the authorised version; but the learned Francis Taylor renders it, "Then was I by Him as an artificer with Him."

It would follow, from what has been advanced, that Adam was created in the image of Christ the God-man; for God who created him, created him

in his [own] image. And we have seen that He who did create was the Christ. This, however, must not be understood to the exclusion of God the Father, for He said, "Let us make Adam in our image;" both, therefore, seem to be embraced in the scripture account, for it says "So God created Adam in his image," and then it adds, "in the image of God created He him." And perhaps in the proposition of God, the same is implied, for He not only says, "Let us make man in our image," but He adds, "after our likeness."* But as Christ himself is "the image of God," so Adam being created immediately in Christ's own image, was created ultimately in the image of God. Hence man is called the image of God, and Adam is also expressly styled "the type of the coming One."—Rom. v. 14.

Adam was the type of Christ; in the constitution of his person; in his relation to Eve; and in his having dominion; which last appears principally intended in Genesis, and is exclusively noticed in the viiith Psalm, and is the subject to which my inquiry is at present confined.

"God said, Let us make man in our image . . . and let him have dominion: so God created man in his image." In the blessing, therefore, He conferred the dominion; and Boothroyd does not hesitate to make the connexion much more intimate; for he renders it, "Let us make man . . . according to our own likeness, that they may have dominion." And Tillock translates it, "Then ΟΜΝΙΠΟΤΕΝΕΪ said, We will make man in our image . . . and they shall have dominion . . . thus ΟΜΝΙΠΟΤΕΝΕΪ created man . . . in the image of ΟΜΝΙΠΟΤΕΝΕΪ created He him."

Adam, then, was a type of Christ in his power and dominion. Now that which is typified must previously exist, at least in idea; one thing cannot be made in the form, or mould, or representation of another, without the idea of the other existing in the mind of him who forms the type. But with respect to the Lord Jesus there was much more than the idea; He actually existed as the Word, and actually put forth his power as the Christ, in creation; but with respect to the constitution of

* "The similitude of the Lord" is apparently a personal title of the Lord Jesus in the Old Testament, (Numb. xii. 8,) and answerable to a similar denomination of Christ in the New Testament "The image of God."

† El certainly denotes power, and seems, when used as a title of God, intended to convey that idea. The plural, then, *Elohim*, would denote powers; and when applied to Deity, may indicate all power, or *Omnipotence*. Thus rulers, I conceive, are called *Elohim* in the Old Testament, as representatives of Him, who shall govern all nations; and to this title, probably, St. Paul alludes, when he says, "The powers that be, are ordained of God:" so he argues, in another place, that a man "ought not to cover his head;" that is to have the sign of subjection to the power of another, as is the case with the woman, "Forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God;" that is, he is the image of God in bearing rule. Hengstenberg will not allow that *Elohim* in the Old Testament ever means angels.—I do not see why it should not, as well as "Powers" in the New Testament.

* This interpretation appears to me to account satisfactorily for the kingdom being said to belong to the Son of man, (Dan. vii. 14.) but in the explanation, (verse 22,) to be possessed by the saints.

his person as the God-man, his humanity having no more than a decretive subsistence, we can only consider Him in these respects as *virtually* set up, or in the *predestinative assumption of humanity*.

But in the order of the divine decrees, which have the relation of end and means among themselves, the purpose of the end precedes the purpose of the means; this is implied in Ephes. i. 11, where the apostle affirms that God works "after the counsel of his own will," in order to the accomplishment of his predestinative purpose. It would not, therefore, be the intermediate state of humiliation—for that would come under the decree of the means—but the ultimate state of glory to which the God-man was predestined, that would, according to our conceptions, be first in intention, in the Divine mind. *Glorified* humanity in the person of Jesus would therefore be the antitype, in the image of whom Adam was created as the type.

It is at this very point of view, so to speak, that I apprehend the psalmist is placed. He sees the Glory-man brought out the head of creation, and from that point he takes a retrospect of that suffering humanity, into the condition of which the Son of God descended, and from which He raised himself and will raise all united to Him.

The psalmist bursts out into an exclamation, "O Jehovah our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the earth! who hast set thy glory above the heavens." This must refer to that time when God's name, in itself essentially excellent, will be known and appreciated throughout all the earth, and when, to all appearance, there will be a higher manifestation of glory upon this planet than even in the heavens themselves. And when, instead of children as soon as they are born going astray and speaking lies, babes and sucklings will praise that strength which will have caused to cease the enemy and avenger.

"When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers; the moon and the stars which thou hast ordained, what is man (*Enosh*, suffering man) that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man (Adam) that thou visitest him?" Some say that these meditations arose in the psalmist's mind at the feast of tabernacles, when dwelling in a booth which, according to the Jewish custom, was purposely so constructed that the stars should be seen. The feast of tabernacles would also be a suitable occasion, for it typified that rejoicing of universal nature which shall take place when God becomes "all in all." Be that, however, as it may, the tenor of this verse indicates a nocturnal scene, when the many distant worlds which are brought to our view, more strongly mark the comparative insignificance of this earth and its inhabitants.

These circumstances might occasion the psalm; but if, as I suppose, the royal prophet was in visional anticipation, himself in the kingdom of Messiah, and from thence taking a retrospect, we must realize in our mind that time when there will probably be a similar result, but from opposite causes; when there will be no night, and yet no need of the sun; when other worlds will not reflect the light of the sun; but the light emanating from the New Jerusalem.

I understand "man," in the 4th verse, to denote man universally, in his lost and ruined estate.—The "Son of man" I understand to be human nature individuated in the person of Christ Jesus, though not exclusively confined to Him, but in the same manner as Adam, his type was an individual, but also a federal head. Thus the dominion of the Son of man, in Ps. viii., will be extended to his fellows, as the dominion of the Son of man, in Dan. vii. 13, is shared by the people of the saints of the Most High, verse 27.

"Thou hast minished Him for a little in comparison with angels;" this necessarily implies a depression from a previous state of exaltation; the minishing was the actual incarnation in the likeness of sinful flesh; but from what was He depressed? The depression could not be of the Deity—that admits of no limitation, nor would that be a lessening of the Son of man. How, then, could there be a lowering of the human nature before it had any real existence, unless from that predestinative assumption of glorified manhood of which I have been speaking?

"For thou hast made Him for a little while lower than the angels, and hast crowned Him with glory and honor." The "little while" was the whole period of "the days of his flesh." The following clause denotes the co-ordinate reign at God's right-hand, for we now by faith "behold Jesus" . . . "crowned with glory and honor."

"Thou madest Him to have dominion over the works of thy hands: thou hast put all things under his feet;" this is the reign of "the Son of man," which will extend over all that was lost in the first Adam: "All sheep and oxen, yea, and the beasts of the field, the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the paths of the sea." This we may see for ourselves is still unfulfilled, and the apostle confirms it: "But now we see not yet all things subjected unto Him."

That this is the subordinate reign we learn from 1 Cor. xv. 27, for the apostle quotes this viiith Psalm in proof that all things are decretively subjected to Christ; and then he adds, (ver. 28,) "And when all shall be subdued unto Him, then shall the Son of man also himself be subject unto Him," &c. So that He receives this dominion upon his becoming subordinate.

* * * * *
Before entering upon my next inquiry, which is respecting the nature of Messiah's kingdom, I will glance at the 2d Psalm, showing how all the points I have hitherto urged are there introduced.

It is a matter of great moment, as I have already intimated on the viiith Psalm, to observe the point of time at which the prophet is supposed to be placed. In Psalm viii. the seer was supposed to have anticipated the day of glory; in this Psalm the point of time is during this dispensation, and after the ascension; the events of that time are in the present tense: "Why do the heathen?" &c., events before that time, though occurring long after the Psalm was enunciated, would be in the past: "The Lord hath said unto me," at the time of the resurrection, "Thou art my Son," &c.—The events future to the session at God's right-

hand are of course spoken of in the future: "I will give thee the heathen," &c.

