

THE  
BIBLE EXAMINER.



SEARCH THE SCRIPTURES -- JESUS.

NO IMMORTALITY OR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH  
JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

---

BY GEO. STORRS.

---

VOLUME XIV.

New-York :  
PUBLISHED AT No. 35 ANN STREET.  
1862.

**J. J. REED, Printer & Stercotyper,  
43 Centre Street.**

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

---

"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, HATH NOT LIFE."

---

Vol. 14.

JANUARY, 1861.

No. 1.

---

## MODERN UNBELIEF OF THE RESURRECTION.

BY REV. J. PANTON HAM, ENGLAND.

"WHY should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?" inquired Paul, in his memorable apology before Agrippa and the court of Festus at Cesarea. It was a question suggested to the apostle's mind by his allusion to the promise made by God to the Hebrew fathers, concerning the everlasting possession of the land of Canaan, a promise which Paul and the Christian apostles taught, would be *literally* fulfilled to these ancient fathers, and their true descendants—the children of Abraham by faith. They were at pains to show that this promise had never been fulfilled,—“These all died in faith not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country,” &c. Heb. 11: 13. The proto-martyr Stephen, thus spoke of this matter before the Jewish Sanhedrim, “Abraham, when his father was dead, removed into this land wherein ye now dwell. And he (God) gave him none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on; yet He promised that He would give it to him for a possession, and to his seed after him.” Acts 7: 5. Compare also, Gal. 3: 16–29. This promise, it is evident, could only be fulfilled by giving Abraham and his spiritual seed, who are the true Israelites, a resurrection from the dead. Hence the prominence of this doctrine in the apostolic writings and discourses, and the reason of the query put by Paul on the occasion above referred to—“Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?” As if he had said—“You look for the fulfillment of the promises to the fathers

that they shall inherit this land forever, and you hope, as children of Abraham, to share this future inheritance on the earth: but the fathers are dead, and you too will die, and therefore this 'Hope of Israel' can only be fulfilled by raising up the honored inheritors of this kingdom of heaven from the slumbers of the grave, and why should you prefer your crude philosophies about never-dying souls to this glorious revelation from heaven—the resurrection from the dead? In disbelieving this doctrine 'ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God.'

The resurrection of the dead, upon which such momentous issues depend to the human race, is pre-eminently a doctrine of revelation. No analogies in nature can do more than very imperfectly illustrate a fact so unique as the revivification of what has actually ceased to live. Such as are made use of as, for example, the germination of seed, and the development of moth-existence from the chrysalis are only apparent analogies. In neither case has death taken place. The life that supervenes here, is not upon death, but upon dormancy. But in the resurrection of the dead, deceased humanity is restored to consciousness and activity. Resurrection gives them a new-birth into being,—by this stupendous miracle of Divine power, they are "born again" into the eternal life which God has promised to bestow through Christ—"the Resurrection and the Life"—upon all believers. But is this doctrine believed now? Nay, verily! Bold as the statement may appear, we hesitate not to reiterate it, that the Christian Church of the nineteenth century denies the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Dead. And, therefore, there is as much applicability in the query of the apostle to professing Christians now, as to that Sadducean and Pagan-Roman auditor to whom it was first put.

An assertion so startling demands proof, and this we proceed very briefly and plainly to furnish. Let us, however, in the first place, see what the professing church really does believe in this matter. Death in the popular apprehension, at least as regards mankind, does not imply a cessation of the living existence, but a transition into a new condition of existence. BACON, in his *Essay on Death*, says—"So we see Death exempts not a man from *being*, but only presents an alteration." The term *death* is therefore understood in relation to humanity, not in its common sense, but in an uncommon sense, a non-natural and figurative sense. When death, so called, takes place, a separation, we are told, is effected between that part of the man which is his rational and moral self, called popularly the *soul*, and sometimes the *spirit*; and that part of him which is the tangible, material organism, in which he is said to have a temporary abode, and which is only necessary to him as the inhabitant of a material

world, being the instrument of, or medium by which he communicates with, and acts in it. This material tenement, in popular language, is called the body. The man himself, we are assured, is not the body, but the soul or spirit, which, while an inhabitant of the body, is living an imprisoned and unnatural life, hemmed in by obstructions and limitations, from which, so says the popular theology—but not so the common instincts—man is only too glad to escape by that great liberator of the soul's life called Death! Life which, when first created by God, was looked on by Him with complacency, and pronounced "very good," is, by our modern theology, pronounced a real evil. And death, which the Book of God declares to be "the wages of sin," the "curse," and "the last enemy" of man, is declared by the consentient voices of the churches to be the way of salvation—the emancipator of the imprisoned soul—the great blessing of life! The following poetic extravaganza is no intentional, although a real burlesque. The poet, "in fine frenzy rolling," puts into verse his own and the popular faith:—

"Life makes the soul dependent on the dust,  
 Death gives her wings to mount above the spheres.  
 Thro' chinks styl'd organs, dim *Life* peeps at light;  
 Death bursts th' involving cloud, and all is day;  
 All eye, all ear, the disembodied power.  
 Death has feigned evils nature shall not feel;  
 Life, ill's substantial, wisdom cannot shun.  
 Is not the mighty mind,—that son of heaven!—  
 By Tyrant *Life* dethron'd, imprison'd, pain'd?  
 By *Death* enlarged, ennobled, deifed?  
 Death but entombs the body—*Life* the soul."

We pause not to point out the contradictions, the follies, and even the blasphemies, of this piece of poetical piety, but pass on to the proof of our assertion that popular Christianity denies the resurrection of the dead.

The soul or spirit of man, we are assured, is the man himself—the rational, emotional, and moral being called man. This soul or spirit, which, strangely enough, is sometimes called a part of the man, and sometimes the man himself, is not affected by death, but is left, or rather liberated intact by this (may we call it?) catastrophe. Death, according to this theory, dissolves the body of man, not the man himself. Then, of course, it literally follows that *the man* does not die. And if the man does not die, the man cannot rise from the dead, for what has never died, can never rise from the dead. "That which thou sowest is not quickened except it die." Here is our first proof. If our logic be at fault, we shall be gratified to have our error exposed. To us it seems a very correct conclusion, that the theology which denies that man,

properly speaking, ever dies, must also deny that man, properly speaking, ever rises from the dead.

But to proceed. Does popular Christianity, then, disbelieve any kind of resurrection? By no means. It believes that there will be a resurrection of *the body*. The same body? we ask. We would remind those who may be disposed to answer in the affirmative, of their notions of this same body—how they are accustomed to describe it now, as the soul's prison house, the soul's entombment, and so forth. Surely the resurrection of the same body cannot be a thing to be desired! No doubt many will be ready to respond, the body which shall rise again shall be a suitable tenement for the soul, one that shall be adequate to its vast capacities and purposes, and which is called therefore "a spiritual body." But pause—this is not the same body, the body which the soul once inhabited, but another body, with different attributes and functions, how then can you say that the body rises again? According to this theory, the former body does not rise again, but a new body is created by this so-called resurrection, or rising again. Such a theology, therefore, logically denies also its own dogma of the resurrection of the body. To get off the Scylla of its own contemptuousness with regard to the body, it gets into the Charybdis of denying the resurrection of the body altogether!

But some will forget their contemptuous mode of speaking of the body when, for supposed orthodoxy's sake, they look forward to the resurrection of the body, and therefore we must use another argument with such persons. These, despite all inconsistencies, and physical impossibilities, will hold on to the creed that the *same body* rises again in the resurrection. We must, therefore, remind these believers that the body, as a separate part of the man, has no inherent life; it has never lived by itself, and therefore cannot die by itself, nor rise again by itself. If any should say, the body possessed vegetative life, and it is this vegetative life which is taken away by death and restored by resurrection; we reply by another question—has the body vegetative life apart from the soul? The proof that it has not, is furnished by the fact, that as soon as the soul, so-called, is separated from it, all its vegetative functions cease, and the process of decomposition commences. The theory, therefore, again fails before the light of reason and common sense.

And that it fails before Scripture is most evident, for the apostle Paul, who has written with great particularity on the subject of the resurrection, in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, distinctly affirms, that the same body or material organism is not raised again in the resurrection, but another and physically different body. "Thou sowest not that body which shall be," he

writes, when thou sowest wheat or any other grain. The body which germinates is the stately plant. The analogy, of course, is not perfect, nor should it be expected to be, nevertheless, it supplies the apostle's purpose, which was merely to show that another body or organism is bestowed in the resurrection, and not the same body. Hence he adds, "So also is the resurrection of the dead; it is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption; it is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory; it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power; it is sown a natural, it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body." Here then is plain, apostolical authority to support the deductions of reason that, the same body does not rise from the dead, and, therefore, the theology that teaches that the soul is the human being, and this never dies, is left without any doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. As we have seen, the doctrine of the resurrection of the body is contrary to sound reason and Scripture revelation. The Bible nowhere speaks of the resurrection of the body, but uniformly of the resurrection of the *dead*. We reiterate, therefore, our charges against the theology of the extant churches, that they deny the great Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, and are logically left without any doctrine of resurrection at all. To them, therefore, Paul's query has a special appropriateness, "Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should *raise the dead?*"

Modern Christendom disbelieves the Christian doctrine of resurrection, for the same reason that the Sadducean Agrippa, and the Pagan Festus disbelieved it,—that is, because they cannot understand it. The teachers of this doctrine now, like Paul, are thought to be beside themselves. Christian philosophy of the nineteenth century, rejects the total decease of the conscious being in death, because it cannot square such a doctrine with its vague notions of personal identity. And Christian sentimentality rejects it, for the very self-sufficient reason, that it does not like it. This latter prefers the dreams of poets and painters, to the deliverances of prophets and apostles. It is useless to argue against a faith which is begotten of the fancy, and is the mere foster-child of the feelings. But of our philosophical friends we would ask, Is your philosophy of identity so definitely shaped to your own perception, that you can venture to say that our interpretation of death and resurrection denies the preservation of personal identity in the being which dies and rises again? Let our objectors publish their philosophy of personal identity, and furnish irresistible evidence of the proposition that God cannot extinguish consciousness, and rekindle the identical consciousness again at his pleasure. Until this proposition be proved, the hacknied objection falls to the ground. Will our objectors deny that God

first created a self-conscious, thinking being from nothing? He who could say, Come ye children of men from the nothingness of the past, can surely say, Return ye children of men to your original nothingness, and, Come again ye children of men. A hundred years ago, both writer and reader had neither consciousness nor existence; that Power, then, which has given both can surely take them away, and restore the identical gift again. Away with the flimsy objection about personal identity. Away with the impertinence which balances man's ignorance against the wisdom and power of the Almighty. If our inability to comprehend a profound mystery is to be the reason for repudiating that mystery, then consistency ought to oblige us to a universal scepticism, for, as one has well said, "Everything is mysterious, or nothing is mysterious."

To restore the Christian doctrine of the resurrection of the dead to the modern creed, it is first of all necessary to accept the Scripture theology of the constitution of man as a being, in no sense endowed with immortality or deathlessness, but dependent on organization for existence and all the functions of an intellectual, moral, and emotional nature. Proud man must bow his head in humility before the universal challenge, "What man is he that liveth and shall not see death? Shall he deliver *his soul* from the hand of the grave?" He must acquiesce in the Scripture philosophy, which teaches that "the dead know not anything, neither any that go down into silence;" that "the dead praise not the Lord;" that "in death there is no remembrance" of Him—"no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave" whither we are going. He must understand better that memorable deprecation by David and David's Lord, when he said, "Thou wilt not leave *my soul in hades*, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." And while he needs more knowledge and humility in reference to this terrible fact of death—the wages of sin—he must cherish more faith in the word and power of God, by which the faithful are assured that, though, like their Lord, they die, yet they shall live again, when he, "the Resurrection and the Life," and the Holder of "the keys of hades and death," comes "the second time for salvation."

---

"THE SPIRITS IN PRISON."—Thompson's translation of 1 Peter 3: 18-20, reads as follows:—

"Brought to life by that Spirit with which he went, and to the spirits which are (now) in prison, made proclamation at the time they were disobedient, when the long-suffering of God was waiting once for all in the days of Noe while the ark was building."



## DR. NOTT ON THE SOUL.

A FEW years since Dr. Nott, then 80 years old, preached in this city on Math. 16 : 26, "What is a man profited, if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul," &c. He said—

"The term soul is used in different senses. It sometimes refers to the present life only; were that its use here, the meaning would be, that nothing which costs life can be counted gain—but the sense is a more important one, as is plain from the preceding words—'whosoever will save his life shall lose it,' and from the words which follow: 'The Son of man shall come and reward every man according to his works.'"

That "the term soul is used in different senses" is true; and this truth should make all men cautious of affirming that it ever means a distinct entity, capable of a separate conscious existence, and immortal, or undying. If such an idea had been intended by the inspired writers, we can hardly account for an original term being used with so many different senses. For example, the term *nephesh*, translated *soul* in the O. T., is also translated "*body, breath, he, himself, creature, person, appetite, fish, heart, mind, life, dead,*" and near thirty other English words still farther removed from all idea of a distinct entity in man designated a soul. Is it to be credited, that a term would be selected to express the modern idea of a soul which is susceptible of so many and such various "senses?"

The New Testament *psyche* has, also, "different senses;" but that any of those senses is the idea of a soul as a distinct entity, endowed with separate consciousness and immortality, is a mere assumption, unsupported by a solitary text of Scripture.

That the sense of the term soul, in Math. 16 : 25, is "more important" than the mere loss of "the present life" is granted; because that loss might be more than repaired by the gift of an endless life through Jesus, by a resurrection. But if "the present life" is lost, and is not followed by the gift of a future life, which is eternal, is not the loss greater than the loss of "the whole world" to that soul or person? "Whosoever will save his life shall lose it." If to avoid suffering, reproach, or death, any man shall deny or reject Christ, he shall lose all part in the life to be given when the "Son of Man shall come in the glory

of His Father, with his angels; and then He shall reward every man according to his works." Then such as have lost "this present life" for Christ and His cause, shall "find" life eternal; but those who "saved" their "present life," by refusing the reproach and suffering to which an attachment to Christ subjected them, shall lose *psucheen, life*: shall have no part in the life to come—they shall not "find it;" that will be their "reward." "The wages of sin is *death*." Rom. 6 : 23. Dr. Nott goes on to say :—

"The soul is that within you which perceives, reasons, suffers, and enjoys. These are the attributes which indicate its nature and display its value. \*\*\* Not the oceans are so vast as his desires, nor the lightnings so rapid as his thoughts. Nor earth, ocean, nor heaven declares the glory of God as does man's soul. 'He said, Let there be light, and there was light;' but He breathed the breath of life, the inspiration of himself, into man, and he became a living soul, alone assimilated to God; for 'tis we alone who can say, 'Tis the divinity that stirs within us.'"

Why say "The soul is that within *you*?" What is the "*you*?" Is it the *body*? Then that is the personality; for "*you*" is a personal pronoun. But it is not the personality, according to Dr. Nott, that "perceives, reasons, suffers, and enjoys;" it is something "*within you!*" Now we venture the assertion, It is *the man* that "perceives, reasons, suffers and enjoys;" and not something "within you," which Dr. Nott afterwards says is "The inspiration of himself"—God. Does God "himself," in you, "suffer?" Is it God "himself," "that stirs within us" when we sin? Or, does not the *soul* sin at all? Or, does the "divinity within us stir" out of "*you*" and let the devil in, when sin is committed? If so, where does "the soul"—"the divinity within us"—go, while this new-comer, this devil-soul is "within us?" How the troubles multiply! Who will help us out of them? We believe there is but one way to be delivered from such absurdities as are involved in the theory of an immortal soul in man, and that is, to return to the Scripture doctrine of man's unity, or oneness. It is *man* that was created: *man* that lives: *man* who was placed under law: *man* that was commanded and threatened; and *man* that dies; and the "loss of the soul" is the loss of *the man* "himself." So speaks the record as given by Luke, Lk. 9 : 25. "What is a *man* advantaged, if he gain the whole world and lose *himself*." But we follow Dr. Nott still further. He says :—

“The soul of man has immortality, an attribute so sublime as to give consequence to whatever possesses it.” \* \* \* “The humblest being that is immortal, is of more value than the Cherubim, if deprived of immortality. Between these two conditions, who would hesitate: a human being, with the Kingdom of God throughout eternity; and Gabriel with a life of thousands of years, then to be blotted out of the map of being? This is a subject of a breadth and depth which never has been adequately discussed and never can be. The common consent of all nations, whether derived from perception or intuition, acknowledges the connection between time and eternity—it is equally interwoven in the fables of classic song, and the dreams of the dwellers by the Ganges and the Missouri.”

The foregoing paragraph opens with a groundless assertion, and winds off, as is usual, with an appeal to “*dreams and fables.*” He next gives utterance as follows:—

“Man’s first wish is for endless happiness; annihilation is an after thought, a dreadful thought, which no man forms till he wishes the Deity extinct. What a depth of horror lies beneath the thought!”

Here is an acknowledgment which may well shame many of our opponents. “Annihilation is a dreadful thought.” So saith this learned and aged divine. Let our adversaries cease to reproach us with taking away terror from the punishment to follow impenitency and unbelief. But Dr. Nott’s charity has nothing to boast of. “No man forms the thought of annihilation till he wishes the Deity extinct,” he says. Such a sentiment was beneath a great and good man; and we are willing to think it resulted from infirmity of mind, resulting from old age. As such we let it pass. Again he says:—

“He who made the soul has declared that it shall exist forever.”

Where, Dr.? Where is there such a declaration in the Bible? “Echo says, *Where?*” Do not tell us of “*dreams and fables;*” we have had enough of them. Give us a “Thus saith the LORD.” The Dr. adds:—

“Everlasting life! Death eternal! Weigh well the import of these fearful words.”

Here the Dr. speaks “plainly, and speaks no parable.” This we can understand: but how shall we interpret the following:—

“What is the value of a soul even now in the infancy of its being, but which, as sure as God lives, will never, never die?”

Are not the two legs of the Doctor's theory unequal? "*Death eternal!*" "*Never, NEVER die!*" According to this theologian, the matter stands thus:—

God "has declared" the soul "shall exist forever:—"

God has doomed the wicked soul to "Death eternal!"

But, "as sure as God lives," the soul "will never, never die!" "The common people heard him gladly," it is said of our Saviour: but could common people solve such a problem as Dr. Nott's? It would be no impeachment of their intelligence if it should be said, common sense must be over-taxed in such a work, and "it is all dark, dark, dark." Where is ALBERT BARNES? Wonder if he finds any light in such theology? If so, pray let him give us the benefit of it! God saith, by the mouth of Ezekiel, "The soul that sinneth *it shall die.*" Ezk. 18: 4, 20. Between the testimony of the LORD and Dr. Nott's baseless assumption, can any doubt where the truth is?

## FUTURE PROBATION.

WE copy the following from the *Christian Ambassador*, a Restorationist paper.

The *New-York Observer* repudiates the thought that any poor soul who dies in sin, shall have an opportunity to repent and reform in the future life. A privilege to experience such a change, is strangely against all the *Observer's* conceptions of justice and right. In speaking on this subject, it says:—

"If we admit that there is a future state of trial for ignorant sinners, we shall be forced to the conclusion that all who die without hearing of Christ, will hear of him under circumstances far more favorable to their being convinced and saved, than if they heard it here. . . . But if sinners are to have the Gospel preached to them in the intermediate state, it will be hard to persuade any of us that it will be restricted to those who never heard it before. Surely it would have been quite as easy to give them the offer here as there. And if they were not favored with it here, we cannot reconcile it with our ideas of Infinite goodness, that others who were so foolish as to neglect their opportunities, shall be forever excluded from the privilege of hearing and accepting the offer that is made to their neighbors. Thus we are led on step by step, to the necessity of believing that this life is not the only state of probation; that all men will have overtures of salvation made to them hereafter. And having not a doubt that all who are offered mercy in the world to come will embrace it, we should conclude that all men will be finally saved. On

the premises from which we started, we are driven to this result. . . . We do not suppose there is one man in a thousand who will take the position of a future state of probation, who will not land in utter Universalism."

"The *Observer* will not allow that even those who have never heard the Gospel, or of Christ, its founder, in this life, should have an opportunity to listen to its truths, or accept of its terms, in the immortal world. Its theory, then, is that a just and merciful God will torture forever, the millions of the heathen, for not complying with terms of which they never heard, and with which, therefore, it was an utter impossibility for them to comply. Can any inhumanity or cruelty greater than this be charged upon the Father of spirits? If God's nature was composed of infinite *malignity*, (instead of *Love*, as the Scriptures declare,) could he act upon a principle more fiendish? But why does the *Observer* object that the Gospel should be preached hereafter to those who never heard of it in this world? Its answer is, that in that case, those who did hear the Gospel in the present life and rejected it, might hear it there, and accept of it and be saved! Here is a reason, and an argument indeed! What a sad misfortune it would be to heaven, what an afflicting loss to God, if a sinful soul should be allowed to become loving, obedient and holy, in the immortal existence! To prevent so great a calamity, the whole heathen world must be cut off and consigned to endless woe, without the slightest opportunity being granted them to avert a doom so awful. And this is the religion the *Observer* advocates! Thanks to Heaven, it is a religion the world is beginning to detest and spurn, as a base libel on God, and Christ, and the Bible."

REMARKS BY EDITOR OF EXAMINER.—In the foregoing we have the two extremes which grow out of one root, an immortal soul in man. The *Observer* and the *Ambassador* agree in this doctrine; and they agree in regard to the success of a future probation, if there is one, *viz.*: universal salvation. Both are in darkness from the blinding effect of a theory which has no warrant or authority in the word of God. An immortal state for men in sin is nowhere spoken of nor hinted at in the Bible. Man is a probationer in this life for a future and endless life: and although that life is only bestowed in Christ and through Him, it does not follow that none will attain to it who have never had the written word to reveal Him to them. A principle our Lord himself laid down is, "He that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much;" and "he that is faithful in that which is least is faithful also in much;" and "In every nation

he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted of Him." The present life is the only needed state of probation ; for though some have not had the advantages of others—as the heathen, for example—yet, if they have been faithful in "the least" God intrusted them with, they will be "accepted of Him," and through Christ—"the resurrection and the life"—they will live again and be glorified, though they had never heard of Him by the hearing of the ear. They are accepted for having acted according to that they had. If they have been unfaithful in "the least," so would they be "in much ;" and a future probation would be a farce ; accomplishing nothing. A future probation being useless, no intimation of it is found in the revelation God has made ; and the idea only gives license to men to slight and misimprove the present, under the fallacious notion of a better chance hereafter, like an indolent man who finds difficulties in the way of industry now, and so does nothing, but waits for a more convenient season. To such persons, such season never comes. Those, therefore, who neglect the present means, because in their estimation too scanty, show an ungrateful heart, and practically tell their CREATOR, He is a hard Master. Such, indeed, will not go to the *Observer's* endless torture ; for the Scriptures reveal no such state ; nor are they to have another trial in a future life ; for such a life is no where made known in the language of revelation. *Before* any one can have an "immortal existence," he must "become loving, obedient, and holy," as the light or truth he has enjoyed would enable him to be. Those who do not thus improve what they have, shall have it "taken away ;" not increased. It is only to such as have improved what God has bestowed that "*more shall be given.*" Those who do not so improve are left in the silence of eternal death—the resurrection-life power never reaches them ; they have no affinity to the Life-giver, and share not in His life communications.

Thus we avoid the shocking position of the *Observer*, and the presumptuous one of the *Ambassador*, and give no license to a life of sin, because we have no greater means for improvement. Let every man improve the means he now enjoys, and he shall reap life eternal. If he does not improve, death and corruption, eternally unrevoked, will be his end. "Behold, *now* is the accepted time, behold, *now* is the day of salvation." In vain will any look for another or more favorable one.

"THESE SHALL HATE THE HARLOT."

THAT the Papal Roman dynasty is the harlot of Revelation 17th, is generally conceded by Protestants, and we trust it has been demonstrated in our pamphlet entitled "*European War.*" The development of powers, called "ten kings," who should "hate the harlot, make her naked and desolate, eat her flesh and burn her with fire," is a feature of that prophecy too clear to be doubted. That such a development is plainly being made, the events of the past few years, especially of the last two, seems undeniable. JOSEPH GARABALDI, who seems clearly to be a representative of those "ten kings," who "have received no kingdom as yet," who, nevertheless, has "reigned as king one hour with the beast," spake a few weeks since, to Italian and Hungarian soldiers, in the following language:—

"This is a memorable day for you, for it cements the alliance of two peoples, and establishes the fraternity of the people. To-day you have destroyed that principle of egotism which has kept the nations separated, and thus has facilitated the servitude of all. The people with whom you have fraternized to-day have the same enemies who threaten you. Your cause is theirs, and theirs is yours.

"But before fighting against this enemy outside, you have internal enemies to beat down, and I will tell you that the chief of them is *the Pope*. If I have acquired any merit with you, I have acquired that of telling you the truth frankly, and without a veil. In using this privilege I tell you that *your chief enemy is the Pope*.

"I am a Christian as you are; yes, I am of that religion which has broken the bonds of Slavery, and has proclaimed the freedom of men; *the Pope* who oppresses his subjects and is an enemy of Italian independence is *no Christian*; he denies the very principle of Christianity—he is the *Anti-christ*.

"*This truth you must spread among all those who are near to you, for it is only when all Italians shall be thoroughly convinced of this truth, that Italy will be really free and united.*"

These are words which tally with the prophecy of Revelation 17th. They show that the irrepressible hatred against the harlot is increasing in intensity; and though somewhat checked in its action, it is only to gain strength for the final catastrophe which is certain to come and is evidently nigh. Did the Italians and Hungarians respond to these sentiments of Garibaldi? The account states—

"Garibaldi had several times to interrupt his speech on account of the applause which his words elicited from the multitude."

A short retirement of Garibaldi to private life, and he will again appear, most likely, to perform a more terrible work against the harlot and her supporters than any that has yet been accomplished; for God's prophetic words will "not return void," but will have a full accomplishment; hence the Roman harlot must be "*utterly burned with fire*," for "strong is the Lord God who judgeth her;" and who employeth earthly instruments as ministers of His vengeance "on the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth."

That harlot power and her devotees were doomed to drink the vials of wrath which were to be "poured out without mixture" upon them: which vials have been in a course of fulfillment since the time of Napoleon I., but after his fall, in 1815, a respite, in some degree, has been given the harlot and her worshipers, till she said, "I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow;" Rev. 18: 7. This she did, after "the scarlet colored beast"—the revived Napoleon dynasty—took her on its back, or restored her to Rome in 1849, and sustained her there till recently: but now her final doom hasteneth greatly. "Therefore"—because she boasted of her secure state—"shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine: and she shall be utterly burned with fire: for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her." Rev. 18: 8.

That papal countries have been and are being terribly scourged, for years, is manifest. Not only has Catholic Europe been the scene of this scourging, from the time of the French Revolution of 1789, but Catholic Mexico has been drinking of the "last plagues" on that harlot power. "The smoke of her torment ascendeth up" on every side, and will continue to do so "for ever and ever," or until she is "utterly burned with fire"—burning and destroying judgments: for the hour of her "judgment has come." The long night of papal misrule and murder is ending. May the Lord hasten it, and bring in the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ. Till then, the world has little to expect in the way of improvement or better government; for unsanctified human nature is the same always and everywhere. Give it power and it is certain to abuse it in a short time. None but He who is the perfect one, because "The holy One and the Just," can ever be looked to, to rule in



strict righteousness. He will "execute justice and judgment in the earth," and "in His days shall the righteous flourish:" Jer. 23 : 5, and Psa. 72 : 7.

In France the Papacy seems to be verging to a catastrophe ; and it is quite likely the scarlet colored beast—the Napoleon dynasty—may yet join with "the ten horns" in hatred of the harlot, and help in her destruction, as the prophecy indicates. A late writer in Paris says :—

"The church party has weakened itself very much by its alliances, here in France, in exact proportion as it has strengthened Napoleon. Openly setting itself forward as the champion, not merely of the Pope's temporal power, but of *all* the retrograde doctrines of the political order—equally the champion of Francis II. and king Pius, and Francis Joseph, and the Duke of Modena ; equally the impugner of Napoleon and Garibaldi and nationalities and free thought—it has arrayed against itself and its allies whatever is modern and liberal, *along with* Louis Napoleon."

The following description of the Papal States is of interest at this moment :—

"Before the war of Italy the States of the Church were divided into four legations, not counting the district of Rome. The first comprised the provinces of Bologna, Ferrara, Forlì, and Ravenna, and were called Romagna. They have been annexed to Piedmont. The second consisted of the provinces of Urbino, Pesaro, Maserata, Loreto, Ancona, Fermo, Ascoli, and Camerino, and are commonly called the Marches. They have on the north, Romagna, on the east, the Adriatic, on the south, the kingdom of Naples, and on the west, Tuscany and the provinces of Spoleto, and Perugia. They separate Romagna from the Neapolitan States. The third legation consists of the provinces of Spoleto, Perugia and Rieti ; the first two constitute what is called Umbria. The town of Foligno, which is in Perugia, is the Fulginium of the ancients. The fourth legation comprises the provinces of Velletri, Frosinone and Benevento ; the latter, however, is surrounded by Neapolitan territory. The district of Rome, which is placed under a special *regimé*, consists of that city, of Viterbo, Orvieto, and Civita Vecchia, the latter being an important commercial port."

Already is papacy nearly stript of all ; she is "desolate and naked : " what remains is to "eat her flesh and burn her with fire." That event, it seems likely, cannot be far off. This prophecy will certainly have its accomplishment ere long. Then shall be heard the triumph, "Alleluia : salvation, and glory, and honor, and power unto the Lord our God," who "bath avenged the blood of His servants at her hand." Rev. 19 : 1, 2.

## A FRIENDLY REBUKE.

ONE of our last year's subscribers, in a letter to us, speaks as follows :—

“ You say, on pages 285, 286, ‘ Not one text from Genesis to Revelation affirms that an unpardoned sinner shall ever live again from the dead : this truth we shall maintain in our writings, and preaching, go where we may : nor do we expect to abandon it, unless we abandon the whole theory.’ The above extract is not qualified in any respect, not even with an *if*. Now were the people in general to adopt your rule (we shall maintain) reformation would be at an end.”

How deserving we are of this rebuke, perhaps we might as well leave others to determine. Will our friend look again at our remark, and see if the words “ do not *expect*,” do not qualify, in some “ *respect*,” quite as much as an “ *if* ?” May we never believe a doctrine so firmly that we do not “ *expect* to abandon it,” without incurring the charge of putting an “ end to reformation ?” Our friend, perhaps, does “ not *expect* to abandon” his view of “ Life from the dead ;” yet it is not impossible but he may see cause to do so. We shall certainly change whenever we see cause ; nor will any previous views prevent such change, when convinced. If our friend had given us the “ one text,” it would have been to the point : but he has not ; and it is not in the Bible. We wished those who might invite us to preach, or who might patronize our Magazine, to know, so far as present light is concerned, we should maintain the doctrine in question. We do not intend to work in the dark in regard to our views of Scripture. If any call this putting “ reformation at an end,” they do not view the matter as we do. We like arguments from the Bible. Inspiration declares, “ he that believeth not the Son shall *not see life*, but the wrath of God abideth on him.” John 3 : 36.

There are but two lives for any of Adam's race, so far as revelation is our guide. One is by being in and from Adam ; the other is by being in and from Christ. The first is a mortal life, giving a mortal existence, and perishes at death : the other is a spiritual life, giving an endless existence, or immortality, and is completed by “ the resurrection of life :” “ neither can they die any more.” The wickedly impenitent would “ not come to” Christ that they “ might have life ;” so they “ utterly perish in their own corruption.” See Lk. 20 : 35, 36 ; John 5 : 40 ; 1 Peter 2 : 12.

## THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

## WHAT IS IT? AND WHERE LOCATED?

IF men would have less to do with fancy and more with the Bible and common sense, we should have less difficulty in understanding the Scriptures. They soar away above the stars, and thus live on a fancy God, a fancy heaven; and to them the kingdom of God is a creation of their own imagination. If we but understood, it is with *this world* we have to do, and not with an imaginary one, we should be saved from infinite perplexity in regard to what is Scripture truth; but a large portion of professed Christians, like heathen philosophers, will take rapturous flights in the fields of fancy. We give the following as a specimen. It is a flight of imagination by a clergyman of much talent and reputation, not far off. He said, in speaking of heaven:—

“There are millions in that world of glory that once lived here. Heaven is made up of little colonies, filled up with those we loved on earth, looking down on us from above the stars. That mother in heaven when she sees her son, on earth, coming back to God, how her heart swells—she gives a shout of joy in high heaven!”

How does this popular minister know that “heaven is made up of little colonies?” How does he know those colonies are “filled up with those we loved on earth?” Is he certain that all such are there? How does he know that heaven is located “above the stars?” Some of those stars are at such distance from this earth that, it is supposed, it would take the light from them thousands, if not millions of years, to reach “this earth:” yet far off, up there these “little colonies” are located!! Aye; and the sharp eyes of those “immaterial spirits” can “look down on us!” Yes, and “see” us, too! Wonders on wonders, truly! Aye, more. “That mother,” in that far off place, “sees her son, on earth, coming back to God;” yes, “how her [immaterial] heart swells!” What next? “She gives a shout of joy in high heaven!” But how does this minister “on earth” know this is so? He has *fancied* this mother up in heaven with her motherly feelings. Now let him not flinch from his position.

but let him go on with his fancy, and fancy that mother "sees" a beloved daughter, that she left on earth, dying; and as she expires, she is plunged down to howl and wail with devils and damned ghosts in endless and unmitigated torture! Does "her heart swell" now? Does "she give a shout of joy in high heaven?" Or, does "her heart" wither, and "she give a" groan of horror? Please tell us, Mr. Fancyman. Do not flinch. Has that mother's heart all at once turned to stone? Is she unmoved at this sight, and as her daughter goes on groaning in anguish, in ceaseless ages of torture, is that mother to remain unmoved?

Let it be remembered, the minister of whom we are speaking is, by profession, a believer in endless torture; he is not therefore to turn away from our suggestion with the reply—"That is none of our concern." He has concerned himself in the other. But all this is fancy: so we will awake from it and attend to sober facts as developed in the Scriptures of truth.

#### LOCATION OF THE KINGDOM.

Our inquiry about the kingdom of God we commence with our Lord's words to his followers, as recorded Math. 25: 34. "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the *foundation of the world.*" Here is a clear indication of the location of the kingdom. It is not a kingdom "above the stars." As our Lord refers us, in his language, directly back to the beginning of this world, we turn to Genesis, first chapter. Here we learn, verses 26 to 28, that this earth is the place of the kingdom, and see that man was here given dominion. "God said, let us make man \*\*\* and let them have dominion \*\*\* over all the earth. So God created man \*\*\* male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said to them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have *dominion* \*\* over every *LIVING THING* that moveth upon the earth."

Here, most assuredly, is a kingdom, and dominion is given, "from the foundation of the world." But we will compare it with Psa. 8. "What is man? \*\* Thou hast made him a little lower than the angels," [Elohim—Gods] "and hast crowned him with glory and honor. Thou *madest him to have dominion* over the works of thy hands; thou hast put all things under his feet," &c.

In Eden, then, we find the kingdom of God in its embryotic

state—or state of development. Eden was the place of the throne, or seat of Empire. That place is the same that we call Palestine, on the western border of Asia, or east of the Mediterranean sea. That Eden and Palestine are one, in location, the examination of a few texts will serve to satisfy us. In Ezekiel 28th, the Lord, in addressing “the prince of Tyrus,” says, “Thy heart is lifted up, and thou hast said, I am a God, I sit in the seat of God,” &c. At verses 13 and 14 the Lord saith to the “king of Tyrus”—“Thou hast been in Eden, the Garden of God \* \* \* thou wast upon the holy mountain of God,” &c. Tyrus lay on the northwest border of Palestine proper, and is, in fact, a part of the land that God included in the gift to Abraham and his seed. Ezekiel 31st, the Lord directed the prophet to speak unto Pharaoh king of Egypt, and say to him, “The Assyrian was a cedar in Lebanon ;” verse 3 : verses 8 and 9, “The cedars in the garden of God could not hide him \* \* nor any tree in the garden of God was like unto him in beauty. I have made him fair \* \* so that all the trees of Eden, that were in the garden of God envied him.” We then have a description of his pride and punishment ; and it is added, verse 16, “I made the nations to shake at the sound of his fall when I cast him down to hell with them that descend into the pit ; and all the trees of Eden, the choice and best of Lebanon \* \* \* shall be comforted,” &c. The prophet then turning directly to Pharaoh, adds—“To whom art thou like in glory and greatness, *among the trees of Eden?* Yet thou shalt be brought down with the trees of Eden.”

Here is Egypt on the southwest border of Palestine—Assyria on the east, or northeast—and Tyrus on the northwest, all said to be *with, among, or near by, the trees of the garden of Eden, or garden of God.* Such evidence seems clearly to indicate that Eden and Palestine are identical in their *location.* If so, we have found the truth of what we before suggested, *viz. :—* That in Palestine the kingdom of God was set up, in its embryonic state, at “the foundation of the world ;” or from the creation of Adam. That was the seat of empire—the throne was there. Adam lost the throne and dominion, and was driven out from it, and refused any further access to it.

#### WHAT IS THE KINGDOM OF GOD ?

After the flood, God reconstructed the kingdom, in *embryo,* through Moses and Joshua, preparatory to the coming of the

King of His own selection. That kingdom was erected on the old ground, or Eden. That this reconstruction was the kingdom of God we will now endeavor to show.

We will first look at Acts 1 : 6. The disciples asked our Saviour—" Lord, wilt thou at this time *restore again* the kingdom to Israel?" Let it be recollected that the preaching of Christ and his apostles, during all their ministry, had been "The kingdom of God : " and after our Lord's resurrection the " forty days" that he remained on earth with his disciples He was "speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God : " see Acts 1 : 3. Immediately at the close of those forty days is the question—" Wilt thou at *this time restore again* the kingdom to Israel?" Our Lord does not intimate that they were in error in fact ; and therefore we conclude that the kingdom of God and the kingdom of Israel are identical. Jesus does not correct their view on this point—of the restoration of that kingdom—of that being the kingdom of God : but only informs them, it was not for them " to know the times . . . which the Father hath put in his own power." We say, then—The kingdom of Israel was, and is, the kingdom of God ; first in its embryotic state, but at length to be fully developed ; at which time the second Adam—Jesus Christ—will have the throne—the seat of empire and dominion.

In further proof on this subject, let us now turn to the First Book of Chronicles. King David, at the close of his life, 1 Chron. 29 : 11, said—" Blessed be thou, LORD God of Israel our Father \* \* \* Thine O LORD is the greatness and the power \* \* \* thine is the kingdom," &c. What kingdom is this? In the previous chapter, verses 4 to 7, David speaks thus :—"The LORD God of Israel chose me \* \* \* to be king over Israel for ever, \* \* \* and of all my sons he hath chosen Solomon my son to sit upon the throne of *the kingdom of the Lord* over Israel. And he said unto me ; \* \* \* I will establish his kingdom for ever," &c. In the next chapter, verse 23, it is said—"Then Solomon sat on the *Throne* of the LORD as king, instead of David his father ; and all Israel obeyed him."

Here is sufficient evidence to justify us in saying—That in Scripture language the kingdom of God—the kingdom of the LORD and the kingdom of Israel, are identical. But we may compare this testimony in Chronicles with a prophecy by Micah, Chap. 4 : 6-8 ; speaking of the day when men shall

beat their swords into ploughshares, &c., it is added—"In that day, saith the Lord, will I assemble her that halteth, and gather her that is driven out; and her that I have afflicted; and I will make her that halted a remnant, and her that was cast far off a strong nation: and the LORD shall reign over them *in Mount Zion* from henceforth even for ever. And thou, O tower of the flock, the stronghold of the daughter of Zion, unto thee shall it come, even the *first dominion*; THE KINGDOM shall come to the daughter of Jerusalem."

Here is confirmatory evidence of the position we have previously established; but we will compare this again with 1 Chron. 17: 9-14. The Lord, here, in addressing David, said—"I will raise up of thy seed after thee . . . and I will establish *his kingdom* . . . and I will settle him in my house, and in *my kingdom* for ever: and his throne shall be established for evermore."

If it be said, the seed here spoken of is Solomon, it still confirms the fact that the kingdom of Israel is the kingdom of God, and so God here expressly calls it "MY kingdom." Though Solomon might be the mediate king spoken of, it is evident the Messiah is the ultimate one; and thus we find Gabriel announcing to Mary, concerning Jesus, "The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end," Luke 1: 32, 33. Thus we have fully confirmed the fact that the kingdom of Israel and the kingdom of God, are one and the same.

#### WAS THIS KINGDOM EVER SUBVERTED?

We now inquire—*Was this kingdom ever taken from Jacob's posterity?* We need not now adduce but one text in proof of this point, and that is Ezek. 21: 25-27. "Thou profane wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, . . . thus saith the Lord God, Remove the diadem, and take off the crown: . . . I will overturn, overturn, overturn it; and it shall be no more, until HE come whose right it is; and I will give it him."

Thus we see, that the kingdom of Israel, or the kingdom of God, was overturned, or "perverted;" but it was done with the certainty that it would be re-established. The re-establishment is the subject of many prophecies, in the Old Testament, and is what the New Testament calls the kingdom of God.

## THE WORK OF MESSIAH AT HIS FIRST ADVENT.

Messiah did not come the first time to restore the kingdom, but to prepare his followers to be rulers in it when restored, and over all the earth. He first offered this honor to the Jews. It had originally been offered to the whole of Jacob's posterity, shortly after their advent from Egypt. Thus; Exodus 19 : 5, 6, the Lord said,—“ If ye will obey my voice indeed, and keep my covenant, then shall ye be a peculiar treasure unto me above all people—for all the earth is mine—and ye shall be unto me a *kingdom of priests*,” &c. But they did not fulfil the condition ; and God first divorced the “ ten tribes,” or the kingdom of Israel, and cast them far off from the territory : see 2 Kings 17 : 18–23. Some time after that He punished the Jews, or kingdom of Judah, in Babylon ; from which captivity they returned. Then, when the “ threescore and two weeks” spoken of, Dan. 9th, were fulfilled, “ God spoke” to the Jews “ by His Son :” see Heb. 1 : 1, 2. What did he speak to them ? He offered them to be “ heirs” of the kingdom of God, or Rulers in the kingdom restored to Israel, under the reign of Messiah, “ David's Son” on “ David's throne.”

In order to their enjoying this high honor, He called them to repentance for past and present wickedness. When they refused this, and put to death the King, the offer of the heirship of the kingdom of God was taken from them as a nation : see Matthew 21 : 38–43. Or, in the words of Jesus, as there recorded—“ The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a *nation* bringing forth the fruits thereof.” Jesus Christ being the true *Heir* of the throne, and having the right to select those who should share in the honor of the government, in the kingdom to be set up, or restored, next sent his ministers to those not under the law covenant, to “ take out of them a people for his name”—even the “ *Royal Priesthood*,” &c., see Acts 15 : 14 ; and 1 Peter 2 : 9.

Such a priesthood is a kingly one. From this honor, we have said, Judah, as a nation, has been excluded for her willful rejection of the Son of God—“ *the Heir*.” Since that rejection, the Gospel—the glad tidings—has been sent to others, not under the covenant made by Moses, or who had, previous to the first advent, been divorced from that covenant relation, and were not sharers in the rejection of Messiah. Such, Christ now invites to the honor and dignity of becoming “ heirs of God and



joint heirs with" himself in the throne and kingdom of Israel ; called the kingdom of heaven, or kingdom of God ; and so soon as the number of "joint heirs," or rulers, are completed, that kingdom will be set up, or developed in its fullness and glory.

If we would attain to this high honor and glory, the first step is to "Repent and believe the Gospel," or the good news—the "glad tidings"—of God's love to us who were not under the law covenant, or who having been given a bill of divorce and sent away, prior to the first advent, are now mercifully called to be heirs under a new covenant. How great has been the love of God and his Christ toward us, in following us who were afar off, and inviting us to such honor and glory. To attain this high and exalted inheritance we must become holy, or Christ-like. We must repent of all our sins and turn away from all iniquity. Without doing this, we cannot be heirs of the kingdom of God. It is by a "patient continuance in well doing," seeking "for honor, and glory, and immortality," that this great blessing can be attained, and we be crowned with "eternal life." None others can reign with Christ in the kingdom of God.

THE KINGDOM OF GOD, when restored, or set up, will consist of a *King—Associate Rulers—Citizens—Dependencies—Territory, and Laws.*

1. A KING ; *Jesus the Messiah.* God has demonstrated his pleasure in this matter by raising up Jesus from the dead. If the fact of Jesus' resurrection from the dead is established, the fact of his Messiahship is put beyond controversy, and his Kingship is undeniable.

2. ASSOCIATE RULERS :—These consist of such as have suffered with Christ, made *immortal* ; no more subject to death ; but, like their king, endowed with endless life by virtue of their union with him ; so that they will reign forever and ever.

3. THE CITIZENS :—These appear to be the restored Israel and Judah ; constituted once more "one nation ;" and will be the inhabitants of the territorial kingdom. In proof of this we have only space now for one out of many texts. Jeremiah thus records the Lord's will in this matter, Jer. 23 : 5-8. "Behold, the days come, saith the LORD, that I will raise unto David a *Branch*, and a king shall reign and prosper, and shall execute justice and judgment in the earth. IN HIS DAYS Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely," &c.

4. DEPENDENCIES :—These are the “left of the nations.” These are not citizens of the kingdom, but are under its dominion and government ; and will be required to submit to that government ; or, if any refuse, they will be destroyed. But we have not space to enlarge on this topic ; and pass to notice—

5. THE TERRITORY :—The kingdom of God has its territory, and is not the whole habitable globe, much less up “above the stars.” It is that described to Abraham, Gen. 15 : 18, “In the same day the Lord made a covenant with Abraham, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land *from the river of Egypt*, unto the great river, the river Euphrates.” It is elsewhere also described, but this is sufficiently definite, as we have established the point, that the kingdom of Israel and the kingdom of God are identical. Besides it is clear from the words of our Lord, Math. 8 : 11, that all the territory of the earth is not embraced in the territory of the kingdom of God. He saith— “Many shall come from the *east and west*, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven :” words which can hardly be reconciled to the idea that all the earth is the kingdom proper. The *dominion* is over the whole world, or habitable globe “from sea to sea, and from the river [the great river Euphrates] to the ends of the earth.” Thus Daniel saw given to one like the Son of man, “*dominion*, and glory, and a *kingdom*, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him : his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.” Dan. 7 : 13, 14.

Let it be understood, then, that while the dominion is universal, the kingdom proper, or territorial kingdom, is between the river of Egypt and the river Euphrates. On this territory was the kingdom of God “prepared from the foundation of the world :” there was fixed the throne ; first occupied by Adam, but forfeited by him ; afterwards occupied by the kings of the house of Jacob ; finally lost by them, and now remains to be occupied by David’s Son—the second Adam—the Lord from heaven ; when the throne, first established by God in Eden, will become permanently occupied—the kingdom be duly organized—the dominion be universal—the reign eternal. One thing more is to be noticed, *viz.* :—

6. THE LAWS :—These will go forth from *Zion*, the seat of empire, and throne of the King. Thus the prophecy of Micah

speaks ;—" but in the last days \* \* the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge [or rule] among the people, and rebuke strong nations afar off ; and they shall beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks ; nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more ; but they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree ; and none shall make them afraid : for the mouth of the LORD of Hosts hath spoken it."

The laws are such as to secure peace, and will promote prosperity, universal contentment, and happiness. Such is the teaching of the Bible in relation to the kingdom of God, and the happiness consequent upon its re-establishment, and full development. Here is reality—not fancy—not a flying "above the stars," no one knows where ; but an *inheriting the earth*, as Christ our Lord and King said the *meek* should do. Let us make haste to secure a part in the "Royal Priesthood." If we reject this offered mercy and honor, we have nothing to expect but ruin and death. Our guilt will be terribly aggravated ; and our doom fearful and unalterable ; even to "be punished with everlasting destruction."

---

## THE BAPTISM OF THE HOLY GHOST.

BY. ELD. H. GREW.

"Now there are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit. And there are diversities of operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all." 1 Cor. 12 : 4-6. These operations are sometimes confounded.

Our divine Redeemer, before his ascension, "being assembled together with (his disciples) commanded them that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which ye have heard of me. For John truly baptized with water ; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." Acts 1 : 4, 5.

What was the nature and design of this baptism of the Holy Spirit ?

What are the recorded facts concerning it ?

"And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, they were all with one accord in one place—and they were all filled with

the Holy Ghost, and began to speak *with other tongues*, as the Spirit gave them utterance." Acts 2: 1-12. "And it came to pass that while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul, having passed through the upper coasts, came to Ephesus; and finding certain disciples, he said unto them, have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. \* \* \* And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and *they spake with tongues* and prophesied." Acts 19: 1-6.

"And they of the circumcision which believed were astonished, as many as came with Peter" (to the house of Cornelius) "because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost. For they heard them *speak with tongues*, and magnify God." Acts 10: 45, 46.

From all these cases, we plainly learn the nature and design of the baptism of the Holy Spirit. It was the impartation of miraculous powers to believers, for the confirmation of the truth of the glorious Gospel of the blessed God, for the salvation of a lost world, at its first promulgation, after the first advent of the Son of God.

It is plainly distinguished, both from the act of Divine renewal, or regeneration by the same Spirit, and from the ordinance of immersion in water. Nor was it a substitute for either. The apostles of our Lord were the subjects of regenerating grace long before "the day of Pentecost," when they were baptized with the Holy Ghost. They were true believers on the Son of God. Math. 16: 17. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ (i. e. 'with the heart, unto righteousness,') is born of God." 1 John 5: 1; Acts 11: 17, also proves that this baptism of the Spirit, was a gift, distinct from, and subsequent to, the gift of believing. That it was not a substitute for water baptism is clearly proved by the fact, that both believing Jews and Gentiles, subjects of this miraculous gift, were commanded to be baptized in water. Acts 2: 38-41; 10: 44-48; 8: 14-19.

The ordinance of immersion in water has a permanent position with the command to believe the Gospel, in the great commission of the Head of the church to his apostles: Math. 28: 19. It is the "one baptism." Eph. 4: 5. For the "one body," or church of Jesus Christ. In harmony with this truth, we read that, "they that gladly received His word were baptized." Acts 2: 41. The 38th verse proves that this was water baptism. See also Acts 10: 47. "Can any man forbid *water*?" &c. The command to be baptized (or immersed) is given to "every" penitent believer. Acts 2: 38. "Blessed are they that do his commandments that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter through the gates into the city." Rev. 22: 14.

Respectfully submitted, dear Christian brethren, by your fellow laborer in the Gospel of Jesus Christ,

HENRY GREW.

---

FROM ELD. JONATHAN WILSON : AGED 84 YEARS.

It may be a privilege for you and others to hear from me at this time. Since I parted with you at Seneca Falls, in Oct., I have visited Lockport, and through Buffalo and Fredonia came home. My health is poor : am afflicted with a hard cough and asthma. I feel that I am now finishing up a long life. I have nearly done preaching. My lungs are failing, and I must soon cease all my labors in this world ; so I turn my thoughts on that to come. I will use my pen, and tell the meditation of my heart concerning eternal bliss.

It is a reviving thought that I am united to the living Son of God, the Life-giving head ; and I shall know divine things in the light of glory. Things which I had hardly heard of, and which because of my ignorance cannot now enter into my heart, shall then be my glorious theme, when resurrected into the Paradise of God. I shall be filled with joy by the knowledge of the Most High, and ravished with the prospect of growing wiser and wiser in the things of God. Though then made perfect—compared with my present state—in knowledge and happiness, yet the extent and degree of these will be on the increase. Though a finite mind can never know all that is to be known of an infinite Being, who only comprehends Himself, yet it will be the excellency, the delight and employment of glorified saints to aspire after more and more knowledge of God.—Though no new perfections, attributes, excellencies, or glories, shall ever be found in God, they being essentially and eternally all in Him, yet the longer I am in His presence the more glorious will He be to me ; because I shall know Him more ; and the more I know of Him the more I shall admire and love Him, and become more and more like Him ; the larger and more capacious will my mind be, and the more shall I apprehend of Him ; and the more God is apprehended and known, the more He is glorified. Thus eternally advancing in knowing, admiring, loving, and being made like Him, the mind enlarging, we will be enabled still more to love and admire, and

to approach nearer in participation of His communicable perfections. Such shall be the uninterrupted employment and entrancing felicity of the blessed, while through the whole "God is all and in all."

GERRY, (*Vermont P. O.*) N. Y., Nov. 20th, 1860.

JONATHAN WILSON, *a Bibleite.*

## THE LORD'S SUPPER.

1. WHAT was its design? 2. How frequent its use?

To the first question, the answer is comparatively easy. The second is not so readily answered. This is evident from the fact that Christians have been and are still divided about it. Some observe it once a month; others once in two or three months; others contend for its weekly observance; and these last *seem* to have most argument in favor of their view. We think, however, they may be mistaken. Their argument, so far as it is derived from the Bible, all turns on the expression "break bread." Does that warrant a weekly communion? or indeed, the eating the Lord's Supper at all?

Their argument is based mainly on two texts. First: Acts 2: 42; where it is said, believers "continued steadfastly in the apostle's doctrine and fellowship, and in *breaking bread.*" This is coupled with Acts 20: 7, where it is said, "And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread," &c. These are the chief, if not the only texts produced in proof of the weekly celebration of the Lord's Supper. Do they sustain such a view? Let us see.

Does the expression "breaking bread" prove it was the Lord's Supper? If so, then it equally proves it was done "*daily*:" for Acts 2: 46, saith, "They continued *daily* with one accord in the temple, and *breaking bread* from house to house." Was this eating the Lord's Supper? Just as certainly as "breaking bread," in the 42d verse, means the Lord's Supper, so does this in the 46th verse; and so it is not only on the "first day of the week," but "*daily*" it is to be attended to: one of the positions is just as strong as the other,

We shall, perhaps, find that neither can be sustained. The phrase "break bread" was in common use as related to ordinary

eating. Math. 14 : 19, it is said, when Jesus fed the multitude, "He took the five loaves, and the two fishes, and looking up to heaven, He blessed and *broke*, and gave the loaves to his disciples, and the disciples to the multitude." Mark 6 : 41, the same form of expression is recorded ; also, another feeding of the multitudes, Mark 8 : 6, the same expression is used. Luke 9 : 16, the same form is used : "He took the loaves and *broke* them." None will pretend here was the Lord's Supper. Compare these texts with the injunction, "Whether, therefore, ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God."

When Paul was carried prisoner to Rome, and had been fourteen days in peril by sea, after long abstinence he besought the ship's company to take something to eat, and "He took bread, and gave thanks to God, in the presence of them all ; and when he had *broken* it, he began to eat." Here were 266 souls that eat of the "broken bread." Was it the Lord's Supper ?

Again : Jesus appeared to two of his disciples on their way to Emmaus, after his resurrection ; and while they were eating at Emmaus, "He took bread and blessed it, and *break*, and gave to them ;" then "they knew him." Immediately they return to Jerusalem, and tell their brethren "what was done in the way, and how He was made known to them in breaking of bread." Was this the Lord's Supper ? Surely not ; for Jesus had said to the disciples, at that Supper, "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." Math. 26 : 29. Some peculiarity in His ordinary manner of breaking bread was what "opened their eyes" to know him.

His ordinary method at common meals was to "break bread," as we have abundantly shown : and the phrase was no more applicable to the Lord's Supper than to any other and all other social meals, especially as the use of *wine* is not once named. Hence, no argument built on this form of words, standing alone, is of any weight in settling the question of the frequency of the celebration of the Supper. In the only instance where this form is used, in connection with "the first day of the week," it was not till a late hour of the night the breaking of bread occurred : for though it is said, the disciples came together to break bread, it is stated that Paul preached unto them till "midnight ;" and because he continued his speech "long" a

young man went to sleep, and "fell down from the third loft, and was taken up dead." Paul went down and restored him to life. It is then added, "When he was come up again, and *broken bread* and eaten, and talked till break of day, so he departed." Nothing is said of the use of *wine* in this case nor in Acts 2 : 42. Surely an important omission, if it was really the Lord's Supper.

Whether this coming together to break bread was an ordinary social entertainment, called "feasts of charity," (Jude 12,) often held by the early Christians, for the benefit of the poor, and for the social expression of a common brotherhood, or for the purpose of celebrating the Lord's Supper, it is impossible to tell from any Scripture record. If it was the latter, it does not prove that such was their practice *every* first day of the week : the regular season for it, might, on this occasion, have fallen on that day ; and it is clear, it was not at the early part of their meeting, but at a late hour of the night that breaking bread actually occurred. If it was the ordinary "feast of charity," the breaking of bread might have taken place both early and late.

We have now prepared the way to come more directly to the inquiry as to the frequency and time of the celebration of this feast ; but we must defer further remarks till another month.

---

### TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN.

SOME person for want of better weapons, I suppose, is reporting that I said, several years since in private conversation, "How will it look for an old man like me to come out and be baptized in this time of life." The report is simply a slander. I never gave place to such a sentiment. It is a libel on my whole life and course. It has, through the mercy of God, been a settled principle with me to follow my convictions, whatever men might think or say. I trust, through grace, to be able to do so to the end. Let the originator and propagators of the above slander, read Psa. 15 : 1-3, "LORD, who shall abide in thy tabernacle ? who shall dwell in thy holy hill ?" *Answer :* "He that walketh uprightly, and worketh righteousness, and



speaketh the truth in his heart : he that backbiteth not with his tongue, nor doeth evil to his neighbor, nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbor." Will "water baptism" answer for the neglect of the practice here spoken of? May we all ponder well the import of this passage of Scripture and reduce it to practice.

EDITOR.

---

OF OUR NEW YEAR'S Magazine, the first number is issued ten days in advance of its date. The EDITOR wishes all his Patrons "*A happy new year;*" and earnestly prays, that both they and himself may make large advances in knowledge and holiness in the time still allotted us in this our pilgrimage and trial state.

If those who send us communications do not see them in the EXAMINER immediately, they are not to conclude they are rejected : and if they should not find place in our Magazine at all, we trust they will not conclude an Editor is never to use his judgment in selecting, from various communications, such as he thinks will best serve his readers. He leaves out no article because the writer differs from him ; all may rely on that. Other reasons determine his course in this matter : those reasons may not be apparent to the correspondent ; but he is not in the stand-point of the Editor. Some articles, though they may be well written, involve points which cannot be settled by the Bible, and necessarily lead off into speculations which might be extended to any length, and yet leave the subject just where it commenced, with no real benefit to any one. These things may do for a weekly paper ; but would soon destroy the interest in, if not the usefulness of a Monthly periodical.

We intend to deal fairly and impartially with all ; still, we are liable to misjudge, and may therefore err in matter introduced or laid aside. We shall try our best ; and with the prayers, patience, and communications of our contributors, we hope to give general, if not universal satisfaction. Be that as it may, we shall seek, first of all, to conduct this Magazine so that we can feel God our Saviour approves our course. It would be a poor reward to have men commend, unless we have the assurance God is honored and His truth furthered. When that cannot be the object and aim of the Editor of this Periodical, he hopes to find a more honorable employment, where he can keep a good conscience, and rejoice in "the love of God shed abroad in" his "heart by the Holy Spirit."

REVIEWERS REVIEWED: By C. F. Hudson.—This is a new work of 36 pages, replying to twelve or fourteen Reviews and other orthodox works; particularly to the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, the *Methodist Quarterly*, the *Theological and Literary Journal*, the *Presbyterian Quarterly*; briefly to Prof. Hovey; to Mr. Landis on Immortality; Mr. Warren's "Sadduceism," and Dr. Thompson's "Love and Penalty." PRICE, in paper, 10 cts.

Also, "THE RIGHTS OF WRONG; or, IS EVIL ETERNAL? with a reply to DR. MANSEL," by the same Author; 24 pages. Price 5 cts. Published by MONROE & Co., 134 Washington st., Boston, Mass.

For sale by GEO. W. YOUNG, 138 William Street, New York.

## H E A V E N .

*That goodly land*, the Christian's home,  
Land of his best estates;  
The welcome and reception there,  
With anchored hope he waits:  
Jerusalem new,  
With golden streets and pearly gates.

*The far off land*, in ages past—  
But now 'tis drawing near;  
Signs of the times descried by faith,  
Proclaim, its bounderies clear—  
From the watch-tower  
The cry resounds, fruition's here.

*The promised land*, from Beulah's light,  
We see celestial day,  
Where night, dark night, no more is found .  
And tears are wiped away:  
Hail day! when clouds  
Shall no more shade our narrow way.

*Beautiful land!* no heart conceives  
The joys that are in store,  
For those whose love, and humble faith  
Doth estimate them more  
Than all beside,  
Redemption's gift—theirs evermore.

*That blessed land!* it nears each day—  
The gathering angels near,  
To call each one, from east and west,  
When we shall see *Him* here;  
While waiting, says  
To all his own, "be of good cheer."

*Oh, land of light! Oh, land of love!*  
Where reigns salvation's song,  
Strains ne'er sung here, shall wake the praise  
In mansions ours ere long.  
Come quick the day  
Uniting all the ransomed throng.

M. C. A.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

---

"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, HATH NOT LIFE."

---

Vol. 14.

FEBRUARY, 1861.

No. 2.

---

---

## THE WAGES OF SIN:

OR, THE FIRST PENALTY, EXPLAINED AND CONFIRMED BY SCRIPTURE.

THE writer of this assumed and believed for many years, that endless suffering was the wages of sin: he assumed that this was the teaching of the Bible, because such had been his early training, and he had never called it in question. His attention was at length directed to the subject by an intelligent friend, who suggested, that if he would lay aside his early prejudices long enough to *search the Scriptures* for himself—as the Saviour admonishes all men to do—he would find that no such doctrine was taught in the sacred volume. The suggestion was prayerfully and deliberately followed, although the writer makes no claim to originality or infallible interpretation; yet he hopes, as the result of his investigation, to present to the reader some thoughts worthy of his attention.

The object of this article will be, first, To shew the specific and only meaning of the penalty first denounced upon man. Then, to shew that this meaning is confirmed by the testimony of the whole Bible, including the New Testament. We wish to do this plainly, summarily, and if possible, to the conviction of every candid reader; because the meaning of the first penalty must, plainly, determine the penalty of sin elsewhere revealed in the Bible. It is not for a moment to be supposed, the penalty of sin is one thing in Genesis, and quite another thing in the Gospels and in Revelation.

For the sake of explicitness, we refer briefly to the law with which the penalty was connected. It is worthy of particular notice, for it was revealed in the infancy of our race, when we should expect laws and penalties to be made very plain, and, because it is the natural key to the whole Scripture lesson upon this subject. The law prohibited our first parents from eating

the fruit which grew upon the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. "Thou shalt not eat of it," were the simple words. No command was ever more explicit. No one who eats could fail to understand it. The penalty was equally explicit, "In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." Only one shade of obscurity, common to every interpretation, could possibly occur, it would seem to any reader. None ever supposed the penalty to signify merely, In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt be a *sinner*. But as Adam did *not* die on the particular day that he transgressed, *neither go into endless misery on that day*, the meaning manifestly was, that he should be *condemned* on that day, to the death specified in the penalty.

What was that death? What could dying mean, but ceasing to live? What more explicit than the inspired definition itself, "Dust thou art and unto dust shalt thou return?" *That was Death*. Animals and vegetables died, and man himself, made of corruptible materials, was told, if he transgressed, he should die also. Who could imagine any latent sense, any allegorical meaning, any tropes or symbols here? To suppose that the body only, and not the soul was intended, is to suppose the "living soul" was no part of the man. Accordingly we find the tree of life secured his incorruption, while he continued in the garden; and when he transgressed and had forfeited life, he was "thrust out of the garden, lest he should eat of the tree of life and live forever." Literal death, therefore, as plainly as both words and deeds could show it, constituted the penalty of man's first transgression.

The language of the apostle, in Rom. 5, shows also, that he thus understood it; and surely the interpretation of the apostle is not to be lightly esteemed. He tells us, "death entered the world by sin, and that death reigned from Adam to Moses." He cannot be speaking of endless misery here. It would not only be no help to his argument, but would render it utterly unintelligible and absurd. He is speaking, manifestly, of literal death, which he therefore supposed was the penalty of the first transgression. Adam himself could not possibly have understood it otherwise; and we think it pretty safe to agree in this respect with these distinguished interpreters.

If any suppose spiritual death, a "death in trespasses and sins," was included, not as a penalty, but as a necessary consequence, there can be no objection; for how could it be otherwise? Can a man fall into the ocean without being in the water? No more can he plunge into sin, without being a sinner. But that is just what the apostle means by spiritual death; "a death in trespasses and sins." But then, neither that, nor literal death, is *endless misery*. This last is altogether another invention, neither expressed, implied, or intimated in the original law or penalty. Haldane freely admits this in his

Commentary on Rom. 5 ; and we see not how any one can deny it with a shadow of reason.

If, then, nothing but literal death was expressed, implied, or threatened in the first penalty ; if there was no intimation of endless misery in addition to that penalty ; then, it is most certain, God will never inflict it. Can any one imagine a deception, or an injustice, greater, more obvious, and more cruel, than to make a law, specify a penalty, and then, in addition to that penalty, inflict one immeasurably more dreadful ? No intelligent mind will hesitate to say, that any civil government who should do this, ought to be universally pronounced most infamous, cruel, and unjust. Let us not, without the best of reasons, impute such conduct to the Righteous Judge of all the earth.

But, says Haldane, the government of God is not merely civil but paternal, and this makes it proper for Him to exercise his discretion in imposing penalties which He had never distinctly specified. On the contrary, the truth, that God is a Father, as well as Judge of mankind, would only render such a deception—such an addition to the penalty specified—the more obviously cruel and unjust. But, “specified”—indeed ; was not the penalty of man’s transgression most distinctly specified ? Could it have been more so than it was, in the language, “thou shalt surely die”—shalt “return to the dust from whence thou was taken ?” How would Mr. Haldane describe literal death more unequivocally ? But says the same writer—“Is not a child guilty when he breaks the command of a father, even though the command be unaccompanied with threatening ?” But we repeat, the Divine command *was* accompanied by a perfectly distinct threatening and penalty. We venture to say, no government, human or Divine, ever specified a penalty more unequivocal. But death, continues the same writer, is only the “symbol” of the eternal misery that should follow. By what law of language, we ask, is it permitted to symbolize these plain words ? If laws or penalties are to be called symbols by every fancy of the interpreter, then no law or penalty whatever can have any specific meaning. It would destroy the value of every law and record in existence ; for no one could determine their meaning. Some of the early fathers were so notorious for hidden senses, and allegorical meanings, that their writings, and especially their explanations of Scripture, are now considered utterly worthless ; and yet we venture to say, no instance can be found, from Swedenborg to Origen, of assigning a latent sense, or a spiritual or allegorical meaning to the plain words of Scripture, more utterly unauthorized by any law of language, or common sense, than is this symbolizing and mystifying the meaning of the simple words, “thou shalt surely die.” There is not a sentence in the Bible which may not mean any-

thing or nothing, upon such a principle. It makes God a liar, and interpretation a farce. Besides, it is commonly supposed, endless suffering is a penalty necessary to keep men from sin and lead them to repentance. If so, it ought most certainly to be specified. To conceal it up to the times of the New Testament, if God really desired to deter men from sinning, would be contrary to all motive, as well as to all candor and truth. We have the same right to say, the law, "Thou shalt not kill," and the penalty, the murderer shall surely be put to death, are either of them symbolical, as any one has to say, the first law and penalty were so. No such thing was intimated in the language, or implied in the circumstances under which it was uttered. But further : supposing it were symbolical, we have the same right to say, death symbolizes an eternal sleep, or eternal darkness, that Mr. Haldane has to say, it symbolizes endless misery. But we protest against all such trifling with the words of Holy Writ. It is a most unwarrantable addition to the sayings of the prophecy of this book.

But if enough has not already been said to satisfy the reader, there is a collateral argument which, we think, renders the meaning of the penalty yet more unequivocal—"Christ died for our sins," and yet he suffered neither spiritual death nor endless misery. But as He paid the believer's penalty, that penalty was, beyond all question, literal death, and that only. The fact that Christ died as our substitute, and yet did not suffer endless misery, explains, it appears to us, most of the alleged heresies and difficulties in regard to the Atonement. Only admit the penalty of man's first transgression was literal, as the Saviour's death was literal ; then, that He "died for our sins" and "bare our sins in his own body on the tree," is perfectly intelligible. Otherwise it is inexplicable and absurd. The idea, therefore, that endless misery is comprehended in the first penalty is altogether an invention of man. It is no where intimated or implied, either literally or symbolically in the language of the sacred writers.

This interpretation is also confirmed by analogy. Destruction has its analogies every where.—Endless suffering, no where. None but monsters of cruelty, like Herod, Nero, Dioclesian, inquisitors or Pagan Gods, seek to protract the sufferings of criminals year after year, as long as they can, in fearful torments. On the contrary, if only an animal is incorrigibly vicious, humanity will destroy him. None but the abominable, revengeful and cruel, will delight in tormenting him. Human justice, in obedience to God's command, puts the murderer to death. She does not prolong his existence in cruel torments, in addition to the penalty. Now, is not this according to every moral instinct of our nature, and in analogy with the government of Divine Providence ? A man sinks in the waters of the

ocean. How terrible and painful beyond description would be his condition there, had not God so mercifully arranged the laws of his being, as to put a speedy end to his sufferings by death. A man falls into a fiery furnace. How quickly are his sufferings terminated by death. Tyrants and inquisitors have often sought to prolong the lives of their victims in cruel tortures, year after year ; but God who abhors their cruelty, interposes by the merciful arrangement of death to defeat their wicked purposes. Is it to be supposed He will imitate their cruelty, by adding endless and infinite suffering to the literal death which He had distinctly specified as the wages of sin ? The soul has indeed "wonderful capacities and powers." Its Author, doubtless, designed they should find happy and useful employment forever. But the fact is just as notorious as human depravity, that these powers and capacities are often most grossly perverted and abused ; so that wicked men often become incorrigible and worse than useless. Which of these alternatives, then, would seem to agree more nearly with the Divine character as exhibited in the analogies of Providence ? Shut them up in a fiery cavern, and keep them alive, cursing, blaspheming and suffering throughout endless duration, utterly useless to themselves and all others ? Would not this be equivalent to saying in substance,—I hate sin so intensely, that now you shall sin, and sin without hindrance throughout an endless existence ? Or, is not the other alternative more like God, and according to the analogy of His Providence ? To destroy them utterly—root and branch—soul and body—or as chaff is burnt up, in unquenchable fire ? This last is the penalty which God has denounced ; and the one, we think, demanded by all sound reason and analogy. To represent God, as some leading men in the church of Christ have done, as contemplating with stoical indifference, or even complacency, the endless sufferings of untold millions of the human race, is, we think, to rob Him of His perfections ; those very perfections of love, sympathy and compassion, which the sacred writers ascribe to Him as His highest glory ; and to impute to Him the very characteristic which we condemn in despots and inquisitors, as opposed to every moral instinct of our nature.

But there is an independent argument, from which some have inferred that endless misery was comprehended in the meaning of the first penalty. "The soul is immortal, and the Bible assumes it." "If, therefore, the soul is *spiritually dead*, and yet lives throughout endless duration, how can it be otherwise than miserable ? Are not sin and misery inseparable, as cause and effect ?" We assent to the conclusion, if the premises were true ; but they are not, and we can show it. The argument is indeed well nigh worn out, and has been often answered ; and yet it is so essential to the endless misery interpretation, and

underlies so entirely the doctrine itself, that to omit the notice of it altogether, might seem to imply an inability, which we certainly do not concede.

There are but two reasons we have ever seen assigned, which furnish even a presumption in favor of the inherent immortality of the soul; neither of which are conclusive of this question, as may easily be shown.

The first is, the desires and longings for immortality, universally characteristic of the human kind. Now, none will doubt God designs to gratify those natural desires which He himself has implanted. But all experience shows He will not do this, *irrespective of means*. The desire of food and clothing, of riches, learning and reputation, are all natural; but they are not gratified, *irrespective of means*. Neglect the means and you will not gain the end, however natural and earnest your desires. "Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap." The same is true of immortality. The means of attaining it are the repentance and faith of the Gospel. None but those who are willing to use these means, inherit immortality; those who neglect them, perish in their own corruption, just as he who neglects food will starve, and he who is not diligent must not hope to become rich. This argument, therefore, in the place of affording any presumption in favor of the immortality of the wicked, is a clear and strong presumption against it.

The remaining argument, to which we referred, is the testimony of reason and conscience, that there will be a judgment hereafter to rectify the inequalities of retribution in this present evil world. Both the Psalmist and the Apostle refer to it in proof, that after death cometh the judgment. But that certainly does not prove that *after the judgment itself*, the wicked shall not be destroyed. Neither of these two arguments, therefore, so commonly and confidently alleged to prove the immortality of the wicked, afford even a presumption that after the final judgment they will not be destroyed forever.

Hence the Bible does not assume any such thing as the soul's immortality. To suppose it were most absurd. It would be to assume that which cannot possibly be proved without a revelation. On the contrary, the testimony of the Bible is, that man, created of the dust of the earth, and composed of flesh and blood, could have secured his immortality only by continuing to eat of the tree of life which grew in the midst of the garden.

But what do writers mean by the soul's inherent immortality? Any thing which God cannot destroy? Certainly not. He can create and He destroy. To pretend otherwise were impious, and that concession is quite sufficient for our argument; for God has said, He will destroy the wicked. He has said it in the first penalty. He has said it in a vast number of passages, both of the Old and New Testament. If we believe not such



testimony. neither should we be persuaded though one rose from the dead.

The argument, however, which we think is relied upon more than all others, to show that endless misery was included in the penalty, "Thou shalt surely die," is derived from several passages of the New Testament. Indeed, we do not think any one would even have imagined endless misery to be symbolized or included in the first penalty, had it not been supposed such an interpretation was demanded by the language of the New Testament. But, is this so? Is it so plainly taught there as some suppose? We think not. Let not the reader, however, suppose we are about to examine in detail, the thousand and one passages which relate to this subject. They denounce punishment upon the wicked. So far all interpreters are agreed. But the passages are few, and them mostly in the New Testament, which are supposed to indicate that endless misery constitutes that punishment. Of these few, we desire to speak briefly. They are often referred to with great confidence, and we think have been too hastily assumed as teaching the endless misery of the wicked. On the contrary, we think they teach their *literal destruction*, very unequivocally, if only the Scriptures are permitted to explain their own meaning.

"These," said the Saviour, "shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." This is commonly regarded as unequivocal testimony to the endless suffering of the wicked. But is this so? Everlasting punishment is here opposed to life eternal. The one must endure as long as the other; and as the righteous inherit immortality, so the punishment of the wicked to correspond, must be endless also. But the Saviour does not here tell us what the punishment of the wicked is, only that it is the antithesis of life eternal. What is that? *not* endless misery, but *eternal death*. Death and not misery, is the antithesis of life. Endless misery would be eternal life, just as truly as endless happiness. Whereas, the Saviour teaches, none but the righteous go away into life eternal. Hence, the Apostle in 2 Thess. 1: 9, defines the everlasting punishment of the wicked to be, "Everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of His power." But why call the destruction everlasting? Would it not be naturally and necessarily so without any qualifying adjective? No. If you kill the body it will rise again; for all shall come forth to the resurrection of life or to the resurrection of damnation. But after the judgment, God will destroy the wicked, both soul and body in hell—in "gehenna;" i. e., the fires of the valley of Hinnom, used to consume dead carcasses, to which the final destruction of the wicked is compared, and from which there is no resurrection; and therefore it is the second death, or death eternal. Literal, eternal destruction,

therefore, is the antithesis of eternal life. And if God destroys both soul and body, He will doubtless destroy the one in the same sense He destroys the other. The body will cease to live, and therefore the soul will cease to live also.

"The worm that dieth not, and the fire that is not quenched," have been so often explained, and their meaning is so indisputable, we should hardly speak of them, were it not they serve to explain other passages, and also to confirm the interpretations already given. The Prophet's own meaning of these terms, and also of "smoke ascending forever," as quoted in the N. T. from Isaiah 66 ; 24, Is. 34, and Jer. 17 : 27, was beyond all question, consuming worm and devouring fire. The worms that devoured those carcasses, and the fire which consumed those palaces and cities, and the smoke which ascended therefrom, died out thousands of years since. This is just as certain as that Jerusalem or Idumea are not burning to this day. The Prophet himself explains it thus, when he speaks of its devouring and consuming them. Barnes, in his Commentary on Mark 9 : 44, gives the same interpretation. "The worm," says he, "feeding on the dead shall not die—shall live as long as there are carcasses to be devoured; and the fire used to burn the bodies of the dead, shall not be extinguished till they are consumed." The worm here spoken of, therefore, has no reference to conscience or endless remorse, as is often assumed; nor the fire to endless duration, nor the smoke to ceaseless ascension; but though they are prophetic imagery, yet they have a perfectly plain and natural meaning, as explained by the Prophet himself. The burning city shall not be quenched, but utterly consumed. The worm, also, shall not die, but utterly devour the carcass. Such, beyond all contradiction, is the meaning of the Prophet, from whom our Saviour quoted this language.

And now we submit the question to any unprejudiced mind: to every one, indeed, who believes the Saviour of the world did really bear witness to the truth, and intended to make himself intelligible. If such was the Prophet's own meaning—as explained by himself, and proved by incontestible facts—does the Saviour, in quoting his words, mean something entirely different, and that without giving the least intimation of any such change of meaning? Would this be honest, any more than it would to *mean* a penny, when you promised a hundred pounds? Would such a prophet or teacher be entitled to your confidence? No. It would be just as truly a falsehood as if he had uttered a contradiction in terms. The Romish church could furnish no specimen of Jesuitism so cruelly deceptive as this would impute to Him who can no more deceive than He can be deceived. It would be indeed a deception of the same kind, equally contrary to all reason, and relating to the same subject as is imputed to God the Father, when it is said the words

"Thou shalt surely die," not only mean what they say, but endless misery in addition. It is imputing to God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, precisely those characteristics of deception and cruelty, which every enlightened conscience so indignantly reprobates whenever they appear in the character and conduct of men.

The words everlasting and eternal fire, are employed by our Saviour and the apostle in the same general sense. Suppose the furnace of Nebuchadnezzar had continued burning to this day, or throughout endless duration—does it follow, that the unhappy persons cast into it, would not have been immediately consumed? But the supposition is unnecessary. Sodom and Gomorrah suffered the vengeance of eternal fire; and the antediluvians suffered by the flood; and the manner in which they were destroyed is adduced by the apostle as an example to all the ungodly, of the Divine displeasure at iniquity. But neither the fire nor the flood, by which they perished, continue to this day. Their victims were utterly consumed and destroyed. Hence they are examples. It was only the literal fire and flood that could make them such. If endless misery had been intended, they were no more *examples* than any other sinners who ever perished. To suppose it, therefore, is nothing less than to impeach the consistency and common sense of the apostle's language.

But every intelligent reader of the Bible knows, the words everlasting, eternal, and forever, do not always mean endless duration. Some have said, indeed, this is the original meaning of the word. But, though we deny that, yet the question is scarcely worth a dispute; for whoever examines will find the word "forever" used in the Bible almost as frequently to express a limited as an unlimited duration. The exceptions, therefore, would bear no small proportion to the examples. But the belief in the endless sufferings of the wicked, has been a doctrine so common, that when these words are used to express their punishment, they are assumed to mean endless duration. But let the same writers speak for themselves: they doubtless know their own meaning. How, then, do they employ the words everlasting, eternal, and forever, which are all, alike, the translation of one Greek word, "*Aion*?" The answer is, they mean by it, an age—a cycle—or endless duration, according to the object of which it is spoken. The insolvent debtor might become the slave of his Jewish creditor "forever," *i. e.*, during his life. The hills of Midian were everlasting, *i. e.*, they would last as long as the world. The smoke of Idumea "ascended forever," *i. e.*, till its cities were utterly consumed. The Jewish age, or dispensation, expressed by the same term, is a frequent phrase of the same writers. When, however, it is said, the Messiah shall reign forever, it means unlimited duration;

because that is His life. He is without beginning of days or end of years: so, also, he that believeth hath eternal—*i. e.*, endless life, for he inherits incorruption; his crown of glory fadeth not away. He shall reign with Christ forever, *i. e.*, as long as his Saviour lives, he shall live also. In these remarks, we surely enter upon no doubtful disputation. We merely let the inspired writers explain their own meaning, and the above is certainly the sense in which they employ these terms. When, therefore, an apostle tells us, in symbols which he and his Divine Master quoted so freely from Isaiah and Jeremiah, that the beast and the false prophet shall be cast into the lake of fire, and tormented day and night forever, his meaning is determined, we think, by the objects to which his language is applied. The best commentators suppose the beast and the false prophet to mean false religions; probably Romanism and Mohammedanism. They, or the nations professing them, were cast into the lake of fire—the furnace of God's fiery judgments—many years since, where they are even now consuming, and will be consuming unto the end: until the Lord shall consume them by the Spirit of His mouth, and destroy them by the brightness of His coming. These fiery judgments, therefore, will continue until every false religion and cruel despotism shall be destroyed, and the kingdoms of this world shall become the kingdoms of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

We find, then, that the leading passages of the New Testament which have been so confidently assumed to teach the doctrine of endless misery, mean, when the Scriptures explain their own words, literal destruction only. We find, the undying worm, and unquenchable fire, whose smoke ascendeth forever; as also the expressions, everlasting and eternal fire; are explained by the sacred writers themselves, to mean consuming and devouring worm and fire; and that this is just as certainly true as that the worms alluded to, and the fires of Jerusalem and Idumea, died out thousands of years since.

There are numerous other passages, both of the Old Testament and the New, which speak of the punishment of the wicked, or teach plainly their literal destruction,—such as, "They shall reap corruption; shall perish in their own corruption; shall be burnt up root and branch; shall be burnt up like chaff, like tares, or destroyed both soul and body." Of these we have not time to speak: they teach literal destruction, or are in perfect harmony with this interpretation. The passages we have attempted to explain, we think, when correctly understood, settle this whole question: they are in perfect harmony with the interpretation already given of the first penalty. Endless misery and undying soul, are expressions no where found in the Bible, or implied in any of its sanctions.

But it is said, if the wicked are to perish literally, it will

diminish the motives to repentance. That the hearts of the sons of men will be sure to answer; destruction is soon over, therefore, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." But, if so, why did not God make the penalty of endless suffering clear and explicit in the first penalty? Why did not the Saviour teach it, in language free from all ambiguity, instead of using language taken from the Prophets, which signifies literal destruction only? Did they not understand the whole wages of sin? and would they not be likely to employ the strongest possible motives to deter the sinner from iniquity, and lead him to repentance? And yet, in the first penalty and in all our Saviour's denunciations of sin, language is employed, which we have seen, expresses literal destruction only. But though a strange assertion from one who professes to preach God's word rather than his own, yet we have heard a minister affirm, that he should be afraid to preach literal destruction, even supposing it true!

What! are ministers to preach the truth, or something which they suppose will do better? If any punishment threatened or executed, outrages every natural sense of justice, though it might deter from the outward act of crime, it certainly could never lead men to repentance. We can repent and love God only when we believe Him worthy of being loved. The hard master may be feared but not loved. It is the goodness of God that leadeth to repentance. His severity can co-operate with His goodness no farther than we feel it to be just. Does the fear of endless misery, in fact, deter men from sin and lead them to repentance? Alas! we fear the general impression that such is the teaching of the Bible, has led thousands into infidelity, to where it has deterred even one from the overt act of sin, or led one soul to repentance. But if literal destruction is the teaching of the Bible, it is certainly safe to preach it to every creature. God will bless the truth of His word, and none need fear to proclaim it who think it safer to preach the word of the Lord, rather than the doctrines and commandments of men.

But everlasting destruction is a fearful punishment when contrasted with the life eternal of the righteous. Is not such a motive to escape from sin, as great as the human mind can adequately conceive? Who can fathom the meaning of endless misery? And yet while the reward is of Grace, the punishment of destruction, though an infinite contrast to the reward of immortal glory, it can easily be seen, may be necessary and just and merciful, whenever the wicked become incorrigible in their wickedness. Not so with endless misery. Whether God inflicts it or permits it, would seem immaterial. Knowing, as God certainly did—if it is true—that a majority of the race would sin and suffer endless misery, what else than

complacency in sin and suffering could have created man? What else than complacency in *sin* and suffering could have said, as God did to Noah, be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth? Would not every sentiment of humanity, in such case, forbid that mankind should marry and be given in marriage? Do Christian parents indeed believe, that all the impenitent go away into endless misery, when they rejoice over the new born child? Would not, and ought not, the bare possibility of such a doom, to convert every occasion of this kind into one of lamentation and woe? But, if the wicked literally perish, such questions are easily answered. Existence is not an infinite curse even to them that are lost; while to those who repent and live, it becomes a blessing worthy of the goodness of God. To say, then, that literal and final destruction is no motive to fear, and a crown of immortal glory no incentive to hope, is absurd. It is to annihilate the difference between final and terrible destruction and the crown of glory which fadeth not away. The penalty of literal destruction has also this manifest advantage—We can see and feel its justice, necessity, and mercy; whereas, we do not believe the moral sense of any intelligent being can ever reconcile the doctrine of endless suffering with the attributes of foreknowledge and goodness in the Creator.

We have endeavored, in these remarks, to present, in a connected argument, the true meaning of the Scriptures upon this subject. And now, cannot those who profess to have all the truth on their side, show us our fallacy, if we are so manifestly wrong? We know, indeed, that several have written upon this subject, professedly, in reply to the literal interpretation of the first penalty. But we have seen nothing yet that was conclusive, or even apparently fair and candid. They speak, generally, as having much authority but little argument. One merely asserts, eternal punishment means endless misery. We think we have not merely asserted, but shewn, it means *eternal destruction*. Another, when we turn to Isaiah to learn the meaning of words quoted from that Prophet, calls it, "contemptible pettyfogging." What! should we go to him to learn its meaning, rather than to the Prophet himself? Others, to all our honest endeavors to ascertain the true meaning of the Bible on this subject, answer by accusing us of infidel tendencies. If indeed we prejudged the meaning of God's word, and compressed its meaning to suit our own fancies, this might be true. But we have not done this. It is our assailants who do this, by bringing us a creed, and bidding us receive it on pain of heresy. Whereas, we go directly to the word of God itself, and compare Scripture with Scripture to ascertain its meaning. This certainly is not infidelity, but rather fidelity towards God. But when we hesitate to submit to their authority, in opposi-

tion to our own conviction of what the word of God means, their answer is not argument, but epithet and derision. What I say they, art thou also of Galilee? Another, assuming that no one understands symbols but himself, authoritatively asserts, the symbols of St. John teach the endless sufferings of the wicked, far more impressively than literal words could do. But he does not prove that they shew it at all. Why does he not condescend to explain these symbols to the level of our apprehension, and shew their meaning is what he affirms? On the contrary, we ask for bread, and he gives us a stone. Surely, if the Bible is so unequivocally on the side of endless misery, it can be shewn; and those who hold different views need not be met with mere naked assertion and terms of derision. We confess the utter failure, thus far, to meet the argument fairly, and the constant resort to denunciation, for the evident want of it has tended greatly to confirm our belief in the literal destruction of the wicked.

We have already protracted this article more than we intended, but we hope the reader will bear with us yet a little longer. We are unwilling to conclude without a word in regard to the *origin* of the common interpretation. How does it happen, when the Bible teaches, we think, so explicitly the literal destruction of the wicked, that so many good men, both of ancient and modern times, have held so different an opinion? We freely confess this circumstance has made us timid, and has, at times, almost shaken our faith in our own conclusions. It is really the most weighty answer to our own interpretation we have ever seen. We think the prevailing opinions of the people of God, entitled to very great deference. God is with his people, and though He does not keep them from all error, as their differences among themselves fully prove, yet they hold the truths essential to salvation; and so do we. But we can not make the interpretations of men our rule of faith, for that is Romanism. It is to abandon the right and duty of private judgment, and assume that others may give an account for us unto God. To receive a creed from man, however great and good, which we honestly believe is opposed to the teaching of God's word, is infidelity towards Him. It is holding the opinions of men in higher esteem than the revelations of God. With whatever deference, therefore, we receive the counsels and interpretations of men, we may not forget, there is a yet higher authority. Besides, are we sure the testimony of the church is as universally opposed to the views taken in this article, as we had supposed? The writer knows several clergymen of good standing, and laymen, also, who hold these views. Howbeit, they do not speak openly "for fear of the Jews." Whether this reason is sufficient, individuals must judge for

themselves ; but, we do think, this reason deters a still larger number from a candid examination of the subject.

Still the question recurs—How did so many good men get an interpretation of the word of God so different, we think, from its true and plain meaning ? Probably, from the early Fathers. They were ingenious, and many of them pious, but not very safe interpreters. They taught monkery, clerical celibacy, and asceticism. We are not such Puseyites as to follow them in these things. The modern church, too, seems not to have understood and practised religious toleration, till the time of Cromwell. We hope to have improved, even upon the Reformers, in this respect. Perhaps God will soon turn over another leaf in the book of Providence, and we shall yet find the church universal holding the right of private judgment, and the literal interpretation of the Bible, with respect to the final punishment of the wicked.

But, the early fathers—Where did they learn the doctrine of endless misery ? Not, we think, from the Bible. That is too literally and plainly opposed to such an interpretation. Where then ? May not the doctrine have found its paternity in the Pagan mythology ? It will doubtless be conceded, that the asceticism of the early Fathers and of the Romish Church, found its parentage in the Gnosticism of the first century, and that, in the philosophy of Plato and Pythagoras, instead of selfishness being the summary of evil, they assumed and taught that evil resided essentially in matter. Hence, they discouraged the marriage relation and made religion consist, not in love to God and man, but in austere rites, celibacy, abstinence, penance, and self-torture. Thus they contrived almost to Paganize Christianity. In brief, so far was this system carried, that it finally resulted in the great apostacy ; and then, the dark night of Mohammedanism and Popery covered the earth. May not the doctrine of endless suffering have slid into the church through a similar channel ? The imaginations of the heathen poets were as corrupt as the age in which they lived ; and they created gods after their own image ; only endowed with superhuman powers of evil. Hence, the gods and goddesses of Greece and Rome were distinguished for every vice, but especially for cruelty, malignity, and revenge. To suppose they would inflict endless sufferings, upon the objects of their vengeance, was perfectly natural. The cruel rage of Juno, and the equally malignant tempers of Olympian Deities generally, which occupy so prominent a place in the songs of Homer and Virgil, found their gratification, as we might expect, in subjecting their victims to endless and cruel torments. Hence, the sufferings of Tantelus, Sisyphus, Orestes, and others, who became the victims of their displeasure. Prometheus, it is said,



stole fire from Heaven. This was doubtless a sin, and his condemnation was just: but not so his punishment. He was chained to an island rock, and an immortal vulture commissioned to prey upon his vitals, which were to be constantly renewed throughout endless duration. Now, that this punishment, (supposing it real) was cruel, vindictive, and unjust, was probably never doubted by a single individual. It is opposed to every moral instinct of our nature. But though he sinned, yet his sin was certainly not greater or more aggravated, than that of many who are supposed to go away into endless misery. Why then so manifestly cruel and unjust in his case, and yet so sternly demanded by justice under the Gospel? His torments, or those of Tantalus or Orestes, were not more terrible than those of endless existence in fire. Taylor, Edwards, and others, represent God as under obligation to render the wicked as miserable throughout eternity, as His infinite knowledge and power will enable Him to do. Surely, nothing worse was ever imagined by the heathen poets. And it is the Father of mercies who is thus represented. The God and Father of us all; not willing that any should perish; rejoicing over the penitent Prodigal; and grieving, therefore, at our least departure from Him. Must not such a representation either divest Him of personality, and render Him as insensible to suffering as a law of nature? or else render Him, of all beings in the universe, the most miserable? To suppose, also, that such a condition of our race, or a large majority of them, would not destroy all the happiness of angels and glorified spirits, is to suppose them bereft of every amiable susceptibility, and converted into objects of utter insensibility; or else into the most hardened and cruel of fiends. We shall wait for higher authority than Edwards (good and great though he was,) before we consent to receive such a representation of the Divine character; and especially, when following the line of our own convictions, and searching the Scriptures for ourselves, we find no such doctrine any where taught or implied in the word of God. We think its paternity far more natural and becoming, when traced up to the Jupiter, Juno and Company of the Pagan mythology.

---

DR. LAW, BISHOP OF CARLISLE, speaking of the *first penalty*, says—"We find the original here, as full and emphatical as words can make it. They are translated—'Thou shalt surely'—but might with more strictness have been rendered—'Thou shalt utterly die;' which one would think sufficiently explained in the sentence passed on our first parents, where they are reminded of their original, and of the state to which this change should reduce them: 'dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.'"

## THE LORD'S SUPPER.

"For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us." 1 Cor. 5 : 7. This text opens up the subject under consideration, and may serve as a key to it. Christ is set forth as He truly is, as the anti-typical passover Lamb. Hence, in order to understand the question at issue, we must examine the passover institution. We turn to Exodus 12.

The LORD was about to pass through Egypt and slay all the first-born of the land. He directs Moses to have the children of Israel take a lamb, on the tenth day of the month, and "kill it in the evening." Then they were to take of its "blood and strike it on the two side-posts and on the upper door-posts of the houses wherein they shall eat it"—the passover lamb. They were to eat it with their loins girded, their shoes on, and their staff in their hands. They were told, "The blood shall be to you a token upon the houses where ye are : and when I see the blood I will pass over you, and the plague shall not be upon you to destroy you, when I smite the land of Egypt : and this day shall be unto you for a memorial ; and ye shall keep it a feast unto the LORD throughout your generations : ye shall keep it a feast forever." They were to put away all leaven out of their habitations, and eat no leavened bread during this feast. Of the passover, it is said, "In one house shall it be eaten ; thou shalt not carry forth ought of the flesh abroad out of the house ; neither shall ye break a bone thereof." An evident prophecy, by a fact, of Christ's death without breaking a bone of Him. John refers distinctly to this prophecy, when speaking of the fact, that His legs were not broken with the malefactors' : "These things were done," saith John, "that the Scripture should be fulfilled, A bone of Him shall not be broken." Thus Jesus is identified as the anti-type of the passover lamb.

Concerning this passover feast, it is thus ordained—"Thou shalt keep this ordinance in its season, from year to year : " and, "it shall be a sign unto thee" \*\*\*\* "and for a memorial between thine eyes ; that the Lord's law may be in thy mouth ; for with a strong hand hath the Lord brought thee out of Egypt." Ex. 13 : 1-10. See the whole text.

We have thus briefly contemplated the passover institution, and find it established as a *yearly* feast, an anniversary one, commemorative of the LORD'S deliverance of Israel, and the slaying of the passover lamb. It was only once in each year the feast was to be celebrated.

The relation of this type to the anti-type will now be considered. In order to do this, we must examine the institution of the Lord's Supper. That it was instituted at the passover, none will question. Of the particulars, Luke's account is the most full. We may notice, it seemed necessary Jesus' death should occur at the passover; and when He sent his disciples to prepare for the passover, He bid them say to the man, where they went for that purpose, "My *time* is at hand; I will keep the passover at thy house with my disciples:" Math. 26: 18. When he was set down, and the disciples, "He said unto them, With desire I have *desired* to eat *this passover* with you before I suffer." Lk. 22: 15.

There must have been a special reason for this intense desire to eat "*this passover*." What reason so likely as that the institution itself, as a type, was to end by the anti-typical Lamb being slain? and hence, Jesus would take the occasion to make such alteration in the institution as should make it correspond to the fact. The passover feast was always kept in the night, and probably lasted most of the night. After the lamb was eaten, and at the close of the supper, a portion of bread and wine, which had been reserved, was used as the conclusion of the service, after which a hymn was sung, and they parted. See Mk. 14: 26. It seems the reserve portion of the passover feast, was that used in the institution of the Lord's Supper. Jesus had told his disciples while eating the passover, "I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God;" and also, "I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come:" Lk. 22: 16-18. He then proceeds with the concluding part of the passover service, "And He took bread and gave thanks, and break it, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: *this do*"—*this* what? this concluding service of the passover—"in remembrance of me." There is to be no lamb used in this service hereafter—for the true Lamb is now to be "sacrificed for us:" hence that part of the passover service is hereafter to be omitted, but "*this*" breaking the bread and eating of it, as

the symbol of His "body given for you," is to remain in use "in remembrance of" Him, and to "show forth His death:" see Lk. 22: 19, and 1 Corth. 11: 26.

"Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup"—what cup? that which concluded the passover supper, and hence called "after supper," *i. e.*, the closing of it—"This cup is the new testament"—the new covenant, in distinction from the old, under which the passover had been established permanently, but was now to give place to a new covenant. "This cup is the new testament in my blood which is shed for you," and Matthew says, "for many, for the remission of sins."

All the circumstances go to show, that the Saviour instructed his disciples, that at the recurrence of the yearly anniversary of the passover they were, hereafter, to attend to "*this*" concluding service only, and to do it in remembrance of Him.

If these things are so, it is plain, the yearly anniversary of Christ's death, or of the slaying of the true passover Lamb, is the true and only authorized time for the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

Because the Saviour is represented as saying, "This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me," some infer, they may do it as "oft" as they choose. But it strikes our mind, this is a misapprehension of our Lord's words. "As oft as ye" do what? "As often as ye eat *this* bread, and drink *this* cup." What bread? and what cup? To us, it seems clear, it is the bread and cup which concluded the passover feast: all the other parts of that service then passed away; but Christ retains "*this*" to be used in remembrance of himself as "our passover, who was sacrificed for us."

It appears to us, the coming together of a number of believers, who can conveniently assemble, at the anniversary of Christ's death, and partaking of a moderate festival, and conversing together, suitably contemplating the fact of their redemption by Christ, the Lamb of God, and concluding the interview by the use of bread and wine, reserved for that purpose, and singing a hymn of praise at parting, is just what is a gospel celebration, or commemoration of our redemption from sin and death by "Christ our passover, who was sacrificed for us."

To suppose the first day of each week was selected to attend to the *memorial* of Christ's death, or to "shew forth His

death," involves an absurdity which has been entirely overlooked. Any celebration on that day, would manifestly have been appropriate only as a memorial of Jesus' resurrection; and it would have been entirely out of place to have kept a memorial of His *death* on the day of His *revival* into life; and we could not admit such a supposition without positive proof, which cannot be found in the Bible.

---

### THE BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

THAT *one* "design of the baptism of the Holy Spirit was the impartation of miraculous powers to believers, for the confirmation of the truth of the Gospel, at its first promulgation," we have never questioned: but, was that its only design? Surely not. No truth is more clearly exemplified than that the Holy Spirit was to be communicated to *all* true believers in Jesus, in some manner it never had been before Jesus was "glorified." A few assertions, from any source, can never settle this question. If "the command to be baptized (or immersed) is given to 'every' penitent believer"—as has been affirmed—is not the "*promise*, Ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit," equally "given to 'every' believer?" "For, the promise" [of this gift] "is unto you and to your children, and to *all* that are afar off, even as *many* as the Lord our God shall call." Acts 2: 38, 39. How then can any one say, or intimate, the *only* design of the baptism of the Holy Spirit was the impartation of miraculous powers, for the confirmation of the truth of the Gospel, *at its first promulgation*? Any person who maintains the infallible inspiration of all the utterances of Peter should be more cautious than thus plainly to contradict him.

"To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word it is" not to be received, let who will utter it. The law and the testimony embrace not the New Testament *only*, but the Old Testament also; and it has a strong claim on our attention, because Christ and his apostles made their appeals to the Old Testament, "saying none other things than those which Moses and the prophets did say should come," &c., Acts 26: 22; and "That all things must be fulfilled, which

were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning" Jesus. Luke 24 : 44.

Will water immersionists inform us, where, in the law of Moses, in the Prophets, or in the Psalms, there is any thing "written" about Messiah's *immersing* any one in water? Is there one prophecy of any such thing? If so, where? and how expressed? Messiah came "to fulfill the law and the prophets;" yes, every "jot" and "tittle" of them. See Math. 5 : 17, 18. If water baptism is prophesied of in the Old Testament, it is by sprinkling or pouring, beyond all reasonable doubt. "So shall he *sprinkle* many nations;" Isa. 52 : 15. "Then will I *sprinkle* clean water upon you;" Ezk. 36 : 25. "Thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them : *Sprinkle* water of purifying upon them," &c. ; Numb. 8 : 7. See Numb. 19 : 17-19 ; also, verse 13, "That soul shall be cut off from Israel ; because the water of separation was not *sprinkled* upon him." "I will *pour* water upon him that is thirsty," &c. ; Isa. 44 : 3.

On the other hand, Do not the testimonies of the Old Testament point to Messiah as He who should do a work for his followers far exceeding all previous dispensations? Do not the Scriptures of the Old Testament specially point to a work of the Spirit, through and by Messiah, exceeding all that had gone before? and did not John the Baptist, Christ and his apostles, claim and assert that He would perform this work for all who truly believe in Him and his promises? which promises were to have their fulfillment after Jesus should be "glorified;" and were made to "all whom the Lord our God" should "call."

It is thus spoken of Messiah by Isaiah—"The *Spirit* of the Lord God is upon me ; because the LORD hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek" \*\*\* "to comfort all that mourn," &c. ; Isa. 61 : 1. Jesus applies this prophecy to himself, Lk. 4 : 21, "This day is this Scripture fulfilled in your ears." "Behold mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth ; I have put My *Spirit* upon him : He shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles : " \*\*\* "He shall not fail nor be discouraged till He have set judgment in the earth : " Isa. 42 : 1-4. "I will pour My *Spirit* upon thy seed," &c. Isa. 44 : 3. "The Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the LORD. As for me, this is my covenant with them, saith the LORD ; My *Spirit* that is upon

thee, and my words which I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed," &c. Isa. 59 : 20, 21. "I will put My *Spirit* within you," &c. Ezk. 36 : 27. "Upon the servants and upon the handmaids in those days will I *pour* out my Spirit;" yea, "I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh:" Joel 2 : 28, 29. Did Peter make a right application of this last prophecy, on the day of Pentecost, when he said, of the baptism of the Spirit on that day, "This is that which is spoken of by the prophet Joel;" and added, "Jesus being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the *promise* of the Holy Spirit, hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear;" and when he further added, "Repent," &c, "and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit; for the *promise* is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call?" If Peter made a right application of the Scriptures quoted, then "the design of the baptism of the Holy Spirit was" not merely "the impartation of miraculous powers for the confirmation of the Gospel at its first promulgation," as has been affirmed: it was a gift promised to all who heartily embraced the truth of the Gospel: it was a promised blessing which was peculiar to the work of Jesus "glorified," to be bestowed on all believers in Him. Thus spake Jesus himself, to the woman of Samaria, "Whosoever drinketh of the water that I shall give him shall never thirst; but the water that I shall give him shall be in him a well of water springing up into everlasting life." John 4 : 14. Again: "He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living waters. (This spake He of the *Spirit* which they that believe on him should receive; for the Holy Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified.)" John 7 : 38, 39.

This testimony of Jesus and of John was prefaced by the declaration, "If *any man* thirst let him come unto me and drink:" then the promise, to all such, of that large measure of the Holy Spirit prophesied of, "as the Scripture hath said;" and it is promised to all believers after Jesus should be "glorified:" it was the promise of the Holy "COMFORTER," who is to supply the place of Jesus' personal presence till He comes again; for, said Jesus, "If I go not away, the COMFORTER will not come unto you; but if I depart I will send him unto you." John 16 : 17. "I will pray the Father, and He shall give you

another Comforter, that he may ABIDE *with you forever* :” John 14 : 16.

Can any language be more clear and explicit of the promise of the Holy Spirit to all believers, in and during the Gospel age ; and in a manner peculiar to this age ; more full, more perfect than ever believers had possessed it, under any previous dispensation ? This age is emphatically the age, or dispensation, of the Spirit : but the professed church has *grieved* and *quenched* it by external rites, ordinances, and ceremonies ; till, alas ! the glory has departed, and forms and externals have swallowed up the living, reforming power, or so stultified it, that the churches are filled with multitudes having the “ form of godliness, but denying the power thereof.”

We shall now confirm the fact, that the Spirit baptism is peculiar to Jesus’ administration, and universal to every living member of His body, the true church ; as clearly distinguished from, and superior to baptism with water, and supersedes it, just as all types are superseded by the anti-types.

John the Baptist, the forerunner of Christ, who was to “ decrease” as Jesus “ increased,” said, “ I indeed baptize you with water” \*\*\* “ but He that cometh after me” \*\*\* “ shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit.” Math. 3 : 11. “ Baptize” *who* “ with the Spirit ?” Was it to be a few ? say, the apostles with “ miraculous powers ?” Does John make any such restriction ? Not at all. It is “ *you*”—the people who should receive Him. The record of this matter, in John 1 : 26–33, is more full and decisive. John said, “ I baptize *with water* ; but there standeth one among you, whom ye know not ; He it is, who coming after me is preferred before me.” \*\*\* “ The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith,” \*\*\* “ this is He of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is preferred before me ; for He was before me : and I knew him not : but that he should be made *manifest* to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing *with water*. And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him ;” \*\*\* “ He that sent me to baptize with *water*, said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is He which baptizeth with the Holy Spirit.”

Here the matter of baptisms is fully laid open. John came “ baptizing with *water*” in order to “ manifest” Messiah “ to



Israel," and his baptism, and pertained to Israel only. His was a baptism of water to precede and introduce another and greater, and His baptism, which was "preferred before" John or his baptism. John must decrease, and Christ must increase; John 3 : 30 ; "for God giveth not the Spirit by measure unto Him;" verse 34. The work and baptism of Christ takes the place of, and supersedes that of John. John's baptism and mission ended with his life; and ended as it begun with the Jews; yet the fullness of Jesus' mission was not opened till He was "glorified." Before that event, after His resurrection from the dead, He said to his disciples, "Wait for the *promise* of the Father, which ye have heard of me: for John truly baptized *with water*, but ye shall be baptized with the *Holy Spirit* not many days hence." Acts 1 : 4, 5. John's *water* baptism is now to be superseded by that which was "preferred before" him or his work. John's was but the scaffolding, the *introduction* to the dispensation of the Spirit, of which it was typical, and to be abolished when it had served its design as a "manifestation" of Him who was to "baptize with the Holy Spirit;" or so soon as the Spirit baptism should be fully opened.

The fact that the apostles and others were the subjects of "renewal, or regeneration by the Spirit," *before* the promised baptism of the Spirit, no more proves this baptism was not to be universal, in all believers, after Jesus was "glorified," than the fact that Old Testament saints "worshiped the Father in spirit" proves no change was to take place in the manner and measure of worship, under the new dispensation, opened by Messiah after He should be "glorified." But Jesus saith to the woman of Samaria, "The hour *cometh*, and now is, when the *true* worshiper shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth:" \*\*\* "they that worship Him must worship *in spirit* and in truth." John 4 : 23, 24. Will any one say, the worship thereafter cannot differ from that going "before," because the old saints had always worshiped in spirit? It seems to us clear, our Lord spoke to the woman of Samaria of the then coming dispensation, in which all carnal or external ordinances were to be displaced by a purely spiritual worship, through and by that baptism of the Holy Spirit, which it was the peculiar prerogative of Jesus "glorified" to bestow; not barely as a regenerating power, but to enable his followers, without the aid of ordinances which related to the *flesh*, or external, to over-

come the carnal or animal propensities, and "bring the body under," so that, "If through *the Spirit* ye do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live:" Rom. 8: 13. And thereafter the "true worshipers" were to become the "temple of the Holy Spirit," not by means of any carnal ordinances, but by the direct communication of the Holy Spirit to every true believer.

To this fact gave all the apostles witness. Peter saith, 1 Pet. 2: 5, "Ye also, as lively stones, are built up a *spiritual* house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ." Paul saith, 1 Corth. 6: 19, "Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit, which is in you, which ye have of God?" Again, he saith, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God *dwelleth* in you?" "The temple of God is holy, which temple ye are." 1 Corth. 3: 16, 17. "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body" \*\*\* "and all been made to drink into one Spirit." 1 Corth. 12: 13. "Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Are ye so foolish, having begun *in the Spirit*, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?" Gal. 3: 2, 3. "He that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." Gal. 6: 8. "Endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is *one* body, and *one* Spirit, even as ye are called in *one* hope of your calling; *one* Lord, *one* faith, *ONE baptism*, *one* God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." Eph. 4: 3-6.

Can any make themselves believe, in such a cluster of "*ones*," the baptism is that of water, when the apostle had elsewhere said, "by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body?" To us, nothing is clearer, than the apostle, by the "one baptism," means the *Spirit* baptism, and nothing else. In not one instance were the "subjects of this" Spirit baptism "commanded to be baptized in water" *after* having received the Holy Spirit, except at the house of Cornelius, which we think has been sufficiently shown to be of doubtful authority, and unwarranted by the commission of Christ to his apostles. See our remarks on this topic, Vol. XIII. pages 327, 328, 375-378. "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. No other baptism will bring us up from the dead ; and the tendency of any other, in our judgment, is to call off attention from the importance of this, and to lead to "glorying in the flesh : " yet we judge them not, and doubt not their sincerity who think otherwise. To their " own Master they stand or fall."

The following shall conclude our present remarks. Jesus said to his followers, " I will pray the Father and He shall give you another *Comforter*, that he may abide with you forever : even the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive because it seeth him not, neither knoweth him ; but ye know him ; for he dwelleth with you and shall be *in you :*" John 14 : 16, 17. Paul saith, " But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be the Spirit of God *dwelt* in you : now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of his." Rom. 8 : 9. John saith, " The anointing which ye have received of him *abideth* in you." 1 John 2 : 27. " God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit." Acts 10 : 38.

Put all these, and a multitude of similar texts together, and see if they do not demonstrate, if any truth can be demonstrated, the great fact of the baptism of the Holy Spirit as that which belongs to the dispensation of Jesus "glorified," who "having received of the Father the *promise* of the Holy Spirit" does now shed it on all His followers, and cause it to *abide* in them, if they do not "grieve" or "quench" it.

---

## FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE.

FROM W. LAING, EDINBURGH, SCOTLAND.

TO THE EDITOR OF BIBLE EXAMINER :—A friend of mine sent me a copy of your Magazine for September last, and suggested that a statement regarding the extent to which a belief of what are termed "The Life Views" exists in Scotland, would be interesting to your readers, and encouraging to yourself and others similarly engaged. Under this impression, I forward you the following remarks.

In 1848, my attention was first called to the teaching of the Bible regarding immortality, by Mr. Dobney's work on "Future Punishment." At the close of that year, Mr. W. G. Moncrieff

published his "Dialogues on Future Punishment," and preached regularly to his congregation in Musselburgh, on the grand theme of God's gift of eternal life to all the mortal sons of Adam, to be enjoyed by them through faith in the Gospel concerning His Son.

It is scarcely needful to add the proclamation of a doctrine so much at variance with Scottish orthodoxy, and the common belief of all the sects, stirred up a considerable amount of furious opposition. Still, in spite of popular prejudice, "the word of truth" found its way to many good and honest hearts, calling forth fresh songs of gratitude and joy, to "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who had begotten them to the hope of life by His resurrection from the dead." The strange idea that the God of love had determined to condemn the greater portion of the race of man to endless being in torments—most horribly intense—fled from many minds, and they felt as relieved from a heavy incubus that continually weighed on their hearts. They felt increased boldness in witnessing for God; and even in regard to the destiny of the lost, could

"Justify the ways of God to man."

By means of the preaching and writings of Mr. Moncrieff, along with those of Messrs. Dobney, White, and Ham, the truth continued to spread.

Here it becomes me to mention the great service done by American writings. British editions were published, and had a considerable circulation.

In October, 1854, Mr. Moncrieff left Scotland for Canada West, and since then no public effort, of any consequence, has been made here in the advocacy of God's method of conferring eternal life in the kingdom of His Son. The whole of the clergy in Britain, so far as I know, are silent regarding that truth which, of all others, is most plainly declared in Scripture—that immortality, so far as regards the sons of men, is the peculiar privilege of those who, by faith in Christ Jesus, are made joint heirs with Him in his glorious kingdom. It is, however, a matter of great thankfulness, that though official talkers have been dumb, all testimony to the truth has not been lost. A goodly number rejoice in God's Messiah as the life-giving Redeemer. The extent to which "the Life question" has permeated Scotland, may be better estimated by the number of

*churches*, than by the number of *persons* holding this truth. While the number of persons identified with this question does not extend to many hundreds, there are no fewer than fourteen or fifteen churches scattered over the country, at considerable distances from each other, and in communication with seven similar congregations in England. Notwithstanding the comparative insignificance of these churches, their very *existence* is an important testimony to the truth of God, amidst the darkness of unbelief, ignorance, and error, and cannot fail to encourage you, who, for many years, have zealously and disinterestedly borne witness to the truth. This encouragement is increased by the fact, that our numbers are steadily increasing. Not a month goes round without bringing us the cheering intelligence of one or two, here and there, being added to our numbers.

Out of these churches there are a considerable number, throughout Scotland, holding "the Life views." but of them I can say little. Some of them, by their connection with churches where such truth must not be named, have, I fear, rendered a *l*l testimony, so far as they are concerned, almost impossible. But my object is not to find fault with any one, but to represent the state of matters in Scotland, regarding the doctrines in question, so far as my information extends.

And now, dear sir, while the foregoing statement may afford encouragement to the readers of your Magazine, it is still a lamentable fact, that the great mass of our population reject the truth as it is in Jesus, and believe the Deceiver's lie. Alas! that it should be so. But so it has ever been, and will be till the fearful and unbelieving are consumed with the breath of His mouth, and destroyed by the brightness of His coming.

In conclusion, permit me to say, that the mere holding and propagating of the truth, that eternal life is through Christ alone, shall be of very little consequence to us at last, unless that blessed truth takes hold of our heart, and brings us unto subjection to God. It is possible to be stout defenders of God's truth without being *godly*. Let us see to it, that we are not partizans, but partakers of the Divine nature. That we are indeed those who have believed to the saving of the soul.

I am, yours sincerely, in the hope of the Gospel,

Nov. 22, 1860.

W. LAING.

## FROM PORT ELLEN, ENGLAND.

RICHARD HODGSON writes :—I have for a long time lost sight of you, and several times have endeavored to ascertain your whereabouts. Last week I received a number of your Magazine. I am now on one of the islands of the Hebrides. I will readily become a subscriber, if you will inform me how I am to remit the money. I was a subscriber for several years. From a number received nearly two years ago, I noticed you had moved from your former position as regards the universality of the resurrection. I also noticed, you had suffered a good deal from the change, by the desertion of former supporters. This is very, very ungenerous; especially when we consider the battle you have waged with heresy on all sides, and stood in the thickest of the fight. I hope you have still around you a few, at least, of your former staff.

Amid all the changes that have taken place since I last had the pleasure of reading your Monthly, I am very glad to see and know you are still a Bible Examiner. Onward then, though you may be deserted by some. Keep a noble Marshall's eye before you—you are drawing near the goal where is the great prize.

In military language, one might say, you should have been "retiring from service," after having endured the heat and toil of the day; but we have need of you yet; there are still many enemies unsubdued, and our Lord is still absent; and this reminds me, that although our watchword is "onward," we must still be cautious lest we overlook, or misunderstand some of His commands.

Being glad to hear you are still in the field, I shall also be glad to hear and see that you are able and willing to wield your weapons in defence of truth.

I have not seen any thing on the resurrection controversy since that in the EXAMINER of 1850. I was then, and still am inclined to hold the position you then held; but if you can supply us with a few of the back volumes, we may perhaps meet with something that has not yet been presented to us.

I am, yours affectionately.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR.—We are glad to hear from our old friend, from the islands of the seas; and thank him most sincerely for the words of comfort he sends us. We do not design to give place, in the EXAMINER, to words of commendation; yet

there are so many who can and do treat those with neglect, if not contempt, to whom they have been indebted, under God, for the light which has liberated them from the cheerless and horrible doctrine of an immortal soul in eternal sin and suffering, that expressions like those of Mr. Hodgson press on us with such weight, we can hardly refrain from giving our friends, in this country, this sample of a different spirit abroad.

Most gladly would we take a place in the "retired from service" list, if we could feel our Lord and Redeemer would approve such a course. His providence will indicate when our work is done: till then, through His grace, we are resolved to toil on, and fight on; trusting He will never leave nor forsake us, while we cleave to Him, with full purpose to do and suffer His will.

We cannot furnish any one with the EXAMINER back of 1860. We do not think, however, but what the reader may find this loss made up, by our gathering the most valuable portions of past years; together with the advanced state of light and knowledge in the present stage of the controversy. Most seem to have overlooked the fact that Protestant Christendom came out of the Romish Church but a short time since; and however honest the desire to be rid of all the corrupt doctrines and practices of that Church, human nature could not endure a full and complete transition back to the simplicity of primitive Christianity. Religious prejudices are hard to overcome; specially when they have had the Church's sanction for so many long centuries, and have been enforced with such awful terrors as endless tortures, to those who dared to question the infallibility of religious teachers. The change, therefore, must of necessity be slow; nor have we ever thought sudden changes were, on the whole, beneficial. It is useless to tear down an old house, how poor soever it may be, till a new one is provided; or, at least, till full provision is made for its immediate erection. A poor house is better than none. So an imperfect religious theory and practice, is better for the world than no religion at all. We do not mean by this remark to give the least countenance to that eternal "stand still" notion which some have adopted, simply because they are too indolent or too cowardly to advance in knowledge, lest they might have to confess they had been wrong, or might have to take such a course as would disarrange their selfish schemes, and they suf

fer in their purse or reputation. Such "love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil."

We hope we may hear again from the friends in England and Scotland. Is Mr. Dobney alive? It is years since we have heard from him, with the exception of a pamphlet on the Sabbath question, which was very good. Where is Edward White? No tidings have reached us from his pen for many long years. And we might ask after some others, who were once prominent in England: but they know what their course should be; and we pray they may be blessed in doing good in the way they judge best.

---

"PERILOUS TIMES SHALL COME."—PAUL.

"COME, My people, enter thou into thy chambers, and shut thy doors about thee: hide thyself as it were for a little moment, until the indignation be overpast: for, behold the LORD cometh out of His place to punish the inhabitants of the earth for their iniquity: the earth also shall disclose her blood, and no more cover her slain."—Isa. 26: 20, 21.

That the foregoing prophecy will have a fulfillment at some period of this world's history, no believer in the Bible will question. If it be said, "We do not know *when*;" the reply is, So much the more need that we watch and pray, lest the "indignation" overtake us off our guard. That the troubles among the nations, and in *this* nation, indicate the possibility of our being in the vicinity of "the great day of Judgment" on the gentiles, *i. e.*, on the nations to whom the Gospel was sent, after it was rejected by the Jewish nation—which is to close up this age, and bring in the reign of JESUS CHRIST, on "the throne of His father David," no believer ought to question. If, then, there is any ground for such a possibility, how does it become all the people of the Lord to heed the words of prophecy we have quoted above. What we ask of all, is, think of those words—ponder them in thy heart—ask thyself, am I seeking security in God—retiring, as far as possible, from all exciting causes which may lead me to occupy a place or position not within the "chambers" of God's protection? "Indignation" is certainly to come; and God's people are only safe by taking heed to His direction and counsel. Above all things, then, the



higher commotions rise, the more seek to "hide thyself" in close communion with God in Christ. So shalt thou be safe; not otherwise.

---

FROM ELD. R. V. LYON.

I ENCLOSE \$1 for the continuance of your valuable paper. Your views on baptism are not in harmony with the Living Oracles!

I am fully satisfied the wicked will never have life from the dead. For the past six months I have taught this blessed doctrine. I am fully satisfied the penalty of the Law is death—the loss of existence, and not torture. This view of the subject makes the character of God look glorious—Jesus the one altogether lovely, and the chiefest among ten thousand. Glory be to God that He has blessed my feeble labors in propagating His truth. I have had the honor of inducting forty-five willing souls into the Christ, by a burial in the water. Three of them were from the Roman Catholic communion.

I thank the Lord, with all my heart, for the opportunity of meeting you at our Conference, at Seneca Falls, last June, and forming an acquaintance with you. That afternoon and evening which we spent together at Bro. Newman's, has been remembered by me for good.—Amen.

Yours, in much love and esteem,

R. V. LYON, Evangelist.

*Spencerville, C. W.*, Dec. 21, 1860.

---

### THE IMAGE OF THE BEAST.

THE apocalyptic Beast is a unit; it has changed its heads; but as the body, which is continually changing the particles which manifest its substance, retains continuously its identity, so has the Beast maintained its individual identity, although it has possessed seven distinct heads.

Persons who wish to preserve a picture, image, or likeness of themselves, or any of their friends, choose, or prefer to have it taken at the period of their most perfect development. It seems to us this principle was observed by our Heavenly Father in producing the image of the apocalyptic Beast. That is to say, "The Image of the Beast," as developed at the present time, is the likeness of the original Beast in his most

perfect development. That is, when Justinian was the head, surrounded by the Gothic revolutionary, or earth-born horns.

Compare the type of intellect possessed by the present head—Napoleon—with that possessed by Justinian—their theological and political developments; and then compare the revolutionary Italian horns with the Gothic, in their origin, purpose, and design: and you have, in these last, *the image of the first.*

---

G. B. STACY.

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.

---

OBITUARIES.—If these are admitted at all, they must be restricted to a few lines. They are, generally, of local interest; and however interesting to the immediate friends—as they always must be—our narrow limits forbid the insertion of them beyond a few lines.

---

TRUMAN FOX, formerly of South Bend, Ind., “fell asleep” in Jesus, Oct. 3d, 1860, after a most painful sickness of three years continuance, which he bore with a spirit of resignation that honored his Lord and Redeemer. His faith in Jesus, as “the Resurrection and the Life,” was unshaken during his greatest sufferings and in death, which he met with the language of Job—“I know that my Redeemer liveth,” &c. He now sleeps with all the saints who have gone down to the dust, till Jesus comes to awake him “at the last day.”

Nothing disturbs his sleep profound  
Until the last loud trump shall sound.

South Bend, Ind.

ADELIA A. BUGBEE.

---

CALVIN MILLER “fell asleep” in Christ, at Honeoye, N. Y., Dec. 21st, 1860, aged 35 years. He was one of the first to espouse the truth of life only in Christ, and emancipate himself from sectarianism. His decease is a serious loss to the believers in Honeoye. He stood foremost among those who search the Scriptures. He suffered much by his disease for more than a year. He often repeated Scripture aloud, nearly the last of which was Job 19: 25, which was used as the text at his funeral. He leaves a wife and three children to mourn his absence. We expect to see him again in Zion the City of our God.

F. BURR.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

---

"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, HATH NOT LIFE."

---

Vol. 14.

MARCH, 1861.

No. 3.

---

## THE JUDGMENT.

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 instruction.

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 anything like certainty; yet we are not of those who suppose the number has been so great they could not all stand upon the globe at one time, as some have affirmed. For a basis of calculation, we will suppose 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 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 everywhere 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 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; 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 resurrection, 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 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 the 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 completed, 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 a hasty conclusion. 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, 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." Math. 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 con-

clude 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 expression "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"—*etc*—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 carry out the punishment and bestow the reward as found written in the books.

It cannot be denied, we think, but 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 might be enlarged upon 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: 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 their own testimony of themselves is such 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 in obedience thereafter to God, eternal life will be given.

## THE BLOOD OF JESUS CHRIST.

IN our article on the Atonement, published in this Magazine, February, 1860, and since issued in a Tract, we presented what we regard as the true Scripture doctrine on that subject. The "blood of Christ" is set forth in the Bible not only as that by which the atonement is made, but is presented in various aspects in relation to believers: only one of those was brought out distinctly in our view of the atonement. We propose to view that blood in various aspects.

## WE ARE REDEEMED BY IT.

"Ye know that ye were" \*\*\* "redeemed with the precious blood of Christ." 1 Pet. 1: 18, 19. "In whom we have redemption through His blood." Eph. 1: 7, and Col. 1: 14. "Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood." Rev. 5: 9. "The church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood." Acts 20: 28. These texts are sufficient to establish the fact that Jesus Christ *redeemed* us by His blood.

## WE ARE JUSTIFIED BY IT.

"Much more being justified by His blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him." Rom. 5: 9. "Being justified freely by His grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth a propitiation through faith in His blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time, his righteousness: that He might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." Rom. 3: 24-26. Thus it is made plain, the blood of Christ is that through which *justification* comes to believers.

## IT IS THE BLOOD OF THE NEW COVENANT.

That is: it is that which seals, ratifies, or confirms the new Covenant. "This is my blood of the new testament," (or covenant,) "which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Math. 26: 28, and Mark 14: 24. "This cup is the new testament in my blood." 1 Corth. 11: 25. "The blood of the

covenant:" Heb. 10 : 29. "The God of peace, that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the *blood* of the everlasting covenant:" Heb. 13 : 20. "Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and the *blood* of sprinkling:" Heb. 12 : 24.

#### WE ARE MADE NIGH BY IT.

"But now in Christ Jesus ye who were sometimes far off are made nigh by the *blood* of Christ:" Eph. 2 : 13. "Having, therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the *blood* of Jesus:" Heb. 10 : 19. For, saith the apostle, "By His own *blood* He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us:" Heb. 9 : 12. Because Jesus, as our great High Priest, has entered into the holy place we have access by His blood, and may come with boldness to the mercy seat.

#### BY HIS BLOOD WE HAVE PEACE.

"For it pleased the Father that in him should all fullness dwell; and having made peace through the *blood* of the cross to reconcile all things unto himself," \*\*\* "and you, that were sometime alienated and enemies, yet now hath He reconciled in the body of His flesh through death"—i. e., through the shedding of His blood.

#### HIS BLOOD IS THE BOND OF UNION.

"The cup of blessing, which we bless, is it not the communion"—*koinonia*, communion, fellowship, participation—"of the *blood* of Christ?" 1 Corth. 10 : 16. His blood is that which first brings Him into relation to men. Faith in that relationship of the Son of God to us, is essential to our accepting His blood as an atonement or offering for us. Justice demands satisfaction of humanity: the only satisfaction, known in law, is life, or the blood of humanity. Christ by taking on him "flesh and blood" placed himself in direct *union* with us; and being ever without sin, by a voluntary act of submission to death obtained the right to deliver from death all such as should accept Him as their deliverer. Accepting His blood as the first bond of union, and acknowledging He shed that blood not for His own sins but for ours, prepares the way for the second bond of union, viz: "The Spirit of life in Christ Jesus:" Rom. 8 : 2. By the "Spirit of life" believers are "made free from

the law of sin and death." It is thus we are brought into a perfect union with Christ the Life-giver. He must first take on Him our humanity, thus forming a relationship to mortality: then we must take on us His divinity, or divine Spirit, thus forming a relationship to His immortality and endless life. The "blood of Christ" is the first step in the programme of human redemption, or eternal life.

HIS BLOOD SANCTIFIES; OR, MAKETH US ACCEPTABLE.

"For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp: wherefore Jesus also, that He might sanctify the people with his own *blood*, suffered without the gate:" Heb. 13: 11, 12. "For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh: how much more shall the *blood* of Christ, who, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God:" Heb. 9: 13, 14. "Almost all things are by the law purged" (or purified) "with blood; and without shedding of blood there is no remission:" Heb. 9: 22. "Elect" \*\*\* "through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience and sprinkling of the *blood* of Jesus Christ:" 1 Pet. 1: 2. "But if we walk in the light as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the *blood* of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin:" 1 John 1: 7. "I beheld, and lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed in white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb:" \*\*\* "What are these which are arrayed in white robes? and whence came they?" \*\*\* "These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white *in the blood* of the Lamb:" Rev. 7: 9, 13, 14. "Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own *blood*:" Rev. 1: 5.

BY HIS BLOOD THE BELIEVER'S DELIVERANCE FROM DEATH  
IS SECURED.

"Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my *blood* hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day:" \*\*\* "he that eat-

eth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me and I in him :” John 6 : 54, 56. “ Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil ; and deliver them who, through fear of death, were all their life time subject to bondage :” Heb. 2 : 13, 14. “ I heard a loud voice saying in heaven, Now is come salvation, and strength, and the kingdom of our God, and the power of His Christ ; for the accuser of our brethren is cast down, which accuseth them before our God day and night : and they overcame him by the *blood* of the Lamb, and by the word of their testimony ; and they loved not their lives unto the death :” Rev. 12 : 10, 11. Why loved they not their lives unto death ? Because Jesus’ blood, to them, had destroyed the dominion of death.

#### CHRIST’S INSIGNIA IS BLOOD.

That is, He is presented thus, Rev. 19 : 13. “ He was clothed with a vesture *dipped in blood.*” That is the grand insignia, or badge of His victories over sin, death, and all His and his people’s enemies. He is the mighty Conqueror : in His conquest He took blood and shed that blood, so that it remains—when the victory is complete—only as the insignia of all His triumphs ; but it will be eternally His people’s glory that they were “ *redeemed by the blood of the Lamb.*”

#### THE JEWS IMPRICATED THAT BLOOD ON THEMSELVES.

That is, the punishment for shedding it.—When they demanded His death, and Pilate disclaimed a participation in it, they cried out, “ His blood be on us and our children :” Math. 27 : 25. This dreadful imprecation has had an equally dreadful accomplishment, and should be a lasting warning to all who make light of or despise the blood of Christ ; for “ If he, who transgressed the law of Moses died without mercies” \*\*\* “ how much more, think ye, will he receive capital punishment, who hath trodden upon the Son of God and hath accounted the *blood* of His covenant, by which he is sanctified, as the blood of all men,” [*i. e.*, as no more “ innocent”] “ and hath treated the Spirit of grace with contumely ?” *Syriac* of Heb. 10 : 28, 29. Let all take heed to the warning ; and remember that only by the blood of Jesus Christ is there redemption or eternal life for

any of Adam's race. He had "innocent blood:" that gave it its virtue. Despise or neglect it, and you perish, hopelessly: "driven away in your wickedness, but the righteous hath hope in his death:" Prov. 14: 32. "All have sinned," or are accounted as sinners and doomed to die. The second Adam came—took our nature—maintained innocency—ever delighted to do the will of God; thus prepared, He gave his life—his blood—to redeem us from sin and death, and to "bring us to God." He is "the way, the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto God but by" our Lord Jesus Christ.

---

## THE LIFE BY CREATION.

BY ELD. JONATHAN WILSON, THE BIBLEITE.

THE life Adam received by creation, and transmitted to his offspring, cannot be a future life. I will give a few thoughts on the nature of the life man can obtain through Christ the second Adam, and only life-giver.

The law given to Adam in Eden was not to give life to him or any of his race, but to continue that life God had given. His life was to be continued by obedience, and from one generation to another by ordinary generation: the whole creation, human, animal, and inanimate: Gen. 11: 12. This life was a created one alike in human beings and animals: it did not exist before creation, and cannot exist after the present order of creation ceases to be. There is no evidence that God designed it to be eternal life to any of its possessors. Therefore it is called natural life, the life of the flesh, and is the blood: Lev. 17: 11. This life must cease, for "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God:" 1 Corth. 15: 50. This was given to Adam to keep, on condition of obedience; for if he disobeyed, "In dying thou shalt die," (margin). He sinned, and God gave the appointment of death on men, "once to die:" also all living things; "after *this* appointment "the judgment". It was given out in Eden; for it all belonged to Adam as his property, (Heb. 9: 27), and was lost to him by his own act; and all judgment that ever has been executed was since that law of mortality was pronounced on all living.

This appointment is not the penalty of God's law for the sin of Adam's posterity or the animal creation: for they never had sinned. All the penalty of God's law was given to Adam before he disobeyed: but the "appointment once to die," was



to give life and immortality, through the second Adam, to them who believe; for the law was weak and could not give life. Hence Christians and sinners are alike under this appointment or curse; "cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." Christ himself was made a curse for us, by dying on the cross. Christ laid down the life he had from his mother, for He was made of a woman. That life never came up from the dead—He left it in the grave, and rose with a spiritual life, which he received from his Father in heaven when He raised him up from the dead; for He saith, "This day have I begotten thee;" Psa. 2 : 7. Mary, a mortal woman, never gave Christ, her son, an immortal soul or life; but God, his Father did, when He raised him from the dead (Lk. 20 : 33); "neither can they die any more, for they are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection."

The law of God given to Adam and his race knew no resurrection to future life for any of Adam's race; therefore, without redemption by Christ, all creation must have lost existence. God's veracity was as much pledged to carry out His law-penalty as to reward obedience. Christ, by His obedience, death and resurrection, has so magnified God's law, that God can be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus : Rom. 3 : 26.

Secondly. Through His blood, Christ obtained a right to give eternal life to as many as his Father had given him. John 17 : 2. The condition of redemption, John 3 : 36, is, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life; he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." This same chapter, from verse 14 to 22, confirms the truth, that repentance and faith are the conditions on which life is bestowed. Our Lord has opened the way of salvation so that such as comply with the conditions shall have future life; otherwise the law of sin and death remains in full force on us, as much as if no atonement had ever been made : John 3 : 18.

Many of my friends are grieved with me because I do not believe those who die without repentance, and faith in Christ for redemption, will ever have a resurrection into a future life, nor die a second time. Now, if any one will show me a law, which God has given to Adam or his posterity, having a penalty of *two* deaths, or to die *twice* for its transgression, they shall have the honor of converting me out of what they call a great error. But they must give me positive Scripture testimony, as I do not build my Gospel faith on parable, inferences, nor spiritualizing the Bible to make it harmonize with some of the preconceived traditions of men. I must have a positive "Thus saith the Lord" to build my faith upon.

The following will show a part of the truth which confirms me in what some suppose to be my great error. Let us look

again at the conditions of future life. John 3 : 36. "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." Again : "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish but have everlasting life : " John 3 : 14 to 20.

The word *perish* is applied to the unbelieving wicked fifty times in the Bible, and not once is future life mentioned for those who die in their sins. John 10th, Jesus saith to the Jews, "Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life." Will He give them life notwithstanding ?

We will now look for the revival into life of the wicked, and their second death. It must be on record, either past or to come, if the doctrine is true. First : At the flood all the living world died except what was in the ark. Were there any resurrected ones there ? No. Then no second dying occurred at that time. Next, Sodom and Gomorrah. Paul says they suffered for every transgression. Were there any wicked dead there ? Certainly not.

Next, at the end of the Jewish dispensation, at the opening of the Gospel, Christ commissioned His apostles to say, "God now commandeth all men everywhere, to repent ; because He hath appointed a day in which He will judge the world in righteousness," &c. Acts 17 : 30, 31. Paul says, *Wrath* came on the Jews "to the uttermost ;" and Jesus had said, "All the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zacharias, whom ye slew \*\*\* shall come on this generation ;" Math. 23 : 35, 36. But there was no revival into life of the wicked dead to share that "uttermost wrath." See 1 Thess. 2 : 14 to 16 ; 2 Tim. 4 : 1. This last text, it is agreed by all N. T. writers, relates to Christ's second coming : then He will judge the quick and the dead. Here we must find the revival into life of the wicked dead, if anywhere ; for here they are judged. We will look at the order of the judgment. 1 Corth. 15 : 21 to 24, "Since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead : for as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Paul says, "If any man be in Christ he is a new creature ;" 2 Corth. 5 : 17 ; such will be made alive ; but every man in his own order ; Christ the first-fruits, afterward *they* that are Christ's at his coming : then the end, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to the Father." Here, then, He gives the "reward to his saints and to his servants the prophets." Rev. 11 : 15-18.

Again : Paul saith to Timothy, God hath appointed a day when He will judge the quick and the dead by the man Christ Jesus. This is the same day ; for it is at His coming and kingdom. Here He executes his first death on all his enemies : and, according to Malachi, destroys them all, root and branch.

