

BIBLE EXAMINER

VOLS. 13. 14. 15.

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. 15. No. 1.] **JANUARY, 1863.** [Whole No. 220.]

THE DOOM OF THE UNGODLY:

OR, THE WICKED DEAD REMAIN ETERNALLY UNDER DEATH'S DOMINION.

A SERMON BY GEO. STORRS, EDITOR OF THE BIBLE EXAMINER.

[The substance of this discourse was delivered at Philadelphia, and reported Phonographically by Joseph McFarland.]

TEXT: "Give me understanding and I shall live" Ps. 119: 144.
"The man that wandereth out of the way of understanding shall remain in the congregation of the dead." Prov. 21: 16.

THE distinct utterances of these portions of inspiration give us confidence in pursuing our inquiry, and in presenting the subject to attention. The first text being from the most pious and honored of Israel's kings, announcing the way of life, and the other from the wisest of those kings, distinctly stating that some "shall REMAIN in the congregation of the dead," seem ample authority for our investigating the subject; and such company as these two kings, may prevent even the timid from being alarmed in search after the truth.

Truth is harmonious in all its parts—the links of which cannot be separated without detriment to the whole chain. It is therefore not a matter of indifference as to what a man may believe, as many suppose. If he believe the truth he will doubtless be benefitted by it; but he will derive much more benefit from a clear perception of the *whole* truth than a part of it.—When the Saviour prayed, "Sanctify them through thy truth, thy word is truth," He prayed, in effect, that we should all feel the force, and understand the importance of truth. So that

whatever phase of that truth may be presented, it demands our attention, and should not be put aside. No one should undertake to say, therefore, that he has *sufficient* truth and does not wish to perplex his mind with abstract notions or irrelevant issues. The point to be examined is not merely what is truth ; but how much is it necessary for us to entertain and to apply for our welfare ? It does not become us to isolate passages of Scripture or to dwell upon a particular text to the exclusion of nearly every other : for the truth, as it is revealed to us from God, runs in harmonious streams through both the Old and the New Testament.

We have heard persons frequently say, in reply to certain quotations : " Ah ! that is from the Old Testament ! " as if it were not worth our while to regard the fitness and self-evidence of anything emanating from that source. But Christ bade the Jews " Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they that testify of me." Now what " Scriptures " were they directed to search ? As the New Testament was not then written, they must have been referred to the Old Testament ; and hence we have not only our Saviour's reference to those " Scriptures," but also His declaration that they testify of *eternal life*. The apostle Paul, likewise, in his discourses to the Jews, repeatedly directs their attention to the Old Testament. For example, when he stood before Agrippa, he claimed to have taught nothing but what Moses and the prophets had said should come to pass, and our Lord, after His resurrection, said to his disciples : " Oh ! fools " (literally, *unwise*) " and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken ; *** and beginning at Moses and all the prophets, He expounded unto them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself."

There are some Christians who are prone to think that the New Testament supersedes the Old ; but on the contrary, the latter serve as a key to the former—they are essential to a just appreciation and proper understanding of them. But let us add, that a theological theory has never yet been started without encountering some apparent or real contradictory texts ; else the world had never been divided into so many radically different religious denominations. One class range themselves

on the side of certain texts that represent their theological ideas ; another class, taking exception to these, discover flaws and contradictions, and settle down upon opposite texts, and so on.

We conclude, therefore, the only means of arriving at a clear apprehension of the truth is to determine the general tenor of the Scriptures, and then construe the discordant texts in harmony with it. For many passages are susceptible of more than one construction ; but the construction which approximates most nearly the general tenor of the Scriptures, and harmonizes best with the known perfections of God, should be regarded as the true one, and adopted. The texts we have chosen as the foundation of our investigation on this occasion, seem flatly to contradict the view generally received by Christendom ; and it must, therefore, be submitted to the test previously recommended.

The term *resurrection* does not occur in the Old Testament, but there are many corresponding phrases, such as "awake—arise—Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell !—Thy dead men shall live," etc. ; which expressions in no instance have the remotest allusion to the wicked dead. In the New Testament the word *resurrection* frequently occurs, as well as numerous equivalent terms ; for example, "*rise, raised, rising, raise, rose, risen,*" &c., but none of them are ever used with reference to a future life of the wicked, unless in the negative form, as "*not rise ; not see life,*" &c. Such terms and phrases as denote future life, belong exclusively to the righteous, and in the Scriptures are applied to them alone ; so that there is not, from Genesis to Revelation, a text which declares that the wicked dead shall live again, or that they shall have a future life at all ; yet there are a few texts from which it may be *inferred*.

Our object at this time will be to define the prospects of dying men—to learn God's purposes, as revealed in His word, in relation to the children of Adam—to reveal to the sinner the nature of his doom—eternal death—and thereby awaken him to the fact that unless he repent and come to Christ he will perish forever "like the beasts that perish." "Well, there is nothing very alarming in such a prospect," he may say ; but to those who enjoy life—who rightly estimate its value—it is an

awful prospect, indeed. Let us turn to and contemplate the picture presented by Job 24 : 19, 20.

“Drought and heat consume the snow waters : so doth the grave 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.”

The term which is here translated “grave,” is *sheol*, in the original—the place or state of the dead : the hidden state.—And here it is stated clearly and unequivocally, *sheol* shall consume the wicked as heat consumes the snow waters : no analogy could be more striking, nor could any language be more expressive of the end of “those which have sinned.”

The Psalmist says, in the 49th Psalm : “They that trust in their wealth, and boast themselves in the multitude of their riches ; *** their inward thought is that their houses shall continue forever, and their dwelling places to all generations ; they call their lands after their own names. Nevertheless, man being in honor abideth not ; he is like the beasts that perish.”

“What !” exclaims one—“would you reduce man to the level of a beast ?” The Psalmist has done it ; or rather God, who inspired the Psalmist by His Spirit, and we can only reply in His words, “Like sheep they are laid in the grave ; death shall feed on them ; and the upright shall have dominion over them in the morning ; and their beauty shall consume in the grave from their dwelling :” or as the margin reads, “The grave being a habitation to every one of them.” The grave, then, is their abode ; and there they must lie forever : but the Psalmist in the next verse says of himself, by way of contrast :—“God will redeem *my* soul from the power of the grave ; for he shall receive me.”

Let us pass on to Isaiah 26 : 14. Here the prophet after having spoken of certain “other lords” who had ruled over his people, says : “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.” And why shall they “*not rise*” ? Because, “The man that wandereth out of the way of understanding *shall remain* in the congregation of the dead.” How important that we pray with David, “Give me understanding and I shall live.” Such shall *not* “re-

main in the congregation of the dead"—"I will raise *him* up at the last day," saith Jesus, who is "the resurrection and *the life*."

It is frequently claimed that the text Isa. 26 : 14 has reference to the final destruction of the wicked, which event, it is said, will occur a thousand years after the coming of the Lord, or at least *after* the resurrection of all the dead. Such a conclusion, however, is erroneous, as will be readily perceived from the contrast presented in the 19th verse. Keeping in mind the previous text, to wit : "They are dead : they shall not rise"—the 19th verse says, "*Thy* dead men *shall live* : together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake, and sing," &c. Here as may be seen, the final condition of the two classes is described—long prior to the resurrection—in language too plain to be misunderstood.

Again, in Isa. 43 : 17, we read, "Which bringeth forth the chariot and horse, the army and the power ; they shall lie down together, they shall not rise ; they are extinct, *they are quenched as tow*." Also in Jer. 51 : 39, the following language is employed : "In their heat I will make their feasts, and I will make them drunken, that they may rejoice, and sleep a perpetual sleep, and *not awake*, saith the LORD." Similar language characterises the 57th verse, likewise : "And I will make drunk her princes and her wise men, her captains and her rulers, and her mighty men : and they shall sleep a perpetual sleep, and not awake saith the King whose name is the LORD of hosts."

The words of the prophet Amos are equally emphatic on this point, chap. 8, last verse : "They that swear by the sin of Samaria, and say, Thy God, O Dan, liveth ; and the manner of Beersheba liveth ; even they shall fall and *never rise again*."

Thus far we have given a fair sample of the evidence of the Old Testament in rebuttal of the prevalent doctrine of a general rising of the dead to life. The passages we have quoted leave no room for inference—unless other texts of the O. T. as plainly contradict them—which cannot be pretended—they apply clearly and directly to the point, and must be intelligible, even, to the most uncultivated mind.

We shall now proceed to examine the bearing of the New Testament on the subject ; but surely no one can for a moment maintain that either Christ or his apostles ever contradicted

the prophets of old? Admitting a text, even,—if such could be—which positively affirms the wicked dead shall live again, what then? Shall we, like the infidel, throw the Book away contemptuously, because it seemingly teaches a different doctrine? No! But our task should be to scrutinize closely to ascertain whether, after all, such discordant texts are not susceptible of a meaning, or interpretation that shall form a link that supplies the seeming break in the great chain of sacred truth. If a text is possibly capable of two interpretations, that certainly should be chosen which is most in harmony with the known or revealed character of God and the general teaching of Scripture. We must determine at the outset, as in the case of the Old Testament, the general tenor or drift of the New. We find the general tenor of the New Testament expressed in a single text; namely, John 3: 16. "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." Here it is manifest, that not an individual member of the human family could have had a resurrection, if Jesus Christ had not come into the world. Of the millions that have successively populated the earth, none could ever return to life but for the redemption through Christ; all must have remained with their kindred dust, according to the law which prescribed their doom: "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return!" But how is this redemption obtained? The question is answered in John 6: 40: "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."

The antithesis of this declaration, namely, "I will raise him up at the last day," logically and necessarily implies that those who do not believe on the Son will *not* be raised up at the last day. The apostle John also says that God has "given us eternal life," and that "*this life is in His Son.*"

Paul said that he labored and suffered that he might be made conformable to Christ's death—that he might attain unto the resurrection of the dead,—or as the original may be construed—"the resurrection *out from among the dead ones.*" So then, Paul must have understood that of the two classes, but one would have a resurrection, and he therefore strove that he

might be numbered with that class. With the apostles, the resurrection of the dead was the great fundamental principle of the Gospel. On this they "harped" continually, until it became a pivot around which everything else seemed made to revolve. They sought earnestly to convince their hearers that by the indwelling of the Spirit of Christ mankind would be raised from the dead; but that if they lived "after the flesh" they should die, and death would exercise eternal dominion over them. Hence, the general tenor of the New Testament is, that there is a future life which will be eternal,—not *temporary*—a life peculiar to the righteous, which nowhere in Scripture is affirmed of the ungodly. To the Sadducees, who denied the possibility of a resurrection, Christ replied: "They who are 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 the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." That is to say, that we, by natural birth, are the children of Adam—of the flesh; and as that which is born of the flesh must perish with the flesh, we can only attain to a new life—the resurrection life—by means of the Spirit of God, the same Spirit which raised Christ from the dead.

We might multiply similar texts; but think that enough have been quoted to establish the general tenor of both the Old and the New Testament in reference to the doctrine of the resurrection.

We will now refer to several texts which have been urged against our view of the subject. The one which is most generally used to demolish us, is to be found in 1 Cor. 15: 22. We will introduce it by a few brief remarks on the context. The apostle says: "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."

There are two ways in which this form of expression may be understood. The word *also* may refer to the supposition that Christ must have perished if He had not been raised from the dead; or it may refer to the wicked, who, not being "in Christ," had died and perished. But to whichever case it may apply, it is evident that unless a man be raised from the dead he has perished.

The text relied on by some of our opponents reads thus :—
 “For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.”

Allow me to remark, I once asked our late Br. Henry Grew, in this hall, whether he intended to use this text against the doctrine of the non-resurrection of the wicked, in the discussion then going on between him and myself in the BIBLE EXAMINER? He replied, “I do not; the apostle was evidently speaking of the righteous only.” Such is the natural inference. Among the Corinthians who had professed faith in Christ, some might ask, “If we are to have a future life—if we are to live beyond the grave, why do we saints die? Why are we buried in the grave?” They said, probably, “Well, if that be true that we must go down to the grave, there *cannot* be life hereafter: if there is to be such life, why are we not translated?” But what said the apostle? “If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable; but now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept.”

What is the “first fruits”? It consists of the first gathering of the crop, as a sample of it: and such was Christ. He was the “first fruits” of the dead—not of the wicked dead—He was no sample of such a harvest—but He was a pledge of the quality of the harvest that was to come. The apostle continues:—
 “For since by man” (that is Adam) “came death, by man” (Jesus), “also, came the resurrection of the dead.” Again:—
 “For as in Adam all die”—all who? You may say, “all mankind;” but the apostle is evidently speaking of those, and those only, who agreed with, or are like the sample or “first fruits,” viz., the believers in Him: or those who were like Him. But why do they die? Because of their connection with Adam; but “in Christ shall all be made alive.” The wicked are not in Christ nor like the “first fruits,” and so are not embraced in the *all* to be made alive; for “if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature:” but we have all a connection with the first Adam—a relationship of the flesh; therefore, we are all subject to mortality, corruption, and death, in which terminates the life received from our earthly progenitor. But God has provided a Second Adam with a life that shall never end; and in order that we may obtain that life we must be united to Him

—must have faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. This life the apostle designates in Rom. 8, as “the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus,” and saith, it “bath made me free from the law of sin and death.” Now, if that “law of the Spirit of life” is not in us, what is to make us free from “the law of sin and death”? how are we to be emancipated? Hence, it is evident the apostle is speaking only of the righteous. He does not affirm corruptibility of one class and incorruptibility of another; but states broadly that “we shall ALL be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye.” If the resurrection embraces the wicked, they must be raised to incorruptibility; and it follows that they will either be eternally miserable or else they will be saved, inasmuch as they cannot “die any more.” There is no escape from these conclusions by those who maintain that the “all made alive,” verse 22, includes all men, irrespective of moral state; for the apostle makes no distinction between the “all” in that verse and the “all” in verses 51 and 52; so that if “in Christ shall all be made alive,” is of universal application, so also is the expression “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 shall be changed.”

Thus our opponents are compelled, by their theory, to take eternal misery in their course or universal salvation: one or the other is inevitable. They may sneer at us for saying so, but that does not alter the truth. The testimony of the apostle is so clear and distinct that no unbiased mind can avoid the conclusion. Look at verses 42–44: “They are* sown in *corruption*; they are raised in *INCORRUPTION*: they are sown in *dishonor*; they are raised in *GLORY*: they are sown in weakness; they are raised in power: it is sown a natural body; it is raised a *spiritual* body.” Thus the state and condition of those raised from the dead is settled beyond all reasonable controversy; and fortunately for the race, the apostle has settled the question that “the dead” who are raised, are “raised in *incorruption—in glory*,” and “*spiritual*.” Thus universalism is the result to which the apostle drives the advocates of a universal reliving of the dead. They may say, boastingly, “I would not

* We insert “They are” instead of “It is” on the authority of Wakefield, and Prof. Murdock’s translation of the Syriac

deny the first part" [of the chap., viz., v. 22.] "for fear of believing the rest, nor pervert half because I did not understand the whole." If the boaster does "not understand the whole," how does he know he understands verse 22? May he not be mistaken or ignorant in that matter as well as the other? Surely, a little modesty would be serviceable to such teachers. But "pride goeth before destruction, and a haughty look before a fall." Inspiration has settled the fact, in unequivocal language, that "the man that wandereth out of the way of understanding SHALL REMAIN in the congregation of the dead"—he "shall NOT SEE life, but the wrath of God ABIDETH on him." Shall any man be allowed to disannul such testimony, by a criticism on 1 Cor. 15 : 22 which is not only worthless, but contradicts the whole scope of the apostle's reasoning in that chapter?—Even if it were admitted that text *might* be read, *by* Christ, instead of *in* Christ, it would not help the advocate of a universal reliving of the dead; for as "all die" by having a *union* with Adam, "even so" those who are "made alive" must be made so by having a *union* with Christ. It is the *union* with these two heads that affects the condition of men for death or life. Adam did not by an act of mere power put all his posterity under death: the union of *nature* with him is what brings death to the race: "even so" Christ, the second Adam, does not by a mere act of power give life to any one; but a union of *nature* with Him brings them into life again. "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." "As we have borne the *image* of the earthy" (Adam), "we shall also bear the *image* of the heavenly" (Adam). The first brings death to *all* connected with him: the second brings life to *all* connected with Him. All others "utterly perish in their own corruption" and do "not see life," because they rejected or neglected the LIFE-GIVER.

The next attempt of the advocates of the reliving of the wicked dead to force Paul to their side, is a resort to Acts 24 : 15; and like most others who have a desperate case to make out, they disregard the apostle's premises and make him contradict his entire teaching elsewhere.

Paul opens this discourse, "I confess unto thee" [Felix, the

Governor] "that after the way which they" [the Jews, his accusers] "call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, BELIEVING ALL THINGS WRITTEN IN THE LAW AND IN THE PROPHETS." Where is it written in the law or the prophets that the wicked or unjust shall live, or have a resurrection from the dead?—
 ANS.—*No where.* But it is written of some of them, "They are dead; they shall not live: they are deceased, they shall not rise"—"they are like the beasts that perish," &c. And this testimony Paul believed; for he testified, he believed "*all* things written in the law and in the prophets." Is he in the next breath giving the lie to this utterance? He did not deal in "yea and nay," for he declares to the Corinthians, his preaching was not "yea and nay," but that it "was *yea.*" 2 Cor. 1: 19. "Believing all things written," &c., "and have hope toward God, which"—"which" *what?* To what does *which* refer? Not to something to be said, but to something already spoken. What then is the antecedent of which? Clearly, it is "*hope*": "which [hope] they themselves also allow" [by maintaining] "that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both" [or, *not only*] "of the just and" [or, but *also* of the] "unjust."

The argument is clearly this: The complaint of the Jews against me is groundless: for, while I preach the resurrection of the just, or those in Christ, and they persecute me for doing so, they, in fact, allow by their doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust, all that my "hope" embraces, inasmuch as the whole embraces *the part* which is the subject of my hope. "I stand and am judged for the hope of the PROMISE made of God unto the fathers"**** "why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?" said Paul before Agrippa. His *hope* was based on the promise of God to the fathers: that promise did not embrace the unjust, and no *threat* of a resurrection is found "written in the law or the prophets." Thus Paul's language, Acts 24: 15, gives no countenance to the idea that his faith embraced the resurrection of the wicked dead: besides he clearly recognizes the fact that at the time of the resurrection some would "remain in the congregation of the dead;" for he says, "I labor and suffer, "if by ANY MEANS I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." Phil. 3: 11. Thus he distinctly

states the fact that a revival from the dead is *conditional*, and not the lot of all men.

We regard this point as settled beyond all reasonable doubt, that Paul had no resurrection, in his gospel, for the unjust or wicked dead : and as he did "not shun to declare unto" men "ALL the counsel of God," and never declared the living again of those who die in their sins, we may be sure he did not hold any such theory.

Some brief remarks on John 5 : 28, 29 is all we have time for now. This text has its difficulties, we admit ; but what view of Scripture doctrine finds no texts of difficulty ? It were easy to show how true it is that all theories have difficulties, else there would be no adverse sects in Christendom.

Our Lord and His apostles made all their appeals to the law and the prophets : this we have abundantly shown. Whatever then be the import of John 5 : 28, 29, it cannot contradict the Old Testament teaching, and does not, therefore, teach that those who have "done evil" come into "life," whatever else it teaches. "They that have done good, unto the resurrection of LIFE": they *live*. "They that have done evil, unto the resurrection of *condemnation*:"—condemned to what ? "He that believeth not shall NOT SEE LIFE, but the wrath of God ABIDETH on him"—such are condemned to "REMAIN in the congregation of THE DEAD." John 3 : 36 ; Prov. 21 : 16. In this view the antithesis is perfect. God hath given His Son "authority to execute judgment:" He does it, "at the last day," by His power over all the living and dead—good and bad : to the good, He gives life : the bad, He *condemns* to "remain in the congregation of the dead"—leaves the "wrath of God" abiding "on them." Thus He judgeth "the quick and the dead at His appearing and kingdom." 2 Tim. 4 : 1.

If any still insist the doers of evil must be made alive, because it is said they "shall hear his voice and come forth," and ask, how could this be if they were not made alive ? We reply by asking them a like question on Ezek. 37. How could the "dry bones hear the word of the Lord" unless made alive ? But they did hear ; and as the prophet "prophesied, there was a noise, and behold a shaking, and the bones came together, bone to his bone. And the sinews and the flesh came up upon them, and the

skin covered them above ; but there was *no breath* in them."— They were not alive ; yet they heard the voice of the prophet and obeyed. Thus we have inspired testimony that the dead, without life, are said to hear and obey ; and until it can be proved, the wicked dead will have life at the resurrection, " at the last day," we may rest assured they " shall not see life"— they have " NO LIFE in " them, because they did not " eat my flesh" nor " drink my blood," as saith Jesus, John 6 : 53 ; they have no connection with the life-giving power, and perish forever in their own corruptible nature.

We might go a step further on the subject as illustrated by Ezekiel's vision of the dry bones : we might admit all the dead wicked would come as near to life as the dry bones did, while there was " no breath in them." What then? Were they alive? *No*. What is lacking? The vitalizing element. What is that? We have no account of any other for dead men, at the last day, but the Spirit of God. But the wicked never had that dwelling in them ; and though God should cause them to come out of their graves, and clothe them with flesh anew, what is to give them life? The Spirit of life enters only into God's people—" I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves, and * * * put my Spirit in you, and ye shall live:" Ezk. 37 : 13, 14. " 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.

But " I don't believe the wicked dead will come out of their graves and not be made alive," says an objector. Well, we do not ask you to believe it ; we only say, it is far more scriptural and reasonable to suppose such to be the fact, than to believe they will be made alive to be tormented and killed again ; and moreover the Scriptures, speaking of the people of God, say, " They shall go forth, and look upon the CARCASSES of the men that have transgressed against me : for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched : and they shall be an abhorring to all flesh." Isa. 66 : 24.

If the advocates of the resurrection of wicked men will have it so, why so be it : but their resurrection will give nothing but *carcasses* to these dead : carcasses which will be an abhorrence

to all living men. These "carcasses" "shall remain in the congregation of THE DEAD," and "not see life."

But some persons sneer at the idea that *carcasses* shall be brought from the graves to be treated thus. They say, "That is a horrible idea"—they "have heard of savages that thus treated the dead bodies of their enemies; but it is shocking to attribute such a thing to God"! Happy that their sensibilities can be shocked by something; but to them there is nothing to disturb their "pure minds" in the idea that God should make those carcasses alive and then torture that life out of them again! That is all right, in their estimation! They can "strain at a gnat, but swallow a camel" as calmly as if taking a sweet morsel!

We give these objectors to raising lifeless carcasses to shame and dishonor, and to show it is a punishment in God's estimation, Jer. 7 : 1, 2. The contents of the chapter commences—*"The calamities to the Jews both DEAD and ALIVE."* What are those calamities to the dead? "At that time, saith the LORD, they shall bring out the bones of the kings of Judah, and the bones of the princes, and the bones of the priests, and the bones of the prophets, and the bones of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, out of their graves: and they shall spread them before the sun, and the moon, and all the hosts of heaven, whom they have loved, and whom they have served, and after whom they have walked, and whom they have sought, and whom they have worshipped: they shall not be gathered, nor buried: they shall be dung upon the face of the earth."

If the Son of man shall thus cause all the doers of evil to "come forth" from "the graves" to "condemnation," not to see life, but to be "dung upon the face of the earth"—whose "carcasses shall be an abhorring to all flesh," who shall say John 5 : 28, 29 is not fulfilled to the very letter?

And now, O sinner, a word to you, and we have done. If you remain impenitent, still rejecting or neglecting God's mercy in Christ; and grieving the Holy Spirit of God, by which alone you can ever be prepared for life, or revived from the dead, your eternal doom will soon overtake you—the night of death will set in upon you—a night from which you will never awake—a night of eternal gloom: no redemption will ever come to

you! Will you persist in a course of sin, with your eyes open to such an awful doom? Will you still listen to the serpent's song—"Ye shall not surely die"? O, beware of that father of lies! "The wages of sin is *death*." but God, in His infinite mercy offers you life—in and through Jesus Christ our Redeemer—that shall never end: a life, the joys of which shall never be interrupted and never cease: a life, increasing in new glories, in the midst of unbounded means for new delights, with holy and glorious society, amid seas of shoreless love, ever fresh and refreshing. O, what a state! what a life! what rapturous scenes! and no alloy! Say, sinner, will you have it? Do not say, *no!* Make haste to Christ the LIFE-GIVER! Make no delay! Time is hastening on, and soon the last sand of thy present life will fall; and then! O, *then*, have you this eternal life made sure to you! Arouse thyself, this moment! another, it may be too late, and all is lost, *eternally* LOST! O, "*why will you die*"! Come to Jesus, perishing sinner. He will receive you—take away your sins, and enroll your name in His "BOOK OF LIFE."

NOTE.—Those persons who wish to see our views more at large than in the foregoing discourse, will find them in a work of 96 pages, entitled "*LIFE FROM THE DEAD: or, The Righteous only will live again.*" See our Catalogue of "*Books and Pamphlets.*" That work was first published in 1857, after much inquiry, for several years. In our judgment, its main positions are unanswered and unanswerable. Those who have made any attempts against those views have carefully avoided approaching their foundation principles; such as "Punishment cannot exceed the threatening—that death is the only proper penalty or wages of sin—that the penalty is *not suffering*, nor the *pain* of dying, nor *dying* itself, but DEATH—to be dead: that no other penalty is known in the law of God, under any dispensation, as penalty proper, or the wages of sin, except one, *viz.*: DEATH." Till these points are met and overthrown, any assault on the author's view of some particular text, is unavailing. Let those who wish, try their skill against the foundation, and see if those principles are not immovable as eternal truth.

The foregoing Sermon may be issued in a "*BIBLE EXAMINER Tract,*" at five cents per copy; which, with the author's work on "*Life from the Dead.*" &c., will present his views of the subject. But if a full view of the whole question of *life*, as held by him, is desired, let the work "*LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST*" be called for. See *Catalogue* on last page. To those of our readers who think we say too much on the *non-resurrection* of the wicked dead, we must say, in our mind the whole subject of immortality is involved in this question, and it stands in the foreground of the whole subject of *life*. Such prominence we must give it, or prove unfaithful to our convictions.

“LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST :”

IS THE DOCTRINE UNIMPORTANT?

BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

WE lately received a letter from a friend, in which, after referring to “the non-resurrection question,” he says, “If the doctrine in question is true, when compared with other doctrines of the Gospel, it is quite unimportant.”

As this is the opinion of many others, who, like the author of the foregoing remark, have taken but a superficial view of the subject, it may be proper to give a public answer.

And first, “the non-resurrection” is of great importance to all who hold the fundamental doctrine of the mortality of man ; who believe that the natural man has no life but animal life, and that he *perishes* in the corruption which results from the loss of that life, unless God interposes his preventing power.

Any principle that necessitates an error must be erroneous.— If “the non-resurrection” doctrine is an error, then the doctrine which leads to it must be an error. The fundamental doctrine to which we have alluded *does* lead to, and necessitate the non-resurrection of every one who is not affected by Christ, the medium whereby God exerts his preventing, restoring, and immortalizing power. “God so loved the world, that He gave his only begotten Son, that *whosoever believeth* in him may *not* perish.” No provision has been made to save the *unbeliever* from perishing. He is left in his natural condition, a victim to the corruption which inevitably follows the cessation of the only life he has. The wrath wrought by the law (Rom. 4 : 15) on the fleshly nature (Rom. 3 : 20) “*abideth on him.*” “It was on him, see ver. 18, in his state of darkness and nature—and can only be removed by faith in the Son of God, which he *has not.*” Alford on John 3 : 36. How can he ever escape the dominion of death while “the sting of death is sin ; and the strength of sin is the law” ? God has ordained “our Lord Jesus Christ” to give “us the victory.” 1 Cor. 15 : 58.

Here then, is the conclusion to which we are irresistibly led by

the fundamental doctrine of man's mortality : No Christian has a right to maintain a principle and reject its legitimate consequence. Either hold *both* or discard *both*. Let no one who holds the mortality of man and yet defends the doctrine of the resurrection of the wicked *utter a word* against the adherents of orthodoxy until he can offer them a consistent substitute for their unscriptural belief. And if any one halts "between two opinions," resurrection and non-resurrection, let him not delude himself with the idea that the subject "is quite unimportant."

But "the non-resurrection question" is by no means the only question involved in the discussion. It is, perhaps, the best provocative to investigation that can be offered to a believer in the mortality of man. But the true glory of the subject is not manifested until its relation to the plan of salvation is shown. It then becomes of startling importance ; the question of questions, surpassing every other as much as the sun exceeds the moon in brightness. Indeed, as the moon obtains its lustre from the sun, so does every other idea in the revelation of God reflect the light of this.

The doctrine of "Life only in Christ" unlocks the mystery that has enclosed *the Atonement* for ages. The popular belief of the *vicarious* death of Christ, that he suffered the penalty of the law *in our stead*, that the innocent Jesus bore the wrath of the violated law in order that condemned millions might go *scot-free*, has been and is now the ridicule of infidels and the perplexity of thinking Christians. Such a view impeaches the justice of God. The touchstone of Life in Christ condemns this theory, while it develops the solution of the mystery.

The death of Christ manifested the justice of God, which was seriously involved in His offer of a future life to a race that had been condemned, in the person of Adam, to a return to the dust from which they were taken, and *consequently, to non-existence*. The reflecting mind is compelled to inquire, How can God bestow a future life on Adam's race without *reversing* His decree of death ?

No answer to this question was afforded until Jesus appeared. And Paul plainly tells us that Christ died to explain the matter. Whom God hath set forth, a propitiation by his blood through faith, *for a manifestation of His righteousness*, because of the

paesin (not *remission*, as in the common version, but as the reference reads *passing over*, in the sense of overlooking) of the sins before done, in the forbearance of God ; for a manifestation of His righteousness in the present time : that He might be just, and the Justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."—Rom. 3 : 25, 26.

The passing over of sins was evidenced in the promise of a future life to Abraham and his seed while the law held a claim on them, by which they were doomed to non-existence. Jesus was set forth to manifest God's righteousness. But how did his death do this ? By discovering to mankind a new life-principle which is not—like the animal life—forfeited to the law. Jesus died to manifest the justice of God in taking the forfeited life. He rose again to show a way of salvation from death by a life not forfeited. If he had possessed no other than animal life the wrath wrought by the law on the animal nature would have prevented his release from death. But he "through the eternal Spirit offered himself," and by that Spirit he was rescued.—"Being raised from the dead," he "dieth no more ; death hath no more dominion over him." "Having been put to death indeed in the flesh, but quickened in the Spirit." Thus God can be just in taking the animal life from all who are in Adam, and yet the justifier to a spiritual life of all who are in Christ ; that is, all who have received "the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead."

Will any one, in view of the foregoing, *dare* to affirm that the doctrine which thus opens to our understanding the Atonement by Jesus Christ "is quite unimportant" ? We hesitate not to say that it is the *most* important doctrine that can possibly be presented to the human mind. It is our fervent prayer that God through His blessed Spirit will indelibly seal this precious truth on our hearts, and make us bold as lions in its defense. The author of the remark which suggested this article will probably allow the subject to be of some importance, if we do not go so far as to compare it with other doctrines of "the Gospel." But we make no such comparison. We never *shall* do so, for in the lovely features of "Life only in Christ" we recognize THE GOSPEL ITSELF.

"The doctrine in question" is, moreover, most intensely *prac-*

tical. It is the most efficient means that can be employed to convict sinners. If the Holy Spirit may be expected to attend any kind of preaching, it may be looked for in connection with the faithful promulgation of this truth. It shows how utterly hopeless is the condition of the natural man. Without *help* he dies like the brute. He must be united to the *living* vine or perish. He must have the "one baptism," the baptism of the Holy Spirit, or he will be eternally held by death. "It is the Spirit that quickeneth." "He that soweth to the Spirit shall *of the Spirit* reap life everlasting." But "he that soweth to his flesh shall *of the flesh* reap (not life corruptible, but) *corruption.*"

It is not only practical with reference to the unregenerate, but also to the believer. It enables him to realize his true relations to God in this life. It shows him the incurable weakness of the flesh. As an animal being he can do nothing pleasing to the law of God. He is entirely dependent on the Spirit of God to help his infirmities and assist him in keeping "the body under."

We know not how to express our heartfelt thanks to our heavenly Father for His goodness, as manifested in bringing the radiant truth of "Life only in Christ" to our comprehension.—And if the whole world should unite in pronouncing it "quite unimportant," it would only stimulate us to the earnest, persistent, and uncompromising assertion of the contrary.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE RESURRECTION.

BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

PROPOSITION J.

The wicked perish like the beasts.

THE 49th Psalm is a sufficient support to this proposition.

"Hear this, all nations!
Give ear, all inhabitants of the world;
Both low and high,
Rich and poor together!
My mouth shall speak wisdom,

And the meditation of my heart is understanding.
 I will incline mine ear to a song,
 I will open my dark saying upon the harp.
 Wherefore should I fear in days of evil,
 When the iniquity of my supplanters shall surround me?
 Those who rely on their wealth,
 And boast in the multitude of their riches ;
 A brother cannot by any means redeem,
 A man cannot give to God his ransom,
 (For the redemption of their life is precious,
 And it ceaseth for ever.)
 That he should still live forever,
 And not see corruption.
 For he shall see *it* ; wise *men* must die ;
 Likewise the fool and stupid *person* must perish
 And leave their wealth to others.
 Their burial places *are* their houses for ever,
 Their dwellings to all generations.
 They laud their names in all lands ;
 Yet *such* a man in honor abideth not,
 He is made like to the beasts *which* are destroyed.
 This their way *is* their folly,
 Yet their posterity delight in their portion. Selah.
 Like a flock to sheol they drive ;
 Death is their shepherd ;
 And the righteous shall have dominion over them in the
 morning.
 And their beauty shall consume ;
 Sheol from *henceforth* *is* their dwelling.
 But God will redeem me from the hand of sheol,
 For he will take me *out of it*. Selah.
 Be not thou afraid because a man grows rich,
 Because the glory of his house increases ;
 For when he dieth he shall carry nothing away.
 His glory shall not descend after him.
 (For in his life he will bless his soul,
 And *others* will praise thee because thou doest good to thy-
 self.)
 He shall go to the dwelling of his fathers,
 They shall never see light.
 Man *that is* in honor and understandeth not,
 Is made like to the beasts *which* are destroyed."

(The foregoing translation is better than the common ver-
 sion, and, to our mind, as perfect a representation of the origi-
 nal as may be. If the present series of articles is deemed
 worthy of a more permanent form than they have in these col-

umns, the propriety of the altered renderings will be fully shown. The *italic* words are used, as in the common translation, to fill "the gaps" left by the Hebrew.)

Our proposition will safely stand on either this or the vulgate version. The wicked, no matter how wealthy, cannot redeem himself nor his brother from the fate of mankind. Corruption is his portion; sheol his dwelling. God redeems the righteous from sheol, but he leaves the wicked to perish just as if there was no salvation provided. They shall never see light, but shall perish like the beasts.

Peter evidently had this Psalm in his mind when he said, in language alike emphatic, "These, as irrational brute beasts, born for prey and corruption, (speaking evil of the things which they understand not,) shall utterly perish in their own corruption." 2 Pet. 2: 12.

SIXTH ARGUMENT

against the resurrection of the wicked.

Those who perish like the beasts will not have a resurrection. But the wicked perish thus.

Therefore THE WICKED WILL NOT HAVE A RESURRECTION.

PROPOSITION K.

The resurrection is a provision of the plan of salvation through Christ.

We can safely assume this proposition. Richard Watson, a close thinker, says, "If the wicked are raised from the dead, it is in consequence of the power which Christ, as Redeemer, acquired over them, and of his right in them. . . . If they are not raised from the dead in consequence of Christ's right in them, acquired by purchase, it behooves those of a different opinion, to show under what other constitution than that of the Gospel a resurrection. . . . is provided for. The original law contains no intimation of this."—Theol. Inst. Vol. 2, p. 286.

PROPOSITION L.

The salvation by Christ does not affect the unbeliever.

"God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that *whosoever believeth* in him may not perish, but have everlasting life." John 3: 16. "He that *believeth* on the Son

hath everlasting life ; but he that *believeth not* the Son shall *not see life* ; but the wrath of God *abideth* on him." John 3 : 36.

The "wrath" spoken of is wrought by the law on the natural man (Rom. 4 : 15) and if he refuses to have it removed by believing in Christ, it "abideth" *still*. "The Son quickeneth *whom he will*." John 5 : 21. The implication is that he does not quicken *every one*, which is supported by the next verse, "For the Father judgeth *no man*, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son." That is, the Son judges in every case, and consequently quickens "whom he will."

"And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of LIFE: *he that cometh to me shall never hunger* ; and he that *believeth on me shall never thirst*." John 6 : 35. "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. 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*." John 6 : 39, 40. "Jesus said unto them, 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*. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life ; and *I will raise him up at the last day*." John 6 : 53, 54. "And ye will not *come to me* that ye might have life." John 5 : 40. "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. "In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me, and drink, he *believing on me*. As the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake he of the Spirit, which *they that believe on him should receive* : for the Holy Spirit was not yet manifested ; because that Jesus was not yet glorified." John 7 : 37-39. "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*." John 8 : 21, 24. "Ye *believe not*, because ye are *not of my sheep*, as I said unto you. *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*, neither shall any pluck them out of my hand." John 10 : 26-28. "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." John 11 : 25-26. "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." Matt. 19 : 16. "They which shall

be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead . . . are the children of God, *being* the children of the resurrection." Luke 20 : 35, 36. "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ : for it is the power of God unto salvation, to every one *that believeth*. . . . As it is written, The just by faith *shall live*." Rom. 1 : 16, 17.

We might continue, and quote many other texts, all giving the same undeviating testimony in favor of the proposition.—If no counter evidence can be presented, there is but one conclusion. It may be safely stated, that there is not a whisper of unconditional salvation in the *least* degree, throughout the Scriptures.

The common idea of an indiscriminate justification is glaringly erroneous, and is based on a wrong understanding of Rom. 5 : 12–21. The passage must not be wrested from its connection as is generally done. Paul's argument on justification extends from Rom. 3 : 21 unto Rom. 5 : 21. Whosoever masters that argument *cannot fail* to perceive that there is not a lip of unconditional justification in it. The line is plainly drawn between the fleshly race of Adam under the condemnation of the law to death, and the spiritual race of Jesus Christ, the second Adam, who are justified by faith to life eternal. 1 Cor. 15 : 22, which is interpreted in favor of an unconditional salvation, is easily and readily explained in harmony with Rom. 5 : 15–21.

SEVENTH ARGUMENT

against the resurrection of the wicked.

As the resurrection is a provision of the plan of salvation through Christ (Prop. K), no person can have a resurrection unless they are affected by that plan. But the wicked are not affected by it (Prop. L).

Therefore THE WICKED CANNOT HAVE A RESURRECTION.

NOTE.—Here we rest our case. Other arguments might be offered, but they could not strengthen the position. If the doctrine of the resurrection of the wicked is true, every one of these seven arguments can be overthrown. If they cannot be refuted, the doctrine must be rejected by every candid person who becomes acquainted with them. We challenge any person to refute any one of them. We are prepared to defend them against all comers, either in public debate or written discussion. We shall notice John 5 : 28, 29 in our next. Also Acts 24 : 15.

CHRIST'S COMING, NOT DEATH, THE GROUND OF CHRISTIAN WATCHFULNESS.

THE TESTIMONY OF A VALUABLE WITNESS.

JOSEPH A. SEISS, D.D., Pastor of St. John's Lutheran Church, Philadelphia, published in March, 1862, a work on The Parable of the Ten Virgins. In the last of the Six Discourses devoted to that theme, the duty of watchfulness in view of the Lord's second appearing is impressively enforced, and the subject affords the author an opportunity to speak of Death in a style quite uncommon among Christian teachers of whose faith the immortality of the soul is a corner stone. The following extract cannot fail to interest our readers, and we commend it especially to the serious attention of all devout minds who would have "the motive powers of Christian piety" exhibited in all the strength and loveliness of their primitive, New Testament integrity.

RUFUS WENDELL.

EXTRACT FROM DR. SEISS'S WORK.

It has come to be the fashion in modern Christianity to adopt a very different strain of exhortation on this subject. It is seldom that preachers are heard urging on their people to watch for the coming of the Son of man. Death is the event to which men are referred, in connection with these passages. as to all intents and purposes the coming of Christ, at least to the individual. And there are some points in which the two concur.—It is where death leaves a man that the coming of the Saviour will find him. Nor is it unscriptural, in general discourse, to overleap the interval altogether, and to ply the conscience with the admonitions of all the gospel the same as if the moment of death brought with it all the great transactions of the last day. But it is a mistake, and one fraught with much practical mischief, to treat of death as if that were the thing to be looked to, and of which to interpret the many solemn injunctions of Scripture with reference to the coming again of Christ. It is proper enough to swallow up death in the scenes of the great day; but it is wholly unwarrantable to allow the scenes of that day to be swallowed up in our contemplations of death. Death, whether

in itself or in its immediate consequences, is altogether a different thing from the coming of Christ. Nor is it at all fitted to take the place in our thoughts and exhortations which belongs to the coming of the Son of man. It has less attractiveness; it is weaker in practical impressiveness; and it presents a narrower, darker, more legal, and less evangelical circle of ideas. And to put it forward in our contemplations instead of the prospect of the personal coming of the Lord Jesus, is to put a gloss upon the Scriptures which they were never intended to wear, to foist our judgment into the place of Divine wisdom, and to destroy one of the most beautiful collections of sacred truth.

It is not enough, my friends, that we may embrace all the doctrines of christianity in our creed. We must at the same time receive them in their proper order and revealed connections. We cannot take the precepts and representations which are given in connection with the coming of Christ, and apply them all to death, and then say that we believe in the coming of the Son of man as the Scriptures present that doctrine. Proper submission to the authority of revelation requires us to receive its teachings in the connections in which God's word places them. And when we are told to watch for the coming of the Son of man, to apply the exhortation to death, and at the same time to put away the subject of the personal advent among articles of no direct practical concern, is to put asunder what God hath joined together, and to undertake to adjust the relations of Divine truth in a way which he has not authorized.

So far from making death the great terminus, the generalizations under which the gospel views things quite overlook it. Starting with the first advent, the prospect stretches uninterruptedly onward to the second. The Christian Church is contemplated as one, unmutilated, ever-continuing, until Christ himself comes, and grace ends in glory. Death is not known in the case, and never once appears upon the whole length of the way, except as, here and there, a shadow, which hinders nothing and to which no attention is paid. Looking at some of the most vigorous and precious passages in which we find the whole course of Christianity surveyed, it would be impossible to learn from them alone that death had any existence. Take this from Hebrews:—"Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear the second time without sin, unto salvation." Death and judgment are referred to in immediate proximity with these words, but only in connection with the course of sin; whilst the course of the Christian is made to reach back to Christ on the cross, in which it takes its rise, and forward to his coming again in the glory of the Father,

in which it reaches its goal, with nothing coming between but the life of faith and hope. Take also this, from the Epistle to Titus:—"The grace of God which bringeth salvation hath appeared unto all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, *even* the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." Here, again, death is quite ignored, and the present world is made to touch directly upon the scenes of the appearing again of Christ, as the great and only event to which the Christian looks, next after his apprehension of Jesus as his Saviour. Two *appearings* are spoken of,—the one looked back to, as *bringing* salvation, the other directly anticipated, as the completion of it. The one is *grace*, the other, *glory*. By conforming to the proposals brought to us in the first, we hopefully await the second. And between these two, Christian life is sustained, with nothing more to separate it from the object of its anticipations in the future than from the object of its faith in the past. It is, therefore, a sad disjuncting of the scriptural adjustments of sacred truth, and an attempt to construct and sustain Christian life upon foundations and supports somewhat other than those appointed, to thrust death in as one of the great themes of evangelical incentive, or as a prominent subject in evangelical contemplations of the future. Death belongs to sin and the curse, not to the gospel and salvation; and no one can substitute it, in any respect or degree, for "that blessed hope, *even* the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ," without damage to true evangelism, and great weakening in the motive-powers of Christian piety.

And, for this very reason, preaching about death, which is usually accepted as the most pathetic, is generally the most ineffective and useless of all. It is a dislocation of the Divine order. It inserts into the gospel a point of appeal different from that which it contains. And on the side of the future it gives to Christianity an artificial contrivance on which to go, in place of the elastic and powerful limb of living bone and muscle given it of God. (pp. 131-135.)

In connection with the concluding paragraph of the foregoing extract Dr. Seiss has a foot-note of some significance. We copy it entire:—

"It is fresh in the memories of some of you," says Rev. Wm. Newton, in his "Lectures on Daniel," (p. 213,) "how, a short time ago, a faithful and honored minister of Christ, of large experience in his Master's work, declared in this pulpit that he was

never conscious of making 'so little headway in proclaiming the truth as when death, and the certainty of death, was his theme.'

"Riding out to attend a funeral some time since, with a minister of another denomination by my side, I said to him, 'Is there any one theme in handling which you feel that you are making less impression on your hearers than with almost any other?' He paused a few moments, and replied, 'I think there is.' 'And what is it?' 'Why,' said he, 'it is very strange,—I don't exactly understand it,—but *I seem never to be so unsuccessful as when I preach about death!*'"

LETTERS AND EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

FROM THE ARMY.—The EXAMINER and other works were received.—They were a feast of fat things to us all. Your kind letter was read by many of the soldiers, and duly appreciated; many having learned of you and your faith in the LIFE-GIVER. A fellow soldier (a Methodist for years) has read some of the EXAMINERS, and from a careful reading of the Bible and your magazine he has come to the conclusion *death* is the wages of sin; and that unless he takes hold of the *Life-giver* by faith, the penalty of the law will be enforced on him, and a revival into life from that death will be impossible. Thus you see, there is a chance, even here in the army, to advance in the truth of God. Many others are looking at these things. As regards a change in the EXAMINER—we wish no change of Editor, nor in the time of its issue. We should be glad to receive it semi-monthly, and still more so to receive it weekly, but think it better well supported monthly than to burden you with a more frequent issue, and not give you the needed pecuniary aid. If our portion is \$10 we will gladly pay it.

10th Army Corps, *Beaufort, S. C.* c.

R. V. LYON, writing from Whitby, C. W., says:—I am deeply interested in the EXAMINER. I shall endeavor to extend its circulation. For the encouragement of the friends of truth, allow me to say, *Bible truth* is progressing in this country, also in western N. Y., where I have labored. Since my note in the EXAMINER, dated July 17, I have immersed 21 souls into the Christ for the remission of sins, and am still in pursuit of some lost sheep.

Eld. JOHN CRAIG, Clinton, Mass., writes:—I am grateful to God and thankful to you for the light given me by the EXAMINER. It is plain the wicked have no claim to life, whatever, when they have rejected the LIFE-GIVER. Death is the penalty for sin, and death they receive; and having received their wages they get no more: there God's threatening ends.

I prize the EXAMINER above every other work except my Bible ; and both agree so well, that reading first one and then the other seems like reading the same thing twice. I wish it could come every week ; but thank the Lord for it once a month.

One of my sons has come home from the army with the loss of his right arm. I have two more there. What will be their fate I know not. Prayers and tears are all I can help them with now. Pray for me.

B. K. DAVIS, Monroe, Me., writes :—About one year ago my mind was first called to the subject of no future life to the wicked. Since then I have diligently and prayerfully studied the Bible, but was not settled on the question till I read "Retribution," which a friend gave me to clear my mind of error, as he supposed. I must say it did ; for I can now say, to me it is clear that whoever gets life from the dead, will die no more. If "Retribution" proves anything, it proves eternal torment. It is a little more than a year since I commenced preaching. Sunday, Nov. 16th, by the help and blessing of God, I raised the *new* banner ; and when the gales of grace shook out its blessed folds we saw inscribed, in letters of living light, "NO LIFE out of CHRIST !" and I must say, I never had such liberty before. God gave a rich blessing truly. To Him be the praise : bless His holy name.

G. B. MARTIN writes from Wright Co., Iowa :—It is a long time since I have heard from you. I emigrated from Penn. to this place in 1858. I have never heard a sermon since I came here : but I have my good old Bible, and I read it daily. I am still looking for the glorious return of the Saviour to this earth to reign with all His saints, and I think the coming nigh, even at the door. It seems to me the prophecy of Micah is fulfilling, "And He shall judge among many people, and rebuke strong nations afar off." This land is far off from Jerusalem where the Gospel first began ; and I think it possible that prophecy points to the present calamities in our country.***I would be glad to hear from you. I know not where you are living, or whether living at all or not. I took the EXAMINER from about its commencement till it was suspended at the close of 1857. I have some of your works. I consider your "SIX SERMONS" the best work ever written : they confirmed me in the view, "all the wicked shall God destroy." May God reward your labors, and bring you safely to His kingdom.

E. WOLCOTT, Oceanport, N. J., writes :—At Herbertsville, where you preached last August, persecution rages against the little flock ; but there is manifest, thus far, an old-fashioned constancy. I trust, by the power of God, the enemy will never be able to root up the vine planted there.

Eld. J. WHITTLESEY, Salem, Conn., writes :—The doctrines advanced

by the BIBLE EXAMINER are so in accordance with the word of God, I am led to wonder they should not be embraced by all who take the Bible as the guide and rule of life. The doctrine of life only through Christ appears so perfectly to harmonize with the sacred volume, that I delight to dwell upon it. I have searched the Scriptures prayerfully to ascertain the truth, which I prize more than fine gold. Your teachings throw a light on the word of God which inspires my heart with sacred joy. It represents God as just and merciful, and no tyrant; and the Saviour all-sufficient; hence I delight to read the Bible Examiner. May God prosper your efforts to enlighten and benefit men.

MRS. L. D. HEATH, Orleans Co., N. Y., writes:—I shall be exceedingly glad to see the EXAMINER *weekly*, and shall take it, let the price be what it may. It is just what the cause at this time demands. I love the ways of the Lord. I never saw such *perfection* of wisdom and beauty as since I saw the light on the non-revival of the wicked dead. It gives light on many portions of Scripture that were dark before, and harmonizes those that seemed in conflict. I am thankful I ever saw the light. "LIFE FROM THE DEAD" was the work that first gave me light. It is cheering to see so many coming out clear and strong on the truth.

LEVI BOUGHTON, Ontario Co., writes:—I am glad the EXAMINER is likely to be sustained. It is the only periodical in the world, so far as I know, that makes CHRIST the *only* source of life to man. All others retain some of the old theological feeling of revenge on the wicked, by giving life to them for the sake of torment and another death.—With my faith in God, I feel exceedingly happy, and rest in our dear Saviour alone for immortal life. I am anxious to see an article from you as to what is to come out of the present war in our country.

D. EDSON SMITH, Onondaga Co., writes:—An intelligent man with whom I conversed on the life theme, said, on the old theory, the Bible seemed unmeaning, and a confused mass, so that he had ceased, for twenty years, to take an interest in it; but the way I talk of it, it seemed a new book. In a public debate I had with a Cambellite, on the state of the dead, this man came ten miles to hear. He became deeply interested. I gave him some of your works; and now, thank the Lord, he is seeking as for hid treasure. His whole mind seems absorbed in the question, "What shall be the end of them who obey not the gospel?"

HELEN ROBERTSON, Utica, writes:—How that name, "LIFE-GIVER," fills my heart! I love to rest my eye on it and think of the Blessed One whose it is, and think of the time when He will bestow "the gift." In conversation with a lady, I opened my view to her from the Scriptures of "No life out of Christ." Her husband is a student of geology, astronomy, and other sciences; and she told me, he saw

such a God of love in all these things, he could not believe in eternal torment : and therefore almost rejected revelation, because the Methodists had taught him, that was the most prominent doctrine of the Bible. I gave her your "Six Sermons." I called on them again and found they were both searchers after truth. He said, the idea he got of God from the Methodists was, that He was always at the sinner's heels, with a pan of hot coals driving him to heaven. He found the God of Nature a different being, and therefore *must* reject the God of revelation. They were reading the Sermons, and much interested.— A few evenings after, the wife came to me rejoicing. O, how happy she was ! She said, she never had anything that did her so much good ; and that her husband was being drawn to the God of the Bible through the power, reasonableness, and straight forwardness of the reasoning of the Sermons. She said, " It will save us *both* from infidelity ; for he [her husband] showed me things in such a light that I *too* was turning away from the Bible." O, bless the Lord, bless His holy name, that the God of the Bible is a *God of love*. This lady is willing that every body should know her change of views : her interest in the Bible is intense. O, what a Bible that is ; and when we take hold of it right, how easy to be understood !

RUFUS WENDELL, Salem, Mass., writes :—The Discussion with Eld. Gates has awakened a new interest here on the Life theme, and the good results are quite apparent in various quarters. We debated seven evenings, and closed on Sunday night. Thirteen half-hour speeches were made by each of us—the closing speech each evening falling to me. I planted myself firmly upon the position that there is no future life for the wicked dead. Let those who wish to combat eternal misery, universalism, and spiritualism, without this weapon do so—I *cannot*. The Lord is opening the way for the spread of the Truth of Life only in Christ, and to His name be all the praise. Be it ours to labor faithfully.

Let me add that the Debate between Eld. Gates and myself was held in the Endicott-St. (Advent) Church, of which Dr. Josiah Litch is Pastor. The attendance throughout was good.

PEACE !

THE *Millennial Harbinger* makes great pretensions of peace. It has such an abhorrence of war that it cannot contain itself in the presence of any Christian who does not agree with it on the subject. The EXAMINER has unfortunately offended this Peaceable periodical by inserting some matter on the War Question. Hear it ; it says :

"The *Examiner*, we think, has departed widely from the 'object' of its publication, as expressed by its proprietor; and can but do itself harm by interfering with a matter that was none of its business, and withal to contain such vile slang."

The Good Book says, "Grievous words stir up anger;" but the *Harbinger* evidently thinks that they stir up peace. The EXAMINER expressed its approval of a western newspaper movement. At this the *Peaceable Harbinger* cries out—

"We should judge by the *Examiner* that this paper is intended to be a warrior."

For myself I am for peace. I do not believe that it is right to take up carnal weapons. But I am just as firmly opposed to that class of men who sow the seeds of war under the white flag of peace. Which is worse, to conscientiously bear arms, or to "breathe out threatenings and slaughter?" "Blessed are the peace-makers.

JOSEPH T. CURRY.

"WHAT IS YOUR OPINION ABOUT THIS WAR?"—So inquire some. Our opinion is, It will end when slavery does, and not before; whether that is before the second advent of Christ, or not till after. We fully believe, it is the nation's "day of judgment;" and repentance or destruction will terminate the war. We wait to see events before saying more on the subject. This war may be the opening of the great drama that is to wind up this age, or dispensation: but we choose to withhold a positive expression on the subject till more light appears.

THE BIBLE EXAMINER has been somewhat delayed in its issue, by the absence of the Editor, and also to give the most time possible for old subscribers to renew, and new ones to come in. We thank the friends for the responses received. In addition to subscriptions, there have been donations from \$1 up to \$20. Some of these have been for the EXAMINER, and some for its EDITOR. May the LORD reward all such with grace and glory.

We thought of issuing semi-monthly; but the increase in the price of paper forbids it, at present, unless a great increase of subscribers can be added to our list, or donations should warrant it.

BIBLE EXAMINER TRACTS.

It is proposed to publish a number of Tracts taken from the pages of the Examiner, entitled "*Bible Examiner Tracts.*" But they cannot be issued without funds. Will those favoring the object, supply the amount necessary? If so, we will put to press, at an early day, the following works: *viz.*—

- No. 1. "LETTER TO A CLERGYMAN; or, *Life only through Christ not a heresy:*" by Dr. J. K. Finley, Pittsburg, Pa. Price 5 cents.
 No. 2. "THE WAGES OF SIN; or, *The first Penalty, explained and confirmed by Scripture:*" by a Clergyman of an Orthodox Church. Price, 5 cents.
 No. 3. "THE SOUL SAVED OR LOST;" by Geo. Storrs. Price, 5 cents.
 No. 4. "THE DOOM OF THE UNGODLY: or, *The wicked dead remain eternally under death's dominion:*" by Geo. Storrs. Price, 5 cents.
 No. 5. "THE JUDGMENT;" by Geo. Storrs. Price, 5 cents.
 No. 6. "EARTH—NOT HEAVEN, IS TO BE THE INHERITANCE OF THE SAINTS:" by Geo. Storrs. Price 5 cents.
 No. 7. "MORAL DEPRAVITY;" by Geo. Storrs. Price 5 cents.
 No. 8. "THE ESSENTIAL BAPTISM;" by Geo. Storrs. Price 7 cents.

To this list others will be added. No. 8 is already issued.—No. 1 has been issued, but the edition was long since exhausted; and if more are desired we must have funds to print them. The other six numbers have never been issued in *Tract* form. The donor may designate, if he chooses, to the printing of which Nos. he will have his donation applied.

The postage on the foregoing Tracts will be *one* cent each, unless sent in packages of 8 ozs. or over: then it will be a *half* cent per ounce.

ELD. A. GUTHRIE, Tompkins Co., N. Y., writes:—I would recommend to every friend of the EXAMINER to send and get a few copies of the "EXTRA" on the "*Essential Baptism*" and circulate in their localities, that it may help to hold in check or cure the spirit of intolerance that is becoming so rampant in some sections of the land.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—We are glad to insert the foregoing recommendation, and trust it will not be unheeded. Soon the proud waves of intolerance will have swept away the last vestige of "brotherly love" if its waters are not checked. We can supply the "*Extra*" to any extent. Let it have wings.—Price 7 cents single: \$4 per 100, sent in that case at the expense of the purchaser.

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. 15. No. 2.] **FEBRUARY, 1863.** [Whole No. 221.]

"WILL THERE BE A RESURRECTION OF WICKED MEN?"

A NOTICE BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

THE above question furnishes the topic for a series of articles lately published in the *Gospel Banner*, Geneva, Ill. We do not esteem them of sufficient weight to merit a formal review, but propose to glance at certain portions of the argument, which, by their weakness and inconsistency, serve to illustrate the futility of the opposition to the doctrine of "*Life only in Christ.*"

The writer begins by taking a middle ground between the theory of the resurrection of *all* the wicked and that of *no* resurrection of the wicked. He says,

"Though the word of God does not teach the resurrection of *all* the wicked, yet it does a resurrection of part—all those that have not already been judged and knowingly condemned to die for their sins."

As belonging to the number who are not raised, he refers to that portion of the Antediluvian world which experienced death by the flood, the Sodomites, and the families of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. He says,

"Being 'over much wicked,' God judged them unworthy of life, and condemned them to death. . . . In view of similar judgments, Solomon says, 'Be not over much wicked, neither be thou foolish; why shouldst thou die *before thy time*?' Eccl. 7 : 17. . . I can come then to no other conclusion in the face of such evidence, but that some being over much wicked have suffered the penalty of the law—died the 'Second Death'; therefore will not appear in the general judgment."

We must acknowledge the decided originality of the writer. We should not have dreamed of having the *over much* wicked

suffer *one* death and the common order of sinners *two* deaths. Our arrangement would have been *vice versa*. We pass on to another point. Our readers will be surprised when they learn that John 3 : 36 ; 6 : 48, 50, 58 ; Rom. 8 : 13, "with many others of the same class" are *not applicable* "to the *present* age." The following is the argument.

"It is quite impossible that such passages can have a strict or complete fulfillment under the present constitution of things ; where die both the righteous and the wicked—he that partaketh of Christ and he that partaketh not—he that liveth after the flesh and he that mortifieth the deeds of the body, all die—all alike are laid in the dust. It is equally impossible to apply the truth they teach to the present age without changing the order of the plan of God" "But when applied to the world to come, where the antitypical 'Tree of Life,' and true 'Bread of Life' actually exist—and the world can have access thereto: then shall not only those who fail to partake of the same, die and not rise ; but on the other hand, those who do partake shall never die. Then shall a 'non-resurrection of the wicked' be no longer a *theory* but truth. Then shall the following passages be strictly and truly fulfilled, with many others of the same class. '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. 'I am that bread of life.' 'This is the bread that cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and *not die*.' '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*.' John 6 : 48, 50, 58."

If we comprehend the writer's meaning, he holds that there is no *vital* connection between Christ and the believer in *this* life. The resurrection does not develop the result of something *commenced here*. There is no such thing as a quickening process in *this* world of which the believer's resurrection is the inevitable consequence. When Christ said, "*I am* the bread of life," he did not mean "that a man may eat thereof," in *this* state of existence. The *eating* is to take place in "the world to come." Then Paul's talk about "the earnest of the Spirit," does not mean that we have a *pledge* of future redemption.—We have not, then, been "*sealed* with the *Holy Spirit* of promise." All we have is the naked *promise*.

Here we have the sad and yet legitimate effect of the exceedingly aquatic theory held by that class to which our writer belongs. The Spirit's office and influence are ignored by them. Immersed in the *symbol* they reject the *substance*. Pronouncing "experimental religion a strong delusion" they seek to supply

the lack by "divers baptisms"—*diaphorais baptismois*—"carnal ordinances" (Heb. 9 : 10). Alas! that men should hew "them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water" and forsake "the fountain of *living waters*." "As the Scripture hath said, Out of His belly (*i. e.*, out of Christ) shall flow rivers of *living water*. But this spake He of THE SPIRIT which they that believe on Him should receive." Let us for a moment turn from such a lamentable theory and consider our Lord's language in John 6th chapter.

"Work not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you." Work not, *when?* In the next age?—Nay, but *now* we are to prefer the "meat" given by "the Son of man" to "our necessary food." Well, if we work for "that meat" *now*, shall we not obtain it *now*? Yea! *Now* we may feed on "that meat which endureth."

"And Jesus said unto them, *I am* the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst." The Spirit given by Jesus constitutes the believer's enduring and all-sufficient portion *in this life*. It is "*in him* a well of water springing up into everlasting life."

"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. 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*." Thus, the resurrection "at the last day" is a consequence of belief in this life. Over all such Christ exercises a preserving power through *the Spirit* which He gives them, so that they shall "not perish," they shall not be lost in death, but will be raised up "at the last day."

"I am that bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and ARE DEAD. *This* is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and *not die*."—Unless "a man" partakes of "this bread" *in the present life* he will certainly perish *in death*, "in his own corruption." But if he eats "thereof," he obtains a life-principle *here* which will preserve him from extinction, and the resurrection "day" will prove that he did "*not die*."

"Then Jesus said unto them, 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.*" This passage proves beyond all doubt that the believer gets hold of the "life" in *this* world, and the *consequential event* follows. "Whoso *eateth* my flesh, and *drinketh* my blood, *hath* eternal life; and I WILL RAISE HIM UP AT THE LAST DAY."

"He that *eateth* my flesh, and *drinketh* my blood, *dwelleth* in me, and I in HIM." Here again the sense is unmistakable; the eating and the dwelling go together, and *this* world is the scene. Again comes the *result*. "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so *he* that *eateth* me, even HE shall live BY ME." Here belongs the parallel text John 14: 17.—"Because I live, *ye* shall live also." And just here Paul's argument in 1 Cor. 15 ch. applies. *Christ's* resurrection necessitates that of *all* those who dwell IN HIM, just as certainly as *Adam's* death necessitates the death of *all* in him. "As in *Adam* all die, even so in *Christ* shall all be made alive."

Our Lord fitly concludes the subject with the luminous and comprehensive declaration, "It is THE SPIRIT that QUICKENETH: the flesh profiteth nothing."

Further on, our writer says,

"We are plainly told that at the winding up of the present constitution of things there shall be a resurrection of the dead: but it is not so easy a matter to make a promised resurrection of the dead, apply only to the righteous."

If the writer will trouble himself so far as to refer to our "First Argument against the resurrection of the wicked," with the accompanying discussion, found in the September EXAMINER, he may see cause to alter his ideas of the "*promised* resurrection." How those who are not "heirs of the promise" can have the *benefit* of it, is yet to be explained. He says,

"Therefore, I say, let them prove that to live again—revive from the dead—necessitates an immortal, an incorruptible nature, and the point is gained that the righteous only will live again. But this cannot be done; for the recorded facts of revelation prove that such is not the case. . . . The son of the Shunamite woman—the widows' sons at Sarepta and Nain—the man who was let down upon the bones of Elisha—the daughter of Jairus—Lazarus, and others, were raised to life by the power of God: but not one obtained eternal or future life. We are also told that Christ gave the Apostles power to raise the dead: but who will presume to say that he gave them power to give eternal life."

Let us have our writer's challenge fairly understood before we reply, "Let them prove that to live again—revive from the dead"—"at the winding up of the present constitution of things"—"necessitates an immortal, an incorruptible nature." If this presentation does not suit our writer it is not our fault; it is the *true* question at issue according to his own statement as laid down in the two extracts. We wish it clearly understood that what God has done in the past by the way of miracles has nothing to do with His future developments. The "recorded facts" alluded to do not affect the doctrine of "the resurrection of *the dead*." We now reply to the challenge.

Paul says, 1 Cor. 15, "So also is *the resurrection of the dead*. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in INCORRUPTION. . . . It is raised a SPIRITUAL BODY. . . . *The dead shall be raised INCORRUPTIBLE.*" Thus Paul gives *the law* of the resurrection "at the winding up of the present constitution of things;" and we defy the writer to prove that a single person will have part in the resurrection at Christ's coming, or *thereafter*, except in accordance with *this* law.

The "recorded facts" mentioned are not at all apposite to this discussion. In not one instance had the subject experienced the weight of the penalty which is appointed to the animal man. "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return," was the sentence which involves not merely death, but *dissolution, corruption, non-existence*. We confess that the resurrection of beings after their identity is lost appears to us impossible. The Almighty must accomplish His *ends* by using *means*; and we believe that the only instituted means to preserve from annihilation in the state of corruption which is entered at death, is *the Spirit* of God. Those who have not that Spirit "*utterly perish in their own corruption*" as certainly as "irrational brute beasts." *There is not an instance on record* of the revival from *corruption* of an animal being, "having not the Spirit;" and we verily believe there *never will be* an instance. And it is a question in our mind whether *any* person was ever restored to *animal* life after having seen corruption. Yet we well understand that such a thing might take place in any case where the identity has been preserved by *the Spirit*. For instance, if Moses was resurrected to animal life, to appear on the mount at the transfiguration, the work was accomplished by the Spirit; although its normal operation effects *spiritual* life.

Our writer uses some arguments which have been answered in the EXAMINER: for instance, that which is based on the rendering *turned back* in Ps. 9: 17. He quotes Prof. Hudson in "Debt and Grace" to the effect that the original word "always denotes a return or turning back to a former place or state."—The statement is incorrect, and has been qualified in the *Crisis* by the Professor. Even if *turned back* is the proper rendering in the text the supposed conclusion is wrong, for the Psalm clearly refers to the *living* wicked at the coming of Christ, as has been shown in the EXAMINER.

Some of the writer's views are strikingly original, but we cannot waste space to present them. We have noticed a specimen at the beginning of this article. It is not necessary to answer every ephemeral argument that appears in print; and for ourselves, we are perfectly willing that the *Banner* articles should be published in a pamphlet, according to the design of the writer. Time will sift the chaffy material to the winds, and he will awake some morning *minus* his "strong reasons." There is one sentiment, however, which we will consider in conclusion, because it is generally held by our opponents, and is radically erroneous. It is contained in the following passage.

"But, says one, the sentence of death has already been executed upon the wicked, and in death shall they remain. Not so fast, friend; for the righteous die the same death, and from the same cause; now if it be the *just* penalty of the *law*, then the righteous have fallen under the penalty, which cannot be *justly* set aside; hence, they also cannot be raised. Such I claim is a legitimate conclusion arrived at from the premises laid down. But the premises are wrong; the death which the sinner and the righteous now die is not for their *own* transgressions; but for *Adam's*; which they were by him subjected to without any transgression on their part. Therefore all may be redeemed therefrom to stand or fall for themselves."

Here we have the assumption that some are *righteous* in the sight of the *law*. "All" are "to stand or fall for themselves," says this writer. Then some are righteous or they cannot "stand." How opposed is this sentiment to the teaching of Scripture! Paul says, "By deeds of *law* there shall *no flesh* be *justified* in his sight: for by law is the knowledge of *sin*." "For *all* have *sinned*, and come short of the glory of God." "For I was alive without law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment, which was or-

dained to life, I found to be unto death." "I am carnal, sold under sin." "For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing." "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 : 20, 23 ; 7 : 9, 10, 14, 18 ; 8 : 7, 8. "But that no man is justified by law in the sight of God is evident." "The Scripture hath concluded *all* under *sin*." Gal. 3 : 11, 22.

Thus our writer and those who reason like him are entirely in the dark with respect to the condition of the natural man. The animal race are already condemned as *sinner*s, and to say that *any* are *righteous* involves a contradiction of God's word. Now suppose we allow that "the death which" men "now die is not for their own transgressions" and that "all may be redeemed therefrom to stand or fall for themselves." What follows? Plainly, that *all* men will have to die *after* this supposed redemption. All must "*fall* for themselves" for none can "*stand*," inasmuch as *all* are condemned by the law. Thus nothing is gained by saying that men do not *now* die for their own transgressions. The trouble is only shifted into the *next* age; a very convenient method, by the way, to get rid of a difficulty.

But what do the Scriptures mean when they apply the term *righteous*? They refer to the righteousness of faith. "The just by *faith* shall *live*." And who are the wicked? The *unbelieving*. We now indorse the remark of our writer: "The righteous die the same death, and from the same cause; now if it be the *just* penalty of the *law*, then the righteous have fallen under the penalty, which cannot be *justly* set aside."—Now follows his conclusion which we do *not* indorse: "Hence, they also cannot be raised. Such I claim is the legitimate conclusion from the premises." "Such," we admit, "is the legitimate conclusion," if the law *only* is considered. But just here *Christ* steps in, and says, "*I* am come that ye may have *life*."—And this life is the consequence not of the righteousness of the law but of the justification through *faith* in the LIFE-GIVER.—The great mistake made by our writer consists in his attempt to get *life* from the *law*; whereas Paul says, "If there had been a *law* given which could have given *life*, verily *righteousness* should have been by *law*. But the Scripture hath concluded *all* under *sin*, that the *promise* by *faith* of JESUS CHRIST might

be given to THEM THAT BELIEVE." If the query now arises in our author's mind, "How can God *justly* give a future life to them that are condemned to eternal death? he has arrived at the point where he will perceive the wisdom and love of God in sending a *spiritual* nature into the world, not under condemnation; "that He might be *just*" in giving the *law* its claim, and yet "the justifier of him who believeth in Jesus" by giving him the spiritual nature. And here the essential baptism comes in, without which there is no future life. "That which is begotten of the flesh is *flesh*; and that which is begotten of THE SPIRIT is SPIRIT."

THE CONDITION OF EUROPE.—"To even a casual observer it is apparent that Europe is gradually but surely drifting into a convulsion. Notwithstanding that respective European Governments profess to be at amity with all neighboring powers, that emperors, kings, and diplomists are studiously polite to one another, and that professions of friendship are on their lips, there is much reason to fear that they mutually distrust one another, and are quietly preparing for the storm which is believed to be impending. Everywhere a spirit of uneasiness seems to pervade Europe. Russia, for instance, would appear to be on the verge of a revolution which may burst forth at any moment. General dissatisfaction is felt in the army, on which the Czar solely relies. A vast conspiracy exists, not only among the soldiery, but among the officers. A secret society, something after the principle of Ribbonism in Ireland, appears to have been formed; and when the work of assassination is decided upon, parties are elected to carry out the sentence of the tribunal. The nobles and the middle class population are also disaffected, and the numerous incendiary fires in all parts of the kingdom indicate how widely the conspiracy has spread. Poland shows unmistakable signs that ere long it will be in a state of convulsion; indeed, actual revolution is only kept down by martial law and the presence of a large army. With these internal sources of disquiet existing in his empire, the Czar has thought it a favorable opportunity to enter into a treaty (it is said of a very intimate character) with France and Italy—a combination that looks ominous for the future peace of Europe, and especially threatening to England."—*London Observer*.

A CORRESPONDENCE

BETWEEN RUFUS WENDELL AND MILES GRANT

RELATIVE TO

A Public Oral Debate in Boston on the Relation of the Wicked Dead to a Future Life.

LETTER No. 1.—R. WENDELL TO M. GRANT.

Salem, Mass., December 16, 1862.

Dear Bro. Grant :—Repeatedly during the past year, as you are aware, have I intimated a desire to meet you in public oral debate on the question of difference between us respecting the relation of the wicked dead to a future life. If my memory serves me correctly, when the matter was first mentioned to you (last winter), you expressed a willingness to discuss the subject. More recently, however, you have suggested that it might appear strange to "outsiders" to see "ministers of the same denomination" engaged in controversy. This consideration, however, appears to me to have little or no weight. That *you* should attach no importance to it appears clearly enough from the fact that you have not refrained from proclaiming throughout our "denomination," in the paper over which you preside, a most emphatic and unqualified commendation of "Retribution." More than all this, you avail yourself of your editorial prerogative to exclude from the *Crisis* the arguments of those of your brethren who repudiate as unscriptural the "great truth" which *you* say is demonstrated with entire conclusiveness in the work just named. These circumstances (with others which might be referred to) render it quite appropriate that you should shrink not from the defense of the views you hold on this question, if you deem yourself competent to maintain them in debate; and the object of this note is to give you a formal invitation to discuss the subject with me, on successive evenings, in Chapman Hall, Boston, and inquire whether you are willing to do so. If you accede to my proposal, we can readily fix upon the form of the question (or questions) and any other needful preliminaries.

I would suggest that it would require ten evenings to do the subject tolerable justice. We might stipulate to debate that number of evenings unless during the progress of the discussion we should mutually agree to bring it to a conclusion in less time.

As to the *time* for holding the discussion, I would name Monday evening, January 5th (*prox.*), and onward—suspending it, of course, on Saturday and Sunday evenings.

The place (lower or upper Hall, as the case may require) has been tendered us by the Chapman Hall brethren, and if we debate you shall be subjected to no pecuniary responsibility.

I should not object to an earlier time than that above named, if you should prefer not to wait till then, though I am of opinion that it would be unwise to mix up the discussion with the approaching holidays.

Many of our friends in Boston (on your side of the question and on mine) would be pleased with, and interested in, such a debate as I here propose. Let us, then, gratify them, and trust that our labor, if performed from right motives and in the spirit of meekness and love, will be blessed of God to the furtherance of His precious truth.

Do me the favor to return an answer to the foregoing (by mail) as soon as you have reached a decision.

Yours affectionately, in the Lord, RUFUS WENDELL.

P. S.—This will go unsealed to Bro. Meservey as I wish him to see it before it is handed to you. I shall give him permission to take a copy of it if he cares to do so.

RUFUS.

LETTER No. 2.—M. GRANT TO R. WENDELL.

Boston, Dec. 17th, 1862.

DEAR BRO. WENDELL:—Yours of the 16th inst. is at hand.

If you are satisfied it is for the glory of the Lord that we should have a discussion in Boston, on the resurrection of the wicked dead, I will consent to debate the subject with you at the time and place named, (Jan. 5th, Chapman Hall) provided we can agree on the form of the question, and other preliminaries. I would propose the following question:—“*Do the Scriptures teach the resurrection of the wicked?*” I would suggest that we speak twenty minutes at a time—two hours each evening, for four or five sessions. I think there is no need of being ten evenings about it. Let us condense, and come to the pith of the matter.

Please write me by return mail, as I am to be off on Saturday, expecting to be gone some days.

Love to the “loved ones at home.”

Your Bro. in Christ,

MILES GRANT.

LETTER No. 3.—R. WENDELL TO M. GRANT.

Salem, Friday Evening, Dec. 19, 1862.

Dear Miles:—I was at Lynn this afternoon; on my return this evening your favor of the 17th (mailed *to-day*) was handed me. In replying without any delay, I have to say,—

1. I am persuaded that the cause of Truth would be promoted by such a Discussion as I have proposed, and in this way I think “the glory of the Lord” would be subserved.

2. I approve of your suggestion that we debate two hours each evening, and that our speeches be twenty minutes in length.

3. You suggest “four or five sessions” for the Debate, and “think there is no need of being ten evenings about it.” In answer to this, I would say that we ought not to engage in such a Discussion unless we are willing to go over the entire ground to the extent of our acquaintance with the subject. Not only so, but our aim should be to carry conviction to the minds of our auditors, and this result I need hardly tell you would not be best attained by merely giving “the pith of the matter.” Of course, our purpose should be to bring out the *pith*, but we should also expect to dwell upon our points sufficiently to render it probable that they are generally comprehended, and their bearings appreciated, by our hearers. Now while I am quite sensible of my inability to do full justice to my side of the question, I am certain that what I am conscious of being able to offer to the purpose, in the way of direct arguments against your

view and in answer to those which I have reason to believe you would bring to its support, could not be said in "four or five" hours. I remain of the opinion that we should stipulate to discuss ten evenings, subject to any curtailment in the number of sessions which we might both consent to after we have entered upon our work. I should certainly have no desire to prolong the Discussion needlessly, but it appears to me improper to begin it at all if at the outset it is known by either of the disputants that the sessions agreed upon are too few in number to do tolerable justice to the subject. If you are unwilling to discuss in two consecutive weeks, I propose that we begin on Jan. 5th and debate five evenings in succession, with the understanding that we will, if either party desires it, debate another five nights, say before the first of March, provided that a less number of evenings shall not be mutually satisfactory. That you may be able at once to decide in respect to this point, I will add that I should prefer not to commence the debate if you are to have it in your power to terminate it *finally*, without my concurrence, in a less number of sessions than *ten*. I trust you will think favorably of the view I entertain touching this part of our preliminary understanding.

4. Now as to "the form of the question." The one you propose—"*Do the Scriptures teach the resurrection of the wicked?*"—is objectionable, and I cannot accept it. There should be no ambiguity in the question, and there need be none. If you are prepared to affirm that the Scriptures *do* "teach the resurrection of the wicked," you cannot be unwilling to affirm that they inculcate the *revival* of the wicked dead. If it is your belief that the impenitent dead are to be the subjects of a resurrection which will not give them a temporary *life*, you are not the man with whom I wish to debate. But you *do* believe they will *live again* by a resurrection. Let the question then be this: "*Do the Holy Scriptures teach that the wicked dead will live again?*"—Should you deem it of the slightest importance to add the words "*by a resurrection,*" you may do so, but let us retain the words "*live again*" or "*be made alive.*" If you shaped the question in the manner you did with the expectation that your only *necessary* labor would be to cite our blessed Lord's utterance concerning the "resurrection of damnation" (John v. 29), you have now my permission to believe that, in the event of a discussion between us, you would not be allowed to *assume* that any one will be brought to *life* by that "resurrection."—The "*pit*" of the expression appears to me to exclude such an idea.

Hoping to be advised without unnecessary delay of your conclusion in regard to my proposal,

I remain your affectionate brother,

RUFUS WENDELL.

LETTER No. 4.—M. GRANT TO R. WENDELL.

Boston, Dec. 23, 1862.

Dear Bro. Wendell:—Yours of the 19th inst. was duly received.

Touching the number of evenings for the discussion, I cannot see the need of so many as you name—*ten*. I still think we can just as well give the subject a *thorough* examination in four or five evenings, as well as to be longer. In most

of my debates, when we have taken up the *two* questions of the sleep of the dead and the destruction of the wicked, I had but *four* evenings, as in the case of Dr. Litch.

I am in favor of having sufficient time to do the work *well*; but do not believe in talking for the sake of making speeches, as do Congressmen, when they wish to cultivate their powers of eloquence. Indeed, I see no reason why we might not discuss the subject as well in *two* evenings as *ten*. But we will not divide on this point.

"Now as to 'the form of the question.'" You object to the one proposed :—
"Do the Scriptures teach the resurrection of the wicked?"

I am *surprised* at your objection, for it appears to me that this form involves the point, at issue between us, in the *simplest* and *clearest* language by which it can be expressed; and this was my aim. I designed to have it so *plain*, that there could be *no possibility* of "ambiguity"; hence I can see no good reason for your objection. I believe in "the resurrection of the wicked," and you believe in "the non-resurrection of the wicked." By *resurrection*, I mean what Mr. Webster gives as the definition of the word :—"A rising again; chiefly, the revival of the dead of the human race, or their return from the grave."

With this explanation, there can be no chance for "ambiguity" in the form of the question proposed for your acceptance; therefore I can see no cause to change it, as it now most *clearly* states my position as opposed to yours; and I cannot conceive of a form that will do it better.

If you wish to debate the subject, I trust you will no longer object to the question proposed.

Your Bro. in Christ,

MILES GRANT.

LETTER No. 5.—R. WENDELL TO M. GRANT.

Salem, Mass., Dec. 24, 1862.

Dear Bro. Miles :—Your favor of yesterday, in response to my last, is received, and as it requires an answer I set myself forthwith about the work.