The first three verses show the opposition to Jehovah and his Christ by both Jew and Gentile, rulers and people, during the whole of this dispensation; commencing with Herod and Pontius Pilate, and continuing until the second advent. The first two verses are in the words of the psalmist, in the third verse he records the language of the Gentiles and the people. These verses denote the character of this present dispensation.

The fourth verse indicates Christ's present situation: "He sitting in the heavens shall laugh, *Adonai* shall have them in derision." This verse corresponds with Psalm ex.: "Jehovah said to *Adonai*, Sit thou at my right-hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool;" and establishes the co-ordinate reign during this dispensation, "whilst the Gentiles are raging," &c.

"Then shall He speak to them in his wrath and vex them in his sore displeasure," [saying,] "Yet am I anointed King upon my holy hill of Zion." This 5th verse marks the close of this dispensation, when Christ will cease to sit in the heavens; and when He will commence to reign in Mount Zion; the "then" of this verse is in opposition to the "now" of verse 10; "now" marking the present period of God's forbearance and long-suffering, "then" denoting the time when his wrath will be come. This verse, therefore, implies the Church's expectation.

As in the 3rd verse the psalmist records the words of the Gentiles, so in the 6th verse he relates the words which will be spoken at the time of the second advent; either by Jehovah, if we follow the Hebrew, or by Messiah, if we follow the Septuagint, which latter I prefer, because the wrath of the speaker in the 5th verse appears the same wrath as that of the Son, mentioned in the 12th verse. These, then, are the words of Messiah at the period of the second advent: "Yet (notwithstanding this opposition of Jew and Gentile,) am I anointed King upon my holy hill of Zion." But whether we suppose the words to be those of the Father or of Christ, they indicate his assumption of the subordinate throne, at the time when the Gentiles shall be visited with his sore displeasure: namely, at the close of this dispensation.

In the 7th, 8th, and 9th verses Messiah himself in his own person, is introduced as the speaker, declaring the Father's decree concerning Him: "I will declare the decree Jehovah said unto me," (when He raised Him from the dead, Acts xiii. 33.) "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," &c.

The decreed subjection of the heathen, mentioned in the 8th and 9th verses, will be fulfilled at the second advent, as Christ has promised to those who shall overcome, in Rev. ii. 27.

In the remainder of the Psalm, David speaks in his own person, urging kings and rulers to wisdom, before it be too late: "Be wise now, therefore, O ye kings: be instructed, ye judges of the earth," &c.; the "now," verse 10, of the day of grace, being opposed to the "then," verse 5, of the day of wrath.

For the Examiner.

THE MEMORY OF THE JUST.

BY S. BATCHELOR.

The memory of the Just I
How blest, though some for ages long have slept
Their deeds like precious ointment now are kept.

They being dead yet speak;
Time past is witness for the faithful dead,
As blessings rest upon the honored head.

They who the burden bore,
And shrunk not in the heat of battle day,
How oft lamented, early past away.

Mothers in Israel,
Their deeds shall outlive time, unknown to fame
For which so many leave a Saviour's name.

Brother and sister dear,
Loved ones may not escape the general doom,
'They sleep, how sweet their rest within the tomb.

But hope survives the gloom,
For they who died in faith, the witnesses
Have not as yet received the Promises.

And we shall meet again,
Yes, with them in the flesh shall see our God,
Should we remain, or sleep beneath the sod.

The soul's immortal birth,
Hail, blessed scene, the resurrection morn!
The righteous sown in death to life are born.

The memory of the Just I
How bright the past, but brighter still the rise
Of hope fulfilled, in new earth Paradise.

Behold the day-star rise;
Swift as an eagle's flight it comes—is here—
Eternity—no death—no falling tear.

Short Sayings.

A man whose ways please God, must be odd
from the mass of mankind.

To go with the multitude of mankind, is to go
with a multitude who do not think for themselves,
but merely respond to the thoughts of a few am-
bitious persons who lead them.

Meekness, modesty, humility, and virtue, are
jewels which are comely to be worn under all cir-
cumstances. E. B.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

New York, December 15, 1856.

THE END of the present volume of our paper has come. It has been a year of labor and trial somewhat more than usual to us; but it has closed, and the result of all we leave with Him who "doeth all things well." We have no idea that we have given perfect satisfaction to all our readers, and some of them have not done so to us. Hence we will balance accounts and begin anew, forgetting the past, and striving to do as much better, for time to come, as our present imperfect state will permit. We see in part, and know in part, now: may the "perfect" speedily arrive, then that which is in part will be done away.—Till then we shall all have need of patience; and may it "have its perfect work."

The prospects of the BIBLE EXAMINER, for pecuniary support, the coming year are not as encouraging at this time as last year at the same time. We have determined we will not drum, dun, nor beg; we state the simple fact, and leave our friends to do what seemeth good to them in the matter. Without our present list of subscribers can be kept good, the paper *cannot* be issued *regularly, semi-monthly*; hence if it shall be found, early in January, that the receipts for 1857 are not sufficient to pay the cost of paper, and the Printer's bills, it is our intention—unless otherwise directed by the subscribers—to return all money received to those who have sent it, and *suspend* the issue of the paper for the present. If that is the pleasure of our subscribers, time will soon settle the matter.

The BIBLE EXAMINER was commenced in 1842, without a subscriber to help us forward. It was sent out as an *occasional* issue till 1847, when it was issued *monthly*, and was continued so till 1854. Since that, or for three years, it has been issued *semi-monthly*. Of itself, it has never been any pecuniary benefit to us, if we except the present year and one year while we issued it *monthly*.—The present year, as we have before stated, it has yielded us about *half* enough to pay the expenses of our family; but in order for this, we had to give up our office in the city of *New York*. If it is now to be *suspended* in its issue, on our own account, we shall have no regrets. If the friends of the cause we have advocated, judge they need its presence no longer, and that they can do no good to others by its circulation, we bow to their decision, and shall try, in our old age, to seek to do

good in some more quiet calling; and thus, in our turn, we shall bid you all "*farewell*."

If the EXAMINER is continued it will not be sent to any one who has not complied with our terms of payment in *advance*. There is no occasion for any to write us to stop their paper. It will, at any rate, be discontinued from this number to all who do not remit pay in advance.

Our friends will see the last EXAMINER for the terms to those who take *two* or more copies, and also for a list of the premiums to those who send \$2 for a single copy. Those who send for the works on which they are to pay the postage would do well to send Post Office stamps so us to *pre-pay* it; as that will be a saving to themselves.—That they may know just what is needed for this purpose we give the amount necessary to *pre-pay* on the different works. On "*Man's Destiny*," *five* cents. "*Discussion*" with Prof. Mattison, *five* cents. "*Dobney Abridged*," *six* cents.—"*Revised and Enlarged Six Sermons*," *ten* cents. "*Our Israelitish Origin*," *fourteen* cents. On each of these works, when sent as a premium, to subscribers, they are to pay the postage.

On "*Bible vs. Tradition*," in paper cover, when chosen instead of any of the foregoing, *one* copy is sent free of postage. On it we pay *nine* cents.

All persons receiving the BIBLE EXAMINER will please remember, they can pay the postage at their own Post Office just as cheap as they can do it through us at this Office. Any distance less than 3000 miles the postage is but a *half cent* if paid quarterly in *advance*; that is, *three* cents for three months. It subjects us to considerable trouble to pay it here. On papers going out of the States we are obliged to pay the postage.

Money sent for the BIBLE EXAMINER is at our *risk*, provided the letter is sealed with a wafer and directed as follows—

GEO. STORRS, Box 4658, *New York*.