At the same time the prophets and saints get their reward the living wicked get their wages, which is everlasting destruction—root and branch—from the presence of the Lord. This is all the penalty of God's law to man, without adding or diminishing. Now, here the wicked dead are judged; but not a word is said about their dying *twice*, or a *second* execution. We must suppose this was the most likely time to execute such a death, if ever. We must suppose, therefore, the judgment of the dead wicked was to acquiesce in their former execution, which would bring the living and dead wicked to the same end, *viz*: total destruction; thus He has made by this execution a clean sweep of all the wicked from the earth; and from this execution there is never to be a revival into life. "They are dead, they shall not live; they are deceased, they shall not rise." Such a death is called the second death; not because they were ever revived from death, but because they lie eternally under the dominion of death, while the saints live again from their death; "death hath dominion no more over" them. The idea of *twice* dying is not found in the Scriptures, that I can find; such an idea I have searched for in vain.

From history, we find the Pope took the immortal soul theory of Socrates and Plato to finish up his creed: then a resurrection *body* to put with it, which Socrates never had in his theory: then the Pope took John's mention of death and applied it to a second dying of the wicked. How scientific his plan is! for now, they can go to heaven or hell when they die; then to revival into life again: then a review of God's previous judgment to be certain they were located right; then the wicked are to die again a "death that never dies," and the righteous to live a life that never lives! And all this, "beyond the bounds of time and space."

From eighteen years' study of the Bible and history, I have become convinced seven-eighths of all the errors in theology, have originated in the adoption, by the churches, of heathen idolatry, *viz*: Socrates' and Plato's notions of an immortal soul in man. See Rollins' History, page 393. Among other branches from the same old heathen root, the reliving and dying a second time of all the wicked has grown up: and if I had not, myself, and other good brethren, made an honest mistake—supposing it to grow from another root—and cut off the top of it, the punishment after the resurrection would have been as long as the immortal-soul system makes it; for they must be raised with a spiritual life, because no other resurrection can be by law or Gospel. Now, candid reader, please read the 49th Psalm before you pass judgment that my position is not truth.

JONATHAN WILSON, the old Bibleite.

Written at Honeoye, N. Y., Oct. 6th, 1860.

## WHAT IS THE TRUE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISM?

1. BAPTISM, as administered by John, was in water. "I indeed baptize with *water*."

2. All that the people knew of baptism, when Jesus commissioned his apostles to preach the Gospel and baptize believers, was that which John had taught them by word and practice. Hence, they knew of no element in which baptism could be performed but water.

3. As Jesus did not command his apostles to administer baptism in any other element than water, it follows that baptism in water was commanded in the commission which He gave to his apostles.

4. It is evident from the incidental mention of the practice that obtained in the church subsequent to the day of Pentecost, that the apostles and first Christians understood water baptism to be commanded. Hence the eunuch said, "See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?" Peter asked, "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized?" Paul baptized "Crispus, the chief ruler of the Synagogue" in Corinth, Gaius, his host, and the household of Stephanas. Ananias said, brother Saul, "why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins." And Paul puts the pertinent question to the Corinthians: "Is the Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? or were ye *baptized* in the name of Paul?" These incidental allusions prove Paul, as well as all the Jewish apostles, understood baptism with water to be a part of their commission.

5. Although it may be admitted that Peter, and his associates, being uneducated men, were subject to many of their Jewish prejudices subsequent to their conversion, and the reception of their commission; the same cannot be predicated of Paul, who was a special ambassador to the Gentiles, and endowed with special qualifications for the performance of his mission.

6. The qualifications with which Paul was endowed, were equal to the work which was assigned him.

7. It would be to assume the possession of higher qualifications than Paul possessed, if we undertake to affirm that Paul erred, either in teaching or practice, or that his qualifications to teach were progressively acquired, and not received.

8. From which considerations it is evident, that whatever Paul taught as Christian doctrine, or practice, he taught authori-

tatively, and therefore his teaching is the highest authority, or the court of last appeal.

9. We have seen that he taught and practiced water baptism, and laid it down as one of the foundation principles. Therefore, water baptism is a Christian institution.

But here arises the question, What is, or what constitutes baptism?

We have seen that John baptized with, or in water. He taught that Jesus would baptize with, or in the Holy Spirit, and with, or in fire. And Paul taught that Christians were baptized into Jesus the Christ, into his death, and into the Christ's body. While Jesus taught that His death was his own baptism. What then is the radical import of baptism? If there be so many things with, or in which it can be performed or administered, what is the precise idea it expresses?

Although it is admitted that the dominant meaning of the word is dip, immerse, submerge, the examples recorded of the baptisms of the Holy Spirit do not fully sustain that as the meaning of the word when used in relation to Christianity. They speak of the Spirit filling the house where the disciples were sitting—of its falling upon them—and its being poured out upon them—and of the invariable results, or effects of the baptism of the Holy Spirit being that the persons baptized with it were "*filled with the Holy Spirit.*"

Again: The death of the Christ, as the representative of baptism, does not justify *dip*, as its dominant meaning. As a burial, it does not justify the sense of dip. For if you simply dip the body in the grave it would not be buried: to be buried, the grave must be filled by a similar process as that by which the Spirit filled the room where the disciples were sitting on the day of Pentecost. The dirt is poured into the grave, and it falls upon the person buried.

Baptism into Jesus the Christ is, no doubt, the same as baptism into the one body. "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body; so also is the Christ." The *into* accomplished by this baptism, is elsewhere called a *planting*, and also an *engrafting*. Now, whilst a scion is dipped into the earth, it is not buried under it; but still it is so perfectly planted into the soil as to become absolutely subject to the laws which govern the soil into which it is planted. In like manner the scion which is cut from one stock and grafted into another, is not absolutely buried into the stock into which it is grafted; but is inserted within its bark, and so adjusted that the life of the stock may flow into it and nourish it, and bring it into jurisdiction to the laws which obtain in the stock itself. Thus a member of the body is not absolutely buried in the body, but its

relations are so intimate as to constitute it a part of the body, affording the life of the body jurisdiction over it, and in it.

To be baptized into death, is to be introduced into the absolute jurisdiction of death. That death may dominate in you, as the life of the body dominates in its members, or as the life of the stock dominates in the scion that has been engrafted into it; or as the life of the soil dominates in the tree that has been planted into its bosom. Thus death held absolute jurisdiction over Jesus, until the Father by "the exceeding greatness of his power" raised him up again. Hence his death was his baptism truly. It gave death the dominion, or jurisdiction over him.

We conclude, then, from the entire premises, that baptism requires such a subjection of the subject to that into which he is baptized, that he becomes absolutely under the jurisdiction of its laws.

Thus, he that is baptized into death, becomes absolutely under the jurisdiction of death.

He that is baptized with the Spirit, is filled with the Spirit—quicken by the Spirit—and led, or governed by the Spirit.

He that is baptized into Jesus the Christ, becomes *absolutely subject to the jurisdiction of the Christ as his living head.*

And, He that is baptized into "the one body," becomes *absolutely subject to the jurisdiction of the Spirit of the body.*

We affirm that this is the purpose and design of baptism—*its doctrinal import*, no matter when administered, or what the element into which it is performed—*its object is to subject the subject to the absolute jurisdiction of that into which they are baptized.* Hence there is more than ONE BAPTISM taught in the Christian Scriptures. John's was the baptism of repentance—that is, for the purpose of subjecting his disciples to repentance, or the confession of their sins. Water baptism as practiced by Christians is the form, or mold of the Christian doctrine—the figure, or likeness of death. It is for the purpose of expressing a voluntary submission to the sentence of death. Hence Paul says, "*We are buried with him by baptism into death.*" That as Jesus was subjected to the absolute jurisdiction of death, when he submitted to *what He termed his baptism*; so believers voluntarily confess the absolute jurisdiction of death over them when they submit to its image, likeness, or form; even as the article dyed takes on the color into which it is dipped, so the believer voluntarily submits to the absolute jurisdiction of death, when he conforms to its image in baptism.

Let us examine the argument of Paul to the Romans as illustrative of this view of the subject. We commence with his statement of the general proposition that, "While we were yet

sinner, the Christ died for us. \*\*\*\* For if when we were enemies we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, *we shall be saved by His life*; and not only so, but we also joy in God, through our Lord Jesus the Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement." Here the apostle affirms that the death of Jesus on our account, removed the sentence or condemnation of the law recorded against us. Hence, our reconciliation to God the Father followed of necessity. The estrangement had resulted from the intervention of the sentence, or condemnation of the law. When, then, "he bare the condemnation of our sins in his own body," and was "wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities, and the chastisement of our peace (or reconciliation) was laid upon Him, that by his stripes we might be healed," or reconciled to God. Because by so doing He took the condemning power—namely, the law—out of the way, "nailing it to his cross," and became its consummation "for righteousness to every one that believeth."

But this reconciliation, or removal of the sentence of death, did not in itself impart life to the reconciled. It was simply the divesting the law, as their jailor, of his legitimate right and power to restrain them of their liberty, or life; but did not impart life to them. Hence, he says, "Much more being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life." For "as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation: even so by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men to *justification of life*," that we might "reign through righteousness, unto eternal life, by Jesus the Christ our Lord." Hence, His death was the reconciliation, or atonement for our sins, accomplished on the cross. His investment with life, as "The resurrection and the Life," was accomplished at the right hand of the Majesty on High. This Peter affirms in the following words—"Therefore, being by the right hand of God exalted, *and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost*, he hath shed forth this which you now see and hear."

Now, the apostle argues from this, "Shall we continue (to transgress), that grace (or favor) may abound? God forbid. How shall we that are dead (to transgression, or to the law, by the body of the Christ) live any longer therein? Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus the Christ, were baptized into his death:" as though he apprehended that they were under the impression, that they could be introduced into the enjoyment of the immunities of the redeemed, without submitting to the necessary requirements. Or as he had said, you claim to have been baptized into the Christ, and to possess the immunities of the redeemed. Have you forgotten that the only way open to the attainment of this position, or relation and its

immunities lies through a baptism into his death? Our baptism in water is a public confession of our faith in Jesus as the Redeemer, and of our faith in his death as the atoning sacrifice by which the sentence of the law is blotted out from against those whose confidence leads them into *conformity to the image of his death*; as expressed in water baptism. It is the symbol by which we manifest our voluntary desire to accept the consummation of the sentence in, and upon ourselves. The apostle had already affirmed, that the sentence—death—had *passed* upon all men. Hence, no man can redeem, or deliver his brother, or give to God a ransom for his own life; consequently the whole race of Adam are dead; that is, the sentence is not only *come upon them*, but is in process of execution. When, then, the apostle affirms they were baptized into the Christ's death, we understand him to affirm, they desired the sentence to be consummated upon themselves. Hence, they voluntarily conformed to the image of his death, that they might thus publicly crucify the old man, with his affections and lusts, and "reckon themselves to be dead indeed unto transgression." Hence, he proceeds, "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death, that like as the Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Thus he affirms, the motive for being buried by baptism into the consummation of the sentence upon ourselves is, that "like as the Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life;" and affirms still further, in the next proposition, that their "newness of life," or their likeness to the Christ's resurrection, was dependent upon their being planted into the likeness of the Christ's death; that is, the one was dependent upon the other; and not one and the same thing. His language is, "For, (or because) *if we have been planted together* in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection; knowing this, that" (by our baptism into death) "our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead, is freed from sin. Now, if we be dead with the Christ," that is, if we have intelligently been baptized for the purpose of being dead to the law, and freed from the service of transgression, that we might occupy the same relation to the law that Jesus who has endured its sentence does, or rather that henceforth we may only act in relation to the law as the members of his risen body—*triumphant over its jurisdiction*; if this be the purpose for which we have been baptized into "the likeness of his death," then "we believe that we shall also live with him: knowing that the Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him. For



in that He died he died unto sin, (or transgression) once; but in that he liveth he liveth unto God." Now follows the conclusion of his argument in relation to baptism. He had commenced it with the strongly put question, "What, know ye not, (or have you forgotten), that so many of us as were baptized into the Christ, were baptized into his death?" And, therefore, after he had argued the point, his conclusion is,— "Likewise, (or in like manner, as the Christ 'died unto sin once,' and hath been raised from the dead, and therefore 'dieth no more,' for that death 'hath no more dominion over him,') reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through our Lord Jesus the Christ. Let not sin therefore, reign in your mortal bodies," &c.

If language has any definite meaning, the apostle certainly speaks of two distinct baptisms in this argument. The one being performed *into the likeness of His death*, and the other, *into the Christ as our life*. And that the baptism into the Christ can only be performed on those who have intelligently been baptized into the likeness of His death.

Whilst, however, we are compelled to recognize these as distinct baptisms; perhaps it would be better to say, that baptism presents itself to us in two distinct phases, one of which is obligatory upon us, and the other, performed upon us by the Lord himself; and that because we have "obeyed from the heart, the form of doctrine" presented in the first; and which was commanded as personally obligatory upon all believers.

In conclusion we affirm, that baptism into Jesus the Christ is the same as that called, the baptism into the one body; and, therefore, as the baptism into the one body is performed by the Lord—the Spirit—it is what John and Jesus call *the baptism of the Holy Spirit*; and is that by which persons are inducted into the enjoyment of the immunities of the new covenant.

I would beg all to think more closely and define their terms more precisely, and give to every member of the Scripture propositions their proper weight and influence. And when they undertake to report either the doctrine or transactions of the apostles, they will be under no necessity to mutilate the testimony, as a recent writer has done, who undertakes to report what Peter answered to the conscience-stricken Jews, who inquired of him what they must do. The writer in question, quotes the following, and marks it as one unbroken quotation: "Repent and be baptized *every one of you into the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins*. Then they that *gladly received His word were baptized*." Then remarks, "This is the way Christ commissioned Peter to remit sins."

Now, compare this with the passage as it reads, and we have

postponed to the distant future also. Hence, many of them remain active politicians, and aspirants to the offices and honors in the gift of their fellows. Their right to accumulate houses, lands, and other wealth, *and appropriate it to their posterity remains unquestioned*; their disposition to indulge their fleshly appetites in eating, drinking, and wearing apparel is undisturbed; and the only change observable is their progress in the knowledge of their theory. They glory in being able to silence all the arguments advanced in support of the popular theories of the day, and denounce all as out of the pale of salvation who do not believe as themselves; consoling and comforting their own hearts with the pleasing assurance, We are the people of the Lord, the people of the Lord are we. Forgetting that, "*knowledge puffeth up, but charity buildeth up.*"

---

### A CONTRAST.

IN these days of malignant animadversion, we need to treasure up every instance of charitable criticism, as a safeguard against the temptation, that we not unfrequently have, to believe modern orthodoxy is but another name for the blindest bigotry.

A refreshing example of Christian courtesy is set by Dr. THOMSON, the new Editor of the *Christian Advocate and Journal*, in the first issue for 1861. The article is headed, "The Great Preparation," in reference to the new work of Dr. CUMMING. After some friendly remarks concerning Dr. C., followed by a few not illiberal observations on "Millerism," he goes on to say:—

"We are inclined to the opinion that the Millenarians commit the same mistake concerning Christ's second coming that the Jews did concerning his first; that is, they interpret prophecies literally which are to be taken figuratively. *Still as we have never investigated the subject thoroughly, we are not disposed to treat carelessly those who think differently; and least of all such modest and master minds as Dr. Cumming.*

"We commend his work to attention. It must be read with interest by the Christian; it will convince him that the world is making rapid progress in the right direction, and that the truth must soon obtain a universal diffusion, although it may fail to convince him that the great consummation is so near at hand as 1867.

"Whether it be near or remote can make but little difference as to our themes or our duties. We are to preach Christ crucified as the sinner's hope, and the means by which His universal reign shall be brought about.

Whether He come at midnight or at the cock-crowing, or at noon, let us be found so doing. In this respect we believe Dr. Cumming is a bright example. His doubtful speculations are held in abeyance in his pulpit ministrations."

Let us now turn to Dr. Thomson's predecessor in the editorial chair, and we shall observe a marked contrast. In the issue dated Jan. 26th, 1860, ABEL STEVENS, L. L. D., belches forth the following dose of grape and canister in an article entitled "Prophets in England."

"No novel has one-fourth of the run which these prophetic romances obtain; and the particular public for which they are written, *consisting of the weak and excitable portion of the community*, that portion among whom all *quacks*, mesmeric, homeopathic, phrenological, etc., no less than prophetic, reap their harvest, *caring only to have something new and strange to believe and dream about*, are content to receive prediction after prediction, never seeming to take notice how many have been falsified, or how inconsistent the new are with the old. The man who does the largest business in the prophetic line, and makes the most lucrative market out of it, is Dr. Cumming. He *trudcs systematically*, and has done for many years, on *the enthusiasm* of his readers"

We quote this merely as a specimen; no more is needed to show the difference between the two Editors. The italics in the above extracts are our own.

JOS. T. CURRY.

## NAPOLEON AND THE POPE.

It is well known our view has been that a *personal* Anti-christ will likely be revealed before the literal return of Jesus Christ to take "the throne of His father David," which the LORD God hath promised to Him. We made the suggestion two years ago, in our pamphlet entitled, "*The European War*," that Napoleon III. might be developed as that opposing power; and though we have not thought best to multiply words on the topic, our eye has constantly been looking in that direction; and as the Papal power has gone its downward course, till it is well nigh dead, we have not failed to mark the indications in France of the coming up of the "beast from the bottomless pit," which having used the Papacy for his own aggrandisement shall, at length, supplant it and become the Imperial Pope, or

real Antichrist. That event, if consummated—as we are inclined to believe it will be—cannot be far distant. The *London Christian World*, of November last, has an article, which because of its bearing on this subject, we place before our readers. It is as follows:—

“We are daily watching with deep solicitude the development of the imperial policy with regard to the head of the Roman Catholic church. What that policy really is, probably no human being knows but the mystery of the Tuilleries himself. That extraordinary personage keeps his designs to himself, but their character is gradually unfolded by facts, and it is with these facts that Europe has to deal. We have long had the impression that Louis Napoleon’s support of the Pope by French troops in Rome—a support which he has rendered now for twelve years, that is, ever since he overthrew the Roman Republic of 1848—is out of no love either for Pope or Popery, but that, in the first instance, it was to secure the aid of the clergy in consolidating his scheme of empire, and that now it is continued as a mere blind until the auspicious moment arrives for appropriating to himself the religious supremacy which Popes have exercised for a thousand years.

“Let not our readers be startled. Again and again we have warned them to avoid the error of imagining that the fall of Popery, as a temporal power, is the immediate antecedent to the diffusion of a purer type of Christianity among continental nations. If they believe this, the event will disappoint them. We should like to believe this, but our interpretation of Scripture forbids. Popery will not be immediately succeeded by Christianity, but it will fall before, and be merged in a great infidel power, whose daring impiety, blasphemy, and tyranny will far exceed everything of the kind witnessed by Europe, even in the most dismal days of Papal might and majesty. As surely as we write these words a dark cloud hangs over Europe; and while we fully sympathize with all who rejoice in the fall of Popery, we cannot conceal the settled conviction that its fall is the signal for the appearance of something immeasurably more terrible than itself. That the continuance of the tremendous visitation will be but brief it is consolatory to believe, but during its short period of existence, its work in the world will be very awful. We do not prophesy, but we read inspired prophets and believe what they say; hence the earnestness and certainty with which we speak in outline on this intensely interesting subject. Nor do we say that the long era of apostasy, from the sublime and holy faith of the apostolic age, will reach its terrible crisis in the man Louis Napoleon, constituting him the personal Antichrist so distinctly set before us by the

prophets of both Testaments ; but every thing in his history—his connection with France, the resurrection of the empire by his skill, his nominal protection of the Pope, while he allows his temporal authority to pass from his hands, his extraordinary reserve, and his insatiable ambition to become the greatest monarch of the world—fixes our thoughts upon him as *possibly* the Pope-Emperor, whose character, career, and destiny are stated with such terrible fidelity in the book of truth. Ever since he ascended the throne of France we have expected something out of the ordinary course of royalty, and especially something in connection with the decay of Popery in its secular aspects, which would most surely arrest the attention of mankind : and ever since his war with Austria, when he knocked that prop from beneath the chair of St. Peter, we have looked for some fresh evidence of the correctness of our impression that Louis Napoleon will not long suffer ecclesiastical supremacy to remain in any other hands than his own, so far as France is concerned. Doubtless his intention is to begin with France ; and when he finds himself fully recognized as spiritual lord of the French people, the way will be cleared for further action until the giddy point of his ambition be reached, and his highest aspiration be crowned with success.

“ It is well known that Louis Napoleon uses the press as never monarch did before, for the purpose of carrying out his plans. An anonymous pamphlet makes its appearance, suggesting some line of policy which, in the interests of France, the government of that country would do well to adopt. The thing is new and startling ; people talk about it ; and as political discussion is not permitted in the newspapers, the pamphlet immediately obtains a wide circulation. A day or two after its publication, a paragraph appears in the official journal disavowing all knowledge of the pamphlet on the part of the government, and generally denying that it has any sympathy with the views of the writer. This only whets the public appetite to peruse the production, and thus the people become familiarized with the idea—the very result contemplated and desired by the Emperor ; and when that result is obtained, he quietly does the thing suggested by the nameless pamphleteer. Well, there has just issued from the Paris press a pamphlet with the title—*LE POPE EMPEREUR*—in which the writer proposes the union of the political and religious sovereignties in the hand of Napoleon III. Although, as we have said, we really anticipated something of this kind, its actual occurrence has deepened our conviction that we are on the eve of a crisis unparalleled in the history of the world. Only one thing was wanting for a day or two to convince us, that the suggestion pointed to a predetermined reality. That one thing speedily

came—a semi-official denial that the government entertained the views of the pamphleteer. Let wise men, therefore, keep their eyes open. Our vigilance will not change the course of events, but it may profitably instruct us in the signs of the times.”

---

### LIFE FROM THE DEAD.

WE find an effort by one of our exchanges to do away the force of Isa. 26 : 14, as proof that some of the wicked dead will never live again. The writer swings over a wide field to bring help to his theory, but carefully avoids the Prophet's contrast in the same chapter. That contrast blows his whole exposition to the winds. The writer's effort is to make it appear Isaiah is speaking of the wicked dead who are raised a thousand years after the righteous and killed a second time. Then it is—according to his theory—it will be said, “They are dead, they shall not live ; they are deceased, they shall not rise,” &c. But the Prophet adds, in the same chapter, 19th verse, “Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise : awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust,” &c. Thus it is as clear as a sunbeam, when it said of the wicked, “They are dead, they shall not live ; they are deceased, they shall not rise,” it is spoken of them *before* the righteous are raised, and not a thousand years *after*, as this writer assumes. It is clearly before the resurrection of either class. The subject is presented by a clear contrast : thus—

*Verse 14, of the Wicked.*

“They are dead, they shall not live: they are deceased, they shall not rise. Thou hast visited and destroyed them, and made all their memory to perish.”

*Verse 19, of the Righteous.*

“Thy dead men shall live; together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out her dead.”

To our mind, no fact is clearer, both the righteous and wicked were in the state of death, when it was said of the wicked, “They are dead, they shall not live,” &c. : to teach otherwise, is to destroy the Prophet's contrast, and leave it without force. An event was spoken of that was future, viz : THE RESURRECTION. In that event, he saith explicitly, one class “shall not” have

part, and the other *shall*. We regard the case too plain to need many words to a mind willing to know the truth.

According to this writer's own showing, the wicked dead are not raised "in that day" in which the "song is sung in the land of Judah;" because he represents it as sung "in the day" of which Paul speaks, "at the last trump," when the saints are raised; while he places the text Isa. 26: 14 at a period after, of more than a thousand years! The song, in fact, by his own showing, is sung during the thousand years, and therefore excludes entirely his idea of the wicked having any resurrection at all; for in "that day," it is unqualifiedly affirmed, "they shall not rise: Thou hast visited and destroyed them, and made all their memory to perish." They are clearly excluded from any part in the revival into life.

---

### THE BIBLE OUR CREED.

SOME have shown a disposition to question the correctness of positions we have taken, because, say they, "Eminent men, and the fathers in early times held and practiced differently."

We happen to be of those who think *the Bible* is to settle all controversies about "faith and practice." That which cannot be clearly proved by the Scriptures, may be tolerated, but is no authority, nor a test of Christian faith or character. We are satisfied all the heresies and false practices that have scourged the Church from its earliest history, have grown out of a disposition to follow men instead of following the unadulterated word of God. In this matter we harmonize with the sentiment of Dr. ADAM CLARKE, in his Commentary on Prov. 8. He says—

"But of these"—the Fathers—"we may safely state, there is not a *truth* in the most orthodox creed, that cannot be proved by their authority; nor a *heresy* that has disgraced the Romish Church, that may not challenge them as its abettors. In points of *doctrine* their authority is nothing with me. The WORD OF GOD *alone* contains my creed.

Such is precisely the position we have occupied for twenty years past. None need wonder if other arguments sent us on any topic of Bible truth, are laid aside as out of place in controversies as to what the Bible teaches. Give us the words of God.

DR. J. F. LEE, North Carolina, writes :—

I am indeed much pleased with the communication in the February No. of the EXAMINER, and hope it may prove as effectual in convincing many of the fallacies of their notions as what has hitherto been written on the same subject.

But I have some reason to fear this hope will not be realized. It is not necessary to assign the reason of this fear, any farther than to say, I doubt very much whether it is possible to advance any arguments more weighty, cogent, or conclusive, than those which have appeared already in the EXAMINER. And this impression with me is abiding, the same *now*, that it was twelve or fourteen years ago, when I first read your Six Sermons. Yet some may read the Feb. No. of this year who have never read your writings, and be led to believe the truth.

I think it is not possible to estimate the value of the EXAMINER in dollars and cents. As a mathematician, I can easily enumerate from millions to vigesillions or centecissions, but I cannot estimate the value of two pieces that appeared in the Examiner for 1860, to say nothing of the value of the whole.

---

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR.—Will the friends of the EXAMINER make a renewed effort to increase its circulation? We need not say *why* we ask this. Will they also help to circulate the Books and Pamphlets in our Catalogue? “A word to the wise” is enough.

---

THE LORD'S SUPPER.—“The Jews concluded their passover by giving to every person a piece of bread and a cup of wine; so Christ, though He set aside, as the nature of his office required, the right enjoined by Moses in that ordinance which He had been commemorating, yet retained the bread and cup added by the Jews.”—Dr. EADIE'S *Biblical Cy.*, p. 355.

---

BAPTISM.—“Tertullian distinguishes the essential characteristics of the two baptisms” (John's and Christ's) “in their spirit and nature. To that of John, he ascribes the *negative character of repentance*; and to the Christian, the *positive impartation of new life* (*De Bapt.* x. ii. ;) a distinction which arises out of the relation of *law* and *gospel*, and is given in the words of the Baptist himself, that he baptizes with water and unto repentance; while the greater One, who was to come after him, would baptize with the Holy Ghost.”—*Cy. of Bib. Lit.*, by DR. KIRTO.



## DARE TO BE RIGHT.

BY GEORGE LANSING TAYLOR.

DARE to be right ! dare to be true !  
 You have a work that no other can do.  
 Do it so bravely, so kindly, so well,  
 As to gladden all heaven and silence all hell.

Dare to be right ! dare to be true !  
 Cowards and quidnuncs dread everything new,  
 If you can't stand at your post in a storm,  
 How can you fight in the ranks of reform ?

Dare to be right ! dare to be true !  
 Foes may be many, and friends may be few ;  
 Truth and her champions oft stand alone,  
 What's a man good for without a back-bone ?

Dare to be right ! dare to be true !  
 Other men's failures can never save you ;  
 Stand by your conscience, your honor, your faith,  
 Stand like a hero and battle till death.

Dare to be right ! dare to be true !  
 Keep the great Judgment-seat always in view ;  
 Look at your work as you'll look at it then,  
 Scanned by Jehovah, and angels, and men.

Dare to be right ! dare to be true !  
 Love may deny you its sunshine and dew.  
 Let the dew fall, for then showers shall be given ;  
 Dew is from earth, but the showers are from heaven.

Dare to be right ! dare to be true !  
 God, who created you, cares for you too ;  
 Bottles the tears that His striving ones shed,  
 Counts and protects every hair of your head.

Dare to be right ! dare to be true !  
 Can not Omnipotence carry you through ?  
 City, and mansion, and throne all in sight,  
 Can you not dare to be true and be right ?

Dare to be right ! dare to be true !  
 The sun may burn red, and the planets burn blue ;  
 God may toss back the systems to chaos again,  
 But his promise forever is yea and amen.

Dare to be right ! dare to be true !  
 Prayerfully, lovingly, firmly pursue  
 The pathway by saints and by seraphim trod,  
 The pathway that climbs to the City of God.

*New York, June, 1860.*

*Ch. Ad. and Journal.*

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

---

"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, HATH NOT LIFE."

---

Vol. 14.

APRIL, 1861.

No. 4.

---

## "ANNIHILATION."—THE METHODIST QUARTERLY.

A REVIEW, BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

The Methodist Quarterly for January, 1861, has an article headed "Annihilation," from the pen of Rev. W. W. PATTON, Chicago, Ill. We think there are indications of peril to the "great image" of Ecclesiasticism; that an all-wise Providence holds in hand "a stone" that shall yet smite it into fragments, preparatory to the development of the true Church of God. That stone is called in the theological tongue "*Annihilation.*"

One fact is of some interest,—the change of tone that is rapidly taking place on this subject. Our opponents are beginning to feel the power of Scripture argument, and their defiant flag, (to use a maritime figure,) which yesterday was nailed to the mast-head, to-day is bent to the halliards of expediency; and the morrow will see it lowered to the deck. A few years ago the mere mention of the doctrine of destruction called forth expressions of derision and contempt; now our leading periodicals treat it as an enemy to be feared; the future will witness its triumph.

The article that we have mentioned is a straw which shows the direction of the wind. Its author uses not the contemptuous language of Mattison, Landis, and Stevens. Probably he is not so deficient in Christian charity. However that may be, we cheerfully accord him the credit of being candid and friendly. But in our estimate of his production we shall forget his personality; we regard his article as the voice of the Methodist

E. Church. As such it is significant of the change to which we have alluded. Let it be clearly understood that the M. E. Church has shifted her position, with reference to this question, since Dr. Stevens perpetrated his last slander.

But let us present the contrast in the words of the writers. Prof. Mattison, at the close of his discussion with GEORGE STONKS, impudently told him, that he and his "fellow annihilationists" did not belong to the "Christian public." When the mantle of Methodism was thrown around Landis by the officials of that church, their issue of his work was heralded to the world by Dr. Stevens in a lengthy editorial; and among other spicy sentences were the following:—

"The Church is especially obligated to guard the unlearned against *the craft and cunning of those who would lead them astray.*" "The class of religious teachers against whom the author directs his arguments, are found partly within and partly beyond the pale of the Evangelical Church, and though claiming to be Christians and believers in the Bible, they array themselves against the commonly received and Scriptural doctrine of the immortality of the soul." "But since the *carnal mind* is always ready to seize upon whatever *opposes the Gospel*, and *promises impunity for sin*, it is not strange that even this crude dogma is sometimes used to *lull the guilty soul into a false security* against future judgment."

On the other hand, Mr. Patton declares the persons who receive this theory "may be Christians at heart." He countenances their "recognition as *evangelical* Christians," providing they treat "Universalism as fundamental heresy." He says, Annihilationism and Universalism "are widely dissimilar; *the former allowing the grand doctrines of evangelical religion*, and even of rigid Calvinism, and *giving a testimony, fearful to many minds, against the fatal consequence of persisting in sin*; and the other being at war in theory and influence with the whole scheme of Christianity." Prof. Mattison branded "the former" "worse than Universalian doctrine." Brother Reformers, are we not gaining ground?

With regard to our treatment of Universalism, we "make haste" to assure Mr. P. that *any* system based on the doctrine of man's inherent immortality is regarded by us "as fundamental heresy."

We now propose to notice as briefly as we can with justice to ourselves, the salient parts of the article. Our author assumes the soul-entity at the outstart, and builds his argument upon it. He thus describes the position of his opponents:—

"The position assumed is, that immortality is not a characteristic of the soul as such, but a gift of God to the righteous alone, which was forfeited in the fall and is restored in Christ." \*\*\* "When we

say that the body dies, we are supposed to mean that it ceases to be ; and hence it is argued that when God says, 'The soul that sinneth it shall die,' he must mean that such a soul shall no longer exist."

The incorrectness of this description is seen at a glance. He makes two blunders. First, in saddling his darling assumption upon us. After all our declarations of the unity of man, we are introduced as arguing from his duality. Secondly, in charging us with such stultiloquy as the following :—

"When the body dies it ceases to exist."

We would inform Mr. P. "that when God says, 'The soul that sinneth it shall die,'" we believe the meaning is, The person that sinneth shall die. Divide man into parts as you will, nothing less than the *whole man* will make a soul. "Man became a living soul." Gen. 2 : 7. Once for all, we affirm the *unity* of man. He is a living soul—a living creature—a living animal, and will die as hopelessly as any other animal, unless he becomes possessed of a new life principle. Whosoever would be saved from endless death, must come to Christ for life, be partaker of the divine nature ; be born of the Spirit, by which he will be quickened "at the last day." John 6 ch.

Our author begins his argument by raising "the question whether Jesus taught that annihilation was to be the final punishment of the wicked." This appears to us unnecessary ; we submit that the doom of the wicked was made perfectly clear millenaries before the advent of Christ. JEHOVAH himself laid down the penalty of the law in the plainest terms to the first sinner : "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." If a commentary is needed to make this intelligible, we have it in the executive sentence, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." This sentence is reiterated so often in the Old Testament, and in such positive terms, that it seems to us something like presumption to ignore it. We are sorry to see such a disposition to slight the Old Testament Scriptures on the part of professing Christians. Paul declared them "profitable for doctrine : " 2 Tim. 3 : 16. The evangelical Tholuck remarks, "that the Christian revelation is indeed *a tree without root*, as long as it is not understood in its intimate connection with God's revelation of salvation in the Old Testament." An orthodox writer of our own country says, "I cannot understand the Gospel unless I first understand the Law. The Gospel is a *remedial* system, \*\*\* and we will never use the remedy, unless we first know the nature and extent of the calamity that has befallen us." This is our position ; the Old Testament reveals "the calamity," the New, "the remedy." That discovers death ; this brings life. It was not Jesus'

mission to declare the "punishment of the wicked." His incidental allusions were mainly those of the Physician who comes to heal. He did not come as a Judge, to declare the penalty of the law; but as a Saviour, a Redeemer, a Life-Giver. Hear his announcement, "I came not to *judge* the world, but to *save* the world." "For God sent not his Son into the world to *condemn* the world; but that the world through him might be *saved*." "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the *Gospel* to the poor; He hath sent me to *heal* the broken-hearted, to preach *deliverance* to the captives, and *recovering of sight* to the blind, to *set at liberty* them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord."—John 12 : 47 ; 3 : 17. Luke 4 : 18, 19. Let no one suppose from the foregoing remarks that we dispute his right to consult the New Testament on any point. It is our duty so to do; but let us not pass by the positive declarations of *ЖЕПОВАН* in the Old Testament. With all respect to Mr. P. we should certainly prefer the following question: Were the allusions of Jesus to the fate of the wicked contrary, in their spirit, to the teachings of the Old Testament? After raising his question, our author goes on to say:

"That the argument from his"—Christ's—"use of the words 'life' and 'death' is not valid to prove annihilation, even should we accept their literal meaning. Death of itself never means annihilation."

Of course, our answer is. Death annihilates *the man*; it returns him to his native dust. This reply is anticipated and met by the rejoinder:

"How does that touch the question of the soul? Is that made up of elementary spiritual particles? Is there such a thing as *soul-dust*, to which dead souls moulder back, and out of which new souls may spring? Is the thinking spirit composite and organic in structure, resolvable by a divine chemistry into an original spiritual substance that has yet no consciousness, no intelligence, no will, none of the distinctive properties of the organized, individual soul?"

Mr. P. here falls back on the never-failing assumption. We shall answer his questions. *Yes, there is* "such a thing as *soul-dust* to which dead souls moulder back," &c. God said to Adam, "*Dust thou*"—the man—the living soul—"art, and unto *DUST* shalt *thou* return." Gen. 3 : 19. Job says, "Wilt thou bring *me* into *dust* again?" Job 10 : 9. Who is the "*me*"? Is it not Job? the "thinking, conscious, intelligent" Job? "*My soul* cleaveth unto the *dust*; quicken thou me according to thy word." Ps. 119 : 25. It is clear to us, Dr. Eadie (orthodox) expresses the truth when he says, (referring to Ps. 16.) "The words 'my soul' mean merely *myself*." Bib. Cy., Art. Hell. The Psalmist's meaning is: I, the living *soul*, cleave unto the *dust*;

I am dying ; O Lord, when I am dead, remember me, and when the "set time" cometh, quicken me according to thy word.

If, in the latter question, our author wishes to inquire whether a man ceases to think when he dies, we can answer in the affirmative by using the Psalmist's words—"Put not your trust in princes, nor in the son of man, in whom there is no help. His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth ; *in that very day HIS THOUGHTS PERISH.*" Ps. 146 : 3, 4. "The Preacher" says, "The dead know *not any thing*"\*\*\*" the memory of them is forgotten." Eccl. 9 : 5. Let us now attend to Mr. P's. definition of "the word life."

"It *always* means something *more than bare existence*. It is never applied to denote that idea alone. What, for instance, has a more certain and real existence than a rock or mountain ? and yet, though that existence has been maintained for centuries, we never say that the rock or mountain is alive."\*\*\*" Life implies the performance of certain peculiar and characteristic functions, and instrumentally the use of certain organs or faculties; in material organizations it is indicated by such facts as development, growth, reproduction, motion, and sensation, while in higher orders of being, from rudimentary up to perfect mind, it manifests itself by desire, knowledge, memory, imagination, reason, love, and will. Thus, while life has a generic meaning common to all that is vital, it differs specifically with each subject. Plants have the lowest form, and then come various gradations of animal life, from the radiata, up through the mollusca, the fishes, the reptiles, and the birds, to the mammalia. Finally, in man we have a yet higher order of life, growing out of the exercise of a nobler range of powers, as found in the reason, the sensibility, and the free will."

We have read the foregoing paragraph carefully, but have failed to comprehend the mystery of the first sentence. Why is Mr. P. so emphatic ? We consider it the expression of a mere truism to say, "Life means something more than bare existence." We should be pleased if we could give as hearty an assent to the whole paragraph as we can to the first utterance. We agree to the whole with two qualifications, one of which we mention here, and the other after the next extract. Mr. P. in substance denies that "desire, knowledge, memory," &c., belong to "material organizations." We affirm the contrary. "Desire, knowledge, memory, imagination, reason, love, and will" are all manifestations of "material organizations," differing in degree of development among various orders of animals up to man as the highest. Mr. P. adds—

"Hence, if one speaks of life we must know to what living being he refers before we can understand his meaning; and the same is necessarily true of death."

We object. The word life, in its literal signification, has a

specific meaning, and conveys a distinct idea to the mind without a particular reference to the "living being." Life is life, and death is the extinction of life, whether you speak of plants, reptiles, birds, beasts, or men. P. goes on—

"Life and death mean something different in animals from what they do in plants, and something far different still in spiritual beings from what they do in mere animals"

We still object, and deprecate so much assumption. Life is life, and death is death. Plants have life, reptiles have life, birds have life, beasts have life, men have life. Take this life away, and plants, reptiles, birds, beasts, and men, are dead. Where is the difference? Why, is not man superior to the reptile? says one. Yes, *man* is; immeasurably superior; but his *life* is not. "For that which befalleth the sons of *men* befalleth *beasts*; even *one* thing befalleth them; as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have *all* one breath; so that a *man* hath no pre-eminence above a *beast*:" Eccl. 3: 19. "For what is your life? It is even a *vapor*, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away:" James 4: 14. As to "spiritual beings," it is sufficient for us to say, man is not a spiritual being. "That which is born of the flesh is *flesh*:" John 3: 6.

"Life and death stand related to the end for which the being was made. While it fulfills that end in the exercise of its peculiar powers or functions, it lives; when it fails so to do, it dies."

Let us try this assertion. The camel was made to inhabit such countries as Arabia, Palestine, &c. Its feet in particular are peculiarly adapted to tread the sandy deserts that abound in those countries. Now, suppose we transport a camel to the rocky state of Massachusetts. Does it now fulfill the end for which it was made? Can it now "exercise its peculiar powers or functions?" *Ans.* No. Well, is the camel dead? According to the above reasoning he is.

"For what now was man made, and in what does the true and real life of a *soul* consist?"

The above confines the term soul strictly to man. The Bible applies it to the beast of the field, the fowl of the air, and the fish of the sea: Gen. 1: 20, 21, 24, 30; 6: 19; 9: 10, 12, 15, 16; Lev. 11: 46; Num. 31: 28, and other places. Dr. Adam Clarke, in his comment on Gen. 1: 24, acknowledges that *nephesh chayyah* (living soul) is "a general term to express all creatures endued with animal life." John Wesley, in his "Notes," makes the following comment on 1 Cor. 15: 45, first clause. "The first Adam was made a living soul. God gave

him such life as other animals enjoy." "Alford's Greek Testament" is a standard work. In his remarks on "demoniacal possessions," he speaks of "that part of man's nature which he has in common with the brutes that perish, the *animal and sensual soul (psuche)*." Without reference to the Bible, these three orthodox commentators deserve the respectful attention of Mr. P. We regret to say, his succeeding remarks make short work of all. Clarke, Wesley, Alford, and Bible are "counted less than nothing, and vanity." Our readers will notice that the italics are his own.

"Man was created in the Divine image for this one end: that he might know, love, obey, enjoy, and be like God forever. All his powers stand related to this single object, and were given for that purpose only. He was made *for God*, and finds his life only as he is in a state of voluntary union with God, filled with the Holy Spirit, developing a pure character, making God the centre of his thoughts, affections and will. *Nothing but this is life when we speak of a soul.* Something less is life for lower orders of being; but this only when we speak of one made in God's image."

We do not agree that the animal man was created for the "one end" mentioned. If he was, then universal salvation inevitably follows. We believe that he has been placed here by his Creator *on trial* for a higher life. This is the "one end" for which he was made. If he endures the trial, develops "a pure character," makes "God the centre of his thoughts, affections, and will," he will be made partaker of a spiritual life in "the last Adam." He will then, *and not till then*, be created anew "for this one end: that he may know, love, obey, enjoy, and be like God forever."

"But even more decisive are the repeated declarations of Christ, that eternal life commences in the present world, that it begins as soon as the sinner believes, and consists of a holy and blissful state of mind. Thus he said to Martha: 'I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.' The meaning is clear: the soul that is spiritually dead shall immediately come to life if it believes, or places faith in Christ, and the life thus commenced shall never end."

Here we perceive the effect a theory has on some minds. One of the plainest passages of Scripture is *wrested* from its obvious meaning to save a pagan fable. And what is worse, a deadly blow is struck at our faith in a literal resurrection. Did Mr. P. ever read the burial service in the Methodist Discipline? Let us quote: "The minister meeting the corpse, and going before it, shall say, I am the resurrection and the life," &c. What words are these? Let Mr. P. answer: "The



meaning is *clear*: the soul that is spiritually dead shall immediately come to life, if it believes or places faith in Christ, and the life thus commenced shall never end." Why, how apposite to the occasion! But we forget ourselves. He is consistent; he believes man has an immortal soul; consequently there is no need of a resurrection. But, no; in other parts of the article Mr. P. completely stultifies himself by upholding a resurrection of all men.

"O, what a riddle of absurdity!"

"The annihilation theory does not harmonize easily with the fact of the resurrection of the wicked. There would seem to be no propriety in such an event if they are to be immediately judged and annihilated. Why not judge the soul according to its character, and punish it with extinction, without recalling the body to life? If the penalty of the divine law be literal destruction to body and soul, we should suppose that when a wicked man dies that penalty was executed on the body which moulders back to dust, and that nothing remained but to inflict the same upon the soul, then or at the general judgment. Why must the body die twice? What end is to be served by summoning it from the grave to destroy it again?"

The main idea of the foregoing appears to be correct. Sure enough! "Why must the body die twice?" "What end is to be served by summoning" the wicked person "from the grave to destroy it again?" Let those who maintain the revival of the wicked, answer this question. We are satisfied with the Saviour's assertion, "*They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: neither can they die any more: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.*" Luke 20: 35, 36. We do not see how any can obtain life except by aid of "the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead." "For he that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting." Gal. 6: 8. The wicked man reaps his harvest in death. "These, as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed," &c., "shall utterly perish in their own corruption." 2 Peter 2: 12. But the righteous must live again to "reap life everlasting." We are as entirely at rest on this point as on any other in the life views. Life from the dead is salvation. The succeeding remark of Mr. P. sounds strangely in our ears.

"This has always been a puzzling question for the annihilationists, nor have they returned a satisfactory answer."

We must say, he here manifests an ignorance of facts not at all befitting him as a disputant. If the term "annihilationist"

belongs to any one, it surely appertains to GEORGE STORRS, a leader of the movement, who has written and preached on the subject for twenty years. Does Mr. P. know that such a man exists? If so, has he taken pains to learn his published views? It appears not, or he would have known that his "puzzling question" has been answered; and if he would inquire further, he would discover that the "annihilationists," as a body, are fast coming to the conclusion the wicked dead will not live again. (For the argument, see "LIFE FROM THE DEAD.") "Anoint thine eyes with eye-salve that thou mayest see."

Mr. P.'s next point is, the inconsistency of the annihilation theory with the words and phrases used by Christ in describing the punishment of the wicked. We shall not reply. If he has read the arguments of Hudson, Storrs, Dobney, and others, and still cries "Give, give," we despair of convincing him. If he has not read them, let him do so before he again lifts the cudgel of controversy. We notice, however, he attempts to make "the narrative of the rich man and Lazarus" do the usual service. Perhaps Prof. Strong's (Methodist, and Pres. of Troy University,) remark may do him some good.

"The whole imagery of this conversation is based upon the current notions of the Jews, and is, therefore, authoritative only so far as it is vouched for by the direct representations of Scripture elsewhere; the doctrine of future retribution for abused privileges is all that is essential to the parable."—*Harmony and Exposition of the Gospel.*

The last objection brought by Mr. P. "to the theory in question is, its lack of sufficient moral power. It is confessedly resorted to by those who shudder at the thought of endless misery, and wish to find some other explanation of Christ's words, without embracing the absurd interpretations of the Universalists. They thus imply the fact that annihilation is preferable to everlasting punishment."

Here is a hint that "annihilation" is not an "everlasting punishment." Let us call up two witnesses on Mr. P.'s side.

1. The younger Edwards. "Endless annihilation is an endless or infinite punishment. It is an endless loss not only of all the good which the man at present enjoys, but of all that good which he would have enjoyed throughout eternity, in the state of bliss to which he would have been admitted, if he had never sinned."—*Reply to Chauncey.*

2. Luther Lee. "Now, should you resort to annihilation, in your last fit of desperation, to avoid the conclusion in favor of endless misery, you would thereby defeat your own theory and award me the argument on the question, as annihilation would be endless punishment." "The term in the question is 'punishment,' not misery, and annihilation, when contrasted with endless happiness would be endless punishment, though not endless misery."—*Letter to A. C. Thomas.* No. 39.

"Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction?"

2 Thess. 1 : 9. We joyfully "imply the fact that annihilation is preferable to everlasting" misery. The doctrine of eternal torment is a stupendous libel on the character of a merciful God. Begotten in the adulterous embrace of Pagan philosophy and degenerate Christianity; nursed in the lap of incipient apostacy; fostered by the Mother of Harlots; faintly illustrated by the tortures of the Inquisition, for centuries the claymore of an ignorant priesthood; it remains to-day a glaring proof of the blindness of the present order of theologians. Some of the wisest and best men the church has produced, have declared their disbelief of it; while others not quite able to overcome their prejudices, have confessed their distress of mind in relation to it. Dr. Cumming, an honest believer in the doctrine, has lately given the testimony of his *heart*, in the following language:—"I must say it is the one difficulty I have encountered in studying this Holy Book, that there should be one spot in God's magnificent universe where tears will be ceaselessly shed; where the wild and the piercing wail of sorrow will rise disturbing the harmony of songs that are perpetual; and where there shall be ceaseless sinning, and therefore ceaseless suffering."—*Great Tribulation. First Series.* Page 271.

In support of his last objection Mr. P. continues:—

"It does not seem to provide for degrees of punishment according to degrees of guilt, as insisted upon so frequently by Christ and by the inspired writers." \*\*\* "Thus there is no restraint for the transgressor in the thought that added wickedness will bring added punishment."

As Mr. P. carefully refrains from giving the testimony of "Christ and the inspired writers" on "degrees of punishment" we will simply say, we regard his remarks as pure assumption. But assuming the validity of the objection, how fearfully does it militate against his own theory. Talk about *degrees* in *eternal* torment! Is not the never-ending nature of the punishment the great weapon of orthodoxy? If you tell a man that he is to live

Burning continually, yet unconsumed;  
Forever wasting, yet enduring still;  
Dying perpetually, yet never dead;

think you he will stop to enquire about "degrees?" Did you ever hear of a single "transgressor" being "restrained" by such an argument?

Mr. P. further says: "But should such a doctrine become prevalent, there is reason to apprehend disastrous results to morals and religion, for practically and negatively it would operate as modified Universalism."

This reminds us of the solemn warnings given us personally by a minister of the M. E. Church, when we first determined to preach "Life only in Christ." He said, the evil effect would be seen on the morals of the community where we preached in less than two months. Ten months have rolled around, and the only effect we have noticed is an increased earnestness and zeal for the truth on the part of the Christian professors who have received it; and a marked display of bigotry and intolerance among those that have rejected it. If the worldlings have been affected, it has certainly been for the better. But we do not offer this as an argument. The servant of God is to declare the TRUTH, even if it should prove "the savor of death unto death" to "them that perish." But we would ask Mr. P., in this connection: What effect has your eternal misery doctrine upon sinners? How is it so many are going to destruction before your eyes? Where is your restraining power? You speak in another place of the "impotence" of the annihilation theory "to restrain human depravity." If our theory is impotent, how much more is yours? It is true that your doctrine *drives* thousands into your church, but what are they after they get in? Mere dead weights and stumbling blocks in the way of other sinners. Jesus said, "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him." "The goodness of God," as manifested in the plan of salvation, must be presented to sinners, if they are led "to repentance."

Again: It is a great mistake to suppose, any human instrumentality can "restrain human depravity." The world will never be converted. It is doomed to destruction. God will choose a people out of the world, and the rest will perish. Thus saith the Scripture.

Mr. P. declares in concluding his article, that the sinner "has begun to live under God's government, and he can *never pass away* from it. *He must exist forever*, and it is for him to say, whether that forever shall be filled with bliss or woe."

Compare this assertion with the following texts. "The world *passeth away*, and the lust thereof: but *he that doeth the will of God abideth forever*:" 1 John 2: 17. "The triumphing of the wicked is short, and the joy of the hypocrite but for a moment," &c. "He shall *perish forever like his own dung*," &c. "He shall *fly away as a dream*, and shall *not be found*. This is the *portion* of a wicked man from God, and the *heritage* appointed unto him by God:" Job 20: 5, 7, 8, 29. "Let the sinners be *consumed* out of the earth; and let the wicked be *no more*:" Ps. 104: 35. "They shall be as *though they had not been*." Obed. 16. "Dead, *they shall not live*; deceased, *they shall not rise*: therefore hast thou visited and *destroyed* them, and

made *all their memory to perish.*" We might quote two hundred passages to the same effect. In taking leave of Mr. Patton, we wish to tell him, and all others of his school,

"There are more things in heaven and earth,  
Than are *dreamt of* in your *philosophy.*"

## "THE METHODIST," AND THE APOCRYPHA.

A REVIEW, BY THOMAS READ, AUTHOR OF BIBLE VS. TRADITION.

Our friend, Rev. J. B. Hagany, in the columns of "*The Methodist*," February 9th, 1861, is disposed to enlighten its readers, respecting the Apocrypha. He says—

"I am encouraged to this by the hope that as some very imperfect Christians seem not to get on well with the aid of the Bible, they may possibly be helped forward by the Apocrypha!" \*\*\* "One of the first sentences in the *Wisdom of Solomon*, is as vigorous and beautiful an expression of the immortality of the soul as ever was written:—'For God created man to be immortal, and made him to be an image of his own eternity.' I do not remember that even in the canonical Scriptures there is anything on the subject so terse and elegant as this." \*\*\* "The short sentence, 'an image of his own eternity,' exalts man to a kind of equality with the Creator." \*\*\* "It ascribes to man one of the two eternities of the schoolmen, and renders applicable to him just one half of the Psalmist's noble strain in praise of the Creator—'From everlasting to everlasting thou art God.' I will venture to say, that if this sentence had been found in either the Old or New Testament, that it would have been made the text for a thousand discourses on the immortality of the soul."

So it seems, alas! that "some very imperfect Christians" have been driven from their fancied strongholds in the canonical Scriptures, in which they were formerly, in their own estimation, so strongly entrenched, to the *uncanonical* Apocrypha, to find expressions to countenance their fond delusion of natural immortality! But in the above, Mr. Hagany makes a frank confession, that a clear expression of inherent immortality *cannot be found* in the canonical Scriptures! (We compli-

ment his candor.) And that, "the Old and New Testament" contain no text so suitable as this, "for a thousand discourses on the immortality of the soul." The last clause, he says, "exalts man to a kind of equality with the Creator!" We remember to have met with expressions, even in the canonical Scriptures, quite equal to this, although we do not canonize their author. "Ye shall not surely die;" \*\*\* "Ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil."

But does his celebrated text indeed teach "the immortality" of the soul? The latter clause is doubtful. The Vulgate reads, "and to the image of His own likeness he made him." Unfortunately for his argument, the tense happens to be in the future, and not in the past; "to be immortal," as says his text, at some *future* period, is very different from having been made immortal at creation. It always looks a little suspicious too, when an argument is built upon a text isolated for the purpose from its context. Suppose we take a peep at it in its connection. See *Wisdom 2: 22*, and onward.

"As for the mysteries of God, they," [the ungodly,] "know them not: neither hoped they for the wages of righteousness, nor discerned a reward for blameless souls. For God created man *to be immortal*, and made him to be an image of his own eternity. Nevertheless, *through the envy of the devil*, came DEATH into the world: and they that do hold of his side *do find it*. But the souls of the righteous are *in the hand of God*, and there shall no torment touch them. In the *sight of the unwise* they seemed to die" [as did the ungodly:] "and their departure is taken for misery, and their going from us to the" [same] "utter destruction" [as the wicked experience:] "but they are in peace." [They sleep in Jesus; their lives or souls are bid with Christ, in God; or, as above, in the hand of God.] "For though they be punished in the sight of men, yet is their *HOPE full of immortality*. (7 v.) In the time of their visitation," [or resurrection, when the mortal, *thmeton*, shall put on immortality: 1 Cor. 15, 53;] "they shall shine, and run to and fro like sparks among the stubble. They shall judge the nations, and have dominion over the people," [the mortals living during the 1000 years reign of Christ,] "and their Lord shall reign forever."

Instead, therefore, of this "sublime" text teaching—as friend Hagany would have us imagine—the uninterrupted immortality of the soul—stern logic compels us to insist that *it clearly teaches the very opposite*. It teaches that the ungodly find death—utter destruction; and the righteous have not, *at pres-*

ent, immortality, but only HOPE for it at the period of Christ's visitation. It teaches also that the Creator designed man to be immortal, although mortal, and placed the tree of lives within his reach, while righteous, to perpetuate his being. And when man became unrighteous, he drove him from the tree of lives, lest he should eat and *live forever*, or become immortal while unrighteous. And in passing sentence upon him, he emphatically describes the nature of his personality, the essential "thou." "Of dust *thou* art, and unto dust shalt *thou* return." The ungodly have no part nor lot in immortality. They are "consumed to naught" in the context, and the righteous, although they by patient continuance in well doing *seek for* immortality, possess it now only in hope and in promise. We quote the context further ; 1 : 11—16.

"The mouth that beliebeth, *slayeth the soul*. Seek not death in the error of your life : and pull not upon yourselves destruction with the works of your hands. For God made not death," [an enemy hath done this :] "neither hath He pleasure in the destruction of the living. For He created all things, that they might have their being : and the generations of the world were healthful : and there is no poison of destruction in them, nor the kingdom of death upon the earth ; (FOR RIGHTEOUSNESS IS IMMORTAL :) but ungodly men, with their works and words, called it" [that is death.] "to them : for when they thought to have it their friend, *they consumed to naught*, and made a covenant with it, because they are worthy to take part with it : " 2 Esdras 7 : 15. "Now, therefore, why disquietest thou thyself, seeing thou art but a *corruptible man* ? and why art thou moved, whereas thou art but *mortal* ?" Ecclesiasticus 17 : 14 ; "The Lord created man of the earth, and turned *him* into it again." 27—32 : "Who shall praise the Most High in the grave, instead of them that live and give thanks ? Thanksgiving perisheth from the dead, as from one *that is not* ; the living and sound in heart shall praise the Lord. How great is the loving-kindness of the Lord our God, and His compassion unto such as turn unto Him in holiness ! For all things cannot be in men, because the son of man *is not immortal*."

We do not wish to discourage friend Hagany in his endeavors to elucidate the Apocrypha ; but we commend to his notice the above extracts from his favored Books, touching the nature of the constitution of the unit man, and we hope that he will possess the candor and the courage to quote them and comment upon them.

## BAPTISM.

It is said, "The commission of the apostles evidently included baptism by water." This is argued partly from the fact that John's baptism was the only one the apostles or the people were familiar with, and that Christ's commission contains no qualifying or explanatory sentence in the matter.

This statement needs some qualification. John did testify the baptism of Jesus was to be of the Holy Spirit, clearly and distinctly ; and Jesus confirmed the same to His apostles just before His ascension to heaven. Hence, though it was natural enough for the apostles, for a time, to misapprehend the words of Jesus, and to suppose water baptism was to be retained, yet it does not follow they were authorized to continue it after the baptism of Christ commenced, according to his word. We have abundantly shown, in our previous articles, some of the apostles did not comprehend the fullness of their commission, even after the day of Pentecost ; for it was to "go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature ;" but we have seen with what reluctance Peter went to the Gentiles at all : Acts 10 : 9-16.

It is urged, as "baptism in water was the medium through which repentance was expressed," in John's ministry, there seems "no reason why it should be rejected now." John's ministry had its peculiarities ; those belonged to that dispensation of which he was the author and finisher ; and were in force no longer than his personal ministry lasted. John had no successors. He was sent to the Jews, and to them only ; and his baptism was a stepping stone from the carnal rites and ordinances of Judaism to the spiritual worship God sought, and that Jesus told the woman of Samaria was about to supersede all those forms of worship which hitherto had been in use. Now, "with the *heart* man believeth unto righteousness, and with the *mouth* confession is made unto salvation." The mouth, and not water, is now the "medium" through which "repentance is expressed." "The word of faith, which we preach," saith Paul, is, "if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart that God hath raised him



from the dead, thou shalt be saved :” Rom. 10 : 6-13. Here is no intimation that water has anything to do with the salvation. If “baptism in water” was “the form of doctrine” Paul speaks of, in chapter 6, it is strange he gives no hint of the matter here, where he is specifying exactly what God does require of man in order to be saved.

The recorded words of our Lord, by Mark, give, necessarily, no “command” to the apostles to baptize at all, in any way. They are, “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” If a man is baptized with the Holy Spirit, for anything we can see, the words of Jesus have their full import in such baptism. If “the gifts of the Holy Spirit follow baptism,” as is suggested by some, then surely the baptism must have been of the Holy Spirit, for we have no account, in any case on record, that those gifts followed until the Holy Spirit first came on the believers. This fact is strong presumptive proof the baptism spoken of by Mark, is the baptism of the Spirit, and not of water. “The words of Luke in his gospel,” say nothing, directly, of any baptism ; water is not mentioned at all, but it is said, Jesus “opened their understanding that they might understand the Scriptures.” The Old Testament, of course, for no other was then written ; and those Scriptures say nothing of Messiah’s immersing any one in water ; but Jesus’ words to His apostles, as recorded by Luke, are, “Behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you,” &c. Here is a direct promise of the Spirit, but not a word about water. As to Luke’s record in Acts, it is very explicit that Jesus’ baptism was to be of the Holy Spirit, in direct contrast with John’s water baptism : Acts 1 : 5.

It is admitted, that “It is manifest that the promise of the Holy Spirit was given at the time, and in connection with the commission to preach the Gospel and baptize believers.” This is admitting, in our mind, the Spirit baptism is *the* baptism our Lord intended, when He said, “he that believeth and *is* baptized shall be saved ;” for, there is only “*one* baptism” belonging to the Gospel, by authority, as Paul declares.

It is also conceded by some on the other side of this question, that “Peter and his associates being uneducated men, retained many of their prejudices ;” but it is urged, “this does not apply to Paul,” who was learned, and called to go to the Gentiles, with “the mystery” specially “made known” to him ; and it is

judged, "the apostle's commission and qualifications were equal to the work assigned him." This is true; but did his commission embrace baptism with water? It is not enough to show that he sometimes *practiced* it; for on one occasion he practiced circumcision. He took Timothy "and circumcised him;" Acts 16: 3. On another occasion he united with "four men which had a vow on them," and was "at charges with them" and "shaved their heads," and "the next day entered into the temple to signify the accomplishment of the days of purification, until an offering should be offered for every one of them:" Acts 21: 17-26. Now, if Paul did such things because of the prejudices of the people where he was, is it strange if he some times baptized with water, though that was no more in his "commission" than circumcision or Jewish purifications? We have his own explicit declaration that baptism with water was *not* in his "commission." He admits he did baptize a few, but is thankful he baptized no more. But was that not in your "commission?" No, saith he—"Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel:" 1 Corth. 1: 17. Thus Paul settles this matter, that he had no "commission" from Christ to baptize with water. Christian Jews, such as Peter, Ananias, and even James and all the elders at Jerusalem, were so wedded to Judaism and the transition rites, that they kept up all the Jewish institutions years after the day of Pentecost; for James and the Elders of the Church at Jerusalem, tell Paul, "Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe, and they are all zealous of the law," &c.: Acts 21: 17-21. Such a pressure more than once led Paul to do that which was not in his "commission," and sometimes brought him into difficulties, so that he was in perils.

To urge, then, that Paul did sometimes baptize with water, as proof his commission included it, is to urge us to accept that which Paul flatly denies—"Christ sent me *not* to baptize." Clearly he practiced it, when he did so at all, as a matter of expediency, and not by the command of Jesus, who manifested Himself to Paul, and sent him to the Gentiles "to preach the Gospel." For the same cause persons may now be baptized with water: not because it was ever included in the Gospel mission, or "commission," but because of human prejudice. Those who feel the need of such a help let them use it till they can walk without. We do not condemn them; and let them

beware they do not condemn us, who believe the "one baptism" is that of the Spirit. We certainly consider it a dangerous position to remain in the water and not go on into the Spirit. "Have ye received the Holy Spirit since ye believed?" is a question as important now as in the time of Paul. Be baptized with water, if that is your understanding of the matter; but take heed and rest not in any outward rites or ceremonies. See that ye receive the Holy Spirit, "which ye have of God;" and which only will bring you up from the dead.

While we assent to the fact that "more than 'one baptism'" is spoken of in the New Testament, we do not admit more than one belongs to or is essential to Christianity matured, *after* Christ was "glorified." To maintain otherwise, is a clear denial of apostolic testimony of "ONE baptism." To make water baptism essential to the baptism of the Spirit, is to contradict facts; for, Cornelius and those at his house were baptized with the Holy Spirit before water was even called for; thus demonstrating the use of water was not the way to receive the Spirit: nor is there evidence any one ever received the Holy Spirit in water baptism. The reception of the Holy Spirit was a separate transaction, sometimes before and sometimes after the use of water. The believers in Samaria had been baptized with water; but it was not till some time after they received the Holy Spirit. See Acts 8: 12-17. This case and that at Cornelius' house disprove the idea of the Spirit being imparted in water baptism, and hence shows this gift is not dependent on baptism in water in any form or manner.

The plea that water baptism symbolized Christ's death, "into" which believers are said to be baptized, seems utterly baseless. His death was by crucifixion, not by burial; so Paul immediately explains his declaration by saying, "Knowing this, that our *old man*" (the animal man) "is crucified with Him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." \*\*\* "Now, if we be dead with Christ we believe we *shall also live* with Him."

Being "crucified with Him," by our baptism of the Spirit into Christ, we are also "buried with Him;" *i. e.*, our "old man" being dead—rendered powerless to control or govern us—is also "buried with" Christ. But before we could be buried *with* Him, we must be *in* Him; and we cannot be *in* Him till by the Holy Spirit we are baptized into Him: then, being of

His body, we are crucified with Him—*i. e.*, are “partakers of His sufferings,” and “likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord.” See 1 Peter 4: 13, and Rom. 6: 6-11.

We sum up thus: To be buried with Christ, we must be *in* Him: then we are of His body, and we are mystically buried with his body. But to be of His body we must be baptized into it by the Holy Spirit. Then we reckon our “old man” as dead and buried with Christ; and when the old man actually dies, the believer’s animal nature is dead and buried with Christ; so that “as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father,” (*i. e.*, by “the Spirit,” Rom. 8: 11,) so shall all the members of Christ’s body be raised up by the same Spirit “at the last day.”

Those who plead for more baptisms than one, and say that Paul referred to water baptism in his epistle to the Hebrews, might as well not decline Paul’s declaration Heb. 9: 10, that the “*divers* baptisms,” were “carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation: but Christ being come a High Priest of good things to come,” such carnal, *i. e.*, *fleshly* baptisms end. The original word here rendered “washings” is *baptismois*, baptisms. Prof. WHITING, after having converted baptizo and baptismon invariably into immerse and immersion, stumbles here into “*bathings!*” Did he see that a uniform translation would ruin his theory, and prove it “*carnal?*”

It is affirmed, and reaffirmed, that Christ “commanded” the apostles to baptize, and that “The commission evidently included baptism by water.” Will those who are thus confident, accept Paul’s declaration that such was “*not*” his commission? Will they examine and see if there is more than *one* text where CHRIST is said to *command* his apostles to baptize at all? Will they search and see if they can find it once recorded that the apostles ever did baptize according to the *formula* Jesus is said to have given them? That is, “In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” So far as the record is our guide, were not all the baptisms by the apostles and their associates, “in the name of Jesus” *alone*? Where is there a recorded *command* of Jesus for any such *formula* in baptism? If these things are so, why urge, as it is done, that Jesus “commanded” the apostles to baptize with water; while, if He did so command, they invariably neglected the *formula* He com-

manded them to use? Were they disobedient in this matter, and did they establish a form their Lord never authorized?

We think when this question is fully investigated, it will be found, baptism with water, by any of the apostles or their associates, was the result of a misapprehension of the entire spiritual character of the dispensation of Jesus "glorified;" or it was "suffered" for a time, the same as the use of "the law of Moses" was suffered to be practiced by thousands of the believing Jews: see Acts 21: 17-24. Baptism with water had been practiced by John in the *transition* state from Judaism to the fully developed Christianity; and those who had practiced it in that transition state could not immediately forsake the old rite for the baptism of Jesus "glorified." They might practice it for a time, as the converted Jews did circumcision and attention to "the law of Moses:" but that did not prove it the baptism of the Christian dispensation, nor make it obligatory on believers ever after. It was clearly designed to be superseded by the anti-type—the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Yet such was the misuse of it in Paul's day, that he says he was thankful he had performed the rite to so few, and declares it was not in his commission.

The Church, however, instead of rising out of mere carnal, or external ordinances, sank deeper into them, and lost to a great extent the spiritual, and came to regard the baptism of the Holy Spirit as a fancy, or at most as confined to the apostles, and their immediate associates, for the confirmation of the Gospel in its first promulgation. Behold the fruits of such a course in the pride, pomp, external show and trappings as developed in Papacy and her harlot daughters; till, alas! the inward life of Christianity has nearly perished by the weight of outward rites and "the commandments of men." The subject is painful to contemplate. May God, in His mercy, speedily restore the "Holy," heavenly "*dove*" to His Church which has so long hovered over it, but has been refused an *abiding* residence therein. May we all take heed to the injunction, "Quench not the Spirit"—"Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption;" remembering, "that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit, which is in you, which ye have of God;" and without which, we are "none of His."

## JOHN LOCKE ON IMMORTALITY.

It has been affirmed that LOCKE held the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. Great names are of little use to any one who is willing to learn of the Bible alone. John Locke, however, cannot with truth be claimed on the side of natural immortality. That he believed all men *candidates* for it, is true : and that is exactly what we believe and have maintained these twenty years. Locke's "*Reasonableness of Christianity*," is a work we read more than forty years ago ; and though we were deeply impressed with his views on immortality, as lost through Adam's fall, and only recovered by faith in Christ yet the strong current of the times in favor of the common view, prevented our settling down on Locke's position for more than twenty years after ; nor do we adopt or hold all his positions now ; but the general position that death is *death*, and not life in torment ; that Adam lost the means of immortality, by losing Paradise and access to the tree of life ; and that all his posterity, therefore, by natural generation, are destitute of immortality, and can only attain it through union with the second Adam, we do firmly believe. In Locke's essay on the "Resurrection and its Sequences," in his *Life* by King, pp. 316-322—Bohn's edition, he says :—

"They" [the wicked] "shall not live forever. This is so plain in Scripture, and is so every where inculcated—that the wages of sin is death, and the reward of the righteous is everlasting life—the constant language of Scripture in the current of the New Testament as well as the Old, is life to the just, to believers, to the obedient, and death to the wicked and unbelievers,—that one would wonder how the reader could be mistaken where death is threatened so constantly, and declared every where to be the ultimate punishment and last estate to which the wicked must all come. To solve this, they have invented a very odd signification of the word death, which they would have stand for eternal life in torment. They who will put so strange and contrary a signification upon a word in a hundred places, where, if it had not its true and literal sense, one would wonder it should be so often used, and that in opposition to life, which in these places is used literally, ought to have good proofs for giving it a sense in those places of Scripture directly

contrary to what it ordinarily has in other parts of Scripture and every where else.

“ But leaving this interpretation of die and death to shift for itself, as it can in the minds of reasonable men, there are places of Scripture which plainly show the different state of the just and the wicked to be literally life and death, wherein there is no room for that evasion. I shall name one or two of them. Luke 20 : 35, 36. Our Saviour tells the Sadducees that they who are accounted worthy to attain that world in the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage, neither can they die any more ; for they are equal unto the angels, and the children of God, being the children of the resurrection. Where Christ plainly declares of the children of God alone, who have been accounted worthy to obtain the resurrection, *i. e.*, the resurrection before the others, that they are like the angels, and can die no more.” \*\*\*\* “ Another text that declares the death and final end of the wicked is Gal. 6 : 7, 8—‘ Be not deceived : God is not mocked ; for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap ; for he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption ; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting.’ In other places, say these interpreters, ‘ by everlasting life, is meant everlasting happiness joined to life ; by death, is meant eternal sufferings and torments without death.’ But here corruption and everlasting life are opposed.

“ Now *phthora*, corruption, signifies the dissolution and final destruction of a thing, whereby it ceases to be ; but corruption can by nobody be pretended to signify the endless sense of pain and torment in a being subsisting and continued on to eternity. Corruption is the spoiling anything, the divesting it of the being it had. Accordingly St. Paul, 1 Cor. 15, uses incorruption for an indefinable [unending] estate of immortality. That which gives some color to their understanding by death an endless life in torment is, the everlasting fire threatened by our Saviour to the wicked. Math. 18 : 8 ; 25 : 41, 46. ‘ But it may suffice to say, that everlasting, in a true Scripture sense, may be said of that which endures as long as the subject it affects endures,’ &c.

“ Isa. 35 : 10, everlasting joy, *i. e.*, that continued as long as they lived. A like expression is that of hell fire, Mark 9 : 43, 44, that never shall be quenched, where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched ; an expression taken from Isaiah 66 : 24, which, though we translate hell, is in the original Gehenna, or the Valley of Hinnom ; where was kept a constant fire to burn up the carcasses of beasts and other filth of the city of Jerusalem, where, though the fire never was quenched, yet it does not follow, nor is it said that the bodies that were burnt

in it were never consumed, only that the worms that gnawed and the fire that burnt them were constant, and never ceased till they were destroyed. So, though the fire was not put out, yet the chaff was burnt up and consumed, Math. 3 : 12 ; and the tares, 13 : 30 ; in both which places, and the parallel, Luke 3 : 17, the Greek word signifies to be consumed by burning, though in our Bibles it is translated burn up but in one of them, Math. 3 : 12. 'Taking it then for evident that the wicked shall die and be extinguished at last,' etc.

### THE JUSTICE OF GOD.

AN old and celebrated theological lecturer, speaking of certain class of Christians, says : "They deny the *vindictive* justice of God, which the heathen, with more sense, admitted. And, indeed, the greatest part of the law of God, as well as the history of Providence, contains little else than a display of God's *vindictive justice*." *VINDICTIVE*—why the very word repels us. But what is its meaning ? Webster says : "Revengeful ; given to revenge." Such a character suits the unjust judge ; but not the Judge of all the earth, who will do right. Such language represents the Holy One as possessed of the passions of depraved humanity. We can fear a vindictive man, especially if we are in his power, but it is impossible to repose confidence in him. It is impossible for the heart to love him. Clothe such a character with almighty power, and it is more to be dreaded than any being in the universe, and is the farthest from being the object of love.

But, as has been said, *Right* is the primary meaning of the word. *Justice is that attribute of the Holy One, which leads him invariably to do that which is right, and nothing except what is right.* It is his attribute of *right-doing*.—*Am. Presb.*

NOTHING betrays so much weakness of understanding, as not to perceive the misery of man *without God*. Nothing is a surer token of extreme baseness of spirit than not to wish for the reality of eternal promises. No man is so truly a coward, as he that acts brave against heaven.—*Pascal*.



## A LIFE OF TRUST.

FEW Christian men there are who have not encountered trying seasons and circumstances in life, which, for the time being, have taught them the nature of trust, and led them to exercise it in a marked and high degree. They have called upon God in the day of trouble, with an humble faith which they never knew before. But if their trouble has passed away, their peculiar sense of dependence has gone with it. If day after day passes by, unmarked by any unusual trial, it is unmarked alike by any unusual conscious exercise of trust. Christians can exercise simple, unconditional trust; they can commit themselves unreservedly to God, and realize that their all is in His hands *occasionally*.—when, as we might say, they are compelled to do it; but to live A LIFE OF TRUST in a living present God, is, apparently, a rare and difficult attainment.

Or, if some attain it in regard to spiritual matters, there still remains a difficulty in extending it to temporals. We may be able to realize every day, in regard to our souls, that it is not we that live, but Christ that liveth in us; we may have grace given us every day to triumph over the ancient enemy, legality, and to exclude boasting as to our salvation and growth in grace, when we can realize no similar dependence on God for our daily bread, for the support of our families, or for our success in life. Even in much of our labor for the kingdom of God, especially for the secular side of it, we may walk very much by sight, and not by faith, depending upon effort more than upon fervent prayer, losing heart or growing unduly elated by the fluctuating tokens which meet us from without, rather than strengthening ourselves in calm communion with and dependence upon our God.

Men have been discouraged from a practical carrying out of the principle of trust into their daily lives, and their efforts for the cause of Christ, from the fear of running into the opposite evils of presumption and fanaticism. To take the promises of Scripture in reference to the hearing and answering of prayer, with any great literalness, has seemed to them contrary to the dictates of common prudence and common sense. Hence there has grown up in connection with the Lord's work, all the complicated machinery of expedients for procuring the needful means, which the world employs, in carrying forward its objects. And we begin to believe that both in regard to the temporal wants of the Christian, and the means needful for carrying on the work of the Lord in the world, Christian people have espou-

sed to a criminal degree the principles and policy of worldly wisdom. They have shrunk from an excess of pietism, and have become entangled in naturalism. The Christian world of today, carried away with the active spirit of the age, is in danger of *trusting in work*, instead of working by trust.

Nevertheless, the Church has not been without bright examples of the life of trust. They have been found in the humble and private walks of life; in unknown instances of the hopeful endurance of poverty, in which the necessary wants of the believer and his family have been supplied in answer to prayer, and in the patient, happy temper of the confirmed invalid, and the life-long sufferer, where unwavering, submissive trust, has converted their sick chambers into the banqueting house of the King, with the banner of his love spread over them, and all who drew near them, in the same spirit.—*Am. Presbyterian.*

---

### ABIDETH FOR EVER.

A LATE number of the *North British Review* contains the following very truthful statement regarding the preservation of the original writings of the Holy Scriptures.

“It is a matter of congratulation that the Bible has passed triumphantly through the ordeal of verbal criticism. English infidels, of the last century, raised a premature paean over the discovery and publication of so many various readings. They imagined that the popular mind would be rudely and thoroughly shaken, that Christianity would be placed in imminent peril of extinction, and that the church would be dispirited, and ashamed at the sight of the tattered shreds of its Magna Charta. But the result has blasted all their hopes, and the Oracles of God are found to have been preserved in immaculate integrity.

“The storm which shakes the oak only loosens the earth around its roots, and its violence enables the tree to strike its roots deeper in the soil. So it is that Scripture has gloriously surmounted every trial. There gather around it a dense ‘cloud of witnesses’ from the ruins of Nineveh and the valleys of the Nile; from the slabs and bas-reliefs of Sennacherib and the tombs and monuments of Pharaoh, from the rolls of Chaldeo paraphrast and Syrian versionists; from the cells and libraries of monastic scribes, and the dry and dusty labors of scholars and antiquarians.

“Our present Bibles are undiluted by the lapse of ages. These oracles, written amid such strange diversity of time, place, and condition—among the sands and cliffs of Arabia, the fields and hills of Palestine, in the palaces of Babylon, and in the dungeons of Rome—have come down to us in such unimpaired fullness and accuracy, that we are placed as advantageously toward them as the generation which hung on the lips of Jesus, as he recited a parable on the shores of the Galilean lake, or those churches which received from Paul or Peter one of their epistles of warning exposition.

“Yes, the river of life, which issues out from beneath the throne of God and of the Lamb, may, as it flows through so many countries, sometimes bear with it the earthly evidences of its chequered progress; but the great volume of its waters has neither been dimmed in its transparency, nor bereft of its healing virtues.”

---

### THE SYRIAN MASSACRES.

THE horrid accounts of the massacres, by the Druses, of Syrian *Christians*, some months since, which excited so much sympathy in this country and elsewhere, has been wrapt in mystery, to our mind. We had strong suspicions those Christians were Catholics, or essentially so; and that the massacre was most likely a part of the fulfillment of the prophecy, “If any man worship the beast or his image” \*\*\* “the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God,” &c. Rev. 14: 9-11. We felt convicted the eating the Harlot’s flesh and burning her with fire, of which the Revelator speaks, was a work that would be manifested in all countries and upon all people who upheld or followed the harlot power. Though some true Christians may suffer by a contiguous location, yet the great indignation will be on the harlot and her harlot daughters. If the Maronite Christians of Syria were not of the harlot direct, they were, as a body, harlot daughters of the “Mother of Harlots,” whose day of judgment has come. We have looked for information on the subject of those unhappy Syrian Christians who have been subjected to such awful sufferings, and at length have obtained what we sought for. It is presented by Mrs. BENTON, the wife of a Missionary, at the scene of those calami-

ties. We copy from the *Am. Presbyterian* of Dec. 20, 1860. Mrs. Benton writes as follows :—

“ It appears that some of our friends in America look upon the late ferocious conflict between the Druses and Maronites of Lebanon, as a religious war, a persecution upon the Christians because they bear the name of Christ. It is our object, in the following brief statement of facts, to correct this mistake if it exists. We all know that the Moslem watchword is, embrace the faith of the Prophet or die. But not so the Druses ; they never proselyte, never persecute, never fight for religion. “ We make war on those who make war on us.” They believe in the pre-existence and in the transmigration of souls, and that God created the souls of all men at the same time, so many Christians, so many Moslems, so many Druses.

The Druses are the original proprietors of their part of the mountain. When they came here with about thirty-three families, about one thousand years ago, they found these wilds uninhabited, save by the panther and the wild boar. They built comfortable houses, and caused the barren mountains to bring forth fruit for food.

The Christians came from the North and settled among them purchasing land of them, and when too poor to buy, occupied the lands of the sheikhs as tenants. The sheikhs were feudal lords, and reigned supreme in their own mountain wilds. In process of time the Christians multiplied, till they became ten to one of the Druses. Jealousies, animosities, quarrels, and murders became common ; there was no government to inter-vene, no law save that of revenge and retaliation. The Druse notion of justice is, that if a sect or nation is five or ten times as large as another sect or nation, then five or ten of the larger must cancel the blood of one of the smaller. Thus they declared that for every Druse murdered by the Christians they would kill ten Christians.

At last the war seemed inevitable. It is impossible for you to conceive the boastful pride and arrogance of the Maronites, and other Papal sects. From the ill-fated town of Deir-el-Kamr came the plan of exterminating the whole Druse nation, or driving them all off to the Hauran, and taking all their property in the mountains. The Druses got hold of this conspiracy, and the plan became universal among the Christians. The Druses were greatly alarmed ; they feared the superior number of their enemies ; they feared foreign intrigue, especially as they knew many of the Christians were armed with French guns. No one expected such results as have been witnessed. The Christians tauntingly challenged the Druses for a day to fight ; they would accept of no overtures for peace,

except that it should be the voluntary retirement of the Druses from the mountain. The Christians knew little of war, had little ammunition, no leaders, no discipline. The Druses, "sons of the sword," regularly organized into distinct clans under their noble sheikhs, now stood on the defensive. The Christian soldiers received the blessing of their bishops and priests, were sprinkled with holy water, and sent forth, with the assurance that their holy fathers would beseech the Virgin and all the saints for their success, and with burning zeal they rushed upon the Druses, "determined to make clean work of it, and not leave a Druse alive on Lebanon."

Thus compelled to fight, the Druses flew into their ranks, and with fire and sword, and with an almost incredible speed, devastated village after village, and town after town, fighting like mad tigers; and the world has turned pale at the recital of their atrocious deeds. The Lord gave them a fearful victory. Now the armies of France are here to ask and demand the rights of the conquered Papists. Suppose the scene transposed; had the Christians accomplished their most unchristian design, and not left a Druse alive on Lebanon, who would have asked after the rights of these poor heathen Druses? who? Do the Christians of the United States know that under the protection of these same Druses, the American missionaries entered Mount Lebanon, and that during all these years we have never received a word of insult or unkindness from a Druse, while by these heathen Christians we have been hated, insulted, reviled, stoned, mobbed, and been in danger of our lives? Now, how can we see these, our friends and protectors, heathen though they be, driven out of their ancient homes and possessions, and not lift up our voice against it? As there are many well-disposed, peace-loving people among the Christians, so there are many high-minded, honorable and friendly Druses. As a people, the Druses are most kind and hospitable to their friends, but cruel and implacable to their enemies; they never forget a kindness or forgive an injury. During the terrible scenes of the past summer there have been many houses and hundreds of lives saved by friendly Druses. Bhamdun, and the other villages and hamlets at the south of us, in the district of the Jurd, were most completely in the power of the Druses; but they took good advice, kept their neutral position, maintained their fealty to the Druse governors, and all were saved. As we stood by the Christian part of our flock in their days of terror, so now we feel it our duty to stand by our Druse friends, and do all we can to save their nation from destruction.

[Who can read the foregoing without seeing evidence that the hand of judgment is on the Harlot power?—EDITOR.]

## FROM G. B. STACY, RICHMOND, VA.

THESE are not only perilous times, in the general acceptation of the term, but particularly so in relation to the development of Christian character ; and at no period of the world's history could it ever be said, with greater propriety than now, that "The cares of this world and the deceitfulness of riches choke the word, and it becometh unfruitful." We ought to endeavor to preserve the varied admonitions of the sacred writers continually resounding in our ears, such as, "Let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall"—"Examine yourselves, whether you be in the faith, prove your own selves. Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus the Christ is in you, except ye be reprobates?" Were it not for my unwavering confidence in God, my heart would sicken and I should despair of the race. But I console myself with the comforting assurance that God our Father is perfectly competent to every emergency of human exigency, and that He is directing the thoughts and actions of mankind into the channels that will ultimately produce the very result that He desires ; and, therefore, I listen to the Psalmist, saying, "Come, behold the works of the Lord, *what desolations He hath made in the earth. He maketh wars to cease unto the end of the earth ; He breaketh the bow, and cutteth the spear in sunder ; He burneth the chariot with fire. Be still, and know that I am God ; I will be exalted among the nations, I will be exalted in the earth.*" And I rejoice in the assurance which he gives in the following verse : "The Lord of Hosts is with us ; the God of Jacob is our refuge." Then let "the nations rage, (and) the kingdoms be moved." Our God shall utter His voice, and the earth-power shall melt away, and the Lord alone will then be exalted. Amen.

Let me assure you of my sympathies and prayers and hopes that I may be able to still further promote the circulation of the EXAMINER. And may the God of peace be with you and bless you continually.

---

[THE *first* of two articles on the "Kingdom of God," by G. B. STACY, will appear in our next issue.—ED.]

## "NOT MUCH TO CHOOSE."

*The Congregational Herald*, published at Chicago, for February 7, after alleging that they who hold the final extinction of the wicked are "to all intents and purposes on Universalist ground," endeavors to support the assertion by saying, among other things—

"The doctrine that the wicked are made happy at death, the doctrine that they suffer awhile and are then made happy, and the doctrine that after intermediate periods of greater or less suffering, they are finally annihilated, are certainly not one and the same doctrine, but there is not much to choose between them; and in this one thing they all agree, *viz*: that the condition of the finally impenitent is *not one of endless suffering*. And this is the one point of prime importance in the whole matter."

This is the third effort made in this paper to disparage the doctrine, that they only will live for ever who prove worthy of eternal life, and that there will yet be a holy universe. But, in the estimate of this writer, that would not be a very grand consummation after all. If he means what he says, he finds "not much to choose between" eternal glory and eternal oblivion. If we may take him at his word, they who patiently continue in well-doing and get nothing more than glory and honor and immortality, gain very little. If they do not also escape *eternal* indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, theirs is no very great salvation. If they shall find out at last that there is no endless woe to impart value to the immortal life of those who are rescued from it, they will be sadly disappointed—cheated and deluded out of nearly all their bliss. The "unsearchable riches of Christ" are easily reckoned up, and found to rate at a low figure, if sin and woe are to come to an end. For, if this writer says true, that doctrine which many confess involves an eternity of evil, "is the one point of prime importance in the whole matter." The universe is of little account, and God will have created, and preserved, and redeemed in vain, if the infinitely fearful doctrine is not true.

I see but one possible explanation which the writer can offer, which I will not name, and which very few of his readers will guess. Whatever he means, he is henceforth welcome to say what he will.

C. F. H.

"THE METHODIST" AND THE APOCRYPHA: *Addenda*.—Let the following paragraph be inserted and read in the 110th page, immediately before the last paragraph.

Be it observed the testimony of the Apocrypha, in relation to the question of the natural immortality of the soul, must be divided into *two* parts. Those books written *prior* to the Babylonish captivity, and a *part* of those written during the captivity, speak out plainly and positively, as we have seen, in accordance with the canonical Scriptures, that the soul of man, or man, is mortal; but if he conforms in all things to the commands of God, he will be raised to immortality at a *future period*. While on the other hand, those books written *subsequently* to the captivity, contain a few passages that evince the theology of their authors had become corrupted in relation to immortality, by their contact and intermarriages with the heathen. These latter books point out the period when a portion of the Jews became contaminated with the heresy, of the transmigration of the soul as a part of the Deity, and unmistakably prove the heathen origin of the immortality of the soul. And, as their language too, at that period, by the same intermixture with the heathen, became vitiated, they were not able to correct their heathen notions by comparing them with their own Hebrew Scriptures. For very few of those born during the captivity were able to read, or even understand, the Hebrew, as may be seen by reference to Ezra. The common language of the Jews, from that period, was Chaldee and Chaldee Syriac, and not Hebrew.

---

"COULD I KEEP THE GOOD NEWS."—A New Zealand girl was brought over to England to be educated. She became a Christian. When about to return some of her playmates endeavored to dissuade her. They said, "Why go back to New Zealand? You are accustomed to England now. You love its shady lanes and clover fields. It suits your health. Besides, you may be shipwrecked on the ocean. You may be killed and eaten by your own people—every one will have forgotten you."

"What!" she said, "do you think that I could keep the 'Good News' to myself? Do you think that I could be content with having got pardon and peace and eternal life for myself, and not go and tell my dear father and mother how they may get it too! I would go if I had to swim there!"  
—*Juvenile Miss. Herald*.



OBITUARY.—We learn that MRS. ADELIA A. BUGBEE, of South Bend, Ind., one of our most intelligent and firm friends, fell asleep in Jesus, Jan. 28. We formed an acquaintance with her eight years ago, on a visit west. She had a short time before embraced the view of "*Life only in Christ*," and His speedy return from heaven. She had been a member of the Presbyterian Church prior to 1853, and suffered for her change of views, but endured as seeing Him who is invisible. She fell asleep "confidently believing Christ would raise her from the dead." A poetic effusion of hers will be found in the EXAMINER of last year, page 200, entitled "Thy Word is Truth." May mercy attend her bereaved husband and child.

---

### CONSOLATION.

BY MARY HOWITT.

THERE is a land where beauty cannot fade,  
 Nor sorrow dim the eye;  
 Where true love shall not droop, nor be dismayed,  
 And none shall ever die!  
 Where is that land? Oh, where?  
 For I would hasten there;  
 Tell me—I fain would go,  
 For I am weary with a heavy woe!  
 The beautiful have left me all alone;  
 The true, the tender, from my path have gone!  
 Oh! guide me with thy hand,  
 If thou dost know that land,  
 For I am burdened with oppressive care,  
 And I am weak and fearful with despair.  
 Where is it? Tell me where!

Friend, thou must trust in Him who trod before  
 The desolate paths of life;  
 Must bear in meekness, as he meekly bore,  
 Sorrow, and pain, and strife!  
 Think how the Son of God  
 These thorny paths has trod;  
 Think how he longed to go,  
 Yet tarried for thee, the appointed wo,—  
 Think of His weariness in places dim,  
 Where no man comforted or cared for Him!  
 Think of the blood-like sweat,  
 With which His brow was wet;  
 Yet how He prayed, unaided and alone,  
 In that great agony—"Thy will be done!"  
 Friend, do not thou despair;  
 Christ from his heaven of heavens, will hear thy prayer.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

---

"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, HATH NOT LIFE."

---

Vol. 14.

MAY, 1861.

No. 5.

---

## MORAL DEPRAVITY.

DID ADAM IMPART TO HIS POSTERITY A NATURE MORALLY CORRUPTED?

TEXT.—"This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds were evil."—John 3 : 19.

THE doctrine of the depravity of man's nature is one on which much has been said. The idea is very generally held by theologians, that man *inherits* a morally corrupted nature from Adam, or by birth.

This doctrine is thus stated by Mr. WATSON, one of the most eminent Methodist Ministers of England. He says—

"The Scriptures teach the introduction of a state of *moral corruptness* into human nature, which has been transmitted to all men."

Mr. BENSON, another minister of the same church, in his Commentary on Gen. 5 : 3, "Adam begat a son in his own likeness, after his image," says—

"Not only a *man* like himself, but a *SINNER like himself*."

"THE ASSEMBLY OF DIVINES," in their "*Larger Catechism*," state the doctrine as follows :—

"The sinfulness of that estate whereinto man fell, consisteth in the guilt of Adam's first sin, the want of that righteousness wherein he was created, and the corruption of his nature, whereby he is *utterly indisposed, disabled*, and made *opposite* unto all that is spiritually good, and *wholly* inclined to *all evil*, and that *continually*, which is commonly called '*Original Sin*,' and from which do proceed all actual transgressions."

These statements of the doctrine of inherent corruption, or

depravity, are too clear to be misunderstood. If correct, they ought to be sustained by a clear and distinct testimony of Scripture. But, is such the fact? We shall see as we proceed in the examination.

That the Scriptures teach a corruptness of human nature by the sin of Adam, we fully believe: but is that corruptness a *moral* one? or only physical and mental? To decide this question, we need first to get the true idea of a *moral* quality. The term moral, may be applied to virtue or vice, good or evil. It is a term, however, which can have no application to any created being, unless the following things exist:—

1st. There must be a law defining the right and the wrong; or, clearly stating the conduct to be pursued, or dispositions to be exercised.

2d. There must be *intelligence* to comprehend the claims of such law, or rule of conduct and dispositions.

3d. The being or creature made subject to such law, must be free: that is, his conformity or non-conformity to said law must not be the result of an irresistible force, made to act on him from any quarter out of himself.

Unless these three things exist, no *moral* quality can exist, no moral act can be performed, no moral sentiment can come into being, and no proof can be exhibited of moral purity or corruptness.

The law may relate to our conduct toward God, our fellow creatures, or ourselves. A relation must exist which has its claims. To recognize those claims, and to act in *harmony* with them, is to be *morally pure*, or holy: to disregard them, is to be *morally corrupt*, or unholy.

One wrong act, however, does by no means constitute a person, necessarily, totally corrupt, or depraved. There must be a universal disregard of all the claims on us, to make one totally depraved: but one moral act of violation constitutes a man a *sinner*, and makes him justly liable to the penalty of transgression.

If a man is compelled to do right, or conforms to law only by fear or force, and not of a free-will or choice, then he is morally corrupt in principle, however right the act itself might be. Fear may enter into the motive to give it strength, but the presence of a higher motive must be there to constitute the person morally pure.

Morality may exist in an animal being, where there is no spiritual element. In other words, moral purity or corruptness does not depend on the presence of a nature that is spiritual : but the being must have intelligence, freedom, and a rule of conduct that is imperative.

The grand mistake of theologians is, in their assuming that all men are possessed of a spiritual nature, and in concluding immortality, or endless living existence, is inherent in all. Assuming this as a fact, they suppose man's inability to do "*spiritual good*," is full evidence of his inherent moral corruptness ; whereas, man's inability to do spiritual good arises from the lack of a spiritual nature : and that lack existed in Adam just as really as in any of his posterity. Paul saith, explicitly, "The first man Adam was not spiritual." See 1 Corth. 15 : 45, 46. The spiritual was the second Adam, "the Lord from heaven : " and a spiritual nature is derived from a union with the spiritual head of the new creation, *viz. : Christ*. Spiritually good acts, therefore, are neither commanded nor expected of any man, by his creation or natural birth : by such creation or birth he is incapable of them, by his very nature and constitution, and not because he inherits a "moral corruptness ;" even if it could be demonstrated such corruptness did exist.

Nor would the most moral development of purity, or conformity to moral claims, enable a man to do "*spiritual good*," unless there be superadded to his manhood a spiritual nature, by the work of the Holy Spirit : for, "Ye must be born again," because, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh ; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Till begotten of the Spirit, no man has a spiritual nature : hence, till then, he cannot perform "*spiritual good* ;" not for the reason assigned by "The Assembly of Divines," but because, God, in wisdom, appointed that a nature to perform such acts, and to receive the reward of them, should be a gracious endowment, to come through "the second Adam."

No matter, then, what attainments a man may make in moral purity or virtue, it does not give him a claim to the kingdom of God, or an endless life ; and he "cannot see the kingdom of God, except he is born of the Spirit." Moral purity *may* make its possessor more accessible to the Holy Spirit's new creating work : but if rested in, *will* the more effectually hinder that work. Here is where thousands stumble : they suppose, if

they attain to a high degree of moral purity, that will give them a title to the eternal inheritance of an endless life; forgetting, that without the birth our Lord speaks of to Nicodemus, they lack that which alone could fit them for such a kingdom; and without which, from their very nature as mere intellectual *animals*, they could not enjoy or relish it, so entirely unlike are the animal and spiritual elements.

We may take for an illustration, the case of the young man, who came to our Lord to inquire what he should "do to inherit eternal life." He professed that he had observed all the commandments, our Lord enumerated, from his youth up; and he seems to have spoken the truth: for, so far is Jesus from denying his statement, it is said, "beholding him He loved him:" yet he "lacked *one* thing." The highest degree of *moral* purity the young man seems to have had: but that—without being renewed by the Spirit, or having a spiritual nature imparted—gave him no claim upon, nor fitness for "eternal life." By "following" Christ he would have received that nature; which, when in actual possession, would be seen to outweigh all the enjoyment the greatest earthly possessions can possibly give. Yet this most moral and virtuous young man lacked that implicit confidence in Jesus, as a teacher, that would enable him to obey him. So, alas! it is with many others of the human family: they rest in their moral attainments, and will not make the sacrifices which open the way for God to impart to them that, without which they "cannot see the kingdom of God."

The doctrine that a "morally corrupted" nature has been "transmitted to all men" by generation, from Adam, we regard as at war with the declaration of God, at war with good morals, and a theological impossibility—*i. e.*, moral impurity cannot be transmitted from father to son, because it can have no existence, except by the act of a free agent.

The doctrine is at war with the declaration of God by the mouth of the prophet. "The word of the LORD came unto me, saying, 'What mean ye, that ye use this proverb concerning the land of Israel, saying, The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge?' As I live, saith the LORD God, ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb in Israel. Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine: the soul that sinneth it shall die."

Here JEHOVAH states, explicitly, that He will not allow His people to promulgate the doctrine that a depraved nature is communicated from father to son : they should not use a proverb which is expressive of the precise idea of the "Assembly's Catechism," when speaking of "original sin" they say, "from which do proceed all actual transgressions." If this is not affirming the very sentiment which JEHOVAH said should no more be uttered, then let them tell us how it could be expressed.

Our Saviour is explicit, in our text, as to the cause of the moral depravity of men : "This is the condemnation, that light has come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light, BECAUSE *their DEEDS were evil.*"—not because they inherit a "moral corruptness."

Gen. 3 : 5, is urged in support of such corruptness. "Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son in his own likeness, after his image ; and called his name Seth." On this text, Dr. Benson says—"Not only a *man* like himself, but a *SINNER* like himself." A strange assumption this ! Where is the proof of it ? It is answered—"Adam had lost the image of God, and hence begat a son *in his own image.*" Again, we ask—Where is the proof to be found that Adam had lost the image of God ? It is answered—"He had sinned before his children were born, and thereby lost it." Still there is nothing but assumption. Let them settle, if they can, first, what was the image of God in which man was made. We shall not stop now to settle it for them, but whatever it was, we affirm, man did not lose it by Adam's sin ; nor is there an intimation in all the Bible of such a loss, but the reverse.

This fifth chapter of Gen. begins with "the generations of Adam : in the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him." Then, without any intimation that Adam had lost the likeness or image of God, it proceeds to say, "Adam begat a son in his own likeness, after his image." As no intimation of any change in Adam's image is recorded, since his creation, we have a right to conclude, he begat a son in the likeness and image of his own creation, *viz.*—the likeness and image of God.

After the flood, the LORD speaks thus, Gen. 9 : 6,—"*Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed : for in the image of God made he man.*" Why is man prohibited from

shedding his brother's blood? BECAUSE—"In the IMAGE OF GOD made he man." Certainly this expression applies to all men and not to Adam only, else it would be of no force. Here, then, we have demonstration that men possessed the image of God *after* the flood.

Again, Paul saith, "A man ought not to cover his head," in praying, "forasmuch as he is the IMAGE of God;" 1 Corth. 11: 7. And James saith, "Men are made after the *similitude* of God." Jas. 3: 9.

Out of the mouth of three such witnesses, we judge the fact is established, that the image and likeness of God, in which man was created, was not lost by Adam's transgression. Do not accuse us of saying, Adam did not become a sinner: we only affirm, he did not lose the image and likeness of God in which he was created. It is for the advocates of the opposite theory to prove, if they can, that image and likeness was holiness: that we deny, and challenge the proof.

This text, Gen. 5: 3, is a most unfortunate one for the "*Original sin*" theorists. This son which Adam begat was *Seth*. So far as appears, he was a good man; nothing is said against him. If Moses had intended to teach the doctrine of inherent moral depravity, it seems most likely he would have given us Cain, as the son begotten in the likeness and image of Adam. But even then, there would have been *two* against *one*; for Abel and Seth being unblamable, so far as known, would have outweighed Cain's perverseness, and proved that Adam must have had a preponderance to the image of God, if that was moral purity.

In the light of this text, we leave our readers to judge if there is any ground for the statement of the Assembly's Catechism, or Dr. Benson's assumption; or any cloak for men to cover up their own indolence in resisting every temptation to sin, and overcoming it.

The doctrine of a communicated moral corruption, to Adam's posterity, in our judgment, is a most mischievous notion, forming a cloak for all kinds of sin and sinners. Satisfy a man he is born, or which is the same thing, *created*, with a "nature utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all" moral "good, and wholly inclined to all evil," &c., and he must be an idiot to come to any other conclusion than that he sins from necessity, and therefore is not blameworthy. Hence, all classes

of sinners, where the doctrine is embraced for truth, do hide themselves under it as a cloak for their sins, and as an excuse for their offspring. Parents, instead of governing themselves and their children, find an excuse for their neglect: "Poor things—old Adam corrupted them—they have inherited a depraved nature—what can we do till God changes their hearts?" &c. Their children are early taught, that the fountain of all their manifested perversion is an "inherent moral corruptness;" thus they are furnished with an excuse, or effectually discouraged from all efforts to serve God; and they cannot but regard Him as a hard master, and not worthy of their love.

Let all beware how they impeach the oath of God, by affirming, children's teeth are set on edge by their father's sin: and let them beware of flattering themselves, there is any excuse for their living in sin a single day. Our sins are our own. Unless repented of, forsaken, forgiven, and we have the renewing of the Holy Spirit, we shall cry in vain, "Lord, Lord, open unto us."

If we are not mistaken, the position of the Assembly of Divines, and all who follow them in it, is a most unwarrantable *assumption*—unauthorized by the Bible—plainly contradicted by that book—and most corrupting in its tendency; though there may be sincerity in its advocates, and they may really think they honor God: we impeach not their piety; but to us it is apparent, they are in error.

To proceed with the examination of texts relied on, in support of their theory, we next examine Psa. 51: 5, "Behold I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me." This text is considered conclusive, by the advocates of inherent moral corruptness. Truly, if it is, the Psalmist, instead of confessing his sin, hides himself under a cloak, as most other sinners do who believe the common theory. He had committed two great sins—adultery and murder. If he does affirm the doctrine usually drawn from this text, he throws the blame first on his mother, and then indirectly on God. Let us see. "Why did I sin these great sins?" *Answer*—"Because my mother conceived me in sin;" *i. e.*, "conveyed to me a nature morally corrupted." Again, we ask, "Why did you commit these enormous crimes?" *Answer*—"I was shapen in iniquity." But, "who shapened you?" *Answer*—God—"Thy hands have made me and fashioned me." Psa. 119: 73.



Now let us sum up the whole.--“ I have committed adultery and murder, BECAUSE God made and fashioned me in iniquity in my mother’s womb !” The blasphemy of such a position is apparent ; yet it is the legitimate result of the doctrine of inherent moral corruption. Let the determined defenders of that doctrine not blush to own their own child, if they still claim the text under consideration.

If it be asked, what did the Psalmist mean, then ? We reply, the language is of similar import to that of Psa. 58 : 3, “ The wicked are estranged from the womb : they go astray as soon as they be born, speaking lies.” Now we all know, that none *speak* at all as soon as they be born : and hence the most that can be intended by the expression is, those who are now wicked, commenced an early course of wickedness : a want of attention to truth in early life has resulted, as all know it does result, in confirmed wickedness and falsehood. So, the most that is intended by the Psalmist’s sentiment, Psa. 51 : 5, is, in his humiliation and penitence for his sins, he speaks in a style of *hyperbole*, which is not uncommon under deep feeling, when the mind struggles to give utterance to its emotions : but the *exaggeration* in such cases is not misunderstood by any one who looks at it impartially.

But again : If the Psalmist’s expression proved, so far as he was concerned, that he was born with a nature morally corrupted—which we do not admit—it could not prove all other men were so. Job affirms the opposite of himself ; for he tells us, he had cared “ for the fatherless and widow,” and that he had “ guided her from” his “ mother’s womb :” Job 13 : 15-18. Here is proof that one of Adam’s posterity was not born with a nature “ utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all” moral “ good,” &c. ; for, James declares, that “ pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows,” &c. Job affirms that he did this from his “ mother’s womb.” Just as early as David was corrupt, Job was pure ; hence, if the advocates of inherent moral pollution take the full benefit of Psa. 51 : 5. their theory is at an infinite distance from being established ; especially, when the holy and blessed God has warned us all against using the “ proverb, the fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children’s teeth are set on edge.”

The next text in support of the common theory, we notice,

is Job 15 : 14. "What is man that he should be clean? and he which is born of a woman, that he should be righteous?" If this text proves anything for the theory, it proves too much. It would prove Jesus Christ had a "morally corrupted nature;" for, he was "born of a woman." Not to press that point, however, we ask, Who uttered these words? Is it answered, "They are inspiration:" we reply, Just as much as the words, "Thou shalt not surely die," are inspiration. "Eliphaz, the Temanite," is the speaker. To him the LORD said, "My wrath is kindled against thee, and against thy two friends; for ye have not spoken of me right," &c.; and He commanded him to make an offering and get Job to pray for him, "lest I deal with you after your folly, in that ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right," &c. Job 42 : 7, 8.

Here is the Lord's own testimony that Eliphaz's discourses were not inspiration, and therefore are not authority: and mark, when Eliphaz had finished the discourse, of which we are speaking, Job commenced, by calling that discourse "vain words;" chap. 16 : 2. Truly, Eliphaz turns out an unfortunate witness for inherent moral corruption!

Rom. 5 : 19, is produced in proof of an inherited moral corruptness. "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners." Does any man suppose Paul meant by this language, "many were made morally corrupt?" for that must be their view, if this text is to avail them anything. If it does mean that, they might as well quote, "He" [God] "hath made him" [Christ] "to be *sin* for us who knew no sin," to prove that Jesus was made sin itself. Suppose we should say—"The Scriptures teach that God made Christ *morally corrupt!*" Would not all Christians call such doctrine, blasphemy? But the text we have just quoted, as really proves Christ was made morally corrupt, as the text, Rom. 5 : 19,— "many were made sinners"—proves Adam's sin made his offspring morally corrupt. But if this text is insisted on, in proof of the doctrine, then let its advocates take the consequences of their construction; for the apostle saith, "As by one man's disobedience [*the*] many were made sinners," [morally corrupt,] "*so* by the obedience of one shall [*the*] many be made righteous," [morally pure.]

If it is the moral corruptness the apostle speaks of, in this text, then moral purity is just as certain to all men as the corruption was. The text, we understand, teaches that as all men

were made subject to death by one man's sin, (or were treated as if sinners), so by one man's obedience "unto death," the same all men shall be treated as if righteous, so far that none shall be holden in death for Adam's sin: that sin cannot hold one of his posterity in death. If death triumphs over any man it is for his *own sins*: Christ has reversed the death power which came upon Adam's race by his sin. God made Christ to be sin, *i. e.*, He subjected him to death for a time, as if He were a sinner, though he knew no sin; but He raised him up from the dead; thus he became "Lord both of the dead and the living;" and has obtained the right to reverse, and has actually reversed, so far as Adam's sin is concerned, death from all mankind. No man shall be held as a victim of death's power, except for his own sins.

As to what Mr. Watson has said, that "The Scriptures teach the introduction of a state of moral corruptness into human nature, which has been transmitted to all men," Paul affirms—"Sin entered into the world, and *death* by sin:" not moral corruptness, but DEATH. Such is the inspired testimony.

It is urged in defence of the doctrine of inherent depravity, that "All little children show it; that their first developments manifest it, and prove that the evil is in their nature."

If their manifestations prove them morally depraved, then little brutes must have an inherent moral depravity: for we have seen some of them fighting each other, before a month old, with as much apparent anger as children manifest when much older. From whence came their evil passions? Did Adam communicate his depravity to them?

If children manifest a spirit of corruption in their first acts, and that is proof they are morally depraved by nature, then as the first action of Adam and Eve, under law, was an act of disobedience, that equally proves they were *created* with a depraved nature! So the advocates of inherent moral depravity inevitably fall back with the blame on their MAKER! Let them escape this dilemma, if they can.

The truth is, Adam and all other men were placed in this world to bring out a moral development, by means of such appliances as infinite wisdom should see fit to employ; and it must be under such circumstances as should not compel or force the agent to a definite course, else his acts would possess no moral character, and the trial would fail of its object. On

the other hand, he must be dependent for aid to accomplish what is demanded of him, in order that his dependence on his CREATOR may be distinctly recognized, and not severed. But this needed aid must be clearly proffered to him, else he may justly make his helpless condition an excuse for not complying with the demands on him.

Children are born into the world under the law of mortality and death. Hence pain, a sense of want, with a strong desire for relief, often, if not always, produces in them that disquietude, accompanied with a strong effort to deliver themselves, which some construe as evidence of inherent moral depravity. But if such depravity really exists, why does it not manifest itself equally and alike in all children? We know it does not. Or the contrary, previous to education, the manifestations of children of the same parents are often widely different, in this respect, from their birth. We have many times witnessed this. One child is terribly "cross," fretful, and constantly disquieted. Another is mild, sweet, and always quiet, from its birth. Why is it so, if the evidence of inherent moral depravity is seen in their first acts? Can the answer be given? It is manifest some physical difference must be the cause: a more imperfect organization in one than in the other, causing pain and uneasiness, which the child has no other means to express than such as it uses. Many a poor suffering child has been grievously wronged by accusations of inherent moral depravity—"old Adam"—when they needed the relief a common sense mother or a skillful physician might have imparted, by which the fancied "old Adam" would soon have been converted into a lamb; as peaceful and quiet as a beautiful morning of spring.

When children come to years of understanding, they are called upon to conform to that exhibition of holiness, or moral purity, God has presented to their consideration; and He has proffered them abundant help to enable them to overcome their animal nature, so as to bring it into subjection to all moral claims. If they do not accept that aid, they sink under the control of the animal, and "live after the flesh:" such "shall die:" but, if "through the Spirit"—the aid God offers them—they "mortify the deeds of the body, they shall live." So speaks Paul, and his testimony is in harmony with all the inspired testimony of the Bible on the subject.

It is a proverb, that "Children and fools tell the truth." Then it is not *natural* for them to lie; and we may safely conclude, they seldom resort to lying till inducted into it by their parents or teachers, who are often promising or threatening them, without carefully keeping their word. Thus deceived, they soon learn to deceive in turn. Lying is no more natural to children than drunkenness: with rare exceptions, both are habits acquired—things they learn of others. The apostle exhorted the Corinthians, "In malice be ye children," 1 Corth. 14: 20; and our Saviour called a little child to him, and said to those around, "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven:" Math. 18: 3. Did he mean to say, "Except ye be converted and become as those who have a morally corrupted nature, and therefore need themselves to be converted, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven?"

Again. There are Christians who maintain that a man may be "sanctified wholly, soul, body and spirit." Surely this would seem to imply an entire renewal, so that "old Adamic" moral corruption would be purged out. How then can that corruption be communicated to their offspring, supposing them to have any after such sanctification? Say, for example, Enoch, who "walked with God three hundred years, and begat sons and daughters." So closely did he walk with God, that "he was translated, that he should not see death." Now, two cannot "walk together, except they be agreed," or are in *harmony*: Amos 3: 3. Surely, God could not be "agreed" with a man morally corrupt. But Enoch walked with Him, and had children born at the same time. How then did this supposed inherent moral corruption find its way into his offspring? The theologian may say, "Enoch's purity was of grace, but his children were born of nature." Be it so; but that nature, in Enoch, had been purified: and if Adam could communicate a corrupt nature, why could not Enoch communicate his pure nature? We suppose the truth is, neither a morally pure or corrupt nature is transmissible: neither can be conveyed by natural generation; because neither can exist without the personal action of a free and intelligent agent, who is under law, and having power in himself, or freely offered him, to enable him to conform to the law.

Let men cease to cast their moral defection on God, as did

Adam, when he said, "The woman whom THOU gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat:" thus adding sin to sin, instead of frankly confessing he sinned wilfully, of his own mind. Multitudes, now, hide their sins and moral defect in the same way, by charging God with bringing them into the world with a morally corrupted nature. But JEHOVAH demands of men to cease this imputation, and saith, "What mean ye, that ye use this proverb, saying, 'The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge?' " He then charges them "no more" to use it, and saith, "*The soul that sinneth it shall die.*" Let men beware of charging God as the *author* of their moral corruption.

While we maintain no moral corruption did or could descend to us from Adam, and show men's sins are their own by their free and unnecessitated choice, we leave no ground for any one to suppose he can merit or obtain eternal life by the highest state of moral rectitude; because God claims the bestowment of that inheritance as his own *free gift*; to be conferred on none except in JESUS CHRIST, and *new birth* of the Spirit; by which they become "partakers of the divine nature;" thus receiving a nature which harmonizes with the Divine mind, and fits for "the kingdom of God." To such only is the promise of endless life.

It may be asked, "What use, then, to strive to be morally pure, if that cannot entitle us to eternal life?" Moral purity has its own reward in the present state, in the consciousness of its own integrity, and in the respect it must ever command from those around us, whose moral sense is at all active.

But, again.—No man can come to Christ for life eternal, without "repentance towards God;" which implies he has forsaken moral impurity, or has a full purpose and determination to do so for all time to come. So that the more moral he has been, the easier is his work, provided he does not rest in his morality as the ground of *claim* for eternal life: that life he must receive, if he ever obtains it at all, as a *free gift* from Jesus Christ, whom "God the Father sealed" to be the *fountain, author, and bestower* of it: for, "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; he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." See John 6th chapter, and 1 John 5: 10—12.

It is a proverb, that "Children and fools tell the truth." Then it is not *natural* for them to lie; and we may safely conclude, they seldom resort to lying till inducted into it by their parents or teachers, who are often promising or threatening them, without carefully keeping their word. Thus deceived, they soon learn to deceive in turn. Lying is no more natural to children than drunkenness: with rare exceptions, both are habits acquired—things they learn of others. The apostle exhorted the Corinthians, "In malice be ye children," 1 Corth. 14: 20; and our Saviour called a little child to him, and said to those around, "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven:" Math. 18: 3. Did he mean to say, "Except ye be converted and become as those who have a morally corrupted nature, and therefore need themselves to be converted, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven?"

Again. There are Christians who maintain that a man may be "sanctified wholly, soul, body and spirit." Surely this would seem to imply an entire renewal, so that "old Adamic" moral corruption would be purged out. How then can that corruption be communicated to their offspring, supposing them to have any after such sanctification? Say, for example, Enoch, who "walked with God three hundred years, and begat sons and daughters." So closely did he walk with God, that "he was translated, that he should not see death." Now, two cannot "walk together, except they be agreed," or are in *harmony*: Amos 3: 3. Surely, God could not be "agreed" with a man morally corrupt. But Enoch walked with Him, and had children born at the same time. How then did this supposed inherent moral corruption find its way into his offspring? The theologian may say, "Enoch's purity was of grace, but his children were born of nature." Be it so; but that nature, in Enoch, had been purified: and if Adam could communicate a corrupt nature, why could not Enoch communicate his pure nature? We suppose the truth is, neither a morally pure or corrupt nature is transmissible: neither can be conveyed by natural generation; because neither can exist without the personal action of a free and intelligent agent, who is under law, and having power in himself, or freely offered him, to enable him to conform to the law.

Let men cease to cast their moral defection on God, as did

Adam, when he said, "The woman whom THOU gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat:" thus adding sin to sin, instead of frankly confessing he sinned wilfully, of his own mind. Multitudes, now, hide their sins and moral defection in the same way, by charging God with bringing them into the world with a morally corrupted nature. But JEHOVAH demands of men to cease this imputation, and saith, "What mean ye, that ye use this proverb, saying, 'The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge?' " He then charges them "no more" to use it, and saith, "*The soul that sinneth it shall die.*" Let men beware of charging God as the *author* of their moral corruption.

While we maintain no moral corruption did or could descend to us from Adam, and show men's sins are their own by their free and unnecessitated choice, we leave no ground for any one to suppose he can merit or obtain eternal life by the highest state of moral rectitude; because God claims the bestowment of that inheritance as his own *free gift*; to be conferred on none except in JESUS CHRIST, and *new birth* of the Spirit; by which they become "partakers of the divine nature;" thus receiving a nature which harmonizes with the Divine mind, and fits for "the kingdom of God." To such only is the promise of endless life.

It may be asked, "What use, then, to strive to be morally pure, if that cannot entitle us to eternal life?" Moral purity has its own reward in the present state, in the consciousness of its own integrity, and in the respect it must ever command from those around us, whose moral sense is at all active.

But, again.—No man can come to Christ for life eternal, without "repentance towards God;" which implies he has forsaken moral impurity, or has a full purpose and determination to do so for all time to come. So that the more moral he has been, the easier is his work, provided he does not rest in his morality as the ground of *claim* for eternal life: that life he must receive, if he ever obtains it at all, as a *free gift* from Jesus Christ, whom "God the Father sealed" to be the *fountain, author, and bestower* of it: for, "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; he that hath not the Son of God hath not life." See John 6th chapter, and 1 John 5: 10—12.



## "RIVERS OF LIVING WATER :"

OR, AN EXPOSITION OF JOHN 7 : 37-39. BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

IN the course of our remarks on this impressive passage, we shall notice, first, the feast ; second, the circumstances that rendered our Lord's words remarkable ; third, His scriptural allusion.

1. THE FEAST. It was the feast of tabernacles. See ver. 2.

We find the record of its institution, Lev. 23 : 33-43. The more noticeable ceremonies were—the dwelling in booths, and the libation of water. The first consisted in taking branches of trees and erecting booths on the flat roofs of the houses, and in the streets, and probably in the fields ; in these they dwelt seven days, to represent the life in the wilderness. Lev. 23 : 40 ; Neh. 8 : 15-17.

The second ceremony was as follows : Each day of the seven, a grand procession was formed to accompany a priest, who brought water in a golden vessel from the pool of Siloam, outside of the city, to the altar in the temple, whercon he poured it, together with wine ; the whole multitude, meanwhile, singing the great Hallel, Psa. 113-118. This custom had a three-fold reference. 1. To the striking of the rock by Moses, Ex. 17 chap. 2. To the rain, for which they then prayed ; for the seed of the ensuing year. 3. To Isa. 12 : 3, and the out-pouring of the Holy Spirit in the days of the Messiah.

"The last day, that great day of the feast," was the eighth day. Strictly speaking, this was not one of the feast days ; the people dwelt in booths only seven days, and the water ceremony lasted the same time. It was a day of rest—a sabbath—a day of solemn assembly. Num. 29 : 35 ; Neh. 8 : 18. The Hallel, however, was sung on this as on the other days.

2. THE CIRCUMSTANCES THAT RENDERED OUR LORD'S WORDS REMARKABLE. Let us bring the scene before us ; it is a magnificent one. Here is the temple, standing in massive grandeur, the sanctuary reflecting from its golden surface the rays of the sun, causing the beholder to turn his eyes from the dazzling brightness, and awakening in the heart of the ardent Hebrew

some dim conceptions of the glory that pertained to "the first house." An immense multitude is gathered in and about the temple from all parts of the land, filled with religious enthusiasm, and fired with vivid remembrances of the glowing past. The smoke of their solemn offering ascends to heaven, reminding them of the days when Jehovah went before the hosts of united Israel—in "The pillar and the flame of fire." And now from the vast concourse arises the thrilling strains of their triumphal song. Even the disciples of Jesus, as they stand around their beloved Master, catch the contagion of the moment and join their voices to swell the mighty chant. The song ceases. There is a pause. Suddenly a voice is heard, loud, clear, and musical; there is something in its cadence that thrills every soul in the temple's area. Hark! what gracious words are these? "If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink." Instantly a murmur runs through the assembly—Jesus—the Nazarene—the carpenter's son! Yes, it is Jesus of Nazareth. They have been singing of "the rock" which was turned "into a standing water"—Lo! Christ, the rock stands in the midst; they have been praying for rain—lo, here is one crying out in effect, "I will pour water upon him that is thirsty and floods upon the dry ground;" they have been thinking of the prophet's declaration, "With joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation"—Lo, the occasion for the other words, "Cry out, and shout thou inhabitant of Zion; for great is the Holy One of Israel in the midst of thee;" they have sung Hosanna, (save now, I beseech thee,) and here is the answer to their supplication.

No wonder that many said, "Of a truth this is the prophet;" and others, "This is the Christ." These were the the spontaneous exclamations of simple hearts, overcome by the wondrous coincidence of the occasion. This, the first public teaching of Jesus at Jerusalem (John 7: 14, 15,) had a mighty effect, so that "there was a division among the people because of him." The leaders of the people (ever foremost, in all ages, against reformation,) wanted to arrest him, but the officers answered—"Never man spake like this man;" and even the fearful Nicodemus was bold to speak for Jesus.

3. HIS SCRIPTURAL ALLUSION. We now come to the most important part of the subject. The reading of the received translation is incorrect, for the following reason:—The Scripture

nowhere says, rivers of living water shall flow from *the believer*. To this it may be replied, the passage is not a quotation of Scripture *at all*. True ; but it is a clear *allusion* to the 47th ch. of Ezekiel, which we shall presently apply to Christ. At the outstart we would render the passage thus :

"If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink, he believing into me. As the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water."

By this alteration no injustice is done the original, while its propriety as a basis for easy explication will be seen. Let us now turn to Ezek., 47th ch., and read from the 1st to the 12th verse inclusive. Here we see waters as from a fountain issuing out from under the threshold of the temple eastward. One fact proves this figurative. There was no fountain in the literal temple ; Solomon made a brazen sea to hold water for its use. What then is the signification of this figure ? By turning to John 2 : 21, we find that the temple was symbolic of Christ's body. We now see the meaning of Christ's words, and the propriety of the above rendering of the text. There can hardly be a doubt, we think, but that Christ referred to this prophecy—"As the Scripture hath said, out of his" (Christ's) "belly shall flow rivers of living water."

Waters running east of the literal temple would follow the course of the Kedron, through the desert of Judea, and empty into the Dead Sea. So Ezekiel : "These waters issue out, and go down into the desert, and go into the sea : brought forth into the sea, the waters shall be healed." Tho application is evident. The temple—Christ ; the waters—the Spirit ; the desert—Sin ; the sea—Death ; the healing of the waters—Life to the Dead.

"But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on Him should receive : for the Holy Spirit was not yet, because that Jesus was not yet glorified."

There was a peculiar significance in the act of the priest at the feast of tabernacles, as he poured the water of Siloam on the altar. The living waters of Ezekiel proceeded from underneath the altar, indicating that their source was in sacrificial death. The Spirit could not be given until justice was vindicated. "The Lamb slain" paralyzed the uplifted arm of Vengeance. When Jesus was glorified, the long beclouded face of Hope beamed with seraphic light.

In the figurative language of Ezekiel we have not only a grand spiritual panorama, but also a most vivid and complete commentary on our Lord's words. The river rises in Christ,—the fountain—bursts into view on the day of Pentecost, and flows onward in a steady stream through the "Great Desert" of Sin ; every one who believes in its life-giving power, and consequently seeks its course to drink, shall live : the water which they drink shall be in them "a well of water springing up into everlasting life." "Every thing *that liveth, which moveth*, withersoever the rivers shall come, *shall live*." This refers, no doubt, to those believers who live during the dispensation of the Spirit, they "shall live ;" *i. e.*, "at the last day." Blessed are they who are "made to drink into one Spirit." The river has been flowing for 1800 years, and will increase in volume and power until it empties itself into the Sea of Death. Signs, we think, are strongly indicative of the proximity of that event. The Lord hasten it.

No more apposite symbol of the state of the dead could be employed than the Dead Sea.

"This Sea of Sodom is so intolerably bitter, that, although the Jordan, Arnon, and many other streams have been pouring into it their vast contributions of sweet water for thousands of years, it continues as nauseous and deadly as ever. Nothing lives in it, neither fish, nor reptiles, nor even animaculæ can abide its desperate malignity. \*\*\*\* There it lies in its sulphurous sepulchre, thirteen hundred feet below the ocean, steaming up like a huge cauldron of smouldering bitumen and brimstone. Neither rain from heaven, nor mountain torrents, nor Jordan's flood, nor all combined, can change its character of utter death."—*Land and Book. Dr. Thomson.*

How well this agrees with the Scripture description of the state of the dead. "The land of darkness and the shadow of death ; without any order, and where the light is as darkness." Job 11. "Wilt thou shew wonders to the dead ? Shall the dead arise and praise thee ? Shall thy loving-kindness be declared in the grave ? or thy faithfulness in destruction ? Shall thy wonders be known in the dark ? and thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness ?" Psa. 88. "There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest." Eccl. 9.

But the river of life can animate the sea of death.. "Which

being brought forth into the sea, the waters shall be healed." Nothing can resist the power of the Spirit; the host of God's elect, from the righteous Abel to the last and humblest believer in our Lord Jesus Christ, shall "return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads." "Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory."

"And there shall be a very great multitude of fish." It is a remarkable fact that the Greek term *ikthus*, a fish, was, at an early period of the Christian era, adopted as a symbolical word. The letters of the word *ikthus*, or the figures of fishes, were, by the Christians, sculptured on their monuments for the dead, and engraved on medals, rings, seals, and even formed on the articles of domestic use. The word was formed from the Greek initials of Jesus, Christ, Son, God, Saviour.

"But the miry places thereof, and the marshes thereof shall not be healed; they shall be given to salt." Dr. Thomson, the missionary and traveler, says, the above miry and marshy places are "along the southern shore of the lake, at the base of Usdum, and the thick strata of rock salt which there formed the plain."—*Land and Book*.

It is clear, then, that part of the sea of death shall not be healed; *some of the dead will not live again*. The waters do not reach them. He that believeth not the Son *shall not see life*, but the wrath of God abideth on them. They are "given to salt."

---

## THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

BY G. B. STACY, RICHMOND, VA.

THE subject of our caption is one, nay, the leading theme of the Bible; and yet it is our impression, that of all the glowing themes of revelation this, its leading one, is comprehended less than any other; and we are deeply penetrated with the conviction that the general fog which beclouds the minds of students of the word, arises principally from this lack of comprehension of "the Kingdom of God." We propose, then, to contribute the scattering rays of light which we have gathered towards the removal of the general obscurity, and hope our effort may

call forth others, so that the truth, in all its luminous glory, may shine forth.

First, then, the meaning of the word Kingdom. It is a compound word made up of, or derived from two roots, namely, a king and his dominion. The first of the children of men to whom the term was applied, was Nimrod, the mighty hunter: the beginning of (whose) kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calnet, in the land of Shinah. It is in the beginning of this kingdom that we are able to trace the term king to its legitimate root. The people's language had been confounded, and they themselves scattered, and, as the legitimate consequence, divided in their interests. We have no record of the confusions and conflicts that must have necessarily resulted therefrom; but we have frequent reference to the fact that all nations felt their utter impotence without a head, or a *king* to lead them on to, or "go out before them," and fight their battles for them. But the fact that four of the dispersed families united in the beginning to make Nimrod their *head leader*, or *king*, leads of necessity to the conclusion that they availed themselves of whatever knowledge of the Godhead they retained, and imitated it in their united recognition of *one head* whom they "set over" themselves. For the sacred writers record all such transactions as the people's act of setting individuals as kings over themselves.

The Psalmist traces the application of the term king to God, as resultant from the fact, He is "exalted as head above all." His language is, "Thine, O LORD, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty: for (or because) all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine: thine is the kingdom, O LORD, and thou art exalted as head above all."

The human organism is configured in, or after the image and likeness of the great God, and is the great model of organisms and organic relations. The most elevated member—that which crowns the whole, or, as the Scriptures say of kings, that which is set over all, is endowed with the capacity and invested with the right to rule over all. Its rule is absolute and uncontrolled, and therefore it is called *the head*, because in every sense of the word it is "over all."

The term head, therefore, expresses the very apex of exaltation and authority. Hence it is the root from which the term king is derived as expressing the highest point to which communities or nations could exalt one of their fellows. Standing, therefore, for, and being used in the place of head, by men in relation to those whom they had exalted to rule over themselves, it came to be used in like manner towards God; and thus came into existence the term, "Kingdom of God," or rather its Hebrew equivalent.

The dominion of a king, *is that over which he dominates, rules, or exerciseth jurisdiction*; that is the sphere of his jurisdiction: hence, that which he cannot command, exact obedience from, or require to obey his behests, is not comprehended within the sphere of his jurisdiction. Thus it follows, that men, the subjects of any given kingdom, constitute the sphere of that king's jurisdiction, and not the territory upon which they happen to be located. The territory cannot obey, and therefore cannot be ruled. It is true, metonymically, we put the territory containing the people for the people themselves, and so call the territory of a kingdom "the kingdom," which it is not in reality.

Now, as the term king was originally derived from the term head, and was applied only to those whom the people voluntarily set over themselves, that they might occupy a similar relation to them to that which God had occupied, but which they had rejected, the term king, as used in the Bible, necessarily means an absolute and uncontrolled monarch. The appendages of what are called by us constitutional governments, are in no sense contemplated in the Bible term kingdom.

The Bible definition of its own term "*kingdom*," is a head, or king, having imperial and absolute jurisdiction over his own subjects, or a jurisdiction as absolute as that which the head exercises over the body. But, while this is the general definition of the term kingdom, "The Kingdom of God" is thus defined: "Thine, O LORD, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty: for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine; thine is the kingdom, O LORD, and thou art exalted as head above all. Both riches and honor come of thee, and thou reignest over all; and in thy hand is power and might, and in thine hand it is to make great, and to give strength unto all."

This is what the apostle calls, "The eternal Godhead," or the eternal headship of God; even "God that made the world, and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth." \*\*\*\* "He giveth to all life, and breath, and all things; and hath made of one blood all nations of men, for to dwell on the face of the earth; and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation."\*\*\*\* "For in Him we live, and move, and have our being." \*\*\* "Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that *the Godhead* is like unto gold, or silver, or stone graven by art and man's device." Hence, He exercised his authority, or rule directly—that is, without any intervening, or mediatorial power—over Adam and his descendants, until their transgressions necessitated the addition of the law, which "was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator." It is true while the transgressions of the sons of God necessitated the addition of

the law "in the hands of a mediator," the sons of men had established heads for themselves, and were in open rebellion against God, *and alienation from his life*. Nevertheless, "The Most High ruleth in the kingdoms of men; and giveth them to whomsoever He will." For his right to rule, and his power to rule, that is, His Godhead, is eternal. Hence, Jesus said to Pilate, "Thou couldest have no power against me, *unless it were given thee of God*." For all "the powers that be are [subordinated] to God:" that is, absolutely under his control, as He demonstrated in the case of Nebuchadnezzar, and as all history demonstrates. Hence, Daniel recognizes the kingdoms of the world as God's kingdom; and therefore he affirms, at the appointed time the judgment shall sit, and the dominion shall be taken away from the then existent beast, namely, Rome, to consume and to destroy it to the end. But he continues—"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."

We affirm that this is the Bible definition of the kingdom of God; and that it is established and corroborated by the facts of history as developed in all ages.

In our next, we propose to examine those phases of "the Kingdom of God" which have been developed in relation to the household of faith.

---

## NATIONAL JUDGMENTS.

GEO. DUFFIELD, in his "Fast Day" sermon, Philadelphia, after enumerating our various national sins, notices the national judgments down to 1850, to the death of PRESIDENT TAYLOR. He then adds:—

"Since that period the judgment trumpets have been blowing, and the vials of God's wrath have been pouring out upon us as a nation almost continually. Blighted harvests, destructive storms at sea, tremendous tornadoes on land, the inexplicable *Financial Panic* of 1857, droughts unprecedented as to extent and continuance, and signs in the heavens, which rarely occur without equally remarkable events on earth; and now, last and worst of all, the great **POLITICAL PANIC**; all these things show us this day, that when 'the judgments of the Lord are abroad in the land, the inhabitants thereof (should) learn righteousness.' Having lost *faith in God*, to so great an ex-



tent, no wonder that we have lost faith in each other, both *financially* and *politically*."

Surely one would think Mr. Duffield and others might see, in his statements, "signs there is no mistaking," that the end of this age is near: for the Saviour said, "There shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars;" ("in the heavens;") "and upon the earth *distress of nations, with perplexity*; the sea and the waves roaring; men's hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth; for the powers of heaven" (ruling powers) "shall be shaken: and then shall they see the Son of man coming in a cloud with power and great glory." Can any unbiased mind fail to see that we are in a proximate state to the last mentioned event? Let us then look up for deliverance, and not trust in man, but make **JEHOVAH** our hope.

---

"THERE IS NO DEATH"—"THERE IS NO GOD."

READER, do you think a minister of Christ would take either of the above as the motto for his sermon? If he should, isolated, would you not think him an idiot or an atheist? Yet a professed minister in Boston, not long since, did actually take the words, "There is no death," Prov. 12: 28, to be used as a leader in proof of "the immortality of the soul!" So far as he is reported, he neither hinted at the connection of his text, or quoted another text of Scripture in support of inherent immortality. The text entire reads thus,—*"In the way of righteousness is life; and in the pathway thereof there is no death."*

This is a clear statement how *life* may be secured and *death* avoided; and clearly asserts, out of the pathway of righteousness there is death. The wise man adds, in the next chapter, "Wickedness overthroweth the sinner" \*\*\* "the lamp of the wicked shall be put out" \*\*\* "whoso despiseth the word shall be destroyed." Verses 6, 9, 13. The Boston minister speaks as follows:—

"My proposition is simply this.—A belief in another life is

a natural property of the soul.” \*\*\* “Now God made that soul, and he is responsible for all its parts. I have dissected all my faculties, and I find no craving which cannot be satisfied. If I would eat, there is food somewhere which I may get; and if I would drink, there is water somewhere for me to find. If I would love, there is something to love; if I would acquire, there is something to get. Every natural longing has its satisfaction. It would have been cruel in God to have given me an unquenchable thirst, or to have planted a racking pain in my body which nothing could allay.

“It is utterly impossible that a being who has been proved a thousand times over and over again, to be supremely good, should have put into the human soul the irrepressible instinct of immortality, and then denied it the object of its craving.”

The fallacy of this statement has been exposed so often, we do not see how any intelligent man could urge it again. The “craving” God has implanted in us for immortality proves more than it is attainable; which we maintain is the fact. But it does not follow, because a man *craves* an object, that he has it or ever will possess it. Thousands have an irrepressible craving for objects they never obtain. The CREATOR designed men for a higher life than that with which He endowed them at creation; and that life was attainable; but the LORD saw fit, in His wisdom, to make the bestowment of it to depend on a moral development in harmony with Himself. Without such development a higher life would be no blessing, but a positive curse. While, then, the craving for immortality should operate as a stimulous to well doing, that the proffered life might be secured, JEHOVAH doubly fortified man against yielding to temptation by announcing to him the fact, *death* would *certainly* follow transgression. Thus desire for immortality, and dread of coming short of it, were both made to bear on man to aid him in the pursuit of the glorious boon.

This Boston divine talks about as sensibly as the laborer who is employed to do an important work, with the promise of the bestowment of a large estate when the work is completed, and he says, “I have an irrepressible craving for that estate, therefore it is mine, for my employer would have been cruel to have given me this thirst and then not allay it: so whether I do the work or not the estate is mine.”

What would our Boston theologian think of such reasoning!

Would he not conclude the *craving* must fail of being allayed unless the work was done? And would he not think the laborer was very illogical in his conclusions? Immortality is attainable; but it will be bestowed on none but such as "*seek for*" it "by a patient continuance in well doing;" Rom. 2: 7. And bestowed only at the resurrection, "at the last day." See 1 Corth. 15: 17, 18, 51-54; and John 6: 40.