1. By your remark, "But we will not divide on this point," I distinctly understand that, if we enter upon the proposed debate, you will not be at liberty without my concurrence to terminate it in less than ten evenings. So far, therefore, we understand each other, and will regard this preliminary item as settled. If the event shall show that we can "discuss the subject as well in *two* evenings as *ten*," you will not be more gratified with the fact than I shall be, though you may be less surprised. I trust I shall be enabled to avoid even the appearance of "talking for the sake of making speeches": to convince you and such of our hearers as are not already convinced *that there is no future life whatever for the wicked dead*, will be the object which I shall have distinctly in view throughout the discussion, and I shall aim at its accomplishment with as much directness as I can command.

2. The form of the question presents itself for further consideration. Your suggestions on this point utterly fail to show that I should not adhere to my purpose not to accept the question you have proposed. "The point at issue between us," as you very well know, has respect to the question whether the wicked dead will *live again*, and you are entirely mistaken if you suppose that your form of question presents this issue "in the *simplest* and *clearest* language by which it can be expressed." We want a question which does not need "explanation." That the one you propose, and seem inclined to insist

upon, is not of this character, and should hence be rejected by me, will be apparent to any who regard the fact that I believe that "the resurrection of damnation" brought to view in John 5 : 29 *does* apply to "the wicked" dead. Your interpretation of the phrase just cited from John 5 : 29, if you believe it teaches a *revival* of the wicked, I dissent from, while your method of quoting from the Dictionary justifies the suspicion (which, however, is more than a mere suspicion in my mind) that "by resurrection" *you do not*, after all, "mean what Mr. Webster gives as the definition of the word." *You dose* his definition with the word "grave," whereas Webster follows that word with a comma, and adds, "particularly at the general judgment." If you will give it as your opinion that Mr. Webster means by his definition that one portion of "the human race" are to be raised from the dead one thousand years later than another portion, I will believe that his definition satisfies *you* just as it stands in the Dictionary, in spite of its abridgement in your letter. But not to dwell upon this point; a simpler and clearer question than the one your propose is this,— "Do the Holy Scriptures teach that the wicked dead will live again?" Again I say, add the words "by a resurrection" if you please, but do not fail to affirm in some direct and unmistakable way that dead sinners will have *life*.

If the *directness* of the question I propose startles you somewhat, I would consent to a little circumlocution for your sake, and take the negative of the following :— "Do the Holy Scriptures warrant the belief that the wicked dead will ever have a conscious existence?" You seem to prefer being on the affirmative in the debate; if, however, your choice would be to take the negative, you may insert "not" before "live again" in the first question above, or "never" in the place of "ever" in the second. That we may reach an early decision as to whether we will debate or not, I will add that—while, for the Truth's sake, I desire to engage in the discussion with you *if* you deem me in error concerning the revival of the wicked dead—I have (for the present, at least) no further propositions to make to you touching the form of the question to be debated. I wish to have no discussion with you if you do not believe the wicked dead will live again, or if, believing it, you insist upon a form of question which does not in the most unmistakable manner commit you to that proposition. When the subject was first discussed in the *ΕΧΑΜΗΝΑ*, the question was, "Will the wicked dead live again?"—Bro. Grew on the affirmative, and Bro. Storrs on the negative. Bro. G. found no fault with the form of the question, however much of difficulty he may have found in maintaining his ground. Should you decline to affirm directly (in debate) the *revival* of the wicked dead, do not fail to indicate the ground of your unwillingness. If the discussion falls through, I am not the only one interested in knowing the precise reason. You may rest assured that I shall not willingly suffer the impression to obtain that *I* have not been anxious to have the question stated in the most unambiguous, and therefore unobjectionable, form possible. In the question debated by Dr. Litch and yourself I find the phrase "*conscious misery*," from which I infer that *you* were

determined that there should be no loophole for a misunderstanding as to the nature of the Doctor's undertaking. But I have said enough.

In conclusion, permit me to assure you that, if your convictions are in the smallest degree unsettled on the question of our difference, I have no desire whatever to draw you into a debate, for in that case you ought to have time to go over the investigation carefully and calmly. I am not without the hope that you may yet become as bold and efficient a defender of Life only in Christ as you now are of No Immortality out of Christ.

Yours in the Lord,

RUFUS WENDELL.

P. S.—Your sermon here on Demonology and Spiritualism did much good. Write by return mail if possible.

R. W.

LETTER No. 6.—M. GRANT TO R. WENDELL.

Boston, Dec. 26th, 1862.

Dear Bro. Wendell:—Yours of the 24th inst. is just received and examined. You think I "do not, after all, 'mean what Mr. Webster gives as the definition of the word,'" resurrection. I think I do.

I mean by the resurrection of the righteous or wicked, that they will come to life again, after they have died. I mean nothing short of this; hence Mr. Webster expresses my belief as to the meaning of the word.

You say, "If your (my) convictions are in the smallest degree unsettled on the question of our difference, I (you) have no desire whatever to draw you (me) into debate."

On this point, I would simply say, my "convictions are" not "in the SMALLEST DEGREE UNSETTLED" in the fullest possible belief that there will be a resurrection of the wicked dead; and, by the help of the Lord, will endeavor to sustain the affirmative of the following question:—

"Do the Scriptures teach the resurrection of the wicked?"

I do not yet see any good reason to adopt some other form of question, so long as this fully involves the point at issue between us.

With what I have said, before you, there can be no room for a shade of "ambiguity" in the matter.

If you are decided not to discuss this question, please say so, and the matter is ended.

Please answer by return mail, if convenient.

Your Bro. in Christ,

MILES GRANT.

LETTER No. 7.—R. WENDELL TO M. GRANT.

On the Cars, Dec. 27, 1862.

Dear Bro. Grant:—Yours of the 26th has just come to hand. In reply, I have to inform you that my decision not to discuss the question you have proposed (viz., "Do the Scriptures teach the resurrection of the wicked?") remains unchanged. My only objection to it is that it does not express what you say you "mean" by it. As a last effort to bring you to terms before this correspondence between us closes, I offer now to take the negative of a question which, while it retains the entire substance of yours, embodies also your definition of one of its principal terms. It is as follows:—"Do the Scriptures teach that the wicked, by a resurrection, will come to life again, after they have died?"

Please to indicate at once your acceptance or rejection of the foregoing question.

Yours affectionately,

RUFUS WENDELL.

LETTER NO. 8.—M. GRANT TO R. WENDELL.

Boston, Dec. 29, 1862.

Dear Bro. Wendell:—Yours of the 27th inst. is at hand, and contents noticed. You say you are decided not to discuss the question I have proposed, and remark:—"My only objection to it is, that it does not *express* what you say you 'mean' by it."

So far as I know, it expresses *just what I "mean by it;"* and still further, I understand it to express very *dearly* the point of difference between us, and for this reason prefer it to any other form of question, which may be more *wordy*, but less simple. If you are willing to meet the point at issue between us, in the *open field*, I see no valid reason for your refusal; neither can I conceive of any good reason for my accepting a form of words not found in the Scriptures, which would only serve to throw the whole matter into confusion.

Whenever you become willing to discuss the simple question I have proposed, which, as I conceive, expresses in the *plainest possible terms* the point of dispute between us; please inform me, and I shall be glad, by the help of the Lord, to stand up in its defense. Till you shall come to such a conclusion, I must consider this "As a last effort to bring you to terms," and the close of our correspondence on the subject.

Your Bro. in Christ,

MILES GRANT.

LETTER NO. 9.—R. WENDELL TO M. GRANT.

Salem, Monday morning, Dec. 29, 1862.

Dear Bro. Grant:—In answer to my note of the 27th inst., containing what was then intended "as a last effort to bring you to terms," you stated to me verbally on Saturday evening that you were unwilling to relinquish the form of question which you had insisted on in your letters. In connection with this avowal you departed so far from your epistolary reticence as to state the grounds upon which all my overtures had been rejected. Your having done this justifies one more attempt on my part to convince you that the position you have taken is utterly wrong and wholly unworthy of the reputation you have acquired as a public debater. And I am especially impelled to make this further effort from the consideration that (in our private interview) you have protested with the warmest emphasis against the suggestion that you dared not to meet the real issue which divides us, or that you were unwilling to do so. Convinced that, as the matter now stands, the verdict of competent and impartial judges will be against you, I give you one more chance to decide that you *will* meet me in "debate on the question of difference between us respecting the relation of the wicked dead to a future *life*." Endeavoring to be brief, I remark—

1. The only question *you* have proposed is this:—"Do the Scriptures teach the resurrection of the wicked?" *Why* do I refuse to accept this form of question? *Why must* I thus refuse? I answer, —for the reason that I cannot conscientiously assume the negative of the question in its unexplained form. Christ declares that "they that have done evil" (meaning "the wicked," as I understand him) shall come forth unto the "*resurrection of damnation*" (condemnation). You receive this statement of our Lord, and it is your "*fullest possible belief*" that it contains an assertion of the *revival* of the wicked dead; —I too believe His declaration, but with all my heart I reject *your interpretation* of its import, being "*rooted and grounded*" in the con-

viction that by the asserted "resurrection" the unholy will *not* "come to life again, after they have died." If we debate, *we must ourselves agree as to the import of the question*; but, since *your* question contains a term whose import we do *not* understand alike in a passage of Holy Writ where we *do* agree in applying it to "*the wicked*," nothing could surpass the absurdity of my accepting your proposal, unless it be your assurance in seeking to force an objectionable question upon me, or the unfairness of your refusal to let your own question exhibit *the sense in which you use the word resurrection*. Had Dr. Litch asked you to take the negative of the question, "Do the Scriptures teach the everlasting *punishment* of the wicked?"—if you had not laughed him to scorn, you would most assuredly have refused compliance; and yet it should be obvious to the most common understanding that such a proposal from him finds a parallel in yours to me. While I accept joyfully any reproach that may arise from my rejection of what you deem the true *interpretation* of John 5 : 28, 29, I must beg to be excused from assuming a position in debate which might *seem*, to say the least, to involve either an entire oblivion of the passage, or a deliberate denial of its verity.

You hinted in our interview that I was seeking an improper *advantage* over you in the statement of a question. I ought not to be required to meet such an insinuation, but the Lord is witness that no such thought has entered my mind. The suggestion, however, finds an ample refutation in what I have written you in this correspondence, and, if we do not debate, you will place me under lasting obligations if you will adhere to your purpose to lay our letters before the readers of the *Crisis*. If the proposed debate falls through, I take it that our brethren in Boston, who hold to the revival of the wicked dead, will no longer feel authorized to say (as one of them has, I believe, repeatedly said)—"Bro. Grant is willing to discuss the subject." Mark this prediction.

You have claimed in your letters that, because you have informed me what you "*mean*" by the word "resurrection" in your question, there can be no "ambiguity" in it. This is a senseless claim on your part unless you "*mean*" by it that you will *defend your definition* of the term in every passage where you may claim that it is used in relation to the wicked dead. This you would be compelled to do, or our discussion would be a complete farce. For instance, if we were discussing the import of John 5 : 28, 29, I should take the ground that the righteous and wicked will literally "come forth," and that both classes are *dead* when they "come forth." Then I should maintain that the proper antithesis of a "resurrection of *LIFE*" cannot be a "resurrection" which *revives* the wicked. (At this point the new theory of a corruptible resurrection life for the righteous, which you regard with favor, would naturally present itself for consideration.) Now, if our discussion could not be prosecuted unless you should undertake to prove that the wicked dead will *live again*, and if you are willing to engage in a contest which you know will at once and inevitably impose this burden upon you, in the name of reason and common sense tell me, if you can, why the question for discussion

shall not plainly commit you to this imperative task. You believe the wicked dead will *live again*. I believe they will be *eternally held in the embrace of death*. These two statements indicate the nature of our difference, while they suggest most clearly that you should either take the affirmative of the question, "Do the Holy Scriptures teach that the wicked dead will live again?"—or you should let me take the affirmative of the following: "Do the Holy Scriptures teach that the wicked dead will never live again?" Your persistent rejection of *both* these questions will be proof demonstrative that you have not the slightest claim to be regarded by others as willing to controvert the real issue between us "in public oral debate."

2. The objection you offered (verbally) to my form of question was, that it is couched in language not found in the Scriptures, and is hence objectionable. The real strength of this hiding place may be readily exhibited.

(1.) Did you ever, in all your twenty-eight discussions, debate a question which might not have been objected to on the same ground?

(2.) Is not the question you propose for my acceptance obnoxious to the same objection?

(3.) Your objection is the merest trifling unless you take the ground that, in your discussions with men who believe the Bible ("ministers of the same denomination" with yourself, for example), you will debate no question which does not commit your opponent to a deliberate denial of statements which he knows the Bible contains. Such a demand is to be tolerated only in men who have lost their reason, but who, on that very account, should not be encouraged to engage in "public oral debate," except by the advice of their physicians.

(4.) I now remark that the *imaginary character* of your objection completely annihilates it. Let us see. The phrases to which you object in my forms of question are "*live again*" and "*be made alive*."—Now it happens, my dear brother, that you have for years, to my certain knowledge, maintained that these phrases *are* Scriptural, and that they are both applied in the Bible to the resurrection of the wicked. Take the first, "*live again*," and turn to Rev. 20: 5,—"*But the rest of the dead LIVED NOT AGAIN until the thousand years were finished.*" Now it is your position (and you have repeatedly avowed it) that "*the rest of the dead*" here means "*the wicked dead*" named in my question, and that the text teaches by direct implication that *they will* "*LIVE AGAIN*" when the "*thousand years*" are "*finished*."—By this short process do I show that *you* have no right to cavil at the phrase "*live again*." Just so with the other—"be made alive."—The Apostle declares, "*in Christ shall all BE MADE ALIVE*" (1 Cor. 15: 23), and ever since I have known you it has been your position (and I have heard you virtually affirm it during the present month) that "*the wicked dead*" are embraced in this statement. Comment is unnecessary. Your objection crumbles to nothing, and you are left in the attitude of insisting that I shall take the negative of your question when I am unable to do so conscientiously, and of refusing at the same time to affirm a proposition which, while it presents our

difference in the most unmistakable manner, has, according to your own emphatic assertion, your "fullest possible belief."

If what I have now written shall have the effect to alter your determination, I wish you without fail to insert the accompanying Notice of our Discussion on the editorial page of this week's *Crisis*. Should you, however, persist in your refusal to discard your question for one that I have proposed, you will not only have placed yourself in a disadvantageous light before the tribunal (the public) which is to judge between us, but you will also have insured yourself against the remotest probability of ever again exciting my surprise by any thing bearing the character of downright puerility.—While I use "great plainness of speech," I do not cease to love you, and therefore subscribe myself, as ever,

Your affectionate brother, RUFUS WENDELL.

P. S., 4 o'clock, P. M.—The foregoing letter was written between three and eight o'clock this morning. Within the past hour I have received your letter of this date, in answer to mine of the 27th, and have carefully perused it. The only reply I desire to make is to say that if the decision it communicates (in substance the same as your verbal answer on Saturday evening) is not modified by what I have now written, you may consider this postscript and the letter which precedes it as the close of my part of "our correspondence on the subject."

RUFUS WENDELL.

NOTE.—When Bro. Grant had read my last letter he was urged, in a personal interview, to recede from his demand respecting a form of question for debate. But, like Paul on one occasion, "he would not be persuaded;" and hence no Discussion was held. The Correspondence is now published that the friends in Boston and elsewhere may judge of the merits of his refusal, and to correct the opinion of such as deem willing to defend, in public debate, the position that the wicked dead will live again.

Bro. Grant informs me that he intends to publish in the *Crisis* of next week the first eight of the foregoing letters, but he declines giving his readers my last letter to him. This does not surprise me, and the regret occasioned by his decision is alleviated by the admiration excited by his caution. The readers of the Examiner will oblige me by placing "Letter No. 9" under the eye of those of the *Crisis*, that they may see the answer rendered to Bro. G.'s frivolous objections to the questions proposed for his acceptance. I wish it likewise borne in mind that my brother has propounded a theory of debate which he will be compelled to violate in any future discussion of Bible questions upon which he may enter.

Bro. G. is in error in supposing that my question would have tended "to throw the whole matter into confusion." Had he said that it would throw him into "confusion" he would only have anticipated the conclusion which I think will be drawn generally by the readers of our correspondence. "Confusion," in the event of a debate, there would have been, doubtless, but out of it I am persuaded the precious doctrine of LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST would have emerged with a strength and glory that must have commended it to the approval of many lovers of truth who desire to "prove all things" and "hold fast that which is good."

January 19, 1863.

RUFUS WENDELL.

THE JUDGMENT.—In our article on this subject in the EXAMINER for March, 1861, we asked of those who believe the righteous will have a priority, in time, in the resurrection.

“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 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 not the wicked raised at the same instant, except they also had been judged and found unworthy to have part in this prior resurrection?”

We now add, There is no escape from these questions by those who hold *all men* are revived at the *same time*, and yet say, the *wicked* are raised *corruptible*: for, it is clear, the righteous come up *incorruptible* and immortal—“the dead shall be *raised incorruptible* :” 1 Cor. 15 : 52. Why this distinction in the revival state, if both classes had not been judged prior to it?—Why should one class come into life *incorruptible* rather than the other, if their destiny had not been decided previously?—Pressed by these questions, the advocates of the re-living of the wicked dead, have been compelled to change their ground, and now assume, both the righteous and wicked are raised *corruptible*, and continue so till after the judgment! But instead of extricating themselves from difficulty by this shift, they are involved in still greater absurdities, besides flatly contradicting the apostle, who says, unqualifiedly, “the dead are raised *incorruptible*.”

The absurdity of this position will appear from a few considerations. Some *period* must be allotted to the day of judgment; and it matters but little what the time is, whether a “thousand years” or ten million. While it lasts, mortal beings must be fed by cultivating the earth or by a miracle. If by either, it implies *mercy* to the wicked; who, according to these theorists, are to have no mercy after their resurrection. The theory also involves the idea of keeping the righteous in a mortal state for a period vastly longer than their present life: and whether mortality then—in the resurrection state—will be at-

tended with weariness and pain may be only a matter of conjecture : it must inevitably be, to most of the righteous, a state of suspense, which cannot be an agreeable condition : and the righteous are likely to have a longer period of infelicity after the resurrection than the whole of this present life !

In opposition to such a wild and unscriptural notion of a resurrection, we oppose the Apostle's statement that, "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 shall be changed : for this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality : so when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, THEN shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory :" *not after a subsequent judgment.*

"The day of judgment," according to these new theorists, in which the whole race of Adam are to undergo a *personal* examination in regard to all they have done, said, and thought, is to be just as long as it takes to "*twinkle the eye* :" *or, "a moment !"* Such a "day of judgment" is not very terrific ! Might we not say, the theory makes void a day of judgment altogether ! It is a mockery to call such a farce, as this theory involves, "*The day of Judgment*" !

It is clear to us, the judgment which decides character and doom is at some period prior to the resurrection of the righteous ; and that the resurrection is the *executive* judgment, executed by the Son of God—as "*the Son of man*"—to whom God has "given authority" to carry out the *prior* decision on all the race : the righteous to be made alive, incorruptible and immortal : the wicked "*not to see life, but the wrath of God to abide on them ;*" eternally to "REMAIN IN THE CONGREGATION OF THE DEAD." John 3 : 36. Prov. 21 : 16.

"RETRIBUTION" is a work by H. L. Hastings, written to oppose the doctrine of "no life from the dead for the wicked."—We say this for the information of our new subscribers. The

Advent Herald, Boston, edited by S. Bliss, speaking of those who hold to life only through Christ, says :

"There is an important issue here involved,—between the two classes of those claiming to hold 'no life out of Christ.'—For if life there means existence, it would preclude the resurrection of the wicked; but if *that* life is a specific condition of existence, it knocks from under [them] the prop on which unconsciousness rests. The advocates of final extinction of being, and yet holding the resurrection of the wicked, are in a dilemma,—either horn of which is fatal to them. For, to be consistent, they must give up either the one or the other of those positions.

We thank the *Herald* for saying thus much. That is the true state of the case. Prove the wicked dead have a resurrection into life—by which we mean a *living* "existence"—and we will yield the whole argument: for "they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, *even* the resurrection *from* the dead *** cannot die any more." There is no "final extinction of being" to any soul of man who lives again from the dead at the last day. Settle the point that all men will have a revival into a living state from the dead, and one of two things inevitably follows, *viz.*: eternal misery to the wicked, or universal salvation and glory. "The advocates of final extinction of being, and yet holding the resurrection of the wicked, are," truly, in a sad "dilemma;" and to them it is a "fatal" one. They came up to the *crowning truth* of the theory of "No life out of Christ," *viz.*, "No life from the dead for the wicked," and here they halted, stumbled, and fell. They are like those disciples, who at the close of Jesus' great life sermon, John 6th, said, "This is a hard saying: who can hear it?" From that time they "went back and walked no more with Him." So we expect it will be now. It is impossible to maintain the position they at present occupy.

AN ARMY DIALOGUE.—"Speaking evil of the things they understand not" is a common thing. Some do so from the fact they do *not* understand: others not simply from this fact, but from an unwillingness to understand anything that differs from their present notions. An illustration of the Scripture com-

mencing these remarks was exhibited here in the army a short time since between P. and the Colonel.

P.—Is a soldier obliged by the army regulations to attend service every Sunday, when he don't believe the doctrine preached by the Chaplain? COL.—Yes. Why? P.—I don't believe in the doctrine preached, and came to ask the question. COL.—Are you a Catholic, sir? P.—No, sir. COL.—What then, sir? P.—I am an Adventist. COL.—O, well, there is so little difference between them and our Chaplain [a close communion Baptist] that it will make no difference with you. I don't make the Catholics go, but it matters not with you; for our Chaplain believes in the Lord's coming as much as you do! P.—The coming of the Lord is a small portion of the difference in our belief. COL.—What then is the difference? P.—I do not believe in the immortality of the soul, nor the eternal misery of the wicked; but he does, and preaches it every Sunday. COL.—What! you don't believe in the immortality of the soul? P.—No, sir! COL.—Well, my private opinion, profanely expressed, is, that any man that don't believe the soul is immortal is a d—d fool; that's all: so you better go and hear a little Christianity; it may do you good.

A CATECHISM FOR THE TIMES.

COMMENDED TO ALL WHO SINCERELY DESIRE AND SEEK AFTER
THE TRUTH.

Question 1.—What is faith in its true sense? *Answer.*—“Now, faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.” Heb. 11: 1. *Ques. 2.*—How many kinds of faith are there? *Ans.*—Three. *Ques. 3.*—What are the different kinds of faith mentioned in the Bible? *Ans.*—Vain, dead, and living faith. *Ques. 4.*—What kind of faith is acceptable to God, and will prove a saving faith to us? *Ans.*—Active, or living faith. *Ques. 5.*—Who was the founder, or father of faith? *Ans.*—Abraham. *Ques. 6.*—Is faith a principle perfect in itself or must we perfect it? *Ans.*—We must perfect it. *Ques. 7.*—How can we perfect our faith? *Ans.*—By works. James 2: 22. *Ques. 8.*—Was Abraham's faith and works agreeable to each other? *Ans.*—They were. James 2: 21, 22. *Ques. 9.*—Was his example, Gen. 14: 13 to 17, agreeable to the precepts left to us by him, and cited by the Saviour and the Apostles? *Ans.*—We think they were, for we are directed by the Saviour and the Prophets to look to Abraham. *Ques. 10.* Does the precepts and example of Christ conflict with or annul the faith or works of Abraham? *Ans.*—Abraham by his works

pleased God,—James 2 : 21 and on,—and Jesus said, If I do not the works of Him that sent me, believe me not : therefore we conclude that the faith and works of Jesus were agreeable with those of Abraham. *Ques. 11.*—If the acts of Abraham,—Gen. 14 : 13 to 17,—were justifiable, then will the elapse of time bring condemnation to those who would follow his example? *Ans.*—An act in the right spirit, in the father of the faithful, never became a wrong in the children, if done by the same spirit. *Ques. 12.*—Did Abraham do his enemies,—Gen. 14 : 15 to 20,—any wrong? *Ans.*—We think not, because he received the blessing of the most high God, at the hand of the Priest, when he returned victorious over his enemies. *Ques. 13.*—Can any of those that have gone forth in this war, with a true intent to free the oppressed, break every bond, and assist the bound in procuring their freedom, look to the most high God for any blessing? Knowing that God is not a respecter of persons, and being assured from the Scriptures of the eternity of His purposes, we think the foregoing a sufficient answer to the thirteen questions.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE BIBLE EXAMINER.—In Vol. 15, No. 21, of the *World's Crisis*, there appeared an article headed, "A Catechism for the Times," by Bro. Thayer, in which he tried to show, by questions and what he supposed to be answers, that good men could not bear arms in this war. I thought there could be no objections to both sides of the question being published in that paper, and so took the liberty to write the foregoing Catechism and forwarded it to the *Crisis*. But it appears that it found no place in the columns of that paper. If you should judge it worthy of notice, you will please publish it.

Co. A, 7th Reg. Conn. Vol.

ALBERT W. PIERCE.

Beaufort, S. C.

THE MIRROR.

FROM O. R. L. CROZIER, MICHIGAN.

TO ED. OF EXR.—In my "Question of Privilege" in the Dec. EXAMINER, I constructed a mirror for the *Harbinger*, mainly of quotations from its own pages, hoping it would reform at sight of itself ; but I am sorry to see, by its issue of Dec. 10, that my good offices, like rays of light in passing through hostile substances, have been prevented from their intended and greatly needed mission. For, losing

temper under kind reproof, that captious sheet again offends good taste by crying "*vile slang!*"—a cheap rejoinder to stubborn facts and unanswerable arguments, such as I have presented against its position and course.

Among the many texts enjoining propriety of speech, and deportment which are forgotten by its Editor, is 1 Tim. 5 : 1 : "Rebuke not an Elder, but entreat him as a father." Had he, who is a mere youth and a *novice* in the cause, thought of this text, he could hardly have been so uncivil as to *smub* the most venerable Elder among us, as he did you, by telling you, It is "*none of your business!*" Is this a specimen of the "more select reading matter" promised in the new form? Such *coarseness* neither indicates Christian refinement in its author, nor is it calculated to foster it among its readers.

The "*personal abuse*" complained of, must refer to my apology for his hostility to our government on the ground of his being an Englishman. Some of the English are as liberal-minded as any people living; but, unfortunately, our English Editors are not of that class. Dr. Thomas, Editor of the Herald of the Kingdom, characterized the two contending parties in our national struggle, as "*Rebeldom and Rabblement*," and his echo of the *Harbinger*, has regarded them in about the same way. They betray even a partiality for the tyrant's lash, and take to its use in their theology and religious policy with great facility. It is the intolerant *British* spirit of *Thomasism*, as much, perhaps, as anything else, that is producing discord and division among us, and bringing into contempt some of the most glorious doctrines of revelation. Wonder if this isn't one of the "unclean spirits;" its vocabulary, pompous, spiteful and vulgar, might seem to indicate such a family affinity. And yet many most excellent brethren are imbibing that spirit under specious names. I am satisfied it is one of Satan's snares—a mischievous device to hinder the Gospel.

The Proclamation of Freedom.

Since writing the foregoing, the President's PROCLAMATION OF FREEDOM—a New Year's Gift to more than three millions of persons—has been published! This is a direct fruit of the war. Many thousands have been made actually free before, in its progress; and the entire extinction of slavery in our country only depends, under God, upon the Government's being firmly supported in the prosecution of the war. This pays us pretty well for the scorn and misrepresentation we have suffered from those who, under the guise or in the fog of "non-resistance," try to hide their hatred or fail to show their love of freedom for the poor. We have no reason to hope the former will repent of their heartless hypocrisy; they will still find means to deceive and mislead those whom they can influence. But some of the latter will, doubtless, see and acknowledge the light on this great subject, though it be in the glowing path of "THE LORD OF HOSTS."

I love to turn away from unfeeling false shepherds, to rejoice with the humble poor. God be praised that the sword of executive justice is hewing the way for light to their miserable abodes. It seems appropriate that their exodus from the house of bondage should be through the blood of their oppressors. How patient they have been! How devoutly they have prayed, and hoped, and waited, and believed that God would give them freedom. And while the precious boon has again and again been almost within reach and snatched away, not an outrage have they committed: they have been unvaryingly true to the Government, and when regularly enrolled in its service have fought the enemies of good order and humanity with true Christian courage. They have proved themselves worthy of the sympathy and aid of their friends. May God bless them, and bless every means used for their benefit.

THE DIFFERENCE.

BY T. P. LEWIS, HARTWICK, N. Y.

THE difference in what? Why the difference between the righteous and the wicked. Is there any if the wicked are never raised to life? In "Retribution," p. 9, the following seems to be made the basis of argument.

"Strict and even-handed justice, according to the laws of God or man, is not meted out to all mankind in this life, or in this world. No fact can be plainer than this. Oftentimes the good are oppressed, and the bad triumph over them. The vile are exalted and the righteous are trodden down. *The innocent are punished* and the guilty escape. The pure are slandered and the infamous are praised. The godly are persecuted and the ungodly are honored." In consideration of these statements, the conclusion is drawn, "there must be a future state of rewards and punishments beyond this world where present inequalities may be adjusted, virtues rewarded," &c., &c.

Now, to him who views this matter superficially, and who, consequently, fails properly to "discern between the righteous and the wicked," the above appears correct. But what are the facts in the case? Paul says, Rom. 8 : 28, "We know that *all things* work together for good to them that love God." If this be true, it may be, justice is "meted out," after all, without the wicked dead living again. Do "the bad triumph over" the good? The good in the end lose nothing by it, since all things

work together for their good. "The righteous" are, in fact, gainers, though "the vile" are exalted over them; for all things work for their good. But that "the innocent are punished," does not appear quite so plain to me. That they sometimes suffer unjustly, I admit. But in 2 Tim. 2 : 12, we read : "If we suffer we shall also reign with him;" and 1 Peter 3 : 14, "If ye suffer for righteousness' sake happy are ye." Again 1 Peter 1 : 7, "The trial of your faith being much more precious than of gold that perisheth." Also 2 Cor. 4 : 17, 18, "For our light affliction which is but for a moment *worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory*; while we look not at the things which are seen but at the things which are not seen." Now, can a man be said to be *punished* when his afflictions, trials and sufferings produce such glory and benefit as are here described? The trouble is, "H. L. H." looks too much "at the things which are seen," and too little "at the things which are not seen." The poet expresses the truth as follows :

" Our troubles and our trials here,
Will only make us richer there,
When we arrive at home."

If, then, our afflictions, persecutions, abasements, and various trials, really "work together" for our good, which even "H. L. H." cannot deny, are they not to us "blessings in disguise?"—And if so, should the wicked be raised to a life of suffering, simply because they were instrumental in bringing them upon us? In order that "present inequalities may be adjusted," is it necessary that the wicked should live in a state of torment "beyond this world" at all?

While "all things work together for good to them that love God," the same "things" to the wicked only work for their evil, and render their damnation the more certain. Hence Paul, in 2 Cor. 2 : 15, 16, affirms himself and brethren to be "in them that perish," "the savor of death unto death; and to the other the savor of life unto life." And so it is with all the circumstances and events, with which the two classes come in contact. This common observation and revelation unitedly teach. With these facts before us, how can we fail to see the great difference between the righteous and the wicked even though the latter die to live no more?

But I wish to make one more quotation, viz., Mat. 5 : 11, 12, "*Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake. Rejoice and be exceeding glad, for (or because) great is your reward in heaven.*" This text, with those previously quoted, will show why a Christian, even though a martyr, can rejoice and be exceeding glad while being reviled, belied, and persecuted.

It is not because their revilers and persecutors are to suffer unspeakable wo and torment ; but because these things work out for them a "reward"—"a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory." He that can stand by the grave of Him who in life was his worst enemy and feel a desire that the sleeping dust before him may be gathered into life to suffer pain and torment, must possess a spirit incompatible with that which was manifested in the whole life and teachings of our blessed Saviour. He that is not satisfied, that all things should work for his good, and that for his various persecutions he should receive a great "reward in heaven," in my humble opinion, is unfit to live in heaven at all.

LETTERS AND EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

FROM MRS. M. C. ALLEN, Black Rock.—I have in years past enjoyed reading the EXAMINER very much ; but permit me now to say, I could wish its pages were not so much occupied by controversy and criticism, as has appeared of late; and likewise that we as a denomination, (our numbers I suppose would now class us in such category,) were more united in doctrine ; but if that *may not* be, that we could quietly agree to differ. If a brother or sister cannot see just as another, still, if basing their doctrinal belief conscientiously upon what is believed by them to be scriptural truth, and their practice is consistent and in accordance with our Saviour's teaching, that a mantle of charity might be thrown over minor differences, and each exercise that forbearance in Christian love, which is due from one another, as professed disciples of Christ. The above remarks I do not apply to *any* exclusively, but I have lamented in all our publications, that some writers have not that spirit of toleration that becomes members of the Christian family, or, that corresponds to the teaching of the gospel. You have ever counseled your readers, as well as taken it for your motto, that they should "search the Scriptures;" and I believe you consider it each one's duty to do so ; but if after carefully and prayerfully attending to the command, they *cannot* see as you do regarding the non-resurrection of the wicked—is it profitable for your readers that the favorite theme, together with that of baptism, should be dwelt upon so largely in the pages of the EXAMINER? I ask the question in humility, and in absence of any dictatorial feeling. As I resort to the fountain of truth, the only guide we have for light, to regulate our belief and practice, I deduce nothing from that source to contradict the plain assertion, that there will be a resurrection of the *unjust* as well as the just. I do not see why one might not as consistently apply the almost numberless passages of sacred writ, which promises *life, long life,* and "*shall not see death,*" to prove those who love God and keep his commandments shall never taste of death temporal, as, that those adduced to prove the non-resurrection of the wicked, *makes clear the fact,*

that they "shall never rise"—"they have become extinct," &c. To me these and like passages seem plainly to refer to the future, "the second death," or, as a great writer expresses it, "the second installment of death."

Will you please give an explanation in your next number, of Heb. 10 : 26-30? Perhaps others as well as myself might be benefited.

"HEB. 10 : 26 to 30."—In compliance with Mrs. M. C. Allen's request (see her letter) we give—if not "an explanation"—a *rendering* of this text, which is simply Prof. Murdock's translation of the Syriac version. It reads thus :

"For if a man sin voluntarily, after he hath received a knowledge of the truth, there is no longer a sacrifice which may be offered for sins : but the fearful judgment impendeth, and the zeal of fire that consumeth the adversaries. For if he who transgressed the law of Moses, died without mercies, at the mouth of two or three witnesses ; 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, and hath treated the Spirit of grace with contumely ? For we know him who hath said, Retribution is mine, and I will repay : and again, The Lord will judge his people."

By this translation all obscurity is removed from the text, and it hardly needs any "explanation" by us. The CERTAINTY of "*capital punishment*" is what the apostle is urging on the *Hebrews* who had "received a knowledge of the truth," if they "voluntarily" turned from the "sacrifice offered for sins."—The text relates to such apostates ; and warns them, there is no escape from DEATH, the "*capital punishment*" for them.—There is no other DELIVERER from that punishment except "the Son of God ;" and He being rejected by these apostates, there was no hope in their case. It is those who *were* the LORD'S "PEOPLE" by calling or profession : such apostate people He will "judge ;" *i. e.*, inflict on them the punishment of death, unrevoked ; which is a "fearful thing." Let all who are tempted to apostasy, beware.

FROM MRS. POLLY G. PITTS, Wis.—May God abundantly bless your endeavors to spread the light of His everlasting rock-foundation *word*—"Life only through Jesus, the LIFE-GIVER ;" and that only to the righteous at the return of their Lord. O, I am revived, strengthened, and grow stronger every day in defense of truth as it is in Jesus, the resurrection and the life. Thanks be to God, the truth is spreading, and therein I do rejoice, and feel to lift up my head, knowing that our re-

demption draweth nigh. I hope with you and the whole elect of God, soon to join with the great voices in heaven saying "The kingdoms of *this world* are become the Kingdom of our Lord and His Christ, and He shall reign forever and ever." My husband says, I must tell you, he is old and poor, and owes you more than he can ever pay, for the light you have been the means of his receiving. We hope, in mercy to fallen man, the EXAMINER will be continued. We are fallen on perilous times. It does appear to me, the nation has become like the chaff of the summer's threshing-floor, and that these political winds will dissolve or carry it away. My prayer is, God save thy selected people, and keep us all ready for thy coming kingdom.

FROM HELEN ROBERTSON, Utica.—My two *new* "Life only in Christ" friends are going on as they begun, searching daily to see if these things are so: they are deep searchers too. They read and search evenings, and then study out these things while at work days. The wife says, They both (herself and husband) think about them all day and dream about them nights. They are anxious to spread the truth and now send for two copies more of the Six Sermons. Bless the Lord! I have also found another independent thinker here, a merchant, and have given him "Life only in Christ" to read. I also send another subscriber for the EXAMINER. Some of my friends at a distance say, I was once a Christian, but have gone astray. O, how it grieves me; but it makes me cleave closer to my heavenly Father. The Lord has comforted me so, and is blessing my labors, I am not sorry I forsook all for life through Christ. If we suffer, we shall also reign with Him. Glory to our Redeemer. In Christ I have peace.

Mrs. CATHARINE COLVER, Berk. Co., Mass., writes:—These hard times press severely on the poor; but "the earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof," so we shall be provided with all needful good through this thorny maze. Then let us gird on the whole armor and stand on the foundation of truth, having the shield of faith and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God. Thus armed we need not fear. So I send five dollars to help the EXAMINER.

FROM O. CLAPP, Boston, Mass.—I received ten copies BIBLE EXAMINER; have subscribers for four; if unable to get others I shall lend or give them to the poor. I hope the EXAMINER will be sustained, as it is the only periodical to my knowledge in the world that holds up Christ as man's only hope of life. I would like to have it more than once a month, but cannot expect it as long as times remain as they are now. Your Sermon in the January No. is worth to me the price of the volume. I have read it over several times and receive good every time.—I bless God for the light I have received through the Examiner, and also for the knowledge received at the Wilbraham Camp-Meeting last

August, when the views of " *No Life out of Christ* " took such deep root in the minds of many. May God bless you, and own His truth; and may it be the means (as it is) of leading sinners to Jesus, is the prayer of your Bro. in hope of Life.

FROM O. R. L. CROZIER,

Grand Rapids, Mich.

I thank you for your kind notice of the Union move, in the Dec. No. of EXAMINER. Such an unselfish, generous expression is refreshing in such times as ours. It is not probable that all our papers will be disposed to unite, and it is possible that none of them will. Either of these causes may prevent it—1. Self-interest; 2. Party ambition; 3. A want of confidence in the safety of free investigation.

All opposers will, doubtless, prefer to be placed in the *third* class.—That want of confidence is dual, consisting of want of confidence in Divine Providence, and want of confidence in the judgment and candor of readers. Some men think all men either babes or knaves but themselves; the former to be fed with food selected and prepared, and the latter not to be trusted, lest, in their suicidal folly they select poison instead of aliment. Now such persons need to be taught the very first principle of human improvement, *viz*, that the very exercise of selecting right from wrong, both in doctrine and practice, is essential, and constantly essential, to the formation of character. Hence, the duty of the Christian teacher is, not to keep evil away from his pupils, but to teach them to avoid or overcome it—show them the deformity of error and the symmetry of truth; the disadvantage of wrong, and the advantage of right; the way and the wages of sin, and the way of life, and urge them to follow it.

Twenty years of free investigation has brought the body of Adventists to their present knowledge of the Scriptures. All along some have boded evil of freedom, while others have insisted upon the safety and the importance of proving all things, and these latter have been numerous and strong enough to keep the body moving forward and alive, while some of the former, remaining where they were twenty years ago, have become *fossilized*. The growth of our people in numbers and influence, during this period, is, perhaps, without a parallel. Our history is a demonstration of the practicability of free investigation. It will go on.—Those who oppose it and try to arrest our progress at their most advanced state, might as well try to hold the wind in their fists.

It is resistance to free investigation that has multiplied papers among us beyond our ability to sustain them. The futility of such resistance has been proved. Let it cease: then the whole body can unite in one

or more strong, first-class papers, which will prevent a great waste of funds and add very largely to our strength and usefulness.

It will do good to discuss this matter. It has many bearings; and if our brethren generally come to understand it in its true light, they will force a union, by letting those vigorously alone who try to prevent it.—Rom. 16: 17, 18. Divisions indicate weakness in the body and carnality in its members; 1 Cor. 3. "Let brotherly love continue."

Truly yours in Christ.

FROM JAMES CRAWFORD, Roxbury, Mass.—If there is any one point of the gospel I have been more intensely moved upon than another, it is the point of *Christian liberty*; which point should be maintained at any cost, either of the minister in the *pulpit* or conference meeting: and none the less as an organ of publicity of the voice of the church, and a right of every Christian *man, woman, and child*, always keeping in view the golden rule, to do unto others as we should wish them to do unto us, under like circumstances.

There is liberty of the largest kind to be found in the gospel, where every member of the body of Christ can occupy their portion of time in conference meetings without an infringement of the rights of another. So as far as time will permit, each gift and talent may be brought into exercise for the upbuilding of its members; and, if done in the gospel fellowship, each and every one has the largest liberty, and perfect union one with another. But if an unchristian step is taken, and this one is hinted at, as *being in error*, and consequently the curse of God is upon him, in consequence of error, it is as detrimental to the well being of the body at large, and to the individual referred to, as a direct charge of being a hypocrite.

Everything that looks like judging another because he does not think as I do, and thus taking from him the confidence of the brothers is, to my mind, sensual and devilish. Is it true we have been to the school of Christ so long, and have not learned the A B C of the liberty of the gospel? A condemnation of another because he does not think as I do, is the nearest thing to universal damnation of anything that presents itself to my mind. Man's salvation is not based upon the size or shape of the head. The apostle does not say, if any man has not the *brain* of the Lord Jesus Christ, or of an apostle, or of any other man; but, if any man has not the *spirit* of Christ, he is none of his.

We are all learners; and if there is a brother or sister in Christ that has made greater progress than any other, let that individual glory in the Lord, that they are thus able to enlighten the scattered flock, and exercise a tenderness for them always in accordance to love and fellowship with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ. If I have *erred* in the above, please correct the same. May the Lord guide you in all wisdom, and *lead you tenderly* by the right hand, to proclaim all His truth, and eternal life will be yours.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—Our friends will bear in mind we are publishing this Magazine at an enormous increase in the expense for paper; and we are sure they do not wish us to bear this alone. We shall go forward, fully believing our hands will be strengthened. That some who have been friends will forsake us, we have calculated; for such has always been the course of a certain class. It was so in Jesus' days; and it is enough for the servant to be as his Master: if some could not or would not endure the truth, that without they eat Christ's flesh and drank His blood—*i. e.*, without a living *union* with Him—they had *NO LIFE* in them; we need not be surprised that members of the same family are found in our day. From such we expect neither sympathy nor aid; but from those who are willing to follow the truth wherever it leads, we look for it, and shall not look in vain, we trust. Have our friends made an effort to increase the circulation of the *EXAMINER*? If not, why not make *one* trial, or take *two* copies each, so as to have one to loan among such as cannot pay for it, or who would not otherwise read it at all?



DONATIONS TO SUSTAIN THE EXAMINER FOR 1863.—L. C. Thorne and W. W. Thorne, (New York merchants, and of the Society of Friends), take two copies and pay \$20 *each*. Geo. K. Carroll, in their employ, takes four copies, and pays \$10. Chas. A. Righter \$5. B. Burnett \$5. Chas. Archer \$5. J. E. Sebring \$5. A. McDonald \$3. Roswell Curtis \$7. Wm. Ockenbock \$1. Benj. Terpening \$2. Jane Terpening \$2. John Webb and Charles Webb \$1 each. Dr. J. K. Finley \$5. Several in Philadelphia have given \$5 each for the same object; and others not named, have given sums less than a dollar; and possibly some names have been omitted that ought to appear; for all these favors we would be thankful.



D. WESTON, of Philadelphia, Pa., fell asleep in Jesus, January 4th, aged 75. He was an early believer in the second advent of Christ and of immortality only through Him. "He died strong in the faith of *life* only in Christ, and of a speedy resurrection." He was the author of several *acrostics* in the *EXAMINER*, bearing the initials "D. W.": see Vol. 13, pages 64, 136, 388, which were his last efforts in that direction.



ERRATUM.—In January Examiner, p. 25, 11th line from top, read "collocations" instead of "collections."

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. 15. No. 3.]

MARCH, 1863.

[Whole No. 222.]

THE TWO OPPOSING TEXTS.

BY JOSEPH T. CUBRY.

OLSHAUSEN, the German theologian, observes that John 5 : 28, 29 and Acts 24 : 15 are the only direct declarations in the New Testament of a resurrection of the wicked. If the general tenor of the Scriptures would permit, these texts might be considered conclusive evidence for that doctrine ; but the seven arguments which we have adduced in opposition afford overwhelming proof that the Scriptures will not countenance the idea.—What then shall be done with these texts ? says one. We answer, Do with them as you do with other texts which you cannot explain. Leave them until you get more light. The advice of John Locke is valuable to all truth-searchers.

"The way to find truth as far as we are able to reach it in this our dark and shortsighted state, is to pursue the hypothesis that seems to us to carry with it the most light and consistency : as far as we can without raising objections, or striking at those that come in our way, till we have carried our present principle as far as it will go, and given what light and strength we can to all the parts of it. And when that is done, then to take into our consideration any objections that lie against it, but not so as to pursue them as objections against the system we had formerly erected ; but to consider upon what foundation they are bottomed, and examine that in all its parts, and then putting the two whole systems together, see which is liable to most exceptions and labors under the greatest difficulties. * * *

"This is the fairest way to search after truth, and the surest not to mistake on which side she is. . . . If a man will embrace no opinion but what he can clear from all difficulties, and re-

move all objections, I fear he will have but very narrow thoughts, and find very little that he shall assent to."

Having premised thus far on the assumption that the considered texts cannot be harmonized with the doctrine of "Life only in Christ," we now advance a step, and take the position that they can be satisfactorily explained without conflicting with it. We will first examine John 5 : 28, 29.

As we view this passage, it does not refer to the literal resurrection, but to the restoration of Israel. We will give our reasons for this assertion as briefly as we can. Verses 17 to 29 inclusive present Jesus in a dual character ; first, in verses 17-26 as the Son of *God* ; second, in verses 27-29 as the Son of *Man*. His *work* as the Son of *God* is depicted in verses 17-26 ; his *work* as the Son of *Man* in verses 27-29. He does *one* work *because* he is the Son of *God* ; He does the *other* work "*because* he is the Son of *Man*." As the Son of *God* he cannot do the work of the Son of *Man* ; as the Son of *Man* he cannot do the work of the Son of *God*. His work in one character is entirely distinct from his work in the other.

What, then, is his work as the Son of God? We answer, the resurrection of the dead. "For as the *Father* raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them ; *even so* the *Son* quickeneth whom he will." Ver. 21. That is, God transfers His power to raise the dead, to *His Son*. "The Son can do nothing of *himself*, but what he seeth the *Father* do : for what things soever He doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." Ver. 19.

God has not merely given the Son the power to raise the dead, but also the authority to decide *who* shall be raised. "The Son quickeneth whom *he will*. For the *Father judgeth* no man, (He does not decide *who* shall be raised,) but hath committed *all judgment* unto the *Son*." Vs. 21, 22.

In the 24th verse Jesus lays down the law by which he will be guided in his judgment "at the last day." "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation ; but is passed from death unto life." Thus, whosoever believes on God in *this* life is a *candidate* for the *resurrection* life ; he already *has* the principle within him, by which his resurrection and eternal life are insured. In other places we are

informed that this quickening principle is the Spirit of God, which, if not *quenched* by the believer himself, will surely quicken him into life. Jesus continues, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour is coming, and *now is*, when the dead shall hear the voice of the *Son of God*; and they that hear *shall live*." Ver. 35. Those to whom he spoke were in their animal condition, and virtually dead by reason of that condition. They *all* heard "the voice of the Son of God" in one sense; they *all* heard with the ear; but the *life* was promised to them who heard not only with the outward ear but with the *inward*. Jesus uses the word "hear" in two senses in another place. "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." Matt. 11: 15. In the 26th verse He assigns the reason why those that hear shall live. "For as the Father hath life in Himself; so hath He given to the Son to have life in himself." Thus we have the work of Jesus as the Son of *God*.

Let us now consider His work as the Son of *Man*. The 27th verse contains the transition from one character to the other.— "And hath given him authority to *execute judgment* also." It may be objected just here that the phrase "execute judgment" belongs to Jesus in his character as the Son of *God*, but the next clause proves the contrary. "And hath given him authority to execute judgment also, *because* he is the Son of *Man*."— This judgment, then, is *another* judgment in *another* character. His judgment as the Son of God is referred to in vs. 21, 22; the judgment, in the 27th verse, is totally distinct and is executed by the Son of *Man*. The word "*also*" in the first clause shows that something more is meant than the judgment before alluded to.

The inquiry now arises, What "judgment" does the Son of Man "execute"? The "sure word of prophecy" affords the answer. Jer. 23: 5. "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall EXECUTE JUDGMENT and justice in the earth." The word "Branch" signifies a descendant, a *Son*. The New Testament commences thus: "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of *David*." Thon David is the "*Man*" referred to in the 27th verse. God "hath given" Jesus "authority to *execute judgment*" "and justice in the

earth" "*because he is the Son of Man;*" *because he is the "righteous Branch" predicted in Jeremiah whom God was to "raise unto David."* A similar prediction occurs Jer. 33 : 14, 15. "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will perform that good thing which I have promised unto the house of Israel and to the house of Judah. In those days, and at that time, will I cause the Branch of righteousness to grow up unto David; and he shall EXECUTE JUDGMENT and righteousness in the land." Isaiah also prophecies to the same effect. "Unto us a child is born, unto us a *Son* is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder. . . . 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 with justice, from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the LORD of hosts will perform this." Isa. 9 : 6, 7. Also Isa. 2 : 2-4; 11 : 1-4. Micah 4 : 1-4. 72 Psalm.

Having interpreted the 27th verse, we pass on to the 28th.— "Marvel not at this." Marvel not at what? Why, marvel not that I, Jesus, in the exercise of my prerogative as the son and heir of David, will "execute judgment." Marvel not that the carpenter of Nazareth, the ridicule of the priesthood, the object of scorn and contempt, with none to sympathize with him but a few poor fishermen, not possessing a foot of land, having no where to lay his head, shall yet ascend David's throne, and extend David's dominion to the ends of the earth! "Thus saith the Lord of hosts, If it be marvelous in the eyes of the remnant of this people in these days, should it also be marvelous in mine eyes?" Zech. 8 : 6.

"Marvel not at this : for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth." Hear whose voice? "The voice of the Son of God as spoken in the 25th verse," says one. We say, Nay! What is the antecedent of the pronoun "his"? Ans. "Son of *Man*." Then they are to hear the voice of the Son of *Man*. But does the Son of *Man* raise the dead? We have already shown that to be the work of the Son of *God*. Where does the Son of *Man* get power to raise the dead? He cannot get it from *David*; he never had that power. *No man* ever had the power to raise the dead. Jesus taught this lesson at the grave of Lazarus. As the peo-

ple were ignorant of his divine relationship and only looked on him as a mere man, he publicly thanked God as the one by whose power Lazarus was to be raised. Jesus, as the Son of *Man*, cannot raise the dead. But it is the "voice" of the Son of *Man* which "all that are in the graves shall hear." Hence, John 5 : 28, 29 does not refer to the literal resurrection of the dead.

But what will Jesus do in His office as King over the earth that warrants the use of the language in the text? We reply, that the restoration of Israel is a work that justifies the language, and that the prophecies of the Old Testament clearly point out Jesus as the Restorer. The predictions already quoted from Jeremiah are connected with others which show that the first great work of Jesus is the Restoration of Israel.

"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth.— *In his days* Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely. . . . Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that they shall no more say, The Lord liveth, which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; but, The Lord liveth, which brought up and which led *the seed* of the house of Israel out of the north country, and from all countries whither I had driven them; and they shall dwell in their own land." Jer. 23 : 5-8.

"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 on them." Jer. 33 : 25, 26. Also Micah 4 : 6, 7. Zech. 8 : 3-8. Jer. 3 : 17, 18. Jer. 30 and 31 chapters.

In Ezekiel 37 ch. the restoration of Israel is represented by the same figure that is used in John 5 : 28, 29; that of a resurrection. Ezekiel's prophecy was probably in the mind of our Lord when he uttered the language in the text. We present in parallel columns the ideas found alike in the prophecy and the text.

John 5 : 28, 29.
"All that are in the graves."

Ezekiel 37 ch.
"These bones are *the whole* (Kol, all) house of Israel." 11 verse.

“The graves.”
 “Shall hear his voice.”
 “And shall come forth.”

“Your graves.” 12, 13 vs.
 “O ye dry bones, hear.” 4 v.
 “I will open your graves, and
 cause you to come up out of
 your graves.” 12, 13 vs.

In Ezekiel 37, the first part of the chapter to the 11th verse contains the *figure*; the last part from verse 11 to the end is the interpretation and repetition in plain language. John 5 : 28, 29 contains the figure alone.

But what is meant by “the resurrection of condemnation” ? Ezek. 20 : 33-38 explains.

“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 peoples, and will gather you out of the countries wherein ye are scattered. . . . and I will bring you into the wilderness of the peoples, and there will I plead with you face to face. Like as I pleaded with your fathers in the wilderness of the land of Egypt, so will I plead with you, saith the Lord God. . . . *And I will purge out from among you the rebels, and them that transgress against me: I will bring them forth out of the country where they sojourn, and they shall not enter into the land of Israel.*”

Ezekiel 34th chap. also refers to a judgment on some of the people of Israel in connection with the restoration.

“As a shepherd seeketh out his flock in the day that he is among his sheep that are scattered; so will I seek out my sheep, and will deliver them out of all places where they have been scattered in the cloudy and dark day. And I will *bring them out* from the peoples, and gather them from the countries, and will bring them to their own land, and feed them upon the mountains of Israel by the rivers, and in all the inhabited places of the country. . . . I will *seek* that which was *lost*, and *bring again* that which was driven away, and will bind up that which was broken, and will strengthen that which was sick: *but I will destroy* the fat and the strong; I will feed *them* WITH JUDGMENT.” Vs. 12-16.

Such, as we view it, is the true meaning of John 5 : 28, 29. If it is not satisfactory to some, and if they still consider the text as a *positive* affirmation of the reliving of the wicked, let them remember that there is *another* text as *positive* in its *denial*. In Isa. 26 : 14 we read “Dead, they shall *not live*; de-

ceased, they shall *not rise* : because (*la-kēn* "for *la-kēn* asher, on this account that, because, Isa. 26 : 14, where it has the force of a conjunction." Gesenius) thou hast visited and destroyed them, and made all their memory to perish."

We will now examine the other opposing text, Acts 24 : 15. Our common version of this text will bear material alteration.—The words "of the dead" should be omitted. The original *nekrōn* is omitted by Lachmann and Tischendorf in their critical editions of the N. T. Of the latter, Dean Alford says, "I cannot but regard Tischendorf's little book as the most valuable contribution which has been yet made to the revision of the text of the New Testament." Griesbach, an earlier critic, marks *nekrōn* as a *probable omission*. Dr. Hackett, in his late Commentary on Acts, says "*nekrōn* in received Greek text lacks the requisite support."

The word rendered "also" in the text is sometimes translated "even." For an obvious reason it should be thus expressed in this instance. Paul speaks of "*having hope* toward God," and then adds, "*which* they themselves allow." The relative "*which*" belongs to its antecedent "hope" according to grammatical rule. Now Paul did not *allow* his hope, but he *HAD* it. But the word "also" would imply that he merely *allowed* it. If we render the original *kai* by "*even*," this contradiction is done away. The word should also come directly after "*which*," according to the Greek. With this correction the text will read, "Having hope toward God, which even these themselves allow."

An attempt has recently been made (Ret. p. 147, 8) to substitute the word "expect" for "allow" in the text. But it will not do ; for if we admit the word "expect," the text will read, "Having *hope* toward God, *which* even these themselves *expect*." This would make the Jews *expect* what Paul *had*, which is absurd. Until the pronoun "*which*" can be made to relate to *what comes after* it, the word "expect" must be rejected. The Greek word *pros-dechomai* properly signifies "*to receive to oneself, to admit*." See Robinson. When applied to *things future* it has the sense of *waiting, expecting* ; but in the present case it does *not apply* to things future. When Paul spoke, he *possessed* a hope, and to *this hope* the verb relates. Hence it must have its primary sense of "admit" or—as it is tropically used—"allow."

We have one more alteration to make in the text. The phrase "both of the just and unjust" is rendered from the Greek *dikaion te kai adikon*. The particles *te kai* may be rendered either "both . . . and" or, "not only . . . but also." See Robinson, Passow, Buttman, Kühner, Matthiæ, &c. We prefer "not only . . . but also" because it better indicates Paul's meaning.—Prof. Hackett, renders the phrase, "not only of the just but of the unjust."

The entire text, as amended, reads thus : "HAVING HOPE TOWARD GOD, WHICH EVEN THESE THEMSELVES ALLOW, THAT THERE SHALL BE A RESURRECTION, NOT ONLY OF THE JUST BUT ALSO OF THE UNJUST."

We will now analyze the text, and consider each idea by itself. I. Paul possessed a hope. What was this hope? In Acts 23 : 6, he said "of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question." To Agrippa he said, "And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the *promise* made of God unto our fathers. . . . For which hope's sake, king Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews. Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead?" Acts 26 : 6-8. To the Philippians he said, "I count all things loss, for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord : for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them refuse (*skubala* pr. 'what is thrown to the dogs') that I may win Christ, and be found in him. . . .that I may know Him, and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings, being made conformable unto His death ; if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead." Phil. 3 : 8-11. From the statements of the Apostle, we draw the following conclusions : 1. Paul hoped for a resurrection. 2. This resurrection had been *promised* to the fathers. 3. This resurrection was to be *striven for* and *attained unto* by the sacrifice of this world's good and by a connection and sympathy with Christ.

We now come to the question which will fix the interpretation of the text. Will the wicked dead have part in the resurrection for which Paul hoped? We answer, Nay. 1. Because that resurrection is based on a *promise* ; and that promise is inherited by "faith and patience." Heb. 6 : 12. 2. Because that resurrection is the consequence of *personal effort* on the

part of the subjects. From these two considerations it is ABSOLUTELY CERTAIN that Paul's hope did not embrace the wicked.

II. The Jews allowed Paul's hope. How did they allow it? By believing as he did? Certainly not. Paul believed in a resurrection through Christ; they did not. They believed in a resurrection through a fleshly connection with Abraham. Their hope of a future life was expressed in the phrase "We are Abraham's seed." John the Baptist struck at this "confidence in the flesh" when he said, "Think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. And now also the axe is laid unto the root of the trees: therefore every tree *which bringeth not forth good fruit*, is hewn down, and cast into the fire." This language shows that the Jews supposed that their mere connection with Abraham would save them, "just and unjust." We have intimations that they condemned the *worst* class of Jews to destruction, but there can be no reasonable doubt that they believed in the salvation of the great majority of Abraham's seed "just and unjust."

Having thus considered the belief of Paul in contrast with that of his accusers, there is no difficulty in explaining the text in harmony with the doctrine of "Life only in Christ." The following conveys the true meaning:

"But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call a sect (*hairetin* see v. 5), so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets; having hope toward God, which *even these themselves allow*, (for they hold) that there shall be a resurrection, *not only of the just but also of the unjust.*"

A CONVERSATION ON IMMORTALITY.

J. Litch.—"If Adam had been mortal in his creation, that is, subject to death whether he sinned or not, then the penalty was no penalty; it was merely carrying out the condition of his being."—*Adv. Herald*, Jan. 20.

Examiner.—We regard this statement as a play upon words, without regard to facts. Adam, in his constitution, was made

liable to death. Whether he should continue to live or die depended on the moral development he should make. If obedient to his CREATOR, he would have access to "the tree of life," and thus "live forever." If disobedient, he is to be excluded from that tree; and, hence, dissolve into his original dust.

J. L.—"He had in him the life of God."

Exr.—Please prove that assertion, if you can.

J. L.—"In Eph. 4: 18, Paul speaks of 'having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God,' &c. To be alienated implies a previous interest in a person or thing." *** "If the unconverted are alienated from the life of God, they once had it—not personally, but in their federal head. The marginal reading of Gen. 2: 7, 'Breath of lives,' indicates a two-fold life, an animal life, the soul, and the zoe or life of God."

Exr.—But do you not say, man was created immortal?

J. L.—"Man was originally deathless, hence, immortal."

Exr.—We think we now understand you. You hold, man was immortal because he had "the life of God in him"—that he became "alienated from that life," hence, lost his immortality: *i. e.*, he is no longer "deathless," though his CREATOR made him so! Thus, immortality is no absolute security against death.

The text you quote from Eph. 4: 18 and your comments on it, seems clearly to stultify yourself. You have to admit these Ephesians never had "the life of God, personally"! Then they never had immortality personally: and so neither had, nor could have immortality till such time as the "life of God" is restored to them; but this "the unconverted" never have; it is the converted only that have the life of God in them. So the sinner has no "immortal soul" now, you being witness. It does not follow, because the Ephesians, while unconverted, were "alienated from the life of God," they "once had it." The term "alienated" does not necessarily imply this. The first sense given the word by Webster is, "estranged:" which signifies, "To keep at a distance," &c. Paul saith, they were alienated from the life of God *through the ignorance* that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart; "not through their federal head," as you affirm. He tells these Ephesians, when they were in their heathenism, they were "*aliens* from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants

of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world :” *i. e.*, they “were far off” from “the life of God”—“at a distance” from it, “estranged” from it; but no idea that they ever had it personally or in their federal head.

Your construction of the Hebrew, “*Breath of lives*,” Gen. 2 : 7, is totally untenable. The language has no such sense as you give it, and will not admit it. The same Hebrew word—‘*ha’yim*’—is used Gen. 7 : 22, and is there applied to “cattle, beasts, fowl, creeping things, and man : all in whose nostrils was the breath of life—‘*ha’yim*.’ If Gen. 2 : 7 proves what you say, it is equally proved by Gen. 7 : 22, that all cattle, and creeping things had “a two-fold life”—“the life of God” !

The facts are simply these : all the animal, or brute creation were made and brought into life *before* man. Man was created last of all creatures that lived by *breathing*. He was formed of the dust of the ground, and so were all the brute creatures ; (see Gen. 2 : 19) : they lived by “the breath of the spirit of life,” (see margin of Gen. 7 : 22), and had a priority in that life. When man was formed, he was to be made alive, or made to live. How was it to be done ? “The LORD God breathed into his nostrils the breath of lives :” the breath which was common to all breathing creatures which God had previously made. Instead of the language indicating any different life being imparted from what was given to inferior living creatures, it settles the fact—if the *record* is to settle it—that man had no other life-element in his creation than what was *common* to all creatures that lived by breathing.

I see our friend *S. Bliss*, Editor of the *Advent Herald*, is coming ; let us hear what he will say about immortality.

Bliss.—“We apprehend that the difficulty in the mind of many in respect to the use of the word ‘immortal’ consists in the meaning they attach to it. That is they use it in its common and popular sense ; which is not its scriptural use. Common usage makes it expressive merely of an ever continuing existence, irrespective of its nature or condition—applying it to the lost as well as the saved. But that is not the meaning the Bible gives it, where it is contrasted with indignation, and wrath, tribulation, and anguish, and as something to be sought for—showing that man is not now its possessor, and that he never will be unless he has part in the first resurrection. Therefore, though the wicked exist forever, they will not be immortal ; for immortality is incompatible with impurity, with insincerity, with sin, or with suffering. For it is a condition of purity, of holiness, of happiness, of deathlessness. If Adam was created such, as

he surely was, then was he created immortal according to its scriptural usage. But if he was created a sinner, and miserable, then was he not immortal. Immortality is thus a condition. But Adam sinning lost that condition, which can be regained only through Christ."

Examiner.—We are glad, brother *Editor*, to hear you speak so frankly. We are specially glad for the evidence that the discussion of the last twenty years has shown you the untenableness of the common idea that all men are immortal. You say, indeed, the word immortal, as used in the "popular sense, is not its scriptural one." But we have met our opponents on the ground of its "common usage"; and by your admission "man is not now" a "possessor" of immortality, in the Scripture sense, and "never will be unless he has part in the first resurrection;" and that "the wicked will not be immortal."—Thus victory follows the discussion, and we "thank God, and take courage," as did Paul on one occasion. The only real point of controversy with you now seems to be, Will "*the wicked exist forever.*" You say, *they will.* We say, *they will not.*—We take the position that *penalty proper* is to be looked for in the plainest expressions of which language is capable. Figurative language may be used to illustrate the penalty, but the penalty itself must, in justice to those who may be liable to it, be in the plainest terms. "*The wages of sin is death,*" is the uniform testimony of the Bible. We will not, however, argue this topic now.

You say, "Adam was created" in "a condition of holiness and deathlessness." We regard this position as a pure assumption, without any foundation in Scripture or philosophy. Holiness is not a *creation*, but a *development*. A thing may be "very good,"—as "everything" God made was—but holiness is another matter. In created beings its existence implies four things, *viz., intelligence, liberty, law, and action.* Where these do not all exist, there can be no such thing as holiness. Adam had intelligence, liberty, and law; but until action took place under that law, holiness could have no existence in him: so that we feel justified in saying, Adam never possessed holiness at all; for his first action under law, was sin. If this position is correct—and we are satisfied it is—then, Adam had no immortality, or was *not* "created immortal, according to" the "scriptural usage" of that word. Adam could not have "lost

that condition" which he never had. He came short of securing immortality, which his CREATOR placed within his reach, and which now "can be gained only through Christ."

WHAT IS TRUTH?—HOW READEST THOU?

OR, DR. BACON AND DR. BEECHER.

At the funeral of Dr. LYMAN BEECHER, father of Henry Ward, the sermon was preached by "Rev. Dr. BACON" of New Haven, Conn. The text was, "Thanks be to God which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

Dr. Beecher lived to near his 88th year, and became for some time prior to his death incapable of the exercise of his reasoning faculties, except at lucid intervals. We state this fact to explain some of the remarks of Dr. Bacon which we quote below. That Lyman Beecher was a good man, and will have part "in the resurrection at the last day," we have no doubt; but that such theology as that of Dr. Bacon should still live, three hundred years after the "Reformation" from Popery, is strange to a thoughtful mind. The sermon was mainly historical of the life and labors of the deceased. The *theology* of the discourse is contained in a few introductory remarks, as follows:

Dr. Bacon said—"It was not in sorrow that they were assembled.—Why mourn that he who had entered on the eighth year beyond his four score, who had outlived his activity, his remembrance of those dearest, save at intervals, who had watched through long twilight deepening into darkness, had been released from the body of this death. Should we mourn that when he had so far survived himself, his lingering strength was at last cut off and thrown away? Should we mourn that the assiduity which with unwearying tenderness waited upon his affliction was now at last relieved? No, let us rather give thanks that *the mortal had put on immortality*, and that it remained for us only to bury in the bosom of its kindred earth the lifeless clay from which *the freed soul had gone forth into endless life*. In such a death there was no anguish, no awful questioning whether the departed was ready. What tears we shed were of love and homage, but not of grief. *The death that had convened us was only the soul's awakening from its long and restless sleep to its immortality*. He would leave the words of his text to make their own impression, and rehearse the life and labors of this servant of the Lord."

We have placed in italics the theology on which we design to remark. We suppose the learned Dr. Bacon uses the terms *mortal* and *immortality* in the sense in which "common usage" employs them. He tells the audience, "the mortal had put on immortality;" and for this he said, "let us give thanks." As we are exhorted to "pray with the *understanding*," it seems equally incumbent on us to give thanks in like manner; for saith the apostle, "When thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say *Amen* at thy giving thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest?" Now, we confess our ignorance of what Dr. Bacon meant when he said of Dr. Beecher, "Let us give thanks that the mortal *had* put on immortality." By *mortal*, he could not mean "the lifeless clay" before him, and which they were about "to bury;" for that, manifestly, had not put on immortality!—Could he mean "the freed *soul*" had previously been *mortal*? Is it not the theology of Dr. Bacon and his school, that the soul is, and always was immortal? How then could it be called "mortal," and be said to have "put on immortality" after having been immortal for more than 87 years prior to the time spoken of in the sermon? Either the soul was mortal once, or Dr. B. could not truly say it "had" now "put on immortality." Moreover, if the doctrine of an immortal soul, in the present state of existence, be true, it can never be said, in truth, at any subsequent period, that it puts on immortality; because it was never otherwise than immortal.

Dr. B. says, "the freed soul had gone forth into endless life." But it always had that life, if it was immortal. It surely never was other than deathless, according to the common theology. As we look again at the sermon, we are led to exclaim—Did Dr. Bacon believe in "*the sleep of the soul*"? Is he a "SOUL SLEEPER"? "Is Saul among the prophets?" Is Dr. B. indeed a convert to such a doctrine? Hark! hear him—"The death that had convened us," he says, "was only the *soul's awakening* from its LONG AND RESTLESS SLEEP to its immortality."

The fact is settled, so far as orthodox authority can settle it, "the soul" *can* "sleep," or else Dr. B. is not orthodox. Hence the doctrine of the "sleep of the soul" is not a *heresy*. The soul *may* sleep—it does sleep: but Dr. B. says, its sleep was while it was in the body. True: but if it can sleep then, it

may sleep when the body is lifeless. How does he know but what it sleeps a still deeper sleep? Paul saith, the dead are "asleep," and states *that* as the condition of all the saints who have died.

Dr. Bacon, in another item of his sermon represents the deceased as gone to "be forever with the Lord." How does a saint who has died come to "be forever with the Lord"? Paul answers that question, 1 Thess. 4 : 13-18. He saith, "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.*" When Dr. Beecher died, did any of these events take place? If so, it is strange that any *minister* was left to preach a *funeral* sermon! Some of them seem not to be embraced in the glorified company! We regret, as Dr. Bacon was among us who are "alive," when "the dead" went to "be forever with the Lord," that he should be left out of so glorious a consummation!

Had Dr. Bacon's sermon had any connection with his text, he would not have committed such a series of blunders in so few words. He makes his text to apply at death ; but Paul applies this language to the consummation "at the last triumph;" at which time, he tells us, "the dead are raised incorruptible," and "we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye;" that *then* "this mortal shall put on immortality," and "death is swallowed up in victory;" at which point he cries out, "Thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." This is all lost sight of by Dr. Bacon, and he "leaves the words of his text to make their own impression," while he goes about other matters. He had forestalled the resurrection and the last trump, in an attempt to gain immortality and endless life for the good old man who lay before him a lifeless being, waiting for the archangel's voice to wake him from the dreamless sleep which had come on him ; a foretaste of which awakoning, God, it seems, was pleased to give His servant, for his comfort, before his last sleep fell on him : of this the following is a pleasing account, furnished by his daughter, Mrs. Stowe, and which was read at the funeral. It must be recollected that much of

the time prior to this manifestation, he had been in an unconscious or insensible state, not recognizing any one, even of his dearest friends.

"Dec. 30.—The veil was rent for a few hours, and a vision of transfiguration was vouchsafed. He called, 'Mother, mother, come sit beside me; I have had a glorious vision of Heaven!' His countenance was luminous, his utterance full and strong as in his best days. He continued: 'I think I have begun to go. Oh, such scenes as I have been permitted to behold. I have seen the King of Glory himself—blessed God for revealing Thyself! I did not think I could behold such glory while in the flesh.' He prayed in an inspired manner for some time, and then soliloquized: 'Until this evening my hope was a conditional one—now it is full, free, entire. Oh, glory to God!'

I asked, 'Had you any fear?'

'No, none at all; and, what is wonderful, I have no pain either,' passing his hand over his head.

I repeated, 'I shall be satisfied when I awake in thy likeness.'

'How wonderful,' he answered, 'that a creature can approach the Creator so as to awake in his likeness! O, glorious, glorious God!'

'I rejoice with you, father.'

'I know you rejoice as a pious woman, but you cannot enter into my experience now.'

'Father, did you see Jesus?'

'All was swallowed up in God himself.'

For an hour he was in this state, talking and praying. The next day he remarked that he had an indistinct remembrance of some great joy. The last indication of life, on the day of his death, was a mute response to his wife, repeating

'Jesus, lover of my soul
Let me to thy bosom fly.'"

We accept this manifestation as a precious reality—as a token from God to His dying servant, that he should "awake in His likeness," at the last trump. As such, we prize it and rejoice in it, and praise God that it was granted to him. It is sweet to think how God can, and often does, so open the glories to follow the resurrection, "at the last day," that His servants fall asleep in full view of them; and the awakening to them, even though a thousand or ten thousand years may have passed, will be as the instant of their death. But such manifestations are no evidence of an entrance into heaven or any other place of conscious joy at the moment of death. They are foretastes—pledges—or, an "earnest" of the glory to be revealed to the people of God, when our Redeemer shall "return from heaven" to glorify His redeemed with Himself. Happy are all they who shall close their present life with the blessed assurance that

God accepts them, and will cause them to awake in His likeness at the last trump; or, if alive, be accounted worthy of such honor as Enoch had, who "was translated that he should not see death:" but "before his translation he had this testimony that he pleased God." "But without faith it is impossible to please Him," adds the apostle.

"THE RESTITUTION AND PHILOSOPHY OF REDEMPTION."—Such is the title of a pamphlet of 16 pages, which some one has sent us. It has no author's name, and hence no one is personally responsible for it. While there is much in it that is good, there are also some things we think ought not to pass unnoticed.—The author says—

"Men will be recompensed when they are raised from the dead; this is the rule. The natural death of man is no more the recompense of the wicked than it is of the righteous. The righteous are raised up to be recompensed. So are the wicked to be raised up to be recompensed."

To these, to us, groundless assumptions, we oppose the fact that JESUS makes the recompense of the righteous to be their rising from the dead—"Every one that believeth on me hath everlasting life, and I WILL RAISE *him up at the last day.*" not I will raise him "up to be recompensed": the resurrection *itself* is the recompense—they are raised immortal and incorruptible. The wicked are recompensed, not by being raised up for that purpose, but by the condemnation "*not*" to "see life," but "the wrath of God *abideth* on them"—they "shall REMAIN in the congregation of the dead": that is their recompense; and they abide in death not because of Adam's sin, but for their own personal rejection of the LIFE-GIVER—the second Adam: they would not come to Him that they "might have life," and thus they confirm themselves in death eternal.

But there is another point more heterodox than that we have noticed. It is found in the following language—

"The law being a system of justice, demands the execution of the sinner, or of a substitute." *** "The sinner, or his substitute, must bear the *whole* penalty." *** "The law requires every soul that sinneth, to die for his sins." *** "And it is *this* death from which Christ come to save man. This death is not the death which is common to us all."***

"Jesus did not come to save man from going into the grave, from dying a natural death; but to save him from *that* death which he has merited by his sin, and from which those who die can never be delivered." * * * "As the first or natural death is not for the sin which it commits, the soul must be raised to life from the first death, in order to meet the death due as the wages of sin."***"Faith and repentance cannot satisfy the demands of a violated law. Christ has done this for all who submit to him."***"The sinner, being reconciled to God, can have his sins remitted without dying for them—Christ having died in his stead."—pp. 8-12.

On the foregoing we remark, "The law" of God knows no "substitute," nor ever accepts one. Justice is shocked at such a suggestion, and it is a high impeachment of it. What! put to death an *innocent* person "*instead*" of the guilty! The idea is a most shocking blasphemy: and it is only because theology has so long used such language, that every man does not cry out horrible injustice!

But again, suppose such a case admissible, the author of the Pamphlet says, the death merited is a death "from which those who die can never be delivered," and that "the soul must be raised to life from the first death, in order to meet the death due as the wages of sin." Was Christ a "substitute" for *such* a death? Did He die—then be raised to life and die again; a death too from which He "can never be delivered"? If Christ has "*died instead*" of the sinner, as this Pamphlet writer affirms, then He must have died a second time, or again after His being raised up! But happy for us, the Scriptures declare—"Christ being raised from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him." Such being the fact, He did not die as a substitute for any sinner, according to this writer's statement of the recompense to be given the sinner, and his theory of substitution falls to the ground.

The whole subject is exceeding plain when not corrupted by the traditions of men. The claim of justice against man, as a sinner, is against him as an *animal* man; or against animal nature, which is all the nature man has by creation or natural generation. By sin he forfeits the life of that nature, and is subject to death. Justice claims that life—the destruction, or dissolution of that nature. Christ took on Him that nature in connection with a *spiritual* one, which the first Adam had not. Thus prepared, He obeyed the law with His whole or entire being, so that the law had no claim of death against Him. He

proposed to give a future and endless life to men against whom the law, or justice of God, had claim for their life as animal beings. To do this, He *vindicates* the claim of justice by a voluntary sacrifice of His *animal* life, as connected with human nature; thus fully acknowledging the righteousness of the claim: by virtue of which, God gave Him power over all flesh, that He might give eternal, or divine life to all who would accept Him as their DELIVERER, or LIFE-GIVER from the dead, by the power of that *Spirit-life* which dwelt in Him, and by which He was raised up from the dead.

Here is no *substituted* sufferer. "He that is born of the flesh is flesh"—nothing more—nothing higher; and the flesh, or animal nature, whether of saint or sinner, is doomed to death without deliverance; but "that which is born of the Spirit is spirit," or spiritual; and "against such there is no law;" for "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." The resurrection, "at the last day," is from this new life-power treasured up *in* Christ; so that all who are *in Christ* are revived by that life-giving power, and "the body of sin," or animal body, perishes, and lives no more."—They are sown an animal body: they are raised a spiritual body." Such as are sown only as animal beings "perish utterly in their own corruption,"—the animal perishes forever and lives not again. Christ, in His spiritual nature, is the only LIFE-GIVER: of that nature we must be partakers, or never see life from the dead.

THOUGHTS ON LIFE AFTER DEATH.

BY T. P. LEWIS, HARTWICK, N. Y.

"BUT IF the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead, dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall ALSO quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you." Rom. 8: 11.

What does this Scripture mean? That God "raised up Christ from the dead" is abundantly evident to all Bible readers. It is equally evident from this text that the "mortal bodies" of those in whom the Spirit of Christ dwells shall *also* be quickened or made alive. The word "also" teaches us that the quickening of Christ's people implies their being *raised up from the*

dead as Jesus was: Just as literally and clearly as Jesus rose, will be the resurrection of those in whom His Spirit dwells.—All this is plain and sure. Yea, and still more is equally plain from this text. As one who desires to be honest before God, I must break lose from former views and prejudices and own, that if language expresses any thing, conditions are plainly expressed in this text, upon the fulfillment of which depends our hope of a resurrection to a future life. But what are the conditions?

“If the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you”—not otherwise—“He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies,” &c. Now what if this Spirit does not dwell in us, can we hope to be quickened, or in other words, to be raised “UP FROM THE DEAD” as Christ was? But I have formerly thought, that all would be quickened, or made alive, irrespective of any conditions. But if those who have not the Spirit of Christ and are “none of His,” are to be quickened, as well as those who have His Spirit and are His, what can this text mean? I am unable to tell.

No man has ever shown, nor can any one ever prove that without a Saviour there could have been a resurrection for any of the human family. All prospect of future life, plainly depends upon Christ. Had there been no Saviour sent into the world, nothing seems plainer to me, than that the whole race of Adam would have terminated their career in the grave—would have been locked in the silence of unending death.

But Jesus came—blessed be God—and “brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.” But what shall we say of those who reject Him and his offer of life? Who have no union with Him? Are they not in the same condition they would have been, had Christ never come? To illustrate: suppose 300 men are placed upon an island and are destitute of food, in a starving condition. A ship visits the island with ample means to rescue them all, and offers to supply them with food and passage on the condition of their entering the ship.—A part only accept the offer, while the others foolishly reject it and remain. Are not those who reject the offer left in the same condition they were in prior to the offer? It is precisely so with those who reject Christ and his great offer of life to the world. Unless it can be shown that the dead would have been raised to life, had Jesus never come as a Saviour, I think it cannot be shown, since Christ has come and the offer has been made, that those who reject Him and His offer will ever live again. Such have only the nature of Adam, upon which the doom of death, unbroken by a resurrection, is in full force. If rescued at all from this doom, it must be done “through Christ.” But Him they have rejected. His offer to save them

from their impending doom, they have spurned. Therefore they die without hope, without Christ, and must necessarily "remain in the congregation of the dead," and "be as though they had not been."

And, again, our Lord's words in Luke 20 : 35, 36, not only confirm this view, but seem to teach it in the most emphatic manner. "They which shall be *accounted worthy* to obtain that world," (i. e., the world to come,) "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*."