Take care to put no other words or figures in the direction, as it will be at *your risk* if you do.

SUBSCRIBERS wishing to pay personally, or sending by private hands, for the EXAMINER for 1857, may do so to GEO. YOUNG, partner in R. T. YOUNG'S *Letter File*, 109 Nassau st., *New York*; who is authorized to act for us in the matter.

"SIX SERMONS," *Revised and Enlarged*—Those who have read this work, have found very much matter not in the *Original*; besides an entire new sermon on "*Christ the Life-Giver*." In addition to this, it is printed with a large clear type, thus affording much more satisfaction in reading. *Price* in plain binding, 63 cents; in gilt \$1. We will put 8 (*plain*) copies for \$3, cash.

WHAT IS IN THE WIND ?

There have been many attempts made, first and last, among the professed believers in the second advent of Christ, to strangle or drive out from among them the doctrine of "*Life only through Christ.*" Various have been the expedients adopted to this end ; but as a large and influential part of those believers have embraced that view, it has been a hard and difficult matter to make much headway in the operation ; for the truth has triumphed in spite of all such efforts. We see, however, by *The World's Crisis*, that a new scheme has lately been contrived to crush out the hated doctrine ; and if we rightly judge the *Editor* of that paper is likely to be drawn into it.

A "*Convention*" has lately been held at Providence, R. I., at which the following resolution, with a preamble, " was adopted with great unanimity of feeling," saith the *Editor* of the *Crisis* :—

Resolved, That as co-laborers in the promulgation of the doctrines intimately connected with the near coming of Christ, they hereafter avoid preaching on the subjects relating to the state of the dead, and final destiny of the wicked, in a manner calculated to give offence to those holding opposing sentiments ; and that they as far as is practicable, express themselves in the language of Scripture.

This resolution, at first view, may seem very harmless, and exceeding reasonable ; but on a close examination it is easy to see that it is a covered attempt to silence the preaching of the great doctrine of life and immortality only through Christ

1. The expression, "they *hereafter* avoid preaching," &c., implies that some *heretofore* have preached on the topics spoken of so as to "give offence to those holding opposite sentiments."

2. This "manner" of "preaching on the subjects" is to be discontinued "hereafter."

3. They are henceforth, "as far as is practicable," to "express themselves in the language of Scripture."

4. This is to be done so as not "to give offence to those holding opposite sentiments."

We would like to have all who voted for this *Resolution* just step back into the Churches from which they have separated on account of the advent doctrine. We venture not one of them need fear but that they will be received with open arms ; only promise "hereafter" to "avoid preaching on the subject" of Christ's second advent "in a manner calculated to give offence to those holding opposing sentiments" &c., and no doubt you will quickly be at peace with all the Churches from which you have separated. On such terms Luther might have remained in the Church of Rome.

But it is only to avoid preaching "in a manner calculated to give offence," &c. If those who have opposed the doctrine of Life only through Christ have preached in that manner let them cease, if they feel called to it. We know that truth, which is opposed to long established traditions, must and will give offence ; and we might as well pledge ourselves not to preach such truth at all as to resolve we will "avoid preaching" it "in a manner calculated to give offence."

If all that was meant to be inculcated was, that those holding opposite views should treat each other *courteously*, then say so, and let it be given as advice, or recommendation : but these *resolutions*, in public bodies, amount to *laws*, though without specified penalties. If violated by those who agree to them, surely, they are guilty of something, for which the same body, reassembled, should call them to account. Then who is to determine what the nature of the offence is ? and what the penalty to be inflicted ? Here we have the stepping stones to an inquisitorial supervision of all our preaching, if we consent to such a resolution as the one under consideration. A more open and frank course would be to adopt a *Creed*, at once, and define what we must or must not preach. How can a believer in life only through Christ tell when he is preaching in a manner to give offence ? He may use, if you please, Scripture, and that almost exclusively, and he cannot be sure that he does not give offence. Let him say "the dead know not anything"—"there is no knowledge in sheol whither thou goest"—"in that very day his thoughts perish," &c., can he know that it will not give offence to an opposing brother, who thinks the dead "know more than all the world" of the living ? Ah, but that is "Scripture language." Very well : what more is the expression, "The dead are unconscious ?" Is this last to give offence, and the other not ? Where is the line, and who is to decide ?

If the advocates of natural immortality and the endless misery of the wicked have found out they cannot meet our arguments, and now wish to bargain with us not to annoy them, let them honestly acknowledge they have no valid arguments in support of their theory, and not ask us to stop in our course of uprooting their tradition about souls never to die, and eternal misery ; and not seek to entrap us with a resolution which they would justly spurn if proposed on the subject of the advent, or personal appearing of Christ, the second time, by the churches they have left because they believed those churches opposed the truth. We

BIBLE EXAMINER.

New York, December 15, 1856.

THE END of the present volume of our paper has come. It has been a year of labor and trial somewhat more than usual to us; but it has closed, and the result of all we leave with Him who "doeth all things well." We have no idea that we have given perfect satisfaction to all our readers, and some of them have not done so to us. Hence we will balance accounts and begin anew, forgetting the past, and striving to do as much better, for time to come, as our present imperfect state will permit. We see in part, and know in part, now: may the "perfect" speedily arrive, then that which is in part will be done away.—Till then we shall all have need of patience; and may it "have its perfect work."

The prospects of the BIBLE EXAMINER, for pecuniary support, the coming year are not as encouraging at this time as last year at the same time. We have determined we will not drum, dun, nor beg; we state the simple fact, and leave our friends to do what seemeth good to them in the matter. Without our present list of subscribers can be kept good, the paper *cannot* be issued regularly, semi-monthly; hence if it shall be found, early in January, that the receipts for 1857 are not sufficient to pay the cost of paper, and the Printer's bills, it is our intention—unless otherwise directed by the subscribers—to return all money received to those who have sent it, and suspend the issue of the paper for the present. If that is the pleasure of our subscribers, time will soon settle the matter.

The BIBLE EXAMINER was commenced in 1842, without a subscriber to help us forward. It was sent out as an occasional issue till 1847, when it was issued monthly, and was continued so till 1854. Since that, or for three years, it has been issued semi-monthly. Of itself, it has never been any pecuniary benefit to us, if we except the present year and one year while we issued it monthly.—The present year, as we have before stated, it has yielded us about half enough to pay the expenses of our family: but in order for this, we had to give up our office in the city of New York. If it is now to be suspended in its issue, on our own account, we shall have no regrets. If the friends of the cause we have advocated, judge they need its presence no longer, and that they can do no good to others by its circulation, we bow to their decision, and shall try, in our old age, to seek to do

good in some more quiet calling; and thus, in our turn, we shall bid you all "farewell."

If the EXAMINER is continued it will not be sent to any one who has not complied with our terms of payment in advance. There is no occasion for any to write us to stop their paper. It will, at any rate, be discontinued from this number to all who do not remit pay in advance.

Our friends will see the last EXAMINER for the terms to those who take two or more copies, and also for a list of the premiums to those who send \$2 for a single copy. Those who send for the works on which they are to pay the postage would do well to send Post Office stamps so as to pre-pay it; as that will be a saving to themselves.—That they may know just what is needed for this purpose we give the amount necessary to pre-pay on the different works. On "Man's Destiny," five cents. "Discussion" with Prof. Mattison, five cents. "Dobney Abridged," six cents.—"Revised and Enlarged Six Sermons," ten cents. "Our Israelitish Origin," fourteen cents. On each of these works, when sent as a premium, to subscribers, they are to pay the postage.

On "Bible vs. Tradition," in paper cover, when chosen instead of any of the foregoing, one copy is sent free of postage. On it we pay nine cents.