---

### THE STRUGGLE FOR DIVINE LIFE.

DR. STEPHEN H. TYNG, speaking of the difficulties, objections, and struggles of an awakened mind to emerge into the divine life, in his "*Lost One Found*," among other things says:—

"Often the difficulty in the way hangs upon some single fact in life which has been a controlling one—some one remaining hostility in the pride of the heart, which refuses to yield—and in the severing of that, the choice may be made free. I recall to mind a very interesting and attractive young man, who sought me once for religious guidance. He had been gay, self-indulgent, and living without God, but he was now awakened and serious, yet hesitating and proud. His wife he described to me as a Christian woman; but he acknowledged himself a neglecter of God's salvation, yet now desiring to find the way of peace. Our conversation occupied a long evening. At last I said, 'Now go home, take your stand for Christ to-night; tell your wife that the time past of your life has been enough for sin, and that you now mean to live for Christ, and seek the kingdom of God. Kneel down with her, and begin your united prayer to-night. Will you do this?' 'No,' he replied, 'I cannot.' I remonstrated and entreated in vain; he was immovable. I then said to him, 'I have nothing more to say,' and for some minutes we sat in silence. I resumed the book which I had been reading, but presently repeated the question, and was again refused. After some minutes' further delay, he rose from his seat and sighed deeply. I saw the tears starting from his eyes, and I asked the same question again. He replied, 'I will,' and immediately left my house. The next evening I saw this young man coming into our lecture-room with a young woman leaning on his arm, whom I had often marked there before, as a stranger

and a woman of a sorrowful spirit. They came to the front seat immediately before me, and kneeled together in silent prayer. How joyful to me was that token of the Divine victory. At the close of our worship I approached them, and he introduced his wife to me. I told her what he had promised me the night before, and asked, 'Did he do it?' She answered me, 'Yes, he did.' I turned to him and said, 'And how do you feel to-night?' 'Sir,' he exclaimed, 'I am the happiest man in the city of Philadelphia.' It was a triumph of grace. For several years this young man walked among us as a useful, active follower of Christ, highly valued and much beloved. He closed his pilgrimage in a rapid consumption. On one occasion near his death, I said to him, 'Do you remember the evening when you first came to my study?' 'Remember it!' said he; 'I shall never forget it throughout eternity. It was the birthday of my soul.' He raised his feeble hands as he spoke, and clasping them together, covered his face, and burst into tears. Years have gone by since then, but the scenes are as fresh before me as the events of yesterday. What an instant effective choice was his! And how truly did that single choice mark him as 'the lost one found!'

---

### PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANS IN ITALY.

REV. WM. PATTON, speaking of those Italian Christians, who have been led to see the errors of the Roman Catholic Church, and to look about them for one more conformed to their new convictions of Divine Truth, says, "They do not incline to the Episcopal Church. Nor do they take to Presbyterianism or Congregationalism. They call themselves Bible Christians, and when they are assembled for worship, they are occupied mainly with reading and expounding the Scriptures, and prayer in the simplest manner, with no precise or set order. Perhaps it is best that they should not be run into any existing ecclesiastical mold; they will act with more freedom, and not being identified with any Protestant organization, they can act with more directness upon their countrymen. Protestantism and infidelity are one and the same in the minds of the masses of the Roman Catholics. To ask them to join the Protestants is to ask them to abandon all religion and become infidels. But to ask them to read the Bible and to pray to God awakens no prejudice."

REMARKS BY EDITOR OF EXR.—Let the foregoing facts be well

considered by those who cry "infidel" against those of us who hold "Life only in Christ." All "Protestants" are infidels in the estimation of those educated under Romanism ; and must we stand still, in the half-way house, to avoid being traduced in the same manner by our Protestant brethren ? They have left a part of Romanism ; we go clear back to Bible Christianity, and take the Bible alone for our Creed. Does that make us infidels ?

---

### THE SYRIAN MASSACRES.

SINCE our notice of this subject, last month, several letters from Mr. Benton,—husband of the lady, a part of whose letter we previously inserted—have been published in the *Am. Presbyterian*. We give the following extract from one of them. Mr. Benton says :—

" It is a matter of thankful record that no American missionaries have been lost amid the massacres, and that we have so many of us continued at our stations and at our work. Our Druse neighbors have said more than once, that a hundred men like your humble correspondent in Mount Lebanon, would have prevented all this war. And ought not the United States of America to have furnished that hundred missionaries for this goodly mountain many years ago, or now to send them hither ? Of a hundred missionaries in Mount Lebanon, each would have a parish of half a dozen villages, and a population of three thousand souls, of all religions except the true. Such a demonstration from the United States would look as though we intended and expected to evangelize the Mountain. France has just sent 5000 soldiers to subdue the Druse country, and found no occasion to fire a gun. All were afraid, and many fled. There is indeed a moral power in mere numbers ; and how can the church of God achieve the moral conquest of the world, without sending forth her choicest sons and daughters, and consecrating her accumulated treasures and energies to this glorious and bloodless conflict ? Omnipotence is pledged to crown every well directed effort with an endless income of joy. But, alas ! notwithstanding the clearest promises of God, all men seek their own, and not the things of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the predicted and promised renovation of the whole earth."

## WALKING IN THE SPIRIT.

“If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit.”—Gal. 5 : 25.

THE Spirit of God lives in us, as the source of our sanctification ; and we are to live in the Spirit, as if he were the atmosphere we breathed, the temple in which he is worshiped, or the habitation in which we dwell. To live in the Spirit, is to live under his influence, according to his word, recognizing his presence with us always. So, to walk in the Spirit, is to walk as influenced, directed, and assisted by him ; looking to him for wisdom to guide us, grace to help us, and power to preserve us. To walk in the Spirit, is to live as a man delivered from the law, rescued from the present evil world, freed from the dominion of sin, and set apart for God's glory and praise. The Spirit is our teacher, leader, and comforter. We yield ourselves to him, and seek to please and honor him. We are careful not to grieve him, or resist him, or quench his holy influences. To walk in the Spirit, is to breathe the spirit of Christ, and exhibit the temper and disposition of Christ in the midst of opposition, persecution, irritation, and many self-mortifying duties. It is to walk as Jesus walked, taking him for our pattern, and seeking grace from the Comforter, to think, feel, and act as Jesus thought, felt and acted. Blessed Comforter ! teach us to live in the Spirit in the present day, and to walk in the Spirit as we walk through the wilderness of this world. Oh, to walk as Jesus walked, to live as Jesus lived, constantly presenting ourselves to God, for his service and praise ! May we render our bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable unto God, which is our reasonable service : and not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewing of our minds. Oh, to be uncarthly ! Oh, to be deeply spiritual !—*Rev. James Smith.*

## PRECIOUSNESS OF FAITH.

PRECIOUS, indeed, is that faith that leans upon God in adversity, that goes to Jesus in trial, and that repairs to the Spirit in sorrow. Precious faith that finds a promise for every condition, a helper in every emergency, a soother for every sorrow ; that can hope against hope, taste a sweet disguised in

every bitter, and see a bright light veiled by each dark cloud. This is the true gold that procures all blessings, and enriches its possessor with all good. He that hath faith in God has every desire of his heart fulfilled. He can dive into the treasures of God's word and say: "All these are mine, for they are my Father's epistles of love." He can turn to the Redeemer's fullness and exclaim: "It pleased the Father that all this fullness of grace, and truth, and love should dwell in Jesus for me." He can repair to the throne of grace and say: "Here I am permitted to draw near to God, burdened with sin, laden with want, oppressed with trial, assailed by temptation, crushed with sorrow, casting, by an act of faith, all my care upon him." Is it not that precious faith that enriches my poverty, that dignifies my meanness, that guides my perplexities, that cheers my loneliness, that calms my grief, that defeats my foes, that paints a bow upon every cloud, and that brings all heaven into my soul? Yes, such is the fruit of that faith of which God is the giver, the Spirit the author, Christ the object, and a poor, empty, unworthy soul the happy possessor.—*Dr. Winslow.*

---

#### METHODISM AND THE LIFE TO COME.

ISAAC TAYLOR, in his "*Wesley and Methodism*," says: "When once this weighty question of the after life has been opened, and when it shall have come into the hands of well-informed Biblical interpreters, a controversy will ensue, in the progress of which it will be discovered that, with unobservant eyes, we and our predecessors have been so walking up and down, and running hither and thither, among dim notices and indications of the future destinies of the human family, as to have failed to gather up or to regard much that has lain upon the pages of the Bible, open and free to our use. Those who, through a course of years, have been used to read the Scriptures unshackled by systems, and bound to no conventional modes of belief, such readers must have felt an impatience in waiting—not for the arrival of a new revelation from Heaven, but of an ample and unfettered interpretation of that which has so long been in our hands. . . ."

"The past Methodism was far from being a message of wrath, proclaimed by men of fierce and fanatical tempers: it was a message of joy, hope, and love; and it made its conquests as

such, notwithstanding those bold and unmeasured denunciations against sin which it so often uttered. And so it will be with the future Methodism; and although it will rest itself upon a laboriously obtained belief concerning the 'wrath to come,'—a belief that will heave the human mind with a deep, convulsive dread,—yet, and notwithstanding this preliminary, the renovation which we look for will come in as the splendor of day comes in the tropics;—it will be a sudden brightness that makes all things glad!"

---

### THE PAPAL QUESTION.

EVERYTHING seems to indicate a settlement of the Papal question according to the plan of the "Vatican and a garden," set forth in the famous pamphlet, "Rome and the Congress," of December, 1859.

The *Ami de la Religion*, (a Roman Catholic journal of Paris,) publishes a letter from Rome, which says:—"Pius IX appears to consider everything at an end. 'Your noble devotedness,' said his Holiness lately to some volunteers, 'is now useless, for all is finished. I have already said the same to several Bishops of France, and to that of Rennes in particular.'"

In the meantime, the idea of religious liberty is making rapid progress in Italy; and if the Pope persists in his refusal to give up the temporal power, he will end by losing not only it, but the spiritual power as well, so far as his Italian children are concerned. It is a wonderful sign of the change which a few years have wrought in Italy, to see Victor Emmanuel decreeing liberty of worship, and admitting in his new laws the practical results of the separation of Church and State. All agree in considering this course as the only possible one; all, with the exception of a few old relics of the middle ages, strive as much for the independence of the Church as for that of the State. In short, as the *Buona Novella* correctly expresses it, people will no longer submit either to a political theocracy, or to a religious bureaucracy, to a kingly pope, or to a papal king but want freedom for all, for the Church as well as for the State. They reject both the papal platform, "Political power as an instrument for propagating the faith," and the platform of the philosophers of Giobert's school, "Religion as an instrument for the advancement of freedom." The principle advocated now, is that of Christ: "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's."—*Foreign Correspondent of the Methodist*.



## THE PARABLE OF THE SOWER.

It is a fact worthy of our serious consideration, that in this instructive portion of our Saviour's teaching, he states, of four classes of hearers of the truth of the Gospel, one only will be saved and obtain eternal life. The deceitfulness of the human heart should induce us, dear reader, to obey the apostolic injunction, "Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves. Know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you except ye be reprobates?" 2 Corinthians 13: 5.

How many, alas! pertain to the class who hear the word, and are in some degree convicted of its truth and importance, who yield to the temptations of the adversary, the father of lies, who thus takes away the good seed, the word of life, out of the heart or mind.

How many who hear and assent to the truth in the conscience, and receive it with joy for a season, who have no root of true holiness in themselves; their sorrow for sin, and their joy being entirely selfish, they cannot endure the hour of temptation. They fall away and perish. A third and numerous class, are those who profess faith in the word of truth and salvation, but not receiving it in the love of it, "the cares of this world and the deceitfulness of riches choke the word, and he becometh unfruitful." He has the form of godliness, but not its spirit and power. No fruit of holiness, consequently no end of everlasting life. He may be sound in head while rotten at heart; loving this present world and minding chiefly earthly things.

Those who hear to their eternal salvation, "are they, which in an honest and good heart, having heard the word, keep it, and bring forth fruit with patience;" Luke 8: 14; thus proving that they have been born or begotten of the Spirit of God, who writes his law on the heart, and imprints it in the inward parts. Holy love is their ruling principle. Their living souls pant after the living God as their eternal inheritance. They watch and pray against all sin, and find their happiness in keeping His commandments—

“ Not with the terror of a slave,  
Do they perform his will,  
But with the noblest powers they have  
His sweet commands fulfill.”

Possessing, by divine favor, a kindred heart of love and compassion with their Saviour, they go “about doing good” in this world of suffering and of sin, laboring and praying for the salvation of the lost. They live soberly towards themselves, righteously towards their fellow men, and godly towards their Father in heaven. Amid the varied chastisements of their Father’s love, they meekly bow to His holy will, and kiss the rod appointed for their growth in grace. With filial confidence in the covenant of everlasting love, they cast their cares upon Him who is causing all things to work for their highest good. While the false professor is resting in the cold form of godliness, their hearts burn with the love of Christ; and though now they see him not, yet believing in His coming to take them to himself to be with Him forever, they “rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory.”

HENRY GREW.

### LIFE FROM THE DEAD.

A friend writes us—“Not long since,” in conversation another, “the remark was made,” it was “thought Br. STORRS had seen his error in teaching” the wicked dead will never live again; “and that he was not as strong in it as he was once.” Our friend adds: “As I had not seen or read anything to that effect in the EXAMINER or elsewhere, I thought I would inquire of yourself, that I might meet such statements in your own words.”

He shall have our own words. Let all know, we have not wavered, nor are we conscious a doubt has arisen in our mind on that question for five years. We are just as settled, men who die in their sins will be eternally holden in death, and live no more, as we are, man is not inherently immortal, or life for the perishing is only in Christ. We are satisfied there is no one doctrine more fully, clearly, and harmoniously taught in the Bible than that of no future life, except by the Spirit of

God dwelling in us by virtue of a union with Christ, the Head of the new creation. Let those who wish to know our views, in detail, on this question, read our Pamphlet "LIFE FROM THE DEAD: or, *The Righteous only will Live Again.*" See our Catalogue. We do not think it necessary to be continually repeating what we have said, as if we feared people would doubt our stability on the question. We no more expect to recede in our views on this point, than we expect to go back to the endless torture doctrine: we could do one just as easy as the other.

---

BOAST NOT, CHRISTIAN.

"Let not him that girdeth on his harness boast himself as he that putteth it off." 1 Kings 20: 11.

O thou who standest in the morning dawn,  
 Whose pulses quicken, and whose heart beats high,  
 Longing to gird the untried harness on—  
 Flushing with ardor—sure of victory ;  
 Thou knowest not how long the day may be—  
 Nor how its heat and toil may waste thy strength ;  
 Youth's buoyant confidence can only see  
 The conflict's opening—not its weary length !

The blood and dust will stain thy snowy plume,  
 The tired hand may fail to strike the blow—  
 The morn that smiles may prove a day of gloom,  
 And hopes that rose in joy may set in woe.  
 Traitors within and foes without will wound,  
 Friends that are dear fall prostrate by thy side,  
 Through the hot noon, upon the battle-ground,  
 Thou must remain till the full eventide.

Then hush the boasting of a thoughtless pride—  
 Put on thine armor—draw thy flashing blade—  
 God for thy strength, and Jesus for thy Guide—  
 In nought exulting, yet in nought dismayed ;  
 Fight manly in the cause of Truth and Right  
 Through life's long day—and when the setting sun  
 Shall bid thee wait the welcome shades of night,  
 All Heaven and Earth shall own the victory won.

FAUSTINA.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

---

"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, HATH NOT LIFE."

---

Vol. 14.

JUNE, 1861.

No. 6.

---

## THE DAY OF REST.

A LECTURE BY REV. H. H. DOBNEY, ENGLAND.

I FEEL a pleasure in concurring with those who are desirous of illustrating the importance and blessed privilege of a weekly rest. And what I propose is to give a sort of bird's eye view of the History and Idea of such a day, as treated of in Scripture. In doing which, it will be convenient if we distinguish between the three Periods into which such history naturally divides itself; for the common idea presents itself under three different and significant appellations; first, "The Seventh Day;" secondly, "The Sabbath;" thirdly, "The First Day of the Week," or "Lord's Day;" a three-fold form of one generic idea.

FIRST FORM.—Two sentences comprise all we have touching the original day of rest, viz., Gen. 2: 2, 3:—

"And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work which he had created and made."

Time will not allow me to attempt any explanation of the account of the Creation, of which our text is the conclusion. A remark or two is all I may offer.

The Bible is a people's book. It is written popularly. Not, however, in the style of the English people of the nineteenth century, but, primarily, as adapted for those to whom it first came; to the Hebrew nation in its early ages, and to the meridian of Judea. It would, of course, have been absurd for Moses—even had he known them—to anticipate the discoveries of science in the far distant times of the future. For the truth *scientifically* put would have either been altogether unintelligible, or looked like falsehood. But, indeed, as long as the world stands, even the most scientific will continue to express themselves popularly, and to speak according to phenomenal rather than absolute or scientific truth, as when they say, The sun rises, or sets.

The first chapter of Genesis teaches us the mighty ground-truth that God is the creator of all things; and, further, gives us the order in which the different parts of creation were successively developed under the forming power of the Infinite Spirit. Possibly, as some have thought, the mysterious, and perhaps by us incomprehensible, processes of creation are represented as they would have appeared to a human spectator, if such a one could have beheld the long and gradual, though distinctly marked process. At all events, written for man, it is from a human stand-point that creation is looked at by its historian, and spoken of *ad populum*. And thus we understand how God is popularly represented as "resting from his work" and "refreshing" himself by repose; Ex. 31: 17; although, looking at it from another point of view, and recognizing that preservation is a continuance of creation, we also understand the words of our Lord, "My Father *worketh hitherto*," a remark which Christ made even in reference to the Sabbath itself.—(See John 5: 17, in its connection.)

Further, in the account of the Creation, we have the idea of *order* and *progression*; and of the *beauty* of order as thus ultimately issuing. And now, when we are told that "God rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made," the idea of holy *rest* is, not only suggested to us, but sanctioned and hallowed to us by the highest authority. And, I for one, feel glad at heart, and grateful, for a higher and happier idea given to me in this busy, restless, noisy world of work and care, than would have been set forth had Moses written as a man of science or a metaphysician, treating of the absolute and unconditioned. By representing rest as welcome even to God, it not only becomes legitimate to man, but is made doubly sweet to him. Wise rest after wise work is hallowed. And another grateful thought is, that work is not valuable for its own sake, but for its results, and that fair result is noble and God-like repose.

Now it is true that in this first, and, for several ages, only mention of the day of rest, there is strictly speaking no *command*. It is a statement simply. But who does not perceive that such a statement is grander, more influential, and elevating than any bare injunction could possibly be? In his love God teaches as the mother does her child, as Christ the world, by example. Let man everywhere ponder it well, that God himself rested on the seventh day, and pronounced it blessed, and can he be wiser than his Maker? Can he dispense with the rest which God found "refreshing?" Will he toil day after day in the field or in the shop, and keep no day of rest with his Maker? But since indolence is not rest, and the rest of the ox is not the proper rest for man, how shall he employ himself on this blessed day? If he rest, as I have said, with his Maker, there will be no need of specific instruction here. The day will somehow be "sanctified," the rest will be a holy rest. If his six days' work be good, I doubt not his rest will be good also. He who knows in what spirit and with what motives to work, will know how to render his repose dignified and holy. But as it would prevent my fulfilling the design I have intimated, to stop here in order to show *how* the day is sanctified, I pass on, suggesting one thing only, viz.: that as God's works are a manifestation of himself, the thoughtful contemplation of "the first volume God ever published," and the finding out how "good" are all his works and ways, would alone, and prior to all further

revelations, beautifully employ a portion of the day which God especially "blessed and sanctified."

To proceed. Whether the seventh day was set apart even in Eden itself, as an ordinance for unfallen man; or whether it was thus hallowed in merciful anticipation of the time when for sinful man labor though irksome would be good, a severe kindness; as we are not told, so I do not undertake to decide. Though, seeing there is no more mention of a day of rest, till the time of the Israelites, some thousands of years afterwards, some have thought, as the Book of Genesis was written by Moses, the reference here is by way of anticipation of the time when the Sabbath was "given to the Israelites," as "a sign and a covenant;" an opinion, however, which though I mention I do not indorse. And it has been deemed remarkable that there is not the slightest allusion to such an institution all through the times that succeeded; that it constituted no part of the covenant made with Noah, the second head of the human family; nor is it hinted at through the patriarchal ages; nor in the Book of Job. So that whether it was known to such as Abraham can only be matter of conjecture, or doubtful inference, and men will decide according to inclination and the general views they form of the day from other sources. But it should be observed that they who cherish the belief that the ordinance of the seventh day was known in those grand old times of simple patriarchal piety—when piety was not overlaid and oppressed by any cumbrous ceremonialism, nor made task-work and a form, but was beautiful in its simplicity and naturalness, a striking contrast to later times when religion has too often been made irksome—lay stress on the known division of time into weeks. But as I do not think this argument can bear much stress, I simply name it. It is true, however, that the observance of the seventh day as one of holy rest may have constituted one of the signs of distinction between "the Sons of God," the pious descendants of Seth, and the rest of mankind, whose increasing viciousness at length incurred the judgment of the deluge. And there is nothing to forbid the supposition that the sacred recognition of the day by Noah was one of the ways by which he was a "preacher of righteousness" during the hundred and twenty years while the ark was preparing. And it *may* be that the omission of all reference to the day in the covenant with Noah, was that it was unnecessary, as having been always cordially observed by him. I say all this may well have been: but as the Scriptures are silent, we are perhaps most respectful to them when we leave that silence unbroken. And so I proceed to the second mention in Scripture of the day; and which will bring out

#### THE SECOND FORM OF THE IDEA.

Exodus 16.—The people of Israel have gone forth out of Egypt some six weeks; so that the signs and wonders wrought for them in the land of Ham, and their deliverance at the Red Sea, are still recent. They have turned towards the wilderness, and are between Elin and Sinai, and in want of food. The Lord promised a miraculous supply—the manna—of which the people were to prepare on the sixth day twice as much as they gathered daily. "And it came to pass that on the sixth day they gathered twice as much . . . and all the rulers came and told Moses. And he said unto them, This is what the Lord hath said, Tomorrow is the rest of the Holy Sabbath unto the Lord," &c. "Six

days shall ye gather it, but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, in it there shall be none." "See, for that the Lord *hath given you the Sabbath*, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days; abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day." Is this the re-sanction of a well-known institution, or the first introduction of it to the Hebrew people? The question must remain an open one; but I confess that the impression it makes on my mind is, that God is teaching them a new thing, new to them, at least. "See, for that the Lord *hath given you the Sabbath*." And the impression will be somewhat deepened, perhaps, by other circumstances, to be presently adverted to.

The next, or third mention of the Sabbath is—

Ex. 20.—The well-known word, "Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy," &c. It thus forms one of those commandments which were audibly spoken to the children of Israel from Sinai; the fourth of the so-called ten commandments. And now, there is no possible room for doubt; all is unmistakably plain. Here there is positive command. This is law. The seventh day is to be kept sacredly free from all *work*. There was to be perfect rest throughout all the dwellings of Israel. As God had rested on the seventh day from all his work, the people that are separated from all nations to be his peculiar people, are to rest with their God, the poor servant and laborer, and the very cattle even, were to enjoy a welcome rest from all their toil; and a holy calm like that of nature was to be the blessed portion of all alike.

And knowing how avarice, or the mere impatience even of some, would soon break in upon the precious boon, if there were not every precaution taken, the blessed privilege was given forth in the form of a duty, and fenced round by all the sanctions of law, and therefore guarded by penalty. For by how much the ordinance was wise, by so much must it be jealously maintained. Its full wisdom I may not pause to point out, but can mention only four things expressly specified as entering into the design. The institution was intended, first, to assist in keeping the people in fellowship with God, of which fellowship, sympathy, and imitation, if I may speak so, are part; thus, God rested on the seventh day, his people shall enjoy a holy rest also. Then, in addition to the magnificent idea of creation to be admiringly pondered, there was their own redemption from the hand of the oppressor to be gratefully remembered. "Remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm; *therefore*, the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." Deut. 5: 15.

A third object included has been already glanced at, but should be formally adduced, viz.: that contained in Ex. 23: 12—"Six days shalt thou do thy work, and on the seventh day thou shalt rest, *that* thine ox and thine ass may rest, and the son of thy handmaid and the stranger *may be refreshed*." And in Ex. 31: 12-17, we learn that it served a fourth purpose, viz.: to constitute one of the distinguishing marks of the people whom—for wisest and most merciful reasons relative to the whole world ultimately—God intended to be for a time distinct from all other nations; all other nations being then sunk in debasing idolatries and vices. "It is a sign between me and the people of Israel for ever." And to this effect, Ezek. 20: 12, and other passages.

Who wonders, then, that so wise and benevolent and beautiful a law should be guarded by even extremest penalties; especially at the first, and among a servile people who soon showed that they could be taught only by the strong hand. If mutiny were on the point of breaking out among a ship's crew, who were most wisely and humanely commanded, and treated rather as friends or children than as sustaining any less happy relation—who would not applaud prompt severity to the individual, as mercy to all? If one incorrigibly determined offender begin, in spite of every warning, defiantly and openly to disobey, and to dare the execution of the threatened penalty, while all others look on to see what the end is to be, and whether they also may brave authority, all thoughtful men will approve the promptest and severest measures. Obedience must be enforced; authority must be maintained. And I, therefore, have no wish to blink the fact that one unhappy wretch, having resolved on testing how far he might disobey with impunity, was put to death for the offence of breaking the Sabbath: Num. 16: 32-36. It has been asked, What, put a man to death for gathering sticks! And I for one say, "under the circumstances—Yes." Nor do I know a single crime that can be committed which may not be mis-represented as a most insignificant thing. Thus murder has been spoken of as "merely diverting a few ounces of red fluid, called blood, from its proper channel." But thus to present things is, not only to confound all distinctions, however vast and important, but to put out the eyes of the mind and reduce one's self to, at all events, moral blindness. No employer would engage a confidential clerk, whose notion of forgery should be that it is nothing more than writing a man's name on a bit of paper; or a shopman, whose idea of abstracting money from the till is, that it is only putting a little of the natural product of the earth in one place rather than another! But when such a mode of stating things is held for valid in this commercial England of ours, then will I also accept the inuendo that, by the alleged law of God, a poor man was stoned to death for merely gathering a few sticks. If any will mis-represent, they are free to do so; only, the vice of unfairness and untruthfulness always recoils and hurts most the perpetrator thereof. For daring to openly disobey and defy the merciful King—for such God was to the theocratic people—who was bent on elevating and blessing all, the first Sabbath-breaker was put to death, as a solemn and timely warning.

But though this fact is a sad one, let not even the Jewish Sabbath be thought of as a day of austerity and gloom. So far from this, it was intended to be "a delight." The cypress never was the emblem of any form of religion that emanated from God. The vine-tree and myrtle are the recognised symbols of the church of the living God, even among the Jews. Those who were sad—as by reason of bereavement, for example—were not to come into the congregation, for a time; while the priests, more particularly representing and embodying the true idea of the people, were not to mourn for the dead. All was to be gladness in the presence of the Lord, as in Psa. 100. And when, after the return from exile, some nine or ten centuries later, the law was read to the assembled people, and they wept aloud, "Nehemiah and Ezra and the Levites that taught the people, said unto all the people, This day is holy unto the Lord your God; mourn not, nor weep. For all the people wept when they heard the words of the law. Then he said unto them,



Go your way, eat the fat, and drink the sweet, and send portions unto them for whom nothing is prepared; *for this day is holy unto our Lord*: neither be ye sorry: for the joy of the Lord is your strength."—Neh. 8: 9, 10.

How the day was to be spent, we are not exactly told. The worship of God would occupy a portion of the time: and if men have no false and morbid views of God, one would think wise worship would be among the gladdest of all glad things; in harmony with the songs of birds, and the breath of flowers, and the merry laugh of childhood, and the deeper gladness of affianced youth and maiden, and the soberer joy of man and matron, and the calm peacefulness of age, when the hoary head is a crown of glory, being found in the ways of righteousness. And such was the experience of many, as it is the testimony of some. See, by way of example, Psa. 92, "a Song for the Sabbath day," or, 95, "O come let us sing unto the Lord, let us make a joyful noise to the rock of our salvation. Let us come before his presence with thanksgiving," &c.

Such men—and they were Poets too—testified that "it was a good thing," and anticipated the day, "When shall I come and appear before God?" And when absent from the land, they reflected pensively on the hallowed scenes and times of by-gone worship. "When I remember these things, I pour out my soul in me; for I had gone with the multitude, I went with them to the house of God, *with the voice of joy and praise*, with a multitude that kept holy day," Psa. 42: 4. And again, "Then will I go into the altar of God, unto God my exceeding joy," or, the gladness of my joy. Psa. 43: 4. And, "How amiable are thy tabernacles, O Lord of hosts!" But there would be no end to quotations. Man, the crowned king of creation, should worship with a higher and holier gladness than nature embodies in her worship, though beauty and song and fragrance are the form of her uncensured homage to her Maker.

On the day of rest, their holy Sabbath, the Hebrews would not only worship God, but teach their children and their households the mighty things of God; and cultivate the social virtues; and enjoy without fatigue their generally delicious climate; and sitting beneath their own vines and fig-trees, or gently walking in happy groups amid the romantic scenes of their beautiful land—adore the goodness that had made them blessed. Happy is the people that is in such a case; yea, happy is that people whose God is the Lord.

Such, then, being in brief, the real state of things, it is but a matter of course, that, as one of the wisest and most benevolent and gracious of all the institutions of the Mosaic economy, the Hebrew prophets in subsequent times should lay the greatest stress on the earnest and thorough recognition of the day of sacred rest, worship and refreshment. Isa. 58: 13, 14—may be referred to as a sufficient illustration of the stress laid on the holy day by the whole prophet class. And when the Jews returned from their exile in Babylon, and felt a renewed desire to keep the covenant of their God, those earnest reformers, Ezra and Nehemiah, began to secure the most exact sanctification, or setting apart, of the seventh day, as the Sabbath of the Lord. And the retrospect of his endeavors in this direction subsequently gave the latter the most unfeigned satisfaction. Thus Nehemiah 10, shows the people entering into a voluntary mutual covenant that . . . "if the people

of the land bring ware or victuals on the Sabbath day to sell, that we would not buy it of them on the Sabbath, or on the holy day," &c. And some time after he records:—"In those days saw I in Judah some treading wine presses on the Sabbath, and bringing in sheaves, and lading asses; as also wine, grapes, and figs, and all manner of burdens, which they brought into Jerusalem on the Sabbath day: and I testified against them in the day wherein they sold victuals. There dwelt, also, men of Tyre therein, who brought fish and all manner of ware, and sold on the Sabbath unto the children of Judah and in Jerusalem. Then I contended with the nobles of Judah, and said unto them, What evil thing is this that ye do, and profane the Sabbath? Did not your fathers thus, and did not our God bring all this evil upon us and upon this city? Yet ye bring more wrath upon Israel by profaning the Sabbath. And it came to pass that when the gates of Jerusalem began to be dark before the Sabbath, I commanded that the gates should be shut, and charged that they should not be opened till after the Sabbath: and some of my servants set I at the gates, that there should be no burden brought in on the Sabbath day. So the merchants and sellers of all kind of ware lodged without Jerusalem once or twice. Then I testified against them, and said unto them, Why lodge ye about the walls? If ye do so again, I will lay hands on you. From that time forth, then came they no more on the Sabbath. And I commanded the Levites that they should cleanse themselves, and that they should come and keep the gates, to sanctify the Sabbath day. Remember me, O my God, concerning this also." Neh. 8. This is the last circumstance recorded in the historical scriptures touching the Sabbath, till we come to the New Testament and the Life of our Lord.

In the time of our Lord the Sabbath had greatly degenerated from its original idea. There was no danger now of its not being observed; but the danger was of the opposite kind. For the holy and beautiful ordinance of God had, in the hands of the ecclesiastical authorities, become a burdensome superstition. It was a day of outward form and ceremony, rigidly enforced, not with intelligent and cheerful regard to its high and blessed design, but for its own sake merely. A number of absurd traditions and ridiculously minute regulations, fondly invented by their Rabbis and others, had overlaid the day, and made it in some respects a poor and paltry puerility; in others a burden for the conscience, and a snare for the soul. So that the "Teacher sent from God," had another duty to perform touching the Sabbath than that of Nehemiah and the prophets, and declared "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines, the commandments of men."

Christ himself, being by natural descent a Jew, and so being born "under the law," observed the day, though in a high and holy manner. If, indeed, *He* can be said to have observed it, whose whole life was one day of equal and uniform piety, and who was in every respect, both inwardly and outwardly, on each of the six days of the week, what he was on the seventh. For with him every day was alike holy, and his moral perfectness left no room for artificial or seasonal distinctions. And it greatly scandalised the rigid formalists of his time that he intermitted none of his labors of love on the Sabbath; but, walking from place to place with his disciples, freely did all the good there was opportunity for, on that day as on others; asserting, in face of the opposition made to

him by the Scribes and Pharisees, that it was "lawful to do good on the Sabbath days;" for their sanctimonious scrupulosity, alas! had reached to such a pitch that, reversing the word of God, they preferred sacrifice to mercy. Thus designedly going on his lofty way without regard to the vicious and vexatious glosses and interpretations of the Scribes, Christ exposed himself to their deadly hatred; and there was no charge more frequently brought against him, than that of "breaking the Sabbath." So that once and again they took up stones to stone him for this offence. Until, at last, he laid down that simple but profound and far-reaching principle and rule, which is at the same time a key to the design, and therefore a certain index to the proper understanding and treatment, of all religious institutions really from God; this, viz., that "The Sabbath was made for man (for the man properly,) and not the man for the Sabbath." Mark 2: 27.

And here we come to a pause.

For Christ came to terminate (by fulfilling) one dispensation, and to inaugurate a new one. He looked therefore behind and before. In him the past and future met, that they might henceforth be totally distinct. He transmuted law into gospel; "thou shalt," into "I will." For he was the bringer in and ratifier of a "new and better covenant;" which, unless a man do truly understand, he can never truly see the real nature of the Sabbath idea under the Christian dispensation, which is intended to be universal: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature."

Judaism was not adapted for a universal religion; and never was designed for adoption by any other people than the small nation of the Jews—a nation that was a family enlarged, being all sprung from one common ancestor—whose entire territory was little larger than the largest of our English counties. As a system, Judaism is complete in itself. All its parts co-here, and are mutually related and adjusted. It is a whole in itself. It was as a whole that it was introduced; and when it is abolished, it is abolished as a whole. And that it was abolished, by the bringing in of a "better thing," the Epistle to the Hebrews was written partly to teach. As, for example, the writer, in chap. 8, says that Christ hath obtained a more excellent ministry—viz: than that of the Jewish priesthood—by how much *he is the mediator of a better covenant*. For if that first covenant—that made with the Jews—had been faultless—competent to answer every holy and spiritual end—no place would have been sought for the second (covenant). But the Lord saith—viz: in Jer. 31: 31-34—Behold the days come when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah.

. . . (The reader will do well to study the intervening verses, viz: 9-12). Now in that he saith, *a new covenant*, he hath made the first old. Now that which *decayeth* and *waxeth old*—superannuated—is ready to vanish away. Heb. 8: 13. Thus did a Hebrew write about their whole law to Hebrews, within comparatively a few years after Christ had risen. Even already it was vanishing away. It was superseded by a simpler, nobler, happier dispensation, as superior to Judaism as Christ is to Moses, the mediator of the one to the mediator of the other.

The Gospel then took the place of the Law. The spirit is substituted for the letter. The law is to be written in the heart, instead of on tables

of stone. The profound teaching of the apostle in 2 Cor. 3, should be deeply pondered and understood; in which, however, he distinctly mentions "the tables of stone," only to shew them as superseded to Christians by the writing on the heart by the Spirit of the Living God. I have said that Christ was the consummator of the one system, and the introducer of the other; that in him the past and future met; that he looked behind and before. His whole life was passed under the law, which he "magnified and made honorable." But when he died, he had done with the past. When he rose from the dead, he of course belonged to the Jewish people, as such, no more. The new system, the new reign, the kingdom of God is inaugurated.

It begins with the resurrection of Christ from the dead, to be henceforth "Lord of all." He belongs to the spiritual realm. He is preëminently a spiritual king. His kingdom is a spiritual one; "not of this world." And this brings us to consider

#### THE THIRD FORM WHICH THE IDEA ASSUMES.

Under Christianity, then, we have done with Jewish Sabbaths, as such, whether Sabbatic days, or weeks, or years. In truth, Gentiles never had to do therewith. No part of Judaism, as such, ever had any claim on us, being Gentiles, and much more being Christians. So that whatever pleas we employ for the observance of a day of sacred rest, we must take good heed not to base them on Jewish law.

But here I must fairly meet the argument, which is so very common employed, that the command, to "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy," is one of the Ten commandments; a part of the moral law, and not the ceremonial; and that the moral law is, of course, as such, of perpetual obligation. Now the distinction between moral and ceremonial is sound. But it is not correct to call the ten commandments "*the moral law*," as is so commonly, yet I must be permitted to add, unreflectingly done. And though it may appear a digression, yet it is essential that I make this plain.

Why, then, were the famous Ten spoken by the mouth of the Lord, immediately to the people, and subsequently traced by the finger of God on stone tablets, while all the rest of the law, containing more than three hundred precepts, was merely delivered through Moses?

Let Scripture be its own interpreter. It needs no aid of mine. To the law and to the testimony. Turn to the account in Ex. 20, and see for yourselves. You will find that when the people had listened to the awful voice during its distinct articulation of the first few sentences, listened with terror, indeed, from the first, that terror so completely took possession of their souls, that they—may I say, interrupted the solemn proceedings?—they drew back from the base of the mountain; "They removed, and stood afar off; and they said to Moses, Speak thou with us, and we will hear: but *let not God speak with us*, lest we die." And the Holy and Compassionate One condescended to their fears, and used Moses as the medium for conveying the rest of his will to the people. "And the Lord said unto Moses, *Thus thou shalt say* unto the children of Israel," &c. And in Deut. 5: 23-28, Moses repeats to the people this fact, as the reason why the Lord, when he had spoken the words of these ten commandments "added no more." And, as having been thus spoken in the hearing of the people, they were written on tables of stone as a permanent record and memorial of the fact that God had really

spoken to them, and were laid up in "the ark of testimony," or "the ark of witness," accordingly. Seeing, then, that this is the simple historical account of the matter, I do not see how we can soundly distinguish and mark off these ten in particular from all the rest, and designate *them* alone, emphatically, "the moral law."

But there are still weightier reasons. It is surely not correct to say that these ten, by themselves, are a summary of moral law, for the chief of all the commands, that which lies at the basis of all, is not among them. Christ is our Master, let us "hear him." When, then, our Lord was asked, Which is the great commandment in the law? he quoted not from the ten, but from Deut. 6: 5. Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, &c.; and said, *This is the first and great commandment.* Moreover he added, *And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself* (from Lev. 19: 18). And then he laid down the grand doctrine, On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets. How is it then that we are so addicted, in the face of Christ's own teaching, to call the decalogue "the moral law," and to give it as a complete and satisfactory summary? Nor should it be forgotten that when James singles out one of the many laws of old, and calls it the very prince, or king, of laws, "the royal law," he also quotes this from Leviticus, *not any one of the ten.* Truly, the time ought to be come in which *Christians*, at least, might be able to adopt from Scripture a happier compendium than that which such multitudes inconsiderately call "THE commandments."

We are conducted to the same conclusion, also, by the opening words of the decalogue, which were plainly the preface, not merely to the ten commandments, but to the whole law given to Israel, viz: "I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage." As, also, by the peculiar promise with which the fifth commandment, as properly concluding the first table (for it is evident that this really belongs to the first, and not the second table) is wound up, viz: "that thy days may be long in the land (of Canaan) which the Lord thy God giveth thee."

I conclude, then, that the ten commandments are an integral and inseparable part of the law given to Israel. All of them, indeed, save that of the Sabbath, are taken up into Christianity, but in a far more elevated and spiritual manner; of which the Sermon on the Mount (and which bears the same relation to Christianity as the law from Sinai does to Judaism) may stand as an illustration. "It was said to them of old time," &c., "but I say unto you," &c. See Math. 5: 21-27, &c.

To resume. Having done with the Mosaic law, and a "new and better covenant" having been introduced, we are prepared to find a new development of the original idea. It was "the first day of the week" when our Lord rose from the dead, and showed himself to his disciples. This was the day prophetically announced as "the day which the Lord hath made." A new era was inaugurated. On the next "first day of the week" he met them again. And, as soon as things had settled down into form, after his ascension, we find the disciples of Christ accustomed to meet on the first day of the week, "to break bread," &c. There are, however, but three distinct passages in the New Testament from which we deduce this; but, what with our own Christian consciousness, and sense of need, and the testimony of P.iny, &c., we feel an unshaken

confidence in the fact. The texts are Acts 20: 7, and 1 Cor. 16: 2, and Rev. 1: 10, in which last, the term employed is, "the Lord's day," and which fairly shows that, already, there was a day so designated, and so known. And from that time to the present, the Church of Christ, however divided, has welcomed each returning Lord's day with holy delight. But the conversion of the Christian's day of rest and social worship into a Jewish Sabbath, which was based on positive enactment, and guarded by the penalty of death, is not only a mistake in itself, but grows out of a misapprehension of the genius or spirit of Christianity. Nor is it correct to say that simply a change of day has occurred from the seventh to the first. There is nothing—that I know of, at least—to sufficiently bear the weight of this assertion. Nor is it necessary to look for evidence. The truth lies much deeper. In a religion intended to be universal—or as the apostle says, "for obedience to the faith among all nations"—the enforcement of a strict outward observance of every seventh day on all the first Gentile converts, as soon as they became such, in the cities of Greece and Rome and every where throughout the ancient world, would have been fatal to its spread. A law which was possible and most merciful to a united and consenting nation, like the small nation of the Jews, would have been an impossibility to the great majority of converts in the first century. But true living Christianity is, to a great extent, superior to, and independent of outward rites and forms. It consecrates, not a portion of our time only, but the whole of it; not here and there a solitary spot, but makes all things holy. The glorious truth which, by the Gospel, came to the consciences and hearts of men, and made them "new creatures," was bound up in no rigid forms that belonged to the outward only. As the Saviour said, "the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life," "the flesh profiteth nothing." "I am come that they may have LIFE, and that they may have it more abundantly." If the heart were right, the life would be pure and sweet and noble. All real evil, all that was in itself morally wrong (as distinct from conventional, ceremonial, or artificial wrong) would be earnestly abhorred as by a holy instinct, wherever the "law was written on the heart," wherever men were turned "from darkness to light," from the kingdom of Satan to the kingdom of God's dear Son. And this kingdom did not consist in outward forms and observances; or, as the apostle says, "not in meats and drinks, but in righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." Every convert became, in a new and higher sense, a son of God; and, conscious of the relationship, called God, Abba! Dear Father. And earnestly imbibing the very spirit of "him that had loved them, and given himself for them," and the mind of Christ Jesus their Lord being in them, each humbly but confidently said after him, "I delight to do thy will, O God, yea, thy law is within my heart." Truly they were "called to liberty." They were "not under law;" had "not received the spirit of bondage again, (which was the characteristic of Judaism,) but the spirit of adoption," *i. e.* a filial spirit. Thus frankly treated, not as servants but as sons, they felt within themselves how much mightier was love than law; or, law as an inward impulse than as an outward injunction. They took the very cross as their dearest symbol, and were ready to lay down their lives for him whose self-sacrificing love had consummated itself on Calvary; and by the noble voluntary devotedness of their whole selves

to Christ and goodness, justified the apostle in his apparently bold but really profound assertion, "knowing this, that the law is not made for a righteous man." 1 Tim. 1 : 9, or, as in Rom. 7 : 6. "But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; *that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter.*"

This in general. But now for its bearing on the relation of Gentiles to any particular article of the Jewish law, however valuable in itself. The Christian church at Antioch, the very first of all the Gentile churches (the "Mother Church," therefore, of all our churches, since that at Jerusalem was composed of Jews only) was gathered by certain private and unofficial disciples, that were scattered abroad by the persecution that arose on the death of Stephen. Acts 11. From this church, Paul was sent out on his first missionary tour, and was highly successful in gathering together, in most places he visited, little bands of converts to Christ, *i. e.* churches, which were composed chiefly of Gentiles. Ultimately he returned to Antioch, to report to the church which had sent him forth (Acts 14;) and while there, certain men came from Jerusalem, insisting on these Gentile Christians becoming identified with the Jewish church by circumcision. Whereupon the entire question came up, "What is the relation of the Gentile church to the law of Moses?" a question which *includes* the one we are engaged with. A deputation was sent from the church at Antioch "to the Apostles and Elders" at Jerusalem, (Acts 15,) which deputation was "received by *the Church, and the Apostles and Elders,*" &c.; and this new, but most inconceivably important question was canvassed before "all the multitude" of believers, and the result was a formal document, in the shape of an Epistle from the collective church at Jerusalem, (being Jews,) thus—"The apostles, and elders and brethren, send greeting unto the brethren which are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia. . . . For it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things; that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication: from which, if ye keep yourselves, ye shall do well. Fare ye well." And the church at Antioch "rejoiced for the consolation." One only of these four things, the last, is strictly moral, and the mention of it only too fearfully needed in those days of idolatry; the abstinence from meats offered to idols was prudentially necessary to new converts from idolatry, lest they should be re-entangled in their old superstitions; and the other two seem adopted as articles of peace and concord, in relation to the pious Jews amongst them. Surely the Sabbath *must* have been mentioned here, had the assembled apostles and elders, with the church, deemed it binding, as a law, on Gentile Christians.

But more formidable attempts were soon made to interweave the old system with the new; and the efforts of the Judaizers in the various churches to enforce the observance of Mosaic customs in reference to particular times and seasons (as well as other things), compelled that great Apostle, who was especially the Apostle to the Gentiles, to combat the mischievous endeavor. And there are three passages in Epistles of his that demand our thoughtful consideration. The first is Rom. 14 : 5, "One man esteemeth (selects for honor) one day above another day; another man esteems every day. Let every man be fully persuaded (satisfied) in his own mind. He that regardeth the day, regardeth it

unto the Lord; and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord doth he not regard it." On which there is a note in Alvord's Greek Testament to this effect: "It is an interesting question, what indication is here found of the observance or non-observance of a day of obligation in the apostolic times. The apostle *decides nothing*: leaving *every man's own mind* to guide him in the point. He classes the observance or non-observance of particular *days* with the eating or abstaining from particular *meats*. In both cases he is concerned with things which he evidently treats as of *absolute indifference in themselves*. Now the question is, supposing the divine obligation of one day in seven to have been recognised by him in any form, could he have thus spoken? The obvious inference from his strain of argument is, that he knew of no such obligation, but believed all times and days to be, to the Christian strong in faith, alike. I do not see how the passage can be otherwise understood. If any one day in the week were invested with the sacred character of the Sabbath, it would have been *wholly impossible* for the apostle to commend or uphold the man who judged all days worthy of equal honor,—who, as in v 6., paid no regard to the (any) day. He must have visited him with his strongest disapprobation, as violating a command of God. I therefore infer that Sabbatical obligation to keep any day, whether seventh or first, was not recognised in apostolic times."

The second passage is that in Gal. 4: 9, 10.—"But now, after thye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage? Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years: (the Sabbatic seasons of the old Jewish law). I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain." Their first spiritualism was degenerating into ceremonialism. "Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?" Then again, 4: 21.—"Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For, &c. So, then, brethren, we (Christians) are not children of the bondwoman (the Jewish church) but of the free. Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us (even Paul and his brethren of the Jews) free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage" (*i. e.* the Mosaic law; see Acts 15: 10).

The third passage is Col. 2: 16, 17. In v. 14, the apostle says, Christ hath "blotted out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us (*viz*: the entire Mosaic law,) which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross. Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of a holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath: which things are a *shadow* of things to come; but the body (*substance*) is of Christ." Christ then is the reality of all that was previously but shadowed forth; as he "is our passover," and "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world," so is he "our peace," and our "rest." CHRIST IS OUR SABBATH; as himself said, "Come unto me all ye that *labor*, and I will give you *rest*."

But I must hasten to a close, leaving unsaid, on this part of our subject, more than I have said; and regretting also that I must be content to treat what remains with undue brevity.

THE RESULT OF THE WHOLE, then, is this, *viz*: Omitting all reference to the Mosaic law, *as law*, and except as we may derive therefrom valu-



able ideas, and learn important lessons, and receive intimations worthy the most reverential pondering; we have three things:—

*First*:—The original “blessing and sanctifying” of the seventh day, as one of sacred and sweet repose, and in delightful remembrance of Creation, and of God as Creator.

*Second*:—The fact of the adoption, by the theocratic king for his peculiar people, of a day of most entire cessation from all work whatever; and which was designed in love to all classes, and out of especial compassion and tender mercy to servants and the laboring classes in general, and all cattle. In addition to the work of creation, there was now the national deliverance of Israel to be remembered, and other national mercies, and the peculiar relation of Jehovah as their King and Law-giver and God. So that, though the institution does not come to us precisely and formally as a command, it does come to us as a lesson of highest wisdom, and recommended by all the authority that can attach to the wisdom and goodness of God.

And, *Third*:—A “Lord’s Day,” in still happier commemoration of a redemption begun for a fallen world, (begun, I say, but in some respects also completed—completed, that is to say, in the person of the new Head of the race, the second Adam, who, as our Forerunner, rose triumphant over Death and entered into glory.)—the day on which one in the likeness of man rose from the grave, and ascended into the pure and heavenly regions, thenceforth to “draw all men unto him.” The first day of the week identifies itself, as it were, with the first of creation, instead of the last; in other words, as the original Sabbath was retrospective, ours is prospective; that was commemorative, ours anticipatory. We are not at the end of something that is past, but at the beginning of something that is future. We have the first day of a “new creation,” and when its six days’ work are ended, glorious indeed will be the “rest that remaineth for the people of God,” when even “the creation also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God.” Rom. 8: 21. Towards that everlasting Sabbath, how earnestly are we exhorted to look, and for it diligently to labor! Heb. 4: 1–11.

Some Christians perhaps would still prefer to place the observance of the day on the ground of positive injunction, as safest. But truth alone is safe. And I confess that the high ground of a divine idea, and spiritual law, and Christian liberty, appears by far the highest. The full idea of the day of sacred rest, as deduced from the three facts I have brought out, remains in all its fullness, and fraught to overflowing with innumerable blessings. But, still, perhaps, some will deem that I leave much unsaid. They will ask for the word that should be spoken to both those who are piously anxious to see the day honored by the masses, and those who unhappily find no pleasure in the Christian’s joyous rest and worship.

To the former, then, I respectfully submit, that the “desecration of the day” which is so sincerely deplored is not itself *the evil* to be lamented and remedied, but only one of the symptoms of it. The task to be achieved, or at least aimed at, is more difficult, even, than the obtaining of an outward decorum on the day which God, in Eden, blessed and sanctified. The many have to be won to God and holiness, to be attracted to religion, by plainer and happier evidences, that, in yielding

their whole selves to the Lord we love, they would truly "find rest unto their souls," and "joy, and peace." "First make the tree good, and the fruit will be good also," said the Master, whose own way was to work from within, outward; whereas most moral and religious reformers have unwisely sought to work from without, inward. I do not think that to begin with enforcing a law of "Sabbath observance" is *the* method that heavenly wisdom points out. They who find no pleasantness in religion are repelled, rather than won, by all attempts to restrain their freedom of action in the few hours that, alone of all the week, so many of them can command. The real problem is, How to so gain their respect and confidence, so engraft on their minds the conviction that "wisdom's ways are ways of pleasantness," that they will of themselves do homage to "the beauty of holiness;" and long to be as we are, and yearn to share our manifest happiness? This is not the case at present, as is too evident. And I think we Christians have to become far more happy illustrations of the power of godliness to bless, ere they will say, "We will go with you, for we perceive that God is with you." But to begin with them by what they resent as an intrusive interference with their liberty and their chosen recreations, is, it humbly appears to me, "putting the cart before the horse," and pursuing a method the exact reverse of that which our Lord adopted. And this the more so, if the brief view I have but suggested of the real idea of the day be the true one, and Christianity be, indeed, a thing of spirit rather than letter, of "life" rather than of form.

And to the other class, I would as respectfully submit the following suggestions: Very few of God's laws are given us in writing, or come to us in the form of a command. We speak, e. g. of the laws of gravitation, heat, health, &c., and everybody knows that if any of them be violated painful consequences result. These laws, however, have to be discovered by observation and experience and thought and reasoning. They are not written commands. They are not express injunctions. But not the less really are they laws, as all the world is agreed. Nor are they any the less operative for good, if observed, or for evil if violated. And thus within the sphere of religion also, and social morals, there are in like manner laws which are not given in the form of express commands, but are nevertheless deducible as the will of God from the facts and lessons of Scripture, and the facts of consciousness and experience and acknowledged need. And thus there may be a Sabbath *law*, where there is no Sabbath *command*. The grateful and cheerful observance of one day in seven, as a season of holy rest from all work and secular labor—and from all recreation, too, that does not tend to promote the repose of both body and mind, and to further the intellectual, moral, and spiritual well-being of the individual and community—comes commended by the highest of all imaginable motives. For in Eden itself God blessed and sanctified it. To the Israelites it was "given" as a boon and blessing; and for fifteen hundred years it was a cardinal institution with that chosen and peculiar people, loved by all the good, honored by all the great, and earnestly enforced by all the true and noble prophet spirits among them. As a rigid and inflexible command, indeed, it is not imposed on us; but it would 'tax the rarest invention to conceive a happier, grander, or more beautiful boon, to a busy

and over-worked nation, than the law of one day in seven as a holy day. It is as important to secure it now as it ever was. Nay, in such an eager, restless, inordinately competitive age as this, it is far more imperatively required, as a universal mercy, than ever before in the history of the world.

If the private worship of God bring with it innumerable blessings, over-running and bedewing the soul, and stretching forward into the future and the infinite, how much additional advantage is there in social devotion, and the common worship of one God and Father, where "the rich and the poor meet together, and the Lord is the Maker of them all." England owes all to her deep religiousness and reverence, as the wisest of the continentals acknowledge. But the general public worship of God (on so many grounds indispensable) demands for its possibility, a general concurrence; and every man whose own conduct, if it were commonly adopted, would render the general religious observance of the day impossible or more difficult, is not only seriously injuring himself but acting perniciously on the nation at large. Surely then, nothing but extreme and most unworthy selfishness (unfraternal, as well as unpatriotic) would say to this, "I don't care!" For, as I have said; In the degree in which the reasons exist, which have ever been alleged for the observance of the Sabbath, in that degree the sacred importance of regarding it as one of holy rest still stands as a reason, though not as an express enactment, as a spiritual, though not a verbal law. And though your personal liberty shall not be brought in question, yet neither must the liberty be infringed on of all those in whatever class, though the very humblest, who desire, in fellowship with their Father, to bless and sanctify a seventh day, and, in fellowship with His Son, to devote the Lord's day to holy purposes. The law of liberty is this: That no man's liberty to do, or not to do, shall trench upon any other man's equal liberty for the same. And I think this rule, if applied, will settle many practical questions that are being now agitated among us. If Christians have no right to exact from non-Christians, these latter have no right to exact upon the former.

God give us all true wisdom, and endow us with "the mind that was in Christ Jesus our Lord," and then we shall love as brethren, and God will be honored amongst us, and his laws and counsels be revered, and God will bless us, and ours shall be called a delightful land, and England shall still be "THE LIGHT OF THE WORLD, AND THE SALT OF THE EARTH."

---

THE FOREGOING article, by Mr. DOBNEY, so nearly expresses our views on "*The Sabbath Question*," that we do not think it worth while to make any exceptions to it, but commend it to the careful study of all. There has been much disputation on the subject to no profit. A legal and superstitious observance of a Sabbath on the one hand, and a licentious neglect of all claims to observe a Rest on the other, are alike unscriptural and unnatural.—EDITOR.

## THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

BY G. B. STACY, RICHMOND, VA.

WE have laid down as an established premise, That "the kingdom of God" is "the eternal power and Godhead;" as defined by David in 1 Chron. 29 : 10-13 ; and by Paul, Acts 17 : 23-26. We have seen, history sacred and profane, justifies this definition ; and we now proceed to examine the developments of the kingdom in relation to God's own household.

In the garden of Eden the jurisdiction of God was expressed in one single restraint. Subsequently it was exercised through the power of faith : hence it is written, "For the promise that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through law, but through the righteousness of faith." \* \* \* "To the end the promise might be sure to all the seed ; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham ;" and therefore, "the law which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect."

The apostle might well ask, "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made." \* \* \* \* "Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us to the Christ, that we might be justified by faith."

The law was, then, an intermediary institution, made necessary by the prevalence of transgression ; when therefore, it became necessary, the necessity of a mediator was also manifest, for the people were no longer fit to approach, and commune with God, as their forefathers had done ; consequently Moses, and after him Aaron and the High Priests, alone, were permitted to enter into the immediate presence of, and commune with God. Still by their voluntary acceptance of the covenant of the law, see Ex. 19 : 5-9, God constituted them "*a kingdom of priests unto himself*." Hence he was their law-giver, and its executer, as witnessed by his visitations upon "Nadab and Abihu," upon "Shilomith's son," upon "Korah, Dathan and Abiram," and upon the whole of Israel, especially by the fiery flying serpents. These are mere instances of the direct execution of the law by God, their king, himself. But when the people desired *a king to rule over them* from among themselves, God testifies they rejected *him, himself*, from ruling over them ; nevertheless "He gave them a king in his anger, and took him away in his wrath." And when David proved to be a man after his own heart, He made a solemn covenant with him saying,

"I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David my servant, *Thy seed will I establish forever, and build up thy throne to all generations.*"

What throne and kingdom did God secure by covenant and oath to David and his seed, or Son and Lord? The answer must be, The "kingdom of priests," which had rejected God from being their king. For, "thus saith the Lord, If my covenant be not with day and night, and if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth; then will I cast away the seed of Jacob, and David my servant, so that I will not take any of his seed *to be rulers over the seed of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*: for I will cause their captivity to return, and have mercy upon them." Hence the angel Gabriel said unto Mary, "Behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give unto him *the throne of his father David*; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end:" that is, as long as men generate upon the earth in accordance with the terms of the covenant as reported in the 89th Psalm. The testimony of Isaiah corresponds with that of Gabriel, namely, "Unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulders; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace. Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, *upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and justice, from henceforth even forever.* The zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this."

These Scriptures establish this point beyond controversy, namely, That the kingdom covenanted to Jesus as the Son of David is the same which was originally given to David, and for the reason that they had voluntarily rejected God from reigning over them: and was therefore henceforth called the kingdom of David, the kingdom of Israel, or the kingdom of the house of Jacob. It is true that David acknowledged that the kingdom was the LORD's, and that He reigneth over all; but this can only be recognized in the same sense it is applicable to all the kingdoms of the world; and therefore the kingdom of priests are not to be recognized as "the kingdom of God" subsequent to their voluntary rejection of Him as their king.

"The Lord hath prepared his throne in the heavens; and his kingdom ruleth over all." And we will "speak of the glory of thy kingdom, and talk of thy power; to make known to the sons of men his mighty acts, and the glorious majesty of his kingdom. Thy kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and thy dominion endureth throughout all generations." These two Scriptures define the kingdom of God in accordance with the

scriptural definitions already adduced, namely, the absolute and eternal government of God directly administered by Himself. This being admitted, from the time the children of Israel sought a king to reign over them, and thereby rejected God himself from being their king, the Scriptures do not recognize "the commonwealth of Israel" as "the kingdom of God." They said, "Nay, but we will have a king over us; that we may be like all the nations; and that OUR KING MAY JUDGE US, and go out before us, and fight our battles." God took them at their word and gave "the kingdom" to the house of David; and from that time it is recognized only as "the kingdom of Israel," or of David.

In originally constituting them a kingdom to himself, they were to be "a kingdom of priests;" that is, a kingdom of intercessors, or mediators—an acceptable power standing between God and the rebellious world, as the medium through whom the world might be brought back unto God; but they rejected their destiny. Still the covenant of God with David, personally, standeth sure, and David's Son and Lord shall accomplish that which the "kingdom of priests" unto God was designed to accomplish. Hence we read, when the throne of David shall be re-established in Jerusalem, and Jesus the Son of David shall be exalted above, or over the nations, then "many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths." "For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet." \* \* \* "And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, *that God may be all in all.*" That is, that the direct government of God may be perfectly developed and administered towards, and in relation to all the inhabitants of the earth.

We affirm that no system of government can be recognized as "the kingdom of God" except that wherein God himself is personally recognized as the King, and where He himself personally administers the government.

The covenant of the law was designed to bring the priests of God under His direct and personal administration; and did do so until they demanded a king from among themselves. Seeing then that the law proved itself "weak through the flesh," God sent his own Son to establish a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah; "not according to the covenant (which he) made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; (which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord;) but this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; after those days, saith the Lord. I will put my law in their inward parts,

and write it in their hearts; *and will be their God,*" (their king—their head,) "*and they shall be my people.*" Thus the proclamation of the Gospel in the name of Jesus was for the purpose of bringing its recipients, or rather their hearts and minds under the direct jurisdiction of God; that his kingdom, rule, or reign might be within them, or that the Christ—the Son of God, or he who was God manifest in flesh, might dwell and rule in their hearts by faith.

Our conclusion of the whole matter is this, That Jesus as the Son of man—the seed of Abraham and of David, is entitled by covenant to the throne and kingdom of Israel and of David. That by his righteous and equitable administration of the law, which shall go forth from Mount Zion, He may bring the world into subjection, absolutely, and by the ministration of the law of the Spirit of life, or "*the new covenant,*" *to the living God as manifested in himself—the Son of God.* So that, as Son of God, He is heir of the kingdom of God; but as Son of man He is only entitled to the kingdom of David. The Gospel, therefore, truly proclaimed the kingdom of heaven, or of God at hand; namely, *the establishment of the reign of God within his children, through the instrumentality of the new covenant.* And holds out as a reward to the believer, who endureth to the end of his own probation, a participation in the administration of the kingdom of the Son of man, or of David, even the promised seed of Abraham in subjugation of the world to the perfect recognition of the absolute government of God, even the Father, in all, and through all. Amen.

---

TO REV. HENRY WARD BEECHER.

BY MRS. C. C. WILLIAMS, SHELL ROCK, IOWA.

*Honored Sir*—One who has the privilege of reading something from your pen occasionally, presumes to intrude upon your notice a few thoughts suggested by reading in the *Independent* for October 11th, 1860, your sermon on the text, "The field is the world." When I came to the "3dly," wherein is discussed the *why* God's ways are as they are, not only "outside of Christian influences" but "inside," I was irresistibly carried back to the time when this inborn uncontrollable desire, which it seemed vain to try to repress, would ever and anon urge on to ask, though secretly, "Why, O! why is it thus and so?" How to reconcile God's dealings with His creatures, especially with regard to their future destiny, with the character of a "God of love," "whose tender mercies are over all his works;" and this

again and again, and ever with a like result. Go back, a voice seemed to say, nor attempt to comprehend my ways, or pry into mysteries, hidden alike from the wise and foolish. 'Tis enough to know that I am a God of Justice as well as Mercy. Thus, silenced but not satisfied, "all that have raised these questions"—and who that can think and feel has not—"must needs lay them down again."

Formidable, unanswerable, and momentous as these questions are, especially when viewed from the stand-point you occupy, *viz*: "each identical man, as immortal as God," I felt on reading these vain, and awfully painful struggles for light—as experience testifies—to solve these tremendous mysteries, that I could not easily repress the desire to say to you—I think these questions can be satisfactorily solved by taking a different stand-point. Once I knew not there was any other than the one you now occupy; then I thought with you, we must not, cannot know now, we must wait till by-and-by; wondering meanwhile how it could be brought about, that what seemed the height of cruelty and injustice here, in human society, *viz*: unnecessarily torturing an offender, could be made to appear just and right there! In this case, there was one thing to fall back upon, *viz*: a confidence that "the Judge of all the Earth would do right." This was, and is the sole relief.

At last, I heard of another platform. I stepped upon it, and from thence looked upon the Government of God in relation to man, present and future; and O! glad sight! I found all I had so vainly sought—a God of love, justice, and mercy; whose words no longer seemed a mockery, when He said, "Turn ye, turn ye, for why will ye die?" In short, One who needed no apologies at our hands. Wonder not, if I desire the world should share the joy. Deem me not impertinent, in entreating you to step, mentally—with the numbers who have tried it—on the platform, "God only hath immortality," and "man is mortal;" and look from thence, and then judge whether or not such a consistent plan as is brought to view can be a deception. I wish to tell you, as briefly as I can, how it looks to me; though you may have heard it all before.

I see our MAKER made no blunders; nor did He do anything that required afterthought or alteration in our creation. "The first man was of the earth, earthy;" flesh and blood—"corruption—which cannot inherit incorruption." A talk just had with my little boy, nearly four years old, illustrates my understanding of our paternity. He asked when we should die, and why? When I told him why, he lisped, "'Touldn't Dod mate us any petter?" I told him, no: He made us so we could make ourselves better; when old enough we must be made to do, till we learned to love and do right ourselves.

Thus I see our natures were understood; and though neces-



sarily carnally minded, and subject to death, as a natural and unavoidable consequence of our natures and origin, yet in no other way than by obeying this "awful law of reproduction," and being endowed as we find ourselves, could we know the joy or benefit of self-denial. In no other way could He have a chance "to take out of them a people for his name," or to "purify to Himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." In view of our natures and needs, the "Lamb was slain before the foundation of the world." "Man was not made subject to vanity willingly;" all must die. So "Jesus has abolished death" (virtually), thus freely doing away the consequences of what comes upon us unavoidably, and places mankind (virtually) beyond death's triumphs, on the ground of accountability.

Where this appeal comes to them, "Why will ye die?" it says to those "inside of Christian influences," You are not to blame for being made carnally minded, nor for being at enmity with God while so; but "let the past suffice," repent now, and believe the Gospel, or, "work out your own salvation with fear and trembling," because God of his good pleasure has endowed you with the power, not only to will, but to do when you have willed; therefore work. To those "outside of these influences," there is "the light (only) that lighteth every man that cometh into the world;" or the innate "higher law" of which the written law is only a transcript. Though faint may be its glimmerings, yet as God is no respecter of persons, I see that in every nation whoever follows this light, or, in other words, fears Him and works righteousness is accepted of Him. In the one case, those who sin in or with a law to guide them, are judged thereby; while those who sin without law, perish without law; being incapacitated in either case—God being the Judge—by their inability to endure temptation, for that self-control necessary for that perfect state of society promised and anticipated in the future, by those who deny themselves ungodliness, &c., here, and live and do right. Thus I see, though "our foundation is in the dust," yet the second Adam is the Head of a new creation, and there is a process brought to light by which we can become "partakers of the Divine nature," even by "overcoming the corruption that is in the world through lust." God says, He will be a Father to such. "He that hath the Son, hath eternal life;" and vice versa. God is "Father of the spirits of all flesh;" beast as well as man: but if God is *our* Father we shall do His works, and thereby evince our relationship. Notwithstanding God's care of his creatures, Paul says—Those who do the abominable things he speaks of, are worthy of death: and Peter reiterates the same of those who, like the beasts, are led by their passions—that like them they will perish—"They are laid in the grave like sheep."

When the Scriptures say, "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him," why is it necessary to believe any one of that class will live eternally, any way, or any where? As all (who remain) in Adam die, while all (who have become united to, or are) *in* Christ shall be made alive, how can one rationally arrogate to himself immortality, when descended from one who was made nothing but a "living soul" in common with every other creature? especially before being adopted into the Divine family, and becoming thereby connected with Him "who is the life?" By what process of logic can the stream be made to rise higher than the fountain? What ground to flatter ourselves or any body else with the idea of being immortal and living eternally any way or any where without "seeking for glory, honor, immortality," and, consequently, eternal life, "by a patient continuance in well doing?" How could a God of infinite Wisdom, after making creatures capable of choosing their destiny, and giving them time to make a choice, do any better than to gather to Himself again His Spirit—which not only creates but animates man and every other creature—thereby remanding those who should prove themselves unworthy of even this short life, back to their original state—no more to see life? What other penalty so God-like as, "Dust thou art, to dust thou shalt return." That you may be able to shed light on this all important topic, and thus dispel some of the agonizing, pent-up *why's*, throughout the length and breadth of the land, is the earnest wish of the subscriber—

CATHARINE C. WILLIAMS.

---

## THE LORD'S SUPPER.

BY JOSEPH T. CURRY, FLY MOUNTAIN, N. Y.

It will not be denied that the Jewish passover feast pointed directly to Christ. The paschal lamb typified "the Lamb of God." "Your lamb shall be without blemish," said God to Moses and Aaron. Christ was "a lamb without blemish and without spot." The passover lamb was killed "the fourteenth day of the month," (Nisan,) "between the two evenings;" that is, between the first westering of the sun (3 p. m.) and its setting. Jesus died at that time. When the soldiers broke the legs of the thieves to hasten their death, Jesus "was dead already, they brake not his legs;" "that the scripture should be

fulfilled, a bone of him shall not be broken." Now this was said of the paschal lamb. It was the blood of the lamb on the houses of the Israelites that caused the Lord to pass over them "when he smote the Egyptians." Jesus Christ "hath purchased the church of God with his own blood," "having obtained eternal redemption for us." "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us," said Paul. This settles the matter.

If Christ is our passover, He *must be eaten* by us. Critics have wondered how the disciples provided a lamb for their feast, as the law required it to be slain on the 14th of Nisan, and they ate the supper on the evening of the 13th. They have forgotten that Christ was their lamb; *the disciples had no other*. And here is the clue to the whole subject. Christ their passover was to be eaten; they could not literally eat Him; the broken bread and the cup after supper were substitutes for His body and blood. As if Jesus said, "I am the lamb, your paschal lamb. This bread represents my body which to-morrow will be slain for you; this cup represents my blood which will be shed for you. By eating of this bread and drinking of this cup you manifest your faith in the atonement. Henceforth, at the annual return of the period instituted by God for the celebration of the passover, you are not to kill a lamb, for I am about to offer myself 'one sacrifice for sins forever,' that you may say 'Christ our passover is sacrificed for us.' But you are to 'do this,' take bread and wine, eat and drink, not as in the past, to *foreshadow* my death, but to *commemorate* the accomplished sacrifice. And as often as you repeat this celebration you show forth my *death* till I come."

This, evidently, was Paul's idea of the Lord's Supper when he said to the Corinthians, "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us; *therefore* let us *keep the feast*," &c.

Commentators have puzzled themselves in trying to account for the fact that Jesus and his disciples celebrated the passover the night before the Jews. It is no mystery. Jesus could not observe the ordinance at the legal time, as He had to be slain at that time. Hence, He said, "I have heartily desired to eat this passover with you *before I suffer*."

We are so prone to follow human authority that I will introduce an extract from Alford's "Prolegomena" to his Commentary, which may serve to strengthen the position.

"In the dispute about the time of keeping Easter between Polycarp

and Anicetus, bishop of Rome, about the year 160, the former defended the practice of the Asiatic churches, which was to keep their Christian passover at the time of the Jewish passover, the evening of the 14th of Nisan, by what he had learned from John and the other apostles."

I was convinced of the beauty and propriety of this view of the Lord's Supper by the articles in the first two Nos. of the EXAMINER for the current year. After preaching two sermons upon the subject, it was clearer than before; its practical observance established it, in my mind, "a thing of life." With some two dozen disciples, on the 26th of March, 1861, at night, (between eight and nine o'clock,) I sat at the table to partake of a supper. I believe it was the Lord's. I doubt not that all felt it good to be there. Several, subsequently, expressed to me their satisfaction. It appeared so natural. We thought of that little company in Jerusalem who were similarly engaged on

"That sad memorable night  
When Jesus was for us betrayed."

We consecrated ourselves anew to the service of Him who said, "Do this in remembrance of me." I intend, as long as I live in the flesh, to "keep the feast" at the appointed time.

---

"DISTRESS OF NATIONS."

"WE are so absorbed in the affairs of our own country that we have scarcely time to read the foreign news. But with famine in India, the threatening aspect of affairs in Syria and throughout Turkey, the foreshadowed alliance of France and Russia against England and Austria, revolution imminent in Hungary, Victor Emmanuel determined on possessing Rome, there is every indication that this will be a year of commotions in the earth and distress of nations, almost without parallel since the beginning of the Christian era.

"Without attempting to apply to passing events specific predictions in the word of God, we cannot fail to see in these events the hand of divine providence marshaling forces for the overthrow of despotism in religion, in society, in the state. The grand historico-phopphetical symbols of the Old and New Testament are self-repeating, and we in our day are as much called upon to study the signs of the times, to watch for the coming of the Son of man, and to be ready for every sign of his appear-

ing, as were the Christians of the first century, as will be those of the last day of earth and time. Let us work and pray, and pray and work, till Christ's kingdom shall fully come."

The foregoing we cut from *The Independent* of this city, of April 25. It is remarkable, considering the source from which it comes, and is one of "the signs of the times." For near twenty years some of us have been calling attention to the state of the world as indicating the near approach of the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ: specially since the European revolution of 1848; and we have not ceased to show, that every year since that time has developed new evidence of the consummation at hand, when "the kingdoms of this world are" to "become the kingdom of our Lord and His Christ," who "shall reign forever and ever." The EDITOR of this magazine published early in 1859, his views of the then coming events, based on the prophecy of Revelation 17th and its connection. Among other things noticed at that time, the following remarks were made:

"The '*Battle of Armageddon*' cannot be very far off. In that, 'the kings of the earth and of the whole world' are to have part. But whether this language includes all nations, or only all the old Roman 'earth,' remains to be seen. A fearful prophecy, in Jeremiah 25, may have something to do with these times, as well as Rev. 17. That prophecy indicatēs that the 'wine cup of fury,' which began on Jerusalem, is to be sent to 'all the nations;' and that they shall be 'moved' and made 'mad' 'by the sword that' God 'will send among them.' After enumerating numerous nations, of years gone by, who shall drink and be visited by that sword, it adds:—'AND ALL THE KINGDOMS OF THE WORLD, which are upon the face of the earth.' \* \* \* 'Thus saith the LORD of hosts, Drink ye, and be drunken, and spew, and FALL AND RISE NO MORE, because of the sword which I will send among you.' A fearful doom on the nations: a doom, which those who fear the coming 'conflagration,' may well seek to escape: but God caused the Prophet to add:—'It shall be, if they refuse to take the cup at thy hand to drink, then shalt thou say unto them, Thus saith the LORD of hosts, Ye shall *certainly* drink: for, lo, I begin to bring evil on the city which is called by my name, and shall ye be utterly unpunished? Ye shall not be unpunished: for I will call for a sword upon all the inhabitants of the earth.' \* \* \* 'Behold, evil shall go forth from nation to nation, and a great whirlwind shall be raised up from the coasts of the earth: and the slain of the LORD shall be at that day from one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth; they shall not be lamented,

neither gathered, nor buried; they shall be dung upon the ground."

Thus we spoke, in view of the word of the LORD, more than two years ago; but the lulling of the storm, after the battle of Solferino, in 1859, caused many to think "the cup" of JEHOVAH'S just indignation on the "nations," for their wickedness and oppressions, would pass away; and especially did this country expect to escape it. Exalted to heaven with privileges under the best government on earth, we had grown proud, forgotten our entire dependence on God for stability and strength, connived at wickedness in Church and State till our sins, like ancient Israel's, had towered high as heaven, and God might justly say, "Lo, I begin to bring evil on the city which is called by my name, and shall ye be utterly unpunished? Ye shall not be unpunished: for I will call for a sword upon all the inhabitants of the earth." That sword has come, and our country begins to feel its awful power. To what extent it will fall on us is known only to Him who wields it. "The watchmen wake in vain, unless the LORD keep the" nation from utter ruin. It becometh the nation to repent of all its sins and to turn from them, not with hypocritical fasts, but by keeping such a fast as God has "chosen." Fasting and praying while we cleave still to our sins will only increase our guilt and cause "the cup" to be held to our lips the longer, or prove our utter overthrow and ruin.

It truly seems as if this nation's "*great day of judgment*" had commenced. Whether that be the case, or whether it be only the first *warning* God is giving it in His mercy, remains to be seen. It is none the less among the "perplexity of nations" indicating the day is swift approaching when our Lord Jesus Christ shall return to reign on earth and over the nations, to the utter subversion and "overthrow of despotism in religion, in society, in the State." Yea, "the kingdoms of this world" shall "become the kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ." Then ends the rule of all tyrants, and JEHOVAH'S true saints—all who have ever lived on earth—shall be made immortal, and "possess the kingdom under the whole heaven." See Dan. 7: 22, 27. "Be wise now therefore, O ye kings: be instructed ye judges of the earth: serve the LORD with fear, and rejoice with trembling: kiss the Son, lest He be angry, and ye perish from the way, when His wrath is kindled but a little. Blessed are all they that put their trust in Him." See Psalm 2.

## WAR: WHAT IS THE CHRISTIAN'S DUTY?

WHILE a "war-spirit" is not the spirit of Christianity, we are not among those who suppose no cause can exist justifying the taking up arms by the civil magistrates; and hence it may be a Christian duty to aid in some way those magistrates in carrying on a war. No duty is more clearly laid down, even in the New Testament, than that of obedience to rulers. See Rom. 13: 1-7; also 1 Pet. 2: 13—"Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well: for *so is the will of God*, that with well doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men," &c. Our Lord both by precept and example sanctioned paying "tribute" to the civil authorities; commanding to "render unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's." Paul commanded, "Let every soul be subject to the authorities of magistracy: for there is no authority which is not of God: and the authorities which exist are established by God: he therefore who opposeth the authority, opposeth the establishment of God; and they who oppose them, shall receive judgment." Syriac of Rom. 13: 1, 2.

It were easy to multiply similar testimony, but the samples we have given are sufficient to show that Christians are bound by Christianity to show themselves loyal to civil magistrates and rulers under whom God has cast their lot: not to do so, is to forfeit their Christian character. That individual revenge, or the taking our wrongs into our own private hands, and not leaving them in the hands of the magistrate, is unchristian, there can be no doubt: and where rulers command to do that which is plainly forbidden of God, we may and ought to suffer, unresistingly, the pains or penalties they may inflict rather than disobey God, whose law is supreme, as in the case of the three Hebrews, commanded to worship Nebuchadnezzar's image.

In promulgating the Gospel, "carnal weapons" are forbidden; but such is not the case in protecting ourselves against unlawful assaults upon our lives as citizens. Paul often appealed to the civil magistrate for protection against such assaults. We

may note one case as illustrating all others, recorded in Acts 23. More than forty Jews had banded together to kill Paul. Information of the fact came to him by his sister's son. He immediately sent this young man to the "chief captain" to seek the protection of the "powers that be:" that power was a "war" power. That military officer provided forthwith "two hundred soldiers, three score and ten horsemen, and two hundred spearmen," to convey Paul beyond the reach of these blood-thirsty Jews. Was that a "war-spirit" invoked by the apostle? Would he have told his military escort, if attacked by the forty Jews, You must not fight: take care you do not hurt them, if they fall upon me in the way! Would Paul have given place to such *monstrous* folly?

The government which gives protection to Christians, and secures their right to worship God according to the dictates of their consciences, has a right to expect the support of those Christians. None can doubt but the Gospel requires them pay *tribute* to such government; and if it requires this tribute to sustain *war*, and Christians are bound to pay it, may it not also call them to active service in that war? and if it becomes *necessary*, may not a Christian man put forth his arm to defend that government against any and all enemies who may attempt to overthrow it by brute force? If Christians should conclude, gratitude to God, for privileges they enjoy under that government, demanded them to defend it by arms, at its call, we believe it might be a Christian *duty* to obey.

So far as a "war-spirit" is concerned, it is equally manifested in the civil magistracy with its machinery to punish criminals, or invaders of private or social rights, as in what is called war in defence of national rights, or lawful government. If, then, it would not be unchristian to aid magistrates in arresting and punishing the violators of personal rights—which is *war* on the transgressor—so neither can it be wrong to aid the highest Magistrate of a nation in executing the constitutional laws of that nation, even though it involves "bearing the sword" to accomplish it. He that denies this, should equally denounce all police arrangements in our cities or villages, which are a war power against transgressors: house-breakers, incendiaries, and midnight assassins should not be molested by *Christians*, because that would be "a war-spirit!" All they "want is to be let alone." Does Christianity require such a pusillanimous



course? Let Paul's example, to which we have referred, and his teaching of obedience to magistrates, answer.

We have felt called to say thus much by what we have seen in some of our exchanges. "*If possible, as much as lieth in you, live peaceably with all men.*" Rom. 12: 18. If war must come, and Christians feel themselves called to take up arms to repel assaults on lawful government—deeming it better to sustain such government than to have anarchy—let them not give place to revenge, or a desire to gratify private animosity, but to promote the public good. It may be necessary to *fight for peace*. Let us not judge those Christians who think such a duty devolves on them.

A more holy man of God than JOHN FLETCHER, Vicar of Madely, England, has seldom blest the world. He lived in the last century. In remarks on "*The Bible and the Sword*," he notices an objection drawn from the Gospel being a Gospel of peace. He says:

"Our Lord, who said to his apostles that a kind of raging spirit goeth not out but by fasting and prayer, said also to them: 'He that hath no sword let him sell his garment and buy one. And they said, Lord, behold, here are two swords: and he said, It is enough,' Luke 22: 36, 38. I grant, that when 'Peter drew his sword, and [rashly] struck a servant of the high priest, Jesus said unto him, Put up again thy sword into its place; for all they that take the sword [to use it rashly, as thou dost, without any order, and without the least probability of success] shall perish with the sword,' Matt. 26: 52. From the whole of this evangelical account, it appears that our Lord allows his followers the use of the sword; and that he only blames it when it is precipitate, and likely to answer no other end than that of throwing the triumphant friends of vice into a greater rage."

To say, war is absolutely prohibited by the Gospel, is the same as to say, "All human government is prohibited;" or that the civil magistrate has no right to "bear the sword." If we had only Christians to deal with, the matter would be different; but if men rise up to overthrow the ruling power of a constitutional government by force, having themselves been represented in that government, they place themselves in the position of a war power, and Christianity condemns them.

We look for a kingdom of peace; and pray that it may soon come; but we are mortal yet, and earthly despots would take away peace from the earth to establish a reign of terror for their own aggrandizement; but such despots shall be broken in pieces: whether God will do it by a direct act of His power or

use human instrumentality to accomplish it, we cannot tell. Hitherto He has used the latter for the most part. Whatever part we may be called to act, let us watch and pray, remembering our only safety is in God and His providence. Undue excitement is not safe, whatever be the subject. It is just as hurtful in religion as in any thing else. Let us calmly rely on God in all things. So will it be well with us come what may.

---

### THE BIBLE EXAMINER.

THE time has come for us to say a few words on the prospects of this magazine. The present year has been unfavorable; partly from the depreciation of all western bills, which has kept some from subscribing or subjected us to loss when they did. Others, doubtless, have withdrawn their patronage from other causes. Now, last of all, come our national calamities, which have deranged or destroyed business, so that many know no how to feed their households, and we as well as others; so that the fact is, we cannot go on with our *regular monthly* issue, as our finances now stand; but we shall continue to issue if we have the means to pay expenses, and hope to be able, ultimately, to discharge our obligations to all paying subscribers, by furnishing the twelve numbers of the present volume, though it may be at irregular intervals and extend into another year. If any are dissatisfied with this arrangement, we will return the amount due them in any of the works named in our *Catalogue*, they sending us P. O. stamps to pay the postage.

There is a way in which we could be relieved and go on regularly. We need \$300 to do it to the end of the volume. We can furnish 300 new subscribers with all the back numbers for this year; and to secure them against loss, in case of failure to complete the volume, we pledge to each paying subscriber to return the amount that may be due them, in any of the works in our *Catalogue* they may designate.

---

THE more quietly we bear our sorrows, the better it is for us; we thus save strength of spirit, which would be lessened by seeking and receiving sympathy. No one can so sweetly sympathize with us as the Man of Sorrows. The wisdom and mercy of God will be found written on every event which concerns you.

## INFLUENCE OF A HOLY LIFE.

THERE is an energy of moral suasion in a good man's life, passing the highest efforts of the orator's genius. The seen but silent beauty of holiness speaks more eloquently of God and duty than the tongues of men and angels. Let parents remember this. The best inheritance a parent can bequeath to a child, is a virtuous example, a legacy of hallowed remembrances and associations. The beauty of holiness beaming through the life of a loved relative or friend, is more effectual to strengthen such as do stand in virtue's ways, and raise up those that are bowed down, than precept, command, entreaty, or warning. Christianity itself, I believe, owes by far the greater part of its moral power, not to the precept or parables of Christ, but to his own character. The beauty of that holiness which is enshrined in the four brief biographies of the Man of Nazareth, has done more, and will do more to regenerate the world and bring in everlasting righteousness, than all the other agencies put together. It has done more to spread His religion in the world, than all that has ever been preached or written on the evidences of Christianity.—*Chalmers.*

## TO RICH MEN WHO ARE GENEROUS IN LIFE.

ENOUGH of censure; let my humble lays  
 Employ one moment in congenial praise.  
 Let other pens with pious ardor paint  
 The selfish virtues of the cloistered saint.  
 In lettered marble let the stranger read  
 Of him who, dying, did a worthy deed,  
 And left to charity the cherished store  
 Which, to his sorrow, he could hoard no more.  
 I venerate the nobler man who gives  
 His generous dollars while the donor lives;  
 Gives with a heart as liberal as the palms  
 That to the needy spread his honored alms;  
 Gives with a head whose yet unclouded light  
 To worthless objects points the giver's sight;  
 Gives with a hand still potent to enforce  
 His well-aimed bounty, and direct its course:—  
 Such is the giver who must stand confest  
 In giving glorious, and supremely blest!

## INFLUENCE OF A HOLY LIFE.

THERE is an energy of moral suasion in a good man's life, passing the highest efforts of the orator's genius. The seen but silent beauty of holiness speaks more eloquently of God and duty than the tongues of men and angels. Let parents remember this. The best inheritance a parent can bequeath to a child, is a virtuous example, a legacy of hallowed remembrances and associations. The beauty of holiness beaming through the life of a loved relative or friend, is more effectual to strengthen such as do stand in virtue's ways, and raise up those that are bowed down, than precept, command, entreaty, or warning. Christianity itself, I believe, owes by far the greater part of its moral power, not to the precept or parables of Christ, but to his own character. The beauty of that holiness which is enshrined in the four brief biographies of the Man of Nazareth, has done more, and will do more to regenerate the world and bring in everlasting righteousness, than all the other agencies put together. It has done more to spread His religion in the world, than all that has ever been preached or written on the evidences of Christianity.—*Chalmers*.

## TO RICH MEN WHO ARE GENEROUS IN LIFE.

ENOUGH of censure; let my humble lays  
Employ one moment in congenial praise.  
Let other pens with pious ardor paint  
The selfish virtues of the cloistered saint.  
In lettered marble let the stranger read  
Of him who, dying, did a worthy deed,  
And left to charity the cherished store  
Which, to his sorrow, he could hoard no more.  
I venerate the nobler man who gives  
His generous dollars while the donor lives;  
Gives with a heart as liberal as the palms  
That to the needy spread his honored alms;  
Gives with a head whose yet unclouded light  
To worthless objects points the giver's sight;  
Gives with a hand still potent to enforce  
His well-aimed bounty, and direct its course:—  
Such is the giver who must stand confest  
In giving glorious, and supremely blest!

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

---

"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, HATH NOT LIFE."

---

Vol. 14.

JANUARY, 1862.

No. 7.

---

## WHO ARE THE ANGLO-SAXONS?

OR, HAS THE PRESENT WAR A CONNECTION WITH PROPHECY?

SOME may express surprise at the above inquiry, and possibly think it of no interest. To such we give notice beforehand, our position is, the prophecies of Scripture point out the main features of this world's history relating to particular families and nations.

That the Anglo-Saxons are a remarkable people in some respects, no one will deny; and that they occupy an eminence in the world and its affairs above any others, we need not spend time to prove. Would not such a people be likely to appear in "prophecies given by inspiration of God"? If so, where?

The origin of this people has been a profound mystery, except that long centuries since they are supposed to have come out of Asia with other clans or tribes emerging from that fountain of the human family, and ultimately taking the lead in civilization and Christianity.

We take the position in the following remarks, that the Anglo-Saxons are the subjects of prophecy—their characteristics and course clearly defined; and their mission and work, in relation to this world, distinctly marked out: and, finally, that they are the posterity of JOSEPH, by his marriage with ASENATH, a princess of Egypt; and have been and are to be the instruments in the hands of God, in destroying civil and ecclesiastical despotisms, and restoring to all men their individuality, by which alone they can occupy a position which is in harmony with God's claim on them.

We do not intend to go minutely into details in this argument, but only give outlines of the subject. Our first resort

will be to prophecy ; and in this we shall lay down two principles, *viz* : Prophecy is of God, and it will not fail.

1. PROPHECY IS OF GOD.—“Knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation”—literally, *impulse*, or *invention*—“for the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man : but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.”—2 Peter 1 : 20, 21.

2. PROPHECY WILL NOT FAIL.—“For my thoughts are not as your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the LORD.” \*\*\*“For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower and bread to the eater ; so shall My word be that goeth forth out of My mouth ; it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it.”—Isa. 55 : 8, 10, 11.

With these two principles we proceed to inquire in relation to prophecies concerning Joseph and Ephraim his son, bearing in mind, none of them can fail.

The first is in Gen. 48. JACOB, the father of Joseph, was sick, and blind through age. Joseph took his two sons, Manasseh and Ephraim, to his father for his blessing. Jacob in blessing them, said, “Let them grow into a *multitude* in the midst of the earth,” verse 16. In the blessing, however, he gave Ephraim, the youngest son, the preference, which displeased Joseph, and he endeavored to reverse it ; but Jacob refused, saying of Manasseh, “He also shall become a people and be great ; but truly his younger brother shall be greater than he, and his seed shall become a multitude of nations”—or “*fullness*” of nations, as the margin reads.

The marginal reading of verse 16 is remarkable. It is, “Let them increase *as fishes do increase*” : the idea of sending off colonies as fishes send out shoals, or crowds of fishes. The grand idea of an innumerable posterity, which would spread abroad over the earth far and wide. Has this prophecy failed, or returned void? Sure as the word of God, it has not and cannot fail. Where, then, are these multitudes? Tell us not, “They are lost” : that is impossible : they are somewhere, though they may not now be known as the posterity of Joseph. Can we find them? Such a people cannot be hid in a corner.

Let us next look at Jacob's prophecy concerning his sons, just prior to his death, recorded Gen. 49. Here all we shall dwell on is that relating to Joseph. He had given to Judah the *one* seed, *viz* : Shiloh, or the Messiah, the Christ ; but of Joseph he thus speaks—“Joseph is a fruitful bough, even a fruitful bough by a well, whose branches run over the wall”—great enlargement, spreading widely abroad—\*\*\*“his bow

abode in strength, and the arms of his hands were made strong by the hands of the mighty God of Jacob" :\*\*\*" even by the God of thy father, who shall help thee ; and by the Almighty, who shall bless thee with the blessings of heaven above"—the atmosphere—" blessings of the deep that lieth under"—blessings from maritime pursuits—" blessings of the breast and of the womb"—the multitudes proceeding from him—" the blessings of thy father have prevailed above the blessings of thy progenitors *unto the utmost bounds of the everlasting hills* ; they shall be on the head of Joseph" : his posterity would spread to an unlimited distance, and find the treasures of the everlasting hills.

Let us now look at the prophecy by MOSES, just prior to his death, Deut. 33. " And of Joseph he said, Blessed of the LORD be his land, for the precious things of heaven"—the atmosphere—" for the dew"—or rain : the moisture for his soil—" and for the deep that coucheth beneath"—a great maritime and naval power—" and for the precious fruits brought forth by the sun, and for the precious things put forth by the moon, and for the chief things of the ancient mountains, and for the precious things of the lasting hills"—all minerals, gold, silver, and the various ores contained in them, which this people would bring out from the long hidden mines—" and for the precious things of the earth and the fullness thereof"—extensive cultivators of the soil—" and for the good will of Him that dwelt in the bush ; let the blessing come upon the head of Joseph, and upon the top of the head of him that was separated from his brethren. His glory is like the firstling of his bullock, and his horns"—*power*—" are like the horns of unicorns ; with them"—by his horns or power—" he shall push the people together to the ends of the earth" :—his power will be great everywhere ; going forward till it will be felt and acknowledged all over the earth ;—" and they are the ten thousands of EPHRAIM, and they are the thousands of Manasseh."

Can any one who believes in JEHOVAH, the God of Israel, for a moment believe all this prophecy concerning Joseph and Ephraim has failed ? Or, which is the same thing, that such a people is no where to be found on the earth ? Hath God forgotten His word ? Sure as such is not the fact, so sure is Ephraim to occupy the positions indicated in these remarkable prophecies.

Where then is Joseph ? Where is Ephraim ? or, where is their posterity, of whom such things were spoken by " holy men of old, as they were moved by the Holy Spirit" ? Is there a people on the earth that seems to answer to these prophecies ? If so, who are they, and where found ? Does not the Anglo-Saxon race fill out this picture of prophecy ? If so, are they the people specified in the prophecy, or has God destroy-

ed the posterity of Joseph and substituted another people, who exactly tally to the prophecy? If the latter, has not the prophecy concerning Joseph and Ephraim utterly failed? We cannot believe it has; therefore we are shut up to the conclusion, the Anglo-Saxons are the literal posterity of Joseph and Ephraim. If such is found to be the fact, it has a direct bearing on many other prophecies, and may help us to get light on the wars in this country, in Europe, and throughout the world.

So far as the multiplying of this people is concerned, the prophecy could not be more perfectly fulfilled. Since their advent into Britain, they have become a maritime people such as none other has been, and have so multiplied and sent out colonies to all parts of the earth as to exercise a controlling power in nearly all lands; and they now number from seventy to a hundred millions, or from one-tenth to one-fifteenth part of the inhabitants of the entire globe. Wherever they have colonized a country they have "pushed the people before them," or have introduced their language, customs, and religion; and maintained their power, till they have rooted out other people, as in North America, or brought the people to accept their institutions and language; thus have they manifested a destiny and characteristics which prophecy gave to Joseph and Ephraim thousands of years since. Not only in these respects have the Anglo-Saxons seemed to develop themselves as the subjects of the prophecies, but also in bringing out "the chief things of the ancient mountains, and the precious things of the lasting hills"; searching out the various metals and minerals which for ages have been hid in those mountain treasures; while at the same time, they have been most extensively employed in the cultivation of the soil; thus bringing forth "the precious things of the earth and the fullness thereof," as the prophecy declared.

When we find all these things combined in the present state, condition, and works of the Anglo-Saxons, and in no other people on the earth, must we not accept them as the posterity of Joseph and Ephraim, or conclude the prophecies concerning that posterity have failed?

As to the *origin* of this remarkable people, there is, perhaps, historically, no definite knowledge; except that many centuries since they came from the north-western portion of Asia into northern Europe, and ultimately found their way into the British isle, where having become established, they have increased and spread abroad as we have seen, and as the prophecy of Jacob, Gen. 48 and 49, and of Moses, Deut. 33, declared Joseph and Ephraim should.

It may be best that we should briefly look after Joseph's posterity as presented in Canaan, and subsequently till carried away captive into Assyria.



In the time of Rehoboam, son of Solomon, ten tribes revolted from his government and set up a kingdom by themselves, which was ever after called the kingdom of Israel, in distinction from the kingdom of Judah. The kingdom of Israel is often called Israel, and sometimes Ephraim, as the tribe of Ephraim was the chief or leading one in the new kingdom. The name Ephraim and Israel were often used as synonymous. Israel, or Ephraim, established idolatry at the outset, under Jeroboam its first king. Against this idolatry, God sent repeated messages by His prophets ; but they did not turn from it. After several hundred years enduring their idolatrous course, He caused them to be carried away captive into Assyria, and they were "placed in Halah and in Habor, by the river Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes." See 2 Kings 17 : 6. This placed them in a northeast direction from Babylon, and beyond what is now called the river Tigris.

This captivity happened more than a hundred years before the Jews were carried captive to Babylon. We do not learn that any thing like intercourse occurred between Israel and the Jews during the latter's captivity in Babylon. The presumption is, there was none ; and that Israel had left Assyria altogether at that time and passed into some unknown country, or were at too great a distance to the northeast to have any communication with the Jews during their captivity.

Let it be distinctly understood, that Israel, or the ten tribes, were never called *Jews*; that was an appellation given to Judah about the time Israel was carried away captive. The term occurs for the first time 2 Kings 16 : 6. The next place is in Ezra 4 : 12. The ten tribes, therefore, are a distinct people from the Jews, wherever they may be.

We hear no more, directly, from Israel after they were placed in the cities of the Medes. At least, the canonical Scriptures give us no further information of their history ; though the prophecies point to them in the future. They were sent out with a "Bill of Divorce" in these words, "Ye are not my people, and I will not be your God : yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured or numbered ; and it shall come to pass, in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God."—Hosea 1 : 9, 10.

Thus, while they were sent away from under the peculiar privileges and covenant they had been favored with, and turned out Gentiles, *i. e.*, "not under the law," yet God reaffirms the promise of making them a multitude of people, to be, at a future period, brought to the knowledge of God. In these circumstances they were left, as we have seen, in the cities of the Medes.

After that, the only hint of their condition and course is in the Apocrapha in these words—

“Those are the ten tribes which were carried away prisoners out of their own land in the time of Osea the king, whom Salmanasar the king of Assyria led away captive, and he carried them over the waters,” [*i. e.* over the Euphrates and the Tigris,] “and so they came into another land: but they took this counsel among themselves, that they would leave the multitude of the heathen, and go forth into a further country, where never mankind dwelt, that they might keep their statutes, which they never kept in their own land. And they entered into Euphrates by the narrow passages of the river: for the Most High then showed signs for them, and held still the flood, till they were passed over: for through that country there was a great way to go, namely, of a year and a half: and the same region is called Arsareth.”—2 Esdras 13: 40-45.

Of the source of information possessed by this writer, we have no knowledge; but there must have been some knowledge or tradition as to the rout taken by the ten tribes when they left the cities of the Medes. From their taking the way of the Euphrates some have supposed they went east, towards China; but such overlook the fact they were already east of that river when they left the cities of their captivity: hence to “enter the narrow passages of the river,” their course must have been to the west, or northwest; and after pursuing their journey awhile, following up that river to its sources, they would change to the north and east, and thus find themselves in the northwestern part of Asia; north of mount Ararat, and between the Black and Caspian seas, occupying the region in the vicinity of what is now called Circassia. From that region came the Angles and Saxons, with other tribes, as we have already remarked, and as all admit, though few have seemed to have any idea these Anglo-Saxons were really a part of the ten tribes of Israel: yet, as we have seen, their characteristics and course seem in exact agreement with the prophecies concerning Joseph’s and Ephraim’s posterity.

SHARON TURNER, the historian, speaking of the *second* stock of the European population, says:—

“The Anglo-Saxons, Lowland Scotch, Normans, Danes, Norwegians, Swedes, -Germans, Dutch, Belgians, Lombards, and Franks, have all sprung from the great fountain of the human race; which we have distinguished by the terms Sythian, German or Gothic.” He adds—“The first appearance of the Sythian tribes in Europe may be placed according to Strabo and Homer, about the 8th, or according to Heroditus in the 7th century before Christ.”

This is very near the time the ten tribes of Israel were lost

sight of, after being carried away captive into "the cities of the Medes," as stated in the Bible History.

Again, Turner says—"The first scenes of their civil existence, and of their progressive power, were in Asia. Here they multiplied and extended their territorial limits for several centuries unknown to Europe."

All this agrees with the facts of Israel, or Ephraim's being removed out of their land in Palestine, first into Assyria, and then in a northwestern direction. And between the third and sixth centuries of the Christian era, Europe, in a manner, changed its inhabitants by the northern tribes issuing upon the Roman Empire.

With us it has long been a settled question, about which we have no lingering doubt, that the Anglo-Saxons are the literal descendants of Abraham, in the line of Isaac, Jacob, Joseph and Ephraim; and are the Israel of the Old Testament. Such is our firm persuasion. Among them is a mixture of all the other nine tribes, as also of some other people; but the predominant and controlling element is Ephraim, whose father was Joseph and his mother an Egyptian princess of the royal blood. After their advent into southern Europe, they were led to embrace Christianity, and were the first to throw off the corruption Popery had affixed to it.

By this people more than any other, and more than all others, has the Gospel been published; and the principles of civil and religious liberty have been developed; and that too to such an extent as has shaken tyrants from their thrones, overturned some of the kingdoms of the heathen, and is sending every form of oppression to the moles and to the bats; and their mission is not yet ended. They have established a government, on the earth, differing from all other governments; the *principles* of which first began to be developed by Luther, a Saxon, and the other Reformers, three centuries ago. Those principles struggled long among the corrupt governments of the eastern continent for a full development, and were baptized with the blood of many martyrs, but at length took refuge in "the wilderness" of America, and finally became embodied in the Declaration of Independence and in Constitutional law; not perfect as it might be, nor perfect as it will be; yet so effective was the principle embodied here, it has smitten the old civil and ecclesiastical monarchies of the eastern continent, till they are in their dying agonies.

Prophecy has distinctly pointed out the literal Israel as the people God would use in breaking up the Babylonish governments of earth. "The portion of Jacob is not like them; for He is the former of all things, and *Israel* is the rod of His inheritance: the LORD of hosts is his name. Thou" (Israel)

"art My *battle-axe* and weapons of war : for with thee will I break in pieces *the nations*, and with thee will I destroy kingdoms," &c. See Jer. 51 : 19, 20. Again, "But thou Israel art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend. Thou whom I have taken from the ends of the earth, and called thee from the chief men thereof and said unto thee, Thou art my servant ; I have chosen thee and not cast thee away. Fear thou not ; for I am with thee : be not dismayed ; for I am thy God : I will strengthen thee ; yea, I will help thee ; yea, I will uphold thee with the right hand of my righteousness." "Behold, I will make thee a new sharp threshing instrument having teeth : " [ Heb. *mouths* : a clear reference to fire arms and cannons ] "Thou shalt thresh the mountains, and beat them small, and shall make the hills as chaff : thou shalt fan them, and the wind shall carry them away, and the whirlwind shall scatter them : and thou shalt rejoice in the LORD, and shalt glory in the Holy One of Israel." Isa. 41 : 8-16.

These prophecies never have had their fulfillment, only so far as they have been or are being accomplished by the Anglo-Saxons and those confederate with them. Other people become incorporated with them, and thus help in the work as "weapons of war" and JEHOVAH'S "battle-axe" to "break in pieces the nations" and rulers—civil and ecclesiastical—founded in despotism ; *i. e.*, governments and religious systems which are opposed to civil and religious liberty : systems which would crush out mankind, and reduce to mere machines humanity, to sustain its own selfish ends and aggrandize a few to the contempt and degradation of the masses ; thus virtually assuming the seat of God, and claiming a homage which belongs to Him alone.

The day of judgment and retribution to such tyrants and their systems, is as certain to come as that God will not give His glory to another ; and in that retribution, JEHOVAH has declared, Israel is His "battle-axe and weapons of war" : as such He has been using them specially for the last two or three centuries, and the work is fast drawing to a close. Heavy and deadly blows have been dealt by Israel, or the Anglo-Saxons—which we now use as synonymous terms—against earth-born tyrannies. The old dragonic despotisms have been dreadfully wounded by JEHOVAH'S battle-axe. But they do not die easy : their ruling passion is strong in dying : the hideous monster is putting forth a death-struggle here in America, "knowing that his time is short." His "wrath" is "great." Well does this satanic power of despotism know, if it fails here in this struggle, its doom is sealed the world over, and for ever.

An intelligent aged gentleman, residing in one of the Southern States, said, not long since—

"This is not a civil war merely. It is a war of civilization against barbarism ; of liberty against slavery : it is a war between the moral, intellectual and industrial culture of the free States" [and the slave States.] "Our rebels represent the *monarchical, absolutist, despotic* instinct of America ; the United States is the exponent of republican, democratic freedom, and humanity, education, culture and progress ; the living elements of the new world. Despotism so often victorious in the old world, may get a lease of power in the new, but only to be overthrown with a crash, which must shake the foundation of tyranny all over the world."

Such is the real state of the case ; and such, we think, is to be the result. The dragonic power fully crushed here, will feel the power of JEHOVAH's *battle-axe* else where, so as to hasten its death struggle every where. The reaction on the old continent, caused by the triumph in these States in the present conflict, will be such as to break finally and forever the dragonic or despotic power throughout the world.

These remarks will show in what light we view the present war in America. It is in fulfillment of prophecy, and will surely result in disappointment to despots, and destroy the power which they have so long used to exalt themselves and to crush the bodies and minds of human beings. Their day of doom has come, or is nigh. The struggle may be severe, and possibly protracted ; but their end is sure. JEHOVAH's word will not return void. His "battle-axe and weapons of war" are in His own hands ; and petty tyrants—who would-be-gods—will find they shall die like men, and "be as though they had not been." See Obadiah 16. "And the house of Jacob shall be a fire, and the house of JOSEPH a flame, and the house of" the despots "for stubble, and they shall kindle in them, and devour them, and there shall not be any remaining of the house of" despots ; "for the LORD hath spoken it." See Oba. 18. Also Isa. 41 : 11, 12. "Behold all they that were incensed against thee" [Israel] "shall be ashamed and confounded : they shall be as nothing ; and they that strive with thee shall perish. Thou shalt seek them, and shalt not find them, even them that contended with thee : they that war against thee shall be as nothing, and as a thing of nought." Such is to be the fate of the foes of Israel, God's "battle-axe and weapons of war."

Let us, as a nation and a people, acknowledge God in all our ways, and seek earnestly to Him for guidance and direction, truly repenting of all our sins, and seek His mercy ; so shall we accomplish His will, and have the honor of being His instruments in working out earth's deliverance from human despots and their wicked and crushing power. Civil and religious liberty shall then lift up its glorious head in all nations ; and un-

der the reign of the PRINCE OF PEACE, "justice and judgment shall be executed in the earth"—"then shall the righteous flourish"—nations "shall beat their swords into plough-shares, and their spears into pruning-hooks : nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more : but they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree, and none shall make them afraid : for the mouth of the LORD of hosts hath spoken it," and who can annul His word ?  
*New-York*, July, 1861. GEO. STORRS.

ON THE SPREAD of the English or Anglo-Saxon language, the *Christian Advocate* of New York, some time since spoke as follows :—

"The spread of the English language is a remarkable fact in the providential dealings of the Most High with mankind. Its study is increasing over all Europe. It is the mother tongue of the United States, as well as of the British Isles, and prevails over the whole of the vast colonies of North America appended to the British crown. It is the language of many of the West India Islands, and is heard, more or less, in all the centres of commercial activity in South America. It is the tongue of the infant empires of Australia, Van Diemen's Land, and New Zealand, and appears destined to overspread the whole Polynesian island groups. From the Cape it is moving upward into the interior of Africa ; and into whatever part Dr. Livingstone pierces from the West, he will bring with him not only the merchandise but the speech of his country. Along the Egyptian highway to Asia it is becoming a familiar sound. Throughout all India, from Cape Comorin to the Himalayas, it is being acquired by the most active and influential of the native population ; and in five of the crowded ports of China it is one of the dialects of everyday life. Wherever the English tongue is spoken its literature finds its way. Hence it is no exaggeration to say that the preparations of a Christian literature in the English language is an object of world-wide importance."

GREAT MEN, like comets, are eccentric in their courses, and formed to do extensive good, by modes unintelligible to vulgar minds. Hence, like those erratic orbs in the firmament, it is their fate to be miscomprehended by fools, and misrepresented by knaves ; to be abused for all the good they actually do, and to be accused of ills with which they have nothing to do, neither in design or execution.

## LIFE FROM THE DEAD :

OR, DO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES REVEAL A FUTURE LIFE FOR THE UNBELIEVER ?

"Retribution; or the Doom of the Ungodly," &c.—"By H. L. HASTINGS."

THE above work is not characterized by a style that has a kindly effect on the mind of an opponent. One needs to have a liberal share of patience to avoid throwing it aside with disgust at its harsh—not to say, impudent—tone. Its unfeeling and contemptuous allusions to one who held a commission in the army of the Lord Jesus when its author was in his cradle, are calculated to make a heavy draft on that "charity" which "will cover the multitude of sins." The New Englander pronounced a previous production of the same pen "ill natured"; that word would tamely indicate the spirit of the author's last effort.

The subject of the book is "Retribution"; but the author's *ideas* of retribution would suit the capacity of a worshiper of Jupiter. A heathen fable relates the retribution bestowed by the Roman god on Prometheus. Chained to a pillar, he suffered the daily and ravenous attacks of an eagle upon his liver, which grew every night as much as it lost during the day.—This continued some thirty thousand years. Our author's conception of retribution well tallies with the story.

It is supposed by many that the writer of "Retribution" believes that the penalty of sin is *death*, and *not torment*. He certainly occupies that ground in another work, "Pauline Theology," as the following extracts show.

"1 Cor. 15 : 16-18. This passage may be adduced as an illustration of the scriptural use of the term *perish*. Certainly the Apostle did not say or wish to say, that even if Christ had not risen, all the good who had believed it would be doomed to everlasting agony—but *simply, that if Christ was not risen, then they could have no hope of being raised by him, and without such resurrection they must ever remain dead, or, in other words, they had perished. And a similar perishing, or loss of existence, is to be the consequence of rejecting the Word of God and the offers of salvation.*" pp. 11, 12.

"There is another most expressive term which he (Paul) frequently uses—namely, *death*. \*\* 'Death is that state of being

in which there is a total and permanent cessation of all the vital actions, when the organs have not only ceased to act, but have lost the susceptibility of renewed action.' Webster gives as a *ninth* sense in which it is used—'In *theology*, perpetual separation from God, and *eternal torments*.' That it has this latter sense 'in *theology*,' no one conversant with the subject will deny—but that *the Scriptures ever made such use of it*, we have no proof; and such a mighty and important definition as this cannot and should not be engrafted upon a word, without the most clear and positive authority. \*\* Taking this then as a *proved position*, that *death is the permanent cessation or extinction of life*, we proceed," &c. p. 15.

"The *wages of sin* is DEATH—this is the well-earned reward of a course of vice, and sin, and rebellion;—this the *inevitable consequence* of rejecting God's mercy," &c. pp. 16, 17.

"Punishment by many has been assumed to be synonymous with torment. This is a *grand mistake*. \*\* The *punishment* is not always in *proportion* to the *pain* endured. Death can be produced by the administration of certain poisons almost without pain—the cutting off of a hand, or the extraction of a tooth might occasion more *anguish* than the infliction of *death* in such a manner; yet who would suppose from that fact, that that which caused the greatest suffering was the greatest punishment? \*\* What this punishment is, will appear from the language of Paul, 2 Thess. 1 : 9, where he expressly declares that they 'shall be *punished* with everlasting *destruction*.' \*\* That this destruction is not to be eternally going on, and never accomplished, is evident from the declarations that teach us that the wicked 'shall *suddenly* be destroyed,' \*\* and that '*sudden destruction* cometh upon them,'" &c. pp. 59, 60.

As a contrast to the above, and to show that the author no longer holds the same views, we introduce some remarks from "Retribution." On page 76, he alludes to "the mistaken idea that *death* signifies simply the *state of being dead*." On the same page, he says :

"No Scripture declares that the *wages of sin* is *death* or *being dead alone*; and no one has a right to draw such an *inference*. 'The wages of sin is death,' but does not PAIN attend the act of dying?"

Again, page 77, he says—"The death denounced against Adam began 'in the day' he sinned; hence toil, pain, decay, sweat, labor, thorns, and thistles, and all the ills which beset him, were a part and parcel of the *doom* which the law expressed in the simple words 'dying thou shalt die.' It took some six hundred and thirty years (930 ?) to *execute* the '*death penalty*' pronounced on Adam; *how long it may require to execute* the



penalty of 'the second death' upon individual sinners, I do not pretend to say. But *all the processes which result in being dead* are as surely *death* as the perfected condition of death. \*\* The *active process* is as fully included in the term *death* as is the *passive result*."

According to the foregoing, if a sinner were tormented a million of years, and then destroyed, "the term death" would cover the whole. If called to give our opinion of such a position, we would declare it *preferable* to *eternal* torment. It is hardly necessary for us to point out the glaring contradictions in the extracts from the two books. In "Pauline Theology" the author thinks the "destruction" will be "*sudden*"; but in "Retribution" he is not prepared "to say how long it may require to execute" it. In the former book he takes it "as a proved position, that death is the permanent cessation or extinction of life"; in the latter, such an "*idea*" is a "mistaken" one. In one book he stoutly *battles* the principle of torment; in the other, he as valiantly *defends* it. In the one, "death," or "loss of existence," is deemed to be a sufficient "consequence" of sin; in the other, the very element that was formerly rejected is boldly introduced, and even placed in the foreground.

In a publishing list, lately issued by the author of "Pauline Theology," he says it "has never been refuted." *We do not think it has*; but it has been most savagely *attacked* by the author of "Retribution." The two books afford a practical illustration of "*Yea and Nay*." (2 Cor. 1: 18.) We suggest that they be bound together and dedicated to Janus.

In other passages of "Retribution" we find further evidence that the author believes in a graduated scale of torment to be inflicted in a future life.

"There must be a *future state* of rewards and *punishments* beyond this world." p. 10. "It would appear that the Almighty holds men responsible not only for their immediate acts, but for the consequences resulting from them. \*\* If the fruit of a man's doings cannot be determined till it reaches its mature results, we see a reason why a man should not be judged immediately at death. The blasphemy of an infidel may send a stream of poison through all time. \*\* Hence, it seems but reasonable that the reckoning and *reward* be deferred until the close of the dispensation, until the grand and mighty results of mortal action for good or evil can be surveyed at a glance, and brought into that final estimate of human conduct which shall precede the *eternal award*." pp. 11, 12.

That is, the more wicked a man is, the more he must be tormented ; but the degree of his wickedness cannot be ascertained at death, as the consequences may run "through all time." So his sentence must "be deferred until the close of the dispensation" in order that he may receive the proportion of torment that accrues from the posthumous result of his actions.

In "Pauline Theology," p. 42, we read : "He (Paul) shunned not to declare the whole counsel of God. But *he did shun to declare the first word concerning eternal torment ; therefore, eternal torment is no part of the 'counsel of God.'*" If this argument means anything, it teaches that no doctrine belongs to the counsel of God unless mentioned by Paul. This principle is found throughout "Pauline Theology." Let us make an application of it to "the penalty of 'the second death'" spoken of on page 77 of "Retribution." Where does PAUL "declare the *first word concerning*" such a thing ? We know that he distinctly states that "the wages of sin is death ;" but so far from mentioning "the penalty of the second death," he does not even utter the expression "second death." The principle above mentioned is just as fatal to "the penalty of the second death" as to "eternal torment."

Again : the author of "Retribution," on page 130, speaks of that lake of fire that "second death." He gives us to understand that "the second death" is the "name" of "the lake of fire." On p. 77, he does "not pretend to say how long it may require to execute the penalty of the second death upon individual sinners ;" but as it required nine hundred and thirty years in *one case* to execute the penalty of *death for one sin*, we may conjecture "how long" "individual sinners" will have to be tormented in "the lake of fire," "not only for their immediate acts, but for the consequences resulting from them" through "all time." Truly the thirty thousand years of torment endured by Prometheus may not be so fabulous as we have imagined !

But let us pass on to the review of the main argument of "Retribution," found on page 59. We there read :

"The fact of a resurrection of mankind to everlasting life, or for the purposes of condemnation and retribution, is drawn from the principle that Christ by his righteous obedience as the second Adam, repairs the ruin wrought by the sin of the first Adam. Hence, the Apostle says : 'Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin ; and so death

passed upon all men, for that all have sinned. . . . Therefore, as by the offence of *one*, judgment came upon *all men* to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of *one* the free gift came upon *all men* unto *justification of life*. Rom. 5 : 12, 18."

"By sin came death, and one sin was sufficient to insure the death of a race. Adam having become mortal, could only bestow on his posterity a mortal and perishing existence. So they were all accounted to have sinned in Adam, and all, righteous and wicked, were in consequence treated as sinners, (as Christ was made to be sin for us who knew no sin,) and hence they died. But, that man might have no injustice of which to complain, God sent his Son into the world, and his obedience procures to all who died, remission and rescue from *that death*, even the free gift of justification of life. This justification of *life* is not the pardon of *personal guilt*, nor is the *life* 'eternal life;' but it is simply the remission of the *death* penalty of the *Adamic law*, thus putting man back again upon the old footing, and giving him an opportunity to *live* forever, as really as if Adam had never sinned."

The foregoing contains two propositions which we proceed to notice,

1. *The death penalty of the Adamic law is remitted.*
2. *All mankind are justified to life.*

1. The expression "Adamic law" is objectionable. It conveys the unscriptural idea that Adam was under a law different from that of his posterity; whereas there is (and never has been) but *one* law, and that is the law of perfect obedience. This "law is holy, and the commandment (thereof) holy, and just, and good." Rom. 7 : 12. Its *penalty* is DEATH. Rom. 6 : 23. If Adam had not transgressed the commandment of the perfect law, *death* could not have had any dominion over him, for the "commandment was ordained to life." Rom. 7 : 10. But he disobeyed, and the *inevitable* and *irreversible* penalty was inflicted. "He died." Gen. 5 : 5. The *same* law also condemns Adam's posterity, "that *every mouth* may be *stopped*, and *all the world* may become GUILTY (" *kupodikos*, liable to punishment, condemned." Robinson) before God. Therefore by the deeds of *the law* there shall *no flesh* be justified in his sight; for by *the law* is the knowledge of *sin*." See Rom. 3 : 9-20. The natural (animal) man *cannot* keep the law of God; (Rom. 7 : 14, 18, 23; 8 : 7, 8;) *consequently*, the whole race are condemned to *death*. The Mosaic or Law Dispensation was introduced to manifest *the weakness* of the natural man. "It was added

because of transgressions." Gal. 3 : 19. There is a wide gulf between the theory of the author of "Retribution" as expressed in the above extract, and that laid down by the Apostle Paul. By the former, Adam's posterity are divided into two classes, *righteous* and *wicked* ; they are "accounted to have sinned ;" they "were treated as sinners, and hence died." But the inspired Apostle tells us, "There is *none righteous*, no, *not one* ;" that, "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God ;" we are not only "treated as sinners," but *we are sinners*. We are "guilty before God," and therefore condemned to the same death that came on Adam, the first sinner. There is but *one law*, and *one penalty*.

Where is the evidence that the death penalty of the law is remitted ? We find no such doctrine in the Bible. It cannot be allowed for a moment. If *one* penalty can be remitted, then *all* penalties may ; the author's "penalty of the second death" included ; and so the way is prepared for the ultimate salvation of all mankind. The inflexible justice of God presents an eternal barrier against any such remission. The Almighty "forgiveth iniquity, transgression and sin," but He "*will by no means clear the guilty*." Man is a sinner, and justice claims his *life* ; for "the wages of sin is death," and death is the extinction of life. Man has but *one* life, and that is animal, a blood life ; "and without the shedding of blood there is no remission" of sin. The law of God demands, obtains, and eternally holds the life of the natural man by virtue of its own righteous penalty. No man can recover that life, unless the LORD ceases to be "a just God."

In the extract, the remission of the death penalty is inferred from Rom. 5 : 18 ; but the very expression "*free gift*" shows that the life there spoken of is not the *restoration* of the *forfeited* life. And we have the clearest evidence that "the free gift" is *eternal* life. There is but *one* "free gift." It is called "the free gift" in Rom. 5 : 15, 16, and in Rom. 6 : 23. The word *karisma* rendered "gift" in King James' version of the latter text, is translated "free gift" in Rom. 5 : 15. The text should read "For the wages of sin is death ; but the *free gift* of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord." The author of "Retribution," on p. 77, virtually admits that "the death penalty" is *not* remitted. He says, "If death signified merely the *being dead*, then, since death has passed upon *all men*, all must remain dead."

2d Prop.—All mankind are justified to life.

The author appears to admit that no one can get a future life unless they are *justified*. In this he is strictly correct.—Life is the *consequence* of justification, just as death is the *effect* of condemnation. There can be *no* life without the removal of condemnation, and that is justification. To justify is “to declare righteous.”

But the proposition states that “all mankind are justified,” or declared righteous. On page 142, of “Retribution,” we are taught, in harmony with the proposition, that all mankind are “made righteous.” Here is such a plain contradiction of the Apostle Paul’s argument that it deserves some attention.

Paul’s great theme is justification by *faith*. He never intimates any such thing as unconditional justification. If he did, there would be ground for the Universalist argument which is used by the author. But we have abundant proof to the contrary. In Romans, 3d ch., after showing that the fleshly nature cannot be justified, (v. 20,) he goes on to present a *conditional* justification, or *imputation of righteousness*.

“But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is *by faith* of Jesus Christ *unto all and upon all them that BELIEVE*. \* \* Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation *through faith in his blood*, \* \* that He might be just, and the justifier of *him* which believeth in Jesus. \* \* Therefore we conclude that a man is *justified by faith* without the deeds of the law. \* \* It is one God which shall *justify* the circumcision *by faith*, and uncircumcision *through faith*. \* \* For what saith the Scripture? Abraham *believed* God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. \* \* To him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifieth the ungodly, his *faith* is counted for *righteousness*. \* \* We say that *faith* was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness. \* \* And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised: that he might be the father of *all them* that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be *imputed* unto *them* also. \* \* Therefore it is of *faith* that it might be by *grace*; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed. \* \* He staggered not at the promise of God through *unbelief*; but was strong in *faith*, \* \* and therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness. Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be im-

puted, *if we believe* on Him that raised up Jesus from the dead ; who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification. *Therefore* being justified *by faith*, we have *peace* with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. \*\*\* Much more then, being now *justified* by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath (death) through Him. For if, when we were enemies, we were *reconciled to God* by the death of His Son, much more, being reconciled, we shall be *saved by His life*."

The Apostle then proceeds to close up the argument in the remainder of the 5th chapter. It is "hard to be understood" by those who never consider the connection that exists between the main argument and its conclusion. A comparison is drawn between the *condemnation to death* that rests upon the natural man through Adam, the head and representative of the fleshly race, and the *justification to life* "which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe," through our Lord Jesus Christ, the head and representative of the spiritual race.

"For if through the offence of one (Adam) many (all in Adam) be dead, much more the *grace of God*, and the *gift by grace*, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many : (all in Christ.) And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift : for the judgment (of death) was by one (sin) to *condemnation*, but the free gift (eternal life) is of many offences to *justification*. For if by one man's (Adam's) offence *death* reigned by one ; (Adam ;) much more they which receive abundance of *grace* and of the *gift of righteousness* shall reign in *life* by one, Jesus Christ. *Therefore*, as by the offence of one (Adam) judgment came upon all men (in Adam) to condemnation ; (to death ;) even so by the righteousness of one (Christ) the *free gift* came upon all men (all in Christ) unto *justification of life*. For as by one man's (Adam's) disobedience many (all in Adam) were made sinners, so by the obedience of one (Christ) shall many (all in Christ) be made *righteous*. Moreover the law (dispensation) entered that the offence might abound. But where *sin* abounded, *grace* did much more abound : that as *sin* hath reigned unto death, (by Adam,) even so might *grace* reign through *righteousness* unto *eternal life* by Jesus Christ our Lord."

We have thus brought out the Apostle's argument that it may be *carefully* considered *as a whole*. It utterly demolishes the proposition that "all mankind are justified to life." We have no lack of evidence in other parts of the New Testament to support our position. But we think enough has been pre-

sented to convince the candid inquirer after truth that the author of "Retribution" has built his castle on a sandy foundation. We shall continue our criticisms in another article.

JOSEPH T. CURRY.

---

### WILL THE WICKED DEAD LIVE AGAIN ?

A WRITER, "H. L. H.," in the *Crisis* of Nov. 6, fills three columns of that paper in an attempt to make out Dan 12 : 2 teaches the revival into life of *all* the dead. Among other things he writes as follows :—

"The prophecy of Daniel, 'And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt;' is not, it is said, correctly translated. *Many* is not *all*. The phrases rendered 'some to everlasting life, and some to shame,' should be '*these* to life,' and '*those* to shame.' So Prof. WHITING renders : 'And many from the sleepers of the dust of the ground shall awake, *these* to everlasting life, and *those* to reproaches and everlasting abhorrence.' '*Those*' are such as do *not* awake. Prof. BUSH renders the expression '*these*,' and '*those*,' and says, 'The waking is evidently predicated of the *many* and not of the *whole*; consequently, the '*these*' in the one case must be understood of the class that *awakes*, and the '*those*' in the other, of that day which remains *asleep*.' Hence it is claimed, if such are the facts, no argument for a resurrection of the wicked to shame and everlasting contempt can be brought from this passage.

It is true that learned men have said all this, and it is quite possible also, that Hymeneus and Philetus said so too, when, with cankerous words they sought to overthrow the faith of some, and prove that the resurrection was *past* already. Prof. BUSH, though an estimable and learned man, became a Swedenborgian, denied the resurrection of the body, tried to show that the apostles were mistaken when they preached it, tried to prove from *this* passage that the *wicked* have no resurrection, and finally did not believe that the righteous have any either ! A hopeful leader. When it is proved the wicked will not rise, the work is more than half done, and the same ingenuity, persevering, will disprove the resurrection of anybody else. We must watch these translations very closely."

The writer of the foregoing may be "a hopeful leader," whether

he be a wise one or not. Suppose we should say, "When it is proved the *everlasting* mountains "will not" last forever, but will be dissolved, "the work is more than half done" to prove the *everlasting* God will be dissolved also; would not some persons doubt if we were among "the wise" who "shall understand"? and would not they justly conclude, "We must watch these translations very closely"?

This "corrector of heretics" goes on to say—

"As to Prof. WHITING'S translation I do not specially object to it, but his comments which apply the '*these*' to the awakened, and '*those*' to the unawakened, and which have been used to prove that the wicked would not rise, I do not think so much of, as I did before I examined them. The same Hebrew expression is found in Joshua 8 : 22, 'so they were in the midst of Israel, *some* on this side, and *some* on that side.' 1 Kings 20 : 29. 'And they pitched *one* against the *other*.' 1 Chron. 24 : 5. 'Thus were they divided by lot, *one* sort with *another*.' These instances I think are sufficient to vindicate our translation from any charge of serious incorrectness. And besides the comment which refers *those* to 'the unawakened' seems to be entirely gratuitous, and directly opposite to the teaching of the passage which says expressly that many SHALL *awake*, and divides the *awakened* into *two* classes by the words *these* and *those*, or '*some*;' and says nothing whatever of any class who remain *unawakened*."

Prof. WHITING understands the Hebrew probably a little better than "H. L. H." At any rate, the Prof. did not translate to serve a theory, as he is a believer in the reliving of the wicked dead. His translation is therefore the more reliable. The appeal by the *Crisis* writer to the word "*some*," in other parts of the Hebrew Scriptures, shows, either he did not "*examine*," as he professes, or that he wilfully covered up the truth. If he has "*examined*," he knows the word "*some*" is "*Not used in Hebrew*." So saith Prof. PICK in his Hebrew Concordance: and Prof. Whiting's translation is thus sufficiently vindicated, and the English one is clearly erroneous.

The next effort of "H. L. H." is to show "*many*" means "*all*." We shall use but a small space in noticing this attempt, which is little else than assumption. But supposing the Hebrew term, *raveem*, would bear that construction, it does not do so from necessity, unless it be from connecting circumstances. Do such circumstances exist in Daniel's prophecy? Certainly not; but the reverse is true.



In the first place, the Hebrew word "*aielch*" does not mean "some." It is "*these*" or "*those*." So saith Prof. Pick as well as Prof. Whiting. Now read "*raveem*" *all*, instead of "*many*," and see what sense there is in the passage; thus—"All of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, *these* to everlasting life, and *those* to shame and everlasting contempt." Now, "all *these*" that awake do so to *live* for ever; and "all *those*" that awake do so to shame and everlasting contempt. Thus the *Crisis* writer has proved *universal* damnation! His "work is more than half done": it is full and complete! There is no salvation only from the "Adamic death," which is followed by an everlasting life of shame and contempt to "all" the awakened ones! We expected from the course of this writer for several years, that he would go back to the endless torment doctrine; but we were hardly prepared to suppose his zeal for torment would lead him to sweep the righteous and wicked, both, into it. So, however, error generally runs till it sinks by its own accumulated weight.

"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." John 3: 36.

"ARE THE WICKED FINALLY ANNIHILATED?"

UNDER the above caption a writer in the *Oberlin Evangelist*, professes to be "seeking light," and is endeavoring to show the Scriptures are against an affirmative answer to his question. We have seen only his article "No. 4." His first argument in that, is drawn from our Lord's words in relation to the sin against the Holy Ghost. He says:—

"Matthew records it—'Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world nor the world to come.' Mark has it—'He that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation:' i. e., is *held* to—bound over to eternal damnation."

On this presentation of our Lord's words, the writer proceeds to say:—

"We are seeking light from the words of Jesus in regard to that 'world to come'; especially we wish to know whether the wicked—e. g.—those who have blasphemed the Holy Ghost, are existing, or have utterly ceased to be. The Saviour solemnly assures us that in that world they *shall not be forgiven*. Is it supposable that he knew they would be then and there, mere non-entities? Is it supposable that he affirmed respecting blank nothing, that *it* should never be forgiven—that *its* sin—the sin of one now become nothing—could never have forgiveness? Did he teach that a blank non-entity is held under eternal damnation? When he said of the blasphemer, his sin shall not be forgiven in *this* world, did he not assume that the blasphemer of whom he spake, existed? And when he adds, 'neither in the world to come,' did he not equally and as much assume the *existence* of the blasphemer there?"

Our friend professes to be "seeking light from the words of Jesus;" and as he writes under the bright shining of the Oberlin Institute, it may be thought presumptuous in us to attempt to help him to what he seems not to have obtained at that noble *Institute*; yet we can not refrain from offering him our feeble aid.

1. Had he consulted Dr. BLOOMFIELD'S Critical Notes on the Greek New Testament, edited by Prof. STUART, he would have been saved from some of his difficulties. Dr. B. says on Math. 12: 32, "neither in this world, neither in the world to come,"—"According to a common proverb, *never*. See the Rabbinical citations in Recens. Synop. For *presumptuous* sins, like this, no expiation was provided, even under the Jewish law."

2. This writer has overlooked the fact that our Lord was not speaking of *this life* and a future one; but of this *aiōni*—this *age*—the Jewish age in which he spake; and that *age* to come, *viz.*, the Christian age, or dispensation. In neither of these *ages* was there any provision for the forgiveness of the sin which is characterized as blasphemy against the Holy Ghost. Had our friend seen this light he would have been saved all his *questions*, which he has put forth with so much apparent sincerity. Oberlin Institute ought to have given him this.

3. Would our friend be willing to "assume" that any sinner will have forgiveness "in the world to come"? meaning, as he evidently does, the life to come? If not, then it is no more true of a "blasphemer" than of any other sinner, that he "hath

never forgiveness ; and our Lord's words are deprived of their force, which is to show that a peculiar sin is never forgiven, while other sins, even "against the Son of man" may be forgiven. Our Oberlin friend will not, we presume, assert that sins against Jesus may be forgiven "in the world to come." Yet our Lord's words expressly declare, "Whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him."

4. Will our friend read Mark 3 : 28, 29 entire, instead of his partial extract ? and also, read Luke 12 : 10 ? If he will, he will discover he is in error as to what is meant by "the world to come," or else our Lord's words, as recorded by the three Evangelists, show that "all sins" except the one named, may be forgiven in "that world." Is he willing to grant so much to the Universalists ? Did Dr. WATTS express a Bible truth when he said, "There are *no* acts of pardon past, in the cold grave to which we haste" ?

---

### THE DEPARTED SAINTS :

OR, INHERENT IMMORTALITY AND THE HOPE OF THE GOSPEL.—

BY RUFUS WENDELL.

By inherent immortality I mean the widely prevalent opinion that all men possess deathless spirits ; and the particular aspect of the doctrine to which I now direct attention, is the sentiment that believers *in death* are personally present with the Redeemer, in paradise or in heaven. I name both these localities because a distinction between them is recognized in current religious thinking, and among those who maintain the distinction, unanimity does not exist as to whether departed saints, in their disembodied state, are in paradise, merely, or in heaven itself—the former place (some might prefer to say *state*) being regarded, with respect to glory, as inferior to the latter, or as the ante-chamber leading to it. I remark, however, that whatever view is taken of this question, there is a very general agreement that the departed spirits of the good are with Christ.

By the blessed hope of the gospel, I mean, of course, the second

“glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ.” By it I refer to the consummation of the Master’s promise—“I will come again, and receive you to myself.” By it I designate the event which loomed up before the faith of a beloved Apostle when, seeking to pour comfort into the hearts of a sorrowing Church, he said—“The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God.”

I present these two doctrines in connection for the purpose of remarking upon the obvious and irreconcilable conflict which exists between them as matters of Christian faith. Both views cannot exert their legitimate influence upon the same individual at the same time. This fact is matter of observation everywhere in Christendom—the reason for it ought to be misunderstood by none. To believe practically that “death is the gate to endless joy,” is necessarily to feel little or no interest in the coming of the Lord and “our gathering together unto him” at his advent. On the other hand, to be profoundly impressed with the truth of the Bridegroom’s return, and with the scenes of grandeur and glory which wait upon the coming of the day of God, implies a recognition of the truth that death is a foe whose dreary domains can never be pierced by the light of life until He comes who holds the keys of hades.

The danger that the notion of disembodied felicity should usurp the place which Christ’s coming ought to occupy in the faith of the Church, is more than hinted at in the following remarks from that able writer on the second advent, Rev. David Brown, of Scotland :—

“It is not enough that we believe the doctrines of Scripture numerically so to speak. We must believe them as they are revealed—in their revealed collocations and bearings. Implicit submission to the authority of God’s word obviously includes this. If, then, Christ’s second appearing, instead of being full in the view of the Church, as we find it in the New Testament, is shifted into the back ground, while other anticipations are advanced into its room, which, though themselves scriptural, do not occupy in Scripture the place which we assign to them, are we ‘trembling’ at the authority and the wisdom of God in his Word, or are we not rather ‘leaning to our own understanding?’ ”

Several important items are stated in the foregoing. 1. The

second appearing of Christ will be full in the view of any Church whose faith is conformed to the New Testament. 2. There is danger of shifting the doctrine of the advent into the background to make room for "other anticipations." 3. Mr. B. seems to concede that these "other anticipations" may be scriptural!

Of course the reader will infer that Mr. Brown has in view the popular idea of going to glory at death when he speaks of "other anticipations." This is the fact, and in order to keep the advent in the foreground, and death in the background, he does not tell his readers that death is "but the voice that Jesus sends, to call us to his arms." No—consistency will not permit him to talk in such a strain, popular though it be. Another extract will show the reader how *death* is viewed by Mr. B. He says:—

"The death of believers, however changed in its character, in virtue of their union to Christ, is, intrinsically considered, not joyous, but grievous—not attractive, but repulsive. It is the disruption of a tie which the Creator formed for perpetuity—the unnatural and abhorrent divorce of parties made for sweet and uninterrupted fellowship. The bliss of the disembodied spirits of the just is not only incomplete, but, in some sense, private and fragmentary, if I may so express myself."

Upon this I observe, that to some the thought of *sleeping* "in Jesus" has greater charms than a state which involves "the *unnatural* and *abhorrent* divorce of parties made for sweet and uninterrupted fellowship," and in which the "bliss" of the saved is "incomplete, private and fragmentary"! Query: Where does the Bible tell us of the *re-union* of the *divorced* "parties" referred to by Mr. Brown? Theologians have a good deal to say about the immortal soul returning to re-inhabit the body, at the resurrection—but where does the Word of God talk thus? Echo answers, where? Jesus does not say—I will bring him *down* from the land of spirits in the last day, but "I will *RAISE HIM UP* in the last day." Again I might inquire, Where does the Bible speak of bliss in a life beyond the present, except as it points us to "the far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory"—to the "fullness of joy" in God's presence and the pleasures forevermore at his right hand? These, blessed be God, are not incomplete, but *perfect*! Neither are they *private*, for they shall be shared, in all their infinitude of joy, by the whole redeemed host of God's elect.