Now if all are to be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, this text, to a common reader, would be meaningless. One thing is certain, those who are "accounted worthy to obtain *** the resurrection from the dead," cannot die again ; for saith Jesus, "*Neither can they die any more*." That all will not obtain the resurrection from the dead is also evident from the fact that a part only are "accounted worthy" to obtain it. It is on the account of worth or worthiness that any one is permitted to obtain it. It follows then, those deficient in these qualifications will most surely fail of it. Again, those "accounted worthy" are "children of God, being the *children of the resurrection* ;" from which it appears those not "accounted worthy," &c., are neither children of the resurrection nor of God. The very idea that some are "accounted worthy" of these immunities presupposes there is a class unworthy of them, and who will, therefore, fail to participate in them. This class shall "not see life ;" "they are extinct ;" "like *sleep they are laid in the grave*." They shall NEVER SEE LIGHT." "They go to NOTHING and perish." "They shall lie down together, THEY shall NOT RISE." So reads the word of the LORD. And who objects? Have I a bitter enemy, one who seeks my injury to the extent of his ability? At length he dies. Would it be a Christian spirit in me, to raise him from a state of unconsciousness to avenge myself upon him?— If possessed of the requisite power to raise him, it looks as if it would be God-like and Christ-like to say, Let him "remain in the tomb," as said Job. Who would wish to awaken a handful of dust, under such circumstances, to sorrow, pain, misery, or to die again? None but the hard-hearted. Surely, it seems to me, God is too good and merciful to do it. But says the objector, "Some portions of Scripture seem to teach that the wicked dead will live again." Very well. But a little more study and careful thought may show you that in this you are mistaken.— Perhaps you feel bitter prejudice against the idea of the "perpetual sleep" of the wicked dead. I felt thus for a long time and for that reason I could not receive the truth. It may be

so with you. If so, the Lord pity you, and help you, to overcome prejudice, and believe "the *truth*, the whole *truth*, and nothing but the *TRUTH*."

THE TWO MAIN QUESTIONS, 1 COR. 15 : 35.

First Question.—"How are the dead raised up?" *Second.*—"And with what body will they come?"

In the Scriptures there are statements that are general and those that are special. There are promises that are general and those that are special. There are requirements that are general and those that are special. As a general statement, we read that God sends His "rain upon the just and the unjust." But a special statement is, that He will "withhold no good thing from those that walk uprightly." As a general requirement we are told, we should "do good unto all men." But as a special requirement we are told to do good "especially to the household of faith."

There is a general statement in the Scriptures that there shall be a resurrection; but from the above two questions we conclude there are specifications to the general doctrine of a resurrection. To say in general terms, there shall be a resurrection, is one thing. To bring forward passages of Scripture that prove it a general doctrine of the Bible, is another thing. But to bring positive passages that specify the doctrine, as to how it shall be accomplished—what nature those will bear that experience it—and what the general and special benefits are that are to be derived from the resurrection, is quite another thing.

The above two questions would seem to demand that positive passages of Scripture be brought forward to bear upon two special questions of the general doctrine. Let it be remembered, the fact of the resurrection is fully admitted, and that the first question is "*How are the dead raised up?*" To this question there can be but one answer: and as there is a general agreement upon this question we will cite but a few of the many passages bearing directly upon this point. John 11 : 25. "I am the resurrection." John 6 : 39, 40; * * "that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up at the last day; * * and I will raise him up at the last day."—Verse 44. "I will raise him up at the last day."

Second question. "*And with what body do they come.*" There are three classes of believers upon this question. First: those who believe a portion of those raised will come with *mortal* bodies and another portion with *immortal* bodies. Second:—

those who believe *all* raised will come with mortal bodies.—Third : those who believe all that are raised will come with immortal bodies. Now, all three of these cannot be correct : and in fact, we may say, but one class of them can be correct. It will not appear so strange to us that the Apostle said—"Thou fool"—when we consider that all the Apostle's arguments had left no clear idea in their minds of *how* the resurrection was to be accomplished, and what body those raised would come with. "And with what body do they come?" Let the Apostle answer this question. 1st. Whatever is sown "is not quickened except it die." v. 36. 2d. Whatever nature the body bears when sown, it does not bear the same when raised. Verse 37. "Thou sowest not that body that shall be." Verse 38.—3d. Every seed shall have its own body. 4th. In the present state there is but one flesh of men : v. 39. Acts 17 : 26, "And hath made of one blood all nations of men." * * * 5th. There is in the present state, but one glory of the sun ; also but one glory of the moon : and although the stars differ in glory from the sun and the moon, yet each star has but one glory in itself : v. 41. 6th. As the sun differs from the moon in glory, and as one star differs in glory from another star, so also is the resurrection of the dead : v. 42.

Inasmuch as we have said in our second statement, that whatever nature the body bears when sown, it does not bear the same when raised, we would let the Apostle settle the question as to what that nature is when sown. "It is sown in corruption"—"It is sown in dishonor"—"It is sown in weakness"—"It is sown a natural body—It is sown bearing the image of the earthy. Now if the six above divisions of the Apostle's argument be borne in mind, we are ready for his answer. Let it also be borne in mind that the question is not—Shall there be a resurrection of *all, some, many,* or a *part*? but, What is the nature of the body of those raised? That's the question.

Now hear the apostle's answer. 1st. They shall come with an incorruptible body : v. 42. It is raised in incorruption : v. 54. "So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption."—2d. With a glorious body : v. 43. "It is raised in glory." 3d. With a body clothed with power : v. 43. "It is raised in power." 4th. With a spiritual body : v. 44. "It is raised a spiritual body." 5th. With a body bearing the image of the heavenly : v. 49 "We shall also bear the image of the heavenly."

In Luke 20 : 35, 36, the Saviour is very plain in answering this question. "But they which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead" * * * "neither can they die any more." Some may say, "It is those who are accounted worthy to obtain that world, that die no

more ; and not those—in particular—that are raised.” We would invite the attention of such to the *and*, at the commencement of the second sentence of verse 35. This conjunction, *and*, connects the expression *world*, with the expression resurrection. It would seem that in order to obtain either that world or the resurrection, there must be found in the person a worthiness. It may be said, the Apostle in 1 Cor. 15, is only speaking of the saints. Well, that’s what we think: still if the expression, “the dead,” v. 35, does not include all the dead that will be raised—then we ask some one to show that this expression—in verse 35—and the same expression in Luke 20 : 37—“Now that *the dead* are raised,” do not mean the same persons, nominally. If we allow the antitype to be anything in nature like the type given, we most certainly must admit the Saviour taught in this place, that Moses showed none but the good would be raised ; for he gives as a pledge, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that there shall be a resurrection. Some may say, “If this conclusion is true, then universal salvation is true.” To such we say, We believe the conclusion to be true. We are willing to admit that salvation is *for* all that desire and seek after it through Jesus the LIFE-GIVER. We are not, however, so afraid of any conclusion, or the consequences of a true conclusion, as to shut out an argument or debar those who differ from us.—We think the harm is not done by the argument, generally, but by the spirit that is manifested in opposing it ; we cannot say in meeting it, *but in opposing it* ; and generally at long range.

Beaufort, S. C.

J. W. C.

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

AMONG the many good results of the resurrection of the apostolic doctrine of LIFE THROUGH CHRIST ALONE, not the least will be, a thorough examination of the claims on our confidence of the various forms and ordinances which constitute so material a part of the modern Church Economy. Water Baptism and the Lord's Supper, being the leading rites, will be discussed with the greatest interest. The former, concerning which there have been so many theological battles, is probably doomed to a final renouncement. The brilliant light of the above-mentioned truth enables us clearly to distinguish the “one thing needful,”—the “*one* Baptism,” which can be no other than

the Baptism of the Spirit. While we see the *necessity* of this Baptism, our faith in that which never could be more than a *symbol* of something better—as John the Baptist was merely an index of Christ—must be seriously shaken, as we allow our minds to feel the weight of Paul's emphatic declaration, "Christ sent me *not* to baptize."

But the subject of the present article is the Lord's Supper : concerning which, the prevailing ideas seem to us extremely unsatisfactory. There is a superstitious dependence on the ordinance, as a means whereby the salvation of the partaker is made more certain than it would otherwise be. This is shown, not only in the conduct of the idolatrous Roman Catholic, but very often in that of his Protestant superior. Thus, the simple and sure plan of salvation by faith is tacitly ignored, and a mere form invested with an importance which our Saviour never designed it to have. This, and other evils will be removed, as we are persuaded, by a true and Scriptural theory of this important and sublime observance. To state its origin is to give the argument. As Luke's account appears to be more complete in detail than that of Matthew or Mark, we will cite it.

"Then came the day of unleavened bread, when the passover must be killed. And he sent Peter and John, saying, Go and prepare us the passover, that we may eat. And they said unto him, Where wilt thou that we prepare? And he said unto them, Behold, when ye are entered into the city, there shall a man meet you, bearing a pitcher of water ; follow him into the house where he entereth in. And ye shall say unto the good man of the house, The Master saith unto thee, Where is the guest chamber, where I shall eat the passover with my disciples? And he shall shew you a large upper room furnished : there make ready. And they went, and found as he had said unto them : and they made ready the passover. And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him. And he said unto them, I have heartily desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer : for I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide among yourselves : for I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come. And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body, which is given for you : this do in remembrance of me. Likewise also

the cup after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood, which is shed for you." Luke 22 : 7-20.

To the Gospel account, we will add the apostolic testimony, as found in 1 Cor. 11 : 23-26.

"For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread : and when he had given thanks, he brake, and said, Take, eat ; this is my body, which is broken for you : this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood : this do ye, as oft as ye drink, 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."

The following points—to our mind—are clearly involved in the foregoing.

1. The Lord's Supper is an altered form of the Hebrew Passover.

2. Its chief design is the *commemoration* of the event which was *foreshadowed* by the primitive ordinance.

3. The bread and wine are the substitutes for the paschal lamb.

4. The Saviour's words, "Do *this*," can have but one meaning,—“Keep the passover henceforth till I come, in its Christian form, according to my example, here given.”

5. The Lord's Supper is a *yearly* feast, as the passover was ; it is to be kept by the disciples of Christ, to shew forth “the Lord's death till He come ;” and it is an acknowledgment of the propitiation made by Christ for us.

The points mentioned are covered by the emphatic words of Paul—“For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us : therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness ; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.” 1 Cor. 5 : 7, 8.

There is one objection which may be urged against the adoption of this simple eucharistic system,—the uncertainty concerning the exact date of our Lord's death. Did it take place on Friday, or—as our Lord's words, Matt. 12 : 40, would seem to indicate—on Thursday ? Did it occur in the year A. D. 28 or A. D. 29 ?

To escape this difficulty, we followed the Mosaic record the last two years ; taking the Rabbinical time as correct. But

since then, we have become acquainted with another cause of uncertainty. The Rabbins say that the month Abib or Nisan (Ex. 13 : 4, Esther 3 : 7) begins with the new moon of March, but the Caraites—who are considered more exact than the Rabbins in their adherence to the Mosaic institutions—say the new moon of April. Gesenius seems to prefer the latter month. He has the following remarks on the word *Abib* :

“*Abib, an ear of grain, a green ear. Lev. 2 : 14. Ex. 9 : 31—the barley was in the ear. . . Chodesh ha-abib, the month Abib, i. e., of green ears, afterward called Nisan, beginning with the new moon of April, or according to the Rabbins, of March ; the first month of the Hebrew year.*”—*Lex.*

With our present information we cannot decide which of the foregoing views is correct. But after all, the matter is not of any great consequence. Suppose we *are* ignorant of the true time. Is it not far better to celebrate the memorial of our Lord's death *about* the time than to *destroy its significance* by following the prevalent customs ? Some observe it every three months ; some every month ; some every week ; and some whenever they have an opportunity. Such a course is about as consistent as it would be to have *Christmas* once a month or week. We show forth the Lord's *birth* once a year. Have we not greater reason to have an anniversary of his *death* ? It is probable that Dec. 25 is about *three* months later than the true time of Christ's birth. Does this fact do away with the pleasing meditations awakened in the hearts of Christians by its annual return ?

To any and all objections, then, we have one answer : “Christ *our passover* is sacrificed for us : *therefore* let us *keep the feast.*” According to Rabbinical time and the general practice of the Jews, the fifteenth day of Abib or Nisan is that which includes the first full moon after the vernal equinox. The moon fulls this year on the 3d of April, about 11 P. M. The feast will come on the same evening.

In connection with this article, the Examiners for January, February, and June, 1861, and April, 1863, may be consulted. We conclude by quoting from the Feb. Exr., 1861. “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.”

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—The foregoing communication has our most hearty approval. To us it is no longer a matter of indifference.—Let there be an anniversary commemoration of our SAVIOUR'S *death*, and “keep the feast” in a way that shall make it significant of its true design. §

A SINGULAR ADMISSION.—Dr. Adam Clarke has the following note on our Lord's assertion, “Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and ARE DEAD.” (John 6 : 49) :—

“That bread neither preserved their bodies alive, nor entitled them to life eternal : but those who receive my salvation, shall not only be raised again in the last day, but shall inherit eternal life. It was an opinion of the Jews themselves that their fathers who perished in the wilderness should never have a resurrection. Our Lord takes them on their own ground :—Ye acknowledge that your fathers who fell in the wilderness shall never have a resurrection ; and yet they ate of the manna : therefore that manna is not the bread that preserves to everlasting life, according even to your own concession.”

The Jews, according to Dr. Clarke, were taken by the Saviour “on *their own ground*.” That “ground” was that the “fathers who perished in the wilderness” would never be raised from the dead. Now if Jesus took the Jews upon their own ground, *how* did he do it ? By assuming, for the sake of the argument, a position of theirs which he in fact repudiated ?—Not at all. He stated a *fact*, viz., that the fathers “*are DEAD*.” If this statement of a *fact* is taking the Jews upon their own ground, and if they held the sentiment imputed to them by Dr. C., it follows inevitably, as the only possible meaning of our Lord's words, that the “fathers” are perished in a sense precluding their resurrection from the dead. And John 6 : 50 shows conclusively that such as now reject “the bread which

cometh down from heaven" will *die as the fathers did*. We should like to see an attempt from the advocates of the revival of the wicked dead to explain John 6 : 49, 50 in harmony with their view. The author of the only work written against the doctrine of Life only in Christ, though he must have been aware of the fact that its advocates believe their view to be explicitly involved in these passages, has not deemed it prudent to undertake their exposition. Silence and evasion are often very significant. The instance before us is of that character.

We have a learned Methodist friend up the Mohawk Valley, *intensely* orthodox on the subject of future punishment. He reads the EXAMINER regularly, and may not be favorably impressed by our attempt to derive countenance from Dr. Clarke to the view of no future life for the wicked. Should this be so, we respectfully ask him to show that our construction of the Dr.'s language is incorrect, and to tell us what *he* supposes the Saviour means by declaring that the fathers "are dead." We extend a similar invitation to any other person who may feel an interest in the matter.

R. W.

A SHORT SERMON: BY THE EDITOR.—*Text*: "The unsearchable riches of Christ."—Eph. 3 : 8.

Christ has *riches*; and they are unsearchable, and so extensive that they cannot be explored, nor exhausted. Let us dwell a moment on this topic. What are we called to? First, a *union* with Christ: to become his bride. Of course, partners in His treasures, honors, and whatever belongs to him. Let this truth be proclaimed. But who and what are we? Mortal, corruptible, dying creatures; whose foundation is in the dust; and all of whose tendencies are to return to dust again; with no principle of immortality or endless life in ourselves. To such creatures Christ is proclaimed, as seeking to bring us into a relation to Himself of the nearest and most interesting character. Men are allured by the charm of *riches*, gold, inexhaustible mines; that wakes up their whole being, and they eagerly inquire what it is, where it is, how they can find it, how they may possess themselves of those treasures? If they find there

is even a chance for success in the pursuit, they enter at once on the expedition, hazarding all the labor, toil, risk, suffering, or privation that may be attending the enterprise. Now, says the apostle, I come to proclaim to you riches unsearchable, a mine that is inexhaustible in Christ. He is the Son of the living God, and heir of God: heir of His incorruptibility, glory, endless life, and whatever pertains to the fullness of God. He proposes to share these riches with us: and in exchange for this short and fleeting life to give us an endless life: instead of these corruptible bodies to give us incorruptible ones: instead of the dishonor of consuming in the grave, by worms, to raise us to crowns of glory that fade not away. In a word, to give us riches as much more glorious, valuable, and durable than the richest diamonds, or the most refined and pure gold, as they exceed the most worthless and loathsome object that earth bears upon its surface. But all comparison fails, and we feel the deepest sense of weakness in the attempt, and leave it to your own reflections to follow up the contemplation of the honor, glory, and riches that are so freely offered to us in Jesus Christ.

LETTERS AND EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

JESUS THE LIFE-GIVER.—It is the key-stone to the arch—God's plan of redemption. O, how sweet it sounds! It is full of music! And it will charm those who will listen to its sweet notes. By it they will be led to see that God is honored—Christ is glorified—the happiness of the redeemed augmented, and a finishing stroke put upon the great plan of redemption, because it leaves the wicked in the dark abodes of *sheol* eternally!

R. V. LYON.

RUFUS WENDELL, Salem, Mass., writes:—My Sabbath at Portland, Me., (Feb. 1st.) was a day of much interest, it being my privilege to break ground there on the subject of Life only in Christ. The congregations, morning and afternoon, were large and attentive. My theme in the morning was Christ's Discourse with the Sadducees on the Resurrection (Luke 20th); in the afternoon I spoke from Rom. 8: 11-13, and in connection with the discussion of that passage I noticed a variety of texts that had been submitted for my consideration. I had great liberty in enforcing what I believed to be the truth on this subject, in which I

am persuaded considerable interest was awakened. I sold six copies of *Life from the Dead*. The evening meeting was devoted to an interchange of views by asking and answering questions. A kind spirit was manifested, and there is reason to hope that the *real* Life view will yet find a firm footing in the Portland Church. The brother who controverted it most tenaciously (though with perfect kindness) was not prepared to say that the righteous will be raised from the dead *immortal!* To have admitted this plain truth would have been subversive of the only *principle* upon which *he* based the revival of the wicked dead. He is a preacher and an interesting man, and I trust he will come to a clearer perception of the truth.

RANDOLPH E. LADD, Springfield, Mass., writes:—I herewith send you \$50, for *my pledge*. My intention now is (if the Lord prospers me) to do more for the EXAMINER and its EDITOR during the year. The Examiner *must* be sustained. This is the response of many hearts every succeeding month. It is of *vital* necessity where there is so universal a departure from the most glorious of ALL TRUTH—"Life *only* through our Lord and LIFE-GIVER"—that whatever of sacrifice is required to keep alive this vehicle of communicating this doctrine *must* be made. Now, if ever, should the friends of the EXAMINER rally around it and sustain its *Editor* in his labors. I wish there might be a full expression of the purpose and intention of the friends of truth, so that his heart might be cheered and his hands strengthened in his work. Many loving hearts beat strongly and earnestly in his behalf, and means *will* be forthcoming to meet his wants. Be of good courage, Bro. Storrs; go fearlessly forward: speak, write, and preach the truth as you see it. Oh, what a blessing to me was that Sermon on the "DOOM OF THE UNGODLY." It is worth the year's subscription. Send me 100 of them, and I will remit the amount for them as soon as received.

A WORD TO THE EXAMINER'S FRIENDS.—Bro. Storrs has incidentally stated a fact to me, in a recent letter on business, which I wish (with his permission) to lay before the patrons of the Examiner. He writes:—"Hereafter I have to pay an *advance* on composition. How I am to stand it all, I can't see; and perhaps it's not necessary I should. The clouds look dark, but the LORD sitteth above them."

By "composition" is meant the *type-setting*. As to this extra expense,—coming on the heel of an enormous advance in the

cost of paper,—I think the EDITOR of the Examiner should not be required, or even permitted, “to stand it *all*”; and I wish simply to suggest to the friends the importance—the *necessity*, rather—of their doing what they can to relieve him of the burden incurred by the increased price of paper and composition. I know not how many copies of the Examiner are sent out this year, but I do know that a *little* aid from each friendly reader of its pages would prove a *great* relief to our brother in his determined effort to continue it on its useful mission. Shall these small donations, simply because they must be small, be kept back? This should not be the case, and I trust that Br. Storrs will receive a good many *tangible* assurances of a willingness to reward him adequately for his labors in keeping the Examiner in the field in these days of shinplasters, high prices and war. No one who can afford to pay more than the subscription price for the Examiner, should be content to receive it for one dollar a year. I enclose herewith one dollar to help pay the increased expenses of publication. . . .

R. W.

THE EXAMINER for *April* may be late in appearing, as the EDITOR expects to be absent from the city a portion of the time prior to the next issue. On that account, also, correspondents may not receive answers to their letters as promptly as they might desire; but we shall attend to them as early as possible after our return. Let none delay writing because they suppose us absent. . . .

“IMMORTALITY THROUGH CHRIST ALONE.—*The Doctrine Safe and Salutary.*—By C. F. HUDSON.”—A Pamphlet of 26 pages. We have received it from the Author, and read it with interest. It is one of the most valuable and interesting of his publications. It is to be had, we presume, of “CARLTON, 413 Broadway, N. Y.,” where other works of the same author can be found.

BIBLE EXAMINER for the years 1852 to 1855 and 1857 are wanted by C. F. HUDSON. Any person having them for those years to part with, will confer a favor by addressing him to “care of G. W. CARLTON, 413 Broadway, New York,” stating the price, &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. 15. No. 4.]

APRIL, 1863.

[Whole No. 223.]

"IT MATTERS BUT LITTLE."

Mrs. PHEBE PALMER, in the Guide to Holiness for Nov., 1861, gives expression to the deep interest she has long felt in the subject of the second advent of the Saviour. "My conviction," she writes, "deepens that the drama of this world's history is fast winding up." Her surprise at the apathy on this subject, so prevalent in Christendom, calls for a word. Would that it might fall under her eye, and that she could be induced thoroughly to ponder the point to which we call attention.—Mrs. P. says,—“To my mind there is that which is so emphatic in the Scriptures of truth on this solemn yet glorious theme, that I am amazed Christians of the present day do not feel more like the early Christians, who would fain have hastened the day by their eager longings for it.”

The longing cherished by the “early Christians” for the Lord’s second appearing is easily explained. Their only hope of a future life was associated with the event. Had they believed that *Death* would translate them to the presence of the Redeemer, and introduce them to the “pleasures forevermore,” the interest they felt in Christ’s return from heaven would be a very proper subject of amazement. But they cherished no such faith.—“The resurrection,” as Dr. Hodge truly remarks in his note on 2 Cor. 4: 14,—“the resurrection, therefore, was the one great, all-absorbing object of anticipation and desire to the early Christians, and should be to us.” “And *should* be to us,” remarks Dr. Hodge. It *should* be, indeed! but *is* it? Emphatically, we reply, *No, it is not*. And so true is this, that Mr. Spurgeon, of London,—who admits that “the very staple of the preaching

of the Apostles was the resurrection of the dead,"—declares that "there are very few Christians who believe the resurrection of the dead." This statement is doubtless too strong, but it is hardly more sweeping than the remark of Dr. Adam Clarke, who says respecting the resurrection, "There is not a doctrine in the gospel on which more stress is laid, and there is not a doctrine in the present system of teaching which is treated with more neglect." Aside, however, from the admissions here cited, the palpable fact which presents itself throughout the length and breadth of Christendom is this,—that the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead is very greatly neglected, and has very little influence in "exciting the followers of God to diligence, obedience, and cheerfulness." And we affirm unhesitatingly that any explanation that will account for *this* defection from the primitive faith, will also give the reason why so little interest is now manifested by professed Christians in the coming of the Lord.

What is the explanation? We have already anticipated it, but we wish to show that in her article Mrs. Palmer herself avows the very sentiment which has so effectually and deplorably turned away attention from that longing for Christ's return which was so marked a feature in early Christianity. First, however, let us look at another remark of Mr. Spurgeon. "By the resurrection of the dead is meant something very different from the immortality of the soul; that, every Christian believes, and therein are only on a level with the heathen, who believe it too." Of course, we *deny* the allegation of Mr. Spurgeon that *every* Christian believes the soul immortal. His assertion that in believing it a Christian is "only on a level with the heathen," we willingly leave with those whom it will be likely either to flatter or offend. Mr. S. declares that the resurrection of the dead and the immortality of the soul are "very different."—Very true; and it will be found that just in proportion as the latter doctrine is made prominent, the former is shifted into the background, its place being usurped by a sentiment which loads the body with disgrace and gives the believer his reward at death. When Mrs. Palmer shall have accomplished as much in correcting the errors which prevail in the church of the present day respecting the believers' condition *in death*, as she has, by her untiring and faithful labors, in awakening an interest in the sub-

ject of personal holiness and entire consecration to God, she will have less cause to be amazed that “eager longings” for Christ’s coming do not more generally prevail among believers. But, alas! her own mind is in darkness in respect to the time when saints will be rewarded. In proof of this, we have only to cite the remark with which her letter in the Guide to Holiness concludes. It is as follows:—“But I have unexpectedly permitted my pen to run on in the contemplation of this glorious subject, until I have little room for anything else. Through grace, I am daily enabled to apprehend more fully that to live is Christ. And whether I tarry till Jesus comes,

‘Or pass through death triumphant home,’
it matters but little. Life at the longest is but for a moment.”

Here we have the theology which should dispel Mrs. P.’s amazement. *Death* is exalted to a level with the coming of Jesus. Through *it* the saint goes “triumphant home.” Through *it* saints have been thus going home for these six thousand years. Truly! if this be the case, “it matters but little” whether Jesus *ever* comes again! and since Mrs. P.’s theory of passing “through *death* triumphant home,” is the prevalent one in the religious world, and since *death* stands ever ready to carry believers to glory, having been constantly about this work since the demise of the first saint, it is not strange that in these days Death is permitted to wear the honor which an uncorrupted faith eighteen hundred years ago was wont to bestow upon the coming of the Lord and the resurrection of the dead.

To believers in man’s entire mortality is committed an important work. The coming of the Lord Jesus, “without sin unto salvation,” is the “blessed hope” of the gospel. To make men see and feel this, we must show them from the Bible that future and endless life comes by a resurrection from the dead, and that Jesus, our LIFE-GIVER, is to achieve this mighty work at his appearing and kingdom. The notion that Death brings triumph to the saint must be exhibited in contrast with the glorious revelation of Jesus and the Resurrection. The lustre of the God-given disclosure of Life only in Christ is destroyed by the fable of the immortality of the soul. Let us evince our gratitude for the light we have received by putting forth unceasing efforts to make known the glad tidings to the unenlightened and the perishing.

R. W.

AN EXPOSITION BY RICHARD WATSON, EXAMINED.

BY RUFUS WENDELL.

Verse 32. I am the God of Abraham, &c.

As the Sadducees received no other of the sacred books than those of the Pentateuch, our Lord draws his proof from one of them. The words quoted were spoken to Moses, Exod. 3 : 6, consequently long after the death of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob ; and the stress of the argument lies in this, that Jehovah, who had been the God of these patriarchs during life, after their death still calls himself their God : " I AM the God of Abraham," &c. Now to be " their God" expressed a COVENANT relation. He was not only the chosen object of their worship and trust, but stood engaged by his covenant with them to be their patron, protector, and the source of all blessings to them in the present and in a future life ; for, in dependence upon this covenant, they were content " to dwell in tents" while on earth, because " they looked for a city which had foundations, whose builder and maker is God." It followed, therefore, from the obvious truth that " God is not the God of the dead, but of the living," or that he could stand in no covenant relation to the dead, that these patriarchs were still alive as to their souls ; which utterly subverted the material doctrine of the Sadducees, that they perished with the body. But how did it prove the doctrine of the resurrection of the body ? From a supposed difficulty in connecting the argument with this doctrine, Dr. Samuel Clarke, Campbell, and others, depart from the plain meaning of the word *resurrection*, and consider our Lord as arguing generally in favor of a future life. But though our Lord's reasoning proves this also, it does it incidentally ; his main discourse being on the resurrection of the body, and the passage before us being quoted from the writings of Moses in confirmation of it. The force of the proof lies in this, that to be " their God" expressed the covenant made with these patriarchs ; for it was the manner of the Jews to quote rather the heads of a passage in the Old Testament from which they argued, or to sum up its substance in a leading phrase ; and this covenant, as the promise made to Abraham shows, comprehended the gift of Canaan to inherit it. But as Canaan was not put into the possession of Abraham and his immediate descendants, it followed either that the promise had failed, or, if not, that it related in its chief and highest sense to the inheritance of heaven, of which Canaan was an instituted type, and that they must be raised again to enjoy it. For if the Sadducees had acknowledged the *immortality of the soul*, and merely denied the *resurrection of the body*, still the *disembodied spirits* of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob *solely* were *then* in possession of heavenly felicity : but the covenant was made with their *whole persons* as men, and could only be fulfilled in their *whole persons*. In confirmation of this view of the argument, it may be remarked that St. Paul

considers the promise, "I will be their God," as involving the promise of the heavenly inheritance: "Wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God, for, (Gr. *gar*,) *because* he hath prepared for them a city." This is what showed God to be their God, that he had prepared for them a city, which they could not possess without a resurrection. Farther, that the Jews thought the promise of Canaan to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, was *personal*, appears from those commentators who contend from this promise that these patriarchs must be raised from the dead to enjoy the land of Israel. The argument of our Lord may therefore be thus stated: Since Jehovah became the covenant God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and even after their death declared that he continued to stand to them in that relation, they cannot be dead in your sense, that is, hopelessly and finally so. As to their souls, indeed, they are still alive; and with respect to their bodies, as the covenant was made with their entire persons, with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as perfect human beings composed of a body and reasonable soul; and whatever was implied in being "their God" related to their whole man; so whatever it promises the whole man must enjoy; and though a temporary death has intervened as to the body, it shall be raised up at the last day, that the covenant of God may stand firm in all its parts, and that he may be "their God" for ever. The additional clause which St. Luke introduces into this discourse shows that our Lord considered the patriarchs as dead only in a mitigated sense, such as was expressed, indeed, by believers in a resurrection, and especially under the Gospel, by the term sleep; "For he is not a God of the dead, but of the living, for, or *because* (Gr. *gar*), all," not only Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, but all THE DEAD, "live unto him;" they live in his purpose and covenant, and are considered as alive by Him that calleth "things that are not as though they were." It affords another proof that the learned Jews have not scrupled to avail themselves occasionally of the wisdom of Christ, that Manasseh Ben Israel, a rabbi of the eighteenth century, borrows this argument of our Lord to prove the immortality of the soul, and nearly in his own words a little paraphrased. Producing the same passage from Exodus, he adds, "For God is not the God of the dead, for the dead are not; but of the living, for the living exist; therefore also the patriarchs, in respect of the soul, may rightly be inferred from hence to live".—*Richard Watson's Note on Matt. 22: 32.*

REMARKS ON THE FOREGOING EXPOSITION.

1. Mr. Watson, it will be seen, *assumes* his theory of man's nature, viz., that "a body and reasonable soul" are essential to a "perfect human being." In his Theological Institutes, however, he undertakes to support the position by argument. Thus he writes: "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 LIV-

ING SOUL, breathed into the body by an *inspiration* from God." It is related of the celebrated naturalist, Cuvier, that he was asked to pronounce upon the merits of the following definition, — "*Crab*, a fish, of a red color, that goes backward." His objections to it were these : "1. *Crab* is not a *fish* ; 2. its color is not *red* ; 3. it does not go *backward*." The anecdote well illustrates our estimate of Mr. Watson's reasoning upon "human nature." By saying "*body*" where the "history of Moses" says "*man*," and "*living soul*" where that history says "*breath of life*," the great oracle of Methodism finds an easy road to his conclusion. But the capital defect in his statement is that it squarely contradicts the record to which it appeals ! However, to dwell upon this point would be aside from our present purpose, and we pass on to notice somewhat minutely the exposition given in full at the head of this article. Should these remarks meet the eye of the friend (Rev. S. M.) who first called our attention to the exposition, some ten years ago, we request that he will point out any flaw he may be able to detect in the observations we here present. His cordial regard for the authority of Mr. Watson as a theologian, and his equally hearty dissent from our view on immortality, should not leave him without a sufficient incentive to challenge an honest effort which seeks to demonstrate the inconclusiveness of an exposition held by himself to be both sound and weighty.

2. If we interpret Mr. Watson correctly, he finds evidence in our Lord's discourse to the Sadducees for believing, 1. that good men's souls live from death to the resurrection in a felicitous disembodied state ; 2. that during the same period the souls of the wicked have likewise a conscious existence ; 3. that the souls of all men are immortal ; 4. that in the resurrection soul and body are to be reunited ; 5. that the bodies of the wicked will be raised from the dead ; 6. that a similar destiny awaits the bodies of the righteous dead. That he deduces the first, fourth, and sixth of these points from the Saviour's argument is perfectly apparent. And that we do not misapprehend respecting the other three is rendered probable by two considerations. (1.) In the sentence preceding the last two of the exposition, Mr. Watson employs the phrase "*all THE DEAD*" in a way we think he would not have done had he designed to restrict its application to the righteous. We admit that such a

limited reference seems favored by his use of the word "covenant" in the same sentence ; but as the word "all" is an important and emphatic one in the sentence, and as Mr. Watson held to a future life for the wicked, we are confident that he did not mean only the good by the words "*all the dead.*" To urge that the "all" must be held to relate exclusively to the good, because the expositor's use of the word "covenant" would not be proper on any other supposition, is equal to saying that Mr. Watson must not be made to contradict himself. But this claim is set aside by the fact that the exposition before us is as self-contradictory as some of its parts are inconsistent with the oracles of God. (2.) The other consideration which seems to warrant our opinion is this. The reference to Manasseh Ben Israel, at the close of the exposition, clearly shows that "the wisdom of Christ," manifested in his reply to the Sadducees, is authority with Mr. Watson for the doctrine of "the immortality of the soul." By this, in common usage, is meant the immortality of the souls of all mankind, and since Mr. Watson gives no hint of a restrained use of the phrase, we feel authorized to conclude that he employed it in its ordinary latitude. By these suggestions do we justify to our own mind the presumption that the doctrine of a resurrection life for the *wicked* dead was held by Mr. Watson to be deducible from our Lord's argument against Sadduceism. With entire confidence we affirm that this position is utterly without foundation. And this leads us to remark—

First, that in asserting it, Mr. Watson nullifies the principle upon which he makes our Lord's argument to rest. According to the exposition we are examining, the basis—the *sole* basis—of the Saviour's proof is the declaration in Exodus, "I AM the God of Abraham," &c. To this we give entire assent. Mr. Watson says, too,—and here again we agree with him,—that the words in question "expressed a COVENANT relationship."—Now comes the question, Will Mr. Watson's own view of the "COVENANT relationship" permit him to find anything in it for the *wicked* dead? *It will not*; for he says that the covenant assures to those interested in it that Jehovah will "be their *patron, protector*, and the source of *all blessings* to them in the present and in a future life." Manifestly, the Lord our God sustains none of these relations to the impenitent dead. We

say, therefore, that for Mr. Watson to base an assumption of a future life for the wicked upon our Lord's anti-Sadducee discourse, is to destroy the entire significance of the "relationship" upon which *alone* Christ founded his reasoning. It will not do for any one to claim in behalf of Mr. Watson that he finds the *wicked* dead designated (if at all) in the words from Luke, "for all live unto him," and that the word "*all*" here embraces a larger number than Mr. W. would include in the "*covenant* relationship;" for it so happens that Mr. Watson does expressly include in the "*covenant*" as many (neither more nor less) as are covered by the words "*all* live unto him."

Second. That the *wicked* are not included in the "*COVENANT* relationship" which constitutes the *sole* basis of our Lord's resurrection argument in his controversy with the Sadducees, is made certain by the Apostle's language (referred to by Mr. Watson) in the eleventh of Hebrews,—“wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for [because] he hath prepared for them a city.” No “city” having been “prepared” for the *wicked* dead, the inference is, not only that the Lord is not *their* God, but that he would be “ashamed” to stand in such relationship to them. We hold it, therefore, as a point *incontrovertibly settled*, that the cavilling Sadducees were “put to *silence*” by an argument for the resurrection that *did not include the wicked*. How can this fact be explained or accounted for except on the supposition that there was no difference between Jesus and themselves respecting the fate of the *wicked* dead? An adverse supposition encounters two grave difficulties—*first*, that of believing that the Sadducees would have failed promptly to challenge the doctrine for which no proof had been offered, viz., the reliving of the wicked dead; and *secondly*, that the Great Teacher would have lost so good an opportunity to bring the weapons of inspiration to bear against their “no-resurrection” heresy in its relation to the wicked dead. Who among the advocates of a future life for *all* the dead will undertake to meet this aspect of the argument? Its bearing in the controversy which is waging respecting “the doom of the ungodly” appears to our mind as very important.

3. We next observe that Mr. Watson, by seeking to deduce from our Lord's reasoning the notion of the disembodied conscious existence of the soul, involves himself in a self-contradiction.

tion. Let us see. Several times in the exposition it is asserted that the *souls* of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are *now alive*, and this view is presented as an unavoidable deduction from the statement of our Lord that those, whose God the Lord is, are not "the *dead*," but "the *living*." To Mr. Watson's assumption respecting man's being a double entity we do not just now object, but we say he cannot maintain, with logical consistency, that the Patriarchs are now actually alive, unless he is prepared to assert that the phrases "the *living*" and "all *live* unto him" (see Luke 20) do not bear a *proleptic* sense; for if the words "the *living*" (applied to the departed) mean, those who *shall* live again, not only do they afford no proof of the consciousness of the dead, but they *disprove* that notion. Now, Mr. Watson, instead of denying the proleptic sense, distinctly asserts it. The phrase, "the *living*," he explains by the other phrase, "all *live* unto him," and the latter statement he paraphrases as follows (the words in brackets being our own)—"they live [not *actual* *ly* and *now*, but] in his *purpose* and *covenant*, and are [actually alive? No, but] *considered* as alive by Him, that calleth 'things that are not [at *present*, but *shall* be] as though they were.'"—Thus does Mr. Watson contradict himself—affirming in one place that *present* consciousness is proved by a declaration which he afterwards urges as evidence that there will be in the *future* a realization which exists *now*, not as an *actual* fact, but *only* in the *purpose* and *covenant* of God.

How does Mr. Watson extort from our Lord's reasoning proof that the "patriarchs were still *alive* as to their souls"? He affirms that it follows from the "obvious truth" that God "could stand in no covenant relation to *the dead*." His unlawful inference from an "obvious truth" is instantly dissipated when that "truth" is clearly defined. To make the inference in question valid, the "truth" *should* be that God can stand in no "covenant relationship" to any who are *actually* "dead." But this is *not* true, Mr. Watson being witness, for he maintains that God *is* in covenant relation with the *dead bodies* of the patriarchs.—On the other hand, to prove Mr. W.'s inference worthless, we have only to take *his* position that it is to "the *dead*" who are "*hopelessly* and *finally* so" that God can stand in no covenant relation. And here it may be proper to add, that those among the departed to whom God does *not* stand in "covenant rela-

tionship"—the wicked—are "hopelessly and finally" *dead*. We challenge a refutation of this position, for we greatly desire to see some one attempt to meet it.

4. "Our Lord," says Mr. Watson, "considered the patriarchs as dead only in a *mitigated* sense, such as was expressed, indeed, by believers in a resurrection, and especially under the gospel, by the term *sleep*." Very true; and all on account of the "covenant relationship," as the Saviour's reasoning clearly shows. The *wicked* are not within the covenant, and are hence not dead in "a *mitigated* sense," but "*hopelessly and finally* so." The New Testament "believers in a resurrection," never applied "the term *sleep*" to the condition of the *wicked dead*.

5. Mr. Watson's distinction between "a future life" and the resurrection is a fiction. In "our Lord's reasoning" no such distinction is recognized. He proved a "future *life*" for "the dead" only by proving that they would be *raised*; not "his *main* discourse," therefore, but his *whole* discourse was on this subject. He did not "incidentally" or in any other way give countenance to the notion of consciousness in death, while the silence of the Sadducees respecting that notion is strong presumptive evidence that they believed our Lord's teachings on that point to be in accordance with their own sentiments.

Salem, Mass., March 3, 1863.

R. W.

WHO ARE EVANGELICAL?

BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

The Greek word rendered *Gospel* in our version of the New Testament Scriptures is *Euangelion*. From thence comes our adjective *evangelical*, of which Webster gives three definitions: the third is, "Sound in the doctrines of the Gospel; orthodox." With this agrees our question. Who are "orthodox?" Who are "sound in the doctrines of the Gospel?" Who are *evangelical*?

The inquiry will be satisfactorily answered by considering what Paul—an authoritative expounder of the Gospel—set forth as *evangelical*. In 1 Cor., xv chapter, the Apostle says:

"Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the *Gospel* which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand; by which also ye are saved, if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain."

This preface gives to the chapter great significance and weight. Paul sets himself to tell the whole story; and we may be well assured that, after such a preface, he would leave nothing unsaid that was at all important in the connection. He might omit many things that are *implied* in his language; but we may be sure that whatever is left *unsaid* and *unimplied* is not evangelical. In this chapter he "declares the *Gospel*," the Gospel "which I (he) preached;" the Gospel which the Corinthian church "*received*," the Gospel, saith Paul, "wherein ye stand;" the Gospel "by which" they were "*saved*." We will state every item in the order which it takes:

1. "Christ died for our sins." V. 3.
2. "He was buried." V. 4.
3. "He rose again the third day."
4. "Now is Christ.... become the first fruits of *those having fallen asleep*," (*hekoimeemenōn*.) V. 20.
5. "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." V. 22.
6. "But *every one* (*hekastos*) 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," &c. Vs. 23, 24.
7. "He must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death." V. 25.
8. "When all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son (Christ) also himself be subject unto *Him* that put all things under him, that God may be all in all." V. 28.
9. "So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption; it is raised in incorruption: it is sown in dishonour; it is raised in glory: it is sown in weakness, it is raised in power: it is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body.... As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly." Vs. 42-49.
10. "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 shall be changed. . . . So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." Vs. 51-55.

We are now prepared to show who, in the present day, are evangelical.

1. Those who believe that *Christ died*. Do the churches that are popularly styled "evangelical" believe this? They do not; they believe that a *part* of Christ, an *inferior* part, died; viz., the body. But the *real* Christ, the *soul* of Christ, they say, did *not die*. The *shell* that *enclosed* the man Christ Jesus *died*, while *Christ* still *lived*. So Paul stands corrected by the *evangelical*, the *orthodox* Christians of the nineteenth century. Paul says, "Christ died for our sins;" they say, "Christ's *body* died for our sins." And this leads us to ask, what is it that *sins*, according to modern orthodoxy? The soul. Well, ought not Christ's *soul* to have "died for *our sins*?" How could the death of the mere *body* of Christ have any connection with the sins of the *souls* of men? And is it not plainly predicted by the prophet Isaiah that God should "make his (Christ's) *soul* an offering for *sin*," and that Christ's "*soul*" was to be "poured out unto *death*?" Isaiah liii. Did not Peter, on the day of Pentecost, apply David's prediction, (Ps. xvi)—"Thou wilt not leave *my soul* in *hell*," (*sheol*, hades, the state of death,) to Christ?

We do not recognize, in these questions, the popular notions concerning man's nature—that he is a *dual* being, made up of *two* entities. We design merely to show that even if we allow all that is claimed, it is absolutely certain that *both* entities *died*, according to the scriptures. For ourselves, we take Paul's words, and *believe* them. "Christ," the *man*, the *whole* Christ, the *whole* man "DIED." He "died for our sins." Not the sins of the *body*, nor the sins of the *soul*, but for "*our sins*." Therefore, on this point, *we claim to be evangelical*.

2. Those who believe that Christ was *buried*. What we have said in relation to Christ's *death* may be understood here without repetition. The same Christ that *died* was *buried*.

3. Those who believe that Christ rose again.

4. Those who believe that the departed saints are "*asleep*."

Here again modern orthodoxy is put to shame. They believe that the saints are wider awake after death than before.

5. Those who believe that "*in Christ shall all be made alive.*" But the so-called evangelical churches hold that the saints are all alive *now*. There is not a single dead saint, according to their theory. If none are dead, how can they be made "*alive?*"

6. Those who believe that the sleeping saints are to be made alive at Christ's coming.

7. Those who believe in the personal "reign" of Christ on the *earth*. How many of the popular churches are evangelical in this respect ?

8. Those who believe that Christ will reign on the earth until he has subjected "all things," and that then he will deliver up all, himself included, to the Father, "that God may be all in all."

9. Those who believe that the dead will be raised in incorruption, glory, power, with spiritual bodies.

10. Those who believe that death will be swallowed up in victory at the *resurrection* ; that then the sleeping saints will be raised *incorruptible*, and the living saints will "put on immortality." But how many of the modern evangelicals expect victory *when they die*, and say that "death is the gate to endless joys!"

On reviewing these points, one thing is clearly apparent ; the modern churches are far astray from the *Gospel*. They are continually insisting on the *great salvation* from *eternal torments*. But Paul has *nothing* to say about it. Very strange that he should omit such an *important* element of the Gospel. We advise the churches to arise in their might, and denounce him as an unfaithful expounder of evangelical Christianity. What would be thought of a preacher in this age who, after promising that he would declare the Gospel which the church had received wherein they stood, and by which they were saved, omitted the most distant reference to the thing from which men are to be saved ?

Again. We have heard, from our infancy, a great deal said about the salvation of the imperilled soul. But Paul says nothing of the soul. Indeed, according to the modern churches, his Gospel only saves the *body* ; for they say that this chapter treats of the resurrection of "*the body.*" So that, according

to their teaching, Paul concerns himself altogether with the mere shell, the outward case, and has no interest for the real man, the immortal entity! He glows with eloquence at the prospect of the release of the *body* from death, but cannot spare a word for the salvation of the only part that is worth saving!

But suppose, after all, that Paul is *right*, and modern orthodoxy *wrong*. Suppose that Paul was correct in saying, "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, *if the dead rise not*? Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow *we die*?" Suppose that the saints *are* asleep in the state of death. Ah! then we shall be enabled to understand the Apostle's exultant cry, in prospect of the resurrection (not of *the body*, but) of *the dead*, "O death, where is thy sting? O hades, where is thy victory?" Then a shudder of fear will run through our dying systems as we think that "the *sting of death is sin*; and the strength of sin is the law;" but which will be dispelled by the glorious prospect opened up in the words, "Thanks be to God, which giveth us the *victory*," (not over torment, but over *death*,) "through our Lord Jesus Christ."

Dr. Abel Stevens, of the M. E. Church, says: "Among the great cardinal doctrines committed to the church is that of the immortality of the soul. This, indeed, lies at the basis of all religion, and cannot be denied, except by those who virtually deny all true religious faith and hope."

Is it not singular that a doctrine which "lies at the basis of all religion" is not *mentioned*, or *assumed*, in the book which contains "*all things necessary to salvation*?" And *when* was the immortality of the soul made one of "the great cardinal doctrines committed to the church?" *When* was it "*committed to the church*?" Surely it must have been *since* Paul wrote his first epistle to the Corinthians; and *since* he sent his *last* epistle to his "son Timothy;" in which he declared that "Jesus Christ hath abolished *death*, and hath brought *life and immortality* to light through the *Gospel*." not the gospel of the immortality of the *soul*, but that of immortality by a *resurrection* from the *dead* at the coming of Christ.

The foregoing extract from Stevens is conclusive on one point—it shows the "*basis*" of his "religion." He says that

the immortality of the soul "cannot be denied except by those who virtually deny *all* true religious *faith* and *hope*." Take away Dr. Stevens' "faith and hope" in the soul's immortality, and he will say with "the man of Mount Ephraim, whose name was Micah"—"Ye have taken away my gods, and *what* have I *more*?" But, Dr., we have supposed that your faith and hope was centered on *Christ*; and Christ says, "I am the *resurrection* and the *life*: he that *believeth* in *me*, though he were *dead*, yet shall he *live*." Can you not muster a few scattered grains of "faith and hope" in this promise? Paul, after explaining the Gospel in 1 Cor. xv., encourages the church in this wise: "Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as *ye know* that your labor is not in vain in the Lord." How did they *know* it? Had Paul been reading to them an essay on the soul's immortality? No; he had preached to them the gospel of the resurrection; and he had proved their resurrection by the fact that *Christ* had risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of those who had *fallen asleep*. And, before he penned these words, he had administered the same truth to the Thessalonian church, as follows:

"I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them who *are asleep*, that ye sorrow not, even as *the rest (hoi lopoi, the rest of mankind, the heathen,) who have no hope*." No hope of what, Dr. Stevens? No hope in the soul's immortality? Let Paul show. "For if we believe that *Jesus* died and *rose again*, even so those *also* who *sleep in Jesus* will God bring *in like manner with (sun; see Rob. Lex., or Liddell & Scott,) him*." The same "God of peace, that *brought again from the dead* our Lord *Jesus*," (Heb. xiii.) will *in like manner* bring from the dead those "who *sleep in Jesus*." He then states *when* this "great salvation" shall be accomplished. "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 (go before) those who *are asleep*. For the Lord *himself* shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God: and *the dead in Christ* shall (not come from heaven, but) *rise first: then* (the dead having first arisen) *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 ever be with the Lord. Wherefore *comfort* one another (*not* with the pagan lie of the soul's immortality—*not* with the delusion that "death is the Prince of Peace," and the gate-keeper of heaven—*not* with the baseless fabrication that the *dead* are *alive*, and know more than all the living—*not* with the ten thousand specious transformations of the serpent deception, "Thou shalt not surely die," which modern D.D.'s and L.L. D.'s build "*all*," their "faith and hope" upon—*not* with the doctrine which has been wrought to its legitimate conclusion in the latter-day demon-trash of Spiritualism—but) WITH THESE WORDS." 1 Thess. iv.

In the light of Paul's gospel, WHO ARE EVANGELICAL ?

ANOTHER SHORT SERMON.—BY THE EDITOR.—*Text* : "Be ye therefore followers of God, as dear children ; and walk in love, as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God as a sweet smelling savor." Eph. 5 : 1, 2.

These verses should be considered in connection with the previous chapter, without interruption. The first is an exhortation founded upon the "kind, forgiving" character of God. He had said—God is kind, tender-hearted, and forgiving to you ; "therefore," he adds, "be ye followers"—[Greek, *mimetai*] *imitators* "of God ;" be like God—kind, tender-hearted, forgiving one another after the example of God in forgiving you—freely, truly. Be, then, imitators of God, as dear [Gr., *agapeta*] "*beloved children*." Beloved of God, who hath freely forgiven you, *in* Christ. How will such seek to *imitate* Him of whose love they have so freely been made the partakers ? How else could they show themselves really "partakers of the divine nature," and truly beloved children ? Will not children be like their parent ? Are they not likely to imitate him just in the proportion that they love and admire him ? Nothing can be clearer. If professed Christians manifest unkind feelings, hard-heartedness, and an unforgiving spirit, they are not "beloved children" of God—even if they pray and shout ever so much ; yea, though they might preach, "cast out devils," and do ever so many "wonderful works," they lack the essential characteristic of God.

Next, the apostle exhorts to "walk in love;" not only occasionally to have those God-like dispositions, he had spoken of, but to "walk"—to make it the continual course of one's life—"in love." Paul had taught them that God's purpose concerning those whom he will *adopt* as children, is that they shall be "without blame before him *in love*;" he had spoken of the "great love wherewith God loved us; even when we were dead in sins," and of "the unsearchable riches of Christ;" also, of his own desire that they might be "rooted and grounded in love"—that is, planted and grow in it, as the soil suited to make them flourish; and now he adds, "*Walk in love*:" love is the foundation—love is the root—love is the soil—love is the end—and in order to that end, we must walk in love—the course, road or way by which we can be brought to the haven—"the adoption of children," or immortality, incorruptibility and endless life. The pattern of love after, or according to which we are to walk is "As Christ also [as well as God,] hath loved us." How did he love us? So that he "hath given himself for us"—in our behalf, or on our account—"an offering and sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savor." Though he knew no sin, nor was guile found in his mouth, yet, for his "brethren," who had sinned, he offered himself to sorrow, suffering and death, that he might deliver them, by overcoming their enemies, and by bringing them from a state of enmity to a state of reconciliation to God and to each other, making peace; therefore, walk in love after his example. If this direction was followed, how soon would it once more be said—"See how these Christians love one another." How can any be prepared for the "adoption," who are not thus walking? How else can they "be without blame before God in love?" Solemn thought! Let us lay it to heart. "*God is love*; and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him." 1 John iv. 16.

"FUTURE RETRIBUTION."

The following extract from the remarks of PROFESSOR STUART, in the *Biblical Repository*, July, 1840, shows how a powerful mind may be exercised in endeavoring to reconcile the hopeless torment theory with the perfections of God or the felicity of the saints in glory. He says:—

"That the subject is one of fearful interest, none will deny who believe in future retribution. That there are difficulties pressed by it on the mind, when one thinks of his own condition, that of his beloved friends, or of his brethren of the human race, it would be *mere pretence* to deny. But it is a consolation to believe, that behind any clouds, however dark, that interpose between us and the light of the sun, his beams still shine clearly. *If parents, husbands, wives, brothers, sisters, must see those dear as their own life perish at last, while they themselves are saved, heaven in mercy will either EXTINGUISH THEIR SOCIAL SUSCEPTIBILITIES, or else give them such a SWEET AND OVERPOWERING SENSE OF THE JUSTICE AND GOODNESS OF GOD as shall not permit the joys of the blessed to be marred, nor the songs of the redeemed to be interrupted, with sighs of sympathetic sorrow.*"

Thus does the Christian mind labor in view of the God-dishonoring doctrine of future hopeless suffering. It is irreconcilable with any ideas we *now* have of the perfections of God or the "susceptibilities" of our natures ; and so we must be transformed into stoics—made callous to all the agonies endured by "parents, husbands, wives, brothers, sisters," and friends, in order to reconcile us to their unmitigated and hopeless torture ! But it is worthy of remark, that Prof. Stuart uses the term "*perish*."—Why this ? Because, his mind could but revolt at the horrid idea of "*endless misery*," for such relatives as he had named ; and he quietly slides into the Scripture language. Thus he shows the power of truth on his own understanding. "The wicked shall *perish* ; and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs ; they shall *consume* : into smoke shall they consume away."—Ps. 37 : 20. Such is "law and the testimony ;" and "if they speak not according to *this* word it is because there is no light in them."—Isa. 8 : 20.

We may safely say—That no transactions will take place in the "future retributions" that saints will need to have "their social susceptibilities extinguished" to witness them. God has said, "Come *now*, and let us reason together."—Isa. 1 : 18. Men may affect to despise "reason," but God does not : and he has made no threat of punishment but what he is willing should *now* be tested by that faculty which he has implanted in man. He calls upon us *now* to exercise it, and condescends, *himself*, to become a party in the matter. Does any man think it can ever be made apparent to reason "now"—in this present life—that

the future and unmitigated sufferings of "parents, husbands, wives, brothers, and sisters," is reasonable or just? Prof. Stuart has given up that point; and, in giving it up, has stamp'd the entire fable of immortality in sin and suffering as opposed to God and truth.

The late pious John Foster, minister in the Baptist Church, England, makes the following remarks on this fruitless torture doctrine:—

"How every hostile feeling becomes mitigated into something like kindness, when its object, perhaps lately proud, assuming, unjust, is now seen oppressed into dejection by calamity. The most cruel wild beast, or more cruel man, if seen languishing in death, and raising towards us a feeble and supplicating look, would certainly move our pity. How is this? Perhaps the character is not even supposed to be really changed amid the suffering that *modifies* its expression. Do we unconsciously take anything like a *tender feeling*, even for *self*, as a proof of some little goodness, or possibility of goodness? Is it for those beings alone that we feel nothing, who discover a hard and stupid indifference to self and everything besides? Perhaps any sentient being, the worst existent or possible, *might* be in a situation to move and to justify our sympathy. *What, then, shall we think of that theology which represents the men whom God has made most like himself, as exulting for ever and ever in the most dreadful sufferings of the larger part of those who have been their fellow-inhabitants of this world?*"—*Mr. Foster's Journal, No. 494.*

Thus the "reason" of the most pious revolts against the popular doctrine of hopeless torment. *Torment* is not the threatened punishment of the Bible to the finally impenitent. That idea has originated in barbarism, and was fostered and nourished by Papal blindness, superstition, and blasphemy, as a justification of her abominable cruelties. Shall Protestants still consent to wear the Harlot's attire; and charge the blessed God of truth and love with calling us to "come *now*" to "reason" with him, while He presents a doctrine for reasons' approval, which reason cannot but reject? Is that the way to turn men from sin to God? Reason and Revelation both answer—*No.* The Bible penalty for sin is *loss—loss of life—of being.* It is to come short of Eternal Life:—"Seeing ye judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life." Acts 13: 46. "The wages of sin is death." Rom. 6: 23. "If ye live after the flesh ye *shall die.*" Rom. 8: 13. "Ye will not come to me

that ye might have life." John 5 : 40. "They which shall be accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead * * * neither can they die any more." Luke 20 : 35, 36. The wicked will not obtain that world ; they come short of it—*lose life—die—perish*—are "*destroyed forever*." Such is the testimony of the Bible ; and with this view reason harmonizes.

The love of God in the heart must lead men to doubt the truth of the doctrine of hopeless misery ; or, if still retaining that doctrine in their theology, they are subjected to an anguish of spirit as unlike anything seen among the apostles, as torment is opposed to rejoicing. As one more illustration of this fact, we present the following from the "*Practical Sermons*" of Rev. Albert Barnes, Philadelphia, whose "*Notes*" on the Bible have been so highly esteemed. Pages 123—125 he says :—

"That the immortal mind should be allowed to jeopard its infinite welfare, and that trifles should be allowed to draw it away from God, and virtue, and heaven ; that any should suffer forever, lingering on in hopeless despair, and rolling amidst infinite torments without the possibility of alleviation, and without end ; that, since God *can* save men, and *will* save a *part*, he has not purposed to save *all* ; that, in a word, God, who claims to be worthy of the confidence of the universe, and to be a Being of infinite benevolence, should make such a world as this—full of sinners and sufferers—and that when an atonement had been made, he did not save all the race, and put an end to sin and woe forever.... I have read to some extent what wise and good men have written. I have looked at their theories and explanations. I have endeavored to weigh their arguments ; for my whole soul pants for light and relief on these questions. But I get neither ; and in the distress and anguish of my own spirit, I confess that I see no light whatever. I see not one ray to disclose to me the reason why sin came into the world ; why the earth is strewn with the dead and dying ; and why man must suffer to all eternity. I have never seen a particle of light thrown on these subjects that has given a *moment's* ease to my *tortured mind*, nor have I an explanation to offer, a thought to suggest, which would be of relief to you. I trust others, as they profess to do, understand this better than I do, and that they have not the *anguish of spirit* which I have. But I confess, when I look upon a world of woe, filled with hosts to suffer forever—when I look upon friends and upon a whole race, all involved in this sin

and danger, and when I see the great mass of them wholly unconcerned, and when I feel that God can only save them, and yet he does not do it—I am struck dumb—it is all dark, dark, dark to my soul, and I cannot disguise it.”

Here is an honest expression of the natural and legitimate effects of the *twin* doctrines of natural immortality and future hopeless torment. But few ministers, whose souls are *harassed* and in the “*dark*” by these views, have the honesty of Mr. Barnes to confess it.

We have now presented our readers a short chapter on this subject, which goes to show the doctrine of hopeless torture in a future life is fast passing out of the theological world. But, with many, the scriptural doctrine of death is still overlooked, and the leaning is to restorationism, or to some other equally unscriptural mode of disposing of the plain testimony, “*the soul that sinneth it shall die.*” Ezk. 18 : 4, 20.

To sweep away all those refuges of lies, let us begin with man as he is—“*of the earth, earthy*”—having no principle of immortality, but a probationer for it. If he persists in violating his Creator's laws, he brings on himself death—cessation of being ; and that state is *eternal*. Such is the Scripture testimony. The evidence to this point is abundant and full. “*Death is the wages of sin.*” “*Sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death ;*” and that death is eternal : hence the punishment is eternal—not torture, but *cessation of being—to live no more.*

CHRONOLOGY AND PROPHECIC EVENTS.

BY THE EDITOR.

As some persons are endeavoring to fix on the time of the second advent of Christ, we have thought best to call attention to a few facts which we presented years ago, and which we think are necessary now to preserve all from an undue confidence in prophetic periods as calculated by those who are quite sure those periods terminate *this* year, or between this and 1868.

Historians and chronologists are anything but united on the exact *time* of many important events which are necessary to define with accuracy the time of the beginning or ending of most

of those periods. The chronology of some of the events noted in the scriptures is based upon these conflicting and discordant materials ; and too much reliance upon profane chronology and popular mistakes as to the reigning king of the times in which the scripture event happened, has led into great errors in the interpretation of the prophecies. This, we conceive, is especially the case with the *ninth* chapter of Daniel.

Let us take a view of the generally received chronology in the Bible in a few particulars. The chronology put against Ezra 1 : 1, or the Decree of Cyrus, is B. C. 536. Haggai 1st commences with the second year of Darius, and the chronology is put down at 520 B. C., when the house of God or temple was put forward to its completion by Haggai and Zerubbabel at God's command ; that is, just sixteen *years* after the decree of Cyrus ; and Ezra 6 : 15, tells us " this house was finished in the sixth year of the reign of Darius the king : " that is, according to the common received chronology, within *twenty-one* years after Cyrus' decree ; and yet, strange to tell, commentators and chronologists have fixed upon the decree of Artaxerxes II., B. C. 457, or *fifty-eight years after the temple was finished*, according to their chronology, as " *the commandment*" that went " forth to restore and build Jerusalem." Also, according to their chronology of Dan. 9th, B. C. 538, the " *seventy years desolation of Jerusalem*" (ending at that time, Dan. 9 : 2,) ended *eighty-one years* before the commandment went forth to restore and build Jerusalem, i.e. if 457 B. C. is the true point from which to reckon that commandment ; and Daniel must have been dead at least *seventy-five years* before Ezra went up to restore and build Jerusalem !

It has seemed to be taken for granted that the Darius of Dan. 9th is the same Darius who took Babylon. From a careful examination of the subject, we are fully satisfied that this is a great mistake. In consequence of this mistake, that chapter has been thrust in between the 8th and 10th chapters, and thus led to inextricable confusion all who have based their calculations upon that theory.

Daniel himself, if carefully examined, shows that these Dariuses were two different and distinct persons. Chapter 5 : 31, tells us " Darius the *Median* took the kingdom ; " the 9th chapter says, " In the first year of Darius the *son of Ahasuerus* of the seed of the Medes." The Scriptures give us Ahasuerus as the husband of Esther, Esther 2 : 16, and the chronology in the margin of our Bible gives this event B. C. 462. Artaxerxes I. reigned between Cyrus and Darius, king of Persia, " *son of Ahasuerus.*"—Any one must be satisfied of this, we think, who, with an unprejudiced mind, carefully reads the 4th chapter of Ezra. Artaxerxes I. died B. C. 424. See Taylor's Manual of History, p. 66

Says Taylor—"On the death of Artaxerxes, his only legitimate son, Xerxes, ascended the throne: but within forty-five days was murdered by his natural brother, Sogdianus; and he again was deposed by another illegitimate prince, Ochus, who, on his accession, took the name of Darius II." This king was surnamed Nothus, that is, "*illegitimate*." He was called illegitimate because the son of Ahasuerus, most likely born of Esther, a Jewess, and therefore would be accounted as not legitimately heir to the throne of *Persia*. It seems to us clear that Darius Nothus is the Darius of Daniel 9th, and he came to that throne about 424 B. C., instead of B. C. 538, as would seem by the chronology now found in the margin of the Bible. - If this be so, then all the other chronological dates in the margin of the Book of Daniel are equally erroneous.

Darius Nothus reigned at a later period than Cyrus (whose Persian name is Coresh,) king of Persia. The communication, therefore, made to Daniel, chapter 9, was at a later period than that of the 10th, 11th, and 12th chapters; and its chronological position in the Book of Daniel is *after* the 12th chapter. Darius Nothus, or "Darius the son of Ahasuerus," is the same, we judge, as Ezra's "Darius king of Persia," Ez. 4: 5; and cannot therefore be identical with "Darius the Median," but corresponds with the Darius of Haggai 1: 1, and Zech. 1: 1; and what further confirms this idea is, that in the "second year" of this Darius, the *seventy years'* indignation of the Lord against Jerusalem ceased. See Zech. 1: 1, 12. The seventy years' indignation which the angel here declared was completed, in the second year of Darius, is identical with the seventy years' desolations which were terminating in "the first year of Darius, son of Ahasuerus;" for the desolations ceased when the work of rebuilding the temple had such a putting forward as resulted in its completion; that was from the "second year of Darius king of Persia." See Ezra 4: 24, and 5: 1-2; therefore, it follows conclusively that Darius the son of Ahasuerus, (Daniel 9: 1,) is the same as the Darius of Ezra, Haggai, and Zechariah; and hence reigned at a *later period* than the Scripture Cyrus (Coresh,) king of Persia, and king of Babylon, and therefore was not "Darius the Median," who reigned before Cyrus. If these things are so, it follows that *the chronology relied on in fixing the dates of the prophetic periods is erroneous, and will forever delude those who follow it.*

Again, as Cyrus reigned before Darius Nothus, or "Darius son of Ahasuerus," and as Daniel's seventy weeks, seven weeks, and sixty-two weeks, were given him under this latter king, it follows that the decree of Cyrus, to restore and build Jerusalem, was previous to the 9th chapter of Daniel; and it is abundantly

evident that the *decree of Cyrus*, and not that of Artaxerxes, is the decree spoken of by Gabriel to Daniel. This we know will be startling to some who have labored to make the generally received chronology harmonize with the facts in history and prophecy; and yet it is demonstration, to our mind, that the decree of Cyrus is *the decree* of which Gabriel speaks, Dan. 9th.

Let us turn to Isa. 44: 28, and we shall see what the Lord saith concerning Cyrus. "Cyrus is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure; even saying to Jerusalem, *thou shalt be built*, and to the Temple, *thy foundation shalt be laid*." This language exactly tallies with Gabriel's annunciation—"Know, also, from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem," &c. Here is a distinct reference to some prophecy on the subject; no other prophecy can be found that so exactly corresponds as that which relates to the acts of Cyrus; and if we are correct as to the chronology of Dan. 9th, that decree of Cyrus had been issued prior to Gabriel's announcement of the time at which to commence the seven weeks and sixty-two weeks, so that Daniel had a definite point at which to begin his reckoning, viz: at the decree of Cyrus. As Cyrus is the only person *prophesied* of as issuing such a decree for the specified object, we have a right to conclude, that is "the commandment" intended by Gabriel. The question arises, *did Cyrus issue a decree exactly corresponding with the prophecy in Isaiah and the declaration of Gabriel?*

In examining this point, we have nothing to do with profane chronology, or the chronology of historians. The Bible must settle the question, and if profane chronology does not tally with it, we have a right to conclude such chronology is false, and not to be trusted.

Let us now examine the foregoing question. Cyrus did issue just such a commandment as agrees with Isaiah and Gabriel.—See Ezra 1: 2, "Thus saith Cyrus king of Persia, The Lord God of heaven HATH CHARGED ME TO BUILD HIM A HOUSE AT JERUSALEM. Who is there among you of all his people? his God be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem, which is in Judah, and build the house of the Lord God of Israel (he is the God) which is in Jerusalem. And whosoever remaineth in any place where he sojourneth, let the men of his place help him with silver, and with gold, and with goods, and with beasts, besides the free-will offering for the house of God that is in Jerusalem. Then rose up the chief of the fathers of Judah, and Benjamin, and the priests, and the Levites, with all them whose spirit God had raised to go up to build the house of the Lord which is in Jerusalem."

Let us next see how this "commandment" was attended to.

In the 3d chapter, after noticing the offerings made by the people when they arrived at Jerusalem, it is said, verse 7, "They gave money also unto the masons, and to the carpenters; and meat, and drink, and oil unto them of Zidon, and to them of Tyre, to bring cedar-trees from Lebanon to the sea of Joppa, according to the grant that they had of Cyrus king of Persia." Then verses 10 and 11 say, "And when the builders *laid the foundation of the temple* of the Lord, they set the priests in their apparel with trumpets, and the Levites the sons of Asaph with cymbals, to praise the Lord, after the ordinance of David king of Israel. And they sang together by course in praising and giving thanks unto the Lord; because he is good, for his mercy endureth forever toward Israel. And the people shouted with a great shout when they praised the Lord, *because the foundation of the house of the Lord was laid*. But many of the priests and Levites and chief of the fathers, who were ancient men, that had seen the first house, *when the foundation of this house was laid before their eyes*, wept with a loud voice, and many shouted."

Thus we have an exact fulfillment of Isaiah's prophecy; and that the building the city was included in Cyrus' commandment is clear from the letter which the enemies of the Jews afterwards wrote to Artaxerxes I., Ezra 4: 12: "Be it known unto the king, that the Jews which came up from thee to us are come unto Jerusalem, *building the rebellious and the bad city*, and have *set up the walls thereof*, and joined the foundations." Here, then, we have also a clear sight of the point of time to which Gabriel pointed as "the *going forth* of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem." The decrees of Artaxerxes and Darius were only an *approval* of the decree of Cyrus, and not "the going forth of the commandment" to have the work done. See Ezra 6: 14, "And the elders of the Jews builded, and they prospered through the prophesying of Haggai the prophet, and Zechariah the son of Iddo. And they builded and finished it, according to the commandment of the God of Israel, and according to the commandment of Cyrus, and Darius, and Artaxerxes king of Persia." "According to the *commandment* (singular) of Cyrus, Darius, and Artaxerxes," &c. The commandment was *one*, originating with Cyrus, but confirmed by Artaxerxes, who finally revoked his *approval*, Ezra 4: 17-24; the decree itself was *unalterable*, according to the laws of the Medes and Persians, but it was renewed by Darius king of Persia, in the second year of his reign, which was the next year after Daniel's prayer, chap. 9, who having examined the ancient records of Babylon, (see Ezra 4: 24,) found the roll containing the decree of Cyrus, Ezra 6: 1, 5; and confirmed that decree in strong language, as may be seen, Ezra 6: 6-12; which concludes with saying, "Let it

be done with speed." From that time, the Jews under the prophesying of Haggai and Zechariah, [see Ezra 6 : 14, and Haggai 1st and 2d chs.,] carried forward the work so rapidly that "this house was finished in the sixth year of Darius," Ezra 6 : 15 ; or, within five years from the time Daniel so earnestly entreated God to "cause" his "face to shine upon the sanctuary that is desolate." Thus was the prayer of this man of God speedily answered, though he, possibly, did not live to see it, as he must have been about ninety five years old "in the first year of Darius, son of Ahasuerus."

[To be Continued.]

"THE WAR QUESTION."

ELD. J. B. COOK, Binghamton, N. Y., sends us the following on the question, saying—"Neither the *Crisis* or *Harbinger* will admit my quotations of the Word as to Government, and our relation to organized 'authority' as God's agency to 'avenge evil,' &c. The *Crisis* seems to say—"The devil got slavery in our system,—the rebellion also : and now the devil in the North is driving at the devil down South' !!! * * * Daniel in Babylon did not talk so. Gratitude to God and every grace forbids this course. With all the faults of our government, it is, in its place, the best that God has given, or will give to any people, till 'JESUS comes.'"

Many tender, feeble Christians are anxious lest they should sin by consenting to have a son, or friend, become a soldier, as if all war was of the wicked one; and government itself only a device of the devil! Such should recall the chosen name of our Father in Heaven "The Lord of Hosts"—and learn that "The powers that be are ordained of God,"—for the best present well-being of his people, and his cause, and the whole of humanity. Every thoughtful person sees that government is somehow important—that God is in some sense the author of all organized "authority and powers" over erring men; but the thoughts of most who think at all, are altogether vague, visionary and impracticable. Please allow a brief note as to a few essential points—the pith of all.

1. Men call God, the God of grace. He calls himself "the God of Hosts"—the God of armies—the mightiest of human agencies. All the world's great revolutions—at the rise of each of "the four" great Gentile empires, Dan. 7, nay, at the establishment of His own kingdom (in type) from Joshua to David (and we must add, at the yet future kingdom of Christ, the anti-type) all result from WAR; and fulfill the word of God. The wars waged, as if only in human passion, accomplish His pre-told purpose.

The first—the Assyro-Babylonian, was as the severing “saw” and hewing “axo” in the hand of the Almighty, “to punish an hypocritical nation”—Israel; and begin “the 7 times” of their terrible captivity, which has been prolonged by Persia, Greece and Rome—each one, the prevailing and warring governments of earth.

2. “The Lord of “Host,” has often honored his chosen people as his “Host.” Nay, more—his most highly endowed servants have commanded such Hosts. Abraham obtained his Melchisedech blessing from the Most High, on his “return from the slaughter of the kings.” Joshua in name and office in the (Hebrew,) is the root and representative of Jesus. So of David the beloved, whose wars overcame the demons of paganism, and opened the way for the Temple, with the kingdom of peaceful Solomon.

Thus God has purged Palestine, the chosen land, given to the fathers in Israel as a nation, by war. When image worship was indulged in the Church in Judea, God raised up the Mahomedan power to re-purge the land of idols—by war. But “the war of the great day of God Almighty” now near, will purge it and give it peace, for “one thousand years!” Rev. 13: 12-14; 17: 14; 19: 11-20; 20: 1-6. “In righteousness he (Jesus) will judge and MAKE WAR;” and “with Him are the called, the chosen and the faithful.”

3. The distinction between God’s servants, before and *after* their miraculous mission, is oft overlooked. Moses, the Prophets and Apostles, acting under a divine commission, were not like common men—the man-commissioned. Till such commission came to them, they were like us, subject to the order of government, and all the obligations of social life.

4. God’s people, without such miraculous mission, have ever been subject to the government that Providence had placed them under. Joseph, Moses and others in Egypt, could live and serve in Pharaoh’s court—yea, all Israel was bound to obey. No one was allowed to oppose, or “speak evil of” Pharaoh. So with the Hebrews in Babylon. “Life” was assured to them in obeying Nebuchadnezzar and the Chaldeans; but “death” in setting up for themselves or city, &c., Jer. 21: 8-10, till “the *time appointed*.” So with Christians under Caesar’s, the 4th or Roman Empire and its divisions. To resist is to incur “damnation,” Rom. 13: 2. Rome has its time and sphere as really as Egypt or Babylon. Under Caesar, Cornelius, the first Gentile convert, and “they of Caesar’s household,” &c., could serve government. But it is damnation to resist God’s appointed government, “before the time.”

Here is non-resistance with God’s reason for it; and here is its limitation—“till the time appointed of the Father.” J. B. COOK.

CHURCH ORGANIZATION.—“I would like to know whether you have a Church organization, and any other information concerning such organization.” S. L. M. C.

The EDITOR of this Magazine has never felt that his calling was to make or build up “organizations.” He has always been

willing that believers, in any given location, should organize for social improvement, in any manner they should judge authorized by the Bible, provided they took the holy scriptures as their only creed or articles of faith ; yet, he has always declined having anything to do in constituting such organizations, and determined for himself, personally, not to be connected with them ; believing his calling was simply to *publish* the truth, without siding with any organized body. For the same reason he has not advised such as embraced his views of life, to withdraw from organized churches with which they might be connected, provided they could remain without doing violence to their own convictions of duty to God and His truth ; persuaded that by remaining where they were they might do more to further the truth than by a voluntary disruption of their relation. If the church will not allow them freedom to express their convictions of truth, of course the relation must be dissolved rather than incur the guilt of unfaithfulness to the truth of God : but, generally, such churches will exclude them, if it finds their principles lead them to avow their faith, however wisely they may utter their convictions of truth. It is better, probably, to let the organization take the responsibility of excluding them, than for them to assume it by withdrawing and thereby lose an influence for good to others which might have been retained by leading a Christian life, and leaving the church to bear the blame of separating them from their body.

But when separated, or having never united with those churches, yet being believers, what shall they do ? Shall they have no organization ? The EDITOR of this Magazine believes *faith* in Christ is an organizing power—the power is that of mutual attraction—Christ the centralizing power—the Spirit of God, with its baptizing influence, joining the believer to the “ life of God ” —the life in Christ. Thus they all become one body ; not by any external formal act, but through the inward grace imparted to each believer : the love of God and of His Christ being the element in which they now move, in whatever position they come together, they are *one*, and need no human inventions to cement them. Such contrivances as are called “ organized churches,” seem to be the result of loss of the “ first love ;” for when that love was in exercise, no such organizations were needed to bring them together or to keep them together.

The EDITOR censures none for organizing, if in their judgment, it is essential to their prosperity, provided they do not give way to an intolerant spirit, and censure such as do not see it their duty to join such associations. He has for the last twenty years stood firm in his determination to unite with no church built on human organization, and has seen no permanent good resulting from them. He has the purpose, however, to fellowship all—in such organizations, or out of them,—who manifest the Spirit of Christ.

IS TRUTH PROMOTED BY LIES ?—That a *religious* periodical should at this late day circulate the *lie* that “HOBBS,” called by his enemies “an infidel,” said, when dying, “I am taking a fearful leap in the dark,” ought not, perhaps, to surprise us.—There is no excuse for this falsehood except ignorance. It is a lie invented in days when men practiced on the maxim, “Let us do evil that good may come,”—“Whose damnation is just,” saith Paul. Dr. S. B. BARLOW, of this city, a physician of forty years’ standing, and of most extensive information, furnished us for the Examiner, June 1st, 1855, an article on Thomas Hobbes, from which we give the following extract :

“THOMAS HOBBS, in 1631, became tutor to the young Earl of Devonshire. He died in 1679, aged 92 years. In his last days he was unable to speak, therefore did not say he was *about to take a fearful leap in the dark*. Neither was he—as some have written—afraid to be alone ; for in the last years of his life he chose to be alone, and was indulged in that by his great friend and patron, the Earl of Devonshire, with whom he lived and died. His biographer says: ‘His last years and days were characterized by cheerfulness, activity and soundness of mind.’ He embraced early the Christian religion, and was equally ready to defend its tenets when attacked by Papists or Sectaries.’ He remained attached to the National Church during his life, and received burial under its forms. * * * He was a meek and child-like believer in the truth of God’s word, ever accepting it without doubt or cavil. * * * He was an orthodox Trinitarian : a believer in God the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.*”

Such was the man, who, for near two centuries, has been stigmatized as an “*infidel.*” Does any one know why? We can tell them—He believed “*immortality is conditional!*” That was the great offence of Hobbes! But his name will yet be praised

for that. His fault was—if it can be called a fault, for one living when he did—that he did not more earnestly contend for this glorious Bible truth. But his excuse for this may be, that ignorance and superstition held such sway in his day, and the Bible was so little in the hands of the community at large, if he had more publicly and constantly insisted on that cardinal truth, he would have labored in vain: the time had not then fully come for its promulgation. Thanks be to the God of all grace, that truth is now being spread to the ends of the earth—*Life and Immortality are in and through Christ alone, and are "conditional."* Let it be sounded through the earth that men may hear and fear, and turn to the *Life-giver*.

LETTERS AND EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

JOSEPH EATON, Delaware Co., Ohio, writes:—I see by a suggestion in the March EXAMINER, by R. W., that you are incurring additional expense this year in its issue. I think the Examiner ought, while the state of things continue as they *are now*, to be \$1.50 per year; for that, at the rate of our depreciated paper currency, would be but *one* dollar in reality. Justice demands that, though \$1 per year for the Examiner is its stated price, yet as that was on the consideration of the then existing state of things at the close of the last volume, the payments for it should be conformed to the nominal prices of things as now existing. I send herewith \$1 to equalize on the *two* copies I take.

MRS. R. W. PIERCE, Wisconsin, writes:—Enclosed you will find \$5 for the BIBLE EXAMINER I for one must have it sustained. I believe the doctrine that none will live again from the dead but those who are sealed with the Holy Spirit. This doctrine is like digging deep and laying the foundation on the *Rock*, Christ Jesus; and it cannot be moved, for it is founded on a rock. I cannot find any other penalty for disobeying God, but *death*: and the reward of obedience, a resurrection and eternal life; the reward to be brought at the revelation of Jesus Christ.

MRS. PILLY G. POTTS, Wisconsin, writes:—I see you are pressed by the hard times. I would help bear the burden of my brethren, under God, and so fulfill the law of Christ. I send \$1 to aid the EXAMINER.—May God bless you abundantly by help from His children. There is glory ahead for the Church of the living God. If this is the "strong nation" which God is rebuking, then the sword must be beaten into plowshares and the spears into pruning-hooks, and nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither learn *war* any more. A King must reign, whose sceptre is righteousness. If the Lord is dashing the nations in pieces, like a potter's vessel, or making them like the chaff of the summer threshing floor, then the political winds may carry them away, and

no place be found for them. So BE IT. Then the eternal Rock kingdom will become a great mountain and fill the whole earth.