All persons receiving the BIBLE EXAMINER will please remember, they can pay the postage at their own Post Office just as cheap as they can do it through us at this Office. Any distance less than 3000 miles the postage is but a half cent if paid quarterly in advance; that is, three cents for three months. It subjects us to considerable trouble to pay it here. On papers going out of the States we are obliged to pay the postage.

Money sent for the BIBLE EXAMINER is at our risk, provided the letter is sealed with a wafer and directed as follows—

GEO. STORRS, Box 4658, New York.

Take care to put no other words or figures in the direction, as it will be at your risk if you do.

SUBSCRIBERS wishing to pay personally, or sending by private hands, for the EXAMINER for 1857, may do so to GEO. YOUNG, partner in R. T. Young's Letter File, 109 Nassau st., New York; who is authorized to act for us in the matter.

"SIX SERMONS," Revised and Enlarged—Those who have read this work, have found very much matter not in the Original: besides an entire new sermon on "Christ the Life-Giver." In addition to this, it is printed with a large clear type, thus affording much more satisfaction in reading. Price in plain binding, 63 cents; in gilt \$1. We will put 8 (plain) copies for \$3, cash.

WHAT IS IN THE WIND?

There have been many attempts made, first and last, among the professed believers in the second advent of Christ, to strangle or drive out from among them the doctrine of "*Life only through Christ.*" Various have been the expedients adopted to this end; but as a large and influential part of those believers have embraced that view, it has been a hard and difficult matter to make much headway in the operation; for the truth has triumphed in spite of all such efforts. We see, however, by *The World's Crisis*, that a new scheme has lately been contrived to crush out the hated doctrine; and if we rightly judge the *Editor* of that paper is likely to be drawn into it.

A "*Convention*" has lately been held at Providence, R. I., at which the following resolution, with a preamble, "was adopted with great unanimity of feeling," saith the *Editor* of the *Crisis* :—

Resolved, That as co-laborers in the promulgation of the doctrines intimately connected with the near coming of Christ, they hereafter avoid preaching on the subjects relating to the state of the dead, and final destiny of the wicked, in a manner calculated to give offence to those holding opposing sentiments; and that they as far as is practicable, express themselves in the language of Scripture.

This resolution, at first view, may seem very harmless, and exceeding reasonable; but on a close examination it is easy to see that it is a covered attempt to silence the preaching of the great doctrine of life and immortality only through Christ.

1. The expression, "they hereafter avoid preaching," &c., implies that some heretofore have preached on the topics spoken of so as to "give offence to those holding opposite sentiments."

2. This "manner" of "preaching on the subjects" is to be discontinued "hereafter."

3. They are henceforth, "as far as is practicable," to express themselves in the language of Scripture."

4. This is to be done so as not "to give offence to those holding opposite sentiments."

We would like to have all who voted for this *Resolution* just step back into the Churches from which they have separated on account of the advent doctrine. We venture not one of them need fear but that they will be received with open arms; only promise "hereafter" to "avoid preaching on the subject" of Christ's second advent "in a manner calculated to give offence to those holding opposing sentiments" &c., and no doubt you will quickly be at peace with all the Churches from which you have separated. On such terms Luther might have remained in the Church of Rome.

But it is only to avoid preaching "in a manner calculated to give offence," &c. If those who have opposed the doctrine of Life only through Christ have preached in that manner let them cease, if they feel called to it. We know that truth, which is opposed to long established traditions, must and will give offence; and we might as well pledge ourselves not to preach such truth at all as to resolve we will "avoid preaching" it "in a manner calculated to give offence."

If all that was meant to be inculcated was, that those holding opposite views should treat each other *courteously*, then say so, and let it be given as advice, or recommendation: but these *resolutions*, in public bodies, amount to *laws*, though without specified penalties. If violated by those who agree to them, surely, they are guilty of something, for which the same body, reassembled, should call them to account. Then who is to determine what the nature of the offence is? and what the penalty to be inflicted? Here we have the stepping stones to an inquisitorial supervision of all our preaching, if we consent to such a resolution as the one under consideration. A more open and frank course would be to adopt a *Creed*, at once, and define what we must or must not preach. How can a believer in life only through Christ tell when he is preaching in a manner to give offence? He may use, if you please, Scripture, and that almost exclusively, and he cannot be sure that he does not give offence. Let him say "the dead know not anything"—"there is no knowledge in sheol whither thou goest"—"in that very day his thoughts perish," &c., can he know that it will not give offence to an opposing brother, who thinks the dead "know more than all the world" of the living? Ah, but that is "Scripture language." Very well: what more is the expression, "The dead are unconscious?" Is this last to give offence, and the other not? Where is the line, and who is to decide?

If the advocates of natural immortality and the endless misery of the wicked have found out they cannot meet our arguments, and now wish to bargain with us not to annoy them, let them honestly acknowledge they have no valid arguments in support of their theory, and not ask us to stop in our course of uprooting their traditions about souls never to die, and eternal misery; and not seek to entrap us with a resolution which they would justly spurn if proposed on the subject of the advent, or personal appearing of Christ, the second time, by the churches they have left because they believed those churches opposed the truth. We

have no idea of putting our neck under a new sect, to ask them what we shall preach or how we shall preach. We require no one else to consult us in this matter, and we will not submit to a resolution, even, which implies that they have any right to be "offended" at our "manner" of preaching what we believe. If our manner is unchristian, rebuke us; and if we do not repent, withhold fellowship from us, and leave us to our own Master.

If Br. GRANT, editor of the *Crisis*, is prepared to be bound hand and foot, in the manner that resolution will bind him, he certainly has liberty to be so: but we trust the believers in "life only through Christ," who read his paper, will not generally sell their birth-right for a mess of pottage. We have bought our right to speak plainly and fearlessly, on all truths, too dearly to sacrifice it to the demands of our opponents, just at a time, too, when they have found they cannot meet us in a fair and open field.

The leading portion of those whose names appear at the Providence Convention are those who have opposed us in the most unscrupulous "manner." If they wish to alter *their* "manner" let them do it. When we feel called to alter ours we shall do so: not by a Convention "resolution," but in a surer way. We know not what Br. Grant's "manner" has been heretofore, but from our little knowledge of him, we should think he had always been exceeding mild and kind. If so, he ought to have considered that he had just cause of "offence" with those who asked him to vote for the resolution we have commented on.—Was not his past course a sufficient pledge that "*hereafter*" he would "avoid preaching on the subjects" referred to, "in a manner calculated to give offence?" Has he ever done the thing *heretofore* that he now *resolves* he will not do *hereafter*?

The fact is, this resolution is a covered attempt to silence the advocates of "life only through Christ," by reducing them to mere quotations of Scripture. This indeed would be all-sufficient if the public generally would let words have their proper and legitimate weight; but most professors of religion have so long been accustomed to put "darkness for light, and light for darkness," that they are ready to affirm death is life; and that when God saith, "The soul that sinneth it shall die," He means not what the words clearly import, but that the soul that sinneth shall be kept alive in eternal torments. And when it is said, "The gift of God is eternal *life* through Jesus

Christ our Lord," it is not *life* that is intended, but *happiness*! This perversion of God's truth must be exposed and refuted; and if any of our brethren can do it "in a manner" to give no "offence" to those who have lived under the traditions of sectarians, and the drilling in the doctrine of "an immortal soul that can never die," then let them do it: but we have no faith or hope that such traditions will give way without some being dreadfully "offended."

Our Saviour preached a sermon on life only through himself which gave offence to many of his disciples even. They said, "This is a hard saying; who can hear it?" Jesus said, "Doth this *offend* you?" and immediately gave them to understand they would soon have harder things to dispose of. This gave them further offence, it seems, for "From that time many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him." See John 6: 47—66.