We have seen how Mr. Brown views death. In contrast with that hear what he says concerning the coming of Jesus. We quote once more :—

“But at the Redeemer’s appearing all the redeemed will be called together, and *perfectly*, publicly and simultaneously glorified. It is necessary to point out the inferiority, in practical power, of the one prospect to the other, or to indicate the superior class of ideas and feelings which the latter is fitted to generate.”

How grateful should we be for scriptural light concerning man’s condition *in death*. *Every thing*, with us who see the *truth* in this direction, hangs upon the resurrection of the dead, and this in turn hangs upon the coming of Jesus.

---

### WHAT IS DEATH ?

CRUDEN, in his Concordance, under the word *Death*, thus expounds its meaning, and the nature of the curse which Adam has transmitted to his posterity.

“Death,” he says, “signifies the separation of the soul from the body,—this is TEMPORAL DEATH. A separation of soul and body from God’s favor in this life, which is the state of all unregenerated and unrenewed persons, who are without the light of knowledge, and the quickening power of grace,—this is SPIRITUAL DEATH. The perpetual separation of the whole man from God’s heavenly presence and glory, to be tormented for ever with the devil and his angels,—this is the second death, or ETERNAL DEATH. To all these kinds of death Adam made himself and his posterity liable, by transgressing the commandment of God in eating the forbidden fruit.”

This strange and unnatural definition of the scripture word death, is that which is generally held by modern Christian teachers. Can such extravagancies fail to shock the understandings of an intelligent and truth-seeking people? Who can be surprised that such teaching should furnish a theme for the severest sarcasms of the skeptic, and enable him to point the finger of scorn at the Christian profession? If the above be the definition of the scripture term death, then it must be applied, to be

consistent, to other passages where this word occurs. "We see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor, that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man." Heb. 2 : 9.

According therefore to the definition given by Cruden, Christ must have suffered this threefold death. 1. Temporal Death, or the separation of soul and body. 2. Spiritual Death, or the separation of the whole nature from God's favor in this life. 3. Eternal Death, or the perpetual separation of the whole man from God, to be tormented for ever with the devil and his angels ! Can any one believe that Christ suffered this ? Of course not ; not even the "orthodox" believe this, though in consistency they should. They urge a *commutation* theory to remove their difficulty.

In the following passage the word death occurs three times. "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same, that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil ; and deliver them who through fear of death were all their life-time subject to bondage." Heb. 2 : 14, 15.

Now the common sense principle of interpretation requires us to understand that *the death* mankind feared, the death the devil had the power of, and the death which Christ died, are all the same. If, therefore, it is the *threefold* death which Satan had the power of, and mankind feared, Christ must have suffered this threefold death. But this would have made redemption impossible, because one element in this death is eternal torment in a state of perpetual banishment from God ! Modern theologians and scripture are as much at variance, on this topic, as their theology is at variance with common sense. The passage just quoted, moreover, obliges the conclusion that death in the apostolic age, and prior to that period, had no such mystic sense as that which now has the accredited seal of popular theology, viz : a separation of the conscious and immortal soul from the unconscious body ; that, on the contrary, it was regarded as a complete and dreaded dominion over the entire conscious humanity, which blasted the hopes, froze the energies, and broke the spirits of the race so far as no clearly defined views of a future life by resurrection were possessed. Under such circumstances, its

melancholy anticipation sat like an incubus upon the life-loving heart of humanity—it was a “bondage” which clung with dismal and oppressive tenacity to them all their life-time, and from which they could only be effectually delivered by a sure and certain hope of resurrection from the dead, through the resurrection of Christ. Surely, it was the fear of this all-engulfing death, not of the threefold death of modern theology, which beget the “bondage” of which the text speaks.

---

## HOLINESS TO THE LORD :

### OR, A MINISTER'S EXPERIENCE.

WM. HILL, whose experience is described in the following letter, was pastor of the Second Presbyterian church of Newburgh, N. Y. He was a faithful man of God while he lived, and triumphant in his death.

It is sweet to feel that we are *wholly the Lord's*, that he has received us, and calls us his. This is religion—a relinquishment of the principle of self-ownership, and the adoption in full of the abiding sentiment, “I am not my own, I am bought with a price.” Since I last saw you, I have been pressing forward, and yet there has been nothing remarkable in my experience of which I can speak : indeed, I do not know as it is best to look for remarkable things ; but *strive to be holy*, as God is holy, pressing right on toward the mark of the prize.

I do not feel myself qualified to instruct you ; I can only tell the way in which I was led. The Lord deals differently with different souls, and we ought not to attempt to copy the experience of others ; yet there are certain things which must be attended to by every one who is seeking after a clean heart.

There must be a *personal consecration* of all to God—a covenant made with God, that we will be *wholly* and *forever* his. This I made intellectually without waiting for a change in my feelings, with a heart full of hardness and darkness, unbelief and sin and insensibility.

I covenanted to be the Lord's, and laid all upon the altar as a living sacrifice, to the best of my ability.

And after I arose from my knees, I was conscious of no change



in my feelings. I was painfully conscious that there was no change. But yet it was sure, that I did, with all the sincerity and honesty of purpose of which I was capable, make an entire and eternal consecration of myself to God. I did not then consider the work as done by any means; but I engaged to abide in a state of entire devotion to God—a living, perpetual sacrifice. And now came the effort to do this.

I must also believe that God did accept me, and dwell in me and become my Father. I was conscious I did not believe this, and yet I desired to do so. I read with much prayer John's first epistle, and endeavored to assure my heart of God's love to me as an individual. I was sensible that my heart was full of evil. I seemed to have no power to overcome pride or to repel evil thoughts, which I abhorred. Christ was manifested to destroy the works of the devil, and it appeared that the sin in my heart was the work of the devil. I was enabled to believe that God was working in me to will and to do, while I was working out my own salvation with fear and trembling.

I was convinced of unbelief, and that it was *voluntary* and *criminal*. I clearly saw that unbelief was an awful sin—it made the faithful God a liar. The Lord brought before me my besetting sins, which had dominion over me, especially preaching myself and indulging self-complacent thoughts after preaching. I was enabled to make myself of no reputation, and to seek the honor which cometh from God only. Satan struggled hard to beat me back from the Rock of Ages, but, thanks to God, I finally hit upon the method of living by the moment, and then I found rest. I trusted in the blood of Christ already shed, as a sufficient atonement for all my past sins, and the future I committed wholly to the Lord, agreeing to do his will, under all circumstances, as he should make it known, and all I had to do was to look to Jesus for a present supply of grace, and to cleanse my heart and keep me from sin at the present moment.

I felt shut up to a *momentary dependence* upon the grace of Christ. I would not permit the adversary to trouble me about the past or future, for I would each moment look for the supplies of that moment. I agreed I would be a child of Abraham and walk by naked faith in the word of God, and not by inward feelings and emotions,—I would seek to be a Bible minister.

Since that time the Lord has given me a steady victory over sins which before enslaved me. I delight in the Lord and in his word. I delight in my work as a minister; my fellowship is with the Father and with his Son, Jesus Christ. I am a babe in Christ. I know my attainments are small compared with those made by many. My *feelings* vary, but when I have feel-

ings, I praise God and I trust in his word, and when I am empty and my feelings are gone, I do the same. I have covenanted to walk by faith and not by feeling.

---

SYMPATHY FOR THE ERRING.—Of how much of our indignation against even a deliberate wrong would we be disarmed, if we could know for ourselves a tithe of all the sorrow, and trouble, and disappointment the poor erring heart had passed through! What efforts are made in youth to stand up against the pressure of the world; and how, when fallen, from miscalculation, or an over confiding nature, or want of tact, it bravely rose up and tried again; and when hard necessity came and drove it to the wall, how it looked around for help, and waited, still striving to stand upright, and fell while striving; and even when fallen, how it yearned for one more chance to rise and be a man, how loth at last to give up all for lost! Could we but see a thousandth part of these struggles, as they rend our brother's bosom, and almost break his heart, how should it disarm us of our vindictiveness, and incline us even, to run to him, and raise him up, and stand by him, and with god-like forgiveness bid him, "Try, try again!"—*Selected.*

---

### THE BIBLE EXAMINER.

THIS MAGAZINE has been suspended since last June, by lack of funds to continue a regular issue. At length it has been determined to attempt to make its visits *monthly*, as heretofore. Though this number is dated January, 1862, it is designed to be the continuation of volume *fourteen*, commenced January, 1861. Thus issued, twelve numbers may be added during 1862, which, with the six of 1861, will make a volume of *eighteen* numbers. To paying subscribers of the past year, we expect only *fifty* cents additional to pay to the end of No. 18. If it is their choice to aid its issue by advancing more, it will be received thankfully by the Publisher.

To encourage *new* subscribers we propose to give them the entire 18 numbers for \$1.25. But it may not be possible to sup-

ply above 300 such, as that may exhaust our store of the six numbers of 1861. Those who would avail themselves of this offer, therefore, will see the necessity of doing so at an early day. The following will show how some of our subscribers feel about the issue of this Periodical.

“No one can feel a keener regard for you than the readers of the EXAMINER. They are those who should respond to the call. I have commenced the work. We cannot suffer the Gospel light which this Magazine has shed, to be put out. I have called on its friends here, and as the result enclose you ten dollars; the first fruit of my labor. I have, in addition, \$24 more pledged, in installments of \$4 per month, to complete this volume. Will others make an effort in this matter, and relieve him who has borne the heat of the day in proclaiming the truth? Shall we not lay aside something for this work? What say you, who love the truth?”

ISAAC L. ALLEN.

*Albany, N. Y., 1861.*

Others who are disposed to follow the example of our friend ALLEN, will do us a favor to report at the earliest period.

Another encouraging item is from A. G. HUDSON, Minnesota, as follows:—

“Can we not have the EXAMINER? One Br., J. K., just told me he would send you ten dollars as soon as he sells his wheat; and another here, I think, will do as much.”

Since writing the foregoing, RANDOLPH E. LADD, of Springfield, Mass., has called on us, at our home, and encouraged us in our work by pledging, for himself, \$5 per month, for six months, to sustain the EXAMINER. Thank the LORD for such tokens of interest in the Periodical which first spoke out on the question of immortality *only* through Christ, twenty years since, when none other looked on the question with any favor. For these years the EDITOR of this Magazine has never faltered in the life question, though often opposed by friends and foes: nor has he spared expense in the work, till his own funds were exhausted. Now, indeed, he is dependent on the aid, financially, of those who love the truths he has labored to develop and defend. The late disastrous state of business matters in the land, had compelled him to hold back from a regular issue; but moral aspects now seem to demand a new effort to send forth the work monthly, if not *weekly*. The responses will soon decide the matter. RUFUS

WENDELL, formerly of Albany, and late *Editor* of the *Crisis*, Boston, Mass., writes us, "In my judgment we cannot afford to let the EXAMINER die. The cause of truth demands its continuance as much *now* as heretofore. I have—as well as yourself—reason to *know* that a new interest has been awakened on the subject of life only through Christ."

Such are some of the encouraging indications calling for the renewal of our monthly issue. It should be remembered, however, that very few periodicals devoted to unpopular truths have ever been self-supporting. That is, the subscription price has failed to meet actual expenses. This is owing to the small number who are willing to subscribe for such periodicals. Somebody must always make sacrifices to put forward such truths. To what better use can those who have means, devote a portion of their substance than for such objects ?

Hereafter, it is expected the EDITOR of the EXAMINER will be aided, each month, by articles from the pens of RUFUS WENDELL, JOSEPH T. CURRY, and others ; so that a greater variety shall be presented in our Magazine than in times past.

This Periodical will continue to be a free medium of thought ; but it must not be supposed every thing sent for insertion will find place in it ; yet no communication will be excluded because the writer differs from the Editor. In these matters he must have some right of discrimination ; but a free medium should never be closed against a correspondent simply because his views are adverse to those of the Editor. He may sometimes misjudge, as he is not infallible, and thereby do injustice to a correspondent. None, however, who have not had experience, can know the difficulties an Editor has to encounter in endeavoring to make a wise discrimination in the selection of matter, without leaving some to suppose their communications have not the attention to which they are entitled.

Will the friends of the EXAMINER let us know, *at once*, what are their views and feelings in relation to supporting it the coming year ?

P.S. We send *this* number of the EXAMINER to the few who had accepted our offer to refund the fifty cents due them at the issue of our last, that they may *renew* their subscription if they desire : if not, please hand this copy to some person who may be induced to subscribe.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

---

"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, HATH NOT LIFE."

---

Vol. 14.

FEBRUARY, 1862.

No. 8.

---

## JUDGMENT AND MERCY.

Jehovah saith, Jer. 30 : 23, 24, "Behold the whirlwind of the LORD goeth forth with fury, a continuing (or cutting) whirlwind : it shall fall with pain on the head of the wicked. The fierce anger of the LORD shall not return until He have done it, and until He have performed the intents of His heart : in the latter days ye shall consider it." He adds—"At the same time, saith the LORD, will I be the God of all the families of Israel, and they shall be my people." Jer. 31 : 1.

In the 25th chapter, Jeremiah was bid take the wine-cup of fury, and go forth with it unto the nations, beginning at Jerusalem, around which the whirlwind was sent, apparently enlarging its circle as it proceeded. On this subject Prof. WILSON speaks thus :

"It took in Pharaoh, king of Egypt, and all the mingled people, and all the kings of the land of Uz ; and all the kings of the Philistines, and Ashkelon, and Azzar, and Akron, and the remnant of Ashdod ; and, turning round to the south-east, it took in Edom, and Moab, and the children of Ammon ; and, coming round again to the west, it took in 'all the kings of Tyre, and all the kings of Zidon, and the kings of the isles that are beyond the sea,' stretching out thus to the farthest west. And then, going round again to the south-east, and thence northward, 'to all the kings of the Medes,' it was said, 'And all the kings of the north, far and near, one with another ; and all the kingdoms of the world which are upon the face of the earth ; and the king of Sheshach shall drink after them.' And this was the command, 'Drink ye, and be drunken, and spue, and fall, and rise no more, because of the sword which I will send among you.'—'Thus saith the Lord, Behold, evil shall go forth from nation to nation, and a great whirlwind shall be raised up from the coasts of the earth.' Much of this we know

to have taken place. Much of it happened in the open view of the world ; and much of it is told merely by its effects ; and this especially with regard to the kings of the north. Israel, or the remnant of the ten tribes, carried captive beyond Assyria, appear to have speedily freed themselves from the Assyrian yoke, and to have become peaceably located along the back of the Black Sea, and the banks of the Danube. Here, however, they were not allowed to remain. In the second century of the Christian era, the whirlwind above described, having reached the kings of the north far and near, a vast multitude of nations were set in motion. The movement seems principally to have occurred in the far east, and thence to have proceeded north-westward, which is the very order of the whirlwind beginning at Jerusalem. One nation was precipitated upon another : the Huns, for example, upon the Ostrogoths ; and the Visigoths upon the Roman Empire : upon which, indeed, an immense number of other nations were at the same time thrown. The Vandals having passed over into Africa, and ransacked the Roman provinces there, whirled round therefrom, under Generic, upon Rome itself, and stripped the very capitol for the sake of its covering. Even thus early this whirlwind fell with pain upon the head of ' the wicked.'

" A respite seemed to be given when the Gothic nations, who also had severely dealt with Rome and its provinces, became spiritually subject to Rome ; when many of them became the chief props of ascendancy. But has the anger of the LORD ceased ? No : ' The fierce anger of the LORD shall not return until He have done ' an expression repeatedly referred to, both in the Old Testament prophecies and in Revelation ; and referring to the accomplishment of judgment preparatory to the millennial reign, the clearing his heritage of all intruders : Ezek. xxxix : 8 ; Rev. xvi : 17 ; xxi : 6. It is here added, ' And until He have performed the intents of His heart.' These are His purposes of good towards His chosen people. It is here intimated that these words would long remain comparatively hidden ; without being weighed and considered, as their importance demands : but it is promised that at length, ' In the latter days ye shall consider it.' We are now in the latter days. The time for consideration is our own time.

" Soon may the mighty thunderings of Israel, as praising the Lord for his goodness, and for his wonderful works unto the children of men, awaken to earnest consideration the long-slumbering Jew. Yea, may both soon unite in awaking the world ' with the thrilling acclaim, ' Alleluia ! the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.'

" The words, ' Ye shall consider it,' may more particularly refer to the Jews, a people present with, or near to, the pro-

phot; whereas the other house, 'All the families of Israel,' were then a people far off, and are spoken of in the third person thus,—'At the same time, saith the Lord, will I be the God of all the families of Israel, and they shall be my people.'—Ammi. The house of Israel is that which is here spoken of. It does not necessarily include that of Judah; but the expression clearly indicates that the different families of Israel, whether of the escaped, or of those that were led captive, have, generally at least, come within the hearing of the Gospel; and put on the profession of being the Lord's people: which cannot in the latter days, be done, but as embracing Christianity."

In our last number we spoke largely of the Anglo-Saxons as the Israel of the Old Testament, and of the work God had assigned them. They had for centuries been tossed about by the whirlwind, but at length were brought out into the large place God had prepared for them. For a long period prior to this enlargement, the following prophecy had been in a process of fulfillment, viz:

"As I live, saith the Lord God, surely with a mighty hand, and with a stretched out arm, and with fury poured out, will I rule over you: and I will bring you out from the people, and will gather you out from the countries wherein ye are scattered, with a mighty hand, and with a stretched out arm, and with fury poured out: and I will bring you into the wilderness of the people, and there I will plead with you, saith the Lord God." \*\*\* "And I will cause you to pass under the rod, and I will bring you into the bond of the covenant: and I will *purge out* from among you *the rebels*, and them that transgress against me: and I will bring them forth out of the country where they sojourn, and *they* shall not enter into the land of Israel."—Ezk. 20: 33-38.

Thus has God been disciplining "the lost tribes," as they are often called, till they were prepared for the great work of being His "battle axe and weapons of war," to "break in pieces the nations." The Rulers of the earth have long set themselves "against the Lord, and against His Anointed." Practically they have said, "Let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us." Despots of every name, civil and ecclesiastical, have ruled, *not* in the fear of God, but for their own self-aggrandizement. Expediency has been their guide, and compromises with sin, in various forms, that their selfish ends might be secured. Thus have they set at nought the counsel of God, to establish their own, till corruption has come

to its full, and God has taken in hand the final purging out of these rebels against humanity, that the people may possess that liberty which God designed for man as man. He is warning all despots, in Church and State, that unless they abandon the iniquitous practice of fattening themselves by the sacrifice of those over whom they have borne rule, He will "dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." Let such despots read the second Psalm, and take warning. But they will not be warned, for they are madly bent on holding their power, in defiance of both God and man.

JEHOVAH'S "battle axe and weapons of war," however, are in His own hands; and He will surely "purge out the rebels," and "destroy them which corrupt the earth." That time seems to have come: the time of JEHOVAH'S judgment on all wicked rulers, but of mercy on those whom they have oppressed; for "He shall judge [vindicate] the poor of the people, He shall save the children of the needy, and shall break in pieces the oppressors." Psa. 72: 4. To this result, we think, "the whirlwind" is now tending, and will "fall with pain on the head of the wicked" oppressors, every where, till they shall be broken in pieces and scattered by the winds, no more to be found.—*Their* day of judgment has come; but a day of mercy to those people who have been outraged by them.

---

## SADDUCEEISM.—A CRITICISM.

BY F. MALCOLM, CANADA WEST.

A PAMPHLET designated "SADDUCEEISM," purporting to be by "the Rev. J. P. WARREN," and issued by the Am. Tract Soc., accidentally fell in my way lately; and though all its arguments have been hundreds of times answered, and refuted, it may not be amiss to point to the very wonderful positions taken by its author in certain paragraphs, as evincing the felt difficulties which the defenders of "orthodoxy" have to contend with; the chief of these is, to find a definition of the important terms *life* and *death* that will comport with their theory; and though God himself has given a definition of the term *death* which one would think it impossible to mistake—though He has solemn-



ly said, "if thou eatest, dying thou shalt die," and has in the sentence given an infallible commentary on the threatening, yet it is maintained that *man*—that is, the far better part of him—does not and cannot die. True, there is no denying that the body returns to dust, but the conscious being, the man proper, is destined to a different fate; instead of dying, he then commences life in earnest, either in conscious bliss or woe. "Speak of the literal death of that mysterious entity called the soul! As well speak of the death of the eternal God."

This author, after referring to certain statements of the opponents of his views, such as that death amounts to a total extinction of being, broadly asserts that death, in its true and proper import, does not mean "extinction of being," and he appeals to Webster, who defines death to be "that state of a being, animal or vegetable, but more particularly of an animal, in which there is a total and permanent cessation of all the vital functions;" and on this definition he remarks—"Observe, not the cessation of existence—but a cessation of certain functions." Webster does not say the cessation of *certain* functions, but "of *all the vital functions*." "No such word," says our author, "as annihilation." But it may be a question, when all the vital functions of a being have totally ceased, might not that being as well be annihilated? A great deal might be said about annihilation. Even admitting that not an atom ever was annihilated, might not a being, as a being, be viewed as annihilated when reduced to atoms, or when *all its vital functions* have ceased?

Again, the author of "Sadduceism" remarks—"Death in the ordinary use of the most unlearned persons does not mean non-existence." To illustrate this he says, "Take the body itself; it dies: but is it not a body still?" Yes, but that is not the question: the question is, Has it life still? Has it consciousness still? He further asks, "Can you not see it, and feel it?" Certainly, it may be both seen and felt; but can it see or feel? that is the question. "Does it not," he asks, "give every sense the same evidence of existence as before?" That may be, at least for a little space; but what is become of *its senses*? Might they not as well be annihilated as be what they are? Pierce that body with any instrument you choose, puncture it all over, go as deep as you please, and say, Is not consciousness and sensibility perfectly extinct? Has not Webster's definition of death, viz., "*total cessation of all the vital functions*," been fully realized in that dead body?

But is it necessary to reason thus with a Rev'd author?—Truly such exhibitions of reasoning as we find here, sometimes tempt us to suspect that a total cessation of the reasoning faculty has actually taken place in the brain of such as exhibit

them. When our author asks, Is not that body though dead a body still? does he mean to persuade us that it is just what it was? or at least that no change of importance has taken place? But hark! who says, "Thou changest his countenance, and sendest him away"? Ah! Is this one of Job's opinions that are not to be heeded as God's declaration? (Sad. p. 24). But here and throughout, our author sets up a man of straw, and spends his strength demolishing him; we do not say either the body or its atoms are annihilated, but we contend, *death annihilates totally all the vital functions of the man*, so that as a man—as a living soul, he is extinct. It is true the body may be seen and felt for a short time at least after death; and if treated as an Egyptian mummy it may be preserved as a body for thousands of years, like unto them; yea, and like unto them it might as well be annihilated.

Again our author gives, page 18, what he conceives to be a statement of his opponents, *viz.*, The curse of the law was death; and death, say the advocates of this doctrine, was total extinction of being—now, Christ himself died on the cross, and the conclusion is therefore irresistible that he suffered "total extinction of being."

How much worse, we ask, is total extinction of being than to die on the cross? Our author appeals to Webster's definition of the term death, and we accept it, and hold it to be every whit as bad as "extinction of being;"—it is "total cessation of all the vital functions." Moreover, our author proceeds to say, "If Christ had a human soul, it must have died as other human souls die, with the body." It seems then, when the Scriptures tell us "Christ died," as they do very often, we must take care to understand that the body merely dies, and so with every human being. When we are told that Abraham died, we must understand that his body merely died, while at the same time we must sincerely believe that *the* Abraham—*i. e.*, all of him that is worth taking account of after death—the Abraham that believed God, and who is the father of all them that believe, is really in heaven, or Paradise, waiting to receive into his capacious bosom the souls of the faithful as soon as they are released from their clay tabernacle.

Well, it is admitted by our author that "Christ himself died on the cross;" of course he holds *his body* merely dead. But when the prophet says, "thou hast made *his soul* an offering for sin," does that mean *his body* merely? "He hath poured out *his soul* unto death." Does that mean his body merely? And when Christ, as recorded by the evangelist, says, "*My soul* is exceedingly sorrowful even unto death," did He mean *his body* merely? Let our author be informed that his explanation of Acts 2: 27-33 appears quite unsatisfactory. He concludes by

saying, "Obviously the reference is to the body only of the Psalmist. Nothing whatever is affirmed of the soul in this passage."

It is passing strange that our author should have made such a reckless assertion in the face of the plain terms of the passage—"Thou wilt not leave *my soul in hell.*" Where is the obvious reference to the body here? The truth is, neither the Psalmist nor the Apostle had any conception of man as two distinct entities; and the grand cause of the perplexity is, our author cannot view him in any other light. Though his Creator designated him *a living soul*, he cannot view him but as a body and a soul; and these distinct entities.

The author of Sadduceeism holds it to be "very revolting, the supposition that Jesus Christ passed into non-existence, so that during the three days prior to his resurrection, there was no Saviour in being." To me it appears no more revolting than to say, "He died on the cross." Will he not allow that the Eternal Father was able to manage the matter of the world's salvation during the three days in question? The affirmation "*Christ himself died,*" involves the conclusion that whatever constituted Christ died; or else the many passages that tell us "Christ died,"—"laid down his life," must be viewed as chargeable with something very like prevarication; and would not this be "revolting"? One of those he is pleased to call annihilationists, is found fault with by our author because he does not hesitate to say, "Christ's soul was not left in the grave: then it must have been in the grave, and *dead.* It did not die a spiritual death, for that would be dead in sin; it follows then, that it died a literal death." "If," says our author, "you revolt from this as impiety and blasphemy, then do not take such a position in regard to the meaning of the word death as compels you to it by the most direct and stringent necessity of logic."

Surely we need not hesitate to quote the language of prophets and apostles, neither to draw from it the only legitimate inferences that can be drawn; nor do we ever feel disposed to revolt at the conclusion that Christ died for our sins, and that He was buried, and that his *soul* was not left in the grave, but that he rose again the third day according to the Scriptures. Revolting, Mr. W.; did you really imagine it would appear to us revolting, the supposition that "Christ himself" actually died—laid down his life—gave himself a ransom for us? No; such language did not appear revolting to prophets nor apostles nor to Jesus Christ himself; nay, sir, it is our hope that "Christ loved us, and gave HIMSELF for us."

But it is the consideration of the non-existence of that perplexing entity the soul that stands out so horrible before your

bewildered gaze, though a few moments cool reflection might suffice to convince you there is really nothing more revolting in the term non-existence than in the term death ; nay, if death be, as according to your creed, the commencement of eternal pains to a vast proportion of our race, then we might revolt from the horrid consideration that would be inexpressibly more revolting than a conception of that we can form any conception of.

Where have we at body only of Christ, not a sentence, word gives the shadow ly the sacred and serving when the ins merely that hu

us ; but instead of the sole part of Christ that died, these writers actually specify *the soul*, as Is. 53 : 10, 12, &c., while they apparently ignore the body. It is obvious, however, they use the term soul in a sense quite different from that in which our author understands it ; he understands it to represent that mysterious entity commonly viewed as the better part of man ; while they use it to represent *the man* himself, the whole of him, as an indivisible existence.

The common phrase, "soft words, but hard arguments," is not characteristic of our author's effort. In not a few instances it would be far more applicable turned the other way ; for his arguments are far softer than his words ; his assertions at least are very strong. Witness the following, commencing p. 36.— "The Scriptures everywhere, and especially in the New Testament, employ language which necessarily and irresistibly implies that the spirit of man is a wholly distinct thing from his body, and that it has or may have an existence entirely separate from and independent of it."

Now if the spirit or soul of man is a wholly distinct thing from his body, and has an existence entirely separate from, and independent of it, why not view them, and treat them as two *wholly and entirely distinct, separate and independent* beings ? According to this writer, Adam and his soul were as distinct, separate and independent beings as Adam and Noah were ; or, if Mr. Warren's assertion be right, it may even be said that Mr. W. and his soul are as distinct, separate and independent beings as Mr. W. and his humble critic.

If then Adam and his soul were really as distinct, separate and independent beings as Adam and Noah were, or any other two beings that ever existed, why are they not viewed and treated as two beings, just as Adam and Noah were ? It puz-

z. the apostles meant the Christ died" ? There is l the New Testament that conclusion. Assuredly "dividing Christ," part of him. If "died," they meant they would have told

the sole part of Christ

zles me beyond measure to see the propriety of viewing and treating two beings so perfectly distinct and independent, as in any respect one being. Why call that entirely distinct, separate and independent being, that Noah is supposed to have possessed, *the soul of Noah*? If it was really an independent being, and withal immortal, we may surely suppose it to have been endowed with such capacities as such " independent" intelligences are commonly supposed to possess ; especially the power of choice, so that it might have chosen to be the co-partner of any other " independent" cotemporary. The question has sometimes been suggested to my mind, why is not the body sometimes spoken of as entirely distinct, separate from and independent of the soul? Ah! Death tells too glaringly the deception ; and were it not that the soul at the death of the body, makes a somewhat hasty exit, its nakedness would soon be discovered.

---

" TO TELOS" AND " RETRIBUTION."

BY RUFUS WENDELL.

AN encouraging indication in regard to the growing prevalence of the doctrine of Life only in Christ, is found in the fact that its refutation has been attempted, recently, upon a somewhat elaborate scale. In the work called " Retribution" we have the result of this effort. That there is a vital disagreement between this work and the author's treatise on " Pauline Theology," has been abundantly demonstrated by extracts from the latter work published in the *Crisis* of Oct. 2, 1861, and from both publications in the EXAMINER for last month. If the author now sees this want of harmony, his mind has undergone a decided change since our last interview with him, for he then utterly denied that the two works contradict each other! This being his opinion of the matter, we cannot believe him favorably impressed with the suggestion that they should " be bound together and dedicated to Janus"! However this may be, we hope a perusal of the January number of this magazine has raised a doubt in his mind regarding the soundness of that interpretation of inspired words by which " justification" and damnation are confounded, and God's " FREE GIFT" is made to

come upon the majority of the human family in the shape of an unmitigated curse! As it is his purpose to modify his mathematical calculations before issuing another edition, we entreat him to consider well whether his mistakes in Scripture exegesis are not of far more serious importance, and, for that reason, entitled to his first attention.

The author of "Retribution" has stereotyped his own estimate of his performance, and proclaims in every number of the *Crisis* his conviction—based upon the "reception" which has been accorded to the book—that "it hits the nail on the head." A correspondent of the same paper, whose "fondest anticipations" have been more than met in the perusal of the pamphlet, is confident that the nail has been driven "so deep that its head will not present itself for another blow"! This belief of our western friend takes the *practical* form of a desire that "everybody" may "speedily purchase and read" the work, and "within the bounds of" his own "conference" he thinks there should be "*immediately*" scattered "over a thousand copies." We greatly mistake if this manifestation of zeal is not regarded with unmingled complacency by the author of "Retribution"; but if the extent of the *wound* is, in this case, to be inferred from the dimensions of the proposed *plaster*, one is perplexed how to understand the following remark of the *Crisis* correspondent: "Let not a minister be deaf to this solicitation, as the book so clearly negates the sentiments which our foes so often charge upon us, and which we as stoutly deny"! We are informed by this writer that "before reading" the book in question he "really formed a *high opinion* of it," and this was because "it had been spoken of in such high terms in the *Crisis*,"—a disclosure which, to be suitably appreciated, should be viewed in connection with the part which the author of "Retribution," himself performed in praising his book, before and after its publication, in the paper named. In only one of the two notices which he would account friendly, from pens other than his own, was it claimed that the book is a Scriptural presentation of "the doom of the ungodly." The adverse criticisms upon it which appeared in the editorial columns (then controlled by the writer of this article) elicited responses which, if published, might throw light upon the condition of doctrinal sentiment which seems to render the extensive circulation of the pamphlet a matter of so much urgency.

Thus much—too much, perhaps—in a general way. Hereafter we shall have to do, mainly, with the doctrines inculcated in "Retribution" and the arguments brought to their support. Its author justly observes, in his "Preface," that—"we are not to rest upon assertions, but upon facts, and the question is not who *says* he is right, but who *proves* it." If the view against which his effort is directed has hitherto rested upon a "system of reckless and unrestrained critical license" and been the occasion of "an avalanche of quibbles, sophistries, and conceits," his book—whether as an example to be *imitated* or *shunned* we need not say—has taught us "a more excellent way," and it shall be the aim of his opponents, in the future, to make their part of the controversy "an *investigation* indeed." Any improvement that may appear in this direction we hope will be duly regarded by him.

We invite the reader's attention to an argument in "Retribution"—pp. 61-63—founded in part upon the two Greek words placed at the head of this article—"TO TELOS." These words, translated "*the end*" in 1 Cor. 15 : 24, are supposed by our author to designate *the wicked dead*, who, it is claimed, are included in the declaration of the 22d verse—"in Christ shall all be made alive." Let it once be assumed that the last "*all*" in verse 22 has an unrestricted application, and that the phrase "*every man*" in verse 23 is equally extensive, and it becomes imperative—if we reject the Universalist interpretation—that the unholy dead, as a class, shall be somewhere found in the connection. The attentive reader of the apostle's argument will not fail to see this necessity. It was evidently felt by the author of "Retribution," and he has not shrunk from the difficult task. His method of meeting the exigency has not, we believe, the sanction of a single writer who advocates the literal destruction of the finally impenitent, and we look upon his argument on this point as a pioneer undertaking. Let us see whether or not it has been a successful one.

1. Our author, referring to the expression "*in Christ*" (v. 22), says, "it may be properly rendered, by Christ." He produces no warrant for this changed rendering, and we must bear in mind that "the question is not who *says* he is right, but who *proves* it." His cause evidently requires that the "*in*" of verse 22 should be *out* of it, and so, because the Greek preposition

" EN" may sometimes properly be rendered " *by*," this rendering is thrust into the text as if by an unquestionable right. But we demur. The Greek preposition for " *by*" in verse 21 is " DIA," and for " *in*" in the verse following it is " EN." It would have been well for the author of " Retribution" to state these significant facts. It has pleased the Holy Spirit to employ different Greek prepositions in these two verses, and we are immovably settled in the conviction that our translators have been faithful to the truth in permitting this distinction to appear in the common version. That death comes *by* Adam and life *by* Christ, is taught in the 21st verse ; but *why* Adam is the cause of death, and Christ, the cause of life, is not unfolded until we reach the 22d verse. There we learn that, in the words of Dr. HODGE—" We die *by means of* Adam, because we are *in* Adam ; and we live *by means of* Christ, because we are *in* Christ. Union with Adam is the cause of death ; union with Christ is the cause of life." Much more might be said here, but we leave the point and proceed.

2. That the reader may be fully in possession of the argument on " TO TELOS," in " Retribution," we present the following extract from the work :—

" The first Adam causes death, the second Adam cures it. Men all die by Adam's sin ; saints, sinners, infants and all, without any regard to their personal conduct. As *in*, or *BY*, Adam ALL die, even so by Christ shall ALL be made alive ; and this without any regard to their personal guilt or righteousness. The expression ' *in* Christ,' signifies, as it may be properly rendered, *BY* Christ. By Adam all die, *by* Christ all are to be made ALIVE. And this includes ' EVERY MAN.' They are, however, to be raised in certain ' TAGMATI,' bands, regiments, or divisions, like soldiers, each under their standards. The word ' *Tagmati*' is used in the Old Testament, by the LXX., to designate the standards of the different tribes of Israel, Numb. 2 : 2, 3, 10, 17, 18, 25, 31, 34, &c. The vast multitude of the dead are here distributed into three ' TAGMATI,' or bands. *First* : the ' APARCHE,' Christ, the beginning, or first-fruits. He leads the host, and so comes forth as the *first* band, at his resurrection. *Second* : ' HOI CHRISTOU ;' ' they that are Christ's ;' these are to appear as the *second* band, ' at his coming.' *Third* : then ' TO TELOS,' the END, the last portion of the army. ' To telos' does not signify ' the end of the age,' or *world*, as many suppose, SUNTELEIA TOU AIONOS, an entirely different phrase, being



used in the Gospels to express that fact. But ' TO TELOS' seems here like *tagmati*, to have a *military* application, which is very apposite in this passage, as Paul had just been using a military phrase which he uses no where else in the New Testament. The word ' *telos*' is defined by the learned Dr. Wahl. ' Collective : *ultima pars, ultimi*, 1 Cor. 15 : 24 ; EITA TO TELOS, *ultima mortuorum pars.*' The last part, the last, in 1 Cor. 15, 24, (the passage under notice,) ' *The last part of the dead.*' The learned Dr. Bretschneider, in his Greek Lexicon of the New Testament, defines the word as meaning in *this* passage, ' *Ultimi, reliqui homines—the last or rest of mankind.*'

Upon the foregoing we observe, (1.) We are not convinced that " TAGMATI," in 1 Cor. 15 : 23, has " a *military* application." The use of the word " by the LXX" more than three centuries before Paul wrote does not *prove* it, as they were uninspired men. If the word had another signification in the apostle's day, he *may* have employed it in that other sense. At this point we cite Dr. HODGE as authority. In commenting upon this verse he observes :

" In his own *order*. The word TAGMA is properly a concrete term, meaning a *band*, as of soldiers. If this be insisted upon here, then Paul considers the hosts of those that rise as divided into different cohorts or companies ; first Christ, then his people, then the rest of mankind."

So far the author of " Retribution " is sustained ; but let us hear Dr. HODGE further. He continues :

" But the word is used by later writers, as Clemens in his Epistle to the Corinthians I. 37 and 41, in the sense of *TAXIS, order of succession*. And this best suits the context, for Christ is not a band. All that Paul teaches is, that, although the resurrection of Christ secures that of his people, the two events are not contemporaneous. First Christ, then those who are Christ's. There is no intimation of any further division or separation in time in the process of the resurrection. The resurrection of the people of Christ is to take place *at his coming*, 1 Thess. 3 : 13. 4 : 14-19."

In view of the foregoing *we* cannot, without farther light, believe that Paul used " TAGMATI" in a "*military*" sense, though to concede that he did so does not at all require the admission that the wicked dead will live again. There is force, we think, in the observation—" Christ is not a band."

(2.) The phrase " TO TELOS" is exhibited in " Retribution" in

a manner well calculated to mislead the large majority of readers. The author *professes* to tell us what it "does not signify" and then gives two learned Doctors in support of *his* application of the phrase in 1 Cor. 15 : 24. If he had informed his readers that "TELOS" occurs 42 times in the Greek Testament, and that, except in *one* of these instances, neither himself, Wahl, Bretschneider, nor any other learned man, pretends to give it a "military" sense at all, (as he admits Paul does not in any other instance,) or supposes it to refer to "*the last part of the dead*" or "*the last or rest of mankind*,"—they might be more cautious than they otherwise will be in receiving the construction the word is made by him to bear in the text under consideration. An inspection of all the passages where "TELOS" occurs would convince most readers, we think, that it has in this passage the sense of "*termination*," which is Greenfield's first definition of the word. We think "Mr. D. N. Lord," by whom the author of "Retribution" is sustained in his view of "TO TELOS," would not have thought of appealing to "Homer" and "Herodotus," if he had not believed that "one of the bands must of necessity consist of those who are not Christ's." The sense given to "TELOS" by the author of "Retribution" ALBERT BARNES pronounces "*a forced and improbable interpretation*." Mr. B. says—"The word denotes properly a limit, termination, completion of any thing." Paul uses the word in question nineteen times.

(3.) Having briefly noticed the sense given to the phrase "TO TELOS" in "Retribution," we come now to consider what, according to our author, it "does not signify." His statement is as follows : " 'To telos' does not signify 'the end of the age,' or *world*, as many suppose, SUNTELEIA TOU AIONOS, an entirely different phrase being used in the Gospels to express that fact." Concerning this proposition we propose two inquiries : Is it *true* ? Is it *honest* ?

The Greek word "*sunteleia*" occurs six times in the New Testament, (Matt. 13 : 39, 40, 49 ; 24 : 3 ; 28 : 20 ; Heb. 9 : 26,) and is uniformly rendered "*end*" in our version. The word is employed in the inquiry of the disciples, (Matt. 24 : 3,)—"What shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the *END* (*sunteleia*) of the world ?" Now the statement put forth in "Retribution" would lead us to expect that our Lord, if he made any

reply to this inquiry relative to the "END of the world," would have used the word SUNTELEIA. On examination of the chapter we find that he did talk about "the end." In verse 6 he says—"the end is not yet;" in verse 13 he says—"he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved;" verse 14 declares—"And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." So much for the English version. *Three times* the Saviour speaks of "the end." Let us now turn to the original and see by what Greek words "that fact" is "expressed." Well in the 6th verse we find the phrase to be "TO TELOS"! in the 13th verse we find it to be "EIS TELOS"!! and in the 14th verse it is "TO TELOS"!!! If this exhibition of the *facts* in the case shall create distrust as to our author's scholarly accuracy, he will have an opportunity to redeem his reputation in his next work, so long announced as forthcoming. The time he consumes in "preparing" it justifies the hope that, if he has not a bad cause to defend, the "lengthy and critical discussions" which it will contain will not be marred by such blunders as we here expose. On page 72 of "Retribution" the author observes: "It is neither my duty, my desire, or my purpose, to undertake the refutation of all the errors which mistaken or perverted men have introduced among the humble seekers after divine truth." We waive all criticism on the palpable arrogance of this remark, but venture to suggest that the pamphlet in which it occurs affords an excellent field for the display of his rare powers of "refutation," and that it is not quite apparent to us how he can shield himself from the responsibility of "undertaking" the work. In doing this, aided by the suggestions contained in the EXAMINER, he might discover "quibbles, sophistries, and conceits" that would minister less to his oracular pretensions than to "humbleness of mind."

But we have proposed another question, and notwithstanding its delicacy, we feel compelled to refer to it. We have seen that the position in "Retribution" upon which we are commenting, is *not true*. We now ask, Is it *honest*? The charity that "thinketh no evil" does not require us to lose sight of several facts. The author of "Retribution" owns a library of rare value—possesses unusual facilities for Bible investigations of every sort—and his writings abound in references to the

Hebrew and Greek originals and the various versions of the same. We believe he is accustomed to consult the Englishman's Greek Concordance. If he has examined it with reference to the use of "TELOS," we do not see how he could have failed to discover that what he says "many suppose" to be its signification *is* its signification in some texts. If he *has* discovered this, we are not responsible for the unpleasant inference which his statement in "Retribution" suggests. "Just so," says one, "but you have no right to assume that he had made the discovery when he published *Retribution*." Pause a moment, dear friend! The title page of "Retribution" makes its author known as the "author of" five other works, with an "etc." added. One of these works is "Reasons for my Hope." In this work the author presents his reasons "for anticipating the speedy realization of" his "blessed hope," and on page 79 he employs this language: "Our Saviour, when his disciples enquired of him what should be the sign of his coming and of the consummation of the age, in the course of his answer said, 'And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come.' Matt. 24: 14." This proves that the author of "Reasons for My Hope" believes that "TO TELOS" in Matt. 24: 14 means the same thing as "the consummation of the age" in the 3d verse, where he says the original "phrase" is "SUNTELEIA TOU AIONOS." Twenty pages are occupied in illustrating the "marked accomplishment" of the work predicted by our Lord, and then the author asks, "And is not the *end* at hand?" Of course he means "*the end*" which Jesus declared should "come," but again *we* say that event is "TO TELOS" in the Greek.

To conclude: if the assertion in "Retribution" was designed to be an *honest* one, we trust the author will see the self-imposed necessity of rendering an explanation to the public in regard to his contradictory utterances. If "the object contemplated" in sending out this work was "earnest practical admonition," as is claimed, the inconsistencies we have pointed out seem illy adapted to such a purpose. The author of "Retribution" has free access to the paper which advertises his publications, and we should be most happy to discover that his anxiety to find purchasers for his last production is equalled by a desire to counteract, as far as may be, the false teachings which it inculcates. Near the close of his treatise he says: "I am convinced

that fidelity to God, and Christ, and truth, demand that I should now speak." He does not tell us how much longer this conviction would probably have slumbered, notwithstanding the "importunities" of "many preachers," had he not "been told by opponents" that he "*dare not* publish (his) work;" but we give it as our deliberate opinion that he would to this day have "kept the MSS. in (his) drawer" had not the editorship of the *Crisis* been conferred upon an individual who could not be expected to regard with much tenderness the narrow, proscriptive policy which, on this question of Life from the Dead, he favored with invincible, if not commendable, tenacity! The references found on the last page of "Retribution" are by no means our only reason for this conclusion. But we care not at present to revive reminiscences in this direction, except to remark that no number of articles, by our author, on "The Free Pottage" will avail to satisfy right-minded men that the doctrine of Life only in Christ is a "wild gourd," to the exclusion of which from our "religious journals" their conductors should devote especial vigilance. The tendency to this feeling, in any person, should be permanently cured by a perusal of "Pauline Theology."

NOTE.—"Retribution" was written in 1857 and published in 1861; "Reasons for My Hope" was written in 1859 and published in 1860. The reader will see the bearing of this fact.

R. W.

---

## LIFE FROM THE DEAD :

OR, DO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES REVEAL A FUTURE LIFE FOR THE UNBELIEVER ?

BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

"If death signified merely the *being dead*, then, since death has passed upon *all men*, all must *remain dead*, and so neither righteous or wicked could be raised."—RETRIBUTION, p. 77.

THE foregoing sentence is elliptical. The author's main idea is not expressed. We are not surprised at its omission, because its plain statement would be diametrically opposed to the main argument of the book, found on page 59, and to which we paid

attention in our former article. We are aware that the mere exposure of a person's self-contradictions does not prove his *theory* to be erroneous. But it *does* show that he is not master of his own position. A person that does not understand *himself* is not likely to enlighten others; and if those who place confidence in him as a safe guide, discover that he is deficient in that clearness of conception which should distinguish a prominent upholder and defender of a religious tenet, they will naturally be led to an examination of their position and course, lest they should ultimately make the disagreeable discovery of the incompetency and unavailability of the chief working member in a concern having for its object the propagation of truth, and in which they had submitted to hold the position of silent partners to the enslavement of the God-given faculty of reason, and to the detriment of the common weal. It ought to be kept in remembrance by all truth seekers, that, although we cannot make correctness of *opinion* a standard requirement in polemics, we have a right to demand *self-consistency*; and that right should be stringently asserted in the case of every one, who, like the author of "Retribution" professes to "PROVE" that "he is right." [See Preface to "Retribution."]

In our former article we endeavored to show that "Retribution" contradicts "Pauline Theology." It is our present purpose to array "Retribution" against "Retribution." Like the cat spoken of in Hibernian fable, it has accomplished the extraordinary feat of swallowing *itself*. And we commence with the extract at the head of this article.

The *omitted*, or rather the *implied* idea already spoken of is this: *The death penalty is not remitted.* A very slight examination of the passage will convince any one that the sentence has *no* meaning, unless with this qualification. If the death penalty is remitted *none* can "*remain dead.*" All mankind must be made alive from that death, *no matter what it signifies*, or what its nature. "If death signified merely the being dead," and if the death penalty is never remitted, "*then, since death has passed upon all men, all must remain dead,*" unless some other provision is made, such, for instance, as that transcendently glorious scheme which confers a *new nature* on the perishing ones. But, if the death penalty *is* remitted, then our author's propo-

sition is destitute of meaning. Thus, we are driven to the following alternative : The death penalty *is* remitted, and the author talks without any meaning ; or, the death penalty is *not* remitted, in which case we have the succeeding flat contradiction.

The death *penalty* is remitted.

“ God sent his Son into the world, and his obedience *procures to all who died, remission and rescue from that death.*” p. 59.

The death *penalty* is not remitted.

“ If death signified merely the being dead, then, since death has passed upon all men, *all must remain dead,* and so neither righteous or wicked could be raised.” p. 77.

Another contradiction. Our author knows that the Scriptures positively deny “ life ” to the wicked, (See John 3 : 36 ; 5 : 40 ; 6 : 53 ; 11 : 25 ; 20 : 31 ; 1 John 5 : 12 ; and other places,) and so he institutes an essential difference between “ life ” and “ alive. ” See page 126. “ The wicked dead do not come forth *to life,* they come forth *to death,* but they are yet *alive.* ” That is, it is one thing to *come to life,* and quite another, to *become alive !* This may do very well to save a theory, but we call it a distinction without a difference. Our author’s illustration of two men coming out of prison would do well enough if it was applicable to the case. But such an illustration is not allowable by any rule of argument, because it involves the very question in dispute, *viz :* the literal resurrection of the wicked dead. We deny the escape of the wicked from their “ prison. ” Let our opponents first prove that they *do* come out, and then they may offer illustrations to show *how* they come out. It is clear to us that if a dead man *becomes alive,* he *comes to life.* We regard the two expressions as synonymous. If we are not correct, then how about Ezek. 18 : 27. “ When the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul *alive.* ” According to our author, he might still fail of “ life. ” But the distinction does not help in the following case.

“ God sent his Son into the world, and his obedience *procures to all who died, the free gift of ‘ justification of life. ’* ” p. 59.

“ Such persons fail to comprehend the difference between the dead coming forth *alive,* and their coming forth *to life.* It is true the wicked dead do not come forth *to life.* ” p. 126.

On one side we have "life" granted to *all* mankind, on the other "life" is denied to *a portion*. Happily, there is a way of escape. Prepositions to the rescue! "Of" is not "to." "Of life" is not "to life." But just here a passage of Scripture presents itself which our author will hardly question. "The smoke of their torment ascendeth for ever and ever," is not more conclusive to the thoughtless believer in eternal misery than is "Marvel not at this" to our champion. In John 5: 28, 29, we learn that "they that have done good shall come forth unto the resurrection of life." How now? The Scripture declares that *the righteous* will come forth to "the resurrection of life," but our author says that *all mankind* come forth to "justification of life." It now remains for him to prove that a man can have "justification" without a "resurrection," and then he will escape the Scylla of one contradiction to be absorbed by the Charybdis of another, for on page 60, he defines "justification of life" by the phrase "a restoration to temporal existence" which could scarcely be accomplished without a "resurrection."

Doubtless some have queried why "Retribution" was issued in two parts. It can be explained. It will be noticed that one side of the contradiction in each of the foregoing cases is found on page 59, in the *first* part, and the other side on pages 77 and and 126, in the *second* part. Some of our readers have also observed in our author's Book List, published weekly in the "Crisis," his modest assertion that "Retribution" has "hit the nail on the head." And an innocent admirer, filled with irrepressible enthusiasm, echoes the classical sentiment in declaring "the nail is driven so deep that its head will not present itself for another blow." How easily men are blinded by their wishes! Mistaken author! He has *missed* the nail altogether, and merely "beat the air." But we do not wonder he thinks he has hit it. He judges by the condition of his hammer. As he poised his wooden instrument for the stroke, it caught sight of the nail of truth, and was so terrified by the thought of a collision, that it shivered in two as it fell. Nothing daunted, the workman has united the pieces together, but alas! they are not one; they bear distinctive marks. The first part or piece is labeled: Death penalty remitted, and life to the wicked. Second part or piece, Death penalty *not* remitted, and *no* life to the wicked.



Contradiction No. 3. One text cited by the believers in "No life out of Christ" gives our author considerable trouble. Seventeen labored pages are devoted to its manipulation. But, to slightly alter his own language on page 74, "All endeavors to dispose of it leave it as it was, a definite and positive statement of a solemn, important, and inevitable fact." "Dead, they shall not live; deceased, they shall not rise: therefore hast thou visited and destroyed them, and made all their memory to perish." Isa. 26: 14. We shall not, at present, review our author's argument, but simply call attention to a portion of it on page 114. The paragraph commencing, "On the other hand," in connection with the following one which ends on page 115, plainly teaches *two* consecutive resurrections; a "first resurrection" at the coming of the Lord, and a second resurrection, "a resurrection to condemnation" at a posterior period. This agrees with the popular Advent view. It is not a matter of surprise that our author should advocate it. He is the Editor, Prefacer, Publisher, and Advertiser of an excellent work called "The Voice of the Church," which ably promulges the same doctrine. But he is so fond of fighting himself that he sets himself square *against* this theory in other parts of his book. Cleopatra-like, he dissolves the jewel of consistency in the goblet of his enmity to what he styles, in the fulness of his ignorance, "an avalanche of quibbles, sophistries, and conceits."

Page 23. After quoting Dan. 12: 1-3, he says, "In this passage we have a plain prediction of the coming forth of '*many*' or literally 'MULTITUDES' that *sleep* in the dust of the earth. And two classes are clearly distinguished as coming forth. One class come forth to everlasting life, to shine as the brightness of the firmament, and as the stars forever and ever; while the other class come forth to shame, to conscious confusion, and to eternal contempt and abhorrence."

In the above extract we have the righteous and wicked coming forth *at the same time*. A reference to pages 138-142 will remove any doubt that this is the author's meaning. Now, is not this admirable? No veteran pettifogger, experienced in the art of making "the worse appear the better reason," could work it better. Does our knight see the grim-visaged heresy of "No life to the wicked" stalk forth? Instantly he dons his *front*

armor of a *simultaneous* resurrection. The fight begins. Suddenly his antagonist draws the lance Isa. 26 : 14 and levels it. He foresees that this will penetrate his armor. What is to be done? Not to be defeated, he hastily retires and puts on a *hinder* armor of *two* resurrections. And when Isa. 26 : 14 comes, he repels it by turning his back. It is a repetition of the anecdote of the little boy and the organ-grinder who had a mimic gallery of statues attached to his instrument. Boy.—“Mr. Organ-grinder, which is Napoleon and which the Duke of Wellington?” Organ-grinder.—“Oh! which you please, my little friend, you pay the money.” So some unsophisticated reader of “Retribution” might inquire, “Mr. Author, am I to believe in a general resurrection of all who died, or in two distinct ones?” *Ans.* “Suit yourself, my friend, my book teaches both theories.”

But let us turn from our author's incongruities to a more serious matter. “Retribution,” from beginning to end, is a tissue of misrepresentations. It constantly teaches the reader that they who deny life to the wicked *do not believe in a judgment*; that they oppose the doctrine of *future retribution*. The foundation for this charge is as fictitious as the story which introduces the book. (A fit introduction!) We believe in a judgment; not, however, in *our author's idea* of judgment; that would force us back into the eternal torment dogma. Still less could we agree with his *statements* concerning the judgment; indeed, he contradicts himself on this point as he does on others. On page 12, he says—

“The day of judgment and the investigations of that day, are not to inform the Almighty of man's deserts, but rather to publicly exhibit to the world that which was already written in God's book, so that justice may not only be *actual* but also *visible* and apparent to all mankind.” And on page 53, “Now many facts are hidden in the dark, and motives, those purposes of heart which give quality to moral action, are concealed from our gaze. But ‘when the Lord comes,’ he shall bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and manifest the counsels of the heart, the secret purposes of the soul, and then shall every man have his proper meed of praise or of blame at the hand of God.”

According to the above, all “the counsels of the heart,” all “the secret purposes of the soul” of every human being are to be “publicly exhibited” to “all mankind.” Let the statement be

clearly understood. "The investigations of that day" are not simply to bring before every individual *his own* misdeeds alone, but also the misdeeds of *every other* individual, "so that justice may not only be *actual*," as it will be whether men are acquainted with the facts or not, "but also *visible* and *apparent* to *all mankind*." This is in consonance with the statement of the EDITOR of the EXAMINER, March, 1861. "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 to be decided upon the evidence then appearing, after which the sentence is to be pronounced, and the execution to follow."

If the judgment at the coming of Christ is to be conducted according to this plan, it is evident that no *two* cases can be tried at one and the same time. For finite minds can not be occupied by more than one case at a time. And our author's suggestion on page 134, that "Men may be judged by *classes*, all of a class together," avails nothing, as there are probably no two individuals who are alike in character and deed. And thus the objection offered by the EDITOR of the EXAMINER to the entire theory is valid. To use his own words, "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." *Millions* of years would be expended in such an investigation.

Again. The *space* that would be occupied by such a multitude forces upon us another difficulty. Our "mathematical" author "once calculated that they all could stand within about seventy-five miles of a given point, or within a circle one hundred and fifty miles in diameter." (p. 138.) We will not spend time in trying to discover a defect in his calculation, for if we found an error it would not affect his *argument*, and we trust we have charity enough to allow that a man may make a "mathematical blunder" without injury to his Christian character, or invalidating his reputation as a "religious teacher." If a person were examined according to the supposed theory he would be

seventy-five miles distant from the periphery of the "circle." We ask, How are the people to *see* so far? Surely if "justice" is to be "visible" to "all mankind," it will be necessary for them to *see* the criminal. If not, how are they to know *who* is being judged?

We would also ask, How are "all mankind" to *hear* the criminal "plead guilty?" Our author says, on page 135, "All will plead guilty who are guilty." But *this* assertion does away with a *trial*. We do not *try* people if they "plead guilty." Our author says, on the same page, "As God can hear a million prayers at once, so he can condemn a million sinners at once." True; but our author forgets he has already said that "The day of judgment and the investigations of that day, are *not* to inform *the Almighty* of man's deserts, but rather to *publicly* exhibit to *the world* that which was already written in God's book, so that justice may not only be actual but also *visible* and *apparent* to *all mankind*." Hence, the question is not whether "God can hear, but whether "all mankind" "can hear"? Not whether "God can condemn a million sinners at once," but whether "all mankind" can?

Our author goes on, p. 135: "It has been stated by persons who were drowning, or falling from a precipice, that the acts of their whole lives would flash upon their minds in a moment of time. And if such a review could be taken by finite men, how much more by the infinite God!"

Very true, our author; but you are not hitting the "nail." The "review," according to what you have said, is to "be taken by *finite man*" of the "facts," "motives," "purposes of heart," in every individual *case*.

We have thus briefly shown some of the difficulties in the way of our author's theory of judgment. It is evident that his own ideas of the judgment are crude and unsatisfactory. And yet he charges those who oppose *his view* of the judgment with "*disputing, perverting, and denying* the doctrine of eternal judgment." The accusation is as false as the other which we have mentioned, *viz*: that we deny a *future retribution*. We believe "the wrath of God," which is *death*, "ABIDETH" eternally and irrevocably on every one who "believeth not the Son." We believe the wicked are "punished with everlasting *destruction*."

We believe "he that soweth to his flesh shall *of the flesh* reap *corruption*." We believe "man that is in honor, and understandeth not, is like the beasts that *perish* ;" that all the wicked "as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, shall *utterly perish* in *their own corruption* ;" and we pray God to forgive those who charge us with denying a "*retribution to the ungodly*." (Page 134.) More anon.

---

### LIFE : PRESENT AND FUTURE.

A friend writes us as follows :—

"There is one point in the discussion of the 'life in Christ' question which I have never seen brought out on your side of the question, and it is quite a point with the advocates of two deaths. I thought I would suggest it that you may, if you think it worth while, notice it in the EXAMINER."

"I allude to the position which some take, that the *zoe*—lif—has reference, almost exclusively, to future eternal life of the saints, or to the principle of eternal life which believers have here and which will be consummated in the future life ; and therefore such passages as John 3 : 36, 'He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life, (*zoe*) ; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life,' (*zoe*), simply mean that, so far as the wicked are concerned, *they* shall not see the *zoe*-life : they, not having the principle of eternal life here, shall not have eternal life hereafter : but that they will be raised to this mortal life, as was the widow's son at Nain ; the ruler's daughter ; Lazarus, &c., who were raised to this mortal life and died the second time, though of course they do not claim that these persons died the second death."

In reply to the objection that "*zoe*—life—has reference almost exclusively to future eternal life of the saints," &c., we remark, that *zoe* of itself determines nothing as to the enduring nature of the life. In the first place, the word is used in relation to this present life. Take for example 1 Tim. 4 : 8, "Having promise of the life—*zoe*—that *now is*, and of that which is to come." This is clear and decisive. Again, the rich man, Luke 16 : 25, was told "thou in thy life—*zoe*—time receivedst thy good things," &c.

These examples are sufficient to show, the word has the gen-

eral sense of *life*, without defining the durability of that life.— Besides, if it did define the life as ever during, why is it so often accompanied, in speaking of the future, by the words *eternal*, *everlasting*, and *endless*. These words, defining duration, are entirely superfluous and out of place, if *zoe* has the sense of endless life in itself. The fact is, it has no such sense: it means simply *life*, leaving the connection to show whether it relates to “*the life that now is*,” or “*that to come*.”

But if we were to grant the advocates of the re-living of the wicked dead that *zoe* almost exclusively relates to the “future eternal life of the saints,” they gain nothing: for, on their own showing, the wicked are excluded from *zoe*; and they cannot produce a single text that saith they shall have *psuchee*—*life*. from the dead: besides, the Saviour saith, “Whosoever will save his life—*psucheen*—shall lose it: and whosoever will lose his life—*psucheen*—for my sake shall find it.” “Find” *what*? Is it not *psucheen*? But what follows as an inevitable conclusion? Is it not—The others shall *not* “find *psucheen*”? and, therefore, find no life at all; our opponents admitting they will not attain to the *zoe*; and Jesus clearly stating they will *not* “find” the *psucheen* they sought “to save.”

Thus the question seems to be settled, there is no future life, either *zoe* or *psuchee*, for the wicked dead. They sowed to the flesh, and of the flesh reaped corruption, and “utterly perished in their own corruption,” “like natural brute beasts.” See 2 Peter 2: 12. “The wages of sin is *death*.” Let that be remembered: it is not *deaths*: no, it “is *death*”: a single and irrevocable extinction of life.

---

## FULL GROWN SPIRITUALISM.

WHAT perfect harmony exists in the theory of modern spiritualism, or “spirit-rapping,” and the Christian believers in the immortality of the soul. We will illustrate this by an extract from a communication in *The Methodist*, of this city, Dec. 28, by Rev. J. B. HAGANY, on the life and death of Mehetabel Wesley, sister of John and Charles Wesley. Mr. Hagany says—

“A few days after her decease, Charles wrote to his wife,

saying—' Last Monday I followed our *happy sister* to her grave.' Some time between her death and burial, he preached her funeral sermon, from the well-chosen words—' Thy sun shall no more go down, neither shall thy moon withdraw itself ; for the Lord shall be thine everlasting light, and the days of thy mourning shall be ended.' During the hour of the discourse, he says, '*I had sweet fellowship with her.*'

" Not a doubt of it !" says Mr. Hagany, " say what ye will, ye fools and blind, ye gross earthlings, who vainly think that the grave takes all ; or, which is kindred to it, that the blessed cannot whisper their sympathies and loves through walls of flesh !"

Do we need to say, here is the very essence of modern spirit-rapping ! Who " the fools and blind" are, God will judge ; and His judgment will be a righteous one. After such sentiments as those uttered by Chas. Wesley, and indorsed by Mr. Hagany, how can he censure those who claim they are spiritualists, and hold " fellowship" with the dead ? No wonder the *Christian Intelligencer* put the Spiritualists in his catalogue as a part of " the Christian church," in its article on " Everlasting Punishment." The wonder is that it should put the " Annihilatists"—as it has done—in the same church. What ! put " fool and blind" in the " Christian church" ! Pardon us. For the moment we had forgotten Paul said—" Ye suffer *fools* gladly, seeing ye yourselves are wise" !

But we are not quite done with Mr. Hagany's account of Charles Wesley, his dead sister, and Mr. H.'s indorsement.

Charles says, " I followed our *happy sister* to her grave."—Before that, however, in preaching " her funeral sermon," he says, " I had sweet fellowship with her." Now Mr. Hagany pronounces those " fools and blind" who " think the grave takes all." But, Charles Wesley said, he followed his "*happy sister* to her grave." Was that true ? Did that *sister* go into the grave who had previously been *happy* ? If so, did not " the grave take all" ? or, did her brother speak falsely when he spoke in that manner ? Mr. Wesley's " sweet fellowship with her" was *before* he " followed" her " to her grave." It was then, if at all, that she " whispered" her " sympathies and loves through walls of flesh" ! Why then did her brother put his " happy sister" in " the grave" ! Or, could she whisper just as well when in the grave as out of it ? Mr. Hagany does not tell

us whether she whispered any more after "the grave" took her; and there is something revolting in the idea of putting her in the grave while she could "whisper." We confess Mr. Hagany's theology, in this matter, looks *foolish*; but we dare not call him a "fool and blind" lest we might "fall into the condemnation of the devil," and so be in "danger of the fire of gehenna."

"In death there is no remembrance of Thee: in *sheol* who shall give Thee thanks?" Psa. 6: 5. "Shall Thy wonders be known in the dark? and Thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?" Psa. 88: 12. "The dead praise not the LORD." Psa. 115: 17. "His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." Psa. 146: 4.—"The dead know not anything." "There is *no knowledge* in *sheol*." Eccl. 9: 5, 10. "For *sheol* cannot praise Thee; death cannot celebrate Thee." Isa. 38: 18.

When Mr. Hagany has digested this inspired testimony, he can be furnished with any amount more of like character; and "fools and blind" may be found to make a large catalogue of Scripture worthies, who had not been corrupted by the traditions of men. Men who believed and taught that the resurrection from the dead, "at the last day," was *the hope* of the Gospel: and not the fancy of "peeping, muttering, and *whispering*" of the dead ones. Such corruptions of the word of God were reserved for more modern times, and have made void the counsel of God relating to the resurrection when "the Lord himself shall descend from heaven."

---

#### A STATEMENT AND A REQUEST:

SOME time about ten years since, I preached on the Judgment. That discourse was first published in the BIBLE EXAMINER, July, 1853, and was republished by request, in this magazine, in March, 1861. I stated in that discourse, "*ten millions* of years" would be taken up in the Judgment, if the common idea of each individual case passing in review, in succession, so as to give account for every word, act, thought, and motive; and if one hour were allowed to each case.



In printing my pamphlet on "LIFE FROM THE DEAD," by some means a double error crept into this statement, and I am made to say "ten *thousand* millions," instead of "ten millions;" and *thirty* minutes, instead of *sixty* minutes, or *one hour*."

What I now wish, is, that all persons into whose hands that pamphlet has fallen, would strike out the word "*thousand*," on page 60, ninth line from the bottom; and the line below, alter so as to read *sixty*, instead of "*thirty*." That will make it correspond with my sermon on the Judgment, and my original calculation; which, however, was never designed as an accurate mathematical calculation, but only to approximate the period.

Future editions of "LIFE FROM THE DEAD" will contain the corrections here pointed out. I hope the friends of truth will see that this Pamphlet is widely scattered. I am satisfied it contains the fundamental idea on which the whole Gospel scheme is built. The race of Adam are all going out of life, and there is but one medium or means of recovery from death, *viz*: Union with the *Second* Adam: the *Life-Giver*; who is "the Resurrection and the Life." All others "remain in the congregation of the dead," and live no more forever. See Prov. 21: 15, 16. Isa. 26: 14. Psa. 49, throughout; also, John 3: 36; and 6: 53.

GEO. STORRS.

*New-York*, January, 1862.

---

## PERILS OF THE HOUR.

1. Our spirituality of mind is imperiled. Never had we so much of a secular nature to occupy our thoughts and feelings as now. Never was there such a consuming, feverish anxiety to hear the news. Never in our day was the nation so kept on tip-toe from hour to hour, in expectation of victory or defeat. Never to us were such vast temporal interests hanging in suspense. To a great extent, such feelings as we have experienced for the past few months, are natural and wholly uncontrollable. But the Christian must refuse to yield his heart utterly to their possession. They must not be allowed to rob his religious exercises of their attractiveness, or to make the place of prayer a tedious and drowsy place to him, or to send a train of wandering thoughts

carcering through his brain, while the preacher is presenting his message. Or if an excited mind will, in spite of all he can do, take off the edge of his enjoyment and freshness in spiritual exercises, then let him resist immovably its temptations to *breaking in upon the regularity of those exercises*. Let him hold with unyielding firmness to his hours of secret communion with God in prayer and the reading of the word, though the roar of battle is in his ears day and night. Let him persevere in his attendance upon the weekly and Sabbath services of the Church, all the more steadfastly, for the distracting circumstances in which he is placed. To be absorbed by the highest human interests, irrespective of their connection with the kingdom of Christ, is faithlessness to our Redeemer. To be anxiously tossed to and fro by their conflicting phases, and to yield up our souls like a reed to every conflicting rumor, is to be guilty of mistrust. We do indeed owe allegiance to our country, higher than that which we owe to our State and municipal government, but higher than all is our allegiance to the Captain of our salvation, who more than all expects, and will have, an unconditional and whole-souled loyalty. Our country may well be dear to us; precious enough to warrant the offer of our lives; but it can be ours for a few years at best. How blind, then, to allow it to usurp in our affections the place of that better country, that heavenly Canaan, that land of Beulah, that glorious everlasting abode of the victor-soldiers of the cross.

Let us rally then the forces of our spiritual life, and beware lest zeal to quell an earthly rebellion, carry us away to something like rebellion against a loftier government and more sacred obligations.

2. While the fire of personal piety is thus in danger of burning low, the streams of beneficence are in danger of running dry. Extraordinary demands are made upon the loyalty and benevolence of all who can give in support of the government. And while its wants are enormous, every kind of business has flagged, and the resources of multitudes are cut off, to a degree unparalleled in any of the financial convulsions which have heretofore been experienced. This is almost always the case to a greater or less extent in war, especially in a civil war. And not only has the South become embarrassed and unable to pay its Northern creditors; but in many instances Southern law has interposed to enhance the difficulty of meeting obligations. The giving power of our benevolent men is therefore greatly reduced, and all of our benevolent operations put in jeopardy. Serious and lasting hindrances to their usefulness may be the result of their present embarrassments. Our missionary enterprises at

home and abroad may suffer serious curtailment. They may lose ground and prestige in a short time, which the labor of years will not suffice to recover. Missionary families in the destitute parts of our own land may suffer hardships, and flourishing enterprises be abandoned. Religious newspapers and periodicals may be compelled to succumb. These things have not yet happened to any great degree. The credit of our societies, based upon a public faith in the liberality of the Christian community, suffices to carry them over brief intervals of embarrassment without serious loss; but it cannot be relied on for any prolonged and great deficiency. The people cannot expect them to survive while other matters are allowed utterly to absorb our attention.

Let us then give them more than their wonted place in our thoughts, prayers and liberal devisings. Let us sincerely inquire what we can do to carry them successfully through this trying era.—*Am. Presb.*

---

## THE BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

### MAY I HAVE IT ?

CERTAINLY you may. How can you, how dare you, live and breathe without it,—without this salvation, the baptism of the Holy Spirit? How can you read, write, pray, testify, open your lips at all, without this special, overflowing grace? How can you rejoice evermore, pray without ceasing, as commanded, give thanks always, be careful for nothing, glorify your heavenly Father in every relation of life, without this?

“*May I have it?*” Unquestionably; why hesitate a single moment? God commands you to present your body a *living* sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto him, which is your reasonable service; to be steadfast, immovable, always abounding; to be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might; to be filled with the Spirit. It is your high privilege to obey God; have respect unto *all* his commandments; especially touching a holy, consecrated life. It is as much your calling to put on the whole armor of God, to be wholly and unreservedly given up to His service, as it is for any sinner to repent, turn from his great wickedness and open rebellion against the Most High. How can you, with any degree of consistency, warn impenitent sinners to turn from their wicked ways and flee the wrath to come, while you are living in open disobedience to the precept, “*Be ye holy,*

for I am holy?" The injunction to be holy *now*, to cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, is just as plain and positive as the command to repent and believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. Beloved, it is not optional whether you will, or will not obey God by this holy, consecrated life; you are solemnly *bound* to do it, as a matter of high privilege. The voice is louder than seven thunders from high heaven: "*Wash you, make you clean.*"

"Sanctify the Lord God in your hearts." "Reckon yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God, through Jesus Christ, our Lord."

Your usefulness, your happiness, your safety, your eternal life depend on this obedience. It is God that speaks, not man.—Moreover, there are no lions in the way, no giants, the sons of Anak; the pathway is open, the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein. Touching this baptism the promises are ample. The Spirit is given to profit with all. The Spirit and the Bride say come, and whosoever will, let him come. Will you have it? Will you accept this offered mercy—this purchased salvation? Will you comply with the conditions?—lay all upon the altar, give all for Christ; bring all the tithes into the store-house; take God at his word! Will you do it? Will you do it *now*? Will you?

"Never be ashamed of Jesus—  
 'Glory ever in his cross,'  
 Count it most exalted honor  
 To advance his blessed cause;  
 Hallowed honors, untold blessings  
 Cluster round the Saviour's cross." *Selected.*

---

THE EXAMINER for *March* will be issued in due time. Our friends who have not yet responded, will do us a favor to do so at the earliest period possible. The responses thus far have been encouraging. Philadelphia is speaking on the subject. Already we have received fifty dollars from there. Roswell Curtis, Auburn, N. Y., has sent us five dollars, and adds, "You can depend on me for fifteen more." A friend in Chicago, Ill., writes, "The friends here all express much pleasure in seeing the EXAMINER once more." \* \* \* "Sooner than have it stop, I would give a dollar for each copy, if I had the money. And from what others tell me they feel the same."

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

---

"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, HATH NOT LIFE."

---

Vol. 14. No. 9.]

MARCH, 1862.

[Whole No. 211.]

---

## THE OBJECT OF CHRIST'S MISSION :

AN EXTRACT FROM A SERMON, BY GEORGE STORRS.

REPORTED BY JOSEPH MC'FARLAND, PHILADELPHIA.

IF the question were asked, "For what purpose did our Lord Jesus Christ come into the world"? how would it most probably be answered? especially, according to the general "theology" of the age in which we live? Some one would reply, "He came into the world to save us from hell." But what do you mean by "hell"? "Why, a place of eternal torment, where 'undying souls'—immortal sinners—will suffer eternal torture." That is the reason why our Lord Jesus Christ came into the world, is it? "Yes! admitting, of course, that he came to save us from our sins, and consequently, from eternal misery."

I am aware that "theologians," recently, have seemed considerably less dogmatical in relation to the doctrine of the endless torment of the wicked. Many of them do not express their views as fully and as distinctly as in former years: but nevertheless, the grand object of Christ's mission was to save men (according to their theological view) from endless torment, and burning flame. But what reasons do the Scriptures present for Christ's advent into the world?

We will permit the Lord Jesus, himself, to reply in His own language, as recorded in John 10: 10. "I am come that they might have *life*, and that they might have it more abundantly." Or, as the Syriac version reads:—"That they might have that which is *excellent*." In other words, an *excellent life*.

Here, then, is Christ's own explanation. Will you accept it? "Oh! yes," replies the theologian, "I will accept that declaration

*for I am holy?"* The injunction to be holy *now*, to cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, is just as plain and positive as the command to repent and believe in the Lord Jesus Christ. Beloved, it is not optional whether you will, or will not obey God by this holy, consecrated life; you are solemnly *bound* to do it, as a matter of high privilege. The voice is louder than seven thunders from high heaven: "*Wash you, make you clean.*"

"Sanctify the Lord God in your hearts." "Reckon yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God, through Jesus Christ, our Lord."

Your usefulness, your happiness, your safety, your eternal life depend on this obedience. It is God that speaks, not man.—Moreover, there are no lions in the way, no giants, the sons of Anak; the pathway is open, the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein. Touching this baptism the promises are ample. The Spirit is given to profit with all. The Spirit and the Bride say come, and whosoever will, let him come. Will you have it? Will you accept this offered mercy—this purchased salvation? Will you comply with the conditions?—lay all upon the altar, give all for Christ; bring all the tithes into the store-house; take God at his word! Will you do it? Will you do it *now*? Will you?

"Never be ashamed of Jesus—  
 'Glory ever in his cross,'  
 Count it most exalted honor  
 To advance his blessed cause;  
 Hallowed honors, untold blessings  
 Cluster round the Saviour's cross." *Selected.*

THE EXAMINER for *March* will be issued in due time. Our friends who have not yet responded, will do us a favor to do so at the earliest period possible. The responses thus far have been encouraging. Philadelphia is speaking on the subject. Already we have received fifty dollars from there. Roswell Curtis, Auburn, N. Y., has sent us five dollars, and adds, "You can depend on me for fifteen more." A friend in Chicago, Ill., writes, "The friends here all express much pleasure in seeing the EXAMINER once more." \* \* \* "Sooner than have it stop, I would give a dollar for each copy, if I had the money. And from what others tell me they feel the same."

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

---

"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, HATH NOT LIFE."

---

Vol. 14. No. 9.]

MARCH, 1862.

[Whole No. 211.]

---

## THE OBJECT OF CHRIST'S MISSION :

AN EXTRACT FROM A SERMON, BY GEORGE STORRS.

REPORTED BY JOSEPH MC'FARLAND, PHILADELPHIA.

IF the question were asked, "For what purpose did our Lord Jesus Christ come into the world"? how would it most probably be answered? especially, according to the general "theology" of the age in which we live? Some one would reply, "He came into the world to save us from hell." But what do you mean by "hell"? "Why, a place of eternal torment, where 'undying souls'—immortal sinners—will suffer eternal torture." That is the reason why our Lord Jesus Christ came into the world, is it? "Yes! admitting, of course, that he came to save us from our sins, and consequently, from eternal misery."

I am aware that "theologians," recently, have seemed considerably less dogmatical in relation to the doctrine of the endless torment of the wicked. Many of them do not express their views as fully and as distinctly as in former years: but nevertheless, the grand object of Christ's mission was to save men (according to their theological view) from endless torment, and burning flame. But what reasons do the Scriptures present for Christ's advent into the world?

We will permit the Lord Jesus, himself, to reply in His own language, as recorded in John 10: 10. "I am come that they might have *life*, and that they might have it more abundantly." Or, as the Syriac version reads:—"That they might have that which is *excellent*." In other words, an *excellent life*.

Here, then, is Christ's own explanation. Will you accept it? "Oh! yes," replies the theologian, "I will accept that declaration

of Jesus ; but"—"But"—what ? These are His plain positive words ; and there is not *one* word about His coming to save men from the "endless misery of hell."

"I am come that they might have *life* !" He declares. Can you understand Him ?—"And, that they might have it more abundantly."

"Yes ! but, then, *life* does not mean existence,—it cannot mean that." Why not ? "Because every man has an undying *soul*, and *will* have an eternal existence." Oh ! indeed ! So, then, Jesus Christ stands corrected by modern theology ! He is not quite accurate ! Instead of saying, "I have come that men might have *life*," He is corrected, and made to say, "I have come that men might have a happy, or a blessed, existence."

Is it to be supposed for a moment that Christ could not have used these words as well as our theologians ? He addressed the common people, and they "heard him gladly."

They did not find it necessary to procure the services of some profound lawyer, in order to have his words explained ; nor did they need to be told that *life* meant nothing of the sort ; or rather, that *life* meant "happiness." While hearing such misrepresentations made, I have been impelled to exclaim :—"Get thee behind me, Satan : thou art an offence to me. Thou savorest not the things that be of God, but of men." They pervert the plain and *obvious* interpretation of the words of Christ ; whether intentionally or not, God will judge. If our Lord meant "happiness," could he not have said it ? Surely the Greek language, in which the New Testament was mainly written, is not lacking in words to express bliss, enjoyment, happiness, and similar ideas. We find such words scattered throughout the New Testament ; therefore, if our Lord intended to convey such ideas, we repeat, He could as well have used the language adopted by our theologians as to have used that He did. It is evident, then, that He did *not* mean what they claim as the proper signification of the words.

But they affirm, man has an immortal soul, and consequently their interpretation is necessary, to meet their views. Moreover, they inform us, the "Church" had "committed to it the doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul," and they are accordingly bound to defend it.

Now it is remarkably strange that the Church should have



had committed to it such a doctrine, when there is not a text from Genesis to Revelation that speaks of it! I would like to ask, who committed this doctrine to the Church? Was it Jesus Christ, the Apostles, or prophets? They are all silent respecting it. I would sooner believe that he who said "All the kingdoms of the world are mine" had committed it to the Church. The Church did not receive it from God; neither from the Apostles, nor from the prophets. How strange that we should be denounced as "Infidels" while the Scriptures nowhere teach the soul's immortality. Are we, then, "Infidel?" I charge our opposers with infidelity!

Take the language of the text—"I am come that they might have *life*." Now infidelity is, in other words, disbelief:—and when you say the *life* there spoken of does not mean life—conscious, or living, existence,—who is the "infidel" then? who now believes the plain, positive testimony of Jesus Christ?

By way of confirmation, let us examine other texts in relation to the point—that Jesus did mean life, proper: literal living existence.

Turn to the case of the young man who asked our Lord what he should do to inherit eternal life. In the 19th of Matthew, we find him described as a young man of more than ordinary intelligence—as a ruler, or person of note. "And behold one came running, and said unto him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?" Here I would remark that it was perfectly natural that a person should have come to Jesus for information relative to the matter and theme of His discourses. Very likely this young man had heard what Jesus taught the people, and he went to Him to be instructed in regard to a matter that lay near his heart. See him as he comes "running!" Does he ask what good thing shall I do to escape eternal torments? What shall I do to escape an eternal hell? Is there an intimation of any such thing in his question? Not a word of it.

Look at the simplicity of his words,—“What shall I do to inherit eternal life;” or, “that I may have eternal life?” How plain, how simple, this question is, upon the supposition that man is a perishing being, and passing away in death. Without revelation, there is no evidence of a future life—no evidence of a life without end. The whole scene of man's history, in

this world, is one of mortality, corruption, and death. He may speculate concerning it as much and as anxiously as he pleases ; but he can learn nothing positive or definite in respect to the future, apart from revelation.

The young man becoming interested in the subject, comes to Jesus and makes his plain and simple inquiry. Now mark the reply. "He said unto him, Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is God : but if thou wilt"—escape endless torment! if thou wilt save thy immortal soul, that can never die! Does our Lord speak thus? Thus would the theology which claims to be *orthodox*, in this age, have spoken ; but not so does Jesus speak. Hear him—"If thou wilt enter into LIFE;" &c. Such is the divine utterance ; and it harmonizes with the whole theme of the preaching of our Lord and His Apostles. Jesus Christ was endowed with the "power of an *endless life*," and came to bestow it on the perishing, if they would accept Him as their DELIVERER. That life was the great theme of all His preaching, declaring, "This is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on Him, may have *everlasting life* ; and I will RAISE HIM UP at the last day." Clearly announcing the bestowment of an endless life as the great end of His mission ; and also the means by which that bestowment is to be consummated, *viz.* by a revival from the dead at the last day. In order to this, there must be *faith* in Jesus Christ as the LIFE-GIVER—the DELIVERER from sin and death : a cleaving to Him as "our hope," and as the only medium between God and us—the "*one mediator*." Such shall have life from the dead, "at the last day," and die no more : they shall "be as the angels of God in heaven:" and because their Redeemer lives, to die no more, so shall they. Such is the life the gospel proclaims. Those who reject or neglect this proclaimed mercy perish from life—"shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on them ;" and death holds them in its eternal dominion—they have no connection with the LIFE-GIVER, and by an obstinate rejection of Him have quenched forever the Spirit of God, by which alone any soul of man is raised up from the dead at the last day. "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. That Spirit is received only by a union with Jesus Christ, the fountain and medium of all God's communications to dying men.

Whoever ye are to whom the gospel proclamation comes, make haste to Christ as your Deliverer. Soon that voice of mercy will cease to you ; and, out of Christ, death will close in on you with the darkness of eternal night—a night from which there is no awaking, and on which no sun will ever rise.

## LIFE FROM THE DEAD :

OR, DO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES REVEAL A FUTURE LIFE FOR THE UNBELIEVER ?

BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

THE second part of "Retribution" is the result of a laborious attempt to refute the arguments of GEORGE STORRS in "LIFE FROM THE DEAD." Candor compels us to acknowledge the truth of the prefatory declaration of the assaulting party. He says, "If I have written earnestly, it is because I am in earnest ; if confidently, it is because I am confident." We are satisfied that the statement is correct. The following extracts from the second part contain conclusive evidence that the writer is "in earnest."

"The same perverse logic which proves no resurrection of the wicked proves no resurrection of any one, no pre-existence of Christ before his birth, no Holy Spirit but the word, no Baptism but the Spirit, no Lord's Supper, no devil, no future punishment, no second coming of Christ, no inspired revelation ; and finally is used by the Atheist to prove that there is no God! *Christian* men will do well to pause before they set sail in *such* a bark, on *such* a voyage, with *such* a pilot." p. 151.

Is he not "*in earnest*"?

"So that by a little combining and twisting, by misapplying a few passages, by making that which was indefinite, absolute, unlimited, and universal, we might prove that *no* person ever would have a resurrection from the dead ; but that all were consigned to indiscriminate annihilation and eternal sleep.—And then, with sufficient skill, we might no doubt pervert every passage that teaches these facts, as some men prove that

there is no Holy Spirit, but the word ; or no baptism, but that of the Holy Ghost ; or no devil, but an evil principle ; or no coming of Christ, but a figurative coming ; thus subverting faith and hope, and making shipwreck and havoc among those who are ready to believe *any* thing which their particular leaders teach. *From such perverse and ignorant criticism as this, may the Lord in mercy save honest men and true Christians.*" p. 91.

Is he not "*in earnest*"?

"The results of this system of reckless and unrestrained critical license might be shown. When once the effort is made to bend Scripture to preconception and imagination, then, under the *specious pretence* of 'freedom of thought,' and 'freedom of speech,' every error may be presented, and every truth disputed. Investigation may be and is desirable, but let it be an *investigation* indeed ; rather than an avalanche of *quibbles, sophistries, and conceits*. But when men under *pretext* of 'free investigation,' 'liberty of thought,' and 'searching for truth,' *aim* to *subvert* the very 'principles of the doctrine of Christ,' and *sap* the foundations of a gospel faith ; when 'the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment,' are *disputed, perverted and denied* ; when '*repentance from dead works,*' and even '*faith toward God*' are *lost sight of* in a maze of *speculative, theorizing, and perverse and subtle* disputation, then," &c. &c. &c.

Is he not "*in earnest*"?

"It is asserted that if all men are to give account of themselves to God, for every idle word they speak, and every act that they do, 'Then the day of judgment will be a period of more than *ten thousand million of years*, if we allow only thirty minutes to each individual judged.'" \*\* "This quotation, which is made verbatim from the writings of the ablest defender of the doctrine that to the wicked 'death is an eternal sleep,' will show what *shifts* men are put to when they undertake to *contradict* the plain, simple statements of the Word of God. The *gray hairs* of such a man should shield him from *contempt*, but nothing but the largest charity can excuse or palliate such a statement as that." \*\* "This is the slight mistake in *figures* committed by *this religious teacher*." \*\* "It is said 'figures will not lie,' but that persons may not always tell the truth *about* figures, is quite evident." \*\* "Such monstrous mathematical blunders are bad enough in infidels, but worse in men who profess to understand and *teach* Christianity." *Sec. 13.*

"Is he not "*in earnest*"?"

*Sec. 13*, from which we take the last extract, has already been ably answered by RUFUS WENDELL, in the editorial columns of

the "*World's Crisis*," Sept. 18, 1861. Our author's own "mathematical blunders" are fresh in the memory of all who read that article. The falsity of the primal statement in the above extract was also shown. The author of "*LIFE FROM THE DEAD*" did not draw his conclusion from the *alleged* premise. He said, referring to Matt. 12 : 36, 37, "If the *literal construction* of this text, and others of similar import, is the true one, *then* the day of judgment will be," &c. In the *extract* it is *amended*, thus : "It is asserted that if all men are to give account of themselves to God, for every idle word they speak, and every act they do, 'Then the day of judgment will be,' " &c. Says Rufus Wendell, in his replication, "We believe it is a settled principle in debate that we have no right to impute to an opponent sentiments which he disclaims, although we may deem them legitimate inferences from positions which he avows." Tried by this just standard, our author is a hundred times guilty. His book *bristles* with false imputations.

The disclaimer made by the author of "*Life from the Dead*" in the "*World's Crisis*," Oct. 2d, 1861, and the "*EXAMINER*," Feb. 1862, was not needed to exculpate him from any *intentional* mis-statement. In the words of Wendell, "The 'blunder,' large as it manifestly is, involves no moral obliquity and in no wise militates against the ability of its perpetrator 'to understand and teach Christianity.'" No person that judges others as he would be judged, and more especially, no one that is acquainted with the man, will hesitate to conclude that the veteran hero of a thousand contests with error and sin, was entirely unconscious of the mistake, until our "*earnest*" inquirer after heresy, with unrelenting hand, launched his malicious shaft at the gray head of his fancied victim.

*The Christian Advocate & Journal*, for Dec. 8, 1859, contains an editorial of Dr. ABEL STEVENS, which is a bigoted attack on them who deny the immortality of the soul. But the article is

"Like the toad, which, ugly and venomous,  
Wears yet a precious jewel in his head."

A certain one, of its sentences, is of more real worth than the sum of all the good things written by its author. It is this :  
"There is a prevailing spirit (*animus*) of the teachings of the Bible which pervades and permeates the whole body of it, so that criticism upon this or that text is of little worth as compared with the general *drift* of the whole book."

The principle here expressed, if practically enforced, will flood the Church with a light, compared to which, all that has hitherto revealed itself, from the Reformation to the present time, will seem like darkness. Says the eloquent CHAPIN, "You may prove anything by a single text. But that is not the way to interpret the Gospel or the Bible. And yet what are our sects built and founded upon? Upon isolated texts, like forts. They take one text and crowd it through to its extreme meaning, without paying any regard to its ultimate meaning in connection with the body and substance of the Gospel." The EDITOR of the BIBLE EXAMINER, in Jan. 1860, remarked, "The principle on which the Editor will conduct his examinations of all Scripture topics is, 'What is the general tenor of the inspired writings on any given subject?' It is manifest that no view of a particular topic can be taken, but what some texts will seem to contravene it. If this were not so, why are there such differences among those who claim to be orthodox? Hardly one of the many sects, but what have cherished peculiarities, which they defend by certain texts against opposing views held by others, who are equally tenacious of some peculiarities of their own. How are such differences to be settled? Certainly not by solitary texts. Can it be done in any other way than by a survey of the general tenor of Scripture, and a harmony of the same with the revealed character, or perfections of God? Such a course is the only safe one; and the only one in which there is any prospect of arriving at the exact truth."

Thus, we have Dr. Stevens, an advocate of eternal misery; Mr. Chapin, an upholder of Universalism; and George Storrs, midway between; all agreeing with regard to the principle of interpretation. We are bold to affirm that the latter is the only one of the three who *practices* what he teaches. In "Life from the Dead," certain weighty principles are deduced from the Scriptures, considered as a whole, and on these principles, as a foundation, the great doctrine of "Life only in Christ" rears its majestic proportions. In vain will opposers attack the *superstructure* while the nether rock is undisturbed.

The author of "Retribution" has not deigned to notice a single principle of "Life from the Dead." He has assaulted certain textual criticisms, and that is all. But we must qualify.

He *has* glanced at, and tried to overthrow, *one* principle, viz : that which affirms the penalty of sin to be *death*. And this at the expense of contradicting his own positive declarations in "Pauline Theology," as we have shown in our first article.

But has our author no principles of his own? He has, but they exist only in his brain. They are not, and cannot be proved from the Scriptures, taken as a whole. The most plausible one may be found on p. 59, the weakness of which was demonstrated in our first article. But isolated texts are the pillars of his *confidence*. If his textual expositions are proved incorrect, his theory will be baseless, even in his own eyes.—In such a contingency, Carthage will be in ruins, and Marius a solitary wanderer among the fragments. Principles nowhere, criticisms overthrown, nothing will be left but—what Junius would call a "*caput mortuum* of vitriol."

Having borne witness to the *earnestness* of our author, we are not disposed to question the truth of his assertion, "I am confident." We are inclined rather to examine the *grounds* of his confidence. Let us try the pillars! We will commence with Dan. 12 : 2.

On the back cover of "Retribution" is a list of works published by our author. One is "The Voice of the Church on the Reign of Christ on Earth. By D. T. Taylor. Edited by H. L. Hastings. A work of vast research and great value."—We turn to Chapter 2d of that work, and find it headed with the following text :

"And many from out of the sleepers in the dust of the earth shall awake : these (shall be) to everlasting life, and those (shall be) to everlasting contempt." Dan. 12 : 2. *Prof. Bush's Translation.*

Beneath this, we read : "The common version of Dan. 12 : 2 reads, 'And many of,' &c. *Dr. Hody* justly argues that if *many*, standing alone, could signify all, *many of* could not, and he adds, 'Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth cannot be said to be *all* they that sleep in the dust. *Many of* does plainly except some.' *Prof. Whiting* says : 'There is an obscurity in this passage, produced by an improper rendering of the Hebrew words '*ailleh—weailleh.*' They are translated in this instance, 'some—and some.' Now, the phrase, composed of the pronoun *ailleh*, with the conjunction *waw* (and) joined to *ailleh*, is the proper expression for *these* and *those.*' He then translates the verse thus : 'And many from the sleepers of the dust of the

ground shall awake, these to everlasting life, and those to reproaches and everlasting abhorrence.' *Prof. Bush* renders it 'these and those,' and says: 'The awaking is evidently predicted of the many and not of the whole; consequently, the 'these' in the one case must be understood of the class that awakes, and the 'those' in the other of that which remains asleep.' *Rev. Edward Winthrop* translates the words: 'And many from out of the sleepers of the dust,' &c. And the learned lexicographer, *Gesenius*, testifies that the Hebrew word thus rendered 'designates a part taken out of the whole.'

In "LIFE FROM THE DEAD" the same testimony of Profs. Whiting and Bush is presented, and the author remarks, "Such being the facts, no argument in favor of the wicked dead being made alive again, can be strengthened by using this text; for when translated according to Whiting and Bush it is against the wicked's living from the dead." p. 39.

As the author of "Retribution" depends on isolated texts to uphold his theory, it is not strange that he should press into his service every one that is likely to help him. But we were rather astonished when we discovered that Dan. 12: 2 is regarded by him as one of his chief supports. He strenuously endeavors to prove by that text a *simultaneous* resurrection of *all who have died* from Adam to the second advent of Christ.—This arrays him in direct opposition to the testimony of "The Voice of the Church" already quoted. But we shall find, as we progress in the investigation, that his desperate expedient for the overthrow of heresy will not avail him. On page 22, after quoting and commenting on the text, he says:

"So clearly is the fact of future retribution here declared, that it is only by a different version and an unwarranted paraphrase of the passage, that persons undertake to evade the force of this most positive declaration of the word of the Lord which foretells a future retribution."

Really! "An *unwarranted* paraphrase"! Dr. Hody, Prof. Whiting, Prof. Bush, Rev. Edward Winthrop, and Gesenius are excellent authority in the "Voice of the Church"; but when their testimony is presented in "Life from the Dead," *then* their work is "*unwarranted*"! We observe it makes some difference to our author "which ox is gored." Pages 138-142 are devoted to the same text. He says:

"It is true that learned men have said all this, and it is quite possible also, that Hymeneus and Philetus said so too, when



with cankerous words they sought to overthrow the faith of some, and prove that the resurrection was past already. Prof. Bush, though an estimable and learned man, became a Swedenborgian, denied the resurrection of the body, tried to show that the apostles were mistaken when they preached it, tried to prove from *this* passage that the *wicked* have no resurrection, and finally did not believe that the righteous have any either! A hopeful leader."

In the "*Crisis*," Nov. 6, 1861, our author has some thoughts on "Controversy." In the course of remark, he speaks of "the wisdom of" \*\* "not undertaking to interpret, represent, or misrepresent the faith of others." This "wisdom," we are sorry to say, finds no patronage in "Retribution." Pages 73, 154 are proofs of the fact. His allusion to Prof. Bush is another. We might easily show that he has "misrepresented" the faith of that good man. But we pass on.

What a pity that only *one* of all the critics quoted in the "Voice of the Church," became a Swedenborgian! Neither Hody, Whiting, Winthrop, nor Gesenius can claim the title of "Hopeful leader." We have always supposed that the *critical* opinion of any "estimable and learned man" is to be respected, even if his *religious* views are questionable. But waiving this, we ask, In what respect are Bush's views inferior to those of "Taylor, Newcome, Dodson, Harwood, Turner, Lowth, Noyes, Jones, Jenour, Wintle, Peters," and the Roman Catholic "Calmet," all quoted by our author? These writers agree with Prof. Bush in holding *the immortality of the soul*. Why is not Bush's authority as reliable as theirs? If we admit the truth of that doctrine, we believe his position is more reasonable than theirs. Our author further says:

"As to Prof. Whiting's translation I do not specially object to it, but his comments which apply the '*these*' to the awakened, and '*those*' to the unawakened, and which have been used to prove that the wicked would not rise, I do not think so much of, as I did before I examined them. The same Hebrew expression is found in Joshua 8 : 22, 'so they were in the midst of Israel, *some* on this side, and *some* on that side.' 1 Kings 20 : 29. 'And they pitched *one* over against the *other*.' 1 Chron. 24 : 5. 'Thus were they divided by lot, *one* sort with *another*.' These instances I think are sufficient to vindicate our translation from any charge of serious incorrectness."

Here is an endeavor to "vindicate" the common version. In the January "EXAMINER" the Editor truthfully remarks, "The

appeal by the *Crisis* writer to the word 'some' in other parts of the Hebrew Scriptures, shows, either he did not 'examine,' as he professes, or that he wilfully covered up the truth. If he has 'examined,' he knows the word 'some' is 'Not used in Hebrew.' So saith Prof. Pick in his Hebrew Concordance."

Gesenius defines the word which is rendered "some" in the common text, thus: "*Ailleh* pron. demonstr. plur. *these*, employed in common usage as the plural of *zeh*, *this*." Thus Gesenius, Prof. Pick, Prof. Bush, and Prof. Whiting all agree. We are not concerned about the opposition of our author, as we are inclined to believe, with the Editor of the EXAMINER, that these scholars "understand the Hebrew probably a little better than 'H. L. H.'"

The *texts* referred to by our author do not help him in the least; if we insert "*these*" and "*those*" in the places of the words otherwise rendered, the verse will be much improved in Josh. 8 : 22, and not injured in 1 Kings 20 : 29, 1 Chron. 24 : 5. Let us first take Josh. 8 : 22. "*And these*" (*weailleh*)—the men who had laid in ambush,—"*issued out of the city against them*;"—the men of Ai; "*so they*"—the men of Ai—"were in the midst (or between the two parties) of Israel, *these (ailleh)* on this side, *and those (weailleh)* on that side."

1 Kings 20 : 29. "*And they pitched, these (ailleh)* over against *those (ailleh)* seven days."

1 Chron. 24 : 5. "*Thus were they divided by lot, these (ailleh)* with *those (ailleh)*." So we see how "these instances vindicate our translation." In view of the foregoing, has not our author abundant reason to say, "*I am confident*"? He goes on:—

"It is however objected that the expression '*many*' is restrictive, many cannot be *all*. But Daniel did not write the word '*many*,' he wrote the word '*Raveem*.' Now the word '*rav*' signifies *many*, or *multitude*. \* \* The word in Dan. 12 : 2, is '*raveem*' the plural form of '*rav*,' so it should be rendered, not *multitude*, but *MULTITUDES*. Hence Thomas Wintle, in his excellent version of Daniel, renders the passage: '*Then MULTITUDES that sleep in the dust of the ground shall awake*;' and he remarks upon it, '*this is a just and exact translation of the Hebrew.*'"

Here are three errors, two of which belong to our author, and one to "Thomas Wintle."

1. The original word rendered "*many*" in the common version is neither pronounced nor written "*raveem*." It is properly written "*rabbim*," according to the rules of Gesenius. We should not have referred to this, if our author had manifested a *decent* confidence, but as he has seen fit to impugn the authority of the best Hebrew scholarship, it is right that people should know how far his knowledge of Hebrew reaches. Such preposterous "confidence" is, to say the least, amusing.

2. Our author says, "It is however objected that the expression '*many*' is restrictive, many cannot be all." He fills three pages to remove this supposed objection. *But this is not the objection.* He has totally failed to apprehend the *real* difficulty. (Refer back to our extract from "The Voice of the Church.") It is not "the expression '*many*'" but "*many of*" which "is restrictive." The actual objection is clearly set forth by Prof Bush, as follows :

"The '*awaking*' is evidently predicated of the '*many*,' and not of the whole. It will be observed that the phrase is not '*many*' in the absolute sense, which might perhaps be understood of all, but '*many of*,' which plainly conveys the idea of restriction, distinguishing a part from the whole. 'I must fully acknowledge,' says Dr. Hody, (Treat. of Resurrect. of the Body, p. 230,) 'that the word *many* makes this text extremely difficult. I know what expositors say, but I am not satisfied with any thing I have hitherto met with. Some tell us that *many* is sometimes used in the Scriptures to signify all, but this does not clear the difficulty ; for there is a great difference between *many* and *many of*. All they that sleep in the dust are *many* ; but *many of* them that sleep in the dust cannot be said to be all they that sleep in the dust. *Many of* does plainly except some.' This we must regard as conclusive. The '*awaking*' is affirmed of the '*many*,' and not of the whole."

The Hebrew preposition represented by "*of*" in the common version is thus referred to in Gesenius' Lexicon, "*Min*, part of any thing ;" and thus in Gesenius' Grammar, "*min* (part), from, out of." The inevitable conclusion to the whole matter is, Prof. Bush's explication (called "an *unwarranted* paraphrase" by our *learned!* author) gives the exact meaning of the original Hebrew : "And many of the sleepers of the dust shall awake ; these (the awakened) (shall be) to everlasting life ; and those (the unawakened) (shall be) to shame and everlasting contempt."

The Prof. further says : " This we have learned, since first adopting this view, is the interpretation suggested by some of the Jewish school, and is undoubtedly very ancient. Aben Ezra, in his commentary on this chapter, quotes Rabbi Laadiah Gaon as declaring ' that those who awake shall be (appointed) to everlasting life, and those who awake not shall be (doomed) to shame and everlasting contempt.' The words of Gaon himself are, that ' this is the resuscitation of the dead of Israel, whose lot is to eternal life, and those who shall not awake are the forsakers of Jehovah,' &c."

3. Says our author, " Thomas Wintle, in his excellent version of Daniel, renders the passage : ' Then MULTITUDES that sleep in the dust of the ground shall awake ;'" and he remarks upon it, " this is a just and exact translation of the Hebrew."

From what has already been shown, our readers are prepared to estimate at its proper value, the critical opinion of " *Thomas Wintle.*"

As to our " confident" author, we leave him to mourn the disappearance of one of his chief pillars. Dan. 12 : 2 bids him a long farewell. In our next we hope still further to test the grounds of his confidence.

CHAS. HODGE, D. D., OF PRINCETON, ON 1 COR. XV, 20-22.

COPIED FROM HIS COMMENTARY BY RUFUS WENDELL.

" 20. But now is Christ risen from the dead, (and) become the first-fruits of them that slept.

" *But now*, NUNI DE, i. e., as the matter actually stands. All the gloomy consequences presented in the preceding verses follow from the assumption that Christ did not rise from the dead. But as in point of fact he did rise, these things have no place. Our preaching is not vain, your faith is not vain, ye are not in your sins; the dead in Christ have not perished, we are not more miserable than other men. The reverse of all this is true. Christ has not only risen, but he has risen in a representative character. His resurrection is the pledge of the resurrection of his people. He rose as *the first-fruits of them that slept*, and not of them only, but as the first-fruits of all who are ever to sleep in Jesus. The apostle does not mean merely that

the resurrection of Christ was to precede that of his people ; but as the first sheaf of the harvest presented to God as a thank-offering, was the pledge and assurance of the ingathering of the whole harvest, so the resurrection of Christ is a pledge and proof of the resurrection of his people. In Romans 8 : 23 and 11 : 16, the word  $\Delta$ ΠΑΡΚΕΕ, *first-fruits*, has the same force.—Comp. also Col. 1 : 18, where Christ is called ‘ the first-begotten from the dead,’ and Rev. 1 : 5. Of the great harvest of glorified bodies which our earth is to yield, Christ is the first-fruits. *As* he rose, *so* all his people must ; as certainly and as gloriously, Phil. 3 : 21. The nature of this causal connection between the resurrection of Christ and that of his people, is explained in the following verses.

“ 21. For since by man (came) death, by man (came) also the resurrection of the dead.

“ The connection between this verse and the preceding is obvious. The resurrection of Christ secures the resurrection of his people, *for* as there was a causal relation between the death of Adam and the death of his descendants, so there is a causal relation between the resurrection of Christ and that of his people. What that causal relation is, is not here expressed. It is simply asserted that as death is  $\Delta$ Ι ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ, *by means of a man* ; so the resurrection is  $\Delta$ Ι ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ, *by means of a man*. Why Adam was the cause of death, and why Christ is the cause of life, is explained in the following verse, and abundantly elsewhere in Scripture, but not here. By *death*, in this verse, is meant the death of the body ; and by *the resurrection* is meant the restoration of the body to life. This, however, only proves that the death of which Adam was the cause includes physical death, and that the life of which Christ is the cause includes the future life of the body. But as the life which we derive from Christ includes far more than the life of the body, so the death which flows from Adam includes far more than physical death.

“ 22. For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.

“ This is the reason why Adam was the cause of death, and why Christ is the cause of life. We die *by means of* Adam, because we are *in* Adam ; and we live *by means of* Christ, because we are *in* Christ. Union with Adam is the cause of death ; union with Christ is the cause of life. The nature of this union and its consequences are more fully explained in Rom. 5 : 12–21. In both cases it is a representative and vital union. We are in Adam because he was our head and representative, and because we partake of his nature. And we are in Christ because he is our head and representative, and because we partake of his nature through the indwelling of his Spirit. Adam,

therefore, is the cause of death, because his sin is the judicial ground of our condemnation ; and because we derive from him a corrupt and enfeebled nature. Christ is the cause of life because his righteousness is the judicial ground of our justification : and because we derive from him the Holy Ghost, which is the source of life both to the soul and body. Com. Rom. 8 : 9-11.

“ That the word *all* in the latter part of this verse is to be restricted to all believers (or rather, to all the people of Christ, as infants are included) is plain, 1. Because the word in both clauses is limited. It is all who are in Adam that die ; and the all who are in Christ who are made alive. As union with Christ is made the ground of the communication of life here spoken of, it can be extended only to those who are in him. But according to the constant representation of the Scriptures, none are in him but his own people. ‘ If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature,’ 2 Cor. 5 : 17: 2. Because the verb (*ζωοποιεῖο*) here found is never used of the wicked. Whenever employed in reference to the work of Christ it always means to communicate to them that life of which he is the source, John 5 : 21. 6 : 63. Rom. 8 : 11. 1 Cor. 15 : 45. Gal. 3 : 21. The real meaning of the verse therefore, is, ‘ As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made partakers of a glorious and everlasting life.’ Unless, therefore, the Bible teaches that all men are in Christ, and that all through him partake of eternal life, the passage must be restricted to his own people. 3. Because, although Paul elsewhere speaks of a general resurrection both of the just and of the unjust, Acts 24 : 15, yet, throughout this chapter he speaks only of the resurrection of the righteous.— 4. Because in the parallel passage in Rom. 5 : 12-21, the same limitation must be made. In v. 18 of that chapter it is said, ‘ As by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation ; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men to justification of life.’ That is, as for the offence of Adam all men were condemned, so for the righteousness of Christ all men are justified. The context and the analogy of Scripture require us to understand this to mean, as all who are in Adam are condemned, so all who are in Christ are justified. No historical Christian church has ever held that all men indiscriminately are justified. For whom God justifies them he also glorifies, Rom. 8 : 30.

“ There are two other interpretations of this verse. According to ο, the verb, *shall be made alive*, is taken to mean no more than *shall be* raised from the dead. But this, as already remarked, is not only inconsistent with the prevailing use of the word, but with the whole context. Others, admitting that the passage necessarily treats of a resurrection to glory and

blessedness, insist that the word all must be taken to include all men. But this contradicts the constant doctrine of the Bible, and has no support in the context. It is not absolutely all who die through Adam, but those only who were in him ; so it is not absolutely all who live through Christ, but those only who are in him."

NOTE.—The foregoing exposition has been copied for these pages, not that we believe it faultless in sentiment throughout, but because we think it contains much truth, and will aid many persons in reaching the conclusion that the view of *no future life out of Christ* is the only one that can be consistently cherished by those who deny immortality to the wicked. Dr. HODGE'S observations are more than a complete answer to the argument in "Retribution" based upon the 15th of 1st Corinthians—an argument which, by the way, seeks to array Paul's utterances in two verses against the entire scope of his reasoning in the chapter.

R, W.

---

## EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT.

THE different views concerning the future state held by the Christian Church may be thus classified, arranging them, exhaustively, under eight divisions :

1. The Roman Catholic Church makes three conditions hereafter, namely : Everlasting joy—Everlasting suffering—Temporary sorrow in purgatory.

2. The orthodox Protestant Church makes two conditions hereafter, namely : Infinite and eternal joy—Infinite and eternal suffering.

3. The old-school Universalists make one condition hereafter, namely : Eternal joy.

4. New-school Universalists and Restorationists make two conditions hereafter, namely : Eternal joy—Temporary and finite suffering.

5. Unitarians make an indefinite number of conditions hereafter, according to the various characters and moral status of men.

6. The Swedenborgians make an indefinite but limited number of heavens and hells, suited to the varieties of character, but having a supernatural origin.

7. The Spiritualists make the other world like this world, with no essential differences, making it a continuation of the natural life.

8. The Annihilationists believe that the finally impenitent will perish wholly, and come to nothing.

At first sight this looks like a very formidable array of varying opinions, and might lead to the conclusion that there is really a wide divergence of Christian sentiment on a point so interesting and so important. But this is far from being the case.

It will be observed by the reader, that the view which holds the final state of all men to be one of everlasting joy or everlasting suffering, is that which has always been held by the great body of professed Christians, which is found incorporated in the standards of every historical Church, and which is now held by nine-tenths of all those, in every land, who bear the Christian name. Can it be that the Holy Spirit, who was to guide Christ's people into all truth, has suffered almost the whole Church to be in error on this point, from the apostolic days down to our own?

The foregoing statement we find in the *Christian Intelligencer*, from which it is taken. It is a little singular that the *Intelligencer* should "class" these "eight divisions" as if all were of "the Christian Church." Yet, if its charity is thus large, we are not disposed to quarrel with it, but must say, ours does not embrace "Spiritualists" as of that Church, in any sense. This remark does not apply to all individuals who may be ensnared in that *anti-christian* system.

If the writer had said of "The Annihilationists," they "believe" the Scriptures teach *eternal life* is the *gift* of God to the righteous, through Jesus Christ; and that those who will not come to Christ that they may have *life*, will reap "the wages of sin," which "is *death*," and hence "shall be as though they had not been," he would have spoken the truth of them, and the truth which is abundantly established by the Bible, and runs through the whole chain of revelation, from Genesis to the last words of inspiration, which wind up with the awful warning not to take away from the words of the book, lest "God shall take away his part out of *the book of life*." Life and Death are the "two conditions" which are brought to view in the Scriptures of truth. "The wages of sin is *death*: but the gift of God is *eternal life* through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 6: 23. Not a single testimony in the Bible affirms the wages of sin is "Infinite and eternal suffering," for which the *Christian Intelligencer* contends. The fact that "the great body of professed Christians" have "incorporated in the standards" of



their churches such a sentiment, is of no weight in the argument ; for we go back of their "standards" to the standard of the Prophets, Jesus Christ, and His apostles ; and such an expression as "infinite and eternal suffering" is not once found in all their testimony against sin and sinners. A strange omission, if such doctrine is the truth. The *Intelligencer* asks :

"Can it be that the Holy Spirit, who was to guide Christ's people into all truth, has suffered almost the whole Church to be in error on this point, from the apostolic days down to our own?"

Here is as clear a claim of *infallibility* as ever was set up by the Roman hierarchy : and be it remembered, it is set up by a *Protestant* Church ! What did this church *protest* against ? Was it not against the infallibility of the "Mother Church," which had for long centuries claimed to be the authorized expounder of the Scriptures ? and did not this same *Protestant* Church deny that infallibility, and claim the right of *private* judgment in matters of faith ? Yet now it comes forward with the claim of truth on a point of doctrine, because it has been held "from the apostolic days down to our own." But, alas for the doctrine, the Apostles themselves did not hold it, and never preached it : not one such sentiment was ever uttered or written by *them* ; and the promise of "the Holy Spirit to guide into all truth" was given to the apostles. If it reached beyond them, will the *Intelligencer* tell us where it rests now, and which of the different denominations possess it ? as they differ more or less on a multitude of points. Remember, the Spirit was to lead into "*all* truth." If the promise is to *all* "Christ's people," then it follows, none are His people who hold any error. Hence the Protestants are not such, unless they are *wholly* free from error. Do they claim that ? If so, how do they differ from the Romish infallibility ? Or, is it the peculiar privilege of the *Christian Intelligencer* to monopolize the beautiful grace to "set in the seat of God" ?

After all, "To the law and to the testimony : if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Isa. 8 : 20. Let men beware of making their church "standards" the *rule* of either their faith or practice. There is but one standard of appeal to a Christian man. The Bible—the *whole* Bible, both the Old and New Testaments—is the standard and the rule by which to determine what is truth.

Whoever allows church creeds or "standards" to contravene or supersede this testimony, is as much an idolator as a worshiper of wood or stone, because he yields a homage to human authority or opinions, which God demands for Himself alone. Our fellow men may be *helpers*, but cannot demand our undoubting assent to their views without usurping the seat of God: hence such homage is idolatry.

"*Everlasting Punishment*" is a terrible reality to all who end this life in impenitency and unbelief: but the question, *what* that punishment is? is an open one. We affirm, it is an eternal deprivation of future life and the eternal reign of death: or, an eternal cessation of living existence. The *Christian Intelligencer* maintains, it is "*infinite and eternal suffering.*" Such a doctrine we regard as an "infinite and eternal" error, and utterly without foundation in the Bible; and no "church standards" can make it true, whatever their age or number, nor harmonize it with the known character of God, or the general tenor of the holy Scriptures.

---

## THE TEST.

BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

Is it possible for us to know who are the Lord's? We can easily recognize *professors* by their pretensions; but can we distinguish those who have the "power" from the mere formalist? "The Lord knoweth them that are His." Can we, in any degree, participate in that knowledge? Paul could. He must have known the pure gold from the refuse, or he could not have used such direct language concerning "Apelles, approved in Christ," and "Rufus, chosen in the Lord." He would scarcely have ventured to affirm that the names of "Clement" and other "fellow laborers" were "in the Book of life," without a *knowledge* commensurate with the assertion. If the Apostle was thus enlightened, why should we be in the dark? Is it because we do not *need* light on the subject? Nay, verily; the reverse is true. Such knowledge is an indispensable prelude to the performance of one of our most sacred duties, which is to "love *the brethren.*" Peter says, "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto un-

feigned love of the brethren, love one another with a pure heart fervently." But how can we obey this command unless we know who *are* "the brethren"? Our first inquiry, then, must be answered in the affirmative.

The next question is, How is this knowledge obtained? We must have some *test* which we can apply in every case. What shall it be? Outward pretension is no criterion, "for many walk," who "are the enemies of the cross of Christ"; they wear "the livery of heaven" as a cover for their evil deeds.—Neither is the approval of any particular doctrine a proof of acceptance with God. What ignorance of Christianity do men show when they make doctrinal opinion a test of moral character! Men generally believe as they are taught by their religious leaders. Many an honest Christian is kept in error by the force of circumstances over which he may be said to have no control. Every one of us can look back to the period when we were in profound ignorance, and yet supposed that we were right. With what indignation did we spurn the first assault on our darling prejudices! And yet we were sincere! We loved God and endeavored to serve Him, and the Spirit bore witness with us that we were the children of God. And now having received light, shall we not bear with them who are still in the dark? And if, in the midst of earnest struggles for truth, we shall unwittingly stumble into other errors, let us remember that the road to perfection is strewn with defects.

Some identify Christians by *outward forms*; carnal ordinances. Take for instance water baptism. There are men who suppose themselves far in advance of the common order of Christians, who make their peculiarity as to baptism a *test* of fellowship.—The Lord have mercy on their blindness! If any baptismal form now in use is essential to salvation, that fact will cut off thousands of real Christians. Here are Methodists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and others who practice infant sprinkling. Then there are Baptists of various designations, who practice the immersion of believers. Make either form a *test*, and all on the other side are outside of the ark. We believe with Dr. Olin, that Christ "calls every sinner into communication with Himself without mortal intervention, and he sanctifies and saves all who believe and come, without reference to names, forms, or hierarchies."

What then is the true test? The founder of Methodism answered thus:—"O that we may never make any thing more nor less the term of union with us, but the having *the mind that was in Christ*, and the walking as He walked." Paul, the "wise master builder," declares, "*In Christ Jesus* neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision," (*forms are nothing*,) "but a new creation. And as many as walk according to *this* rule, peace on them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God." May the Lord enable us to stand THE TEST!

" Let party names no more  
The Christian world o'erspread;  
Gentile and Jew, and bond and free,  
Are one IN CHRIST their Head."

---

### " CONFESS YOUR MISTAKE."

THE author of "Retribution," on the sixty-first page of his pamphlet, declares that—" 'To telos' does not signify 'the end of the age,' or *world*, as many suppose." We have proved this assertion to be contrary to the facts in the case, and in opposition to H. L. H.'s own teaching in a work given to the public in the interval between the writing and publishing of "Retribution." Nothing is more obvious to our mind than that H. should as publicly retract his error as he would have other men do in like circumstances. And that his pure mind may be stirred up by way of remembrance as to this duty, and for the benefit of those who believe that some regard ought to be paid to consistency in a work designed for "earnest, practical admonition," we reproduce an edifying item of history.

Some years since a "doughty champion of heathen traditions" affirmed in a public discourse, in New-York, that "the immortality of the soul had not been called in question from the days of our Saviour till within the last ten years." This individual was a somewhat noted "Professor," and his blunder was thoroughly exposed in a letter addressed to him through the BIBLE EXAMINER of June 1, 1854. The writer of the letter, in concluding his task, spoke as follows:

"I leave these *facts* to combat your *assertion* that the immortality of the soul has not been denied since the time of Christ. Such is not the fact, and if you care as much for truth, as an

honest man ought, you will be willing to confess your mistake. Will you allow your hearers to believe and report that no one since the days of Christ, but a few men within the last ten years, have denied the immortality of the soul? This is not a matter of argument, but of *fact*. Are you willing that men should know *the truth*, or are you determined to imitate the policy of Rome, whose infallible *decrees* have done more to sustain the doctrine of natural immortality than all the writings of holy men of old? I trust you are an honest man; I do not suspect that you would misrepresent—I regard your statement only as an evidence of lack of knowledge and too great confidence in your position. I have a dilemma here: I must believe that you did not understand the subject you were talking about, and hence you stated things for truth, of which you had *no evidence*, or else I must assume that you knew the facts, but contradicted them by your statements. As lack of information is more pardonable than falsity, I accept the former alternative," &c.

The name appended to the communication from which we have quoted may be found on the title page of "Retribution." We, too, "have a dilemma" and upon one of its horns the author of "Retribution" must himself be impaled. The "alternative" which he accepted in the "Professor's" case we are satisfied was the wrong one; but, in his own case, we will cheerfully believe that his mistake concerning "*to telos*" resulted from "lack of information," if he will publicly affirm that such was the fact, and then show that such a declaration is compatible with what he has written in "Reasons for My Hope." The lapse of a few years has not put us in love with "the policy of Rome," and if resort is now had to that "policy" to sustain an unscriptural doctrine of "retribution," or to beguile the unwary into the belief that the doctrine of Life only in Christ is successfully refuted in the book called "Retribution," we are "determined" that the effort shall not wholly escape merited rebuke.

R. W.

---

AT WORK.—Eld. JONATHAN WILSON, "The Bibleite," as he calls himself, now 85 years old, writes us, he is engaged in sending Tracts to persons in different parts of the country. He puts "The Atonement—Man's Nature and Destiny," with his "Law of God, and Rail Road" into one, by sewing them together, pays the postage, and sends them off preaching. If any friend has a *dollar* to help in the work send it on, directed to him, "Vermont, Chaut. Co., N. Y." It will be well applied.

## A NOVELTY IN "RETRIBUTION."

BY RUFUS WENDELL.

THE author of "Retribution" (p. 126) refers to a "theory" which he says "will do to go with the vagaries of Ann Lee;" he then remarks—"If there is a lower depth of exegetical nonsense than this, I hope not to explore it." Concerning the propounders of the "nonsense" he observes:

"Such persons fail to comprehend the difference between the dead coming forth *alive*, and their coming forth *to life*. It is true that the wicked dead do not come forth *to life*, they come forth *to death* but they are yet alive."

We will endeavor to help the reader to a correct understanding of the two sentences just cited. In doing this, we shall probably help the author of "Retribution" into difficulty. The fault, however, is with himself, and we hope he will be patient while we apply the remedy which his recent effort appears to demand. If he wishes deliverance from the entanglement in which he has involved himself, the pathway of escape lies open before him. Over its entrance he will find the familiar direction—"Confess Your Mistake." But to the question in hand.

1. Whatever our author means by "coming forth *alive*" must in his view be alike applicable to *all* the dead, as will appear from the consideration that the Apostle's declaration, "in Christ shall all be made ALIVE," (1 Cor. 15 : 22,) is claimed by him to have an unrestricted reference to the righteous and the wicked. The reader will please mark this point.

2. The above being granted, it results that, according to our author's understanding of 1 Cor. 15 : 22, there is nothing in the mere fact of being "made ALIVE" that insures *perpetual* existence by precluding the possibility of dying afterwards.

3. It follows from this hypothesis that the righteous dead, since they are included among the "all" who "shall be made ALIVE," must be brought to life *mortal* and *corruptible* and be *subsequently* "changed" to *immortality* and *incorruption*. This, unless designed as a new and very striking example of "exegeti-

cal nonsense," is just what our author's propositions *must* mean ; and thus "the difference" which some "persons fail to comprehend" is, when our author's language is stripped of its disguise, precisely equal to "the difference between" being "made ALIVE mortal to "put on incorruption" afterwards, and being "made ALIVE" mortal to be killed afterwards. In these statements we but exhibit the inevitable inference which the logic of "Retribution" forces upon the careful and intelligent reader.

To remove all doubt, however, as to the correctness of our interpretation of our author's words, we will state, in addition to what has already been submitted, that the explanation we have given is that which, on the 26th day of October last, *we received from his own lips*. The portion of his book which was the subject of controversy in our conversation was the argument relating to "the justification of life." What enhances the difficulty in which the foregoing statements involve the author of "Retribution," is the fact that, in the interview to which we have referred, he expressed himself as *not settled* in the belief that the righteous dead will be "made ALIVE" mortal, admitting that such a view seemed to be contradicted by Paul's declarations, (1 Cor. 15 : 42-44,) "it is raised in incorruption," "it is raised in glory," "it is raised in power," "it is raised a spiritual body." At the same time, it was not pretended by him that the reasoning in "Retribution" could be harmonized with the common view that *only an incorruptible life* is in store for "the dead in Christ." We presume that even our author would not claim the ability to construct a Scriptural argument on the resurrection to which both of these widely different theories could adapt themselves with equal facility.

Now we have in this matter a two-fold complaint against our "Retribution" friend : (1) In the language we have quoted he asserts with dogmatic confidence that concerning which, in conversation, he expresses himself in doubt, and which he knows not how to harmonize with several positive Bible affirmations ; and (2) he proposes a *novel* theory concerning the resurrection of the just in terms which are needlessly obscure. But perhaps we are too exacting, and "fail to comprehend" as we should the circumstances under which his pamphlet was given to the pub-

lic. Had he not been repeatedly told that he "dare not" publish it? and had not the taunt been endured long enough, even for one who has "no appetite for controversy"? Was not a certain "Pottage Kettle" in New England becoming "free" to an alarming extent? and were we not "periling the lives of the whole company" by admitting into it "gourds" which had not been pronounced "wholesome food" by the "prophet" in Providence? And was it not desirable that at the approaching Wilbraham Camp Meeting he should be prepared to furnish an antidote for the "gall of bitterness" whose *deadly* influence he so much deprecated? Clearly, it was "high time" for him "to awake out of sleep" and give to the printer the "MSS." which had so long "lain unpublished." And in prosecuting this new undertaking in the field of authorship, how could he be expected to express himself as *doubtful* upon a point vitally important to his main position? How, on the other hand, could he be expected to provoke a tornado of opposition to his work, from those who believe, equally with those who deny, the revival of the wicked, by a distinct, unambiguous avowal of the position that *incorruption* will not be awarded to the righteous dead until *after* they are "made ALIVE"? A middle ground was left to our author, and, as a result of his preference, we have vagueness and dogmatism mingled in admirable proportions.

In writing thus freely concerning the sentiments of our author, we are not unmindful of the fact that our method will scarcely commend itself to his approval. He has quite recently sought to enforce upon his *Crisis* auditory "the wisdom of undertaking to tell what we think ourselves, and not undertake to interpret, represent, or misrepresent the faith of others. Few," he avers, "can do it and escape the charge of inaccuracy or unfairness." Now this we call decidedly rich! Has not our author *undertaken* to "interpret the faith" of Job, and Solomon, and David, and Ezekial, and Isaiah? Has he not *undertaken* to "represent the faith" of Paul, and Peter, and John, and the teachings of Christ? More than all, has he not undertaken to "mis-represent the faith of others" when he charges a denial of "future retribution" upon those who maintain Life only in Christ? And though he has *succeeded* only in the *last* of these undertakings,



shall he assume that "few" *others* can undertake the work he discountenances without imitating the "inaccuracy" and "unfairness" which find such ample illustrations in his recent attempt to "hit the nail on the head"? Our friend's suggestions in the *Crisis* came *too late*. Before they appeared, the purpose was formed in some minds to undertake to "interpret" and "represent" his "faith" on "the doom of the ungodly," and the readers of this Magazine need not to be told that the danger that we shall "mis-represent" him arises mainly from the vague and contradictory character of his utterances. But the writer of this article wishes one thing borne in mind, and that is, that he is not only willing, but anxious, to make prompt and ample amends for any "inaccuracy or unfairness" that may appear in what he writes or says, and he will esteem it a favor if the author of "Retribution" will hold him rigidly to this declaration. Our determination to stand always upon this platform has been somewhat reinforced by examples of an opposite character which we have seen during the past year.

We have spoken of our author's new theory as being *vital* to his argument. That it is so becomes apparent when we consider the reasonableness of the demand that those who hold to the revival of the wicked dead shall produce *positive* Bible testimony in support of the doctrine; at the least, we claim that *one* promise or menace of *life* for the ungodly should be forthcoming. The equity of this requirement is seemingly felt by our author, and he attempts to meet it. His proof texts of this direct and positive character are two in number, and are as follows: "by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of LIFE," (Rom. 5: 18,) and, "in Christ shall all be made ALIVE," (1 Cor. 15: 22.) Now it so happens that the righteous dead are manifestly embraced in both of these declarations, and it is simply absurd to suppose that the passages can bear *at one and the same time* the double burden of *incorruptible* life for the righteous and *corruptible* life for the wicked. To claim that they import *immortal* life for *both* classes would make havoc alike of the truth of God and of our author's notions respecting "conscious punishment after death." One alternative, therefore, remains for our author—only one; this he has seized,

despite his doubts, and the damage he will receive from his weapon will be in proportion to the firmness with which he grasps it. We agree with him that there is "justification of life" for the righteous dead, but when he asks permission to define this "justification" as denoting "a restoration to a *temporal* existence," the well-informed Bible student will claim the liberty to decline his leadership. Should any accept it, they will perhaps repent their folly when they see before them "an avalanche of quibbles, sophistries, and conceits."

The theological novelty at which we have glanced tallies better than the common view with our author's ideas of the judgment, and may it not for that reason, added to the considerations already named, have found favor with him? He denies that the dead, *as dead*, are judged, and we do not see, nor do we think he does, how this denial is to be reconciled with the theory that "the dead in Christ" *while dead* are "accounted worthy" of eternal life, and that the act which makes them "alive" makes them also immortal. Serious incongruities seem to be involved in the idea that immortalized and glorified saints are to be subjected to the "investigations" which, in "Retribution," are associated with the judgment; and since the DEATH "to" which our author believes the wicked will "come forth," is to *follow their* judgment, we think it would be irrational to charge him with holding that the righteous shall "come forth" "to" a LIFE which will be conferred *prior* to *their* judgment. We shall be surprised if he disowns this interpretation of his reasoning. Should he do so, it will be interesting to learn how he can explain the logic of his book; if he does not disown it, and cannot do so, we shall have another instance in which, for reasons neither "hard to be understood" nor easy to be approved, he has left an important conclusion, which could have been plainly stated in a few words, to the mercy of *inferences* which, though quite legitimate, the majority of his readers cannot be expected to draw from his language.

A word, before we close, upon the point which is doubtfully held in our author's mind, while it is unqualifiedly, though covertly, propounded in his book. Saith the Apostle, "So WHEN this corruptible SHALL HAVE put on incorruption, and this mor-

tal shall have put on immortality, THEN shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." Our remark is this : if there is to be an interval of time between the resurrection and the immortalization of the righteous dead, it is obvious that "*Death*" will be "swallowed up in victory" before "incorruption" is "put on." But since the text teaches that "the saying" in question shall not "be brought to pass" until the change to "immortality" shall have been perfected, it follows that the resurrection and the change are simultaneous.

But we forbear for the present, promising hereafter (D. V.) to pay further attention to the limping logic of "Retribution." Meanwhile we hope the strictures already elicited upon it may aid its author in attaining to a clearer apprehension of "the truth" as it "is in Jesus." In the light of truth we shall be glad to have him discern two facts, namely, that the wicked, "shall not see life," and that the "dead in Christ" shall be "raised in incorruption." These views are alike comforting to the believing heart and honorable to our Life-Giving Lord and Redeemer.

---

#### EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

FROM JOSEPH T. CURRY.—"I was pleased to find the following sentiment in MILNER'S His. of Chris. the other day. It is true of *all* 'changes,' 'political' or otherwise."

"All political changes are wrought by a compact, organized, and disciplined minority. The mass of mankind are shown by experience, and appear fated by the constitution of our nature, to follow any vigorous impulse from a determined and incessantly aggressive few."

"I hope this will be the character of those who believe the sublime doctrine of "Life only in Christ." May they be a 'compact, organized, and disciplined minority,' until, with the help of God, they have swept away the last vestige of superstition, ignorance, and bigotry from 'the bride' of Christ!—May they be 'determined and incessantly aggressive'! Sparing no proper endeavors, may they not rest from their labors 'while

it is called to-day! Now is the time of conflict; but we need have no fears concerning the result. 'The morning cometh! The morning of complete victory! The glorious day! May the Lord speed His chariot wheels!'

FROM MRS. POLLY G. PITTS, Union, Wis.—“We have received the EXAMINER, and I am so glad in the Lord for it that I hardly know what to say. If I could tell you of the gladness of my heart for the Lord's mercy and long-suffering and sweet reviving hope, that maketh not ashamed, and the increase of faith that works by love and purifieth the heart, overcometh the world, laying hold on Jesus, it would fill sheets of paper. Surely God is to work for the final redemption of His people. The moral heavens and earth are full of the signs of Jesus' coming to dash the nations to pieces, and take the Throne of David, and to reign for the ages and onward, world without end.

“We shall take the EXAMINER as long as it is issued, if we can pay for it. Do not *refund* any thing, for you owe us nothing but love and Christian union. We owe you much. To you I am indebted for light on the Scripture doctrine of *life*—of the sleep of the dead—the destruction of the wicked—of the resurrection, and of the glorious restitution. Blessed be the Lord, the light is spreading, and He is preparing His children for the kingdom.”

FROM CHARLES H. SUTTON, Manayunk, Pa.—The EXAMINER for February has come to hand. I have given it a careful perusal, as I was interested in the two articles *reviewing* “RETRIBUTION.” I think in a letter to you in reference to the January number, I stated, if I had any doubts of the *non-living* of the *wicked*, “Retribution” had dispelled them all.

I am glad that two such men as WENDELL and CURRY have taken “Retribution” in hand: they handle it as it deserves, and the author of it—if “honest”—will be compelled to so alter and correct it, that nothing of the original will be left. “The nail,” that “has been driven so deep that it will not present itself for another blow,” was—unfortunately for the author—not clinched, for the point protruded so far on the other side, that a slight blow drove not only the head up, but the “nail” is quite out, and not another one left to hold the work together. Instead of being the golden nail of truth, it is but a composition of sarcasm; sophistry and contradictions, showing itself to be the dross of misstatement and error. “Life only through Christ” is the great doctrine of the Bible. May the Lord enable us to “*buy the truth*,” no matter what the cost, “*and sell it not*.” I do sincerely hope that you may be sustained in the publication of the EXAMINER: it is a work much needed in these days of fables.

## THE EXAMINER: A WORD TO ITS FRIENDS.

BY RUFUS WENDELL, SALEM, MASS.

WE cannot afford to do without the EXAMINER; at no time in the past, as it seems to me, has its co-operation in the spread of truth on the Life theme and kindred subjects been more greatly needed than now. No other periodical supplies the want which it has thus far met, and which it will continue to meet while it remains in the hands of him who has thus far conducted it. This assertion is not made at random, nor are these suggestions offered by the Editor's request. From the first until now the EXAMINER has been, in the most desirable sense, a free medium through which truth on Bible subjects has been elicited, and none who have a tolerable acquaintance with facts need be told that it has exerted a very wide influence for good. The part it has performed in breaking ground on the Immortality question is well known, and for its pages was reserved the honor—as well as the odium—of clearly bringing out and defending the crowning feature of this great theme, *viz.*, “No life from the dead for any who are not in Christ.” By a slow but steady progress this latter view has gained a foothold in all quarters, and from the minds of multitudes the prejudice which has hitherto precluded investigation has been removed. The efforts of not a few to proscribe this question and prevent inquiry into it have been in vain, and at no time has the willingness to hear and investigate been as great as it is now. Interesting facts illustrating this assertion might be given in abundance. Under these circumstances, the EXAMINER—“set for the defence” of the truth in question—should be kept in the field and vigorously at work. Shall it be sustained? Will its friends rally to its support, and do all they can to increase its circulation? As a monthly or semi-monthly magazine, shall we not *make an effort* to give it a subscription list larger than at any time since its commencement? Will not *each one* of its present patrons see what they can do in this matter? The example of RANDOLPH E. LADD and others should stimulate those whose means will permit it to pay more than their bare subscriptions, in order that the EXAMINER may be placed upon a self-sustaining basis and its EDITOR receive something for his toil. To ascertain what may be *duty* in this mat-

ter, let us ask ourselves for how much we would be willing to have this Magazine permanently discontinued. I trust that this voluntary appeal may induce some to take hold of this enterprise with a hearty good will. Thus doing, they may feel assured that their labor will not be in vain in the Lord. R. W.

RANDOLPH E. LADD, *Springfield, Mass.*, under date of Jan. 25, sent us *ten* dollars on his pledge of \$5 per month, for six months, to sustain this Magazine, and writes as follows :

“The continuance of the EXAMINER either monthly or weekly—the latter would be the better—is a *necessity* of our times. Where shall we look for the *present* truth, if not to those who follow the light, now more than ever given to such as humbly and prayerfully seek for it ?

“I stand pledged before the Lord to do my proportion towards sustaining it ; and I think the time *has* come when *all* who believe in the sublime and God honoring doctrine of ‘No future Life except through Jesus Christ the Life-Giver,’ should rally to the support of the oldest, the ablest, and the boldest periodical in the defence of this and other Bible doctrines, in our world.

“The conductors of other papers holding similar views on this question, do not give it the prominence that its importance demands : while others still, seek to exclude it altogether from their columns.

“I trust an earnest and combined effort will immediately be made to place the EXAMINER on a safe and sound basis for its regular publication either weekly or monthly. Why not call a conference of brethren, at some convenient point, and consult the best course to pursue ?