DR. ALBERT FOX, writing from Pawling, says:—The truth is gaining ground among brethren and sisters. Some of them are overjoyed at what they now see: others stand in fear of those in authority; but truth is mighty and will prevail. How good the Lord is to those who are willing to forsake all for the truth! I have been laboring in public and private to bring the truth of "life only in Christ" before the people; not to build up a sect or party, but to gladden the hearts of such as love the Lord. Thanks be to God for watchmen who will go up into the gaps, and will not hold their peace until Jerusalem be made a praise in the earth. Be of good cheer: I shall do all I can for the EXAMINER.

MRS. JULIA DODGE, Pawling, writes:—I herewith acknowledge the receipt of the EXAMINER for Jan., Feb. and March. I am highly pleased with them. I am glad to find a people at *this* time who have the spirit of the Gospel in their hearts as adventists had it when I first came into the faith. This doctrine of no life out of Christ, carries the life-giving power with it. It is something I have hid in my heart for some time, and have been waiting for it to be spoken from the sacred desk—to have it held up to the light, that others might see and rejoice in it as I did. I am glad to find so many, whom I esteemed as the best among us as a people, have embraced it. I was pondering in my mind, how I should find out your address, when the Examiners came. I saw at once Bro. R. F. Ladd had sent them, and felt the Lord had led him to do it.—Tears of joy flowed from my eyes, and I blessed the Lord in my heart. I shall do what I can to get this truth before the people.

ELD. R. V. LYON, in Canada, writes:—The truth has not lost its power to attract and lead men to embrace the Christ. Since my last note to you, quite a number have been led to see there is no future life for the wicked. Among the number is a brother who had been a confirmed Universalist. I have had the privilege of immersing six into the LIFE-GIVER for the remission of sins. Three of them last Sunday evening, after talking on Rom. 6: 2, 3. Glory be to God that there is power in the truth!

JACOB V. COLLAMORE writes from the army of the Potomac:—The truth of Christ as the resurrection and the life is spreading. It is making reading men and praying men in our ranks. To God be all the praise.

JAMES L. BOYD, Philadelphia, writes:—In response to the call of Bro. Wendell, I enclose my "mite," (\$1.00,) and also another dollar from my brother typos (who are subscribers) and work in the same office with me. We expect an advance for our composition work soon, as compositors, in Philadelphia, and therefore it is but just that we should send you an earnest of its anticipated advantage.

MRS. B. PARKS, (one of the two friends Helen Robertson wrote of,) Utica, writes:—I rejoice in the belief that there is life only in Christ: that instead of the wicked suffering endless torments, they shall return

to the dust. My husband and myself are striving to live so that we may be accounted worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead.

SAMUEL J. BRIMHALL, Western Penn., writes :—The doctrine of no future life for the wicked meets with some opposition here; but to my mind it harmonizes with the general tenor of the Scriptures. It is appointed unto men *once* to die, and after this the judgment; and I have got to learn that the Bible reveals another death. This glorious system of no future life out of Christ, is in close connection with that of the judgment and the resurrection: consequently, there is much yet to learn, and a vast field for investigation and reflection. Let us still have the EXAMINER.

SINCE the last issue of this Magazine, the EDITOR has spent two Sabbaths at *Springfield*, Mass.; where, considering the inclemency of the weather, there was a good gathering of the people, and he enjoyed a season of kind and brotherly intercourse with old friends, made some new ones, and obtained several new subscribers. The Editor thanks his friends for their liberal aid to himself and the cause he advocates. R. E. LADD, in that city, takes 30 copies of this Magazine. JOSEPH T. CURRY is laboring stately among the people there, and appears to be highly prized by them. He ought, however, to be more extensively known all through the region round about. Let him be invited to employ the talents God has given him, in other fields, as well as in *Springfield*. We are aware that the friends in that city are sorry to lose his labors even for a Sabbath, yet they will rejoice to have his usefulness extended. Hartford, Worcester and Boston, as well as other places, should share in his labors, and will find themselves benefitted by them.

The Editor has also spent one Sabbath in *Hartford*, Conn., and had an excellent season in proclaiming the gospel of Christ to attentive and interesting assemblies of the people. Here, likewise, he received encouragement, and trusts his labors were not in vain. Some eight or ten subscribed for the EXAMINER, and a number of the pamphlet, "*Life from the Dead*," were disposed of. To the people, he would express his gratitude for the help afforded him. May the word of life abide *with* them, and *in* them, unto life everlasting.

NEW SUBSCRIBERS will continue to be supplied with the EXAMINER from January, for the present. Some thirty *new* subscribers have been received during the past month, besides the renewal of some *old* ones. Let our friends continue their efforts in its behalf.

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. 15. No. 5.]

MAY, 1863.

[Whole No. 224.]

CHRONOLOGY AND PROPHEPIC EVENTS.

BY THE EDITOR.

THE chronology generally received, and found in the margin of our Bibles, makes the time of "Darius, son of Ahasuerus," to be 538 B. C. In the book of Esther, where we have an account of Ahasuerus, the chronology of Esther's marriage is put at 457 or 458 B. C., and the decree which Haman procured for the destruction of the Jews, is made to be 453 B. C.; that would make it *four years after* the decree of Artaxerzes to Ezra, to "restore and to build Jerusalem," according to the received chronology! Can any man, in his senses, believe that? Look at it. The common chronology necessarily makes Artaxerzes and Ahasuerus the same identical king, for they were both reigning in 457 B. C. Then, according to that chronology, this king marries Esther 457, issues his decree to restore and to build Jerusalem the same year, and in 453, issues another decree, by the instigation of Haman, to have all the Jews in his kingdom destroyed! We ask, if such a combination of events is likely to be true? or, what is still more marvellous, Townsend makes all three of these events to happen in 457! Now mark: Darius of the 9th ch. of Daniel is son of Ahasuerus; and yet, stranger to tell, his chronology is put at 538 B. C.; that is, 80 years before Ahasuerus married Esther; thus, if we reckon from this marriage, making the son at least one hundred years older than his father, if we allow Darius to be twenty years old when he came to the throne!

It must be manifest to all, that Ahasuerus reigned *before* the Darius of Daniel 9th, and hence Darius, son of Ahasuerus, was not and could not possibly be "Darius the Median," who "took the kingdom" of Babylon; and therefore, Darius, Daniel 9th, must have been Darius Nothus, who, according to Taylor's Manual of History, p. 66, came to the throne about 424 B. C., and

fixes the chronology of Daniel 9th at that period, or 114 years later than the present chronology for that chapter. If this be so, it is equally clear there must be an error in the chronology given to the Cyrus of the Scriptures; for Darius Nothus' reign could not have been 112 years after the first year of the Scripture Cyrus, as it would be if 536 B. C. was the true chronology of Cyrus. We cannot suppose that Ahasuerus of Esther reigned *after* Cyrus, for several reasons: first, it is not likely that a king immediately after Cyrus' decree to restore and to build Jerusalem, to lay the foundation of the temple, and for the Jews' return, would have issued the decree for the Jews' destruction; or, if he had, if that decree did not include the Jews in Judea, it seems improbable that there would have been such mourning and resistance, when they might have removed to Judea under Cyrus' decree and been safe. But again, we find *Mordecai* among those who returned from captivity under Cyrus' decree, Neh. 7: 5-7: "I found a register of the genealogy of them that *came up at the first*," says Nehemiah. In that list he names *Mordecai* as one "who came with Zerubbabel," (see also Ezra 2: 1, 2).—Zerubbabel laid the foundation of the temple under Cyrus' decree, (see Ezra 3: 8-11, and Zech. 4: 9). Under the decree of Darius Nothus, or the son of Ahasuerus, the temple was finished. Ezra 6: 15. The true state of the matter seems to be this: the Ahasuerus of Esther reigned *before* the Cyrus of the Scriptures, and is possibly the same as "Darius the Median."—Artaxerxes I, who *hindered* the work going forward at Jerusalem, reigned next *after* Cyrus; he was succeeded by Darius Nothus, son of Ahasuerus, at which time Daniel had his interview with Gabriel, as recorded Daniel 9th; the next year after that, Darius put forward the building of the temple, according to Cyrus' decree, (see Ezra 5th and 6th,) and the house was finished in the sixth year of his reign, or about 418 B. C. If this be true, then the common chronology makes the decree of Cyrus nearly a century too early; for, at the longest, that decree could not be more than "forty and six years" (see John 2: 20) before the temple was finished, so that Cyrus' decree could not have been earlier than 464 B. C., and probably it was some time later.

It is possible the seventy years *captivity* in Babylon commenced in the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, (see Jer. 25: 1, 11, 12). The "desolations of Jerusalem" in the nineteenth year of the same king, (see 2 Kings 25: 8-10). The difference between the commencement of the captivity of the Jews, and the commencement of the desolations of Jerusalem in that case, would be 18 or 20 years; the termination of these two events would therefore be equally distant. The 9th of Daniel speaks of "seventy years *desolations of Jerusalem*," corresponding with

the 70 years *indignation* against Jerusalem. (Zech. 1 : 12).—The latter prophet shows that indignation was then *ended* (v. 16) in the second year of Darius, (v. 7). This corresponds with Dan. 9 : 2, where it is evident the 70 years desolations of Jerusalem were *ending*; hence, the decree or command to restore [thy people] and to build Jerusalem, had gone forth about 20 years previous, near the termination of the *captivity*; or, in the first year of Cyrus. Now, as the first year of Darius, son of Ahasuerus, or Darius Nothus, was about 424 B.C., the decree of Cyrus must have been about 444 B.C., if the first year of Nebuchadnezzar is the true date of the commencement of the captivity.

In Dan. 9 : 25, Daniel is commanded to "*know and understand* that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem," &c. Now, if this communication was made to Daniel B.C. 538, according to the common chronology, that is, before *any decree* had been issued, Daniel did neither "*know*" nor "*understand the matter*;" for he was just as ignorant where to begin his reckoning now, as before Gabriel came, and Gabriel still fails to accomplish his commission. But if we take the first year of Darius Nothus, then the decree of Cyrus, and no other, had gone forth previously; and Daniel had a definite point of time to commence his reckoning for his 7 weeks and 62 weeks, and would therefore "*understand the matter*," as Gabriel had enjoined upon him to do. Any other view of the chronology leaves Daniel just as much in the dark as before Gabriel's visit. Archbishop Magee, of Dublin, says—"The decree of Cyrus is obviously the command referred to in Dan. 9 : 25."

Dr. Wall says of Archbishop Magee—"In strength of intellect, no writer that ever engaged in the investigation has been found his superior," (in endeavoring to reconcile the language of prophecy with the received chronology). Yet, his mighty intellect found the reconciliation impossible, and so will every other man who has but one object, *viz., to know what is truth*, without regard to theories.

The decree was to restore [thy people] and to build Jerusalem; therefore it must have been before the first year of Darius; for Jerusalem was at that time inhabited. (See Hag. 1 : 4.) In Ezra 4 : 12, also, which was before Darius, the building of the city is mentioned. Daniel knew of the decree of Cyrus, and he knew of no other, as we have before remarked, and he had witnessed the return of the Jews, under Zerubbabel, and knew that the "*foundations of the temple were laid*" by Zerubbabel, and the rebuilding commenced; he must therefore have supposed that the decree of Cyrus was the one Gabriel spoke of. If Gabriel had meant some future and unknown decree, Daniel was

rather deceived than informed. When it was demanded of the Jews by what right they proceeded to build the temple, they appealed to the decree of Cyrus, and to no other human authority. (See Ezra 5 : 3-16.)

Tertullian, one of the Christian writers of the second century, commenced the 70 weeks of Daniel with the first of Darius Nothus, and so did Sulpitius Severus in the fourth century, and both maintained that "Darius, son of Ahasuerus" was Darius Nothus; and the great Joseph Mede dates the 70 weeks from the third of Darius Nothus. Scalliger, Dr. Parry, and Hales, all commence the 70 weeks with Darius Nothus.

How are we to extricate ourselves from the difficulties in which we are involved by conflicting opinions and dates? We are of opinion there is "a way of escape" out of all this confusion, which the *learned* and *unlearned* have thrown around us. We conceive it has arisen from three causes :

First—Making Darius the Median, and Darius, son of Ahasuerus, to be the same person.

Second—From confounding Cyrus the Great (or *Khosrau*) with the Scripture Cyrus, (or *Corésh*).

Third—From making the 70 weeks and the 7 weeks and 62 weeks to have a common beginning, as though the 7 and 62 were only a subdivision of the 70. All three of these positions, we think, are erroneous.

Much confusion also has arisen from not observing that there are *two* periods in Babylon and Media, one the 70 years *captivity*; the other the 70 years *desolations of Jerusalem*. We have already spoken of the *possibility* of the captivity commencing with the *first of Nebuchadnezzar*, but are more inclined to the belief that it commenced in the *eighth* year of that king; and that instead of eighteen or twenty years intervening from the captivity to the *desolations* it was only *eleven*.

Ezekiel 40 : 1, shows us that the period at which the *Desolations of Jerusalem* commenced is *eleven years* later than the *Captivity*; thus he says—"In the five and twentieth year of our captivity, in the beginning of the year, in the tenth day of the month, in the fourteenth year after that the city was smitten." Compare this with Ezek. 33 : 21, where he says :—"It came to pass in the *twelfth* year of our captivity—one that had escaped out of Jerusalem came unto me, saying, *the city is smitten*." Here then we have demonstration that the time had elapsed from the commencement of the captivity to the desolation of Jerusalem was *eleven years*. But this is not the only proof. In 2 Kings 24th chapter, we learn that "Jehoikim became *servant* to Nebuchadnezzar three years," and "then turned and rebelled against him." Jehoikim died and was succeeded by

Jehoiachin, who reigned but *three months*, before he was taken captive by Nebuchadnezzar, in the *eighth year* of the reign of the king of Babylon. (See also Jer. 52 : 28.) At this time Nebuchadnezzar "carried away all Jerusalem, and *all the princes* and *all the mighty men of valor*—none remained save the poorer sort of the people of the land." Here, manifestly, is the commencement of the 70 years *captivity* in the *eighth year* of Nebuchadnezzar. Then, in 2 Kings, 25th chapter, we have an account of the *desolation* of Jerusalem, and it is stated thus, vrs. 8 to 10—"In the fifth month on the seventh day of the month, which is the *nineteenth year of king Nebuchadnezzar*, king of Babylon, came Nebuzaradan, captain of the guard, a servant of the king of Babylon, unto Jerusalem ; and he *burnt the house of the Lord*, and the king's house, and all the houses of Jerusalem, and every great man's house burnt he with fire—and break down the walls of Jerusalem round about." Here, then, is a further demonstration that *eleven years* intervened between the captivity and the desolation of Jerusalem ; and as 70 years were allotted to *each* of these, we shall find a corresponding termination to the captivity and *desolations*.

The presumption is, that Daniel was among the captives that were carried away with Jehoiachin, in the eighth year of Nebuchadnezzar. We will suppose that he was then *fourteen years* old. If so, he must have been 84 years old in the first year of Cyrus, king of Persia, for that year ended the 70 years *captivity*. (See Ezra 1 : 1.) This proclamation is expressly said to be made "that the word of the Lord by the mouth of *Jeremiah* might be fulfilled ;" which prophecy related, specially, to the *time* of Judah's captivity. In the first year of Cyrus, then, the 70 years captivity ended—Daniel lived to see it, and to witness the promulgation of Cyrus' proclamation ; though being at that time at least 84 years old, he did not go up to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel, Joshua, and their associates. Daniel is alive in the third year of Cyrus, as we learn from Dan. 10 : 1, which was the next year after "the foundation of the house of the Lord was laid," (see Ezra 3 : 8-11,) "in the third year of Cyrus," probably, the news reached Daniel, in Persia, that "the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin" (see Ezra 4 : 1-5,) were plotting to prevent the work going on, which led Daniel to the "mourning" and fasting for "three weeks," recorded in Dan. 10th ch.

Daniel not only lived to see the end of the 70 years captivity, but also to see the end of the "70 years desolations of Jerusalem," [see Dan. 9 : 2,] which must have been eleven years later than the first of Cyrus, or the end of the captivity ; so that when the desolations ended, which was in the first or second year of Darius, son of Ahasuerus, or Darius Nothus, [compare Dan. 9 :

1, 2, with Zech. I : 7, 12, 16,] Daniel must have been at least 95 years old. The temple, or house of God, was finished in the sixth year of the reign of Darius, at which time Daniel, if living, was 100 years old ; it is probable, however, that he had gone to rest before that time.

At the time Daniel had the communication from Gabriel, ch. 9, the *foundation* of the temple had been laid, but the work had been hindered, so that it was still unfinished. And Dr. Townsend, in his chronological arrangement of the Bible, makes this prayer of Daniel, 9th ch., to be during the *suspension* of the rebuilding of the temple ; and yet, strange to tell, he falls into the common error of placing that chapter 538 B.C., that is, *before* the temple began to be built, and consequently could not be during the *suspension* of the work.

[To be Continued.]

THE CATACOMBS.

SELECTIONS BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

THE quotations in this article are extracts from a little book —“The Catacombs of Rome”—compiled ten years ago, by Bishop Kip, of the Prot. Epis. Church, from several foreign works, which are the result of immense research and patient labor.

“The first writer whose attention was turned to these remains of the past, was Father Bosio. He spent more than thirty years (1567 to 1600) in exploring the Catacombs, penetrating into some of the innermost crypts which had been closed for centuries, and in making drawings of ancient monuments, inscriptions, and paintings. It became the absorbing passion of his life, until, we are told, he ‘lived so much in the dark catacombs, that the bright light of the sun was painful to his eyes.’ Yet he did not survive to see the result of his labors made known to the world, but died while writing the last chapter of his work. His accumulated manuscripts and drawings, with the partly-finished engravings, passed into the hands of Father Severano, who added a chapter of his own, and published the work at Rome, in the year 1632, under the title of ‘Rome Sotterranea.’”

Since, a number of works have been written on the subject ; among them is one by Father Boldetti, who “passed more than

thirty years in the examination of the tombs and crypts :” another, by M. D’Agincourt, “who toward the close of the last century settled himself in Rome, to investigate these relics of primitive days. He intended to stay six months, but like Bosio, it became the study of his life ; and he remained for fifty years solely occupied in collecting and arranging the materials of his work.”

“It has been conjectured by some writers, that these excavations were commenced long before the founding of the Eternal City by that race who made it famous under the name of Rome. There are traces everywhere of a former mighty people inhabiting these sites, long anterior to the age assigned to Romulus and Remus. . . But they were a people all knowledge of whose language and records has perished. . . It is supposed that by them these quarries may have been first opened. The Romans inherited the domains of this mysterious race. . . The great increase of the city in the latter days of the republic, led again to the working of quarries in the immediate neighborhood, to procure the materials necessary for building. The soil of the Campagna rests on tufa and pozzolana, and volcanic sandy rock, easily quarried, and from its texture well adapted to the excavation of long galleries, while the Esquiline hill was undermined to obtain sand for making cement. . . In this way it was that these crypts or galleries were first formed, until the whole subsoil on one side of Rome was in the course of time perforated by a network of excavations, which ultimately extended to a distance of fifteen or, as some say, twenty miles.— But when these quarries were exhausted of their original stores, they stood vacant, ready to be appropriated to any other use. And none, of course, would know their intricate windings but those whose hands had formed them, and by whose labor these excavations had been made.

“Then came the advent of the Christian faith. The *arenarii*, or sand-diggers, and the workmen in the quarries, were persons of the lowest grade, and cut off by their occupation from the crowds in the busy city, probably formed a separate and distinct community. There is reason to believe, that Christianity found among them its earliest proselytes, for its first followers everywhere were the lowest in the social scale. . . In times of persecution, therefore, the converts employed in the subterranean passages had already provided for them a secure retreat, which also they opened to their brethren in the faith, until it became the place of refuge of the Roman Church. . . That the Catacombs were, throughout, well known to the early Christians, is evident ; for all parts bear trace of their occupancy.

We meet on every side with tombs and chapels, paintings and inscriptions, and for three hundred years the entire Christian population of Rome found sepulture in these recesses."

The *inscriptions* in the Catacombs are of the greatest interest, inasmuch as they show that the great doctrine of LIFE THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE was the faith of the earliest Christians.— It is for the sake of these inscriptions only that we have introduced the Catacombs to the readers of the EXAMINER,

Bishop Kip draws a contrast between the epitaphs of the heathen tombs and those of the Christian.

"No hope beyond the grave sheds its light on the pagan monuments. The expression, 'DOMVS ETERVALIS, *An eternal home,*' constantly appears. . . A gloomy stoicism—a forced resignation—is the highest feeling we can discover. They turn to the life that is past, only with Epicurean regret that its pleasures can be enjoyed no longer. Take, for instance, the Anacreontic language in the following :—

'To the Divine Manes of Titus Claudius Secundus. Here he enjoys everything. Baths, wine, and love, ruin our constitutions, but—they make life what it is. Farewell, farewell.'

So in this, where life is looked upon as a play :—

'While I lived, I lived well. My play is now ended, soon yours will be. Farewell, and applaud me. Lived 57 years.'

"But nowhere can we trace anything but calmness and peace in the inscriptions of the early Christians. Brief as they may be, they yet evidently look to a life beyond life. We see how immediate was the elevating influence of the new creed. . . A light had risen to dispel the horror of darkness which had hitherto reigned over the grave."

Bishop Kip says that the "noble philosophy of Greece" and "the glorious dreams of Plato" do not "seem to have dawned upon the minds of" the Roman heathen. We are very glad to distinguish the *same ignorance* of "the noble philosophy" and "glorious dreams" among the *Christians*. No word of confidence is expressed in the soul's immortality. The visionary doctrines of modern theology were unknown to the earliest adherents of Christianity. Their epitaphs show beyond all question that they believed in the *sleep* of the departed saints. The following inscriptions are given in Bishop Kip's book :—

VALERIA DORMIT IN PACE

Valeria sleeps in peace.

DORMITIO ELPIDIS

The sleeping place of Elpis.

VICTORINA DORMIT

Victorina sleeps.

ZOTICVS HIC AD DORMIENDVM

Zoticus laid here to sleep.

"Frequently, too, we find the inscription :—

IN PACE DOMINI DORMIT

He sleeps in the peace of the Lord.

"In a portion of the epitaph which Placus recorded above his wife Albania, he says :—

You, well deserving one, having left your (relations) lie in peace
—IN SLEEP. YOU WILL ARISE ; A TEMPORARY REST is granted you."Two doctrines are here set forth ; one plainly—the other inferentially : the sleep of the saints, and the non-resurrection of the wicked. The latter doctrine is *positively* discovered in an inscription which is introduced by Bishop Kip, thus :—

"The only case in which anything like denunciation is found, is where it is directed against those who should violate the sanctity of the grave. . . Somewhat in the spirit of the Hebrew Psalms, inscriptions like the following, they recorded their curse—

MALE PEREAT INSERVLTVS
JACEAT NON RESVRGAT
CVM JVDA PARTEM HABEAT
SIQVIS SEPVLCHRVM HVNC
VIOLAVERIT.*If any shall violate this sepulchre,
Let him perish miserably, and remain unburied ;
Let him lie down, AND NOT RISE AGAIN ;
Let his portion be with Judas."*Thus, the Catacombs of Rome give in their testimony to the doctrine of *Life through Christ alone*. We cannot do better than to let Bishop Kip conclude. We wish his words could convince him of the truth which he is compelled to preach when he compares the buried city of Pompeii with the Catacombs : Life and Immortality through Jesus Christ by a resurrection "at the last day."

"The ruined streets of the pagan city have been once more opened, and again the sun shines in its vacant homes ; yet as we tread where once gathered thousands 'lived and moved and had their being,' what other sentiment is gratified but that of curiosity? Everything is 'of the earth, earthy' ; we see nothing but what relates to this material life, and we learn no lesson but that of the fearful profligacy of these bright campanian cities. But amid the darkness of the Catacombs, we are

reminded of that spiritual day which shone upon those who there made their home, and which now speaks out from the inscriptions on their graves. It is not alone a place of gloom and desolation. It reminds us not even primarily of death.—Its dominant sentiment is that of immortality. From the distant past—from their rock-hewn tombs—we hear the voice of the buried martyrs, calling on us to rejoice and hope, because the darkness has rolled away from the sepulchre, and Christ has become to us, as He was to them, **THE RESURRECTION AND THE LIFE.**"

"THE PROPHETIC TIMES."

THIS is the title of "a new serial, devoted to the exposition and inculcation of the doctrine of the speedy coming and reign of the Lord Jesus Christ, and related subjects." It is published by W. Z. Harbert, 112 North Tenth-St., Philadelphia. The prospectus informs us that "it is to be edited solely by ministers of acknowledged orthodox views, who will see that nothing contrary to order or pure evangelical faith and charity shall be admitted into its columns." The names of Drs. Seiss, Newton, Duffield, Jr., Forsyth, Adair, and Revs. William Newton and Edwin E. Reinke are mentioned as editors. We are glad to see this effort on the part of the "orthodox" to disseminate such vital truth and we bid them God speed. We are sorry, however, to find serious cause of condemnation in the first number. Two brief extracts will present the matter.

1. "We shall need every one's help. We solicit co-operation in any way that it is convenient to give it."

2. "Having no connection whatever with the erratic and irresponsible men usually claiming attention on these themes, we come before the public as accredited ministers of orthodox churches, with no motives other than fidelity to the truth and to the souls of men."

We shall not go far out of the way in interpreting the latter extract as a deliberate declaration of hostility to that class who are not content with the avowal of faith in the speedy personal Advent of our Lord Jesus Christ, but who earnestly combat the popular dogmas of the immortality of the soul, eternal torment, &c. While the "*Times*" solicits "every one's help" and "co-operation," in the first extract, the second extract gives us

to understand that "the erratic and irresponsible men usually claiming attention on these themes" are not included in the phrase "every one." The *Times* has "*no connection whatever*" with the class alluded to.

We regard this position as simply monstrous. For a number of years a certain class of earnest people have been pressing the great theme of Christ's Second Advent upon the attention of the churches; and it is not too much to say that *nine-tenths* of the interest which is now manifested in the churches on the subject is the direct result of the labors of this class. They have been "instant in season, out of season" in the great work: To be sure, there has been much to condemn in their past history—much of fanaticism, contention, and visionariness; but a great deal of this evil is owing to the contempt that has been heaped upon them by the churches. There has been no lack of fierce and hateful detraction from "orthodox" lips.—The terms—Millerite—Storrite—Soul-sleeper, etc., have been freely bandied among the "evangelical" masses. Is it any wonder that many, in consequence of this opprobrium and lack of sympathy, have fallen into divers errors and have gone to extremes? But notwithstanding the acknowledged evil that has existed, and that now exists to a considerable extent,—there can be no doubt that there are *thousands of sincere, devout, and earnest* Christian men and women who are held together in mutual sympathy by the thrilling doctrine of the Second Advent, and kindred *truths*. Many of them are poor in this world's goods; many of them are ignorant as regards worldly wisdom; *but there is more knowledge of the Holy Scriptures and a deeper understanding of the mysteries of God's word* among this people than in all the "orthodox" churches combined. But the D.D.'s of the "Prophetic Times" will have "*no connection whatever*" with these people! We hesitate not to predict that these cruel words will yet be gladly retracted by those who are now so stiff with ecclesiastical prejudice and bigotry. They will very soon be glad to acknowledge the class which they now despise, as *their brethren* in the faith. And what is more, *they will eagerly come* to these "erratic and irresponsible men" for MORE LIGHT.

But what does the *Times* mean by "erratic" men? Because men refuse to allow ecclesiastical authority to hold them in its

iron embrace, are they therefore "erratic"? Because men find that the modern church creeds are based on a sandy foundation, are they therefore "erratic"? Because men discover that the doctrine of man's natural immortality is *unscriptural*, are they therefore "erratic"? Because men renounce the infamous lie of *eternal torment*, are they therefore "erratic"? Because men believe the apostolic declaration that the departed saints are "*asleep*," and deny that the *dead* know more than all the *living*, while the Scriptures affirm that "the dead know *not anything*"—that "the dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into *silence*"—that when a man dies "in that very day his thoughts perish"—are they therefore "erratic"? Because men maintain that a vital union with Christ by the baptism of the Spirit is the indispensable means of obtaining a future life, are they therefore "erratic"? Because men cry with Paul—"What *advantageth* it me if the dead *rise not*?"—are they therefore "erratic"? We cannot better reply to this "erratic" charge than by using the language of the *Times* in another place: "Let it be remembered that it is the *word of God* with which we have to do, even that word according to which we must be judged, *no part* of which we are at liberty to disregard or explain away, and it cannot but appear to all fair and serious-minded people that it becomes every one to be *very cautious* how he *scouts, discards, or ignores these subjects*, lest he be found *thrusting aside* instruction *deeply connected* with his present and eternal good, and *casting contempt* upon those *holy oracles* through which *ALONE* all saving knowledge comes to mankind."

And what does the *Times* mean by "irresponsible men"?—Are we not *all* responsible beings? Must we not all give an account to God? And if we act with strict reference to this high responsibility, are we not complete in that respect?—Must we have the theologico-ecclesiastic spoke-shave applied to us that we may be accepted wheels to the car of truth? Must we run in the curriculum of the popular divinity schools or else be branded as "irresponsible"?

"We come before the public," says the *Times*, "as accredited ministers of orthodox churches." Indeed; and who accredited you? *Men* like yourselves. And are not *we* men? Is there a divine seal upon all who go through the popular forms of ordination? How happens it, then, that so many "accredited

ministers" prove themselves to be "wolves in sheep's clothing"? To what class do the "blind watchmen" belong? The accredited ministry. Where must we go to find "dumb dogs," that "cannot bark; sleeping, lying down, loving to slumber"? To the accredited ministry. Where must we apply the language of the prophet—"Yea, they are greedy dogs that can never have enough, and they are shepherds that cannot understand; they all look to their own way, every one for his gain from his quarter"? Where, except to *many* among the "accredited ministers of orthodox churches?"

But the conductors of the *Times* have "no motives other than fidelity to the truth and to the souls of men." This is no more true of *them* than it is of those whom they style "erratic and irresponsible men." On this common ground we will clasp hands with all—the reverend Doctors of the "Prophetic Times" included; that is, if their patrician cuticle does not shrink from contact with our plebeian palms. J. T. C.

WHAT IS TRUTH?

BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

"WHAT is truth?" said the Roman Procurator to Jesus.—Whatever may be the true explanation of his meaning, the infinite importance of the abstract enquiry cannot be a subject of debate; at least, among Christians. Religious truth is, of all treasures, the most valuable; and he only who makes its search the chief labor of his life, appreciates his responsibility to God and himself.

But divine truth comes not at every call. There are certain indispensable conditions to be observed by him who knocks at her gate. The natural will must be subjected to the Divine. "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine." The gaze must be *fixed* heaven-ward; the things of earth must lose their attractiveness; the pride of the animal nature must be checked—the haughty crest lowered; the Spirit of God must be a welcome guest and an abiding inmate of the heart,—if we would "know the things that are freely given to us of God." "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit

of God; for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

The words of the wise man—"Buy the truth,"—have not been deprived of their deep significance by the lapse of three millenniums. The truth is to be purchased; not with money, altogether, but with time—ease—worldly honor; especially the latter. "How can ye believe," said the Master, "who receive honor one of another, and seek not the honor that cometh from the only God?" "The friendship of the world is enmity with God." Let it perish, then, *with* the world! Sell it for truth.

Some prevalent errors should also be discarded or avoided by the truth-searcher:—trust in the wisdom of men; undue reliance of "the Fathers" and the great names of the divinity schools; too much respect for the preconceptions of Self & Co.; opposition to free investigation; etc.

Although Pilate's question did not elicit a response, the emphatic answer is on record. In that transcendent prayer which forms such an appropriate conclusion to his last and most thrilling discourse, the God-man said: "THY WORD is truth." His words but echoed the Psalmist's: "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." The aged Paul reiterates the sentiment to Timothy: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."—Happy is he who believes that it is even so; who is proof against the insidious attempts of modern skeptics to impeach the Divine authority of the Bible; who can distinguish the pure record from the corruptions introduced in the sacred text by human ignorance and weakness; who has learned how to compare "spiritual things with spiritual," according to the apostolic practice, and thus to insure himself against the possibility of mistaking the errors of men for the truth of God.

The Bible, then, is the standard. The Bible *alone* is the standard of appeal; "fully containing the will of God," so that we may not "compare any writings of men, though never so holy, with the divine Scriptures;" nor may we "compare *custom*, or the *great multitude*, or *antiquity*, or succession of *times* or *persons*, or *councils*, *decrees*, or *statutes*, with the TRUTH OF GOD." *Const. Ref. D. Church in U. S. A., 1793.*

The Bible being the repository of the truth, it becomes every lover of truth to "read, mark, learn and inwardly digest" its divine matter. "It is not enough," says Thomas Chalmers, "to entitle a man to the name of a Christian, that he professes to believe the Bible to be a genuine communication from God. To be the disciple of any book, he must do something more than satisfy himself that its contents are true—he must read the book—he must obtain a knowledge of its contents." Stephen Olin remarks to the same effect: "It will not do to float along with the current, and submit questions of so profound and intense interest to idle tradition, or human authority, or church pretensions, any more than to the rash temerity of our reason. . . I by no means satisfy the demands of so high an obligation by ascertaining what is the current or popular opinion, or what is the voice of the fathers. . . My business is to learn what is the mind of God. His own account of the matter is in my hands, and there I must search for his doctrine, armed with whatever resources diligent, thoughtful, prayerful study, and good books, and learned, simple-hearted, God-fearing teachers may be able to supply. I specially desire not to be misunderstood on this most important point. The Gospel not only tolerates—it imperatively demands of every Christian that he should seek diligently to know the true import of the Bible."

Next in importance to the discovery of truth comes its dissemination. It is the bounden duty of every one to faithfully declare, and use every available means to spread, whatever of truth he may have acquired, and he is called to it by every tie that binds him to humanity. Divine instruction is too precious to be hid under a cover; or buried in the earth; hence, it should be held forth to the children of men, even at the risk of its rejection by many. Ezekiel was commanded to speak the words of Jehovah to Israel whether they would hear or whether they would forbear. The disapprobation of the world has no terrors to him who is supported by the consciousness of the Divine acceptance; one smile of God will expunge a thousand human frowns. Let no one be content, then, with the mere acquisition of truth, but

"On! let all the soul within you
For the truth's sake go abroad!
Strike! let every nerve and sinew
Tell on ages—tell for God."

DO THE DEAD "COME FORTH" ALIVE?

A CRITICISM BY RUFUS WENDELL.

WE wish to notice this month a single paragraph in Retribution, and quote from it the following :—

☞ "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*, they come forth *to death*, but they are yet *alive*. Two men 'come forth' out of a prison, one is set at liberty, the other is doomed to expire upon the gallows. One comes forth '*to life*' the other '*to death*,' one *to live*, the other *to die*; and yet one comes forth *alive* just as much as the other. So in the resurrection. All will come forth *alive*, but some will come forth '*to life* everlasting,' and others to condemnation, and to 'the second death.' When Jesus came to the sepulchre of Lazarus did he say, 'Lazarus, come forth *alive*,' as if there was a possibility that a dead carcass might come forth in its lifeless condition? Jesus said, 'Lazarus, *come forth*,' and he was obeyed. Does John say he came forth *to life*? Does he say he came forth *alive*?— Not a word of it. Shall we then infer that Lazarus was *dead* after Christ raised him, because it does not say that he 'came forth *to life*?' When that same voice which said 'Lazarus, *come forth*,' shall call for 'all that are in the graves,' they '*shall come forth*,' they that have done good to the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of condemnation.' Though the wicked will not come forth immortal, they will come forth alive as truly as did Lazarus when Jesus said to him 'Lazarus, *come forth*.'" (*Ret.*, pp. 126-127.)

A little careful examination of the above extract will show that its author when he penned it was more "earnest" than logical. We begin by observing that *we* do *not* "fail to comprehend the difference between the dead coming forth *alive*, and their coming forth *to life*." The real "difference," however, between the two is not, as we conceive, correctly apprehended by the writer whom we are now noticing, and he has given two illustrations which completely nullify his notion of the condition in which the dead "come forth." When he asserts, as he does, that the wicked dead will come forth *alive* *to death*, he makes a clear distinction between the condition *in* which they come forth and the condition *to* which they come forth. So in the case of his prison culprit, who, *alive*, comes forth "*to death*"; that *to* which he comes forth is not the condition *in* which he comes forth. Here, then, we find a *principle* present-

ed in Retribution, and by applying it to the interpretation of John 5 : 28, 29, we shall be conducted to a conclusion which, according to our author, exhibits the lowest depth of "exegetical nonsense" which he would be willing to "explore." The passage in question declares that all that are in the graves shall come forth "unto" the *resurrection*. Now our author believes that the *revival* of the dead will not *precede* their *resurrection*; but as the principle above stated demands that their *coming forth* shall precede their *resurrection*, it follows that they are *dead* when they *come forth*—which we believe to be the precise fact in the case. Be it known, therefore, that the author of Retribution is bound by his own logic to admit that the dead are *not alive* when they *come forth*. We see no possible way for him to reconcile the idea of the wicked dead coming forth *alive* UNTO a *resurrection which gives them life* with his statement that they "come forth to DEATH." His prison illustration ought to suggest the true method of escape from the dilemma in which his logic has placed him. If a *living* prisoner can properly be said to come forth "to *life*," because he is set at *liberty*, a *dead sinner* can with equal propriety be said to come forth *dead* TO a "resurrection" whose essential quality (as the proper antithesis of the *life* which is conferred upon the good by their resurrection) is *condemnation* not to see life but to abide eternally under the wrath of God.

But how about Lazarus? We answer, his case is in complete harmony with the view we have expressed above. That he "was *dead* after Christ raised him" we are as ready to deny as the author of Retribution. But *that* is not the issue. The point is this,—Did he "come forth" *dead*? We believe he did, and for this opinion we have several reasons. 1. If he came forth *alive*, his *revival* (and hence his resurrection) must have taken place *in* the cave wherein he was buried. This supposition seems to be refuted by the fact that the miracle of the resurrection was witnessed by the people that stood by, and by the fact that the verity of the transaction could be best attested if it took place outside of the cave. 2. That Lazarus came forth *dead* is implied in the fact that he came forth *bound hand and foot with grave clothes* and his face bound about with a napkin. Upon the hypothesis that he came forth *alive*, we must still recognize a *miracle* in bringi him forth, from the fact that,

"bound" as he was, he could not use his limbs and come out of the grave unaided. We have no reason to suppose that his *life* was restored before it would be of use to him. This points us to the moment when they loosed him and let him go as the instant when the Lord of Life manifested his resurrection power. 3. That Lazarus came forth *dead*, and was *raised from the dead afterwards*, is rendered *certain*, as it seems to us, by the record given by the evangelist in John 12: 17, which reads as follows: "The people therefore that was with him when he called Lazarus out of his grave, AND raised him from the dead, bear record." Here the *coming forth* of Lazarus is presented as a distinct thing from his *resurrection*; the conjunction "and" marking the two transactions as *not identical*, and showing that the dead man came out of his grave *before* he was raised from the dead.

We believe that *all* the dead will literally "come forth"—the righteous to receive *life*, the wicked to be cast dead into Gehenna, where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched.—"Fear him, which *after* he hath *killed* hath power to cast into Gehenna." Luke 12: 5. We do not here forget that the *dead* are to be *judged*, but we wish to reserve our remarks on that point for another article.

When the author of Retribution says that "the wicked will not come forth immortal," it must be borne in mind that the theory of his book is that *no* man will come forth *immortal*.—Paul's doctrine, however, is that "the dead shall be raised incorruptible." We search *his* writings in vain for any hint that "a restoration to a temporal existence" awaits the saints, or that any will be made alive who are not in Christ.

Salem, Mass., Dec. 11, 1862.

A SHORT SERMON FOR PREACHERS.

BY R. V. LYON, THOROLD, C. W.

"For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." 1 Cor. 15: 22.

In the discussion of this interesting text, there are three things to learn in order to arrive at the truth, as taught in the text and context.

1st. The people addressed are the Church of God. Proof: 1 Corth.

1: 1, 2; 15: 12. 2d. The reason why they are addressed, is found in the 12th verse. 3d. The object of the address is found in the 33d verse. Hence the world are not addressed in the chapter.

Paul lays down four positions, and most admirably sustains them, in this chapter.

1st. The necessity of the resurrection of God's dead men—the Church. Proof: verses 13–19, 32. 2d. The certainty of their resurrection.—Proof: verses 20–29. 3d. The nature of it. Proof: verses 34–57.—4th. The practical effect it should have upon their lives. Verse 58.

1. The apostle shows the brethren, that if they were right in taking the position, that they were not to have a resurrection out from among *the dead*, then it would be certain that their preaching was vain—that they had testified falsely—that their faith was vain—they were yet in their sins—their hope confined to this life; and those having fallen asleep in Christ, have “perished”—*apollwmi*, “to destroy *totally*, to die.” Hence there is no more of them! And I [Paul] will embrace the epicurean philosophy, make the best of this world—for soon I must *DIE*, *apothneesko*, “to die, to become putrescent, rot as seeds,” and this will be my end!

2. The conditions upon which one can attain unto the resurrection spoken of in this chapter: and the certainty of attaining unto it, if its conditions are complied with.

The conditions. What are they? I answer: *Hear*—understand and believe the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of the anointed. Change your course of conduct, from *wrong* to *right*, and be inducted into the Christ by a burial in water—then *develop* Christian character; by a life that shall be in strict conformity to the teachings of the apostles; and all will be well with thee! For says *Heydenr*, and subscribed to by *Dr. Bloomfield* in his critical notes upon the Greek text: “By their (the Church's) connection with the first Adam brought *death*; but by their (the Church's) becoming connected with Christ, life; by the one they (the Church) shall be delivered from that dominion: the evils inflicted on them (the Church) by the former, will be entirely done away by the latter!” But “every man in his own order: Christ the first fruit”—that is, the first in the *order* of the resurrection, from the fact that he is said to be in verse 20th—“The first fruit of them that slept.” And if his resurrection is a pledge and representative of the entire race of the first Adam—as *H. W. Beecher* and *Retribution* have taught—then the legitimate conclusion is, the salvation of the entire family of the first Adam in the kingdom of God, where they shall bask forever amid the sunbeams of endless day!

But upon a critical examination of the text and context, you will see that *Brn. B.'s* and *R.'s* premises are false! Hence, their *conclusions are equally false!* Mark the language of Paul: “The first fruit of them that slept.” Christ is the antitype of the wave offering; and this wave offering was *one sheaf of pure ripe grain*. Not a thorn nor a briar was bound up in it!! Therefore, Christ cannot represent sinners, for they are compared to “thorns and briars.”

As Christ separated himself from sin and sinnerz, by leading a life of faith and obedience—so must those whom he represents. And as he was

raised incorruptible, to enjoy an endless life, come into possession of the "kingdom of David," and "reign over the house of Jacob forever," "have dominion from sea to sea, and from the river unto the ends of the earth,"—so in like manner will those be raised and exalted whom he represents! "But every man in his own order"—or band. "Christ the first fruits;" that is, *the first in the order of the resurrection!*—"AFTERWARDS THEY THAT ARE HIS AT HIS COMING." Are all men his? You answer, Nay! Then, sir, according to your own testimony, they will not all be made alive in or by Christ. Therefore they will "REMAIN IN THE CONGREGATION OF THE DEAD."

Again, Paul presents their baptism as testimony of their resurrection. V. 29. "Otherwise, what will THOSE do who are BEING IMMersed on behalf of the DEAD? If the dead are not raised at all, why then are they immersed on their behalf?—*Diaglot.*

Here we have immutable testimony that in the act of being immersed into the Christ—their faith in the resurrection embraced only those who believed the gospel and obeyed it.

And as proof of the resurrection of those who sleep in Jesus, Paul presents their immersion.

The nature of the resurrection of those who are made alive in Christ. Verses 34-57 ***. "So also is the resurrection of THE DEAD. It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption. * * * It is raised in glory. *** It is raised in power. It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body." First the "natural body; and afterwards that which is spiritual." *** "Behold I show you [brethren] a mystery; we [brethren] shall not all sleep [die], 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 [the saints, who are alive at the coming of Jesus,] shall be changed. For the trumpet shall sound, and THE DEAD," spoken of in my text, "shall be raised incorruptible, and we [the living saints,] shall be changed," from mortality to immortality. Then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; the strength of sin is the law, but thanks be unto God that giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ."

Here the apostle, in describing the nature of the resurrection, testifies *positively* to the following facts! 1, That those who are raised in or by Christ, will be raised incorruptible, spiritual and immortal. 2, They will sing the victor's song. 3, They will give thanks to God, which giveth them the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ. And if the entire race of the first Adam are to be made alive in or by Christ the second Adam: then the conclusion is unavoidable that all men will be saved. But the 56th verse teaches us that those who die in their sins, will be *held in a state of death eternally!*

The practical effect the doctrine of the resurrection should have upon the lives of those who believe it, v. 58.—"Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord."

THE WICKED DEAD WILL LIVE AGAIN.—Please tell us how to reconcile the following with your views of the *non-resurrection* of the wicked. "*All that are in the graves shall hear his voice ; and shall come forth.*" (John 5 : 28, 29.)

The word rendered "*hear*," in the above quotation, is from the Greek word *akouo*,—and occurs about 450 times in the New Testament. Its meaning, according to *Greenfield's Greek Lexicon*, is : "To hear ; hearken, listen to ; hear, obey ; know, understand."

To prove that this is its true meaning, I will give a few examples :—"In Rama was there a voice *heard*,"—(Mat. 2 : 18) "When Jesus had *heard*,"—(4 : 12) "Whoever *heareth* these sayings,"—(7 : 24) "He that *heareth* my word,"—(John 5 : 24) "When the dead shall *hear* his voice," (v. 25) "They that *hear* shall live,"—(v. 25). This surely means a *literal hearing of the ear*, does it not ?

The word rendered "*come forth*," is from the Greek word *exerkomai*, and occurs in the N. T. about 200 times. Its meaning, according to *Greenfield's Lex.* is :—"To go or come out of a place ; to depart ; to go out, be cast out," &c.

A few examples will prove this to be the true meaning of the word :—"The angels shall *come forth*,"—(Mat. 13 : 49) "Therefore *came* I *forth*,"—(Mark 1 : 38) "This kind can *come forth* by nothing," &c.,—(Mark 9 : 29) "He that was dead *came forth*,"—(John 11 : 44) "I *came forth* from the Father,"—(16 : 28) "After that shall they *come forth*, and serve me in this place,"—(Acts 7 : 7).

Now, please tell us how the "wicked dead" can "*HEAR his voice*," and "*COME FORTH*," (!) if they never "*live again*" !

Concord, N. H., Feb. 17, 1863.

T. M. PREBLE.

IF BRO. PREBLE will tell our readers how the "*dry bones*" of Ezk. 37th, "*hear* the word of the LORD," and "*CAME together*, bone to his bone," he will fully answer his own question. Read in connection with the foregoing inquiry, the remarks on John 5 : 28, 29 in the January and March Examiners for this year ; also the remarks of R. W. on the inquiry, "*Will the Dead come forth alive ?*" in the present number.

DONATIONS TO SUSTAIN THE EXAMINER AND ITS EDITOR.—Juline French, \$1. Sally Dillingham, \$1. James Field, \$5. Dr. J. Trever, \$1. Mrs. R. W. Pierce, "an offering to the Lord," \$4.50. Geo. W. Allshouse, \$3. Adam Warthman, \$20. P. Dickinson, \$5. Mrs. C. C. Williams, \$1.

"FOREVER AND EVER."

BY HONESTUS.

"And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone where the beast and the false prophet are, and shall be tormented day and night forever."—Rev. 20: 10.

"And the smoke of their torment ascendeth up forever and ever; and they have no rest day nor night who worship the beast and his image," &c.—Rev. 14: 11.

A traveler returns from California by the way of Cape Horn, and tells us that the ship encountered a fearful storm, and that the *waves ran mountains high*; or a hunter tells us, he saw an eagle pounce upon his prey with the rapidity of lightning.—Now, the Alleghanies are 3,000, the Alps 15,000, and the Himalayas 28,000 feet high, and lightning is supposed to move at the rate of 200,000 miles in a second. Does any one then suppose the waves of the sea are ever 3, or 15, or 28,000 feet in literal height? or that an eagle ever moved at the rate of 200,000 miles in a second? Certainly not. Every one understands their meaning. The waves ran very high, and the eagle flies with great rapidity. This is the universal method of employing figurative language. It is understood to be *indefinite*. In eastern countries greater license in the use of figurative terms is used than in our own, as every one knows who is acquainted with Persian or Arabic poetry or tales. Nevertheless we once heard a preacher, an expounder of God's word, say that the terrific imagery in which the Bible denounced future punishment expressed far *less* than the reality: that, as the stars are millions of times larger than they appear, so future punishment will be a million of times more dreadful than the figurative terms of Scripture express. We think this just as absurd, just as far from any true and common-sense interpretation of God's word, as if he had said, after reading the language of the traveler or the hunter, that the ocean waves were a million of times higher than the Andes, or that an eagle flew a million of times faster than lightning!

Now, nowhere is figurative language employed with greater freedom than in Isaiah and Revelations; and it is to be interpreted, obviously, just as it is elsewhere; at least, if the writers intended to be understood.

Does any one suppose that, in those naval wars spoken of in Rev. 16 : 3, 4, the sea and rivers became *literally blood*, or red with blood ; and that every fish in them *died* ? These passages, Croly supposes refer to the destruction of the Spanish Armada, and Keith to the battles fought for centuries in Lombardy, which he supposes the land of rivers, pre-eminently. Certainly, no such reality was ever experienced in the sea or anywhere on the land. Or again, in the great battle described in Rev. 14 : 20, does any one suppose that after any battle ever fought, or *to be fought*, blood covered the earth up to the horses' bridles for the space of 200 miles ?

Again. Is it a historical fact that the land of Idumea ever became as burning pitch, or that no one ever passed through it since its destruction ? and yet this was *foretold*. The true and common-sense interpretation is, that it was terribly destroyed, and that afterward it ceased to be the path of caravans to the east.

Now, in the passages at the head of this article, the beast and the false prophet are devoured. Who are they ? Whether Popery and Mahometanism, or Paganism, is immaterial. They are false religions. But false religions will not exist after the judgment. They will certainly be exposed and destroyed ; and commentators are generally agreed that the language refers to the terrific judgments visited upon the nations professing Romanism and Mahometanism for the last 50 or 60 years. Now, *how long* shall they be *tormented* in these flames of war and civil and priestly tyranny and internal anarchy ?—throughout *endless duration* ? The writer of the Apocalypse says, "*forever and ever.*" What does he mean ? In Exodus 21 : 6, the writer describes the ceremony of binding a servant, and after its conclusion adds, "He shall serve him *forever,*" *i. e.*, during the life of the master or servant. Here, beyond all dispute, it means *an age*—the age of master or servant. Again. Lev. 25 : 46, "They shall be your bondmen *forever ;*" and Deut. 15 : 17, "He shall be thy servant *forever ;*" and so in numerous passages. The word as used by the same writer, whatever some lexicographers may define it, means indisputably—*an age*—the life of a *man*. Again. It means the *age* of the Jewish economy. As is Exodus 32 : 13, The Jews should inherit the land which God had given *forever ; i. e.*, as long as their

economy lasted and they continued to be a distinct nation. In 1 Chron. 23 : 13, Levi and his sons should burn incense before the Lord *forever*—i. e., during the age of the Jewish economy. Again, Isaiah 60 : 21, "Thy people shall inherit the land *forever*." Then, also, it is said many times, the Lord shall reign *forever*—i. e., throughout endless duration.

The word *forever*, therefore, does not *always* mean *endless duration*. It means—*an age—a cycle*—whether it be the age of a man, a *dispensation*, the world, or the eternity of the Divine existence. What then does it mean in those passages of Revelation? This must be determined by the age of the beast and the false prophet. Now in 2 Thess. 2 : 8, this mystery of iniquity, or anti-Christ, which all Protestant commentators, at least, agree, means the beast or the false prophet, or both, it is said, "The Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy with the brightness of his coming." Even Mr. Barnes, holding as firmly as *he* does the dogma of endless misery, and denying as confidently as he does the premillennial advent of the Saviour—even he admits these words must mean the literal second coming of Christ to judge the world. Then, according to the apostle, the beast and false prophet shall be *destroyed* and *consumed*. Forever and ever (an amplificate of the word forever—like Verily, verily), therefore, means, in these passages—*not endless duration*—but the *age of these heresies*—whether they shall terminate *premillennially*, or with the end of the world. This not only explains the meaning of the words but saves us from the absurdity of supposing that *false religions* can be *held*, and their worshipers be *punished* for holding them throughout an endless duration.

LIFE—LIFE.—There has been considerable labor by some advocates of the reliving of the wicked dead, to show that *zoe*—i. e., *life*—is a word peculiar to *eternal* life, or the life of the righteous after resurrection, and that "the wicked are never said to have *zoe*, i. e.," say they, "*eternal* life." They tell us, "The term *life*, when from *zoe* signifies *eternal* or *everlasting* life."

Now this position is a mistaken one, as the following exam-

ples will show. "That he would grant us, that we *** might serve him *** in holiness and righteousness *** all the days of our life"—*zoe*. Luke 1: 74, 75. "For a man's life—*zoe*—"consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth." Luke 12: 15. "Thou in thy lifetime"—*zoen*—"receivedst thy good things." Luke 16: 25. "For his life"—*zoe*—"is taken from the earth." Acts 8: 33. "I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life"—*zoe*—"**** shall be able to separate us from the love of God." Rom. 8: 38, 39. "For all things are yours, whether *** life"—*zoe*—"or death." 1 Cor. 3: 21, 22. "If in *this* life"—*zoe*—"only, we have hope in Christ," &c. 1 Cor. 15: 19. "Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life"—*zoes*—"or by death." Phil. 1: 20. "For what is your life"?—*zoe*—"It is even a vapor that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away."—James 4: 14.

These texts, we judge, are sufficient to convince the candid that the term *zoe*, of itself, does not signify "eternal life;" and especially the last quoted text must convince all such, that *zoe*, in James' mind, has no such meaning as the advocates of the reliving of the wicked dead apply to it. So far from it, it would be the very word to express *the life* which they say the wicked have after they live from the dead to die again, *viz*: "It is even a vapor that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away."

Add to this evidence the fact that *zoe* has so often connected with it the words *eternal* or *everlasting* as expressing in what sense the term is employed to distinguish it from a short or "vapor" *zoe*, and what other conclusion can we arrive at, than that *zoe* is no proof of a durable life when used without the qualifying adjective *aionion*—eternal? On this topic our views are well expressed by the late Editor of the *Advent Herald*, S. Bliss, Feb. 24. He says:—

The word *zoe* is *** never expressive of *eternal* life, and is in no place in the Bible thus rendered. It has in it no element expressive of duration; which, when given in its connection, is always expressed by some adverbial or adjective qualifier. Thus the phrase, *eternal life*, is nowhere represented in the Greek by *zoe*; which, in such connection, is simply the representative of life, as significant of its kind,—its duration, as expressed by its appendage *eternal*, being otherwise represented. Thus in the text John 3: 36, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting

life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life,"—the word life is in each case represented by *zoen*; whilst everlasting, in the first connection, is represented by *aionion*—the phrase rendered life everlasting, being *zoen aionion*; whilst life, in the last connection, is *zoen* without any expression of its duration.

The author of this extract—since deceased—was a believer in the revival of all men from the dead and of the eternal pain of the wicked as the penalty of transgression. In the previous paragraph of his article, from which we have taken this extract, he says:—

God might raise, [the wicked], and then continue them forever, or terminate their existence according to his pleasure. The duration of their existence we predicate on the declaration of other Scriptures. In the present argument the reasoning is simply this: that if pain is the predicted penalty, as the penalty is eternal so must be their existence; but that if loss of being is the penalty, when they have once endured that, the law can have no farther claim upon them; and therefore, as we think, there must be abandoned either the claim that pain is the penalty, or that their existence is limited.

This is a fair statement of the argument. To be consistent, it seems to us, the advocates of the reliving of the wicked dead to die again, must abandon "*pain*" as "the penalty"—and of necessity, a reliving from the dead—or accept *eternal* pain as an inevitable consequence, as the punishment is *eternal* beyond all reasonable controversy. No *temporary* suffering is, in Scripture, set forth as the penalty proper for sin; such punishment is designed to *reform*, and always implies hope, and the possibility of reformation, with the acceptance of the LORD. The true scriptural penalty for sin is *death*. When *once* in death "the law can have no farther claim on them," except to *hold* them in death. "The wages of sin is DEATH:" not *dying*, nor the *pain* of dying, nor *two* deaths. The wages are fully given when life has ceased, not before. A revival to kill again, is, to our mind, a simple act of injustice, as it is nowhere expressed in the law of God against transgressors.

LITTLE CHILDREN.—A friend asks us our "position on the children of the righteous who have died before coming to years of understanding—will they have a resurrection or not?"

Our "position" is, *they will*. "The promise is unto you and your children." Acts 2: 39. Our Lord said, "Suffer little

children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God."—Luke 18 : 16. *Believing* parents brought their "infants" unto Him, that He would bless them. See also Matth. 19 : 13-15. The disciples rebuked those who brought them, but Jesus taught them to allow little children to be brought to Him; and "He laid his hands on them;" thus imparting a blessing to them; and if that blessing is not revoked by a subsequent life of impiety after attaining the years of understanding, we judge that blessing will carry them into the kingdom of God, by a *resurrection* "at the last day." Let parents consecrate themselves and their children to God in the "everlasting covenant:" so shall they "come again from the land of the enemy"—"the last enemy, death, shall be destroyed."

AN INQUIRY ON BAPTISM.—How do you understand the *baptism* spoken of 1 Corth. 15 : 29, "Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead," &c. ?

L. C. T.

We understand it to relate to the *baptism of suffering*. The apostle's argument is, "If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most *miserable*": v. 19. But there is a resurrection from the dead, *viz*: "Christ the first-fruits; afterwards that they are Christ's at his coming." *** "Else"—if it were not so—"what shall they do who are baptized"—endure all manner of sufferings for Christ and His cause—"for the dead, if the dead rise not at all?" "Christ died;" and if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen" (v. 13) but is still "dead:" why then subject ourselves to all manner of sufferings "for the *dead*" Christ, and the hope in him, as He is still dead, "if the dead rise not at all?"

That this view is the correct one the entire context shows; for the apostle immediately adds, "Why stand we in *jeopardy*"—a word here substituted for baptized in the previous verse—"every hour?" *** "If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the dead rise not? let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." Why should we subject ourselves to be baptized, or overwhelmed with sufferings of every kind and every form "for the *dead*"

Christ, and make ourselves "of all men the most *miserable*," "if there be no resurrection of the dead"! Let us act more wisely, and make the best of *this* life by eating and drinking, and giving place to all such enjoyments as shall make our life comfortable and happy, for we shall soon die, and that ends all our hopes, "if the dead rise not at all."

That our position is correct is highly probable from the language of our Saviour to his apostles, when two of them asked to sit, one on His right hand and the other on His left in his kingdom, He replied—"Can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? And they said, We can. Jesus said unto them, "Ye shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of, and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized," Mk. 10: 38, 39. And in Lk. 12: 50, Jesus saith, "I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!" This baptism was one of suffering and death. The apostles and first Christians were called to endure or pass through this baptism, and were "in jeopardy," or in danger of death, "every hour" for their faith in Christ. This view of the subject removes the obscurity from the text which has puzzled so many expositors, and makes a harmony of the whole chapter. So it appears to us.

"OLD BIGOTRY" NOT DEAD YET.—One of the simon-pure *Advent Herald* men—"Eld. Samuel Chapman"—writing to "Dear Br. Litch," now editor of that paper—says—

"Spent a week or more in Hartford. Should have mingled with the brethren at the Advent Hall on the Sabbath, but the noted G. S. was there with his 'non-resurrection theory,' and I chose to remain at home and write to absent friends, rather than give countenance to the theory, even so much as to be seen in the congregation."

"G. S.," of course, stands for GEO. STORRS. So it comes to pass, an "Eld." in the "Advent" church could stay "at home and write to absent friends, on the Sabbath" rather than "mingle with the brethren at the Advent Hall," because "the noted G. S. was there with" something he did not like! How true to life is such conduct drawn by our Saviour—"He seeth the wolf coming, and leaveth the sheep and fleeth" * * * "because

he is a hireling and careth not for the sheep"! Truly, he "stood and prayed thus with *himself*, God I thank thee that I am not as other men," *** "or even as this" "noted G. S." "I chose to remain at home," &c., "rather than" go where my august presence might "give countenance to the theory" that the wicked "are dead, they shall not live; they are deceased, they shall not rise:" no, Lord, I could not stand that by being "seen in the congregation"!

We recommend to this "*Eld.*," and those of like spirit, to read, mark, learn and inwardly digest Rev. 3: 17, 18. For the information of our friends abroad, we will say "G. S." preached in Hartford, on the day spoken of, on the *Atonement*, and the *Loss of the Soul*. They can judge how much cause the *Eld.* had to "remain at home."

CORRESPONDENCE.

Mrs. BISHOP (wife of S. W. Bishop), Warner, N. H., writes:— Please find enclosed a trifle to help bear the extra expense you are subjected to, in the publication of the EXAMINER. The precious truth to which it is especially devoted, I prize above rubies. And how glad I am I ever learned that it is truth—that "*wisdom* has hewn out" its "seven pillars"—and I no longer fear to gaze with admiring eyes upon its matchless beauty. I say *fear* to do so, for time was, when I hardly dared to let my mind dwell on the faint glimpses of its "excellent glory," that even then penetrated my darkness, lest it should make me dissatisfied with what I thought *must* be the doctrine of Revelation! "so foolish was I, and ignorant." But I have learned "wondrous things out of the law;" and have found that *Truth*, when divested of human tradition, is *just the best thing possible!* and of necessity it must be; it is an emanation from the Fountain of all wisdom and goodness: and "the plan" devised by the Infinite, to save perishing man, is the best, the wisest, the most just, and the most *merciful*, that could possibly be devised—*it admits of no improvement!* The beauty of it does not consist wholly in the fact that it teaches "no life out of Christ," though that is a truth altogether worthy of its author: but it goes farther, and has taught me what no other plan ever did, *how God can "be just,* and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus." So long as people are content to nibble around a few texts of Scripture, that in the light of previous education seem to favor the popular view, making that the "Alpha and Omega" of their investigation, their progress towards truth will not be flattering: but let them once begin, Samson-like, to "*feel*" for

"the pillar" on which their temple rests, and the result can hardly be doubtful.

If there is, in the ranks of the opposition, a man who stands "higher than any of the people from his shoulders and upward," I wish he might be induced to step out, away from the "rifepit"—behind which his weaker brethren might have more excuse for hiding—into the open field of fair, free discussion; and let the people have a chance to judge for themselves. It matters little who goes over to meet him, only let "the sling," the "smooth stone," and the "shepherd's bag" go with him. It is passing strange that the managers of a religious paper, who think two-thirds of their readers are such poor, little, weak lambs, or, (to borrow the language of one of their number,) such "big-headed religious babies," that they cannot bear the calm, candid Christian discussion of an important Bible question, should still have no scruples about filling column after column with *one side* of that question, so long as their brethren, whose views are sadly misrepresented, *are not permitted to "have their accusers face to face, and have license to answer for themselves!"* I am getting almost tired of seeing huge piles of "brick" and "slime" (Bible and tradition) thrown together, all in confusion, as one might imagine they were on the plains of Shinar, about the time "they left off to build the city," and none allowed to say, "*Let there be light!*" or to bring "order out of chaos." But we must "bide our time," and it will come! *These questions must ere long demand an answer, "After whom is the king of Israel come out? after whom dost thou pursue? after a dead dog? after a flea?"* Does that doctrine, that "does not rise to the dignity of a doctrine of the church," that is a mere "dogma," "a notion," "devoid of common sense," does it indeed require so many thrusts, from the longest spears of our most mighty men, before it can be compelled to give up the ghost? Has it indeed "the strength of an unicorn?" *We must hear for ourselves "what this new doctrine is."* When that time comes, and *come it will*, there will be an answer to the prophet's prayer, "Open the young man's eyes that he may see!" and the Temple of Truth, "beautiful for situation," will rise in peerless majesty before their astonished vision, its every stone, hewn in the mount of God, and brought together by the hand of "the master of assemblies," "without the sound of a hammer;" while all around hedging it in on every side, "the mountains are full of horses and chariots of fire!"

God bless you evermore, for your ceaseless efforts to spread this precious truth. And may you, together with the Aarons and Hurs, that have stayed up your hands, until the people that "dwell alone," and are not "*reckoned among the nations,*" have begun to "*prevail,*" find your recompense "at the resurrection of the just."

D. OLSON SMITH, Onondago Co., writes:—

I feel that I must have the EXAMINER, even though it cost double what it does. I read three other Advent papers, but they all to my mind, leave out the foundation-stone—"Life ONLY through Christ." For two years I have been undecided, willing to receive the truth,

no matter what the consequences, and carefully investigating the question with regard to the resurrection of the wicked. Have carefully perused "Retribution," have read the *Crisis* carefully, and other papers, and am now *firmly* grounded on the doctrine of Life only through Christ. Christ's death cannot effect the wicked. A person to have life after death must have within them the same spirit that raised up Christ from the dead, otherwise "they shall never see light." My wife and I are battling alone for the truth. But thank God several are beginning to investigate for themselves.

HELEN ROBERTSON, Utica, writes :—I received the books I sent for, as also those you kindly sent in addition. A number of them are already in circulation. The news of the gospel is so good that I long to spread it as much as possible. I could spend my life in making known the mystery of the gospel. I am afraid few understand it.

I told you in my last, a *few* of us intended to commemorate our Lord's death at the appointed time. A "little flock" of us—ten in number—met in a private room and did "*this*" in remembrance of Him. We all felt it was a reality—"a thing of life." We had a blessed season, the presence of the Master himself being with us.—It was a foretaste of that supper when He shall drink it new with us in his Father's kingdom. What a privilege that we could meet so simply, feeling that we had our Lord's approbation. The mode was new to all except myself, yet every one felt at home. Two more would have come if they could.

Our number is steadily increasing, and we often express the desire to hear Bro. Storrs preach. I trust the way shall be open before long. May the time be hastened.

B. K. DAVIS, Monroë, Me., writes :—Let me give you a word of encouragement. The blessed truth of "Life only in Christ" is steadily gaining ground in this part of the State of Maine. Although its advocates have to contest the ground inch by inch, yet Error falls every time and in every trial; thank God. The little "Ironsides" of truth, in these last days, are more than a match for the old forts of error, and they are compelled to surrender unconditionally. Thanks be to our blessed Master.

ALBIN CHANDLER, Syracuse, writes :—The little church in this place are rooted and grounded in the "one faith of life only in Christ."—We rejoice that God has found faithful, bold, and yet humble servants, willing to cry "Here am I, Lord," when His truth requires a herald. May the grace of the LIFE-GIVER sustain and cheer you.

MRS. SALLY DILLINGHAM, Mass., writes :—I like the EXAMINER much. I do believe God will raise from the dead all that die in Jesus, and no others: that is my firm belief. Go on; let your light shine and you will have your reward.

J. LEWIS, Ill., writes :—The truth of no future life for the wicked is gaining ground here. One man, a confirmed infidel, took to reading his Bible; and when some said to him, "What! you reading

the Bible? that's something new!" his reply was, "I have got something new to read about: I had rather run the risk of going to the theological hell than to be blotted out of being."

THE EDITOR of this Magazine, since the last number, has preached one Sabbath in Oceanport, N. J., one in Newark, N. J., and two in Boston, Mass.; between the last two, he visited Salem and preached to the people among whom Rufus Wendell exercises his ministry. In all these places he had a most cordial reception, and has much reason to thank God, and the friends for the pleasant and he trusts profitable interviews.—Deep attention was given in all the places to the words of life spoken. The truth of "*Life only in Christ*" seems to be rapidly gaining on the minds of the careful inquirers as to what the Bible teaches; and we do not see how it can be otherwise. If some will rave at us—a remarkable instance of which will be found in the *Crisis* of April 14—it will not stop investigation, and their own eyes may be opened when they come to see the "carnal weapons" they seem disposed to employ.

The first and second Sabbaths in May the *Editor* expects to be in Boston again. He praises the Lord that a strong and active class of young men are taking hold of the work in that city. From that vicinity the word of life will yet show its life-giving power in all the region round about.

WRITERS who expect to find place in our columns will save themselves trouble and expense by examining the "*Standing Rules*" of this Magazine. They must state their own views without a *direct* attack on any other writer who occupies our pages. This can be done easily. If any writer in this magazine criticises articles which the author chose to have appear elsewhere, and not in the EXAMINER, that does not entitle him to a place in our pages in direct reply. We have in one instance granted it as a privilege—the case of La Roy Sunderland, last year—but it cannot be claimed as a right. So far as there is misrepresentation in the criticism, if any, on being informed of it we will endeavor to give it correction: but to do so we cannot insert *eight* pages of foolscap MSS. for writers who have no other claim on our pages than the fact that their articles in another periodical have been noticed in ours.

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. 15. No. 6.]

JUNE, 1863.

[Whole No. 225.

"TO LIVE OR NOT TO LIVE."

A CRITICISM BY THE EDITOR.

Under the above head *Eld.* D. T. TAYLOR, formerly one of the most respected and able men among the class of people called *Adventists*, has entered the field against those who hold there will be no reliving of the wicked dead. If *Eld.* T.'s name had not appeared as the author of the four articles in the "*World's Crisis*," no one acquainted with him would have believed *such* an emanation ever could flow from his mind: it certainly looks *just like* the ebullition of the mind of "somebody else." He opens by saying:—

"My pen won't stay idle any longer, though, in taking it up to overhaul this matter, I stand a chance of having a stream of human wrath and sophistical criticism poured on my devoted head for nine months, as somebody else has had."

Is the Elder charitable in these remarks? It seems to us he is far removed from his usual chaste and kind manner. Who has poured "human wrath" on any one's head in this controversy, at all? The charge is simply monstrous; and, we trust, he will yet see it so. Saith *Eld.* T.—

"I don't love controversy, but I am driven to it. The error is so rampant, and yet so devoid of common sense, that my spirit is stirred within me. It writes itself."

The Elder seems not to act with his usual liberty: he is "driven" to the work. Then he has no reward to look for. Paul said, "If I do this thing willingly, I have a reward: but if against my will" *** "what is my reward then?" No man should allow himself to be "driven" into controversy: he will

surely show that it is his *own* "spirit" that has moved him, without telling his readers so. But how strange that a topic "so devoid of common sense" should have aroused Eld. T. so amazingly! Did he think "common sense" had left every body but himself, and he must come forth to revive it in others? Ah, but "the error is so rampant"—is growing so fast and rank! Truly that is cause of alarm! But no one who has any "common sense" can possibly be injured by it! Pray, keep cool, Eld. Why do you make haste to battle?

"I enter the polemical arena to combat—not a doctrine, but a notion. It does not rise to the dignity of a doctrine of the church, nor shall I be guilty of calling it one."

The Eld. is after "a notion!" Why does a king in Israel follow such a phantasma? Is he likely to overtake it? If he does, will he demolish it? If so, what great exploit has he performed? Killed "a notion!" Don Quixote's battle with a wind-mill was not so wild an undertaking, nor quite so visionary as the exploit to which our Eld. sets himself.

After the first paroxysm of indignation by the Eld. in which he seems to say, like his brother prophet, "I do well to be angry," he proceeds:—

"Among the things worth noticing in this connection is this: the notion has no history in the Christian church. It is a novelty."

Did Eld. T. notice this same fact, if it be a fact—which we deny—in regard to the non-immortality of man and the unconscious state of the dead? both of which "notions" he has embraced as truth!

The doctrine which he calls "a notion" has a "history in the Christian church." The doctrine is, that the saints *only* have a revival into life from the dead. The early Christians spoke only of the revival of such. In the *Crisis*, where Eld. T.'s articles appeared, and in one of the same numbers, is an article from C. F. Hudson, relating to the fable of the Phœnix, in which he says—

"The fable was sometimes employed by the early Christians as an argument for the resurrection. Clement of Rome regards the bird as specially designed for an emblem of that event, and says: 'Why, therefore, should we esteem it a great matter, and wonderful, that the Creator of all things should raise up *all those who have served HIM HOLLY*, since by a bird he manifests to us the magnificence of His PROMISE,'"

Two things are distinctly marked in this item of "history in the Christian Church," 1st. The revival from death was based on God's *promise* and was a matter of promise. 2nd. It embraced only those "who have served Him holily." This is a stubborn piece of "history" for Eld. T. Again, Bishop Kip's researches among the Catacombs, or burying-places of the early Christians, shows they regarded life from the dead as belonging to the saints *alone*, and that the wicked dead would never be revived. The following inscription shows this :

"If any shall violate this Sepulchre, Let him perish miserably, and remain unburied; ; Let him lie down, AND NOT RISE AGAIN; Let his portion be with Judas."

Thus is Eld. T.'s assumption of "no history," &c. disproved; his first pillar crumbles to the dust, and his following question, viz: "Who, in all antiquity, denied the resurrection to life of the wicked dead?" is squarely met, and we retort—"Who, in all antiquity" *taught* "the resurrection to life of the wicked dead?" *Where*, till Christianity was corrupted by fables, was such a doctrine promulgated? Plainly, nowhere "in God's church or out of it." "So" Eld. T.'s "brand" comes back to its author: the revival "to life of the wicked dead" is a "dogma of mere human invention," like that other papal monstrosity, or "Roman dunghill decretal, the soul is immortal;" to use the language of Luther. Says Eld. T.

"I wonder what hobby, of man's invention, will next be saddled and mounted, for some pugilistic novice to ride Jehu-like through our ecclesiastical ranks! Churches in order and union clear the track!"

How much there is in this outburst of amazement from a "pugilistic novice" who has just entered on the discussion of a "notion," we cannot say. Some of those to whom the reproach seems to be aimed, have as many "gray hairs" as himself, and fought the battle single handed and alone, and at their own pecuniary expense, against the dogma of an inherent immortality and eternal torment, before Eld. T. began to read the alphabet on the life theme, tho' he now embraces so much of the *hobby* as relates to immortality only as the gift of God and the final cessation of the being of the wicked. "Churches in order and in union" in those early days did *not* "clear the track," but the truth of God cleared its own track—so it is like to do again; and churches of whatever "order," will find that

it will take something more than sneers and ridicule to stop the car of truth.

We pass over entirely, for the present, Eld. T.'s string of *flings*, which occupy an entire column of the *Crisis*, and only ask our readers to take our work, "LIFE FROM THE DEAD," and compare it, item by item, with the Eld.'s short method of disposing of matters not convenient to meet squarely. One small error in his quotation of Scripture we call his attention to, because he has twice quoted the text in that paragraph incorrectly. He has made Paul say, Rom. 2 : 16, that God shall "judge the secrets of ALL men by Jesus Christ." The word *all* is not in the text, and the context plainly shows that it relates only to men to whom Christ has been preached ; "for as many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law," and of course are not embraced in the class whose secrets are to be judged by "Jesus Christ, *according to my gospel.*" The gospel, or good news of Christ, and life from the dead is that which, instrumentally, judges the secrets of men, wherever it is preached : "in the day" of the preaching of that gospel, men's characters and doom are decided : the secrets of their hearts are revealed by its power ; they "contradict and blaspheme"—despise and reject Christ, or accept Him as their DELIVERER. A perfect revelation is made of each heart where the gospel is preached in its simplicity and purity. Said Jesus "For judgment I am come into this world ; that they which see not might see ; and that they which see, might be made blind." John 9 : 39. Thus the secrets of men were being judged and made manifest and their doom fixed as the gospel was preached to them. The thoughts men entertain of Jesus Christ where He is made known, reveal their true character and fix their final state. "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.*" John 6 : 40. This language shows who will be revived into life by a resurrection ; and it clearly excludes all rejecters of Jesus Christ. There is no revival of dead men except by *promise*, and there is no promise except to those who believe in Jesus where He is preached.

Eld. T. in speaking of the seven men and one woman, Mark 12 : 23, 25, asks—"Is it certain these characters were not wick-

ed?" We reply, It is certain they were all righteous in the estimation of the Sadducees, because the seven men had strictly conformed to the law in severally marrying this woman: and if Eld. T. will have it that our Saviour's words, in *vr.* 25, "when they shall rise from the dead," proves that all seven of them would be raised from the dead, then we answer his question boldly, *It is certain* none of them were "wicked," for Jesus adds, "they" *** "are as the angels of God in heaven." Eld. T., why did you try to put darkness for light by introducing that case? We can excuse you: for with such barrenness of proof of the reliving of the wicked you called to your aid a text which condemns yourself.

Eld. T. asks, "How punish the men who are totally dead, and to remain so forever?"

Eld. T. believes in the "eternal punishment" of the wicked, or he does not believe the Bible: yet he holds the wicked will not live eternally. We retort on him, "How punish the men who are totally dead, and to remain so forever?" Does he answer, "as death is their punishment, and they are to remain under it forever, their punishment is eternal." *Exactly so.—Death*, and not dying, is their punishment: hence when dead, if they are *penally* excluded from a revival they are punished, and that punishment is eternal.

Eld. T. opens his *SECOND* article as follows:

"Death to the wicked an eternal sleep! A very pleasing consideration this for incorrigible sinners."

You forget that was the very cry of "orthodoxy" when you embraced the doctrine that literal destruction was the end of the wicked. They too cried "French infidelity" as loud and as persistent as you do this day; but we outlived that cry and so we doubtless shall yours. If men had rather die like brutes than have life through and by Christ, how can you help it?—The word of truth is a savor of life unto life to some, and of death unto death to others. Can we mend it so that all will embrace the life-way? If a little future torture is salutary in bringing men to life, why not accept the largest amount claimed by "orthodoxy?" If a little is so good, as you think, how much better must be the larger dose, which you reject! But our *Eld.* waxes warm as he proceeds. He says:

"The implacable and obstinate errorist is to be rebuked sharply and t horoughly, lest his poison contaminate the body."

Well now, who is judge as to this matter of error? Is Eld. T., all at once, exalted to the seat as *umpire* in the case? If so, who exalted him? By whose authority was he placed there? If God has done it, let the Eld. show his credentials. If men have done it, let us know by what authority they have acted? If he has exalted himself to the awful seat, God will in due time abase him. Who is an "implacable and obstinate errorist" if not the man who lifts up himself as umpire, uncalled and uncommissioned of God? Is he a Christian? So am I. Is he a minister of Jesus Christ? So am I. Is he in possession of the right to give his thoughts and convictions of the true sense and meaning of the words of God? *So am I.* Have I no right to denounce those who differ from *me* as "implacable and obstinate errorists?" No more has he. *Man*, who made *you* judge or ruler over other's faith? Controvert other's views you may; but to denounce them as "implacable and obstinate errorists," while they believe in Jesus and accept Him as their life, you nor any other man or body of men cannot do and be guiltless before God, in my judgment. Why, "you know not what manner of spirit ye are of;" to "our own master we stand or fall:" but you say—

"If the views I oppose are pernicious in their tendency, radically unsound, and ruinous in their influence on evil men, I shall not forget that the loving Christ once said: 'Ye serpents—wo unto you!'"

"*If*:" that is well put in. Who is to decide whether the views you oppose are "unsound," &c.? You may decide for yourself; but that does not prove the decision is not wrong, for you are not infallible. You have no authority to call us "serpents," and cry, "wo unto you!" because Jesus, who was truth itself and knew all men, and "knew what was in man," once thus addressed the hypocrites around Him. Do not deceive thyself by supposing you are heaven-authorized to do likewise, lest the measure you have meted to others may be meted to you again.

"I love everybody, but love won't buy my silence when the Word of God is assailed. I court no mortal's smiles—fear no mortal's frowns," saith the Elder.

We are glad you are brave, but Jehu once said, "Come see my zeal for the Lord," when it was quite evident some other motive influenced his conduct. It is easy to misunderstand the

influences that some times control our actions. You assume, we who hold some men, who are dead, will never live again, " assail the Word of God." Do you *know* such to be the fact? Do you cleave to the Word of God? So do we. Do you make that word the standard of appeal? So do we. Do you claim the right to construe it according to your understanding? So do we. Do you claim the right to preach and print your views of the Word of God? So do we. Do you claim to adhere to that word as authority in all matters of faith and practice?—Are we a whit behind you in this respect? But say you—

" All the old, long-established doctrines of a future judgment and Gehenna-fire for living, guilty sinners, are thrust aside, to give place to a notion of yesterday's birth, now persistently pressed upon our churches."