Suppose he had had the wise counsellors assembled at the late Providence Convention, and they had persuaded him to let them draw up a resolution; how would it run? Peter, James, and Judas, perhaps, from the Committee to draft a *preamble* and resolution. They report as follows:—

"*Whereas*, unity of labor, and as far as may be, unity of faith are necessary to the successful prosecution of the work of God; and as there is a diversity of sentiment among us as a people, producing to some extent dissimilar interests; and as we believe, that a candid and Christian interchange of views would remove in a great measure the conflicting interests, if not harmonize the discordant views: therefore—

"*Resolved*, That as co-laborers in the promulgation of the doctrines intimately connected with the [Messiahship] of Christ, they hereafter avoid preaching on the subjects relating to the state of the dead, and final destiny of the wicked in a manner calculated to give offence to those holding opposing sentiments: and they as far as is practicable, express themselves in the language of Scripture."

In the foregoing preamble and resolution, we have the exact words of the Providence Convention, with the exception of the word in brackets, which is substituted for the words "near coming." Does such a "Report of the Committee" seem strange after Jesus had so preached as to "offend many of his disciples?" Only think! nearly all were about to "go away!" Must not something be done to soothe their feelings? And if the Providence Convention resolution is only "adopted with great unanimity of feeling" how smooth everything will go!

There was an informal resolution passed by the "twelve," after Jesus turned to them and said—"Will ye also go away?" "Peter," as spokesman for the twelve, "answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of *eternal* LIFE: and we believe and are sure that thou art that Christ, the Son of the living God." Noble confession! how unlike the Providence Convention resolution. No matter who is *offended*, or who goes away—life, *eternal life*, and that only through and by Christ, is to be the great theme: that except a man eat Christ's flesh and drink his blood he has no life in him, and is not to share in the promise—"I will raise *him* up at the last day."—Like those who fell "in the wilderness," they "are dead"—have "no life in" them. This was the doctrine that gave offence then, and gives offence to "many" now: and if the Editor of the *Crisis* or any one else thinks it can be preached in a manner not calculated to give offence to those who oppose it, they will find themselves as much mistaken as Paul did when he thought to escape the condemnation of the Jewish Christians, for preaching to the Gentiles against their being circumcised, and so, on the advice of some of his cautious brethren, he undertook to go through with certain Jewish purifications to appease them, but soon found himself in more trouble than if he had not sought to pacify them at all. See Acts 21: 17—40.

The Pope—His Destination.

FROM HENRY BALDWIN, JR.

Bro Storrs.—I had occasion to call on a *Jewish Rabbi*, minister of the Congregation which worship at the Synagogue in *Fulton street*, in this city;—a learned man. Being detained to dinner, I took occasion to ask him what he thought of the rumored project for the removal of the *Papacy* to *Jerusalem*; and how the *Jews* and the *Pope* would ever agree, in case the *Jews* should speedily be restored. "I will tell you"—the *Rabbi* readily replied:—"the *Pope* is not going to *Jerusalem*,—he is going to *America*."—"Ah!" observed I; "and then this pretended project of a removal to *Jerusalem*, is only a cloak to conceal their real designs?" "That is it," said the *Rabbi*. Considering all the evidence before us, respecting the design upon the Valley of the *Mississippi*—this supposition of the *Rabbi* looks not unreasonably.

Albany, N. Y.

REMARKS BY EDITOR.—We suspect none of us can tell very definitely where the *Pope* will go, till the event reveals it. We think, however, the *Papacy* will go to "perdition" quite as soon as to *America*; but time will show.

From Eld. Edwin Burnham.

Brother Storrs.—Your paper—the *BIBLE EXAMINER*—was put into my hand, by a friend, this morning; and after looking it over I felt a desire to address you a line, and commend your course of free investigation of all Bible doctrine. That is the only way, I think, to arrive at truthful conclusions. I admire the neatness and elegance of your little sheet, and hope you may prosper in all the right. If my scribblings will be of any use to you I shall be glad, occasionally, to write a few lines, and help you. May the blessing of God be upon you.

EDWIN BURNHAM.

Newburyport, Mass., November, 1856.

The following is the first offering Br. BURNHAM has ever made to our paper.—Ed. Ex.

The Resurrection of the Dead.

It is a most happy circumstance for us that the Scriptures are so full and explicit in relation to this blessed doctrine. The resurrection of the dead! What a world of awful and glorious meaning in that expression! What solemn, tender, and moving associations of thought come crowding into the mind when the words are read or heard!—Fathers, mothers, wives, husbands, children, brothers, sisters, friends, and loved ones are sleeping in the dark, damp, silent, noisome grave, and we hear their welcome voices, and look upon their lovely forms no more, while days, and months, and years roll on. Shall it be so forever? No; blessed be the omnipotent God! They shall live again. The mighty God hath spoken, and He will make His promise good. He who formed our bodies at the first—who gathered the particles of our wonderful and curious frame—who arranged our muscles, bones, sinews, and nerves, when as yet there were none of them—He shall be able, when we and ours have decomposed in the tomb, and wasted away in the dust of the earth, to call bone again to his fellow bone, and dust to kindred dust. Let the sceptic mock, and utter his jests, and enquire how the Almighty can bring back again our parts and parcels, when they shall have assimilated with different minerals, vegetables, and animals! nevertheless it shall be done. What if these wise ones, when God was about to make this solar system, had been within hearing of the council of heaven, and had heard it said, Let us make an orb, and call it earth, 8,000 miles in diameter and 25,000 miles in circumference, and a sun, to heat and enlighten it, a million times larger than that, and various other orbs of immense magnitude, and make all this body of matter out of nothing; what would they then have said or thought? Would they not, with their present disposition, have sneered in the face of God and angels?

Would they not, with more assurance than now they speak in relation to the resurrection, have at once exclaimed, Impossible! But, "He spake

and it was done: He commanded and it stood fast." And shall He find it hard to *gather* who at first *created* from non-existence? Let us rejoice that we depend not on human power, or even angelic might to accomplish our hope. We wait on Him and for Him who holds the winds in His fists, and the waters in the hollow of His hand"—who "sitteth on the circle of the earth," and turns the seasons in their courses—who guides the fury of the storm with His will, shakes the blazing lightnings from His fingers, scatters abroad the echoes of the bellowing thunders, rolls the jarring earthquake at our feet, and controls the floods and flames—who weighs the hills and mountains in His balances, and to whom the inhabitants of the earth are like the small dust of the balance.—This all powerful God is ours! He shall speak again, and the silence of the tomb shall echo to His voice, and the prisoners of darkness shall show themselves. He shall speak, and the heavens and the earth shall quake, and from earth and ocean His chosen ones shall come to the brightness of immortality. Hail, hour of God! Hail, crowning event all-glorious! We that have "the first fruits of the Spirit, groan within ourselves" for the joyful introduction of that glad day. O come redemption dual!

EDWIN BURNHAM.