“I am ready to second any proposition having for its object the spreading of this ‘present truth.’ My heart is absorbed in it. ‘My reins are consumed within me’ in meditating upon its wondrous glories. It illuminates all other doctrines, as the sun does the solar system. I see it in every part of the Scriptures like lines of light. I am amazed at its copiousness, and astonished at my own and others blindness to it heretofore. But it is the work of the Spirit of God to cause the willing mind to see it ; and the ‘Spirit searcheth *all* things ; yea, the *deep* things of God.’”

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

---

"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, HATH NOT LIFE."

---

Vol. 14. No. 10.]

APRIL, 1862.

[Whole No. 212.

---

## WORSHIP: ITS NATURE AND CHARACTER.

A SERMON, BY GEORGE STORRS, AT PHILADELPHIA.

*From the Phonographic Notes of Joseph McFarland: Published by request.*

"And the devil, taking him up into an high mountain, showed him all the kingdoms of the world, in a moment of time. And the devil said unto him, 'All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them; for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will give it. If therefore thou wilt worship me, all shall be thine.' And Jesus answered and said unto him, 'Get thee behind me, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.'" —LUKE 4: 5—8.

This is a part of the account of our Lord's temptation of forty days in the wilderness. We are told that He was full of the Holy Ghost, and was led by the Spirit, and tempted of the devil. The original word translated "*Ghost*" is the same as that translated "*Spirit*," and means the same thing; it is *pneuma*. The Greek word *diabolos*, translated "devil," is the same as that, in Hebrew, which is translated "Satan." Both words, however, primarily signify *adversary*—one who opposes, or stands in the way. In the Old Testament the term "Satan" is applied to the angel of the LORD. Thus, the angel of the LORD who stood in the way of Balaam, is called *Satan*; and the LORD himself is sometimes called *Satan*.

There may be a wide difference of opinion in relation to the nature or personality of the individual who bears the appellation of "the devil," without detriment to the Christian character of those who entertain such opposite views. The majority, however, agree that there was 'something' that tempted Christ. Yet some believe that unless the tempter was a personality, Christ must have had evil impulses, and was therefore not

“without sin.” But Jesus could not have been “tempted in all points, like as we are,” except he had been *in the flesh*, or placed in a nature like our own ; hence, “He took on Him flesh and blood,” or the “seed of Abraham,” and was “made in the likeness of sinful flesh.”

I am aware that many vague and vulgar notions on this subject are widely prevalent. Many seem to think that a *personal* being offered food to Jesus, and used oral language, such as I have just been reading ; yet none of us, I imagine, have ever been tempted in that manner—have ever seen a “personal devil,” or heard him speak. The apostle James, alludes to this subject in the following language : “Let no man say, when he is tempted, I am tempted of God : for God cannot be tempted of evil : neither tempteth He any man. But every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust has *conceived*, it bringeth forth *sin* : and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth *death*.”—James 1 : 13-15.

It is necessary to a trial of this nature, that there be an object of temptation which shall address itself to the subject in an assailable point, which if it is gained, “lust hath conceived,” and then it “bringeth forth sin,” which terminates in *death*.—Now, “because the children were partakers of flesh and blood, Jesus took part of the same”—of the same desires of the flesh which sway humanity. But this does not imply an evil nature in Christ ; for none of the natural desires of the flesh are evil in themselves. At the expiration of the “forty days,” Jesus must naturally have experienced a strong desire for food, which He might easily have gratified, inasmuch as it was, doubtless, in the power of His hand to have produced it supernaturally. But this would not have been in *harmony* with the Divine mind. In thus appeasing His hunger, without a direct permission or command from the Father, He would have sinned. In withstanding the temptation He developed His character for obedience.

My main object in selecting this text is, that I may speak of worship—its nature and character. To *worship* any one, is to acknowledge dependence on them. It implies submission to, or compliance with their commands or requirements, and confiding in them. Whatever then is our supreme dependence is our God. If that object is a created one we are idolaters.

The tempter demanded homage of Jesus, and offered Him



"all the kingdoms of this world" as a recompense. No one, I presume, will undertake to say, that the devil literally presented Christ with a view of all the kingdoms of the world: in the nature of things, that was literally impossible: nor could a mountain have been found sufficiently high to afford such a prospect. Hence it must have been a presentation to His mind. He must have seen with His "mind's eye" the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them. But "the devil lied," says some one, "he never owned the kingdoms of the world." The devil may be a liar; but does he never speak the truth? Did he not say, "all that a man hath will he give for his life," and is that not true? What manner of being soever it was, therefore, which tempted Christ, it certainly spoke the truth: for if the kingdoms of this world do not appear to be under the direction and the rule of the devil or something equally as bad, I am altogether unable to comprehend the laws of evidence.—And such is a necessary consequence of the pride and overweening confidence of the rulers of this world: they have not ruled in the fear of God, nor regarded Him as the supreme and controlling power.

The kingdoms of this world are to become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ. God at the outset, I believe, intended to bestow the power, the glory, and the dominion of this world upon the Second Adam—Jesus, the anointed. We find repeated testimony on this subject in the Old as well as in the New Testament; and God foreseeing how men would treat His Son when He came into the world, said for His encouragement: "Sit thou at my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool." If He is rejected of men, God would raise Him up from the dead, and seat Him on the Father's throne, till His enemies should be subdued. Again: He said—"I will set my King upon my holy Hill of Zion—rule thou in the midst of thine enemies:" and how many prophecies there are which declare that "His dominion shall be from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth;" that "all the ends of the earth shall fear him," and that "His kingdom and dominion are to be everlasting, never to pass away or be destroyed."

Let us return to the subject of temptation. The apostle did not err when he said that Christ was tempted in "all points like as we are." Let me, by way of illustration, for a moment suppose that the object of your temptation, lust, or desire,

assumes the shape of a farm. There are two ways of obtaining it ; one of which is by patient industry and economy to amass the means ; and the other, by parsimony or downright dishonesty—lying, cheating, and stealing, to accumulate the money more rapidly. In the former instance you will have obtained the object of your desire by a method which God approves ; in the latter, by means which He condemns ; or, you gave place to temptation to obtain the object desired.

God had promised the kingdoms of this world to His Son ; and it entered into His plan to render Christ extremely poor, in order that He might be exposed to those temptations which surround the poorest man on earth—exposed to the scorn and contumely of the world, and at last be ignominiously put to death by wicked hands. So Christ went down to the grave amid the jeers and the contempt of the multitude, to be raised from the dead to a life eternal ; and now, “ death hath no more dominion over Him ;” He sits at the right hand of His Father, where He will remain until the time appointed by the Father for Him to take possession of His kingdom in the lawful way—to inherit and “ possess it forever and ever.”

But Christ might have obtained the kingdoms of this world by a much shorter way—the devil’s way, or the way of *the flesh* ; for He must have been as fully aware of the honor, pomp, and magnificence of empire, and as capable of meeting its requirements, as the greatest monarch that ever lived ; else He had not been “ tempted in all points like as we are.” The trial must have been severe, and the struggle a grand one beyond conception, or He would not have cried out in His anguish—“ Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me.” Picture, if you can, His humiliation, when charged with being in league with the devil—when buffeted, spit upon, scourged and vexed ; hissed and hooted at ; or the terrible struggle between ambition and duty. “ If you are the Son of God,” said the tempter, “ you may soon render yourself popular. You have only to convince the people of your wondrous ability to perform any thing you please—to make them a powerful nation—and you will be elevated to the throne, and all the other nations on earth will do homage to you.”

Such is the course pursued by ambitious men of the world—those who seek to become kings, emperors, or presidents ; they sacrifice truth, principle, justice—anything for the sake of

place and power. Suppose that Jesus had yielded to the temptation—no doubt He might have become great, and the world have resounded with His fame ; but He would also have sinned, and, consequently, died, and the world lost not merely a great King, but a *Redeemer*. “ Yes : come forward ; now is your decisive moment : ” urged the devil—“ proclaim that you are the Messiah, and have appeared to deliver your people from their trials and tribulations ; confound the Scribes and Pharisees with an exhibition of your miraculous power, and the tide of popularity will carry you in what direction soever you may wave your hand.” This was the way of the flesh—the devil ; but it was not God’s way. Then replied Christ, “ Get thee behind me, Satan”—*adversary* : adversary of my permanent glory and everlasting inheritance—“ for it is written, Thou shalt worship” (or do homage to) “ the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.”

Where then is Christ’s acknowledgment of dependence upon others ? I have said, “ worship ” implies an act of homage proceeding from an inferior toward a superior ; an acknowledgment of dependence upon him, or submission to his commands ; and this was what the tempter proposed to Christ, as his reward for the kingdoms of the world. But Christ rejected them ; and so should we turn to God, from similar allurements, and acknowledge and worship Him as above all gods ; otherwise, we are idolaters.

There is an excellent illustration of this subject, Rom. 1 : 25, where the apostle, speaking of those who gave themselves up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, adds :

“ Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever, amen.”

The marginal reading is “ *rather than the Creator.* ” The moment that men forsake God, and renounce His law and authority, just so soon do they bow to the tempter. They may still faintly recognize God in the recitation of some creed or articles of faith—in some form or fashion of the hour—but they entertain no real and abiding faith in Him as their *supreme* benefactor. Saith the apostle—

“ Because that which may be known of God, is manifest in them, for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the

things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead, so that they are without excuse: Because that when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened: Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools." Rom. 1: 19--22.

Thus, when men obey the law of the flesh, and make that supreme, they become fools: for it is the fool who "hath said in his heart, 'there is no God.'" The consequence is what the apostle describes in the following verses—

"And changed the glory of the incorruptible God, into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four footed beasts, and creeping things: Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness, through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonor their own bodies between themselves: Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed for ever. Amen." Rom. 1: 23--25.

When men abandon the living God, for gods of their own choice, He leaves them to make the experiment and experience the result—to enjoy their "vile affections," and sink deeper and deeper in their iniquity.

As the worship of any person or any thing consists in our dependence upon that person or thing, so in proportion to the fervor and intensity of our worship, do we assimilate to the character of the object worshiped. If a man make his talents—even though they be exercised in the dissemination of truth—an object of worship or dependence, he will have erected a god in himself—he becomes a self-worshiper: and so on, in a variety of ways. We may worship money, beauty, power, position, and become as idolatrous as those who cried "Oh! Baal, hear us!" If any one worship a theory, even a theory in religion, and make that theory the object of his dependence and reliance, he acts the idolator as truly as any that ever fell down to wood or stone.

We may worship a ruler—that is, do him homage or reverence—without being guilty of sin. For example, it is said, 1 Chron. 29: 20—"That all the congregation blessed the LORD God of their fathers, and bowed down their heads, and worshiped the LORD *and the king.*"

That they did not worship the king as supreme, is evident from the context, as well as the very nature of the case. They worshiped the king as *king*, and rendered him homage and obe-

dience as one who was subject to the Supreme Ruler of the universe ; in thus doing they did not sin. But if they had only worshiped the king and overlooked JEHOVAH, then they had committed idolatry.

There are other circumstances in life, in which God requires us to worship our fellow creatures. For instance, He requires the child to worship his parents—to reverence them, and acknowledge its dependence upon them ; also, the wife to worship her husband, or reverence him, as Sarah did Abraham,—not *as God*, but as one upon whom she is dependent for support and comfort.

Therefore, we may say, that in all the various relations of life where God has made us dependent upon others—who may be above us in the order of His providence—homage and reverence to them, as persons upon whom we are dependent, is in perfect harmony with our worship of God as the Supreme.—But in all these relations there is a point beyond which we cannot go without sinning. If a parent or a ruler enjoins or commands a child or a subject to do that which God has plainly forbidden, he must not be obeyed. It will avail nothing to urge, as an excuse, that he has been commanded to do wrong. In such a case, we should exclaim, in the language of our text, “Get thee behind me, Satan ; for it is written : Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.”

Here, I will take occasion to allude to the attitude in which we are placed in respect to our Government. Congress, as you are all aware, has ordained in the Fugitive Slave Bill, that men shall assist in capturing a fugitive slave, and remanding him to the custody of his master. This I regard as a wrong, and sooner than obey such a law, I would perish like John Rodgers at the stake : for God says, “Thou shalt not deliver unto his master the servant which is escaped from his master unto thee : he shall dwell with thee, even among you, in the place which he shall choose in one of thy gates, where it liketh him best : thou shalt not oppress him.” Deut. 23 : 15, 16. Our nation has this sin to meet, in the awful calamity which has befallen it.

Let me still further illustrate this subject by reference to the case of Cornelius, in which the circumstances were rather remarkable. When Peter had entered the house of Cornelius, he—Cornelius—fell down and worshiped him ; but Peter bade

him arise, saying that he was also a man. I do not believe that Cornelius intended to worship Peter as a god ; but Peter, who was a worshiper of the living and true God, and a servant of Jesus Christ, was fearful that Cornelius, in his admiration of the messenger, might lose sight of the message which he had been sent to deliver ; he therefore cautioned him in time.—Happy would it be for the Christian world if ministers would do likewise, now-a-days ; but, alas ! many of them are too eager to receive all the homage they can, without reminding the people of their duty to the living God.

The worship, then, which is due to God from us, is an acknowledgment of absolute dependence upon Him as the Supreme Being, accompanied with the humiliation which should characterize such inferior and sinful creatures as ourselves. The apostle refers to this subject in Acts 17 : 25.

“ God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that He is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands : neither is worshiped with men’s hands, as though He needed anything, seeing He giveth to all life, and breath, and all things.”

Can you imagine anything that would better express dependence so complete, so perfect as this ? Much need have we, in these days of trouble and trial, to adhere to this principle more strictly and closely than we have ever done before. Let us, then, acknowledge God, and come before Him with humiliation and confession, and thanks for His mercies ; with prayer and supplication at His footstool. “ But”—says one—“ I am placed in such trying circumstances, sometimes, that I don’t know how to be thankful.” Well, we can appreciate your perplexity perfectly well. Consider the circumstances of one who had filled a lofty station—whose power was second only to that of the king—but yet whose enemies conspired to cause him to be put to death—in the course of whose administration no corruption had ever been known—whose only fault consisted in loving God more than the king—whose resolution to obey Him through good or ill was never shaken—DANIEL ; he “ prayed and gave *thanks*” after he knew he was to be cast into the lions’ den ! In that den he prayed to Him who is able to save, and he was delivered. We have always abundant cause for giving thanks to God, no matter what may be the circumstances amid which we are placed. Worship Him “ in spirit and in truth,” and, like Daniel, we shall be delivered from the evils that surround us.

## . THE ORIGIN AND END OF EVIL.

BY ELD. JONATHAN WILSON, VERMONT, CHAUT. CO., N. Y.

GOD has given us, by Moses, the beginning of all things created, according to their perfect order and nature, each having seed in itself of its own kind. Man an animal, of the same materials and life as any other living creatures on earth, to live on the fruits of the earth, to breathe the same air as other animals, and die when they cease to breathe, as others do—for “all have one breath”—but distinguished only by an organ of knowledge to constitute him king over the inferior creatures, and a capacity for trial by a law to see if he would yield subjection to God, and so live forever, or take his portion with animal nature and die as they do.

The test was, Obey and live ; or disobey and die. Man's situation was like the well ballanced scales, which if any outside power bear on either part it would destroy a just weight, or accountability. Where then is the origin of evil in the world ? *Answer* : Man was created with a desire to increase in knowledge, which was right. Without this, the tree of knowledge would have been no test to him. The common theology is, that man has an immortal soul ; but as that idea is not in the Bible, nor such an expression ever employed in it, some argument is sought to support it. The usual one is, because man has a faculty for and desires immortality, it must be he has it.

Not so did Paul reason on Bible subjects. He said—“For we are saved by hope ; but hope that is seen is not hope, for what a man seeth why doth he yet hope for ? for if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it.”—Rom. 8 : 24, 25. Also, Peter saith—“Be sober and hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought unto you by Jesus Christ.” 1 Peter 1 : 13. Men desire to be rich. Does this desire arise because they are rich ? No, but the reverse. The Christian hopes for immortality. The reason is, he does not yet possess it : and the Bible does not promise it to him till the resurrection of the last day. So we see it is not because he has it, but because he has it not. But I find no fault with those who use the argument spoken of, for it is the best they have for natural immortality ; if they had a better they would use it, for this is out of harmony with common sense and the Bible. The origin of the sentiment is found in Rollin's History, Vol. 1, p. 393. Socrates and Plato, both idolators.

Now for the origin of evil. Sin is said to be the transgression of the law ; and by sin came death. Could this be done by Adam and Eve in Eden, independent of all outside power,

being probationers, on trial for life or death? Let the Bible answer. "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God, for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man; but every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed: then when lust hath conceived it bringeth forth sin; and sin when it is finished bringeth forth death." James 1: 12. Doubtless, James had special reference to Eve in her temptation in Eden.

"As it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this" appointment "the judgment, so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many, and unto them that look for him, will He appear the second time without sin," or a sin offering, "unto salvation." Now as God's appointment was *one* death only for sin, so Christ's atonement was for redemption from that death for those only who believe on Him.

I am persuaded God never designed animal nature should inherit the kingdom of God, but it was given for a state of trial to develop moral character fit for a change to a spiritual nature and the kingdom. Thus we see, there was no flesh accountable at that time but Adam and Eve: they were distinguished from all other animals by possessing knowledge and a desire to increase it, which was right, in a lawful way. The tree of life, as well as the tree of knowledge, was there to preserve their animal life during their trial state. Though free from want, and should have been happy and obedient, yet Eve's desire overstept the law of God—she took the forbidden fruit. What a change took place in all creation. Sin and the curse of the law altered the whole scene. God had just previously pronounced all things "very good." Then there was no angelic devil or sinner in God's universe. Paul saith, "Adam was first formed, then Eve: and Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression."

We will now look at the progress of sin ever since Eve's lust produced and planted the germ of sin. Paul saith, "All the law is fulfilled in one word, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself: but if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another. This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the *lust* of the flesh." He then enumerates "the works of the flesh," and tells us, "such things" will exclude from "the kingdom of God." See Gal. 5: 14. Paul saith nothing of an angelic devil producing "such things" in men, but charges it on the working of *the flesh*. The apostle saith of himself, "In me, that is in my *flesh*, dwelleth no good thing." James asks, "From whence come wars and fightings among you? Come they not hence even of your *lusts* that war in your members?" Again, Paul saith, "Now these things



were our examples, to the intent we should not *lust* after evil things, as they also lusted." 1 Corth. 10: 6. Peter speaks of Christians "having escaped the corruption that is in the world through *lust*." 2 Pet. 1: 4. Moses saith, "He called the name of that place, Kibroth-hattaavah, [*i. e.*, *the graves of lust*]: because there they buried the people that *lusted*." Numb. 11: 34. Again, "Put off the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful *lusts*." Eph. 4: 22. Also 2 Tim. 4: 3, "For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine, but after their *own lusts* shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears," &c.

We have now traced the outside of creation to find a personal angelic devil, and find none; yet we have found the origin of all evil that ever cursed the human race. It grew out of the *lust*, or *desire* of Adam and Eve to obtain knowledge in an unlawful way: the same *lust* exists in their posterity.

We will now look for a devil inside of creation, and see if we can find some character that will verily fill six personified names. It is that rebellious, murderous, and lying principle produced by our first parents against God and His law, saying, "Thou shalt not surely die." And as it was the *lust of the flesh*, described by James; *first*, called a "serpent," because of its deception: *second*, a "dragon," because of its power of evil: *third*, "the beast," because it is of an animal nature: *fourth*, called a "false prophet," because of its false teaching: *fifth*, called "satan," because an adversary: *sixth*, "the devil," because a destroyer.

In John 8th chap., our Lord had a conference with unbelieving Jews who claimed to be Abraham's seed. Jesus admits they are his seed, but not his children. He counts relationship by the likeness they bear to their originator. Hence Jesus said they were of their father the devil, and his works they would do. He then gives us the character of this six named devil, *viz.* 1. A murderer. 2. A liar from the beginning. The beginning of what? of creation; told the first lie we have on record: he said man should not die, if he did rebel; in that was he the father of lies. The same lie is now passed as good currency in our world: it even brings a premium.

Our Lord, John 6: 70, said, "Have I not chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?" This was spoken of Judas. Here is a personal devil, but not an angelic one. Also, Jesus called Peter "satan," adversary, Math. 16: 23. Both these persons were sons of Adam and Eve, though many generations passed between them. Paul found another of the same family, *viz.*: "Elymas the sorcerer," and gave him his character, and said, "O full of all *subtlety* and all mischief, thou child of the devil,

thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" Here Paul resisted the devil and he went blind. "Resist the devil"—or wicked lusting after unlawful things—"and he"—a personified devil—"will flee from you:" James 4: 7. "Neither give place to the devil:" Eph. 4: 27. "Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil:" Eph. 6: 11. "Lest he fall into the condemnation of the devil:" \* \* \* "the snare of the devil:" 1 Tim. 3: 6, 7. "Recover from the snare of the devil:" 2 Tim. 2: 26. "Had the power of death; that is the devil:" Heb. 2: 14. The power of death was in the lust of the flesh, by transgressing the law of God. If we "have not the Spirit of Christ, we are none of His." When we obey the Gospel, by repentance and faith, we become united to Him, and are partakers of the Holy Spirit, and come under the government of His word and Spirit, which is shed on us through Jesus Christ our Life-giver. Our body is now to be kept under: it is the seat of warfare. The animal nature of man produces a carnal mind which is not subject to the law of God: so the mind of Christ in us wars against the animal mind, and they are irreconcilable enemies: the conflict will only end when the animal nature is dead. It is dying by crucifixion; and when dead cannot be redeemed from death: it dies under law that cannot give future life nor admit of such life. So death ends the last battle between these conflicting powers: the flesh goes back to dust, and the believer's spirit life is hid with Christ in God. The resurrection, at the last day, develops that life in a spiritual body: the animal body perishes for ever under the curse of the law. Christians are taken from under the *curse* of the law, but are not from the death of the law: they sleep in the grave till Christ comes the second time; then shall the trumpet sound and they shall be raised incorruptible, clothed with immortality, their spirit life developed in a glorious body from which all that was animal is excluded, and eternal life is the glorious result. "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:" John 3: 36. "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. We "which have the first-fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves do groan within ourselves, waiting for *the adoption*, to wit, *the redemption of our body*." Rom. 8: 23. The wicked "utterly perish in their own corruption;" and *animal* nature, in all, dies to live no more. Thus *ends evil* from earth. Amen.

## LIFE FROM THE DEAD :

OR, DO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES REVEAL A FUTURE LIFE FOR THE UNBELIEVER ?

BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

Isa. 26 : 19. The latter clause of this text is claimed by the author of "Retribution" as "positive proof" of the reliving of the wicked dead. A reproduction, in brief, of the argument drawn from Isa. 26, by the believers of "Life only in Christ," will be a suitable preliminary to a review of our author's statements in support of his position. We quote as much of the chapter as belongs to the argument.

"O Lord our God, other lords beside thee have had dominion over us : but by thee only will we make mention of thy name. *They are dead, they shall not live ; they are deceased, they shall not rise : because*" (instead of *therefore*, see Gesenius,) "*thou hast visited and destroyed them, and made all their memory to perish.* Thou hast increased the nation, O Lord, thou hast increased the nation : thou art glorified : thou hadst removed it far unto all the ends of the earth. Lord, in trouble have they visited thee, they poured out a prayer when thy chastening was upon them. Like as a woman with child, that draweth near the time of her delivery, is in pain, and crieth out in her pangs ; so have we been in thy sight, O Lord. We have been with child, we have been in pain, we have as it were brought forth wind ; we have not wrought any deliverance in the earth ; neither have the inhabitants of the world fallen. *Thy dead shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust : for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead.*" Isa. 26 : 13-19.

One palpable fact stands forth in this passage, viz : the resurrection is spoken of in the *future* tense. Speaking of the righteous, it says, "*Thy dead shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise.*" Here then is a positive declaration, beyond the reach of controversy, that when these words are spoken (whether in the past by Isaiah as a simple prophecy, or in the future as a song "in the land of Judah") the dead are yet *to be* raised. In verses 16-18, the people of God are represented as groaning for deliverance, and the 19th verse comes in as a com-

forting assurance of *future* redemption. The contrast between the righteous and the wicked with reference to the approaching resurrection is clearly drawn. The righteous "*shall live,*" they "*shall arise.*" But of the wicked, it is said, in the 14th verse, "Dead, they shall *not* live ; deceased, they shall *not* rise : *because thou hast visited and destroyed them, and made all their memory to perish.*"

To neutralize this argument, the author of "Retribution" produces Bishop Lowth's version of the 19th verse, which is as follows :

"Thy dead shall live ; my deceased, they shall rise :  
Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust !  
For thy dew is as the dew of the dawn ;  
*But the earth shall cast forth as an abortion, the deceased tyrants."*

Our author then says, "The passage above quoted clearly speaks of the resurrection of the dead of God's people, who 'awake and sing' as if refreshed, like flowers by the dew of morning ; but after these dead live, and the dead bodies of God's people revive, there is yet another part of the resurrection foretold in the words 'the earth shall cast out the DEAD,' or as Lowth renders it,

'The earth shall *cast forth*, as an abortion, the DEAD TYRANTS.'

"I shall now proceed to show the grounds upon which this version rests, and without claiming for it entire verbal accuracy, I think it can be shown to indicate an important fact not contained in the other versions, and yet clearly existing in the original Hebrew.

"The Hebrew word rendered *dead* in the common version, or '*dead tyrants*' by LOWTH, is REPHAIM. It is defined by GESENIUS 'the quiet, the silent, i. e. the *shades, manes*, dwelling in hades, whom the Hebrews supposed to be destitute of blood and animal life, (nephesh,) but not wholly without some faculties of mind. As a proper name the founder of a race of tall men,' &c. Prof. Pick, in his Hebrew Concordance, defines the word "feeble ones, helpless.' The word is one about which there is much obscurity, and I shall not attempt to define it accurately, but I shall nevertheless endeavor to illustrate its use."

He then quotes all the instances where the word occurs with the same meaning. Job 26 : 5, Psa 88 : 10, Prov. 2 : 18, 9 : 18, 21 : 16, Isa. 14 : 9, 26 : 14, "They are *deceased (rephaim)*, they shall not rise." Isa. 26 : 19. "The earth shall *cast out the dead, (rephaim).*" He says further :

“The ‘other lords’ that had dominion over the people of God, dying, had become *rephaim*, they were thus consigned to that company and congregation. ‘They are *rephaim*, they shall not rise.’ In the same connection in which the prophet declares that their oppressors had become *rephaim*, he, while describing the joyful resurrection of the righteous as herbs revive beneath the dew, declares that the earth shall also *cast out*, or give birth to the *rephaim*, as to a wretched abortion. The *rephaim* are always represented as *unrighteous*, and these *rephaim*, or dead, are *not saints*, nor were saints ever called by that name in the word of God, in the whole Bible. The term *rephaim* is never applied to the people of God, dead or alive. Hence arises the conclusion that this class of whom it is said, (14th v.) ‘they are *deceased*, or *rephaim*, they shall *not rise*,’ it is expressly said, (19th v.) ‘the earth shall *cast them out*,’ and as the word refers to the wicked, and to them *ALONE*, there is here positive proof of the *resurrection* of the *wicked dead*.”

Our author is not contented with his own brilliant achievements in the field of self-contradiction, but wishes also to make the prophet Isaiah a partner in his vagaries. The prophet, in the 14th verse, says of certain wicked men, “They are dead, they shall *not live*, they are *deceased*, (*rephaim*,) they shall *not rise* ;” but our author endeavors to make him squarely contradict this assertion, in the 19th verse. Whatever construction may be put on the last clause of that verse, we are firmly grounded in the conviction that it *cannot* thus impugn the *previous* declaration of the prophet.

We wish to make a brief inquiry with regard to the word *rephaim*. Is it *certain* that it “refers to the *wicked*, and to them *alone*,” as affirmed by our author? If it is *not* certain, then he has made the prophet contradict himself to no purpose. He says, “The word is one about which there is *much obscurity*, and I shall not attempt to define it accurately.” Contrast this with his subsequent statement. “It is expressly said, ‘the earth shall *cast them out*,’ and as *the* word refers to the wicked, and to them *alone*, there is here *positive proof* of the resurrection of the wicked dead.” If this is not an “attempt to define it accurately,” we know not what would be. Gesenius, from whom our author quotes, does not give the slightest intimation that the word refers to the wicked *alone*. His definition applies

with *equal* propriety to the *righteous* dead. He says, "Rephaim, *properly* 'the quiet, the silent,' i. e. the *shades, manes*, dwelling in hades," &c. Prof. Pick's definition, as given by our author, agrees. "Feeble ones, helpless," expresses the condition of *all* the dead. The fact that the word is *generally* used in the Scriptures with reference to the wicked does not prove that it is to be *always* thus understood. Prof. Noyes' translation of verses 16-19, quoted by our author, appears to be correct.

"O Jehovah in affliction have they sought thee ;  
They have poured out their prayer when thy chastisement was  
upon them.

As a woman with child when her delivery is near,  
Is in anguish and crieth aloud in her pangs,  
Thus have we been before thee, O Jehovah !  
We have been with child ; we have been in anguish,  
Yet have, as it were, brought forth wind.  
The land is not delivered,  
Her inhabitants are not born.  
Thy dead shall live again ;  
The dead bodies of my people shall arise.  
Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust !  
For thy dew is like the dew upon plants,  
And the earth shall be delivered of her dead."

The imagery of the passage, brought out in this rendering somewhat clearer than in the common version, seems to demand an application of the concluding clause to the *righteous* dead. The land of Palestine, which contains the dust of God's ancient people, is compared to a "woman with child when her delivery is near." In the midst of the groans and prayers of His elect, God assures them that the woman shall be safely *delivered*, "the earth shall be *delivered* of her dead."

But suppose we allow our author his point with regard to the word *rephaim*, he still fails of evidence to establish the reliving of the wicked dead. Bishop Lowth's version, upon which our author builds his argument, says, "The earth shall cast forth *as an abortion*, the deceased tyrants." Now the word "*naphal*, an abortion," occurs Job 3 : 16. "Or as an hidden untimely birth I had not been : as infants which *never saw light*." Dr. Clarke says on this text, "*Or as a hidden untimely birth*, an early miscarriage, which was scarcely perceptible by the parent herself :

and in this case *he had not been* ; he had never had the distinguishable form of a human being, whether male or female." No additional comment is needed to show that the word "*abortion*" is *against*, rather than in favor of a reliving of the wicked dead ; but the testimony of Prof. Bush, who holds the same view of the word *rephaim* as that stated by our author, will effectually dispose of the matter. In his remarks on the latter clause of the 19th v. he says,

"The term for dead is *rephaim*, which in scriptural usage is a term of *reproach*, being the same with that employed above, v. 14, to denote the *deceased tyrants*, of whom it is affirmed that they *shall not live again*. \* \* Here obviously is mention made of a class of men who are *never to rise again at all* in the true sense of a resurrection. The *dead* here spoken of are the *wicked dead*, \* \* of whom it is in effect declared that the earth casts them out with loathing from her bosom, as if no longer able to bear the burden of their accursed dust. For the earth, however, thus to 'cast out her dead' is not to make them the subjects of a *resurrection*, but implies rather the utter and final destruction and dispersion of their remains, as unworthy to be any longer retained in their resting place."

Thus we perceive that the reliving of the wicked dead does not necessarily follow, even if our author's definition of the word *rephaim* is correct. But we have still another barrier to raise in some further testimony of Prof. Bush. He continues,

"Our remarks thus far upon this clause have proceeded upon the assumed accuracy of the established version, which makes 'earth' the subject of the verb here rendered 'shall cast out.' But it is to be observed that the words are susceptible of a very different sense. The root of the verb is *naphal*, to fall, and *tappil* is the future of the Hiphil or causative form, signifying *to cause to fall, to cast down* ; in which case the rendering may be. "Thou wilt cause the earth or land of the giants (tyrants) to fall ;" and this accounts for several of the ancient versions, which greatly vary from our common rendering. Thus the Greek, *The land of the ungodly shall fall*. Syriac, *But thou wilt overturn the land of the giants*. Arabic, *But the land of the ungodly shall totter. The wicked to whom thou hast given power and they have transgressed thy word, thou wilt consign them to hell*. Vulgate, *And the land of the giants thou wilt drag down to ruin*. We feel scarcely competent, amidst this variety of construction, to determine the precise import of the

passage, but it would seem clear that it is designed to set forth a striking contrast between the predicted lot of the two different classes of men here described. Of the one, a resurrection in some sense is affirmed, of the other denied." (Anastasis, p. 119.)

So much for the "*positive proof* of the resurrection of the wicked dead" in Isa. 25 : 19.

Before leaving this section of "Retribution," we call attention to a brace of little inconsistencies, which serve to display our author's happy faculty of self-refutation. He says on page 110 of the phrase "the earth shall cast out the dead,"

"There is here positive proof of the resurrection of the wicked dead to judgment and retribution, *when* the dead saints shall live, and their dead bodies shall arise."

In this sentence we have the wicked dead and the righteous dead raised *at the same time*. And the phrase "the earth shall cast out the dead" is quoted as "positive proof" of the fact. Let us now turn to pages 114, 15. We there read,

"If this distinction be well founded it may be possible that the redeemed of the Lord, having witnessed the judgment on their living foes and oppressors, may say with absolute exactness, 'They are dead, they shall not live,' there being no positive proof that I know of, of a resurrection from that death inflicted by the Lord upon his enemies at his coming; while of those who had already died and *were destined* to a resurrection to condemnation, it could also be said, 'The earth shall cast out the *rephaim*.'"

In this sentence we have "the redeemed of the Lord," (embracing of course the living saints who have been changed, and those who have been raised from the dead,) using *the same words* with reference to the *future* resurrection of the wicked, which are quoted above by our author to *prove* the *past* resurrection of the *same* wicked.

Again. The title of the book under review is "Retribution, or the Doom of the Ungodly, *after* the Resurrection of the Dead, Just and Unjust." The entire and unequivocal drift, of the first part at least, is to prove that *all* mankind, *living and dead*, are to experience TOGETHER an *investigating* judgment. But in the sentence last quoted, and also in the previous one, *on*



page 114, our author *excludes* from this judgment the whole generation of wicked men who are alive at his coming. He sweeps them all into destruction before a single one of the wicked dead is raised. This fact overthrows his whole judgment theory which imperatively demands the presence of *every* child of Adam at the judgment "*after* the resurrection of the dead, just and unjust."

And yet again. On page 113, he says,

"Let earth's beastly empires be destroyed and given to the burning flame ; let the sceptre of oppression be broken, and the throne of iniquity cast down ; let the last enemy be destroyed by the power of One who is stronger than he ; let death be swallowed up in full and endless victory ; let the fire of God purge out the last memorial of his puny foes ; and *then* shall the redeemed exclaim :

'They are dead, they shall not live,' &c."

Now when death, the last enemy is destroyed, it is evident that there can be *no more* death. All that live *after* that event will certainly live forever. And the words "They are dead, they shall not live," are *not* to be sung, according to our author, *until* death has been destroyed. But in the quotation already made from page 114, 15, he plainly teaches that *after* this song is sung *the wicked dead are raised* ; hence eternal torment or eternal happiness is their portion, but as our author is too fond of torment to let the opportunity escape, we may congratulate him on his success in proving the never-ending misery of every wicked partaker in the resurrection.

---

## WHAT IS THE GOSPEL ?

IS IT GOOD NEWS, OR SOMETHING ELSE ?

BY JACOB GRIM, PHILADELPHIA.

THE author of a work called "Retribution," says,

"Many things are contained in the Scriptures which are not at all 'good news' to those who deny them. 'He that believeth not shall be damned.' Is that good news ? 'The wages of sin

is death.' Is that good news? 'The soul that sinneth shall die.' Is that good news? 'They shall be punished with everlasting destruction.' Is that good news? 'All kindred of the earth shall wail because of him.' Is that good news? I thought the gospel told us what was *true* rather than what poor, ignorant, sinful mortals might think pleasant, amusing, and agreeable."—Page 151, sec. 16.

Now, we would say, the Scriptures contain many things that are *not gospel*. The question then is, What is the Gospel? Paul says, in Gal. 3 : 8, "The gospel was preached to Abraham, saying, In thee shall all the nations be blessed." The author of "Retribution" tells us, "The *gospel* says, they shall have death : shall die : shall be damned : shall be punished : and shall wail because of him."

Paul says, in 1 Cor. 15 : 1, "I declare unto you the gospel which I received" \* \* "by which also ye are saved if ye keep in remembrance what I preached unto you ; unless ye believed in vain : for I delivered unto you, first of all that which I received : how that Jesus died : " second, " that He was buried : " and third, " that He rose again."

Now the two first propositions were never doubted in the days of the apostles ; but the third was ; and the apostle goes on to prove that fact—"He was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve ; after that he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once ; and He was seen of James, and the apostles, and last of all he was seen of me." "Therefore whether it was I or they" (that saw the Lord) "so we preach and so ye believed." "Now if Christ be preached that He rose from the dead, how say some among you, that there is no resurrection of the dead? And if Christ be not risen from the dead, our preaching is vain : yea, and we are found false witnesses of God, because we testified that God RAISED up Jesus from the dead. And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain, ye are yet in your sins : then they ALSO which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished."

Peter testifies to the same fact in Acts 3 : 15, saying, "Ye killed the Prince of Life, whom God raised from the dead ; whereof we are witnesses." The same gospel was preached to Cornelius. Jesus preached the same gospel when he said, "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son ; that

whosoever believed in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

Now it seems to me, the gospel is a proclamation of Life ; which certainly is good news ; but in order to make it effectual the way must be ordained of God : and secondly, it must be proven to be effectual : and this is what the apostle said he had received. First, says he, Jesus DIED : that fact was clearly demonstrated. Secondly, He was buried ; that was not denied. Third, He arose from the DEAD. This last fact the apostle demonstrates to them by eye witnesses that saw the Lord : and as the apostle declares, 1 Tim. 1 : 10, " that He hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel." Here, then, is *the* gospel : man *was* in a dying condition, and God has proclaimed the way of Life through the gospel.

Thus the apostle, in 1 Cor. 15 : 47, says, " The first man is of the earth, earthy : such are they also that are earthy. The second man (will be) the man from heaven, heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy man" (by a natural generation) " we shall also bear the image of the heavenly man." Verse 21, " For since by man came death : by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all" (his children by natural generation) " die : so in Christ all" (his children, regenerated by the Spirit of God) " shall be made alive : but every man in his own order : Christ, the first fruits:" (Christ is not fruits : now the first fruits is a pledge that the harvest shall be like them : Christ was a pattern, and John says, when He who is our Life shall appear we shall be like him) : " afterward they that be Christ's at his coming."

Peter says in Act 4 : 12, " Neither is there deliverance" (from death) " in any other : for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby to have Life."—*Murdock's Syriac Translation.*

Man is begotten into the world by the law of generation. God begets His children from the dead by the Spirit, through a resurrection. Jesus says in Luke 20 : " They that attain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, cannot die any more ; they are the-children of God, being the children of the resurrection." The means made use of, is the Spirit of God. Paul says, If the Spirit of God that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you,

it shall quicken your mortal bodies. How true the saying of Jesus : " That which is born of the *flesh* is *flesh*, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit."

" Retribution," page 80, sec. 3, says, " It may just as well be inferred that the wicked will be raised by some *other means*, as that they will not be raised at all. If it is asked how a wicked man can be raised without the Spirit of God, an infidel might also ask how the righteous man could be raised with it, or by its indwelling."

Here is a quibble to run away from the truth. We accept his motto on the gospel, page 152, " What then is the gospel ? Let God be true and every man a liar." (" Retribution.")

Paul saith, God raised Christ and will *also* raise us by His Spirit. Jesus says, Ye do err not knowing the Scriptures neither the power of God. Again. Paul, in Eph. 1 : 19, says, God showed his mighty power which He wrought in Christ when he raised him from the dead : and he shows what that power is when he says, If the Spirit of God dwell in you it will raise you up, even as it raised up Christ ; whom we have testified that we have seen. And in Acts 10 : 41, Peter testifies, they did eat and drink with him (Christ) after that He rose from the *dead*. Here then is positive fact that God did by His Spirit raise Christ from the dead ; and it is given by Paul in Romans as a pledge that He will in the same manner raise all those in whom His Spirit dwells.

Can " Retribution" point out, in the gospel, some other way in which sinners MAY have a resurrection from the dead, and not resort to the quibbles of those he calls infidels ? " Let God be true and every man a liar." Where does " Retribution" stand ? It seems he wishes to place the lie in the other scale. Let him read the following :—" He that believeth not God hath made *Him a liar* ; because he believeth not the record that God gave of His Son : and *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* ; he that hath not the Son of God *hath not life*." 1 John 5 : 10-12. The *gospel* proclamation is *wholly* good news, and nothing else, whether men " deny" it or not. See Luke 2 : 10, 11. " The angel of the Lord " probably understood the matter as well as the author of " Retribution."

## THE INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE.

THIS MAGAZINE is a Bible *Examiner*, and not a *Fragment Bible*. A collection of fragments of texts proves nothing, except the prevailing views of the collector. It remains, after that, to show that these fragments of Scripture have such sense as the selector may think ; or whether the *context* and the *general tenor* of Scripture does not forbid the doctrine intended to be supported by them. Not once is the soul called "immortal" in the Bible : not once does the phrase "endless misery" or "eternal torment" occur in that Book ; yet what believer in those doctrines cannot give fragments of texts that in his mind clearly proves both those doctrines ? Not one solitary text can be found in the Bible that saith a wicked man when once dead, shall ever be made *alive*, or come to *life* again : yet the advocates of their *living* again can furnish fragments of Bible which satisfy their minds they will *live* again, though the Scriptures never once say so. We think this mode of attempting to prove a particular doctrine is unavailing ; but in this number we give samples of its uselessness.

The *first* of the following articles, "No. 1," was sent us by our aged and much respected friend whose signature it bears. The *second* article, "No. 2," was prepared, not to prove a doctrine, but to help show the uselessness of attempting to establish a theory by isolated and fragmentary texts, taken up at will from any part of Scripture, without carefully considering the context and general tenor of the Bible, and comparing all with the known and revealed character of God, so as to make a harmony with it.

If "No. 1" proves a doctrine, "No. 2" equally proves an opposite one. All the statements are true, but the doctrine taught by either, must harmonize with the *general tenor* of Scripture, as we have said, or the construction put on the texts must be an error.

## FRAGMENTS FROM THE BIBLE.—No. 1.

"There are many devices in a man's heart ; nevertheless, the counsel of the LORD, that shall stand." Prov. 19 : 21.

"—it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the

judgment :” Heb. 9 : 27. “—the hour is coming in the which *all* that are in the graves shall *hear* his voice, and shall come forth ; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life ; and they that have done evil to the resurrection of condemnation :” John 5 : 28, 29. “ Be not afraid of them that kill the body—fear him which after he hath killed, hath power to cast into hell ; yea, I say unto you, fear him :” Luke 12 : 5. Matt. 10 : 28. “The multitudes (raveem) of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall *awake*, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt :” Dan. 12 : 2. “ 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*.” Acts 24 : 15. “— 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. Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men,” &c. : 2 Cor. 5 : 10, 11. “The wicked shall be returned (*shoov*) into hell (*sheol*) and all the nations that forget God.” Ps. 9 : 17.

“ And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them which do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the judgment of God ? Or despisest thou the riches of his goodness, and forbearance, and long suffering ; not knowing that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance ? But, after thy hardness and impenitent heart, treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God ; who will render to every man according to his deeds ; to them who by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory, and honor, and immortality, eternal life. But unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, *tribulation* and *anguish*, upon every soul of man that doeth evil ; of the Jew first and also of the Gentile : But glory, honor, and peace, to every man that worketh good ; to the Jew first and also to the Gentile. For there is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law ; and as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law” \* \* \* “ *in the day* when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ,” &c. Rom. 2 : 3—16 ; 14 : 10.

“ And I saw the dead small and great, stand before God ; and the books were opened ; and another book was opened, which is the book of life : and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works ; and the sea gave up the dead which were in it, and death and hell (*hades*) delivered up the dead which were in them : and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and *hades* were cast into the lake of fire.

This is the *second death*. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." Rev. 20 : 12-15. "Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the *first* resurrection : on such the *second death* hath no power : " Rev. 20 : 6. "He that overcometh shall not be hurt of the *second death*." Rev. 2 : 11 ; 14 : 9, 10 ; 20 : 5, 6. 2 Tim. 4 : 1. Eccles. 11 : 9 ; 12 : 14. Ps. 73 : 3, 4, 17-20. Acts 17 : 31. Matt. 12 : 36. 1 Peter 4 : 5. Heb. 10 : 27-29. "So then every one of us shall *give account* of himself to God : " Rom. 14 : 12.

Respectfully submitted, HENRY GREW.

## FRAGMENTS FROM THE BIBLE.—No. 2.

"Prove all things ; hold fast that which is good." Thess. 5 : 21. "It is appointed unto men *once* to die : " Heb. 9 : 27. "Drought and heat consume the snow waters ; so doth the grave (*sheol*) those which have sinned" \* \* \* "he shall be *no more* remembered : " Job 24 : 19, 20. "The wicked" \* \* \* "shall perish forever *like* his own dung : " Job 20 : 5-7. "The man that wandereth out of the way of understanding shall *remain* in the congregation of the dead." Prov. 21 : 16.

"I say unto you *my friends*, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that *they* can do : " \* \* \* "fear Him which *after* He hath killed hath power to cast into hell"—*gehenna* : Luke 12 : 4, 5.

"They are *dead*, they shall *not live* ; they are deceased, they shall *not rise* : therefore hast thou visited and destroyed them, and made all their memory to perish." \* \* \* "*Thy* dead men shall live ; with my dead body shall *they* arise : " Isa. 26 : 14, 19.

"Of the *hope* of the resurrection of the dead I am called in question." \* \* \* "The Pharisees confess" the "resurrection : " Acts 23 : 6, 8. "We have found this man" (Paul) "a pestilent fellow" \* \* \* "a ring leader of the *sect* of the Nazarenes." "This I" (Paul) "confess, after the way which they call *heresy*, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing *all things* which are written in the law and in the prophets : 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 : " Acts 24 : 5, 14, 15. "I" (Paul) "have suffered the loss of all things," &c. "if by any means I might attain unto the *resurrection* of the dead : " Phil. 3 : 8, 11. "They that trust in their

wealth," \* \* \* "their inward thought is, their houses shall continue for ever;" \* \* \* "nevertheless man being in honor abideth not: *he is like* the beasts that perish" \* \* \* "*like sheep* they are laid in the grave; death shall feed on *them*" \* \* \* "the grave" (*sheol*) "being a *habitation* to every one of them"—(marginal reading). "But God will redeem *my soul* from the power of the grave" (*sheol*). "Be not afraid when one is made rich" \* \* \* "for when he dieth" \* \* \* "he shall go to the generation of his fathers, *they shall never see light*. Man that is in honor and understandeth not is *like* the beasts that perish:" Psa. 49. "These as natural brute beasts" \* \* \* "shall utterly perish in their *own corruption*:" 2 Pet. 2: 12.

"The wicked shall be *turned* into hell" (*sheol*) "and all the nations that forget God:" Psa. 9: 17. "Thus saith the Lord, your Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel; For *your sake* I have sent to Babylon, and have brought down all their nobles, and the Chaldeans;" \* \* \* "they shall lie down together; *they shall not rise*: they are *extinct*; they are quenched as *tow*:" Isa. 43: 14, 17. "Babylon shall become heaps" \* \* \* "without an inhabitant;" \* \* \* "I will make them drunken, that they may rejoice, and sleep a *perpetual sleep* and *not awake*, saith the Lord:" Jer. 51: 37, 39. "They that swear by the sin of Samaria" \* \* \* "shall fall, and *never rise up again*:" Amos 8: 14. "For as many as have sinned *without law* shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned *in the law* shall be judged *by the law*" \* \* \* "in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ:" Rom. 2: 12, 16. "Now is the judgment of this world;" John 12: 31. "When ye see Jerusalem compassed about with armies," \* \* \* "*these be the days of vengeance*, that all things which are written may be *fulfilled*" \* \* \* "for there shall be great distress in the land and *wrath* upon this people," (the Jews who "have sinned *in the law*"); Luke 21: 20, 22, 23. "For the *wrath* is come upon them" (the Jews) "to the *uttermost*:" 1 Thes. 2: 14, 16. "He that believeth not the Son *shall not see life*; but the *wrath* of God *abideth on him*:" John 3: 36. "This is the will of Him that sent Me, that every one that seeth the Son, and believeth on Him, may have everlasting *life*: and *I will raise him up at the last day*:" \* \* \* "Verily, 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.*" Jh. 6 : 40, 53. "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 ; [and hundreds of other texts of the same import.]

Respectfully presented.

---

### THE AWAKING IN DANIEL 12 : 2.

A. M. OSBON, D. D., of the M. E. Church, published some six years ago a work entitled "Daniel Verified in History and Chronology." The "Introduction" of the book is by Dr. WHELDON, the Editor of the Methodist Quarterly Review. We think Dr. Osbon errs in applying Dan. 12 : 2 to a "*political resurrection* of the Jews," but his reason for not finding a universal awaking in the passage appears to us conclusive. His remarks on this point are as follows : R. W.

"Let us recur for a moment to the structure of the passage. This can be best shown by paraphrasing the verse. '*Many* of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some [the many who awake shall awake] to everlasting life, and some [those who do not awake shall sleep in] shame and everlasting contempt. Only the '*many*' who shall be found '*written in the book*' shall awake.'" \* \* \* "It will not help the case at all to quote Romans 5 : 19, for the passage is not a parallel. The '*many*' of the apostle is a very different thing from the '*many*' of the prophet. The former uses the word to denote all the persons of whom he is speaking '*many* were made sinners ;' the latter to designate a portion of a larger number, '*many* of them that sleep in the dust.' It is perfectly apparent, then, that the particle of severalty fixes the antithesis between the states of those who *awake*, and those who *do not awake*, and not between the *states* of those who awake."

---

### ALBERT BARNES ON ROMANS 8 : 11.

BY RUFUS WENDELL.

THE only reason for repudiating the literal sense of "shall quicken" in Rom. 8 : 11, that we have met with outside of "Retribution," is that assigned by ALBERT BARNES, in a single

sentence in his notes on the passage: Mr. B. remarks: "That this does not refer to the resurrection of the dead seems to be apparent, because that is not attributed to the Holy Spirit." There seems to be no force whatever in this objection, except upon the assumption—a false one, we think—that no doctrine can be true if based entirely upon one plain Scripture statement. But waiving this, we meet Mr. B.'s assertion, that the resurrection "is not attributed to the Holy Spirit," with the declaration, in 1 Peter 3 : 18, that Christ was "quickened by the Spirit." And how can Mr. B. weaken the force of this passage as a reply to his assertion upon Rom. 8 : 11? He does it by affirming that Christ's quickening was accomplished by the agency of "his own divine nature," as the "second person of the Trinity," and this he regards as the import of "Spirit" in the text. His reason for not finding "the Holy Spirit" in 1 Pet. 3 : 18, is that he thinks "it may be doubted whether the work of raising the dead is anywhere ascribed to that Spirit." By thus reasoning in a circle, this able expositor excludes "the resurrection of the dead" from Rom. 8 : 11 *because* it brings clearly to view the quickening agency of the Holy Spirit; he is convinced that 1 Pet. 3 : 18 does not speak of the Holy Spirit *because* it affirms the literal quickening of our Lord; and, finally, he makes the supposed silence of *each* text concerning the agency of the Holy Spirit in raising the dead a *reason* for refusing to find that doctrine revealed in the *other*! Convince us that such logic is sound, and we will undertake to prove that Mr. Barnes is a most estimable man *because* he is a resident of Philadelphia, and then demonstrate that he lives in Philadelphia *because* he is a most estimable man!

We would remark, also, that the failure of Mr. Barnes to recognize the resurrection of the dead in Rom. 8 : 11 seems clearly to involve him in inconsistency. Let us see. He defines the word rendered "quickened" in 1 Pet. 3 : 18 as meaning "made alive," and says: "This does not mean *kept alive*, but *made alive*; recalled to life; reanimated. The word is never used in the sense of *maintained alive*, or *preserved alive*." Bearing in mind these emphatic assertions, we will now see how Mr. B. explains Rom. 8 : 11, observing at the same time that "quickened" in the text in Peter and "shall quicken" in this passage, are translations of the some Greek word. Of the

words, "shall also quicken your mortal bodies," "the sense is," according to Mr. B.'s exposition, "that under the Gospel, by the influence of the Spirit, the entire man will be made alive in the service of God. Even the corrupt, carnal, and mortal body, so long under the dominion of sin, shall be made alive and recovered to the service of God. This will be done by the Spirit that dwells in us, because that Spirit has restored life to our souls, abides with us with his purifying influence, and because the design and tendency of his indwelling is to purify the entire man, and restore all to God."

Now we ask, has not Mr. Barnes here lost sight entirely of the distinction he contends for when he affirms that "the word" rendered "shall quicken" "is *never* used in the sense of *maintained* alive?" Manifestly he has done this very thing, for the *quicken*ing work of the Spirit, which the *definition* refuses to regard as *keeping* the believer alive, is described as his *abiding* "with us with his purifying influence," and as "his *indwelling*." The exposition has evidently in view a work of divine grace in the Christian by which he is to be "kept," "maintained," "preserved," in his heaven-born relationship, throughout the period of his probation; but inasmuch as the exposition assures us that "quicken" *never* means "kept alive," "*maintained* alive, or *preserved* alive," we deem it quite safe to reject his interpretation of Rom. 8 : 11, and to believe—as we do without a single doubt—that the passage does "refer to the resurrection of the dead." A further consideration demanding the rejection of Mr. B.'s exposition, is the fact that it permits no distinction between the quickening referred to in the passage and the *condition* upon which that quickening rests as a matter of promise. This point, however, will present itself hereafter for our consideration.

In conclusion, we would remind the reader of John 6 : 63, which declares, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth." Mr. Barnes thinks the Holy Spirit is not here meant, but if he errs in this opinion, as we incline to believe he does, the passage affords as clear a proof as we could desire that the Holy Spirit as an agency is concerned in raising the dead. Prof. HUDSON takes this latter view of the text and likewise finds a literal quickening in Rom. 8 : 11. See "Christ our Life," pp. 74, 50.

In the EXAMINER for May, we shall probably attend to the

reasoning by which the author of "Retribution" disposes of the argument which Rom. 8 : 11 is made to yield in favor of the non-revival of the wicked dead.

---

### THE LORD'S SUPPER.

BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

IN 1 Cor. 11th chapter, Paul says, "I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus the night in which He was betrayed took bread : and when He had given thanks, He brake it, and said, Take, eat : this is my body, which is broken for you : this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also He took the cup, when He had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood : this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till He come."

John Wesley says the Lord's supper was "instituted in the room of the passover." We believe it. The death of Christ was *foretokened* by the Jewish passover, in the death of the paschal lamb. But when the real lamb, the "Lamb of God" was slain, the Jewish passover was done away, and the Lord's Supper *commemorates* as *past*, what before was typified as *future*. The bread and wine used by Jesus represented the body and blood of *our* Lamb. "For even Christ *our* passover is sacrificed for us : therefore let us *keep the feast*." 1 Cor. 5. We esteem it a precious privilege to join with the disciples of Christ in the celebration of this memorial.

As the subject has been perhaps sufficiently examined in this volume, (see January, February, and June numbers for 1861,) we merely call the attention of those interested to the near approach of the period for keeping the feast. We are without information as to the day of the year in which Christ was crucified. It has been a topic of considerable inquiry but without a definite result. But if we harmonize with the Mosaic record, we shall approximate as near exactness as is necessary.

From Ex. 12 : 2, 6 and Num. 9 : 2-5, we learn that the passover was killed on the fourteenth day of the first month ; called Abib by Moses (Ex. 13 : 4,) and Nisan since the captivity. (Esther 3 : 7.) As the Jewish months were lunar, the *fifteenth* or middle day was that in which the moon full. Hence, the *fourteenth* day *precedes* the day of the full moon.

The fifteenth day of Nisan included the first full moon after the vernal equinox, which occurs a few days past the middle of March; this year, the 20th of March. The moon fulls this year April 14th; this brings the feast on *Sunday, the 13th*.

With regard to the *hour*, we suppose any hour after sundown and before morning is proper. See Ex. 12 : 8, 10, Matt. 26 : 20. About 8 P. M. would be suitable to our habits and customs.

As to the *manner* of celebration, the word "*supper*" gives us a clue. The disciples should meet at some convenient place, and partake in a sociable way of a plain repast. At the conclusion, a portion of bread and wine should be passed round in token of the body broken and blood shed for us, and of our faith in the atonement. Singing and prayer would fitly conclude the meeting. And may the great Head of the Church preside!

---

#### EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

ELD. A. WOOD, Wiscasset, Me., who has been a great sufferer for years, writes : " I highly prize the EXAMINER. Would that your subscription list could increase a hundred fold. But the Lord reigns and the truth *will* triumph.

" My health is *very* poor. I almost die daily. However, I try to trust in Him in whom *alone* we have eternal life. How sweet will be that *life* of purity, holiness and glory. May the Lord bless and keep you."

ELD. R. V. LYON writes from Canada West—" I have long thought of writing a note for the " EXAMINER " for the encouragement of its readers as well as yourself. Since my last, I have been laboring constantly to win a bride for my Master, by presenting the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus. Truth has taken effect in the hearts of many.

The non-living of the wicked, puts a finishing stroke upon the great work of redemption. The doctrine is being received by the majority of the brethren where I have labored. Others look upon it favorably, with a few exceptions. I have scattered some \$30 worth of your *valuable* book : LIFE FROM THE DEAD : OR, THE RIGHTEOUS ONLY WILL LIVE AGAIN." I have sent you one hundred of my Tract, which I have just published upon John 5 : 28, 29.

I have had the honor of baptising fifty-three mortal souls into the Christ, for the remission of sins, since my last. Glory be to God, that there is power in the truth, when it is *dis-rob*ed of all the mysticism that a false theology has thrown around it!

I am glad you have resumed the publication of the EXAMINER. I intend to do something in securing subscribers for it.

"AN EXPOSITION OF JOHN 5 : 28, 29. By Eld. R. V. Lyon,"  
Published by Thos. G. Newman, Seneca Falls, N. Y. Price 3 cts.

This is a pamphlet of some dozen pages. The author regards the text as spoken of a *national* and *political* resurrection of Israel. His view is well stated, and far more likely to be *the truth* than that which makes it a *reliving* of all the wicked dead from Adam to the last sinner that shall die. Such procedure as a reliving of all the wicked dead supposes, is, to our understanding, a violation of all the principles of justice, by inflicting a punishment of which a vast majority of the wicked never heard, and which has no foundation in any revealed law of God ; certainly not for four thousand years after the creation of Adam. To our mind the idea of raising all those wicked dead to *life*, to "slaughter" them again, is an impeachment of the oath of God, in which He has sworn by Himself, saying, "As I *live*, saith the LORD God, I have NO PLEASURE *in the death* of the wicked." We say, "Let God be true" though it should make "every man a liar." To our mind, the wicked dead can no more be made *alive* again than God can cease to "*live*;" or than He can cease to be God. There never were but *two heads of life*—the *animal* Adam and the *spiritual* Adam. The first gives only *animal* life, and when it is extinguished in a wicked man there is nothing to revive him into life. The second head of life is so by virtue of His *spiritual* life, which He imparts to all His children, and by it they are to be born from the dead : all others "utterly perish in their own corruption," and live no more. A fearful doom ! but a doom that awaits all the ungodly who reject Christ the living head of the new creation ; or who, not having heard of Christ, are "unjust in the least" light they have enjoyed ; such would be "unjust in much," and hence justly perish. "Shall not the Judge of all the earth *do right*?" He will : and therefore having never revealed, or threatened a future *life* to the ungodly, will never give or inflict it.

Our pamphlet "*LIFE FROM THE DEAD : or, The Righteous only will live again,*" though made an object of attack, we regard as unharmed in its main positions ; and no assault on it needs any defence from us. If the "iron-clad *Merrimac*" assails it, it will prove a "*MONITOR*" fully able to meet its antagonist.— See notice of it on last page of the cover of this Magazine.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

---

"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, HATH NOT LIFE."

---

Vol. 14. No. 11.]

MAY, 1862.

[Whole No. 213.]

---

## THE ATONEMENT.

BY JOSEPH T. CURRY, SPRINGFIELD, MASS.

ALTHOUGH evangelical Christians are not agreed concerning the details, they concur in appreciating the priceless value and vast importance of the Atonement made by our Lord JESUS CHRIST. All acknowledge their dependence on its gracious provisions for salvation. Life and Immortality hang on this one doctrine. Are the various tenets of Christianity compared to the foundation of a building? *This* is the corner stone. Are they likened to a solemn chant, whose melody makes all hearts glad? *This* is the key-note. Is the Gospel a crown of "loving-kindness and tender mercies"? Its doctrines are the encircling brilliants, and the Atonement is the center-gem.

The believers in the Christian religion have always claimed for it the merit of simplicity. They have pointed with exultation to this superior feature of the Gospel system. The Saviour's sublime announcement, "The poor have the Gospel preached to them," was significant of its adaptation to the ignorant as well as the wise, the illiterate alike with the educated. The light of this fact, however, appears to be somewhat obscured by the mystery that attends the doctrine of the Atonement.—No other Bible theme comes to us with such an indefinite aspect. Theologians have made it a prominent topic of controversy, in the course of which, differences of the most uncompromising character have evolved themselves, giving rise to conflicting theories, and making permanent divisions of the great Protestant whole. While theologians have disputed, laymen, both learned and ignorant, have been utterly confound-

ed, so much so as to dismiss the subject from their minds. The conclusion arrived at by thousands is expressed in the language of the late Sir JAMES STEPHEN :

"No human intelligence can conceive the true sense of that revelation which exhibits to us Him who is love, as becoming, in the person of His Son, a sacrifice for us. Alas, for the foolishness which has agitated the world in the attempt to embrace or to analyze so profound a mystery. \* \* A darkness which no inquiry tends to dissipate, and which no conjecture contributes in any measure to dispel, broods over all questions respecting the nature and the reasons of that obstacle, and respecting the meaning of that hypostatic union of the Logos with our humanity, and respecting the nature of Him by whom and in whom that union is effected, and respecting the sense in which His sufferings have made a propitiation for our sins."—*Epilogue to "Essays in Eccles. Biog."*

We are prompted by this candid confession to ask, Is it possible that God has spoken in vain? Is His "revelation" to man, after all, *no* revelation, but "a mystery so profound that no human intelligence can conceive its true sense"? Is the "attempt to embrace or to analyze" it indeed "foolishness"? Is all this true? Nay, verily! This "darkness which no inquiry tends to dissipate and which no conjecture contributes in any measure to dispel;" which "broods over all questions," is a *theological* darkness. It has no relationship with God's precious word. That offspring of speculative paganism, the dogma of natural immortality—in popular parlance, "the immortality of the soul"—which is so tenaciously held by the modern teachers of nearly every sect, is the fundamental cause of the thick darkness that envelopes the church. It forces its advocates to reject the literal interpretation of the Holy Scriptures. "The soul that sinneth it shall die," says the word.—"The soul cannot die," answers Plato. And theology, to be in harmony with the pagan philosopher, coins a new meaning for the word "death." Death means *torment*! This necessitates another definition for the correlative term. *Life*, says theology, means *happiness*, or "a holy and blissful state of mind."

Thus the plain declarations of Scripture are torn and mangled, and the words of inspiration forced into a hateful and repugnant union with the vain imaginations of heathen teachers. Does such a condition of affairs allow us to wonder that the central doctrine of the Gospel, which underlies all the rest, is an unsolved problem to the church? Is it strange that she



has yet to discover that the Bible *fully explains* the Atonement, so that a child may understand? Well may ISAAC TAYLOR say,

"Those who, through a course of years, have been used to read the Scriptures unshackled by systems, and bound to no conventional modes of belief, such readers must have felt an impatience in waiting—not for the arrival of a new revelation from Heaven, but of an ample and unfettered interpretation of that which has so long been in our hands."—*Wesley and Methodism*, p. 289.

The Lord once sent the plague of darkness on the land of Egypt, "but all the children of Israel had light in their dwellings." So in our day, while "darkness broods" over the realm of theology, as a punishment for the neglect of God's word, (Isa. 29 : 11-14,) there is *light*, glorious light, divine light, shining on them who "*search* the Scriptures," and call no man "Rabbi." To all such the Atonement by Christ "looketh forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun."

We shall not essay the profi less task of describing the different theories held by the various theological schools, in relation to the Atonement. Our object is simply to set forth what we conceive to be the true doctrine in the light of Scripture. If, in the progress of our remarks, we notice any adverse arguments, it will be for the purpose of removing obstructions to the proper understanding of the subject. We trust, also, that the strength of the truth will be made apparent by their contrasted weakness.

Rom. 5 : 11 shall be our point of departure, as we are persuaded it contains the clue to the whole investigation. "And not only so, but we also joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the *atonement*." The word *katallagee*, here rendered atonement, comes from the verb *katallasso*, which signifies to *reconcile*. In accordance with this definition, the marginal reading is *reconciliation*. The original word, whether as verb or noun, is thus translated in every other instance in the New Testament. We quote such as bear on our subject. "For if when we were enemies, *we were reconciled* to God by the death of His Son, much more *being reconciled*, we shall be saved by His life." Rom. 5 : 10. "And all things are of God, who *hath reconciled* us to Himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of *reconciliation*; to wit, that God was in Christ, *reconciling* the world unto Himself, not imputing

their trespasses unto them ; and hath committed unto us the word of *reconciliation*. Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us : we pray you in Christ's stead, *be ye reconciled to God.*" 2 Cor. 5 : 18-20. An intensive form of the word is found in Eph. 2 : 16, Col. 1 : 20, 21. We believe the entire redemptive work of Christ is expressed in the word "RECONCILIATION."

Reconciliation is thus defined by Robinson : "*Katallagee*, a change from enmity to friendship." This leads us to consider

THE ENMITY. It is represented in Rom. 7 : 14, 22, 23. "The law is spiritual : but I am carnal, sold under sin. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man : but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind." Here are the parties to the enmity ; the *law of God* on one side, the *natural man* on the other. There is an irreconcilable antagonism between them. A correct idea of the nature of each is needed to comprehend this fact. First, the law ; secondly, the natural man.

1. GOD GOVERNS BY SETTLED AND UNCHANGING LAW. As Tennyson has it,

"The hollow orb of moving circumstance  
Rolls round by one fixed law."

Man is overshadowed by this eternal truth. The law that governs him has two phases, a natural and a moral. The natural law regards man in common with the animal genera ; but the moral law, being designed for intelligent beings, concerns man alone. The Apostle calls it "the law of God." He says it is *holy, and just, and good.*" Rom. 7 : 12. It "is a copy of the eternal mind, a transcript of the Divine nature : yea, it is the fairest offspring of the everlasting Father, the brightest efflux of His essential wisdom, the visible beauty of the Most High ; the original ideas of truth and good, which were lodged in the uncreated mind from eternity, drawn forth and clothed with such a vehicle, as to appear even to human understanding."—*John Wesley*.

Its commands to its subjects are characterized by the most profound wisdom, while its provisions for the protection of the obedient, and its penalty on the disobedient, are as immutable as the throne of God, and as irresistible as His Omnipotence.

Its requirements are comprehended in the words of Jesus, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and thy neighbor as thyself." "This do, and thou shalt *live*." It is called by Paul, "the commandment of *life*," Rom. 7 : 10. *Murdock's Syriac Test.* That is, it secures life to all them that fulfill its requisitions. Its penalty on the transgressor is *death*. Says the Apostle, "The commandment of life was found by me unto *death*." And this penalty of death is as *irreversible* in the case of offenders, as is the provision of life in the case of the obedient. If the law can withdraw its protection from the obedient, then it can relax its penal hold of the disobedient, both of which suppositions are contrary to its perfection. *The law has no mercy.*

Here it will be proper to treat more fully on the nature of the penalty. We are satisfied it is *literal death*, according to the apostolic testimony already given. It agrees with the sentence pronounced on the first sinner, and beautifully harmonizes all the Scripture declarations on the subject. The view may be further enforced by a collateral argument. It will be generally admitted that Christ suffered the penalty of the law. Some, however, deny it. But we have positive Scripture evidence of the fact. "JEHOVAH hath made to light upon Him the iniquity of us all. It was exacted, and He was made answerable. \*\* For the transgression of my people He was smitten to death. \* \* By the knowledge of Him shall my servant justify many ; for the punishment of their iniquities He shall bear. \* \* He poured out His soul unto death ; and was numbered with the transgressors : and He bare the sin of many." Isa. 53. *Lowth's Trans.* "Who His ownself bare our sins in His own body on the tree." 1 Pet. 2 : 24. "Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." Heb. 9 : 28, We might increase the testimony, but it is needless.

It being thus certain that the penal curse came on Christ, we have a safe rule by which to try every penal theory. Nothing can be claimed as the penalty unless it can be proved that Christ endured it. The dogma of "eternal torment" falls at once before this test, for it was not suffered by our Saviour. Some say the penalty is "a second death, after being raised from the first." But no such punishment came on Jesus. "He died unto sin *once*." Rom. 6 : 10. "As it is appointed unto

men *once* to die, \* \* so Christ was *once* offered to bear the sins of many." Heb. 9 : 27, 28. This settles the question of the penalty of sin forever. It is *not* torment, although the execution may be attended by pain. It is not *two* deaths, neither is it "a second death, after being raised from the first." "The wages of sin is DEATH." Rom. 6 : 23.

2. THE NATURAL MAN. Paul personates him. "We know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin. \* \* For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing." Rom. 7. "The carnal mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God." Rom. 8. "There is none that doeth good, no, not one. \* \* What things the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God. Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in His sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin." Rom. 3.

From these plain assertions of the Apostle, we draw our conclusions of the *enmity*. There is a diametrical opposition between the law of God and the nature of man. The law is *spiritual*, and its requirements can be met by a spiritual nature only; but man is *animal*, and can perform the deeds of the animal nature only. "They that are in the flesh *cannot* please God," or, what is the same thing—cannot obey the law of God. The law demands perfect obedience; but the natural man "is *not subject* to the law of God, neither indeed can be." And no reconciliation can be made between the law and the nature. The enmity is indestructible so long as the parties continue to exist together, and as the law is eternal, unchangeable, irresistible, the result is easily predicted. The animal nature is held in the *penal* grasp of the law, and the consequence—certain as the life of God—is death. The "irrepressible conflict" must go on until the last vestige of that nature is swept into oblivion. What an utterly hopeless case, then, is that of the natural man! His nature, his life, his existence is forfeited to the merciless law. Well then may he cry, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from this body of death?" Rom. 7 : 24.

Having surveyed the enmity, let us now turn to

THE RECONCILIATION. How can it be effected? How can man be brought into harmony with the law, and thus prolong his existence? How can he escape destruction? How can he be delivered from the animal nature, the body of death? One thing is needed. One thing can deliver him. One thing will endow him with a life that shall never end. What is it? A *spiritual* nature. This will change "the enmity" into "*friendship*." It will enable man to keep the perfect, the spiritual law. And life, eternal life is his. Whoever brings this nature is the atoner, the reconciler, the Saviour. Who will do the work? Who answers the cry of agony? Who but "THE LORD, the LORD God, merciful and gracious, long suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth"? All things are of God, who hath *reconciled* us to Himself by Jesus Christ." JESUS is the medium whereby the spiritual nature is transmitted. "The first Adam was made a living soul;" as John Wesley says, "God gave him such life as other animals enjoy." He was the primal representative of the *animal* race, who were tried and condemned in his person. "By one man's disobedience many (all in Adam) were made sinners." Rom 5. He showed the proclivities of *all*, and upon *all* the irreversible sentence has gone forth, "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." But "the last Adam," JESUS CHRIST, brings in the *spiritual* nature. He is the primal representative of the spiritual race, (to which all who are united to Him by faith will belong,) who were tried and *justified* in His person. "By the obedience of one shall many"—all in Christ—"be made righteous." Christ manifested the proclivities of *all* in Him, and upon *all* the free gift comes, which "is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord."

Here is the only way of escape from the destroying curse of the law. A union with Jesus Christ, the spiritual man. "God so loved the world, that He gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him *should not perish*"—with the animal nature—"but have everlasting life": by getting hold of the spiritual nature. And here we observe, the atonement or reconciliation is not *universal* in the sense of actual salvation, inasmuch as no one can be saved except *by faith*, which is followed by the baptism of the Spirit. But the atonement or re-

conciliation is *offered* to all ; there is no necessity that a single individual of Adam's race should perish. The illustration used in John 3 : 14, represents the case exactly. "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up." In Num. 21 : 8, 9, we have the history. "And the Lord said unto Moses, Make thee a fiery serpent, and set it upon a pole : and it shall come to pass, that every one that is bitten, *when he looketh upon it*, shall live." But suppose some would *not look*, would they be saved? Certainly not. The brazen serpent, in that case, would be of no effect. So it is with the atonement of Jesus Christ. Its benefits are purely conditional. "So must the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever *believeth* in Him should not perish, but have eternal life." The texts that are supposed to teach an unconditional atonement, may all be harmonized with this view. Col. 1 : 20. "And having made peace through the blood of His cross, by Him to reconcile *all things* unto Himself." This is explained by 2 Cor. 5 : 19. "God was in Christ, reconciling *the world* unto Himself." How? By "not imputing their trespasses unto them." That is, "the sins of the whole world" are imputed to the *animal nature*. Whoever possesses that nature is convicted of *sin*, "for sin is the transgression of the *law*," and the law condemns that nature as *sinful*. But God, to reconcile the world unto Himself, introduces a *new* nature, a spiritual nature, which, if a person accepts, God regards him as *spiritual*, and no longer imputes his trespasses to *him*, but to his *animal* nature. Thus, "the whole world," *may*, by accepting the terms, be reconciled to God, and therefore the Apostle continues, "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us : we pray you in Christ's stead, *be ye reconciled* to God."

1 John 2 : 2 is supposed, by many, to prove an unconditional atonement. "And He is the propitiation for our sins : and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." This is qualified by Paul in Rom. 3 : 25. "Whom God hath set forth a propitiation *through faith*." Although the benefits of the propitiation are offered to the whole world, yet it is on the *express condition* of faith.

The word "*propitiation*," *hilasteerion, hilasmos*, Rom. 3 : 25, 1 John 2 : 2 ; 4 : 10, answers to the Hebrew *kapper, atonement*.

It carries with it the idea of an expiatory sacrifice. Although not so important a word in the elucidation of the Atonement doctrine as "*reconciliation*," yet it legitimately belongs to our subject. In distinguishing "*reconciliation*" from "*propitiation*," we remark that the former word covers the whole subject, while the latter expresses but an *incidental* work. By this, we do not mean an accidental, but a *subordinate* work. For instance, a man contracts with another, to put a new house on a lot now occupied by an old one. Now, if we say, "the man is going to put a new house where the old one stands," we tell the whole story, and the *removal* of the *old* house is implied. But if we say, "the man will remove the old house," we only speak of an *incident* in the main work. To apply the illustration, Jesus comes to reconcile. But while prosecuting the work of "*reconciliation*," he makes a "*propitiation*." He comes to bring a new nature, but incidentally, he destroys the old one. There was a two-fold necessity for the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ.

1. In order to save the animal race it was necessary that the Saviour should be connected with them. To raise them up, the reconciler must descend to their level. He must "stoop to conquer." And what an inconceivable stoop was that! From the throne of the universe to the womb of Mary! "Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men." Phil. 2: 6, 7. "For He (God) hath made Him (Christ) to be sin (by His connection with the animal nature) for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him:" by a union with His spiritual nature. 2 Cor. 5: 21. His assumption of our nature brought Him under the condemnation of the law. "He was numbered with the transgressors." Isa. 53: Hence, His question, "Why callest thou me good?" This shows the utter powerlessness of the animal nature, of itself, to overcome sin: to sin is its natural tendency. "God sent His Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, that He might, in His flesh, condemn sin." Rom. 8: 3. *Murdock's Syr. Trans.* "For in that He died, He died unto" (by or for) sin once." Rom. 6.

From the foregoing we conclude that the first necessity for Christ's death lay in the fact that He possessed the nature

whose inevitable tendency, of itself, or without divine, supernatural, or spiritual aid, is *to sin*, or to resist the restraints of God's law, and to pursue a course which is the sure precursor of death in every case. Viewed in this light, His death was a propitiation, inasmuch as it clearly demonstrated that the animal nature in itself, and without a superadded spiritual nature, was incurably sinful in its tendency, and gave man an opportunity to plead for mercy on the ground that he would keep the perfect law when provided with a nature in harmony with it, and in the meantime would use all helps within his reach to keep under the animal nature until he should be safely delivered from it. In short, it affords an escape from destruction for all those, who, like Paul, can *sincerely* and *truthfully* say, "For that which I do I allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I." This, we are persuaded, is the meaning of John in his first epistle, 2d chap. "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father," (the law dispenser,) "Jesus Christ, the righteous;" (the representative of the spiritual race in the future, just as Adam represented the animal race, then in the future; as Adam, the sinner, brought condemnation and death on all his posterity, by showing their proclivities, so Jesus Christ, the righteous, stands as the advocate and high priest, and makes intercession for all His people, covering them with the mantle of justification by pleading their perfect obedience when they get the perfect nature at the resurrection :) "and He is the *propitiation* for our sins: and not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world." Every one in the whole world that earnestly strives to do His will; if under the Gospel, by a living faith, if not under the Gospel, according to the light given.

2. But the principal sense in which Christ's death was a propitiation, is conveyed in Paul's words, Rom. 3: 25. We offer the following as a correct representation of the original.— "Whom God hath set forth a propitiation, by His own blood, through faith, to declare His righteousness in overlooking the sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; and to declare His righteousness at the present time: that He might be just, and the justifier of *him* which believeth in Jesus." In Lev. 17: 11, we read, "The life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement



(or propitiation) for your souls :” (yourselves). The law claims the *life* of the fleshly nature, and this life “is in the blood.” Man shares this life with other animals. Hence the shedding of their blood from Abel to Christ was an acknowledgment, on the part of the sacrificers, of the law’s claim. And they were justified by these sacrifices. Every one was a propitiation, not as having any virtue in itself, but as typical of the *true* propitiation in the person of Jesus Christ. The real claim of the law cannot be met by any animal man, without a surrender of his own existence. But Jesus, having a *twofold* life, a blood life and a spirit life, could lay down the former and thus *pay the debt*, and yet *survive*. “Being put to death *in the flesh*, but quickened by *the Spirit*.” 1 Peter 3 : 18. It was necessary that God should set forth Jesus as a propitiation, in order to show mankind how the law can be magnified in the death of the sinful nature, represented in the blood of Christ, and the sinner yet escape destruction by virtue of the perfect nature, represented in the Spirit of Christ. “The blood of bulls and of goats” could not satisfy the law. “Wherefore when He cometh into the world, He saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldst not, but a body hast thou prepared me :” (to make a *real* propitiation by giving the law its due ; ) “Then said He, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first,” (the Mosaic system of sacrifices,) “that He may establish the second.” (The real propitiation made by the sacrifice of the animal man.) “By the which will we” (all in Christ) “are sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus once. And every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins : but this man, after He had offered *one* sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God.” Heb. 10. Let no one take this in a vicarious sense ; that is, that Christ made this sacrifice *in our stead*. He offered up *the animal nature* as “*one sacrifice*,” not in our stead, but as our *representative*. As the head of the spiritual race, He made the same propitiation to the law that we all make. (All in Christ.) As all in Adam died in his person, he being their representative, so all in Christ made a propitiation in His person, as their representative. As all in Adam die *individually*, as well as federally, so all in Christ make a propitiation individually as well as federally. Every Christian pro-

pitiates the law when he gives up the animal life. Hence, says Paul, 2 Cor. 5, "The love of Christ constraineth us; (Christians;) because we thus judge, that if *one* died for *all*," (as representing all,) "then are" (*not* were) "all dead:" (all have the death nature and will have to surrender it:) "and He died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves," (unto the flesh, the animal nature; because by His "one sacrifice" He renounced, in their behalf, all trust in, or sympathy for that nature,) "but unto Him which died" (in the flesh) "for them, and rose again. Wherefore" (as our head and representative has renounced the flesh) "henceforth know we no man after the flesh:" (we count the whole fleshly race "dead because of sin,") "yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we Him no more."— (As an animal man: we know Him now after the Spirit.)— "Therefore if any man be *in Christ*," (if he has been baptized by one Spirit into the one body of Christ,) "he is a *new creature*:" (he has a spiritual nature begotten in him; a living principle which "will raise him up at the last day:") "old things are passed away; behold all things are become new."

Much more might be said on this exhaustless theme. But we must bring our remarks to a close. It is worthy of observation, that the whole of the stupendous work of man's salvation may be justly credited, as it often is, in the Scriptures, to the *blood* of Christ. Because His blood-life was *lost* in our behalf. "He hath *purchased* the Church with His own blood."— "Ye are not *redeemed* with corruptible things, \* \* but with the *precious blood* of Christ." "Being *justified* by His blood." "The blood of Jesus Christ His Son *cleanseth* us from all sin." Believers are said to *eat* His flesh, and *drink* His blood.

If the Atonement is valued by those who are blind to all its real beauties, *how much more* should the believers of "Life only in Christ" regard it? Here the Law and the Gospel clasp hands. Here Sinai and Olivet exchange greetings. Here

"Vengeance and compassion join  
In their divinest forms:  
Here the whole Deity is known,  
Nor dares a creature guess  
Which of the glories brighter shone,  
The justice or the grace."

"Surely His salvation is nigh them that fear Him ; that glory may dwell in our land. Mercy and truth are met together ; righteousness and peace have kissed."

---

### THE SECOND DEATH.

THE phrase second death conveys to the mind of most persons, especially those who have been so educated, the idea of dying twice. Now if we can find that the penalty for sin is to die twice, let us bow to the authority of Scripture, as every honest seeker after truth will : but if no such penalty is announced, shall we add to the Scriptures a penalty which is not threatened ?

It has been truthfully said that punishment cannot exceed the threatening without injustice to the guilty party. If the law of the country condemns a guilty man to the punishment of the prison for ten years or a fine of one hundred dollars, it certainly would be unjust to *double* the penalty of either fine or imprisonment. The man is sentenced to imprisonment for ten years—he serves out the time. Can it be consistent with the penalty of the law to imprison him again another ten years for the same offence ? Manifestly it would be unjust. Why ? Because the punishment exceeds the penalty of the law. Again—would it harmonize with justice to inflict any portion of the penalty before trial, conviction and sentence ? Certainly not. How then can it be seen to be consistent with justice (to say nothing of mercy) to send men to a place of torment for perhaps hundreds of years, and then bring them up from their hell of torment for a trial ? And would it be any more reasonable to suppose that God will bring the wicked dead to life again for trial ? They are now under the penalty which is death : to bring them to life again for trial, would seem to imply that possibly there had been a mistake. To my mind it seems more in harmony with reason as well as with revelation that men are having their trial in this life—every day we are making up our account—we are on trial, and at the close of life the account is fully made up—the man has had his trial all along through life and his final condition is determined at death. If in Christ, he

*sleeps*—if out of Christ, he is “ CONDEMNED ALREADY ;” and consequently has perished—he is dead ; and there is no threatening that he shall come to life again to die a second time. Why is it said of the righteous dead, that they sleep ? It is because they had a hope of awaking or coming to life again ; just as a man who lays down at night to sleep ; he hopes or expects to awake in the morning. In the former case it is certain to the Christian, because he has the sure word of promise. Whereas, in the latter, he has no promise that he shall awake from his natural sleep.

In the case of the wicked—there being no threatening of a second death, nor any of another temporary life, and not being in Christ—not having the Spirit which raised Christ from the dead—it is difficult to see how he can be raised to life again to die a second time without a repetition of the penalty.

How then are we to understand the scriptural phrase “ the second death ” ? Rev. 20 : 14 reads, “ and death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death.” The Syriac reads thus, “ This (namely) this lake of fire is the second death.” Here then is the idea of the second death—not dying *twice*, but the lake of fire is the second death. The old world was visited with a universal judgment, *viz*: the flood, which drowned all its inhabitants then living, except Noah and his family, eight persons in all, who were saved in the ark. This was the *first* general judgment upon the world and was by water. This was the first death. The second general executive judgment upon the world of the ungodly will be by fire—“ This (namely) the lake of fire is the *second* death.” All who are in Christ at that time, and all who sleep in Jesus in the dust of the earth will be saved by being in Christ, the antitype of the ark which saved Noah and his family. This same idea of the first and the second death is conveyed in 2 Pet. 3 : 5-7, “ By the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, PERISHED : But the heavens and the earth, which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and PERDITION of ungodly men.”

The word perished must of course apply to the inhabitants of the world that then was—for the world itself did not perish

—and seems to convey the same meaning as the word perdition, as applied to the ungodly of this world. See Webster [except his theological definition]. Perished, *decayed ; wasted away ; destroyed ;* Perdition, *Entire loss or ruin ; utter destruction.* o.

---

## ENOCH'S TRANSLATION.

BY RUFUS WENDELL.

REV. B. W. GORHAM, an estimable minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, is one of the editors of the *Guide to Holiness*, and in the February number he has published a discourse on ENOCH, from which we extract two paragraphs :

“The translation of Enoch is a proof of the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. He did not die—he did not *seem* to cease to exist—but he went away ; he simply changed the place of his abode. No man who witnessed his ascension, or who believes the record of it, can possibly doubt the continuance of his existence ; and he who believes that one human being exists after he has ceased to be an inhabitant of time, assumes the doctrine of immortality.” \* \* \* “The event is in proof, also, that the *body* of man, as well as the soul, shall inherit immortality. God has been pleased that from each of the grand divisions of the human family, the Antediluvian, the Mosaic, and the Christian, there should ascend to him one man, body and soul, the first fruits of that great harvest, when ‘all that sleep in the dust of the earth shall arise.’”

Shall we ever see an end to this looseness of reasoning on the momentous subject of human destiny ? The smallest amount of reflection should have shown Mr. Gorham that Enoch's translation furnishes an argument against “the doctrine” of which he considers it “a proof.” “The doctrine of the immortality of the soul,” as held by men of Mr. G.'s school, applies indiscriminately to the wicked and the good. Paul informs us that “BY FAITH Enoch was translated that he should not see death,” and that “before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God.” Now, suppose we admit that Mr. G.'s view of a *soul entity in man* is true, how, we ask, does the favor shown to Enoch, at the close of his long walk with God, carry with it the inference that the soul entity of a man who walks after his own

lusts, lives in unbelief, and never has the testimony that his ways please God—shall live forever? Who can fail to see that the premise is altogether too narrow for the conclusion? "The continuance of his existence" was, in the case of the Antediluvian patriarch, a *peculiar* testimony to the righteousness of his character, and nothing could well be a greater perversion of the occurrence than to make it the ground for an inference that a life beyond the present is made sure to the impenitent. Enoch "did not die," it is true; but *the wicked* "shall UTTEREY PERISH in their own CORRUPTION." Enoch, it is true, "did not seem to cease to exist;" but "evil doers shall be cut off; \* \* for yet a little while, and the wicked SHALL NOT BE: yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be." Thus we see that *sin* tends to *death*: "the soul that sinneth it shall die." No man "assumes the doctrine of immortality," as held by Mr. G., until he has been blinded with respect to a vast array of Bible testimony which proves that only the good will live eternally.

But we deny that Enoch's translation gives the least countenance to the immortal-soul-entity theory of Mr. Gorham. The patriarch "was translated *that he should not see death.*" The inference is that HE would have "seen death" if he had not been "translated." Now, if it be admitted that the *entire man*, "Enoch," was "translated," it will follow that, but for his translation, the *entire man* would have died. This, however, could not be if part of the man were *immortal*. Therefore, man in his *entire nature* is *mortal*, as the Bible declares him to be.

There is a blessed significance in Enoch's translation. It seems to be an illustration, in advance, of the apostle's assurance, "we shall not all sleep." The grand basis, however, of Christian faith and hope is *the death and resurrection of the Lord Jesus*. Enoch neither died nor had a resurrection; but "Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living." His Lordship of the dead will secure the revival of all who are *in him*; "for if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." As for the wicked dead, they have *not* "fallen asleep in Christ," and for that reason "are perished." *They* will not be "Christ's at his coming," and hence will *not*

"be made alive." *They* are dead *in their sins*, and since "the sting of death"—its power to hold its victim with an unbroken grasp—"is sin," they will have no part in the "victory" over "death" which God giveth to his people "through our Lord Jesus Christ." The quotation at the close of Mr. Gorham's paragraph will be in perfect harmony with these sentiments when corrected so as to agree with the Bible: "*many* of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall AWAKE." May those who read and we who write be of that happy number.

---

### ROMANS 8: 11 IN "RETRIBUTION."

A REVIEW BY RUFUS WENDELL.

"If the spirit of him that raised up Jesus Christ\* 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. Hence it is *inferred* that a wicked man cannot be raised from the dead, because the Spirit of God does not dwell in him.

"This inference, however, is not at all necessary. It may just as well be inferred that the wicked will be raised by some *other* means, as that they will *not* be raised at all. If it be asked *how* a wicked man can be raised without the Spirit of God, an infidel might also ask *how* a righteous man can be raised *with* it, or by its indwelling? The answer to both these questions would be, 'Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures nor the power of God.' God can make dead men live without Christ's Spirit, as easy as he can make them live *now* without it, or as easy as he can make corn grow without it, for aught I know. Indeed, if we must question Scripture statements and predictions of *facts*, we might as well question the resurrection of any one, or inquire, How does man *live* at all? and if we failed to comprehend the *process* we might then proceed to deny the fact.

"The only inference that *need* be drawn from the passage in question is, that, while it declares that Christians shall, through the quickening energy of the Holy Spirit, be raised to an immortal and glorious life, those who have *not* that spirit must be dependent on some other power for even a temporary existence; and when brought to life again it must be by a mere act of physical Omnipotence, and hence they cannot hope to receive that immortal existence which results from the indwelling of this Divine Spirit.

"It might also be asked by what means were the Shunamite's son,

\* In quoting this passage the author of "Retribution" has inserted "Christ" once too often.  
R. W.

and the sons of the widow's at Sarepta and at Nain raised up? How was the resurrection effected in the case of the man who revived at the touch of Elisha's bones, or in the case of the Ruler of the Synagogue's daughter? It can hardly be proved that in these cases the persons were all raised by the indwelling of the Divine Spirit. And these thus raised, were not so immortalized that they could not 'die any more,' though they were the 'children of the resurrection,' nor did they gain the deathless 'age to come,' for that is still in the future.

"The passage is sometimes quoted, 'He that is dead is freed from sin.' But *were these* persons freed from sin when dead? Did the temporary death cancel all previous responsibilities? By no means. Nor does the temporary death of the ungodly now free them from any sin, save that of Adam. But when finally dead, and dead forever, then they will have satisfied the claims of the law, and perished beneath its exactions, and so they will be freed from sin."—*Retribution*, pp. 80, 81.

The first thing demanding attention in the extract before us, is the fact that our author raises a false issue with his opponents. This is to be regretted mainly for the reason that his success in demolishing his own man of straw will be accepted by some readers as evidence that he has harmed an antagonist. He fails to state accurately the inference which is drawn from Rom. 8 : 11 by the advocates of Life only in Christ, and several of his sentences lose all their relevancy when his erroneous imputation is corrected. We do *not* assert that a wicked man, because the Spirit of God does not dwell in him, "*cannot* be raised from the dead." We hold no doctrine requiring such an impeachment of God's omnipotence. The question in dispute has reference, not to Jehovah's power, but to His revealed purpose. Our inquiry is not whether the wicked *can* be, but whether they *will be*, raised from the dead. We have, therefore, no occasion to ask "*how* a wicked man *can* be raised without the Spirit of God," or to deny that "God *can* make dead men live without Christ's Spirit, as easy as He can make them live *now* without it, or as easy as He can make corn grow without it." The Lord "*can*" leave His saints in Hades eternally, but He *will not* do it. He "*can*" likewise restore the wicked to life, but His ability to do this affords no proof that they will not forever "remain in the congregation of the dead." (Prov. 21 : 16.) What is possible with the Most High, as a matter of abstract power, is a question entirely out of place in this controversy. This phase of the subject is, however, presented by the author of "*Retribution*," and we must meet his reasoning as we find it. We admit God's



power to revive all the dead, but we believe the Bible teaches that the exertion of this power will be limited to those who shall "be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light." (Col. 1 : 12.)

The real question, therefore, to be considered is this,—Is a quickening from the dead predicated of believers, in Rom. 8 : 11, in such a manner as to authorize the inference that the wicked dead will not be made alive? We affirm that there is—our author, that there is not. With the true issue, as we have stated it, before us, the "infidel" inquiry supposed by our author should be met simply by an appeal to "the power of God," and by reference to the fact that "thus it is written." It remains to be seen whether or not an inquiry as to "*how* a wicked man can be raised without the Spirit of God," is to be disposed of in like manner. We refrain from remarking upon our author's generous insinuation that his opponents, because they fail "to comprehend the *process*" of the revival of the wicked dead, "must question Scripture statements and predictions of *facts*." If he can afford to stand committed to such a line of argument, we can certainly afford to leave him unmolested in the satisfaction it yields him, and "proceed to" ascertain whether he has rightly interpreted the "statements and predictions" of the Bible concerning human destiny.

Having called attention to our author's mistake in raising an imaginary issue, we are now happy to admit that he has not omitted to grapple with the real question in hand. Apparently ignoring the difference between "cannot" and "will not," he follows the remark, that the "inference" of his opponents from Rom. 8 : 11 "is not at all necessary," with this observation: "It may just as well be inferred that the wicked dead will be raised by some *other* means, as that they will *not* be raised at all." "*Just as well*," says our friend. In other words, both inferences, though entirely antagonistic, have equal foundation, while one of them is declared by our author to be "not at all necessary"! Thus it comes to pass that he gives us liberty to infer just nothing at all, respecting the wicked dead, from the text under consideration! If this be an advance in the inquiry, there appears, nevertheless, to be no progress. But will our friend be content to leave the matter in this shape? By no.

means. He plainly sees that the inspired "IF" in Rom. 8 : 11 necessitates an inference of some kind, and so he tries again. Before we examine his next experiment in the matter of "inference," he must be permitted to tell us what, in his view, the passage in question "declares."

"It declares," observes our author, "that Christians shall, through the quickening energy of the Holy Spirit, be raised to an immortal and glorious life." This statement of "Retribution" suggests several remarks, to which we invite attention :

1. It may be seriously questioned whether the *quickenings* in the passage is ascribed to the agency of the Spirit of God. This statement, of course, lies against the view we expressed on this point in our article, "Albert Barnes on Romans 8 : 11," in the April EXAMINER ; but since that article was written, we have received information which compels a modification of our former confidence touching the facts in the case. Prof. STUART says :

"It is worthy of particular remark, that the last clause of v. 11 \* \* has been the subject of much critical conjecture and variation in its reading. The Mss. A. B. C. (which has AUTO for ΑΥΤΟΥ), 12 codd, minusc. and many of the fathers, exhibit the common reading, viz. DIA ΤΟΥ ΕΝΟΙΚΟΥΝΤΟΣ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ ; while DIA ΤΟ ΕΝΟΙΚΟΥΝ ΑΥΤΟ ΠΝΕΥΜΑ is the reading of D. E. F. G., the majority of Mss. minusc. Syr., Erp., Sahid., Vulg., Ita, Origen, Ephiph., Phot., Chrys. (usually), Method., Thod., Maxim., Theoph., Oecum., Iren., Tertul., Hilar., Ruf., Sedulius. This seems to be best supported, and is preferred by Erasmus, Stephens, Mill, Bengel, Griesbach, Knapp, Koppe, and many recent critics."

We have examined the Vatican Greek Testament and find that it gives the latter of the two readings named by Stuart, and which he says "seems to be best supported." We also find the reading in question supported by BLOOMFIELD. With this evidence before our mind, we cannot feel at all confident that what STUART calls the "common reading" is the true one. Dr. ADAM CLARKE gives the two readings in the order STUART does, and says of the latter that it "gives almost no variety of meaning." It "may," he says, "be neater Greek, but it is not better sense than the preceding." CLARKE renders the clause, "because of the Spirit of him who dwelleth in you." Prof. STUART, speaking of the reading which he deems "best supported," says :

"The reading DIA TO . . . . PNEUMA, in the Acc., of course obliges us to translate, BECAUSE OF *the Spirit which dwelleth in you*. In this way the last clause assigns a reason or ground why he who raised up Jesus from the dead, will quicken his true followers ; it is because he has given them his Spirit ; and having done thus much for them, he will complete the work which he has begun."

Dr. HODGE treats the point under consideration thus :

"*By his Spirit that dwelleth in you*, or, as it must be rendered according to another reading, '*On account of his Spirit that dwelleth in you*.' The sense in either case is good. According to the former, the meaning is, that the resurrection of believers will be effected by the power of the Spirit of God; and according to the latter, that the indwelling of his Spirit is the ground or reason why the bodies of believers should not be left in the grave."

Prof. STUART says, "the internal probability is strong against the first reading," while Dr. HODGE declares that "the internal evidence is decidedly in favor of the first reading." (It should be observed that by "internal evidence" these learned critics refer to the sense which the scope of the passage and context favors, and not to the evidence for or against the readings suggested.) We have thus presented the considerations which incline us to the opinion that the author of "Retribution" is mistaken in supposing that Rom. 8 : 11 refers the quickening of believers to "the energy of the Holy Spirit."

2. Our author errs in affirming that Rom. 8 : 11 declares that Christians shall be raised "to an immortal and glorious life." It simply declares that they shall be *quicken*ed ; and Mr. BARNES says the word means "made alive," but is "never used in the sense of *maintained alive*, or *preserved alive*." Should our author dissent from this view, we have only to remind him that the word here rendered "shall quicken," is translated "shall be made alive" in 1 Cor. 15 : 22, where *he* finds only "the justification of life," which he interprets to mean "a restoration to a temporal existence."

3. If we admit that the Spirit's "quickening energy" is brought to view in Rom. 8 : 11, we have, according to our author's position, the incongruous spectacle of the revival of two classes of mankind (righteous and wicked) *in the same condition, by different instrumentalities!* For it should be distinctly borne in mind that the doctrine of "Retribution" and of its

author is, *that the righteous dead are to be made alive mortal, and immortalized afterwards.* "Raised to an immortal and glorious life," means just this in *his* vocabulary, though we have yet to find the first individual, however intelligent and careful, who has learned, or even surmised, our author's real position on this subject by perusing his book. His reticence on this point, when an explanation seems so obviously to be required by the vagueness of his pamphlet, is not calculated to impress one with the conviction that he is solicitous to be understood. We shall be never so much mistaken if he does not yet find this doctrine of a corruptible life for the dead in Christ a "troublesome stone." It will be generally regarded, we think, as a prodigious absurdity, having not a shadow of support in the Bible, but the most ample and positive inspired testimony against it. Its enormity is only enhanced when it is associated with the "quickening energy" of the Spirit of God. In our humble judgment, the man who, having such a theory to defend, goes from home to witness displays of "exegetical nonsense," puts himself to needless trouble.

We turn now to our author's *inference* from Rom. 8 : 11. "The only inference," says he, "that *need* be drawn from the passage in question is, that \* \* those who have *not*" the Holy Spirit "must be dependent on some other power for even a temporary existence ; and when brought to life again it must be by a mere act of physical Omnipotence, and hence they cannot hope to receive that immortal existence which results from the indwelling of this Divine Spirit." If this be not a courageous attempt to turn the tables against an opponent, we know not what would be entitled to the appellation. But we are not in the least alarmed, and will proceed to test this "only inference" of our author. It contains four elements, viz. 1, that the wicked dead are to be "brought to life again" ; 2, that their future "existence" will be "temporary" ; 3, that they will not be quickened by the Spirit of God ; 4, that they will be revived "by a mere act of physical Omnipotence." Upon all which we submit the following suggestions :

1. If Prof. STUART'S rendering, "BECAUSE OF his Spirit that dwelleth in you," be correct, our author's only pretext for inferring any future life for the wicked, from the text, vanishes for

ever. We hope he will give due weight to this consideration. On the other hand, the effect of the rendering in question upon our views appears in the conclusion of Dr. HODGE, "that the indwelling of (God's) Spirit is the ground or reason why the bodies of believers should not be left in the grave." As no such "ground or reason" pertains to the wicked, the legitimate inference would be that *they will be* "left" unquickenened. Thus it will be seen that believers in life only for the righteous have nothing to fear from the changed rendering.

2. But let us examine our author's inference upon the supposition that the true reading of the passage under consideration justifies the rendering, "BY his Spirit that dwelleth in you." The issue then between him and his opponents would be this: he claims that in the text the thing which is peculiar to believers is the quickening *agency*, whereas they hold it to be the *quickening* itself. Upon the assumption that the *agency* of quickening is the peculiarity, he bases the *inference* that the Apostle's language implies the revival of the wicked dead, and that their revival will be effected by "some other power." We propose to test the soundness of the principle here relied on by our author; and in doing so we must now allude to a fact which will receive merited attention in our next article. The extract from "Retribution" which we shall give next month will exhibit its author in the strangely inconsistent attitude of "not presuming to dispute the position that this quickening [in Rom. 8 : 11] is the present work of the Spirit of God, upon those who, by its power, are *joined to the Lord*, and made partakers of the divine nature." Now if we apply to this figurative interpretation of the passage the principle that a *universal* quickening is *assumed* therein, and that what distinguishes the children of God is the *agency* to which their revival is ascribed, we are driven to the absurd conclusion that those who have *not* the indwelling of the Holy Spirit are by "some *other* power" to be "*joined to the Lord*, and made partakers of the divine nature." Moreover, we must suppose that this relation "to the Lord" and participation of "the divine nature" will be merely a "temporary" affair. We should like to know how our friend is pleased with this logical deduction from the "invention" he has "sought out" to save his theory of "the doom of the ungodly." But we are disposed to subject his

device to some further scrutiny. The Apostle declares "that he which raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also BY JESUS." (2 Cor. 4 : 14.) Here, as in Rom. 8 : 11, the resurrection of Christ is affirmed, and then that of his followers promised ; and if the principle adopted by our author is valid, we must *infer* from 2 Cor. 4 : 14 that the wicked dead are "dependent on some other power," than the one here named, for their resurrection.—The revealed agency here being "BY JESUS," we inquire, are the wicked to be revived by "some other power" ? If our author says they are *not*, we ask, what becomes of the principle he applies to Rom. 8 : 11 ? If he says they *are*, we have only to remind him again of 1 Cor. 15 : 22 to show him his dilemma, for there he finds the resurrection of the wicked, and renders the passage, "BY CHRIST shall all be made alive." A single other example will suffice to show that our author's comprehensive inference from Rom. 8 : 11 rests upon a principle that produces "exegetical nonsense" when applied to texts of analogous import. Saith the Apostle, "God hath both raised up the Lord, and will also raise up us BY HIS OWN POWER." (1 Cor. 6 : 14.) Here, again, as the reader will observe at a glance, the passage in Romans is paralleled in two of its leading features, and God's "OWN POWER" is presented as the agency "BY" which believers shall be raised. Now the principle we are examining would require us to *infer* from 1 Cor. 6 : 14 that the resurrection of the wicked dead, being itself taken for granted, is to be accomplished by "some other power" than God's "OWN POWER," and that this "other power" is "a mere act of PHYSICAL OMNIPOTENCE." The thoughtful reader will be able to estimate the true value of a premise, or principle, that inevitably tends to the conclusions we have here exhibited. It appears to us to be far-fetched and worthless. To abandon it, however, while admitting that Romans 8 : 11 brings to view the resurrection of the dead, must, in our opinion, be fatal to the doctrine that the wicked dead will live again. We will here place before the reader's eye three passages from the New Testament, (two of which have been already used for illustration,) that the mind may receive a distinct impression of their bearing upon our argument :

"And God hath BOTH RAISED UP THE LORD, and will also RAISE UP US by his own power." 1 Cor. 6 : 14.

"Knowing that he which RAISED UP THE LORD JESUS shall RAISE UP US ALSO by Jesus, and shall present us with you."—2 Cor. 4 : 14.

"For if we believe that JESUS died and ROSE AGAIN, even so THEM ALSO WHICH SLEEP IN JESUS will God BRING WITH HIM." 1 Thess. 4 : 14.

We ask, what truth stands out prominently in all these texts? It is this: that God will raise believers from the dead *because* He raised the Lord Jesus from the dead. Now read Rom. 8 : 11:—"But IF the Spirit of him that RAISED UP JESUS FROM THE DEAD dwell in you, he that RAISED UP CHRIST FROM THE DEAD shall ALSO QUICKEN YOUR MORTAL BODIES by [*margin*, because of] his Spirit that dwelleth in you." It is perfectly evident that the double mention here of Christ's resurrection has its entire significance in the fact that the "mortal bodies" (persons) of believers shall "*also*" be *quicken*d—not in the fact (if such a fact is here expressed) that their revival is to be effected by the *agency* of the Spirit of God. This latter thought has nothing to correspond with it in the Apostle's references to our Lord, for he does not tell us, as Peter does in his Epistle, that Christ was "quickened by the Spirit." From all which we conclude that Rom. 8 : 11 may still be regarded as a Gibraltar of the doctrine that life from the dead is the peculiar privilege of the regenerate.

Our author next refers to five Bible instances of persons who were revived from death. In the first, God raised the child in answer to Elisha's prayer, to the great joy of the bereaved Shumanite (2 Kings 4 : 18-37); in the second, He raised a child in answer to Elijah's prayer, exhibiting his goodness to a bereaved widow and convincing her that the prophet was "a man of God" (1 Kings 17 : 17-24); in the third, our blessed Lord raised "a dead man" as an act of "compassion" to a weeping "widow" who had been bereaved of an "only son," and the instant effect of the miracle was that "there came a fear on all: and they glorified God, saying, That a great prophet is risen up among us; and, That God hath visited his people" (Luke 7 : 11-18); in the fourth, we have the fact, without any explanation, that a man, who, in being let down into the sepulchre, touched the bones of one of God's prophets, "revived, and stood up on his feet" (2 Kings 13 : 20, 21); in the fifth, the Saviour

rewarded the *faith* of Jairus by restoring to life a daughter who was "not dead" (as the wicked dead are) "but sleeping."— (Mat. 9 : 18-26.) The author of "Retribution" is *welcome* to all the evidence *these* miraculous displays of Divine power afford, that the impenitent dead, in whom the Spirit of God has not dwelt, shall be quickened, in the last day, to a life that will be *an awful curse in its every aspect*.

We come now to one of the most singular paragraphs to be found in "Retribution"—to a place where our author's "exegetical" machinery seems to be in very bad working order. He has well nigh ruined it on Rom. 8 : 11, and deserves our commiseration. But let us follow him a little. He produces Rom. 6 : 7, "he that is dead is freed from sin," and says "the passage is sometimes quoted." By whom, or for what purpose, it has ever been "quoted," he omits to tell us. *We* should as soon think of quoting it to prove that Paradise is in the "Southern Confederacy," as for the purpose of disproving the revival of the wicked dead. An examination of the connection in which the passage stands will show that it describes the condition of a *living saint*, whereas, under the manipulation of our author, it is made to set forth the condition of a *damned sinner*. Something of a difference ! If we may be justified in characterizing this interpretation with severity, we have only to appropriate a sentence from our author and say—"From such perverse and ignorant criticism as this, may the Lord in mercy save honest men and true Christians." For "freed" in Rom. 6 : 7 the marginal reading is "justified." The Greek word (ΔΙΚΑΙΩΟ) here rendered "freed" occurs elsewhere in the New Testament thirty-nine times, where it is translated "justify," "justified," "justifier," "justifieth," *thirty-eight* times, and "righteous" *once*. As the author of "Retribution" has—in the portion of his argument which we shall reproduce and examine next month—summoned to his aid "a writer of no less ability than the noted John Locke, Esq.," we will here give Mr. Locke's paraphrase of Rom. 6 : 7. It is as follows : "For he that is dead is set free from the vassalage of sin, as the slave is from the vassalage of his master."—As Mr. L.'s Note on the passage may have special weight with our author, we give it below :

"The tenor of St. Paul's discourse here, shows this to be the



sense of this verse ; and to be assured that it is so, we need go no farther than ver. 11, 12, 13. He makes it his business in this chapter, not to tell them what they certainly and unchangeably are, but to exhort them to be what they ought and are engaged to be, by becoming Christians, viz : that they ought to emancipate themselves from the vassalage of sin ; not that they were so emancipated, without any danger of return, for then he could not have said what he does, ver. 11, 12, 13, which supposes it in their power to continue in their obedience to sin, or to return to that vassalage, if they would."

ALBERT BARNES says that the Apostle's "whole argument has respect to the state of the Christian here ; to his being freed from the bondage of sin." We might multiply indefinitely proofs from expositors showing how fearfully our author has perverted the Apostle's meaning ; but instead of doing this, we will quote Rom. 6 : 6-10 entire, and substitute, in brackets, our author's interpretation of "dead" in verse 7 for the word itself :

"Knowing this, that our old man is CRUCIFIED with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is [ETERNALLY DAMNED] is FREED (*lit.* JUSTIFIED) from sin. Now if we be DEAD with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him : Knowing that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more ; death hath no more dominion over him. For in that he died, he died unto sin once : but in that he liveth, he liveth unto God."

If we may presume that our author knows that "freed" in Rom. 6 : 7 has the sense of "justified," it is easy to show that he has very loose views of the meaning of *justification*. He believes, of course, that the believer's state in this life is a justified one—resulting from "faith" and securing "peace with God."—Again, he believes that the dead in Christ are to be quickened by the Spirit into a life which he calls "the *justification* of life."—He holds, moreover, that the wicked dead, "by a mere act of physical Omnipotence," will receive the same "*justification* of life." And, lastly, that they will be "*justified* from sin" when—on account of their sins—they are "finally dead, and dead forever." Until we have come to confound *salvation* and *perdition*, we shall cordially repudiate our author's assertion, "and so they will be freed from sin," as false and pernicious.

In conclusion, we observe that it is wholly gratuitous in our author to talk of "the *temporary* death of the *ungodly*." We

shall hereafter undertake to show that Christ's discourse with the Sadducees proves positively that the righteous only are *thus* dead. They "*sleep* in Jesus." Of the *sleeping* maid the Saviour declared, "She is *not* DEAD." Are *any* "DEAD" in the sense in which "*she*" was "*not* DEAD"? If there be any such, will they ever live again?

---

### ONE OF THE SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

THE following item of information is of deep interest, if true, as indicating changes in the natural world which may produce as great a revolution there as those going on in the civil and ecclesiastical world are likely to work out in their convulsions.

"FILLING UP THE SEA OF AZOF.—While sudden and violent revolutions impend over nations, Nature is accomplishing, slowly and silently, far more portentous changes. There are harbors famed for ages as commercial centres, from which the sea is gradually withdrawing its waters. The deltas of great rivers grow by accumulation from year to year, till the rivers themselves forsake them and seek new channels. The Sea of Azof, the outlet of the commerce of the Don, is rapidly becoming a vast and impenetrable marsh. Between two measurements, 32 years apart, its depth has diminished 11 feet; and the prediction of Strabo may yet be accomplished, that some time both the Sea of Azof and the Black Sea will become a waste tract of intermingled lakes and morasses. The largest river of Central Asia, the Oxus, according to the unanimous testimony of ancient authors, rolled its waters into the Caspian Sea. In modern times it has emptied into the Sea of Aral. But it seems to be about to resume its ancient channel to the Caspian, an event which would revolutionize the conditions of commerce between Europe and Asia. The Oxus would then recover its renown as a great highway of nations. The Euphrates, also, is leaving its ancient bed from a point above Killah, and taking a more westerly course. Year by year the new channel receives a large proportion of its waters; the stream that adheres to the old channel has already ceased to produce the inundations, which, like those of the Nile, can alone fertilize its borders; the country adjacent to the ruins of Babylon begins to wear the aspect of hopeless aridity; and the ancient capital of Semiramis and Nebuchadnezzar will soon make the centre of a desert. Nor does the river promise to fertilize a new district, but loses itself in the innumerable lakes and marshes which extend to the Persian Gulf."

"WHY ARE YOU BAPTIZED? *The Question answered on the basis of 'The Comm n Faith.'* By William Morris, M. D.," Philadelphia.

Such is the title of a Pamphlet sent us, whether by the author or some one else we do not know. We have read it, however; and considering its author is a strict *Baptist*, we must say he is far more charitable than we had supposed. We would specially commend the work to those who lay so much stress on *immersion* as the only way *into* Christ. He rejects the idea that John's baptism was *Christian* baptism. He says—

"John's baptism was not Christian baptism at all; it "per-tained to the nation of the Jews; which nation stood in a pec-uliar relation to God. It was a special institution of God, in-termediate between 'the law' and 'the Gospel of the grace of God'—an institution peculiar and unique."

To the question, as to the *example* of the Saviour in baptism, he says—

"I certainly would not speak of 'following Christ *in* bap-tism': for Christian baptism is unto the proper confession of Christ (not as our example, but) as our DIVINE AND ONLY SA-UIOUR, who has redeemed us to God by his blood."

On the text "Except a man be born of water," &c., John 3: 5, our author speaks well. He renders the text "Except a man be born OUT OF WATER (*ex hudatos*) and of the Spirit:" \* \* \* "that which is born *out of* the flesh is flesh, and that which is born *out of* the Spirit is *spirit*:" \* \* \* "but it would be absurd to say, *that which is born out of water is water.*" He goes on to say —

"It was customary with the Hebrews to call certain *facts* by the name of *figures* whereby they are described or represented: and in His latter statement the Lord speaks of being *born out of water.*" \* \* \* "To the Hebrew mind, *pure, flowing and ferti-lizing water* was the emblem of *life*, and also of the *Holy Spirit*, as given. Hence it is called MAH-YIM CHAH-YIM, *living waters*. And hence our Lord speaks of '*water*' and of '*living water*'—without any qualifying remark—as the understood figurative word for *life*, and for the Holy Spirit, as given. This familiar figure of speech the Lord Jesus used when he said to Nicodemus, 'Except a man be born *out of the water,*' &c. "This well known mode of expression the Hebrew Rabbi would at once understand; but by some Gentile ecclesiastical Doctors it has

been remarkably misunderstood. *They* have mistaken a Hebrew *figure* for an *aquuous fact*."

On the text 1 Peter 3 : 21 our author has spoken so well, we give a copious extract. He says :

"Peter had just mentioned 'THE ARK.' The English text then reads thus : 'The like figure whereunto, even baptism doth now save us (not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) BY THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS CHRIST FROM THE DEAD.' The word here translated 'the like figure,' is *antitypon*, and the English form of this word is *antitype*.' 'The ark' was a type or figure of some GREAT REALITY, which is here called '*baptism*.' But Christian baptism is, itself, only a type, a figure, a shadow ; and there cannot be a type of a type, the figure of a figure, the shadow of a shadow. Is there then some great REALITY which may be *justly* regarded as the antitype of *the ark*? Is there some great FACT which is called *baptism*, according to the usage of the Hebrews, who called certain facts by the names of the figures whereby they were described, or represented? In a word, Is there some great *reality*, which God, himself, calls BAPTISM? There is : and that great REALITY IS THE DEATH OF CHRIST. 'I have a baptism to be baptized with ; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!' Thus spoke the Lord, Luke 12 : 50. It is by Christ's BAPTISM OF DEATH that we are now saved ; but not even the death of Christ apart from his resurrection ; therefore Peter proceeds to say : '*By the resurrection of Christ from the dead*' ; and on this account, the idea of resurrection is superadded to that of death in the symbolic meaning of the Christian baptism ; which is primarily a *type* or *figure* of the death of Christ. But as Christian baptism is, itself, only a figure, it can only figuratively save." \* \* \* "CHRIST has actually and efficaciously saved us : the Holy Ghost, in the Gospel, has declared that we are saved persons, as those who believe in the Son of God : and we *appropriate* the salvation which God has made ours (through the *death and resurrection* of His Son) in the exercise of a living faith. This appropriative faith, Peter, in this passage calls, 'the answer of a good conscience towards God.'"

As a *Baptist* our author has done himself credit in the work before us ; yet he has totally failed, we think, to place the Christian baptism where John the Baptist and our Lord placed it, *viz* : "He"—*Christ*—" shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit :"—" the same is He which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost" : and Paul saith—" By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body."

This "*Christian Baptism*" our author has overlooked, and made *water baptism* to take its place; and yet that is only "*a figure*" in his view, and *not essential* to salvation, as he very clearly shows. There is an essential baptism, and that must be the "*one baptism*," and cannot be *water baptism* according to our author's own admission. We thank him, however, for the good things his work contains.

---

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

FROM IOWA we have received a letter which will speak for itself, though we withhold the writer's name, not knowing if he would like us to use it at present. He says:—

"Though not personally acquainted, allow me to say, for five years I have been examining the doctrine of 'No immortality nor endless life, except through Christ:' and for the last two years have come firmly to believe it, and am now doing what I can in the community in which I live to induce others to embrace the beautiful truth. I am a member of the Congregational Church in this place—one of the deacons—President of the Society, &c., and by the grace of God I am trying to persuade the minister and people to overcome prejudice and false education, and interpret the Scriptures according to the obvious principles of human language and common sense. Some are investigating for themselves and many are doubting, so that by 'patient continuance in well doing' we may hope some day to witness fruits." \*\*\* "We must persevere and break the adamant wall of old prejudice, and we shall yet live to see this truth orthodox, popular, and generally embraced. May God help you in your struggle."

CLAMOR FRANKE writes from Ohio: "I am much interested in the BIBLE EXAMINER, and wish to encourage the effort to put it on a permanent basis. Please accept the five dollars sent herewith as my contribution for the present year.

"The truth of '*Life only in Christ*' is a glorious one to me beyond description. Would that such as feel indifferent to it would see the beauty and excellence of it over the common traditions of men!"

S. J. BRIMHALL, writes from Penn.: "The BIBLE EXAMINER is to me richer in Bible truth than any other reading matter that I receive. My prayer is, that it may be long and ably sustained. It is a pleasure to do all I can for its support so long as pure dazzling truth glows on its pages. Truth is exceedingly precious."

**THE EDITOR.**—Since the last issue of this magazine the Editor has visited New England and spent two weeks in Boston and Salem, Mass. He had an agreeable interview with many of the lovers of truth. He preached in Boston (Chapman Hall) seven discourses to large and attentive audiences. F. A. BERICK is the stated minister there, and the congregation is blessed in having so able and worthy a Pastor. He is sure to be useful and successful under the divine care.

[P. S.—Since the foregoing was in type, the *World's Crisis* has come to hand. It states that

“ Eld. Storrs preached on his peculiar views concerning the wicked dead, who, with all their offspring, he thinks will not be included in the resurrection.”

This slanderous statement might be excusable if “ Eld. Storrs” had not publicly denied holding such views in regard to the offspring of the wicked. One violent priestly opposer attempted, at the close of his first sermon in Boston, to fix on him the doctrine that there is “ no resurrection of little children.” This attempt was made before a large audience, and proved a signal failure. “ Eld. Storrs” stated that he held no such doctrine and had no sympathy for it. As an *opinion* he held that the children of believers would share with their parents in the future life and glory: as to the children of unbelievers, he expressed no opinion, but left them to the disposal of the wisdom of God. The statement of the *Crisis*, therefore, is an unjustifiable attempt to heap reproach on “ Eld. Storrs’ ” views. If his opponents think a discerning public will approve such warfare—“ publicly and privately”—they may find themselves in error.]

At Salem the church is blessed with the labors of RUFUS WENDELL, and cannot fail of being edified by his efficient labors. Much harmony and love seem to exist in their body.

The interests of the BIBLE EXAMINER were promoted by the Editor's visit, and some thirty *new* subscribers obtained, beside other assistance. Thanks to its friends, and to the LORD for His divine blessing.

**THE BIBLE EXAMINER.**—One number more will complete our obligation to those subscribers who paid *only one* dollar at the commencement of 1861. We are thankful that we have been able to meet that obligation. The rule on which we have ever conducted this magazine—of not sending beyond the subscriber's payment—will be continued, and no one will receive it after June who *has not*, or who *does not* signify the wish by a new remittance of at least *fifty* cents to complete this year. If those who are able remit more, it will be exceedingly acceptable.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

---

"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, HATH NOT LIFE."

---

Vol. 14. No. 12.]

JUNE, 1862.

[Whole No. 214.]

---

## "LIFE" AND "DEATH."

A SERMON, BY GEO. STORRS, DELIVERED AT PHILADELPHIA.

*From the Phonographic Notes of Joseph McFarland.*

TEXT.—"For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."—John 3: 16.

IN nearly every age of the world, Christians have been compelled, like the workmen of Nehemiah, when rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem, after the Babylonish captivity, to remove the rubbish of the former structure, in order to lay the foundations of a new building. Such labor is not the most progressive and pleasant in the world; but it is necessary to overthrow error before truth can be established in its stead. There has been so much perversion of the meaning of the Scriptural terms *life* and *death*, that it becomes necessary for us to attempt to explain their ordinary and uniform signification, by their self-evident relation to circumstances.

The word *life*, it is said, means happiness, bliss, enjoyment; and *death*, not the cessation of life, but misery, wretchedness, woe. Now all these ideas, or conditions of the mind, are much better expressed by their own appropriate terms than by the use of those which imply something altogether different: hence, there is no necessity for employing the word *death*, when that to which life is essential is meant. True, the words *life* and *death* are sometimes used figuratively; but never thus when denoting rewards promised or punishments threatened.

Much labor has been expended to prove that *death* does not mean the cessation of life, when spoken of in reference to the

wicked, but "a state of unhappiness—a futurity of woe—a miserable hereafter," &c. ; but a proper understanding in regard to these two terms will enable us to comprehend the condition of the world, apart from the provision contained in the Gospel, as well as the final state of those who reject Christ.—Let us trace the word *perish* through the New Testament and see whether it is susceptible of a different construction. In the first place, we find it occurring in Matt. 8 : 25.

"And when he was entered into a ship his disciples followed him. And, behold, there arose a great tempest in the sea, inasmuch that the ship was covered with the waves ; but he was asleep. And his disciples came to him, and awoke him, saying, Lord, save us : we *perish*."

What is the meaning of the word *perish* in this verse? "Death by drowning," is the natural response. Certainly, no one can infer that the disciples were apprehensive lest they should be hurried into the place called "hell," or be tormented. On the contrary, they thought death by drowning would be their fate unless Christ saved them : such is the obvious interpretation of the text. Again : in the country of the Gergesenes, Christ was encountered by two men, possessed of devils ; (Matt. 8 : 32,) and it is said that when the devils were cast out, they ran violently down a steep place into the sea, and *perished* in the waters. The "devils," in this case, you perceive, were not sent to "hell" to be tormented ; but they lost their lives in the sea.

In Matt. 9 : 17, we read : "Neither do men put new wine into old bottles : else the bottles break and the wine runneth out, and the bottles *perish*."

Here, the bottles cease to be : when they are broken, and the wine escapes, they are no longer bottles : they cease ; they *perish*. Also, in Matt. 26 : 52.

"Then said Jesus unto him, Put up again thy sword into his place : for all they that take the sword shall *perish* with the sword."

What does the term "*perish*," in this verse, mean? Evidently, to die : to lose existence by means of the sword. In Luke, chap. 13, Jesus, in reply to some who had told him of the Galileans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices, said :



"Suppose ye that these Galileans were sinners above all the Galileans, because they suffered such things? I tell you, nay : but except ye repent, ye shall all likewise *perish*."

What "thing" had those Galileans suffered? Why, *death* ; and the mingling of their blood with their sacrifices.

"Or those eighteen, upon whom the tower in Siloam fell, and slew them, think ye that they were sinners above all men that dwelt in Jerusalem? I tell you, nay ; but except ye repent, ye shall all likewise *perish*."

In the one instance, it is very clear that the Galileans were slain by Pilate ; in the other that those upon whom the tower fell, were crushed to death ; and Christ, evidently availing himself of the circumstances, impressed upon the minds of the Jews, who regarded that form of death with horror, that unless they should repent, a similar fate awaited them. But He did not remind them that those Jews who had perished, had gone to a place of torment ; there was not the slightest allusion in any such consequence. The Jews as a nation did not repent and, accordingly, they suffered as Jesus had foretold. Their temple was thrown down, their towers fell ; they were burned, and slain,—they *perished* "in like manner ;" and the very site of their city was ploughed up.

Those who endeavor to give these texts a forced application to a state of torment in the other world, pervert the language of Jesus, and destroy the harmony and simplicity of the Gospel. In the 33d verse of the same chapter, we find the following :

"Nevertheless I must walk to-day, and to-morrow, and the day following : for it cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem."

Here Christ obviously meant that he would lose his life, or be put to death. In the 11th chapter of Luke, we read :

"From the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, which *perished* between the altar and the temple : verily I say unto you, It shall be required of this generation."

Also, in the case of the prodigal son—Luke 15 : 17.

"And when he came to himself, he said, How many hired servants of my father's have bread enough and to spare, and I *perish* with hunger !"

Did the prodigal son, in this instance, mean that he would

"perish" after the manner described by theologians; namely, be tormented forever? Unquestionably, no! He meant precisely what he said; that he was dying of hunger—perishing for the want of food. On one occasion, whilst endeavoring to convince his disciples of the loving providence of His Father, Jesus told them that not a hair of their head should *perish*. The word was evidently used in its figurative sense to illustrate the extreme solicitude on the part of God, for the welfare of His children; and not to indicate a mode of punishment.

In John 11 : 50, it is written—"Nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation *perish* not."

From the reference which Caiaphas makes to the prophecy concerning Christ's death, no one can mistake his meaning—the cessation of national life.

In Acts 5 : 37, we have a part of Gamaliel's advice to the Sadducees who were about to lay violent hands upon the apostles. He says :

"After this man rose up Judas of Galilee in the days of taxing, and drew away much people after him : he also *perished* ; and all, even as many as obeyed him, were dispersed."

The "Judas" to whom he refers must have been slain, else there had been but little force in the example. He had probably encountered violent opposition, and perished (lost his life) in the tumult.

Again in chapter 8 : 20, Peter replies to Simon the sorcerer, "Thy money *perish* with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money."

Did Peter mean that his money should be tormented? In 2 Cor. 4 : 16, the following language is employed :

"For which cause we faint not; but though our outward man *perish*, yet the inward man is renewed day by day."

Does Paul say, "though our outward man be *tormented*"? We cannot discover it. He means that our physical structure is corruptible, and perishes day by day according to the laws of our material nature. Some might here take occasion to say that Paul believes in an "inward man"—so do we. We believe that the "inward man" is by the implantation of the Divine

spirit of God in the heart of the believer. But Paul does not affirm an “inward man” of the sinner ; for it is a gift bestowed upon the child of God.

Turning to the 11th Hebrews, verse 31, we find : “ By faith the harlot Rahab *perished* not with them that believed not, when she had received the spies with peace.”

The Old Testament informs us that in consequence of her faith, Rahab was not slain with her countrymen, in the sack of their city ; but escaped with her life. Peter in his second epistle 3 : 6, says :

“ Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, *perished*.”

That is to say, simply, the inhabitants of the earth’s surface were drowned, or lost their lives in the overwhelming flood. Jude in the 11th verse of his epistle says :

“ Woe unto them for they have gone into the way of Cain and ran greedily after the error of Balaam for reward, and *perished* in the gainsaying of Core.”

Now, what was the manner of Korah’s death? The earth opened and swallowed him up with all his company. So, you perceive, that in all the passages I have cited, where the term *perish* occurs, it implies, merely, the loss of life, under varieties of circumstances and by various means, or the extinction of being.

We will now endeavor to determine the meaning of the term “perish” in its relation to the final state. Turning to Matt. 18 : 14, we read :

“ Even so it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should *perish*.”

Here, in allusion to their final state, the word is used in the sense of dying. Again : in John 10 : 27, 28 :

“ My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me : and I give unto them eternal life ; and they shall never *perish*.” \* \*

Paul, in Acts 13 : 41, says to the blaspheming Jews : “ Behold ! ye despisers, and wonder, and *perish*.”

If Paul had meant eternal torment, instead of *perish*, he would in all probability have spoken accordingly ; but inas-

much as he did not, his language is susceptible of but one construction; namely, that if the Jews persisted in unbelief, despising the works of God and the proffered redemption through Jesus Christ, they should *perish*—lose their lives eternally.

1 Cor. 15 : 17, 18 : "And if Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then, they, also, which are fallen asleep in Christ, are *perished*."

Their final state is here spoken of. They are dead he argues; and if there be no resurrection of the dead, they are perished, beyond recovery. Again : 2 Cor. 3 : 15, 16.

"For we are unto God a sweet savor of Christ in them that are saved, and in them that *perish*."

Thus I have noticed nearly every text in which the word *perish* occurs, in the New Testament, and have demonstrated its uniform meaning to be death or extinction of life, irrespective of the moral character of those of whom it is affirmed; but as respects the *final* state, it has reference only to the wicked, and will bear no other construction than that of *eternal* death or extinction of life.

"God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son: that whosoever believeth in him should not *perish*;"—mark the contrast—"but have everlasting life."

Here, to perish, is contrasted with everlasting life, the antithesis of which is everlasting death. The world was fast sinking into oblivion—eternal death—without a ray of light to illumine the darkness of futurity. Men were returning to the dust from whence they had sprung, without God, and without hope; but God so loved them—not that they so loved God—that He gave His "only begotten Son" as a propitiation for their sins. The Gospel proclamation is *Life—Life* from the *dead*, through Jesus Christ, the second Adam, the head of the new creation, who came to reveal the foundation of life, that men might live forever; that they might possess immortality, incorruptibility. The Gospel does not come to us with a curse, but with a blessing; and I had almost exclaimed with the apostle: "If any man preach any other gospel than this, let him be accursed!" Can you imagine that the angels of the Lord, who appeared to the shepherds, on the dawn of that day which

\*Some of which have been purposely omitted by the reporter.

ushered Christ into the world, gave utterance to a lie? "The angel said unto them, Fear not: for, behold, I bring you good tidings of *great joy*, which shall be to all people."

And the heavenly host praised God saying: "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men."

Now, let any one point out the curse contained in the gospel, or anything that resembles a curse. On the contrary it is full of love and life, and offers an eternal life through faith in the Son of God, who said: "This is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day."

If men neglect this great salvation, there is no hope for them—no escape; Christ will profit them nothing. To my mind, this fact is as clear as the sun in the noon-day sky, when there is not a cloud to be seen. God has pledged His word to those who believe in Him that He will give them eternal life by means of the resurrection at the *last day*—will clothe them with honor, glory, and immortality. When our Adamic life is gone, unless we have believed in Jesus, there is no hope for us; but by believing in Him, we obtain a new and divine life, which emanates from Him, who is the head of the new creation. If we have no connection with Christ there is no power to bring us up from the dead, and we remain there forever. Then, my dying friends, will you not accept the proffered gift of a new life, by embracing Christ as the Life-giver? For He has said in loving terms, "He that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out."

Whatever our sins may have been, He is ready to be gracious, and to blot them from His memory, and enroll our names in the "Lamb's Book of Life."

If we sleep in the dust of the earth when Jesus appears again, we shall awake to life eternal; or if we be alive on that great day, we shall "be changed—in a moment—in the twinkling of an eye." "For the trumpet shall sound, and the dead" in Christ "shall be raised in incorruptibility." They shall be raised by the *Spirit* of God, to live no more by flesh and *blood*; and their life shall be as eternal as the Spirit of God itself.

## ON THE USE OF THE GREEK WORD ZOEE.

BY S. D. BEEGLE.

I was much pleased with your remarks—as also those of your correspondent—in the February number of the EXAMINER, upon the use of the above Greek word. I had, long before, noted the peculiar use of the word in the New Testament; and also, the assumption by some writers, of the position spoken of by your correspondent, *viz.*: that “zöee has reference almost exclusively to the future eternal life of the saints; or to the principle of eternal life which believers have here; and which will be consummated in the future life.” Not to mention others, C. F. HUDSON, in “Debt and Grace,” p. 252, remarking upon Math. 10 : 28, says,

“Nor can the word here rendered soul, be taken as referring to the future, eternal life of the believer, as when it is said that his ‘life is hid with Christ in God;’ for this sense of the word life is altogether different, as the fact of life, and the principle of life are different ideas; and the former is expressed by a special term both in Hebrew (*chajah*) and in Greek (*zöee*) where it so often occurs in the phrase ‘everlasting life.’”

Now it may be interesting to your readers to learn from the learned Doctor FRENCH what are his ideas respecting this word. In his “Synonyms of the New Testament,” p. 128, in tracing the difference between *zöee* and *bios*, he says,

“The Latin language, and the English, are alike poorer than the Greek, in having but one word, the Latin ‘vita,’ the English ‘life,’ to express these two Greek. There would indeed be no comparative poverty here, if *zöee* and *bios* were merely duplicates; but, covering as they do very different spaces of meaning, it is certain that we, having but one word for them both, must use this one in very diverse senses; it is possible that by this equivocation we may, without being aware of it, conceal very real and important differences from ourselves; for, indeed, there is nothing so potent to do this as the equivocal use of a word.”

He then proceeds to remark, “The true antithesis of *zöee* is *thánatos*,” and here he refers to several passages from the Scriptures, from Plato and Herodotus, in illustration of this remark, after which he continues,

“*Zöee*, in fact, being very nearly connected with *“aö*, *“aëmi*, to breathe the breath of life, which is the necessary condition of living. But while *zöee* is thus life *intensive*; *bios* is life *extensive*, the period or dura-

tion of life ; and then, secondly, the means by which that life is sustained ; and thirdly, the manner in which that life is spent. Examples of the use of *bios* in all these senses the New Testament supplies ;" and some of which he quotes.

Further on he says, " The distinction (between the two words) displays itself with great clearness in our words 'Zoology' and 'Biography ;' " the former, he says truly is properly applied to animals, because they *live* as well as men ; while the latter is applicable to men only, because they not only live, " but *lead* lives ; lives in which there is that normal distinction between one and another which may make them well worthy to be recorded." Thus " while thanatos and zöee constitute the true antithesis, *yet they do so only so long* as both are *physically* contemplated. So soon as a *moral* idea is introduced the antithesis is not between thanatos and zöee, but thanatos and bios." He now refers to Plato, and quotes from Hienophon in farther illustration. But the Doctor having said thus much, meets a difficulty, and sets himself about removing it.

" But this being the case, bios and not zöee being thus shown to be the ethical word of classical antiquity, a thoughtful reader of Scripture might very well inquire with something of perplexity; how it is to be explained that there all is reversed—zöee being certainly in it the nobler word, belonging to the innermost circle of those terms whereby are expressed the highest gifts of God to his creatures ; so that, while bios has there no such noble sense, zöee is continually used in the very noblest connection, to express the highest blessedness of the creature."

Such, according to our author, are the facts ; and we will now give his explanation of them, and leave the reader to accept or reject it as he likes. He says, p. 132,

" A little reflection will supply the answer. Revealed religion, and it alone, puts death and sin in closest connexion, declares them the necessary correlatives of each other—and as an involved consequence ; in like manner, life and holiness. Halone proclaims that, wherever there is death, it is there because sin was there first ; wherever there is *no* death, that is, life, it is there because sin has never been there, or, having been once, is now cast out and expelled. In revealed religion, which thus makes death to have come into the world through sin, and only through sin, life is the correlative of holiness. Whatever truly lives, does so because sin has never found place in it, or having found, has been expelled from it. So soon as ever this is felt and understood, zöee at once assumes the profoundest moral significance ; it becomes the fittest expression for the very highest blessedness. Of that whereof you predicate absolute zöee, you predicate of the same absolute holiness. Christ affirming of himself *egö cimi ee zöee*, implicitly affirmed of himself that he was absolute

holiness ; and in the creature, in like manner, that only *lives*, or triumphs over death, death at once physical and spiritual, which has first triumphed over sin." (A pretty good argument, by the way, for destruction doctrine.) "No wonder then, that Scripture should know of no higher word than *zōe* to set forth either the blessedness of God, or the blessedness of the creature in communion with God."