This sentence contains several inaccuracies. 1. It does not set aside a future judgment for "*living* sinners." 2. The Bible " doctrine of Gehenna-fire" is, that *dead* sinners, and not "*living*" ones, only, are the subjects of this fire. " Fear Him, which after He hath *killed*, hath power to cast into hell"—*gehenna*.—Luke 12 : 5. So, you mistake in this matter. Again Eld. T. says—

" Paul saith : Men die once—after that the judgment. Judgment for whom? I answer, For all who die,—for the very men who die. Death and judgment are 'appointed' for each and all. And from that judgment the risen wicked dead, made alive, go away to die 'the second death.' "

Here is a strange mixture of truth and error. Let us hear what Paul did say—" 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 shall he appear the second time without sin unto salvation ;" or, as the Syriac has it—" *for their life*." Who *live* at the second appearing of Christ? "*Them that look for him*." Then the others are excluded from life, and are not made alive, as Eld. T. affirms. Look at the text again. " It is *appointed* unto men *once* to die." " After *this*" appointment " the judgment." God appointed death once, and only *one* death : after this appointment He institutes the judgment, or *trial* of each individual in his probationary state, which was to decide who should live again : and He caused the proclamation to be made of life through Christ to them who would accept it as a gift in Him.

To give this life, He is coming again, and will give it to those, and to such only as "look for Him." At that hour all others are condemned to *abide* in death and "not see life." Such we regard as the true sense of "the Word of God." Paul has no *two* deaths in his statement of the matter, and he will not suffer himself to be corrected by even so worthy a personage as Eld. T. Our worthy opponent next resorts to the book of Revelation, and says—

"The dead 'stand' before God. How stand without life? Do corpses stand? By what supernatural process are the dead galvanized into an erect posture, while dead as a door-nail? O, they are so 'represented,' that's all. As well might one contend that, when the dead hear, and the blind see, their hearing and sight are not restored, as to affirm that, when the dead stand they are not restored to conscious life."

The Eld.'s logic here is not new, but it limps just as it always did. There is no analogy in his illustration. If John had said, I saw the dead *alive*, then the analogy would avail something, possibly. He said, I saw the dead *stand*: not, I saw them alive. But how could they stand, "while dead as a door-nail?" Eld. T. perhaps can answer his question by making the experiment of making "a door-nail" stand. We have made many such nails stand in "an erect posture" even without the help of *galvanism*. But seriously. Will Eld. T. turn to Isa. 14, and tell us how, when the king of Babylon went down to hell—*sheol*—hell stirred up "the dead" to "meet" him "at his coming," and set them to talking, saying, "Art thou also become weak as we?" &c., if at the same time they were not alive? for, saith the Eld. "(bear in mind, 'the dead know not anything') and so they could not talk as they did unless they were alive! Will he now say, "O, they are so 'represented,' that's all"? Does not the Eld. see his logic or his theology is in fault? Surely any one else can if he cannot. The constant resort to the allegorical book of Revelation by the advocates of future torment for the wicked shows the weakness of their position in a most marked manner. They spell their lessons backward, and make the allegory teach the doctrines which cannot be sustained by one "Thus saith the LORD." Eld. T. says—

"Christ says, without respect to character, 'The dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live.'"

Did Eld. T. intend to blind the minds of his readers by this

statement? Did he not know that the word *hear*, in this text, is used in two different senses? To hear frequently has the sense of "to listen to; to attend to; to *obey*," in Scripture as well as in other writings. Thus the prophet says, "*Hear* and your soul shall live." The word "dead," also, has a figurative use in Scripture; as "She that liveth in pleasure is *dead* while she liveth." Now look at the language of Jesus, so mangled by Eld. T., "The hour is coming, and *now is*, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God :"—this gospel of life shall be preached to sinners "*dead* in trespasses and sins," for the "obedience of faith among all nations"—"and they that hear"—*obey* it—"shall live." Is this saying "without respect to character" that all who "*hear shall live*"? The use of this text, for the purpose it has been used, is a most palpable error; but we will not call them "ye serpents," and cry "Wo unto you": we would rather say, "Father forgive them, they know not what they do." Eld. T. next says—

"The palpable erroneousness of this theory is seen in its whittling down, in effect, the judgment to come,—the day of wrath; gloom and distress, the fiery indignation, the tribulation to come, on the men who troubled the churches eighteen centuries ago, and who most obviously are the very ones to be punished with everlasting destruction at the epoch of Christ's flaming advent," &c.

Our Eld. has here made a statement not so easy to reconcile with after statements in the same article. He says—

"The unholy dead lived not again till the thousand years were finished :""* * * "The good will *revive* at his coming; the wicked will *revive* a thousand years after."

"Two and two make four" is an obvious truth; but that the "men who troubled the churches eighteen centuries ago, are the *very ones* to be punished with everlasting destruction *at the epoch* of Christ's flaming advent," and yet not be alive, or "*revive*" till "*a THOUSAND years after*" that advent, may be very clear to Eld. T., but is not so clear to us who try to learn at the fountain of truth and life. But says the Elder—

"If it be supposed that this wrath refers, not to sinners who shall have died, but, rather, to those who are found alive at the coming of the last day, then where would be the *equality* in the divine administration, and infliction of wrath, punishment, justice and judgment on the two classes, provided this were so?"

Our Saviour has provided the answer to this inquiry, Math. 23 : 35, 36, speaking of the wickedness of that people in per-

secuting and killing the Lord's prophets, &c., He says, "That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth from the blood of righteous Abel, unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar: verily, I say unto you, ALL *these things* shall come on THIS generation."

Can the Eld. see where "the *equality* in the divine administration and infliction of wrath" was in this case? one generation, then living, having to bear "all these things," while the previous wicked, who were dead, were left undisturbed. The grand principle is this—When wickedness reaches a climax, under any dispensation, then comes the *executive* judgment, which closes the age, and the *execution* falls on the then living wicked, who have by their exceeding wickedness taken on themselves all the sins of those who had gone before them, and the righteous judgment of God meets out to them accordingly: "all these things shall come on *this* generation:" but none of the wicked dead were made alive to share in those tribulations: "they" were "dead, they shall *not live*; they are deceased, they shall not rise." Isa. 26: 14. Eld. T. goes on—

"I look upon this view as being the most serious defection from the true faith that has ever obtained among us since we first had an ecclesiastical existence;—a view most obnoxious to the evangelical portion of the church, and one that saps the very foundations of the doctrine of a 'judgment to come' and retribution for sin;—a view which, once received by the ungodly, who place no value on eternal life, would lead them recklessly to say, 'Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die.' Behold the tree and its legitimate fruit."

So the Eld. is "orthodox," "evangelical," and of "the true faith;" at least in his own estimation. He talks precisely as the self-styled "orthodox" and "evangelicals" talked when we first advocated immortality only as the gift of God to the righteous, and from which the wicked were excluded; but the Eld. advanced into that doctrine by the help of the eye-salve of truth; and another touch of the same ointment may help him to "see clearly" that life from the dead is as really a gift of God's grace, bestowed *only* on the righteous, as that immortality is. It will be no more marvellous if he is converted to the latter truth, than that he was converted to the former one.—They are *twin* doctrines, and nothing but death to both can separate them, or make them void. They stand or fall together.

If "the ungodly" are led by these truths to say, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die," who can help their mad choice? Neither the future misery, or eternal misery doctrine, holds these "reckless" sinners back from giving loose to their love of this present life and its sensual indulgences: and we fear these "torment" doctrines are contributing more to the mad career of reckless sinners than all other errors that ever disgraced the church. They serve to beget a reckless spirit by their presentation of the character of God in such light as to becloud the grand and glorious truth, "GOD IS LOVE," and lead thinking men to conclude, it is vain to try to please such a being as the torment doctrine represents Him to be, and so rush madly and "recklessly" into every indulgence of sense while they may. "Behold the tree and its legitimate fruit"! Again the Eld. says—

"It is claimed to be exceedingly strange that the second death, if it ever prove a fact instead of a fable, is never spoken of anywhere but in the book of Revelation." * * * "Isn't God to be believed when he says a thing *once*? Shall we doubt him, and try to explain his words away (especially when those *words* are the *explanations* of symbols), because he don't repeat and reiterate those words? If God is God, is not one statement as good as twenty? Who says it isn't?"

Has the Eld. been candid in this extract? The question is not, is God's speaking "once" sufficient? but, has God spoken *at all* what you say? Or, again: as the phrase "second death" occurs no where in the Bible except in the allegorical book of Revelation, are we not shut up to that book, so far as the Bible is to decide what is the true meaning of the phrase? Eld. T. is not to *assume* he has the sole right to determine its import, and then charge us with calling in question the veracity of God, because we reject Eld. T.'s application of the phrase! Nor is he to assume, without proof and against facts, that the phrase "second death" is an "*explanation* of symbols." The only explanation of the phrase is given in verse 14 of the 20th chapter. "Death and hell were cast into the lake of fire: *this* is the second death." Now, whatever else is embraced in the phrase, it does not embrace the idea of dying twice: for "death and hell" did not die twice, nor die at all except symbolically.—Revelation then being its own interpreter, the second death implies only such destruction as precludes a recovery: thus

death and hell were destroyed, and thus every impenitent unbeliever is destroyed who dies in his sins and lives no more.— For outside proof on this point we quote some extracts from Prof. Hudson's "Debt and Grace," in relation to how the Jews understood it.

"We learn from this place (Num. 14 : 37) that they *died* the second death."—"They shall die the second death and *shall not live* in the world *to come*."—"They shall die the second death, so as *not to enter* into the world *to come*."—"Every idolater, who says there is another God besides me, I will slay with the second death, from which no man can come to life again." Hudson also gives the "statement of Julius Africanus (A. D. 221) that 'Adam being one hundred and thirty years old begat Seth ; and living thereafter eight hundred years he died, to wit, the SECOND DEATH.'"

It was a death from which there was no release ; and those who died this death "*shall not enter the world to come*," or age to come ; hence will not be revived from the dead "*at the last day*."

"Isn't God to be believed, when he says a thing only *once*?" asks the Elder. We answer, He undoubtedly is. Is the Elder willing to abide this test ? Has not God spoken more than once, of some wicked ones, "They are dead, *they shall not live* : they are deceased, *they shall not rise*" ? See Isa. 26 : 14 and Ps. 49. "If God is God, is not *one* statement as good as twenty?" asks Eld. T., and he adds, "Who says it isn't?" The reply of Nathan to David is singularly appropriate here—"Thou *art the man*" !— But he goes on—

"Just exactly as it is said in the N. T., that 'the Law' is done away in Christ, without distinguishing either ceremonial or moral, but including and meaning both, so it is also declared that the dead, speaking in general terms, shall live again ; no distinction being made of character, the good and bad being both included. 'God is—the God—of the living ; for ALL (will) live unto him.' *Boothroyd*, 'All live to him.' *Thompson*, 'To him, they are ALL alive.' Lk. 20 : 27-38."

Wonder if Eld. T. is not now a convert to the *conscious* state of the dead ? It seems so ; he talks so exactly as they do.— What does Jesus say of those "all" who "(will) live unto him?" He says, "they are the *children* of God, being the children of the resurrection," and "neither can *they die* any more." Did Eld. T. really mean to sweep into the broad stream of universal

salvation, for fear he could not otherwise secure the resurrection of the wicked? So it is, one error begets another, just as one truth evolves another.

Our Saviour makes a clear distinction between the righteous and the wicked in this text. "God is not the God of the dead," who are to live no more, but "those who are accounted *worthy* to obtain that world and the resurrection of the dead" *** "are the children of God"**** "ALL" such "live to him;" or, in His purpose and *promise*; as when He said to Moses, "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob:" that declaration affirmed a relation between God and these men which was a pledge of their resurrection—they "ALL live to Him." What has this to do with wicked men, who have no such relation to God, and to whom God has made no such pledge? Will Eld. T. take *the "children's bread and cast it to dogs"*? Alas, that through the force of prejudice or misapprehension he should seem to make an effort to do so. May infinite wisdom and love yet remove the scales from his eyes.

On the text, "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive," Eld. T. says it "is better" to "render it *by Christ,*" and adds—

"Only the good are ever in Christ, or can awake in him. The evil are to 'hear his voice' and live, but not in Christ, nor to immortality or eternal life. But be it remembered that the *all* who are to come to life by Christ, is the exact *all* who died by Adam, i. e., the whole race." *** "Let God be true."

And "be it remembered" also, that "THE DEAD *are raised INCORRUPTIBLE,*" and Eld. T. says, the wicked dead are not to "live to immortality;" yet Paul declares "*the dead are raised incorruptible!*" Has Eld. T.'s "brains" now "got puzzled in estimating the difference between six and half a dozen?" Will he tell us the exact difference between "immortality" and "incorruptibility"? If there is none, shall not we "Let God be true," even if Eld. T. is found to be mistaken? Though the word "all in Christ" is not agreeable to him, nor reconcilable with his theory, it is, nevertheless, the truth, that the raised dead are "incorruptible"—that they are "raised *in glory*"—"raised *in power*"—"raised a spiritual body:" and he will please "remember," it is "*the dead*" that are thus raised; so that if "the exact *all* who died in Adam" are embraced in the

dead raised "by Christ," the same *all* are glorified, and do not and "cannot die any more."

Eld. T. quotes Rev. 20 : 5, thus, "The unholy 'dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished'"; he remarks on the text—

"It is worthy of note the same form of the Greek verb *anazao*, used here to set forth the reliving of the unholy and unblessed dead, is rendered 'revived' in the following passage" *** "Christ both died and rose, and *revived*." *** "Is it any wonder, the advocates of the 'non-re-living of the wicked' want to get rid of this passage of Revelation? It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks."

Doubtless the Elder knows his last remark is true from experience. Even this doubtful text will not work in his harness till he has attached his *gloss* to it. He quotes it, not as it stands—"The rest of the dead," &c., but "The *unholy* dead," &c. Was the text too *sharp* to meet squarely? Who are "the rest of the dead"? and what is the death they are in? These are points not to be assumed. We do not allow the Elder, or any other man, to do this for us. Suppose it be a literal resurrection, is it certain it is "the *unholy* dead"? Certainly, it is not. The living of those in the previous verse, embraced only such as "were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshiped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands." Does this include all that are righteous, of every age and class? Clearly, it does not; it is only the martyrs for Christ and the word of God. Is there no revival from the dead for other saints and virtuous heathen? Yes, but "they lived not again until" a later period. Is not our gloss as good, at least, as Eld. T.'s? We think it is; and that we construe it as fairly as he does, without being anxious "to get rid of it."—That the text is a doubtful one, Elder T. might have known, if he had used his eyes in reading the *Syriac* version of the N. T., from which he has made an occasional quotation. The text, the Eld. thinks so troublesome to us, is not found in the *Syriac* at all; and Prof. Murdock says, The *Syriac* version is "the oldest version of the N. T. in any language." This version, however, was copied, originally, from some early Greek version, though not now to be found; but its not being in the *Syriac* is evidence it was not in the early Greek; and this text is not found in the

best Vatican or Moscow editions ; *i. e.*, in neither the Latin or Greek church ; and Matthaei, who, Bishop Middleton said, has given us the best version of the Greek N. T. of any man, put the text in his first edition in brackets as doubtful, and in his second edition he struck it out as *spurious*. If such a text can help Eld. T., and those of his theory, he is welcome to it, and all the credit arising from its use, especially when there is not another text of like character in the Bible.

Elder T. opens his THIRD article with a sort of apology for speaking so severely against us ; and to justify himself he says—

" Paul said, of less objectionable teachers, ' Rebuke them sharply [*i. e.*, with severity], that they may be sound in the faith.' "

Let us see who these " less objectionable teachers " were of whom Paul spake. He thus describes them, Titus 1 : 10-13, " For there are many unruly and vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision : whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake. One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, said, The Cretians are always liars, evil beasts, slow bellies. This witness is true. Wherefore rebuke them sharply," &c.

Such were the " less objectionable teachers " Eld. T. speaks of ! We know, now, how he estimates those who differ from him on the resurrection question—they are worse than those who " *are always liars,*" &c. No wonder he thinks he does " well to be angry " with such reprobates ; but yet one may query, who gave him authority to " *judge*" us, " and set at naught " another's servants ? Who gave him this authority ? Says the Elder—

" I think Paul told the ministry to do this. "

Ah ! and who are " the ministry " ? Are you a minister ? So am I, and a number of years your senior both in age and in the ministry. Have you regarded the apostolical injunction, " *Rebuke not an elder,* but entreat him as a father " ? Have you acted in obedience to Paul, in this matter ? I leave the answer to yourself before God.

Says Eld. T., " Some men possess the wonderful power to make error look just like truth. "

Those must be " wonderful " men ! Certainly, Eld. T. is not one of them. His errors are so palpable, in this controversy, that he is clear from that class of men.

But "we are bored almost to death," says Elder T.

We can tell you a cure for that, Elder. "Let the peace of God, that passeth all understanding, keep your heart and mind through Christ Jesus," and do not think all the church are "big-headed religious babies" except yourselves; nor that Christ has committed the government of His church exclusively to you. "Let your moderation be known to all men: the Lord is at hand." "In your patience possess ye your souls."

The Eld. says—"If Rev. 20: 13 teaches any thing, then, without a shadow of doubt, it teaches that, in God's own time, all the dead, in the sea, in Death, and in Hades, will again come to life."

Supposing we should say, "If" Isa. 26: 14, "teaches any thing, then, without a shadow of a doubt, it teaches that," certain wicked persons there spoken of, "are dead, they shall not live; they are deceased, *they shall not rise*"; would a thoughtful man conclude we had fully proved the fact of the non-living again of some of the wicked dead? Now Isa. 26: 14 teaches something, and the presumption is, in the absence of positive testimony to the contrary, that it does teach some wicked dead men will not live again: especially as the language is not figurative, symbolical, nor doubtful as to its meaning.

That Rev. 20: 13 teaches something is an undoubted truth: but is Eld. T. authorized to tell us, if it does not mean what he thinks, it does not mean anything? When, and by whom was he constituted an *infallible* expounder of symbols and allegories? Why does he reject the "orthodox" interpretation of eternal torment, so clearly expressed Rev. 20: 10, and not admit the most literal sense of that text, and yet insist upon the most literal construction of verse 13? His principles in his exposition of this verse, should, it seems to us, lead him to embrace the doctrine of the eternal torment of the Devil, and along with him, other wicked beings.

That Rev. 20: 13 does not teach the reliving of the wicked dead, is certainly as clear as that the 10th verse does not teach the eternal torment of any one; and more clear, from the fact the 13th verse does not affirm the reliving of the wicked, but employs language of a symbolical and figurative character, such as is used in Isa. 14, where hell—*sheol*—is represented as "stirring up the dead" in it, and causing to be "raised up from their

thrones all the kings of the nations," and "they shall all speak" to the fallen king of Babylon, who had come down among them, and say, "Art thou also become weak as we?" &c. Now, Eld. T. does not believe those dead kings knew anything, and yet they are "raised up" and "talk." If here is no proof—in this language—of life, neither is there any in the language of Rev. 20 : 13, which is not even as strong as Isa. 14. For further remarks on Rev. 20 : 13 see our work, "LIFE FROM THE DEAD." We trust our friends will see the importance of giving that work a wide circulation at this time. Elder T. has several flings at it, but has not presumed to "*feel its* PILLARS:" its foundation principles are untouched by him and all other writers on his side the question. Eld. T. asks—

"Did any body ever hear of the resurrection of a dead man, whether good or bad, that did not come to life? If so, where is the privileged individual?"

Did any body ever hear of the resurrection of a *bad* man, that was dead? "If so, where is the privileged individual?"

"Was the son of the Shunamite woman, the widows' sons at Sarepta and Nain, truly good? Prove it."

You affirm that *bad* men are raised from the dead. We deny it, and you call upon us to prove that certain persons raised were good! No: it is for *you* to prove any of them were *bad*. Can you do it? You know you cannot; and you hide your lack of argument by calling on us to prove a negative! Eld. T. refers to Heb. 11 : 35, where it is said, "Women received their dead raised to life again," and refers to Elisha's raising to life the widow's son, and he says—

"It is thus shown that it was, *possibly*, a graceless young man who experienced the *anastasis*, or resurrection. And *if* God has raised two wicked men to life, he can others, without being under the necessity of making that life eternal."

"*If*" and "*possibly*": we italicised those two words in the extract, that the reader might see to what straits the Eld. is driven. He has nothing more on which to build than a "*possibly*" and an "*if*," and these crippled limbs will hardly stand the shock of "they are dead, they shall not live: they are deceased, they shall not rise." "*If* God has raised two wicked men," &c. "*Prove it*," Eld. T. *If*s do not stand in this battle. The

“women who received their dead to life again” did it “*by faith*.” and it is not for you to *assume* such mothers had wicked sons ! Again we say, “Prove it.” As to God’s *power* to raise the wicked dead, we have no more doubt than you. It is not a question of power, but of fact, of revelation, of promise, or of threat. That question staggers you at every step, and you have to use *if* and *possibly*, and assume, because you have not a single plain testimony of the wicked dead’s *living* again, such as we have a right to demand, if it is a part of the penalty of transgression.— “The wages of sin is *death* :” that is plain and unequivocal. Show us in equally plain terms that the wages of sin is to relive from the dead, with torment after, and another death. Thus far you have utterly failed in my judgment. But says Eld. T.—

“The sinner reaps, for his sowing, a corruptible body,—he rises up as he lies down.” Gal. 6 : 8.”

About as accurate as usual. The text you refer to grinds to powder your whole theory. “He that soweth to his flesh, shall of the flesh reap *corruption*,” saith Paul. Not “a corruptible body”: that is *not* corruption. A corruptible body may have life in it: but *corruption* has no life; it excludes, utterly, all life; and this text settles the fact that “corruption,” and not life in any form, is what those reap who live after the flesh: they go to corruption, and that is their eternal portion. Says the Eld.,

“The proof that wicked men are to revive again in the judgment, lies in the scriptural assertions that they are to have a resurrection to life.”

And yet Eld. T. with all his labor has not given us one “Scriptural assertion that” the wicked dead “have a resurrection to life” ! He has assumed it, and he has *inferred* it, but not one “Thus saith the LORD” has he given in all his labor, while he has set aside more than one testimony that some of the wicked dead “*shall not rise*” : and his strongest text from which he has drawn his inference, John 5 : 29, binds him down to the fact that they, and they *only*, “who have done *good*” come “unto the resurrection of *life*” ; while they that “have done evil” come not to this resurrection, but “unto the resurrection of *condemnation*” ; to *what* ? Let John the Baptist tell you, “He that believeth not the Son of God *shall not see life*, but the wrath of God *abideth* on him.” Ch. 3 : 36. Thus we see, only those who have done good come to the “resurrection of life,” while the evil

doers are condemned, at the resurrection hour, *not to see life*, but to have the wrath of God *abide* on them.

"Two 'Thus saith the Lord's' are as good as a hundred; the Almighty's *ipse dixit* being good without a voucher or endorser," saith Eld. T.

That is true: but where has God ever said the wicked dead shall "have a resurrection *to life*," as Eld. T. affirms; and when He has said, they "shall not see life," and Christ has said, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have *no life* in you," and said this in direct reference to the resurrection "*at the last day*," whose "*ipse dixit*" shall we receive, God's and His Christ's, or Eld. T.'s? Can any hesitate as to where the truth is?

Eld. T. says, "If the word resurrection does not, in and of itself, assert the reliving of the wicked dead, then it fails to teach the re-living of the holy dead. So the Grand Resurrection is but a *splendid farce!*"

This is the language of despair. If the Eld. cannot prove the reliving of the wicked dead his hope of a future life seems to fail. We will say for his encouragement, we are not dependent on the term resurrection for our hope, useful as that term may be.—That the holy dead shall live again is promised and affirmed in almost all forms of expression—"Because I live ye shall live also."—"I will raise him up at the last day."—"He that loseth his life for my sake shall find it."—"The gates of *hades* shall not prevail against my church."—"Knowing that he which raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also by Jesus."—"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."—"I give unto them eternal life, and they shall never perish." We have given samples enough to show how thoughtless was Eld. T.'s despairing remark, and to comfort his heart that the "Grand Resurrection" will not be "*a splendid farce*," even though he may not have the gratification of seeing all the millions of the wicked dead restored to life, in all their loathsomeness, and hear their curses and blasphemies; thus making God the great "*Revivalist*" of wickedness: such a *revival*, as one would think would make the cheek of heaven itself *turn pale*. But we forbear to pursue the awful thought of such a scene as Eld. T.'s

theory supposes. We regard it as part and parcel of the endless torment theory; born of the same mother, and doomed to the same overthrow; and may God speed the hour when His glorious name shall no more be blasphemed by such representations of the Divine government, and of the heart of the God of Love.

Eld. T.'s FOURTH article opens with a laudatory salutation of the "dear *Crisis*," which we pass. The texts which he introduces to show "that when our Lord comes it will be a *pay-day* for all"—such as, "The Son of man shall come in his glory—and *then* shall he *reward every man* according to his works," we have so fully answered in our work "LIFE FROM THE DEAD," we shall pass with but few words now. Eld. T. says—

"The non-resurrection theory contradicts these passages, and says the wicked dead are reaping their reward,—gone to sleep, never to awake; that's all. Then their going to sleep must be the day of wrath and revelation of God's judgment."

It is Eld. T.'s theory that "contradicts" the first text he quotes; and he contradicts himself also. The text says, "The Son of man shall come in his glory, and THEN"—not a "thousand years after," as he affirms—"shall he *reward EVERY MAN*"—not a *part* of them "*then*," and the others "a thousand years after"! No, Eld., the two legs of your theory are not equal, and it limps badly. "THEN," when He comes, "shall he *reward every man* according to his works." Now Eld. T. will not deny that the *good* are rewarded *then*—at that hour; and by all laws of language, human and divine, the others are also. Hence it is a mere question of what the *reward is*. We affirm, at that hour the doom of the *bad* is equally fixed; and they are rewarded by leaving them under the eternal *dominion* of "death," "the wages of sin," if they are dead at His coming; or *punishing* them "with everlasting destruction" if alive and remaining at that hour. So we justify the text, and Eld. T. condemns it by dividing the *time* of reward. The "going to sleep" of the wicked dead, is not "the day of wrath and revelation of God's judgment"—that day is at Christ's coming, when the judicial judgment is carried out into full *execution* by destroying the living wicked, and causing the wrath of God to *abide* on the wicked dead, so that *they* "shall not see life," but "REMAIN IN THE CONGREGATION OF THE DEAD." Thus "every man" is rewarded "according to his works."

Eld. T. says, "The non-resurrection theory says, in effect, that *hades* is the place of punishment for evil men." *** "I read of another place, viz: *gehenna*." *** "Now *gehenna* is not *hades*. The latter is never set forth as the final place of punishment for sin."

Though *hades* is not necessarily the same as *gehenna*, yet *hades*, or *sheol* its corresponding, word in the Hebrew, is sometimes "set forth as the final place of punishment." Thus Job 24 : 19, "Drought and heat consume the snow waters : so doth the grave"—*sheol*—"those which have sinned." Hence here *sheol* is represented as "the final place of punishment." Again, Psa. 9 : 17, "The wicked shall be turned in *sheol*." Here is an example contradicting Elder T.'s assertion. His school, to prove the wicked dead will live again, contend the word "*turned*," in this text, should be translated "*re-turned*." We do not admit it ; but if we did, it would only show how inaccurate the Elder is, in his statement ; for it would then read, "the wicked shall be returned into *sheol*"—Greek, *hades*—as "the final place of punishment : " so *hades*, when spoken of as the state of the wicked, is not, in reality, materially different from *gehenna*.

Saith the Eld., "God can and will destroy both soul and body in *gehenna*-fire, which is no doubt John's lake of fire."

But that "lake of fire" John saw, did not burn up the *devil*, Elder ; see Rev. 20 : 10. Do not be in too much haste in your "*no doubts*." The lake of fire in Rev. is never called "*gehenna*-fire"—it is only your *inference* ! "That's all."

Eld. T. waxes warm, and he says, his texts are so plain "my opponents are 'reduced to the extremities of solution' to dispose of them.—Accordingly, the plow-share of ruin is got out, and Mr. False-Criticism hitches on his hobby-horse, and drives it through the Book. The passages only mean—a few millions of sinners, who live to see our Lord come ; or, it may mean—some dead corpses will be flung into *gehenna* ! That's all."

And did not Jesus say the same thing ? Is He "Mr. False-Criticism" who said, "Fear him who, AFTER he hath killed, hath power to cast into *gehenna*" ? Are here not "dead corpses" to "be flung into *gehenna*" ? Surely they are not alive when "flung" in. We are right glad to be found in so good company as our blessed Lord. It is frightful to the Elder to think dead corpses should be flung into *gehenna* ! but he is placid as a summer's morn at the idea of making *alive* all dead sinners—most of whom never heard of *gehenna*, nor of Christ, nor of life

hereafter—and constituting them a living mass of flesh and bones to roast them in gehenna-fire till the life given unasked and unsought is scorched out of them! That is charming in his view! It is a shocking piece of mercy for God to announce to him, that instead of seeing sinners made *alive* from the dead to writhe in gehenna-fire, he must “go forth and look upon the *carcasses* of the men that have transgressed against me.” See Isa. 66 : 24.

The thing the Eld. has kept in the foreground throughout his articles, is an attempt to cast ridicule on the idea that the wicked might be brought out of their graves, and yet not be made alive. Now, though *we* have never affirmed such a thing, and he has been most unjust in the prominence he has given that idea, yet there is more Scripture harmonizing with it than for the reliving of the wicked dead. See the text Isa. 66 : 23, 24 ; also Jer. 8 : 1, 2 ; and the fact that “AFTER He hath killed” they may be cast into “gehenna-fire ;” a phrase, by the way, which imports no more than a destruction from which there is no recovery, no revival into life. But the Eld. says—

“The idea” that “dead corpses” are to be “consigned to gehenna”*** “is a view unworthy of any public teacher and too *absurdly silly* to waste words about.”

The Eld. will please settle that controversy with Jesus, the great “teacher,” who tells us to fear Him, who, *after* He hath *killed*, hath power to cast into gehenna.

The Eld.’s “recipe for success” in “the next new schism and sect,” which he offers “gratuitously” to the “leaders” of it, we think he had better keep for *home* use : it is in harmony with his present attempt, and the attempts of some of his associates heretofore, to ridicule those whom they oppose. Your “recipe,” Eld. will take best among yourselves, and it is so *life-like* of “somebody else,” who works with you, that we do not wonder you made it so full and clear.

The Elder’s opinion of “Retribution” is a “*notion*,” of course, and we shall let it pass as a very harmless notion. That “Retribution proved a fire-brand” may be true ; but who it burned most, is a matter of opinion : *time will tell*. No wonder the Eld. anticipated somebody would say,

“Br. T. you have dipped your pen in gall” *** “you write snappishly, and in bad humor.” “You don’t talk like yourself.”

This shows his conscience is not quite “seared as with a hot

iron;" he supposes some "Bro." may say these things of him. No doubt many will: many have already; even not a few who had before the highest respect for him. We sincerely regret that he has given occasion for any one thus to think or speak of him.

The Eld. is informed, he may rest from his fear of having to pass the purgatorial fires "for *nine months*," as we judge *one month* is amply sufficient to dispose of his labored effort, which would not have called for a notice, at all, but for the previous reputation of its author for candor and good sense. How depraving is error!

In conclusion, we ask our readers, once more, to read and circulate the work "LIFE FROM THE DEAD: or, *The Righteous only will live again*." We wish to present no other reputation of Eld. T. and his brother "Retribution:" neither of whom have moved or shaken a *pillar* in that work: it stands just as strong as the first day these "CORRECTORS of heretics" made their assault on the glorious truth it advocates and defends, *viz.*: "LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST;" which is still our *motto*. Come to Him, perishing sinner, or you "shall not see life, but the wrath of God" will *abide* on you. O, haste to Christ for life.

NOTE BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.—It will be well for all interested in the question at issue, to observe, our opponents do not meet *our arguments*. They do not *notice*, much less *answer* them. Eld. Taylor boastingly cries out, "'Retribution' has never been answered!" But does he not know there was a book written long before "Retribution?" If there is a particle of "common sense" in his saying Retribution has not been answered, how much more have we to exclaim, as we *do*, "LIFE FROM THE DEAD" has not been answered! The author of Retribution *ostensibly* noticed it, but the great principles and arguments of that book wore not *breathed at*. And Eld. T. came out with a vaunting introduction, telling us, he would "overhaul the matter," yet he is just as careful as his predecessor in "the polemical arena," not to take up our positions. He finds fault with our *explanations* in relation to a few texts which apparently oppose our view—but *our positive arguments he leaves untouched*. He will never know what "Gibraltar" means [theologically speaking] until he has mastered "LIFE FROM THE DEAD."

EXTRAS.—We have printed a hundred copies *extra* of this number of the EXAMINER. If any one wishes a few, they can have them for \$1 *per dozen*, but must apply soon.

CHRONOLOGY AND PROPHETIC EVENTS.

BY THE EDITOR.

IN our last, we asked, "How are we to extricate ourselves from the difficulties in which we are involved by conflicting opinions and dates?" We answered as follows:

We are of opinion there is a way of escape out of all this confusion, which the *learned* and *unlearned* have thrown around us. We conceive it has arisen from three causes:

First—Making Darius, the Median, and Darius, son of Ahasuerus, to be the same person.

Second—From confounding Cyrus the Great (or *Khosrau*) with the Scripture Cyrus, (or *Coresh*).

Third—From making the 70 weeks and the 7 weeks and 62 weeks to have a common beginning, as though the 7 and 62 were only a subdivision of the 70. All three of these positions, we think, are erroneous.

We then noticed another point from which confusion arose, viz.: The "not observing that there are *two* periods in Babylon and Media, one the 70 years *captivity*; the other the 70 years *desolations of Jerusalem*." On these points we refer the readers of the Examiner to what we there said. With regard to making Darius the Median, and Darius, son of Ahasuerus, to be the same person, we judge the absurdity and impossibility of that being the case has been sufficiently made manifest.

The point to which attention is first called, now, is, that Cyrus the Great (or *Khosrau*) and the Cyrus of the Scriptures (or *Coresh*) are not the same individual, but two distinct and very different persons.

In the first place, Cyrus the Great did take Babylon at some period of its history, by turning the waters of the river Euphrates; all are agreed in this fact. In the next place, we have no account that Babylon was ever taken but once in that manner. Now, there is not the least particle of evidence in the Scriptures that any Cyrus had anything to do in taking Babylon in the time of Darius, the Median, or the reign of Belshazzar. The Scripture account, to say the least, renders it extremely improbable and absurd to suppose that any Cyrus, and especially one who should be a near relative to Darius, the Median, and his first General, as well as the man who actually took Babylon for that Darius, should not be mentioned in the government of Babylon, which immediately followed under Darius, (see Dan. 6: 1,) but that Daniel, a Jew and a foreigner, should, by this

same Darius, be made Prime Minister, instead of this imaginary Cyrus the Great. Besides, it would follow, that if Cyrus had any office in the government, it was a place inferior to Daniel ; for Darius was personally administering the government, as Daniel 6th clearly shows. If Cyrus, then, was an inferior to Daniel in the government, he was thrown into the lion's den with all the other presidents and governors who ruled over the land, or he was spared ; if either of these events happened to him, it would be strange indeed if the Scriptures should pass over in silence the transaction at the time of its occurrence. We might multiply the improbabilities of supposing that Cyrus the Great, or any other Cyrus, had anything to do in the conquest of Babylon, in the time of Belshazzar, but these are, to our mind, unanswerable ; and it is evident those profane historians, most relied upon in settling the chronology of Cyrus the Great, have made up their account more from *conjecture* than from facts.

That Cyrus the Great did take Babylon by turning the water of the river from its channel is a truth ; but *when* did he do it ? Not in the days of "Darius the Median." The city, it will not be pretended, was ever taken in this manner but once. It must not be forgotten that kings and princes had, in those days, many names, often ; and it would not be possible, always, to determine, by the mere name, what person performed certain actions. That person may be called by one name at one time and another name at another. So Cyrus the Great might have had other names besides that of Cyrus ; not unfrequently they changed their own names, or the name of their wise men or princes, to correspond with the names or character of some of their gods ; see the case of Daniel and his companions, whose names were changed, or new ones added by their king. Daniel's name was "Beltshazzar, according to the name of my god," says Nebuchadnezzar, Dan. 4 : 8. Nebuchadnezzar is a name evidently attached to that king, not as his real name, but as a name he has assumed from some of his gods.

We see, then, if a transaction, and that not occurring but once, is attributed to two or more different names, those names must belong to the same individual, and identifies him as the actor in the case. Now, if the turning of the water of the river and taking Babylon by that means, is, by some historians, who are respectable authority, attributed to Nebuchadnezzar, for example, then, if they are not mistaken in that fact, the conclusion would be, Cyrus the Great and Nebuchadnezzar must be one, and identical ; because, these things were never done but once, and yet Cyrus the Great and Nebuchadnezzar acted in this identical affair. Let us now examine this matter a little, for we have room only for a few words here.

Berosus says, Nebuchadnezzar "so far completed Babylon, that none who might besiege it afterwards should have it in their power to *divert the river* so as to facilitate an entrance into it." Thus it appears Babylon was taken in the manner attributed to Cyrus, before Nebuchadnezzar reigned, or Berosus was guilty of a great error. If he was correct in his statements, the city had been thus taken prior to Nebuchadnezzar; and if so, the fact is, that Cyrus the Great took Babylon prior to the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, and not in the days of Belshazzar. Nebuchadnezzar, then, reigned after Cyrus the Great, or their persons are identical; it is most likely to be the latter; and then Cyrus the Great, who is the same as Nebuchadnezzar, carried away captive the Jews, and was not their liberator, according to the common notion and chronology, which has made a world of confusion in the interpretation of prophecy.

Diodorus Siculus (Berosus in Cory. p. 39,) informs us that he who built the hanging gardens at Babylon, was Cyrus. L. Vives, in his notes on Augustine's City of God, says: "Bede saith that Cambyses, son of the elder Cyrus, was called by the Jews Nebuchodonosor."

Sir Wm. Jones says: "The Great Cyrus, whom I call, without fear of contradiction, Cai-Khosrau; for that I shall only doubt Khosrau of Ferdour was the Cyrus of the first Greek historians, and the hero of the oldest political and moral romance, when I doubt that Louis *Quatorze* and Louis *Fourteenth* were one and the same French King." He then goes on to give his reasons, which are conclusive. Again he says in his work, vol. 3, p. 106: "Whatever our chronologers say, it is not easy to conceive that the Jews were delivered by *this* Cyrus. The name Coresh, used by Isaiah, has no affinity with the Persian word Khosrau, and we cannot suppose any corruption of the sacred text; whereas all the Persian writers agree that a prince named Coresh, who was sent by Bahaman, son of Asfundier, to govern Babylon in the room of Baltazar, actually protected the captive Jews, and permitted them to rebuild their temple." Sir Wm. Jones adds: "Our historians, deceived perhaps by the name Cyrus, which the Greeks gave both to Khosrau and to Coresh, have fixed the return of the Jews much earlier than the truth."

The proclamation of Coresh, or Cyrus, in Ezra 1: 1-2, may be considered an objection to the idea that Coresh could be any other than a supreme and independent king. But several things may be noted on that point. First. The language of Coresh, in regard to the extent of his dominions, is his own, and not inspiration. Second. It was not an uncommon thing for an eastern prince, who was appointed by another, to be more powerful than his sovereign. Third. The phrase "all the kingdoms of the

world," in eastern language, may signify no more than "all the *land,*" or territory concerned in the Jews' return, that being the subject matter of discourse; and that "land" was the land where they were in captivity and the land of Canaan; which "the God of heaven" had placed in the hands of Coresh. Allowance is also to be made for the style of the ancients. See an example in 1 Kings 18 : 10, "As the Lord thy God liveth, there is no nation nor kingdom, whither my Lord hath not sent to seek thee: and when they said, He is not there, he took an oath of the kingdom and nation, that they found thee not."

We are not to infer from this language of Obadiah that Ahab had actually and literally sent into all nations and kingdoms; but the expression denotes that the inquiry had been of a most extensive character. Bishop Patrick says, "It would be a foolish conceit, from this expression, to attribute anything like universal dominion to Ahab, hence all commentators limit the expression either to the neighboring nations in league with him, or to the ten tribes, or to the nations where he could in reason think that Elijah had hid himself." "Nothing," says Poole, "is more frequent than to understand general expressions with such limitations."

Cyrus the Great could never use the same language that Coresh did without some limitation; for, he certainly never did, literally, possess "all the kingdoms of the world."

The conclusion we arrive at is this: Cyrus the Great and the Cyrus of the Scriptures, are two distinct persons—one living at the commencement of the captivity, the other at its termination. By not understanding this fact, chronologists and commentators have fallen into great confusion, and opened the door to bring discredit on revelation itself, by adopting some of the most absurd propositions, in regard to periods and time, that can well be imagined.

We wish to group together a few points that show, to our mind, irresistibly, that the common chronology of the times of Daniel and Ezra must be erroneous.

The Decree of Cyrus, by that chronology, is placed B.C. 536.

The second year of Darius, under whose decree the temple was finished, is placed B.C. 520.

See Haggai 1 : 1-15, and compare it with Ezra 5 and 6 : 8-12, 15. The temple, then, was finished in the sixth year of Darius, or B.C. 516.

The common chronology makes the first decree of Artaxerxes, under which Ezra went up to Jerusalem B.C. 457.

That is 59 years after the temple was finished!

Strange, truly, that the commandment to restore (thy people)

and to build Jerusalem, should be so long after the temple was finished !

The common chronology places Dan. 9th chap., B.C. 538.

The 70 years "desolations of Jerusalem" were then ending ; compare verse 2 of that chapter with Zech. 1 : 7, 12, 16. That is, according to the common chronology, *eighty-one* years before the commandment of Artaxerxes : and Daniel must have been dead at least *seventy-five* years before Ezra went up. Thus, that commandment would have been no guide to Daniel ; and Gabriel trifled with him in telling *him* to "*know and understand*" a point not yet passed, and to which he gave him no clue by which he could be guided.

RE-LIVING OF THE WICKED DEAD : A SUGGESTION.

BY S. D. BEEGLE.

I HAVE read most of what has been written against the resurrection of the wicked, and though many of the arguments are forcible, yet there is a pointedness and power in many of the scriptural arguments upon the other side, which it is not easy for me to resist. My object in this article, is not to enter into a general discussion of the matter, but to suggest a mode of harmonizing some of the conflicting considerations which bear upon it.

Two of the principal arguments against the reliving of the wicked dead, are as follows : *First*, the fact that in a number of places in Scripture, the resurrection is spoken of as if it was *peculiar* to the righteous. *Second*, it is said such a resurrection, *if it takes place*, must appear simply vindictive, and therefore the idea is unreasonable.

As to the first difficulty, we would suggest whether the fact, (supposing it for the present to be a fact,) of the resurrection of the unjust, may not be harmonized with the passages above referred to, by an application of the same principle of interpretation, which is warranted by our Lord in his use of the words *Death, Die, &c.* While we know that the righteous die, as well as the wicked, Christ evidently speaks upon some occasions *as if death was peculiar to the wicked.* Thus John 6 : 50, "that a man may eat thereof and *not die.*" John 8 : 51, "if a man keep my saying he shall *never see death.*" John 11 : 26, "Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall *never die.*" Compare also John 10 : 28 ; 3 : 15, 16 ; and numerous other passages which affirm

that "they shall live," and that "they *have* eternal life." Now the key to be used here, is given us by Christ himself, in what he says respecting the maid, in Math. 9 : 24, and parallel passages ; and respecting Lazarus in John 11 : 11, 14. "The maid is *not dead*." But why so ? If she was *merely* asleep was it any miracle to awake her ? "Our friend Lazarus *sleepeth*," says Christ. His disciples thought this would be a *benefit* to Lazarus ; but "then said Jesus unto them *plainly*, Lazarus is dead." Now the principle is this : in the case of those whose death is but temporary—to be followed by a revival into life—it is *not considered worthy to be called death* : so, also, the present *life*, of the wicked, seems to be considered by Christ as unworthy to be called life ; and hence they are said to "have *no life*," John 5 : 40 ; 6 : 53 ; as "not to see life," John 3 : 36 ; and as *dead*, Math. 8 : 22. Compare Paul in Eph. 2 : 1, and Col. 2 : 13, &c., &c. And upon the same principle, it may be, that the resurrection of the unjust, as it is soon to be followed by utter destruction, is not considered *worthy to be called a resurrection*. I hope this thought will be carefully and prayerfully weighed by those who oppose the idea of the resurrection of the wicked. For one I confess myself unsettled respecting this question.—May God guide us into *all* truth ; and above all, may we not depart from the written word, nor from a sound interpretation of it.

The second idea, above named, is no difficulty to my own mind ; but as it seems to be so to others, I wish to offer a suggestion. It is said, "It is hard to believe that they (the wicked) are raised up *by a miracle* that ends in their destruction, or that accomplishes nothing but a judgment, which in this view must appear simply vindictive," (Hudson's "Debt and Grace," p. 263). Hence, Bro. Hudson attempts to account for such resurrection by dismissing the idea of its being miraculous, and *connecting it with the redemption, by a law*, that finds illustration, (as he thinks) in the fact that damaged seeds often exhaust their vitality, and perish, in germination, and other like facts.

We might here ask Bro. Hudson, if he is not, in this instance, like the Rationalists : "preferring a law of nature to the assurances of its author." Debt and Grace, p. 2. But, not to insist upon this, and taking it for granted, for the present, that there is such a law, connecting this resurrection with the redemption ; we may ask, who established that law ?—and supposing it to have been a *necessary* law ; who *declines* to suspend, miraculously, *the operation* of that law upon the wicked dead ? Would not either of these, viz., establishing the law, if unnecessary ; and if necessary, declining to suspend its power over the *wicked* dead, appear *as* vindictive as raising them up by a miracle ?

But we think their resurrection by miracle, *need not necessarily* be looked upon as vindictive. Human rulers are not vindictive because they inflict upon criminals the penalties which wisdom has decided it necessary to threaten. Even Washington was not vindictive when he refused to accede to the earnest plea of Major Andre, that he might be permitted to die a *soldier's* death, by being shot, instead of the death of a spy, by being hanged. Undoubtedly the generous impulses of Washington's nature would have prompted him to have granted this request, but for one thing, viz., he considered the exigencies of his government demanded that the most impressive example should be made of Andre, that could be made consistently with reason and international law. So God, for the advantage of his moral government, *may have seen it NECESSARY to threaten* just this doom to the wicked; and if *it was necessary to threaten* it, then there will be no vindictiveness in inflicting it. The need of such threatenings will hardly be questioned by the thoughtful student of the human heart and of human society. The moral bearings of the doctrine of *no* retribution beyond the grave, are worthy of *very careful* consideration. To say the least of it, such a doctrine must very greatly loosen the restraints of vice. Brethren, let us ponder it well, and pray over it a great deal.

NOTE TO THE ABOVE.—The writer of the foregoing will get rid of his "doubt" on the "reliving of the wicked dead," if he will carefully consider the conclusion to which his own reasoning inevitably leads. His article distinctly recognizes the fact that *Death*, in the Bible, has a *mitigated* and an *absolute* sense. The former of these is that sense which regards Death as a state "to be followed by a *revival into life*"; the *absolute* sense, then, must regard Death as a condition which will *never* "be followed by a *revival into life*." Amen. Now, apply the principle, and you establish the doctrine of Life only in Christ.—Our friend is right in asserting that "Death" is presented in our Lord's teachings as "*peculiar to the wicked*." But *what* Death? The "principle of interpretation" brought forward by Bro. Beegle furnishes the answer, viz., a death which is *not* "to be followed by a *revival into life*." If the "principle" is a good one, this answer is the only one that is admissible. And what follows? We reply,—it follows that when Jesus said, "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and *ARE dead*" (John 6 : 49), he meant to teach that there would be for the fathers *no* "revival into life;" it follows that when He said,

"This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and *not* DIE" (vr. 50), he clearly inculcates the doctrine that the rejecters of Christ will *not* have their Death broken, or interrupted, by "a revival into life;" it follows that the declaration, "If a man keep my saying, he shall never see *death*" (John 8 : 51), must have such an interpretation as will exclude the disobedient from any "revival into life;" it follows that when our Lord declared, "Ye shall seek me, and shall DIE *in your sins*" (John 8 : 21), His threatening pointed to an *absolute* Death, from which there would be *no* "revival into life;" it follows that the Saviour in His assurance to Martha, "Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall *never* DIE" (John 11 : 26), virtually affirmed, that, as being himself "the Resurrection and the Life," He would "never" grant "a revival into life" to unbelievers. Turn now to 1 Cor. 15 : 17, and see how the statement, "ye are yet *in your sins*," is made to explain why—"if Christ be not raised"—those fallen asleep "ARE *perished*" in a sense manifestly precluding *any future life*; thus showing that *sin*, unpardoned, stands as an eternal barrier to "a revival into life." Then ponder the declaration in the fifty-sixth verse, "The *sting of death is sin*," and see how clearly the Apostle evinces the truth that "sin" gives to Death such a fatal, damning power as must forever shut out the impenitent dead from any "revival into life." The sentiment, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we DIE," is sound wisdom *if* the *righteous* dead are never to live again, and in precisely *this* aspect—no other—does the Apostle present it; the fact, however, that the *righteous are* to be raised up at the last day is—as the matter actually stands—the reason why Epicurean indulgence shall be shunned, and holy living cultivated, by the followers of the Lord Jesus Christ. The *wicked*, because they live after the flesh, "shall DIE" (see Rom. 8 : 13); for them, therefore, there remains *no* "revival into life;" they will be eternally left *unquicken*ed. Infinite love says, "*turn and live*." Let us heed the expostulation with our whole hearts. R. W.

DONATIONS TO THE EXAMINER AND ITS EDITOR.—W. S. Olmstead (for two monthly pledges), \$2. Mary Barnes, \$1. "Once-a-month," \$1. "C." \$1. Philadelphia, (no name), \$1.

BOSTON, Mass.—In that city the friends of truth and love have taken a new Hall, in “KAST BUILDINGS,” 104 Hanover-St. It is a large, pleasant, and airy place, and very quiet: far better in this and every respect than Chapman Hall, where they formerly met. The first and second Sabbaths in May the EDITOR of this Magazine spent with this church in its new location.—The fractious elements seem to have gone “out from us, because they were not of us;” and so peace and harmony are, at present, triumphant. May our gracious Lord grant it may continue so. Deep interest was manifested the two Sabbaths the Editor was there; and the prospect was most encouraging. They have invited JOSEPH T. CURRY to follow in the ministry of the word of life, for four Sabbaths, at least. May heavenly wisdom be granted him, and much good result from his labors in Boston: we think it cannot be otherwise: let all pray that it may be so.—The truth of “*Life only in Christ*” has a strong hold there, and is not likely to be shaken by any assaults of Eld. D. T. Taylor, or others of like spirit. We can afford to be calm and patient: the cause is the cause of God, and He can and will defend it from all the attacks whether from good or bad men. At no period of the history of this truth, since its revival from the rubbish of Romanism, has it stood in a more prosperous position than now. The “*fire and sword*” our opponents have used against us, have only served to brighten our armor and call attention to the subject, which only needs to be understood to commend itself to every mind willing to know the truth. It fills the hearts of saints, who receive it, with joy: “*it is so like the God of love,*” who has “no pleasure in the death of the wicked.” Let us go calmly forward, and God will prosper us.

The first sermon in the new Hall in Boston, was on the Lord's Supper, as an *anniversary* feast to “show the Lord's death till He come.” The Sabbath being the full moon at which the Caraitic Jews keep the passover, and most likely to be the true time for the feast, in our judgment, we kept it in the evening, and had a most interesting time. Some sixty partook of the feast; all seemed refreshed and strengthened, and we were reluctant to part. Thank the Lord for that precious season. We trust, all in the faith of Jesus as the LIFE-GIVER will yet see and practice the *annual* communion as the true and only season to “show the Lord's death.” We shall give an article on the subject 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. 15. No. 7.]

JULY, 1863.

[Whole No. 226.]

THE ANTICHRIST.

BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

THE word *antichrist* occurs only in the Epistles of John. The prefix *anti* may signify either opposition, or substitution.—Hence, the Antichrist of John may either be an opposer of Christ, or a usurper of his office. The Apostle's language shows that the former is meant. And yet the latter would involve the former; for a usurper of Christ's office would be the most effectual opposer conceivable.

"Ye have heard that the Anticbrist shall come," says John. He then goes on to state that there were, even then, "many antichrists;" men who opposed Christ: but he appears to have referred to *the* Antichrist which "shall come," when he said "Who is a liar, but he that denieth that Jesus is the Christ? He is the Antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son."—1 John 2 ch. Again, in his second epistle, he says, "Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." He then declares this to be characteristic of the coming one: "*This* is the deceiver and the antichrist." (In our three quotations we have employed the definite article, in accordance with the original.)

In connection with John's words comes the prediction of Christ, John 5: 43: "*I* am come in my father's name, and ye (Jews) receive me not: if *another* shall come in his own name, him ye will receive." It is certain from this prophecy that the Jews will formally accept a false Messiah. The man who assumes this character will do, substantially, what is declared by John in his epistle: coming "in his own name"—that is, offer-

ing no credentials from "the Father"—he will, of necessity, be compelled to deny that "Jesus is the Christ;" "that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh;" for it would be absurd for a mortal to claim the Messianic office, if the Messiah *has come* in the flesh, and is now to be looked for as a spiritual being, in all the glory of his immortal nature, to assume "the government" which is his "right."

The Antichrist will be an apostate Christian. The "many antichrists," saith John, "went out from us:" so will it be with "the antichrists." By "Christian" we mean an adherent of the nominal church.

The Antichrist will spring from the Roman Catholic pale.—In 2 Thess. 2 ch. Paul says, "Now we beseech you, brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ . . . that ye be not soon shaken in mind. . . as that the day of Christ is at hand. Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed." The "falling away" has been consummated in the Roman Catholic Church, the "mother of harlots and abominations of the earth." As the "man of sin" is mentioned in connection with the apostasy, it is quite certain that he will arise from that quarter. He will out-Herod Herod; attaching to himself all the infamy of his mother church, with the crowning addition of the denial of "the Father and the Son," by his wicked assumption of the Messiahship.

Paul continues: "And now ye know what withholdeth (or, holdeth) that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now withholdeth will withhold, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall that Wicked be revealed." That is, the falling away or apostasy which already worked in Paul's day was to continue until the time came for the revelation of the "man of sin."—Thus the Roman Catholic Church will usher in the "man of sin," "the son of perdition."

The Antichrist will be a Spiritualist. "Whose coming," saith Paul, "is according to the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders." 2 Thess. ii. 9. As Jesus attested his character by miracles, so his counterfeit will use the Satanic power of Spiritualism as a proof of his right to the throne of David. The Antichrist, in fact, is "the coming man" talked of by Spiritualists.

The Antichrist will be a prince of the Roman or Latin power. In the ninth chapter of Daniel is recorded the earnest prayer of the prophet with reference to the time of the restoration of his people Israel, and the return of the glory to the holy city of Jerusalem. "The man Gabriel" was sent to answer the prayer. He said, "Seventy weeks (of years, Lev. xxv. 8) are determined upon thy people, and upon thy holy city, to finish the (punishment of) transgression, and to make an end of (the punishment of the national) sins, and to make reconciliation for (national) iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness (by the second advent of the Messiah) and to seal up (complete, fulfill,) the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy (Jesus as "King over all the earth," Zech. xiv. 9). Know, therefore, and understand, that from the going forth (see Ezra vii.) of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem shall be seven weeks, and three-score and two weeks." That is, in 483 years from the decree of Artaxerxes, recorded in Ezra 7, and which was made B. C. 457-8, "Messiah the Prince" was to be manifested. This was fulfilled A. D. 25-6, when John the Baptist manifested Jesus to Israel. See John 1 : 31, 34, 41, 49.

Gabriel continues, "And after three-score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, (accomplished A. D. 28-9,) but not for himself: and *the people* of THE PRINCE THAT SHALL COME shall destroy the city and the sanctuary." The seventieth week does not follow the sixty-ninth. If it did, the prophecy should read "In the seventieth week shall Messiah be cut off." But no mention is made of the last week until *after* the destruction of Jerusalem, which occurred A. D. 70. The 27th verse reads, "And he shall confirm a ('*the*' not correct) covenant with many for one week." Here is the seventieth week, which *immediately precedes* the fulfillment of the 24th verse, at the Second Advent of Christ. Hence, we conclude that the seventieth week of Daniel comes in at the *close* of the gospel dispensation. "*He*" that "shall confirm a covenant" must be "THE PRINCE THAT SHALL COME" of the preceding verse. The "*people*" of this prince destroyed the city, i. e., the Romans. Hence "the prince that shall come" will be a *Roman prince*. In the 25th and 26th verses, the two princes are distinguished as "Messiah the Prince" and "the Prince that shall come;" the *true* Christ and the *false* one.

The Antichrist will make a seven years "covenant with many" (of the Jews)—probably to restore them to Palestine and protect them in their worship. Dan. 9:27. In return for this favor the Jews will fulfill Christ's prediction and "receive" "the prince that shall come" as their Messiah.

The Antichrist is spoken of, Daniel 11:21-45. Prideaux says: "Jerome and Porphyry exactly agree in their explication of the eleventh chapter of Daniel, till they come to the twenty-first verse. For what follows from thence to the end of the chapter was all explained by Porphyry to belong to Antiochus Epiphanes and to have been all transacted in the time of his reign. But here Jerome differs from him, and saith, that most of this, as well as some parts of the eighth and twelfth chapters of the same book, relate principally to Antichrist; that although some particulars in these prophecies had a typical completion in Antiochus Epiphanes, yet were all of them wholly and ultimately to be fulfilled only in Antichrist; and this, he saith, was the general sense of the fathers of the Christian church in his time. And he explains it by a parallel taken from the 72d Psalm, which in some parts of it was typically true of Solomon . . . but was wholly and ultimately only so of Christ. And therefore, he would have these prophecies which are in Daniel 8:9-12, 23-26; 11:21-45; 12:6-13, to be fulfilled in the same manner, that is, in part and typically in Antiochus, but wholly and ultimately only in Antichrist."—*Prideaux*, vol. II. 140. Prideaux further says: "Antiochus Epiphanes having been a great oppressor of the church of God, under the Jewish economy, and the type of antichrist which was to oppose it in after ages under the Christian, more is prophetically said of him in Daniel than of any other prince which these prophecies relate to." Vol. II. 137.

Is Louis Napoleon "the man of sin"? Time will show. At present, we are thoroughly possessed of the belief that he is the man. We have said that the Antichrist will be an apostate from the Roman Catholic church, and a Spiritualist. Napoleon answers to this mark. To be sure, the Pope calls him "the eldest son of the Church," but he has also denounced him with bitterness. At any rate, the fact that Napoleon is a Spiritualist is conclusive. He professes to be guided by the spirit of his uncle, and we know that Hume, the celebrated American medium, is a great favorite at the Tuileries.

Napoleon is also a prince of the Latin race. True to this mark, he has plainly expressed his design of uniting the Latin race on both sides of the Atlantic. In relation to his expedition to Mexico, he has lately said: "If Mexico preserves its independence, and maintains the integrity of its territory, if a stable government is constituted with the assistance of France, we shall have *restored to the Latin race* on the other side of the ocean *its strength and prestige.*"

There is great reason to believe that Napoleon will yet fulfill the prediction in Dan. 9 : 27, and make a treaty with the Jews to protect them in their re-establishment in their own land. An incident which has come to light is very significant. "The Israelite Indeed" for February, copies from the "Bristol Times" a report of a lecture delivered at the Strand Church Miss. Auxiliary Meeting, by the Rev. C. E. Oakley, rector of Wickwar. We extract the following remarks:

"A Jew said to the speaker in Algiers in 1859, 'I have lived here from a boy, and known many revolutions in the native governments. I have watched the French governments under the various conditions of a Constitutional Monarchy, a Republic, and an Empire. I have seen only one stable thing in Africa all this time, and that has been the character of my people.— There has been only one fixed ruling idea, perpetually waxing in greatness and increasing in power, *the idea pervading our race that we are soon to become a great nation again, and so return to our land.*' He (Mr. Oakley) asked him if he carried that out in acts, by assisting with his wealth to carry his countrymen back. He replied that many Jews along the seaboard were forming themselves into a community for that very purpose. They were sending their poor brethren to Jerusalem, and laying out their money there before going themselves. He would add a single fact which he told me on the authority of a dignitary of the church from whom he heard it. One of the great Jewish financiers of Europe recently had an interview with the French Emperor. After talking some time of great monetary speculations, the financier was about to depart, when the Emperor stopped him and said abruptly, 'Well, Jew, and when is your nation going back to Palestine?' 'When your Majesty is prepared to lead them there.' The Emperor asked, 'Is your race prepared to receive me as their Messiah?' To that the Jew gave no answer, but it was a conversation pregnant with much thought."

The history of Louis Napoleon has already agreed with some

parts of Dan. 11 : 21-45. The 21st verse is a most graphic description of his condition before the Revolution of 1848—"a vile person"—and of his subtle and triumphant accomplishment of his designs with reference to the imperial power. Vs. 22-24, are readily interpreted in harmony with his subsequent career. Vs. 25, 26, might be applied to the Italian war which ended so suddenly by the peace of Villa Franca ; and the 27th is a good description of the manner in which that peace was made. In the years 1855, '56, and '57, Napoleon coined more gold than both England and the United States together ; which partially fulfills the first part of v. 43, and his proclivity for negro troops—a fresh instance of which is displayed in the late transmission of black soldiers to Mexico—equally answers to the last part. The 45th verse is alluded to by Dr. Barclay, in his "City of the Great King."

"The Sultan has not only made an oblation of the churches of St. Anne, the Holy Sepulchre, and various other 'Holy Shrines' to the Emperor of the French, but has also given him decidedly the largest and finest square in the Holy City—the site of the Palace of the Knights of St. John—that he may 'plant the tabernacle of his palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain.' The right of appointing to the high office of 'Guardian of the Hill of Zion, and Custodian of the Holy Land,' is thus conferred upon Louis Napoleon, the acknowledged patron of the Latin Church."

The prediction in Dan. 8 : 23-25, has its accomplishment in one respect—Napoleon is "a king of fierce (hard, stony,) countenance." "This man-mystery," says one, "the depths of whose duplicity no Oedipus has yet sounded, is a problem even to those who surround him. I watched his pale, corpse-like, imperturbable features, not many months since, for a period of three hours. I saw eighty thousand men in arms pass before him, and I never observed a change in his countenance or an expression in his look which would enable the bystander to say whether he was pleased or otherwise. . . He did not speak to those around him, except at very long intervals, and then with an air of nonchalance, of ennui, and eternal occupation with self." All who are acquainted with the man agree in testifying to the frigid and inaccessible nature of Napoleon. Dan. 8 : 25 well answers to his character—"And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand." He is emphatical-

ly a man of craft and policy—beyond all question, the first diplomatist in the world.

The apocalypse affords collateral evidence of great weight as to Napoleon-being the man of destiny and prophecy. In Rev. 17 we have the "woman"—the Papacy—sitting on a "beast"—the Roman Empire. The "seven Kings" are the seven forms of government—Kings, Consuls, Decemvirs, Dictators, Tribunes, The Roman Emperorship, The French Emperorship. "Five" had "fallen" in John's time, and the Roman Emperorship was the "one is," which continued in various forms until 1806, when Francis II abdicated the imperial crown of Germany at the dictation of Napoleon I. The French Emperorship was virtually another form of government. Napoleon's infant son was "provisionally entitled 'King of Rome,' in notification of his future destiny to succeed his father on the throne of the Roman Empire."—*Menzel's His. Ger.* The seventh head continued "a short space"—till 1815—when it was seemingly "wounded to death." Rev. 13 : 3. But the "deadly wound was healed" when Napoleon III seized the imperial power 1852. This re-vivification of the French Emperorship was predicted, on the strength of the Apocalyptic utterances, by several writers *twenty years* before Louis Napoleon became Emperor of the French.

In conclusion we call attention to the remarkable fact that Napoleon's name answers to the number "six hundred three-score and six." Rev. 13 : 18. His first name, Louis is *Ludovicus* in Latin. Reduced to Roman notation we have L 50, U 5; D 500, O 0. V 5, I 1, C 100, U 5, S 0=666. So also with Napoleon when rendered in the dative case—as it would be on a statue in Greek. N 50, a 1, p 80, o 70, l 30, e 5, o 70, n 50, t 300, i 10=666. It is singular that the word "*Apollyon*," Rev. 9 : 11, so nearly parallels *Napoleon*. We are inclined to think that the Antichrist is referred to in Jeremiah's prophecy, ch. 4 : 7. "The lion is come up from his thicket, and the destroyer of the nations is on his way ; he is gone forth from his place to make thy land desolate." The word *Napoleon* is etymologically set forth in this text. The Greek word may be analyzed thus : *Napos, thicket ; leon, lion.* Napoleon—Lion of the thicket.

THE BAPTISM OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

A DIALOGUE.

ELD. R. V. LYON.—It is as clear as a sunbeam in mid-heaven, that a *visionary* conversion, that none can describe or know anything about, and a *fancied* faith, that the disciples of Jesus at the present time or day, are baptised with the Holy Spirit—then following a *fancied* spirit, that has sealed sentiments upon their hearts, which are in direct opposition to the *Living Oracles*, has been the means of bringing the cause of truth into disrepute ; thereby *prevented* the thinking and candid mind from embracing it!—*Mill. Har.*, May 13.

EXAMINER.—We are perfectly agreed as to the character of "a *visionary* conversion" and "a *fancied* faith"; also, of "a *fancied* spirit," &c., but the implied idea, that because some are visionary and fanciful, therefore no one has any thing *real* in these matters, we do not agree with, at all : and such a sentiment is the very thing that has filled the churches with a dead formality, so that multitudes have "a name" to live "and are dead."

LYON.—It is true that the baptism of the Holy Spirit was promised on the primitive disciples, that they might be endowed with power to confirm the covenant or unfold the Christian system to the Jews first, then to the Gentiles. And we shall find, upon an investigation of the Oracles of Divine Truth, that in every instance in which they were baptised with the Holy Spirit, it endowed them with power to speak with tongues !

EXR.—You give us Acts 2 : 1-11, and similar texts, in proof of your position ; but we beg you to remember, in none of these instances is it called being "baptised with the Holy Spirit."—The Spirit was said to be *poured* on them, it *fell* on them, was *shed* on them, they were *filled* with it, &c. We shall show you that the communication of the Spirit was to *all believers* ; and it is for you to show all of them were "endowed with power to speak with tongues?" But we will hear what you say on the fulfillment of a prophecy.

LYON.—It ought always to be remembered that when Jehovah fulfills a prophecy in the dispensation to which it belongs, it is final ; hence, we are not to look, nor expect a second fulfillment of Joel's prophecy in this age—"I will pour out of my Spirit,"—for Peter testifies that it had its fulfillment on the day of Pentecost ; and its effects were seen, as we have shown you.

EXR.—Here you distinctly admit the baptism of the Spirit

belongs to *this* dispensation. That is true. You say, "Its fulfillment on the day of Pentecost was such "we are not to look, nor expect a second fulfillment of Joel's prophecy in this age:" *i. e.*, in this dispensation. This assumption proves far too much. You dare not deny that the same baptism did occur in several instances after the day of Pentecost, even contrary to Peter's expectation, and, in one case, to his utter amazement. How then is it true that this *one* fulfillment on that day was its "final" one, so that we are not to "expect a second fulfillment in this age"?

The truth is, Peter's language—which you do not quote—condemns your construction of the prophecy and its fulfillment; for that prophecy, as Peter quotes it, expressly includes the whole dispensation, including the signs and wonders in the sun, moon, &c., which are immediately to precede "the great and notable day of the Lord"; and he declares this pouring out of the Spirit is to be on "all flesh," and that "in the last days"; not on the day of Pentecost only, nor for the ability to speak with tongues merely; for saith Peter to the multitude, "Repent and be baptized *every one* of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and *ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost: for the promise*" (of God by Joel, as well as by Jesus Christ) "is unto you and unto your *children*, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call."

This does not look like restricting the baptism of the Holy Spirit to the day of Pentecost, nor to the Apostolic ministry, but extends it to the latest period of the dispensation which was then opening.

Because some spake with tongues who received this baptism, does it follow that all did or would? We know they did not; for Paul saith, "God hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversity of tongues:" and he asks, "do all speak with tongues?" and tells them to "covet earnestly the best gifts." He also assures them "the manifestation of the Spirit is given to *every man* to profit withal," and that, while there are "diversities of gifts," it is "the same Spirit," and that this Spirit divides "to every man severally as he will." See 1 Corth. 12.

The difficulty with you is, you assume the baptism of the

Holy Spirit, or the gift of that Spirit, is confined wholly to speaking with tongues and working miracles. Is it not so?

LYON.—We have positive testimony that the disciples after they were baptized with the Holy Spirit, were enabled to speak fluently a language that they had never learned! And by the supernatural power which the baptism of the Holy Spirit conferred upon them, they could with ease preach the Gospel to nations whose language hitherto they had been perfectly ignorant of; and by the same power they could demonstrate the truthfulness of their message by performing a miracle in the presence of their hearers. * * * Now as it is an immutable *fact* that like begets like, we therefore conclude that *none* at the present day are baptized with the Holy Spirit.

EXR.—Thus your exact position is seen. Seeing your premises are untenable your conclusion must be also; for we have shown the Spirit was given for other purposes; and we shall now show further, that it was promised to all believers, and was received by all in the apostles' days.

In the ministry of John the Baptist, he testified to the multitudes, "He that cometh after me" * * * "shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit." Baptize *who*? Was it to be a few? say the apostles and a few others, that they should "speak fluently a language they had never learned"? &c. Does John make such a restriction? No, indeed. It is "*you*"—the people who shall receive 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." See Math. 3 : 11; and John 1 : 26-33.

Jesus said to his followers, before He left them, "I will pray the Father and He shall give you another *Comforter*, that he may abide with you for ever: 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, "Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be the Spirit of God *dwell* in you." Rom. 8 : 9. Saith John, "The anointing which ye have received of him *abideth* in you." 1 John 2 : 27. Saith Jesus, "If *any man* thirst, let him come unto me and drink: 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 glo-

rified)." John 7 : 37-39. Thus we see, the gift was for all believers, after Jesus should be glorified.

Acts 5 : 32, Peter saith—"We are witnesses of these things; and so also is the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them who *obey* him." Here is no restriction in the gift of the Holy Spirit: it is to them who obey him; and to obey Him, is to believe on Jesus. "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom He hath sent." John 6 : 29. Those "who obey him" receive the Holy Spirit: to them God gives it: yet you, who believe the only way to get into Christ is to be immersed in water, and call that "*obeying* the gospel," strangely conclude—"NONE at the present day are baptized with the Holy Spirit"! Where then is the seal of your obedience? Saith Paul "After ye believed, ye were *sealed* with that holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession." Eph. 1 : 13, 14. Hence the apostle charges them, "GRIEVE not the holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption." Eph. 4 : 30. How can we more effectually grieve the Holy Spirit than by denying his work and office, as promised and imparted by the great Head of the church? "The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us." Rom. 5 : 5. Here the gift of the Holy Spirit is clearly a bestowment on all believers, and for something very different than that of speaking with tongues or working miracles.

"Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is *in* you, which ye have of God." 1 Corth. 6 : 19. A universal gift to believers is clearly marked in this text.—"The *communion* of the Holy Ghost be with you *all*." 2 Corth. 13 : 14. The gift is not for a few tongue-speakers or-miracle workers, but for "ALL."

We might go on to multiply texts to any extent, but the samples given will suffice to show the gift of the Holy Spirit—the Comforter—though it enabled some to speak with tongues and work miracles, was not given for that exclusively: that was only a part of the design in its bestowment; and though that use of it has ceased, so far as we know, yet its more important work—such as "the renewing of the Holy Ghost"—its "baptizing into *one* body" all believers—its shedding "the love of God abroad in our hearts"—its "bearing witness with our

spirit, that we are the children of God," &c.,—is still continued to all who truly believe in Jesus.

If some abuse these glorious truths, and pervert them to purposes of fanaticism, shall we cast away the gold with the dross? Because this truth has become "a savor of death unto death" to those who follow their fancies, instead of looking to it that "The Spirit and the Word *agree*," shall we cast away that, without which there is no life from the dead? For, be it remembered, "If"—and only *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.

NOTE.—Those who wish to see our view in full on the foregoing subject we hope will read our *Tract* on "THE ESSENTIAL BAPTISM." See Catalogue on last page of Cover.—EDITOR.

QUESTIONS ABOUT BAPTISM.

BY H. J. SWEETLAND.

I am firm in the belief that immersion in water is the only mode of baptism as commanded by our Lord, Math. 28 : 19, 20 ; and Mark 16 : 15, 16. I do not write to provoke controversy, but I have read your pamphlet on the "Essential Baptism," and I wish to ask you, if you have changed your mind in the last fifteen years on this subject? You then said in the Examiner, "We believe baptism is an ordinance of our Lord ; and one that should not be neglected." By this I suppose of course, you refer to water baptism ; for the baptism of the Holy Spirit is a different thing, if it exists in our day, (which I doubt,) from the baptism of water.

1. REPLY.—We most certainly have "changed" our "mind in the last fifteen years" not only on the baptism question, but on several other things. We are not petrifactive ; we have changed, and we expect to do so again, if we see cause. When any person has obtained that position, in this life, that he cannot change any more, he should at once be made a Pope, or sent to a more perfect world, as he is not likely to do much good here, and will be very likely to become an intolerant bigot. We do not believe in changing for the sake of change, nor

without mature and patient examination, but never to change, is to make no progress at all: it is to be stereotyped and petrified.

You said, fifteen years ago, "If a man is born of God, we cannot conceive that an emergence from water completes the one birth: if so, how was the dying thief born of God? how were Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and all the prophets born of God?" I would ask in return, Is the baptism of the Holy Spirit essential to the new birth? If so, how were Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and all the prophets born again? for, according to your own admission, they never had this baptism, for it was not given till after the resurrection and ascension of its author.

2. REPLY.—We think if you had studied our pamphlet on the "Essential Baptism" more carefully, you would have been saved the foregoing inquiry. We state in that pamphlet, "The Holy Spirit was to be communicated to *all* true believers in Jesus, in some MANNER it never had been before Jesus was glorified." Again we say, in that pamphlet, "The FACT that the apostles and others were the subjects of the '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 O. T. saints 'worshipped 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."

Thus you will see, we distinctly recognized the work of the Spirit under the previous dispensation. We never *admitted* that any man, under any dispensation, could be born again without the Holy Spirit; and David prayed, "Take not thy Holy Spirit from me." But the O. T. points to a dispensation that was to have a measure of that Spirit that no previous one had; and John the Baptist first announced that this larger measure was placed in the hands of JESUS to administer or bestow on them that should believe on Him. "*This*" administration did not commence till Jesus was glorified, and is essential to divine life now, and to a resurrection from the dead, as we have shown elsewhere. The O. T. saints had this Spirit direct from the Father, in virtue of a Redeemer to come. We have it direct from JESUS GLORIFIED, who has received the gift for men who believe on His name. Both the manner and the measure

differs from its communication to the O. T. saints, though the gift itself is the same. The O. T. saints were still under tutors and governors—carnal rites and ordinances—which were to continue till the time appointed of the Father ; or till Christ came with that fullness of the Spirit by which believers should be emancipated, and no longer worship in the oldness of the letter, or law, but worship the Father in the Spirit, without the further use of carnal ordinances. Believers of the O. T. were accepted as children under age ; but when the fullness of time came, God sent forth His Son to bring about a state of things in which maturity should be produced that did not exist in any previous age, and to this end gave such a measure of the Holy Spirit, as, in comparison with which, it might be said, the Spirit was not yet—or previously—given, because Jesus had not yet been glorified.

Fifteen years ago, you asked, "Does the new birth now and the new birth in the days of the patriarchs and prophets differ essentially? If not, and they did not have an 'emergence from water,' how can it be shown that in order to the new birth a man must emerge from water?" You said, "If water baptism is essential to the new birth, it was always essential." I ask, if the baptism of the Spirit is essential to the new birth was it not always so? How could patriarchs and prophets be born again without this baptism? Yet it was not given till after the ascension of Christ. It appears to me one is as broad as the other.

3. REPLY.—See our remarks in reply 2 ; which fully covers the ground of this last question. As your concluding question is of the same character as the two we have replied to, we omit it altogether : a reply would be only to repeat what we have said : but we give your "P. S."

Understand me : I do not believe water baptism, conversion, or Spirit baptism, if it is now administered, are either or all of them the new birth. This I understand to be at the resurrection. The resurrection from the dead is, to my mind, the new birth, and none will be born again but those who have the Spirit of God in the heart ; consequently the wicked will not have a resurrection.

RESPONSE.—So we come together at last : "the Spirit of God" is the "ESSENTIAL" thing : call it baptism or what you please ; only have *the thing*, without which there is no new birth here nor hereafter. The Scriptures declare, "He"—Jesus—"shall baptize you"—all believers—"with the Holy Spirit."—That is our *internal* "witness" that "we are the children of

God ;" and without it we shall not be "the children of the resurrection." Who that admits this last item, can doubt, the "Essential Baptism" is that of the Spirit ?

"CAST FORTH AS AN ABORTION."

THE methods resorted to, by the advocates of the reliving of the wicked dead, to prove their position, show how much they lack in argument. The following effort we take from the *Crisis* of May 12th.

VARIED RENDERINGS OF ISA. 26 : 14, 19.

Verse 14. "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."

"They are dead, they shall not live ; they are deceased tyrants, they shall not rise ; therefore hast thou visited and destroyed them ; and all memorial of them thou hast abolished."—*Bishop Lowth's Translation of Isaiah.*

Verse 19. "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust ; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead."

"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."—*Lowth's Translation.*

"And the earth shall cast out the dead."—As an abortive birth is cast out of the womb, to which the grave is compared (Job 1 : 21.) But as the verb here used does not properly signify to cast out, but to cast down, or cause to fall."—*Benson's Commentary.*

If then, the deceased tyrants are cast forth as an abortion, the text teaches most forcibly the resurrection of wicked men to a mortal life again.

V. P. SIMMONS.

Danielsonville, Ct.

How exceedingly logical the conclusion of "V. P. Simmons" ! Because "the earth shall cast forth, as an abortion, the deceased tyrants—therefore "the text teaches most forcibly the resurrection of wicked men to a mortal life again" ! Did V. P. S. know that an abortion is brought forth dead ? It seems not. Job, however, understood it when he wished he had died at his birth, "Or as a hidden untimely birth I HAD NOT BEEN ; as infants which never saw light." So God saith of some dead men, "He shall go to the generation of his fathers ; they shall never see light."—Psa. 49 : 19. Such is an abortion.

The Crisis' correspondent's conclusion squarely contradicts the testimony of JEHOVAH in the 14th verse, which is, those tyrants "are dead, they shall NOT LIVE." If then the earth is to cast them out as an abortion, it casts them out *dead*, having not even "a mortal life." Besides, the quotation from Mr. Benson, if of any value, condemns the position of V. P. S. ; for it is not "cast out, but to *cast down*, or *cause to fall*." So instead of the dead tyrants coming out of the earth they are *cast down*, and do not get up, at all. That looks just like the truth: "they are deceased, they shall not rise." What is the next resort of the TORMENT theorists?

DOES CHRIST RESTORE ALL THAT ADAM LOST?

That is: Does the second Adam restore to the whole race what the first lost? The advocates of the reliving of the wicked dead perpetually insist that Christ does restore it; and say, "Justice demands that our *natural* life should be *restored* to us;" because, "man lost natural life through Adam."

If there is any value in this position, "justice demands that" *all* man lost by Adam should be restored. Let us see where such a theory will land its advocates.

1. Adam lost innocence. That must be restored. 2. Adam lost access to the tree of life. That must be restored. 3. Adam lost Paradise. That must be restored. 4. He lost life. That must be restored. Must we all have a trial in Paradise, with access to the tree of life, because Adam had, and lost it for us? If the reasoning of our opposers is worth any thing, such must be the result. Are they prepared to take this ground? They must take it or fail utterly in their position, that because Adam lost life for his posterity "justice demanded" it "should be restored."

Our Lord Jesus Christ, glorified, saith—"To him that *overcometh*, will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the Paradise of God." Hence, if men do not overcome, they will not have access to the tree of life; and if justice will allow of their being excluded from one thing Adam lost, it may of all the other things, including "natural life;" especially, as they have had opportunity to regain all that was

lost, under a dispensation where, if sin has abounded, grace has much more abounded : so that, if men regain nothing Adam lost the fault is their own, and justice is unimpeachable in refusing to restore any thing lost by Adam, seeing they have personally treated with neglect or contempt the proffered benefits offered them freely.

This plea of Justice's demanding the restoration of natural life, from the dead, breaks down under its own weight ; for God never does restore the natural life; even to the righteous : they do not come from the dead in that way, but by "the Spirit of Him who raised up Christ from the dead." So natural life is not restored to them, and *injustice* is done the righteous, if our opposers' assumption is valid.