THE RIGHT SPIRIT.—The following letter, from sister WOOD, of Millport, Pa., manifests the right spirit; but we apprehend some who have been our subscribers will not imitate it. They have thought themselves cured of sectarianism, but this last test, in the EXAMINER, has been too severe for them, and so they will silently give us leave to discontinue the paper. We are sorry to part with them, but they must act according to their own convictions of duty. So we claim the right to act, and we cannot complain of others for doing the same. One brother, however, we are informed, thinks there ought to be another paper started and sustained by those opposed to the views of the EXAMINER on "*Life from the Dead*;" and he has hinted that he would like to *edit* the new paper. If there were any ground to complain that we have refused brethren a place in our paper, who differed from us, or that we have not treated them courteously when we inserted their articles, then there would be cause to wish for another paper in opposition, if we refused them justice in the case. Till that is the case, an opposition paper, started for the purpose above named, would be the clearest evidence possible that its origin is in a sectarian and selfish spirit. But we intend, by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, not to "fret" at any course our opposers may pursue, assured that a good conscience is more to be prized than to be an *Editor*. If the BIBLE EXAMINER has perform-

ed its mission, and is no longer needed in the field, no one will rejoice more than we at its discontinuance. If any think it is a desirable position we have had to occupy, they just know nothing about it. To be thrown out, alone, beyond the sympathies of a large portion of the Christian world—to be regarded either with suspicion or contempt, by those who we trust love the Lord, because we have followed our own convictions of what truth is—to be blamed and forsaken by those who have professed to be profited greatly by the truths, for which we have sacrificed all we had of earth's goods to promulgate—to live a life of continual crucifixion for what we believe to be truth, is not a life to be coveted: and if we could have done it with a good conscience we would have given over the struggle, long ago, and sunk into the quiet of some comfortable church, where we could have rested from this continual tossing of tempestuous winds.

We now say, once for all, if our receipts for the EXAMINER, early in January, do not warrant an honest expectation, that we can meet the cost of paper and printing, we shall not issue it longer, but will return whatever money has been sent us by subscribers, and bid them all "*farewell*" till a more favorable time shall arrive to renew the conflict. Having said thus much, we now give the letter which led us into this train of remarks. It is as follows:—

Br. Storrs.—Seeing the time has nearly arrived that we should renew our subscription, I write to let you know we intend to do so. We are not of that number who say "*farewell*" to the EXAMINER or its *Editor*, although we differ with you in regard to the question, Will the wicked dead be made alive? I believe they will—you believe they will not. You may be right. I dare not say, I know I am right and you are wrong; but my impression is, they must be resurrected to life in order to suffer the second death. We are informed that at Christ's *coming* every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him. Now I cannot see how they that pierced him can see him unless they are made alive. But if I am in an error my prayer to God is, I may see it, and I will most certainly renounce it. My motto is, *truth*. We have taken the BIBLE EXAMINER for the last two years, and shall continue to take it unless something more than mere differences of opinion intervenes between us and its *Editor*. For me to say Brother STORRS must believe just as I do, or I will not take his paper, is, to my mind, the same as to say, you must believe *our creed* or you must leave our church. I hope our brothers and sisters who are of like precious faith with us, and especially those who have been creed-bound, will look well to this, remembering we should not lord it over God's heritage, but grant every one the right

of conscience. I have done what I could to procure new subscribers. One Brother has said, there is so many isms here that the people do not care to know anything outside their creeds: nevertheless there are some in this vicinity who are willing to stand up for the truth at all hazards. That you and I, dear Brother, may be ready to meet our Saviour at his coming and kingdom, is the sincere prayer of the one who has penned these lines.

CAROLINA WOOD.

From Rev. Abel Wood.

WISCASSETT, Dec., 1856.

Dear Brother Storrs.—I enclose two dollars for the EXAMINER. I wish it were in my power to make it twenty. Is it not surprising that a paper devoted to matters of so deep interest should be so poorly supported? But so it ever has been. Error will have its numerous adherents, while truth is little cared for.

I have conversed with ministers, and church members. They have seemed to admit the force of the argument; but, strange to say, have not interest enough in the matter to investigate and strive to learn whether "These things are so!"

Will you permit me to say a few words about myself? I am nearly fifty years old. At the age of 24, from being a very worldly and wild youth, I became interested in religious matters; and, in what has ever seemed to me to be a very remarkable manner, was, I trust, converted. Soon after I united with the Calvinist Baptist church. When 26 years old I was ordained as a minister of that church. Have been settled in only two places: *this*, my native town, and Alma, ten miles distant. About six years ago, I was violently attacked with neuralgia—suffered intense pain in my head and limbs. Have nearly all that time been confined to the house; and of course have not performed any ministerial duty. My head, however, has generally been clear, and I have read most of the time.

I happened to meet a volume of your Six Sermons, which called my attention to the subject, and have become entirely settled as to the fact, that "the wages of sin is death," and "the gift of God Eternal Life through Jesus Christ our Lord." And when I understand more and more distinctly (as I do) how this concords (if I may use the word) with the plain, simple word of God, I am astonished, that the christian world (so called) are not more interested in it. At the last Association, I withdrew from the Baptist Association, and am no longer a member, although I have never been excluded from that church. My

pecuniary means are quite limited, hence my inability to do all I should like to for the good cause.

May the Lord strengthen, guide and keep you.

Yours truly,

ABEL WOOD.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR.—We thank Br. Wood for the foregoing information. Though he has taken the EXAMINER the year past, and we knew he was a Minister of the Gospel, we were entirely ignorant of his history and Church relation. We sincerely hope it may please the Head of the Church to restore his health and make him a burning and shining light in this dark age.

Effects of the Doctrine.

What doctrine? That of teaching that people go to heaven at death. The following article first appeared in the *New York Evangelist*, and since that in the *Christian Advocate*. As it has passed through two such sound orthodox sheets, we shall not be accused of fabricating it. It shows how difficult it is to teach an unsophisticated mind error.

Knocking at the Door.

A TRUE STORY.

The glowing sun of a midsummer afternoon poured through the curtainless windows of a little village school, and small curly heads drooped like delicate flowers in the languid air. Among them all, little Katie's sunny ringlets fell the lowest; and if you had lifted the golden veil, you would have seen that the weary eyes had forgotten to con the line of long, hard words in the worn spelling-book, and that the silken fringes of the drooping lids were pillowed lovingly upon the sweetest little cheeks in the world. Yes, in the heated air, soothed by the lazy drone of the hungry flies, and by the restless hum of young student voices, Katie had fallen asleep.

She was dreaming, too. She was dreaming of a little brother, darling Charley, who, in the bright spring-time, when the violets were just opening their sweet blue eyes after their long sleep, had strayed away from earth, and passed through these gates of glory always open for the entering of little feet. And she dreamed that she clasped him to her lonely heart, and begged him never to leave her again. And amid the greatness of her joy she sobbed aloud, and started to find Belle's soft arm around her, and to hear her whisper, "What is the matter, darling?"

Before poor Katie could well collect her thoughts to answer, the school was dismissed, and she heard the teacher exclaim, "Harry home, children, or you will be caught in the shower."

But Katie could not hurry, and as she walked slowly out of the door, again little Belle's sweet voice cried, "Poor Katie, are you sick?"

Then Katie poured into the sympathizing ear of her little friend all her troubles, and finished by saying, "I could not bear to find it only a dream;

I feel as if I must see Charley once more."

"Where do you think he is?" asked Belle.

"In heaven, I know," replied Katie; "and mother says he cannot come back to us, but we can go to him some time;" and her sobs broke out afresh.

"Why don't you go to him now?" cried Belle.

"I don't know the way," said Katie. "I was very sick when they took him away in the little coffin, and I don't know where they went."

"Are you sure they went to heaven?" said Belle, eagerly.

"O, I know it," said Katie.

"Then," said impulsive little Belle, "then I can show you the way. I saw where they put your little brother." The glad light in Katie's tearful eyes was beautiful to behold.

"Will you, will you show me, Belle, now, this very afternoon?"

"Yes, indeed," cried Belle; and with clasped hands, unmindful of the gathering gloom, these little pilgrims set forth on their journey to heaven.

Once on the way, a doubt oppressed Belle. "Are you sure, Katie, that you can get in?"

"Ah," said Katie, with sweet assurance, "how Charley will run to open the door!" and her cheek flushed with anticipation.

"Do you suppose Charley is *very* happy?" urged Belle.

"Very," said Katie, emphatically.

"And what does he do all the time?"