We have now done with these long quotations, and in conclusion would only add, it seems to us far more reasonable to suppose that the scriptural use of the word *zōe* indicates very clearly that the promise of future life to the believer, does not define its attendant circumstances, but that it is simply *life* ; animated, conscious existence ; while *other* passages and promises fully assure him of the *blessedness* of that life.

---

## THE TRUNK AND THE BRANCHES.

BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

The doctrine of man's inherent immortality is the fundamental error of theology. It is the one trunk, from which proceed, as branches, the various theories of sectarianism. For centuries, the most strenuous endeavors have been made to destroy these branches. The war has been a mutual one, one branch against the others. But the time has now come to attack *the trunk*. Demolish that, and there will be no trouble about its offshoots. They will die for lack of sustenance.

f. Inherent immortality is the development of a heathen *notion* ; the offspring of Platonic philosophy, and the nursling of men who "by wisdom knew not God." We can easily account for its existence. Thinking men, without the light of Revelation, would naturally indulge in speculations concerning the future. They would run nearly as follows : "Are we, then, doomed to perish like the brute ? Are these minds, that grasp, and discuss such abstruse problems in science—that are capable of such astonishing attainments in knowledge—that conquer such great obstacles in nature—that accomplish such triumphs in art—that are ever seeking to lift the curtain of death—are they not adapted to a higher life than the present ? Yes, they are." So far they were correct. But not having divine assistance to aid them in



their conclusions, they conceived the idea of an innate principle in man which would survive the present state of existence. But these sublime speculations were never hardened into belief. "It is a fact which ought never to be lost sight of in these inquiries, that among pagans, opinions on these subjects have never been either certain or rational; and that error once received has in no instance been exchanged for truth; but has gone on multiplying itself, and assuming an infinite variety of forms. Cicero, having reckoned up the opinions of philosophers as to the soul's immortality, concludes thus: 'Which of these opinions is true some god must tell us; which is most like truth is a great question.' It may be allowed that Cicero alternated between unbelief and doubt; but never, I think, between doubt and certainty." (Watson's Theol. Inst.)

"Which of these opinions is true, some god must tell us," said Cicero. He had hardly passed from the stage of action, when the divine Informer came, and "brought life and immortality to light *through the gospel*." Standing by the tomb of Lazarus, He gave expression to a truth which robbed the grave of its terrors, while it swept the absurdities of heathenism into oblivion. "I am the RESURRECTION and the LIFE; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and he that liveth and believeth in me, shall never die." Good News in truth. It brings hope to man while he trusts—not in Plato, but Jesus. Not in himself, not in the soul, but in "the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead." Not inherent immortality, but immortality by a resurrection "at the last day."

The three largest branches of the trunk of inborn immortality are Eternal torment, Universalism, and Spiritualism. The condemnation of the unbeliever, as taught in the Scriptures, necessitates his perpetual and hopeless suffering in the future, *if he is immortal*. But we cannot assent to the idea of eternal suffering without doing violence to our intelligence. Now God's word commends itself to our reason. "Come, let us reason together," it saith to the sinner. Says Jesus, "Why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?" It was the reason of Abraham that appealed to God in the question "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" We are not at liberty to slight the suggestions of this God-given faculty. Some people appear to

think that the Bible was given to prostrate reason. No greater mistake can be made. The Bible is related to reason as the sunlight is to the eye. The sun will not give us light if we keep our eyes shut. Neither will the Bible inform us unless we exercise our reasoning powers. Perhaps some will say, "Many undoubted Scripture teachings are contrary to reason." We reply, not one. Some portions of revealed truth may be above our comprehension, but not contrary to reason. The existence of the Uncreated is something that I cannot understand, but it is perfectly consistent with my reason, which demands a First Cause. "*From everlasting to everlasting thou art God*" is as luminous as the sun in mid-heaven, but I can no more *look* at one than the other. "The resurrection of the dead" is beyond my comprehension, but it agrees with my reason. The *how* confounds me, but the *fact* commends itself.

No divine teaching conflicts with reason. This to us, is an axiom. Says Coleridge, "If there be anything in all the system of revealed religion inconsistent with reason, it does not belong to the household of faith." Another writer declares, "It is not lawful for any man, taking the sentence, 'God is love,' to use it as a fiery rod, though it were of celestial gold, wherewith to sear the eyeballs of his reason." (Bayne's Christian Life, p. 336.) But the eternal conscious existence in misery of *any* creature is inevitably and ceaselessly opposed to reason. Nature does not abhor vacuum more than reason does endless torment. In the words of Bishop Newton, "Imagine a creature, nay, imagine numberless creatures produced out of nothing, delivered over to torments of endless ages, without the least hope or possibility of relaxation or redemption. *Imagine* it you may, but you can never seriously *believe* it, nor reconcile it to God and goodness."

Here we present a two-fold syllogism.

Whatever is contrary to reason, is contrary to Revelation.

But eternal torment is contrary to reason.

Therefore eternal torment is contrary to Revelation.

Again,

Whatever necessitates eternal torment is contrary to Revelation.

But natural immortality necessitates eternal torment.

Therefore natural immortality is contrary to Revelation.

The second branch now claims our notice. Universalism is the natural result of an appeal to reason from the doctrine of eternal torment. But the Christian may not appeal to reason alone. Revelation must also be consulted. If reason rejects eternal suffering, Revelation no less positively denies the salvation of the unbeliever. "Believe and thou shalt be saved." "Except ye repent ye shall all likewise perish." "If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His." "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." "The soul that sinneth it shall die." "The wages of sin is death." Hence we argue,

Whatever is contrary to Revelation, is contrary to reason.

But the salvation of the unbeliever is contrary to Revelation.

Therefore the salvation of the unbeliever is contrary to reason.

Again,

Whatever necessitates the salvation of the unbeliever is contrary to reason.

But natural immortality necessitates the salvation of the unbeliever.

Therefore natural immortality is contrary to reason.

Thus we perceive that Revelation and Reason unite in condemning inherent immortality. Revelation condemns it by denying universal salvation, Reason, by denying eternal misery.

The third branch. Spiritualism, the heresiarchy is the deadly enemy of the whole Christian scheme. It is the crowning blasphemy, before which the Papacy itself is tolerable. It has denied every distinctive feature of Revelation. The existence of sin—the Divine generation of Jesus—His miracles, death, resurrection, atonement—the inspiration of the Bible—even the existence of God, are all ignored by this terrible system.

It would be a strange anomaly if this "abomination of desolation," every part rotten with corruption and reeking with moral poison, had a good foundation. What, then, is its basis? Let it speak for itself.

"The first, the greatest, and the grandest truth coming through modern Spiritualism, is the immortality of the soul."—*A Spirit.*

"We have no proof of immortality aside from spiritual communications."—*Mrs. Elmer.*

“The phenomena of modern Spiritualism, by their startling significance and world wide diffusion, have assumed an importance worthy the earnest consideration of all rational minds, demonstrating as they do, the immortality of the soul.”—*Spiritual Convention, Plymouth, Mass.*

“This new dispensation comes to supply the want to the countless thousands who are now slumbering in indifference or toiling in infidelity; to convict man of his immortality,” etc.—*Judge Edmonds.*

“Spirits come to convince us of the great truth of immortality.”—*Dr. Lyon.*

“Spiritualism, according to the modern acceptation of that term, embraces all those who believe in the immortality of the soul. Beyond this common faith there is no doctrine or creed necessarily incident to Spiritualism.”—*Spiritual Convention, Rockford, Ill., 1858.*

We would ask the candid Christian if the very fact that this wicked system is founded on the inherent immortality of man, does not throw a dark shadow over that doctrine? The existence of Spiritualism is strong presumptive evidence against inherent immortality.

Let the “mind that hath wisdom” consider the trunk and the branches. Kill the trunk, and the branches will decay. The “conflict of ages” will cease. Best of all, an effective barrier will be raised against “that Wicked” one, “whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders.”

---

## EXTRACT FROM LORD KING ON JOHN LOCKE.

SELECTED BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

“THE religious opinions of this great man may best be collected from his writings: to an ardent piety and a firm belief in the religion he professed, was joined a truly Christian charity for all those who differed in opinion from him. The religion of Locke was that revealed in the Scriptures, which, in his opinion, was the most remarkable religion in the world. Of the particular form of his faith, it is more difficult to speak, because he was always averse to vain and idle disputations: but

for the dogmatical and mystical doctors of the Church he certainly had no predilection. Reason was his rule and guide in everything; toleration was his text; and he abhorred those only who pervert that divine precept, which teaches to promote peace on earth, and good-will towards man. Those who rely upon his authority, and make use of his name, would do well to consider what manner of Christian he was; and when they bid others believe because he believed, let them also teach as he taught, and practice those virtues which he practiced."

NOTE. As the author of "Retribution" has referred to John Locke, as "authority," and made "use of his name," we hope a consideration of Lord King's advice in the foregoing will bring him back to the position held by him in "Pauline Theology," from which he has so distantly receded. On page 60 of the latter work, he offers the following advice to believers in the *death* of the wicked:

"It must be the purpose of believers to urge the matter, not roughly and unkindly, but in the spirit and temper of Him who did not 'strive' or 'cry.' Let not truth be wounded in the house of its friends by unkind and unchristian conduct. While you maintain a readiness to give to every one that asketh of you a reason of the hope that is within you, let it be 'with meekness and fear,' and let Christian patience characterize all your communications with those who may oppose themselves to the truth as it is in Christ Jesus."

To "*opposers*" he says:—

"Let me bespeak of you then one favor. 'Let brotherly love continue.' Be kind. Do not destroy brotherly confidence by bitter and angry words. We are poor sinners in God's sight, and have no foundation upon which we may safely build a superstructure of self-conceited pride and exclusiveness."

---

## GEMS FROM LOCKE.

SELECTED BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

To prejudge other men's notions, before we have looked into them, is not to show their darkness, but to put out our own eyes. "Try all things, hold fast that which is good," is a divine rule, coming from the Father of light and truth, and it is hard to know what other way men can come at truth, to lay hold of

it, if they do not dig and search for it as for gold and hid treasure ; but he that does so must have much earth and rubbish before he gets the pure metal ; sand and pebbles and dross usually lie blended with it, but the gold is nevertheless gold, and will enrich the man that employs his pains to seek and separate it. Neither is there any danger he should be deceived by the mixture. Every man carries about him a touchstone, if he will make use of it, to distinguish substantial gold from superficial glitterings, truth from appearances. And, indeed, the use and benefit of this touchstone, which is natural reason, is spoiled and lost only by assuming prejudices, overweening presumption, and narrowing our minds. The want of exercising it in the full extent of things intelligible, is that which weakens and extinguishes this noble faculty in us.—*Conduct of the Understanding.*

REASON is natural revelation, whereby the eternal Father of light and fountain of all knowledge, communicates to mankind that portion of truth which he has laid within the reach of their natural faculties : revelation is natural reason enlarged by a new set of discoveries communicated by God immediately, which reason vouches the truth of, by the testimony and proofs it gives that they come from God. So that he that takes away reason to make way for revelation, puts out the light of both ; and does much the same as if he would persuade a man to put out his eyes, the better to receive the remote light of an invisible star by a telescope.—*Essay concerning Human Understanding.*

---

### THE TRUTH ONWARD.

WE find the following announcement in *The Methodist* of this city. The minister spoken of is not the only one we have heard of recently, who has renounced the doctrine of *inherent* immortality. It doubtless is a cause of regret and alarm to those who still adhere to that doctrine ; but it is a matter of devout thanksgiving to the God of all grace that intelligent men have forsaken a dogma that has led to such a flood of theological corruption and which is the main pillar of papacy and moderns.piritualism, as well as *Mormonism*, to say nothing of the dis honor done to the character of God by the consequence it carries in its train.

THE DOCTRINE OF ANNIHILATION.—Rev. J. A. Ross, in behalf of the Congregational ministers of Cumberland Co., M., had

addressed a note of inquiry to Rev. H. G. Storer, of Scarborough, in that State, stating that he is reported to have expressed his belief in the final annihilation of the wicked. To this note, written Jan. 9th, Mr. Storer replied on the 18th of Feb. ; and it appears from the following extract that the suspicions of the Cumberland Ministerial Association are fully sustained : " You will please assure them, also, concerning an article of my religious faith, that ' to those who by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for honor, glory, and immortality,' I believe that ' God will render eternal life,' and to them only ; fully expecting that ' the second death' will be for the wicked at the day of final judgment—the eternal end of their conscious existence ; and that, when they have experienced everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord in and by the fires of Gehenna, then will God bring to pass that glorious ' restitution' of all things spoken of by all the holy prophets since the world began."

---

## ROMANS 8 : 11 IN "RETRIBUTION."

A REVIEW BY RUFUS WENDELL.

" It may also be noted that some critics deny that there is any reference to the resurrection of the dead in the passage in question. A writer of no less ability than the noted JOHN LOCKE, Esq., denies that the word *quicken* here signifies to *raise*, and referring to some one who had advanced the idea, he says : ' He might therefore have spared the word *quicken*, which he produces out of John 5 : 21, as of no force to his purpose, till he had proved that St. Paul here in Rom. 8 : 11, was speaking of the resurrection of men's bodies out of the grave, which he will never do till he can prove that *τῆνθά, mortal*, here signifies the same with *νεκρά, dead*. And I demand of him to show *τῆνθον, mortal*, anywhere in the New Testament attributed to anything *void of life*. *τῆνθον, mortal*, always signifies the thing it is joined to to be *living* ; so that the words " *shall quicken even your mortal bodies,*" in that learned author's interpretation of these words of St. Paul, here signify, *God shall raise to life your living dead bodies*, which no one can think a very proper way of speaking ; though it be very good sense, and very emphatical to say, " *God shall by his Spirit put into even your mortal bodies a principle of Immortality, or spiritual life,*" which is the sense of the Apostle here. See Gal. 6 : 8 ; 3 : 21.'

" Besides the connection of *this* to the former chapter, (vii) contained in the word ' therefore,' the very antithesis of the expressions in one and the other, show that St. Paul, in writing this very verso, had an eye to the foregoing chapter. There it was ' *sin that dwelleth*

in me,' that was the active and overruling principle. Here it is '*the Spirit of God that dwelleth in you*,' that is the principle of your spiritual life. Then it was '*who shall deliver me from this body of death?*' Here it is '*God by his Spirit shall quicken your mortal bodies*,' i. e., bodies which, as the seat and harbor of the sinful lusts that possess them, are indisposed and dead to the actions of a spiritual life, and have a natural tendency to death. In the same sense, and upon the same account, he calls the bodies of the Gentiles their '*mortal bodies*,' Rom. 6 : 12, 13, where his subject is, as here, freedom from the reign of sin, upon which account they are there styled '*alive from the dead*.'—NOTES ON LOCKE'S PARAPHRASE OF ROMANS.

"I do not presume to indorse or dispute the position that this quickening is the present work of the Spirit of God, upon those who, by its power are joined to the Lord, and made partakers of the divine nature. I will only remind the reader of those passages which mention a quickening of the saints as now accomplished. 'And you hath he quickened who were dead . . . hath quickened us together with Christ, and hath raised us up together,' &c. Eph. 2 : 1, 5."—*Retribution*, pp. 81-83.

Rom. 8 : 11 is "the passage in question" referred to in the first sentence of the foregoing extract. Having in our May article disposed of our author's wild comment on the passage, "he that is dead is freed from sin," we now return with him to Rom. 8 : 11—and for what? Alas! to be told "that some critics deny that" the text contains "any reference to the resurrection of the dead." But what of this? Has not our author fully committed himself to the view that "the passage in question" does teach "the resurrection of the dead"—of the righteous by explicit declaration, and of the wicked by "inference"? Yes—but he has consulted a "noted" writer (far more eminent as a philosopher than as a theologian,) and now, though not prepared to "indorse," he yet does "not presume to dispute" the position that the "quickenings" in Rom. 8 : 11 is "the present work of the Spirit of God." In his wavering he so far cancels his earlier concessions as to "remind the reader of those passages which mention a quickening of the saints as now accomplished." Why this reminder? Evidently, to make his readers share his want of confidence in the idea that Rom. 8 : 11 contains the doctrine of the resurrection. But why this solicitude, if he has succeeded in subverting our inference from the text and establishing his own? "Ay, there's the rub." It is just possible that he may have been haunted by an observation of Prof. STUART, who, refusing to recognize the resurrection as being taught in the passage, says :



"If vs. 10, 11, be construed of *literal* death and life, then ALL THE PROMISE that is made to Christians here would be, that their bodies shall be raised up at the last day, and the INFERENCE would seem to be, THAT THE WICKED WILL NOT BE RAISED UP ; which we know to be contrary to the doctrine of Paul and other New Testament writers. Such an exegesis, then, although IT IS THE MOST COMMON, seems to reduce the whole passage to comparative insignificance, OR ELSE makes it speak that which is contradictory to Christian doctrine."

We cordially agree with Prof. S. that Rom. 8 : 11, in teaching the resurrection of believers, is reduced to "comparative insignificance" *if* the wicked are also to be quickened. The Prof. had not the sagacity to see how the *inference* unfavorable to the revival of the impenitent could be turned aside while that of the righteous was retained in the passage. "Retribution"—for publishing which our author once "hoped" there would be "no occasion"—was given to the world, it would thus seem, about forty years too late. Its earlier appearance might likewise have been serviceable to OLSHAUSEN, who has the following remark on the passage in question :

"A SURE PLEDGE, then, for the glorification of A MAN'S OWN BODY is given by the consciousness of that awakening power dwelling in the Spirit of God, which has verified itself in the waking of Christ from the dead. Finally, the apostle so *represents the resurrection*, as though it were *merely something imparted to the holy*, as though there were NO RESURRECTION OF THE WICKED."

But whether our author had, or had not, seen the foregoing concessions of STUART and OLSHAUSEN, it may be safely assumed that he did not throw aside Mr. LOCKE'S exposition of Rom. 8 : 11 until he had read the following suggestive observations by that writer :

"One thing more the text suggests, concerning this matter ; and that is, if by 'quickening your mortal bodies, &c.' be meant, here, the raising them into life after death, *how can this be mentioned as a PECULIAR FAVOR TO THOSE, WHO HAVE THE SPIRIT OF GOD ?* for God will also raise the bodies of the wicked, and as certainly as those of believers. But that, which is promised here, is promised to THOSE ONLY who have the Spirit of God : and therefore it MUST BE SOMETHING PECULIAR TO THEM," &c.

We suspect our author found less difficulty in withholding the foregoing extract from his readers than he did in excluding its

influence from his mind. Be this as it may, he has shifted his ground of defense, and the nature of our task varies accordingly. He adduces Eph. 2 : 1, 5 to invalidate our argument from Rom. 8 : 11. At this point we are happy to cite the remarks of Prof. HUDSON who discusses the passages from Ephesians as follows :

“Eph. 2 : 1 : ‘Dead in trespasses and sins.’ (Comp. ver. 5, and Col. 2 : 13.) This expression is understood by so many able commentators as a *prolepsis*, that we need not waste words upon it. We think it plainly suggested, if not required, by the context. The christian hope had just been connected with the resurrection and glorification of Christ, ‘in the heavenly places’ (ch. 1 : 18–20). Read, then, vs. 5, 6 : ‘Even when we were dead in sins, hath [God] quickened us *together with Christ*, and hath raised us up together, and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus.’ Here the resurrection is anticipated ; as also in Col. 2 : 12 ; 3 : 1. Contrasted with this future life appears the death under whose power and sentence men are brought by sin. Hence the paraphrase of Chrysostom : ‘Ye did lie under sentence of death.’ This was *because* of trespasses and sins. The dative case, either with or without the preposition *en*, is known to express the relation of cause.

“This view is given, in one or both of the passages, by Theodoret, Jerome (‘mortui per peccatum’), Theophylact, Erasmus, Zwingle, Vatablus, Zanchius, Piscator, Calixtus, Schlichtingius, Leausobre and L’Enfant, Michælis, Bretschneider (‘morti obnoxii peccati causâ,’ Lex. N. T.), Wahl, Flatt, Käuffer, Meyer (‘certo morituri’), Macknight (‘doomed to death on account of trespasses and sins’).

“The relation of sin as a *cause*, and not a mere state, is also allowed by Euthymius, who says *DIA* (through), and Doederlein : ‘miseri *propter* peccatum’ (on account of sin).”—*Christ our Life*, pp. 47, 48.

We have long thought favorably of the *proleptical* sense contended for by HUDSON, and until we see cause to reject that view “we need not waste words upon” the last paragraph in our extract from “Retribution.” Prof. HUDSON’S view of Rom. 8 : 11 will be of interest and is as follows :

“Rom. 8 : 10 : ‘And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin ; but the spirit is life, because of righteousness.’ But the body certainly cannot be spiritually dead, and the proleptic sense of the term is evident. Hence Augustine remarks : ‘It has seemed to me much better to say that the body is called

*dead* because it is now under the necessity of dying, which it was not before sin.' (Retract. l. 1, c. 26.) And Fritzsche, in his able and learned commentary: 'It is indeed most certain that 'life' and 'death,' and the 'quickening, of mortal bodies, (vs. 10, 11,) should be explained literally, with Beza, Calovius, Vitringa, Turretin, Räckert, Reiche, Usteri, and others.' The figurative exegesis he regards as a 'strange perversion of Paul's words;' and the mixed interpretation—of ver. 10 figuratively and ver. 11 literally—as none at all. He cites Arrian speaking of the body as naturally dead; and refers to Gen. 20: 3; 1 Tim. 5: 6. To the names he gives we may add, as endorsing the proleptic sense, Calvin, Vatablus, Zegerus, Estius, Menochius, Toletus, Parcus, Gomar, à Lapide, Beausobre and L'Enfant, Bengel, Flatt, Whitby, Hammond, Clarke, the 'Five Clergymen,' Alford, Bretschneider, Wahl, Kauffer, Meyer, Tholuck."—*Christ Our Life*, p. 50.

The quotation from JOHN LOCKE, Esq., of which our author has availed himself, now claims our attention. It has a history which will be of interest to our readers. Mr. LOCKE was born in 1632, and cotemporaneous with himself were Dr. DANIEL WHITBY, born in 1638, and Dr. EDWARD STILLINGFLEET, Lord Bp. of Worcester, born in 1635. The last named is said by Lord MACAULAY to have been "renowned as a consummate master of all the weapons of controversy." In 1690 Mr. Locke's celebrated *Essay Concerning the Human Understanding* was first published in England. This work was assailed by the Bishop of Worcester on various points, and, among others, on the ground that it contained teachings inimical to the Church's article of faith touching the resurrection of THE BODY. This attack by the Bishop became the occasion of a controversy between himself and Mr. Locke, and the latter, in his "Second Reply" to the "Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Worcester," dated "Oates, May 4, 1698," distinctly avows his want of faith in the resurrection of *the body*, and enters upon an elaborate defence of his position. At a later date Dr. WHITBY published the "Preface" to his "Commentary and Paraphrase" on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, and in this "Preface" he furnishes a masterly vindication of the doctrine of "the resurrection of the same body which dieth"—the sole occasion of his doing so being the teachings of LOCKE in his "Reply" to STILLINGFLEET. It is to this argument of Dr. WHITBY that LOCKE refers, and attempts a partial

reply, in the extract from his Notes given in "Retribution." Dr. WHITBY, in his Commentary on Rom. 8 : 11, contending for a literal quickening in the passage, replies as follows to the argument of LOCKE which appears in our extract from "Retribution":

"The late commentator and paraphrast, here exposed by Mr. Locke, is D. W., and yet he is so unhappy, as neither to approve of Mr. L.'s interpretation, nor dislike his own. He cannot approve of Mr. L.'s interpretation, that SOMA NEKRON, and THNEETON, signify a body morally dead, because sin reigns not in it; (1.) because SOMA NEKRON, absolutely put, bears no such sense in scripture, but only signifies a body without life, or breath, James 2 : 16. (2.) Because this interpretation makes the apostle say, ver. 10, the body is dead already, i. e., as to all activity of sin, which reigns no longer in it, its sinful carnal lust being mortified, and yet makes him promise, ver. 11, that if the Spirit of God dwell in us, God shall quicken our mortal bodies, i. e., saith Mr. L., 'he shall deliver them from the dominion of their carnal lusts;' that is, it makes him promise God shall do hereafter what he told us, ver. 10, was already done. (3.) In those words, 'He that raiseth Christ from the dead,' the apostle must be supposed to speak of a real death of the body; and therefore in the latter clause of the same sentence, 'He shall quicken their mortal bodies,' it is reasonable to conceive, he speaks of quickening those bodies in the same sense, viz., by raising them from the dead. Nor hath Mr. L. said anything of weight against this sense. For,

"First, Whereas he saith, 'It cannot be proved that THNEETA, mortal bodies, here signifies the same as NEKRA : ' (1.) he hath not proved the contrary. (2.) His own interpretation plainly makes them both to signify the same. And, (3.) what is more likely than that SOMA NEKRON, ver. 10, and SOMATA THNEETA, ver. 11, should be of the same import ?

"Secondly, When he addeth, that 'THNEETON, mortal, always signifies the thing joined with it to be living;' he considered not that the same apostle saith, that at the resurrection from the dead, TO THNEETON TOUTO, 'this mortal body shall put on immortality,' and that when, TO THNEETON TOUTO, 'this mortal body shall have put on immortality, death shall be swallowed up in victory.' Secondly, I add, that THNEETON, when it relates, as here, to a body, to be quickened, never bears any other sense, but that of a dead body. \* \* \*

"Lastly, Whereas he objects to the want of connection in this interpretation, with the subject the apostle is here discoursing of, that is very plain; for the apostle is here discoursing of the ben-

efits and advantages which Christians shall receive by living, 'not after the flesh, but after the Spirit;' that this will cause them to 'mind spiritual things,' ver. 5, that it will give them 'life and peace,' ver. 6. So that though their bodies die because of sin, they shall obtain a happy resurrection through the Spirit dwelling in them; *ARA OUN*, 'therefore,' saith he, ver. 12, 'we are debtors not to live after the flesh, for they that do so, *AROTHNESKONTAI*, shall die' (not in the moral, but in the penal sense), 'but they who through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the flesh shall live;' for, ver. 14, 'as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God,' and so shall obtain 'the adoption, i. e., the redemption of the body' from corruption, verse 23."

Thus it will be seen that Mr. LOCKE was thoroughly answered during his life time by "a writer of no less ability than the noted" Dr. WHITBY, and that the answer was *subversive of his theory* that the BODIES of the dead would *not be raised*.

We have stated that Mr. LOCKE did not believe in the resurrection of the body. This declaration can be abundantly proved, notwithstanding the assertion of Mr. L. (in a citation we have already made from him) that "God will also raise the bodies of the wicked, and as certainly as those of believers," and the following remark in his "Reply" to the Bishop of Worcester—"I do by no means deny that the *same* bodies shall be raised at the last day, yet I see nothing your lordship has said to prove it to be an article of faith." It is a just observation of Archbishop WHATELY that "when a writer is at variance with himself, it is usual to judge from the nature of the subject, and the circumstances of the case, *which* is likely to be his real persuasion," etc. Now we have a threefold reason for exhibiting, in this connection, the "real persuasion" of Mr. Locke on the subject of the resurrection: (1.) it is interesting to know the opinions of men as "noted" as he was on subjects of such importance; (2.) to estimate rightly the argument of Mr. L. on Rom. 8 : 11 it should be known that he held views on the resurrection which would be overwhelmed by establishing the fact that a literal quickening of "mortal *bodies*" was taught in that passage; and (3.) the author of "Retribution" should have his eyes opened to the fact that JOHN LOCKE'S views on the resurrection were about as unscriptural as those of the late Prof. BUSH, and that if the latter can only

be called "a hopeful leader" in *irony*, the former should not be too confidently quoted by a writer who loves to put his opponents in the same ranks with "Hymeneus and Philetus."

On the subject in question, Mr. LOCKE, in his "Second Reply" to the Bishop of Worcester, wrote at great length, and we must content ourselves with extracts that touch the immediate point before us. He says :

"The resurrection of *the dead* I acknowledge to be an article of the Christian faith ; but that the resurrection of *the same body*, in your lordship's sense of the same body, is an article of the Christian faith, is what I confess I do not yet know." Again : "In the New Testament \* \* I find our Saviour and the apostles to preach the resurrection of *the dead* and the resurrection *from the dead*, in many places ; but I do not remember any place where the resurrection of the *same body* is so much as mentioned. Nay, which is very remarkable in the case, I do not remember in any place of the New Testament \* \* any such expression as *the resurrection of the body*, much less of the *same body*. And it may seem to be not without some special reason, that where St. Paul's discourse was particularly concerning the body, and so led him to name it, yet when he speaks of the resurrection, he says, *you*, and *not your bodies*, 1 Cor. 6 : 14." In one place Mr. Locke supposes the case of one who "believes what the Scripture proposes to him, viz., that at the last day *the dead* shall be raised, without determining whether it shall be with the *very same bodies* or no." In another place Mr. L., referring to the language of the apostle in 1 Cor. 15 : 35-38, says : "Words, I should think, sufficient to deter us from determining any thing for or against the *same body* being raised at the last day." Elsewhere, however, in allusion to 1 Cor. 15 : 37, Mr. L. remarks : From which words of St. Paul, the *natural argument seems to me* to stand thus : If the body that is put in the earth in sowing, is not the body which shall be, then *the body* that is put in *the grave* is not that, i. e., the *same body* that shall be." Again : "I do not take these two sounds, *man* and *body*, to stand for the same thing ; nor the *identity* of the *man* to be the *same* with the *identity* of the *body*." Mr. Locke admits that "Christ was raised with the *same body*," but does "not see how it follows that" mankind "should be raised with the *same body*." "The case," says he, "I think *far different* betwixt our Saviour, and those to be raised at the last day." We invite attention to one more extract : "Another evidence that St. Paul makes a *distinction* between the *dead* and the *bodies* of the dead, so that the *dead* cannot be taken in this, 1 Cor. xv, to stand precisely for the

*bodies* of the dead, are these words of the apostle : ' But some man will say, how are the *dead* raised, and with what *bodies* do *they* come ?'—which words *dead* and *they*, if supposed to stand precisely for the *bodies* of the dead, the question will run thus : How are the dead *bodies* raised, and with what *bodies* do the *dead bodies* come ? which seems to have no very agreeable sense. This, therefore, being so, that the Spirit of God keeps so expressly to this phrase or form of speaking in the New Testament, or *raising, quickening, rising, resurrection, &c.*, of the *dead*, where the resurrection at the last day is spoken of, and that the *body* is *not mentioned* but in answer to this question, With what *bodies* shall those dead who are raised come ? so that by *the dead* cannot be precisely meant the *dead bodies* : I do not see but a good Christian, who reads the Scripture with an intention to believe all that is therein revealed to him concerning the resurrection, may acquit himself of his duty therein, without entering into the inquiry whether the dead shall have the *very same bodies* or no ; which sort of inquiry the apostle, by the appellation he bestows here on him that makes it, seems not much to encourage. Nor, if he shall think himself bound to determine concerning the *identity of the bodies* of the dead, raised at the last day, will he, by the remainder of St. Paul's answer, find the determination of the apostle to be much in favor of the *very same body,*" etc.

So much for Mr. LOCKE. We utterly dissent from his Resurrection theory, or, what we think might be called more properly, his *denial* of the Resurrection ; but we happen to know that his reasonings on the subject had great weight with Prof. BUSH,\* and that they were largely employed by the latter in his "Anastasis." "Prof. BUSH," says our author, "denied the resurrection of the body." Our readers can now judge whether the same accusation would not lie with equal force against the writer by whose aid the author of "Retribution" is enabled to present us with one of his numerous illustrations of the doctrine of "yea and nay."

But we must conclude. Our author suggests the possibility that "a man might explain away the Rocky Mountains, or the everlasting hills"—a point on which we confess to a degree of skepticism. We are convinced, however, that he will need the preparatory discipline that would accrue to such an achievement, if he ever succeeds in deducing a sense from Rom. 8 : 11 that will accord with sound principles of interpretation, and not be

\* Mr. Landis, in his Reply to "Anastasis," speaks of Mr. Locke as "Professor Bush's oracle," and says that the latter "quotes from him continually in discussing the New Testament argument and especially when any difficulty presses a little too hard."

in point-blank hostility to the sentiment that Omnipotence will interpose to secure "even a temporary existence" for such as have died in their sins. The redeemed alone will ever be permitted to take up the exultant song, "O death where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?"

---

"HONESTY THE BEST POLICY."

If a man has committed a mistake, and that mistake is a slander—*i. e.*, is a false report to the injury of another—honesty requires the author to correct the mistake at the earliest possible period. Has this been done by the *Associate Editor* of the *World's Crisis*, in the case of the slander perpetrated on "Eld. Storrs" in that paper of April 9? Immediately on the appearance of that *Crisis* the following letter was sent to the *Associate Editor* :

NEW-YORK, April 13, '62.

"Eld." Morgan : You say, in your report of the Conference, "Eld. Storrs preached on his peculiar views concerning the wicked dead, who, with all their offspring, he thinks will not be included in the resurrection."

I do not expect either justice or mercy from some of my opponents ; but I did expect *justice* from *you*. The statement that I preached, as my view, that "all the offspring of the wicked dead will *not* be included in the resurrection" is false, and slanderous ; and should be retracted as *publicly* as it has been made. I *publicly denied* holding the sentiment you have attributed to me ; and I know not what excuse you have for attempting to fix it on me in the face of my denial. I would be glad to offer for you the plea of misunderstanding my denial ; but it was too explicit to admit such excuse. If you were present and heard it, there is none for you. If you were not present, and made your statement from some enemy's report in those "private" opposition conclaves, of which you speak, you are highly censurable. It must be as great a sin to "bear false witness against thy neighbor" as to hold the wicked dead will live no more. Yours for the truth,

GEO. STORRS.

In reply to the foregoing Eld. Morgan wrote as follows :

BOSTON, April 17, '62.

Rev. Geo. Storrs, New-York.—Dear Sir : Yours of the 14th inst. reached me yesterday, and will receive the attention due



shortly. You will accept my thanks for your kind and timely notice of my error: for, believe me, Sir, it was the farthest of all things from my mind to "slander" you.

Meanwhile may I ask when you corrected or retracted the statement you made some years since, when you said (in substance at least) that the non-resurrection of the infants of unbelieving parents was, or is, connected with the belief that unbelievers would not be raised from the dead? I think it was something of this sort that gave me my wrong views of your present position relative to this subject; or this with other things I need not here mention. Also will you do me the kindness to say what texts of Scripture require us to believe that the infants of heathen and unbelieving parents will be raised from the state of death?

An early reply will oblige, Yours, most obediently.

P. B. MORGAN.

To this letter the following reply was sent:

NEW-YORK, April 21st, '62.

Eld. P. B. Morgan,—*Dear Sir*: I am bound to accept your disavowal of *intention* to "slander" me, and I acquit you *so far* but the slander *remains*, and is just as mischievous as if intentional till it is recalled as publicly as made.

Your question surprises me as much as the slander of which I complain! I ask in reply, *When, where, and how*, did I ever make the statement, "that the non-resurrection of the infants of unbelieving parents was, or is, connected with the belief that unbelievers would not be raised from the dead?" I am not aware that I ever made any such statement: but if I had—which I do not admit\*—my denial, publicly, in Boston, of now holding such view was a sufficient "*correction or retraction*" to have shielded me from your imputing it to me, as my view, in my ministry at Boston.

You ask me also, "What texts of Scripture require us to believe that the infants of heathen and unbelieving parents will be raised from the state of death?"

I do not say there are any: I simply say I leave those infants entirely at the disposal of the infinitely wise God, to be dealt with according to His wisdom, without attempting to determine whether they will, or will not be made alive.

Yours, respectfully,

GEO. STORRS.

Eld. M.'s letter, it will be seen, was dated April 17th, and he admits that the "notice" of his "error," in the statement he had made in the *Crisis*, was "kind and timely." Why then did he

\* When I made this reply, I supposed M. referred to some expression I had made since I held the wicked dead would not live again, and not while I was an opposer of it.

allow that "error" to pass on two weeks, to the *second* issue of the *Crisis*, without correcting it? Instead of making the correction at the earliest point of time, it is put off, and the false impression permitted to do its work for "three full weeks" after it was sent out on its evil mission; and at the time "Eld. Storrs" was looking for a Christian acknowledgment of the mistake in the *Crisis*, he received the following note:

BOSTON, April 24th, '62.

Eld. Storrs,—Sir: Yours of the 21st I have received, and will say, the statements I refer to are in the *Examiners*; what numbers I cannot now tell you, not having them at hand. They were made I think in a review of Dr. Walsh, but am not certain. I supposed they were as true as if made in 1862; and I as little dreamed of "slander" as I presume you did when you made them. My correction I shall make in next week's *Crisis*. And I am very respectfully,  
Yours, P. B. MORGAN.

This last note from Eld. M. carried conviction that the delay in making the correction was for the purpose of seeking some thing, which he had not yet found, as a cloak for his misstatement, instead of a frank confession of "error"; and it contrasts strangely with his first letter in which he says, "Accept my thanks for your kind and timely notice of my error." Had he as kindly and timely corrected his "error," I would have no occasion, as I now have, of complaining of his strange course in what he calls "OUR 'SLANDEROUS' STATEMENT CORRECTED."—Does that *correction* give evidence of any thing like Christian magnanimity? It seems impossible that Eld. M. could have stooped to so degrading an act as that of connecting with his correction of what he admits to be a "gross mistake," an article written by "Eld. S." more than *twelve* years ago. What had that article to do with the correction of an error into which Eld. M. had fallen? Does it not mark the correction itself as a forced one—an endeavor, while compelled to correct an error, to do it in such manner as to screen himself by adding to the reproach of the injured party? So it looks; and I confess, I have still so much charity for Eld. M., I do not believe he could have been betrayed into such a course if he had not been prompted to, and aided in it, by some evil-minded genius who haunts the *Crisis* office.

Let not Eld. M., nor any one else think I complain of his republishing what I wrote twelve years ago against the non-living

of the wicked dead. It is probably the best argument he or any of his faith can produce, though I have long since become satisfied it is untenable. If it suits them, let them adopt it; but let them call it their own, for it is not now mine, any more than the arguments I *used* twenty-five years ago for the immortality of the soul and the endless misery of the wicked are mine to-day—I repudiate both it and them. I say again, let Eld. M. and others use it, if they will; but who that has a sound and discriminating mind, will not see that in the connection in which he has placed it, it is not only in bad taste, but an act of injustice?

Eld. M. had said, in his article, for which a correction was called and which he promised to make, “Eld. Storrs *thinks* the wicked dead with all their *offspring*, will not be included in the resurrection.” It happens “Eld. Storrs” not only does not *think* so, but that he *never* did think so. But whether he ever *did* or not, what has that to do with what he “*thinks*” *now*? Just about as much as what Paul *thought* before his conversion had to do with what he thought afterwards. Said Paul, “*verily thought* with myself, that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth.” Suppose some professed Christian had gone away and reported—“Paul *thinks* he ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus”—:—Would not every one say, “It is a slander”? And suppose the person who had made the false report, had said, when called on to retract, “Well, I will correct my error, but Paul *did* think so once, and I supposed it was as true now as then”! Could any man in a sane mind and possessed of a Christian spirit take such a course?

Suppose Eld. Morgan should change his present church relation and unite with the Episcopal Church—as “report” says he *thinks* of doing. After he is in that church, some one publishes that Eld. M. “*thinks* the soul is not immortal.” Would he think that a slander, and publicly deny that he held such doctrine? If he called on the person who reported the slander to correct it, how would he regard the act, if, after a needless delay, that person came out and said, “I am mistaken; but Eld. M. did hold that doctrine some years ago, and I supposed his arguments were as true as if made since he joined the Episcopal Church: and to show how he talked then, I will give you a specimen

'*verbatim et literatim*,' and here it is." Suppose that person should then fill a column with extracts from Eld. M.'s proofs that the soul is not inherently immortal, and scatter it, broadcast, in an Episcopal paper. Would Eld. M. *think* he was treated magnanimously? or would he regard it as the act of a small and spiteful mind? I leave it to his own reflection if the person's course would not seem to have a moral "upas within it."

New-York, May 5th, 1862.

GEO. STORRS.

### ANOTHER PASSENGER WAKED UP.

Are "Pilate and Herod made friends" just now? Another voice from BOSTON indicates that not only did the preaching of the EDITOR of this Magazine in that city prove a "troublesome stone" to the future-misery advocates, but also to the spirit rapping advocates. It is true these last came in for a portion in our preaching in Boston, but to no great extent; yet sufficient, it would seem, to quicken memory, and call up ghosts of the past, somewhat after the same fashion as it was done at the *Crisis* office. We find the following in the *Herald of Progress*, of this city; a paper edited by Andrew Jackson Davis, of clairvoyant notoriety. The date of the communication shows it was written just after our visit to Boston. It runs as follows:—

#### A FALSE PROPHET.

MR. EDITOR: There is a preacher of the old theology in your city by the name of George Storrs, a sectarian of the "strictest sect," a good man, I doubt not, but very much befogged in antiquated notions about God and hell-fire. Some years ago we were associates in the cause of anti-slavery, and, dining with me one day, at my residence, 72 Greene-street, New-York, Mr. Storrs uttered and put his name to the following prediction, the record of which I have kept, and I now publish it, as I told Mr. Storrs I would do, in the process of time:

"I predict that slavery will be abolished in the District of Columbia within three years, and probably within two years of this day.

March 20, 1838.

GEO. STORRS."

Well, twenty-one years have demonstrated Mr. Storrs, not indeed a bad man, but a false prophet. and, I doubt not, as much in error in respect to the final destiny of the human race, (a part of whom he thinks will be annihilated, as he has been in respect to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Storrs has done simply what we are all very apt to do, until we learn better. He takes many things for granted in respect to God, the Bible, and another world, of which we know nothing at all. This habit (once confirmed) of taking things for granted, is very apt to make false prophets of us, as in the case it has done with my old friend, the Rev. George Storrs.

Boston, April 18, 1862.

LA ROY SUNDERLAND.

There are several things about this article to which we call attention. 1. "Storrs is a preacher of the old theology." What does Mr. Sunderland mean by this? He does not mean that I preach what is called orthodoxy, or inherent immortality, for he holds to such immortality, and that is a point of first importance to the theory of the so-called "spiritualists." He means, then, that Storrs believes the Bible, and draws his theology from that Book; therefore "Geo. Storrs is a sectarian of the 'strictest sect.'" So understood, I plead guilty to that charge; and trust I may not be led off by any *ignis fatuus* of "spiritualism," from the true light which our gracious God has given us, to guide our feet in the way of peace.

2. "But Mr. Storrs is very much befogged in antiquated notions about God and hell-fire," says Mr. Sunderland. That is, Mr. Storrs still holds to Bible doctrine! But why is this so dreadful? Because it proves Mr. Sunderland "*A false prophet.*" Do you ask, how so? Because he "predicted, at *my* residence, 18 Chester-st., Philadelphia, some sixteen years ago, that I soon would give up the notion of the *inspiration* of the Scriptures. True, I did not get him to put his "prediction" down on paper, but it has not been forgotten; and because Mr. Sunderland has proved to be "a false prophet," he thinks Mr. Storrs is "very much befogged in antiquated notions about God," &c.; hence sets himself to work to prove me such as he himself is. How does he proceed? He brings forward a paper with my signature, which he got me to sign when I was more hopeful of human nature, and its susceptibility to truth, than I am now, or have been for many years, and sends it to the *Herald of Progress*, which "demonstrates" that "Mr. Storrs is a false prophet." Very well; it is far better to be proved a false prophet concerning good hoped for, than to be prophesying evil, as Mr. Sunderland did at my residence in Philadelphia.

But let us look at "Mr. Storrs' prediction." It may properly be divided into two parts. *First*—"I predict that slavery will be abolished in the District of Columbia." That part of the prediction is *now* a fact; and it is somewhat singular that it should be done just about the *time* in the year of the date of the prediction. So far "Mr. Storrs" is proved to be a *true* prophet. But he was mistaken in the *time*! True: and so far he over-rated the susceptibility of human nature to the claims of truth,

justice and righteousness; and human nature has proved worse and more wedded to wrong than he believed it could be: but slavery *is* "abolished in the District of Columbia": thanks be to God for that.

Our old friend Sunderland says, "Twenty-one years have demonstrated Mr. Storrs a false prophet, and, I doubt not, as much in error in respect to the final destiny of the human race (a part of whom he thinks will be annihilated) as he has been in respect to the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia."

Very likely Mr. Sunderland is correct in this statement.—What was my "error" in the slavery case? In the *time*. How great was the error? "Twenty-one years!" Well, Mr. Storrs was so many years too fast; but *the event came at last*. Mr. Storrs thought "a part of the human race" would have been "annihilated" just about eighteen years ago: and if he is no more mistaken than he was in the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, then the "annihilation of a part of the human race"—viz. the rejecters of Christ "as the resurrection and the life"—will be annihilated in about *three* years from this date; that will fill up the "twenty-one years" of my mistake in *time* in the abolition case! one *event* is as certain as the other; though I do not affirm the mistake in time will be equal in both cases; but if I am no more in error in the one *event* than in the other—as I fully believe I am not—then the rejecters of the *Life-Giver*, Jesus the Messiah, may look for their utter, total, and eternal annihilation within about *three* years. That is a short notice, and my advice to them all is, "*That thou doest, do quickly*"—"The night cometh in which no man can work."

New-York, May 7th, 1862.

GEO. STORRS.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—This number completes our obligation to those subscribers who paid *only* one dollar for 1861, and have not made a *new* remittance. Any person who receives the *July* number will regard it as a *receipt* for our claim on them to the close of this volume. Those not receiving it, will understand their subscription has run out, or we are mistaken about it. If the latter, please inform us immediately.

We call attention to our offer, made in January last, to *new* subscribers, to give them the six numbers of 1861—which make a part of the present volume—for twenty-five cents. If any *old* subscribers, who have renewed this year, or who may renew for the remainder of this volume, wish the six numbers of last year, they also shall have them for 25 cents, if applied for soon.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

---

"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, HATH NOT LIFE."

---

Vol. 14. No. 13.]

JULY, 1862.

[Whole No. 215.

---

---

## PHILOSOPHICAL ESSAYS ON CHRISTIANITY.

TRANSLATED FROM ETUDES PHILOSOPHIQUES SUR LE CHRISTIANISME. NO. 5.

WE have until now wandered, like the Magi, on the faith of a star. We have seen it rise over the cradle of the world, shining brilliantly upon the Jews, sparkling through the clouds of Paganism, and we have followed its path, and perceived that it has concentrated the attention of the entire earth. This star stopped suddenly in its course eighteen hundred years ago. At that period the hope of the nations terminated, their traditions faded away, their sacrifices were abolished, and their oracles became silent. [See Plutarch's work entitled: "Why have Oracles Ceased?"] Was this because the expectation of the nations had proved a chimera? or was it not, rather, because the *object* of their expectation actually appeared? How earnestly ought we to desire to solve this great alternative!

Without aiming to penetrate the decrees of Providence, we may still say that it was necessary, in order that man should feel his own impotence, that the Rehabilitation should not be the *immediate* consequence of the Fall. In our first number, the translator slightly glanced at the state into which the world had fallen previous to the coming of Christ, as in the original work the subject is too fully treated of to admit of more than a casual notice. Man had, in fact, sunk in immorality and in ignorance to the bottom of an abyss, and to the first Fall had succeeded a series of falls—the lamentable prolongation of the first—from which God's mercy could alone elevate them. Such was the moral state of the human species during the reign of the first Cæsars, and what was their external state? Bossuet, in his "Discourse on Universal History," speaks of the manner in which God's providence, through the revolutions of nations, first by the conquest of Alexander, and then by the Romans, had united at the time of which we are now speaking, the whole known world into one empire, so that the Divine Shepherd had

only to come to his flock and take them to himself. The prophet Daniel—chap. ii.—has spoken wonderfully of this great movement. The image, in the king's dream, had a head of gold—"Asia." The kingdom which came after was of silver—"Greece"; the third was of brass, and to "command all the earth"—"*that of Alexander*;" the fourth was of iron, and was to break all the others—"Rome;" and the following verses speak of the "kingdom of Christ," which should become a "great mountain and fill all the earth." We recommend our readers to look to this in their Bibles, and let them remember that the Jews (though unbelievers themselves,) guarantee to us the truth of the letter of the prophecy which was shown to Alexander when he paid a visit to the Temple of Jerusalem. [Josephus' Antiq. Book XI, ch. 8.] The Pagan authors, too, were struck with the witnessing of the hand of God in the formation of the grand unity of the Roman world. [Titus Livius, Book I, v. 4 and 55; Cicero's Orations; Plutarch on the Fortune of the Romans; Polybius' Hist., Book I—and many others.] In fact, the barriers which separated the nationalities, were broken down. The same language was heard everywhere. The Alexanders and the Cæsars had, indeed, as Isaiah said, "prepared the way of the Lord," by lowering the mountains, raising the valleys, and making "the rough places plain." At this time, too, there was a universal presentiment that, at that time, and from Judea, should arise the expected governor. Tacitus, in his history, speaks of this (Book V, chapter 13). Suetonius says the same thing and in the same terms. Cicero tells us that the oracles had announced, for a time he believed to be that in which he lived, the arrival of *a king, whom he who would be saved must acknowledge*. [Note di Divinitat, Book II, ch. 54. See also Virgil's 4th Eclogue.]

It was, however, in Judea, that this expectation was strongest, and Macrobius, a Pagan historian, says that Augustus heard that Herod, in his fear of a rival, "had actually murdered his own son, *with the other male children*." [Macrobius, Book II, ch. 4; Book VI, ch. 31.] Josephus also says: "They," the Jews, interpreted "all the prophecies according to their own idea, which was, *that there would arise at that time a man of their country, who would command the whole earth*." [Josephus' Wars.] The same history is full of false Christs who attempted to personify the true Messiah, so that no former age had ever been like it; and let us also add that the expectation has since ceased in the entire universe, and the Jews, in the Talmud, have actually laid a curse on those who ever again try to calculate the advent of Messiah. It was in the midst of all these circumstances, of the greatest moral decomposition of humanity, of its greatest material unity, of the rumors which resounded from



east to west, and of its false Christs, that the true Messiah entered into the world—not, however, as a prince and a conqueror—no! He deceived the universal hope, the better to fulfill it in the end. But let us enter directly into this mystery, and ask: What did Jesus come to do on the earth? He came to raise a world from sensuality, and pride, and vice, by showing an example of humility, gentleness, and virtue; to render suffering sublime, as the world had before made a divinity of pleasure; and as a God, humbles himself infinitely to become man. He descended even to the lowest of mankind. In his office of Mediator he became a man of ignominy and grief—what a type of our poor nature!—when, as it were, to parody our illusions, Jesus was crowned, but with thorns; draped, but with rags; armed with a reed as a scepter; saluted king, and at the same time covered with opprobrium. At the same time, however, we behold him as God when we perceive goodness, justice, innocence, patience, humility, courage, resignation, love, all united and shown in his most unmerited suffering.

Truly he was a king—"but not of this world!" Yet in the bosom of this world has Jesus raised a kingdom—that of *truth* and *virtue*. \* \* \* The Christian, in fact, (*not in name*.) receives \* \* \* a fecundity for good which causes him to perform prodigies of virtue. We do not say that there are not virtuous men of all creeds, but there is this difference. Men in other religions may be *naturally* good, but the true Christian is good notwithstanding and *contrary to his nature*. It was not the worship of Venus which rendered the Roman matrons chaste, and it was by despising the false religions of his time that Socrates became wise; but Christianity has made the St. Vincent de Pauls, the Fenelons, the Bossuets. \* \* \* Where Philosophy could form, perhaps, *one* of these benefactors of their kind, Christianity has *formed legions*, whose graces reflect the grace of Jesus Christ, which shines in their souls, and induces them perpetually to sacrifice themselves for others, without display and without pusillanimity. Between human morality and that of the true Christian there is a total difference. The former is an abstention from evil, and the latter is a tendance towards good. The one is like a flower which grows only in the sun of prosperity; the other, on the contrary, flourishes equally in storm as in sunshine; the former is only the reflection from the light of the gospel—the latter its burning influence felt in the soul. Such, in brief, is the grand revolution operated by Jesus Christ in the moral world; such the immense succor he has brought to fallen man! True it is that the world has called Christianity the enemy of the human species, while she has in return styled the world the enemy of heaven and of truth. The struggle has continued and will continue till "the king-

doms of this world become the kingdom of our God and his Christ"—or till the stone spoken of by the prophet Daniel shall become a "mountain which shall fill all the earth."—Dan. ii : 35, 44.

---

## THE RETURN OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST,

AND THE HOPE OF THE EARLY CHURCH.

BY W. LAING, EDINBURG, SCOTLAND.

WHILE the wonder-stricken Apostles were looking steadfastly toward heaven after their ascending Lord, two celestial messengers stood by them in white apparel, and addressed them in the following terms. "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? That 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 i. 11. Henceforth the return of Jesus to this earth became the burden of the Apostles' doctrine, and the hope and expectation of the early believers.

Judging from the purport of the bulk of the theological treatises and pulpit discourses of the present day, one would hardly expect that in the New Testament epistles and the Revelation of John, the Second Coming is mentioned or alluded to, not fewer than sixty-eight times. Yet such is the fact.

It is not, however, from the frequency of reference, simply, to this grand event that its importance in the estimation of the Apostles and the early believers appears, but also by the earnest and glowing language in which it is invariably mentioned. Thus Paul, in his letter to saints at Rome, indicates the intense desire of himself, and of those to whom he was writing, in the following stirring and graphic language:—"I reckon that the sufferings of the present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us; for the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now; and not only they but ourselves also, WHO HAVE THE FIRST FRUITS OF THE SPIRIT, even *we* groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, *viz.*, the redemption of our bodies." Rom. viii. 18-23. The same writer commences his letter to the church at Corinth by expressing his thankfulness to God on their account, because they "came behind in no gift, *waiting for the coming* of our Lord Je-

sus Christ," who, says he, "shall confirm you unto the end, that ye may be blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. i. 7, 8.

It is to the same event the Apostle refers in his letter to the faithful in Christ Jesus residing at Ephesus, when he speaks of "the day of redemption," "the redemption of the purchased possession." Eph. i. 14; iv. 30.

Writing to the Philippians, he thus expresses his hope and theirs: "Our conversation is in heaven, from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his own glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able to subdue all things unto himself." Phil. iii. 20, 21.

In exhorting the brethren at Colosse to "mortify" the desires of the flesh, he employs this motive. "For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." Col. iii. 3, 4, 5.

Referring, in his first letter to the Thessalonians, to the result of his preaching among them, he congratulates them that it was such as to lead them to "turn from dumb idols to serve the living God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus, who delivered us from the wrath to come." 1 Thess. i. 9, 10. And the object of his earnest prayer that "the Lord would make them to increase and abound in love one toward another, and toward all men," was "to the end that he might stablish their hearts in holiness before God even the Father, at the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints." Chap. iii. 12, 13. And when, in the same letter, he administers consolation concerning those who had fallen asleep, the same event—the return of the Lord, and its concomitant results, are the burden of his theme. "I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning those who are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others that have no hope, for if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so those also who sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent [*i. e.* go before] those who are asleep; for the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God, and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we who 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." 1 Thessalonians iv. 14–17. To this gathering together of the resurrected and transformed saints to the Lord Jesus, Paul also refers in the fifteenth chapter of his first letter to

the Corinthians, in these sublime and soul-stirring utterances, "Behold I show you a mystery; we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we [i. e. we who are alive] shall be changed." "Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory."

The second letter to the Thessalonians opens with words of encouragement to the brethren under the severe tribulation they were called on to suffer for the truth's sake. It is a promise of "rest"—rest to the troubled—a rest which the righteous Lord would award to them "when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, taking vengeance on those who know not God, and obey not the Gospel of his Son, when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and admired in all those that believe." 2 Thess. i. 7-10.

When near the close of his career, we find the same Apostle committing a solemn charge to Timothy, his own son in the faith, which he introduces and enforces in the following terms—"I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the living and the dead at his appearing in his kingdom; Preach the word," &c. "For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my dissolution [*analusēs*] is at hand. 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 to me at that day; and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing." 2 Tim. iv. 6, 7. "The grace of God that bringeth salvation to all men," says the same writer in his letter to Titus, "hath appeared, teaching us that, denying all ungodliness and worldly desires, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, looking for the blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour, Jesus Christ." Titus ii. 12, 13. It is thus evident that the second appearing of the Lord Jesus was a subject of the greatest moment to the Apostle Paul, and to the churches of the saints to which his letters are addressed.

The same fact characterizes the letters of the other Apostles preserved to us in the New Testament. Hear James: "Be patient, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord. Behold the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruits 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." James v. 7, 8. Hear Peter: "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again to a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, to an inheritance in-

corruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation ready to be *revealed* in the last time ; wherein you greatly rejoice, though now for a season, if need be, you are in heaviness through manifold trials ; that the trial of your faith being much more precious than gold, though it be tried with fire, might be found unto praise, and honor, and glory, *at the appearing of Jesus Christ*. Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober and hope to the end, for the grace that is to be brought to you at the *revelation* of Jesus Christ." 1 Pet. i. 3-7, 13.

Listen to John : " And now, little children, abide in him, that when he shall appear, we may have confidence, and not be ashamed at his coming." " Beloved, now are we the sons of God ; and it doth not yet appear (*i. e.* it is not yet manifested) 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 one that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure." 1 John iii. 28 ; iv. 2.

Once more : Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, testifieth that " Enoch, the seventh from Adam, made the following prophetic announcement, " Behold, the Lord *cometh* with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all ; and to convince all that are ungodly among them of their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed ; and of all their hard speeches, which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." Jude, verses 14, 15.

There is another fact in relation to the teaching of our blessed Lord and his Apostles, and the faith and hope of first believers, to which we would also call attention, *viz.*, That the appearing of the Lord Jesus, and the gathering together of his saints to himself, was an object not only of desire but also of *constant expectation*. This has appeared in some of those passages already quoted ; and is clearly stated in many others, such as the following : " Now is our salvation nearer than when we believed. The night is far spent, the day is at hand ; let us, therefore, cast off the works of darkness and put on the armor of light." Rom. xiii. 12, 13. " You," Corinthians, " come behind in no gift, *waiting* for the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. i. 7. " The Lord direct your hearts into the patient waiting for Christ." 2 Thess. iii. 5. " Of the times and the seasons, brethren, you have no need that I write unto you, for you yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night. Therefore let us not sleep, as do others, but let us watch and be sober." 1 Thess. v. 2-6. " Let your moderation be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand." Phil. iv. 5. " He that testifieth these things saith

Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so come, Lord Jesus." Rev. xxii. 20.

This constant waiting and watching for the coming of the Lord was based on the fact that they knew not how soon he might appear. That they did expect his speedy appearing is manifest, but how soon it might be they knew not. The Lord Jesus himself said that he would come suddenly—like a flash of lightning, and that the time of his appearing was hid from men and angels—yea even from himself. "Therefore," says he, "watch, for you know not at what hour your Lord doth come." Matt. xxiv. 36-44; Mark xiii. 32-37.

There is one passage which is often cited against the idea we are now illustrating, viz., 2 Thess. ii. 1-12. One writer on the Second Coming of the Lord, avers that the Apostle here "fearlessly crushes" the idea that "the day of Christ was at hand," and that no "pre-millennialist" would employ the language of the Apostle, as he would be afraid of "destroying the possibility of watching." Now, whatever be the meaning of the Apostle's language here, it is a fact that the same writer tells the Christians at Rome that "the day is at hand," and, that this idea was not peculiar to him, but was taught also by the other New Testament writers, we have already had ample proof. Can it be that the Apostle here seeks to "destroy" what he and his fellow Apostles commonly taught? No such thing. The mistake arises from a wrong translation of the Greek term rendered "at hand."

The term used in Rom. xiii. 12 (*ēngiken*) is, undoubtedly, correctly translated "at hand," and is frequently so rendered in the New Testament, but this is far from being the case with the term employed in 2 Thess. ii. 2 (*enestēken*). It is never in any other instance rendered "at hand" by our translators; and in several instances they render it *present*, in opposition to *future*, or coming. (Compare Rom. viii. 38; 1 Cor. iii. 22; vii. 26; Gal. i. 4; and Heb. ix. 9.) *Present*, not "at hand," is evidently its meaning here. The sense of the passage and the uniform testimony of the Apostles demand this. So rendered, the passage runs thus, "We beseech you, brethren, concerning the coming of the Lord and our gathering together unto him, that you be not soon shaken in mind, or be troubled, neither by spirit nor by letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is present," *i. e.*, already come.

It was not to crush their hopes, or allay their "feverish enthusiasm" regarding the speedy appearing of their glorified Redeemer, that the Apostle wrote these words of caution, but contrariwise, to prevent their being "shaken in mind,"—to quiet their fears that the day of the Lord was already present. Nothing short of the greatest misconception of the earnest de-

sire, hope and expectation of the early Christians could lead any one for a moment to imagine that the church of the Thessalonians had any reason to be "troubled" because the day of Christ was at hand; for was it not at "that day" the holy Apostle expected to receive from his Saviour's hand "a crown of righteousness"—a crown which would be awarded not to him alone, but to all those also who love the Saviour's appearing?

But, on the other hand, the notion which some men appear to have been at pains to teach the brethren at Thessalonica—the notion that the day of Christ had already come, while the brethren who had fallen asleep had not awaked, but were slumbering still, and they themselves yet unchanged, and all things remained as formerly, afforded cause for their being troubled and shaken in mind,—it is to remove this idea, or to prevent its being believed, that the Apostle employs the language in question.

On the further exposition of this passage it is not our purpose to enter, neither does our argument require it. We may, however, state in passing, that, from no uncared-for consideration of the Scripture has the conviction taken possession of our mind, that the mystery of iniquity already working in the lifetime of the Apostle shall not be fully developed till the resurrected and transformed saints shall have been caught up together to meet the Lord in the air. Then all restraint being removed, the mystery of iniquity shall be developed. "The man of sin," "by signs and lying wonders," shall carry men captive at his will, till the Lord shall come with the angels of his power, and ten thousand of his saints, to "punish the ungodly for their ungodly deeds;" and, Satan being bound and cast into prison, the Messiah shall establish his kingdom of righteousness and peace, and reign gloriously over the whole earth.

This, however, only in passing. Let us return to, and restate, our position, which, it is presumed, has been shown to be well fortified—*The Second Appearing of the Lord Jesus Christ was a matter of intense desire, earnest hope, and constant expectation to the Apostles, and the churches to which their letters are addressed.*

And now, dear reader, the question may be put, How stands it with you? Do you love the appearing of the Lord from heaven, and live in continual longing expectation of his coming? It is as true now as it was eighteen centuries ago that "the Lord shall come as a thief in the night," and that fact is as good a reason for constant waiting and watching, as it was when used for that purpose by our blessed Lord. But it is no less true that "the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey

not the gospel of his Son." O see then that this faith and obedience be yours.

There are many wondrous events predicted to transpire in connection with the rise and overthrow of Antichrist, and the coming and kingdom of our Redeemer, which all deserve careful and attentive study, and I would be the last person to discourage a comparison of these predictions with events now transpiring in the world, but you will permit me emphatically to insist on this one thing—that you shall on no account allow your conclusions on these matters to render null or of no effect our Lord's command to "Watch, therefore, for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come." Blessed are those servants whom our Lord at his coming shall find watching for and serving Him!

---

## LIFE FROM THE DEAD :

OR, DO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES REVEAL A FUTURE LIFE FOR THE UNBELIEVER ?

BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

In "LIFE FROM THE DEAD," by Geo. Storrs, pp. 20-1, occurs the following: "The Psalmist thus speaks, Ps. 9 : 17, 'The wicked shall be turned into hell'—*sheol*—'and all the nations that forget God.' Job saith, chapter 24 : 19, 'Drought and heat consume the snow waters : so doth the grave'—*sheol*—'those which have sinned ;' \* \* 'the worm shall feed sweetly on him : he shall be no more remembered ; and wickedness shall be broken as a tree.' Either of the foregoing texts, alone, are adverse to the idea of the wicked dead ever being made alive ; and, *combined*, go to demonstrate that sinners never recover from *sheol*, but are as totally *consumed* there as 'snow waters' are by 'drought and heat ;' and we might as soon expect a 'broken tree' to be restored as a dead sinner to be made alive in his 'wickedness.' From *sheol* or *hades* the wicked never recover. Such a recovery is a peculiarity of the Church of Christ alone. We might as well look for the reliving of 'the nations that forget God,' in their nationalities, when 'turned into *sheol*, as for sinners to be revived into life who have gone down into it."

The author of "Retribution" attempts to destroy the force



of the above ; with what success will appear in this article. He says, p. 85—

“ It is said in Ps. 9 : 17, ‘ The wicked shall be turned into hell with all the nations that forget God.’ Now *hell* in this passage is in the Hebrew *sheol*, which signifies merely the *place or state of the dead* ; hence, if the wicked are to be turned into *sheol*, they are simply doomed to *die*, and hence it is inferred that there is no future retribution awaiting the ungodly.”

We wish our readers to compare the foregoing extracts together, and observe how *exactly*, how *fairly*, our author gives the argument which he is about to answer ! We shall not waste space by pointing out the glaring mis-statement in the latter clause. And this is but a specimen of his manner of representing the adverse theory, throughout his book. He says further—

“ In reply to this, it may be urged that all men, righteous and wicked, Job, Jacob, the kings of Israel, and those of Babylon, at death entered *sheol*. But the punishment here denounced is the special doom of ‘ the wicked,’ and of ‘ all the nations that forget God,’ and so it cannot be any fate in which righteous and wicked are both alike involved.”

That is, it is not possible that the Scriptures should, in any case, mention as “ the special doom of the wicked ” something to which the “ righteous ” are liable. What then must be done with the texts like Ps. 55 : 15 ? “ Let death seize upon them, let them go down alive into sheol : for wickedness is in their dwellings and among them.” Does “ death ” never *seize* the righteous ? If not, it will follow that no righteous person ever died. Do the righteous never go down alive into sheol ? Then no righteous person was ever swallowed by an earthquake ; no righteous person was ever drowned.

Suppose a military court-martial sentences a culprit to be shot. Our author might argue with as much propriety as in the above case that something more must be meant than simple death by the bullet, for the most honorable soldiers, even the very ones who constitute the court-martial, are exposed to the same *fate*. For ourselves, we perceive a vast difference between the fate of the righteous and that of the wicked, although both enter sheol. “ Sheol *consumes* those that have sinned,” or that die in their sins. “ Thou castedst them down into *destruction*. How are they brought into desolation as in a moment ! *They*

*perish with sudden destruction.\** As a dream when one awaketh ; so, O Lord, when thou awakest, thou shalt despise their image." Ps. 73 : 18-20. "Like sheep they are laid in sheol ; death shall feed on them ; and the upright shall have dominion over them in the morning ; and their beauty shall consume in the grave, being an habitation to every one of them." (Margin.) Ps. 49 : 14.

But not so with the righteous. "But God will redeem my soul from the power of sheol : for he shall receive me." Ps. 49 : 15. Prof. Bush paraphrases the whole passage thus :— "Their goodly forms with all their beauty, are now turned to loathsome masses of putrefaction, and become the prey of corruption and worms ; and however splendid the dwellings they have left, yet now they are doomed to remain forever, without hope of redemption, in the gloomy regions of hades to which they have gone down. But thanks be to God, *my* prospect is not like *theirs*. I have hope in my death. Though I may be called to submit to the universal law of 'dust to dust,' yet I shall not, like them, remain irrevocably under the power of the grave. God will redeem my soul from its thralldom and graciously receive me to the joys of his presence forever."

The author of "Retribution" goes on to say : "The whole of the obscurity existing upon this much debated passage, arises, I have long been persuaded, from a most palpable and positive mistranslation of the Hebrew word *shooov* here rendered 'turned.' The current and universal meaning of this term, according to Gesenius and other lexicographers is, to cause 'to return, turn back to repulse.' This is its constant and ordinary meaning in hundreds of places where it is used in the Old Testament. 'Unto dust thou shalt return.' Gen. 3 : 19. 'The redeemed of the Lord shall return.' Isa. 55 : 7. 'The waters returned.' Gen. 8 : 3. 'And the messengers returned.'" Gen. 32 : 6. Hundreds of passages could be cited to show the import of the word to be invariably the same, and it is rendered 'turned back' in the third verse of this very psalm. 'Now no man can return to any place or state where he has never been before ! Man is formed of *dust*, and the dust can return to dust. \* \* But no man, righteous or wicked, when he *dies* the *first death*, can return, or be returned, or driven back into SHEOL, from the fact that he has never been there. \* \* It clearly follows then, that no man can be driven back into sheol, save those who have once been there, and have been brought forth or delivered up by sheol. Then they can be driven back into its darkness again. But 'the wicked' and 'all the nations that forget God' are to be driven back to sheol ; then they must first die and

\*See Gesenius' Heb. Lex., Article "Ballahah," for the italicised clause. The common translation is incorrect.

enter SHEOL, then be raised or delivered up by it, and afterwards they shall be *driven back* to SHEOL again."

Our author gives *three* meanings to the word in question, and then gravely informs us that "the import of the word is *invariably* the same"! "Return," "turn back," and "repulse" are *identical* in his vocabulary!

How would it sound to translate thus: "The wicked shall be *repulsed* into sheol"? It appears to us that a very different meaning is conveyed from *returned*. And how much preferable is *turned back*? "The wicked shall be turned back into sheol." Is the idea of returning to a former place or state necessarily involved? We think not. Suppose a case. Here is an army of rebels drawn up in battle array, having a river behind them. They are attacked by the loyal forces and "driven back" into *the river*. Does "it clearly follow then" that this army *previously came out* of the river? And yet we are told "that no man can be driven back into sheol, save those who have once beer there"! We do not see any advantage to our author's theory in the use of any other word than *return*. Of the three meanings given by him that alone will help him. We think he is peculiarly unfortunate in his contrivances. It happens that the phrase preferred by him in this instance is used in Ezekiel. "Thus saith the Lord God: "Behold, I am against thee, O Gog, the chief prince of Mocheck and Tubal: and I will *turn thee back*, and put hooks into thy jaws." 38: 3, 4. "And I will *turn thee back*, and leave but the sixth part of thee." 39: 2. In neither of these instances is the idea of a *return* to a former place or state conveyed.

Our author has certainly gained nothing by altering the translation from "turned" to "turned back." As for his assertion that turned is "a most palpable and positive mistranslation of the Hebrew word," we regard it as "a most palpable and positive" error. His declaration that "the import of the word is invariably the same," is without a shadow of authority. He refers to Gesenius. We have before us "Gesenius' Hebrew and English Lexicon, translated by Robinson, Twelfth Edition." We turn to the word SHUBH, and find the following definitions attached: 1. To turn, to turn away, to turn back, to return." Here, then, are *four* definitions where, if our author were correct, there would be but *one*. And the very rendering which

he calls "a most palpable and positive mistranslation" actually stands *first*. Attention has been called, in former articles, to his displays of "exegetical nonsense," and here we have a fresh exhibition of his brilliant achievements in that line.

Let us turn (we do not mean *return*) to the sundry passages of Scripture where the word means *turn* and not "return." Prov. 1 : 23. "Turn you at my reproof." Ezek. 3 : 19, 20. "Yet if thou warn the wicked, and he *turn* not from his wickedness, \* \* he shall die in his iniquity. \* \* Again, "When a righteous man doth *turn* from his righteousness." Ezek. 18 : 26-31. "When a righteous man *turneth* away from his righteousness \* \* when the wicked man *turneth* away from his wickedness. \* \* Repent, and *turn* yourselves from all your transgressions \* \* wherefore *turn* yourselves, and live ye." Ex. 32 : 12. "Turn from thy wrath." Isa. 59 : 20. "The Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that *turn* from transgression." Josh. 19 : 12, 27, 29, 34. "And *turned* from Sarid eastward \* \* and *turneth* toward the sun-rising \* \* and then the coast *turneth* to Ramah \* \* then the coast *turneth* westward." Jer. 23 : 22. "Then they should have *turned* them from their evil way." Mal. 2 : 6. "And did *turn* many from iniquity." Dan. 11 : 18, 19. "After this shall he *turn* his face into the isles. \* \* Then he shall *turn* his face toward the fort of his own land." Jer. 34 : 11, 15, 16. "But afterward they *turned* \* \* and ye were now *turned*. \* \* But ye *turned* and polluted my name." Job 15 : 13. "Thou *turnest* thy spirit against God." Ps. 90 : 3. "Thou *turnest* man to destruction."

In his attempt to forge a weapon to use against heresy, our author has proved *too much*. He places the fulfillment of the Psalm at Christ's coming. We doubt not that he is correct in this. But he has forgotten that the *living* wicked are to be punished at that time. Now the text does not say "the wicked *who have been dead*," but "The *wicked* shall be turned into sheol." The *living* wicked are at least included here. But *they* cannot be returned into sheol, for they have "never been there."

He would have us believe that the translation must needs be altered to remove "the obscurity existing upon this much debated passage." We cannot agree. The text explains *itself*, if we drop the interpolated word. "And" is not in the original. Omit it, and the text reads—

“The wicked shall be turned into sheol,  
All the nations that forget God.”

Question. What wicked shall be turned into sheol?

Answer. *All the nations* that forget God.

If the Psalm refers to Christ's coming there is no difficulty. Certain *wicked nations* are to be destroyed at that time. The Scriptures afford ample testimony to this, in other places. In the 17th of Revelation we read that “the ten horns \* \* have one mind, and shall give their power and strength unto the beast. *These* shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them.” In the 19th ch., “I saw heaven opened, and behold a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. \* \* And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite” (not the wicked dead, but) “*the nations*. \* \* And I saw an angel standing in the sun; and he cried with a loud voice, saying to all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven, Come and gather yourselves together unto the supper of the great God; that ye may eat the flesh of kings, \* \* captains, \* \* mighty men, \* \* horses, and of them that sit on them, and the flesh of all”—the nations that forget God—“free and bond, both small and great. And I saw the beast, and the kings of the earth, and their armies, *gathered together* to make war against him that sat on the horse, and against his army. And the beast was taken, and the false prophet. \* \* These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone. And the remnant were slain \* \* and all the fowls were filled with their flesh.” Joel 3. “For, behold, in those days, and in that time, when I shall bring again the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem, I will also *gather all nations*”—that forget God—“and will bring them down into the valley of Jehoshaphat”—judgment of God—“and will plead with them there for my people. \* \* Proclaim ye this among *the nations*; prepare war, wake up the mighty men \* \* assemble yourselves, and come, *all ye nations*”—that forget God—“and gather yourselves together round about: \* \* let the *nations* be wakened, and come up to the valley of Jehoshaphat: for there will I sit to judge *all the nations* round about.” Zech. 14. “Behold the day of the Lord cometh \* \* I will gather *all nations*”—that forget God—“against Jerusalem to battle. \* \* Then shall the Lord go forth and fight against *those nations*.”

The 9th Psalm—"I will praise thee, O Lord, with my whole heart; I will shew forth all thy marvelous works. I will be glad and rejoice in thee: I will sing praise to thy name, O thou most High. When mine enemies are turned back." Ezek. 38: 3, 4; 39: 2. "They shall fall and perish at thy presence. For thou hast maintained my right and my cause; thou satest in the throne judging right. Thou hast rebuked *the nations*"—not the wicked dead—"thou hast destroyed the wicked"—all the nations that forget God—"thou hast put out their name for ever and ever. \* \* *The nations*"—not the wicked dead—"are sunk down in the pit that they made: in the net which they hid is their own foot taken."—See Ezek. 38: 10-12. Micah 4: 11, 12.—"The Lord is known by the judgment which he executeth." Ezek. 39: 21.—"The wicked"—*rasha*, singular, 2 Thess. 2: 3, 8, 9; Ezek. 38: 1, 17—"is snared in the work of his own hands. The wicked"—*reshaim*, plural—"shall be turned into sheol, *all the nations* that forget God. \* \* Arise, O Lord; let not man prevail: let *the nations* be judged in thy sight. Put them in fear, O Lord: that *the nations* may know themselves to be but men."

---

### A LETTER AND RESPONSE.

ELD. STORNS—I have been contemplating writing to you for some time; but have delayed from one number of the EXAMINER to another, hoping to see different matter appear in it; but I see little ground for hope any longer. The favorite "hobby" that seems to be the theme for yourself and a few others—the non-living of the wicked—which keeps a very prominent place in the EXAMINER. If you think it is the best way to try and win souls to Christ, when we are just at the judgment—a very brief period and the labors of the faithful servant of Christ will be over—then you will have to carry on the work at the expense of somebody else, for I can't spend my precious moments in reading such matter, much less in paying for it. Gladly would I aid you, if the EXAMINER was filled with matter as in days past. I see no good resulting from the question of the non-resurrection of ALL the wicked, but *evil, discord, and division* of those who ought to be *united as one* in Christ. As yet all the arguments offered (and I have examined a great deal) have failed to convince me that there will not be a resurrection of the UNJUST, as well as the JUST; but I have not for a number of years believed the term "UNJUST" embraces ALL out of Christ: for those who have died without

law, will PERISH without law. God will never raise up those who have never heard his law, to suffer the penalty of his law. Idiots and others, throughout the past dispensations, as well as the present.

Here let me ask you a question or two. 1. Does the sinner die in consequence of his sins? 2. Is this death (that all die) all the WAGES due for continuing in sin? 3. If so, Do not the righteous receive the same wages for a long time; some for a thousand years? Please answer these in the EXAMINER by giving *all* the rest I have written, and oblige yours in hope of life through Jesus Christ. G. DILLABAUGH.

Seneca Falls, N. Y., May 11, 1862.

EDITOR'S RESPONSE.—We cheerfully give Eld. Dillabaugh's letter, as he requests. As he asks a response, we as cheerfully respond, though it must be kept in mind, our "Rules" prohibit "a direct personal controversy \*\*\* in our pages."

Our motto for twenty years has been—"NO LIFE OUT OF CHRIST" for any of Adam's race. We have steadily followed that principle wherever it lead us, irrespective of friends or foes; though not without examining the arguments against us by all parties, and modifying or changing the details when we were convinced there was error in any of our positions. This course we trust to pursue to the end, even to "the judgment," and think that "is the best way to win souls to Christ." Our Lord once preached a sermon on life, that caused "many of His disciples" to say, "This is a hard saying; who can hear it?" And "from that time many of his *disciples* went back, and walked no more with him." See John 6.

If any lover of truth expects to pursue a course in which all, even sincere persons, will go with him, he may learn that he has made no progress, and that those he sought to please have made as little advance as himself. Truth has never been popular, and is not likely to be till Jesus returns to reign on the throne of David. Whoever has made advance, can find, no doubt, the time was when he made the same objection to the truth which he finds others now making; and the *expense* of publishing the truth, he has found many sincere persons refusing to aid in bearing; because they believed it would produce "evil, discord, and division among those who ought to be united as one," forgetting that no advance was ever made without encountering opposition; and that, frequently, from good men, though laboring under prejudices which may have grown up from unavoidable circumstances. The advocate of unpopular truths will sometimes find

himself supported by so few, that in amazement he may be led to exclaim, "Will ye also go away?" Many refuse to go onward because so few go; or because so many have gone back. They undoubtedly think it is a "hobby," and they think truly. Who ever yet succeeded in any enterprise who had not a hobby? Every successful mechanic has his hobby. It is simply giving his mind to one trade instead of being "*jack at all trades.*" The Gospel itself is a hobby—i. e. "*a favorite object.*" The Gospel was the hobby of the apostles. They preached Christ as the Saviour—the LIFE-GIVER: and taught men that the resurrection was only through Him; and that if they would have life they must come to Christ for it.

The "hobby" of the EDITOR of this magazine is—"LIFE, future or eternal, is only in and through our Lord Jesus Christ: and that those *only* will share in it who fear God and work righteousness according to the light they have, if they have come to years of understanding to discern between good and evil. This life to be given by a revival from the dead, or a translation, at the last day: and the terror is, the failure of reaching life at all, and of coming short of entering into life." Hence we urge men to come to Christ for life; and assure them they will perish utterly in their own corruption, or animal nature, unless they now secure a life part in the LIFE-GIVER.

Such is our "hobby," and such we intend it shall continue to be while we labor at all for our Lord and Master. If others cannot aid us in it, we judge them not, but leave them to Him who judgeth righteously.

Eld. Dillabaugh says, he does not believe "the term *unjust* embraces ALL out of Christ;" and that "those who have died without law," &c., "God will never raise up," &c. This view at once destroys the argument based on John 5: 28, 29, in proof of the revival into life of the wicked dead; for that saith "ALL that are in the graves," &c., and they that have "died without law," &c., are in the graves. We are glad, however, that our friend has admitted thus much. Aside from John 5: 28, 29, where can he find any man that ever has lived, or that now lives, who has heard of such a "*penalty* of God's law" as a *revival into life from the dead to die again?* If there is any such penalty, we fail to see it, and venture to say it cannot be found.



We will now give attention to Eld. D.'s questions. He asks—"1st. Does the sinner die in consequence of his sins?" *Ans.* No: but death *holds* "dominion over him" in consequence of his sins. "It was not possible that Christ should be holden of death;" see Acts 2: 24: and "being raised from the dead He dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him;" see Rom. 6: 9. "The sting of death is sin:" 1 Cor. 15: 56. The sinner dying with that *sting* not taken away, has a deadly poison in him which eternally prevents his deliverance from the dominion of death: *death* continued, unrevoked and eternal is his doom. Such is "the wages of sin;" and "the strength of sin"—the sting of death—"is the law." Unless "the curse of the law" is removed, by removing the *sting* of death, there is no deliverance; the sinner is "holden with the cords of his sins," Prov. 5: 22, and "he shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." John 3: 36.

Eld. D.'s 2nd question is—"Is this death (that all die) all the wages due for continuing in sin?" We have given a sufficient answer to this question in our response to the first. We will add, however, it is not *dying*, nor the *pain* of dying that is the wages of sin, but *death*—deprivation of life *without hope* of recovery;—"the wicked is driven away in his wickedness: but the righteous hath *hope* in his death:" Prov. 14: 32. "All die," but all do not die alike: the righteous hath the hope of the gospel, which is the hope of life from the dead, because of God's mercy in the forgiveness of their sins and His rich provision of a Redeemer over whom death could not hold dominion; so that "if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." 1 Thess. 4: 14. The wicked die without hope and are "holden with the cords of their sins:" deliverance to them never comes. When the day of *reliving* from the dead arrives, Jesus the *executive* judge, calls forth his people into life, and condemns all others to the *eternal dominion* of death. Eld. D. will see, "all" do *not* "die this death;" hence, his third question needs no answer; for the righteous die in the sure and certain assurance that they shall live again; and for this they labor and suffer, now, "if by *any means* they may attain unto the resurrection of the dead;" see Phil. 3: 11.

## DYING TWICE : IS IT A BIBLE DOCTRINE ?

“ALL men are equally subject to the first, or Adamic death, regardless of what they have done or can do; hence to receive the wages of personal sins there must be a temporary life from the dead for the wicked, in order that they may suffer the wages of sin by dying a second time.”

Such is the strong argument of the advocates of future misery for the wicked. They seem to overlook the clear distinction of death as a *penalty*, and death as a *disciplinary* administration. They also combine the idea of *suffering* with death, as if *that*, and not death itself, were the penalty; or, at least, they think suffering is an essential part of it. Both of these positions we regard as erroneous.

1. No man dies the death to which Adam was subjected, except for his own personal sins. Adam's death was a penal infliction: that is, it was the penalty of the law under which he was placed; which law made no provision for deliverance from death's power. None of his posterity were ever under the penalty of such a law, unless they became so by their own personal act. They were “made subject to vanity”—or, to a life brief in duration, ending in death—“not willingly”—or, not for personal sins, but as a part of a system of discipline to which God subjected Adam's posterity, making their trial one of more severity than Adam's, and their deliverance from death *possible*. Hence the “subjection was made *in hope*.” In this subjection to suffering and death all Adam's descendants participate: but only those of them “which have the first fruits of the Spirit” ever will have the hope realized, or receive “the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.” That is the hope of the gospel: it is deliverance from death, or from “vanity.” Whoever is delivered from this, is “delivered from the *bondage of corruption* into the glorious liberty of the children of God.” All others remain under the bondage of corruption for their own personal sins in not improving their day of discipline: their sins were not remitted, and they reap eternal bondage to corruption, or death.

2. The idea that *suffering* must be combined with death to make the penalty complete, we regard as a pure assumption, en-

tirely without foundation in the Bible, and as the offspring of the eternal misery theory. No reason can be assigned for the temporary revival to life of the wicked dead, to torment and kill again, which is not just as good for eternal torment. Both are without any manifest object to Adam's race. Each system demands torment—so far as any reason appears—without any design of benefitting the saved or lost. Besides this, suffering is no expressed part of the penalty for sin. "*The wages of sin is DEATH.*"

That the law given Israel, under the Mosaic dispensation, threatened sufferings and tribulations of various kinds and degrees, is admitted: but not a word in that law extended those sufferings beyond *this* life. There is not a word, therein, of a life after death to a wicked man, or suffering in a life beyond the present.

Let it be distinctly marked, then, that *dying* a "second time" is no expressed penalty of any law God has ever placed man under; either Adam or his posterity. There was *one* trial for Adam, and but one, so far as revelation is our guide. His posterity have but *one* trial; but their's is far more severe than his: yet this is in mercy to them; for though subjected to death as a part of their disciplinary state—thus keeping them constantly in mind of what sin deserves—yet they were bid hope in a DELIVERER, who should bring them up from death's dominion, if they would *believe* in Him, or rely on Him for such deliverance. Their reception or rejection of this promised DELIVERER was that which should determine their final state, whether to be delivered from death or to have it *confirmed* on them as the penalty of incorrigible unbelief and sin. "This is the will of Him that sent me," saith Jesus, "that every one that seeth the Son and *believeth* on Him, *may have* everlasting life; and I will raise *him* up at the last day." "He that believeth *not* the Son shall *not* see life, but the wrath of God ABIDETH on him." Such is the utterance of eternal truth; and none will escape death's eternal dominion, who *once* come under it, if they have refused to accept Christ as their LIFE-GIVER: their *one* death is confirmed as penal, "at the last day," by the reliving of the righteous dead, while the wicked dead remain under the "condemnation" of death eternal, and do "NOT SEE LIFE;" or, if

alive, at the last day, are "punished with everlasting destruction," and live no more. See 2 Thess. 1 : 9. They do not die *twice* ; but their death is irrevocable, and may therefore be called the second death, because subjected to death's eternal dominion for their personal sins, which were unremitted.

## THE DEATH PENALTY : AN OBJECTION.

RESPONDED TO BY RUFUS WENDELL.

"If ceasing to be, or non-existence, is the punishment threatened, then men were punished before they were born ; and those who fall asleep in Jesus are, for the time being, suffering the same punishment as those who die impenitent. On your theory, some of the righteous dead have been thus punished for the past 6000 years. And can you harmonize this with Scripture ?—W."}

We do not hesitate to affirm that this plea for ceaseless torture is a very lame one. We will submit a few remarks for consideration, hoping that candid minds will not fail to appreciate certain bearings of the question with which "W." seems not yet to have become familiar. He does not desire controversy, but perceives, as he supposes, a conflict between our theory of future punishment and the teachings of Scripture, and wishes us to harmonize the two, if we can.

Our first remark is, that W. must not expect us to "harmonize with Scripture" the idea that "some of the righteous dead have been punished for the past 6000 years." The notion is opposed to Scripture—it forms no part of our theory—and we steadfastly repudiate it. The punishment threatened is for the wicked—not for those who come to Christ for life. The latter class, in dying, "fall asleep in Jesus," but this condition—"in Jesus"—involves a relationship to the Fountain of Eternal Life and Blessedness which is incompatible with the idea of punishment. Whether the consistency of this disclaimer is in any way compromised by the assertion of literal death as the penalty of sin, will perhaps be apparent if we view the subject for a moment in the aspect in which W. presents it.

Let us weigh his first statement. "If ceasing to be is the

punishment threatened, then men were punished before they were born." We marvel that such a premise should be relied upon to support such a conclusion! What is the premise?—That "*ceasing to be* is the threatened punishment." What does this statement involve? We answer, It involves the actual living existence of a moral agent. This is so, (1.) because that cannot "*cease to be*" which has no being; and (2.) because a "*threatened*" punishment implies that the subject of the menace has an existence. If, then, "*ceasing to be*," as a threatened punishment, presupposes the *previous* existence of the subject of such punishment, it follows that our understanding of the "*wages of sin*" does not contain the absurd implication that "*men were punished*" *before* they had an existence, or, in the words of W., "*before they were born.*"

W. does not, (whatever may be his opinion) affirm that *ceasing to be, forever*, would not be a punishment to those by whom immortal bliss is attainable, and we therefore raise no argument on that point. But we deem it important to remind him that neither torment nor privation *necessarily* implies punishment. To suffer pain or to be deprived of desired good are both punishments only when they result from the voluntary infraction of known law, or law that might be known. (We speak of the Divine administration.) Applying this principle to the righteous and wicked dead, we observe that though both classes are—actually, not relatively—in "*the same*" condition, neither class are, even "*for the time being*," suffering punishment.—They are dead by virtue of a law which sweeps all into the grave, irrespective of moral character. Their personal obedience or disobedience to moral claims has had nothing to do with the matter. "The creature was made subject to vanity, [*mortality*] not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope." Rom. 8 : 20. The time approaches, however, when the manifestation of the sons of God will take place; when the saints who are held by the power of the grave are to receive an incorruptible life, by a resurrection from the dead, through the mighty working of him who is "*the resurrection and the life.*" He is "*alive forevermore*," and has left us this assurance concerning the believer—"I will raise him up at the last day." The time, then, when all *who will*, may have a deathless being, is "*at the last day*," and every moment of "*non-exist-*

ence" beyond this hour of deliverance "from the bondage of corruption," will be a period of *punishment* to all who have failed to lay hold on eternal life by faith in the Life-giver, Jesus Christ.

There are some who hold that the punishment of the wicked dead does not *begin* until a thousand years after the righteous dead have been glorified. This, we conceive, is equivalent to the assertion *that the wicked will never be punished at all*. The *essence* of the revealed death penalty is *privation*—the *loss* of all the joys to which the redeemed are admitted in God's everlasting kingdom ; and as this *privation* is just as real during the first thousand years that follow this dispensation as it ever can be, the *punishment* must necessarily be as real during this period as ever it can be during the wasteless ages of eternity. We wonder that any intelligent believer in the doctrine of immortality through Christ should dissent from this view, especially so since it rests upon the most positive testimony of the Word of God. "These," saith the Saviour, "shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal." There is no intimation here that the life, which is mentioned *last*, is to be conferred a whole millennium before the infliction of the "punishment," which is mentioned *first*. The apostle Paul brings out the truth on this point in the clearest manner in the first chapter of the second epistle to the Thessalonians. "And to you who are troubled *rest with us, when* the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking *vengeance* on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ : who shall be punished with *everlasting destruction* from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power ; *when* he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe . . . in that day." When do believers enter upon their eternal rest? Answer—when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven. When is vengeance executed upon them that know not God? Answer—*at the same time*. When will Christ be glorified and admired in his saints? Answer—when he shall come. When will everlasting destruction be inflicted upon them that obey not the gospel? Answer—*at the same time*.—What countenance, then, does the Bible give to the opinion that the retribution of the impenitent does not run parallel with the entire period during which the righteous live to die no more? Answer—*none at all*.

Returning from this digression, we would express the hope that W. will not hastily conclude that the literal interpretation of the death penalty does not harmonize with sound reason and the general tenor of Bible teaching. The gospel of the Son of God comes to dying men with the offer of deliverance from mortality by a new and imperishable life. Our present life “is even a vapor, that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away.” How vastly important that we realize its frailty and fleetness, and that we secure and retain an interest in “Christ, who is *our life*,” that when He shall appear we may also appear with him in glory.

“The conditions”—says another with whose words we conclude—“upon which the human family receive the Life, which is deposited for them in Christ, are so clearly revealed in the Word of God, as to preclude the necessity for mistake. If we would partake of the life and nature of the vine, a living bond of union must exist between us. God hath sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live *through him*. And ‘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.’ If we would partake of this life we must grasp firmly the Life-giver, by an unwavering faith. If we would enter into life we must keep his commandments. And if we thus patiently continue in well-doing, if we seek for glory, and honor, and immortality, God will grant to us, at the resurrection of the just, his priceless ‘gift’—*Eternal Life*.”

---

## “RETRIBUTION” AND CORN-GROWING.

A CRITICISM BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

“RETRIBUTION,” p. 80, says, “God can make dead men live without Christ’s Spirit, as easy as he can make corn grow without it, for aught I know.”

The last four words of the above are well put in. They ought to be added to the title of the book. Its author would have “hit the nail on the head” if he had placed them at the bottom of every page. Well may he say, “for aught I know.”

And yet, the expression would not redeem some of his statements; for he *does* know that the believers of "Life only in Christ" are *not* working "under *pretext* of free investigation," &c. : he *does* know that they do *not* "AIM to subvert the very 'principles of the doctrine of Christ,' and sap the foundations of a gospel faith;" he *does* know that the "resurrection of the dead, and eternal judgment" are *not* "disputed and denied" by them; he *does* know that they do *not* "lose sight of 'repentance from dead works,' and even 'faith toward God.'" (See p. 154.) We cannot suppress our condemnation of these and other atrocious misstatements in his book.

He intimates that God can make dead men live as easy as he can make corn grow. Now while we believe in God's Omnipotence, we are far from supposing that He can do one thing "as easy" as another. We believe it requires a *much greater* exercise of power to raise the dead than it does to make corn grow. And the Scriptures uphold the belief. Paul says, "I \* \* cease not to give thanks for you, making mention of you in my prayers \* \* that ye may know what is the \* \* *exceeding greatness* of His power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of His *mighty power*, which He wrought in Christ *when he raised him from the dead.*" Eph. 1 : 15 : 20. "God hath both raised up the Lord, and will also raise up us by His own *power.*" 1 Cor. 6 : 14. The same "*mighty*" power that raised up Christ will raise those who are "in Christ." For this cause, Paul desires to know "the *power* of His resurrection." Phil. 3 : 10.

---

## QUESTIONS ON BAPTISM.

1. Does Baptism *initiate* or *graduate* the disciple in the school (church) of Christ ?

2. Is it to mark degree of knowledge ? or docility and earnest desire for more instruction in the gospel ?

3. *If degree of knowledge*, did not the apostles need baptism on the day of Pentecost, also again after the conversion of Cornelius ? And were they so baptized ? Also, are not young persons virtually excluded, or at least discouraged, from a profession of Christianity ?



4. Is baptism to indicate an indubitable and present fitness for salvation? or submission to Christ, a spirit of obedience to God, and a desire to use every means of grace for the perfection of character and the attaining of salvation?

5. Are we justified in advising parties conversant with the general doctrines of christianity to postpone baptism for want of sufficient instruction? Should we not rather, if the character is satisfactory, cheerfully welcome them, on profession of faith, to baptism and the fostering care of the church?

6. Is not the making of knowledge a measure of fitness for baptism, liable to beget spiritual pride and a false security in those so baptized?

7. Is there not danger of *embarrassing* the way of salvation, as well as of making it seem easier than it is?

8. Is the true import of "one baptism," Eph. 4 : 5, *once immersed*?

9. Does not the commission, Matt. 28 : 19, 20, indicate that baptism is an initial step in discipleship, and that the full instruction follows that rite?

10. Does not the New Testament make knowledge subordinate in importance to the "bond of perfectness," in which alone the unity and true efficiency of the church is possible? O. R. L. C.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—The foregoing questions were handed us by the person whose initials are attached to them. He is a resident of Michigan; believes in and practices *water* baptism. To such believers they are appropriate and important; and should receive their most serious attention. We presume the author has had experience, in his ministry, which made him feel the importance of presenting them for individual consideration, not for controversy. Admitting *water* baptism to be a *Christian* institution, of perpetual obligation, these questions have all the force of demonstration.

---

THE BIBLE EXAMINER.—The following extract from a letter speaks *substantial* encouragement. It is from a source, if we were permitted to give his name, that would command the respect of all our readers. It comes from the region of the Ohio river. He says—

"I am glad to see the EXAMINER revived, and hope its 'sha-

dow may never grow less,' but greatly increase, and its usefulness also. I take three other religious publications, and I prize it more highly than any of them ; perhaps if it was not that ' comparisons are odious,' I might say than *all* of them. I will cheerfully contribute, aside from my subscription, ten dollars a year to its support for *two* years ; reserving to myself the privilege of renewing the contribution at the end of two years, if it is not self-sustaining by that time. The payments to be \$5 the first of July, and \$5 the first of January."

This is encouraging talk, and the writer has sent the \$5 for July first, and \$1 besides to renew his subscription. Who will do in like manner ? All the funds we have received this year do not amount to enough to pay the expenses of paper and printing ; yet we shall go steadily on till the last dollar is used up, allowing the EDITOR not a cent for his services. We know that no other magazine or paper does, or is likely to supply its place. Let those who wish its continuance ACT *now*. We trust they will ; we shall go on in that faith.

---

### CORRESPONDENCE.

FROM ELD. JOSEPH MARSH, Whitby, C. W., late of Rochester, N. Y.—

The specimen numbers of the BIBLE EXAMINER, which I requested of you, were very thankfully received, and have been examined with much interest. If I understand the objects of the EXAMINER, it is not to present any specific dogma or dogmas as a *test* of Christian fellowship, but it holds out the hand of Christian union to *all* who sustain a godly character. This is Bible ground ; for the design of the glorious and eternal purpose of God as revealed under his various dispensations, relative to man in this life, has been and is to change his *character* from a sinful to a holy one, that his *nature* may be changed from a state of mortality to that of immortality at the glorious appearing of the Lord. The most correct knowledge and profession of small or large portions of the truth, avail nothing if the character of the professor is not thereby moulded into the moral image of Christ. Where such a character is found, though the knowledge of the possessor may be limited and the faith imperfect, nevertheless God accepts such ; and it is my highest joy, as I trust it is yours

also, to do the same. Here all true Christians can and should meet in holy friendship and be joint laborers in the great work of saving from sin and death sinful and perishing mortals.

I perceive that another and prominent object of the EXAMINER is to advocate the important doctrine of *life only in Christ*. To be *in Christ* is to have his *character*. The wicked have not the character of Christ; consequently are not *in him*: therefore they will not have life, and must, as a matter of course, "perish in their own corruption." Or to state the case in another form, the wicked have not only the *mortal dying nature* of Adam, but have his *sinful character* also, therefore they are *in Adam*, in both nature and character; hence their *death*, without the least hope of life, is doubly certain: *first*, from a natural cause, viz.: the mortality of their Adamic nature, which originally was of the earth earthy, and as Adam's posterity possess the same nature he had, they are subject to death as he was. *Second*, on account of their sins, the wages of which is death. Now, unless a mortal nature blended with a sinful character, has the surety of life, the sinner has no promise, hope or surety of living again when once he has fallen in death! It will not do to say that he will be restored to natural or animal life again, for Adam the progenitor of that life is dead, and therefore can neither live himself nor give life to his children; and as to Christ, the Second Adam, he does not give *animal* life. There is, in God's order of life, "a natural and a spiritual body." Adam the first was the life-giver to the natural body, and Adam the second is the life-giver to the spiritual body. The one is the father of the natural life, and the other the father of the spiritual or eternal life.

Now, in order to have our mortal or Adamic bodies made immortal, or quickened into life from the dead, we must, while in this present life, be "*in Christ*," and then we shall "be made alive" at his coming. But how must we be *in Christ*? Not in *nature*, for that is Adamic and cannot be changed till the resurrection; and further, the *gospel* changes *character* and not *nature*. Then the only way we can be *in Christ*, in this mortal life is, to be in him in *character*. The sinner is not thus in Christ. Hence the difference between the saint and the sinner lies not in nature but in character. They both have the Adamic nature, but one has the Adamic or sinful and the other has the godly or Christ character. The one, to all intents and purposes, is in the sinful dead Adam, and must die to live no more, while the other, in point of character, is in Christ, with the blessed assurance, though his Adamic body must fall under the power of death, of being "made alive" with an undying nature, at the coming of the Lord.

Had it not been for a very few passages of Scripture, I should have embraced this doctrine at the commencement of my ministry, near forty years since. Those passages appear plain to me now, and to be in perfect harmony with this sentiment, as I may show at another time. It never looked reasonable, or in strict harmony with the wisdom and mercy of God to raise to life countless beings solely for the purpose of satisfying his vengeance in either destroying or inflicting on them endless torment! But as I supposed the Scriptures taught the former, I therefore entertained the sentiment. Though I now see differently, I feel no disposition to cast off, as unworthy my Christian fellowship, those who differ from me in this respect, and hope they will entertain the same Christian feelings towards me and others of like faith touching the end of the wicked. But whether they will or not, it is our privilege and duty fearlessly to speak the truth in love regardless of consequences. I am sorry to say, however, that this priceless, this martyr principle is seen in but few of the religious teachers and papers of these degenerate times; a time-serving policy evidently reigns supreme over the pulpit and the press, so that the truth in all its harmonious bearings cannot be spoken to the people. I thank God, however, that there is *one* exception, so far as I know, in reference to religious papers. And the BIBLE EXAMINER is that exception: it publishes what is conceived to be the truth by its EDITOR, regardless of the censure or applause of others; and still it is not proscriptive or denunciatory, but tolerant and friendly in its character; therefore every lover of truth and free investigation and Christian toleration, should highly value the work.

It is over a year since I retired from the work of the ministry on account of my health, which is still precarious, though I hope it is on the amend, and that ere long I shall be able to devote my whole time to the blessed work of preaching the word of life. I have preached occasionally the past year, but nearly every time a return of my disease has been threatened, and I have been glad to return to my quiet home for rest and the restoration of my health.

The cause of Bible truth was never more precious to me than now, and the evidences that the coming of the Lord draweth nigh, were never more conclusive than at this eventful time; and most gladly would I publish the truth and give the note of warning far and near could I do it. But as I cannot, I submit and say, The will of the Lord be done, and bid God-speed to those who have the strength, ability and moral courage to carry forward the good work. Yours, in hope of eternal life.

FROM ELD. R. V. LYON, WHITBY, C. W.—I am still in the battle-field, contending for the faith once delivered to the saints. And I do rejoice that my labors have not been in vain in the Lord. Since my last I have immersed fifteen mortal souls into the Christ for the remission of sins. Have formed or organized two *ekklesias*, one in the township of Elma, C. W., and one at Hawksville, C. W.

The doctrine of future life only through Christ, has a place in the heart of all who are clear from bigotry. Yours, truly.

LEVI BOUTON, Ontario Co., N. Y., writes:—I am much pleased that the EXAMINER is again sent out on its mission, as no other paper fills its place. Life only through Christ is to me a glorious doctrine; honoring the character of the Supreme, relieving Him from an act, not intended to reform and benefit His creatures, in causing them to live from the dead for the express purpose of destroying them again, without any chance of life. I wish you success in spreading the truth; for it looks as if the time is short in which to do it.

---

### FAMILY PRAYER.

THE grand infirmity of family prayers, or of what is sometimes called family religion, is that it stands alone in the house, and has nothing put in agreement with it. Whereas, if it is to have any honest reality, as many things as possible should be soberly and deliberately put in agreement with it; for, indeed, it is a first point of religion itself, that by its very nature it rules presidingly over every thing desired, done, thought, planned for, and prayed for in the life. It is never to finish itself up by words, or supplications, or even by sacraments, but the whole customs of life and character must be in it by a total consent of the man. And more depends on this, a hundred times, than upon any occasional fervors, or passionate flights, or agonizings. The grand defect will, in almost all cases, be in what is more deliberate, viz.: in the want of any downright, honest, casting of the family in the type of religion, as if that were truly accepted as the first.

See just what is wanted, by what is so very commonly not found. First of all, the mere observance kind of piety, that

which prays in the family to keep up a reverent show or acknowledgment of religion, is not enough. It leaves every thing else in the life to be an open space for covetousness, and all the gay lustings of worldly vanity. It even leaves out prayer; for the saying prayers is, in no sense, really the same thing as to pray. Contrary to this, there should be some real prayer, for the meaning's sake, and for the shell of religious decency, in which the semblance may be kept. This latter kind looks, indeed, for no return of blessing from God, but only for a certain religious effect, accomplished by the drill of repetitional observance. There is also another kind of drill sometimes attempted in the prayers of families, which is much worse, viz. : when the prayer is made every morning, to hit this or that child in some matter of disobedience, or some mere peccadillo into which he has fallen. Nothing can be more irreverent to God than to make the hour of prayer a time of prison discipline for the subjects of it, and nothing could more certainly set them in a fixed aversion to religion and every thing sacred. This kind of prayer prays, in fact, for exasperation's sake, and the effect will correspond.—*Dr. Bushnell.*

---

THE RIGHT SPIRIT.—The following letter from Judge DIMMICK, of Illinois, evinces the right spirit. May such a spirit be everywhere cultivated.—ED.

I send you enclosed one dollar for the BIBLE EXAMINER, in advance for the next six months. Though I believe in a general resurrection of the dead, yet I am not unwilling to see this doctrine reviewed by the Examiner, in the light of the Scriptures. Truth fears not an accurate scrutiny, but will shine the brighter for the ordeal—therefore, if the said doctrine cannot stand such a test, then let it be superseded by one that will, as the alternative. I seek the true faith.

Yours in Christian love,

ISAAC DIMMICK.

---

THE REVIEW.—No further *direct* notice will be taken of "Retribution" in this magazine: the Reviewers agreeing with the EDITOR that it has been sufficiently refuted, and that a presentation of the subject of "*Life only in Christ,*" as held by us, is all sufficient, by itself, to refute any opposing theory.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

---

"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, HATH NOT LIFE."

---

Vol. 14. No. 14.]

AUGUST, 1862.

[Whole No. 216.]

---

---

## JUDGMENT.

AN EXAMINATION BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

VAGUE are the popular ideas of divine judgment. And as inconsistent as vague. But can we wonder, when we consider their basis, the doctrine of inherent immortality? Having repudiated that serpent lie, we renounce *in toto* every thing that proceeds therefrom, beginning with eternal torment, and ending with the common judgment notion. "To the law and to the testimony."

There are different kinds of judgment spoken of in the Bible. We find it convenient, at present, to notice four. First, the Messianic judgment in the world *to come*; second, national judgment in *this* world; third, the judgment of *Christians*; fourth, *individual* judgment.

1. THE JUDGMENT OF THE MESSIANIC AGE. "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise up to David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth," Jer. 23 : 5. The Hebrew verb *shaphat*, from which the noun *mishpat*, *judgment*, in the text is derived, has two meanings according to Gesenius. "1. *to judge*. 2. *to govern, to rule*, as connected with judging; since to dispense justice was the part of kings and chief magistrates." The latter meaning obtains in the present instance. Gesenius elsewhere says, (article *Din*.) "The ideas of ruling and judging are closely allied not only in Oriental practice and policy, but also in their languages." The text reveals the fact that David's throne is yet to be occupied by a King in prosperity, and that *judgment* shall then be executed in the earth. This,

of course, refers to the age *to come*, the age of the Messiah. In Luke 1: 31-33 the angel Gabriel confirms the prediction of Jeremiah, and identifies the King. "Call his name JESUS. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto Him the throne of his father David: and He shall reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of His kingdom there shall be no end." By "the house of Jacob" is meant all the natural seed of Jacob that are embraced in the covenant of faith, together with as many Gentiles as have been grafted in to the Abrahamic tree in the present gospel dispensation. "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed." Gal. 3: 29. "Many shall come from the east and west, (the believing Gentiles,) and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven. But the children of the kingdom (unbelieving Israel,) shall be cast out into outer darkness." Matt. 8: 11, 12.

"Behold a king shall reign in righteousness, and princes shall rule in judgment"—*mishpat*. Isa. 32: 1. Who are the *princes*? Jesus named twelve of them. "Peter said unto Him, Behold, we have forsaken all, and followed thee; what shall we have therefore? And Jesus said unto them, 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." Matt. 19: 27, 28. But are there to be no other rulers? Have none others "forsaken all, and followed" Jesus? If *this* entitles to a throne, then *every one* who enters the kingdom will be a ruler. For Jesus, on one occasion, said to the "multitudes," "Whosoever he be of you that *forsaketh not all that he hath*, he cannot be my disciple." Luke 14: 33. Yes, to *every* disciple, Jesus says, "Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you *the kingdom*." Luke 12: 32. "Ye are a chosen generation, a *royal* priesthood," says Peter, 1 Epis. 2: 9. And John exclaims, "Unto Him that loved us, \* \* and hath made us *kings* and priests unto God and His Father; to Him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen." Rev. 1: 5. Every occupant of the Messianic kingdom will be a prince, a king, a ruler. Jesus will be "King of kings, and Lord of lords." The twelve apostles will be subordinate kings, over "the house of Jacob," and the "house of Jacob" shall rule—what? Let Paul



answer. "Do ye not know that the saints shall judge *the world?*" 1 Cor. 6 : 2. Those who inherit the kingdom of God in the land of Palestine are to judge or rule the earth at large. Daniel declares, "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, \* \* and there was given Him dominion, and glory, and a *kingdom*, (the kingdom of Israel,) that all people, nations, and languages, should serve Him." Dan. 7 : 13, 14. Again he says, "*Judgment* was given to *the saints* of the most High; and the time came that *the saints* possessed the kingdom." 22v. Again, "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." 27v. Jesus will give the saints rule, dominion, and power over the whole earth, and they "shall judge the world;" "princes shall rule in judgment." In that day shall the 149th psalm be sung in the land of Israel: "Praise ye the Lord. Sing unto the Lord a new song, and His praise in the *congregation of saints*. Let *Israel* rejoice in Him that made him: let the children of Zion be joyful in their King. Let the saints be joyful *in glory*. Let the high praises of God be in their mouth, and a two-edged sword in their hand; to execute vengeance upon the nations, (see 2d Ps.) and punishments upon the people; to bind their kings with chains, and their nobles with fetters of iron; to execute upon them *the judgment written*: *this* honor have ALL His saints. Praise ye the Lord."

We think that it was the prediction of *this* "judgment to come" that made "Felix tremble." As Paul boldly and eloquently unfolded the sublime realities of the world and judgment to come, when animal rule and power should be forever overthrown; and as the consciousness of his manifest unworthiness to participate in the glory to be revealed, was brought home to Felix, he "trembled," in spite of his unbelief. (We can scarcely suppose that Felix had any real faith in what Paul said.)

This judgment is also spoken of in Rev. 20 : 4. - "And I saw *thrones*, and they sat upon them, and *judgment* was given unto them \* \* and they *reigned* with Christ a thousand years."

We are strongly inclined to interpret Matt. 25 : 31-46 in connection with this judgment. Dean Alford, author of the

best commentary on the Greek Testament, also places its fulfillment in the future age. We transcribe such of his remarks as we deem correct.

V. 31. "This His glory is that also of all His saints, with whom He shall be accompanied : see Rev. 19 : 14 (comp. ve. 8.) Zeck. 14 : 5."

V. 32. "The expression *panta ta esthnee*, (all nations) implies 'all the nations of the world,' as distinguished from the *eklektōi* (elect) already gathered to Him."

Vs. 37-39. "The answer of these *dikaioi* (righteous) appears to me to show plainly (as Olshausen and Stier interpret it) that they are *not* to be understood as being the covenanted servants of Christ. Such an answer it would be impossible for *them* to make ; who had done all distinctly *with reference to Christ*, and for His sake, and with His declaration of ch. 10 : 40-42 before them. Such a supposition would remove all reality, as indeed it has generally done, from our Lord's description. See the remarkable difference in the answer of the faithful servants, vs. 20, 22. *The saints are already in His glory*—judging the world with Him (1 Cor. 6 : 2)—accounted as parts of, representations of, Himself (ve. 40)—in this judgment *they* are not the judged. But *these* who *are* the judged, *know not* that all their deeds of love have been done *to and for Christ*—they are overwhelmed with the sight of the grace which has been working in and for them, and the glory which is now their blessed portion. And notice, that it is not the *works*, *as such*, but the *love* which prompted them—that love which *was their faith*,—which felt its way, though in darkness, to Him who is love,—which is commended."

V. 40. "*Tōn adelphon mou*, (my brethren.) Not necessarily the saints with Him in glory—though primarily those—but also any of the great family of man. Many of those here judged may never have had opportunity of doing these things to the saints of Christ properly so called. In this is fulfilled the covenant of God to Abraham, In thy seed shall *all the nations* of the earth be blessed. Gen. 22 : 18."

2. NATIONAL JUDGMENT IN THIS AGE. "Moab is confounded ; for it is broken down : howl and cry ; tell ye it in Arnon, that Moab is spoiled, and *judgment*"—*mishpat*—"is come upon the plain country." Jer. 48 : 20, 21. The whole chapter is devoted to the prediction of Moab's judgment. "These predictions began to be accomplished when Nebuchadnezzar, five years after the destruction of Jerusalem, invaded Moab and carried away its inhabitants ; thus, according to the prophecy,

*causing to wander* from their home, the people who had never before gone into captivity." It does not appear that they were ever again an independent nation. They were successively subject to the Persians, Syrians, Egyptians, and Romans; and have now, like their brethren the Ammonites, long since been '*destroyed from being a people*;' their very name was lost, many centuries ago, and they have become mingled with the Jews and Arabians. Respecting the land and cities of Moab, the prophecies are remarkably full and explicit, but not more so than the evidence of their complete fulfillment, which the present state of that country furnishes." *Wickens' Scripture Prophecy*. "Thus far the judgment of Moab." Jer. 48 : 47.

"We would have healed Babylon, but she is not healed: for-sake her, and let us go every one unto his own country: for her judgment"—*mishpat*—"reacheth unto heaven, and is lifted up to the skies," Jer. 51 : 9. "The inspired seers declared that Babylon should never recover from its overthrow. '*It shall sink*,' said Jeremiah, '*and shall not rise again*,' Jer. 51 : 64. The prophet Isaiah, too, in foretelling its ruin, made use of a comparison which precluded all hope of its restoration. '*It shall be*,' said he, '*as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah*. It shall never be inhabited, neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation,' Isa. 13 : 19, 20. It was in the last particular—its final and utter desolation—that Babylon was to resemble the '*cities of the plain*;' for as to the method and time employed in producing the determined end, there was in the two cases a wide difference. In the one case it was accomplished, as in a moment, by the immediate interposition of Heaven; in the other, human agency was employed to bring about the same end by slow though sure degrees."—*Wickens*.

We might produce testimony with regard to the other cases of national judgment in *this* world, but the two instances of Moab and Babylon are sufficient. We believe that Jesus referred to this kind of judgment when He upbraided "the cities wherewith most of His mighty works were done, because they repented not: Woe unto thee, Chorazin! Woe unto thee, Bethsaida! for if the mighty works, which were done in you, had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes. But I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment,

than for you. And thou, Capernaum, which art exalted unto heaven, shalt be brought down to hades : (These are hyperbolic expressions, figuratively representing the height of prosperity, and the depth of adversity—*Bloomfield*.) 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, That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment, than for thee." Matt. 11 : 20, 24.

The judgment of Tyre, Sidon, and Sodom was "more tolerable" than that of Chorazin, Bethsaida, and Capernaum, in two respects. 1. The possession of peculiar and exalted privileges, although despised while they exist, generally raises a false hope in the minds of the rejecters of those privileges. Such people are apt to plead for leniency and expect to obtain it *because* they have been thus privileged. They cannot believe that *they* will be judged with the same severity as others who have never had such advantages. Hence, if they are visited with the *same* weight of judgment they *feel it much more*. Here are two young men, each condemned to death for crime committed. One from his earliest youth has breathed in an atmosphere of piety and culture ; the other has been nurtured in the school of vice. Now it is easily perceived that the punishment of death for crime is much "more tolerable" in one case than the other. When the man of early privilege discovers that his birth, friends, natural advantage, all avail nothing "in the day of judgment," he will feel the ignominy and penalty far more acutely than him who was a stranger to such hopes. When Jesus comes, many people will be ready to plead their familiarity with His teachings and even with Himself as represented in His disciples, (Matt. 25 : 40, 45,) as cause of justification. "We have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and thou hast taught in our streets." But the answer will be, "I tell you, I know you not whence ye are." Their fate will be more intolerable than that of many who have had fewer advantages. In this respect, Chorazin, Bethsaida, Capernaum, felt the truth of the Saviour's prediction. Though the inhabitants of those cities might say, "We have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and thou hast taught in our streets," yet they did not escape the judgment. Jesus vividly contrasted their opportunities with those of Tyre, Sidon and Sodom. Much "more tolerable"

was the judgment of the latter than the former. And this was especially true of Capernaum, the principal scene of the Saviour's ministry and residence, (ch. 9: 1.) It was thus "exalted to heaven." But this only made *the fall* more intolerable. It was "brought down to hades." If any of those cities might claim exemption on the score of privilege, it was Capernaum. But it had no preference "in the day of judgment."

2. The judgment of Sodom, was "more tolerable" in another respect. Sodom was destroyed *at once*; but Capernaum suffered a lingering death. According to Jeremiah, the first punishment was "more tolerable." In contrasting Sodom and Jerusalem, he says, "The punishment of the iniquity of the daughter of my people is *greater* than the punishment of the sin of Sodom, that was overthrown *as in a moment*, and no hands stayed on her." Lam. 4: 6. And he illustrates the difference in the same connection. Dr. Clarke comments thus: "He thinks the punishment of *Jerusalem* far greater than that of *Sodom*. That was destroyed *in a moment*, \* \* Jerusalem fell by the most *lingering* calamities; her men partly destroyed by the sword, and partly by the famine." As to Bethsaida and Chorazin in contrast with Tyre and Sidon—the latter *still exist*, but the former were *entirely* swept away. The very sites of Capernaum, Chorazin, Bethsaida are matter of dispute among travelers. See Robinson, vol 3. pp. 283—300. Thus the judgment of Tyre and Sidon was "more tolerable."

Before leaving this point, it may be well to notice an objection that may be urged to the above. Our Saviour in His prediction, uses the *future* tense. "It *shall be* more tolerable." Alford says, "Had our Lord been speaking of the outward judgment on the rebellious cities, the future might have been used of *them*, but could not of Sodom, which was already destroyed." We answer, the future tense could not have been intended to apply to Sodom, for its destruction was *final*. See Jude 7. "Sodom and Gomorrah \* \* are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of *eternal* fire." The only reasonable sense that can be attached to the phrase "eternal fire" is, eternal *in effect*. A fire whose *effect* is eternal. The effect of the fire on Sodom was to destroy it, and as the effect is *eternal*, the destruction of Sodom is eternal, and *final*.

3. JUDGMENT OF CHRISTIANS. That Christians have a judg-

ment peculiar to themselves may be easily demonstrated from the Scriptures. The *individual* judgment, (which we shall hereafter notice,) decides whether a person may stand in this judgment of Christians or be condemned with the world. "The ungodly shall not stand in the judgment,"—*mishpat*—"nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous," Ps. 1: 5. "The righteous," then, have a judgment of their own. We are exhorted to strive to have a part in this judgment. "Watch ye therefore, and pray always, that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things that shall come to pass, and to stand before the Son of man." Luke 21: 36. All who attain to this judgment will be saved, but there will be a difference of *rewards*. "Behold, I come quickly; and *my reward* is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be." Rev. 22: 12. Some Christians will be "scarcely saved;" 1 Peter 4: 18, others will have an abundant entrance. 2 Pet. 1: 11. Paul says, "According to the grace of God which is given unto me, as a wise master-builder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereupon. \* \* If any man build upon this foundation GOLD, SILVER, PRECIOUS STONES, *wood, hay, stubble*; every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall *try* every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a *reward*. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer *loss*: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire." 1 Cor. 3: 10—15. From this judgment of Christians Paul argues in Rom. 14 ch. "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations. (Margin. "Not to judge his doubtful thoughts." That is, we are not to condemn a man for *theory's sake*. If a godly walk and conversation is manifested, we are to "receive" the person without reference to theory.) \* \* Who art *thou* that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. \* \* But why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for *we shall all stand* before the judgment seat of CHRIST. \* \* So then every one of *us* shall give account of *himself* to God. Let us not therefore judge *one another* any more." The same judgment is referred to in 2 Cor. 5: 10, 11. "For we"—Christians—"must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things in

body, according to that he hath done, whether good or bad. Knowing therefore the fear"—*phobon*—"of the Lord, we persuade men." The Greek noun *phobos* which we have rendered *fear* is improperly translated *terror* in the common version. In this we are supported by Robinson, Hudson and others. See especially, Robinson's Lex. We conclude our remarks under this head by quoting 1 Peter 4: 17, 18. "For the time will come that judgment must begin at the house of God: and if first at us"—Christians—"what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God? And if the righteous"—those who "suffer loss"—"scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner *appear*?" Christians "*appear* before the judgment seat of Christ." 2 Cor. 5: 10. Christians "stand before the" same tribunal. Rom. 14: 10. But "where shall the ungodly and the sinner *appear*?" Where shall they "*stand*?" Ans. *Nowhere*. Not at the judgment seat of Christ, for "the ungodly shall *not stand* in the judgment, nor sinners in the congregation of the righteous." Ps. 1: 5. They shall not see Christ, for "without holiness no man shall see the Lord," Heb. 12: 14. In Rev. 1: 7 we read, "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see Him" (the eyes of the "kings and priests" of the preceding verse. See also Heb. 9: 28. "Unto them that look for Him shall He *appear*,") "and they which pierced Him," (the righteous Jews who look for the Messiah at the time of His coming. See Zech. 12: 10.)

4. INDIVIDUAL JUDGMENT. Let us inquire into the nature of that individual judgment which comes upon all men under the Gospel dispensation. This judgment decides who shall be saved from death; who shall have a future and immortal life. It has two phases, viz: The trial or investigation; and the executive act. The common idea that the investigation is deferred till the end of the world is obnoxious to many objections. One proceeds from the principle that no man is pronounced guilty until he has been tried. If this principle is just, as we believe it is, then it will follow that the trial or investigation takes place in *this* world, during the life of the individual. "He that believeth not is *condemned already*," John 3: 18. Thus, the unbeliever is sentenced *here*, after a fair trial. The fact of his refusing to believe in Christ shows that "his deeds" are "evil." "For every one that doeth evil *hateth* the light, neither

cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved," 20v. The same is taught by Jesus in John 8 : 21, 24. "Then said Jesus again unto them, I go my way, and ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins. \* \* I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins : for if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins." Thus the unbeliever is condemned in this life and dies *in* that condemnation ; "the wrath of God abideth on him." John 3 : 36. No *future* investigation is needed to decide his fate. *This life* is the scene of trial. God is *now* bringing "every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good, or whether it be evil." Eccl. 12 : 14. The rebel against God is *now* treasuring up unto himself "wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God." Rom. 2 : 5.

"The day of wrath" is the day of *executive* judgment. "The righteous judgment of God" is then revealed. The question, "Who shall have life?" will then be decided by the executive Judge. "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself; and hath given Him authority to execute judgment also," in dispensing this life to "whom He will." John 5 : 21, 26, 27. This judgment takes place at the coming of Christ. "As it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment"—the executive judgment which either gives or withholds the future life—"So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for Him shall He appear without sin unto salvation." Heb. 9 : 27.

"The Lord Jesus Christ" "shall judge the quick and the dead at His appearing and His kingdom." 2 Tim. 4 : 1. The effect of the executive judgment on the living righteous will be to change them to immortality; 1 Cor. 15 : 51; on the living wicked to punish them "with everlasting destruction;" 2 Thess. 1 : 9; on the dead or sleeping righteous to raise them "incorruptible," 1 Cor. 15 : 42, 52; on the dead wicked to condemn them "not to see life," John 3 : 36; not to "see light," Ps. 49 : 19; not to escape the power of hades, which "prevails against" them, Matt. 16 : 18; not to gain victory over death and the grave; 1 Cor. 15 : 54-57. Vengeance,

"With determined aspect, turns

Her adamant key : enormous size



Through destiny's inextricable wards,  
 Deep driving every bolt,  
 Then hurls it through the dark profound,  
 Ten thousand thousand fathoms; there to meet,  
 And ne'er unlock her resolution more.”

NOTE.—In the foregoing article, we have not succeeded in giving much more than an outline of the subject of judgment as it looks to us. That portion which relates to *individual* judgment deserves a more extensive notice. See EXAMINER March, 1861, on this head.—J. T. C.

---

“THE JUDGMENT SEAT OF CHRIST.”

BY THE EDITOR.

THE notion that Christ will *personally* sit on the judgment seat, as judges sit in human administration, is generally held by Christians. In this way they suppose He is to act in deciding each individual case of the human family. We do not affirm such will not be the case, but it appears to us a different view is both more reasonable and scriptural.

That Christ is, by God the Father's appointment, the supreme Ruler of this world, we have no doubt; but the proof of that fact will not be entered on at this time. What are we to understand by the “Judgment seat of Christ”? and what is it to *stand* before it? are the questions to which we call attention.

1. The judgment seat of a ruler is that *form* of administering the government and laws which he has ordained, and by no means includes the idea of his *personal* attention to a formal investigation and decision. This position is so self-evident that we shall not argue it. The laws of the government are carried out by such officers or means as the governing or law-making power shall determine. The laws of Christ's ordination are those by which men are to be judged. We mean, the laws of the dispensation under which each individual has had his trial or probation. “He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not *my words*, hath one that judgeth him: *the word* that I have spoken, **THE SAME SHALL JUDGE HIM IN THE LAST DAY.**”—John 12: 48. That “word is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged

sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of"—or, as the Syriac reads—*judgeth* "the thoughts and intents," or reasonings "of the heart: neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight: but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of him with whom we have to do."—Heb. 4: 12, 13.

The judgment seat of Christ, then, is *the word* of Christ. That is what decides our destiny or doom. That word *now* tries our acts and thoughts, or motives; and we are to *live*, or not, "at the last day," as that word decides. If it condemns us, we "shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on us." John 3: 36. If it approves us, Jesus has pledged that word, He "will raise" us "up at the last day."

2. But to be more explicit, What is it to "stand before the judgment seat of Christ"? The answer to this question may relieve some minds from the infinite perplexity attending the usual idea of judgment, by the personal sitting of Christ to judge each individual, by investigation and a formal sentence. If such is to be the case, there is no precedent in the history of human governments. Let us look at the case of the apostle Paul, Acts 25.

Paul was brought before the Roman Governor in Cesarea, charged with crime by the Jews. It is said this governor was "sitting on the *judgment seat*." He asked Paul if he was willing to go up to Jerusalem and be judged of the matter before him. Paul replied—"I stand at CESAR'S *judgment seat*, where I ought to be judged." Does any one suppose Paul thought himself standing before Cesar in person? or that Cesar was personally present? He was not willing to be put into the hands of the Jews, and says, "No man may deliver me to them. I appeal to *Cesar*." Did Paul expect Cesar would appear in *person* to attend to a formal trial of himself? or, did he mean the *words*, or laws of Cesar were what he would have to decide his case? When Festus replied, "Hast thou appealed to Cesar? unto Cesar shalt thou go;" did Paul expect Cesar would sit personally to judge him? Surely no one would affirm such an absurdity. Those who stood at Cesar's "judgment seat" were not judged by Cesar, *in person*, but by "the words," or laws of Cesar.

So, to "stand before the judgment seat of Christ," according to Paul's language, is not to stand before Christ's person, but to be made responsible to "the words," or laws of Christ; those words, and not the words or judgment of men, are to decide whether we shall have *life* or be holden of *death* "in the last day." "The words I speak unto you they are spirit and they are life," said Jesus. If the "spirit" of a discourse is not perceived, the hearer will certainly err in his conclusion, as was the case when Jesus told his audience, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you."

The judgment seat of Christ, then, is the judgment of acquittal or condemnation which His "words" bring to each individual while in a probationary state and "at the last day," when He shall come "to execute judgment on all;" giving life to all to whom His word had promised it, and sealing the condemnation of *death* on all who have rejected that word, whether it came only by the light of nature or by direct revelation. Those who "have sinned without law"—having been "a law unto themselves"\*\*\*"their consciences bearing witness, and their thoughts accusing or else excusing one another"—they "shall also perish without law." Their destiny is fixed by Christ—who hath "power over all flesh"—not by any law or word of direct revelation, but by "the law"—that is, the *spirit* of it—"written in their hearts." Thus "God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ;" all of whom pass in review, or "stand before the judgment seat of Christ," where their final state is decided, by the *word* which He has spoken to them under whatever dispensation they may have lived. Christ is no more to be supposed to sit personally and visibly in this deciding judgment, than Cesar sat personally in the cases that came under cognizance by his laws or words. Paul stood before the judgment seat of Cesar, so shall we "all stand before the judgment seat of Christ:" all cases will be decided by His word, which He has spoken to the children of men.

.....

NOTE.—The foregoing article was prepared by the EDITOR before that on "Judgment," by J. T. Curry, was received. There is such a harmony between the two that we concluded to insert both together. We trust all will be interested in them.

## "ANOTHER PASSENGER WAKED UP."

IN THE EXAMINER for June we noticed an article, purporting to be from La Roy Sunderland, which we copied entire. Our notice has called forth a document from some source, claiming to be the production of the same L. R. Sunderland. We will not vouch for his authorship of it. We "do not know *by whom* or *when*" it was "written." Our readers will understand what we mean by this statement before they get through the document, which is herewith laid before them. It is as follows:—

## "WAKED UP."

DEAR STORRS—Please accept my thanks for the copy of your monthly you were kind enough to send me, containing your criticism under the head of "Another Passenger Waked Up." But, as you have fallen into one or two misapprehensions respecting myself, both past and present, I hope you will allow me to set you right in this matter. And this you will do, I am sure, if you have not abandoned the principle which once governed you when we conducted a paper together. That principle was this, namely, never to criticise any one in our columns without allowing him the right to reply.

(1.) The design in my article on a "False Prophet" was to show the danger of *taking things for granted*, of which there is not, and cannot be any sufficient proof. This design you seem to have overlooked, as you not only omit to notice what I said about "God, the Bible, and another world of which we know nothing at all," but, you have repeated this error in your remarks about me. Thus, you took it for granted, without one particle of proof, that your "preaching" in Boston was the occasion of my having published that old prediction of yours! You thought your "preaching" proved a "troublesome stone" to me! You were mistaken, my friend, and hence you have assumed a little more credit to yourself for "preaching" than is justly your due. The truth is I did not know that George Storrs had been in Boston until I saw his announcement of his visit in the Bible Examiner. Nor am I willing to allow that I have ever been asleep in any sense as you intimate, from which your preaching could have waked me up. For some forty years have I been wide awake in respect to theological subjects; having used all the means in my power for testing the contents of the Bible, which I find to be a human production, containing a mixture of truth and error, and hence not to be relied upon as a FINALITY as *authority* in matters of Faith.

(2.) You have erred again in taking it for granted that I am an advocate of the spirit rappings. I am an investigator, but not a lecturer, disciple, nor advocate of spiritism, any more than I am of Methodism or annihilation. No "revelations" purporting to come from "another world of which we know nothing," are authority with me in matters of faith or morals. If they were so, I could believe as the writers of the Bible

affirm, when they represent that God is *vindictive, ferocious, angry,* and *destructive* (Jer. 13 : 44. Deut. 7 : 16. 1 Sam. 15 : 2, 3, and 6 : 19. Num. 32 : 13. 25 : 4. Jer. 17 : 4. Deut. 4 : 24.)

(3.) But, it is evident enough, that each writer of the Bible gives his own notions of God, and hence we find them representing God as having accepted *human sacrifices* (2. Sam. 21 : 8, 9, 14. Gen. 22 : 2. Judges 11 : 30, 31, 32, 34, 38, 39.) They tell us, that God has approved of *deception and lied*, by proxy. (Josh. 2 : 4, 56. James 2 : 25. Ex. 1 : 18, 20. 1 Kings 22 : 21, 22.) According to the "revelations" of these writers, God has allowed *adultery* (Num. 31 : 18. Hos. 1 : 2 ; 2 : 1, 2, 3,) and he has, moreover, *approved and instituted slavery* and human bondage. Gen. 9 : 25. Lev. 25 : 45, 46. Joel 3 : 8.) And finally, he has failed in his predictions as many human beings do. (Jer. 18 : 7-10.)

But I will not enlarge in these references to Bible views; albiet it is the legitimate and avowed design in your publication to examine the points to which your attention is now invited.

(4.) My friend Storrs has erred again in saying that I *predicted* a change in his views respecting the "inspiration" of the Bible. This is a mistake. In the conversation alluded to, I *predicted* nothing, I merely expressed an opinion; expressed "when I was more hopeful" of George Storrs, "than I am now, or have been for many years." What I said was not uttered as a prediction, nor was it in reference to the fact of "inspiration," but it was, solely, in respect at its INFALLIBILITY. I expressed the hope, that if Mr. Storrs were the man I have taken him for, he would soon outgrow the notion in which we had both of us been indoctrinated, as to the *Infallibility* of "inspiration." For myself, I am quite sure that however much the writers of the Bible may have been inspired, it is a human production, and contains numerous errors precisely like all other books, which I know to have been written by human beings.

(5.) Your remarks on your own prediction seem to me far-fetched and hypercritical. You divide it, you say, into two parts, and with equal propriety you might divide it into a dozen parts. Why, my dear sir, it was not the event of emancipation that was predicted at all. The *event* of emancipation, nobody doubted! The only thing which you could predict was *the time*, for it was then, only, a question of time. In that you failed, and no matter whether it were one year or "twenty-one," you failed, and thus proved yourself a false prophet. There is no escape from this epithet; your failure, as you say of my annihilation, is "utter, total, and eternal." And had I failed as you have done, I think I would make a clean breast of it, give it up, and say so, frankly.

(6.) You seem to have been at a loss to understand what I meant when I said that you were "a preacher of the old theology." And, how am I to account for it, that you over-looked my own explanation of what I meant? I meant, precisely, what I said, namely, that you "take for granted many things about God, the Bible, and another world of which we know nothing at all." You do not know, by whom or when the Bible was written. You do not know what the condition of any man will be after death. You know nothing of any other state of existence.

And, yet, you are in the habit of speaking of a sinner's being "*wicked*" even after he has been annihilated! Hence you speak of the "*wicked* dead." But, if the wicked are annihilated, they can no more be called wicked after death, than you can say of *nothing*, it is "*wicked*." How can a *nonentity* be called "*wicked*?"

(7.) And, finally, my friend Storrs gives me the extent of his Christian Faith, and his *charity*; these graces in his heart have "this extent, no more;" and, so, merely because I do not, (and I do not because I cannot) agree with him, in his notions of Jesus, he pronounces my doom to be "utter, total and eternal annihilation in about three years!" *Credat Judcaus Apella!*

Boston, May 28, 1862.

LA ROY SUNDERLAND.

RESPONSE TO THE FOREGOING, BY THE EDITOR.—We do not admit the *right* to claim a reply by the author of an article which we have transferred *entire* to our columns; especially, an article so manifestly personal as that which called out our notice. Of the fairness of our criticism, our readers were competent to judge. But we can afford to be generous, and have therefore given place to this new production. To save repeating what the author has said, we have placed figures at the commencement of each section to which we respond; and the corresponding figures in our response indicate the section to which it is a reply. The admission of the foregoing article into our columns is not to be construed into a claim by its author, or any other person, to introduce like articles hereafter. See our "Standing Rules for Writers for this Magazine," 3d page of cover.

(1.) If Mr. Sunderland's "design in" his "article on a 'False Prophet' was to show" what he says, why did he select "Geo. Storrs" more than any other among thousands nearer home? and why did he call "Geo. Storrs a sectarian of the 'strictest sect'?" Does that look as if his "design was to show the danger of *taking things for granted*"? If it was, no wonder we "overlooked" it. The whole article shows on its face the "design" of giving "Geo. Storrs" a portion personally.