The truth is, God gives to all men natural life now, shortly to end eternally. If this life is improved as God requires, He has promised another life, by another life-principle, which shall never fail. No other life has He promised : and life is never threatened, nor inflicted as a punishment. To say it is, is about equal to saying, "Ye shall not *utterly* die:" which is Bishop Law's translation. Sinners by rejecting or neglecting the method God has appointed for their recovery from sin and death, are "holden with the cords of their sins;" and death reigns eternally over them ; not because of Adam's sin, but because they refuse or neglect God's proffered mercy for their recovery. Is this not "justice" ?

ELD. T. M. PREBLE AND THE WICKED DEAD.—Our readers will recollect we published an inquiry by Eld. Preble on John 5 : 28, 29. It seems he overlooked the article and wrote us, after the June EXAMINER had reached him, stating we had "not yet noticed" his "questions," and "wished to know whether" we "intended to do so, if not" he proposed "to have them appear in some other paper." We informed him, he would find his article in the May Exr. He then wrote us, quoting a portion of his previous article, which we think unnecessary to print again, except the question itself and our reply. Our readers can turn to the May number and read his article, if they wish to refresh their memories. Eld. Preble's question was thus stated :

"Now please tell us how '*the wicked*' can '*HEAR HIS VOICE,*' and '*COME FORTH,*' (1!) if they never '*LIVE AGAIN*'!"

In reply we answered :

"IF BRO. PREBLE will tell our readers how the '*dry bones*' of Ezk. 37th, '*hear the word of the LORD,*' and '*COME together,* bone to his bone,' he will fully answer his question." To this he now replies as follows :

Thank you, Bro. Storrs, for referring the answer of the above question to me, as it is ready, easy and plain. Now let us "*hear*" the word of the LORD as found in Ezek. 37th : "Thus saith the Lord God unto these bones : Behold I will cause *breath*" (yes, BREATH,) "to enter into you, and ye shall LIVE"! Yes, LIVE! Good. Not much mystery in this, for it is quite common for those who are "*alive,*" to "*hear*"! But would it not be rather an uncommon, or mysterious thing for a *dead* man to "*HEAR*" the word of the Lord!

So we would now "tell our readers" that the "*dry bones*" of Ezek. 37th, will "*HEAR the word of the Lord,*" and "*come together,*" just the same as "*ALL that are in the graves*" will "*HEAR*" his voice, and "*COME FORTH*"! In both instances the Lord God "*will cause breath to enter into*" them, and they "*SHALL LIVE*"! Therefore, when God says they "*SHALL LIVE*"! let us be careful and not say, They *SHALL NOT LIVE*!!

Concord, N. H., June 3, 1863.

T. M. PREBLE.

We confess ourself utterly unable to see any force in Elder Preble's comment on Ezk. 37. Did the dry bones *hear* the word of the LORD and *obey before* any breath was imparted to them? Manifestly, they did, and "*came together, bone to his bone : and while I beheld,*" saith the Prophet, "lo, the sinews and the flesh came up upon them, and the skin covered them above ; but there was NO BREATH *in them.*" This is the point Elder P. should have met ; but he jumps it in triumph, and exclaims, "Yes, LIVE! Good. Not much mystery in this, for it is quite common for those who are *alive to hear*"!

But mark well, the dry bones were not alive ; but they did hear ; for "there was a noise, and behold a shaking, and the bones *came together ;*" and yet up to the time the sinews, flesh and skin covered them there was "*no breath in them*"—they were *not* ALIVE at that point ; and it required a call of the Prophet on the wind—*ruah*, spirit—by an additional command of God, in order for *life* to be there. Does not every one see, the fact that they afterwards lived does not solve the question at all, how they heard and obeyed when there was no breath in them ?

It is, indeed, a "rather uncommon, or mysterious thing for a *dead* man to '*hear*' the word of the Lord!" but that mysterious thing happened to the dry bones, and Eld. P. has not begun to

prove the contrary. The fact that they should afterwards live, does not touch the question. **THEY DID HEAR, and OBEY ;** and that *before* they were alive. If these "*dry bones* of Ezk. 37, will hear the word of the Lord and *come together*, just the same as ALL that are in the graves will hear his voice and *come forth*," as Eld. T. affirms, then ALL that are in the graves will come forth having "*no BREATH IN THEM ;*" and hence will not be alive at that time: and not till the breath, or spirit, enters into them will they live ; and then the question arises has God said He will put it in them whether righteous or wicked ? Certainly in Ezk., it was God's "*people*," and they *ONLY*, into whom breath entered. Eld. P. says, in triumph :

"When God says they '*SHALL LIVE*' ! let us be careful and not say They *SHALL NOT LIVE* ! !

Yes, but where has God said, the wicked dead shall live ?— Just give us one such text. He has said of some of them, "*They are dead, they shall NOT live :*" and we had better be careful and not say, *THEY shall live*," lest we "*make God a liar*." See Isa. 26 : 14, and 1 John 5 : 10.

Returning to Ezk. 37 : Who are the persons into whom breath shall enter ? Are they the wicked dead ? Let God himself answer.

"Son of man, these bones are the whole house of Israel : behold they say, Our bones are dried and our hope is lost : " * * * "therefore prophecy and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God ; Behold, O *MY PEOPLE*, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel : and ye shall know that I am the LORD, when I have opened your graves, O *MY PEOPLE*, and brought you up out of your graves, and shall put *MY SPIRIT* in you, and ye shall live, and I will place you in your own land : then shall ye know that I the LORD have spoken it and performed it, saith the LORD." Ezk. 37 : 11-14.

Thus we see, it is God's "*people*," and they *only*, that He says shall live ; and that, too, by His putting His "*Spirit* in them." We think it will be a more difficult matter to prove the promise of life from the dead covers the wicked, than any of our opposers have yet dreamed of. "*They are dead, they shall not live ; they are deceased, they shall not rise :*" * * * "*Thy dead men shall live ; together with my dead body shall they arise :*

awake and sing," &c. Isa. 26 : 14, 19. Eld. P.; we trust, will now see the propriety of our referring him to Ezk. 37, in our note to his previous article. Whether he has made the matter "easy and plain," we leave our readers to judge.

H. W. BEECHER.—THE ATONEMENT.

BY MRS. C. C. WILLIAMS, SHELLROCK, IOWA.

To EDITOR OF EXR.—Reading your extract—in the Aug. Exr. for 1862—from a sermon by H. W. Beecher—characteristic alike of the current Trinitarian Theology and the man—revived the long-entertained purpose of commenting on a declaration found in his sermon in the *Independent*, of Nov. 21st, 1861, on the text, "Wherefore he is able to save," &c., Heb. 7 : 25. After speaking of the various theories on the subject of Christ's suffering—why it was necessary—what it effected, and so forth, from the days of Origen to the present time, he comes down to what he says is the "current theory" of those with whom he "most sympathises in faith"—the New School Theologians—the Congregationalists—*viz.*, "That the sufferings and death of Christ were necessary, in order that God might vindicate his justice before the public sentiment of the universe." Then follows the passage containing the declaration I wish to notice, which I will quote entire. He says :—

"I do not say that it is not so, only how did you find it out? Do you ask *me* then on what ground *I* put the necessity for the sufferings of Christ? This is my whole faith on the subject, the New Testament teaches that there was a reason which made it necessary that the blood of one should be shed, to atone for the sins of men. *That reason is not explained.* I learn in the New Testament that it was needful that my God in Jesus Christ should suffer for *me*. I accept the *fact* with reverence and gratitude, but I do not seek to know on this point, what the *New Testament has not explained*; and the example of those who have attempted to explain it, has left me with less disposition to make the attempt."

What am I, that I should undertake to gainsay the declaration of one from whom so much can be learned, as the author of the above? Yet if such passages as the following do not declare the fact that Jesus died and the reason of the fact—what do they mean?

"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. "And for this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions, under the first Testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Heb. 9 : 15. "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, *that* he might bring us to God." 1 Peter 3 : 18.

With deference I would say, the foregoing passages, and others that might be named of kindred import, seem to me not only to declare the necessity of Christ's suffering for us, but the reason for that necessity—*viz.*, That He might destroy death, and the devil : and deliver them, &c.,—that by means of death He might deliver them from the transgressions under the first Testament, and thereby bring us to God, &c.

Unlike the faith and resignation which does not seek to know what the distinguished author of the foregoing extract says *has* not been explained, I have allowed what I conceive to be the importunate God-implanted *why* and *how* that would not be put off, to pry into the reason—eagerly grasping at anything offered by any of the New Testament writers on the subject, in order to arrive at a solution of the momentous *why* ? This I conceive is the difference—There is no reason to expect to find unless we seek. Inexplicable and incomprehensible, according to his belief ; simple and consistent, according to the Bible theory. Man is mortal and must die. Being first natural—or animal—and following the dictates of his nature—necessarily—he sins involuntarily : for, "the carnal mind is enmity against God ; is not subject to His law, neither can it be." But in process of time other powers develop themselves. But of what use ? Jesus has abolished death for all (virtually), and it will do to talk about *eternal life*. 'Tis His to redeem from the unavoidable fate awaiting all—and bring it within reach of all on condition that they believe on him and show their faith by living as He lived, instead of living as heretofore after the flesh. The great Mediator says—Believe on me—I will suffer for you ; henceforth your only guilt shall be rejecting me ; which if you do, you must die in your sins, and the wrath of God will abide on you ; but if you connect yourself to Me, thereby partaking of the Divine Nature, I will raise you up to everlasting life. On the theory that Jesus is God—man is immortal—dying is living a great deal more and better than when alive, no wonder that so many great and good men have given this "question of ages" such conflicting and extravagant explanations ; or, wiser still, like the author of the extract above, none at all. May the question come home—Who is to blame for its non-solution ?

OUR FAULTS.—"Confess your faults one to another," is an injunction not difficult to comply with, and yet very few seem willing to do so, and fewer still can bear to be told of their faults. In this world of vanity and infirmities, no one is perfect in the true sense of the word. We all have our faults; some little imperfections in our composition, though slight they may be; still they are marks against us. Yet it is a rare thing, even among the very best of us, to meet with one who can bear to be told his faults, or caught confessing them to be such.—True, there are some who appear patiently to endure reproof, and will thank you for having administered it; but in a majority of cases, they will even then by their manner show their displeasure in some form. No, we cannot bear to be told of our faults. Neither are we willing to allow to others the credit which we claim for ourselves; for if our neighbor chance to commit any indiscretion, or by any word or deed unveil his faults, we at once take delight in proclaiming them abroad, and seek an early opportunity of reminding him of them in a spirit anything but generous, or well calculated to cause a reform.

The wide circle of society is diversified by an endless variety of dispositions, characters and passions. Every one is marked by some peculiarity, which distinguishes him from another, and nowhere can two persons be found who are in all respects alike. While so much diversity exists, it cannot but happen that men in their intercourse with each other, will often find cause for disagreement, and will charge others with the very faults which they themselves have committed. No grade of society is free from error. "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her." Hence in every station, the highest as well as the lowest, and in every condition of life, public, private and domestic, we find that faults will come in and wrongs will exist in some form. But from whence do these evils arise?—Does not experience whisper to us, it is because we possess so little self-knowledge, and the virtues of humility and forgiveness?

Absolute perfection of understanding is impossible; but we make the nearest approach to it when we have sense to discern and humility enough to acknowledge our own faults. We ought to view our own character with an impartial eye, and learn from our own failings to give the indulgence to others which we claim for ourselves. Common failings are the strongest lessons of mutual forbearance, and should teach us humility and forgiveness. But pride too often turns us from our duty. In the height of self-estimation we forget what we are, and claim that to which we are not entitled. We are as rigorous to offence as if we had never offended; as slow to forgive as though

we never required it. From this false position let us descend to our proper level, and divest ourselves of self-conceit and uncharitable prejudices.

NORMAN A. SMITH.

The above is so perfectly the doctrine of the Saviour, and so much needed to reconcile society generally, and would unite so many among us, as a people, if carried out, in mutual labor for the salvation of the perishing, that I forward it to you for publication, hoping it may prove a benefit to many among us who are at variance.

C.

10th Army Corps, *Beaufort, S. C.*

THE OUTGOING AND INCOMING ADMINISTRATION.

WHILE we should be thankful to our Heavenly Father for so good a government as that with which we have been favored, yet amid the din of war and the clashing of party politics; the upheavings of society in all its departments, together with the threatened overthrow of thrones and kingdoms, the student of the Bible can but think of Jehovah's declaration, "I will overthrow the throne of kingdoms, and I will destroy the strength of the kingdoms of the Gentiles." If God's word shall not pass till all be fulfilled, then the present dynasties of earth are to give place to something better. While we do not think party politics a subject about which the disciples of Christ should waste their energies, we cannot subscribe to the dogma, that there is no connection between politics and religion. The true Christian is a pure politician. Christianity, in short, is nothing else than politics. It relates purely to the science of the government of earth, and only will have its perfect development and realization when the "kingdom and the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him." (Dan. 7: 27.) And when we speak of this political aspect of the Christian religion, which is thus to culminate, we do not mean that it shall so spread and establish itself by means of present instrumentalities as to give a Christian character to governments now existing, but that the governments of earth are to be dashed in pieces and ground to powder by the kingdom which the God of heaven shall set up. (Dan. 2: 44.) This incoming administration is to be a restoration of that which was in the beginning when God made man and gave him dominion over all the earth and over every

living thing which moveth on the earth. God was supreme, Adam his vicegerent, and the offspring of Adam his joint heir to the dominion. "Multiply, replenish the earth, and subdue it, and have dominion." "Let them have dominion." (Gen. 1 : 26-28.) The great rebellion entered the garden of Eden, and sin blighted this fair heritage, till God drove man from the garden and guarded the way to the tree of life, that he might return unto the dust. Was not this original kingdom the one which God "prepared from the foundation of the world," and which Christ will give his sheep at the day of judgment? (Matt. 25 : 34.)

The great questions which have confused the earth and made it a Golgotha for so many thousand years, have been the right of dominion over the earth. The old usurper, the instigator of rebellion, proclaims himself the monarch of all the kingdoms of earth and all their glory. Thus when the Son of God had been proclaimed from heaven at the banks of Jordan, and was led up into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil, among other proposals was this : He "showed him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time" and said, "All this power will I give thee and the glory ; for that is delivered unto me, and to whomsoever I will I give it. If thou therefore wilt worship me, all shall be thine."

The dominion of earth, then, was the question at issue between the Son of God and Satan. The tempting bait of a bloodless possession of the dominion of earth. Rejecting it, as President Lincoln did a similar one, he took up the gauntlet thrown down by the arch rebel, and with full knowledge of the blood which must flow, he proclaimed, "I came not to send peace on earth but a sword. Henceforth there shall be five in one house divided ; three against two and two against three." "A man's foes shall be they of his own house." The onset was made on Christ himself, and pursued to the death of the Messiah for his assumption of royal character against the claims of Satan. Since then, uncounted millions for their adherence to their Master's cause have paid the penalty with their lives. This relentless war against the Son of David and his claims to dominion were all foreseen and foretold by him before his crucifixion. And not by him alone, but by the holy prophets who had preceded him. "He shall wear out the saints and prev il against them," said the prophet Daniel. And thus it is to be till the "Ancient of Days shall come, that the saints shall possess the KINGDOM."

Each successive experiment at expurgating the dominions of earth by the introduction of a new and more perfect race and administration has proved abortive.

The first administration was vested in the hands of Adam in his primeval holiness as already shown. But the seducer entered

Eden's happy bowers, and in an evil hour seduced him from his allegiance and duty, and prostrated his dominion in the dust. Things went on from bad to worse, till the earth was filled with violence and every thought and imagination of man's heart was evil, and only evil, and that continually. In this state of things the Lord swept the race, with the exception of one righteous man and his family from the earth, and gave to him, on his emergence from the ark, the dominion of Adam, which in the beginning was vested in him, but with no better success. In the days of Abram and Lot, Sodom and the cities of the plain were so corrupt that not ten righteous persons could be found there, and the storm of fire swept them away. Egypt, and Canaan, too, so debased themselves by rebellion against God that they were given up to destruction. At length God's chosen people, under a government of his own framing, were planted in a good land under the most favorable circumstances, surrounded by such influences as were the best calculated to keep them obedient, but all in vain. The administration of Moses, Joshua, the Judges, Samuel, David and all his descendants, were perverted, till God said, "I will overturn it, and it shall be no more till he comes whose right it is; and I will give it him." Then David's house and Judah's tribe went into captivity, and David's royalty was suspended till the coming of Messiah.

Thus every institution of earthly government has been perverted by Satan from its design to be an agency for good to the human race, to be an engine of oppression.

The institution of government has been of God; its perversion of Satan. He has managed in each instance to obtain the control of affairs to accomplish his own diabolical purposes.

But God's plan of establishing on earth a perfect government is not always to be defeated. He shall yet set up a "kingdom which shall never be destroyed, nor be left to other people. But it shall break in pieces and subdue all these kingdoms and stand forever."—*Advent Herald*.

"ALL THINGS ARE POSSIBLE WITH GOD:"

OR, A RICH MAN MAKING A RIGHT USE OF RICHES.

Rev. Justin Perkins, writing from London to the *Independent*, says:—

Some of our readers may recall the name of William Rawlinson, who last year gave for the American Board, in its straightened circumstances, some three thousand dollars, and was, more-

over, the chief instrument in raising "the crisis fund," so called, for the same object. On my way from Liverpool to London, I turned aside to Taunton, to spend a day with Mr. R., whose acquaintance I made during my former visit in England. Of all mortals whom I know, Mr. R. is one of the most devoted and faithful stewards of the Lord Jesus. He is a wealthy silk manufacturer, employing at present about five hundred persons. He does not allow his capital to increase from year to year, but, after the frugal support of his family, he scrupulously hands back to the Master's use all the "gain" which that Master intrusts to his care.

Mr. R. labors abundantly in word as well as in deed. Himself the personification of modesty, yet equally so of efficiency, he redeems time from superintending his large factories to visit the sick, the suffering, and the dying, and speak to them of Christ and salvation; and the number of committeeships on which he serves, for various religious and charitable objects, it would be difficult to count up.

A rap at my door this morning brought Mr. R. to my room, with the statement, "I have a short religious service at one of my factories every morning at nine o'clock; will you conduct it this morning?" I gladly accepted the proposal, and nine o'clock found us in the factory, surrounded by three hundred operatives, who had just assembled, with their hymn-books in their hands. Mr. Rawlinson read the hymn,

"How sweet the name of Jesus is,"

which was beautifully sung by nearly all present. I then read a short passage from the Bible, on which I remarked a few minutes, and led in prayer. As an extra, on this occasion, they then sung the hymn,

"When shall we all meet again?"

Such a service has been kept up by Mr. R. daily in that factory, for twenty years. Some fifty of the operatives are hopefully pious, and all thus become comparatively intelligent on religious subjects, while the effect of such service to promote order and good character among them, is incalculable. Most of them are females. The younger children attend school half of the day.—There is no working at night, and all have Saturday afternoon to themselves. The establishment is in fact a great Christian family, of which Mr. R. is the revered head.

"You have a great pressure of business on your hands," I said to him, as we were walking to his factory, having in mind the late hour at which he was writing business letters in his family last evening.

"Yes," he replied, "I would curtail my business, and take

life easier, but for the purpose of thus doing more for the cause of Christ."

Mr. R., with his thousands at command, occupies a dwelling as humble as the houses of most New England pastors—and very much more so than some of them—while his whole style of living is perfectly plain and simple, though of course more comfortable than the luxurious equipage affected by the most religious men of his means in America.

The Lord bless this faithful steward, beginning with his own household. His five children, ranging between the ages of eight and twenty-three, who are models of gentleness and modesty, are all hopefully pious. And the number of other persons brought to Christ, as I was told in Taunton, through the active labors of this meek and quiet man, is quite large every year. Mrs. R. is a helpmate of her husband; and a happier family I know not in this world.

At Mr. R.'s family altar America is remembered in his fervent supplications. He, like thousands of Christians in England, pray earnestly that the terrible war may speedily cease, and the abomination of slavery come at once to a perpetual end. I tell these good people to reverse the order of these petitions, and they will better meet the case, as I read the providence of God—the removal of slavery, the cause of the war, being an indispensable antecedent to any practicable settlement of our troubles.

THE HOLY SPIRIT.—“I realize all the time that the Holy Comforter is with me. We never could find our way through this dark world to our heavenly home, had not God given us an infallible guide. The personal, omniscient, omnipotent Holy Spirit is guardian, comforter, and sanctifier. If we ‘walk not after the flesh,’ but walk after the Spirit, he will lead us safely. He may lead us often ‘by a way that we would not,’ for if we knew the way we would not so much need a guide; but he will lead us into the paths of righteousness here, and to the fields of glory hereafter.

“It is our blessed privilege to have access to the Holy Comforter, and fellowship with him, as the disciples had fellowship with their incarnate Saviour. We hear this doctrine announced in every benediction—‘The communion and fellowship of the Holy Ghost be with you all forever’—but how few realize it as it is our blessed privilege! I realize it more and more every year. What the Church especially needs are—perfect loyalty to God, perfect confidence in God, perfect love for God.”—*Rev. Wm. Taylor*, writing from Palestine, formerly of Baltimore, Md

LETTERS AND EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

HELEN ROBERTSON, Oneida Co., N. Y., writes:—Since my last, the "little flock" here has been suffering persecution. The minister called on Sister —, and denounced her in a very hard spirit. He threatened to excommunicate her and every one who had received the blessed truth of "No life out of Christ." He did not care how many, high or low, rich or poor, all would be turned out; he was determined to root it out of the church. She told him she had been thinking for some time that she had better be separated from his church, and it did not trouble her. He told her she would, from the day of her separation, lose God's smile; that her spiritual life would begin to fail; and warned her to consider.

But let me tell you, before this faith of the Gospel was presented to her and her husband, he was entirely sceptical about the Bible. She, although a member of the said church, saw the absurdity of its doctrines, so that she too was beginning to turn away from the Bible. But now both love the blessed Bible: it is their daily study: they now try to live in exact conformity to its spirit and teachings, and have established a family altar. Her two sisters and mother, are now with us, all rejoicing in hope of the glory of God. My sister was, also, waited on by two of the deacons; but she stood firm. Indeed, she has seemed firmer than before. Another one said, if she was to be denied the privilege of reading and seeing for herself, she had rather be in the Roman Catholic Church. Last evening I talked with two others who have been investigating the truth for a few months. The husband said, this was a consistent theory; it was in accordance with the Bible: the wife said, it was clear to her as noonday sun. Others are searching the Scriptures to see whether these things are so, nothing terrified by the adversaries.

One who communed with us on the 3d of April, has since died. She died with unwavering faith—not of going right to heaven, but of being resurrected immortal at Christ's second coming. Future life *only to the righteous* never seemed to me so scripturally true as when I sat by her bedside—from time to time—reading portions of Scripture to strengthen and enlighten her while going down into the dark valley of the shadow of death. O, who can ever break the binding power of that last enemy but Christ? and for whom will he break that power but his own? Oh, glory to God for light and truth!

I visited, a short time since, a man in Trenton Village. He had studied out the first principles of our faith over fifteen years ago, from the Bible, before becoming acquainted with our writers or people. He has since got some of your works, but is still an independent student. I asked him if he believed there would be future life to the wicked. He said he did not: that that was altogether out of harmony with the plan of salvation. I told him a great many Adventists believed they would live again. He said, that is the old theology. They can't let it go.—They hold on to it, as it were, with one finger. He is over eighty years of age, but very energetic indeed. He subscribes for the Bible Examiner, and wishes it sent from the beginning of the present year. I conclude with the prayer that our God may bless you, and strengthen you to labor for Him.

A. A. BABCOCK, Michigan, writes:—We are living in fearful times: what the end will be I cannot tell. It seems as if oppression must be felt North as well as South. O, how this nation has sinned! The hand of God is laid heavily upon-us. What bitter weeping, throughout this whole land, for brothers, fathers, sons! But when the black man wept to us, we heeded it not. Has he not cried to God to avenge his wrongs, and has not God heard him? Truly He has heard his cry, and our children are slaughtered by the oppressor's hand, and we have not humbled ourselves before God and confessed our sin.

I have come to the conclusion, "There is no life out of Christ." I have taken my Bible and commenced at Genesis, taking God's sentence on Adam; the sentence for murder; on the antediluvians, on Sodom, on Lot's wife, and the sentence Ex. 19: 12, 13; and so for every sin man can commit, you will find God passed the sentence of death, and I have yet to learn where He has revoked one of the penalties.

J. W. C. GRAY, Esq., Illinois, writes:—The Pamphlets you sent me I have given to various persons to read; some of them to ministers; and they generally think they are the true Gospel. The "Atonement" and the "Essential Baptism" are approved by nearly all who read them. I shall do the best I can for the EXAMINER.

W. H. RANDOLPH, Penobscot Co., Maine, writes:—The EXAMINER comes to hand regularly, and I think it the best publication I ever got hold of. Go on publishing the blessed truths of God's word in these last days. Error must fall when the light shines so clear on the Bible. The more we search the old chart, and scour up our armor, the more blessed it looks, and the more blessed it is.

J. W. MAFFIT, Hamilton Co., Iowa, writes:—With your permission, I will renew my last year's proposition. I will be one of twenty to give ten dollars each to defray your expenses on a trip as far West as Iowa.

FROM HILTON HEAD, S. C.; June 9, 1863.—The EXAMINER continues to come to us. It would do your heart good to see with what earnestness its rich contents are read. It is well known in camp, and many are the inquiries to know if it is not time for it to come again. Brother P. says, send this dollar to Bro. Storrs for me, and tell him we feel the cause must be supported, and so must he. That our feelings run pocket deep, you will please find inclosed from me a dollar also. God is with us—whom shall we fear? The narrowness of one paper, and its hard speeches against the Government, which to-day gives it protection, has obliged us to expell it from camp. God bless you; multiply your days of usefulness, and give you grace and strength to yet stand in the front of the battle. While I write a fellow soldier comes into our tent and says, "I must take the EXAMINER, and here is a dollar for it."

ALVAN METCALF, Mass., writes:—I have taken a class in the Sabbath School, and offered to give the BIBLE EXAMINER to as many as would

come. There were eight last Sabbath, and I think there will be more. I send eight dollars, for which send as many copies of the Examiner as you can. I may send for more.

THE EDITOR, since the last issue of the EXAMINER, has spent one Sabbath in New-York—two in Springfield, Mass, and two in Newark, N. J., with much satisfaction to himself; and so far as he can judge, with profit to the people. He has not failed to hold up "*Life only in Christ*," without disguise. He has nothing to hide or to fear in the promulgation of this glorious doctrine. It needs only to be understood to commend itself to the candid and unprejudiced mind: not that he means to say no such minds will feel difficulties in embracing this view; but he does mean to say, that the doctrine itself looks so *like* GOD, and makes such a harmony in the Divine character, and so perfectly agrees with all the other branches of the life theme, that they cannot but feel, *if it is true*, it is the crowning glory of the whole system, and invests it with such uniformity and harmony as it cannot have without it. He intends to labor patiently and perseveringly in its promulgation, forbearing those who differ with him, only asking of them to manifest the same spirit toward himself; otherwise, how can they justly claim our fellowship? If they will, as some have, persistently and reproachfully cry "*hobby*," and the like, can they calculate on our respect, to say nothing of our Christian fellowship? The fact is, no man, in any department in life, ever accomplished any thing of much importance, who had not a "*hobby*." One man never yet had a capacity to excell in many things, except in extraordinary cases. Each man has his gift of God, and it is peculiar to himself: that gift he must employ on the object, business, or calling for which it is given: and one great reason why there are so many failures, mechanically, civilly, ecclesiastically, and otherwise, is, men mistake their gift or calling, or divide it on too many objects, so that they excell in nothing, and comparatively, accomplish nothing for themselves or the world. Let those who cry "*hobby*" against what they do not like, because, it may be, their minds have not yet been open to grasp the subject, remember an apostle has said, "There are diversities of gifts, but the

same Spirit." You have no more right to call your brother's gift a "hobby," by way of reproach, than he has to do the same to you. Let every one improve his own gift; but do it in love, not in a spirit which would compel every other to submit to his mode or method, or be visited with reproachful names. The cry of "hobby," as used by our opposers, is manifestly designed to cast reproach on the advocates of "*Life only in Christ.*" We ask them to cease from the use of it, if they wish to command our respect and Christian regard. If they mean simply what the word truly imports, *viz.*, "*A favorite object,*" say so. Our "favorite object" is to make all men see there is life *only* in Christ for dying men; and that that life is a *divine* life, and can only be had by a living union with Him by faith—"The just shall live by faith." Without this faith in, and union with Christ there is "*no life in*" men, or for men, beyond this present scene of trial: if they will not come to Christ "for life" they will "utterly perish in their own corruption." Such is our firm and unshaken belief: the promulgation of which we cannot neglect without the conviction of unfaithfulness to God and men.

DISCUSSION IN BOSTON.—Joseph T. Curry recently invited Miles Grant to a discussion, in public oral debate, of the question, "*Do the Scriptures teach the Resurrection of the Wicked?*" The invitation was accepted, and the parties mutually agreed that the discussion should be held in Kast Building, Boston, on the evenings of June 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th; that each disputant should speak twice each evening; and that the speeches should be twenty-two minutes in length.

The discussion has been held in accordance with the foregoing arrangement, Bro. Grant assuming the affirmative, Bro. Curry the negative, and Prof. C. F. Hudson acting as Moderator.—Large audiences attended the debate, and much interest was manifested in the doctrine up for investigation. The disputants maintained a kind, Christian bearing towards each other from first to last, and nothing occurred to mar the interest of the occasion.

The Debate was phonographically reported by Bro. E. P. Woodward, of Boston, and will be immediately *published*, by

Bro. Curry, in pamphlet form. This arrangement has the cordial approbation of Bro. Grant, and as soon as the Debate is out of press its price will be announced in the *Crisis*, when we hope it will be largely ordered and read by the friends on both sides of the controversy.

We shall have something further to say respecting the Discussion, in the EXAMINER, when it is published.

June 13, 1863.

R. W.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—We shall have a full supply of the foregoing *Discussion* as soon as it is ready; and though we do not yet know the price, those who wish us to furnish it to them may send their orders and the amount of funds they wish to invest in the work, and we will supply them at the earliest period possible. Though we have not seen it, we have the fullest confidence it cannot fail to interest all persons who are disposed to investigate the question. We join in the wish of "R. W." that it may "be largely ordered and read." The expense of *reporting* and printing will be heavy on the party of the "negative," as he took the whole responsibility of the Report on himself. Let him not bear the burden alone.

P. S. Since the foregoing was in type, we have received information that the work is in the Printer's hands, and will soon be ready for delivery. *Price*, 25 cents: postage, three cents. The usual discount will be made to those who buy to sell again. We suggest, that those who wish a quantity send the amount of money they wish to invest, directed to "JOSEPH T. CURRY, care of O. Clapp, No. 30 & 32 Winter-St., Boston, Mass.;" and that they send immediately, as only a limited number will be printed.

DONATIONS FOR THE EXAMINER AND ITS EDITOR.—W. S. Olmsted, his "monthly," \$1. I. S. Small, \$1. "Once a month," \$1. A. W. Pierce (in army, S. C.) \$1. Wm. Wright, \$1. David Rollins, \$5.

THE JUNE EXAMINER.—A few copies of that number can still be had, if wanted. We can also supply *perfect sets* to new subscribers from January. Bound and *unbound* volumes for 1860 and '61 and '62—or Vols. 13 and 14—can still be furnished to those who desire them.

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. 15. No. 8.]

AUGUST, 1863.

[Whole No. 227.]

THE TREE OF LIFE: TO WHOM ACCESSIBLE.

A SERMON BY THE EDITOR.

TEXT.—"To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life which is in the midst of the paradise of God."—Rev. 2 : 7.

If a benefit is announced for our acceptance, several inquiries arise, such as, Is the offered good of real value; and if so, how valuable? What is the character of the party making the offer? Is he truthful and reliable? Is he able to do as he proposes, and what is the evidence of his ability? If all these points are settled, the inquiry follows—On what terms can the good be secured?

1. *Is the offered good of real value, and how valuable?* The benefit is, access to the tree of life. That tree is first presented to our view in the garden of Eden, where man was placed at his creation, with permission to eat of every tree therein, except the tree of knowledge of good and evil. By transgression he was excluded from the tree of life, "lest he" should take thereof "and eat and *live forever*." Access to that tree would secure life, uninterrupted by death. The innate love of life and abhorrence of death makes such a means of security of inestimable value.

Let it be announced that such a tree has been discovered, which, beyond all doubt, would heal every disease "flesh is heir to," and renew the youth of the aged and infirm, at any and all stages in life, and what would be the effect on earth's population? Would it not produce a greater excitement than has ever yet been witnessed? Suppose this tree is to be found in only one location; what a move would be seen for the favored

spot! Every vehicle of conveyance, from a hand-cart to railroad cars and steamships, would immediately be put in use to convey men, women and children to the scene of interest.—What a gathering from all lands and of all classes! Many would fancy themselves sick who never felt pain, and make haste to the place where health and life were to be secured against a possibility of interruption for evermore. The cost of reaching the place would be wholly disregarded, if the fact was established beyond doubt, that such a tree had been discovered. The halt, the lame, the blind, the cripples of all classes, as well as the more favored invalids, would all be seen in the vast army seeking health and life.

Thus all parties and classes proclaim, with an earnestness there is no mistaking, that this *life tree* is of value beyond all human calculation. All men have an inherent love of life of which they cannot divest themselves.

Such a remedy as we have supposed in the foregoing illustration, is offered in our text. It will not only remove all the disorders to which men are liable in this life, but also bring to life the dead, and so perform its work that they "cannot die any more": life, vigor, health, and eternal enjoyment is the result of access to *this tree of life*! Is the announcement to you incredible? Do you inquire—

2. *What is the character of the party making this offer? Is he truthful and reliable?* This inquiry is reasonable. The party is presented to us in the first chapter by the beloved disciple, John, who thus introduces him. Says John—"I was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God, and for the testimony of Jesus Christ. I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, and heard behind me a great voice, as of a trumpet, saying"*** "what thou seest, write in a book and send it unto the seven churches which are in Asia:" * * * "And I turned to see the voice that spake with me. And being turned, I saw seven golden candlesticks; and in the midst of the seven candlesticks one like the Son of man, clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle. His head and his hairs were like white wool, as white as snow; and his eyes were as a flame of fire; and his feet like unto fine brass, as if they burned in a furnace; and his voice as the sound of many waters: and he had in his right hand seven stars: and out of

his mouth went a sharp two-edged sword ; and his countenance was as the sun shineth in his strength : and when I saw him, I fell at his feet as dead. And he laid his right hand on me, saying unto me, Fear not ; I am the first and the last : I am he that liveth and was dead : and behold, I am alive for evermore, amen ; and have the keys of hell" [*hades*] "and of death."

Such is the description of the party in question. Once a sufferer on earth, even unto death itself : a party with whom John was conversant in a previous period, and on whose bosom he had leaned his head without fear ; but now He who was once a man of sorrow and acquainted with grief, is so changed, and appears in such glory, the beloved John falls at His feet as dead ! He had seen his Master on the mount of transfiguration, and said, with Peter, "It is good to be here ;" but there is a glory on Patmos so much exceeding any thing John had seen before, that he is overpowered, and "flesh and blood" give way, and life seems to become extinct ; but the hand of that beloved Master touching His servant, with the consoling words, "*Fear not,*" enabled him to look up, while it is announced, "I am He that *liveth*, and was dead—and behold I am alive for evermore, and have the keys of hell and of death." Jesus had told His disciples, just before his death, "The gates of hell" [*hades*] "shall not prevail against my church." Now He demonstrates to John the fact, that He has in His hands power over death and *hades* ; for He had the "keys." The devil "*had* the power of death," (Heb. 2 : 14). Jesus went down under death, but it was impossible that He could be holden of it, for He had never sinned, and could only by a voluntary act be under it at all ; but that He might obtain the right and power to deliver His church from death, He descended into it and came up again with the "keys" in His possession, and thereby secured the resurrection of all His followers.

Do you still ask, Who is this party that saith, "I will give to eat of the tree of life"? God the Father shall answer. While Jesus stood at Jordan, John the Baptist saith, I "saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him : and lo, a voice from heaven, saying, *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased.*" Again, we go forward to the mount of transfiguration ; a bright cloud overshadows the company there, and "a voice out of the cloud, said, *This is my beloved Son, in*

whom I am well pleased : *hear ye him.*" Truly, "Him hath God the Father sealed." He is, indeed, "The way, the *truth*, and the life." If any testimony is trustworthy, then can we rely on that of Jesus, who "was dead, but is alive for evermore."—
But—

3. *Is He able to do as He proposes ; and what is the evidence of His ability ?* While here on earth, He healed all manner of sickness and disease ; raised the dead, opened the eyes of the blind, walked on the sea, commanded the stormy winds to cease and they obeyed : yea, "By him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible," *** "all things were created by Him, and for Him ;" *** "and by Him all things consist : " and "all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth," saith the party of our text, whose ability we are considering. His revival from the dead is full proof of the validity of His claim to such power. No impostor was ever compassed about with such a cloud of witnesses and testimony of ability to do all that he promised. If the evidence on this point is not ample, no amount of it could convince the doubter : he is farther gone in unbelief than the hypocritical Pharisees who said, "If thou wilt come down from the cross we will believe ;" and yet when He had risen from the dead, and it was so demonstrated to them that they could not deny it, they gave the soldiers, who had guarded the sepulchre, large sums of money to tell the most infamous and improbable lie that was ever uttered, *viz.*: "The disciples came by night and stole him away while we slept"! If asleep, how did they know anything about it? Poor frightened disciples, who all forsook their Master and fled when He was arrested by His murderers! how did they get courage to venture on an armed guard to steal their *dead* Master! And if they did venture, how happened it, they were so fortunate as to arrive there just at the time when all the guard were so sound asleep as not to awake at the rolling away of the "great stone" which secured the sepulchre? Wonders multiply at the folly of unbelievers : and those who can reject the resurrection of Jesus, as an accomplished fact, are hopelessly lost to all value of truth in testimony. The fact of His resurrection being settled, all the other facts of His power are established with it, beyond a doubt. His *ability*, then, to do all He has said, is not a matter of uncertainty.

4. *The Tree of Life and the Paradise of God.* What are they, and where located? Whether the *tree of life* is literal, or a symbol, is of small importance to us. That the reference is to the literal tree in Eden, there can be no doubt; and the use of that tree is clearly stated by JEHOVAH himself: if man "eat thereof" he would "*live forever.*" The proffered good, then, in our text, is an unending life, bestowed by Christ, the LIFE-GIVER.

The term Paradise, signifies "a garden of delight," or pleasure. The word occurs but three times in the Bible, Lk. 23 : 43, "to-day, shalt thou be with me in paradise": 2 Corth. 12 : 4, "caught up into paradise": and in our text. Much has been said about it; and most professed Christians seem to suppose it is some intermediate state of bliss, entered on between death and the resurrection; some holding, it is heaven itself; while others suppose it is located in the lower parts of the earth.—But the first class, while they insist that the dying thief and Jesus were together in paradise, on the day of the crucifixion, find an unanswerable argument against their idea of its being heaven, because Jesus said to Mary, three days after, "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father"; so that if their heaven is paradise, and the thief went there, on the day of the crucifixion, he did not find Jesus. The other class are just as much in difficulty; for while they contend paradise is not heaven, but an intermediate place somewhere else, they cannot reconcile Paul's desire to depart and be with Christ, which they urge in proof of the conscious state of the dead, with the fact that "Christ has ascended into heaven itself," and that deceased saints do not go there till after the resurrection, if at all; so that Paul's desire to be with Christ could not be realized immediately after death, as he would have to be retained in the paradisaical state till Christ's "return from heaven," at "the last day."

In Paul's use of the term paradise, 2 Corth. 12 : 4, he distinctly makes it synonymous with "the *third* heaven;" for what he calls paradise in verse 4, he calls the third heaven in verse 2; so that we have only to determine what and where this heaven is, to know where "the paradise of God" is to be located. Turning to 2 Peter 3d chapter, we find this apostle speaking of the scoffers of the last days, and he says, "For this they will-

ingly are ignorant of, that 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."***"Nevertheless we, according to His promise, look for *new heavens* and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."

Here, then, we find the "third heaven : " the *first* destroyed by water : the *second* to be "dissolved" by fire : the *third* to remain. As the apostle John, carried away in vision, Rev. 20 and 21, saw "earth and heaven" flee "away," and then "saw a new heaven and a new earth," in which there was "no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain," so Paul "knew a man" who was caught away in vision and saw this "*third* heaven"—this new state in which "the paradise of God" is found ; where "the tree of life" stands, so that there is no more pain, sorrow, or death, to any who have access to it ; in paradise restored, the flaming sword removed, "the Lamb which is in the midst of the throne shall feed them:"—"I will give to eat of the tree of life which is in the midst of the paradise of God," saith "He that is alive and was dead ; and behold" He is "alive for evermore."

5. *On what terms can access to the tree of life be secured ?* "To him that *overcometh*." A victory is to be achieved. Adam the first was overcome. Adam the *second* overcame, and is set down with His Father on his throne. Temptation is to be encountered ; or, trial is to be endured : none can overcome without it. A triumph in obedience to God insures the promised benefit. The first thing to be subdued is *self* ; or, our animal propensities. These are not to be destroyed during our time of trial, nor to be put under unnecessary and uncommanded restraint. Every one of our natural appetites, with which our Creator endowed us, He intended should be a source of pleasure, to be gratified in a lawful way and in a temperate manner. This is evident from the fact, that God said to Adam, "of every tree of the garden thou mayest *freely* eat ;" one only was excepted.—Here was permission such as we should expect from a wise, kind, and benevolent Creator. He gave man no appetites or desires but what he made provision for their being a source of

pleasure ; and pleasure, too, in the highest degree, by restricting them in such manner, only, as to prevent man from being enslaved or surfeited by them. There are some mistaken, but well-meaning persons, who torment themselves and others around them, all their life long, by false notions of self-denial ; some carrying their ideas so far as to think it is inconsistent with holiness to desire even *pleasant* food. A man can no more help desiring pleasant food to eat than he can help desiring pure air to breathe. But if his circumstances, in providence, are such that he cannot have "savory meat such as I love," as said Isaac, he can be thankful for what he has, and not murmur because he has not such as he may desire. There is no virtue in being indifferent as to whether we eat mouldy bread or fresh : and so there is no virtue in crushing out any of the natural desires or appetites : the virtue is in restraining them to God's appointed order in their gratification ; both as to a lawful indulgence and a temperate manner. Thus to use them, is to honor the Creator and to excite gratitude to Him. Those who act otherwise, may find God does not accept their offering, and may ask, "Who hath required this at your hands?" and add, "Bring no more vain oblations ;" such "incense" may be found an "abomination" to Him. Use all our members and senses so as ever to impress our minds with a deep sense that God is good ; for it is "the goodness of God that leadeth thee to repentance."

The grand victory, then, is, to so subject all our desires to the will of God, so that in their gratification we shall have such regard for our fellow-men as to carry out the rule He has given us, to "love thy neighbor as thyself." This rule will not allow us to encroach on his means of enjoyment by overreaching, deceiving, or taking advantage of his ignorance, necessity, or weakness, to wrest from him any thing that is necessary for his lawful enjoyment of his God-given desires, or capacity for happiness. In a word, we are to *overcome* all desires for happiness or enjoyment which infringes on the rights of others, whereby they are deprived of the means or power to participate in lawful enjoyment. Such a victory embraces all that the Christian world have called victory over "the world, the flesh, and the devil." Our view, we think, simplifies the subject, and brings it to the comprehension of all minds which are disposed to come under the government of God.

But how can we attain to this moral grandeur? First, by a believing contemplation of the life of Jesus; and second, by the aid of the Holy Spirit, which Jesus is exalted to bestow on all who truly set their hearts to follow Him. Without such divine aid, we shall struggle in vain, and always fail; but, as saith the apostle, "I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me." Here is the secret of our power to overcome. Rest in God, through Christ, by the Holy Spirit, and victory is certain: the promise of our LIFE-GIVER will be realized, and we shall eat of the tree of life in the midst of the paradise of God.

Some suppose, Christ must restore to the whole race *all* that the first Adam lost. The main thing lost was, access to the tree of life. Our text tells us to whom the second Adam will restore that, *viz.*: "To him that *overcometh.*" Let us see to it, we do not deceive ourselves by the vain expectation of gaining any thing lost by Adam, unless we come off conquerors through the blood of the Lamb. That we may be thus victorious, let there be no delay in beginning the conflict. Soon our eternal destiny will be sealed by access to the tree of life, or an utter and final exclusion from it, involving the *loss* of "an eternal weight of glory."

"THE LAST DITCH."

OR, D. T. TAYLOR'S APPEAL TO THE FATHERS.

WHEN men who profess to take the Holy Scriptures for their only and sufficient rule of faith and practice, are forced to seek help for a theory in other quarters, we think it is a sure sign of weakness. Some of the advocates of the resurrection of wicked men are beginning to cry "The Fathers—the fathers!" Eld. D. T. Taylor recently favored the readers of the *Crisis* with four articles, filled with incoherent platitudes and abusive exclamations; and the very first point he made was outside of the Scriptures. He asked, "Who, in all antiquity, denied the resurrection to life of the wicked dead?"

The Editor of the EXAMINER, in his crushing reply, to the four articles, briefly noticed this point, and referred to a remark of

Clement of Rome, and also to an inscription found in the Catacombs, as affording evidence against "Eld. T.'s assumption of 'no history,' &c."

At this Eld. T. has made what he supposes to be a deadly thrust. Glad to introduce "the Fathers" into the controversy, thus *calling off attention from the scriptural argument*, he launches an antique craft in the Crisis for July 14. Let our readers particularly notice his opening remarks :

"It has been asserted that the view recently urged upon our churches, viz., the non-resurrection of the wicked dead, has a history among the early christians; that until christianity was corrupted by fables, the doctrine of the re-living of the unjust was nowhere taught in or out of the church of God,—and we are challenged to produce from all antiquity evidence of the general belief in such a future re-living. And these bare assertions are accompanied with another, namely: that the first Christians spoke only of the revival into life of the saints. How much history is perverted by these baseless statements, and how overwhelmingly the evidence, derived from the first Christians, recoils on the heads of those who have made them, will be seen by the following testimony."

The foregoing would lead any one not acquainted with the facts to suppose the historic argument had been *started* by the Editor of the EXAMINER. Eld. T. would palm himself off as a modern Crusader rushing into a combat *provoked* by a Laracenic defiler of "Holy Mother Church." Let him understand that he is not sharp enough. He *himself* has raised the issue, and no matter *how* it is settled, *he* is the only one that can *lose*. The Editor of the Examiner has always repudiated arguments drawn from a class of men of whom sturdy Adam Clarke has truthfully remarked: "There is not" * * * "a heresy that has disgraced the Romish Church that may not challenge them as its abettors. In points of *doctrine*, their authority is, with *me* nothing. The WORD of GOD alone contains my creed." *Com. on Prov. viii.*

Eld. T. proceeds in three columns of testimony to show "how much history is perverted by these baseless statements, and how overwhelmingly the evidence, derived from the first Christians, recoils on the heads of those who have made them." Our readers will be amused, as we extract the Elder's items of evidence, to perceive how well he shows "How not to do it." He says :

"The earliest I have to offer is found in Eusebius (Lib. 3, c. 20), who says of the relatives of our Lord, that they told Domitian, the Roman Emperor, that Christ's kingdom would take place 'at the consummation

of the world, when he should come in his glory, *judge the quick and the dead*, and reward *every man* according to his works.' This occurred in the year 95, while as yet the apostles were alive, and the language is strongly confirmative of the general faith in the re-living of 'every man.'"

"The general faith in the *re-living* of every man!" Is the Elder out of his senses? There is not a *word* said about the "*re-living* of every man." If Christ, in his judgment of "the dead" leaves every wicked man in the power of Hades, and raises from the dead all "who are accounted *worthy* to obtain that world, and the *resurrection* from the dead," will not "*every man*" be rewarded "according to his works?" Where, then, is the necessity of a resurrection of all men to fulfill the first item. The Elder continues :

"The so-called Apostolic Fathers are Clement, Barnabas, Ignatius, Hermas, and Polycarp. Of these five, the first one named is quoted, at second hand, as saying, that 'God will raise up all those who have served him holily,' according to his promise. Well; but does he therefore deny the resurrection of the bad? or does he teach that the good *only* will be raised? Nay, verily. Clement says, the Lord destroyed Sodom, and saved Lot, 'thereby making it manifest that he will not forsake those that trust in him, but will bring the disobedient to *punishment* and correction.' 1st Epis. c. 6: 1, 2."

Clement says, the Lord destroyed Sodom, "thereby making it manifest that he will *** bring the disobedient to punishment and correction." But did the Lord destroy the Sodomites and then raise from the dead, and destroy them again? If not, where is the pertinency of the quotation?

"And again: 'Behold the Lord cometh, and his reward is with him, even before his face, to render to *every one* according to his work.' c. 16: 8. In chap. 23, he quotes Prov. 1: 23, and onward, at length,—a passage that obviously refers to an executive judgment inflicted on a whole race of live but doomed sinners; manifestly at the great *Krisis*; for, in c. 13: 1, he refers to just such an epoch, in the words, 'The condemnation—or judgment, *to come*.'"

We have shown the irrelevancy of the first text in remarking on the Elder's first item. Elder T. says, Clement quotes "Prov. 1: 23, and onward, at length," and then tells us what *he* (the Elder, *not* Clement) thinks it means. *Clement* does not say that the passage "obviously refers to an executive judgment inflicted on a *whole race* of live, but doomed sinners." Elder T.'s name is not *Clement*; if it were it would belie his conduct.—

The last quotation from Clement is, "The condemnation to come." Well, what is the *condemnation*? "He that believeth not the Son shall not *see life*, but the wrath of God *abideth* on him." John 3 : 36. Elder T. says concerning Clement :

"In his 2d Epistle, c. 3 : 2, he speaks of the Gehenna-fire which the Scriptures indicate will not appear till the last day; and in verse 8th says, 'If we do the will of Christ, we shall find rest, but if not, nothing shall deliver us from *eternal punishment*, if we shall disobey his commands.' And in explication of Clement's words, I would here remind the reader that this eternal punishment begins, not at death, but, at the last judgment. See Matt. 25 : 46; 2 Thess. 1 : 9."

Our Elder leaves us to infer whether it is Clement or *himself* who thinks "the Scriptures indicate" that "the Gehenna-fire will not appear till the last day." The astute Elder did not quote Clement on the Gehenna-fire, probably because he wanted the benefit of the said inference. We give the quotation : "Fear him who after you are dead, has power to cast both soul and body into Gehenna-fire." The talk about "*the last day*" is the Elder's. His quotation of "verse 8" does not touch the point at issue; hence the kind Elder gives "an explication of Clement's words" which he hopes will twist it as he wants it. He then continues :

"In chap. 4, he says of the wicked, they 'shall receive a *double condemnation*,' and shall be '*miserable*.'"

Perhaps Jude's expression "twice dead, plucked up by the roots" will parallel the "double condemnation." Neither phrase teaches the *resurrection* of wicked men. Elder T. makes a point concerning the word "*miserable*," which is very natural for him. His theology is set to the tune "Torment." "A faithful regard to *honesty* and *fairness*," which he so politely recommends to his opponents, will lead him to confess that he has *garbled* in quoting the word "*miserable*." He evidently intended that his readers should think that Clement meant *future* torment, misery *in another life*. A full quotation of the passage in which the word "*miserable*" occurs, will expose the fraud. It is as follows :

"Let us, therefore, serve God with a pure heart, and we shall be righteous : but, if we shall not serve him, because we do not believe the promise of God, we shall be *miserable*. For thus saith the prophet : Miserable ARE the double-minded, who doubt in their heart, and say, these things have we heard, but we have

seen none of them, though we have *expected* them from day to day." 2 Cor. 4 : 10, 11.

Clement is not speaking of *future* misery ; it is the misery of those who "*doubt*" the promises in this life. "Miserable *are* the double-minded." Elder T.'s "eagerness to catch at the word" *miserable* "exhibits the desperation of a cause whose advocate is ready like a drowning man to grasp at a *straw*." and a *miserable* "straw" it is.

It should be observed that the "2d Epistle of Clement" from which Elder T. quotes so *miserably* is "*doubtless spurious*."—Hudson's Debt and Grace, p. 290.

Having finished with Clement, we are next referred to "Ignatius" and "Hermas."

"Ignatius, the martyr, wrote of 'the wrath to come,' and says the wicked shall '*die*,' and 'shall depart into *unquenchable fire*,' (Epis. to Ephesians 4 : 2, 3), but nowhere expressly affirms or denies the revival of the bad. Hermas, in his first book and second vision, exclaims, 'Happy are all they that do righteousness; they shall *not* be *consumed forever*,' and in Sim. 9 : 172, says, 'They who have known the Lord and seen his wonderful works, if they shall live wickedly, they shall be *doubly punished*, and shall *die forever*.' This double, or two-fold punishment, is spoken of by Jeremiah (chap. 17 : 18), and I think properly refers to the first and second death."

The phrase "doubly punished" refers, as Elder T. "*thinks*" "to the first and second death." But the question is *not* what Elder T. *thinks*, but what *Hermas* thought. By the way, is it not the teaching of Elder T.'s school that "the first death" is not the *punishment* of sin? If so, what does he mean by calling it a part of the double punishment? The Elder next introduces Polycarp.

"Polycarp wrote of Christ as follows: 'Whom *every living creature* shall worship, who shall come to be the judge of the *quick* and *dead*, whose blood God shall require of those who *believe not* in him.' Epis. to Phil."

The Elder must have extraordinary eyes to see the re-living of the wicked in the above. He continues :

"And again: 'We are all in the sight of our Lord and God, and must *all stand* before the *judgment seat* of Christ, and shall *every one* give an *account of himself*.' Chap. 2 : 18."

Eld. T. gives the last half of a sentence ; we will give the first. "If therefore we pray to the Lord that he would forgive

us, we ought also to forgive others : for we are all in the sight of our Lord and God," &c. The language does not of necessity apply to the *wicked*, for Polycarp was talking to *Christians*; who are to have a judgment of their *own*, in addition to the judgment of individuals of both kinds. See 1 Cor. 3 : 10-15. Elder T. says :

"He thunders his anathema on all Sadducees and Pharisees (this last sect held the death-sleep of the wicked was eternal) by exclaiming, 'And whosoever perverts the oracles of the Lord to his own lusts, and says there shall neither be any *resurrection* or *judgment*, he is the first-born of Satan.' Chap. 3 : 2."

Our opponents are doing good service in showing that the Pharisees "held the death-sleep of the wicked was eternal;" for *Paul* said, "I am a *Pharisee*, the son of a *Pharisee*; of the hope and *resurrection of the dead* I am called in question." Paul fully identifies himself with the Pharisees on this question.—With relation to the quoted text, we believe that "there shall be" a "resurrection" and a "judgment." Try again, Elder.

"At the scene of his martyrdom, he solemnly warned the pro-consul in these words : 'You threaten fire that burns for a moment and is soon extinguished, for you know nothing of *the judgment to come*, and the fire of eternal punishment reserved for the *wicked*.'—*Eusebius*, B. 4, c. 15. The testimony of Polycarp is quite positive, of its kind, in teaching a future re-living of all."

How does Elder T. know that Polycarp uttered the foregoing words? They are *not in his writings*, but are taken from the account of his martyrdom which "is received at *fourth hand*." Hudson's Debt and Grace, p. 292. If we are to believe one part of the story, we may as well swallow the whole. "One passage savors of the miraculous, where it is said that the body of Polycarp, which could not be consumed, being pierced by the executioner, there came out a dove and a quantity of blood which extinguished the fire."—*Ibid.* This savors of the fabulous. The Elder's last remark tallies well with the fiction :—"The testimony of Polycarp is *quite positive, of its kind*, in teaching a future re-living of all."

Before leaving Polycarp, we call attention to a remarkable oversight on the part of Elder T. That is, it would be remarkable, if the explanation were not obvious. His *first* quotation is immediately followed by something too heretical for the Eld. We will give the whole passage :

"Whom every living creature shall worship, who shall come to be the judge of the quick and the dead, whose blood God shall require of those who believe not in him. But he that raised up Christ from the dead shall *also raise us up in like manner, IF WE DO HIS WILL* and walk according to his commandments."

Whose are *the Fathers*, now, Elder ?

There is another passage of Polycarp which is rather strong for the Elder, but not for us.

"Walking according to the truth of the Lord who was the servant of all. Whom *if we please* in this present world, we shall also be made partakers of that which is to come, according as he has *promised* to us, *that he will raise us from the dead.*"

So much for Polycarp. The Elder next appeals to Barnabas :

"But that in the epistle attributed to Barnabas, another of Paul's fellow laborers, is very explicit. In this epistle, ch. 3 : 13, 14, it is written, 'For God will judge the world without respect of persons, and *every one* shall receive according to his works. If a man shall be good, his righteousness shall go before him ; if *wicked*, the *reward* of his wickedness shall *follow him.*' In chap. 4 : 10, he teaches that this judgment shall be '*after the resurrection.*'"

The Elder has here fallen into the common mistake—that of considering "judgment" to have but *one* meaning. In the third chapter of Barnabas he reads, "God will judge the world." He then *assumes* that the *same* judgment is spoken of in ch. 4 : 10 ; whereas the latter passage refers to *Christ's judgment on the throne of David* : at which time "the saints shall judge the world." But they cannot judge the world before *they* are judged and rewarded as *individuals*. Thus there are *two* distinct judgments—that of all men as individuals, at the "appearing" of Christ, the consequence of which will be *the resurrection* of "the worthy ;" and that of "the world" in the future age, when Christ with his immortal saints shall "execute judgment and justice in the earth." Elder T. goes on :

"And, in ch. 6 : 11, he asserts his belief that those who mocked, pierced, and crucified Christ, 'shall *see Christ in that day.*' He bids his readers 'call to remembrance, day and night, *the future judgment.*' ch. 14 : 18."

The phrase "shall see Christ in that day" refers to the *Jewish nation*, which shall be restored to the Divine favor. See Zech. 12 : 10. As for "the future judgment" no one doubts it. The Elder says :

† "Finally, in the most unambiguous language, exclaims, 'He that chooses the other part (evil) shall be *destroyed*, together with all his works. For *this cause*, there shall be a *resurrection*, and a *retribution*.' Hence he exhorts, 'Be ye taught of God, seeking what it is the Lord requires of you, and doing it, that ye may be *saved* in the *day of judgment*.' Ch. 15 : 8, 13."

Another piece of garbling, Elder! We will give what *precedes* your first extract :

"It is therefore fitting that learning the just commands of the Lord" *** "we should walk in them. For he who does such things *shall be glorified in the kingdom of God*. But he that chooses the other part *shall be destroyed*, together with all his works. For this cause, there shall be a resurrection, and a retribution."

We fancy that our quotation of the whole passage in the connection gives quite a different meaning to "resurrection and a retribution." As the *Elder* has it an uninformed person would suppose that the resurrection and retribution *both* belong to the sinner. But as the passage reads there are *two* classes mentioned—those who are to be *glorified*, and those who are to be *destroyed*. For *this cause*, there shall be a *resurrection* (for the glorification of the first class) and a *retribution* (which is the *destruction*—not the resurrection—of the second class). The *Elder* now triumphantly remarks :

"There is no mistaking this testimony, which clearly exhibits a belief in the re-living of evil men, among the Christians of the first century, who were the associates and pupils of the inspired apostles; for none of these five apostolic men wrote subsequent to A.D. 108. And their testimony comes fairly in before Christianity was corrupted by fables."

Alas, for you, *Elder*! you have not adduced the *first word* from either of the "five apostolic men" in favor of your cause. On the contrary, we have *three* explicit declarations of a *conditional* resurrection—one from Clement, and two from Polycarp. "Whose are the Fathers," now, *Elder*? In the light of the foregoing, is not your next remark, to say the least, *ludicrous*? You have *refuted nothing*, and yet you say :

"Here I might stop, content with a refutation of the assertions to which I am replying, but the faith of the first Christian writers and churches having also been called in question, I add their abundant and one-minded view of the matter."

You now go on to give us the opinions of men who wrote *after* "Christianity was corrupted by fables," which all goes for

nothing. You first quote the "Sibylline Oracles," the very name suggesting heathen fables. Next you give us "Justin Martyr;" who appears to have been a strong believer in your doctrine of the reliving of wicked men, but he also believed in some other things which savor of a "*corrupted*" belief; which impeaches him as a witness in this case. The following are his sentiments:

"The souls of the wicked, united to the same bodies, will be punished with eternal punishment, and not for a period of a thousand years only, as Plato asserted." "The souls of the wicked are punished in a state of sensibility after death. "But with what sensation and punishment the wicked will suffer, hear such statements as these: Their worm shall not be quiet, and their fire shall not be quenched; and then shall they repent when it will avail them nothing."—*Debt and Grace*, p. 313-14.

Prof. Hudson "justifies the remark of Bunsen, speaking of the Christians of this [Justin Martyr's] period, that 'scarcely any one of the eminent men had a clear idea of the laws of interpretation, and of the limits between exegesis and speculation, fact and idea. Thus all, more or less, fell into the abyss of allegorical mysticism, which is a declaration of exegetical bankruptcy.'"—*Debt and Grace*, p. 317-18.

How do you like your company, Elder? You next call up "Tatian" who asserted *eternal torment*; next "Irenæus" who believed that *the soul of the natural man survives the death of the body*. You then cite "Athenagoras," who held *the immortality of the soul*, and who thought that "the wicked will be punished in *another life*, because this life is *too short* for their just recompense." You quote this passage so serenely that we are almost tempted to think that you *yourself* believe in eternal torment. "Theophilus" is your next teacher who "claims that the poets and philosophers stole from *the prophets*" their doctrine of "eternal punishments."—*Debt and Grace*, p. 319.

"The Apostolical Constitutions" are next drawn on, in which the immortality of the soul is maintained. Next you present "Tertullian" who thought the doctrine of eternal pains was of *utility* to the sinner. You then refer to "Minucius Felix" who thought the wicked *deserved torment*.

Thus you go on, striving to establish your views by the aid of men who cannot by any means be allowed to settle the question. The Editor of the EXAMINER asked, "*Where*, till Chris-

tianity was *corrupted by fables*, was such a doctrine promulgated?" We now repeat the question. Not a word have you in the "five apostolical Fathers;" where, then, is your "overwhelming evidence?"

It is evident from the three passages from the apostolical Fathers that the doctrine of *Life only in Christ* has their support. Their *total silence* concerning the resurrection of the wicked is ominous of itself. Eld. T. says :

"The use made of a dateless and unambiguous inscription found by Bishop Kip in the catacombs of Rome (which partakes more of the nature of an unchristian, vindictive anathema, than it does of an article of true faith), exhibits the desperation of a cause whose advocates are ready like drowning men to grasp at a straw."

Ah! that inscription *hurts*, does it? It is "dateless," is it? What of that? *Who put it there?* If you say it was a wicked man you are not helped in the least, for he was evidently acquainted with Christianity; for he speaks of *Judas*, and also of the *resurrection*: a pagan would have been ignorant of *both*.—Now if the early Christians believed in the resurrection of *all men*, what sense is there in the inscription: "Let him lie down, and *not rise again*?" This "dateless" inscription is a terrible foe, Elder! And who knows but what there may be *more* of the same sort in the Catacombs? Bishop Kip says, "In inscriptions *like* the following, they recorded their curse."

When we prepared the article on the Catacombs (May Exr.) we little thought that it was just adapted to Eld. T.'s case.—The bow was drawn at a venture but the shaft *hit*. The Lord be praised for the signal manner in which he defends his own truth!

"Hang out the banner on the outer walls"! Let *Life only in Christ* be the thrilling watchword! The long night of fable and tradition draws to its close. The emerald light of the morning begins to creep up from the horizon! Soon the *Sun* of Righteousness will appear ushering in the eternal glories of "the perfect day."
J. T. CURRY.

AN APOLOGY.—Elder D. T. Taylor, in closing his article in the *Crisis*, July 14—to which J. T. CURRY has replied in the *EXAMINER* this month—says:—

"I have been ironical and severe—I know how to be sober, positive, and gentle,—*all for God's truth.*"

Such is the apology he makes for the language he employed in his four articles which we reviewed in the June Examiner: articles so out of character for *sobriety* and *gentleness* that he then said, some would say, "Br. T., you have dipped your pen in gall" *** "you write snappishly, and in bad humor." Now, it seems, he was only "ironical and severe," and "*all for God's truth*"! When we read this apology, we could not help thinking of what a *pro-slavery* minister in this city said of an *anti-slavery* one, about 1838. Said he, "I wish I had Br. — here — *I could wring his nose to the glory of God.*"

That Elder T. "knows how to be *positive*," no one need doubt after what he has written on the life question; but whether he is judge of what is "a faithful regard to honesty and fairness" some may doubt after reading J. T. Curry's searching review of his appeal to the "*fathers.*"

REPHAIM—OR, ANOTHER "ABORTION."

H. F. Carpenter, in the *Crisis*, July 7, has made an attempt to work Isa. 26 : 19 into shape, to uphold the notion of the re-living of the wicked dead. He quotes from the "Works of the Rev. Mr. A. Pirie, published some sixty years since in "Scotland," and introduces his quotation by saying, Mr. Pirie

"Gives us the following exposition of Isa. 26 : 19, which may be of service to the readers of the *Crisis*, as it bears upon a question now before their minds, a question not mooted by Mr. Pirie, because unheard of then, a consideration which entitles his remarks to greater weight in our decision of the matter as coming from an impartial critic."

On these introductory remarks of H. F. C., we would say, if the question of the non-living of the wicked dead was "unheard of" in Mr. Pirie's time, their immortality was just about as much unquestioned at that time; so that Mr. P.'s remarks were doubtless written under the influence of the doctrine of inherent immortality. But, what does Mr. P.'s exposition prove? Is it that the wicked are immortal, and will live from the dead? It proves one just as much as the other; but it does neither, and we shall probably find on examining the

extract H. F. C. has given us, that it leads to a very different conclusion from what he supposed. We give the extract entire. It is as follows :

“ We have already seen, that the living and rising again of the righteous dead, in the beginning of that verse, must be taken literally. Now to this it is added, ‘And,’ or but ‘the earth shall cast out the dead.’ Unluckily our translators did not know what to make of the word *Rephaim* in this text, which they translate ‘the dead.’ In almost every other text where this word occurs, they have rendered it *giant*—the true sense of the word. Giants may be either dead or alive ; and as the earth is here said to cast out the *Rephaim*, they thought they must have been in the grave ; and hence they considered the word as denoting the dead in general. An unpardonable mistake ! The word always signifies either men tall in stature, above the common race of mankind ; or great in crime, ring-leaders in apostasy from the truth, and in persecuting those who are of the truth. Such were the giants in the days of Noah, and such Nimrod and his coadjutors in an after period. Now, as all called by this name in Scripture are considered as leaders in iniquity, the word was used to denote all pre-eminence in crime,—tyrants and persecutors, whether kings, generals or priests.

“ Hence it is evident, that although the word here signifies the dead, yet not the dead in general, much less the righteous dead, but dead giants, or monsters, either in stature or in crime—the *wicked dead*. That this is the true sense of this passage will appear, if you consider,

“ 1. That the dead in the first clause of the verse are called ‘thy dead’—the church’s dead, or those who have died in faith ; but the dead in the end of the verse are distinguished by no such epithet. The former are *Melchiba*, dead, yet the sons of the church, although sleeping in the dust of the earth ; the latter are the *Rephaim*, that are everywhere in Scripture considered as the church’s enemies, dreadful and terrible.—Thus in Deut. 2 : 11, the *Rephaim* or giants, a people great and many, and tall as the *Anakims*, were called by the *Moa-bites*, *Emirus*, a word signifying *terrible, horrible, dreadful*, descriptive of their figure and character.

“ 2. The former are said to live, to arise, as Christ’s dead body, to awake and sing, as herbs rise and rejoice in the influence of the heavenly dew ; whereas the latter, the *Rephaim*, are said to be ‘cast out’ by the earth. The earth is here considered as a mother, happy in bringing forth the righteous, as a mother rejoices when she is delivered of a son ; but when the *Rephaim* appear, she casts them out, rejects them as a vile, abominable

thing, as a mother throws away a mole or abortive conception. This is the exact sense of the word *tephel*, rendered 'cast out.' How just the idea! A mole, or monstrous birth, is not born as a son, but cast out as a vile and loathsome thing.

"I trust it is now evident, that the prophet in this verse, means to state a contrast between the resurrection of the righteous and the wicked dead. And if the verse had been properly translated, the contrast would have been evident even to the English reader. 'Thy dead shall live, my dead body shall they arise: awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust, for your dew shall be as the dew of herbs; but the earth shall cast out with contempt the Rephaim.' Thus it accords exactly with what the Psalmist says on the same subject, 'When I awake I shall be satisfied with thy likeness.' When I rise from the dead, my body shall be as the body of Jesus, when he arose. Ps. 17: 15. But 'as a dream when one awaketh' is despised and neglected, 'so O Lord! when thou awakest them' or in awakening them, 'thou wilt despise their image.'—*Pirie's Works*, Vol. 1, pp. 227, 228.

Let us see what we can get out of this exposition and comment.

1. The rising and living again of the righteous dead, is *literal*. True.

2. The word *Rephaim* means *giant*, and not "the dead," as our translation has it: and these "giants may be either dead or alive; and as the earth is here said to cast out the *Rephaim*" the translators "thought they must have been in the grave." *** "As all called by this name in Scripture are considered as *leaders* in iniquity, the word was used to denote all pre-eminent in crime,—tyrants," &c.

From Mr. Pirie's own showing, it cannot be proved these *Rephaim*, of which the text speaks, were dead at all, at the time spoken of: they might have been the living ones; yea, they must have been, for the prophet had just said of those tyrants who had had dominion over God's people, "they are dead, **THEY SHALL NOT LIVE**; they are deceased, **THEY SHALL NOT RISE**;" so we are shut up to the conclusion the *Rephaim* (*tyrants*) spoken of in the verse under consideration, were the *living* tyrants, who were now to be cut off from the earth when God's people should rise from the dead, and harmonizes with Rev. 11: 18, where His saints are represented as being *rewarded*, and the destroyers, or tyrants of the earth destroyed: "the earth" itself shall

cast them out; they are no more to be found: too vile to live they are “cut off from the earth, and shall be rooted out of it.” Prov. 2 : 21, 22. They are to “be punished with everlasting destruction” at the return of Christ from heaven. When God’s ancient people, Israel, were brought out of Egypt into the land of Canaan, a land in which *Rephaim*—giants—dwelt, and who were a terror to Israel, even, these giants were “cast out” of the land—i. e., cut off: so when God shall cause His people to come up out of their graves, and give them possession of the earth—their promised inheritance—the *Rephaim*, the tyrants, that have so long corrupted the earth, and are alive at the time, shall be cast out of the earth, i. e., cut off, and be no more an annoyance to His people.

3. Observe: Mr. Pirie says, “The church’s dead are said to live, to arise, as Christ’s dead body,” &c.; * * * “whereas the *Rephaim* are said to be ‘cast out’ by the earth,” *** “as a mother throws away a mole or abortive conception: this is the exact sense of the word *tephel*, rendered ‘cast out.’”

What can be plainer—if the text refers to the *dead* *Rephaim*—than that the prophet intends to reiterate what he had said verse 14, “They are dead, they shall not live, they are deceased, they shall not rise,”—for, they are thrown away as an abortion, a vile and abominable thing; of course, they have no life. The verse when properly rendered, according to Mr. Pirie, gives no countenance to the idea that the *Rephaim*, or dead giants, are awakened, or have life restored to them.

The reference to Ps. 73 : 20,—which is coupled with Psalm 17 : 15 without notice of its disconnection—at the close of the extract, does not help Mr. P. nor H. F. C. The English translation admits no such construction as that of awakening the *dead* at all. The Septuagint reads, “As the dream of one awakening, O Lord, in thy city thou wilt despise their image.” But allowing Mr. Pirie’s rendering, it does not begin to prove the wicked *dead* are the subjects awakened. The *living* wicked are the subjects of discourse in this Psalm, who go on carelessly in prosperity till they are overtaken by sudden destruction, and are “awakened” only to feel “terror” at their coming doom; but there is no help for them, for God despises their image: they have despised Him, and He now leaves them to reap the reward of their folly.

Thus, instead of the advocates of the re-living of the wicked dead finding help from Mr. Pirie, they are only left the more hopeless of any escape from the plain declaration of verse 14, that dead tyrants shall *not* live nor rise. Thus ends the second effort to make an "abortion" alive.

THE DISCUSSION IN BOSTON.—Eld. M. Grant and Joseph T. Curry held a discussion of four evenings in Boston, June 9 to 12, on the question, "*Do the Scriptures teach the Resurrection of the Wicked?*" It was fully reported and is now published in a pamphlet of over a hundred pages. Price 25 cents single copy ; \$2,25 per dozen : one-third off from the retail price by the hundred. *Postage*, two cents per copy.

The Editor of the EXAMINER would be expected to favor the negative of the question. Whether either of the parties have brought out any new arguments or not the reader will judge. We were astonished at Eld. Grant's confession at the opening of his first speech. He says :

"The question before us is one of some interest, and a new one to me. It is one that I have not examined particularly till within a few days."

This question has been agitated among the believers in immortality only through Christ for twelve or fifteen years, and for a considerable portion of that time Eld. G. has had the editorial charge of the "*World's Crisis*," and while admitting numerous articles on the affirmative of the question, he has lately discussed in Boston, he has steadily refused the negative a hearing in his paper ; he has opposed us in the promulgation of our views, and carried his feeling so far as not to invite the Editor of the EXAMINER to preach on "*The Stand*" at the camp-meeting last fall at Wilbraham, Mass. Now he announces, "The question is one that" he has "not examined particularly till within a few days" !

If this statement is true, will any man believe, in this examination of "a few days" he did anything more than to endeavor to fortify himself in his previous hostility? Is it not a proclamation that he was incompetent to examine the subject at all? In defence of the affirmative he has done as well as could be expected ; but, in our judgment, has totally failed to establish

it. He seems puzzled with his own statements, often times. Look at the following statement, after saying "Christ purchased us with his own blood," he speaks as follows, p. 19—

"Of whom did Christ purchase us? That word implies a previous claim, does it not? I cannot purchase a thing of you if you have no claim on it. Then he didn't purchase us of God: he wants to get us reconciled to God. Not of Satan: he has no claim on us. We think he purchased us from the *law*. What law? The one Adam violated, the penalty of which was death."

Now compare this with what he says p. 21, as follows:—

"I die in consequence of Adam's sin. I am not to blame. Justice demands that I should have my life back again."

If this last statement is true, "Christ died in vain," so far as Adam's posterity are concerned: for if God had withholden the restoration of this life He would have committed an act of injustice. "*Justice demands*" it "back again," says Eld. G. He might as well say, it demanded God should create us, at first. It was optional with the Creator not to give life, or, if He creates, to give a temporary one, or an endless one to the creatures He should bring into life. He was under no obligation to continue it to man, more than to any other animal being, unless He promised to do so. He did not promise to do it to Adam himself, only conditionally; and He did not promise it to his unborn posterity on any terms; and He saw fit to make it certain that posterity should be "made subject to vanity"—a short life; but at the same time, gave them "hope" of a better and an endless life on condition of the improvement of this temporary life: if the specified improvement is not made, the "hope" fails, and being "wicked" they are "driven away in" their "wickedness," while "the righteous" *only* "hath hope in his death." See Rom. 8: 20 and Prov. 14: 32. The wicked have no claim on justice or mercy for the *animal* life to be restored, and God has neither promised or threatened to restore it to saint or sinner: it perishes in both, because proved, by trial, to be worthless for the *spiritual* service God has demanded of men. Hence the life given—of grace, not of "justice"—is a spiritual, a divine life: and no other life is spoken of, after the death of the animal nature, to which all men are subjected.

Those who wish to procure the *Discussion* in quantity should send to Boston for it. Direct, "JOSEPH T. CURRY, care of O.

Clapp, at Bliss & Co.'s, No. 30 & 32 Winter-St., Boston, Mass." For single copies they can send to Boston or to us, as they please.

AN IMMATERIAL SOUL.—A certain writer, whom we will not name at present, says,

"The soul of the man had been created *out of nothing*, and the soul of the woman was evolved out of the soul of the man."

This "Doctor" (we will call him) is a believer in the final destruction of the souls of the wicked *after* they have a resurrection from the dead ; and to show an "immaterial soul" can perish, he says :

"The microscopic *spermatozoon* in which the man is originated, and from which he is born, contains within its mysterious minuteness the vital and active immaterial principle, that is essentially the future man. By virtue of the laws of psychical evolution, this soul becomes evolved and embodied, in the process of gestation ; and, in due time, a child is born ; and is progressively manifested in the babe, the youth and the man. And it is a fact well known in the science of physiology, that at the moment of each one conception there are *very many spermatozoa* present, and also that each *spermatozoon* present, contains within itself the seminal principle of a human being—in a word, that which is essentially an immaterial soul ; and that excepting the one that becomes the embryo infant, all these vital seminal souls, soon die and perish and are no more. And it is also very well known that thousands and millions of embryo infants, die and perish in the womb before they are born."

There now, who can better describe an "immaterial soul" ! It is "created out of nothing," and millions on millions of them, in their "seminal" state, "soon die and perish," after having struggled in vain to get bodies—in the conception—because they cannot get embodied, as only "one" of them "becomes the embryo infant : " except, possibly, the *struggle* may be so fierce between these "seminal immaterial souls" that *twins* may be the result, and sometimes *three* or *four* get embodied ! Alas, for the mother, when that is the case ! Then so many millions more of them die "before they are born" ! Who will say, after such manifest wisdom, that an "immaterial soul" is not a tremendous reality !

"Materialism," in the estimation of some persons, is nothing without an immaterial soul, even though it is "created out of

nothing." Without this, in their opinion, there would be no resurrection of the identical man. The *power* of God to reproduce the same personality does not satisfy them, even though it is clearly shown God has *promised* to do it, in respect to the righteous. They must have some explanation by which they can see how the identity is preserved. They tell us, "All real things, all of which we can think without contradiction or absurdity, are possible with God." *** "To say that God can not do a nothing is certainly no restriction of his power, but rather an assertion of it."

Will it not follow from this position, that the idea of "The soul of man" being "*created out of nothing*"—being a "contradiction" and "absurdity"—is not true? because, it is not "possible with God" to do a "thing," the "very idea" of which "nullifies itself; it is not thinkable; there is no such thing." It is said, "The necessary laws of being or existence correspond precisely with the necessary laws of thought." Then an immaterial soul has no existence, if it is to be "created out of nothing" in order to exist; for no law of thought can produce something out of nothing; and the philosophy which can assert such a soul does exist, need not be puzzled by a materialist's view of the resurrection of any one, whether righteous or wicked; especially with the view we hold, that the divine life is the germ of the resurrection life.

The materialistic view of man, by creation and natural generation, does not admit of a doubt in our mind; and hence the necessity of being *begotten again* by the Spirit of God: or a new life-element being imparted to us, by which we shall be born from the dead; and without which, when we die "we are as dead as dead can be." with which, we shall be quickened into life "*at the last day*," the same identical man, though then living by a life-principle which makes us immortal and undying. We have no puzzle on the subject. We take God at His word.

THE METHODIST of this city has just commenced its fourth year. It is one of our best *exchanges*. Office No. 114 Nassau-St. Terms of subscription, \$2 per year in advance. All business letters to be addressed to the "*Publishers of THE METHODIST.*"

“A BRAND OUT OF THE FIRE:” or, *Joseph Barker*.—It seems incredible that this man, after the career he ran in this country of the blackest infidelity and atheism, should have been reclaimed, and now be “clothed and in his right mind.” A more hopeless case of apostacy we never knew: we mourned his fall, and grieved at his ridicule of Christ and Christianity. The first and only interview we ever had with him was in the Convention at Hartford, Conn., ten years since, where we withstood him, and his deistical associates. We had read his “*Christianity Triumphant*” some years before, and were not prepared to find him so furiously opposed to the religion of Jesus. His case we concluded then, and ever since have regarded as a case of hopeless apostacy. After that Convention he labored for some two or three years to spread *atheism* in Philadelphia, Pa., and elsewhere. He had found, at the Convention in Hartford, the “God of Nature”—which he and his fellow deists worshiped—could not be defended any better than the “God of the Bible,” whom they affected to believe was a most “outrageous” being; and he immediately went over to atheism: necessity compelled him to do so. That race he run for a time; we know not how long, as we had not heard from him for several years. But, behold, the information comes to us from England this “brand” has been “plucked out of the fire.” If such indeed is the fact, we have reason to adore and bless our gracious God for His abundant mercy. The only information we have on his return to a “right mind” is the following, which we take from *The Methodist* of this city.