"Plays with the angels with such lovely wings," cried Katie, with great animation. "And they pick up stars, that lie all over the floor of heaven, and play with them. And the rainbows, I suppose they keep them all the summer; and how Charley used to love rainbows! He cried once because—"

"Dear me," said Belle, interrupting her in great dismay, "it rains, and we are so far from home; what shall we do?"

"But we are almost to heaven, aren't we? Let us hurry, and go in there."

"Yes," said Belle; "I see the door."

"Where? where?" cried Katie breathlessly.

"There," responded little Belle, pointing to the rising ground and iron door of the village vault.

"O," exclaimed Katie, with intense disappointment, "is that heaven? O, Belle, it is like a great grave;" and her little lip quivered sadly.

"Why," said Belle, "that is where they took your brother, the very place; and you said he had gone to heaven. Besides, continued she, brightening, "when we get through the little dark door, it may be all very bright and beautiful on the other side."

"Perhaps it is," said Katie, more hopefully.

But now the large drops began to fall very fast, and a thunder storm, in all its sublimity, burst upon the little travelers. The burdened west gleamed like an ocean of flame, and the floor of heaven resounded to the solemn tread of the mighty thunder. Still the little children, with clasped hands and pale lips, pressed on, and their angels who "do always behold the face of our Father," watched over them lovingly, and they walked secure in the heavenly company.

At last the busy, pattering feet, reached the gloomy entrance, and Katie's sweet, hopeful lips were pressed close to the cold door.

"Knock," cried Belle; and with all her strength Katie did knock, and a hollow echo was all her reply, while the dead within heeded not the call from fresh, young, hopeful lips, and the little brother, with folded eyes, and pale clasped hands, heard not the sweet, imploring cry.

"Charley, dear Charley, it is your sister; your own sister Katie; won't you open the door?"

"He does not hear you, Katie, it thunders so," said Belle. "Let us wait a little while;" and they waited.

Soon there was a lull in the storm, and again Katie, strong in faith, knocked at the dreary door, and her loving cry: "Charley, dear Charley," echoed sadly back.

"Do you hear anything?" asked Belle, with parted lips; "is he coming?"

"No," replied Katie, "I thought once I heard his little feet, but it was only the rain."

"Perhaps," suggested Belle, with large imaginative eyes, "perhaps he is playing with the angels a great way off, in a beautiful garden."

"O," sobbed Katie, "I hope he will not love the little angels more than me!"

"Knock once more, just once," whispered Belle. With wavering faith again the little, soft hand pleaded for entrance, and a tremulous voice cried piteously: "Charley, darling, dear, sweet little brother, please open the door to your own poor Katie. Do not love the little angels better than me. O, Charley, Charley!" She threw herself upon the ground, and sobbed in an agony of grief and disappointment.

"Katie," said Belle, half frightened at this outburst, "let us go home now, and come again tomorrow and try."

"No," said Katie, with touching hopelessness, "I shall never come again. Let us go."

She rose without another sob, or fresh tear, even upon the wet cheek; but the grieved expression of the sweet, childish mouth was pitiful to behold.

"Back over all the dreary way went Katie and Belle. Little shoes wet, little dresses dripping, little heads bent like dew-laden flowers, little hearts very heavy.

At Katie's door stood her anxious mother, peering through the shadow for her darling.

The child sprang to those loving arms, and with one cry that spoke all the agony of bitter doubt that had crept into her young, conflicting heart, exclaimed: "O, mother, I have been knocking at the door of heaven, and Charley would not let me in."

Dear, grieved little Katie, refusing to be comforted in this thy first great sorrow. It may be that ere the violets come again, "God's hand will beckon unawares," and with a better guide thou shalt find indeed the door of heaven. Then knock, little pilgrim, and thou shalt be heard amid the hallelujahs of all the heavenly choirs. Back shall roll the blessed portals, and Charley shall lead thee with eager wings to the feet of Him who loves little children, while the song of angels shall be, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven."

From M. C. Allen, Black Rock.

Br. Storrs.—As others who are "looking for the Lord from Heaven," and "the man Christ Jesus," to subdue all things unto himself, to set up His spiritual kingdom, and to remove the curse from the earth, it has been a great source of delight to me to study the prophets. I have read prayerfully, that I might understand what the holy prophets have spoken, ever since the world began, respecting the glorious restitution of all things. Having Scott's commentaries, I took them up recently, to read them once more, and ascertain what he has said, relating to that interesting subject. His views like all of the same school, favor a spiritual reign of holiness on earth, to be accomplished by man's agency. All the passages, where the true interpretation can be none other, than, (according to the rules of correct exegesis) the literal and personal coming of the Son of man, he violates by his own beclouded views. He leaves the real sense, vague and undefined making all to comport with his preconceived opinion; and passes over paragraphs proving the second advent, or tries to explain them as wholly figurative. But what is vastly more painful, to the devout, humble christian, who dares not advance *one sentiment* in addition to the "word," is to see such perversions and ingenuity to put a false construction on the plain statements of revelation.

It is with astonishment and humility we find such contradictory constructions, and so much added, in "these last days," to God's eternal truth. While the punishment of the wicked is reiterated by the prophets, to be death, destruction, and that plainly proclaimed, Scott adds his comments of eternal *suffering* and *torture*, in a world of which, not a syllable is spoken in the Bible. One instance—on a plain text which interprets itself—is Isaiah 66: 24. He says, "Whatever eternal events may be alluded to or predicted, the worm and the fire represent the place and nature, of the punishment of sinners in *another* world. The fire, which is kindled by the wrath of God, shall not be quenched or cease to torment for ever: the worm of keen self-reflection and the anguish of an accusing conscience, will endure for ever; because the existence and consciousness of the condemned will be everlasting."

In confirmation of these sentiments, he quotes Bishop Lowth, who says—"Our Saviour expressed the place of torment under the image of Gehenna; and the punishment of the wicked, by the worm which there preyed on the carcasses and the fire which consumed the wretched victims. Marking, however, in the strongest manner the difference between Gehenna, and the invisible place of torment, namely, that in the former the suffering is transient; the worm itself, that preys on the body, dies; and the fire which totally consumes it, is soon extinguished: whereas, in the figurative Gehenna the instruments of punishment shall be everlasting, and the sufferings without end."

Let me ask candidly, where is the marked difference pointed out in Scripture of which he speaks and where is the place of endless torment? where does our Saviour say the suffering shall be without

end? Are not the above quotations, adding to God's words?

H. Grew to R. Wendell.

Dear Br. Wendell.—You are pleased to set "Bro. Grew of 1852" against "Bro. Grew of 1856." For proof of discrepancy, you make two quotations from "Bro. Grew of 1852," viz—"The wages of sin is DEATH," and "Life in a miserable state, is *no more* DEATH than life in a happy state." It remains for you to show what "Bro. Grew of 1856" believes inconsistent with either of these quotations. I deny any and all inconsistency.

My two propositions which you have quoted, are no more incompatible with my belief of the conscious suffering of the wicked as a judicial punishment, between their "resurrection to condemnation," John 5: 29, and their "second death," Rev. 20: 14, "according to the deeds done in the body," than they are incompatible with my brother's belief of their sufferings, as a judicial punishment, antecedent to their first death.

Yours for the truth,

HENRY GREW.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—We have only room in this number, for the above note from Br. GREW. If we continue to publish, his other communication shall have attention. We think Br. Grew laboring under a mistake in regard to Br. Wendell's believing in "a judicial punishment, antecedent" to death. But he must answer for himself, if he has opportunity.

From E. T. Welch and E. Wolcott.

OCEANPORT, N. J. Dec. 4th, 1856.

Dear Br. Storrs.—We wish you to send to the following persons the last number of this year.— [The names of about thirty are given.—Ed.]