If our preaching in Boston did not "prove a troublesome stone" to Mr. Sunderland, it is quite evident our criticism did; and he may have been "waked up," after all, though reluctant to acknowledge it.

(2.) Mr. Sunderland *was*, the last we saw or read of his writing, an advocate of "spirit-rapping," and practiced at that necromancy for pay, for such as wished to consult their dead friends. We have heard a *report*, it is true, that he had been badly de-

ceived by those ghost-rappers, and had become vexed with them ; but we had seen nothing from his pen on the subject since he ceased to publish his "*Spiritual Philosopher*," which departed into the "*Spirit World*." The "*Philosopher*," he announced as "*Open to the Higher Spheres of Intelligence above*," &c. Both those papers manifestly were devoted to spirit-rapping, and rapping against the Bible. If Mr. Sunderland has abandoned "spiritism," he evidently has not his dislike of the Bible ; yet if he has left the former, he may possibly find the latter to be the only light to guide his feet into the ways of peace. At present, he "knows nothing of another world," and he is equally in ignorance of *this*, only so far as his own senses give knowledge ; his principles forbid believing any evidence ; especially, *written*, for he could "not know by whom or when" it "was written ;" so he slides into a self-constituted god, embracing only what he sees, hears, smells, tastes, or feels, *personally*. He does "not know by whom or when" any history of nations or individuals "was written ;" and for aught he *knows*, there is no such continent as we call Europe, Asia, and Africa ; and never were any such persons as are called Julius Cesar, Constantine, Napoleon Bonaparte, or any others whose names are a matter of *history*, and not of his senses. To such ignorance—if they are consistent in their unbelief—are those reduced who reject the testimony of the Prophets, Jesus Christ, and His Apostles. But "consistency," with them, "is a jewel" too precious to deal in : it would soon show them the impenetrable gloom in which they are involved, not only in regard "to another world," but in relation to this also.

Does Mr. Sunderland pay homage to any God ? or is he not only a *deist* but an *atheist* ? "No revelation purporting to come from another world," &c., "are authority with" him, etc. "If they were," he "could believe God is *vindictive*," &c. If Mr. S. is not an atheist, can he prove *his* God is *not* vindictive ? If so, how ? He can not *see* his God ; and no "revelation from another world" would command his "faith." Hence his God may be *vindictive, angry, ferocious, and destructive*, for all he can prove to the contrary. Nay : in the absence of revelation, his God is so. Look at that city overthrown and destroyed by an earthquake, or made desolate by a sweeping plague : hear those wailings that come up on every side from the sufferings

of the children of men : behold the surging ocean, while it dashes the struggling mariners on the rocks of death, or sweeps them down into its unfathomable bosom, leaving helpless and dependent households and little children to mourn the want of a father and protector : see those desolating floods, from swollen rivers, carrying ruin in their way, laying waste the labor and destroying the hopes of those who have toiled patiently in heat and rain for a sustenance for themselves and families !—Such is the god of deists, possessing all those terrible attributes which they suppose the God of "revelation" has, but not possessing the disposition or ability to give the victims of his "vindictive, ferocious, angry, and destructive" proceedings any reasons of his conduct towards them ; while the God of the Bible, by "revelation," informs men why He chastises, corrects, or punishes them ; thus putting them on their guard against committing iniquity, and admonishing them to conform to His will that they may obtain a meetness to enter on a life in which no evil shall have place, and where sorrow and sighing are for ever excluded : at the same time informing men, in this state of trial, that an obstinate resistance to His revealed will and purposes, will be followed by their final, total, and eternal destruction. Here is an open and frank exposition of His actions—the reasons for them, and that all is designed for the ultimate and greatest possible good to the subjects of discipline, and will so result, if they do not prevent such an issue by their own wilful obstinacy.

Thus the God of the Bible, in splendor, moral grandeur, mercy, and kindness, as far surpasses the God of the deist as light is superior to darkness. The deist's god lets him "know nothing of another world ;" hence is really "vindictive," &c.—apparently without a cause and without reason—and offers no support to his suffering victims by casting light on a blessed future they may secure. No ; his victims must have no "revelation from another world" ! Does their god think them so stupid that no such communication would benefit them ? True, some will not come to the light, though it shines with glory inexpressible. Such are about as wise as he would be who should shut himself in a dungeon to escape the light of the sun, because he had discovered what he thought to be a few "*dark spots on its face*" !



(3.) So far as the *historical* parts of the Scriptures are concerned, we claim no inspiration for them further than the facts recorded could not otherwise have been known. Where there is no necessity for revelation or inspiration, there none is made. In a historical transaction all that is necessary to establish the fact, is to establish the credibility of the witnesses and the faithfulness of the record. The record is their own language, and the ideas of the transactions may be their own, and do not, necessarily, always harmonize with the divine mind, though the honest expression of the writer's view of the matter. This concession does not in the least invalidate the inspiration, or direct communication of doctrines concerning God and His relation to us, and designs towards us, which no human mind could have attained to without supernatural revelation. Those are the things which come to us by revelation or inspiration, and were made known to "holy men," and by them communicated to others, and attested by such evidence as to command faith. The inspiration was not always in the *words* employed by the writers; these words might have been their own. The doctrine, the duty, the sentiment, the fact, was what "was given by inspiration of God:" so far the record is inspired and accurate; but the words chosen to make the record were human: that is, the writer employed language peculiar to himself, or such as he would have done in the record of any other matter. If the deist thinks he gains any thing by these admissions, or that the Christian loses any thing, he is mistaken: our foundation is made invulnerable by it.

The deist is not to assume that he knows exactly what it is proper and right for God to say and do. That is to assume that he himself is infallible; while he has often found himself in error, and is at best imperfect in knowledge. Says Dr. McCULLOH, on the "*Credibility of the Scriptures*":

"We fully recognize the right of the deists to object to any portion of the Scripture writings, except where they undertake to assail them according to their assumptions of what is suitable or unsuitable for God to have done. On this subject we will not waste time in disputing with them, until they shall have demonstrated the infinite excellence and moral attributes of the Creator of all things. Such a demonstration they have never yet made, and I firmly believe it is impossible for any human being to make through any investigation of the *visible* universe."

Such being the fact, how does Mr. Sunderland, or any deist, *know* but what the Scripture writers do faithfully represent the character of God, even supposing his ideas of that representation are true? Can he *prove* the contrary without appealing to "revelation" itself? We affirm, he can not do it. His attempt, therefore, to fix reproach on what he thinks the Scripture writers "represent God" as doing *personally*, or "by proxy," falls to the ground. For aught he knows, without Scripture revelation, God's character and purposes may be precisely what he thinks taught or recorded by the Scripture writers. Would it not be far more humble and reasonable to conclude himself mistaken in the construction he puts on the texts he has presented to prove the unreliability of Scripture testimony? We know Mr. Sunderland once contended, strenuously, that the Bible did not sanction "*chattel slavery*," but condemned it. We think he was right then and wrong now. The texts he has referred to, to sustain various charges, we may take up and consider at another time.

(4.) We pass this section by simply saying, whatever was *inspired* of God is "infallibly" true; of that we never had a doubt, and have not now. How much of the sacred writings were so inspired, may be a fair question of discussion. What is inspiration and what is merely historical, we think is not difficult to determine. "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or whether" the writer "speak of himself." The root of the difficulty in giving credit to revelation, may be in hatred to the restraints it places on men in sinful courses.

(5.) There is but one remark in this section we shall notice, leaving the rest for the decision of our readers. Mr. Sunderland says—"As you say of *my* annihilation." Did we say any thing of Mr. *S's* annihilation? We said, "The *rejecters* of the *Life-Giver*, Jesus the Messiah, may look for \* \* \* eternal annihilation." Now, if he is one of those "rejecters" our remarks applied to him; not otherwise. His taking it to himself is an admission that he is a rejecter of Jesus the Messiah. We are sorry to learn such is the fact; but as his first move from Christianity was into "spiritism," we do not wonder that his next was to the rejection of Christ: that is the legitimate result of "spiritualism."

(6.) If Mr. Sunderland's object was what he pretended, *viz.*, to show "Geo. Storrs a False Prophet" in relation to the "abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia," we think all will see, he traveled out of his way to introduce theology. But he says, he defined what he "meant, precisely." Because Mr. Sunderland "knows nothing at all" in respect to some things of "another world," he "takes it for granted" that "Mr. Storrs" is equally "befogged" as himself. He says, "You do not know by whom or when the Bible was written." That surely is "taking things for granted of which" Mr. Sunderland "knows nothing at all." Because he is ignorant in that matter, is that proof that "Geo. Storrs" is also? We do not admit of any such conclusion—it is a mere assumption. We admit he is ignorant in the matter, because he professes to be so. But because he has been deceived by "lying spirits," when involved in "spiritism," is he authorized to pronounce "Geo. Storrs" equally in ignorance, who has consulted the "Spirit of Truth"? He may judge of his own knowledge, but not of ours, in relation to "another world." If he has put out his own eyes so as to be "blind, and cannot see afar off," he must not expect us to plead *guilty* to the same ignorance. We admit Mr. Sunderland "knows nothing of any other state" than the present; and that he is entirely ignorant of "what the condition of any man will be after death:" but, why is he in this profound gloom? Because he has rejected the only "light" by which "any man" can know what is "after death." "The light" that once was in him has "become darkness, and how great is that darkness"!

Mr. Sunderland falls into the strain of "orthodoxy" in opposing our view of the end of the wicked. He says, "You speak of the 'wicked dead': but if the wicked are annihilated, they can no more be called wicked after death, than you can say of *nothing* it is 'wicked': how can a *nonentity* be called 'wicked'?"

A simple illustration will enable our old friend to comprehend what he seems anxious to know. If emancipation should take place throughout all the land, all would say, "The slaves are free"; and, likely, speak of the "freed slaves." Would Mr. S. be puzzled to understand such language? He would not think of asking. How can *slaves* be free? He would be in no doubt as to the meaning of the language. So when we speak of "the

wicked dead," we speak of their character while living: they were wicked while alive; and when these wicked persons are dead, or annihilated, then the prayer of the Psalmist is answered—"O, let the wickedness of the wicked come to an end."—Psa. 7: 9. They become "nonentities," and we do not speak of their being wicked only in relation to their life time. We should feel that we insulted Mr. Sunderland's intelligence, if we were to express a doubt of his now understanding what we mean when we "speak of the wicked dead."

(7.) Mr. S. judges of the "extent" of our "Christian faith and charity" in the light of the impenetrable darkness in which he has involved himself by forsaking that "True Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." We have no "graces in" our "heart" that makes us wiser or more charitable than Jesus, the Messiah: nor do we wish any. Mr. Sunderland *could* once believe in Jesus as his Lord and Saviour. That he "cannot" now, may be true: we shall not dispute that; for, "inspiration" has told us, "It is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance; seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put him to an open shame." Alas! that such should seem to be the exact condition of La Roy Sunderland, with whom, when he was a Christian, we have taken sweet counsel, and walked with him to the house of God, and listened to his elevated and stirring appeals in behalf of Jesus and his salvation for dying men.

When he now says, "Friend Storrs pronounces *my* doom to be utter, total, and eternal annihilation," he goes beyond the truth. "Mr. Storrs pronounces" no man's "doom," as an individual. He states what he believes the Scriptures teach is to be the end of the incorrigibly wicked, and leaves each individual with God and himself to settle the question of *personal* character. "Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee," saith the Lord. A man's own faith and acts, or unbelief and acts, will fix his final state. Thus hath God appointed, and none can annul His decree.

## AN EXTRACT FROM A SERMON BY H. W. BEECHER.

FROM THE INDEPENDENT OF JUNE 19TH 1862.

"THERE are those who teach that God cannot suffer, and that suffering is incompatible with perfectness. \* \* \* 'What! do you teach that God died?' \* \* \* It was declared to be blasphemous to ascribe suffering, and much more blasphemous to ascribe death to God. \* \* \* Let me say a word in respect of dying. Do you suppose death means annihilation of the spirit? You might as well claim that it is absurd to say that God threw off the robe of empire, as to claim that it is absurd to say that he died. What is it to throw off a robe? God dies as man dies. And how does man die? We lose the body that we may have the soul. He that dies is like a man in prison, the roof and sides of which are swept away by some earthquake, so that he is left standing a free man. \* \* \* Dying means unclothing, or taking the material substance from, a spirit. And if it pleased God, in the person of Christ, to descend and take upon himself the human form, is there any more absurdity in speaking of his dying, than of speaking of a man's dying? I do not hesitate to say God died. My God is Jesus Christ. He, as an eternal spirit, became clothed in the flesh, and limited himself by being subject to the laws of nature as we are: and when he had fulfilled his earthly mission, he laid the flesh aside—and that was dying. And that is all that dying means to anybody. I do not know why an inclosed God cannot die as well as the inclosed spirit of man. God can both suffer and die: and it is taught that he suffered and died for the sins of the world."

REMARKS ON THE FOREGOING.—We think it is a law of nature and of God, that when absolute "perfectness" is attained suffering is excluded. Mr. Beecher's God, "though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered; and being *made perfect*," &c. Heb. 5: 8, 9. Who was it said to Mr. B.'s God, "Thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee?" And to whom did Mr. B.'s God "offer up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears to him that was able to save him *from death*, and was heard in that he feared?" Heb. 5: 5-7. And why did Mr. B.'s God desire to be saved "from death," when death would only "sweep away the roof and sides" of his "prison, so that he" would be "left standing a free" God? Why did Mr. B.'s God cry out in agony when His prison house was being cleared away, by the cross—the "earthquake"—and say, "my God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" No wonder Mr. B. labored so hard to "throw off" the absurdity" of his theory, with which he saw it would be charged. Can he tell us when the *eternal* "God threw off the robe of empire?" No

doubt, such an assumption is quite as "absurd" as "to say that he died!"

According to Mr. B.'s theology, when JEHOVAH threatened Adam if he sinned he should surely die, the threat amounted to just this—"Adam, thou shalt not eat of that tree, if you do, I will blow your prison walls away and sweep the roof clear from you, and you shall be left standing a free man!" What a sublime punishment! No wonder Adam and Eve were in a hurry to get such a glorious freedom! How could they be reconciled to wait nearly a thousand years for the boon they had been so prompt to secure! They must be models of patience and submission! Doubtless all their posterity copy after these virtues in their illustrious progenitors; for they all seem to be of one mind in their desire not to let the "sides and roof" of their old "prison" be "swept away," lest they should be "left standing free" too soon! All men must be exceeding pious, or Mr. B.'s definition of death is somehow defective, for all are quite willing to remain in "prison" and to defer "standing free" till a more "convenient season."

We have not however considered all the beauties of the theory. Mr. B.'s God resumed his prison of "flesh and bones," the third day after his death: for he "died, and was buried, and rose again according to the Scriptures:" see 1 Corth. 15: 3, 4. How strange that He could not endure to be left "standing a free" God more than "three days!" There must be something repulsive in the mind of Mr. B.'s God in remaining unclothed, or without "the material substance" for company. He hastens to put it on again, and so "rose from the dead the third day." Mr. B. found it easy for his God to die, according to his definition of death; but he will have to give a new definition to resurrection, as well as to death, to make his theory have any show of emanation from a thinking mind. Did *his* God rise from the dead? The Scriptures affirm that Jesus Christ did; and "that Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him." See 1 Corth. 15: 4, and Rom. 6: 9. "God dies as man dies," says B. "We lose the body that we may have the soul." When *his* God died, then, he lost "the body," and that was being made "free:" "he laid the flesh aside," he put away "the material substance." Why does Mr.

B. refrain from noticing the fact that his God "rose from the dead the third day"—that he afterwards said to his astonished disciples, "Behold my hands and feet that it is I myself: handle me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." Here is the "material substance"—he is "clothed" with it again, notwithstanding it seems so hateful in Mr. B.'s *theory*: the "prison" is reared anew; and as "he dieth no more," Mr. B.'s God is to remain *eternally in prison!*

But Mr. B. says, "I do not see why an inclosed God cannot die as well as the inclosed spirit of man." Here is "confusion worse confounded." In the first place, "the heaven of heavens cannot contain God," (1 Kg. 8: 27). "Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the LORD:" Jev. 23: 24. "In Him we live and move and have our being:" Acts 17: 28. How then is God to be "inclosed!" Can He be shut up in "prison"—in "material substance?" We do not ask how God could *manifest* Himself "in the flesh,"—shining through it upon earth's darkness—but how could He be "inclosed" in it, as in a prison?

In Mr. B.'s remark, the two legs are not equal. To have made them so, *man*, and not "the *spirit* of man," should be spoken of as "inclosed." He says, *God* was inclosed. Was *man* inclosed? No: "the LORD God formed *man* out of the dust of the ground." When Mr. B. can prove that *man* had a "*spirit inclosed*" in him, his illustration may be of some value; till then, it has place among his many groundless declarations.

Why is Mr. B. so profoundly wise in defining what death is? Because he has assumed that man has a distinct entity inclosed in his body, called *soul*; and that it is immortal. He says, in another part of his sermon, "it is enough for" him "to know that man has a soul, and that that soul is immortal." That would be enough if he only *knew* it, but does he know it? If so, will he give us Bible authority for it? Can he do that? We "know" he cannot; but he can declaim about it, as a school boy would about the "inhabitants of the moon." Let him give us a "Thus saith the LORD" in proof that man has a soul entity which is "immortal." We forewarn him, that he will be in as critical a position as king Saul was before he consulted the *spirit rapper* at Endor: he went not to her, till God had forsaken him, and "answered him not, neither by dreams, nor by Urim

nor by Prophets." There is not an utterance of JEHOVAH, nor of His Prophets, from Genesis to Revelation, which speaks of the soul as *immortal*; no, not one. But Mr. B. and others *assume* it, and so call darkness light, and light darkness, "corrupting the word of God to establish their own traditions." "If the blind lead the blind" shall they not "both fall into the ditch?"

---

### WHAT IS IT TO PERISH ?

FROM AARON G. HUDSON, FLORENCE, MINNESOTA.

TO EDITOR OF BIBLE EXAMINER:—The following article I sent last winter to the *Crisis*, requesting them to publish it. They refused. At my request they have returned it to me. Will you insert it in your magazine, that your readers may see what course the *Editors* of the *Crisis* intend to pursue? I love the truths the *Crisis* advocates, but I can not, neither will I knowingly tolerate popery in any of its forms.

Yours, amenable to the Bible and the Bible *only*.

June 11th, 1862.

---

#### *For the Crisis.*

"For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3 : 16.

I wish to present to the readers of the *Crisis* a few thoughts that arise in my mind when I read this language of our Saviour; and if the conclusions at which I arrive are not correct I should be glad to have my error pointed out. Whatever the penalty of the law is, whether it is dwelling eternally in a literal fire, suffering eternally the horrors of a guilty conscience, torment for a time, to a greater or less degree, ending in death; whether it is dying once, twice or thrice; or whether it is *remaining* in death, I understand it is expressed in this passage by the word *perish*. I conclude then, if God had not so loved the world as to have given His Son, the entire race must have perished. In other words, God saw them exposed to this penalty, when He was so moved with pity that He determined to give His Son to die for a doomed race.

Another point to which I arrive is—Those who do not believe on the Son will perish: and it will be remembered, there is but



one perish in the text : they will not be affected by the gift of the Son : they will perish just as they would have perished had no Son been given : in short, grace does not affect the penalty. Again ; those who do believe on the Son will *not* perish ; for if they should perish the gift of the Son would be a failure. At this point I think I can see at least what the penalty is not. First : all who believe have been in a state of trespasses and sins : they have been sinners : yet they have not perished ; consequently, being a sinner or being in a state of transgression, is one thing : to suffer the penalty for that transgression is quite another thing. Again : most of those at least who believe have labored, sweat, suffered, had sorrow, pain, and sickness ; yet they have not perished ; for whosoever believeth on Him shall not perish. But, once more : thousands of those who have believed with all their hearts are now dead : still, they are not perished ; consequently to die even, and be in a state of death, is not what is conveyed by the term perish.

I now ask my reader to turn to 1 Cor. 15, and carefully examine the argument ; then notice the conclusion in the 18th verse. If I understand the argument, it is this—if those who have fallen asleep in Christ are never raised, in that instance they are perished. Now just pause a moment and inquire—Have they suffered eternal misery ? have ghosts of unforgiven crimes eternally haunted them ? or, have they come up and gone down the second time ? Then just notice the adverb *also*. If it means anything it means somebody has perished. And if the righteous dead are not raised, then they *also* are perished. But if Christ raises them, then I conclude they are not perished. I understand our text, then, to mean simply this—Whosoever believeth on Him will not remain under the power of death, but be raised up at the last day. God grant that he who pens these thoughts and they who read them may not perish but have everlasting life.

AARON G. HUDSON.

---

## THE DYING THIEF.

FROM W. J. LUSE, MICHIGAN.

In regard to the dying thief, Luke 23 : 43, you say, in your "*Watch Tower*," page 75, in giving the words of our Lord, "*thou shalt be with me*," "This is a positive declaration to the thief that he should be with him in paradise." This I think is not correct, as the declaration in the Bible is negative, and the verb is negatively conjugated and reads thus, "*Shalt thou be with*

me?" Mark and Matthew give their positive testimony that the thieves both reviled our Lord. In Luke the thief says, "Remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." The Saviour knowing that the thief addressed him in an ironical manner, thus answers him and says: "I say unto thee to-day, shalt thou be with me in paradise?" As much as to say, You who are now reviling me! no, never!

What he said to the thief, therefore, I interpret in harmony with the testimony of Matthew and Mark. See Matt. 27: 44. Mark 15: 32. Am I right in saying that the thief had no promise of being with our Lord in paradise?

EDITORIAL RESPONSE.—We have for many years doubted the genuineness of the text, altogether; but have thought it best to expound it as if genuine, so as not needlessly to give offence to any one. If the view of our friend is correct—and we are not prepared to affirm it is not—then the difficulty which all Commentators have found in reconciling Luke's account with the other Evangelists is overcome. It was this apparent discrepancy between them that first led us to doubt the genuineness of the text in Luke, so Matthew and Mark both say, "the *thieves*" reviled Christ, and neither they nor John say any thing of the repentance of either.

In addition to this, the general tenor of the Bible is against the idea of a successful cry for mercy in a dying hour; especially where the previous life has been one of uniform rejection of God's calls. "Because I have called, and ye have refused; I have stretched out my hand and no man regarded; but ye have set at nought all my counsel, and would none of my reproof: I also will laugh at your calamity, and mock when your fear cometh, \* \* \* then shall they call upon me, but I will not answer," &c. See Prov. 1: 24—31. Many other texts harmonize with this.

---

## QUESTIONS ON THE BAPTISM OF THE SPIRIT.

BY W. H. WHITMAN, ILLINOIS.

QUES. 1.—In the days of the Apostles the baptism of the Holy Spirit was followed by miracles: *i. e.*, those that were baptised with it could work miracles: see Acts 2: 1-4; 10: 44-46; 19: 6, 7. If men are baptised now with the Spirit, why is it

they can not work miracles? Why will not the same cause produce the same effect now, that it did 1800 years ago?

ANS.—The baptism of the Spirit was that which pertained to the whole body of Christ. “By one Spirit are we *all* baptised into one body”—“now are ye the body of Christ.” Thus wrote Paul to the Church at Corinth; 1 Corth. 12: 13, 27. But *all* who received this baptism did *not* “work miracles in the days of the apostles;” for, in this same chapter, Paul asks, emphatically, “Are all workers of miracles?” He shows that such was not the fact, but that “God had set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased him.” He shows that different members had different gifts, and that the gift to work miracles was not imparted to all.

It is clearly an error, then, to suppose the baptism of the Holy Spirit necessarily brought with it the power to work miracles. That such power was imparted to some in establishing the new dispensation, in its opening, is true; but that is no reason why it should be continued after the inspired apostles had filled up the testimony, or canon of scripture. The continuance of the miracle, working power after that period would tend to weaken, rather than to strengthen the truth, by making that *common* which God gave for the confirming of the Church before the doctrines of the Gospel had been fully established and embodied for the future use of His people.

These remarks might be much extended, but they seem to us to be a sufficient answer to the first question with its preceding statement.

QUES. 2.—“If miracles are not to follow the baptism of the Spirit now, when did they cease, and why?”

ANS.—We consider this question sufficiently answered in our reply to the first.

QUES. 3.—“How does the baptism of the Spirit take place?”

ANS.—It is “shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour;” Titus 3: 5, 6; and by it we are made “members of the body of Christ:” see again 1 Corth. 12: 13, 27. “For through him”—Christ—“we both”—believing Jews and Gentiles—“have access by *one Spirit* unto the Father.” See Eph. 2: 18. If any one desires a more definite answer to this last question, ask God for His Holy Spirit—for, “If ye being evil,

know how to give good gifts unto your children ; how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him." Luke 11 : 13. The recipient of this baptism does not "sound a trumpet before" himself ; but he has "the *comfort* of the Holy Spirit ;" see Acts 9 : 31 ; which Jesus promised to His followers before He ascended to heaven : see John 16 : 7 ; 14 : 16, 17. And John the Baptist testified to all—"He that sent me to baptise with *water*, the same said unto me, upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is He which baptiseth with the *Holy Spirit*." John 1 : 33.

---

### AN EXTRACT AND TEN QUESTIONS.

"We are told in the same chapter [the 15th of 1 Corinthians] that the first Man Adam, though a living soul, was of the earth earthy. He was destined to return to the earth, and all his posterity partake of his nature and share his destiny. This is the much talked of penalty of original sin. His disobedience entailed upon the human race indiscriminately natural death by which we return to dust, our earthy origin, from which we are brought up to everlasting life by the second Adam, who was for this purpose made a quickening spirit. Yes, my friends, had it not been for the mission of the second Adam or Lord from heaven, the whole human family would have turned to dust and perished forever. This fact gives point and force to the declaration, that God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on [in] him might not *perish* but have *everlasting life!* Upon the hypothesis, that man is naturally immortal, and does not cease to exist consciously and intelligently at death, whether he be saint or sinner, this declaration is meaningless not to say false.

"Again : Our Lord himself teaches explicitly the doctrine that future life depends on the resurrection, and not on an immortal or spiritual nature. He says, 'And this is the Father's will that [which] hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I shall [should] lose nothing, *but should raise it up again at the last day.*' John vi : 39. Here it is affirmed, beyond all doubt, that his people will be lost without a resurrection. There is no evading this conclusion. As I have shown repeatedly, this could not be the case if my friend's doctrine were true. The resurrection could be dispensed with, and the righteous could still live and enjoy happiness." (Extract from Dr. N. Field's

"Twelfth Reply" to Rev. Mr. Connelly in published "Debate on the State of the Dead," pp. 211, 212.)

THE foregoing argument appears to me to be sound and scriptural, and in perfect harmony with the doctrine of no future life for the wicked dead. But as Dr. Field rejects this doctrine, I wish to ask him a few questions through the EXAMINER.

1. Does the above extract express your present sentiments?
2. Do you believe the extract is in harmony with the doctrine of the revival of the wicked dead?
3. Should you answer the last question affirmatively, I ask, was Christ "made a quickening spirit" for the "purpose" of imparting a temporal life to the wicked dead?
4. Why do you *simply* say that "we are brought up to *everlasting* life by the second Adam," if he is also to bring up the wicked dead to a *different kind of life*?
5. Had there been no intervention of a Saviour, and had "the whole human family" on that account "perished forever," would the ends of *justice* in the Divine government have been defeated by virtue of the non-occurrence of a limited period of torment for sinners in a future life?
6. If the "fact" that the race were exposed to the peril of *dying to live no more forever* "gives *point and force* to" John 3 : 16 ("God so loved the world," etc.), does it not follow that precisely this peril awaits those who do *not* believe in Christ?
7. Was it any part of "the mission of the second Adam" to substitute, in the place of an existing danger, the peril of being *made alive, tormented, and killed again*?
8. Does "perish" in John 3 : 16 define the penalty that would have fallen upon all men without an atonement, or the penalty to which the impenitent are now actually *exposed*? If not both, *which of the two* is the question.
9. If our Lord's declaration in John 3 : 16 "is meaningless" upon the hypothesis "that man is naturally immortal," is it a single whit less so upon the hypothesis that sinners will not actually "perish" as they would have perished if no atonement had been made?
10. If the "people" of God "will be lost without a resurrection," must there nevertheless be a resurrection from the dead of those whose doom it is to be eternally "lost"?

Submitted in Christian love for the truth's sake,

SALEM, Mass., July 10, 1862.

RUFUS WENDELL.

## ON THE STATE OF MAN IN DEATH.

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

---

“THE SILENCE OF THE SCRIPTURES respecting *The Immortality of the Soul*, or of the race, or of the lost.”—By C. F. HUDSON.

This is a valuable Tract of 24 pages: price 5 cents; or \$3 per 100. Published by G. W. Carleton, 413 Broadway, New York. It is worthy to be widely scattered.

---

THE RESPONSE to the inquiry, “Shall the EXAMINER be sustained?” since our last issue, has been encouraging, as follows:—

Leonard C. Thorn, 36 Church st., New York, (of the Friends’ Society), \$15. Geo. K. Carroll, \$10. Wm. Hathaway, \$5. B. J. Burnett, \$5. Alexander McDonald, \$5. John Berry, \$2.50. Jas. E. Sebring, \$2.50; the last six named, all of Westchester Co., N. Y. Mrs. Polly G. Pitts, of Wis., \$1.

---

THE BIBLE EXAMINER.—Four numbers more will complete the present volume of this Magazine. It must be continued if the friends of “*Life only in Christ*” wish a medium through which to state and defend their position, and communicate with others. To encourage new subscribers, and early remittances, we offer those who send us \$2 the 18 numbers of the present volume and the 12 numbers of the volume for 1863. Or, we will give any one who remits us \$1 the entire *present* volume (18 Nos.) in sheets, if called for soon.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

---

"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, HATH NOT LIFE."

---

Vol. 14. No. 15.]

SEPT. 1862.

[Whole No. 216.]

---

---

## THE DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION.

THE following article by JOSEPH T. CURRY is from his manuscript of a work he designs to publish in a book. It will be understood, this is only a fragment from his coming work; and when that appears it will have *notes* appended explaining those passages where the translation is altered in certain texts which he quotes.—ED. OF EXR.

### PROPOSITION A.

*The doctrine of the Resurrection is based on a Promise.*

#### THE PROMISE.

"Now the LORD had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee. \* \* So Abram departed, as the LORD had spoken unto him \* \* and into the land of Canaan they came. \* \* And the LORD appeared unto Abram, and said, Unto thy seed will I give this land." Gen. 12: 1—7.

"And the LORD said unto Abram, after that Lot was separated from him, Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art, northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward: for all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed forever. \* \* Arise, walk through the land in the length of it and in the breadth of it; for I will give it unto thee. Gen. 13: 14—17.

#### THE COVENANT.

The promise was ratified by a covenant, as follows:

"And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the LORD appeared to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God; walk before me, and be thou perfect. And I will make my covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly. \* \* Behold, my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be

a father of many nations. Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, (High Father,) but thy name shall be Abraham; (Father of a multitude;) for a father of many nations have I made thee. \* \* And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be thy God." Gen. 17: 1-8.

It must be understood that this promise and covenant only affect those who have "the *faith* of Abraham." The land of Canaan has been possessed by Abraham's seed under the law, but not under the covenant of faith. Under this covenant the *righteous* seed are to inherit the land "for an *everlasting* possession." "For the *promise* \* \* was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the *righteousness of faith*. \* \* \* Therefore it is of *faith*, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, (those of natural Israel who have faith,) but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; (among the Gentiles;) who is the father of us all." Rom. 4: 13-16. Paul says to the Hebrews,

"By *faith* Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should *after* receive for an *inheritance*, obeyed. \* \* By faith he *sojourned* in the land of *promise*, as in a strange country, dwelling in tents with Isaac and Jacob, the *heirs with him* of the same promise: for *he waited* for the city which hath the foundations, whose builder and maker is God. \* \* \* Therefore sprang there even of one, and him as good as dead, so many as the stars of the sky in multitude, and as the sand which is by the sea shore innumerable. *These all died in faith, not having received the promises*, but having seen them afar off, and saluted them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth"—*i. e.*, during their mortal existence. Heb. 11 ch. "We desire that every one of you do show the same diligence to the full assurance of hope unto the end: that ye be followers of them who *through faith and patience inherit the promises*." Heb. 6 ch. He says to the Galatians, "If ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs *according to the promise*." Gal. 3: 29.

It should also be noticed that in the covenant, God constitutes himself "a God unto" Abraham and his seed, as the heirs of the promised inheritance. Hence, when after the death of



Abraham, He would remind Isaac of His promise, "He appeared unto him \* \* and said, I am *the God* of Abraham." When He said to Jacob, "I am the *LORD God of Abraham* thy father, and the *God of Isaac*," the *promise* to Abraham and Isaac came into remembrance: and when He said to Moses, "I am the God of thy father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob," the covenant promise to Abraham and his seed was again reiterated. From this, we may safely conclude that the *LORD God* of Abraham holds a relation to the "heirs of promise" which He does *not* hold to others. "God is not ashamed to be called *their God*: for He hath prepared for them a city." Heb. 11: 16.

#### THE OATH.

The promise was further confirmed by an oath, which is recorded, Gen. 22: 16-18. Paul refers to it, Heb. 6 ch.

"For when God made promise to Abraham, because He could swear by no greater, He swore by Himself, saying, Surely blessing I will bless thee, and multiplying I will multiply thee. \* \* \* For men verily swear by the greater: and an oath for confirmation is to them an end of all strife. Wherein God, willing more abundantly to show unto the heirs of promise the *immutability* of His counsel, confirmed it by an oath: that by two immutable things, (His promise and oath,) in which it was impossible for God to lie, *we* might have a strong consolation, who have fled for refuge to lay hold upon the *hope* set before us."

#### THE HOPE.

The promise, supported by the covenant and oath, given to Abraham, renewed to Isaac, (Gen. 26: 2-5, 24,) and again repeated to Jacob, (Gen. 28: 13-15,) was a solid foundation for the hope of the patriarchs. "If we *hope* for that we see not, then do we with patience *wait* for it," says the Apostle. Hence Jacob, the last recipient of the formal promise, expresses the unshaken hope of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in his dying testimony. "I have *waited* for thy salvation, O Lord."

The hope thus solemnly delivered by Israel to his twelve sons, and handed down from generation to generation, was kindled "to a flame," by the advent of Him, "who taketh not hold of angels, but of the *seed of Abraham*." Heb. 2: 16. Said Paul to Agrippa, "And now I stand and am judged for the *hope* of the *promise* made of God *unto our fathers*: unto which promise our twelve tribes, earnestly serving God day and night, *hope* to

come." Acts 26 : 6, 7. And at Rome he declares, "For the hope of Israel I am bound with this chain." Acts 28 : 20.

#### THE RESURRECTION.

"The hope of the promise" cannot be realized without a resurrection of the dead. As "the hope" proceeds from, and is sustained by "*the promise*," so the resurrection proceeds from, and is sustained by the *hope*. For this cause, Paul, in his discourse before Agrippa, after mentioning the hope, immediately adds, "What! is it judged incredible by you that God should raise the dead?" And before the Jewish council, "he cried out," "Of the *hope and resurrection of the dead* I am called in question." And Peter echoes, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who, according to His abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a *lively hope*, by the *resurrection* of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an *inheritance* incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away." 1 Pet. 1 : 3, 4. In the Scripture testimony thus far presented, we have a complete chain of evidence to support our proposition. The promise is the first link ; the covenant is the second ; the oath, the third ; fourth, the hope, and last, the resurrection. The promise is the seed-corn ; the covenant is the blade ; the oath, the stalk ; the hope is the ear, and the resurrection, the full corn. The promise, covenant, and oath make a triple cord upon which is suspended the hope, to which is attached the resurrection. Take away the link of promise and the chain goes. Kill the seed of promise and all its developments of blade, stalk, ear, and corn in the ear, are prevented. Sever the cord of promise, and the hope and resurrection fall to the ground. Divested of metaphor, the case stands thus : If there were no promise, there would be *no hope* ; if there were no hope, there would be **NO RESURRECTION**. As the resurrection rests on the hope, and the hope on the promise, it plainly follows that the resurrection rests *on the promise*, and proposition "A" is proved.

If an architect were employed to draw the plan of an edifice, subject to the post-examination of a competent board of judges, he could not fail to be gratified in their approval of his work. We experience the same feeling in relation to the foregoing argument. An *infallible* seal of approval is furnished in the Gospel record. Jesus said to the Sadducees, "Now *that the dead are raised*, even Moses shewed at the bush, when he calleth the

Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." Luke 20, Matt. 22, Mark 12.

We have already shown the significance of the assertion, "I am the God of Abraham," &c. It was a title assumed by God in direct reference to the *promise*, He is the God of Abraham and his seed because He has covenanted with them to give them the land of Canaan in a future and eternal life. As that life depends on a resurrection from the dead, the affirmation quoted by Jesus *proves* the resurrection. Thus, Jesus sustains our proposition, and we present the

FIRST ARGUMENT

*against the resurrection of the wicked.*

The wicked, not being "heirs of the promise," are excluded from every blessing based on that promise.

But the resurrection of the dead is based on that promise.

*Therefore* THE WICKED ARE EXCLUDED FROM THE RESURRECTION.

WHAT MANNER OF SPIRIT IS THIS ?

"In order for a man to be a Christian, he must, of necessity, have complied with the terms of reconciliation, which are, a belief in *'the Gospel'*; 'repentance toward God'; and immersion 'for the remission of sins.' Then, and not till then, can it be said that any man is *in Christ*. Gal. 3 : 27."

Such is the utterance of the *Millennial Harbinger*, July 23. If the author of it had said, he did not feel *himself* "in Christ till then," and that *he* was not "a christian" till he was *immersed* in water, we would have had no controversy with him on the subject: but when he sets up his act as a law for others, or makes his construction of Scriptures a test for every other person, so as to pronounce sentence of exclusion upon all who have not come up to his standard, it is quite another matter, and we cannot help retorting in the language of Paul, "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth. Yea, he shall be bolden up: for God is able to make him stand." Rom. 14 : 4.

We have not the slightest objection to any one acting in the matter of "immersion" in accordance with their own conviction of duty for themselves: but let them beware they do not under-

take to judge all others in this matter ; but the *Harbinger* does it. Hear it again. It speaks thus :—

“ Who are the sheep ? All who have complied with the terms of ‘reconciliation’—no more, no less. These are predestinated to *inherit* the kingdom, if they ‘continue in well doing.’ Who are the brethren ? The sheep—the disciples—the Christians ! Are any of those who have climbed up ‘some other way,’ the sheep also ? No ! they are thieves and robbers,” said Jesus.”

Thus the *Harbinger* would have us believe that no man is a sheep, a brother, a Christian, a disciple of Christ, but is a thief and robber, unless he has been immersed in water for the remission of sins ! Is such a spirit the legitimate fruit of the “immersion” doctrine ? If so, the fewer immersed the better for the cause of Christian charity. We say again, let those be immersed who believe it their duty to be ; but let them show the *spirit* of Christ if they expect us to believe them Christians : “ For though” they “speak” as if they “understood all mysteries, and all knowledge, and have not charity” they are “nothing.” See 1 Corth. 13.

The application of our Lord’s words, about thieves and robbers, by the *Harbinger*, to the unimmersed, is out of place, in our judgment. Look at the text John 10 : 1–13. The thieves and robbers were false shepherds : “ he that entereth in by the door is the shepherd of the sheep”—“ he calleth his own sheep by name and leadeth them out”—“ all that ever came before me” [professing to be the shepherd] “are thieves and robbers.” \* \* \* “The thief cometh not but for to steal, and to kill, and to destroy : I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly. I am the good shepherd : the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep. But he that is a hireling” [the thieves and robbers] “seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep, and fleeth,” &c. If we admit the text is applicable to persons seeking salvation, it applies to such as seek it in some other way than by Christ. He is the only medium through whom any can find life : but to use this scripture to prove no man is a sheep, a brother, or a Christian, unless he has been “immersed for the remission of sins,” we regard as a perversion of the words of Christ to establish a tradition of men. The *Harbinger*, however, quotes one text, at the close of our first extract, to prove its position of immersion as essential to

being a Christian, in Gal. 3 : 27. Let us look at it, and see how much support it gives to the exclusive position.

To take a text entirely out of its connection to the exclusion of the apostle's argument, we think, is not the way to prove anything. To select the third chapter of Galatians to prove immersion in water is the way into Christ, was a most unfortunate choice for an advocate of that theory. Three things are prominently set forth in that chapter. *First* : that outward things, or things done to "the flesh," are not the things to mature Christian character ; hence it is not likely immersion in *water* has place in the chapter at all. "Are ye so foolish ? having begun in the *spirit*, are ye now made perfect by the flesh ?" v. 3.

The *second* thing set forth is, that justification is by *faith*, and not by any outward right or ceremony. "Abraham *believed* God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Know ye therefore that they which are of *faith*, the same are the *children* of Abraham ? And the scripture foreseeing that God would *justify* the heathen *through faith*," [not through "immersion,"] preached before "*the Gospel*" unto Abraham, saying, "In thee shall all nations be blessed." So then, they which be of *faith* are blessed with faithful Abraham : vs. 6-9. Again : "The scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the *promise by faith* of Jesus Christ might be given to them that *believe*." v. 22. "The law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that *we might be justified by FAITH*:" v. 24. "For ye are all children of God by *faith* in Christ Jesus : " v. 26. "For ye are all one in Christ Jesus : " v. 28.

The *third* thing in this chapter which calls for special attention is, how came they "all *one* in Christ ?" Was it by *water* "immersion," or baptism of the *Spirit* ? Let us see. "This only would I learn of you, *Received ye the Spirit* by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith ?" v. 2. "He therefore that ministered to you *the Spirit*" \* \* \* "doeth he it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith ?" v. 5 "That ye might receive the promise of *the Spirit* through faith : " v. 14. "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ : " v. 27. Has the apostle, all at once, dropped the *Spirit* and substituted water to get believers into Christ ? and that too, without once mentioning water in the whole epistle ?

He has urged the fact that by faith they received the Spirit, the promise of God to the man who should believe ; and he affirms they are "all one in Christ Jesus," and this evidently by faith and the baptism of which he speaks ; and of no other element or agent does he here speak, in this baptism, except the Spirit ; and he tells us positively elsewhere, "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." 1 Corth. 12 : 13. It is thus they are "baptized into Christ," and "have put on Christ : " thus "if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise : " v. 29.

Whatever may be said, then, in favor of *water* baptism, or of immersion as the only way to use it, that is not *the* baptism of Paul, Gal. 3 : 27. He was speaking of the Spirit of promise, by which a man is united to Christ and "puts on Christ." While persons, therefore, may be baptized with or in water, let them beware lest they themselves stumble and fall, and so neither *begin* nor *end* "in the Spirit," but in "the flesh." That fleshly spirit is always an intolerant one ; and, where it has power, a persecuting one. It succeeds only by putting all who do not submit to its expositions and demands out of its charity, as no Christians, no brethren, no disciples, not the sheep of Christ ! Let us all beware of that spirit which is judging another's servant, and virtually "beating the men servants and maidens," lest our Lord coming suddenly "cut us asunder."

It is not to be expected we shall all "see eye to eye" till the "LORD shall bring again Zion." Let us then "be patient unto the coming of the Lord," and endeavor to keep our own garments clean. "God will judge His people."

---

## INTOLERANCE.

BY HOMO.

THE greatest evil in the world, and the evil which is the most difficult and the last to be cured, is intolerance ; a disposition to condemn those who differ from us in opinion, and to endeavor to frighten or to force them into agreement with ourselves. And the greatest and highest of all virtues, the last to which humani-

ty attains, seems to be a disposition to "forbear with our brethren in love." This virtue seems to be the crowning virtue ; the virtue which comes to complete and perfect the Christian character. In order to be tolerant, it seems necessary that a man should have both an enlightened understanding, and a truly loving and disinterested mind. It seems almost impossible for ignorance and selfishness to be tolerant. There seems to be no cure for intolerance therefore, but the spread of the pure, bright light of Gospel truth, and the diffusion, throughout society, of the spirit of Christian love. We can never put down intolerance by speaking against it ; we can never establish toleration by preaching in its favor. If we wish to break down the spirit of intolerance, and to bring people to forbear one another in love, we must pour forth light unceasingly and unsparingly, and we must labor for the spread of Christian love with all our powers. I know that by freely pouring forth light upon our fellow men, we shall rouse their intolerance, and bring forth their lurking fury with greater violence against ourselves ; but this should not discourage us. It is by bringing men's intolerance out, that it is to be destroyed : it is by bringing down their wrath and fury on ourselves that those fierce fires are to be quenched. As the lightnings are rendered harmless, by being disengaged from the clouds by the skill of the philosopher, and brought down to the earth and lodged therein, by proper substances, so must it be with the lightnings of intolerance. We must disengage those frightful fires by the application of truth to the black and full charged souls of ignorant and selfish men ; and we must then receive the fiery streams upon ourselves, and be content, though at the risk of being scathed and blasted, to be the conductors of this moral lightning to its grave.

It does not appear to me, that the great evils of humanity can be cured in any other way, than by the children of light and the children of love, presenting themselves as victims, and willingly suffering themselves to be destroyed. It appears to me as if God had made a law, that evil shall be destroyed by voluntary suffering only ; that sin shall be destroyed, by being allowed to destroy its antagonists ; that if men will see error and intolerance brought to an end, they shall, instead of complaining of the evil merely, meet in close encounter, and slay it by the sac-

rifice of their own life. It seems to be a law, that no great revolution, no great change for the better, no Christian reformation, shall be thoroughly accomplished, but by the sufferings and the sacrifice of the reformers. I once indulged the hope that things had so far changed, that now the lovers of truth and freedom, the friends of Christ and of mankind, might carry forward the work of Christian reformation without peril. I entertained the pleasing thought, that reform must now be popular, and that nothing awaited the Christ-like and devoted friends of improvement, but rewards and honors. I fondly thought that the friends of reform would secure both the favor of God, and the applause of men. But I awoke, and behold it was a dream. I awoke, to dream such dreams no more. I now expect no good to man from any advocate of reform, who is not willing, like his Master, to give his life a ransom for his brethren. We can only bless our fellows, and we can only bless ourselves, by voluntary suffering. All that would aid the work of Christian reformation, must, like its great author, give themselves a sacrifice.

Let us then prepare for trials. Let us, if we would serve the cause of truth and righteousness, deny ourselves, take up our cross, and follow Christ. Let that mind be in us, which was also in Christ Jesus. "And if we suffer for righteousness' sake, happy are we. It is better, if the will of God so appoint, to suffer for well-doing than for evil doing: for Christ himself suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, to bring us to God." Since Christ therefore has suffered for us in the flesh, let us arm ourselves also with the same mind: prepare to be sacrificed in the same cause.

I fear no evil, and utter no complaints. I submit to the appointment of my heavenly Father with joy. I do not now regret that my dream of a quiet and peaceful reformation has been broken. The prospect of sorrow does not alarm me. I have suffered in this cause, and my sufferings have proved to be springs of joy. While by our sufferings we are killing bigotry and sin in others, we are perfecting ourselves. Let us "count it all joy when" we "fall into many trials; knowing that the trial of our faith worketh patience;" produces toleration; reconciles us to the will of God; enables us to bear with men; so we become "perfect and entire, wanting nothing." Happy result—glorious end.



"GOD TOOK HER."

TURN which way we will we find men turning the words of Scripture into foolishness by their traditions. We give one or two samples of this pernicious course. The account of the death of a pious lady in Brooklyn, closes thus :

"When struggling in death she exclaimed, 'This is no dark valley! this river is very narrow! I can step across it!' With assurances of love to all her friends, she concluded with 'Good-by! good-by!' and she 'was not, for God took her.'"

Is the concluding remark justified by the text to which it refers? It relates to the case of Enoch. It is said of him, Gen. 5 : 24, "Enoch walked with God : and he *was* not ; for God took him." The word "*was*," in this text, is supplied, not being in the original. We get the true sense from the Apostle, Heb. 11 : 5—"By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death, and was not found, because God had translated him." Now let Gen. 5 : 24 correspond with this apostolic explanation and we have this fact—"Enoch *died* not ; for God took him," or "translated" him : he did not die. But the pious lady, to whom the inspired language was applied, did die—she "struggled in death : " yea, she died ; and yet words are applied to her which belong only to one who "died not"—one who was "translated that he should *not* see death." By the theology of the account of this lady's death, she went just as Enoch did. By the language of the apostle, if Enoch had died, it could not have been said—"God took him." It was because he did not die that such language was applied to him.

Another case was that of a minister who was praying God to comfort persons who had a friend die, and he asked that God would "say to these mourners, when they came to the grave, 'he is *not here*,' for he is not Lord—he has gone to heaven."

In this case, it will be seen, God was asked to use language to these mourners, when they should lay their dead friend *in* the grave, that was spoken of Jesus, by the angel to the women, *after* He had risen from the dead and come *out* of the grave. In the case of Jesus it was a glorious truth : in the other case, it would have been a monstrous falsehood ; which the minister asked God to utter. In other words, the theology of the minister led him to suppose mourners could be comforted by an untruth. It is certain, however, that God never did sanction

such a method of comforting mourners. No: His method is to point believers to the resurrection, "at the last day," when "the Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout; with the voice of the arch-angel and the trump of God;" then "the dead in Christ shall rise first, and we who are alive and remain" [unto that event] "shall be caught up together with them to meet the Lord, and so shall be forever with the Lord. Wherefore *comfort* one another with *these words*." See 1 Thess. 4: 13-18. How unlike the corrupted theology of such a misdirected, though it might be a well-intended, prayer!

The evil of all such unscriptural statements and prayers, as we have noticed, is, they draw away the mind from the true source of comfort, and the scripture hope of the resurrection of "the dead in Christ," and argue a lack of faith in the glorious revival from the "dominion of death, to die no more," by which the saints become "the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." Lk. 20: 35, 36. Besides, they beget a habit of a loose—not to say criminal—use of the language of scripture, which prevents the intelligent use and the sanctifying effects of the truth.

---

## ORGANIZED POWER.

BY POLLY G. PITTS, WISCONSIN.

My mind has often been afflicted when contemplating this power, and I *feel* to-day that organized power is that which is treading down the people of God, and stamping upon them. I mean the power of those organized bodies, professing to be the true Church of God. Not that they call themselves the Church of God, for they all have their own name, their own division, their own sect. I have long been oppressed by that power, and for years I have wrestled with it. How oft have I felt the great paw of the beast upon me, and the gripping of those great iron teeth. But, thanks be to God, the paw is lifted, the teeth are getting old and decaying, and we have a foretaste of victory through our Lord Jesus Christ, over the beast, and all that opposeth or exalteth itself above the plain Word of God. How I pity many of the honest sons of God, who have begun to feel and see that they are responsible to God alone; then to have that power press them to the earth, put on them their sectarian

screws, crush out their individuality, and make them passive tools in their hands to do their bidding! And why is all this? One thing is, they feel the need of Christian fellowship and help; and have not the moral courage to stand alone, and like Noah condemn the world, and become heirs of the righteousness which is by faith, and they feel it is dreadful to be called unpopular, unsound, and to have it said, "You are not of us, Why? because you will not take the Bible and this little book as a rule of faith and practice. If you will take them you may" (as Beecher says) "put your own private construction on them both, as every one does, then walk with us." But it is like a yoke of bondage to take the book, [the creed,] and he feels that with the Bible he is perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. Well, for a while he thinks with the Bible I can stand alone, I will not join any sect. He turns away, but there meets him *public opinion*, and it is almost as bad as organized power. He sees that a public profession gives a man many worldly advantages and worldly friends, and he hates to have his hand against every man, and every man's hand against him, and be always contending; and he thinks that many good men have lived and died under organized power, and have been esteemed the light of the world, and the salt of the earth, so he gives up the contest, goes with the majority, but often feels like the prophet when he said, "O that I had in the wilderness a lodging place of a wayfaring man, that I might go from my people," &c.

When I view all these things in the light of God's Word, I feel to say, "Bless the LORD, O my soul, and all that is within me bless His holy name. Bless the LORD, O my soul, and forget not all His benefits." O what a lamp the Word of God has been to me. I can say its light grows brighter and brighter, and will unto the perfect day. I feel to say, If ever I draw back from declaring that God's Word, and that alone, will thoroughly furnish the Church of God and His ministers; "let my right hand forget her cunning, and my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth." As Luther said, "Shall every one that lifts his head in defence of God's Word alone be struck down? God forbid. It does not belong to the pope, or any other creature, to add new articles of faith. There is no authority for the believing Christian but the holy Scriptures; that alone is of divine right. What signifies the outward link that connects us with a visible church, enslaved by the commandments of men?" It would be no help to me, but rather a disadvantage. For now I am Christ's free man, and like Luther I feel that I am responsible to God alone, and have a right to think and speak the convictions of my own mind, untrammelled by civil or ecclesiastical despots. "To ob-

ject to our affirming with full conviction what we believe, is to strip us of our faith itself."—*Luther*.

Many are the excellent sayings of the Fathers in defence of God's Word alone as the only rule of faith and practice. One is this: "Truly the attaching more importance to man's teaching than to God's Word, was in substance the heresy of Montanus, as it is the real character of the Pope, and indeed of all who rank church authority or mystical impulses above the plain words of the sacred writings."—*The Fathers*. "If Bible language will not convey our ideas, there is reason to fear that our ideas have come from a source different from the one whence truth only springs."—*Moncrieff*. The Christian is not called to calculate his resources, and count the means of success. His one concern is to know that his cause is the cause of God—and that he has no aim but his Master's glory; doubtless he has an inquiry to make, but it has reference only to his motives; the Christian looks in upon his heart;—not upon his arm: he regards right—strength. And that question once well settled—his path is clear. It is for him to go boldly forward, though the world and all its armies should withstand his progress, in the firm persuasion that God himself will fight against his opposers. It is contrary to the will of God, that man should be subject to man in that which pertains to eternal life. Subjection in spirituals is a real worship, and should be rendered only to the Creator. Who has power to determine what doctrine Christian men shall profess, or on what point they shall be silent? What is the sole infallible authority for Christians? *Answer*: God's Word, and that alone.

In the BIBLE EXAMINER for February 1, 1857, there is a short extract of an article on organized and unorganized power, from the *Northern Independent*. It says—"A like stubborn individualism has marked the history of every man who has achieved anything of consequence in Church or State. The blind devotees of order—the men who go with society irrespective of principle, and who make popularity the test in ethics—these have never done any service to the cause of humanity. It is not in them. They are mortgaged, paralyzed, an organization has struck them dumb." Now I will give the remarks on the extract, by the Editor of the Examiner. He says:—

"Organizations, after all that has been said in their favor, are paralyzing in things spiritual. A few men, in all cases, control them and their actions; while the great body are glad to throw their personal responsibility on others; too indolent to think and act for themselves, and glad of an excuse for not doing it. They will find in the end, that individuality is what will be

raised 'up at the last day,' if raised to life at all. 'I will raise *him* up,' saith Jesus. Let every man act for truth and God as an individual who is alone responsible to God, and keep clear of all useless and pernicious trammels. The coming together of believers in Jesus for mutual encouragement, exhortation and prayer—drawn by love—we fully recognize as important, and not to be neglected, where more than one can be found ; and the Saviour has promised His presence with them. But formal organizations—which always, and necessarily imply human arrangements—in church matters, we are satisfied are attended with more evil than good, and directly lead to lording it 'over God's heritage.' Out of these arrangements arise lordships, church quarrels, a crushing out of individuality, or causing members to feel themselves not responsible to God. Their acts, opinions, and general course being in harmony with the majority of those with whom they are connected, they think is a sufficient guarantee that they are right. We scarcely ever knew a church 'trial,'—what is called 'disciplining' a member—that did not divide the church into parties, who became more or less hostile to each other. If love brings Christians together it is equally sufficient to keep them together. When love has so departed as not to do this, the separation is speedy and natural, where these organization chains have not been thrown around them ; and the cause of truth is not so much reproached as by the strife of organized bodies. We know that organizations have some advantages ; but in our opinion, the disadvantages by far exceed them. We have stood aloof from all such human combinations for the last seventeen years ; and likely we shall continue to do so till our warfare is accomplished. Personal responsibility to God we recognize, and under its power we hope ever to act. For our opinions we hold ourself responsible to no man nor body of men. For our acts any Christian is at full liberty to deal with us by the rule of Scripture ; beyond that of withdrawing fellowship, if our conduct is bad, and we are irreclaimable, no Christian man can go without intruding on the prerogatives of God ; so we believe." To the foregoing I can say, *Amen*. So I believe.

It was said of JOHN HUSS that he did not go as far as LUTHER, and in many things he was in error. But one fundamental tenet of his involved the whole reformation in itself: this was, that "in matters of Christian faith and practice, the Bible is the last and conclusive appeal." So I believe. Bless God for giving me the same holy faith, of all the best and holy, that have ever suffered, or stood up for truth on the earth.

The new organization may deny us their love and Christian sympathy, but they cannot deny us the strength and grace that

God imparts. It is not their will, nor any power of theirs, but our own faith that the Lord has made essential to our salvation. The soul may dispense with the visions, but it cannot live without the Word of God. No, no, I feel it is now, as it was in Luther's day. Freedom of speech, freedom of inquiry, and freedom of religious belief, has now to maintain a conflict with organized bodies—as they did that day, within the very gates of Rome—against the power that claims to hold in its hands the monopoly of spiritual knowledge, and at its own will to suppress the voice of Christian truth, or allow its utterance.

Another writer has said truly, "We cannot make the interpretation of men our rule of faith, for that is Romanism. It is to abandon the right and duty of private judgment, and assume that others may give an account for us unto God. To receive a creed from man, however great and good, which we honestly believe is opposed to the teaching of God's Word, is infidelity towards Him. It is holding the opinions of men in higher esteem than the revelations of God."—*Bible Examiner*.

There is another saying that has come into my mind, and it makes me think of the conflict that is now going on between the powers of darkness and the powers of light and truth. D'AUBIGNE, speaking of the reformation by Luther under God, says—"The first day's battle was for God, the second for the priest, the third for reason—what shall the fourth be? The confused struggle, the hard-fought conflict, as we believe, of all these powers together, which will end in the triumph of Him to whom triumph belongs. But the battle which the reformation fought in the great day of the sixteenth century, was not one and single—but manifold. The reformation had to combat at once several enemies; and after having protested against decretals, and the sovereignty of the Pope—then against the apophthisms of rationalists, philosophers, and schoolmen—it took the field against the reveries of enthusiasm, and the hallucination of mysticism: opposing alike to these three powers, the sword buckler of God's holy revelation. We cannot but discern a great resemblance—striking unity—between these three powerful adversaries. The false systems which, in every age, have been the most adverse to evangelical christianity, have ever been distinguished by their making religious knowledge to emanate from man himself. Rationalism makes it to proceed from reason. Mysticism from a certain internal allumination; Roman Catholicism from an allumination derived from the Pope. These three errors look for truth in man. Evangelical christianity looks for it in God alone: and while Rationalism, Mysticism, Roman Catholicism acknowledge a permanent inspiration in men like ourselves, and

thus make room for every species of extravagance and schism. Evangelical Christianity recognizes this inspiration only in the writings of the apostles and prophets, and alone presents that great, and noble, and living unity which continues to exist unchanged throughout all ages."—*History of the Reformation*.

O, what has not sectarian organized power done? It has done everything it could to desolate the church of God. It has torn asunder the most sacred ties of Christian unity; it has tread down, with impunity, the hopes of her that was driven out, and marred the way of her that halted; it has drank of the deep waters, and fouled the residue with its feet. O what will the *rulers* of that power do, when the prayers of God's oppressed children are poured out? when the rivers of tears that have been shed shall be avenged?

Do they not know that we have one everlasting comfort that can never fail us? "The true church is Christ's body, and the fulminations of sectarianisms cannot cut us off from membership in it."—*Finley*.

O how can we pray in faith, "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do"?

## HOW PROTESTANTS STUDY THE BIBLE.

THE liberty of opinion allowed in theological institutions, is thus portrayed by EDWARD BEECHER:—

"There is nothing imaginary in the statement that the creed power is now beginning to prohibit the Bible as really Rome did, though in a subtler way. During the whole course of seven years' study, the Protestant candidate for the ministry sees before him an unauthorized statement, spiked down and stereotyped, of what he *must* find in the Bible, or be martyred. And does any one acquainted with human nature need to be told that he studies under a tremendous pressure of motive? Is that freedom of opinion the liberty wherewith Christ maketh free? Rome would have given that. Every one of her clergy might have studied the Bible to find the Pontifical creed on the pain of death. Was that liberty? Hence, I say, that liberty of opinion in our theological seminaries is a mere form, to say nothing of the thumbscrew of criticism by which every original mind is tortured into negative propriety. The whole boasted liberty of the student consists in a choice of chains—a choice of handcuffs—whether he will wear the Presbyterian handcuffs, Baptist, Methodist, Episcopal or other evangelical handcuffs.

Hence it has now come to pass that the ministry themselves dare not study the Bible. Large portions thereof are seldom touched. It lies useless lumber : or if they do study and search, they dare not show their people what they find there. There is something criminal in saying anything new. It is shocking to utter words that have not the mould of age upon them."

---

### DR. CUMMING AND HIS TWO THEORIES.

To the believer whose intellectual horizon is no longer be-dimmed by the anticipation of a glorified state *in death*; it is painful to witness the attempts occasionally made, by advocates of the immortality of the soul, to exhibit the doctrines of Christ's second advent and the resurrection of the dead in their scrip-tural importance. What gives a painful character to such ef-forts is the fact that the individuals of whom we speak are com-pelled to be inconsistent. They must, when they speak of man as having an immortal nature, recognize consequences with respect to the intermediate state which logically demand that the Christian's eye of faith shall have that state for its engross-ing object. On the other hand, if the plain, oft-repeated utter-ances of the New Testament touching the Saviour's appearing and the resurrection are allowed to exert any considerable measure of their appropriate influence upon the devout mind, the interval between death and the resurrection must inevita-bly cease to be regarded as a period of reward. The vision of a rightly-instructed faith rests upon things which are unseen and eternal (2 Cor. 4 : 18 ;) but, as the Bible nowhere locates these " things " both in hades and in the resurrection state, so also it does not require us to adjust our longing aspirations to conditions of being so dissimilar in point of character and dura-tion. We could not do it if we would, and as a matter of fact it is found that, as a general remark, the masses of professed Christians, who regard death as a state of consciousness, have almost nothing to say of the second advent and the resurrection. Our design, however, at present, is not to dwell upon the pre-vailling neglect of these important truths, but to furnish the reader a somewhat illustrious example of the inconsistency which we have indicated as unavoidable by those who would



cling with equal tenacity to the doctrine of the Lord's coming, as a great practical truth, and to the popular notion of the separate conscious existence of the soul.

The celebrated Dr. JOHN CUMMING, of London, is the man for our purpose. In one of his last publications, "THE GREAT PREPARATION," on page 103, he says :

"The instant the soul emerges from the body, it enters on its place of joy or its place of sorrow ; and the addition of the body to that soul at the resurrection is only the enhancement of its joy or in addition to its sorrow. 'After death,' he [Paul] says, 'the judgment.' This soul does not cease to be because it ceases to inhabit its terrestrial tenement : the disorganization of what we see is the emancipation of what we are ; and when the dead dust is taken to its resting place beneath the green sod, the living soul that is really the man, that constitutes the individuality, that emerges from the wreck, ascends to the presence of God, rests not, if it be a believer's, till it worships as a priest within the veil, where there is fullness of joy, and where there are pleasures for evermore."

So much for Dr. Cumming as an exponent of the immortal soul theory. We will not pause to comment upon the palpable contradiction which his statements give to the Mosaic account of creation. Dr. C. is a distinguished advocate of the doctrine of Christ's second appearing, as an event near at hand, and we wish now to let him speak in that capacity. We quote from page 145 of the work already named :

"Well, then, should the day of the Lord come—and, mark you, the whole of the reasoning in the Apostolic Scriptures is based invariably upon the supposition that it is at your doors—are you ready? In the New Testament we never find any motives drawn from the prospect of death. Death is ignored in the New Testament ; it is scarcely supposed to be ; it is from this life to the higher life, or from this world to the lower world ; the leap from the one to the other is not interrupted by the grave, the valley of the shadow of death, that lies between them."

Who could believe, if not assured of the fact, that these two extracts are from the same author and found only three chapters apart in the same book! In the former, *death emancipates* "the living soul that is really the man," sending "the man" to the place "where there is *fullness of joy* ;" in the latter these amiable offices of the "grim monster" are forgotten, and he is "ignored" and "scarcely supposed to be." The extracts will sug-

gest suitable reflections in the minds of most of those who read the EXAMINER. Men and brethren, our work is an important one. Let us be more earnest in meeting the responsibilities growing out of the position we occupy. We must show mankind that they are *wholly mortal*, if we would succeed in impressing their minds with the sublime glories of the resurrection. The Bible platform must be ours—"the first MAN IS OF THE EARTH EARTHY." "The Lord God formed MAN of the DUST OF THE GROUND \* \* and MAN became a LIVING SOUL." These statements cut Dr. C.'s theory in pieces. Let us endeavor to persuade all honest minds to receive them in their plain import. Death is *not* "ignored in the New Testament," if it was, there would be no adequate basis upon which to present Christ as "the resurrection and the life." The New Testament recognizes *death* as a fearful *reality*, and everywhere presents motives why we shall seek deliverance from its power. Christ has the keys of death and hades and will give such deliverance to all who come unto him that they may have life. The notion that saints are rewarded before Christ, who is our life, shall appear, is "ignored" throughout the Bible. Let us ignore it, and with the word of truth do all in our power to drive the tradition from the minds of those who cherish it.

RUFUS WENDELL.

---

### MAN'S CREATION. GENESIS 2 : 7.

RICHARD WATSON, in his "Theological Institutes," says :

"That human nature has two essential constituent parts is manifest from the history of Moses :--the BODY, formed out of pre-existent matter, the earth ; and a LIVING SOUL, breathed into the body by an *inspiration* from God."

Mr. Watson is clearly in error. 1. "The history of Moses" says nothing about "human nature," but it does tell us about "man." 2. To say that the Mosaic account (Gen. 2 : 7) makes it "manifest" that *man* "has two essential constituent parts" would be a contradiction of the record. 3. The account by Moses is as silent concerning "the BODY" as it is concerning "human nature." The "*man*" was "formed out of pre-existent matter, the earth." This is "manifest," for the Bible expressly so declares. 4. Mr. Watson says "a LIVING SOUL" was "breath-

ed into the body." The "history" to which he appeals squarely contradicts his assertion, for Moses informs us that that which was "breathed" was "THE BREATH OF LIFE," and that into which it was breathed was the "nostrils" of *man*. What "is manifest from the history of Moses," as we read the account, is this, viz., that "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." If Mr. Watson had adhered to the plain statements in the "history," he would have had a much better theory of "human nature." In that case, however, he could not have become a *standard* author in the denomination that justly reveres his memory.

Having noticed Mr. Watson, we will now see whether Dr. ADAM CLARKE is more fortunate in expounding the testimony of Moses. The Doctor's note on Gen. 2 : 7 (in his Commentary) is as follows :

"In the most distinct manner God shows us that man is a *compound* being, having a body and a soul, distinctly and separately created; the body out of the dust of the earth, the soul immediately breathed from God himself. Does not this strongly mark that the soul and the body are not the *same thing*? The body derives its origin from the *earth*, or, as apher implies, the dust: hence, because it is earthy, it is decomposable, and perishable. Of the soul it is said, *God breathed into his nostrils the breath of life: ruach chaiyim*, the breath of LIVES; i. e., animal and intellectual. While the breath of God expanded the lungs, and set them in play, his inspiration gave both spirit and understanding."

We affirm that "in the most distinct manner" the Mosaic account "shows us" that "*man*" was "formed of the dust:" therefore, he was a *unit*, and not a *compound* being." With equal distinctness Moses assures us that "the breath of life" was breathed, whereas Dr. C. declares the "*soul*" was breathed. Moses was correct and the Doctor mistaken. We deeply regret that so many are hindered from understanding Moses by their careless or bigoted reception of the erroneous statements of the learned commentator.

RUFUS WENDELL.

---

"To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to his word,] it is because there is no light in them."—Isa. 8 : 20.

## ON THE ACT OR COVENANT OF RELIGIOUS CONSECRATION.

COPIED FOR THE EXAMINER FROM PRESIDENT UPHAM'S WORK,  
"PRINCIPLES OF THE INTERIOR OR HIDDEN LIFE,"

BY RUFUS WENDELL.

It must be obvious, from what was said in the last chapter, that no one can reasonably expect to make much advancement in religion without a permanent and devout personal consecration. Unless the Christian is willing to make such a consecration, and unless he actually adds the execution of the thing to the desire or willingness to do it, by a formal and decisive act, we can see no encouragement that he will reach those results of personal inward experience which will be hereafter indicated. This is a duty so important, so much depends upon it, that it seems to be necessary to give to it a separate and more particular consideration.

(1.) And the first remark which we have to make on this subject is, that the consecration of ourselves to God, which is so inseparable from the progress and perfection of the divine life, should be made **DELIBERATELY**.—A consecration made in this manner, viz., with calmness and deliberation, is due to our own characters as rational and reflecting beings. As God has made us perceptive and rational, he desires and expects us, especially in important transactions, to act in accordance with the principles he has given us. It is not reasonable to suppose that God would be pleased with a consecration made thoughtlessly and by blind impulse, rather than by deliberate reflection. Man has deliberately rebelled and gone astray, and it is due to himself and his Maker, it is due to truth and to holiness, that he should deliberately and reflectingly submit and return; that his repentance of sin should be accompanied with a clear perception of his sinfulness; that his determination to do God's will should be attended with some suitable apprehensions of what he requires; and that his fixed purpose of future obedience should be sustained by the united strength of all appropriate considerations.

(2.) We observe, in the second place, that the consecration must be made for **ALL COMING TIME**. It is true that there may be specific consecrations of a modified character, restricted to particular objects and occasions, and limited also to definite periods. A person, for instance, may devote himself exclusively, for a limited time, to the one important object of erecting a place of public worship. And regarding him as giving to this one object all his powers of body and of mind, we may proper-

ly speak of him, in an imperfect or modified sense of the term, as CONSECRATED to this particular work. But it is quite obvious that such instances of consecration are exceedingly different from the one under consideration; which is fundamental and universal in its character, and which would be inconsistent with itself if it were applied to one object to the exclusion of others; which takes into view the very being and nature of the soul; which considers the principles of man's departure from God, and also the principles involved in his restoration; which recognizes the full amount of God's immutable and infinite claims; and which, therefore, on the ground of truth and rectitude, as well as of safety and of happiness, cannot be made for a less period than all time and eternity.

(3.) It may be remarked again, that the consecration, including our bodies as well as our spirits, and our possessions as well as our persons, all we are and all we have, all we can do and all we can suffer, should be made without any reserve. There are many professors of religion who are willing to give up something to the Lord; and perhaps it can be said that there are many who are willing to give up MUCH; but the consecration of which we are speaking, requires us to be truly willing to give up ALL; and not only to be WILLING to give up all, but to do it. It is true that, in our present state, some things are needful for us, and our heavenly Father assures us that he is not ignorant of it. But while, in compassion to our obvious wants, he bestows upon us these things which are necessary to beings who must be fed, clothed, and sheltered, he requires us to hold these and all other gifts of a temporal nature, which we sometimes call our own, as bestowments imparted by himself for a special purpose, and to be retained and used in perfect subordination to the divine will. And still more important and necessary is it, that all the exercises of the mind, that all powers and efforts of the intellect, and all desires and purposes of the heart and will, should be laid sacredly upon the divine altar; in perfect simplicity of view; without any reservation, and without any regards, however secret and intimate, to the claims of self; inscribed, as it were, within and without, with holiness to the Lord; FROM God, OF God, and FOR God. Consecration without reserve implies that we are not only to give up our persons and powers to be employed as God wills, but also to endure or suffer as God wills; and it implies also that we are to give them up, to be employed and to suffer just in the time and place, and in all the precise circumstances, which are agreeable to God; without presuming to dictate to him in the smallest respects, and without any will or choice of our own.

(4.) Finally, in the full conviction that no efforts or purposes

of our own will be available without divine assistance, we should make the consecration in reliance upon divine strength; recognizing, on the one hand, our own entire weakness, and at the same time fully believing, on the other, in the willingness and readiness of God to aid and deliver us in every time of temptation and trial. A consecration, made without a distinct recognition of our own insufficiency, and without the expression and the reality of reliance on God alone as our only hope, would be wanting in the most essential element. It would necessarily fail of the divine blessing, and could not result in any good. "Lay it down to yourself as a most certain principle," says Dr. Doddridge, "that no attempt in religion is to be made in your own strength. If you forget this, and God purposes finally to save you, he will humble you with repeated disappointments, till he teach you better."

A consecration, thus deliberately made, including all our acts, powers, and possessions of body, mind, and estate, made without any reserve either in objects, time, or place; embracing trial and suffering as well as action; never to be modified, and never to be withdrawn; and which contemplates its fulfilment in divine and not in human strength, necessarily brings one into a new relationship with God, of the most intimate, interesting, and effective nature. It is not easy to see how a soul, that is thus consecrated, can ever be deserted. Divinity is pledged in its behalf; and in all times of temptation and trial, when clouds and storms hang darkly and heavily around, there will always be a redeeming power, a light in the midst of shadows, the shining of the bow of promise.

A word further remains to be said here. I am aware there are some men, who seem to appreciate the necessity of entirely consecrating themselves to God, and perhaps may be said to be willing to do it, but who have felt a difficulty in one particular. They have inquired, with a good deal of solicitude, How is it possible to make a consecration now which shall bind us to fulfil the will of God in all the emergencies of the unseen and untried future?—including cases, the difficulties of which we are now unable to appreciate, and therefore do not know that we have now, or ever shall have, strength to meet them. In respect to such cases, all we can say is, that we must commit ourselves into the hands of God in *simple faith*; remembering his declaration, that "his grace is sufficient." God hath said, Heb. xiii. 5, 6, "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee. So that we may boldly say, The Lord is my helper, and I will not fear what man shall do unto me."

In the conclusion of this subject, I would introduce another short passage from Dr. Doddridge.—"I would further advise

and urge," he says, speaking on the matter of making an entire consecration of ourselves, "that this DEDICATION should be made with all possible solemnity. Do it in *express words*. And perhaps it may be in many cases most expedient, as many pious divines have recommended, to do it in writing. Set your hand and seal to it, that, on such a day of such a month and year, and at such a place, on full consideration and serious reflection, you came to this happy resolution, that, whatever others might do, you would serve the Lord."

[Following the foregoing is a "FORM OF CONSECRATION, abridged from Dr. Doddridge," which I have not transcribed. It may be found in Upham's "Interior Life," pp. 38-40. R. W.]

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—The *spirit* of the foregoing *extract* we heartily approve. The *formalities* of the "consecration" we do not condemn, if any choose to adopt them; but we confess, it strikes us, few persons could proceed with the minutia of such a course without its proving a trial, if not a snare to them. The scriptures do not seem to require the formalities implied in it, nor do they condemn them. The *spirit* of such a consecration should be cultivated by all, ever maintaining an earnest effort, that "Whether we eat or drink, or whatsoever we do," to do all to the honor of our divine Lord and Master, who hath redeemed us by His blood.

---

### THE LIFE OF CHRISTIANITY.

WITH what a mysterious yet invincible power does the green blade force its way through the heavy clods which cover it and hide it from view! So frail is it that the slightest bruise threatens to beat it to the earth, while yet so omnipotent is it that it will spring forth to the light, however great the weight which may be cast upon it. And how strikingly this energy of vegetable life illustrates that life which is divine. The plants of righteousness, though they may be heavily weighed by a body of sin and death, by manifold sorrows, temptations, and tears, will nevertheless grow upward toward the great Source of eternal day. Satan may place the heavy foot of persecution upon the growing kingdom of Christ, but he cannot press out its life, for its roots are divine; he may endeavor to put his finger for the rising sap in the true vine, that so the branches may not appear, but he cannot; he may cut them off, but they will bud forth again. The life which Christ imparts to the soul will rise

and rise until, overflowing the bounds of sinful fear and the conventionalisms of the world, it bursts into life, bearing down all opposition and compelling even the ungodly to admit that Christ has gained another friend. Reader, dost thou entertain the hope that thou hast received life from Christ? Take heed, examine; life will manifest itself. Wouldst thou prevent this, and, listening to thy own timid heart and the suggestions of Satan, hast thou sought to hide the expressions of his beneath the cold damp soil of worldly policy? O foolish sexton! thus to bury thy hope. What evidence hast thou that thou hast life at all? Hast thou not read that there is first the blade? It must come forth; it will declare itself. Art thou not afraid? Hast thou pondered the words of Christ? "Whosoever, therefore, shall be ashamed of me and my words, in this adulterous and sinful generation, of him also shall the Son of man be ashamed when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." Awake, arouse thyself, and let thy love display itself in keeping the commandments of Christ.—*Lessons from Jesus.*

---

IS THE DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION FOUND IN MOSES?—In the *Christian Advocate and Journal*, May 22, 1862, we find the following remarks by the Editor, EDWARD THOMSON, D.D.

"A friend inquires whether the doctrine of the resurrection was not taught to Moses, and thinks that our Saviour's words in Matt. xxii, 23 *et seq.* imply this. We must distinguish between the doctrine of immortality and that of the resurrection of the body. Notwithstanding the ingenious reasoning of Warburton, we think the former doctrine is to be found in Moses, but not the latter."

Dr. T. may be correct in asserting that the resurrection of *the body* is not taught in the writings of Moses. If he had added that it is not found in the Bible we should not demur. But would the Doctor have us believe that the resurrection of *the dead* "is not found in Moses?" If so, we submit the words of Christ in refutation of the position.

"Now that the dead *are raised*, even *Moses shewed* at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." Luke 20 : 37.

We should like Dr. T. to explain where "the doctrine of *immortality* is to be found in Moses" except in connection with *the resurrection.*

JOSEPH T. CURRY.



## THE SOURCE OF CHARACTER.

WOULD you know the value of a general, do you merely measure his cannon, or test his mathematics? Both these are important; but examine his heart. The will directs both the body and the mind, and the heart controls the will. And as the religion controls the heart, you may in the last result measure a man by that. The soldiers that, like Cromwell's, march with Bibles in their boots, load the cannon by the grace of God, and fire it with a psalm, cannot easily be beaten. Give us plenty of the substance of things hoped for, and the evidence of things not seen. Let one feel that he stands on truth, that the laws of the universe and the attributes of the Almighty are pledged to his support, and you might as well try to chase a rock as him.—Faith justified Abel and translated Enoch; floated the ark and founded the Church; crossed the Red Sea and shook down the walls of Jericho. In all ages it has out of weakness become strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens, and led out willing martyrs for the mountains or the flames.

Love is another element of strength. Human love is strong. We read in the Edinburgh Encyclopedia that a timid mother in an Italian village saw a hungry lion that had escaped his keeper take up her child that was playing at her door, and run to the grove at the outskirts of the town. Alone, unarmed, she pursued him, overtook him, faced him, and with a voice and look that belong only to a mother, she said, "Give me my child!" The hungry monarch of the forest, terrified by the awful energy that beamed through her whole frame, dropped his prey and retreated.

If human love makes us thus strong, O what will divine love do! How easy and delightful will it make all burdens! How welcome all sufferings! Like the weights of the clock, it will unseen and silently carry our hands round the circle of duty. Take care of the heart, and the life will take care of itself—as the fountain determines the nature and force of the stream. Take care of the heart, and we may boldly look to the Judgment!—*Chris. Ad. & Jour.*

---

GENERAL JACKSON.—When General Jackson was President of the United States, says an aged laborer in the presidential garden, a few years since, he could tell an honest man from a rogue when he first saw him. I remember that a clergyman with a stiff white choker, and an untarnished suit of black, called

on him one morning when he was overlooking some work that I was performing in the garden, and requested an appointment to some office, saying :

"General, I worked harder for your election than many of those upon whom you have bestowed office."

"You are a minister of the Gospel?" said Old Hickory, inquiringly.

"Yes," said the clergyman, "I was a minister, but I thought I could do better by becoming a politician ; so I stumped the district week days for you, and preached for the Lord on Sundays."

Old Hickory, turning short towards him, and looking him full in the face, said :

"If you would cheat the Lord you would cheat the country. I will have nothing to do with you, nor any like you. Good morning," and he walked rapidly away. I never shall forget the look of that hypocritical clergyman. Had the last judgment been set, and he before the great white throne, I doubt whether he would have looked more blank or chop-fallen.

---

## CHRISTIAN FINANCE.

BY LA FAYETTE NORRIS, IOWA.

I HAVE long desired to say something in the EXAMINER about the finances of Christians. It is quite common among some of all denominations to think it a sin for a believer in Jesus to lay up anything. Such think a Christian should always be very poor, or get poor as soon as possible. I desire to utter my protest against this idea. I regard it as highly pernicious ; for it engenders indolence of both body and mind. A very poor man can do but little for the cause of truth except as a preacher ; and it is not preachers we want so much as means to sustain them. It is the well-to-do farmer and mechanic, in comfortable circumstances, that give the most for religious and charitable purposes, and rear the most intelligent children.

I do not wish to be understood as affirming it is a sin to be poor, but that it is not a sin to rise into comfortable circumstances. I believe a man should endeavor to acquire property, not for the honor and ease it brings, but that his power of doing good may be increased. But many persons meet with so many and serious misfortunes in life that they are always poor : such need

the sympathy of those who are more fortunate. I may feel the force of what I have written more than some others, for I came near being led astray by this false doctrine when I first embraced the truth. I believe it has been the means of many apostatizing.

---

EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

ELD. R. V. LYON, at Toronto, C. W., writes July 17th :—I am much interested in the EXAMINER, because I am in love with the doctrine of *future life, only* through the Christ; and that those who refuse to believe the Gospel and obey it, can never get out of *sheol*. Amen. This doctrine does honor to JEHOVAH—makes Christ more glorious and lovely—augments the happiness of the redeemed, and puts the finishing stroke upon the great plan of redemption! Glory be to God, for the light which shines upon my path!

Since my last note to you, I have immersed eleven souls into the Christ—and on their way rejoicing, I have left them to journey for the glory-capt hills of the saints' Eden home—while I am in pursuit of a bride for my Master.

LA FAYETTE NORRIS, — city, Iowa, writes :—In this place we had no meetings until last winter, when a few of us started a Union Sunday School. From small beginnings it has increased to a congregation of seventy-five, young and old. I am Superintendent, and teacher of the Bible-class, and have been much blessed in my labors. I wish there were books for children on the glorious life theme. Could you not have a Department for them in the EXAMINER? I would be willing to pay a larger subscription price for this purpose.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—We will devote a space for children if our correspondents will furnish suitable articles. The gift to edify children is a special one, and very few seem to possess it; yet some do; let them employ it; we shall be glad to hear from them.

E. WOLCOTT, New Jersey, speaking of a Grove-meeting, held in a new place, 50 miles south of New York, Aug. 10th, says—“There are a few things which were successful, and for which I feel grateful. 1st. That a goodly number were plainly told, there is no life or immortality except through our Lord Jesus

Christ. Blessed truth! 2d. There existed a kind and loving spirit among the brotherhood. 3d. The Lord's bounty to supply our wants, and a delightful day, (Sabbath.) Praise the Lord."

---

THE EDITOR of this Magazine preaches nearly every Lord's day somewhere, when invited. Since the last EXAMINER was issued, he has spent one Sabbath in Plymouth Hollow, Conn.; one at a Grove-meeting, Herbertsville, N. J.; one in Newark, N. J., and one at a Grove-meeting in Ulster Co., N. Y., and trusts his labors were not in vain; for this he praises the Lord and rejoices in hope. Second Lord's day in this month (September) he will be in PHILADELPHIA, the Lord willing.

---

THE RESPONSE to sustain this Magazine.—Since our last issue W. S. Olmsted, Hartford, Conn., has sent us \$1, and says, "It is the first of one dollar per month in aid of the future publication of the EXAMINER, which I propose to give as long as the paper continues to be published by its present proprietor." *Donations.*—John Kemp, \$5. Roswell Curtis, \$5. Roswell Hart, and R. R. Hart, \$1 each. Chas. H. Sutton, \$2. D. B. Salter, \$4. Randolph E. Ladd, \$15, and he says, "I will pledge \$50 to sustain the next volume."

---

"BIBLE TEACHER."—This is a small quarto paper, of eight pages, to be issued semi-monthly, or less frequently, as funds will allow, by JOSEPH MARSH, at *Whitby*, C. W. *Terms*: Fifty cents for twelve numbers.

---

THE BIBLE EXAMINER.—A friend in Iowa writes us—"I hope the friends of truth will not let the EXAMINER be suspended again. Let those who are in comfortable circumstances remember they can pay 5, 10 or 20 dollars as easy as those who are poor can pay the subscription price. If you should conclude to publish *weekly*, I hope you will preserve its present form, but I think you would succeed best to issue it with 16 pages at \$2 per year."

We would be glad to have, at once, an expression of the wishes of the friends of this Magazine as to its issue next year, whether it shall be monthly, semi-monthly, or weekly; and whether its present form or some other shall be employed. The continuance

of it, in some form, is indispensable, if a free medium of communication between the friends of "*Life only in Christ*" is to be maintained. Almost every cause, of interest, is supported by the free and liberal efforts and sacrifices of its friends. Shall not the friends of this cause be as liberal and self-sacrificing as those who are supporting what we deem to be error? Can we show ourselves in earnest love with the truths we profess to prize, and yet let the medium of our communication languish for lack of means to go on? If a new *Editor* is needed to inspire the friends, we will cheerfully resign our position, if we can have a guarantee that the same liberty of expression shall be maintained that has been from the birth of this periodical, twenty years ago.

We wish not to make any boasts, but we believe we have made more efforts, and expended as much money as any, if not all, of the friends of the EXAMINER to maintain it on its course. In saying this, we mean no reproach to any one. Some have done nobly, and have our sincere thanks for their timely aid; but have all done what they could to prevent any possibility of the failure of the periodical that came out first, single-handed and alone, in defence of immortality, future and eternal life in Jesus Christ alone? We cannot and will not say they have not; for we cannot judge in the matter; but we appeal to each to ask himself, if he has "done what he could."

We have no duns to make—no reproaches to cast on any one; but wish to stir up, if possible, a deeper interest in publishing the truths and continuing the investigations in which we all have professed to feel so much interest. Shall we go on in the work, and extend our operations? If so, let all lend the helping hand at once. What we do let us do quickly; for "the night cometh in which no man can work."

We renew the offer of last month—Any person sending us one dollar for the present volume shall have the whole 18 numbers, if sent for soon. Those who have paid \$1 subscription, *this year*, shall have the six numbers of last year, if they desire it, without charge, till all are sent off. We shall be glad to supply our friends with the entire volume. If any wish the volume *bound*, at its close, they must secure it soon by sending their order. The price will be \$1.50, and sent at the purchaser's expense. The volume will contain 576 pages.

HENRY GREW, of Philadelphia, fell asleep in Jesus, Friday, August 8th, aged 80 years. David W. White writes us, "His end was peaceful. Although he suffered much, yet he seemed perfectly resigned to the will of God. He said he was in the Lord's hands, and He would do what was right. Br. Grigg and myself saw him Monday previous to his death: he told us he hoped soon to meet us in the kingdom of God."

Eld. Grew's character and writings are too well known to make it necessary to remark on them. Though we differed with him on some theological points, we always loved him for his piety and the kind spirit he ever cultivated. We doubt not he will have part in the revival *into life* "*at the last day.*"

### OLD FOLKS.

Ah, don't be sorrowful, darling,  
 And don't be sorrowful, pray;  
 Taking the year together, my dear,  
 There isn't more night than day!

'Tis rainy weather, my darling,  
 Time's waves, they heavily run;  
 But taking the year together, my dear,  
 There isn't more cloud than sun!

We are old folks now, my darling,  
 Our heads they are growing gray;  
 But taking the year all round, my dear,  
 You will always find the May!

We have had our May, my darling,  
 And our roses long ago,  
 And the time of the year is coming, my dear,  
 For the silent night and the snow!

And God is God, my darling—  
 Of night as well as day,  
 And we feel and know that we can go  
 Wherever he leads the way.

Ay, God of night, my darling—  
 Of the night of death so grim—  
 Has a resurrection gate, good wife:  
 That's the gate that leads to Him.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

---

"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, HATH NOT LIFE."

---

Vol. 14. No. 16.]      **OCTOBER 1862.**      [Whole No. 217.]

---

## LIFE ONLY THROUGH CHRIST :

OR, DR. FINLEY AND THE PRESBYTERIAN STANDARD.

Dr. J. K. FINLEY, author of the "*Letter to a Clergyman*," has sent us the two following articles. His letter to us, preceding them, will explain the occasion of their production. He writes :

*Pittsburgh, Aug. 26.*

Geo. STORRS—*Dear Sir*,—The Editor of the *Presbyterian Standard*, published in Philadelphia, on his return from the General Assembly, in the latter part of May, called and spent several days with his relatives here, of whom I am one. Calling to see him professionally, he and two others of our mutual friends who were present attacked me very vigorously on the life views. We had quite a time of it for about three hours, and I was not forced to retreat by any means. At the close of our interview the Editor asked if I had any publication that gave a condensed view of the subject. I told him I had, and gave him "*The Letter to a Clergyman*;" on handing it to him he remarked he would *score* it in his paper. I asked if he would allow me to reply in his paper? He said he would; but one of his friends very promptly observed that if he did, he would soon run his paper into the ground; whereupon he hauled in his horns, and claimed that if he did not mention my name in his paper, he thought I ought not to claim the privilege of replying. So the matter stood when he left. About two weeks after his return he came out with the article which I send you. I promptly responded and sent on the accompanying reply. He declined *only* on the ground, that it would probably injure his paper, and of course I did not insist. I send you both articles to do as you think best with them. My relationship and intimacy with the Editor will account for the badinage, observable in several parts of my letter to him. If you publish at all, I think his article and the reply should both be published; but if you do not think them adapted to the "*Examiner*" please to destroy them.

From the Presbyterian Standard.

## IMMATERIALITY AND IMMORTALITY.

In a recent discussion with an intelligent gentleman who holds the doctrine of the annihilation of the wicked, he alleged that the immateriality of the soul is of no weight in the argument for its immortality. This position we then denied, and we now deny it for the sake of all who may be tempted to a similar belief. Whatever perishes is destroyed by the solution of its contexture, and separation of its parts, but the soul has no parts, it is un compounded and indivisible, and therefore it cannot be conceived how it could experience solution or be naturally corrupted or impaired. Having by its very immateriality a *natural power of perpetual duration*, it cannot perish by any inherent cause of decay. A positive act of the Creator is necessary to its annihilation. The annihilation of a being that subsists, requires an act of power similar to that which gave it existence at first. Have we then any reason to believe that God will cause his power to intervene to annihilate our souls?—Why the argument from analogy against such a supposition, which we have only space at present to state, seems to us conclusively to settle this question. There is not a single atom in the human *body* destroyed. The organic structure is altered, fibre and fluid are decomposed, the whole enters into new combinations, but not a particle is lost. In so far, indeed, as the knowledge of the Universe extends, there does not appear a single instance of annihilation throughout the material system. There is no reason to believe, that, throughout all the worlds which are dispersed through the immensity of space, a single atom has ever yet been, or ever will be, annihilated. Changes, it is true, are incessantly taking place in countless variety, throughout every department of nature, but amidst these various and unceasing transformations, no example of annihilation has yet occurred, to the eye of the most penetrating observer. If, then, annihilation forms no part of God's plan in the world of matter, how can it be supposed to do so in the world of mind? Shall the material Universe exist amidst all its variety of changes, and shall the noble creature for whose sake the Universe was created, be cut off forever in the infancy of its being, and doomed to eternal forgetfulness? Shall the stupendous structures which men have reared, survive the ravages of time, and display their beautiful proportions to successive generations, while the architects which planned them are reduced to the condition of the clods of the valley? Shall the marvelous volumes which distinguished scholars have written, descend to future ages, to unfold their sublime conceptions, while the illustrious minds which gave birth to these productions, are enveloped in the darkness of eternal night?—Manifestly there is a gross absurdity in admitting such conclusions.

And this absurdity is still more palpable when the case is viewed from another side. Progression is the order of all that we see in the world. Though every part of the visible creation is transient and imperfect, every part is in a state of advancement, and striving at something more perfect than itself. The whole unfolds to us a beautiful scale of ascension, every division harmoniously playing into every other division, and with the nicest adjustment, preparing for its furtherance. Thus we look



at those crystals which appear upon the copper or the silver ore, we see they are just the striving of that substance to reach the next grade of excellence, the vegetable product. So, too, if we turn to the flower, the tree, and the fruit, as for instance, the sensitive plant, we find the vegetable presenting the foreshadow and striving after animal life. And if we go to animal life, we find some creatures treading upon the very heels of man, and striving to reach his dignity and glory. Now man is not an exception to this universal law of progress toward perfection. On the contrary, under the genial influences of education, his mental powers are ever being strengthened and more fully developed. How, then, can it be imagined that his mental powers are destined to annihilation? To believe this, is nothing less than to charge the benevolent Being by whom we are "fearfully and wonderfully made," with the egregious folly of equipping us to run the race of immortality, and stopping us short in the very entrance of our course. It is to charge Him with implanting within us a desire for knowledge which is placed beyond our reach, and a thirst after happiness which we are doomed never to enjoy. It is, indeed, to insult the Majesty of Heaven by supposing that He would speak into existence the beautiful fabric of Nature to be looked upon by us as the transient scene of the stage, that He would freight these heaven-built vessels of ours with a priceless treasure, as if to sail over the wide ocean of eternity, and then by the arbitrary exercise of a power at which we instinctively shudder, wreck them and sink them when but properly launched from the shore. No, no, it cannot be that the only wise God would endow any of his creatures with powers the extent of which cannot be adequately estimated, only to be exercised during the brief period of our pilgrimage here. This act would be destitute of that design and proportion which are so distinctly manifested in all his works. Both Reason and Revelation enable us to say—

"The Sun is but a spark of fire,  
A transient meteor in the sky,  
The soul immortal as its sire,  
Shall never die."

#### REPLY OF DR. FINLEY TO THE FOREGOING.

*Mr. Editor*,—A friend has handed me a No. of the *Standard*, of June 12th, containing an editorial under the heading of "Immateriality and Immortality." If instead of dignifying our interview as a "recent discussion"—you had designated it as a sort of John Brown raid, sprung upon me, by yourself and a couple of your particular friends, it would have been more expressive of the true state of the case, and especially if you had told your readers that it ended as such raids usually do, in the triumph of the right, and the defeat of the lawless. I would suggest also, though I acknowledge this is a matter of taste, that your article would have been quite as agreeable to the feelings, and have done as much good, or perhaps, I had better

say, as little evil, if such expressions as, absurdity, gross absurdity, egregious folly, &c., had been left out. Still I will not be sticklish on this point, it being as I said a matter of taste, and we know it is a very old adage, "that there is no accounting for tastes."

You begin your article by saying, "In a recent discussion with an intelligent gentleman, who holds the doctrine of the annihilation of the wicked, he alleged that the immateriality of the soul is of no weight in the argument for its immortality. This position we then denied, and we now deny it for the sake of all who may be tempted to a similar belief." Now is it not passing strange, my dear editor, that you should have forgotten in so short a time, what all the others present remember, that I never for one moment admitted the truth of your notion that the soul is immaterial. I affirmed my belief that man is a unit, and expressly denied that he consisted of a material body and an immaterial soul. I told you I was unqualifiedly a *Materialist*, and believed that when God said to Adam, "Dust thou art," He told the whole story, without any reservation; that nothing could be plainer than the declaration in the inspired narrative, "And the Lord God formed *man* of the *dust* of the ground."

In the "Letter to a Clergyman," which you informed me you had read, I expressly deny that man by natural generation has any but a fleshly or material nature; and I gave scriptural reasons for it, which I must be allowed to say have never been refuted, and I believe cannot be refuted by arguments drawn from the word of God.

In our "recent discussion" I affirmed that *man* was a *soul*, that he was a dead or inanimate soul, before God "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life," and that the only effect of this operation was to make him a living and animated soul,—the inspired record is, "And man *became* a living soul." This is a truthful as well as a common-sense understanding of the sacred narrative.

My own minister, whose pulpit ministrations are very acceptable to me, and I trust not unprofitable, began his morning prayer a few Sabbaths since, in the following manner: "We thank thee, oh God! that thou didst breathe into us immortal souls, and that thou didst give us a spirit that goeth upwards, and the beasts a spirit that goeth downwards to the earth."—

Now a child of ten years old, if left alone to his own unprejudiced judgment, cannot fail to see, so far as the history God has given us of man's creation is relied upon, that he might as well have thanked God that he had breathed into us the soul of an angel or any other absurd and unscriptural fancy.

The Bible account of man's creation, makes no mention of God having added anything to the constitution of man; He merely by starting the process of breathing made that a living soul, or living man, which had been previously a lifeless one. A steam engine is one, as really before steam is generated, and it is set in motion as it is afterwards.

You argue against the perishable nature of the soul, from its constitution, or rather I might say, from its want of constitution: having, as you say, "no parts, it is uncompounded and indivisible, having by its very immateriality, a natural power of perpetual duration." I might say the same things of *nothing*; and indeed your definition of a soul is about as good a definition of *nothing* as could be devised.

Now, my dear sir, you will greatly oblige me, if you will tell me where you have learned all this about the nature of the soul. I am very sure you did not get your information from the Bible; and without any disposition to be uncharitable, I hope you will excuse me for saying that I suspect it was obtained from the "oppositions of science falsely so called," against which Paul cautions Timothy, and which he says "some professing, having erred concerning the faith." If my suspicions are correct, I would in all kindness recommend you hereafter to "ask wisdom of God, who giveth liberally and upbraideth not." The question before us is not as to the nature of the soul, but the nature of man; and any notions you may have about a separate human soul, of its nature, capabilities, modes of existence, and duration, are nothing more nor less than human speculations, and of no more importance than any other human speculations. Mr. Isaac Taylor says, "This doctrine concerning what is called the immateriality of the soul, should ever be treated as a merely philosophical speculation, and as unimportant to our Christian profession." The same distinguished writer also says, "The pretended demonstrations of immortality drawn from the *assumed* simplicity, and indestructibility of the soul as an immaterial substance, appear *altogether inconclusive.*"

It is evident from what has been said, that any argument drawn from the nature of the soul, is clearly a *petitio principii*—an assumption of the position, which is the foundation of your whole argument. While this is the case there can be no doubt of the fact, that a correct apprehension of the nature and constitution of *man*, does lie at the foundation of the whole question of man's future destiny. For no one can for a moment believe, if man is not necessarily and inherently immortal, that God would put forth his almighty power, for the purpose of sustaining in existence everlastingly, a frail mortal, a creature of the dust, in order that he might inflict upon him throughout the ceaseless ages of eternity, the inconceivable torments, supposed by Christians generally to be included in the simple word "death," everywhere throughout the Bible, given as the penalty of sin.

Your analogical argument, derived from the imperishable nature of elementary matter, allow me to say with all proper respect, is unworthy of you, it is trifling with matters of most serious import, neither does it affect the question at issue. I suppose you will admit that God *created* all matter. I take it for granted, as a matter of course, that you do not believe with some of the ancient heathen philosophers, that matter is eternal. If God, then, created, can he not destroy? and further than this, you and I both believe that God not only created, but also that his continued power sustains the various objects of creation. Instead then of requiring for the annihilation of matter, as you affirm, "an act of power similar to that which gave it existence at first," all he has to do is to withdraw his sustaining power, and it falls back into its original nothingness—in other words, is annihilated. And if there was such an entity in existence, as you have so fancifully described, under the designation of *soul*, would it not under corresponding circumstances, relapse into its original nothingness, and in the emphatic language of Holy Writ, "be as though it had not been?"

But as I take it, the subject at issue between us, has nothing whatever to do with mere elementary matter—the oxygen, carbon, iron, calcium, &c., which enter into the composition of dust, and thus into the constitution of man—but with man himself, organized, intelligent, sentient *man*. And when we say that

wicked men will perish, or be destroyed ; (or if it suits you better to say annihilated—be it so, though it is not the term by which we prefer to express our views,) we only affirm what God himself declares shall be their end. David in the Psalms says, "All the wicked will He (God) destroy." Our Saviour in speaking of the end of the wicked says—"Broad is the way that leadeth to destruction." Paul says, "Whose end is destruction," and again, "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction." If you will look over your article again you will see that it is of no force, unless we denied the immortality of the righteous, and whilst it might pass for a pretty good plea in favor of the salvation of all men, it is a very poor one against the destruction of the wicked. I, and those who like me, are stigmatized as annihilationists, believe as fully as you do, that the righteous will be immortal or have eternal life ; and we believe it for the same reason that we believe in the destruction of the wicked, viz : because God has said so in the Bible. He tells us that while "the wages of sin is *death*, the gift of God is *eternal life* through Jesus Christ." That eternal life and immortality are synonymous terms, I think no one but a theologian would ever doubt. God tells us that if we seek in the way he has appointed for immortality, he will bestow upon us eternal life, showing that they are convertible terms.

God in his word informs us that he is rearing a grand spiritual temple, for his own glory, and to magnify the riches of his grace in behalf of our sinful race. It is being "built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone." He intends to work into it all the lively or living stones, which only are suitable for the purpose, and those that cannot be thus used He intends to cast aside and destroy. He appeals to us as reasonable and interested creatures for the propriety of His course, and no one can help seeing and admitting that it is eminently just and proper. But when you come in by your unauthorized speculations and insist that the unsuitable and injurious materials which would only mar the beauty and symmetry of the noble structure, shall not be destroyed, but retained as a foul blot forever in His fair creation, you not only deny his plain declarations, but you affirm what is in the highest degree unreasonable, and derogatory to His glorious character as revealed to us in his Word, and which

I may also say will require stronger proof to establish than mere fancies.

And now, I shall not insist upon your publishing this—according to your promise, especially if you think it will injure the interests of your paper. If you would publish my “Letter to a Clergyman,” and this reply also, besides giving your readers more of real Bible truth than they are accustomed to get, it will indicate that you are making *progress* in the right direction yourself, and I am sure will increase the interest of your paper. *Audi alterem partem*, is nothing more than fair, but I do not insist.

I remain very truly yours,

J. K. FINLEY.

*Pittsburgh, Penn., June 18, 1862.*

## PERISHING CONDITION OF THE NATURAL MAN.

BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

FACTS beyond the reach of dispute demonstrate that man is perishable. The history of sixty centuries establishes the truthfulness of the poet's declaration,

“Death is here, and death is there,  
 Death is busy everywhere;  
 All around, within, beneath,  
 Above is death, and we are death.  
 Death hath set his mark and seal  
 On all we are, and all we feel;  
 First our pleasures die, and then  
 Our hopes, and then our fears, and when  
 These are dead, the debt is due,  
 Dust claims dust and *we* die too.”

Nature, with unerring precision, points to the grave, but she gives no hope beyond. The vulgar supposition that she teaches that man is naturally possessed of immortality is discountenanced by the best orthodox thinkers. Says Bishop Watson:

“Notwithstanding the illustrious labors of Gassendi, Cudworth, Clarke, Baxter, and above 200 other modern writers on the subject, the natural mortality or immortality of the human soul is as little understood by us as it was by the philosophers of Greece or Rome. . . . The importance of revelation is by nothing rendered more apparent, than by the discordant sentiments of learned and good men (for I speak not of the ignorant and immoral) on this point. They show the insufficiency of

human reason, in a course of above 2000 years, to unfold the mysteries of human nature, and to furnish, from the contemplation of it, ANY ASSURANCE OF THE QUALITY OF OUR FUTURE CONDITION."—*Apology for the Bible.*

Dr. Stephen Olin, who now sleeps in Jesus, has left on record a glowing testimony to the worthlessness of "natural arguments for the soul's immortality." He allows them to be "of some value to enforce and illustrate the doctrine as revealed in Christ," but says they "are of no worth out of that connection." He says :

"The strongest of these are, 1. The nobler powers of the mind, adapted to higher pursuits and contemplations. Yet, in most cases, these powers are little developed—hardly enough to fit men for their duties—and they tend to things sensual and worldly so generally and strongly as to lead to the belief that they are only destined to live for the present.

"2. The continual progress of the soul in knowledge and virtue ; and yet, in the natural course of things, the mind declines with the body as old age comes on, and seems extinct with death.

"3. The strong desire for immortality. Yet other desires still stronger—those for life and happiness—are disregarded in God's administration. Life and immortality were brought to light by Christ, and were only guessed at by the heathen; and there is nothing in mere Theism to satisfy the soul that it shall exist after death ; or, if it does, that existence can be otherwise than wretched. Men are pushed up to the brink of the grave with no light beyond—doubtful, at best, of all beyond. The vast procession of humanity, swept on by an invisible fate, plunged into a midnight gulf. Generation after generation disappears, and no one knows their destiny. We look above, around to men, onward to the departed, to all in vain, for a solution of our dreadful doubts. No voice is heard. It is a still and dark domain that of death ! Is the soul to think, to feel, to joy, to suffer, to hope, to aspire no more ? Is all to return to dust ?—Will the uplifted arm of God crush the spiritual as it demolishes the material ? Will there be no more imaginings—sleeping, waking visions ? no more communings with those we love ? no greetings ? no sympathies ? The deep struggling of the soul against depravity and corruption—the hungering and thirsting after the true, the pure, the lovely—was it all for naught ?—Does it end here ? Shall this struggle be the end of me ? the gloomy pit of corruption be my home evermore, and make me the equal—the victim of the loathsome worm, that but to-morrow shall begin his feast upon my flesh ? Has the wisdom of

man, has the experience of the entire race, has the religion of nature—Theism or Deism—has any but God, has God out of Christ any answer for these interrogatories of a dying, despairing race? No! there is no answer. Earth, and the shades below, and heaven above, *deny all response—all hope* to the soul in its hour of suspense, and agony, and doom. And here we are driven forward, an unwilling herd, toward this fatal limit—*looking for light, and there is no ray; calling for help, and there is no answer!*

“*This honor of being nothing would be the grand evil; this suspense as to the future would be the natural and fierce plague of the soul under the circumstances supposed, and which must cling to our very being without the aid of the Gospel.*”—*Sermon on “Faith in Christ the great want of the Soul.”*

Matthew Simpson, one of the present Bishops of the M. E. Church, remarks:

“As to the immortality of the soul, *revelation alone* can give a distinct answer. We may reason from the mind’s faculties, we may talk of its powers, and we may know the analogies that abound in nature, still a doubt comes back again—a doubt so strong that it never dispelled the fears of antiquity. Indeed, while the philosophers reasoned upon this subject, and reasoned ably, one of them, as able as any of his compeers, said that the philosophers had rather promise immortality than prove it to be true; and Julius Cæsar, as many may remember, said, in a speech delivered in the Roman Senate, that death was the end of hope, as well as the end of fear. He felt somewhat like the Greek poet in an elegy on his friend, when he sung:

‘Alas! the tender herbs and flowery tribes,  
When crushed by Winter’s unrelenting hand,  
Revive and rise when vernal showers fall;  
But all the mighty, virtuous, and wise  
Bloom, fade, perish, fall; and then  
Long, dark oblivious sleep succeeds,  
Which no propitious power dispels,  
No changing seasons, nor revolving years.’

“But how delightful for us to turn from the mere conjectures of philosophy, from the denials of orators and poets, and the dim fancies that hang round the mind, to the clear declarations of Holy Writ! There we find that man is immortal, that his soul shall live as long as the throne of God endures, and that the breath which the eternal Jehovah breathed into man when he gave him the breath of life shall last as long as eternity.”—*Sermon on the Resurrection.*

We need not devote any more time or space to show that na-



ture does not teach the inherent immortality of man. Watson, Olin, and Simpson, are conclusive as to this point. But it will be noticed that they agree in maintaining that although nature fails to give evidence, yet *revelation* comes to help. Watson gives a hint, and the others make direct assertions. And here we are reminded of the adage :

“ When Doctors disagree,  
Disciples then are free.”

Olin and Simpson do not agree as to the way in which revelation teaches the immortality of the soul. The latter finds the doctrine in the account of man's creation, while the former denies that it is there, but finds it in the Gospel. We will notice their statements in order, beginning with Simpson.

The Bishop says, “ How delightful for us to turn . . . to the clear declarations of Holy Writ! There we find that man is immortal, that his soul shall live as long as the throne of God endures, and that the breath which the eternal Jehovah breathed into man when he gave him the breath of life shall last as long as eternity.”

He evidently refers to the account of man's creation in Gen. 2 : 7. “ And 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.” We fail to perceive anything in this text to support Bishop Simpson's assertion. It states that God breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life, but does *not* say that it “ shall last as long as eternity.” And if we “ turn to the clear declarations of Holy Writ” in Eccl. 3 : 18-20, we shall find positive evidence against the Bishop's affirmation.— “ I said in mine heart concerning the estate of the sons of men; that God might manifest them, and that they might see that *they themselves are beasts*. For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts ; even *one thing* befalleth them : as the one dieth, *so dieth the other* ; yea, they have all *one breath* ; so that a man hath *no pre-eminence* above a beast : for all are vanity. All go unto *one place* ; all are of the dust, and *all* turn to dust again.”

But the Bishop would no doubt follow Watson, Clarke, and others, and appeal to the plural term “ *lives*” in Gen. 2 : 7. Watson renders the text, “ The Lord God . . . breathed into his nostrils (or face) the breath of life, (*LIVES*), and the man be-

came," &c. Clarke says, "the breath of LIVES; i. e., animal and intellectual." Says Prof. Mattison, "The phrase 'breath of life,' is rendered 'breath of LIVES' by all Hebrew scholars. Not only did animal life then begin, but another and higher life which constituted him, not only a mere animal, but a 'living SOUL.'"

The appeal to the Hebrew is not worth a straw. "The Hebrew often uses plural forms when other languages employ the singular. Thus, under the plural form are expressed—\*\*spaces of time, as *chay-yim*, life, &c.—Rödiger's Gesenius's Heb. Gram. To illustrate, "The Lord God said unto the serpent . . . dust shalt thou eat all the days of thy life"—*chay-yim*, lives. Gen. 3 : 14. "Unto Adam He said, . . . in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life"—*chay-yim*, lives. 17 v. "Behold I, even I, do bring a flood of waters. . . to destroy all flesh, wherein the breath of *chay-yim*, lives." 6 : 17. "And they went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh, wherein the breath of life"—*ruach chay-yim*. 7 : 15. "All in whose nostrils the breath of the spirit of life—*nish-math ruach chay-yim*—of all that was in the dry land, died." 22 v. Thus the plural "lives" will prove the immortality of brutes as easily as it will of men.

As to the phrase "living soul"—*nephesh chay-yah*, it is used in Gen. 1 : 24. "And God said, Let the earth bring forth the living creature—*nephesh chay-yah*—after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind." So that this phrase gives man "no pre-eminence above a beast." John Wesley, in his note on the first part of 1 Cor. 15 : 45, "And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a *living soul*," says, "God gave him such life as *other animals* enjoy." Contrast this with Mattison's statement above.

A single quotation from the New Testament will set Bishop Simpson's assumption aside. 1 Cor. 15 : 18. "Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are PERISHED." That is, "if the dead rise not." See context. Now if man receives an immortal entity at birth, he *cannot* perish. Resurrection or no resurrection, "his soul shall live as long as the throne of God endures." We prefer to accept Paul's statement in lieu of the Bishop's.

Let us turn to Dr. Olin's position. It is in advance of Simpson, Clarke, and Watson. He goes to the *Gospel*, to *Christ*, in

search of that which they find in Gen. 2 : 7. But he is in error, inasmuch as he finds *soul* immortality in the Gospel, instead of *resurrection* immortality. He is right in saying, that "Life and Immortality were brought to light by Christ." But how did Christ bring it to light? Did he tell mankind to look into themselves for it? Nay, verily. But he said, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have *no life in you*. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life : and I will raise him up at the last day. . . .As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father : so he that eateth me, even he shall live *by me*. . . .It is *the spirit* that *quickeneth* ; THE FLESH PROFITETH NOTHING." John 6 : 53, 57, 63. Thus Jesus shows the perishing condition of the natural man.

"Hear this, all people ; give ear, all inhabitants of the world : both low and high, rich and poor together." "If ye live after the *flesh* ye shall *die*." "He that soweth to his *flesh* shall of the *flesh* reap *corruption*." "Man that is in honor and understandeth not, is like the *beasts* that *perish*."

---

## THE DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION.

BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

### PROPOSITION B.

*God is not the God of the wicked.*

This proposition needs no argument to establish it. It is the legitimate consequence of the covenant made with Abraham, which is sufficiently elucidated in our remarks on the first proposition. This covenant embraces "the children of the promise" alone. Rom. 9 : 8. "But unto the *wicked*, God saith, What hast *thou* to do to declare my statutes, or that thou shouldest take my *covenant* in thy mouth?" Ps. 50 : 16.—When the children of Israel (the ten tribes) revolted from the Lord, He said, "Ye are not my people, and *I will not be your God*." Hos. 1 : 9. And Paul, in referring to the multitudinous seed of Heb. 11 : 12, 13, says, "God is not ashamed to be called *their God*," the undoubted inference from which is, "He

is ashamed to be called the God of the wicked. (See Sept. Ex. pp. 450-1).

PROPOSITION C.

*God is the God of all that have a resurrection.*

The words of Jesus settle this point. "Now that the dead are raised, even Moses shewed at the bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. For He is not a God of the dead, but of the living : for all live unto Him." Luke 20.

To comprehend the meaning of these words, we must keep in mind the question at issue between Jesus and the Sadducees. It was not whether Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were *then alive*, for the controversy was founded on the fact of their being *dead* ; and the question was, Will "the dead" be "raised" ? The true idea of Jesus' argument is conveyed in the following paraphrase.

"If God did not intend to raise Abraham and his seed from the dead, He would not call himself their God ; for He is not the God of them that have no resurrection ; but He is the God of them who are to be raised. *They* are all alive to 'God, who quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which *be not* as though *they were*' (Rom. 4 : 17) ; hence, He is the God of the living." Thus proposition "C" is proved.

SECOND ARGUMENT

against the resurrection of the wicked.

Those, of whom God is not the God, will not have a resurrection (Prop. C).

But God is not the God of the *wicked*. (Prop. B).

Therefore THE WICKED WILL NOT HAVE A RESURRECTION.

THE FATHER'S GIFT.

BY ELD. R. V. LYON.

FUTURE LIFE IS ONLY OBTAINED THROUGH THE CHRIST BY BELIEVING THE GOSPEL AND OBEYING IT.

John 11 : 25. "Jesus saith unto her, I am the resurrection and the life, he that believeth in me, though he were dead, (or

shall die,) yet shall he live," in the resurrection at the last day. "And whosoever liveth and believeth in me" *at the last day*, "shall never die." Amen! John 3 : 16, 36. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." "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." "I am the way," into a future world—"the truth and the life." I am come that ye might have life, and have it more abundantly." 1 John 5 : 12. "He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life;" that is, he hath no future life! hence he dies that death from which there is no recovery. Reader, can you endure this? John 10 : 28. "My sheep hear my voice, and I give unto them aionion LIFE; and they shall by no means perish to the AGE."—*Diaglott*. John 6 : 53, 54. "Then said Jesus unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat of the flesh of the Son of man, and drink of his blood, ye have no life in you." "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day."

Reader, if this testimony of Jesus is to be received, then it follows of necessity, that if this *aionion* LIFE does not dwell in you by faith and obedience to the truth, you can never be raised up out of *sheol* at the last day, or any other day!

Again, Jesus testified, that "as the Father hath life in Himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself, and hath given him power over all flesh, that he should give *aionion* LIFE to as many as His Father had given him." Rom 6 : 23. "For the wages of sin is death; but the gracious gift of God is aionion, life, by the anointed Jesus, our Lord."—*Diaglott*.

That is, the aionion, or future age life, or age-lasting life, is the gift of God, and comes through the Christ. Therefore he is the only medium appointed by the Father, *through which* aionion, or age-lasting life, can come to any of the children of the first Adam. Consequently the wicked can never have this future-age life, or age-lasting life, unless the Father give Jesus power to bestow it upon them, in order that He may exhibit Himself as a *tyrant* instead of the God of love and justice, by placing them in a lake of burning lava, where they will be writhing in keen anguish, and shrieking in hopeless agony! And all this, according to the popular theology, in sight and speaking

distance of the saved ! Oh "orthodoxy" ! Is there among you a father, a mother, a husband, a wife, a brother, a sister, a son or daughter, that will have a heart so destitute of those better feelings which God originally planted in the heart of man, when he came forth from the hand of his Maker, that they can, in the sight of all this state of suffering, be happy, and shout Alleluia ! In view of your proximity to the judgment, and your accountability to God, *I charge you to answer this solemn question correctly !* Reader, if you would be made a partaker of this "unspeakable gift" of our heavenly Father ; to Jesus you must quickly come, by believing the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of His anointed, and yield implicit obedience to all his requirements. Delay not the work for a moment, to secure life in the Christ ; for on the last crumbling sands of time that belong to this age you are now standing ! A little in the distance, and your ears will be saluted with the rumbling of his chariot wheels, as they will be seen rolling down the burning pathway of the heavens ! THEN it will be too late to secure life in him !! But now you can enter the rock that has been cleft, and there find a hiding place amid the storm of vengeance which will soon fall upon a guilty world ! And when that storm is over, the victor's palm you can bear, the white robe wear, the conqueror's song sing, and fair Beulah's blissful plains behold, and among its beautiful groves walk, with the shining hosts of God's elect, and strike the key-note in redemption's song ! Amen.

*Whitby, C. W., 1862.*

---

#### REMARKS ON ACTS 24 : 15.

THIS text is one of the main forts of the advocates of the re-living of the wicked dead. In an edition of our pamphlet, "LIFE FROM THE DEAD : or, *The Righteous only will live again,*" we have revised our remarks on this text, pages 44-46, so that they read as follows :

"The next text claimed as positive testimony that all the wicked dead will be made alive is Acts 24 : 15, where Paul

saith, 'I have hope toward God, which they themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust.'

This text would have great weight on the question if there were no opposing considerations. The apostle elsewhere has spoken of the resurrection as a peculiar *favor*, for the attainment of which he labored and suffered, "if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead:" Phil. 3 : 11. The resurrection of which Paul speaks, Acts 24, is an object of "*hope*." Hope is made up of desire and expectation. If the apostle *expected* the wicked would be made alive again, he could hardly *desire* it. Could it be an object of desire to see all the wicked in one vast company, weeping, wailing, crying for mercy, and mercy deaf to all their sorrows, anguish and despair? Could he *desire* to listen to the curses and blasphemies, and witness the rolling sea of wickedness that would pour forth from the revived sinners and blasphemers of all sorts? This could not be an object of "*hope*:" but the apostle's relation to the resurrection, of which he speaks, is that of "*hope*"—"having *hope* toward God \*\*\* that there shall be a resurrection of the dead;" as God hath *promised* to our fathers who believed in Him; and why do the *Jews*, my accusers, find fault with me? for they "*allow*" my *hope* by maintaining "there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust;" for this they did maintain.

The idea of the apostle is clearly this—The Jews by holding to a resurrection of *both* classes, in fact, *admitted* Paul's "*hope*," "*which*" hope embraced *only* the just: the Jews' doctrine covered Paul's ground, but went beyond it. Insomuch therefore as *the whole* includes *the parts*, the Jews "*allowed*" what Paul contended for, and thus proved their complaint against him to be groundless.

Paul's "*hope*" was based upon a *promise*; for he saith, ch. 26, "I stand and am judged for *the hope of the promise* made of God unto our fathers \*\*\* for which hope's sake \*\*\* I am accused of the Jews. Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?" When or where did a "*promise of God to the fathers*" embrace the resurrection of the unjust? Or where is a *threatening*, to them, of a resurrection? Clearly, *nowhere*. But the promise did embrace the just, and

them only, as Jesus shows in appealing to Moses in proof of the fact, in his discourse with the Sadducees, Luke 20, and parallel texts.

But if the Jews allowed Paul's hope, why did they accuse him? "Because he preached unto them JESUS and the resurrection." Acts 17: 18. He proclaimed life from the dead only through Jesus, and to those "in Christ;" making the resurrection *peculiar to believers*, while the wicked had no part in it.

Thus the oft-repeated assertion, that "Paul said, There shall be a resurrection of the dead both of the just and the unjust," is without foundation in truth. If not said by him, in this text, as his faith, there is not an instance of his ever saying it in all his preaching and Epistles.

---

## "RETRIBUTION," SECOND EDITION.

NOTICE OF, BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

THE author of the above work appreciates, in part, the criticisms made on his first edition, in these columns and elsewhere. Although he appears to question the "fitness" of the critics "for such discussions" (p. 135), yet he has yielded to their efforts in a few instances. The article in the Feb. Exr. by Rufus Wendell on "'To Telos' and 'Retribution,'" has caused the following contrast in the two editions.

1st Ed.

"'To telos' does not signify 'the end of the age,' or world, as many suppose, SUNTELEIA TOU AIONOS, an entirely different phrase, being used in the Gospels to express that fact." P. 61.

2d Ed.

"'To TELOS' does not here, I think, refer to 'end of the age,' or world, as many suppose, 'SUNTELEIA TOU AIONOS, an entirely different phrase, being usually employed to express that fact.'" P. 61.

A change for the better is also visible in the 13th section of the second part, it being nearly all rewritten, thus obviating some of the objections brought against it. We also observe an alteration in the appearance of page 140, suggested, we suppose, by the March Exr., p. 269. But more on this point presently.

These two or three corrections only bring out in glaring relief the many blemishes—both in style and argument—that remain uncorrected and unaltered. However we will endeavor to con-



tent ourselves with the few offered crumbs, in consideration of the probability of something more solid in the coming work, “now in course of preparation” by our author, on the “Resurrection of the Dead.” We patiently await its appearance, desiring—we cannot say hoping—that it will have less denunciation and more argument than its predecessor.

Our author notices his critics in the preface to the second edition thus :

“As it regards those critics who have endeavored to compensate for the softness of their argument, by the hardness of their words, and for their lack of knowledge by their intensity of zeal, I beg to be excused from entering into controversy with them, as I do not wish to dispute with men whose arguments are interspersed with charges of hypocrisy and falsehood. I think it well for men to retain the manners of gentlemen, even if they discard the faith of Christians.”

If we remember right, it was Archbishop Leighton who said that the Christian is God Almighty’s gentleman and the gentleman is the devil’s Christian. Accepting the definition, we prefer to be a Christian instead of a gentleman. We are persuaded that there are too many gentlemen and too few *men* in the world. We do not, however, charge our author with belonging to either class. He certainly is not a *gentleman* if measured by the rule he lays down in the foregoing extract. It is this: No person is a gentleman “whose arguments are interspersed with charges of hypocrisy and falsehood.” By “charges,” we suppose he means *false charges*; for if they are truthful it is no detriment to a person to make them. Are our author’s arguments interspersed with such charges? Let the following extracts from his book reply.

Ret. p. 71. “Clearly as the great facts of ‘a resurrection of the dead, just and unjust,’ and a judgment upon all mankind, both living and dead, are revealed in the Holy Scriptures, there are still those who question these truths, while they at the same time PROFESS great reverence for the Word of God.”

P. 153. “When once the effort is made to bend Scripture to preconception and imagination, then, under the *specious* PRETENCE of ‘freedom of thought,’ and ‘freedom of speech,’ every error may be presented, and every truth disputed. . . . Men under PRETEXT of ‘*free investigation,*’ ‘*liberty of thought,*’ and ‘*searching for truth,*’ AIM to subvert the very ‘*principles of the doctrine of Christ,*’ and sap the foundations of a gospel faith,” &c.

Thus the author of Retribution does not come up to his own

idea of a gentleman, for he clearly charges "hypocrisy and falsehood" in the foregoing sentences upon somebody. The emphasizing is ours. As the writer of this article is one of the "critics" referred to, he presents in this connection all the "charges of hypocrisy and falsehood" which he has made in these columns, and declares his willingness to take back any or all of them when they are proved to be unjust.

Feb. Exr., p. 246. "Retribution,' from beginning to end, is a tissue of misrepresentations. It constantly teaches the reader that they who deny life to the wicked *do not believe in a judgment*; that they oppose the doctrine of *future retribution*. The foundation for this charge is as fictitious as the story which introduces the book."

P. 248. "He charges those who oppose *his view* of the judgment with '*disputing, perverting, and denying* the doctrine of eternal judgment.' The accusation is as false as the other."

July Exr., p. 410. "And yet, the expression would not redeem some of his statements; for he *does* know that the believers of 'Life only in Christ' are *not* working under *pretext* of free investigation," &c.: he *does* know that they do *not* AIM to subvert the very 'principles of the doctrine of Christ,' and 'sap the foundations of a gospel faith;' he *does* know that the 'resurrection of the dead, and eternal judgment' are *not* 'disputed and denied' by them; he *does* know that they do *not* 'lose sight of 'repentance from dead works,' and even faith toward God.' (See p. 154.) We cannot suppress our condemnation of these and other atrocious misstatements in his book."

Let it be understood that the foregoing extracts from the EXAMINER are the *only* charges of "hypocrisy and falsehood" that have been made in these columns. And the writer *sticks to them* as *truthful* charges. And here we make *another* charge. In his second edition, p. 155, 6, our author says,

"Already I am informed, that besides various publications sent forth to promulgate this notion, and assail the scriptural doctrine of future retribution, certain individuals are putting forth every effort to bring the matter to the notice of others, and make the acceptance of, or the silent assent to, this opinion, the basis of their Christian fellowship."

At Wilbraham Camp Meeting, in August, Dr. Jacob Fox, of North Adams, Mass., and Charles Hastings, of Springfield, Mass., went in company to the author of "Retribution," and asked him *who* he referred to in the above statement, and he refused to say. One thing is certain, the charge is entirely false,

so far as the Editor and regular contributors to the EXAMINER are concerned. We are inclined to consider it a mere slur on the body of believers in the doctrine of "Life only in Christ." The spirit of "Alexander, the coppersmith" still lives.

But the "critics" are charged with "lack of knowledge." We greatly acknowledge our ignorance in a great many respects, and yet we are not willing to take the palm out of the hands of our author. We submit part of page 140 of Ret. (on Dan. 12 : 2) to the judgment of the most indifferent Hebrew scholar, and ask if it is not ridiculous in its author to charge others with "lack of knowledge" and "fitness for such discussions."

"It is however objected that the expression '*many*' is restrictive : many cannot be *all*. But Daniel did not write the word '*many*,' he wrote the word רַבִּים. Now the word רַב signifies *many*, or *multitude*. 2 Chron. i. 9, 'Like the dust of the earth in *multitude*.' 2 Chron. xx. 2. 'There cometh a great *multitude* against thee.' The word in Dan. xii. 2, is רַבִּים; the *plural* form of רַב, so it should be rendered, not *multitude*, but *MULTITUDES*."

We notice three errors in the foregoing passage. 1. רַבִּים (rab-bim, *i* sounded as in *pique*) is said to be "the plural form of רַב" (rabh, *a* long ; *bh* sounded as *v*). This statement is incorrect ; רַבִּים is the plural of רַב (*a* short).

2. רַב does *not* signify *multitude*. To prove that it does, our author cites Ps. 97 : 1, in his *first* edition. "Let the *multitude* of isles be glad." But unfortunately for his critical pretensions, the original word in that text is *not* רַב, but the plural רַבִּים. Having discovered his error before the preparation of the second edition, he substitutes *another* text, 2 Chron. 1 : 9. "Like the dust of the earth in *multitude*." But here again he is at fault, as the common reading is not a *literal* translation of the Hebrew. King James' translators have placed the true lection in the margin ; "Heb. *much* as the dust of the earth."

3. Here our author's "lack of knowledge" culminates. In both editions he cites 2 Chron. 20 : 2 to prove his point. "There cometh a great *multitude* against thee." We turn to the Hebrew and lo ! the word rendered "multitude is not רַב but הַמֹּדֵד (hamōd)."

Thus when we consider that the *real* objection to the common

interpretation is *not stated* in our author's quoted remarks, and that his whole subsequent argument does not *touch* the point at issue (See March Ex., p. 269), we have *four* principal errors in these nine lines extracted from "Retribution," not to speak of the minor ones which we have noticed. We beg leave to transfer the title which he has given to Prof. Bush, to himself, viz: "Hopeful leader."

It would not be difficult to point out other manifestations of a "lack of knowledge" in "Retribution," but we forbear. It had been decided not to "take any further direct notice of the book in this magazine," but the renewed insolence visible in the second edition has provoked this article. May God forgive the provoker and teach him "a more excellent way."

---

### "THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISMS."

EDITOR OF EXAMINER:—I wish to call your attention to several facts, with the request that you will publish this note, if you think best, and accompany it with such remarks as you shall deem appropriate.

1. The author of "Retribution," near the close of his work, refers to "men" by whom, in *aiminy* "to subvert the very 'principles of the doctrine of Christ,' and sap the foundations of a gospel faith, \*\* 'the doctrine of baptisms, and of laying on of hands' \*\* are disputed, perverted and denied." I have reason to know that this thrust was intended mainly for yourself on account of the views you have avowed on the subject of "the essential baptism." Some of your present subscribers may not know what your sentiments are on this question.

2. The author of "Retribution" has, since the publication of the work, expressed to me his doubt whether the *Baptism* of the Holy Spirit could be proven to belong at all to believers of the present day. Not only so, but he has within the same time repeatedly, from the pulpit, scouted (as well he may) the idea that in our day it is possible for any man to baptize another person with the Holy Spirit.

3. In the *Crisis* of Jan. 15, 1862, is a communication from E. S. Willard, dated "Hammonton, N. J., Dec. 9th, 1861," in which the writer says:

"Two comely daughters and a son, with two middle-aged pilgrims, have been waited upon through the 'birth of water' into the 'newness of life,' brought to light in God's holy word; others are in embryo, struggling for life." \*\* "The servant whom God sent here to do this work for him was the one he sent before 'from far at his own charges' (equally cheap now) 'whose praise' through grace 'is in all the churches'—Br. H. L. Hastings."

4. A lady residing in Hammonton, N. J., in a letter which I have seen, dated the 17th inst., writes as follows :

"I presume that you have, in the *Crisis*, the account of the baptism of five individuals into the Second Advent Church, by H. L. Hastings, some time in December. The ceremony was performed a little different from what I ever saw before. He said that in connection with that ordinance was that of *laying on of hands*. So after the immersion, and whilst standing in the water, he put his hands on their heads, and prayed for the *Baptism of the Holy Ghost*."

I send you herewith the *Crisis* article above named. Does it not show, and does not the extract just cited show, that H. L. H. is teaching that immersion in water is a pre-requisite to "newness of life" and the Baptism of the Spirit? If this be so, what are we to think of his course in the two particulars I have named above? Perhaps the publication of this note will induce him to define his real position on the subject of Baptism. At the last Wilbraham Camp-meeting he observed, while remarking upon the "pure water" spoken of in Heb. 10: 22, that there was a "river full" of it near by. Does he correctly apprehend the apostle's meaning?

R. W.

Salem, Mass., Feb. 20, 1862.

The foregoing communication, though written and sent to you for publication, was, as you will remember, suppressed at my request. It is now, however, my wish to lay it before our readers—in doing which I desire to renew the request that you will accompany it with such observations as you shall think are demanded by the additional facts which I will mention. If I were now to choose a heading for this article it would be this—*Have we an Apostle among us?* The relevancy of such an inquiry will be appreciated by any reader who witnessed the scene that was enacted last Sunday evening in front of the preachers' stand at the Wilbraham Camp-meeting. For the information of such as were not at the meeting in question I will state that, as I am

informed, on Sunday afternoon eighteen persons were baptized by H. L. Hastings. The additional ceremony, which is described as having been performed at Hammonton "whilst standing in the water," was here reserved for dry land and the evening. It was attended to on this wise. The baptized ones (some twenty-five persons,\* I am told) were arranged in a half circle before the preachers' stand; around them was a large assembly of spectators. The introductory services consisted of a lengthy address by H. L. H., in which he sought to vindicate the scripturalness of the innovation which was being brought before us. His only Old Testament authority, as far as I have learned, was the example of Jacob blessing his sons in connection with the laying on of hands. But he had left the O. T. when I joined the assembly, and was just calling attention to authoritative examples found in the book of Acts. They were, first, the case recorded in Acts 8: 14-17, where the apostles Peter and John, having prayed for certain baptized disciples, laid hands on them that they might receive the Holy Ghost; second, the case of Ananias (Acts 9: 17) who put his hands on his "brother Saul," *previous to his baptism*, that he might receive his sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost; third, the case of Paul laying his hands upon certain Ephesian converts who thereby received the Holy Ghost and were enabled to speak with tongues and to prophecy. Acts 19: 6. Then he urged the practice of the early Christian church as asserted by certain early writers, and before concluding he cited us to the Episcopal rite of *confirmation* as illustrating the tradition of the church on this subject. Having thus paved the way for what was to follow, the work of "laying on of hands" began. In this H. L. H. was assisted by J. D. Brown, but the vocal prayers, constituting the principal feature and occupying about three-quarters of an hour, were all offered by H. L. H., with such momentary intervals as were needed for removing the hands of the administrators from the head of one person to that of another. The *many* prayers were followed by *one* of a general character, and in this way the novel service was at length terminated.

If the entire ceremony was not an unmeaning display, the Bible examples (particularly those from the N. T.) adduced in

\* This number includes several who had been baptized before Sunday.

its justification show that the impartation of the Holy Ghost by means of the imposition of hands was the object H. L. H. had in view. And yet he failed, during his protracted introductory remarks (so far as any remember with whom I have conversed), to make this avowal, and it found expression in only a portion of the prayers he offered in connection with the laying on of hands. At the Hammonton baptism, however, it seems this design was not obscurely set forth. But with respect even to his doings there I am at a loss how to vindicate his consistency. He is represented as having there "prayed for the *Baptism* of the Holy Ghost," whereas in the *Crisis* of June 11, 1862, he avers that "no *promise* of God" for being "thus baptized" in these days can be produced. In his *Crisis* article he does not treat the bestowals of the Holy Ghost in the three instances already cited from Acts as being *baptisms*, and this fact suggests that the letter from which I have quoted may have been inaccurate in using the word "baptism." If so, I have no charge of inconsistency to bring against H. L. H. regarding the added feature at the Hammonton baptism, but I do say that at Wilbraham, last Sunday evening, he should have distinctly stated that the object for which he laid hands upon the newly baptized was that they might receive the Holy Ghost, and thus have left no one witnessing the ceremony to guess what was its significance. Eld. Carpenter, I am informed, at a baptism in Poultney, Vt., laid his hands upon a candidate for baptism, as she came out of the water, and bade her "receive the Holy Ghost." H. L. H. should have been no less explicit than this at the camp-meeting, for it is due to the people that they should be fully apprized of the fact, not only that he regards the "laying on of hands" mentioned in Heb. 6 : 2 as being of perpetual obligation in the church, but that he regards it as an appointed channel through which the Holy Ghost is imparted to believers after their immersion in water.

What do you think of this business? Your answer to this question, which you have given already in conversation with your friends, will also be of interest to the larger circle whom your influence reaches through the EXAMINER. For myself, I utterly repudiate this new device as wholly destitute of Bible

authority and only mischievous in its tendency. As such I am prepared to oppose it on every suitable occasion.

Salem, Sept. 5, 1862.

— RUFUS WENDELL.

RESPONSE BY THE EDITOR.—The writer of the foregoing asks us, "What do you think of this business?" We answer unhesitatingly, It is a development of *anti-Christ*, and as rank a piece of a *rogancy* as has been developed in modern times; evidently intended by the operator to give to himself an importauco and power over the subjects of his folly which he could not gain by other means. This is strong language; but we use it deliberately, and under a full conviction that duty to God and to believers in Christ demands it of us.