“MR. JOSEPH BARKER, who has been noted for the number of times he has changed his religious opinions, and has been for many years past an avowed infidel, recently addressed a numerous assembly in Mirfield, England, on the death of Mr. Samuel Medley, saddler, Mirfield. He described the life of Samuel Medley, and characterized him as a good man—a man of prayer; and stated that he had visited him shortly before his death.—His text was: ‘Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his.’ After discoursing on this text in reference to Mr. Medley’s death, he made reference to his own religious creed. He remarked that he had been very changeable, and compared himself to one who had wandered from the warm South into the freezy regions of the North Pole, and into the

dismal darkness beyond, where he had been lost to all and to himself. He thanked God for his deliverance from such a perilous position, and he now avowed himself a Christian. With reference to his expulsion from the New Connexion Methodist Society, formerly having preached at the New Connexion Chapel, Mirfield, he said it was a very just sentence passed upon him."

We rejoice in Mr. Barker's return to the acknowledgment of Christ. If his return is genuine, does he not owe it to himself and to Christianity, to visit America again, and proclaim his repentance as wide as he proclaimed his infidelity and atheism while here? especially in Hartford and Philadelphia? and thus to some extent undo the great evil inflicted on those communities. May God direct his course.

ORTHODOXY AND SPIRITUALISM.—Dr. J. G. Holland, well known by his *sonbriquet*—"Timothy Titcomb," is the author of a series of articles now appearing in the *Springfield Republican*, entitled "Letters to the Joneses." He says some good things, utters a great many truisms, and has a good sprinkling of nonsense withal. His *seventh* letter is addressed to "Salathiel Fogg Jones, Spiritualist;" in which he takes occasion, as a representative of orthodoxy, to overhaul Spiritualism.

The "Herald of Progress," a Spiritualist paper, has published an answer to the letter, which must cause considerable wincing among orthodox thinkers. It exposes the extreme weakness of the redoubtable Titcomb in several points; especially in relation to Immortality and the Bible. Titcomb says:

"You caught me by the button-hole one day, at the corner of a street, and announced to me the conviction that you could demonstrate the immortality of the human soul. You may, perhaps, remember the smile which your announcement excited. I confess that it amused me.—You seemed as interested and pleased about the matter as if you had never heard of such a thing as immortality before. A book had been in your hands ever since you could read, that told you all about it."

His replicant answers thus:

"You *smiled*, did you, when I told you that I could demonstrate the immortality of the soul. I think I had seen you *smile* before that. But 'smiles' are not usually regarded as arguments, though they are sometimes evidence of conceit. Did I seem interested and pleased about the matter, as though I had never heard of immortality 'before'? I had often

heard about it, but never before did I know it, from tangible evidence, to be a fact. I had *believed* in it, but I had never beheld any objective proof of it until the advent of modern spiritual manifestations. You assert: 'A book had been in your hands ever since you could read, that told you all about it.' Now this is simply untrue, and you are old enough to know it. I never before heard of any sane man who dared to stultify himself by such a gratuitous statement. I never saw such 'a book.'—Did you? If you mean the 'Bible,' allow me to tell you that you never were more mistaken in your life. The 'Bible' don't even attempt to demonstrate the immortality of the human soul. In some portions it teaches just the contrary. Read Eccl. iii : 19, 20–21 : 'For that which befall-eth the sons of men, befall-eth beasts; even one thing befall-eth them. As the one dieth, so dieth the other; *yea, they all have one breath, so that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast; for all is vanity.* All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again.' On to this place this passage from the New Testament, which, in speaking of God, declares: 'Who only hath immortality.'

"One whole sect of Christians teach that the Bible does not teach the doctrine of the natural immortality of the human soul, and quote scores of passages to prove it."

What we have anticipated is coming to pass. The enemy will compel the orthodox to give up what they have not done at the warning of friends. For years many Christians have agitated this very question; showing from the infallible word that man is not immortal by nature. But they have been treated with contempt. The punishment now comes upon them who have been so utterly indifferent to advice. They stand humiliated by the insulting foe. We thank God that many Christians hold "that the Bible does not teach the immortality of the human soul," and that "they quote scores of passages" to prove their position—not to speak of the eternal *principles* of the Scriptures, which establish with overwhelming power the great truth that the animal man is perishing, and that without the principle of spiritual life communicated by the Lord Jesus Christ, he perishes "like the beasts." Let our motto be "No future life except through Jesus Christ and the Resurrection."

J. T. C.

REV. J. B. WALKER ON THE FUTURE LIFE.—The *Restitution* (June 17, 1863), contains some interesting extracts from Rev. J. B. Walker's work, entitled "God Revealed in Creation and in Christ." We copy the following as especially valuable.

Germs of a Future and Better Life perceptible in the Spiritual Constitution of Good Men.

It is well known to naturalists that Swammerdam, by a process not necessary to detail here, discovered the lineaments of the butterfly in the caterpillar, even before its metamorphosis into a chrysalis.

This fact has its analogy in the spiritual economy of all *good men*.^{*} We say, all *good men*, because it is true that there are many of the human family who possess an *inoperative* instinct of immortality, but in whose bosoms no spiritual insight can discover the *lineaments* of a future life. We use the analogy, therefore, only so far as it goes. But have we not in this analogy, viewed in the light of Swammerdam's discovery, a distinct intimation of the *anastasis* of those individuals of the human family in whose bosoms are found the germs of a life, the intuitions and habitudes of which differ from those of the present existence?***

The manner in which the lineaments of the butterfly are attached to, or detached from, the body of the caterpillar, is a process which can not be observed; neither can we discriminate in regard to the attachment to, and detachment of, the new life from our earthly hearts and habits: but one exists as really as the other. New appetites are developed, which are satisfied only with spiritual things. The conscience recognizes new obligations, which are of a spiritual character. There are new hopes and fears, and a new direction of the will. So that, as a matter of fact, the moral powers of the soul are becoming detached from earthly things as their supreme good, while they are simultaneously developing themselves into the features of a new life.

^{*}It was ascertained by Raumer that an injury inflicted upon the chrysalis produced a defect in the future fly. And those who have observed know that in many species the greater number of nymphæ *utterly perish in their own pupæ*.

We call attention to the fact that Mr. Walker's argument proves the *anastasis* or resurrection of "*good men*" alone. Indeed his foot-note affords positive evidence *against* the revival of *wicked men*. Raumer ascertained "that an injury inflicted upon the chrysalis" (The pupa of an insect, or the last apparent change of the larva, before its appearance as a perfect insect." *Worcester's Dic.*) "*produces a defect in the future fly.*" Suppose the injury is so great as to *prevent the appearance* of the future fly! Mr. Walker proceeds to observe that this is the case sometimes. "Those who have observed know that in many species the greater number of nymphæ" (insects in the second stage of metamorphosis) "*utterly perish in their own pupæ.*"—They do not "*see life.*" They "*utterly perish in their own corruption.*" So do the wicked dead. They are unfit for another life. They do not obtain the Spirit and consequently "*are like the beasts that perish.*" Who will be the next witness for Life only in Christ?

J. T. C.

LETTERS AND EXTRACTS FROM LETTERS.

RANDOLPH E. LADD, Springfield, Mass., writes :—As the time of the great annual gathering of the friends of our Lord, at the Wilbraham Camp-meeting is approaching, we feel very desirous that the readers of the EXAMINER should know of it, and be making preparations to attend in as large numbers as possible. We feel assured in our own mind, the glorious truths maintained and defended by the writers in the Examiner, are steadily and rapidly gaining strength in all our advent churches : and although the great *central truth* of “ No future life for any not in Christ ” is not loved and prized by many of our brethren, as its merits deserve, yet there are but few who will venture seriously to oppose it ; and that little opposition will gradually wear away before the rising and growing importance of this doctrine in rescuing from the grasp of infidelity and spiritualism the great, grand scheme of the “ Resurrection of the Dead,” as revealed in the New Testament.

Those of our brethren who were at the Camp-meeting last year, will remember, with pleasure and praise to God, the many precious seasons there enjoyed in the “ SPRINGFIELD Tent.” How gloriously the truth shone forth, and how like the “ dew upon Hermon ” conviction distilled upon the hearts of many of the dear saints of God. His special blessing was there. The presentation of the *doctrine* of “ No Life hereafter for the unholy dead,” but “ Life from the dead ” as a peculiar privilege, made the season of our meeting a deeply interesting and profitable one. We trust and pray it may be much more so the present year. Many more have seen the truth and are now rejoicing in it, and there are not a few, who date their experience of the “ deep things of God,” with their embrace of this sublime truth. Let us say to all who love our blessed Lord, we expect to “ HANG OUT OUR BANNER ” this year, as we declared we should the last, “ *if the Lord permit.* ” There will be other tents this year where the truth will be held up ; but we expect the Springfield Tent will be especially “ favored of the Lord.” Come then, dear brethren. You have been waiting and longing for the appearing of Jesus. Meet us and greet us at Wilbraham the 24th of August, and may the good Shepherd cause it to be the most profitable and richly spiritual feast we have yet enjoyed in that memorable grove. Let us pray much and earnestly that we may possess more of the Spirit of our Master—that we may manifest the truth to the hearts and consciences of others—that we may possess meekness, wisdom, gentleness, prudence and love unfeigned. Come with large

hearts and hopes, expecting they will be filled : and " My God shall supply all your needs." In behalf of many brethren.

DAVID ROLLINS, Wisconsin, writes :—I send you \$5, as a free-will offering, to help to sustain you in publishing to the world truths which I think all ought to know. I feel to thank and praise the LORD for the light I have received from you, under God, in relation to the final condition of the wicked dead. As the penalty of the law is death, who has a right to add to or take from the decision of the LAW-GIVER ? I have wholly renounced the old theory, and rejoice in the belief that " there is life only in Christ." In this belief, there is a beautiful harmony in the word of God : the Atonement is complete. They who come to Christ and believe in Him may have everlasting life. O, how good the LORD is to me, in my old age, (in my 74th year,) in giving me an understanding of the great Bible truth ; and how I wonder I never understood it before ! The LORD is good : His mercy is everlasting, and His truth endureth throughout all generations.

SMALL THINGS.—A young lady once presented me with a book-mark having the inscription, " God bless you," and exacted the promise that it should be placed in my Bible, but never to remain a day opposite the same chapter. Faithful to my promise, I took it home, and, rubbing from the lids of my Bible the dust of a week, I placed it in the first chapter of Matthew, and daily read a chapter and changed its place. I had not read long before I became interested as I had never been before in this good book ; and I saw its truths, that I was a sinner, and must repent if I would be saved. I then promised God that I would seek his face at the earliest opportunity, and if He saw fit to convert my soul, that I would spend my life in His cause. It came ; I sought His face, and received the smiles of His love ; and now I have a hope within me, " big with immortality," and all, I do attribute to that book-mark and the grace of God. Oh, my readers, " despise not the day of small things." A word spoken in season, a simple Christian act, a sincere, simple prayer, may turn a poor wandering sinner from the error of his ways.

DONATIONS FOR THE EXAMINER AND ITS EDITOR.—R. L. Jaques, Esq., \$2. Chas. H. Sutton, \$1. Jas. E. Seabring, \$5. Mrs. R. W. Pierce, \$2. Geo. K. Carroll, \$5. L. C. Thorne, \$10. Dr. J. K. Finley (half yearly pledge), \$5. " Once a month," \$1. John Kemp, \$5.

THE EXAMINER for *September* may be late in appearing : possibly not before the middle of that month.

A MISTAKE CORRECTED.—In the June number of this Magazine, in giving some account of the church late of Chapman Hall, but now in "*Kast Buildings*," we said, "The factious elements seem to have gone 'out from us, because they were not of us.'" Some persons, we learn, suppose we intended by this remark those who meet at Lowell-St. We will only say, they were not the persons intended, at all; nor were they in our mind, or included in any sense in what we there said. We trust this will *correct that mistake*.

"IODINE WATER."—We have added four pages to this number of our Magazine to introduce to the attention of our readers this medical preparation. We have done so, not for pay, nor because our pages are used as a medium of advertisement—for we have uniformly declined them—but, gratitude to God, and a sense of obligation to "Dr. ANDERS & Co.," has made us insert the following four pages.

My only son, GEO. F. STORRS, now 37 years old, has been afflicted, for some dozen years, more or less with painful swellings and inflammations in various parts of his body; oftentimes, seemingly, he was near to death; then a respite for a season, but only for a return of the disease with more violence. For the past three years he has had an open sore on his breast; and latterly one near his collar bone, with ulceration in his throat, that was rapidly increasing, so that dissolution appeared inevitable. In this condition he applied to Dr. Anders & Co. By the use of the *Iodine Water* the ulceration in his throat disappeared in a short time. Continuing its use, in less than two months he was apparently healed, and his general health much improved. This son, whom I had feared would fall asleep in death before this summer should close, is now, apparently, in a fair way to recover as perfect health as is common to our mortal state. In gratitude to God, who has *thus* answered prayer, and in justice to Dr. Anders & Co., I have made this statement and inserted the following pages, satisfied that there is virtue in the *Iodine Water* treatment which the readers of this Magazine will thank its EDITOR for bringing to their notice.

GEO. STORRS.

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. 15. No. 9.]

SEPT., 1863.

[Whole No. 228.]

HOLINESS.

BY JOSEPH T. CURRY.

THIS subject has been much obscured by an erroneous method of explaining its philosophy. Its discussers, from John Wesley down to the various contributors to the periodicals of the present day, which are exclusively devoted to its treatment, appeal only to the inward exercises (commonly called "experience") of individuals for data. To us, this seems a great mistake.—Holiness is a *Scripture* doctrine, and should be elucidated by arguments drawn *from* the Scriptures. The testimony of individuals is worthless except as it reflects the teaching of the Scriptures. First the proof, then the illustration; first "the law and the testimony," next the corroboration from experience.

The Apostle Paul exhorted the Hebrews to follow holiness, affirming that without it "no one (*oudeis*) shall see the Lord." Modern theorists endeavor to prove that this "holiness" is an advanced state of Christian experience; and that a person may be "justified by faith," and yet be a stranger to "holiness." This position is simply monstrous; for "no one can see the Lord" without "holiness;" and if a justified person is not necessarily holy, it will follow that a justified person may be lost! This fundamental error forces a logical mind to reject the theory taught by Wesley and others. We are all the more willing to "search the Scriptures" for information concerning this topic, inasmuch as we have observed that those who are the firmest in their dependence on mere "experience" are the most obstinate adherents of the unscriptural dogma of the immortality of the soul, with its hideous result, eternal torment.

"Experience" is their god, and they will receive no doctrine which does not tally with it. Our motto, on the contrary, shall be: The truth of God as revealed in His word, whether it agrees with our experience or not. "Let God be true, but every man a liar."

What is holiness? The Greek word *hagiasmos* is from *hagi-azō*, which is found in the Septuagint version of the O. T. for the Hebrew verb *qadash*; which signifies "1. to be pure, clean, pr. of physical purity and cleanness.... Hence 2. to be holy, sacred."—Gesenius. Thus the word *holiness* primarily means *physical purity*, but has acquired a *moral* definition. The question arises, Whence came the moral definition? Who gave the word this higher import? As the idea of moral purity is not natural, it must have come directly from God. When it came from God it was expressed by a word or words. The earliest use of the Hebrew word by God in his communication with man is recorded Exodus 3: 5. When Moses turned aside to see the burning bush, God said, "Draw not nigh hither: put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is HOLY ground." The word *holy* here receives its moral meaning. The ground was holy, not because it was essentially different from the contiguous soil, but simply in consequence of the association of the moment. God was there. Here, then, we have the corner-stone of the doctrine of holiness. Its standard, its essence, its exemplar, is the Almighty. He says, "I the Lord your God am holy." Lev. 19: 2. He is the "Holy Father." John 17: 11.

God having constituted himself the standard of holiness, we are interested to know the distance between His nature and ours, that we may understand how far we naturally come short of that "holiness without which no man shall see the Lord."—God's nature was declared by Jesus in his conversation with the Samaritan woman. "God is *spirit*." (*pneuma ho Theos*).—John 4: 24. Such is *not* man. "That which is begotten of the flesh is *flesh*." John 3: 6. *Another* generation is necessary to make man a "partaker of the Divine nature." "That which is begotten of the Spirit is *spirit*." Man by nature is *flesh*—no more, no less. God by nature is *spirit*.

In Cor. 15 we have further evidence that man is "flesh and not spirit." "There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual

body. And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul ; [“God gave him such life as other animals enjoy.” Wesley’s Notes,] the last Adam was made a quickening *spirit*. Howbeit that was not *first* which is *spiritual*, but that which is *natural* ; and *afterward* [the second Adam, Jesus] that which is *spiritual*. The *first* man is of the *earth*, earthy.” Vs. 44-47.

Thus the popular doctrine of man’s inherent spirituality is false ; and with it falls its consequence, inherent immortality. God’s nature is totally distinct from that of man ; the one is spirit, and spiritual ; the other is flesh, and soulical. God “only hath immortality ;” “man hath no pre-eminence above a beast.” 1 Tim. 6 : 16. Eccl. 3 : 19. Hence, if God calls His nature holy, he condemns man’s nature as lacking holiness.—Paul finds in this conflict of the spiritual and natural the secret of the condemnation. He says, “The law is *spiritual* : but I am *carnal* [fleshly], sold under sin.” “The carnal mind is enmity against God ; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.” Rom. 7 : 14 ; 8 : 7.

In view of these things, how utterly absurd is the theological talk about Adam’s original *holiness*. God “made” (1 Cor. 15 : 45) him not spiritual or holy, but wholly *animal*, without the first particle of spirituality. “That was not *first* which is spiritual, but that which is *natural*.” And this was Adam’s normal condition. Being purely natural, the statement in 1 Cor. 2 : 14 was as true in his case as in that of his posterity : “The *natural* man receiveth *not* the things of the Spirit of God : for they are foolishness unto him : neither *can* he know them, because they are *spiritually* discerned.” Hence, the trial in the garden of Eden could have but *one* result—the demonstration of the total incapacity of the animal man to keep a law which arrayed itself against his *natural* instincts. But some one will say, “Then the trial was a mockery.” We answer, Was the trial of Jesus a mockery ? And yet *His* trial could have but *one* result—the demonstration of the complete harmony which exists between the spiritual law and the spiritual nature. The first Adam’s trial showed the lack of holiness in his nature ; the second Adam’s showed the holiness of His nature. The “living soul” was condemned ; the “quickening spirit” was justified. And the Almighty foreknew the inevitable result of each trial. God’s object in each case was to inform *man*, not

Himself. Looking back to the garden of Eden, Adam and his posterity have seen their *natural* unfitness for a future life.— But in connection with the sentence of condemnation God made a promise to Adam of a future seed, “a child of hope.” This child, Jesus of Nazareth, has exhibited to the world His fitness for a future life and the fitness of all those who through faith prove themselves worthy of being made like Him. Hence, we contend that Adam and Eve had the *offer* of salvation. Whether they accepted it or not we do not affirm.

Absolute holiness cannot be ours until we are made “like Him.” 1 John 3 : 2. What then is meant by the command, “Be ye holy”? Lev. 11 : 44, 45 ; 19 : 2 ; 20 : 7, 26. *Relative* holiness is here referred to. The man who prefers the will of God to the will of the flesh, and accepts the helper which God offers—the Holy Spirit—and is determined to “walk after the Spirit,” to struggle against the animal nature and “bring it into subjection,” is *accounted* holy in this life ; it is not what he *is* that is considered, but what he aims *to be*. “For we through the Spirit *wait* for the hope of righteousness by faith.” Gal. 5 : 5. Hence, Paul was *relatively* holy when he cried out, “O wretched man that I am.” He saw his condemned state as an animal man and groaned for the time when he should be delivered from the “body of death.”

The holiness of man in this life is simply a development of character. It consists in the cultivation of a preference for the spiritual. Whenever a person resolves to break from the thralldom of the flesh and welcomes the Spirit of God as an abiding inmate of his heart, he becomes essentially holy. He has “holiness without which no man shall see the Lord.” The business of his life is to “follow after” that which he has espoused. Hence, many persons who are totally unacquainted with the parade of words used by the would-be expounders of holiness are immensely in advance of them in reality. How many, who talk of “sanctification” obstinately oppose the plainest teachings of the Bible! The mortality of the whole man, the utter destruction of the wicked, the dependence of man on a resurrection from the dead for a future life, the personal and speedy coming of Christ, and other doctrines of great moment are ignored and denied by the great majority of those whose ideas of holiness are founded on their own “experience” and

that of others. They cry out to Christ, "Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked;" but they disregard the answer that comes back, "Yea, rather blessed are they that hear the *Word of God*, and *keep it.*"

The *Bible* measure of holiness is the true one. The first act required of the inquirer is *belief*. Not belief in some *theory of experience*, but belief of *the truth*. "*Sanctify them,*" said the Master. How? By a peculiar *experience*? Nay! "*Sanctify them through thy truth; THY WORD is truth.*" The seekers after holiness ask, "What shall we do, that we might work the works of God?" The reply is significant: "*This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom He hath sent.*" Well, who has been sent? *Ans.* "The true bread from heaven." "And Jesus said unto them, *I am the bread of life.... This is the Father's will who 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.* 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.*" If a person believes *this* statement, he cannot believe the immortality of the soul. *Here Bible holiness begins.* Faith! Faith in Christ!—Faith in Christ as the *Life-giver*! "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." What have we to do, then, but to follow after holiness—practice that which is commenced in faith?

LIFE FROM THE DEAD.

UNDER the head of "*The Resurrection of Condemnation*" Prof. C. F. HUDSON has recently published five articles. We have no intention of reviewing them, being willing they should carry all the weight they are entitled to; but as he published an article in the *BIBLE EXAMINER* in 1857, pp. 122-125—to which we made no reply at the time—and has now reproduced that article entire in his recent effort in defence of the resurrection of the unjust or wicked dead, we have thought best to place some extracts from it again before our readers that they may judge of the value of his position on the question. He speaks as follows—

"I will offer what I regard as the true view of the resurrection of the unjust, and, taking the doctrine out of its old theological connection, will try to give it a new setting, in which it may even reflect the divine goodness and love." ***

"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. He might be *just*, but He would not appear great or magnanimous." ***

"The wicked dead are raised, then, *not for the sake of* their punishment. Rather, 'the second death' is the *result* of their resurrection; and the *reason* or *design* of that resurrection is to be sought elsewhere. The Bible never speaks of the wicked as being raised up *in order* that they may be punished, or that God may collect his dues in their sufferings, or for any other need of justice. The justice of the Infinite, or of the Universe, is not so poor as this."

Thus he seems to reject, entirely, the idea held by all, or nearly all future *torment* theorists, that the wicked dead are raised in order to, or for the sake of inflicting torment on them as a punishment. If this point is accepted as truth, a very natural inquiry is, For what then are they recalled from death, when *once* dead? He responds as follows—

"The resurrection of the wicked is rather, in common with that of the righteous, the effect and the token of man's deliverance from the power of death. It comes as the natural sequel of man's rescue from that doom—of his release from that bondage—of his redemption from that condemnation—of a proclaimed remission of the sins that are past, and a respite granted, so that personal faith and union to Christ alone are now wanting, that the new life-power may be a life possession, an inheritance of immortality. The prison doors are opened, and the convict is let out to see the light of day. He is told that the sentence of the law is annulled, so far as God is concerned—he has only to accept the Deliverer as his Lord, and death hath no more power over him. And though in this figure we date the *time* for the sinner's choice after the limit which God has fixed, yet it may illustrate the actual relations of the Redemption and the Resurrection. The latter appears to us the natural outgrowth of the higher life-power which accompanies the former."

That is, if we understand his last remark, "The Resurrection" is "the *natural* outgrowth of the higher life-power which accompanies Redemption." In other words, the life-power in redemption has so far affected the sinner, that, though he dies in his sins, this divine life-power is so inwoven in him, some how, that it *naturally* brings the sinner up from the dead: yet, strange to tell, this divine life-power is not strong enough to keep him alive, but a second dying is the "result of life"

from the dead. Or, the sinner has received, in this life, just enough of the "higher life-power" to open his "prison doors" and be "let out to see the light of day," and to know what he might have had if he had improved the means employed to bring him the full strength of the higher life-power.

If such a manifestation is not "*being punished*," it would seem difficult to tell what punishment is: and if it is not being "*raised up for the sake of being punished*," we cannot see for what "sake" it is. All that is to result from it, according to this statement, has been revealed to the sinner before his death; and the Prof. is obliged to make his "figure date the *time* for the sinner's choice after the limit which God has fixed." Surely, one would suppose that fact would have opened his own eyes to see he had placed the sinner where God has not placed him, and where there is, therefore, no warrant for himself or any other man to place him. We regard the Prof., however undesignedly, as having clearly reversed God's order in His manifestation of the work and order of redemption: that manifestation is not *after* this life, but *in* this life: and it is only those who believe on the Son of God—where He is proclaimed—that He will "raise up at the last day." If the wicked man has enough of "the higher life-power" to raise him up at the last day, he may be assured the same life-power is fully equal to keeping him alive eternally; for to give life requires more power than to preserve it; and besides, that higher life-power never dies: the law cannot kill it. Prof. H. says—

"There is some indication in the Bible, that the resurrection is not absolutely universal, but is limited to those who have known the revealed will and good pleasure of God. 'They that have sinned without the Law shall also perish without the Law; and they that have sinned in the Law shall be judged by the Law.' The distinction here made, while it seems to preclude the judgment of the heathen, after a resurrection, 'by the Law'—may expressly denote such a judgment of the ungodly in Christendom."

Thus he gives up John 5: 28, 29 as proof that *all* in the graves shall live again, and admits "the resurrection" may not be "absolutely universal." And, as "they that have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law," will he, or any one else, please give us chapter and verse "in the law" where the "judgment" of any man is said to be "*after* a resurrection"? Where is the law? Just give us the statute. Can it be done? *We*

know it cannot. Do not tell us it "*may* denote such a judgment of the ungodly of Christendom." It *may* NOT denote any such judgment. Where has the *law* said it does? We cannot take conjectures for evidence. Prof. Hudson in closing, speaks thus—

"I conclude then, the resurrection of the unjust has precisely the same relation to the 'second death,' that their present life has to the first death. Life is not for *the sake of* death, just the opposite—yet death is here in this world the common result of life. So the resurrection of the unjust is not for the sake of their aggravated death. It is given to them, freely as this life is—it is the index of many blessings which the Gospel has brought them—and condemnation is the result."

Truly, this is "the conclusion of the whole matter." He says, "Life is not given for *the sake of* death, just the opposite."—Then it must be given for the sake of life. "Yet," he adds, "death is here in this world the common result of life." That is, we suppose, if we did not have life we could not die. How self-evident. "So," saith the Prof., "the resurrection of the unjust is not for the sake of their aggravated death." But he has said, "The wicked dead are raised *not for the sake of* their punishment:" yet death to a sinner is the "wages of sin"—the punishment; and "the second death," as held by him, could not occur without the resurrection, and that death he has elsewhere told us, is "the death of the soul," which did not die with the body in the first death, and so he maintains a resurrection of the wicked dead in order to kill the soul. He says, "My view is simply this—that there are two instalments of death: the death of the body kills it:"****" this death also deprives the soul of its action:"****" the first death destroys the body and not the soul:"****" the second death kills finally and forever." See Bible Exr., vol. 13, pp. 282-3.

"The wages of sin is death," and he affirms the first death does not kill the soul; it is to be killed by a "second instalment of death." As in order to this, the wicked must have a resurrection, must not that resurrection be a necessity, according to his theory? or, must it not be "*for the sake of* death"? How else can the soul be made to die, if his view of "two instalments" is the truth? And if life from the dead is necessary in order to kill the soul—which is a part of the punishment for sin—is not life from the dead given "*for the sake of* death"? Yea, are not the wicked "*raised up for the sake of being punished,*" not

withstanding the Prof.'s disclaimer? And, though he says, if such is the case, "I know not how to vindicate the *goodness* of God," is it not manifest his theory makes the resurrection of the wicked dead a necessity in order to complete their punishment? and therefore they are "raised up for the sake of being punished." Can he escape the dilemma without abandoning his theory? We think not. Take the following syllogisms.

The wages of sin is death in two instalments.

The first instalment does not kill the soul :

Therefore the wicked dead must live again *for the sake* of killing the soul.

Or, The soul is not killed by the first death :

But the death of the soul is a part of the *punishment* for sin :

Therefore the reliving of the wicked dead is a necessity *for the sake* of destroying the soul.

Would not the Prof.'s idea of the matter involve him, necessarily, in a syllogism much as follows—

Without a resurrection of the unjust the soul would not be killed :

But the resurrection is not *for the sake* of killing the soul :

Yet the death of the soul is the *second instalment* of the punishment for sin.

Or thus—

The soul can only be killed by a second instalment of death :

Therefore the wicked dead will have a revival into life :

But, "if the unjust are raised up for the sake of being punished, then I know not how to vindicate the *goodness* of God."

Would the Prof.'s philosophical mind think this a logical argument? We confess it looks to us like the predicament of the man who maintains man is wholly governed by motives ; and getting between two motives equally powerful he cannot move at all.

He continues—"The resurrection of the unjust is not for the sake of their aggravated death." If it is in order to give them the "second instalment of death," *viz.*, the death of the soul, will he tell us whether it is, or is not harder to kill the soul than the body? And if it is harder, whether a resurrection to kill the soul is not a "resurrection of the unjust for the sake of their *aggravated death*"?

Men cannot kill the soul, but can kill the body :

Therefore the soul is harder to kill than the body :

Hence the resurrection of the unjust, to kill the soul, is for a more "*aggravated death*."

To talk of life from the dead being "given to them freely, as this life is;" and of its being "the index of many blessings which the Gospel has brought them," to us, looks so unlike God that we do not believe Prof. H. can ever "vindicate the goodness of God" to other thinking minds, if he can to his own, with such a theory. He has evidently become entangled in an inextricable dilemma by trying to avoid the torment theory, on the one hand, and the non-resurrection of the wicked dead on the other.

He says, "Life is not for *the sake of* death, just the opposite—yet death is here in this world the common result of life."—The "result" of a thing, if we understand it, is that which it produces. It is that which proceeds from it as a consequence. Can it be said, in propriety of language, that death thus proceeds from life? Death proceeds from sin: in man, it is the "common result" of sin; "sin entered into the world and death by sin," &c.

Again he says—The resurrection life is "given," the unjust, "freely as this life is"***" and condemnation is the result."—Here he seems to hold, condemnation is the consequence of their resurrection: *i. e.*, the condemnation proceeds from a "freely given life" from the dead. The present life is given to men to improve so as to secure an endless life: but the future life is "freely given" to the unjust for no such purpose—their case is helpless and hopeless from the moment it is "freely given." We see no analogy in the gift of the two lives. In this life they may secure the free gift of justification: in that life they can secure nothing—not even condemnation, for that had been secured before this life ended; for, "he that believeth not is condemned already," saith the Saviour.

After all the Prof.'s struggles, we think he will find, life from the dead to the righteous only—life from the dead as a peculiar gospel benefit, conferred on the good alone—is the only Bible theory, and the theory which harmonizes all the perfections of God, humbles man, and exalts our Redeemer and LIFE-GIVER.

"Asleep in Jesus: blessed sleep,
From which none ever wake to weep."

No: they shall hear no more sorrow or sighing; none shall awake except those who "awake and sing," [Isa. 26: 19, and 1 Corth. 15: 53-57,] God shall have wiped away all tears for-

ever. No wailing of awakened and despairing sinners shall grate on their ears : no horrible sights are to mar their joys : for the wicked " are dead : they shall not live : they are deceased ; they shall not rise." Amen.

THE JUDGMENT : HEB. IX. 27, 28.

IN our remarks on the above text in June, we stated our conviction of the meaning of the apostle, which has called out some strictures from Prof. Hudson. He uses the following language :—

" Mr. S. says : ' Let us hear what Paul did say '—' As it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this—*appointment*—' the judgment,' etc. (Bib. Ex., 1863, p. 157. The italics are his.) This exposition seems itself to need explanation. But none is offered"****" A word is inserted which seems to be required only by the theory of the author," &c. " We ask, then what is meant by the judgment coming after the appointment that man should die ? That appointment was made, at the latest, a few days after the foundation of the world. And now we are told that the judgment occurs sometime after that. How much wiser are we made by this interpretation ?"—*Rest'n*, p. 31.

It happens, we did give some " explanation," though it is said, " none is offered." We stated the matter thus—

" ' It is appointed unto men once to die. After *this*' appointment ' the judgment.' God appointed death once, and only one death : after this appointment He institutes the judgment, or *trial* of each individual in his probationary state, which was to decide who should live again : and He caused the proclamation to be made of life through Christ to them who would accept it as a gift in Him. To give this life, He is coming again, and will give it to those, and to such only as '*look* for Him.'—At that hour all others are condemned to *abide* in death and '*not see life*.' Such we regard as the true sense of ' the Word of God.' "

Is here *no explanation offered* ? It may not be as full as is desirable, but it is some explanation of our view of the text.—The term *judgment* is not to be understood as having one unvarying sense in the Scriptures. Its sense is various, and one sense of it is, clearly, that of the gospel proclamation. Thus Isa. 42 : 1-7. " Behold my servant" *** " I have put my Spirit

in Him : He shall bring forth *judgment* to the Gentiles"****" He shall bring forth *judgment* unto truth."****" He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set *judgment* in the earth."****" I the LORD"****" will give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light of the Gentiles: to open blind eyes," &c. Matthew reiterates the Prophet's language—"A bruised reed shall He not break, and smoking flax shall He not quench, till He send forth *judgment* unto victory: and in His name shall the Gentiles trust." Math. 12 : 20, 21.

Is not here clearly brought to view the gospel proclamation ? and is not that proclamation the *judgment* spoken of in these texts and others of like character ? One definition given of the term judgment by CRUDEN is, "*The gospel, or kingdom of grace.*" And is the EDITOR of this magazine to be censured, because he uses his God-given right to express his conviction that the judgment spoken of by Paul, Heb. 9 : 27, is the dispensation of God's grace, introduced *after* He had appointed the race of Adam once to die ? Death was "appointed" to Adam's race without regard to what their moral character might be : after *this* appointment of death, God instituted a judgment dispensation, or a dispensation of love in the-second Adam, who should bring forth this judgment, and set it in the earth for the benefit of all men. Those who accepted it, and developed a moral character such as God should require, were to have the benefit of Christ's second appearing, as they had had of His first : such should live from the dead : the others had "judged themselves unworthy of everlasting life" (Acts 13 : 46), and live no more : the appointment "*once to die*" is confirmed on them and made eternal.

Does Prof. Hudson still ask, "What is meant by the judgment coming after the appointment" once to die ? and say again, "We are told the judgment occurs some time after that." We reply, the judgment of which we speak, could not in the nature of the case be till *after* this appointment to die ; for the judgment, or gospel proclamation, is appointed as a means to deliver man from death, and he needed no such deliverance till *after* he was appointed to death. Does the Prof. still ask, "How much wiser are we made by this interpretation ?" We do not know as *he* is any wiser ; but it does not therefore follow that no one else is. We have inserted no "word required only by

the theory of the author," and we trust no one else has a "theory" which needs to reject it. But be that as it may, we are satisfied our exposition of the text is in harmony with the general tenor of the Scriptures and cannot be *proved* to be erroneous. Besides, the whole argument of the apostle, in the previous part of this chapter, goes to show his mind was on the work of redemption by Christ, and not on judgment in the popular sense of that term. We now submit the subject to our readers.

NO LIFE OUT OF CHRIST.

BY ELDER S. W. BISHOP, WABNER, N. H.

"Because we trust in the living God, who is the Saviour of all men, especially of those that believe."—1 Tim. iv: 10.

THIS text, in connection with some others, is supposed to teach the doctrine of a revival into life, of all men both righteous and wicked, as the grand result purposed by the infinite God in sending his Son into the world to die.

This view of the case argues, of course, that had Christ not died, no such reliving would have taken place. It is urged that the death of the entire race comes on them independently of their agency, and in consequence wholly of the sin of Adam the first. That therefore justice imperatively demands that the second Adam shall redeem all men from the consequences of the sin of the first Adam. This view of the subject makes life from the dead absolutely a matter of debt. That is, God was bound by every principle of justice, to arrange some plan by which the entire race may be unconditionally delivered from the dominion of death. If this position be correct, why quote Rom. v. 18 in proof of a resurrection of all men? Rom. v. 18 positively disproves this position, for Paul declares that the life through Christ is a *free gift*. Now if it be a free gift, it is of *grace*, and not of *debt*. God cannot confer on the human family, as a free gift, by an act of grace, what is their just due.

If it is of grace, it is not of debt, and vice-versa, which is it, of debt or of grace? If it be of debt, then must the plan be so arranged that it will bring to life ALL the dead, or else whoever is left out of the arrangement will have just cause to complain of injustice. If such just cause of complaint does exist, provided the wicked portion of the human family do not get life from the

dead, it follows as a matter of course that if they are made alive it will prove to them a blessing. For where no good is lost, there can be no just cause of complaint; surely no sane person would complain of injustice done him, because he escaped an awful calamity. It must be perfectly evident that if the non-living of the wicked dead deprives them of no future good, there can be no just cause for complaint on their part, if they do not thus live. The question is, then, does their non-living deprive them of any future good? Certainly not, unless they have a probation after being raised with a chance to secure eternal life. My brethren will all admit that no opportunity will be afforded resurrected sinners to repent. It is therefore settled by the consent of all, that no future good awaits the wicked dead; consequently no injustice can be done them by letting them lie in death eternally. But again; the idea that the whole human family can claim a future life, as justly due them from their Creator, presents to my mind the plan of redemption in altogether a false light. It is saying that God was compelled, as an act of justice strictly due the human family, to send his Son into the world to die to save them from the Adamic penalty. This being true, the offering of the blood of Christ was not a free gift; no, it was to cancel a debt due from the infinite God to the creature he had made. That text, then, is not true that declares that "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son," etc. It ought to have read, God was so in debt to the world, that he sacrificed his Son to square the account.

Paul was mistaken when he said, "by grace are ye saved," according to this view. But where in the Word of God do you find your doctrine of debt? Surely not in Rom. v. That chapter abounds in declarations positive, that the life through Christ is wholly of grace. Read the chapter. Not only so, but Paul declares plainly in that chapter, that the indebtedness is wholly ours. See verses 6, 7, 8. And that life is granted to us as a *free gift*, the abounding grace of God. See verses 15-20 inclusive. There is no doctrine of debt here. This doctrine of debt is not found in Heb. ii. 9, for it is there distinctly asserted that Christ tasted death for every man, not to satisfy a demand justly held by the human family against the Eternal; *but by the grace of God*. It is not found in Rom. ii. 23, 24, for Paul there says we have all sinned and come short of the glory of God; and that we are justified *freely* by the *grace of God*, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. This doctrine of debt is not found in 1 Timothy i. 15, for the statement there made is, that Christ came into the world to save sinners. This doctrine of debt is not found in 2 Tim. i. 9, for we are there told, it is according to his purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ

Jesus. It is not found in Acts xv. 11, for we are there told that we are saved through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.— Finally, this doctrine of debt is not Gospel, for the Gospel is emphatically what it is called in Acts xx. 24, "*The Gospel of the grace of God.*" This doctrine of debt only exists in the imaginations of men anxious to sustain a theory. But does the death of Christ secure the reliving of the wicked dead? To suppose that it does, is to suppose that life from the dead is given them by a positive act of redemption through his blood. This being the case, and as, according to every principle of sound reasoning, redemption must better the condition of the person redeemed; therefore if the wicked dead are thus redeemed from death, it must prove to them an unqualified blessing. If their resurrection is a blessing, they are not raised to be punished, unless that punishment is correction, and shall result in their reformation. This no one claims. All admit among us as a people, that when men close their eyes in death, their destiny is unendingly fixed.

It is farther believed, and admitted by all who hold that the wicked dead will live again, that the moment they are conscious in life, they experience a degree of mental agony, such as no mortal ever felt before. This surely can be no blessing. To change a man's condition from unconscious nonentity to a life of the most excruciating torture, whether that torture be mental or physical, surely cannot be redemption. I think if the sinner could be assured that he would escape a calamity of the enormous dimensions of the one named above, he would be entirely willing to lose *such* a part in *such* a plan of redemption (?). But is not a redemption that proves a real curse, a paradox? so we think. If therefore the wicked dead are raised at all, their resurrection must be penal, and that only. They must be raised to be punished; their punishment must be certainly something besides literal death; for they are literally as dead as they ever can be, i. e., if death is an unconscious nonentity till the resurrection. And surely, that God who works all things according to the counsels of his own infinite wisdom, and who has declared that his very nature is love, and that he has *no* pleasure in the death of the wicked, would never raise the wicked to life, and subject them to unabated anguish, unless justice demanded that thus he should do. If simply literal death is the penalty of God's law, justice must be satisfied to leave the sinner in death. Mark, there is no mixed penalty attached to the law of God. It reads distinctly, "*the wages of sin is death.*" If this death is to be construed in its literal signification, every son and daughter of Adam's race who have died in their sins, having died penally, are just as fully under the penalty of God's law as they ever can be, and that law is just as fully satisfied (so far as respects its

claims on the sinner), as it would be if he died ten thousand times. But if death is to be construed in a figurative sense, and means conscious suffering, then, as we have remarked above, the issue is entirely changed, and the doctrine of rendering conscious suffering is clearly involved. That the death which is the penalty of God's law, the wages of sin, is literal death, is proved from the whole tenor of the Scriptures of Truth; we therefore expect no revival of wicked dead into life.—*Restitution.*

MAN AND HIS REDEMPTION.

MRS. L. R. K. BISHOP, Warner, N. H., writes:—The following article is an extract from a private letter written to one of my correspondents. With some hesitation, I have, at the suggestion of a friend, re-written it for the EXAMINER, should you think it will be useful. It contains some of the foundation principles on which rests the doctrine of “no life out of Christ,” as they present themselves to my own mind. Not to occupy too much space, I pass all preliminary remarks, and commence my extract with the argument on

“THE PLAN.”

“Man, by virtue of his creation, is possessed of an animal nature only: or, in other words, was created an intellectual animal, fully qualified, by his superior intelligence, to comprehend the claims of moral law, and his own obligations to obey the LAW-GIVER: and at the same time left perfectly free to choose whether he would, to use a figure, walk up the inclined plane, on which he was placed, to immortality, or down to death. The law given to test man's obedience and thus develop a moral character, was not “thou shalt love God with all thy heart,” because man had no spiritual nature to meet such a requisition; for the Apostle in contrasting the nature of the *first* and *second* Adam says—‘That was not *first* which was *spiritual* but *natural*, (or animal) and *afterward* that which was *spiritual*.’ But the test applied to bring out a moral development was perfectly adapted to his animal nature: it was *eat* or *not eat*, with the consequences stated in the plainest terms. Man chose to lay loose rein upon the neck of appetite and ambition, and death followed. But was the sentence of death, that righteous penalty of the law, pronounced upon all men merely because Adam sinned? I answer unhesitatingly, no! Such an idea *offends my sense of right*, and

I think it can harmonize no better with that eternal principle of justice, that is the very foundation of the Almighty's throne.— And this view of the case is materially strengthened, by calling to mind how God reprimanded his ancient people, for using this proverb, 'The *fathers* have eaten sour grapes, and the *children's* teeth are set on edge.' Could He have done so consistently if He had acted on *that very principle* in the beginning? I think not.

"What then is truth? To me, it seems to lie in this direction: God created Adam a *representative man*: he was not only the *head* of the race, but *their representative*, and when he sinned, he acted just as every other animal man would have done, under the same circumstances: consequently, the sentence of death was pronounced upon the whole race, in *his* person, *because he sinned as their representative*. The Apostle states the case thus: 'By man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed through to all men, *for that all have sinned*.'— But *how* have all sinned? First, through their representative, and then personally, as soon as they come to years of understanding; thus proving that they had been *faithfully represented!* Therefore the Apostle says, 'If we say that we have *not sinned*, we make Him a *liar*, and his *word* is not in us,' for that testifies 'there is none that doeth good, no, not one'*** he hath concluded *all under sin*,' has declared 'the *whole world guilty before God*,' or 'subject to the judgment of God' (margin).

"Thus we see, the law is out against the entire race of man; and the *reason why men die, is because they are sinners in the eyes of the law*; and it will take the only life that man possesses to square his account with his Creator: consequently, when justice is satisfied, having taken the forfeited life, it leaves man in a state of death with no possible way out. Now what? That God whose mercy is just as infinite as his justice, looked upon the race in this helpless condition, going out of life—the grave open at their feet, waiting to swallow them up and hold them in its loathsome prison-house eternally; and 'He so *loved the world* that he *gave* his only begotten Son.' It was a *FREE gift*—the plan is *wholly* a gratuitous one. He had dealt with them on the strictest principles of eternal justice, and yet His great heart of love yearned toward them in their ruined state, and 'He *gave* his only begotten Son that *whosoever believeth* on him should *not perish*, but have everlasting *life*.' In this text is brought to light the whole plan of life through Jesus Christ. Its foundation, 'God so *loved the world*,'—the instrument employed in its execution, 'His *only begotten Son*,'—the *conditions* on which its benefits can be realized, 'whosoever *believeth on him*,'—and last, its aim, or object, and its grand result, 'should *not perish*, but have everlasting *life*.'

“ We have seen that the only life man has by virtue of his creation, is forfeited to the law ; and as sure as justice lives, it must be yielded up *never to be restored* : consequently, God did not devise a plan to save men from *dying*, and thus cheat justice out of its claim, but it was to save him from *perishing in death* ; that is, the plan of Life through Jesus Christ reaches down into the grave, where justice leaves man, and by a new life-principle, obtained through faith in the second Adam—and on which the law could have no claim—it raises him up, making him ‘ equal to the angels,’ to ‘ die no more.’ While then the only life man has *outside* the plan, is forfeited to the law and perishes at death, the *only life* IN THE PLAN is ‘ *everlasting life*.’ Can we state then the inevitable conclusion in any better language than that employed by the beloved disciple ? ‘ This is the record that God hath given us *eternal life*, and *this life is in his Son* ; every one that taketh hold of the Son, taketh hold of life ; and every one that taketh not hold of the Son, hath not life ;’ and he adds, on another occasion, he ‘ *shall NOT SEE LIFE, but the wrath of God*’ (the penalty of the law) ‘ *ABIDETH ON HIM.*’ ”

REPHAIM.

REPHAIM is a Hebrew word, which occurs in the Hebrew Scriptures of the Old Testament *twenty-two* times. For the benefit of such inquirers as do not have recourse to the Hebrew text, we give every passage as it appears in the common version, *italicizing* the word which answers to *rephaim*.

Gen. xiv. 5. “ And in the fourteenth year came Chedorlao-mer, and the kings that were with him, and smote the *Rephaim* in Ashteroth Karnaim, and the Zuzim in Ham, and the Emim.” Gen. xv. 18–21. “ The Lord made a covenant with Abram, saying, Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates : the Kenites, and the Kenizzites, and the Kadmonites, and the Hittites, and the Perizzites, and the *Rephaim*, and the Amorites, and the Canaanites, and the Girgashites, and the Jebusites.” Deut. ii. 10, 11. “ The Emim dwelt therein in times past, and people, great, and many, and tall, as the Anakim ; which also were accounted *giants*, as the Anakim ; but the Moabites call them Emim.” Deut. ii. 20, 21. “ That also was accounted a land of *giants* : *giants* dwelt therein in old time ; and the Ammonites call them Zamzummim ; a people great, and many, and tall, as the Anakim ; but the Lord destroyed them before them ; and

they succeeded them, and dwelt in their stead." Deut. iii. 11-13. "For only Og king of Bashan remained of the remnant of *giants*; . . . all Bashan, the kingdom of Og, gave I unto the half tribe of Manasseh; all the region of Angob, with all Bashan, which was called the land of *giants*." Josh. xii. 4. "And the coast of Og king of Bashan, which was of the remnant of the *giants*." Josh. xiii. 12. "All the kingdom of Og in Bashan, which reigned in Ashtaroth and in Edrei, who remained of the remnant of the *giants*; for these did Moses smite, and cast them out." Josh. xv. 8. "And the border went up to the top of the mountain that lieth before the valley of Hinnom westward, which is at the end of the valley of the *giants* northward."— Josh. xvii. 15. "The land of the Perizzites and of the *giants*." Josh. xviii. 16. "The valley of the *giants* on the north." 2 Sam. v. 18, 22. "And the Philistines also came, and spread themselves in the valley of *Rephaim*. . . And the Philistines came up yet again, and spread themselves in the valley of *Rephaim*." Job xxvi. 5. "Dead things are formed from under the waters, and the inhabitants thereof." Ps. lxxxviii. 10.— "Wilt thou shew wonders to the dead? Shall the *dead* arise, and praise thee?" Prov. ii. 18. "For her house inclineth unto death, and her paths unto the *dead*." Prov. ix. 18. "But he knoweth not that the *dead* are there; and that her guests are in the depths of hell." Prov. xxi. 16. "The man that wandereth out of the way of understanding shall remain in the congregation of the *dead*." Isa. xiv. 9. "Hell from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming: it stirreth up the *dead* for thee." Isa. xxvi. 14. "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. xxvi. 19. "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*."

We have been thus exact in presenting the foregoing texts because we wish all our readers to understand the reason why the word *rephaim* is applied in the common version both to the *living* and the *dead*. *Rephaim* is the *plural* of *two different words*—*rephai* and *rapha*. See Gesenius's Lexicon. As the plural of *rephai* it occurs in the first *twelve* passages which we have quoted. In the first *two* of the twelve, it refers to "an ancient Canaanitish tribe beyond the Jordan, celebrated for their gigantic stature." It is used "in a wider sense" in the next *five* of the twelve, and "appears to have comprehended all the gi-

gantic races of the Canaanites, the Ernim, Zamzummim, and Anakim." "From the Rephaim on this side of Jordan was named the Valley of Rephaim." Josh. xv. 8; xvii. 15; xviii. 16; 2 Sam. v. 18, 22.

In the remaining passages—eight in number—*rephaim* is the plural of *rapha*, a noun which is derived from the verb *rapha*. The verb is defined by Gesenius: "1. Pr. to sew together, to mend, to repair. 2. to heal, to cure. 3. to allay, to quiet." The noun *rapha* takes its meaning from the third definition of the verb, and signifies, as Gesenius states, "properly 'the quiet, the silent.'" With this meaning the plural *rephaim* is applied to the dead, who "go down into silence." Ps. cxv. 17. Hence Dr. Eadie says that *sheol* is the "world of the dead—the region of the *Rephaim*—the *helpless*"—Biblical Cyclop., Art. Hell. In commenting on Isa. xiv. 9, Albert Barnes says that *rephaim* "is applied to the shades, or spirits of the dead, as being weak, feeble, or without power or sensation, from the word *Rapha*, weak, feeble, powerless." (Barnes' expression—"shades, or spirits"—is merely the language of his *theology*; it does not belong to the definition of the word in question.) Prof. Pick agrees with the critics already mentioned in defining *Rephaim* "feeble ones, helpless." Dr. J. A. Alexander, reputed by Prof. Green the "greatest of American orientalists and scholars," says on *Rephaim*, Isa. xxvi. 14: "It is here a poetical equivalent to *dead*." Pursuant to Platonic philosophy he translates it "*ghosts*." Prof. Turner in agreement with Dr. A. renders *rephaim* in Ps. lxxxviii. 10—"shades."

We think that no one has any right to apply *rephaim*, in the first sense mentioned, to the eight passages where it has the second sense mentioned. When used in the first sense it always refers to the living; when used in the second sense, it always refers to the dead. In the first sense it can never be applied to the dead; in the second sense it can never be applied to the living. The subject-matter must decide whether *rephaim* refers to living giants or to dead persons. A glance at the last seven texts quoted above will leave no doubt that the word refers to the dead in each case.

Another fact must be considered—there is not a text in the Bible where the word means "*wicked dead*." The word *itself* does not decide the character of the dead; that must be settled

by the *text*. It may refer to the *righteous* dead or to the *wicked* dead. In Ps. lxxxviii. 10, the dead *in general* are spoken of; the verse contains a parallelism; the second line repeats the sentiment:

“Wilt thou show wonders to the *dead* (*methim*) ?

Shall the *dead* (*rephaim*) arise and praise thee ?”

The passage teaches the *unconscious* state of the dead, and therefore the Psalmist deprecates it. In Isa. xxvi. 19, the *righteous* dead are referred to. “*Thy dead* (*metheka*) shall live . . . the earth shall cast out (bring forth) the *dead* (*rephaim*).”

In the other five instances the subject shows that the *wicked* dead are meant. In Isa. xxvi. 14, the prophet says of certain earthly oppressors: “They are *dead* (*methim*), they shall not live; they are *deceased* (*rephaim*), they shall not rise.”

The prophet does not say that they shall not rise because they are *rephaim*, for that expression is a parallel to *methim*.—Now the *wicked* are no more *methim* than the *righteous* are. “*THY methim*,” says the prophet in verse 19, “shall live . . . they shall arise . . . the earth shall cast out the *rephaim*.” Hence *rephaim* is parallel to *methim*—as in verse 14.

The case is very clear and can leave no query in a candid mind. We have three instances where *methim* and *rephaim* occur as parallel terms, and the application is different in each instance. In Ps. lxxxviii. 10, *methim-rephaim* are the *dead without reference to character*; in Isa. xxvi. 14, they are the *wicked* dead; in verse 19, of the latter chapter they are the *righteous* dead. The term *rephaim* is used, in all three places, TO AVOID THE REPETITION OF THE WORD *methim*. The *methim* in Ps. lxxxviii. are shown to be *unconscious*. The *methim* in Isaiah xxvi. 14, *shall not live—shall not rise*. The *methim* in Isaiah xxvi. 19, *shall live—the earth shall bring them forth*.

In the late discussion—Boston—the affirmative did his best to neutralize the plain statement of Isaiah—ch. xxvi. 14. He quoted verse 19: “The earth shall cast out the dead,” and said: “Who are ‘the dead’ there? The same word rendered ‘deceased’ in verse 14,—*Rephaim*. Who are the *Rephaim*? I come to a point of interest. Gesenius tells us they are ‘an ancient Canaanitish tribe beyond Jordan, celebrated for their gigantic stature.’” (Dis. p. 44). On page 70 he again said:—“Gesenius defines the word *Rephaim*, rendered ‘the dead’ in

verse 19,—‘An ancient Canaanitish tribe beyond the Jordan, celebrated for their gigantic stature.’”

Thus, the foundation of our late opponent's argument against Isaiah xxvi. 14, was a definition of Gesenius. Will our readers believe us when we declare that *no such definition is given by Gesenius?* The definition given does not belong to *rephaim* as used in the text referred to. Gesenius gives it as a definition of the word *Rephaim* as used in Genesis, Deut., Joshua, and 2d Samuel. We hesitate not to say that the affirmative's statement is *utterly untrue*. We transcribe the *real* definition as found in Gesenius: “*Rapha*. Plural, *rephaim*, pr. ‘the quiet, the silent,’ that is, *the shades, manes*, dwelling in Hades, whom the Hebrews supposed to be destitute of blood and animal life (*nephesh*) but yet not wholly without some faculties of mind; Ps. 88, 11; Prov. 2, 18; 9, 18; 21, 16; Is. 14, 9; 26, 14, 19; c. art. Job 26, 5.”

The foregoing is Gesenius' definition of the word in Isaiah xxvi. 14, 19. But this did not suit Elder G.; so he took the same term *rephaim*, where it is used as the plural of *another word*—*rephai*, as we have shown—and gives the meaning of *this* word as found in Gesenius. The definition given by Elder G. had no more to do with the word under consideration than any other word taken at random out of the Lexicon. Elder G.'s talk on *rephaim* occupies *four* pages of the printed Discussion—all based on a false definition. On page 69 he said: “Now we come to the *Rephaim* once more. My friend doesn't let it alone. That is his ‘Vicksburg,’ his stronghold. *I purpose to take it in the name of the Lord and His word.*” (The italics are ours.) In view of the facts, is not such *cant* contemptible?

Having fixed the spurious definition for a basis, our opponent found himself compelled to perform a feat of twisting. If verse 19 teaches the resurrection of the wicked, verse 14, with far greater emphasis, teaches the contrary. “They are dead, they shall *not live*; they are deceased, they shall *not rise*.” The word *kam*, translated “*rise*,” has a second primary meaning “to stand;” and thence comes to signify “endure,” in some places. So Elder G. renders the passage: “They are dead, they shall not live; they are *Rephaim*, they shall not *endure*”—“shall not *continue*.” Did he not see that the structure of the passage *demands* the common version? “They are dead, they shall not

A "LESSON" OF DOGMATISM.

live ; they are deceased, they shall not"—What word will answer to *live* except *rise*?

Elder G.'s *comment* on the text is wonderful : " That race has now run out. 'There is not a giant left of the Rephaim.'" Well, *when* did that race run out? He answers (Dis. p. 82), "They are not spoken of as being alive since David and Jonathan killed the last of them, mentioned in 1 Chron. 20 : 5-8. They *are dead.*" Well, then, were these *dead giants* (the last, as you say, slain by David and Jonathan, about 1037 years before Christ) "*visited and destroyed*" by God Himself 300 years after, for Isaiah to say of them, " *Other lords* beside thee have had dominion over us....they are dead, they shall not live?" Or if, as you claim in another place, this is a part of a "song to be sung in the land of Judah" at the coming of Christ, by what logical process do you identify those tyrannous lords "*visited and destroyed*" by Jehovah with the giants slain by David and Jonathan?

Elder G.'s statement about the death of the last of the Rephaim is not far from the mark (*for him*) "the last" of the *Rephaim* was slain more than *four hundred years* before the exploits recorded 1 Chron. xx. See Deut. iii. 11. *The Rephaim are not mentioned* in 1 Chron. xx.

Finally—the *Rephaim* of olden time NEVER "HAD DOMINION over" Israel. So that the "other lords" were *not* the *Rephaim*.

From the utter failure of our opponent's effort to overthrow the positive statements of Isaiah, we draw the following conclusion—"It is hard to kick against the pricks." J. T. C.

A "LESSON" OF DOGMATISM.

The *Gospel Banner*, (June 1st) published at Geneva, Ill., contains a letter from a correspondent in Springfield, Mass., in which some strictures are made in relation to the teaching and preaching of one "Elder Joseph T. Curry" concerning "Baptism." The writer of the letter says, "he [the said preacher] takes his lesson from George Storrs, who has written a pamphlet entitled the 'Essential Baptism.'"

We suppose that the writer looks upon the said preacher as he would a young robin, which opens its mouth and receiving

whatever the parent bird drops therein without any discrimination. The preacher confesses that he has received more than one "lesson" from the person named; and if he is not very much mistaken, the author of the letter is in the same condemnation, for he is a strong believer in the doctrine of "Life only in Christ," which is the chief "lesson" now taught by George Storrs.

We wonder if the letter-writer is prepared to accept the "lesson" given by the editor of the *Banner* in his response to the letter. The editor says:

"As to the pamphlet alluded to on 'Essential Baptism,' we have not seen one, but from the specimen given in the above communication, presume that we have both read and heard the same arguments before. Over twenty years ago we read a pamphlet against Water Baptism, by one Joseph Barker, a Methodist preacher and reformer, (now a bold infidel;) and one who was on the right track in many things. He took the same ground as Storrs, Curry & Co., that the Baptism of the Holy Spirit was the 'one Essential Baptism,' and that Peter and his brethren were mistaken, and did not understand the commission of their Master, because of their Jewish prejudices. This is very dangerous ground to occupy. It is a pathway leading directly to infidelity. It led Joseph Barker not only to scepticism, but to a denial of the inspiration of the Bible, and to become a bold and public blasphemer of the name of its Divine author. We look upon all such triflers with the authority of the Book and its author, whether professed friends or foes, as all of one class: the only difference being in degree. They are essentially infidel."

Will the letter-writer take this "lesson"? Or will he refuse to remember the Saviour's words, "By *their fruits* ye shall know them"? Does he believe this precious dogmatizer when he says that "Storrs, Curry & Co." "are *essentially infidels*?"

What wholesale slaughter does the said Editor make of truth and common sense! How does he know that Barker's belief in relation to Baptism "LED" him "to a denial of the inspiration of the Bible," and to "blaspheme the name of its Divine author"? It is a disgrace to the common cause that such shameless trash should be countenanced by Christians. It is just such talk as this that makes the Advent cause a stench in the nostrils of the people. May the Lord in his mercy save us from ever being identified in the least degree with men who talk thus!

The editor calls us "triflers with the *authority of the Book* and its *Author*." What a falsehood is this! We merely use the wisdom given us by our Heavenly Father to discover the

true teaching of Christ. But because we are so unfortunate as to disagree in our conclusions with the omniscient editor of the *Banner* we must be branded with *infidelity*! But, thank God, he can *only* rave! God will take care not to commit. His cause to such characters. And we will not allow ourselves to think that the correspondent of the *Banner* will accept such a lesson of dogmatism and malignant prejudice as is offered him.

Both correspondent and editor speak of "Eld. Curry's *twist*" in reading John iii. 5, thus: "Except a man be begotten of water, *even* the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of God." The editor says, "It is 'born out of water *and* spirit'—not *begotten* of or by water, *even* spirit."

We would ask this sapient editor, whether our rendering "*begotten*" is not allowed by the original word? If he has a tithe of the knowledge which we suppose a translator of the Scriptures should have, he is aware that the original word has two senses—"1. to beget, as a father. 2. to *bear, bring forth*, as a mother." The subject matter must decide which is the meaning in every case. In 1 John, v. i., the common version has it both ways. We prefer "*begotten*" in the verse under consideration. Will the editor of the *Banner* say that we have not the critical right? Did he wish to throw dust in his correspondent's eyes by merely playing on the English translation?

Our reasons for preferring the word "*begotten*" are as follows: John i. 13, belongs to the subject. "Which were *born*, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of *God*." The same expression, "*born of God*," is found in the common translation of 1 John iii. 9; iv. 7; v. 1, 4, 18; five places. Now this phrase is certainly incorrect; for God is not the *mother*; we cannot be *born* of Him. He is the *Father*; hence the phrase should be, as it is in some places in John's Epistle, "*begotten of God*." We think our translators were inconsistent in rendering one word *two* ways in 1 John v. 18. It should be "*begotten*" in both cases.

In 1 Pet., i. 23, we have a clear proof of our position. "Being *born* again, not of corruptible seed," &c. Every one must admit that the word should be "*begotten*" in this place. The *Divine* generation is referred to: hence we read, "Being *begotten* again, not of *corruptible* seed"—not of blood, nor of

the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man—"but of *incorruptible*"—of God—"by the word of God; which liveth and abideth forever."

Our argument is further strengthened by the true reading of John iii. 3, 7. "*Again*," in both verses should be "*from above*," as in the margin. The original word *another* is compounded of the adverb *ano*, "*up, upwards, above*," and the particle *then*, "denoting *motion from a place*." Hence *from above*, is the literal and primary meaning. Dr. Robinson supports this in his Lexicon. But how would it sound to read, vs. 3, 7, "*born from above*." Such is not the case. But we are "*begotten from above*."

Two generations are spoken of by Jesus—one of the *flesh*, the other of the *Spirit*. That which is begotten of the *flesh is flesh*,—a fleshly nature is the result of fleshly generation. "That which is begotten of the *Spirit is Spirit*"—a spiritual nature is the result of the Spiritual or Divine generation. Jesus propounded to Nicodemus the great truth, that if a man will have *another* life, that life must be preceded by *another* generation. "Flesh and blood" (the animal nature) "cannot inherit the kingdom of God." 1 Cor. xv. 50. Hence, "except a man be begotten from above, he cannot see the Kingdom of God." Except a man be begotten of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God." "Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be begotten from above. The wind bloweth where it listeth, but thou canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is begotten of the Spirit." It is a mysterious work, wrought during the mortal existence of the believer, by which his "mortal body" is "quickeneth," for "it is *the Spirit* that quickeneth." All who are not begotten of the Spirit are of the class referred to by our Lord when he said: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood ye have *no life* in you." No quickening principle. He immediately adds: "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood *hath eternal life*," (hath the quickening spirit) "and *I will raise him up at the last day*." John vi.

It will be noticed that we do not recognize any *birth* of the Spirit. We are *born* at the *resurrection*, and not before. Our Lord is the first-fruits of the resurrection—"the first-born from

the dead." But there can be no *birth* whatever without a preceding generation ; hence all who are not re-generated by the Spirit of God will fail of the birth—they will not be "the *children* of God, *being* the children of the resurrection." Luke xx.

Having thus vindicated the rendering "begotten," we now inquire what *water* has to do with Christ's subject in his conversation with Nicodemus ? Plainly nothing, except as a *symbol*. *Water* is a symbol of the *Spirit* in other places. In His conversation with the Samaritan woman (John iv.) Christ used the word *water* as a symbol of the Spirit. Can any one doubt it ? "In the last day, that great day of the feast," He did the same. "This spoke He of the *Spirit*." John vii. 37-39. "Rivers of living water" is a symbolic expression for "the Spirit." Why then shall not John iii. 5, be read thus : "Except a man be begotten of water, even the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God" ? The Greek conjunction, *kai*, rendered "and," may also be rendered "even." One instance where it is thus used will be sufficient here. 1 Cor. xv. 24 : "Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God *even*" (Gr. *Kai*) "the Father." When used thus, it is called *kai* explicative.

But let us notice the interpretation of the text as given by the editor of the *Banner*. He says:

"Jesus was evidently alluding, in this conversation with Nicodemus, to an existing institution, well known to the Jews, to observe which they were called by the Harbinger of the Messiah; for John was then preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins; those who refused to submit to that baptism, (which all admit to be an immersion in water), Jesus said 'rejected the council of God against themselves.' But in addition to this, he also taught Nicodemus the necessity of being born of the Spirit."

The editor has hit the nail in saying water baptism was "an existing institution, well known to the Jews." It was a common practice among them, especially the baptism of proselytes. Says Dean Alford :

"When *men* were admitted as proselytes, three rites were performed—*circumcision*, *baptism*, and *oblation*; when *women*, two—*baptism* and *oblation*. The baptism was administered in the day-time, by immersion of the whole person; and while standing in the water the proselyte was instructed in certain portions of the law. The whole families of proselytes, including infants, were baptized." *Com. on Math.* iii. 6.

Maimonides, the great Jewish Rabbi, says :

"And so in all ages, when a Gentile was willing to enter into covenant, . . . and take upon him the yoke of the law, he must be circumcised, and baptized, and bring a sacrifice."

The Talmud of Babylon says :

"When a proselyte is received, he must be circumcised : and when he is cured they baptize him in the presence of two wise men, saying, 'Behold he is an Israelite in all things.'"

The Talmud of Jerusalem testifies the same, with the addition of "sacrifice." The Gemara of Babylon says, "The proselytes entered not into covenant but by circumcision, baptism, and sprinkling of blood."

"When the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem" to question John the Baptist, they did not manifest any wonder at the rite, as if it was a new thing ; they merely questioned his authority as an administrator. "*Why* baptizest thou then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet?" "Lightfoot cites from the Rabbinical books, testimonies that the Jews expected a general purification or baptism, before the coming of the Messiah (from Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26, and Zech. xiii. i.), and that it would be administered by Elias." But they were puzzled to know why *John* baptised? John answered them, saying, "I baptize with *water* : but there standeth one among you, whom ye know 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. And I knew him not ; but 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 who *baptizeth with the Holy Spirit*.' And I saw, and bare record, that this is the Son of God." See John i.

Have we not the most conclusive evidence in this chapter, that John's baptism was merely *typical*, and to "manifest to Israel" the *real* baptizer with the *essential* baptism? According to his own testimony, John's baptism was to be *super-seded* by a greater. Now if the editor of the *Banner* is correct in his position, that the "water" in John iii. 5, refers to John's baptism, then *we* are justified in *our* position that John's baptism is not an institution for the 19th century, because it was super-

seded 1800 years ago. So taking his own interpretation of the text *our* case is safe. He says :

"First a water birth; then a spirit birth. The *first* is the immersion in water of a penitent believer of the Gospel. . . . The *second* is a spirit-birth, or a physical transformation of flesh into spirit. 'That which is born of spirit is spirit.' It will be as much spirit when born or produced *out of* spirit, as that now born or produced out of flesh is flesh. Jesus is the model—the first-born from the dead—the chief of his brethren."

Our friend's statement is rather rickety. He says the *first* birth "is the immersion in water"—the *second* birth "*out of* spirit." How an *immersion* can be a *birth*—or how going *in* to the water can have any analogy with coming "*out of* spirit" is not clear to us. But this little muddle is native innocence when compared with the stupendous heresy of putting the great spiritual work spoken of by Jesus into the *next age*. We endeavored to uncover this western monstrosity in the Feb. *Examiner*. We showed that the author of the article published in the *Gospel Banner* and headed, "Will there be a resurrection of wicked men?" denied a vital connection between Christ and the believer in *this life*. He put Christ "the bread of life" in the *age to come*. We now have the heresy reiterated by the editor of the *Banner*. He distinctly states that the "spirit birth" is at the *resurrection*. As he refuses our word "begotten," he is left without any work of the Spirit in *this life*, which, as we have endeavored to show, is absolutely indispensable in order to obtain a future life. All he has in *this life* is *water*! And yet this spurious theory is called "Gospel"! And those who claim that the Spirit baptism is the great essential in *this life*, are said to teach something "extra from the Gospel." The editor says, further on :

"This spirit-birth or change of physical nature is dependent on a preparatory moral and ceremonial change, or a full and implicit obedience now to the revealed will of God."

The editor's ideas are purely Mosaic. In the old dispensation there was a "moral and ceremonial" law, which was binding. But Paul discovered the *carnality* of the *ceremonial* law which was adapted to the child-state of Israel. He says, in Gal. iv. "We, when we were *children*, were in bondage, under the *elements* of the world"—the Mosaic economy. In speaking of

"the first tabernacle," in Heb. ix. he says, it "was a *figure* for the time *then present*, * * * which stood only in meats and drinks, and *divers baptisms*, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the *time of amendment*." But our editor will not accept the amendment. He still prates of "*ceremonial change*." He speaks of a "*moral change*" which, in connection with the ceremonial, he calls "*a full and implicit obedience to the revealed will of God*." He is trying to be "*justified by law*." But what saith Paul: "*By deeds of law there shall no flesh be justified in His sight: for by law is the knowledge of sin*." Rom. iii. Again, in Philippians iii: "*I count all things loss . . . that I may win Christ, and be found in Him, not having mine own righteousness, that which is of law, but that which is through the faith of Christ*." In Gal. v. he says, "*Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by law; ye are fallen from grace*."

When will men learn that there is no justification by law—that the Mosaic law, written in stone, was but a dim presentation of God's one great spiritual law—which cannot be apprehended in all its fulness, until we are made entirely spiritual in the resurrection? When will animal men learn that they are condemned by the spiritual law, by virtue of their *inferiority of nature*, and not merely by overt acts? The only thing that the law can possibly do with reference to the animal man is to *condemn* him. Hence to talk of "*full and implicit obedience*," while we are *incapable* of it, is sheer absurdity. Does the editor of the *Banner* delude himself with the idea that he now renders "*full obedience*" to God? Why his imperfection (not to use a stronger word) is manifested in the very article which we are now noticing. The law says, "*Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor*." This law he has broken in charging "*Storrs, Curry & Co.*" with *infidelity*. If we could review all his writings, all his actions, all his thoughts, how many other and more serious breaches of God's spiritual law would necessarily be uncovered! It was the contemplation of the comprehensive sweep of God's law that led Paul to cry out, "*O, wretched man that I am!*" And it was only the view of Christ, the righteous, that calmed his troubled spirit. The holiest men that have ever lived have manifested the most profound

self-abnegation and humiliation in view of their shortcomings. John Wesley, on his death-bed, could see no worthiness in himself, but cried out,

“ I the chief of sinners am,
But Jesus died for me.”

Time would fail us to tell of multitudes of the salt of the earth who have borne the same testimony. *We are not saved because we are worthy*, but because CHRIST IS WORTHY.

“ Jesus thy blood and righteousness
My beauty are, my glorious dress.”

Does the editor of the *Banner* think that an *immersion in water* perfects him? Does he think it brings him a step nearer to God? On the contrary, does he not give us abundant evidence that his theory makes him morose, uncharitable, “ignorant of God’s righteousness”? Is it any wonder, then, that he seeks to establish *his own* righteousness? J. T. C.

CHRISTIAN DEPARTMENT.—A haughty, severe, and stoical deportment, and an unrelenting strictness of opinion, on the social and cheerful enjoyments of life, are far from giving a just and true conception of religion to such as are averse from it, and devoted to the pomps and vanities of life. This severity (instead of convincing them of their errors, and recalling them to the God of mercy and goodness) may harden their minds still more, by representing the worship of God as a system of unceasing hardships and mortification. Many good but mistaken people too often seek to convert and reform others, by exhibiting, in their own practice, certain acts of self-denial.—But it is not in these that true religion consists. When used in moderation, they may, indeed be innocent, and sometimes useful; but God is not to be served only with the words of the mouth, or the bending of the knee; it is the pure and upright heart which he requires, and with which alone he will be satisfied.

With this pure and upright frame of mind, we may live in the world without either affectation or singularity, and cheerfully conform to its reasonable amusements, and yet preserve the most strict subjection to our duty to God.***This is true religion, and the service of God—of that God, who made the world and all things in it, and who, although a jealous God, is the God of love, who delights in the happiness of his creatures. All other ways of serving him are but the outward forms of ceremonies instituted by bigotry and superstition.—*Fenelon.*

THINKERS.—The world owes a vast debt to its thinkers (and they are not a great multitude, in the highest and sublimest sense of thinking). I call not him a thinker who travels in the old ruts and grooves of accepted opinion.***I call him a thinker who, in the realm of opinion and research, is a brave pioneer, far ahead of the common lazy throng of obsequious brains, exploring untrodden realms and climbing up acclivities hitherto untried in mental adventure. Admit that such men are sometimes heretics and extremists; yet I would rather be a heretic and an extremist in some degree than have it said of me when I am dead, that I found the world at my birth anchored in the mud of an old false prejudice, and lived three-score and ten years, and died and left the world, as far as respected one brave manly endeavor of mine, as much in the mud as ever. Nay, I would rather give the world one single new good thought and die like an ephemera than live a million of years like a bivalve of the sea-beach, inert and embedded in the darkness of cowardice and bigotry.—*J. L. Corning.*

DEATH.—When we survey death at a distance—when, in youth, health, and vigor, we cast our eyes towards the grave, our reflections are transient, and we are unmoved by the awful prospect; but when sickness, age, and infirmities show us the near approaches to the tomb, our weak nature turns with horror from the idea of dissolution. It is only through faith in the promises of God, and hope in the infinite merits of our Redeemer, that we can steadfastly look on death, and overcome the terrors which the most perfect of mortals must feel at putting off mortality.***Death is to the best an awful summons, and human nature turns from the bitter cup; but let our spirit say with our blessed Lord—‘My God! not my will, but thine be done.’—*Fenelon.*

THE GREAT CAUSE of Christian fear and despondency is want of faith. Faith is the chief corner-stone of the spiritual temple, and the only source of true confidence. It hushes fears—it silences doubts—it alleviates afflictions—it rolls off burdens. It makes trials pleasures, and sorrows sweet. It calms the soul in the hour of bereavement, fortifies it in the hour of death, and lightens up the grave with the radiance of immortality.

Our business is to see a perfect conformity to the will of God, and then leave him to give us such comfort as he sees good.

LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST : A NEW ERA.

THE day has dawned—the Life views are no longer to be refused a place in a *weekly* periodical, but are to take a stand among other truths of the Bible before a reading world. It will be seen, by the following document, that the friends of “Life only in Christ” are determined to take hold in earnest, in reliance on the LIFE-GIVER ; and we trust all the friends, in every part of the country, will take hold with a firm resolution that there shall be hereafter no lack of *means* or efforts to carry forward the great and glorious work God has committed to our hands.—EDITOR.

AT A MEETING held near Wilbraham Camp-Ground, August 29th, 1863, the following persons were present : George Storrs, Rufus Wendell, W. S. Campbell, Dwight J. Weaver, James L. Boyd, Thomas Weaver, Willett H. Hanford, William Roworth, R. E. Ladd, Caleb Thompson, S. F. Rogers, Albert Fox, George K. Carroll, Royal Boston, Joseph B. Eggleston, Leonard Plumer, Ozias Clapp, A. W. Macdonald, S. W. Bishop, George W. Denny, Isaac L. Allen, Henry J. Sweetland, Andrew C. Jenkins, Joseph T. Curry, William Stark, G. L. Rice.

Rufus Wendell was chosen Chairman, and Joseph T. Curry Secretary. After some remarks it was voted that a Committee of four be appointed by the Chairman to act with him in considering a plan of operations for the spread of the doctrine of Life only in Christ ; the said plan to be reported to this body at its next meeting.

The Chair appointed W. S. Campbell, J. T. Curry, George K. Carroll, and S. W. Bishop. Adjourned to meet at four P. M.

In consequence of the extreme length of the afternoon sermon from the Stand, the body did not meet till five P. M. The Committee having given their report, remarks were made concerning a name for the body.

Voted that we constitute ourselves a Society under the following name—“*The Life and Advent Union.*”

Voted that the officers of this Union be a President, Vice-President, Secretary and Treasurer.

Voted that a Committee of five be appointed by the Chair to nominate officers. The following were appointed :—James L. Boyd, Geo. K. Carroll, Isaac L. Allen, Royal Boston, and S. F.

Rogers. After retiring to consult together, they reported the following persons: For President, George Storrs; for Vice-President, Rufus Wendell; for Secretary, Joseph T. Curry; for Treasurer, Leonard C. Thorne. Report received. The persons nominated were elected by a unanimous vote.

W. S. Campbell, Rufus Wendell, R. E. Ladd, J. T. Curry, and Ozias Clapp were constituted a Committee to draft and report a Constitution.

Adjourned till 8 A. M., August 30.

8 A. M. August 30, 1863. Roll called by the Secretary.—The following additional names were received as members of the Union: Nathan Lazell, Walter Stickney, Ophir Haynes, S. S. Brazee, John Crosbie, Barnet Matthias, Arnold H. Tourtelot, Henry J. Chamberlain, Luther Paine, S. Cooper, John S. Armington, Russell Barnard, Jacob J. Johnson, V. N. Davis, William W. Doughty.

The following names were suggested by members present on the supposition that the persons named, though actually absent, would doubtless indorse the action of the individuals who presented them: William H. Thorne, Leonard C. Thorne, Philo Richardson, Edward Lloyd, James T. Cornell, D. B. Salter, William H. Doughty, A. Decker, William Payne, George W. Brown, Charles Gardner, William A. Smith, William Munger, A. H. Landon, Willard M. Hall, C. D. Leet, George W. Wiggin, Nathaniel Davis, Joseph Thomas, Lewis Gunn, John Billings, Charles A. Hastings, John Speir, and Rollin Harrison.

The Committee on Constitution reported. After various alterations and amendments their report was adopted. The following Constitution was formally established:

“We, the members of ‘The Life and Advent Union’ do mutually agree to the following

CONSTITUTION.

“Article. I. The object of this Union is to use all available means to promulgate the Doctrine of Life only in Christ, the Personal, proximate Advent of our Lord Jesus, and all sentiments calculated to spread vital godliness.

“II. Any person believing in Life through Christ alone, (thereby denying any future life to unbelievers,) and sustaining a Christian character, may become a member of this Union by subscribing to the Constitution.

“III. The officers of this Union shall be a President, Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer, and Thirteen Directors, who together shall constitute the Managing Board, and who are to be elected annually.

“IV. The Managers shall be authorized to collect funds for

the Union, which fund shall be transmitted to the Secretary, who shall keep account of the same and transfer them to the Treasurer.

" V. The Board of Managers shall have power to choose an Executive Committee from their number to facilitate business.

" VI. All receipts for the Union shall be published monthly by the Secretary with the name of the donor.

" VII. The Annual meeting and such other meetings as may be deemed necessary by the Board of Managers, shall be called by giving six weeks' notice.

" VIII. The Secretary shall keep a record of the names and Post-office addresses of the members.

" IX. This Constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote at any annual meeting."

The following Directors were unanimously elected : Randolph E. Ladd, J. L. Boyd, Ozias Clapp, S. W. Bishop, W. S. Campbell, S. F. Rogers, Isaac L. Allen, Walter Stickney, Albert Fox, Caleb Thompson, John Billings, A. Decker, Jacob J. Johnson.

Voted that the Secretary report the proceedings of the Union in the next number of THE BIBLE EXAMINER.

Voted that such members of the Board of Managers as are present be constituted a Committee to confer together with reference to the publication of a weekly newspaper.

Voted that a Committee of five be chosen to solicit pledges of money at this Camp-meeting in aid of the Union.

J. T. Curry, Rufus Wendell, Albert Fox, Gilbert L. Rice, Henry J. Sweetland were appointed.

The Union joined in prayer with George Storrs.