As we know you cannot afford to scatter the EXAMINER any longer, having done so heretofore to the extent of your means, and more, until thousands of the people of the United States have been made glad by the blessed doctrine of "Life and Immortality through our Lord Jesus Christ *alone*;" and as we have been made to rejoice greatly on account of this truth, we feel that duty compels us to act our part, that others may see the truth and rejoice also, and thereby be better prepared to meet the coming King, who is very soon to be revealed to the admiration of all those who believe, in that day. The "truth" has had a sanctifying effect upon our hearts and lives. We love the dear Saviour better than we ever did.—The *knowledge* of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ has, in a great measure, destroyed our barrenness and unfruitfulness. This truth and the hope of being like our Saviour when he appears, has led to much purging out the *old* man with his deeds, and the putting on the new man.

We have concluded that the plan of sending the EXAMINER, as we propose, will introduce it to circles where it has not yet been read; and if the doctrine taught therein should arrest their attention, they may subscribe for the coming year.

REMARK BY THE EDITOR.—These brethren accompanied the foregoing note with \$10 and two new subscribers at \$2 each. If all who are with us in the faith of "LIFE only through Christ," were as prompt, and as much in earnest as they are, we should not have lisped a note but that the EXAMINER would be fully sustained. These brethren have no large store of this world's good; and they get their bread by the labor of their hands. Many have been blessed by the truths we publish. A large number of them, however, remind us of our Lord's words, when one, of "ten," only returned, who had been healed, "to give glory to God." But we add no more.

"LIFE FROM THE DEAD: Or, the Righteous only will Live Again."—Though we have not received pledges sufficient to meet the expense of the issue of this work, we have determined—in view

of the possibility of the EXAMINER being suspended—to publish it immediately, and it is in the hands of the compositor. Those, therefore, who have pledged funds for this object will do us a favor to forward the amount as early as possible; and others who are disposed to help in getting out the work will please remember us now. Those who send funds immediately shall have the amount returned in the work at the cost price as soon as it is out.

The retail price will not exceed 25 cents. We shall put it at less if possible; but this will depend entirely upon the demand for it. Two or three thousand can be worked off at a less price, per copy, than one thousand. We would be glad to have it read by all believers in life only through Christ, whatever conclusion they might arrive at. A consecutive argument on the subject has not, before, ever been presented to our readers. What they have read has been in disjointed parts, so as to make it extremely difficult to satisfy their own minds, perfectly, either way. We do not claim that this work is perfect, yet we think it will help to settle the question.

INDEX FOR 1856.

An Old Heathen.....	8	Judgment, The—Editor.....	4	Poetry—Time of Reward, 48. The Part-
Annihilation—Mr. Thompson.....	33	Judge Hart, of Oswego.....	9	Quiet Spirit—Its Power.....
Assert your Right.....	96	Jews in Palestine.....	105	Regeneration, Final—Bull.....
A Correspondence.....	185	Just Rebuke.....	267	Resurrection, 1 Cor. 15—Ed.....
Annihilation Annihilated.....	187	Just Letters—Cook, Merwin, Ludd, 13. Sr.		Rap him again sharply.....
Baptized for the Dead.....	78	in Christ Wade, 14. Prof. Huber,		Romanism in Italy.....
Belief of the Ancients—Cowles.....	188	M. C. Allen, C. Colver, 15. Uratio		Resurrection—Editor.....
Bible vs. Creeds.....	282	Eaton, 23. W. H. Barne, 24. Grim,		Religion Abroad.....
Backsliding in Old Age.....	302	29, 109, 187. Wm. Ridgeway, 30.		Resurrection—Burnham.....
Constitution of the Ch.....	35, 97, 140, 180	Eld Blain, 31, 128, 187, 286. Sciencik,		Right Spirit.....
Cultivation of Spiritual Feelings.....	77	31. Harris, Dye, 39. Rev. 47.		Spirit of Christianity—Ed.....
Comfort, Rev. Silas.....	81, 295	Merrill, 48. Hudson, 59, C. C.		Scripture Exp—C. C. W.....
Articles by Steam.....	107	Williams, 70. Lewis, 107. Cowles,		Spirit Rapping.....
Christ Died for Us.....	173	103. Dr. Huntington, 127, 216. Z.		Sulduces—Partly Right—M. J.....
Church Officers—Grew.....	205	Campbell, 128. P. A. Smith, B. S.		Say Your Prayers in Fair Weather
Christian Race.....	229	Batchelor, Macknight, Jr., 151.—		Soul Saved or Lost—Ed.....
Concerning Editors.....	238	Lindey, 224. Mrs. Judson, 271.		Scott, Orange.....
Christian Advocate and its Editor.....	257	Wendell, 272. Ross, 251. M. C.		Spirit.....
Christianity in Chinese Revolution.....	302	Allen, S. Mason, 252. Ferree, 253.		Saul and Woman of Endor.....
Destroyer of Anti-Christ.....	38	Wade, 255. Private Letter, 258.		Sight and Faith: or Earth & Heaven
Day of Crucifixion.....	64	Grew, 294. E. Burnham, 315. A.		Strictures on Bishop Bull.....
Death Not a Transition.....	91	Wood, 517.		Shall we vote?.....
Dr. Pye Smith—Hann.....	91	Living Soul—Z. Campbell.....	129	Strogliam—Editor.....
Dualism, Dr. Post—F.....	214	Lazarus in Abraham's Bosom.....	142, 225	Stricture by H. Grew.....
Dream of Caleb Edmonds.....	277	Lewiston, Me., Exclusion of Bre.....	143	Turned into Hell.....
Death Bad Testimonies.....	279	Man's Origin and Nature.....	80	True Prayer.....
Divine Life—Joyful Church.....	289	Mind and Matter.....	160	Trust for Daily Bread.....
Eastern War—English Tract.....	41	Man's Destiny.....	192	Thoughts and Ap.—Whately.....
Egyptian Light-house.....	112	Man's Inheritance—Editor.....	258	The Covenants—Grew.....
Ecl. 9: 4-6. Exposition of.....	189	Misleading Spirits.....	260	The Pope—his destination.....
Excellent for Loving & Forgiving.....	275	New York Central College.....	54, 68	Wicked Dead—Grew and Editor.....
European Affairs.....	293	Napoleon and Jerusalem.....	60	24, 44, 45, 67, 72, 80, 203
English Tracts.....	200	Nander's Hypothesis.....	243	—Hall and Editor.....
Effects of the Doctrine.....	317	Nature and Immortality.....	505	65, 73, 113, 181, 168, 209, 210
Gentleness of Christ.....	78	New Idea of the Pope.....	230, 232	—W. A. M.....
Great Business of Life.....	192	Obituaries—A. Porline, 111. Anno		140
Grew & Macknight Jr.,.....	103, 156, 197, 201, 234, 255	Poter, 215.		208
Glorying in the Lord.....	168	Prayer of Jesus on the Cross.....	17	231
Gin on John 5: 28, 29.....	294	Personalities—Cook.....	22	15
Great Cure all.....	276	Proof of Immortality—Wesleyan.....	40	70
Harvest of the Earth—Eng. Tract.....	109	Presentiment.....	62	223, 241
How to be Rich in Heaven.....	109	Palentino—Cook.....	63	232
How They Talk.....	123	Preaching and Preachers—Editor.....	104	304
Harmony in Family.....	125	Prayer of King Henry VIII.....	105, 143	313
Immortality—Essays.....	1, 18, 49	Personal Anti-Christ.....	130	
Is Death of Nature?.....	109	Prophecy.....	259, 273, 291, 308	
I have Lived too Fast.....	240	Papal Contest in France.....	208	
In Heaven an Hour.....	281	Present & Future Knowledge—Ed.....	283	
Important Questions.....	256	Penalty of the Law—Grew in '52.....	294	
		Purifying Hope—Editor.....	208	