The EDITOR of this Magazine was present at the Camp-meeting where the farce, described in R. Wendell's communication, was transacted. He did not indeed go to *see* it, but was near enough to *hear* the thunder of that stentorian voice, which—not for "three-fourths of an hour," but—for nearly or quite a full hour roared forth professed prayers, which strongly reminded one of the Saviour's words, "When thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites are: for they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men."

But why was it a development of *anti-Christ*? Because, *first*—Christ has the sole power to baptize with the Holy Ghost. John the Baptist said, "He that sent me to baptize with *water*, the same said unto me, 'Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.'" John 1: 33. Again, Acts 2: 32, 33, "This Jesus hath God raised up, \*\*\* therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear."

The baptism with the Holy Spirit is a direct and exclusive work of the anointed Saviour. That He commissioned and authorized His *Apostles* to baptize with the Holy Spirit we admit; but that He ever commissioned any other person or persons save *one*, viz., Ananias, we deny. In the case of Ananias, he was directly commissioned by the Lord Jesus in person, and only for *one* particular occasion, (see Acts 9: 10-18); and then the baptism of the Holy Ghost *preceded* the baptism with water, if water was used at all, which is a disputable point.



The only other persons authorized to baptize with the Holy Spirit by laying on of hands were the Apostles, or "*Legates*," as the Syriac reads. They were Christ's "ambassadors;" sent forth to act in His name empowered to work miracles and to impart the Holy Ghost in certain cases. But in no instance did they impart to others the power thus to bestow the Holy Spirit. Simon Magus, the sorcerer at Samaria, thought, indeed, that the Apostles might impart it to him, and offered them money to do so; but the attempt proved him to be "in the gall of bitterness, and in the bond of iniquity." Let others beware lest they are found in the same condemnation, by seeking to make "money" by it, or professing to have the gift for the purpose of having men think they are "some great one," as Simon Magus did.

There is no proof that the Apostles, or Legates, of Jesus could impart to others the power to baptize with the Holy Ghost. It is evident that power was confined to them alone and never passed into any other hands. They had no *successors*, and in the nature of the case they could have none; they were chosen, appointed, or ordained by Christ *personally*. No other ministers, whatever claims they may set up, were ever thus chosen and ordained: no other ministers ever did impart the Holy Spirit, or baptize with it. It was given the Apostles as the Legates of Jesus Christ, for the confirmation of the truth of His gospel: it passed into no other hands either during their ministry nor after their decease; and Christ Jesus our Lord demonstrated to them that He was the *sole* fountain and dispenser of this gift when He took it out of Peter's hands, at the house of Cornelius, and gave it direct, without even the intervention of the Apostle; thus teaching Peter, and all others, that this baptism was not dependent upon any human agency; and Peter "Then remembered the word of the Lord, how he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." See Acts 10 and 11.

As the Apostles had no successors, whoever claims *their* authority and power is just so far *anti-Christ*; because they assume to act for or instead of Christ without His authority. But if we were to admit—which we do not—that the Apostles could impart the power to others to communicate the Holy Spirit by laying on of hands, it is manifest it could only come down to

others by a *regular* succession from them. How then came any man in possession of that power without receiving it in and by that regular succession? How came "H. L. H." in possession of that power which he seems to assume he has? What successor of the Apostles laid hands on him and imparted it?—There are but two prominent claimants, we believe, in Europe and America, as "regular successors of the Apostles," viz., *Rome* and the *Church of England*. Which of these authorized "H. L. H." to lay hands on men and women in order that they shall receive the Holy Ghost? If they have not done it, has Jesus Christ personally appeared to him, as He did to Paul, and commissioned him to do so? If so, *when* and *where* did He do it? and what are the evidences of such commission? If no satisfactory response can be given to these reasonable inquiries, is it not manifest that the pretender is a fanatic, an imposter, or *anti-Christ*? or all of these combined? To us, it is certain he is.

P.S. To those who wish to see the Editor's views on "*The Essential Baptism*," we would say, the "BIBLE EXAMINER—*Extra*," (28 pages) just issued, gives those views in full. Price 7 cents, single copy: \$4 per hundred copies.

---

THE POWER OF GOD.—Were the attribute of God's power made the foundation of our prayers, it would impart enlargement to our petitions, vigor to our pleadings, and life to our expectations. In asking for temporal mercies, or for spiritual, "He is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think;" "The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof;" "The silver and the gold are his;" "Promotion cometh not from man;" "God is the judge, he putteth down one and setteth up another." All nature obeys his command; all gifts are at his disposal; the hearts of men are in his hands, to turn whithersoever he will; the dispensations of providence are simply the working out of his purposes; with him are the issues of life and of death; the angelic host wait his directions and do his pleasure. From the minutest atom, from the very hairs of the heads of his people, or the sparrow that falleth to the ground, to the worlds that roll in space, and the cherubim and seraphim that surround the throne, all is subject to, and all is controlled and directed by, the Almighty God. The same Almighty One can break the

stony heart, can cause the tears of penitence to flow, can make pure as snow souls defiled with sins red as crimson. With him is the residue of the Spirit; he can open the windows of heaven, and pour down blessings greater than we know how to receive.

There is no restraint to his power in grace, any more than in providence. Take the sublimest thought that the Holy Spirit ever put into the heart of man, or the highest and most comprehensive petition that he ever caused to spring up from the depths of a sanctified soul: God is "able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we can ask or think." Let us go to the mercy-seat throughout the coming year in the full belief of this blessed revelation of God's omnipotence as exercised in our behalf. We shall thus derive comfort and strength to ourselves, and give glory to Almighty God.—*Christian Observer*.

---

CONFIDENCE IN CHRIST.—The dew of thy grace is shed upon my wasting spirit with refreshing consolation. My soul languishes, but soon it will exult in thee; my flesh withereth, but after a few days it will revive. I am compelled to undergo corruptions, but thou wilt free me from this decay when thou bringest me out of all evils. Thou hast newly created me in the image of God, and how can the work of thy hands perish? Thou hast redeemed me from all my foes, and how shall death alone triumph over me? Thou hast devoted thy body, thy blood, and thy entire self for my salvation; how, then, shall death hinder those benefits which were bought with so precious a price? Thou art my righteousness, and my sins shall not prevail over thee; thou art my life and resurrection, and my death shall not overcome thee; thou art my God, and Satan shall not have power over thee. Thou hast given me the earnest of the Spirit, and in his will I glory, in his will I triumph; and I firmly believe, nothing doubting, that thou wilt permit me to enter into the marriage supper of the Lamb. Thou hast clothed me with the wedding garment, which I received when baptized (Gal. iii, 27) into Christ; nor will I stich to this precious, most beautiful robe the tattered rags of my righteousness. How dare I spoil its beauty with my abominable tatters! In this robe will I appear before thy face when thou wilt judge the world in righteousness and truth.—*Gerhard's Meditations*.

---

CHRISTIAN RETIREMENT.—Social devotion is no substitute for closet duties, for only by secret communion with God are the best

elements of Christian character developed and matured. There is reason to fear that the multiplication of social meetings has drawn many away from secret prayer. Rev. J. C. Ryle gives some important hints on this point: "We are told that when the apostles returned from their first ministerial work, our Lord 'took them and went aside privately into a desert place.' We cannot doubt that this was done with a deep meaning. It was meant to teach the great lesson, that those who do public work for the souls of others must be careful to make time for being alone with God. The lesson is one which many Christians will do well to remember. Occasional retirement, self-inquiry, meditation, and secret communion with God, are absolutely essential to spiritual health. The man who neglects them is in great danger of a fall. To be always preaching, teaching, speaking, writing, and working public works, is unquestionably a sign of zeal. But it is not always a sign of zeal according to knowledge. It often leads to untoward consequences. We must take time occasionally for sitting down and calmly looking within, and examining how matters stand between our own selves and Christ. The omission of the practice is the true account of many a backsliding which shocks the Church, and gives occasion to the world to blaspheme. Many could say with sorrow, in the words of Canticles, 'They make me keeper of the vineyards, but my own vineyard have I not kept.'"—Cant. 1 : 6.

---

THE TWO CHARACTERS.—There is a negativeness of character which is often mistaken for amiability, or impartiality, or some other kindred virtue. The person possessing it never takes sides on a question of importance enlisting the interest and action of men, and is equally well pleased whichever party wins in the contest. The future of the Church, of the government, of society, of man, are of but little account to him, so that he is left undisturbed in his quiet, plodding, aimless journey through life. He avoids the opposition, strife, and bitterness encountered by the positive man, but then he is practically, and for all useful purposes, nobody; accomplishes nothing in life, and dies to be forgotten as soon as he is buried.

---

MOURN not that you are weak and miserable. The gentle breeze is better than the hurricane, the cheerful fire of the hearthstone than the conflagration.

**SINFUL HABITS.**—Be not too slow in the breaking of a sinful custom ; a quick, courageous resolution is better than a gradual deliberation ; in such a combat, he is the bravest soldier that lays about him without fear or wit. Wit pleads ; fear disheartens ; he that would kill Hydra, had better strike off one neck than five heads ! fell the tree and the branches are soon cut off.  
—*Quarles.*

---

### EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

ELD. R. V. LYON writes :—

I am deeply interested in perusing the columns of the EXAMINER, because it holds up Jesus as the only way out of sheol into a future world. The reviewers of Bro. "Retribution" have done their work well. But God shall have the glory ; because He furnished them with the truth to undermine Bro. "R's." edifice, which he had reared upon a bed of quicksand : and it does appear to me, if he was not misguided by a zeal which he supposes to be knowledge, he would give up his present position, and make an honorable retreat, and plant his feet again upon the platform which he laid down when he wrote "Pauline Theology," viz., that the punishment of the wicked is the *loss of life*, to be holden in death, instead of torture.

R. E. LADD writes :—"I am certain we have the most glorious truths yet revealed to man, and my soul rejoices in them.—But it costs every thing to maintain and defend them. The tenderest ties are sundered in some cases. I love the truth."

---

"SHALL THE BIBLE EXAMINER be issued *monthly, semi-monthly, or weekly* ?"—To this inquiry several responses have been made.

A. G. HUDSON, Minnesota, writes :—"If it can be published weekly, next year, I will give five dollars.—Dr. J. Kelly says he will give ten. I think as much more can be obtained in the neighborhood. We want no resignation of *Editor*. We are not particular about the form of the EXAMINER, so that we have the matter."

A gentleman, of the "Friends' Society," in this city, says :—"If proper provision can be made to compensate the *Editor*, I

will give *twenty* dollars towards the semi-monthly issue of the EXAMINER."

RUFUS WENDELL writes :—" If the EXR. is not issued weekly, it seems to me our best course will be to sustain it *vigorously* as a *monthly*, in its present form—making it the repository of all the best things we can produce or procure on the truth of *Life only in Christ*. We want no change of *Editor* while you are able and willing to serve us. In God is your strength ; may He gird you for further conflicts in behalf of the Truth."

MRS. C. C. WILLIAMS, Iowa, writes :—" In your last issue you ask for an expression of the wishes of the friends of the EXAMINER respecting its issue next year, &c. As one of its friends (not to be judged, however, so much by what I do, as what I would) I would say, I regard its present form, time, price, Editor—all—unobjectionable, and hope all may remain as nearly unchanged as is consistent with progression, till some more imperative necessity demands a change than at present seems manifest to me. At least, may 'George Storrs, Editor,' long greet the eye as it rests on the title page. I am thankful so many feel willing to do so much : may the number increase proportionate to the importance of the subject ; for, not till right doctrines and corresponding acts prevail will wars cease."

---

THE RESPONSE.—Since our last issue, the following donations have been received for the Examiner : James Jackson, \$5. S. Cooper, \$1. J. B. Eggleston, \$1. Charles A. Hastings, \$5.—Chas. D. Leet, \$5. A lady friend, \$5.

---

THE EDITOR of this Magazine, since its last issue, has spent one Sabbath at the Wilbraham Camp-meeting, (Mass.) but took no part at the "Preachers' Stand," not being invited to do so. He has also preached one Sabbath at Newark, N. J. ; and spent two in Philadelphia, he trusts to the profit of the friends and to himself ; for which he desires to give praise to the LORD.

The Lord willing, he will preach in CHAPMAN HALL, *Boston, Mass.*, the first and second Sabbaths in this month, (October,) by request of friends there.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

---

"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, HATH NOT LIFE."

---

Vol. 14. No. 17.] **NOVEMBER 1862.** [Whole No. 218.

---

---

## "YEA AND NAY" ILLUSTRATED: A DILEMMA OF ORTHODOXY.

BY RUFUS WENDELL.

THE advocates of the immortality of the soul and endless misery, in allowing those doctrines to exert a ruling influence upon their interpretations of the Bible, are compelled, not only to do great violence to Scripture language, but also to make the utterances of God contradict each other. We propose in this article to exhibit before the reader, in distinct relief, an eminent instance of this orthodox necessity. The argument contained in the fifteenth of First Corinthians furnishes the points for our purpose. Without further preliminary remark, we come at once to our work. In doing which we invite attention to the eighteenth verse and a portion of verse thirty-second:

"Then [i. e., "if Christ be not raised"—v. 17] they also which are fallen asleep in Christ ARE PERISHED." Verse 18.

"If the dead rise not, let us eat and drink, for to-morrow WE DIE." Verse 32.

Before preferring the charge which we shall bring against orthodox expositions generally, we wish the reader's mind fully impressed with the fact that the destinies set forth in the phrases "are PERISHED" (v. 18) and "we DIE" (v. 32) are one and the same thing. The careful reader will require no argument to prove this asserted identity of import. And it may be of some importance to add, that, so far as we are aware, commentators are uniformly silent as to any direct assumption that the phrases in question are not statements of the same fearful doom. But, unfortunately for the class of expositors to whom we now al-

lude, what they do not *directly* assume upon the point here indicated, they do, nevertheless, virtually assert by their methods of explaining the two passages before us. What we mean by this remark will presently appear.

It may be proper that we should here state, distinctly, that by the words "ARE PERISHED," in verse 18, we understand the Apostle to mean, that, "if Christ be not raised," believers who have departed this life have become eternally extinct, and will have no life whatever beyond the grave; and that by the declaration, "for to-morrow WE DIE," in verse 32, we suppose him to teach, that, if believers are not to rise from the dead, they will in a little time perish out of being, to live no more forever. It forms no part of our present design to prove that we correctly apprehend the Apostle's meaning; but, before passing on, we will cite an apposite passage from HUDSON'S "Debt and Grace" (pp. 176, 177), emphasizing the expressions which strike us as concessive to the advocates of the non-revival of the wicked dead. The Professor, in allusion to Paul's statement in 1 Cor. 15 : 17, writes as follows :

"He evidently meant, that if there were no resurrection they were still subject to death, AS THE CONSEQUENCE OF SIN; there was NO FUTURE LIFE for them. In a similar way, if we mistake not, Christ would exclude the unbelieving Jews from the eternal life: 'Ye shall seek me, and shall die in your sins.' And when he said to one who wished to bury his father, ere he became his disciple: 'Let the dead bury their dead,' he simply characterized those who had no part in him, as the subjects of death. They were dead, because they had NO FUTURE LIFE."

Our accusation against orthodox expositors as a class is this: that, notwithstanding the *manifest* fact that verses 18 and 32, in the 15th of 1 Corinthians, coincide in the consequences which they predicate of the non-resurrection of Christ and of the non-resurrection of the dead, respectively, these expositors deduce *endless misery* from verse eighteenth, and the doctrine of *No Future Life* from the thirty-second verse—thus arraying two inspired statements against each other.

This is our charge. Now for the evidence by which it is sustained. Our witnesses shall be men of eminence and piety, whose writings have done much to mould the doctrinal sentiments of the present and past generations.

We are to show, first, that it is the common method of orthodox commentators to connect the doctrine of endless torment with the word "PERISHED" in 1 Cor. 15 : 18.



1. THOMAS SCOTT, in his note on verse 18, says :

"Nay, further, they who had died in the faith, and fallen asleep in Jesus, whether by a natural death, or as martyrs, had certainly perished in their sins, if Christ was not risen : for whatever might be urged on other grounds, for the immortality of the soul, there could be no other way of forgiveness, acceptance, and eternal life, than through the efficacy of his atoning sacrifice, the belief of which could not consist with the denial of his resurrection."

It will be seen from the above, that Mr. Scott does not assert that the doom of perishing was incompatible with "the immortality of the soul;" but, as he unquestionably held that such a doom was not compatible with immortal *happiness*, we must conclude that he held it to be consistent with immortality in *suffering*.

2. Dr. JAMES MACKNIGHT wavers between truth and error in his treatment of the passage before us. He paraphrases verse 18th thus :

"Certainly also they who have suffered death for believing the resurrection of Christ are perished: They have lost their existence here for a known falsehood, and shall either have no existence, or a miserable existence, hereafter."

Dr. Macknight's note on the words (1 Cor. 15 : 17, as rendered by him), "Ye are still in your sins," requires him to find "a miserable existence" in verse 18, and since he was an advocate of endless misery (i. e., for the *soul* after the *body* is literally consumed in the fires of the last day!), we will not hesitate to rank him on the orthodox side of the alternative presented in his paraphrase.

3. Dr. ADAM CLARKE's note on verse 18 is as follows :

"All those who, either by martyrdom or natural death, have departed in the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, *are perished*; their hope was without *foundation*, and their faith had not *reason* and *truth* for its object. Their bodies are dissolved in the earth, finally decomposed and destroyed, notwithstanding the promise of Christ to such, that he would raise them up at the last day. See John 5 : 25, 28, 29 ; 11 : 25, 26, &c."

Dr. Clarke writes in the foregoing as if neither he nor the Apostle believed those who had "fallen asleep" possessed deathless spirits which might be affected by our Lord's failure to make an atonement! As to Paul, the implication is quite correct ; but, since the Doctor differs from Paul on this subject, we must seek outside of his note on verse 18 to learn what he

thought would be the fate of the believer's *soul* in the event of Christ being not raised. Our task is an easy one. On verse 17 the Doctor has this observation :

"If he [Christ] have not been raised from the dead, there is a presumption that he has been put to death *justly*; and if so, consequently he has made no *atonement*: and *ye are yet in your sins*, under the power, guilt and condemnation of them."

In his note on John 3 : 16, the Doctor says : "The world was in a ruinous, condemned state, about to perish everlastingly ; and was utterly without power to rescue itself from destruction." An examination of the Doctor's further remarks on the passage in John, will show that endless misery is what he means by "destruction" and "to perish everlastingly."

4. ALBERT BARNES is as unambiguous as could be desired in his note on our passage. We quote his words :

"*Are perished*. Are destroyed ; are not saved. They hoped to have been saved by the merits of the Lord Jesus ; they trusted to a risen Saviour, and fixed all their hopes of heaven there ; but if he did not rise, of course the whole system was delusion, and they have failed of heaven, and been destroyed. Their bodies lie in the grave, and return to their native dust without the prospect of a resurrection, and their souls are destroyed. The *argument* here is mainly an appeal to their feelings : 'Can you believe it possible that the good men who have believed in the Lord Jesus are destroyed ? Can you believe that your best friends, your kindred, and your fellow Christians who have died, have gone down to perdition ? Can you believe that they will sink to woe with the impenitent, and the polluted, and abandoned ? If you *cannot*, then it must follow that they are saved. And then it will follow that you cannot embrace a doctrine which involves this consequence.'"

We pause here only to observe that Mr. Barnes is premature in asserting that the dead in Christ, since they are *not* "perished," "*are saved*." Had they *perished*, they *could not be saved*, but as, instead of perishing, they have only "fallen asleep in Christ," Jesus can raise them up at the last day. This he has promised he will do, but until he has done it, we shall err from the truth if we declare that the departed "*are saved*." Our Lord's second appearing will be "unto SALVATION." Let us, therefore, wait for his return from heaven, as the primitive saints did. Says Mr. Barnes himself, in his note on 1 Cor. 1 : 8— "The earnest expectation of the Lord Jesus became one of the marks of early Christian piety." Alas ! that men of the talents and piety of Mr. Barnes are doing so little, in these last days, to

restore the church to her proper attitude in relation to the advent of her Redeemer! "Is there not a cause?"

5. Dr. CHARLES HODGE, the learned Princeton Professor, shall furnish the last testimony under the first head of our inquiry. He writes thus in his excellent commentary :

"*Are perished*; rather, *they perished*. 'They perished when they died.' Perdition, according to Scripture, is not annihilation, but everlasting misery and sin. It is the loss of holiness and happiness forever. If Christ did not rise for the justification of those who died in him, they found no advocate at the bar of God; and have incurred the fate of those who perish in their sins."

"Errorists," writes Prof. Hodge in his note on 1 Cor. 15 : 17, "seldom see the consequences of the false doctrines which they embrace." Precisely so ; and this article will be a signal failure if it does not prove that theologians who deduce "everlasting misery" (with "sin" or without it) from 1 Cor. 15 : 18, have shut themselves up to the "consequence" of squarely contradicting themselves when they attempt a faithful echo of the declaration, "to-morrow WE DIE."

We propose now, in the second place, to show that the five expositors whom we have cited find the doctrine of *No Future Life* in the phrase, "to-morrow WE DIE," 1 Cor. 15 : 32. We begin, as we did before, with

1. THOMAS SCOTT. In his note on verse 32 we find this observation :

"Whereas, the epicurean maxim, 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die;' let us indulge every sense and appetite, without restraint, and shrink from all hardship as much as possible, for death will soon terminate our pleasures, and nothing further is to be expected; this would be the natural inference from a denial of that doctrine, when carried to its unavoidable consequences."

We need hardly remark that *annihilation* becomes our doom when "*nothing further is to be expected.*"

2. Dr. MACKNIGHT paraphrases the words, "to-morrow we die," thus : "*we are soon to die, and after death there is nothing.*" His note on the words, "Let us eat and drink," &c., is as follows :

"This, which may be called the Epicurean's manual or creed, hath been the favorite maxim of the sensual and profane in all ages. Accordingly Isaiah tells us, that the wicked, in derision of his prophecy concerning the destruction of Jerusalem by the Chaldeans, said to one another chap. 22 : 13, 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we shall die.' The

author of the Book of Wisdom likewise hath very well expressed the sentiments of the wicked in his time, chap. 2 : 1-9, from which it appears that by *dying* they meant their own utter annihilation."

3. Dr. ADAM CLARKE, on the verse before us, writes :

"What the Apostle says here, is a regular and legitimate conclusion from the doctrine, that *there is no resurrection* ; for, if there be no *resurrection*, then there can be no *judgment* ; no *future state of rewards and punishments* ; why, therefore, should we bear crosses, and keep ourselves under continual discipline ! Let us eat and drink, take all the pleasure we can, for to-morrow we die : and there is an *end* of us forever. The words, *Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die*, are taken from Isa. 22 : 13, as they stand now in the *Septuagint* ; and are a pretty smooth, proverbial saying, which might be paralleled from the writings of several epicurean heathens."

4. ALBERT BARNES, in his note on verse 32, says :

"Paul does not quote these words as having any original reference to the subject of the resurrection, but as language appropriately expressing the idea, that if there is no future state," &c. On the words, "we die," he says : "We *must* die. The idea here is, 'We must die, without the prospect of living again, unless the doctrine of the resurrection be true.'"

5. Dr. HODGE says, that the clause, *If the dead rise not*, "does not belong to the one preceding, as it is pointed in our version, but to what follows." In this he is in agreement with Clarke.

From Hodge's note on verse 32 we quote the following :

"The natural consequence of denying the doctrine of the resurrection, involving as it does the denial of the gospel, and the consequent rejection of all hope of salvation, is to make men reckless, and to lead them to abandon themselves to mere sensual enjoyments. If man has no glorious hereafter, he naturally sinks towards the level of the brutes, whose destiny he is to share."

The Lord be praised that there is a "glorious hereafter" for the good. As for the rejector of Christ, "he naturally sinks towards the level of the brutes, whose destiny he is to share." "Like sheep they are laid in the grave ; death shall feed on them." "Man that is in honor, and understandeth not, is like the beasts that perish." See 49th Psalm. "But these, as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, \*\* shall utterly perish in their own corruption." 2 Pet. 2 : 12.

Our task is accomplished. We have exhibited one of the dilemmas of accredited orthodoxy. She talks "yea and nay," and she does so from necessity. If *any one* who shall read this article deems himself able to show that there is harmony, or the possibility of it, where we have attempted to prove the ex

istence of confusion and contradictions, we presume he can find a hearing through the EXAMINER, and for the truth's sake we are disposed to invite the effort. It is certain (because self-evident) that the atonement of Christ, if it saves from endless misery, does *not* save from eternal extinction of being. On the other hand, if the peril of our race was that of dying to live no more, it is no less certain that the work of redemption did not interpose to rescue the recipients of its benefits from everlasting suffering. But just here, as we have seen, orthodox writers are hopelessly at fault, for they assert these contradictory consequences, while we know that inspiration cannot, and therefore does not, inculcate both. Who that does his work as an interpreter from any other standpoint than that of no future or endless life out of Christ, can do better than our five commentators have done?

*Salem, Mass., Sept. 11, 1862.*

---

## THE DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION.

BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

### PROPOSITION D.

*If the doctrine of the resurrection of the wicked is true, it is contained in the Old Testament.*

IN another place (see Prop. A.) we have shown that the wicked are excluded from that resurrection which is *promised*, and which comes as a *blessing*. Hence, if they have a resurrection at all, it must either be *threatened*, or it must be implied in some other *threatening*. If it comes in the way of a threat, that threat must be a penalty of *the law*. But the law is contained in the Old Testament. Consequently our proposition stands.

### PROPOSITION E.

*The doctrine of the resurrection of the wicked is not contained in the Old Testament.*

If the doctrine of the resurrection of the wicked is contained in the O. T., it is either *directly* threatened, or it is implied in some other threat. We suppose no reflecting person holds that

it is directly threatened *by itself*. Some, however, think it is directly threatened in connection with another threat. Two texts, and but two, are quoted from the Old Testament in support of this idea, viz : Job 21 : 30, and Dan. 12 : 2.

Job 21 : 30. "Do ye not know their tokens, that the wicked is reserved to the day of destruction? they *shall be brought forth to the day of wrath.*"

A review of the subject in dispute between Job and his friends has convinced us that his meaning is not presented in the common rendering of this verse. Dr. Conant, in his introduction to the book of Job, as translated by him for the Am. Bible Union, refers to the positions taken by the conflicting parties. Of the three friends, he says :

"According to these, the Omniscient who cannot be deceived, the Almighty who cannot be resisted, and the infinitely Just who can do no wrong, must, by the laws of his own nature, deal with every man according to his deserts; and his treatment is therefore the true index of the man's moral character. Accordingly their addresses to Job assume his guilt as the cause of his sufferings. And since the degree of guilt is the exact measure of punishment, these extraordinary judgments mark him out as an eminent transgressor." He then states Job's argument.

"Job, on the other hand, conscious of his rectitude, denies their inferences in regard to himself, and condemns the stand-point from which they judge of man as false and untenable. Their traditionary wisdom he confronts with the actual observation of life, that the wicked are not thus dealt with according to their deserts. The strong-handed preys on the weak; he wrongs the widow and the fatherless; grows rich on the unrequited toil of the poor; desolates whole cities and possesses himself of their treasures. Yet God suffers him to live unvisited by his judgments; his children grow up wantoning in luxury and pleasure; and at length he dies in ease and plenty, and is laid with sumptuous obsequies in an honored grave."

This argument of Job is contained in the 21st ch. Vs. 17-21, as they are rendered in the common version, do not harmonize with the argument. Dr. Conant, in his translation, corrects this, and shows that those verses have the same drift as the preceding ones. The *whole* chapter, as rendered by him, with the exception of v. 30, teaches *one* thing, viz. : the general prosperity of the wicked in this world. Thus Job vindicates himself.

Dr. C. did well in thus assimilating vs. 17-21 to the general argument; *if he had corrected the 30th verse likewise* his work would have been complete. But he did the next best thing; he put the following reading in the margin. "The wicked is kept

in the day of destruction ; they are brought on in the day of wrath." He remarks on his note, "Some translate as in the margin. Meaning : *the wicked is kept*, i. e., he is preserved, when the more weak and defenseless perish ; *they are brought on*, i. e., are conducted safely through."

We believe this reading is much to be preferred to the common one as a presentation of Job's meaning. And it effectually crushes the idea that the resurrection of the wicked is taught in this verse. But we think that the original Hebrew will warrant yet another rendering, viz : "The wicked is kept in the day of calamity ; they are conducted (with funeral pomp) in the day of death."

Our reasons for this translation—which we prefer to any other—are as follows : The word rendered "destruction" in the common version is *edh*. Gesenius gives two meanings : 1. *misfortune, calamity*. 2. *destruction, ruin*. He refers to Job 21 : 30 as having the first meaning ; we have therefore rendered it "calamity." The word rendered "wrath" comes from the verb *abhar*, "to pass over. Arab. to pass over a river, also to pass away, depart, die."—Ges. It means *to die*, in Ps. 37 : 36 ; Job 34 : 20 ; 33 : 18 ; 36 : 12. We have therefore rendered the noun *death*. "*They shall be brought*" is translated from the Hophal form of the verb *yabhal*. Gesenius defines the Hophal form, "to be led, brought, conducted. \* So of persons, mostly in state or solemn pomp \* OF FUNERAL POMP. Job 10 : 19 ; 21 : 30, 32." We have emphasized here, to show that Gesenius teaches that the word translated "*they shall be brought forth*" in the 30th verse has the *same meaning there* that it has in the 32d verse, where it is rendered "*shall be brought*," and that in *both* cases it refers to "*persons conducted in funeral pomp*."—Dr. Conant recognizes this meaning in the 32d verse. He translates thus, "And he, to the graves is he borne away, and watch is held over the tomb." In his note, he says, "He is borne *in state* to the burial place, and his tomb is guarded from violation."

The following paraphrase will convey the meaning of the last eight verses.

"Behold, I know your thoughts, and the devices which ye wrongfully imagine against me. For, in order to prove your point, ye ask, Where is the house of the prince ? and where the dwelling places of the wicked ? Are they not overthrown and

destroyed? and is not this a proof that God does not permit the wicked to enjoy prosperity? To this I answer, Have ye not inquired of travelers? who have ample opportunities of judging in this matter; Do ye not know their reports, that in many cases the wicked is preserved in the day of general calamity? and when death at last overtakes them they are honored with magnificent funeral rites. Who shall declare his way to his face? and who shall repay him what he hath done? He is now dead and out of the reach of earthly vengeance. And he is borne in state to the sepulchre and his tomb is sacredly guarded from profanation. Sweet to him are the clods of the valley; and all men will draw after him, as before him, without number. How then comfort ye me in vain, when in your answers there remains only deception!"

Thus Job 21 : 30 is quoted in vain to prove the resurrection of the wicked. We will now notice Dan. 12 : 2.

"Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

The first part of this text is clearly restrictive. "*Many of them that sleep* \*\* shall awake." The phrase "them that sleep in the dust of the earth" of course has reference to *all* the dead. *Many of* these sleepers awake. They do not *all* awake. Here then are two classes, those who awake and those who do not awake. The effect of this awaking is shown in the latter part of the text. Some (of the sleepers, i. e. those who awake) to everlasting life, and some (i. e. those who do not awake) to shame and everlasting contempt. A literal translation of the text would so fix its significance that no one would think of offering it in favor of the resurrection of the wicked. A false construction of the word "many" is the cause of its being used in behalf of that doctrine. It is said that "many" may mean "all." Rom. 5th ch. is referred to as affording instances. The words "all" and "many" are truly interchangeable in that chapter, but it should be observed that, in the original Greek, the *article* is prefixed to "many." Properly, the reading should be "*the many.*" But in Dan. 12 : 2 it is not "*the many,*" but simply "many;" and not only "many" but "many of;" which, as we have already noticed, settles its restrictive meaning.

It has been remarked by eminent Hebraists, Bush, Whiting, and others, that the word "some" is not a true rendering of the



original. The Hebrew word is a demonstrative pronoun, defined by Gesenius "*these*." The corrected text reads thus :

"And many of the sleepers in the dust of the earth shall awake, these to everlasting life, but those to shame, to everlasting abhorrence."

Rabbi Saadias Gaon, 10th century, on this text says, "This is the resurrection of the dead of Israel whose lot is to eternal life ; *but those who do not awake*, they are the destroyed of the Lord," &c.

As Job 21 : 30 and Dan. 12 : 2 do not teach the resurrection of the wicked, no *direct* threatening can be admitted. There remains but one way in which the doctrine can appear, viz. : as implied in some other threat. But it can be implied in no other threat, unless that threat is to be executed in a future life. Such a threat must be a penalty of the law ; for no one believes that a God of love would revive beings from the dead to inflict a punishment that was not demanded by the violated law. "Say unto them, As I live, saith the Lord God, I have *no pleasure* in the death of the wicked." Ezk. 33 : 11. We are thus led to the question, Does the law contain a penalty to be inflicted in a future life ? If it does, then the wicked will be raised from the dead to suffer it. If it does not, then Proposition "E" is proven.

Does the law contain a future life penalty ? We answer, No. But *one* penalty is revealed in the Old Testament, and that is DEATH. "Thou shalt surely die." Gen. 2 : 17. "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Gen. 3 : 19. This penalty was pronounced on the animal man in the garden of Eden, and has never been revoked. The whole animal race is subject to it, being condemned by the law as sinful ; for "by the deeds of the law there shall *no flesh* be justified . . . by the law is the knowledge of *sin*." Rom. 3 : 20. What is *death* ? "That state of a being, animal or vegetable, but more particularly of an animal, in which there is a *total* and *permanent* cessation of all the vital functions, when the organs have not only ceased to act, but have lost the susceptibility of renewed action."—*Webster*.

It is evident that this penalty does not admit a future life to the animal man. He is a sinner, and the penalty of sin is death ; the extinction of life. Every person that dies suffers the penalty. Says Dr. Chalmers :

“Here there is a common ground on which the certainties of divine revelation meet and are at one with the certainties of human experience. We are told in the Bible that all have sinned, and that, therefore, death hath passed upon all men. The connection between these two terms is announced in Scripture to be invariable—and all observation tells us, that it is even so. Such was the sentence uttered in the hearing of our first parents; and all history can attest how God hath kept by the word of his threatening—and how this law of jurisprudence from heaven is realized before us upon earth, with all the certainty of a law of nature. \*\* It is indeed a striking accordancy, that what in one view of it appears to be a uniform process of Nature, in another view of it, is but the unrelenting execution of a dread utterance from the God of Nature. \*\* When death makes entrance upon a family, and, perhaps, seizes on that one member of it, all whose actual transgressions might be summed up in the outbreakings of an occasional waywardness, wherewith the smiles of infant gayety were chequered—still how it demonstrates the unbending purposes of God against our present accursed nature, that in some one or other of its varieties, every specimen must die.”

As no penalty is mentioned in the law beyond that of *death*, our proposition is fairly proved. But perhaps we ought to notice several texts, in the Old Testament, which are supposed by some to countenance a future life penalty. Ezek. 18 : 26 is the principal one.

This text is not appealed to, except in connection with a phrase found only in the Apocalypse, viz. : “the second death.” It will be obvious to the candid mind that the book of Revelation is not the book to decide what is the penalty of the *law*. It would be a high impeachment of the justice of the Almighty to suppose that the penalty of the law is mentioned in direct terms for the *first* time 4000 years after the first transgression, and in the *last* book of the sacred canon, and that book the most highly figurative in its expressions of the whole sixty-six. Whatever the phrase means, (and we have no difficulty in relation to it,) it is evident that it must be interpreted in accordance with the penalty laid down in the *law*.

Some, however, are determined to make the Apocalypse their “book of the law,” with regard to the penalty, if not in any other respect. The thunderings and lightnings of Sinai are not terrific enough to satisfy them. Hence, they talk of “the penalty of the second death.” They explain it as “a second death after the first.” And as a kind of support they quote Ezekiel 18 : 26, which reads : “When a righteous man turneth away

from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them ; for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die."

The argument used to make this solitary witness agree with their theory is briefly this: The righteous man turneth away from his righteousness and committeth iniquities and *dieth in them*. Here is the *first* death. Then comes the threatening. *For* his iniquity that he hath done *shall* he die. This must surely be a second death. Therefore the prophet has reference to "the penalty of the second death after the first."

If we show that the text agrees with the penalty of the law which we have already defined, it will serve to rebut the foregoing. A reference to the previous context will give us a clue to the meaning of the 26th verse. In the 21st verse we read, "If the wicked will turn from all his sins that he hath committed, and keep all my statutes, and do that which is lawful and right, he shall surely live, he shall not die." Here it is positively stated that the righteous man "shall not die." If we should interpret this according to the method pursued in the argument just referred to, we should infer that the repentant sinner spoken of in this verse "shall not die" in *any* sense. Here is neither a "first death" nor a "second death," but a positive affirmation that "he shall *not* die." This simple fact makes against the inference drawn from the 26th verse.

But what is meant by the declaration, "he shall not die"? As an animal man he *must* die, for "it is appointed unto men once to die," (Heb. 9 : 27) and the law claims the life of the animal man and will certainly have it. Jesus was sent into the world to explain this apparent contradiction ; to answer the question of ages, "If a man die, shall he live?" "He poured out his soul"—life—with the blood—"unto death." Isa. 53 : 12. He died as an *animal* man ; he lost his *animal* life. He was "put to death *in the flesh*," because the *law* demanded his animal life in common with that of every other animal man. But did he die in the complete sense of the term? No. "In the days of his flesh"—of his *animal* life—"he<sup>30</sup> offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to *save* him from *death*, and *was heard*." Heb. 5 : 7. Truly, he was "put to death in the flesh," but no less truly, he was "quickened in the spirit," he was *saved* from *death* ; "and

being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him." Heb. 5: 9. Thus, it has been demonstrated that a man may die, and yet "*not die*;" that the claims of Justice can be met and yet the sinner be saved. This has been done by the introduction of a *Spirit Life* on which the *law* has no claim. Whoever partakes of that Spirit "shall not die." He may come under the power of death as an animal man, just as Christ did; but he escapes its eternal dominion by virtue of "the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead."—Rom. 8: 11. And this explains Ezekiel's words, "He shall surely live, he shall not die."

Jesus used a similar expression in His great Life sermon, John 6 ch. "This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, *and not die.*" He had previously spoken (49 v.) of a class of persons *who were already dead*, in the sense in which others should "*not die.*" Thus the phrase "*he shall not die,*" with its opposite, "*he shall die,*" is definitely interpreted by the infallible Teacher.

Let us analyze Ezek. 18: 26, in the light of the foregoing explication, and discover how much support it gives to the doctrine in dispute. "*When a righteous man*"—(a man whose name is in "the Book of Life")—"turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them;" (the death that comes on all animal men) "for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die." His name is stricken from "the Book of Life," and he dies as an animal man, "having not the Spirit."—Jude 19; Rom. 8: 13. Instead of being a candidate for the resurrection life in Jesus Christ, he perishes in his own corruption as a natural brute beast, made to be taken and destroyed. 2 Peter 2: 12.

Two passages in the 37th Psalm are sometimes offered to prove the resurrection of the wicked. 34 v. "Wait on the Lord, and keep His way, and he shall exalt thee to inherit the land: when the wicked are cut off, thou shalt see it." Nothing is here said concerning a revival into life of wicked persons to be cut off. A cutting off of the wicked who are alive at the coming of Christ will exactly fulfill the text. Besides, another interpretation is admissible, and we are inclined to favor it, because we think it better harmonizes the verse with the rest in the chapter. The

word "it" is not in the original ; and Gesenius says "to see is put for to enjoy the light, to live . . . Thus is to be understood the difficult passage in Gen. 16 : 13, *do I then here see* (i. e. live) *after the vision of God*, i. e. after having seen God?" If we should adopt this explanation in the present case, the meaning of the text would be, "When the *wicked* are cut off, *thou shalt live.*"

38 v. "But the transgressors shall be destroyed together : the end of the wicked shall be cut off." This verse, instead of favoring the reliving of the wicked, rather opposes it. Prof. C. F. Hudson remarks on "the phrase in Ps. 37 : 38, 'The end of the wicked shall be cut off,' compared with Prov. 24 : 14, 20. The Hebrew word here rendered 'end' and 'reward' is the same which commonly denotes 'after time,' 'the future.' . . . It might be not inaptly rendered *hereafter*, thus : 'The hereafter of the wicked shall be cut off.' 'Then shall there be a hereafter (to thee) and thy expectation shall not be cut off.' 'There shall be no hereafter to the wicked man.' But the sense is perhaps more aptly given by a Jewish Rabbi, speaking of a cessation of existence, thus : 'There shall be no *residuum* to the wicked man ; the light of the ungodly shall be extinguished.'"—(Debt and Grace, p. 180.) If a wicked man has no *residuum*, no *hereafter*, it is but the consequence of the penalty "Thou shalt surely die." There is no room here for a future life penalty.

There is but one more passage to notice, and that is Psalm 73 : 17-20.

"I went into the sanctuary of God ; then understood I their end. Surely thou didst set them in slippery places : thou castedst them down into destruction. How are they brought into desolation, as in a moment ! *they perish with sudden destruction.* As a dream when one awaketh ; so, O Lord, when thou awakest thou shalt despise their image."

No comment is needed here. The text not only fails to prove a future life penalty, but declares the contrary. Literally interpreted, it shows that there is no escape from death for the wicked man. Job, in anticipating the resurrection, says (14ch. 14, 15 v.) "All the days of my appointed time will I wait till my change come. Thou shalt call, and I will answer thee : thou wilt have a desire to the work of thy hands." But the case of the wicked

is different; the Lord will not "have a desire" towards them, for, says the Psalmist, "thou shalt despise their image."

#### THIRD ARGUMENT

##### *Against the Resurrection of the Wicked.*

If the doctrine of the resurrection of the wicked is not contained in the Old Testament, it is not true. (Prop. D.) But the doctrine of the resurrection of the wicked is not contained in the O. T. (Prop. E.)

Therefore IT IS NOT TRUE.

---

### "ANTICHRISTOS, PSEUDO-CHRISTOS."

WE endorse the sentiments contained in the following remarks of Dean Trench, and found in his "Synonyms of the New Testament" under the foregoing heading. We believe that "the Antichrist" is yet to be developed, and from various considerations have been led to embrace the view held by many prophetic students, that Louis Napoleon, the present Emperor of France, is the person. It has been the general opinion for centuries that the Papacy is referred to in the titles, Antichrist, Man of Sin, &c. We readily admit that the Papacy is an anti-christian system, and the Popes of Rome belong to the Apostle John's company of "many antichrists" (1 John 2: 18), but we do *not* admit that any Pope has answered to the character of "THE Antichrist" of 1 John 2: 22. "He is *the* (Gr.) antichrist, that denieth the Father and the Son." But we will hear the Dean.

"The word *antichristos* is peculiar to the Epistles of St. John, occurring five times in them; 1 Ep. 2: 18, bis; 2: 22; 4: 3; 2 Ep. 7; and no where besides. . . What is the force of *anti* in this composition? Does *antichristos* imply one who sets himself up *against* Christ, or one who sets himself up *in the stead* of Christ? Is he an open foe, who seeks violently to usurp his seat; or a false friend, that professes to hold it in his name?"

"There is no settling this matter off-hand, as some are in so great a hurry to do; seeing that *anti*, in composition, has both these forces. . . .

"For myself, St. John's words seem to me decisive on the matter that resistance to, and defiance of, Christ, not the false assumption of his character and offices, is the essential mark of Antichrist; that which, therefore, we should expect to find em-

bodied in his name ; thus see 1 John 2 : 22 ; 2 John 7 ; and in the parallel passage 2 Thess. 2 : 4 he is *ho antikeimenos*, (the opposer) where none will deny that the force of *anti* is that of opposition : and in this sense, if not all, yet many of the Fathers have understood the word. . . He is in Theophylact's language, *enantios tō Christō* (contrary to Christ), ' *Widerchrist*,' as the Germans have rightly rendered it ; one who shall not pay so much homage to God's word as to assert its fulfillment in himself, for he shall deny that word altogether ; hating even erroneous worship, because it is worship at all, hating much more the Church's worship in spirit and in truth ; who, on the destruction of every religion, every acknowledgment that man is submitted to higher powers than himself, shall seek to establish his own throne ; and for God's great truth, ' God is man,' to substitute his own lie, ' Man is God.'

" The term *pseudo-christos*, with which we proceed to compare it, occurs only twice in the New Testament ; or, if we count, not how often it has been written, but how often it was spoken, only once ; for the two passages (Matt. 24 : 24 ; Mark 13 : 22) are records of the same discourse, In form the word resembles so many others which appear to have been combined of *pseudos* and almost any other substantive at will. . . The *pseudo-christos* is not one who denies the being of a Christ ; on the contrary, he builds on the world's expectations of such a person ; only he appropriates these to himself, blasphemously affirms that he is the Foretold One, in whom God's promises and man's expectations are fulfilled. Thus Barchochab, or ' the son of the star,'—as claiming the prophecy at Numb. 24 : 17 he called himself—who, in Adrian's reign, stirred up again the smouldering embers of Jewish insurrection into a flame so fierce that it consumed himself with more than a million of his fellow countrymen—he was a *pseudo-christos* : and such have been that long series of blasphemous pretenders and impostors, the false Messiahs, who, since the rejection of the true, have, in almost every age, flattered and betrayed the expectations of the Jews.

" The distinction, then, is plain. The *antichristos* denies that there is a Christ ; the *pseudo-christos* affirms himself to be the Christ. Both alike make war against the Christ of God, and would set themselves, though under different pretences, on the throne of his glory. And yet, whilst the words have this broad distinction between them, while they represent two different manifestations of the kingdom of wickedness, we ought not to forget that there is a sense in which the final Antichrist will be a Pseudo-christ as well ; even as it will be the very character of that last revelation of hell to absorb into itself, and to reconcile for one last assault against the truth, all anterior and subordinate forms of evil. He will not, it is true, call himself

Christ, for he will be filled with deadliest hate both against the name and office, as against the whole spirit and temper, of Jesus of Nazareth, now the exalted King of Glory. But, inasmuch as no one can resist the truth by a mere negation, he must offer and oppose something positive in the room of that faith which he will assail and endeavor utterly to abolish. And thus we may certainly conclude that the final Antichrist will present himself to the world as, in a sense, its Messiah ; not, indeed, as the Messiah of prophecy, the Messiah of God, but still as the world's Saviour ; as one, who, if men will follow him, will make their blessedness ; . . . abolishing those troublesome distinctions, now the fruitful sources of so much disquietude and pain ; those, namely, between the Church and the world, between the spirit and the flesh, between holiness and sin, between good and evil. It will follow, therefore, that however he will not assume the name of Christ, and so will not, in the letter, be a *psuedo-christos*, yet, usurping to himself Christ's offices, presenting himself to the world as the true centre of its hopes, as the satisfier of its needs and healer of its hurts, he will in fact, take up into himself all names and forms of blasphemy, will be the *psuedo-christos* and the *antichristos* at once." JOSEPH T. CURRY.

---

## WILL ALL MEN HAVE A FUTURE LIFE ?

### DR. FIELD'S REPLY TO RUFUS WENDELL.

*Dear Brother.*—You think the extract from my debate with Thomas P. Connelly is a virtual admission that the wicked dead will never be raised. I cannot see that it is. The fact that there is no *everlasting* life out of Christ is, no reason why there may not be temporary life out of him. The Scripture says, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life ; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life." Yet unbelievers see life every day. Some of them for scores of years. Now how is this to be reconciled with the idea that wicked men cannot have any kind of life out of Christ ? If they can have it here, why not in the next world ? Was the child that Elijah raised to life, immortal afterwards ? Was Jairus' daughter raised to an immortal life ? Were Lazarus and Dorcas raised to die no more ?

When you explain how these persons could be raised to natural life in consistency with the fact that there is no life out of Christ, then I can upon the same principle explain how it is that the wicked will be restored to life in the second resurrec-



tion. No one will contend that the persons named could have been restored to any kind of life, had it not been for God's interposition in behalf of the world. Had He withdrawn his favor from man after the fall, the whole of Adam's posterity would have perished like the beasts of the field.

There are two kinds of life contemplated in the resurrection of the dead. One spiritual, the other natural: the first immortal, the second corruptible. Eternal life to the righteous; temporary life to the wicked. The latter class live again just as they had lived, subject to the second death. On no other principle can I explain the Scriptures in regard to the resurrection of the just and the unjust.

I have read the criticisms on those passages affirming the resurrection of the wicked, and I must say they are in the highest degree sophistical. The literal principles of exegesis are abandoned in expounding the penalties of God's law, which might if carried out explain away the law itself. Every truth in the Bible can be subverted by such a process of reasoning.

When it can be satisfactorily proven to me that the resurrection of the wicked is a mere figure of speech—that there is no reality in it—then I could safely say to desperadoes, thieves, tyrants, and assassins, go on in your career of crime, for there is no penalty awaiting but to lie down and die like a beast. The doctrine is perfectly monstrous. It is not in harmony with the common sense principles of justice. If true, it would impair the respect of the good and virtuous for the divine government. It would embolden men, who have no idea of reformation, to commit the most atrocious crimes.

I tell you, my brother, you have gone to a dangerous extreme in logic of "no immortality out of Christ." While that principle is true, some of your deductions from it may be false and pernicious.

It has been a source of comfort to the righteous in all ages, when afflicted, persecuted, and slain by the enemies of God, that there will be a retribution for them in the world to come. It has afforded widows and orphans, who have been made so by the hand of the assassin, consolation to know that God is just, and that there is a tribunal before which the murderer will ere long appear, and answer for his crimes.

When we contemplate the violence and crime in the earth, perpetrated every day with impunity, we are constrained to believe that there ought to be punishment for the wicked in the world to come—that to live in sin, in infamy, and crime, and then die, as they often do suddenly and without pain, is not an adequate penalty for their wickedness.

Yours, for the truth, N. FIELD.

## RESPONSE TO THE FOREGOING.

*Dear Doctor* :—Whatever else may be said of your foregoing “Reply,” it is certainly a failure in this,—it leaves *eight* of my “ten questions” *unanswered!* To this I will add, that I do not yet perceive any want of agreement between the “extract” given from your “Debate” and “the doctrine of no future life for the wicked dead.” Should you feel inclined even now to respond directly to each of the “ten questions” addressed to you in the August EXAMINER, you will place me in a position where it will be quite proper to say something further about the extract. And I shall be quite happy to be placed thus if it be not distasteful to yourself to have your attention again directed to my inquiries. Your ability, your candor, and your kindness, all combine to make it pleasant as well as profitable to compare views with you upon controverted points. Be assured that you cannot offend me by using “great plainness of speech.” If the doctrine I advocate carries with it consequences that appear to you to be “perfectly monstrous,” do not hesitate to say so as long as you think so. This discussion of the relation of the wicked to a future life requires no concealment of matured convictions, and the discovery of truth will be best promoted by our saying what we honestly believe of the views we feel called upon to oppose. I am not wholly without the hope that you may yet see cause for such a modification of your present opinions as will bring us both upon the same platform, touching this question of life from the dead. At all events, any views you may advance on the subject should receive the careful consideration of those from whom you differ.

I turn now to the points presented in your letter. And I could wish at the outset that we might understand each other with precision in regard to the Bible phrases “no life” and “shall not see life.” We agree, I presume, as to the fact that “*no life out of Christ*” is a Scripture doctrine, but differ as to whether the phrase can without violence be regarded as the equivalent of the doctrine of *no future life for the wicked dead*. The determination of this question requires an appeal to the sixth chapter of John, whence the expression “no life” is derived. That chapter will likewise aid us in ascertaining the import of the words, “shall not see life,” John 3 : 36. Now in regard to John 6th I ask,—Does not Jesus make the non-resur-

rection of the wicked the basis of the declaration which concludes the 53d verse—"ye have *no life* in you"? Bearing in mind your truthful concession, that, "had it not been for God's interposition in behalf of the world" (i. e., "had He withdrawn his favor from man after the fall"), "the whole of Adam's posterity would have perished like the beasts of the field,"—let us read the 33d verse: "For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth LIFE unto the world." Considering what was the actual exigency of "the world," as stated by yourself, is it not easy to see that the obvious import of the text is repugnant to the idea that the despisers of "the bread of God" will receive from Christ any life whatever? Does the text *seem* to imply that the rejectors of that life which is the gift of divine "favor," will have forced upon them an accursed existence to which they would not have been liable if God had not interposed "in behalf of the world"? It seems to me that, from the standpoint common to us both, it ought not to be difficult for us to render harmonious answers to these questions.

Come now to verse 39: "And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day." The obvious sense of this passage is, that those whom the Father hath *not* given to Christ will be *lost*—a truth to which other scriptures bear ample testimony. It also appears from the passage, that to be raised up again at the last day is the proper antithesis of being *lost*. If this inference (and no other seems possible) be correct, the wicked are manifestly excluded from the resurrection of the dead. In this connection it is proper to remind you that the "life" brought to view in this chapter, both before and after the declaration, "ye have *no life* in you," is a *future, resurrection* life—a fact which (as I may have further occasion to insist) completely nullifies the adverse inference which you seek to draw from the consideration that "unbelievers see life every day." Upon your theory or mine, the "no" (standing before "life") is absolute and unqualified in relation to the "life" intended; but, according to my view, the sense is, *no FUTURE life*, while you, seeking support for the notion of a *temporary future* life, contend that the sense is, *no EVERLASTING life*.

Advancing a step, the 40th verse claims our attention. "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth

the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life : and I will raise him up at the last day." Here we see that "everlasting life" is conferred by a resurrection from the dead. Now hear John the Baptist : "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life ;" i. e., according to chap. 6 : 40, he will be raised up at the last day ; "and he that believeth not the Son *shall not see life ;*" i. e., shall not be raised up at the last day ; "but the wrath of God *abideth* on him ;" i. e., he is doomed to remain eternally under the power of death. I have shown that the bestowal of everlasting life is unmistakably associated with being raised up at the last day. Now show us, brother, if you can, that the Bible in like manner connects "the wrath of God" with the raising up of those upon whom that wrath is ceaselessly to abide.

The 44th verse is next in proof that the resurrection was the prominent thought in the discourse of Jesus, and I wish this fact borne in mind as we come to vs. 47-50. "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life. I am that bread of life." These verses (47, 48), interpreted in the light of vs. 39, 40, bring distinctly before the mind the resurrection at the last day. Now comes a contrast. "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and ARE DEAD," v. 49. Here we say is a contrast. The glorious destiny of believers had just been asserted in words implying their revival at the last day, and now the case of the transgressors in the wilderness is presented, of whom it is said, *they* "ARE DEAD." Who can fail to see that this emphatic declaration teaches their exclusion from any future life ? What meaning *can* be given to the words "*are dead,*" in the connection in which they occur, if they do not teach that the "fathers" referred to were dead in the sense that *they* would never be raised up to life ? But Jesus proceeds to renew the contrast in a manner which seems absolutely to shut us up to this conclusion ; for the 50th verse declares—"This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and NOT DIE." *Not die*—HOW ? Evidently, "not die" *as the fathers did*. Now, then, if the "fathers" did not die in such a manner as precluded forever their revival into life, in what sense can it be said of *them*, any more than of the *righteous*, that they "*are dead*" ? If you can give no satisfactory answer to this question, doctor, you will not fail to see that, before we

reach the declaration, "ye have *no life* in you" (v. 53), we have a clear assertion of the doctrine I hold, and that the words "*no life*" may justly be held to exclude the wicked from any life beyond the grave. And you will also see that it is *only in this sense* that you can impute to me, and others of like faith, "the idea that wicked men cannot have *any kind of life* out of Christ." As Jesus was discoursing to *living* men, it was of course *not possible* that the statement, "ye have *no life* in you," should be understood to deny their possession of an *animal* life, derived from the first Adam; but in addressing such language to persons who, but for his death and resurrection, must inevitably have come short of any life after death, it is in the highest degree rational to suppose he intended to teach them that their refusal to receive him would leave them exposed to precisely that doom. The view here given also derives strong confirmation from the contrast immediately following the "no life" passage. Verse 54 says, "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise HIM up at the last day,"—language clearly implying that the "no life" of the previous verse means *no RESURRECTION life*. And to make assurance doubly sure our Lord again alludes to the "fathers." Hear his words: "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even HE shall LIVE by me. This is that bread which came down from heaven: NOT as your fathers did eat manna, and ARE DEAD: he that eateth of this bread shall LIVE FOREVER," vs. 57, 58.

To your question, "If they [unbelievers] can have it [life] here, why not in the next world?"—I answer, 1. The wicked will not be "accounted worthy to obtain" the next "world."—For proof see our Lord's reply to the Sadducees. 2. The life we have "here" we derive from the first Adam. We lose this life when we die and can never get it again from Adam. If we live again, Christ must revive us. As "the bread of life," *he will* thus revive all who are to be changed to immortality and "fashioned like unto his glorious body." It is plain enough "why" his vivifying power will never reach the wicked dead. They die in their sins, and as *sin* is "the sting of death," the "grim monster" must forevermore hold them in his embrace.

I of course answer in the negative your inquiries respecting the child raised by Elijah, the daughter of Jairus, Lazarus, and

Dorcas. Until you prove that either of these persons were wicked when they died, their restoration to "natural life" presents nothing analogous to such a revival as you believe awaits the wicked. Nor would the cases be analogous if you could prove this. If you see fit to press this point, I shall be happy to meet it more fully. I see nothing difficult in it.

I regard what you assert concerning "two kinds of life" in the resurrection of the dead as wholly an unfounded assumption. Should you think it worth while to bring forward any *proof* of your statement, be kind enough to inform us whether the "two kinds of life" are to be bestowed simultaneously. Do you hold that all the dead will be raised when the Lord comes? Those scriptures which speak of the "second death," as well as those which are by many supposed to teach the resurrection of the wicked, can I think be harmonized with the doctrine of no life out of Christ, without any resort to sophistry. Possibly you have not seen the most conclusive things that can be said on some of these passages.

However it may seem to you, my dear brother, "*I could not safely say to desperadoes*" and like characters, "*go on.*" *Eternal life* is of such infinite value as to render it to the last degree unsafe and unwise for men to persist in a "career" that would identify them in destiny with the beasts that perish. To my mind nothing is more "perfectly monstrous" than such a suggestion from a person professing to believe that "the wages of sin is *death.*" It is a mighty reaction in the direction of eternal torment, and in principle no better than that doctrine. Tell us frankly, do *you* believe that "men who have no idea of reformation," and whom you think my doctrine would embolden "to commit the most atrocious crimes," could ever be brought into the love and service of Christ by the dogma of torment in another life? Prof. Hudson speaks thus: "Respecting the resurrection of the unjust, then, I can heartily say that *if they are raised up for the sake of being punished,* then I know not how to vindicate the goodness of God." The Professor believes in the resurrection of the wicked, but this view of the matter he regards "as totally false, and unwarranted by any principle of reason or by any word of Revelation." (See EXAMINER for April 15, 1857.)

I think you are entirely mistaken if you suppose it is a

“ source of comfort ” to the children of God to believe that their enemies are to be hopelessly tormented in another life. Never have I met with such an instance, and to my mind the idea has not the slightest countenance in the teachings or example of Christ, prophets, or apostles. Turn to Romans 1 : 26–31, and you will find an enumeration of the most abominable sins of which humanity is capable, and yet Paul declares “ that they which commit such things are worthy of DEATH.” My brother, does *death* mean *torment*? It may be well that you should define your position on this point. That “ there *ought* to be,” and that there *will* be, “ punishment for the wicked,” requires no argument ;—but that those who, because they possess not “ the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead,” have “ *no life*” in them, will be made alive from the dead to receive “ an adequate penalty for their wickedness,” is only to be asserted when the fact is found to be explicitly revealed in the oracles of God. Bring forward, then, if you can, one passage of Scripture affirming that a future *life* awaits the impenitent dead.

Yours in Christian love, RUFUS WENDELL.

---

THE RESURRECTION—ITS IMPORTANCE.—Edward Thomson, D.D., of the Christian Advocate & Journal, in a recent editorial on “ The Resurrection of the Body,” says :

“ This subject has been lifted into a disproportionate importance by the remnants of a shipwrecked sect endeavoring to sustain themselves on the scattered planks of other platforms weaker even than their own. It is not the one great theme of Scripture teaching, and should not be of pulpit effort. One sermon a year will give the subject as great a prominence as the Bible does.”

Adam Clarke, D.D., speaking on the same subject, in his Commentary, says :

“ The subject of the resurrection appears to have been thought of much more consequence among the primitive Christians than it is now. How is this? The Apostles were continually insisting upon it, and exciting the followers of God to diligence, obedience, and cheerfulness through it, and their successors in the present day seldom mention it. \* \* \* There is not a doctrine in the Gospel on which more stress is laid, and there is not a doc-

trine in the present system of teaching which is treated with more neglect."

The reader will see how Dr. Clarke stands corrected by Dr. Thomson. The latter thinks "one sermon a year" on the Resurrection will do. From his standpoint he might consistently go even further, and protest against the doctrine being preached at all. His theology has a substitute for the resurrection, namely, glorification in death; and since the latter, in point of time, comes *first*, the value of the former becomes a nullity, and it may be safely affirmed that *it* can prefer no valid claim to even an *annual* presentation. We would like exceedingly to witness an experiment with this once-a-year policy upon the doctrine of the immortality of the soul! And since the Bible gives this dogma *no* prominence, the doctrine being not once named there—we should think our orthodox friends might act upon our suggestion for a single twelvemonth without wounding their consciences. We mean, not merely that *preaching* upon the soul's immortality shall be thus restricted, but that during the period of the experiment Christian men and women shall consent to make no allusion to the soul as having a separate conscious existence in death, or as being deathless in its nature. We would have them make the trial of speaking of departed saints as asleep, hid in the grave, at rest, knowing not anything, not having any more a reward, dead in Christ, &c., &c. If they will try this for only one year, we venture the prediction that they will see reasons why, during all the remainder of life, they shall be "continually insisting" upon the Resurrection, as the crowning glory of the believer's hope. But we intended simply to show how our two "doctors disagree." The Bible must read very differently before we shall willingly part company with "the remnants of a shipwrecked sect," if the worst indictment against them is the charge of "lifting into a disproportionate importance" the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Dead. R. W.

*Salem, Mass., Oct. 1, 1862.*

---

OUR EDITORIAL this month, though lacking on our part, is well supplied by our regular contributors, who have much lightened our labors by their excellent contributions. The Editor's



absence from home so large a portion of time for several weeks past, must be his excuse that our readers have no more from his pen: but they have no cause for regret, as they have been furnished with a rich feast by BRS. WENDELL and CURRY. Thank the LORD for such helpers.

---

### LETTERS AND EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

GEO. T. COLLINS, Franklin Co., N. Y., writes:

I do not want the EXAMINER to stop, nor any change in the *Editor* as long as God spares you to us, and you are willing to serve us. I should be very glad to have it weekly, but if we cannot, then semi-monthly, retaining its present form. If I am not forced into this awful war by the draft, so that I can attend to my family, I will give \$10 to assist the enlargement or more frequent publication of the EXAMINER. I shall know soon.

You will see by the *Crisis*, No. 2, volume 16, that H. L. H. has got a coadjutor in E. Burnham, as bitter as orthodoxy itself. He dignifies the doctrine of the non-resurrection of the wicked as a new notion, of which he gives a list, and supposes another step would land us in the vortex of French infidelity itself. I am led to ask if E. B. knows any thing he did not learn? And was each new thing he learned a "new notion"? Did he arrive sometime at a point in his theology where he learned "the dead know not anything," and "All the wicked will God destroy"? Did he write a tract to prove it? Did he suppose he had then fathomed the whole mind of Deity? Does he think it becoming to abuse his teacher, if the teacher gives more lessons than he chooses to learn?

But when I recur to the teachings of H. L. H., E. B., and others of this class, I find them teaching that death is the punishment of the wicked, and not conscious endless misery. We were told in every variety of expression, it was not dying, nor the incidents of dying, but the consummation of it, culminating in the total loss of life; that the punishment was *death*, and that death was the extinction of life.

But it would seem, some of them have received so great an injury from their fellow men, that nothing but the conscious misery of the wicked—for a time at least—would satisfy their feelings.

But if E. B. has found a "new notion," would it not be as well to examine the argument for it, as burn the book and excommunicate the author? Has he got so perfect that charity has no home with him?

If A. is sentenced by our law to be hung till he is dead, and that is the highest punishment known to us, he certainly does not receive it while living. Up to the time the hangman performs his office, he has not suffered one iota of the punishment due by the sentence of the judge. His liberty has been restrained, but it was to keep him for

punishment. Now if his neck is broken by the fall, he does not suffer a moment. Is the law satisfied? Certainly. The law claimed the life of the victim and has taken it. To what purpose would the law claim it a second time? Evidently only for an offence committed subsequent to the expiation. If the culprit has committed ten thousand crimes, his life expiates them all, for the simple reason, it is all he has to give.

I am not vain enough to suppose I could write anything on the subject new or interesting to you; but to persons isolated, as we are through the country, it is pleasing to communicate with one another. I should be glad to hear more and see more of our friends, but it may not be.

I ask your attention, if you think proper, to E. B.'s article.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—A man that has been in "*Doubling Castle*" for years, as "E. B." has, on the state of the dead, and who can use the slang about the French Infidelity of men whose piety and ability will not suffer in comparison with his own, may as well be left to his own folly. All he has said has been answered again and again.

CHAS. H. SUTTON, Philadelphia, Pa., writes: I feel so much the necessity of a periodical which will advocate the whole truth of "*Life only through Christ*" to dying men—one that is not one-sided nor bigoted as the religious papers generally are—that I must help the EXAMINER as much as in me lieth. Such a magazine should receive the hearty support of all lovers of Bible truth, and especially "*Adventists*;" therefore please find enclosed five dollars to assist its *Editor* in publishing it.

The author of "*Retribution*," in the *Crisis* for Sept. 16, says:

"I continue my previous offer to send a copy of it free to every person who denies the resurrection of the ungodly, if they will agree to read it carefully."

If it will be any comfort to him, I will say, I purchased two copies of that work. One from our late Br. H. Grew. That good man was so much ashamed of the un-gentlemanly and anti-Christian sarcasms it contained, that he mutilated a portion of the work in trying to erase the offensive matter, rather than it should pass through his hands with such unbecoming language. I read it carefully; examined its arguments, and found them so light and flimsy, that if any doubt remained on my mind, previous to ending it, as to the non-living of the wicked dead, "*Retribution*" has banished it all. I now believe with my whole heart, the *Heaven-sent*, the *God-revealed* doctrines, that there is life only through Christ; that the ungodly "shall not

see life." I believe my heavenly Father to be a God of love ; not that vindictive being some would make him. If God has no pleasure in the death of the ungodly, would he bring them out of the grave to torture them to death a second time ? No ! They "shall remain in the congregation of the dead." Amen ! and Amen !

A LADY in Connecticut writes :—The doctrine of "no life out of Christ," is a precious one to me. Instead of dishonoring God, as some say it does, I think it brings more honor and glory to His name ; and I feel anxious to have it spread over the land, and will do what I can to have it ; it puts the finishing touch to the plan of salvation ; and it gives Jesus all the glory. How people can meet it with such a spirit, I cannot see ; such a bitter and determined opposition. If it is the truth of God—and I firmly believe it is—He will take care of it, and us. Pray for us that our faith fail not, but that we may bear patiently all the trials of this life, in hope of that crown which is laid up for the faithful. I should like the EXAMINER weekly ; even if it were but half as large. We get very hungry waiting a month. I will pay five dollars the coming year to have it weekly. I think I shall send you more money soon. I will send the EXAMINER for six months to a number of persons who, I think, will read it.

DR. JOSEPH TREVER, Lockport, writes :—Have you light enough to see our present position in this age ? Surely we have fallen upon evil times, but our consolation is, the LORD reigneth. As a nation we are being sorely punished for our iniquities, and I see but little signs of a repentance. True we are moving slowly the yoke of oppression, but I fear are not yet ready to cast it off. Our President has taken one step in the right direction ; though I think postponing its accomplishment rather too long. It almost unman's me to read the accounts of the blood and carnage of our day. The LORD grant that it may soon cease. Slaveholding is now showing fully its satanic wickedness ; and yet there are multitudes even in the North ready to apologize for it, and compound with it. Some say, "The world is growing better." I cannot see it. Surely we are approaching the end. The hope that Jesus will soon take unto himself His kingdom and reign, is our consolation. May grace, mercy and peace, rest with you and all who love the appearing of our Lord.

I. N. JEROME, Iowa, writes :—Your "Bible Examiner" has become an indispensable *family article*, and I herewith forward you one dollar to have it continued. I rejoice to see the truth circulate and triumph. Few candid minds have I met of late, who were willing to investigate the subject of no immortality except through Christ, who were not forced to admit the evidence well nigh conclusive and the argument irresistible. The prime falsehood of the inherent immortality of man, originating in the conceit of the human heart, has mud-

died our mental philosophy and corrupted our whole system of theology.

These are eventful times, especially in our own country, and amid all the changes and revolutions now in operation, I pray God to re-establish the old truths and deliver us wholly from the false teachings and traditions of men.

A. GUTHRIE, Thompkins Co., N. Y., writes :—I am thankful for the favor of the EXAMINER monthly, and would be glad to see it oftener if it could be sustained. I remain with much sympathy for yourself in your trying position, and with Christian regard for your able contributors.

GEO. W. ALLSHOUSE, Monroe Co., N. Y., writes :—Please send me seven copies of "BIBLE EXAMINER, *Extra*." Your views on "*The Essential Baptism*" I have read before, and think they are correct ; but as they are given in different Nos. of the Examiner, it is more difficult to present them to other persons in order to convince them of the truth ; but in this *Extra*, I presume all, or most, that has been said on the subject, is embodied, which makes it convenient. I think an *Extra*, occasionally, is an excellent way of giving your views in full on different subjects. I should like to see this done in reference to the *Lord's Supper*.

As to the future appearance of the EXAMINER, to me it matters not whether we have it oftener than once a month or not, *so we have it* ; and you can "count me in" for five dollars, and what more I shall be able to give.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—In our recent visit to Boston, several persons urged us to call for a fund to issue *Tracts* and *Extras*. If that course is best, some one must take the lead in raising such fund ; the *Editor* cannot. If he had the means he would issue, occasionally, *Extras*, as suggested in the foregoing letter. If those who have the means, feel disposed to furnish them, we will do what we can to further the object.

We could wish the *Extra* on "*The Essential Baptism*" might be scattered widely ; for we are quite sure something of this kind was never more needed than now. Let it be sent abroad and read. If it does nothing more, it will stay an intolerant spirit which now seems to be swelling its floods high as heaven. The *Extra* contains nearly all we have written for three years past on the baptism question : and we regard it as a full reply to all the arguments which have been presented on the opposite side. But read, and then judge. Price, *seven cents*, single copy : \$4 per hundred.

THE EDITOR has recently visited Boston, Salem, and Springfield, Mass. In all these places the doctrine of "*No Life out of Christ*" is one of deep interest. The two latter places may be said to be thoroughly settled on the question, among most of those who receive the life views at all. In Boston the interest on the subject is deep and increasing. The attendance was large, and attention to what was spoken by us, the two Sabbaths we spent there, was of the most encouraging character. A strong desire prevails with most, to have the subject presented in all its fullness. They regard the doctrine of "life from the dead *only* to the righteous" as the grand climax of Scripture truth; exalting Christ the Lifegiver, and magnifying the love of God, honoring His glorious name, putting a grandeur and glory on a future life, of which those who believe in a *corruptible* resurrection have no conception. This glorious truth is onward; and the opposition to it only increases the desire to know our arguments for a doctrine so "spoken against." The doctrine, fully embraced, emancipates the mind and heart from the last remnant of the old *endless misery* theory; of which a corruptible resurrection with torment for a time and another death, is the last and vilest remnant, more dishonorable to the character of God than endless misery itself, and with less evidence in Scripture for its support. There is something awfully grand in the endless misery theory; while the corruptible revival theory, to torment and kill again, seems to present a small and revengeful mind, unworthy the God of truth and love.

---

THE BIBLE EXAMINER.—One number more completes the present volume, and we wish to know at the earliest moment what is likely to be the number we shall print for *January*, 1863. Our rule has always been, to send to no subscriber beyond the time to which he has paid. We thus avoid any orders for discontinuance, and leave our patrons at liberty to signify their wish to continue by a new remittance. It is essential, however, that we should be informed early of the intention to renew, else we may not be able to supply all the numbers.

To avoid useless expense, we print no more than are likely to be taken up by subscribers. All who intend sustaining the Ex-

AMINER should let us know by the 20th of December, if possible. Any person sending us \$3, current funds in New York, for three subscribers—old or new—shall be entitled to one copy of the 18 numbers of Vol. 14 (the present one, unbound), to be sent to his order; provided the money is sent before our supply is exhausted. We can furnish at least one hundred sets, and hope we may be called to do so.

If any wish the present volume *bound*, they must remit for it soon, as we do not intend to *bind* more than are likely to be wanted. The price will be \$1.50, sent at the expense of the purchaser. The postage will be from 35 to 40 cents, most likely.

Any person sending us \$5 for the next volume—whether for subscribers, or as a donation—shall be entitled to the present volume *bound*.

---

THE RESPONSE.—Since our last issue, the following donations have been received for the Examiner: Chas. H. Sutton, \$5. A friend in Boston, \$5.

---

THE EDITOR PHOTOGRAPHED.—An artist in Boston, the other day, invited Mr. Storrs to sit for his likeness, and obtained three excellent "negatives" of him (card or "album" size)—one in a sitting posture, one standing, and one bust. I suspect that many of the Editor's friends would like to possess a copy of one of these pictures, and I have asked his permission to say in the EXAMINER that single copies will be sent post-paid to persons sending him 28 cents. Four copies will be sent for one dollar. The order should designate *which* of the photographs is desired: I would advise friends to call for the *standing* posture, for I think that picture on the whole the best of the three. The *faces* are all good, but I have a preference as to the *position*.

RUFUS WENDELL

---

ERRATA.—It is not worth the while to notice *every* error that may occur in the columns of the Examiner. Most of them are trivial, and may easily be corrected by the readers. But we call attention to one in the October number, which ought not to be passed over. On page 490, Dr. Olin is made to say, "This *honor* of being nothing would be the grand evil." It should read, "This *horror* of being nothing," &c. A less important error is that on page 501, 3d line from bottom; the Hebrew character for *k* occurs, instead of that for *n*.

J. T. C.

# BIBLE EXAMINER.

---

"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, HATH NOT LIFE."

---

Vol. 14. No. 18.] **DECEMBER, 1862.** [Whole No. 219.]

---

---

## LOVE.

BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

WHAT a talismanic word is Love! What an ambrosial fragrance it sends forth! How often has the human bosom thrilled at its command! How it lifts its subject above the murky atmosphere of self! How fraught with unearthly power are its precepts, and yet how gentle is its sceptre!

We speak not of that animal passion which satisfies the heart of the mere worldling. Created within us for obvious reason, and shared by the brute creation, it bears the stamp of mortality, and will be swept away by the same stroke that releases us from the animal nature, "the body of death."

The love to which we allude has its fountain in the infinite God. "Love is His darling attribute." This assertion has been often criticised as subtracting from another perfection of the Divine nature, *i. e.*, Justice. This objection is founded on the erroneous assumption that Love and Justice are antagonistic principles. On the contrary, they are indissolubly joined, bearing the relation of parent and child, Love being the parent.—That Justice proceeds from Love will appear from its definition. Webster calls it "the virtue which consists in giving to every one what is his due." Can a person possess this "virtue" without the previous possession of Love?

The exhortation of Jesus, "As ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise," was simply a command to "do justly." His next remark was a clear recognition of the fact that Justice flows out of Love. "For if ye *love* them which love you, what thank have ye?" The Divine Teacher knew

that no one is capable of doing unto others as he would have others do unto him, without first *loving* them.

A grievous mistake is made by those who bring the attributes of God into conflict with each other, and make war in the very Holy of Holies. This error is a strong element in the support of the idea of torture as a penalty of sin. For when the enlightened seek to show the inconsistency of the supposition that such a penalty proceeds from a God of *love*, the reply is instantly made "But He is a God of *justice* as well." The panacea for this disease in the body theologic is the glorious truth that GOD IS RULED BY LOVE, AND JUSTICE IS THE CONSEQUENCE. Hence, Justice can have no penalty which is not approved by Love.

"God is Love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him." This love which proceeds from God as the fountain, is bestowed upon man *if he will receive it*. It comes not through the instrumentality of man, but directly from God. No human form or ordinance can draw it from heaven. It comes with "one baptism," the baptism of the Holy Spirit. "The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us."

Paul, in his epistle to the Galatians, contrasts "the works of the flesh" with "the fruit of the Spirit." In mentioning the fruit of the Spirit he gives *Love* the first place. And in his first letter to the Corinthians this "central idea of Christianity" is set forth as the one thing needful. The truth is, all the other graces grow out of Love; "Joy, Peace, Longsuffering, Gentleness, Goodness, Fidelity, Meekness, Temperance."

These other graces are *supported* by Love. It bears the same relation to them that the sun does to the planets. Like the sun it is apparently stationary, while the planetary graces encircle it with unceasing movement; the law of Gravity, by which the sun holds the lesser orbs, being an illustration of the heavenly power which Love exercises toward its kindred excellences. Like the sun it actually moves; as that mighty orb, accompanied by its dependencies, revolves around a still vaster centre, so Love and its satellites move round the centre of all spiritual systems.

If the solar light were withdrawn from our earth it would soon be uninhabitable. The withering of vegetation would be the premonition of the speedy extinction of animal life. Universal



desolation would reign, and upon it would be stretched "the line of confusion, and the stones of emptiness." A would ensue were the light of Love withdrawn. As the sun imparts light and heat to its inferiors, so does Love. What were Joy without Love? How could peace exist without Love? Without Love, Longsuffering would be an abstraction; Gentleness an impossibility; Goodness a mockery; Fidelity a sham; Meekness and Temperance, absurdities. Every one of these graces would be blighted, withered, crushed, annihilated, and their habitation a den of unclean things. But wherever Love emits its heavenly radiance, the graces thrive. "Love *rejoiceth* (not in iniquity, but in the truth.)" Joy arises from Love. So does Peace. "Great *peace* have they which love thy law." "O that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments, then had thy *peace* been as a river." "My son, forget not my law; but let thine heart keep my commandments: for length of days, and long life, and *peace* shall they add to thee." So when the law is kept there is *peace*: but "*Love* is the fulfilling of the law"; therefore Peace flows from Love. "Love suffereth long and is kind." Longsuffering is the effect of Love. And so with the rest.

Let others preach a gospel of terror, if they can reconcile themselves to the contradiction; be it our grateful task to publish the glad tidings of Love. It was Love which prompted God to create man; it was Love that completed the work in Jesus Christ. It was Love which "like a chain drew Christ from glory, and bound Him to the cross;" Love descended into Joseph's tomb and "made the cheek of darkness pale" and "the knees of terror quake." It is Love that enters the human breast, smites the Dagon of Self from his throne, and tramples him under feet.—Love is the grand conception of the gospel dispensation.

While on this subject, we desire to record our protest against an erroneous idea held by some good people. They appear to think that, if a person has a Christian spirit, a spirit of Love, he is necessarily compelled to be mild and gentle on all occasions. If, aroused by some monster evil that crosses his pathway, his eye flashes, his countenance changes from a state of repose to one of indignation, his voice assumes a denunciatory tone, his pen sharpens, the cry is heard, "What a bad spirit!" An able writer of our day has well answered the charge. He says: "When

charity becomes intensest, it scorches. Amiability is love in its negative form, but when love assumes its positive form, when it becomes an earnest and broad humanity, then it begins to sparkle and flash and smite. He who reveres the good and cleaves to it, necessarily abhors the evil, and denounces it; and he who has small abhorrence of evil has usually but a feeble allegiance to good. It was out of the bosom of his loving kindness that Jesus launched the frightful bolts of his invective at the Scribes and Pharisees of his time; clearing the atmosphere of their hypocrisy by dreadful process of thunder-storm, that the common people might not suffocate. It is out of his heart of infinite pity for the world that the Almighty Father makes the wicked consume away, and buries faithless nations in shameless graves."

If the view taken by this writer is not just, how are we to account for the many instances in which holy men of God while "*moved by the Holy Ghost*" denounced the enemies of God and man, and called down upon them the judgments of heaven.—Take, for example, the many passages in the Psalms of this character. "What the Holy Spirit actually commanded, or inspired the Old Testament writers to utter, on moral subjects, is, and must be, in harmony with absolute morality. It must be the same in these times as then. And if the imprecatory Psalms are inspired, they are in sympathy with divine purity and benevolence; if not inspired, the admission makes fatally against the inspired authority of the other portions of the Psalms."—*Hibbard*.

But while we feel it our duty to expose and denounce ungodly men as the enemies of God, we are to be extremely careful not to permit any feeling of *personal* enmity to obtain. While we hate evil men as the representatives of evil, we must preserve that degree of love to them which it is our duty to exercise toward our enemies. Then, when we cry out with David,

"Do not I hate them, O Lord! that hate thee?  
And am not I grieved with those that rise up against thee?  
I hate them with perfect hatred:  
I count them mine enemies:"

We shall be enabled to continue as he did with the sincere prayer,

"Search me, O God! and know my heart:  
Try me, and know my thoughts:  
And see if there be any wicked way in me,  
And lead me in the way everlasting."

## THE DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION.

BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

## PROPOSITION F.

*Future Life is the consequence of justification, and without justification there can be no future life.*

This proposition contains a double statement of a single fact ; the second clause iterates the first.

Justification is the opposite of condemnation ; the former is the act of declaring righteous, while the latter is the act of declaring unrighteous.

All men, by nature, are under the condemnation of the law of God. The cause of this condemnation is explained by the Apostle Paul. "The law is spiritual : but I am carnal." Rom. 7 : 14. This spiritual law requires spiritual acts, to perform which, a spiritual *nature* is necessary. As man is not spiritual, but animal, fleshly, (1 Cor. 15 : 46) he cannot achieve such acts. "Therefore by deeds of law there shall no flesh be justified in His sight : for by law is the knowledge of sin." Rom. 3 : 20. "The strength of sin is the law." 1 Cor. 15 ; 56. Thus, the effect of the law on the animal nature is condemning. "The law worketh *wrath*." Rom. 4 : 15. "Law entered, that the offence might abound." 5 : 20.

The result of the condemnation of the law is the infliction of the penalty, which is death. Gen. 2 : 17 ; 3 : 19. Rom. 6 : 23. "Hence, it is appointed unto men once to *die*." Heb. 9 : 27. "By one man sin entered into the world, and *death* by sin : and so death passed upon all men, for that *all* have sinned." Rom. 5 : 12.

As death comes upon mankind because of *condemnation*, it follows that a release from death—in other words, a future life—cannot transpire without the *removal* of condemnation, which is *justification*.

## PROPOSITION G.

*There is no justification for the unbeliever.*

This thesis is the irresistible inference from Rom. 3 : 21 and

5 : 10. The Apostle shows that there is no justification except through faith in Jesus Christ. Consequently, there is no justification for the unbeliever. Rom. 5 : 15-21 is the grand conclusion of the Apostle's argument. The *condemnation to death* which came on the animal race through Adam, its head and representative, is compared with the *justification to life*, which comes on the spiritual race (*i. e.*, those who "believe on Him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead,") through the second Adam, its head and representative. As "the many" or "all" in Adam are condemned, so "the many" or "all" in Christ are justified. Justification for the believer ; no justification for the unbeliever. "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life" (the consequence of justification) ; "but the wrath" ('the law worketh wrath') of God *abideth* on him." John 3 : 36.

#### FOURTH ARGUMENT

*against the resurrection of the wicked.*

None, but the justified, will have a resurrection (Prop. F).

But the wicked are not justified (Prop. G).

Therefore THE WICKED WILL NOT HAVE A RESURRECTION.

#### PROPOSITION H.

*The animal life—when once lost—is forever lost.*

The law of God demands the animal life of man as a forfeit ; and what the law seizes can never be restored. God cannot be just and give back to man that which he has penally taken.

#### PROPOSITION I.

*The wicked have no life but animal life.*

Mankind possess an animal or blood life in the present state of existence. It is corruptible and evanescent. Another life is revealed in the Scriptures, which is spiritual and incorruptible. "The first man Adam" was the medium through which the animal life was communicated ; Jesus, "the last Adam" is the medium to communicate the spiritual life. But the spiritual life is given only to those who have faith. Hence the wicked or unbelieving are debarred from the spiritual life.—They "have no life in" them but animal life. John 6 : 53 ; 5 : 40.

## FIFTH ARGUMENT

*against the resurrection of the wicked.*

Those who have no life but animal life will not have a resurrection. (Prop. H).

But the wicked have no other life. (Prop. I).

Therefore THE WICKED WILL NOT HAVE A RESURRECTION.

## A WRONG INFERENCE FROM A RIGHT PREMISE.

A CRITICISM BY RUFUS WENDELL. 1

RETRIBUTION, on p. 37, says: "Christ has become the great repository of life for mankind." This is one of a series of statements designed to prove that Christ will give life to the wicked dead. We object;—not, however, to the statement, but to the conclusion drawn from it. The assertion is true, but the only Scriptures which can be adduced in its support are uniformly hostile to the idea that the unholy will participate in the life brought to view. Let us cite a few passages. "For as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." John 5: 26. We shall presently see what H. L. H. *once* thought of this passage. The latter clause of it reveals the Son of God as being himself, by the Father's will, a "repository of life." But will "mankind"—all of Adam's race—therefore become partakers of that life irrespective of the moral characters they may bear? Or is its bestowal conditional? Jesus shall instruct us on this point. "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so *he that eateth me, even he shall live by me.*" John 6: 57. The case is a plain one. Our blessed Lord is a "repository of life" *because* he is "the *bread* of life," and if men refuse to eat the "*bread*" they will inevitably fail of the "*life.*" The impenitent do thus refuse, and hence Jesus declares to them, "*ye will not come to me, that ye might have life,*" John 5: 40—language, we may add, which proves that the "life" contained in the Divine "repository" will never be *forced* upon "mankind." As the fountain of *life* "unto the world" (John 6: 33), the mission of Christ is one of blessing only, and hence we are told (1 John 4: 9),

"In this was manifested the *love* of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we *might* live through him"—not *must* "live through him," as *Retribution* would have it.

But *what kind* of "life" does H. L. H.'s theory find in the "great repository"? We answer—a *mortal, corruptible* life for *all* the dead, *good* and bad, and a post-judgment immortal and incorruptible life for the holy. To saint and sinner the first installment of life from the "repository" is an *unavoidable* destiny, and the Saviour's expostulation (already cited) is made to mean, Ye will not come unto me that ye might have life *given* to you *after* you have had "a restoration to a *temporal* existence" forced upon you. A beautiful assumption this to thrust upon the attention of the public, without a single *attempt* to rescue it from the annihilating force of the Apostle's positive statement—"the dead shall be *raised* INCORRUPTIBLE." We presume that the exigencies of this latest and most miserable of theological inventions have something to do with its author's purpose to inflict upon the world a work on "The Resurrection of the Dead." We make deliberate choice of the word *inflict*, for we feel compelled to believe that the advocate of the doctrine of a corruptible life for the righteous—be his talents what they may—cannot produce a work on "The Resurrection of the Dead" that will not be essentially dishonest *or*—a mass of rubbish. We shall "soon" know which, if our author's progress in the enterprise realizes the "hope" he has expressed. Meanwhile, it is proper that our readers should be informed that this notion of a corruptible life for the righteous is gaining adherents among believers in the revival of the wicked dead. And the *World's Crisis* (whose *Editor* is in "Doubting Castle" on the subject) has the honor of being the medium through which the defense of the view by argument is first attempted. This was done a few months since by H. Munger, in an article entitled "A Few Thoughts." When H. L. H. has thrown the light of his meditations and investigations upon the subject, in the forthcoming work, it may be deemed desirable to devote "a few thoughts" to the refutation of his and Mr. Munger's reasonings together. It is due to Mr. M. to state that he claims to have held the view for years. He does not claim to have taught it to the author of *Retribution*, but he does *disclaim* having learned it from

that work. It is also proper to add that Mr. Munger insists that if his view is *not* true, Universalism or No Life out of Christ *must* be true. We told him he was quite right in this; and since we *know* that his theory and Universalism have neither of them any Bible foundation, we heartily embrace the only remaining alternative, and inscribe on our banner—"No *Future* Life out of Christ and No *Corruptible* Resurrection Life in Christ." In the *Crisis* of Oct. 14th, W. Sheldon, a constant contributor to that paper and a warm admirer of *Retribution* and its author, falls into the ranks of this new theory. His article is upon the "Judgment Day," and his third paragraph begins with this sentence:

"Let the judgment come 'in the last day,' then let sentence be passed and executed upon mortals."

The context and the scope of the argument make it certain that these "*mortals*" include the resurrected saints. Not a lisp, however, does this writer offer in explanation of the passages which he very well knows are generally regarded as incontrovertible proof of a contrary opinion. Perhaps his courage will ere long be equal to the undertaking. We wait to see, and, if the occasion is furnished, shall not fail to report progress.

We have perhaps excited the reader's curiosity, by alluding to an opinion *once* held by the author of *Retribution* on the passage, "The Father hath life in himself." These words were used by him as the motto for a very excellent article on "LIFE" in the *EXAMINER* for Dec., 1852. It commences thus:

"Sublime and yet simple as are the teachings of our Saviour, there are few sentences among them all which seem more like loopholes piercing the darkness of nature, and letting in the light of heaven, than this simple announcement."

Did H. L. H. ten years ago dream of such a thing as that Christ would raise up his people *mortal* "in the last day"? No, indeed, if his writings were then, as we believe they were, the expression of his real sentiments. But we will cite his words from the *EXAMINER* article already mentioned. Having spoken of "Adam" as being originally "employed by God as a channel or reservoir through which the principle of natural life could be communicated to the human family," and of the fact that "this channel of communication, having been polluted at the outset," could "only communicate a transient and mortal principle of life to mankind," he proceeds in the following manner:

“For the conveyance of immortal life to his people, God has in wisdom selected another medium—not liable to the accidents to which the former medium was subject, but able to preserve and convey to mankind, unpolluted and unimpaired, the treasure committed to him. Such a medium we recognize in the Second Adam—the Lord from heaven.

“That He might effectually restore and redeem the human race, that he might fully remove the evils resulting from the transgression of our common father, and that he might communicate to his followers a deathless and eternal existence, it pleased God that in him all fullness should dwell, and ‘as the Father hath Life in Himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself.’ And as the Father is able to raise the dead from their graves, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will. In him was life, and amid the darkness that engirded and enshrouded a death-doomed race, this only could afford them relief. ‘The Life was *the light of men.*’ He boldly declares himself to be the way, the truth, and the Life; and informs us that while the object of thieves was to kill and steal, his object was the communication of a more abundant, yea, a boundless Life. Standing by the sepulchre of a departed friend, he, for the consolation of the mourners, declared himself the Resurrection and the Life. And the apostle in accordance with this, while exhorting his brethren to heavenly mindedness informs them that (as they have, by putting off the old man with his works, renounced their relationship to Adam,) they are dead, and their life is hid with Christ in God; and consequently he points them onward to the period when He who is *their life*, shall appear as the time when they also shall appear with him in glory.”

What a deplorable thing it is that the man who could once write these sentiments should ever have been able to forget them long enough to pen such a tirade on “the doom of the ungodly” as was sent forth in 1861. But we have no space for reflections of this kind. Recalling now the *Retribution* statement that “Christ has become the great depository of life for mankind,” and requesting the reader to keep in mind its intended bearing upon the revival of the wicked dead, we resume our quotation from H. L. H.’s “Life” article at the point where we closed our extract above. He says: —

“The conditions upon which the human family receive the Life, which is deposited for them in Christ, are so clearly revealed in the Word of God, as to preclude the necessity for mistake. If we would partake of the life and nature of the vine, a living bond of union must exist between us. God hath sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live *through him*. And ‘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.’

“If we would partake of this life we must grasp firmly the Life Giver, by an unwavering faith. If we would enter into life we must keep his



commandments. And if we thus patiently continue in well-doing, if we seek for glory, and honor, and immortality, God will grant to us, at the resurrection of the just, his priceless 'gift'—*Eternal Life.*"

To all which we say *Amen* and *Amen*. If H. L. H. could see it to be his duty to burn up his "second edition" of *Retribution*, and then devote himself to scattering his EXAMINER "LIFE" article like leaves all over the land, in tract form, we could heartily wish him God-speed in the work. It would show that he was returning to "the old paths." We should esteem a journey on foot from Salem to Boston well repaid, if we could induce him at least to insert the article entire in his contemplated work on "The Resurrection of the Dead." Such expressions as "grasp firmly the Life Giver" would be in most refreshing antagonism to the phraseology which will be needed to elaborate his new discovery of a mortal resurrection life for the saints, while they would prove an excellent antidote for that pernicious fiction. The "Life" article—in which we see nothing to dissent from—concludes as follows :

"This is the great discovery of the Gospel. Christ hath abolished death and brought Life and immortality to light in it; and in this blessed revelation we rejoice. In the language of Saurin we may say:—'Death, then, has nothing, henceforward, that is formidable to the Christian. In the tomb of Jesus Christ are dissipated all the terrors which the tomb of nature presents. In the tomb of nature I perceive a gloomy night, which the eye is unable to penetrate; in the tomb of Jesus Christ I behold light and life. In the tomb of nature the punishment of sin stares me in the face; in the tomb of Jesus Christ I find the expiation of it. In the tomb of nature I read the fearful doom pronounced upon Adam and upon all his miserable posterity: Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return; but in the tomb of Jesus Christ my tongue is loosed into this triumphant song of praise, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? . . . Thanks be to God who giveth us the victory, through our Lord Jesus Christ." Through death he has destroyed him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; that he might deliver them who through fear of death were all their life-time subject to bondage.'"

---

### "PERVERSE AND IGNORANT CRITICISM."

THERE is in *Retribution* quite an assortment of arguments and replies to arguments which have not yet been noticed in the EXAMINER. We give below an extract from that work :

"Job says, 'Drought and heat consume the snow waters; so doth the grave (SHEOL,) those which have sinned. The womb shall forget him; the worm shall feed sweetly on him: he shall be no more remembered; and wickedness shall be broken as a tree.' Job xxiv. 19. Hence, it is said sinners are as totally consumed in SHEOL as snow waters are by drought and heat, and we might as soon expect a broken tree to be restored, as a dead sinner to be made alive in his wickedness.

"But if it be claimed that SHEOL consumes *eternally*, those who have *sinned*, the Apostle says, '*all have sinned*,' and this interpretation of the passage would cut off all hope for any one. And Job says, almost in the next breath, 'no man is sure of life,' and again, 'As the cloud is consumed and vanisheth away; so he that goeth down to the grave (SHEOL,) shall *come up* no more.' Job vii. 9. And Jacob said, 'I *will go down* into the grave, (SHEOL,) unto my son mourning.' Gen. xxxvii. 35."\*\*\*  
 "If SHEOL consumes *men* as drought does waters, it may be worthy of note that all the waters consumed by '*drought*' come back again in *rain*. And besides, the time *when* wicked men are thus consumed *may* be the time when the wicked are *turned back* or *return* into SHEOL. And notwithstanding all this array of Scripture about SHEOL, Jacob *will* come forth from thence, HADES *will* deliver up the dead that are therein, and though SHEOL may consume *all* because death hath 'passed upon all men for that all have sinned,' yet there shall be a resurrection of the dead just and unjust. And though saints and sinners now lie commingled in the grave, yet at the last day not only shall 'they that have done good,' come forth to 'the resurrection of life,' but also they "that have done evil to the resurrection of condemnation.'" pp. 90-92.

The logical acuteness displayed in the above extract will be obvious to every reader who will analyze it with a little care. Let us see what it amounts to.

The statement cited from Job 24th embraces the 20th verse as well as the 19th. The author of Retribution knows very well that those who employ it to prove the non-resurrection of the wicked regard it as designating, not those who merely commit sin, but those who also *die in their sins*. More than this, he himself distinctly affirms that "the time *when* wicked men are thus consumed" [i. e., as stated in Job 24 : 19, 20] "*may* be the time when the wicked are *turned back* or *return* into SHEOL." The idea, then, that "SHEOL consumes *eternally* those who have *sinned*" *may* be conveyed by the passage, *Retribution* being authority for the statement. What now?—  
 "Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter." Says our astute author,—  
 "if it be claimed that SHEOL consumes *eternally*, those who have *sinned*; the Apostle says, '*all have sinned*,' and *this interpretation of the passage*"—namely, the very interpretation which H. L. H. declares "*may* be" the *true one*—"would

cut off *all hope for any one.*" A fitting comment on this kind of logic is best made in the language of inspiration: "So they hanged Haman on the gallows that he had prepared for Mordecai." (Esther 7: 10.) Our author may think we have *mis-applied* this historical incident, but as it was "written for our learning" we hope he may be instructed by it. He will certainly acquit us of any "combining and twisting" in making the quotation.

But, asks one, is not the deduction of the author of *Retribution* a fair one? *No*—and for this plain reason; the phrase of the Apostle, "all have sinned" (Rom. 3: 23), is not equivalent to Job's phrase, "those who have sinned." The former describes a class to whom salvation is possible; the latter, those who *die in impenitence*. Nothing could be more unfair than the manner in which our author, by "combining" passages so manifestly irrelevant to each other, seeks to draw an inference against the view held by his opponents.

Job 7: 9 is not parallel to Job 24: 19, 20, and presents no difficulty whatever. The 10th verse makes the matter plain, and is as follows: "He shall return no more to HIS HOUSE, neither shall HIS PLACE know him any more." The final "more" of v. 9, being in italic, seems to have been supplied by the translators, though in *Retribution* it is found in small capitals. Any one will see that Job 7: 9, 10, is compatible with a resurrection. The author of *Retribution* gives no reason for supposing that the same is true of Job 24: 19, 20. His insinuation that it may be applicable to *all* because "death hath passed upon all men," is sufficiently contradicted by the clear scope of the passage. His "*may be*" explanation, by which he applies it to the finally impenitent, involves him, as we have seen, in the denial of a future life to any body. His suggestion concerning a "*return into SHEOL*" shall receive attention when he attempts an answer to Mr. Curry's recent criticism on Psalms 9: 17.—We would suggest that he might derive much advantage from a careful study of that brother's EXAMINER articles on "The Doctrine of the Resurrection." It would be especially gratifying to us to see him display his powers of refutation upon Mr. C.'s "Second Argument against the resurrection of the wicked," found in the Oct. number. We regard it as *absolutely unanswerable*. It certainly was not met by Mr. Grew when presented,

in 1856, by the writer of this article. In this connection we will say that we accept Mr. Curry's "Second Argument" as an ample fulfillment of our promise, in the May EXAMINER, that we should "hereafter undertake to show that Christ's discourse with the Sadducees proves positively that the righteous only are *thus* [i. e., *temporarily*] dead."

As to Jacob's descent into SHEOL, we need merely remark that the Bible does not say that the grave consumes him or that death feeds upon him. On the contrary, his resurrection is expressly taught, over and over again. May it be our earnest endeavor to meet him in the kingdom of God.

We now quote from *Retribution* the matter whose omission is indicated by stars in the above extract :

"So that by a little combining and twisting, by misapplying a few passages, by making that which was indefinite, absolute, unlimited, and universal, we might prove that *no* person ever would have a resurrection from the dead ; but that all were consigned to indiscriminate annihilation and eternal sleep. And then, with sufficient skill, we might no doubt pervert every passage that teaches these facts, as some men prove that there is no Holy Spirit, but the word ; or no baptism, but that of the Holy Ghost ; or no devil, but an evil principle ; or no coming of Christ, but a figurative coming ; thus subverting faith and hope, and making shipwreck and havoc among those who are ready to believe anything which their particular leaders teach. From such perverse and ignorant criticism as this, may the Lord in mercy save honest men and true Christians."

We have thus given entire the 5th Section of "Part II" of *Retribution*. Whether our author's invocation, at the close of the last extract, has necessarily failed of an answer because *he* has not been saved from the kind of "criticism" he professes to despise, we leave our readers to judge.

In conclusion, the writer wishes to say that he has changed his mind as to the propriety of dismissing *Retribution* from the attention of the readers of this magazine. We are now quite settled in the conviction that the shallowness of its claims to fairness and sound logic should be more thoroughly exposed. To say we *can* answer its arguments, is hardly as well as to be able to say they *have* been answered, and point to the columns of the EXAMINER in proof of the assertion. The question is prominently before the people ; and since *Retribution* seems to have a pretty wide circulation among those who are interested in the subject, while the columns of the *Crisis* are closed against the

presentation of the arguments for Life only in Christ, it seems needful to show more fully than has yet been done, that H. L. H.'s theory rests upon arguments that will not bear the test of careful examination, however calculated many of them may be to convince or confound persons whose habits of investigation or want of time disqualify them for placing a correct estimate upon the work. Some of its most objectionable features have not yet been named in the EXAMINER.

R. W.

Salem, Mass., Nov. 1, 1862.

---

THE TREE AND ITS FRUIT: or, *Life from the Dead to torment and kill again a specious heresy.*—If a resurrection from the dead with torment after and dying a second time “is the wages of sin,” or the penalty of the law, then *how* is an atonement to be made? Did Christ die *twice*? Did He rise from the dead and suffer torment for awhile and then die again? If not, how are his sufferings and death *once* an atonement for sin? or, how did He vindicate the claims of the law, seeing He did not come under its penalty at all? Surely, this new invention of penalty strikes down the atonement, as Christ did not come under any *such* “curse of the law.” In this sense of the *penalty*, He was *not* “made a curse for us.” But the Apostle affirms, “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being *made a curse* for us:” Gal. 3 : 13.

Here then we plant ourself—Christ has not “redeemed us” at all—as He did not suffer *such* “a curse” as that of life from the dead to be tormented and die again—or the penalty for sin was to die “*once*,” and not *two* deaths, as maintained by the advocates of a future life to the wicked, with torment and another death.—Such a doctrine is a virtual denial of the atonement, and “Christ is become of no effect” for salvation “from the curse of the law,” according to that theory. But “Christ being raised from the dead *dieth no more*; death hath no more dominion over Him” \* \* “He died unto sin *once*”—“Christ was *once* offered for sin.” Rom. 6 : 9, 10. Heb. 9 : 28. If *once* in death is *not* “the wages of sin,” we repeat it, *no atonement is made*, and there is no deliverance for any child of man from the curse of the law.

To our mind it is a self-evident truth that no wicked man,

dying in his sins, will ever live again : his death is final and eternal : he is "holden with the cords of his sins," and "utterly perishes in his own corruption." Prov. 5 : 22. 2 Pet. 2 : 12.

---

### FREE DISCUSSION.

FROM O. R. L. CROZIER.

*Grand Rapids, Mich., Oct., 1862.*

TO EDITOR OF BIBLE EXAMINER :—I must thank you for your generous consent to publish my concluding article in the War Discussion, which I have been holding in the *Millennial Harbinger* with its Editor. A word on its exclusion from that paper may be due.

On the breaking out of the present war, the *Harbinger* took strenuous non-resistant ground, and has so far failed to appreciate the moral issues involved in the war, that it has usually placed the combatants on a par, and has not, as I have observed, uttered a word editorially of sympathy for our government, but has repeatedly assailed it with asperity. Some of its patrons persistently but kindly sought a hearing on the "other side" of the "Bible Question" involved, but were harshly repulsed for more than a year ! But the *Harbinger* is "a free paper, giving freedom of thought to all" !!! So is the *Boston Pilot*, if you will only think as its Editor does. In his issue for Jan. 29, 1862, the Editor accepted our proposal for a hearing, and decided that it should be a discussion, each side to have not only "three or four articles," but "twelve columns." After four months more of sundry moves still to shut off the subject, my first No. appeared June 4 ; and my fourth No. appeared in Aug. With that No. I stated that I would fill out my remaining space with a closing article. The Editor made no objection till he saw my article ; and then "laid it on the shelf," claiming that as I had had "four articles," I was not entitled to any further hearing. We were to have "twelve columns each." I have used ten columns, and he thirteen and a half. He had no right to use in the discussion more than twelve columns, much less to cut me off short of twelve. But he eats *his* pie and more too, and then rudely snatches the remainder of mine !

As we were to have "twelve columns each," and as he has already used thirteen and a half, I submit that he is bound in fairness to allow me to fill out my twelve columns, *without reply*.

No doubt the Editor of the *Harbinger* thinks he has done right in all this matter. A man whose moral sense will allow him to hold his paper dumb even (to say nothing of being on the wrong side) when

civil and religious liberty is trembling in the balance, as it has been and still is in this mighty struggle, would seem capable of any degree of stultification. How can a man be expected to regard the rights of a correspondent, who is indifferent to the rights of 4,000,000 of men; yea, of a nation of 30,000,000; yea, of the whole brotherhood of men? for so broad do the issues of this struggle extend. The rebels could hardly ask a better religious ally at the North than the *Harbinger* has been, steadily denouncing the judgments of God against any who should help to put them down. It is rather cool for a foreigner to ask our support in such a work as this.

I wish our editors might see and use the present chances to intone public sentiment with an honest conscience: direct the aroused mind of the nation toward righteousness and truth.

The following is the *rejected* article, which I now lay before the readers of the *EXAMINER*.

#### DISCUSSION--WAR.

QUESTION.—Is it right for Christians to support Civil Governments during the times of the gentiles, to the extent of bearing arms in their behalf?

#### AFFIRMATIVE, No. 5.—CLOSE.

My respondent is the Editor, I learn by his last No. As he is English by birth and sympathy, his indifference toward our Government in its extreme peril, is not strange; we trust, however, he will bear with us Americans, if we exhibit a lively interest in its welfare. But, to close the Affirmative—

1. We should guard against allowing our wish to escape responsibility, to control our judgment in deciding what is right in this as in every other matter. Some men don't see, because they don't want to see; but the right side is the best side on every subject, whatever it may cost us.

2. The *burden of proof*, in this discussion, has been misapprehended by the Negative. He says, "We do not say to *the world*, 'It is wrong to fight.'" He thus admits, as a general principle, that it is right to bear arms in support of civil government. That is precisely the doctrine of the Affirmative, and we extend that principle over all men, and hold that *all* who live under and enjoy the benefits of a government, are bound in right to support and defend it. If becoming a Christian excuses a man from rendering the government any aid it may need to secure its existence or its success, while it allows him selfishly to enjoy the blessings of that government at other people's cost and risk, this feature of Christianity is, apparently, so utterly at variance with the "golden rule" of Christianity as to call upon the Negative for the most positive proof of its existence. The Negative allows that it is *right* for "the world to fight:" now let him prove that it is *wrong* for Christians to do *right*, or else abandon his ground.

3. I fail to see the relevancy of most of the Scriptures used by the

Negative. Copying many texts is one thing; citing and properly applying such as are applicable is quite another thing. Of the latter, two will represent the whole—1. "Love your enemies." This is used so loosely by the Negative as to forbid any chastisement of evil doers: but their punishment to any extent that may be necessary in order to protect the rights of good men, is not incompatible with loving our enemies. We are not required to be any more perfect than God, nor to love our enemies more than he loves his: and, after blessing them long, and all efforts to reform them failing, "*all the wicked will he destroy!*" 2. "Resist not evil." This is used about as loosely as the other. One text will suffice to answer the Negative on this passage, and that is, "Resist the Devil." Now, certainly, the Devil is "evil;" and the Negative, by his mode of argument, would require this text to read: "Resist *not* the devil!"

4. The Scriptures seem very plain. Hear them:

"Render therefore unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's." "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works but to the evil." \* \* \* "For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.—Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake."

"Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, to be ready to every good work."

"Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king as supreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well. For so is the will of God, that with well-doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men. . . . Honor the king."

These texts, and others cited in my first and second numbers, make the duty of the Christian in the present time plain. It may not be his duty to volunteer: but if called upon by the Government, when it really needs his aid, to bear arms in its support, would the above quoted Scriptures allow him to refuse? When our Chief Magistrate says, Come, can the Christian say, I will not come, and yet claim that he "obeys the Magistrate?" Can he thus resist the power without incurring "*damnation?*" Better die on the field of battle than perish under the displeasure of God.

To obey magistrates in a lawful demand is to obey God: we cannot, as I see, in such a case, excuse ourselves from the former by pleading the paramount obligation of the latter. There is no conflict between the two, so long as the Government is a terror to evil-doers and a praise to them that do well. Providence seems to be forcing our Government in that direction, and I hope ere long its confidence



in the morality of the nation will induce the bold and noble policy that the occasion and justice demand ; to let all the loyal men help in the most effectual way to put down all the disloyal.

5. It is hardly fair for my opponent, shielded by his foreign citizenship, to counsel his brethren [as he has done] to brave the *odium* and PENALTY of Treason. Perhaps he "can afford" it ; but we, Americans, cannot. Such reckless disregard of public faith will do our cause no good. All know that Christ and his disciples were *falsely* accused of treason. Surely, this will not justify us for being actually guilty of it.

6. "The legitimate effects of having the war spirit," as intended to apply by the Negative, exist only in his fancy ; and they are paraded in this discussion from want of better argument. I am not aware that any of our brethren who believe that the Government is entitled to Christian support in its present struggle, have lost their former piety or are any less devout or honest than those who differ from them, or are any more blood-thirsty or vindictive. They are much like other men : and would gladly escape cost and peril and the use of harsh means, if they could do it honestly ; but they are not willing to ignore Scripture and stultify common sense to excuse selfishness or timidity. They are practical men, and are willing to do their whole duty in every relation of life, and co-operate, in their humble spheres, with the powers ordained of God for the public welfare.

7. Finally, we may still differ on this question, and honestly so. Let us be cautious and kind ; and allow freedom of honest expression and action. Each must act upon his own convictions ; and is responsible for his own conduct. Honest diversity in such matters is no bar to Christian fellowship. Give our brethren a fair chance, and they will come out right on this, as on other subjects. Let us all be faithful to the word, whatever may come : this is our only safety. If great trials await us, great grace will be given to bear them. Nothing will be suffered to befall us that cannot be made to work for our good, either in this life or the life to come. The present state of things should cause us to pray more fervently than ever, Thy kingdom come. Let us labor, and be ready for it.

O. R. L. CROZIER.

---

A QUESTION OF "PRIVILEGE."—*Brother Editor.*—Will you allow me, in behalf of the "*fighting brethren*," to protest against the invasion of our privileges by our pacific brethren, and to file our claim to the exclusive use of such "*carnal weapons*" as the following, *to wit* :

1. Charging brethren with "*corruption*" and a "*general relaxing of fidelity to Christianity*," for *one* shade of difference in opinion ; with "*deceiving the hearts of the simple*" by "*throwing fog and dust*" with "*fair speeches and vain babbling*."

2. All boasting of our superior "patience," and other virtues; calling brethren "*envious*," "*wicked*," "*liars*," "*cowards*," "*wolves*," "*devils*," &c., for different views of policy, or expressing through a paper or in meeting opinions different from our own. We insist upon our monopoly of all such epithets, and deprecate the soiling with them of lips fresh with the honied words of "love."

3. Crying "*shame*," in default of Scriptural arguments. The impugning of motives; persistently trying, by misrepresentation, to keep those who differ from us in a false light; trying to prevent a fair hearing by others of views which we disapprove—these "works of darkness" we can not consent to share in common with those who deprecate our "profession."

4. We also claim the exclusive exercise of the office of public *scavenger*, to hunt out and publish, by direct charge or by insinuation, the missteps of brethren who seem to be in our way, either of old or recent date, and whether or not we have, by years of affiliation, testified our satisfaction of the offender's innocence, or with his reformation.

5. We further claim, as appropriately ours, the entire right to promote discord, schisms, divisions, party strife, and selfish interests as opposed to the best interests of the church; and the exclusive privilege to be unkind, implacable, resentful.

The aforesaid exhibitions of the "carnal mind," *et id omnia genus*, are all munitions of *war*, and belong to the War Power, and I claim, in behalf of the War Fraternity, their exclusive use *at discretion*. If we shall seem over-lenient, and appear too long to forbear the use of such harsh means, our more civil brethren may rest assured that this is merely a profound stratagem, by which we shall the more certainly gain our object, ("if by any means we may save some,") and with the least possible sacrifice of life and property; and we pray that they will not, in their over-zeal, try to wrest these dangerous weapons out of our hands. We are happy to relieve our "*mild*" and "*peaceable*" brethren by assuring them that we will attend to these unpleasant duties which grow out of "*the war spirit*," so far as it may seem to us "a military necessity," and that they can, without detriment to the general welfare, give themselves to those more amiable practices which "make for peace," and "things whereby we may edify one another."

In order that all whom it may concern may be informed of this our caveat, I imitate the example of others, with some addition, and request that the *Harbinger*, *Banner*, *Teacher*, *Crisis*, *Review*, &c., &c., will "PLEASE COPY."

Hoping that we may learn wisdom by the things which we have suffered, and put away all anger, wrath, malice, evil-speaking, and bitterness—love, not in word only, but in deed and in truth—and put on charity which is the bond of perfectness,

I am truly yours in the gospel of peace on earth and good will toward men.

O. R. L. CROZIER.

*Grand Rapids, Mich., Oct. 30, 1862.*

A NEW WEEKLY PAPER has been suggested by some Advent friends in Michigan, intended to be established on a liberal basis, giving to all persons interested in the Advent and Life views an equal opportunity to confer together on those and kindred subjects ; designed to be a first class weekly paper, and unite as far as possible all kindly disposed Christians in one body so far as to interchange thoughts and views in a spirit of good will to men, to treat all with Christian courtesy however differing on the various topics which may come up for investigation. That such a medium of *weekly* communication is much needed we have long felt. Those papers which are conducted by persons who exclude whatever does not exactly harmonize with their own views, do not meet the necessity of the times in which we live. They might answer for the age of popery ; but that night is too far passed to submit to such exclusiveness,—and a liberal, tolerant weekly periodical is needed, and must soon be had, if there is to be any salvation from innumerable factions with their petty leaders to lord it over such as can be gathered around them.

The “Michigan Church Conference” has made a move in this matter, and appointed a Committee to confer with individuals and other Conferences on the subject. O. R. L. CROZIER, *Grand Rapids, Mich.*, is the person to whom communications can be made on the subject, and who was appointed by that Conference to correspond on the subject. We wish the effort success.

---

## LETTERS AND EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

G. W. DENNY, of Conn, writes:—I have read “Retribution” and find its position is, that the wages of sin is *torment* ; at least, in part. When I left the sectarian faith eighteen years ago, I discarded eternal suffering as unscriptural—not being the wages of sin, as I had previously supposed. I find limited torment quite as unscriptural, and therefore reject both ; still believing God’s word—“The wages of sin is *death*.”

The EXAMINER seems to be just the thing for the times, and I should be glad to see it issued weekly : I think that would be much better received ; and will, if it contains domestic and foreign news, be well sustained. I send you \$5. Use it in some way to glorify our Father which art in heaven. If the EXAMINER appears weekly I will pay *ten* dollars the first year, and perhaps more.

VOICES FROM THE ARMY.—*Camp Hitchcock, Hilton Head, S. C., Oct. 21, '62.*

TO ED. BIBLE EXAMINER.—It is with pleasure we send you herewith \$4, for your valuable magazine. Through the kindness of a chosen friend in our adopted State, we have received the EXAMINER from time to time. We consider it not only a duty but a privilege, and honorable, to be contributors, and thereby supporters of so valuable, free, and open-spoken magazine. Many well digested and chosen articles are lost to the religious public from being rejected by others—that have the might—not right—to reject all articles that are not in harmony with their conceited views of the interpretation of Scripture. We are happy that we can inform our friends there is one periodical where they can have their views presented—where a liberal Christian inquiry can be made—and a candid hearing granted. We have the privilege of presenting the EXAMINER as that paper.

We receive the *Crisis* at the hand of those remaining in our New England homes. The time has been when a privilege was granted to all lovers of truth to present their views and ask candid questions through its columns; but at present it appears to be the prerogative—if not the right—of its Editor to reject all articles he may please to call contentious.

While we write one of our fellow soldiers comes along, and we inform him of the subject of our letter. He says, "I am a Methodist in denomination, but liberal to all who would follow our Lord; so I shall take the EXAMINER. I have read it at your hand, and you will please send Bro. Storrs \$1 for me." As soldiers, we that have enlisted for the liberty and light of others, find we are rejected by those who in other days received us as those of like precious faith. The receiving of the truth of life from the dead only through Christ, turned many away. Enlisting in this war—though we intend to "do violence to no man"—turned away many others, and brought down many hard judgments (of others) upon us. Yet while cast down by them we have great reason to thank God we are neither destroyed or forsaken by Him. We are happy to say to you, many are interested to hear the truth, even here in the army: and many times our tent is witness of their interest while they spend many evenings with us in talking of these things, asking questions and offering objections and views which make it interesting to both us and them. Some have already become convinced that all their hope of *future reliving* depends upon a resurrection to life through Christ: others are convinced that the doctrine of eternal misery is a dogma, dishonorable to the good and wise God we would adore. We hope soon to be able to give you a good report of the workings of the truly rich articles in the EXAMINER; also the light and truth others have obtained by reading your work, "*Life from the Dead*," which we received from Conn. You will please accept this from those, who, though times are hard and our (government) pay small, feel it not only a duty but a privilege to offer our little in support of your magazine; and we would cheerfully share with you in these trying times. We say, God bless and prosper you in issuing the EXAMINER and other works that shall scatter

fight and give instruction to the people, to lead them to the LIFE-OVER.

Comp. A. 7th Reg. Conn. Volunteers.

{ T. K. BUTLER,  
J. W. CRADTRE,  
ALBERT W. PIERCE.

Mrs. C. E. CONKLIN, Seneca Falls, writes :—The cause of God in this place moves slow but steadily on. Brother GUTHRIE gave us a discourse the other evening on the time of partaking the Lord's Supper. It was good and timely, as the brethren had discussed the subject some. I think the prospect bids fair that we shall adopt the Scripture mode hereafter : but it's so hard after we see the truth to break away from old habits. The first time I ever heard the idea advanced of no life from the dead for the wicked, I said, "That looks just like God." Yet the thought occurred to me that there was much Scripture to refute it. I was surprised after examining the subject, to see how easily those Scriptures were reconciled, except the one in John 5 : 28, 29. That still remains obscure. I lay it aside, frankly confessing that I do not know its true import. But on the other hand, I find so many more Scriptures that I cannot reconcile with my former views, that now I stand as firm as a rock on God's word. It is hard to convince a person against their will, and I fear there are too many persons—I will not say Christians, for it is not Christ-like—who derive "comfort," as Doct. Field says, in the thought that their enemies will be tormented hereafter. How unlike the teachings of Christ, who said, "Love your enemies." I think in studying the Scriptures we want to use common sense just as we would in any thing else. God has himself said, "Come and let us reason together."

I am glad to see the EXAMINER sustained, and it is not for the want of a disposition on my part, that I am not helping to bring about its weekly visits. No, no. Its contents are soon devoured after its arrival—and then a long month before another. However I am glad to get it at all. I have so often thought of the sermon you preached last winter on the 6th of John. How I wish it could be published : it was always an intricate chapter to me, and you made it so plain. I was glad to see Bro. Wendell take up some portions of it.

HELEN ROBERTSON, *Ulrica*, writes us :—I sometimes feel that we may have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet not have many fathers ; for, by the grace of God, you have been the means of leading me into truths, to which, perhaps, I might otherwise have been a stranger.—Thank God : and may He bless you, and give you a crown of rejoicing in that day when Paul gets his. There is not much rejoicing now ; we are all groaning and crying for the redemption. It will come.

I sometimes think how you have stood when nearly all men forsook you ; but the time has come when ways will open for you to go and preach to the people "the words of *this life*." I learned from a friend in Boston of your being there, and how you succeeded. How I blessed the LORD. There will be opposition : we expect it ; but thank God so many were willing to hear.

Praise the Lord that we have a BIBLE EXAMINER *in truth*. It will be kept up—there is no doubt of that ; and I, for one, say, let us have it, at least semi-monthly. Perhaps it is not quite time yet to have a weekly issue. I know its present form is more expensive, but it is so neat, and it keeps it separate from other papers. I would rather pay more than have it changed to newspaper form.

In a friendly discussion with a minister, who believes the saints are conscious when dead, he cited 2 Corth. 5. I told him that *seemed* like going to heaven if other Scriptures taught so ; but they did not ; so that being *indefinite language* must mean something else. I studied that chapter after we parted, and I think if they make out that "earthly house" to mean the human body, and the immortal soul goes *right* to that "building of God," "in the heavens," they must believe in the "transmigration of souls"! What else is it? It is the soul going from one body to another. And what is the use of the resurrection? O, absurdity!

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—The writer of the foregoing is the daughter of a pious and devoted Baptist minister in one of the western States, who came from Scotland some years since to enjoy a more perfect liberty to serve God according to his own convictions of the experience of religion. The daughter seems to have shared in her father's spirit, but has gone in advance of him on the life question. She was led two or three years since into the glorious truth of "*No Life out of Christ*," and is fully settled in the fact that *life from the dead* is only to the righteous. May the LORD sustain her in all her conflicts.

RUFUS WENDELL writes, Salem, Nov. 3d :—There were times, a few years ago, when you were tempted to believe your work in behalf of truth was about accomplished. How impressively has this idea been disproved by the events of the last two years—of the last year especially. I have not time to dwell upon this thought, though it is one of much interest to me. May God preserve your health and life until your work is all done, and bring you through Christ to His eternal glory.

Such a day as yesterday I have not known since I began to preach. Our morning Conference meeting was a precious one, and I raised the standard of no life out of Christ, expressing in strong terms my joy in being delivered from the last vestige of the old endless misery theory. In the afternoon I spoke on the words, "If thou wilt enter into LIFE, keep the commandments, and with the Lord's help I proclaimed Life only in Christ with an energy that was *never* given me before. O, what enlargement of soul I experienced while seeking to

press home this precious truth on the attention of my congregation ! It seemed as if I could not stop discoursing on the blessed theme.

---

THANKS BE TO GOD.—The *Editor* of this magazine feels to give praise to the LORD for the mercy received from His hands in temporal and spiritual things. He has truly lived, the year past, in temporal things with as little light before him as he has ever had ; but his mind has been kept in unusual freedom from anxiety in the matter, and God has not left him to distrust His care, nor to suffer for things needful. But the Editor feels especially to praise his Redeemer that he has evidence this year, more than for many years, that his ministry of the word has not been in vain. A short time since a sailor called on him, who had been awakened and led to Christ, the Life-giver, by his preaching at Botanic Hall, in this city, last spring ; since which time he has been one voyage to sea, and comes home rejoicing in his Redeemer. The same day that this sailor visited us, and told us of his joy in the Life-giver, a gentleman called on us, and said, “ You have been a great blessing to me. I came to this city an infidel and a blasphemer—I was led by curiosity to hear you preach at Botanic Hall—it was on *Life only through Christ*—it was new and strange to me, and I became deeply interested, and determined to seek that life—I did so, and found the Saviour, and am now filled with joy in Him—I went to my home, in another city, and told my wife I had given my heart to Christ to love and serve Him, and she was induced to seek life, also ; and now we are both rejoicing in the LIFE-GIVER—the Bible to us is a new and most interesting book, and so plain and easy to be understood—how different from what it used to be.”

Such was a part of his conversation with us, and we could not refrain from praising God with our whole heart : bless His holy name. Here was given us living evidence that the doctrine of “ life only through Christ,” presented and pressed home for the acceptance of the sinner, is made effectual by the Holy Spirit in leading to *seek* life. Again, we praise our Redeemer for His love and mercy.

We desire that all who hold with us on the life theme may not

only present the glorious truths we have received, but urge it on sinners to seek life in 'Christ without delay ; for, if death sets in on them before a union is established with Christ, they will sink in endless night, and "never see the light" again. Hasten, sinner, whoever thou art, to Christ *for life*. The *theory* is good, but you must have the *experience* or perish without hope. Delay not then another hour—take hold on Christ—consecrate yourself to Him without reserve, and He will take away your sins and enroll your name in His "*book of life*." May that, dear reader, be your happy lot. Come now ; make the consecration while you read these lines—let there be no delay—no putting the matter off for an hour. *Be the Lord's now and forever*. So shall you be raised "up at the last day," and live to die no more.

---

STRANGE FACT.—The London correspondent of the *Dublin Evening Mail* gives the following remarkable and interesting account of measures taken by the Jews in anticipation of their restoration to the Holy Land, stating that his information is derived from different and altogether eligible quarters, from which an insight was accidentally gained into these remarkable workings of Jewish enterprise and opulence. Conscious that, during their long expulsion from a land of their own, the habits they have acquired totally unfit them for the possession and cultivation of their ancient country, should they be reinstated in it, they have founded a college near Paris, to which the sons of many of the best Jewish families have been sent to receive, in addition to the ordinary branches of education, instruction in the principles of scientific knowledge relative to agriculture. What is yet more extraordinary, and the more so from their own explanation of the measure, is their distribution in Italy, through an agent appointed by themselves, of copies of the New Testament. In justification of this strange and apparently inconsistent step they assign the following reason: "The Protestants, wherever we find them, treat us, on the whole, well, and have no political interests opposed to our return to power. The Roman Catholic Church, on the contrary, by the countries which submit to its dictation, is enabled to exercise, and does actually exert, a very strong influence in a direction entirely contrary to our desires. The only argument which we have ever found that Church una-



ble to answer is the New Testament. Let us therefore spread it over her own peculiar soil." Among the many dangers which now threaten the political influence of the See of Rome, it is indeed remarkable if we have to reckon the distribution of the New Testament in its immediate vicinity by Jewish hands.—*Liverpool Courier.*

---

WHAT THINK YE OF CHRIST?—What are our views of his person, his priesthood, his atonement, his intercession, his power, truth and love? Is he altogether glorious in our eyes, and precious to our hearts? Do we trust in him as the incarnate Son of God, and submit to him as anointed King of Israel? Do we apply to him in all his characters and offices? Do we desire that all his enemies should be put under his feet, without excepting any of our own sinful passions? Do we deem him entitled to all the service and honor which we can possibly render him, and far more? According to a man's practical judgment in these matters, will his state, character, and conduct be.—*Dr. T. Scott.*

---

BIBLE EXAMINER.—This volume is now closed; 18 numbers in all; *six* of which were issued in 1861. Any subscriber who has paid \$1 for *this* year, shall have the six numbers of *last* year without charge, if sent for soon; or while any of those numbers are left.

Will our friends who intend to renew their subscriptions do so immediately, that we may know how many to print for January, 1863? Unless we do know this, we cannot pledge ourself to furnish *that* number to them; as paper has advanced in price so much recently, we cannot print more than are actually wanted. Let our friends act at once, and we shall go safely on: otherwise we shall be embarrassed in the work. If it is "hard times" with any of you, it is equally so with us; and the *littles* from the *many* will be felt less by them than for us (one) to bear the burden alone. The BIBLE EXAMINER *must* be issued, and it *will* be. No other periodical does or can supply its place. Let its friends speak immediately, *financially*; and they need not confine themselves to \$1; if their liberal hearts are disposed they

can send two, five, ten, twenty, or a hundred dollars to its support, and thereby strengthen the hands of its Editor. The same amount of funds will not pay the expenses of this Magazine for the next year that did this. Nearly everything to be paid for is much higher, and still increasing. Our friends will see the necessity of persevering and increased efforts. Give us but a tithe of the self-sacrifice and pouring forth of funds manifested by some in procuring "volunteers for the war," and we shall be abundantly sustained in the greater work of emancipating the minds of men from the degrading and God-dishonoring traditions which have so long enslaved them.

Shall we have the needed aid? and shall it be forthcoming at once? If you intend to help on the work do not delay till you lose the feeling now aroused on the subject; but go immediately to every one there is any prospect of succeeding with, and see what can be done to put the EXAMINER on a permanent basis for the coming year. Let us hear from you at the earliest period possible. The *January* number may be delayed in its appearance unless we have early remittances from all our subscribers and friends.

Let our directions about remitting funds be strictly attended to. See third page of cover. See also our *offers* to those who send us money, and in relation to the EXAMINER bound or unbound, in the November number, page 544.

---

DR. A. DOOLITTLE, long known as a Physician, and as an early friend to the Advent and Life views in this city, fell asleep in Jesus, Oct. 24th, aged 68 years. His faith in Christ and in the Resurrection "at the last day" was firm and unshaken.

---

THE RESPONSE.—G. W. Denny, \$5. Volunteers at Hilton Head, S. C., \$2. Peter Kemp, \$3.

---

PHOTOGRAPHS OF THE EDITOR.—Orders for them will be filled as early as possible. Some little delay may attend it for a few weeks to come.

## CONTENTS OF VOL. 14, 1861-2.

A Contrast—Curry, 89. Atonement—Curry,	321
Annihilation: The Methodist Quarterly, "	97
Abideth Forever, 121. Antichristos, Pseudo-christos,	628
Anglo Saxons: Who are they?—Editor,	193
Another Passenger Waked Up—Sunderland and the Editor,	382, 430
Act or Covenant of Religious Consecration,	470
A Wrong Inference from a Right Premise,—Wendell,-	551
Baptism of the Holy Spirit,	25, 51, 111, 255, 445
"    Doctrine of—Stacey, 92. Questions on, by O. R. L. C.,	410
Blood of Jesus Christ, 74. Bible our Creed,	94
Beecher, H. W., letter to, by C. C. W.,	180
Bible Examiner,	191, 222, 287, 411, 478, 543, 571
Barnes on Rom. 8: 11—Wendell,	315
Beecher, H. W.: A Sermon; extract from,	439
Christ's Mission: Object of—Editor,	257
"    Confess your Mistake"—Wendell, -	278
Christian Finance—Lafayette Norris,	476
Confidence in Christ: Christian Retirement,	509
Dr. Nott on the Soul, 7. Day of Rest—Dobney,	161
Distress of Nations, 195. Departed Saints—Wendell,	215
Dying Twice: Is it a Bible Doctrine?—Editor,	400
Death Penalty: An Objection—Wendell,	406
Doctrine of the Resurrection—Curry,	449, 493, 519, 559
Dr. Cumming and his Two Theories—Wendell,	466
"    Doctrine of Baptisms"—Wendell and Editor,	502
Dr. Field and Wendell on a Future Life,	446, 530
Exposition of John 7: 37-39—Curry,	142
"    1 Corth. 15: 20-22. Dr. Hodge,	270
Everlasting Punishment. Different Views of,	273
Enoch's Translation—Wendell,	335
Editor at Boston,	352, 543
Extract from Lord King on John Locke	366
Future Probation: The Ambassador and the N. Y. Observer,	10
Friendly Rebuke, 16. Faith: Preciousness of, -	155
Foreign Correspondence, 57. Family Prayer,	415
Full-grown Spiritualism—Editor,	250
Free Discussion: or, "War,"—O. R. L. C.,	560
"    God Took Her," 459. God: Justice of—119; Power of,	503
Gems from Locke, 367. Gen. Jackson	475
Hate the Harlot, 13. How Protestants Study the Bible, -	465
Holy Life; Influence of, 192. Holiness to the Lord,	220
Honesty the Best Policy—Eld. Morgan and the Editor,	378
Is the Doctrine of the Resurrection found in Moses? -	474
Image of the Beast, 63. Intolerance,	456
Interpretation of Scripture—H. Grow and the Editor,	311
Judgment and Mercy on the Lost of Israel,	226
"    : An Examination of—Curry,	417
"    Seat of Christ—Editor,	427
Kingdom of God: What is it, and Where Located? -	17
"    "    :—Stacy,	146, 177
<b>LETTERS:</b> Eld. Jas. Wilson, 27. R. V. Lyon, 63, 319, 415, 477, 511. Dr. J. F. Lee,	
95. G. B. Stacy, 125. J. T. Curry, 235. Polly G. Pitts, 236. C. H. Sut-	
ton, 236, 540. R. E. Ladd, 233, 511. Eld. A. Wood, 319. J. N. Jerome,	
351. Clamor Franke, 351. S. J. Brimball, 351. Eld. J. Marsh, 412. La-	
rynelle Norris, 477. E. Wolcott, 477. A. G. Hudson, 511. R. Wendell,	
512, 569. Mrs. C. C. Williams, 512. Geo. T. Collins, 639. A Lady, 541. Dr.	
J. Trevor, 541. J. N. Jerome, 541. A. Guthrie, 542. Geo. W. Allshouse,	
542. G. W. Denny, 565. Army Volunteers, 566. Mrs. E. C. Onklio, 567.	
H. Robertson, 567.	

Life only through Christ : or Dr. Finley and the Presb. Standard,	482
“ by Creation—Eld. Wilson, 78. Life of Trust,	120
“ Present and Future ; or <i>zoeë</i> , 249. Life of Christianity,	473
“ from the Dead, 159. Life and Death—Editor,	353
“ “ “ : A Review—Curry.	203, 241, 261, 301, 394
Lord's Supper—by Editor, 23, 48, 95 ; by Curry.	183, 318
Locke on Immortality,	117
Love—Curry,	545
Letter and Response : or, Dillabaugh and the Editor,	400
Methodist : Apocrypha—T. Read,	108, 127
Moral Depravity—Editor,	129
Methodism and the Life to Come,	156
Man's Creation : Gen. 2 : 7—Wendell,	468
New Year's Magazine, 31. Napoleon and the Pope,	90
Not Much to Choose, 126. National Judgments,	149
OBITUARIES : Truman Fox and Calvin Miller, 64. Mrs. A. A. Bugbee, 128. Henry Grew, 480. Dr. Doolittle, 572.	
Organized Power—Mrs. Pitts,	460
Origin and End of Evil—Eld. Wilson,	297
Oberlin Evangelist's Inquiry,	213
Perilous Times, 62. Perils of the Hour,	253
Primitive Christians in Italy,	153
Papal Question, 157. Parable of the Sower,	155
Philosophical Essays on Christianity,	385
Perishing Condition of the Natural Man—Curry,	453
“ Perverse and Ignorant Criticism,” 556. “ Privilege,” Question of,	563
POETRY : Heaven, 32. Dare to be Right, 96. Consolation, 128. Boast Not, Christian, 160. To Rich Men who are Generous in Life, 192. Old Folks, 460.	
Resurrection : Modern Unbelief—J. Panton Ham,	1
“ Its Importance—Wendell,	537
“ Retribution” and Corn-Growing—Cerry,	409
“ : Second Edition ; Notice of—Curry,	498
“ : A Novelty in—Wendell,	280
“ : Rom. 8 : 11 in “	337, 369
Return of the Lord Jesus—W. Laing, Scotland,	358
Remarks on Acts 24 : 15—Editor,	496
Right Spirit,	416
Spirits in Prison, 6. Syrian Massacres,	122, 154
Struggle for Divine Life, 153. Sympathy for the Erring,	222
Sadduceism : A Criticism—Malcolm,	223
Statement and Request by the Editor,	252
Second Death, 333. Signs of the Times,	348
State of Man in Death—Dr. Lant Carpenter,	443
Source of Character, 475. Sinful Habits,	511
The Judgment—Editor, 65. The Test—Curry,	276
“ To Telos” and Retribution—Wendell, 233. Truth Onward,	368
“ There is no Death”—“ There is no God,” 150. The Thief—Lusk,	443
The Trunk and the Branches—Curry,	382
The Father's Gift—Lyon, 494. The Two Characters,	510
Thanks be to God, 569. The Response,	448, 478, 512, 544, 572
The Awakening : Dan. 12 : 2,	315
The Tree and its Fruit,	559
Whom it may Concern, 30. Wages of Sin—A Clergyman,	33
Walking in the Spirit, 155. What is Death ?	219
War : What is the Christian's Duty ?—Editor,	189
Will the Wicked Dead Live Again ?	211
Worship : Its Nature and Character—Editor,	289
What is the Gospel ?—Grim,	307
“ Why are you Baptized ? Notice by the Editor,”	349
What is it to Perish—A. G. Hudson,	442
What Manner of Spirit is This ?—Editor,	453
Wrong Inference from a Right Promise—Wendell,	552
“ Yea and Nay ” Illustrated : A Dilemma of Orthodoxy—Wendell,	513
<i>Zoeë</i> : Use of this Greek Word—Beegle,	360