Adjourned to meet at 1 P. M.

1 P. M. Roll called. The following additional names were recorded : N. D. Wight, Madison Weaver, Phineas A. Sherman, Hiram E. Twing, Mary Twing, Helen Robertson, E. C. Paine, Joseph K. Marshall, Timothy Oliver.

The Committee on the weekly paper reported. Report accepted. It consisted of the following items, which were unanimously adopted :

1. The paper shall be called "*The Herald of Life, and of the Coming Kingdom.*"

2. It shall be published in New York City.

3. The Union shall have an Editorial and Printing Office of its own.

4. The Union will discharge the obligation of George Storrs to the Bible Examiner subscribers for the months of November and December by sending as many copies of the newspaper as

will furnish an equivalent. The Bible Examiner to be *suspended* in favor of the new paper, after its next issue.

5. The paper shall be under the immediate control of an Editorial Board, composed of GEORGE STORRS, *Editor*; and Rufus Wendell, J. T. Curry, W. S. Campbell, and S. W. Bishop, Assistant Editors.

6. RUFUS WENDELL shall be *Business Agent*.

7. The salary of the Editor shall be Twelve Dollars per week.

Voted that the subscription price of the paper shall be Two Dollars per year.

Voted that the paper be conducted on the cash principle.

Voted that the paper be not started until the sum of One Thousand Dollars is in the hands of the Treasurer, aside from the subscriptions for the paper.

Voted that Advent preachers have permission to publish their appointments in the paper.

Adjourned *sine die*.

JOSEPH T. CURRY,
Secretary.

TO THE FRIENDS of the New Movement, *Greeting*: "The Life and Advent Union" is an institution. Earnest, Christ-loving men have inaugurated it, and God's smiles have warmed it into life. Our first object is to start a new weekly paper on a substantial basis. It has been decided not to do any thing until the sum of One Thousand Dollars is in the hands of the Treasurer. Those who have already given their pledges of money will please forward it as soon as possible, that the enterprise may go forward at once. Those who have not yet been heard from are respectfully informed that their pledges and money may be sent either to the President, Secretary, or Treasurer. Perhaps the speediest way of communication at present is to send to the President—GEORGE STORRS, Box 4658, *New York*. Letters to the Secretary must be addressed, for the present—JOSEPH T. CURRY, care of *O. Clapp*, 30 & 32 Winter-St., *Boston*, Mass. Letters to the Treasurer are to be directed—LEONARD C. THORNE, 36 Church-St., *New York*. The Secretary will be pleased to hear from all persons who desire to be members of the Union by subscribing to the Constitution. Above all, let fervent prayers ascend to "the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ," that the word of Life may have free course and be glorified through.

the instrumentality of "The Life and Advent Union." "The Lord is our power, the Lord will provide." Amen.

JOSEPH T. CURRY.

PLEDGES.—The Secretary of "*The Life and Advent Union*" will acknowledge all sums of money received for the Union in the first number of the new paper.

J. T. C.

PROGRESS.—Believers in "*Life only in Christ*" will be gratified to hear from the late Camp-meeting at Wilbraham. The truth has progressed during the past year, and the evidences were abundant throughout the week. The prayer and conference exercises in the Springfield tent, were exceedingly interesting. The central power expressed its conviction of the influence of the new movement by nailing its favorite text (John 5 : 28, 29) above the Preachers' Stand. Much interest was felt in relation to the question whether the EDITOR of the Examiner would be permitted to preach from the Stand this year. A Committee was chosen to confer with the Camp-meeting Committee on the subject. The latter called the preachers together to decide. A vote was taken and a large majority decided that GEORGE STORRS should preach. He delivered his discourse the same (Friday) evening; and although it rained the most of the time but few retired until the close. It is believed that many were powerfully convicted of the truth by the sermon. The Spirit of God was felt in a gracious manner. "Let every thing that hath breath praise the Lord." Brethren Bishop and Campbell also delivered valuable sermons on the Life theme in the course of the meeting.

J. T. C.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR.—It is proper to say, in addition to the Secretary's report, that more than seven hundred dollars were pledged on the spot, at the organization of the "UNION." Many of the most able friends were not present; we shall look to hear from them, and trust it will be a liberal response, and doubt not it will be. If the "one thousand dollars are paid in"—as we trust they will be—before this month is closed, the first number of the new paper will be immediately issued.—To carry forward the work with energy, there ought to be at least *two* thousand dollars put into the hands of the TREASURER immediately.—Other works are to be issued besides the "HERALD OF LIFE," &c. Let the friends in every place call a meeting and act at once: or, if they are isolated, send on your personal pledges or the amount you may be disposed to give to this grand enterprise. It is desirable to commence our work in earnest immediately.

"THE LIFE AND ADVENT UNION."—RUFUS WENDELL writes: I wish cordially to congratulate the friends of truth that this new organization has been formed. Its origin and object are sufficiently set forth in the Report which its Secretary lays before the readers of the BIBLE EXAMINER. It is the offspring of a desire, long cherished in the minds of some individuals, to bring about systematic and well-directed co-operation in effort among the friends of the precious doctrine of Life only in Jesus Christ. Not a few of us have long felt that the growing prevalence of this glorious truth demanded that its advocates (by which I mean all who have received the doctrine in the love of it) should consolidate their labors and influence, for its more efficient promulgation. But *how, when, and where* the initiative should be taken for the achievement of an end so desirable, was a problem more easily proposed than solved. The object has, however, been kept steadily in view, and, in spite of all seeming discouragements, we have labored on *in hope*, fully persuaded that the time would arrive for us to assume and maintain a position, with reference to this vastly important theological reform, far more advantageous than any we have hitherto occupied. The opportune moment seems at length to have arrived. The advance step has been taken at last.—That it has not been prematurely taken, is abundantly attested by the zeal and unanimity exhibited by those who took part in our deliberations at Wilbraham. THE LIFE AND ADVENT UNION has been formed and entered upon its mission. We commend it to the blessing of Almighty God, and to the prayers of such of His dear children as sympathize with the work which it is designed to promote. For the spread of His holy truth, and the upbuilding of His church in the blessed hope of the gospel, was it conceived and set on foot, and now our dependence is upon Him for guidance in carrying forward its operations.

It will be seen by the Secretary's Report, the first work to which *The L. & A. Union*, after its formation, turned its attention, was the subject of having a weekly religious paper. As a result, our friends have before them a fully developed plan in this direction, and in a few weeks they will be called upon to pass judgment upon "THE HERALD OF LIFE, AND OF THE COMING KINGDOM." I feel persuaded that this movement will be hailed with deep satisfaction by nearly all believers of Life only in Christ, and by many others. I say by many others, for it will be the earnest aim of the Editor and his Assistants to adapt the paper to the varied wants of the Life and Advent body at large. We anticipate that it will grow in favor with large numbers of those even who will be slow to accept the argument for that aspect of the great Life theme which it will steadfastly proclaim to a perishing world. Other subjects, pregnant with thrilling interest, will also receive constant attention in its columns,

and we trust that the paper is destined to enter upon a career of wide and ever increasing usefulness. But on these points more will be written in the paper itself, by those better able than I am to say the right things in the right way.

It only remains for me to express the hope that all the patrons of the EXAMINER will cheerfully support "THE HERALD OF LIFE," and do all in their power to give it a large list of paying subscribers.

WM. STARK, Penn Yan, N. Y., writes, Sept. 1st: "Herewith *ten* dollars to redeem my pledge to 'THE LIFE AND ADVENT UNION,' under the sacred chestnut tree, which the LORD preserve."

NOTE BY ED.—"The sacred chestnut tree" spoken of, stands in an open field, *alone*: a noble tree, in Wilbraham, Mass. Under its wide-spread branches, and around it, "The Life and Advent Union" was formed and all its business transacted, as reported by the "Secretary," J. T. Curry. That *tree* stands as a witness to what we regard as one of the most important religious movements of this century. "A grain of mustard seed" it may be in the commencement, but we have the fullest confidence it will increase under the dew and rain of heaven, and the warming influences of that divine life which the great LIFE-GIVER will impart, till multitudes will gladly take refuge within its branches or under its shadow from the plague of "Spiritualism" and the "Torment" theories which have been and are carrying their withering blasts through Christendom, deceiving multitudes of Christians and sinners; in the first, crushing out the pure love of God which characterized the early Christians, and driving sinners to the rejection of Bible Christianity, by a false view of its Author and His revelations. In the name of our Lord JESUS CHRIST, and in dependence on Him, "The Life and Advent Union" has come into being, and trusts to be enabled to accomplish its work. Let praying and working men and women throughout the land come up to the help of the LORD in spreading *life-giving* truth every where.

EIGHT PAGES have been added to this number of the EXAMINER to make room for the "Report of the Secretary" of "The Life and Advent Union," and other communications relating thereto. "The Herald of Life," or this magazine will appear early in October, we expect.

DONATIONS FOR THE EXAMINER AND ITS EDITOR.—W. S. Olmsted (his monthly subscription) \$1. "Once a month," \$2. Allen Logan, \$1. Eld. J. Craig, \$1. G. W. Denny, \$3. Geo. T. Collins, \$5. R. L. Jaques, Esq., \$10. Friends in Boston, \$6,75.

NOTICE.—From the time “*The Herald of Life*,” etc., commences its issue, the BIBLE EXAMINER will be *suspended*; and what may be due to the subscribers of this magazine will be paid them in the *new paper*, if they do not object. If they choose, however, to *pay* for the “*Herald of Life*,” from its outset, and hold their claim on the EXAMINER for the remainder of this volume, we shall satisfy them accordingly; but the first number of the new paper will be sent to all subscribers of this magazine, and we trust they will gladly accept it, and send at once as many new ones as possible. Persons sending five subscribers to “*The Herald of Life*,” with the pay in advance, will have the sixth copy *gratis*. All communications in relation to it, for the present, may be addressed to us, “*Box 4658, New York*.” Other arrangements will be made on the issue of the first number of the new paper.

THE HERALD OF LIFE,

AND OF THE COMING KINGDOM.

GLAD TIDINGS.—“*The Life and Advent Union*” are determined to issue a weekly paper, at *New York City*. This determination proceeds from a spirit of unconditional loyalty to the Government of JESUS CHRIST, and to the great principle that He is the only LIFE-GIVER for dying men; and believing the time for the establishment of His Kingdom on earth is not far off, but is fast approaching. “*The Union*” goes forth to its work in reliance on God and the power of His truth; it asks each and every one who loves the truth and who is able to help, to do so by subscribing to its funds, and especially by subscribing for the paper themselves and soliciting others to do the same.

The TERMS of “*The Herald of Life*,” &c., will be \$2 per year, exclusive of postage or delivery. Half-yearly subscriptions will be received, but all who are able should pay for the year, at once. The following blank form of a subscription list is attached to help those disposed to get subscribers :

| Names of Subscribers. | Post Office Address. | | | Amount Paid. |
|-----------------------|----------------------|---------|--------|--------------|
| {Write plain.} | Name of Office. | County. | State. | |
| | | | | |

BIBLE EXAMINER---EXTRA.



THE ESSENTIAL BAPTISM:

BY GEO. STORRS.

JOHN the Baptist saith, "He that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit decending, and remaining on Him, the same is He which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost."—John 1: 33.

NEW-YORK:

1862.

THE PRICE OF THIS "EXTRA" is seven cents single copy, (postage included;) per hundred, \$4; sent at the purchaser's expense.

Orders for it, by mail, must invariably be addressed,

"GEO. STORRS, BOX 4658, NEW YORK."

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. 13.

AUGUST, 1860.

No. 8.

"THE ESSENTIAL BAPTISM."

THE BAPTISM OF JOHN is a distinct baptism from that ordained by Christ. 1. It is called "The baptism of John," invariably. Jesus said, "The baptism of John, whence was it?" Mat. 21 : 25. "Being baptized with the baptism of John." Luke 7 : 29. "That word ye know, which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, *after* the baptism which John preached," &c. Acts 10 : 37. "When John had first preached *before* his (Christ's) coming the baptism of repentance," &c. Acts 13 : 24. Apollos came to Ephesus, he "spake and taught the things of the Lord, knowing only the baptism of John." Acts 18 : 25. Paul found certain disciples at Ephesus whom he asked, "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?" Their reply was, "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." He inquired what baptism they then had received: "they said, John's baptism,"—Acts 19 : 2, 3. Surely John's baptism, then, was not the "Christian baptism," for no one would think, now, a person had received that baptism, who had been baptized and had not heard of the Holy Ghost.

2. JOHN understood that He, whose fore-runner he was, would have a baptism entirely distinct from that he preached and practiced. Hence he saith—"I indeed baptize you with *water* unto repentance: but He

that cometh after me is mightier than I:*** He shall baptize you with the *Holy Ghost*," &c. Mat. 3:11. Mk. 1:8. Lk. 3:16. John 1:26-33. This last verse is exceeding emphatic: "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*."

3. Jesus distinguishes His baptism from John's: thus, "For John truly baptized *with water*; but ye shall be baptized *with the Holy Ghost* not many days hence." Acts 1:5. And this baptism was not confined to the apostles; for at the house of Cornelius, while Peter was speaking the word of life, "the Holy Ghost fell on them" to whom he was preaching; and he was astonished, but immediately "remembered the word of the Lord, how that He had said, John indeed baptized *with water*; but ye shall be baptized *with the Holy Ghost*." Acts 10:44, & 11:15, 16.

Jesus' disciples baptizing with water, during His personal ministry, is surely, no evidence *that* was His peculiar baptism: for Paul tells us expressly—"Jesus Christ was a minister of the circumcision," &c. Rom. 15:8. He came into the world, "made under the law;" and kept all its ordinances and institutions, unto the end of His life, a last act of which was, "to eat the passover." John tells us, "the Holy Ghost was not yet given" [in Jesus' life time]; "*because Jesus was not yet glorified*." But after He ascended on high, commenced the bestowment of that gift; not barely to confirm the word, but as a universal gift to all believers: not indeed that all should work miracles, but as a life-imparting power, without which, there is no divine life in man; and without which, no man can live again from the dead: for it is "the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead" that is to "quicken your mortal bodies," if ever made alive from the dead; and in order to this, that "Spirit" must "dwell in you:" see Rom. 8:11. But how is it to "dwell in you," except ye have received it of Christ, who has received this "gift for men"?

That the gift of the Holy Spirit—or baptism of the Spirit—was not to be confined to the apostles, or the age of miracles, is evident from many testimonies. John addressing the *multitudes*, who came to his baptism, saith of Christ—"He shall baptize *you* with the Holy Ghost," &c. Jesus saith, "If *ANY man* thirst, let him come unto me and drink: *he* that believeth on me, [*any man*], as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. (But this spake he of the Spirit which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because Jesus was not yet glorified.)" John 7:37-39. Peter saith, on the day of Pentecost, "Ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost: for the promise" [of that 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. Here is no *limiting* the "baptism of the

Spirit" to the apostles, or the days of miracles: it is to be a universal gift on all believers in Jesus. Peter also saith—"God hath given the Holy Ghost to them that obey him." Acts 5: 32. "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed?" was a question put by Paul to some who had not been fully instructed into the knowledge of the Gospel benefits. Acts 19: 2. To the Corinthians Paul saith—"By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body." 1 Corth. 12: 13. There is no such expression as "baptized into one Spirit:" it is, "By *one Spirit* are we all baptized into *one body*"*** "and have all been made to *drink* into one Spirit." That one body, is "the body of Christ"; verse 27. It is the only way any soul of man can be *in* Christ, viz., by the "one Spirit" baptizing us "into one body": and hence is the "essential baptism" without it, no life from the dead. Again Paul saith to them—"Kne ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, which is in you which ye have of God?" 1 Corth. 6: 19. Once more, he saith to them—"He which establisheth us with you in Christ, and hath *anointed* us, is God; who hath also sealed us, and given *the earnest of the Spirit* in our hearts." 2 Corth. 1: 21, 22. To the Galatians he saith—"Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive *the promise of the Spirit* through faith." Gal. 1: 2, 14. "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption." Chap. 4: 30.

It were easy to multiply testimony; but enough has been presented to show that believers in Jesus, every where, and in all times, were to look for and receive the baptism of the Spirit; and that we *now* live under the dispensation of the Spirit, and it is a gift designed for every member of Christ's body; without which a man is neither *in* Christ, nor will be raised "up at the last day," to life. If so, then the "baptism of the Spirit" is *essential* to the attainment of Eternal Life; and is an indispensable baptism, under the Gospel age—or age commencing from the day of Pentecost till Christ shall return to raise His saints from the dead.

John's baptism was the "*Introduction*" to the Christian dispensation; but not *the thing* itself. He was sent to "Prepare the way of the Lord," and to call the attention of the people to Him who was to "come *after*" him. John declares, "I knew Him not: but that He should be *manifested* to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing *with water*."*** "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*." Here surely is a solemn and glorious fact distinctly stated; not barely that Messiah's baptism was different from John's, but it is to be applied to all who receive Him: not to be confined to a few at or near the day of Pentecost; or merely to

work miracles—which was the superabundance of its power, for a specific object—but, as we have seen in the Scriptures already presented, to cause men and women to become and continue the "sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty:" for, saith the apostle, "Ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will *dwell* in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people." 2 Corth. 6: 16–18.—"As many as received him," (Christ,) "to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name; which were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." John 1: 12, 13.

To suppose, "John 7: 38, refers to the future state," is not admissible. "Jesus cried saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water." The Evangelist adds, in explanation—"This spake He of the Spirit, which they that believe on him should receive: for the Holy Ghost was not *yet* given; because Jesus was not yet glorified;" showing that when Jesus was glorified, then commenced the baptism of the Holy Spirit with which He was specially commissioned to baptize all His people—of whatever nation or country—into His "one body," and thus secure their resurrection, "at the last day," by that Spirit dwelling in them.

Does any one say, "*Christ's baptism*, by John in the Jordan," was "Christian baptism"? We ask in reply—Was He baptized into "the name of Jesus"? Was He baptized "into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost"? We only need to ask these questions to show there is no foundation for the supposition, that Jesus received Christian baptism, by John in Jordan. He did, indeed, receive the baptism of the Holy Ghost in the *presence* of John, but not till He had left the *water*; showing that a greater and more important baptism than John's was His. Well did John say, to Jesus, "I have need to be baptized of thee." John understood his own baptism, with water, as an introductory institution to that greater and more important baptism of the Holy Ghost, soon to be introduced by Him that came "*after*" him; hence he well said, "*He* must increase; but *I* must *decrease*." John's baptism decreased till it *ended*, as an institution, by the baptism of the Holy Ghost, poured from on high, after "Jesus was glorified."

But, says a believer in John's baptism as a Christian institution, "the apostle Peter directed them to be baptized with *water*, on the day of Pentecost, and he could not be mistaken, for he was inspired." *Inspired* for what? we ask. Was he inspired so that he could not err in any thing he did or said from that time forward? "Let us pause in view of the inevitable consequences of such an inference." When Peter quoted the prophecy of Joel—verses 16 to 20—was there a perfect inspiration in his application of it? Was there no mistake? What did Peter say?...

"THIS IS THAT which was spoken by the prophet Joel; and it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh," &c. Was that outpouring of the Spirit, on the day of Pentecost, "upon ALL flesh"? Has that prophecy had its fulfillment in the broad sense Peter applied it, even unto this time? Was Peter so inspired as never to err? If so, why did he say, "Not so, Lord," when he was bid "rise, slay and eat," Acts 10: 14? How came he so fearful of going to the Gentiles, when his Master, long before, had bid him "go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature"? How came it to pass, Paul had to rebuke him on one occasion, because Peter was afraid to eat with Gentile believers in the presence of believing Jews? How could Paul say, "I withstood him to his face, because he was to be blamed"? See Gal. 2: 11-14.

The inspiration of the apostles related to *testimony concerning Jesus* as the Messiah—the Christ—the Son of the living God. The special, the great work they had to do, was to declare fully "the record God gave of His Son," viz., "This is the record, that God hath given unto us eternal life, and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son hath life; he that hath not the Son hath not life." 1 John 5: 10-12. Jesus himself states how they should be inspired, and for what work and purpose, viz.: "Ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you: and ye shall be WITNESSES unto Me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." They were inspired with "power," courage, or boldness to declare, in the face of the greatest dangers, the things they had seen and that Jesus had taught them; and to witness to all men that He was raised from the dead; that through Him is remission of sins; so that by being, "by one Spirit, baptized into one body," they should live from the dead as had Jesus, the head of that "one body." There is no evidence that their inspiration went to deliver them at once from their national prejudices and customs. These were left to be superseded and done away as they could "bear" it. Let any one read the account of the council held at Jerusalem, Acts 15, and see if such was not the case. See, also, what is said, many years after, when Paul went up to Jerusalem, Acts 21: 20—James addressed him thus—"Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law," &c. They are not yet clear of their Jewish prejudices and practices.

It seems clear, baptism with *water* was a *transition* state, to prepare the way for the more purely spiritual dispensation of which Christ was to be the founder and head; and this dispensation was not opened in its designed fulness till "Jesus was glorified." Then commenced the baptism of the Spirit, according to His promise, and as John the Baptist had declared: carnal, or external ordinances were now at an end, so far as related to any virtue in them or benefit from them. Practiced they might

be, by those whose prejudices would be shocked by the immediate abandonment of them. Hence the believing Jews were "all zealous of the law" of Moses, and practiced even circumcision, more or less, for years after the day of Pentecost; and were just as particular about "meats and drinks" as before the Holy Spirit was given. Even Peter was thus particular, notwithstanding his "*inspiration*," so that he told the Lord,—years after—"I have never eaten any thing that is common or unclean": Acts 10: 14. In respect to outward ordinances, the apostles had to learn gradually, and by new manifestations, the fact, that "they who worship the Father must worship Him *in spirit* and in truth": that "circumcision availeth" nothing, "but a new creature"; that the "desire to make a fair show in the flesh," so "that they may glory in your flesh"—or that which is done outwardly to the body—was a "desire" not to be encouraged, because its tendency was to call away the mind from a more important and *essential* work of the Spirit—even to be made "a new creature." See Gal. 6. Some made slow progress in the abandonment of "ordinances after the commandments and doctrines of men"—"which all are to perish with the using"—even in the apostles' days.

"Buried with him in baptism," is dwelt upon by some to prove water baptism is the baptism of Christ. We have often been surprised at the utter disregard of the apostle's argument by such persons. Nothing is clearer, to our mind, than the fact, Paul was speaking of the baptism of the Spirit, in both texts, where that phrase occurs. Let us look at its connection, Col. 2: 9, and onward.

"For in him" (Christ) "dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily: and ye" (believers) "are complete in Him, which is the head of all principality and power: in whom also ye are *circumcised* with the circumcision made without hands," (*i. e.* by the Spirit), "in putting off *the body* of the sins of the flesh" (now *dead*) "by the circumcision of Christ": (the circumcision Christ employs, which is the Spirit, by which *the body* of sins had been put off, so that the believer is represented by that work of the Spirit as) "buried with him" (Christ) "in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him" (into a new life) "through the faith of the operation of God," (not the operation of John the Baptist in raising them out of the *water*; but "of God"), "who hath raised him from the dead."—The Spirit of God raised up Christ from the dead, (see Rom. 8: 11), so the baptism of the Spirit works the death and *burial* of "the body of the sins of the flesh"—cuts these off and buries them, but raises the believer up, by its power, or "operation," to a new or divine life—to "walk in newness of life."

Thus the Spirit baptism stands out as the great—the *essential* baptism. Without it, no man hath divine life, or can attain to future or eternal life. Let all men take care how they call off attention from this work of the Spirit, by substituting some external rite in its place, and thus turning men away from that which is essential to LIFE ETERNAL.

THE ESSENTIAL BAPTISM.

THE idea that Peter "solved the mystery of the kingdom"—on the day of Pentecost—in his direction to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, seems entirely inadmissible. Why is it that those who use this direction of Peter, omit entirely one of the most important items of Peter's discourse? *viz*: "Ye shall receive the Holy Ghost: for the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." If any mystery was solved that day, it was this—Jesus will baptize His followers with the Holy Ghost, as He said. Why do water immersionists, generally, overlook or totally disregard this fact?

It has been said, Peter in preaching the word to Cornelius explained the matter, that through the *name* of Christ whosoever believeth in Him should receive remission of sins; and after Cornelius and his house had heard and understood the word, they were commanded to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus: and it is asked, if we do not learn from this history "the necessity of putting on the name of Christ by baptism?" It is added, "These were the words whereby they should be saved;" and "this is a remarkable history."

Truly, it "is a remarkable history;" but it is still more remarkable that this "history" has been so garbled, and its most

striking and important features overlooked. Though "about eight years" had passed since the day of Pentecost, Peter had to have a new revelation, by a sheet let down from heaven, before he would go to the house of Cornelius; and when he goes there, the Lord gives him a still further item of instruction, which he had been "slow of heart" to learn, *viz*: that the baptism of Jesus was of the *Holy Spirit*, and not of *water*: for "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word." This "*astonished* they of the circumcision"—the Jewish believers—who "came with Peter;" and in their astonishment, for the moment, Peter himself acted very much as when the Lord commanded him to "slay and eat" what he saw in the sheet: then he said, "Not so Lord!" Now, at the outpouring or baptism of the Holy Spirit, at the house of Cornelius, he cries out "Who can forbid water," &c.; as much as to say, "Not so Lord, we must not have things in this way." So, for this once, he uses *water*, but we never hear of his doing it again; and he tells us what he learned by that lesson, which God gave him at the house of Cornelius. When he was called to account by his Jewish brethren at Jerusalem, Acts XI., for going "to men uncircumcised," he defends himself, and relates what happened, and how, while he was speaking, the Holy Spirit fell on them: "Then," says he, "*remembered* I the word of the Lord, how that He said, John indeed baptized with *water*; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost."

This transaction, by the miraculous interposition of God, seems to have cured Peter of his fond attachment to "*carnal ordinances*;" for we find him in the next general council, Acts XV., giving an account of this matter at the house of Cornelius, and he says nothing about baptizing with water, but he speaks thus, "God which knoweth the hearts bear them witness, giving them the *Holy Ghost* even as He did unto us"—Jews—"and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith:"—not by water—"now therefore why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? But we believe that through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they."

Here Peter laid out the Gospel, like a wise and well instructed master-workman; and we inquire, "What is the grace

of our Lord Jesus Christ" by which "we shall be saved?" Is it *water* baptism? Peter does not mention that at all: he *remembers* now, the baptism of Jesus is that of the Holy Spirit. Jesus told his disciples, John baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit; and Peter, in the council, saith not a word of the water baptism at Cornelius' house, but fixes at once on that of the Spirit, as the means by which the believers' hearts were purified. He appears now to consider all carnal ordinances as a "yoke, which neither our fathers or we were able to bear." To suppose water baptism was that by which their sins were washed away, is to suppose that Peter omits the weightier matter of the Gospel, in this council, to speak of the lesser: it is to suppose, men may receive the Holy Spirit and yet their sins not be taken away, because they have not been into water!

"The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ," then, is that gift of the Holy Spirit which He promised to bestow on His disciples, and such as believe in His resurrection from the dead. The gift of the Spirit, He is exalted to "shed forth" on all believers; by the sanctification of which, they shall be prepared for the kingdom, and ultimately raised from the dead; or if alive, at His coming, they shall be changed by it to immortality, and thus "be saved," or have life eternal. It is *the* baptism of all baptisms: the "*one* baptism" which secures the resurrection from the dead.

But to save Peter to the side of water baptism, a resort is had to his words, 1 Pet. 3., 21. In this resort, a total disregard of the context and design of the apostle seems to be the course of those who rely on it. Peter saith, Christ was "put to death in the flesh, but quickened by *the Spirit*." He then states, this was the same Spirit by which God preached to the old world "in the days of Noah, while the Ark was preparing, "wherein"—in the Ark—"eight souls"—persons—"were saved by"—*dia*, i. e., *through*, or *during the time* of the "water," or flood. They were saved or kept alive by being preserved *from* the water: not saved by water: their salvation was by being kept out of the water, by the Ark; into which they did not enter by water, but by heeding the *Spirit*, which the world resisted and heeded not while it was *preaching* to them. Noah and his family did heed that Spirit, and by it were led into the Ark, and lived while all others perished in water. Noah's being

led into the Ark by the Spirit, and being saved therein, was a "figure" of the "baptism" which "now" will "save us" who are baptized into Christ—the anti-typical Ark ;—(" not the putting away of the filth of the *flesh*"—by the use of *water*—" but the answer of a good conscience toward God), by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Christ is the Ark, in whom is life and safety. But how are we baptized into him? Let Paul tell us: "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body," *** "now ye are the body of Christ." 1 Corth. 12: 13, 27.

Thus we learn what baptism it is that brings us into the Ark, and we are saved from death "by the resurrection of Jesus Christ;" for, "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." Here is the baptism which saves us, by bringing us into Christ, as Noah was brought into the ark. By this baptism, all who have it are preserved, or saved from extinction of being "during the time of the waters" of death, and come forth to life safe by the Ark, Christ Jesus.

"So we see that Peter" has not forgotten what he "*remembered*" was the teaching of Jesus, as he learned it by the fresh lesson given him at the house of Cornelius. Peter never talked any more about water baptism, but he does dwell strongly on the Spirit's work.

Does any man suppose a "moral purification" is effected by baptism with water? Why then was not Simon Magus purified? He "believed and was baptized" with water, (Acts 8: 13); yet he was still "in the bond of iniquity," (verse 23). Had he received the baptism of the Holy Spirit, surely he would have been free from that state. Only "by one Spirit are we all baptized into" Christ. Shall we try to "climb up some other way?" May we not find such a course to be robbery?

It is asked, "How can a believer get at the name of Jesus without immersion in water into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit?" When and where did the apostles use that formula in water baptism? Never, so far as the record is our guide.

The illustration so often used of a "lady wishing to take on herself a man's name, that she may have a legal right to all that belongs to him," to have which "she must come lawfully to the marriage ceremony," fails entirely when applied to "the

church ;" for, it is affirmed, "Immersion into the name, can only unite or marry" believers "to the name of Jesus." Those who take this position are too much in a hurry to bring off the "marriage ceremony," and deceive the simple-hearted with the idea that they *are* "married," when they are only "espoused ;" and fancying themselves married, by having been baptized with water, many "put on airs," which are anything but graceful ; forgetting, the wedding day is fixed for the time of our Lord's return from heaven, when only such as come from the dead by the Spirit of God—which raised up Jesus, or are changed by that Spirit, if they are alive at that time—will constitute the band who are *then* to become "the bride, the Lamb's wife ;" till then, Jesus will not take them for His wife ; nor till then will the *true* "marriage ceremony" be performed. Let all beware they do not undertake to forestall the wedding day, lest their very act should deceive the "lady" into the idea that she is already married, and so be led to neglect the important preparation, without which she will fail to be of the true bride. She can only be ready by being adorned with "the fruits of the Spirit ;" and in order for that, the Spirit must " *dwell* in you."

It is asserted, "Christ has left us a pattern" in His baptism. Indeed! Was He baptized for the remission of his sins? Was He baptized that He might become a *bride*? Was He baptized to perform the "marriage ceremony?" It has often been asserted, but never yet proved, that Christ's baptism was a pattern. Was it so any more than his death? Both were peculiar to Himself, and belonged to Him alone.

It is asked, Was there not "something striking" in God's acknowledging Jesus as His Son after his baptism in water? Yes, very "striking ;" but those who ask this question overlook several facts : first, that John said, "I knew Him not, but that He should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come baptizing with water." Thus Christ's baptism was for His manifestation, and to show who was to "baptize with the Holy Spirit." Another fact is, that John was to witness the descent of the Holy Spirit on Jesus, whose baptism with the Spirit was to supersede all external and carnal ordinances, as the spiritual worship of the Father was to supersede the carnal ordinances of Judaism. To this fact John bore witness distinctly—"He shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit."

It is said, Paul "taught the way of getting into Christ was

by being baptized into Him." True; and he taught distinctly how that was done: "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body:" thus "ye are of the body of Christ:" 1 Corth. 12: 13, 27. Water baptism does not bring us into Christ, else Simon, the sorcerer, was in Him, for he was baptized; and he "believed Phillip, preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ;" and thus had the exact prerequisites which water immersionists contend for. Yet he was not "in Christ." See Acts 8: 12, 13, 20-23.

We confess our surprise at the use made of some Scripture expressions by advocates of water baptism, as the essential baptism. For example; they quote 1 Corth. 6: 9-11, where the apostle had enumerated a catalogue of blackest sins, and adds, "Such were some of you: but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God," and apply the "washed" to water baptism. The apostle asks these same persons, at the 19th verse—"Know ye not that your body is the temple of the *Holy Spirit*, which is in you, which ye have of God?" Let it be remembered "God is a Spirit: and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." To suppose Paul meant any external or carnal *washing* in 1 Corth. 6: 11, is to suppose him the most imbecile reasoner imaginable. He had said, "I thank God that I baptized none of you," &c.; and yet he tells these same persons, it was by water baptism they were "washed" from their abominable pollutions! Thus the most important work of his ministry, and without which all his preaching and their faith would have been useless and vain, he left undone; leaving them in their sins and pollution, and out of Christ, so far as his own acts are concerned, because he did not or would not immerse them in water, when that was the only way to wash them and introduce them into Christ! We wonder if this is not being moved away from the Gospel of Christ! "Are ye so foolish; having begun in the Spirit are ye now made perfect by the flesh?" Gal. 3: 3.

We respond to the sentiment, "This subject should have an impartial examination: its importance demands it." But we have no responsive echo to the remark, that such as differ from us "are guided by their *feelings* instead of being guided by the word." To their own Master they stand or fall. It is a small matter to be judged by fallible mortals. Jesus our Lord is the Judge.

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 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, on pages 9, 10, 11, 12, 23, 24. "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.

QUESTIONS ON BAPTISM, ETC.

BY FRANCIS MALCOLM, CANADA WEST.

I feel pleased that you have given place to the different articles on Baptism. Good may result from such a careful and candid investigation of the subject. I would propose a few questions, the answers to which, I think, would not fail to interest, and perhaps profit, many of your readers.

1. What is the baptism of the Spirit?
2. Are Christians of the present day baptized with the Spirit?
3. Can it be shown, from the Scriptures, that the general belief that the Christian graces, faith, hope, charity, &c., are the work of the Spirit, is correct?
4. If they are, how does God reward *men* for work that He does himself?

5. Is not baptism taught in the New Testament as a Christian duty? and how does that agree with the idea that it is the Spirit?

RESPONSE TO THE FOREGOING.—“1. *What is the baptism of the Spirit?*” To this question, we answer in general, It is to receive the Holy Spirit, communicated by Jesus Christ. John the Baptist saith of Jesus, “He shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit.” Jesus, after his resurrection, in an interview with his disciples, “Breathed on them, and saith, *Receive ye the Holy Spirit.*” On another occasion, He said, “John truly baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit not many days hence.” The baptism of the Spirit did not take place till after Jesus was glorified, or till He ascended to heaven: thus John the Evangelist teaches, according to the words of Jesus, chap. 7: 38—“He that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living waters.”—“This,” saith John, “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.”

“2. *Are Christians of the present day baptized with the Spirit?*”

In answer to this inquiry, we remark—It seems impossible for a man to be a “Christian” who has *not received* the Spirit. Paul saith, “Ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be *the Spirit of God dwell in you*: now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.” *** “But if the Spirit of Him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by *His Spirit that dwelleth in you.*”—Rom. 8: 9, 11. Also, see 1 Corth. 12, 13, “For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body.” That one body embraces all that are truly “Christians,” and it is “the body of Christ:” v. 27. Please see remarks on “The Essential Baptism,” pages 3 to 8.

“3. *Can it be shown from the Scriptures that the general belief that the Christian graces, faith, hope, charity, &c., are the work of the Spirit, is correct?*” “4. *If they are, how does God reward men for work He does himself?*”

We have put these two questions together. “Faith” cometh by hearing: it is founded on testimony: that testimony is the word of inspiration, or the word which the Spirit of God inspired men to speak or write. Hence two agencies are concerned

in it. God's first; man's second. The free Spirit of God is always first: the free reception by man is secondary. Without the first, faith has no soil to take root in. Without the last, the grace or Spirit of God is bestowed "in vain." "God worketh in us," we must "work out:" and God does not "reward men for work He does himself," except as man receives, appropriates, and actively works "together with Him." "Without me, ye can do nothing," said Jesus. "Through Christ strengthening me, I can do all things," said Paul. "What God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." We "receive the Spirit by the hearing of faith," Gal. 3: 2. "The fruit of the Spirit is love, peace, joy," &c. Gal. 5: 22. The tree is first received and planted, before these fruits grow: hence they flow from a believing reception of Christ and the promised Spirit; and the entire "reward" is a "gift of God," viz.: "eternal life, through Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 6: 23.

"5. Is not baptism taught in the N. T. as a Christian duty? How does that agree with the idea that it is the Spirit?"

If baptism "with water" is the "essential baptism," when, where, and by whom is it "taught as a Christian duty?" If "taught as a Christian duty," it must be shown to be a command of Christ, who is the FOUNDER of the Christian dispensation. It will not meet the case to say, Peter commanded it on the day of Pentecost, and at the house of Cornelius; for in both those instances the question may arise, whether he did not overstep his commission, or misunderstand it, in that matter; for it is clear, he did not understand our Lord's commission, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature," else he would not have needed a new revelation, after the day of Pentecost, before he would obey the commission, as is evident from the vision his MASTER gave him, to remove his Jewish superstition, Acts 10: 9-16. It is also evident, Peter was not free from his Judaism; he had not passed out of the transition state, entirely, when the transaction of baptizing with water was performed at the house of Cornelius; for Jesus had informed his disciples, after His resurrection, that "John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit not many days hence;" showing, the baptism of the Holy Spirit was, at that time, future, and was the true Christian baptism. Of baptizing with water, Jesus said nothing, except that John did it, in the transition state from Judaism to Chris-

tianity proper. At this point the new dispensation is to be opened in its fullness, and Jesus speaks of only the "one baptism" as belonging to it—"Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit:" that is *the* Christian baptism. Peter did not fully comprehend this fact till after the transactions at the house of Cornelius. There he was taken by surprise, for the baptism of the Spirit took place before he had said anything of water; and he had supposed water was essential before the Spirit could be given, as is evident from his words on the day of Pentecost, when he told his hearers to "be baptized, *and* ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit," showing that he then supposed it necessary to be baptized with water *in order* to receive the Holy Spirit; but his Master corrected him in this matter by a direct act, at the house of Cornelius; thus showing that water baptism was superseded by the baptism which constituted the peculiarity of the Christian dispensation, at its full development; the baptism which John pointed out as the work of Christ, and which Christ had told his disciples should come on His followers. Peter's act, therefore, in "commanding" water baptism, *after* Cornelius and others had "received the Holy Spirit," was clearly without divine authority, and it seems likely he never practiced it again; for afterwards, in his defence of himself in going to the Gentiles, in rehearsing the transactions of that time, he says, "The Holy Spirit fell on them as on us at the beginning; then *remembered* I the word of the Lord, how He said, John indeed baptized with *water*; but ye shall be baptized with the *Holy Spirit*." Peter had forgotten this teaching of his Master, and now has to be taught anew, or have it brought to his remembrance.

It is undeniable that the baptism of the Spirit is a baptism of the Christian dispensation; and as this dispensation has but "ONE baptism," water baptism cannot be that "one." To us such a conclusion is inevitable; and though difficulties may attend the subject, the Spirit baptism cannot be set aside, without a virtual denial of the testimony of John the Baptist and Christ himself. Nevertheless, if any think water baptism is *their* "duty," let them satisfy their own convictions, but see that they do not judge *others* in the matter. On no other ground can union be maintained.

While some admit, "the Spirit baptism is that by which the essential relation of Christians to their living head is established," they maintain, water baptism is essential to the reception of the Spirit. This position not only makes *two* baptisms essential, but is disproved by the case of Cornelius and those who heard the word at his house; for the Spirit baptism came *first*; thus demonstrating, it is not "contingent" to nor "dependent upon" water baptism.

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 th 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, speed restore the "Holy," heavenly "*dove*" to His Church which 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."

THE BIBLE EXAMINER.

THIS *Magazine* is devoted mainly to Bible questions ; specially to the great themes of JESUS CHRIST'S personal return to, and reign on earth—Life, future and eternal, only through Him—and literal death, never to be revoked, as the wages of sin.

It is intended to be issued *Monthly*, 32 pages octavo. TERMS, *One Dollar* for 12 numbers ; paid *in advance*.

REMITTANCES.—Persons making communications to us, will please consider it a *receipt* for money they send, if they receive what they write for, instead of our acknowledging their letters in the EXAMINER. Generally, in case of remittance, they receive what they order before the acknowledgment could appear in our Magazine. To *print* all the names of Correspondents is attended with inconvenience and unnecessary expense.

LETTERS should be well sealed, but never "registered." Money for the EXAMINER is at the *Editor's* risk, when sent as herein directed, without adding to, or omitting any thing from the directions. If this course is not complied with, it is at the risk of the person remitting.

MONEY sent for any of the works in our *Catalogue* of Books, is at the risk of the *purchaser*, except when the *retail* price is remitted, then it shall be *mutual*. The risk is small, if our instructions are strictly followed ; we will not be responsible in any degree unless this is done. Be careful, in all cases, not to send depreciated Bank bills. We have had to pay *twenty* per cent. on some funds sent us, or else return the money. This ought not to be.

THE POSTAGE on the *bound* Examiner, for 1860, is *twenty-six* cents, any distance less than 3000 miles.

We invite our friends to examine the *Catalogue* of works, on the last page of this cover, and send for such as they can make profitable to themselves or others. By doing this, you will benefit the cause we advocate, and help the EDITOR of this Magazine.

Invariably address, GEO. STORRS, Box 4658, New-York.

—:O:—

STANDING RULES FOR WRITERS FOR THIS MAGAZINE.

1. Each writer is required to state his own views on the topic he takes up, without a direct personal controversy with any other writer in our columns. This course does not restrict liberty of expression on any topics others have presented, but is designed to save personal feelings.

2. Each individual correspondent is *alone* responsible for the sentiments of his article : the fact of the insertion is not to be construed as an approval by the EDITOR.

3. The main object of this Magazine, as expressed on its cover, must be kept in view by all writers : other topics may, however, sometimes be admitted, if space will allow.

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

On all books and pamphlets, sent by mail, the postage has to be *pre-paid*. The following works will be sent, any distance under 3000 miles, postage free, on receipt of the retail price:

SIX SERMONS on the inquiry, *Is there Immortality in Sin and Suffering?* To which is added a sermon on *Christ the Life-Giver*, or the faith of the Gospel, by the EDITOR of the *Bible Examiner*; with an Introduction defending the Bible and its Author against Infidels. This work contains double the amount of matter of the original Six Sermons. *Price*, in plain binding, 50 cents; postage, 10 cts.: in paper covers, 80 cents; postage, 6 cents.

THE WATCH TOWER: OR, MAN IN DEATH; and the Hopes for a Future Life.—A Pamphlet of 96 pages. A thorough cure for the modern *necromancy*, mis-named "spiritualism," which is really *animalism*. *Price*, 20 cts. Postage, 3 cents.

LIFE FROM THE DEAD; OR, The Righteous only will live again. By the EDITOR of the *Bible Examiner*. The author believes this subject is one of vast importance. It illustrates the whole Gospel scheme, and shows the mercy of God in its true light, while man is seen to be wholly mortal. It cuts up the modern *man-worship*, which is hurrying so many on to rank atheism. *Price*, 20 cents. Postage, 3 cts.

LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST.—This embraces the whole of the three previous named works, and the Tract on Atonement, bound in one volume of 360 pages, and lettered on the back. It contains a full view of the doctrine of "No life out of Christ," as taught by the EDITOR of the *Bible Examiner*. *Price*, \$1. Postage, 15 cents.

THE DISCUSSION between Prof. MATTISON, of the Methodist E. Church, and the EDITOR of the *Bible Examiner*. Question:—"Does the Bible teach that the creature Man—which the LORD God formed of the dust of the ground—has a super-added entity called the *soul*?" *Price*, 30 cents, in paper covers only: Postage, 5 cts.

MAN'S DESTINY.—*Immortality*: The Arguments from Nature and Scripture, by Rev. T. M. POST, D. D., St. Louis, Mo., Reviewed by the EDITOR of the *Bible Examiner*. *Price*, in pamphlet, 30 cents. Postage, 5 cents.

BIBLE vs. TRADITION: in which the True Teaching of the Bible is manifested: showing the true meaning of the terms Soul, Spirit, Hell, Everlasting, Eternity, Life, Death, &c. An invaluable help to understanding the Scriptures. *Price*, bound, 75 cents; Postage, 15 cents. A cheap edition, in paper covers, 40 cents. Postage, 9 cents.

FUTURE PUNISHMENT, by Rev. H. H. Dobney, Baptist Minister, England. "*Part. Second.*" 200 pages. This work shows that literal *death* is the punishment of the wicked. *Price*, in paper covers, 30 cents: Postage, 7 cents.

MAN'S NATURE AND DESTINY: or, the Animal man and the Spiritual man: A Sermon by GEO. STORRS: *Price*, 5 cents. Postage, 1 cent.

LETTER TO A CLERGYMAN; or, Life only through Christ, not a heresy; by Dr. J. K. FINLEY, Pittsburg, Pa. *Price*, 3 cents. Postage, 1 cent.

"EUROPEAN WAR; OR The Position and Prospects of the Papal Roman Power, and Napoleon Dynasty, as indicated in Scripture prophecy. By GEO. STORRS." Published in May, 1859, just prior to the breaking out of the war in Italy. The author believes the positions taken in the work will prove to be substantially correct, though some of the events may be arrived at in a manner not apparent at the time he published his views. *Price*, 10 cents. Postage, 1 cent.

OUR ISRAELITISH ORIGIN.—This is a work written by Prof. WILSON, England, some years since, which we republished, believing it could not fail to interest all thinking men, whatever might be thought of the accuracy of his positions. For ourself, we indorse his general theory that the *Anglo-Saxons* are the literal descendants of Israel, in the line of Joseph and Ephraim. *Price*, 50 cents, in paper covers only. Postage, 7 cents.

☞ We may have other works for sale besides those mentioned in the foregoing list. One-third discount will be made on the above works, *for cash*, to such as purchase \$3 worth; but, in that case, they are sent at the expense of the purchaser. By the *hundred*, a still further discount will be made.

THE ATONEMENT.—A Tract of 12 pages. *Price*, 2 cts: single; by the 100, \$1.50. **BIBLE EXAMINER** bound, for 1860, \$1.50. Ten copies will be sent to one address on the receipt of \$10; sent in either case at the expense of the purchaser.

Orders for any of these works may be left with GEO. W. YOUNG, 35 Ann-Street, New York. All Letters, sent by mail, must be addressed,

GEO. STORRS, Box 4658, New York.

HERALD

OF THE

KINGDOM AND AGE TO COME.

"And in their days, even of those kings, the Eloah of the heavens shall set up a kingdom that shall not be abolished for ages, and a dominion that shall not be left to another people. It shall grind to powder and bring to an end all these kingdoms, and itself shall stand for ages."—DANIEL.

JOHN THOMAS, Ed.] West Hoboken, Hudson Co., N. J., Mar. 1861. [VOL. XI. No. 3.

On the Nature and Constitution of Man.

BY R. LASIUS.

No part in the wide circle of science is more important and more worthy of consideration than the knowledge of the nature and constitution of man. It is the study of this subject which engaged the attention of thinking men, in ancient as well as in modern times; yet, from the diversity of opinion, it is to be inferred that to the majority of men this question remains a problem still, and that the solution is even considered an impossibility.

From the testimony of Herodotus, it appears that the Egyptians were the first who taught the two-fold nature of man. The same doctrine is also the principal one which Pythagoras borrowed from them, according to Ovidius, who makes that philosopher pronounce the following words:

"Morte earent anime, semper priore relicta,
Sede, novis domibus habitant, vivuntque receptae."

However, the ancients found it difficult, even after having received the doctrine that man could be separated into two parts, body and soul, to comprehend how it was possible that the latter could exist without a body. It was only at a later period that philosophers broached the opinion, that the soul, after its separation from the body, returned to a common soul of the universe: animam digressam a corpore refundi in animam universi. The Hades of the Egyptians and Greeks contains, therefore, the corporeal shadows of the dead; and so familiar was this conception, that one of the Hebrew prophets used it in a parabolic figure. (Isaiah xiv.)

According to the Egyptian doctrine, therefore, the soul would not remain without a body, but had to enter a new one after having left the former. This transmigration of souls had to be accomplished through

all kinds of animals, and was finished after the lapse of 3000 years, as Herodotus relates. But as metempsychosis was considered as a punishment or purgatory, the desire arose to conciliate the judge upon whom the decision in the matter devolved as well as to retain the soul as long as possible in the body to which it belonged originally, and to preserve the same from decomposition, as is related by Diodorus. For this latter reason the bodies of the deceased were most carefully embalmed by the Egyptian physicians, and to those only was granted that privilege, who in the terrestrial court of death had been pronounced virtuous and innocent. Of these it was believed, that if they had justified themselves also before Osiris in Hades, they would live a happy life conjoined with him. For this purpose, tools which the deceased had used during life, articles of food, of luxury, or of ornament, were put with the body into the tomb, together with written hymns and prayers addressed to the subterranean deities to serve as passports.

In order to gain the second point,—the justification before Osiris,—prayers were pronounced in the act of interment, the deceased was recommended to the mercy of the judge, and writings which substantiated such expectations were also put into the tomb. If the deceased had found mercy before the eyes of Osiris, and his body had been carefully protected from decay by embalming, his mummy was thought to continue in life like unto that of Osiris, who immediately after his death and interment went into Hades, and performed there the office of judge of the dead.

The fate of those whose conduct during life had been objectionable, was different. To them it was neither allowed to dwell in Hades, nor in their former body, which they had defiled by misdeeds. Therefore their soul was transferred at once into the body

of an animal for punishment and correction; with them they had to suffer the same fate; they were hunted, killed, sacrificed, until at last, being cleansed and purified at the expiration of a great number of years, they were allowed to reënter a new human body. The place designated for a life after death was the "amonthes," *i. e.*, a dark subterranean place, where the souls had to stay until their transmigration into other bodies. There it was also decided, according to their past acts and deeds, if they had deserved to pass through the bodies of the lower animals before they could enter a new human body. A graphic description of the subterranean court, according to the idea of the ancient Egyptians, is given by Lepsius. It contains the enumeration of all persons constituting the Egyptian Hades, and nobody can doubt that the Greek Hades is a complete imitation of it. The Greeks adopted likewise the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, of its subterranean residence, a court of death, etc. Other nations adopted these doctrines from them, with various additions and modifications.

The Pythagoreans and Stoics contended that the soul was the real and essential part of man; they designated the body as a burden, a dark habitation, a place of punishment and correction of the soul or mind.

Plato taught that man consists of three parts, *viz.*, body, soul, and spirit. He admitted also a threefold soul: the angry, the desiring, and the intelligent soul or spirit. The first one he located in the chest, the second beneath the heart, and the last in the head. The intelligent soul he considered to be the essential part of man; it had to govern the other two, and it was, according to his doctrine, a part of the divine essence. It is this latter doctrine which was transmitted to the present time, although its adherents modified it in various ways, as it can be seen in the writings of Paracelsus, Böhme, Luther, Helmont, and others.

It seems that the ancients found it even more difficult to determine the question as to the origin of man, than that as to his nature and constitution. For as they knew not the Pentateuch, or at least did not recognize it, they could not conceive of any theory which had only the appearance of plausibility, and if they began to reason upon such theories, they fell into utter absurdities. It is not necessary to mention the inventions of their poets, who fancied that men were formed out of the stones of Deucalion, or that they grew upon oaks like acorns. Among the Greek philosophers the idea prevailed, that men as well as the world had always existed. Of Aristotle and his disciples it is known, that they held this doctrine, and the same is probable in regard to Plato, Dicaearchus, Pythagoras, Xenoc-

rates, and Theophrastus. Some philosophers, as Epicurus and Lucretius, ascribed the origin of men to a mere accident, so that by an accidental conglomeration of atoms and an occurrence of irregular births it had happened, that human bodies, in such a form as they now exist, accidentally originated. Others, as Empedocles, presumed that the different members were produced by the earth, piece by piece; that they afterwards grew together, and having been mixed with fire and moisture, they made up a living, perfect man. Democritus of Abdera, thought that men took their origin from water and glue.

It is difficult to comprehend how the first theory could be believed even by those men who set it forth, for they were in other respects not deficient of close observation and logical reasoning. They must have entirely overlooked the fact, that, except under very peculiar, unfavorable circumstances, and in a few localities, there is a steady and uninterrupted increase of population all over the globe; that single families grow to tribes, communities, and even to whole nations, who gradually, and in the course of time, cultivate tracts of land which had ever been deserts, inhabited only by the wild beasts of the forest. If, on the contrary, men had always existed, there could not have been a time recorded by the most ancient tradition when their number was not the same, or even larger, than at present.

The second theory does not reflect any more credit upon its inventors than the first mentioned one; for when we contemplate that man is possessed of a multiplicity of different organs, every one of which subserving a distinct purpose, occupying the very best place to perform its appropriate function, and in harmony with all the other organs, we cannot be in doubt for a moment but that this can neither be the result of accident nor of the productivity of the soil, even when assisted by heat and moisture. But, said they, the earth may have exhausted its high degree of fertility, yet it produces new plants, shrubs, and trees as abundantly as in the remotest time of which we have any knowledge, and no such accident as alluded to ever occurred. Besides, the whole world shows such an immense scene of variety, order, conformation to a definite purpose, and beauty, that by the knowledge to be obtained from our feeble understanding, all language fails in force of describing so many and incomprehensible wonders, all figures are wanting in power to measure, our very thoughts lose their limitation, so that our judgment of the whole ends in an inexpressible but the more eloquent astonishment. Everywhere do we see a chain of effects and causes, of end and means, of regularity in generation

and decay, and as nothing could of itself come into that condition wherein it is, it points always to another thing as to its cause, which in its turn makes the same inquiry necessary. So the whole universe must resolve into nothing if there was not a Supreme Being existing apart from this infinite mass of accidental things originally and independently, who sustains all things, and as the cause of their origin secures also their preservation.

There remains now the Mosiac account of the origin of man to be considered. According to the testimony of Moses, the Lord God formed man from the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of lives; and man became a living soul. Now it is of importance to know what the scriptures define to be a living soul. It is a living natural or animal body, whether of birds, beasts, fish, or man. The phrase living creature is the exact synonym of living soul. The Hebrew words "*nephesh chayiah*," are the signs of the ideas expressed by Moses. *Nephesh* signifies creature, also life, soul, or breathing-frame, from the verb to breathe; *chayiah* is living, the participle of the verb to live. *Nephesh chayiah* is the genus which includes all species of living creatures; namely, *Adam*, man; *bene*, beast of the field; *chitu*, wild beast; *remesh*, reptile; and *ouph*, fowl, etc. In the common version of the scriptures, it is rendered "living soul;" so that under this form of expression the scriptures speak of "all flesh" which breathes in air, earth, and sea. As man then is a living soul in the sense of his being an animal or living creature—*nephesh chayiah*, *Adam*—he has no other preëminence over the creatures God made, than what his peculiar organization confers upon him. Moses makes no distinction between him and them; for he styles them all living souls, breathing the breath of lives. Thus literally rendered, he says, the Elohim said, the waters shall produce abundantly the reptile living soul; and again: "every living soul creeping." In another verse, "let the earth bring forth the living soul after its kind, cattle, and creeping thing and beast of the earth, and lastly, whatsoever Adam called *nephesh chayiah*, the living soul, that was the name thereof. Quadrupeds and men are not only living souls according to the scriptures, but they are vivified by the same spirit. The account reads thus: God said, "I bring a flood of waters upon the earth to destroy all flesh wherein is *ruach chayim*, spirit of lives;" and in another place, "they went in to Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh, in which is *ruach chayim*, spirit of lives. And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl and of cattle, and of

beast, and of every creeping thing, and every man; all in whose nostrils was *nehemet ruach chayim*, breath of spirit of lives." It is this *ruach elohim*, or instrumentally formative power, which first caused a motion upon the waters, and afterwards disengaged the light, evolved the expanse, aggregated the waters, produced vegetation, manifested the universe, vitalized the breathing-frames of the dry land, expanse, and sea. Thus we read, "if God set his heart against men, he will withdraw to himself *ruachu venshematu*, i. e., his spirit and his breath; all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again to the dust." In another place, "by the *nehemet-el*, or breath of God, frost is given." Speaking of reptiles and beasts, David says, "thou withdrawest *ruachem*, i. e., their spirit, they die; and to their dust they return. Thou sendest forth *ruhech*, i. e., thy spirit; they are created. Whither shall I fly, *meruhech*, from thy spirit?"

Here is then a doctrine which is very different from those which were set forth by the Egyptian and Greek philosophers and their adherents. Man is presented by Moses, not as a being of eternal existence, nor of accidental origin, but as a creature, formed by the Supreme Being from earthy substances in common with the animals over which he is destined to rule. Like them, he is vivified by the *ruach*, or power which was instrumental in the formation of the universe, and by the *nehemet*, or breath, vital air, or atmosphere, which keeps all the breathing creatures from perishing and returning to the dust.

The identity of the elements composing the planet earth, with those which are found to compose man, is now a well-established fact. All of them are obtained from the surrounding world. Since the days of Paracelsus, who taught that only three parts participated in the formation of the human body, viz., salt, sulphur, and quicksilver, science has made considerable progress. Chemistry has succeeded as so far to demonstrate eighteen of the elements in the human body, and it is not improbable, that with further advancement of our knowledge, the reverse of the above proposition will be found true, that all the elements which enter into the composition of the earth, are also constituents of the human body.

The *ruach*, or spirit, is that wonderful imponderable agent which pervades the whole universe in its broadest, or rather illimited extent. It suspends in space the remotest of the stars of the bright galaxy of heaven; it causes the heavenly bodies to perform their diurnal and ellipsoidal movements with regularity and order, and to radiate forth their waves of light in an unceasing flood. Its effects appear in the flash

of lightning and peal of thunder; in the tornado, which shivers into fragments the mighty oak of the forest, and in the zephyr, which cools our cheek in the summer heat. It draws together the atoms of matter which make up the granite rock, the gold, the water, and the air; it causes the iron to attract iron; it enables the delicate roots of the plants to attract from the soil the elements for the elaboration of their nutritive juices, and to make them rise to the highest branches and leaves. It dwells also in the animals and in men, enabling them to inspire the vital air, and to convert food into their own substances. It gives polarity to their brains and nerves, and enables them to manifest the phenomenon of thinking. So a bond of union is established between man and the remotest parts of the universe, while man communicates with his Maker by means of this same dynamical agent. Without it all matter would resolve itself into atoms, and fall back into chaos. Although we do not possess instruments to indicate the presence of this agent which rejoices in the inappropriate name of electricity, in the space external to the planet which we inhabit, and to measure the danger which it there produces, we are justified to conclude that the centrifugal and centripetal force of gravitation are nothing else but the effect of the agent under consideration. While its effects there in moving and keeping in equilibrium ponderous bodies fill our imagination with amazement, the contemplation of the same power in its working on the terrestrial world calls out our far greater admiration. We meet here an unceasing chain of chemical changes, of combination and decomposition, of attraction and repulsion, whereby matter is modelled and remodelled in every conceivable form. To a casual observer, accident seems to be the supreme ruler in all these changes, but when we begin with close attention to compare one group of events with another, and arrange these again under larger divisions, and in this manner pass from details to a general view, we cannot fail to perceive a cooperation of means to a certain definite end, resulting in one harmonious whole, and pointing to one agent, to which all these effects are due.

[To be concluded.]

Bible-Examinerism Reviewed.

AFTER so long a time, and how long we are unable to tell, our old friend of the editorial community, "the Reverend" George Storrs cycled, has visited our table in the form of the "Bible Examiner" revived. It is not often that we are reminded that our friend is still above ground; nor are we to him even now indebted for the information that he is still

strumming upon the one string of the same old fiddle. The reason is that we belong to a "class of professors" to which he has an awful aversion, because of "the exclusive and denunciatory spirit" by which he deems it to be animated. Of that class he regards us *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, as "the Dragon, that old Serpent, the Devil, and Satan;" and might possibly, if in visiting his official sanctum we did not do so *incog.*, (as we once did without being discovered,) throw the ammunition ink-stand of his battery at our head, as his old divine brother Luther is said to have done at the Devil's in Wartburg four hundred years ago. A paroxysm of orthodox horror, there is reason to think, flashes with tremendous and chilling effect over his organ of charitableness at the mere mention of our name. It is a name which sets that same old fiddle of a single string to scraping forth the most un-Paganini-like discord that ever son of the fiddle-bow split ear-drums or set teeth on edge with. Our name is not sweet music or Orphean melody to his "mortal soul;" but discord harsh and grating; and stirs up his inner man with all the indignation and wrath compatible with his peculiar piety. "Dogmatist," or "that dogmatist," is the word or phrase, in which he embodies his pious horror and indignation at our "exclusive and denunciatory spirit." The very sound of the word is awful; and how we have been able to survive and hold our own after being shot at with such an arrow from the bow of his "Reverence," is wonderful to tell! But so it is. The Bethanian President has killed us, no one knows how often! and the Reverend George Storrs denounces us for a dogmatist of the most exclusive and denunciatory stamp; and yet we still live and, our enemies behold us (Rev. vi, 12.) with feelings destitute of comfort and agreeableness.

The unlearned reader may perhaps think that there is some terrible and disgraceful charge embodied in this awfully doggish word—doggish in sound, if not in signification. It is rarely used in a complimentary sense, yet it is a very good word in itself, and expresses what all intelligent and honest men ought to be who know the truth. A dogmatist is "a bold advancer of principles;" and one who asserts positively, and teaches magisterially. A dogma is an established principle; and he that asserts it positively is a dogmatist and a dogmatizer. But why does our "divine" make this word a vehicle of discordant indignation when our name is mentioned? Because we hold the doctrine of Christ to be well-defined and established; that we understand it; and do positively

assert, and are certain that we can prove the assertion by a fair and candid use of the scriptures, that he who believes the gospel of the kingdom and is immersed shall be saved; and that the editor of *the Examiner*, having not yet understood the gospel, and consequently faithless of it, is "dead in trespasses and sins;" and that, even if he believed the truth, his case is still worse, inasmuch as it is testified that he has never been "born of water." Here is the rub. If we would stultify ourselves and admit that such as he are christians, we should not be regarded as a dogmatist in an evil sense, in his estimation at least. But this we cannot do and be loyal to the truth. The New Testament is our standard of christian men and things; and in its pages we find no example of a christian after Pentecost, who had not been buried in real water into the death of Christ. This is incontrovertible; yet he that affirms it is a dogmatist!

But leaving our divine friend to the enjoyment of all the satisfaction he can extract from the contemplation of our dogmatism, we proceed to offer a word or so upon the George Storrs in print before us. He is still examining the Bible, a picture of which enrayed in light, and overhung with an olive-branch, adorns the cover of his periodical. Over the book are the words "*Our Creed*;" and under it, "*Search the Scriptures*." The olive-branch, we presume, is offered to all to whom the "*Bible Examiner*" may come, dogmatists of a certain "class of professors" excepted, with whose sentiments he does not desire in any way to be identified. Our reverend friend would not think of offering it to us, because he knows well that it would not be accepted. The olive basis with all true believers is obedience to the gospel of the kingdom, after the example of the 3,000 on Pentecost, and the Gentiles at the centurion's. When he attains to this, the faithful will all exclaim, "God bless George Storrs! go in peace, and sin no more."

But we fear that at present he is far off from this. He says, "The Holy Bible is our creed." Being a Protestant-Methodist divine, we suppose he means that it is his creed in the Protestant sense. "The Bible, the Bible alone, is the religion of Protestants," exclaimed Chillingworth one of the fathers of our divine friend's religion. But if he had not said so, no one who understands the Bible would have suspected it; so also any such person reading the "*Bible Examiner*" would not have thought such a thing if it had not been suggested by the device over the book. But Protestants often say, "You can prove any thing from the Bible." We

do not believe this saying, however. One thing only can be proved by the right use of it; and that is "*the truth as it is in Jesus*." But granting that any thing can be proved by it,—then we conclude that the Protestant creed is any thing that can be so proved! We have been long convinced of this. The Protestant creed is an assent to any thing most convenient for the nonce. The Bible is its creed in this sense; and, viewed from the Protestant stand-points, is of all hooks ever imagined the most singular. It is supposed to have as many significations as there are sects, or systems of opinions, in the world-religious, and though each contradicting other indefinitely it matters not, they are right! The world may be compared to a huge factory in which the clergy are hard at it, (and often times "*hard up*,") spinning, weaving, and grinding up the Bible into fabrics suitable to the several marts in which they trade their wares. The Bible is to them what cotton is to the hypocrites of the Manchester school. These cry out that "slavery is the sum of all villainies," while they oppress their own hirelings with worse than negro bondage, and get lordly rich upon cotton produced by the same "sum of all villainies." So the clergy cry out against sin, and invoke the Bible against it, while they twist, and wrack, and torture it into all forms of hideousness until its identity is lost in the sorcery by which they have their wealth. This is a definition in fact of their sayings. "The Bible is our creed." "The Bible is our religion." Yea, after this fashion it is the Devil's as much as theirs. It is also our reverend friend's creed in the same sense—taking what suits him, rejecting what is inconvenient, and ignoring the greater part as unintelligible!

In the number before us he says, his motto is "*Onward*." We should rejoice at this if it were true. We regret, however, to testify that the specimen in hand evinces the contrary. It demonstrates that our divine friend is positively ignorant of the merest first principles of the doctrine of Christ. Nay, he does not seem to know the meaning of the words he uses. The one string of the cracked fiddle upon which he has been scraping for the past thirteen years, is "*No immortality, nor endless life, except through Jesus Christ alone*." Now taking this to mean what he expresses, it evinces that when our divine contemporary draws his bow and sounds forth the phrase "*nor endless life*," he thinks he has produced a chord different from "*no immortality*!" He does not seem to know that *immortality* and *endless life* are equivalents. This is unpardonable in a man—a divine man—who

has been wringing the world's nose for its ignorance and stupidity in respect of immortality for so many years past. It is proof to us that Mr. Storrs himself does not yet know what immortality is. It is evident he thinks it something else than "endless life" from his use of the particle "nor" after immortality; as if immortality were one thing, and endless life another; and that neither were obtainable except through Jesus Christ. Christ is life, and therefore immortality; but how he becomes such to Daniel under the law, and to Cornelius under "the faith," our divine friend knoweth not; and never will know, so long as he rejoices in his own prudence.

We suspect that our Advento-Methodistic divine has been misled by our English version of 2 Tim. i. 10, which reads, "Jesus Christ hath brought *life* and *immortality* to light through the gospel." This would be excusable in a pupil; but for a "reverend divine"—for one of "the wise and prudent," a denouncer of dogmatists, there is no excuse. Our sagacious friend ought to know that "*immortality*" is not in the text at all. It is not *αἰωνία*, but *ἀθάνατος*, that is, associated with "life." It takes *life* and *aphtharsia* to constitute *immortality*; which is life manifested through incorruptible substance, and therefore endless. These are brought to light through the gospel of the kingdom; in respect to which our friend is lamentably in the dark.

Nevertheless, far be it from us to say that no good has been done as the result of our divine friend's performances upon his single string. The Lord is said proverbially to draw many a straight line by very crooked instruments. Our reverend contemporary is manifestly one of these. He is capable in the work of demolition. He can pull down; but is utterly incompetent to build upon the foundation of the Deity. He can prove to men and women that they and their babies are distinguished from the beasts that perish only by the peculiarity of their organization; and that if any of them would have "*immortality* and *endless life*" they can get *them* through Jesus Christ alone; but beyond this he cannot go. Not that he thinks he can go no further. He imagines that he is "thoroughly furnished;" and able to set the whole matter squarely before them. But in this supposition we know that our divine friend greatly errs. This is the established conviction of "that dogmatist" to whom his charitableness has not been able to reach; and not the "dogmatist's" only, but the conviction of all who are

intelligent in the scriptures, and acquainted with our divine's speculations. We have found men exorcised of the immortal soul demon, yet spasmodically jerking upon the parched and arid strand of Advento-Methodism, like fish gasping for water on the shore. On investigating their case, we found that they had been hooked by our friend's tackle. His hook and gudgeon-bait were in their jaws. They could ridicule immortal-soulism; and speculate upon Louis Napoleon as the eighth head of the beast; and had some vague and confused notions about the personal and speedy advent of the Jesus endorsed by the Laodicean Apostasy: but of apostolic christianity in its faith, obedience, and spirit, they were as ignorant as the craftiest leader of the blind could wish. These we have had to teach the first principles of the oracles of the Deity. Having got rid of immortal-soulism by our divine friend's instrumentality, to that extent had much rubbish been scavenged from their hearts, and the conviction of the truth facilitated. When this got possession of their understandings and affections, in so doing Christ entered into them, and ejected our divine friend with disgrace. In opening their eyes to see the truth, our friend's theological empiricism was abundantly revealed. They found that to demonstrate error was not necessarily to exhibit the truth. They discovered that our divine friend could reduce men, women, and babes to the level of perishing beasts, but could not exalt them to equality with the angels of God. When he had convinced them that they were no better than a dead dog, he could not demonstrate to them how they might attain to joint-heirship with Israel's future king; so that, failing in this, he left them gasping for life upon the shores of universal confusion and doubt, and really in a worse plight than before: for in this life where ignorance is bliss it is folly to be wise, if the wisdom acquired fails to show us any good. It is better for a man to believe that he is immortal and that he will go to heaven at death if he is good, than to believe he is like the beasts, but that he may become immortal, and yet leave him in ignorance how the Deity has decreed that that desirable consummation may be attained. We do not care to convince men of error unless we can also convince them of the truth. Men without restraint are wild beasts; better therefore that they be restrained by superstitious dread than not restrained at all. This is the providential arrangement under which the world exists. God knows that in the absence of his power

in manifestation, anarchy would be universal, and violence would fill the earth, if mankind were not subjected to their fears. Hence, till the establishment of the dominion of the saints he leaves the masses in subjection to strong delusion ministered by the spirituals of wickedness in the heavenlies. By this agency they are restrained. They fear hell-flames, they fear the Devil, they fear the clergy, and they fear the myrmidons of the law. They fear all these as the ministers of God; and in this sense they fear God. They are afraid of him with a fear that hath torment. They are restrained from perjury, robbery, murder, and adultery, not because they love truth, are naturally honest, humane, and chaste; but because they fear the flaming torments of an endless hell, which it is the special business of their clerical guides, whose mission is to lead them into the ditch of perdition, to enstamp in sulphurous and livid characters upon their minds. We would not withdraw them from this influence if we could. Better that mankind should live in terror of "the Devil and his Angels," than that they should fear neither God, devil, nor man. We labor to pluck brands out of the fire—to bring men to the obedience of the gospel of the kingdom, that in being emancipated from the world's terrors, they may be constrained by the love of Christ which surpasseth the knowledge of the natural man. Our divine friend may possibly purpose the same thing; but unfortunately power is wanting to effect it. He can deliver men from their fear of "an endless hell," but he cannot plant them upon the scriptural basis of joy unspeakable and full of glory. The truth must be known before it can be taught; it must be believed before it can be obeyed; and it must be obeyed before any earthborn, impious or devout, can have any right to the immortality which comes through Christ alone. All of which our divine friend practically ignores as dogmatism pure and simple, and to be execrated by all who would reign in his esteem!

But let us hear from our reverend friend himself. As a poor blind dogmatist we humbly and respectfully inquire, "How are we to obtain 'immortality AND endless life' through Christ? "Come to him," saith he; "be united to him as the branch to the vine; lie upon him by faith, and you are a 'new creature'; a 'spiritual nature' is developed; the man is begotten by the Spirit, and now has spiritual senses, which he had not before; he now sees spiritual objects; knows and loves God, which he did not before, however

much his intellect might have been convinced there was a God. * * * A spiritual discernment the natural man hath not, and cannot have till he has a spiritual nature imparted which can only be done by a union with Christ." Yes, "come to him;" but how? "Be united to him;" true, but how is the union to be effected? "As the branch to the vine;" and how is that? Are we to grow on Christ as branches upon trees; and if so, how is our twig inserted into the stem so as to become a part of the tree? "Live upon him by faith;" yes, but how are we poor dead dogs to become alive, what are we to believe? "A spiritual nature is developed;" but how? "The man is begotten by the Spirit;" by what means? "A spiritual nature is imparted;" how? "By union with Christ!" Thus our divine friend travels in a circle. He begins by telling us we must be united to Christ, and ends by telling us the same thing; but leaves us in total darkness as to how the union is to be effected. His proposition is, that a spiritual nature can only be imparted by union with Christ; but with all his divine verbiage, how the union is to be effected he cannot explain.

THE BIBLE EXAMINER ON INFANTISM EXAMINED.

On page 321 of the number before us, the editor has an article on "Infant Salvation;"—some persons, he says, have been charging him with the denial of the salvation of infants. But he rebuts the accusation as false, if not malicious. "Must infants," he inquires, "perish because they cannot believe? An exclusive water-immersionist says, they cannot be baptised because 'believers only are entitled to that ordinance.' Must they, also, necessarily perish because not believers? Let who will take such a position, the editor of this Magazine does not take it, nor believe it; he regards it as a blasphemous position." He says there is no declaration against infant salvation in the Bible; and thinks there are strong indications that the Redeemer will give to some of them, at least, a part in the kingdom of heaven.

Our divine friend's argument in this is, that it is blasphemy to affirm the perdition of beings because they cannot believe; and that therefore they will certainly become immortal by resurrection. Now his position is that men are as the beasts that perish. Granted. If men be beasts, are they horn beasts, or do they turn into beasts when infancy is passed? Is a rattlesnake not a rattlesnake because it is only an infant snake? Then infants are

beasts as well as men; the only difference being that the former are little beasts, and their parents great ones. Our divine friend's infants, then, are little beasts who cannot believe. Now concerning these he inquires, "Must little beasts perish because they cannot believe?" We would go further, and ask, *Should any beast perish because it cannot believe?* Or, should one beast be saved because it is little; and another be damned because it is great? Ought such a difference to be made between a biped six feet high and one only a foot; or between a mouse and an elephant? We, though nothing but a dogmatist in our divine friend's estimation, do nevertheless think, that "immortality and endless life" ought not to be predicated of one beast in preference to another, because of their dissimilarity in size and their disparity in years. Nor can we see why our divine friend should award immortality to some, and not to all little beasts. Surely all human infants are equal before the Lord! And yet our divine will only immortalize "some of them, at least!" This is certainly a piece of favoritism we were not prepared for from a Methodistic free-gracer. Had he been one of old Johnny Calvin's elect, we should not have been surprised; seeing that they pave hell with infants' skulls! But so it is, and we cannot help it.

Well, here is our divine friend publishing consolation to "philoprogenitiveness" at a sacrifice of "the truth as it is in Jesus." He affirms that *inability to believe is no disqualification for immortality*. This principle makes immortality accessible to beasts of all sizes, and of every age and species. He asserts that some infants who cannot believe will be immortalized; which is tantamount to saying, that *immortality is attainable through Jesus Christ without faith, without obedience, without tribulation, and without character!* Now, if this be true of a multitude of infants, born of the lust of the flesh, and of all temptation inexperienced, why should not all adults become immortal too? Our divine's position reduces the wisdom and benevolence of God to folly and cruelty. This life is a sore struggle with evil and temptation; so sore that there are but few that enter into life eternal. If they had died in infancy they might have been saved; but, having increased in size and years, they are crushed with the cares, appetites, and temptations of life, and then blotted out of existence. Such is our divine's notion—a mere fiction of the flesh; a sophism too absurd for a serious refutation.

But what are these infants for whose

precious sakes our astute divine friend nullifies the first principles of the oracles of God, and makes his word of none effect! They are the incarnations of the amativeness of flesh and blood. This definition which is wholly and indisputable true, embraces also and equally the young of all animals. Now, our divine friend denies that the human incarnations of the lust of the flesh have immortal souls; and affirms consequently, that there is no particle of the Divine Essence in them. This is true; but in view of this fact, in view of his having reduced them thereby to equality with, or rather to the low level of the beasts, differing only from the beasts as one beast differs from another in organization: and of his having sent them to *sheol* without knowledge, without faith, without consciousness of having been in this evil world at all, without character good, bad, or indifferent; in view of all this, and seeing that the only manifestation of life their organizations ever developed was exclusively instinctive, such as swallowing, screaming, or sleeping—wholly and solely animal; will our divine and reverend and philosophical friend be pleased to inform his admiring patrons upon what principle in "heaven beyond the skies" or beneath them, he confers "immortality and endless life" upon the incarnations of human lust to the exclusion of infant lambs, sinless puppies, and all the "little innocents" of the monkey race? This question reminds us, that his great master, John Wesley, did entertain the notion that "every creature," that is, all quadrupeds and bipeds, would rise to "immortality and endless life;" and so he "delivered into the glorious liberty of the children of God." Now, if this be Methodistic orthodoxy—that all dead dogs, cats, hogs, *et id genus omne*, are to be immortalized, we see no valid reason why dead infants, those for instance that God commanded Israel to slay, those that were swallowed up with Korah, and those "sweet little cherubs" belonging to Babylon's daughter which afforded so much happiness to the Medes and Persians in their dashing them to pieces upon the stones (Ps. cxxxvii. 9):—we see no reason why these "little angels," these "sinless innocents" once so dear to their maumas, should not "come again from the land of the enemy!"

The logic of our divine friend, in demonstration of this result, is certainly very profound and clerically conclusive. It is this: "Jesus Christ quickeneth whom he will." Admitted. "The adult who believes in him has everlasting life, and he will raise him up in the last day." Ad-

mitted, if "believes in him" is understood in Christ's sense of the words, otherwise not. If in addition to this, he "will quicken" all infants into life eternal at the last day, who shall say he cannot, or will not? May he not do what he will with his own? "If, IF, IF—*quod erat demonstrandum!!!* But "if, in addition to this" he won't, what then? Our divine logician argues that because Jesus will immortalize adults, *believers* in the resurrection, he will therefore immortalize all, or some, infant-*unbelievers* also. This is great! But, saith he, "who shall say he cannot?" Dogmatist as we may be, we would not so speak; yet we would venture to add, "who shall say Christ cannot immortalize John Wesley's quadrupeds?" Is the admitted ability of Christ to do what he pleases, any argument that he will do anything or everything that comes into the crazy brains of the old man of the flesh? But our divine friend is not satisfied with daring all the world to deny what every one admits; he is so bold and courageous in the cause, that he adds, "who shall say that he *will not*? May he not do what he will with his own? Shall it be said by presumptuous man, that He who has all power in heaven and in earth in his hands cannot, if "he will," put His spirit in "little children," and raise them up to life eternal? If it be said, there is no promise of it in the Bible; it may be answered, "there is no declaration against it there." But all this proves nothing, because it proves too much. Who shall say he *will not* raise John Wesley's dead beasts? May he not do what he likes with his own? Are not the cattle upon a thousand hills His who made them? Shall it be said by presumptuous man, that he cannot if he will "put his spirit into the little children of Johnny Wesley's pet beasts, and raise them up to life eternal? Was not the team that horsed Elijah's chariot "spirit," and may they not once have laid dead in the knacker's yard, and been cut up and boiled into dog's meat; and afterwards been delivered into the glorious liberty of galloping through the empyrean? Shall it be said by presumptuous man that this was not done; and that the Omnipotent *cannot* and *will not* repeat the marvel? If it be said, there is no promise of it in the Bible; it may be answered, there is no declaration against it there! In this easy and facetious way, we presume to "dogmatize" our reverend friend's divinity into its peculiar and native absurdity. His theosophy is too ridiculous for a grave refutation; therefore all we can do with it is to fry it in his own pan.

But we have not quite done with our divine and marvellously enlightened teacher of babes, and guide of the blind. He asks, with a boldness threateningly fatal to the unlucky dogmatist who cannot say "no,"—"Has not Christ a right to do what he likes with his own?" Certainly he has. But then this admission does not prove that dead incarnations of human amativeness are scripturally comprehended in "*his own*." He does not lay claim to the devil's own, which is the world that does not, will not, and cannot believe, past, present, and to come. Christ's own are defined in the address of Jesus to the Father in John xvii. They are styled "the men which thou gavest me *out of the world*, who have kept thy word."—"I pray not," said he, "for the world, but for them which thou hast given me; for they are thine, and thine are mine. I have given them thy word. Sanctify them through thy truth: thy word is the truth. For their sakes sanctify myself, that they also might be sanctified through the truth. Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also who shall believe on me through thy word. I give to them eternal life." These are Christ's own—*intelligent persons who believe into Jesus, and are kept from the evil in the world, through the apostolic word*. He claims no others as his own, and prays for no others. Christ does not lay claim to our divine friend, because he does not believe into him through the apostle's word, and is not sanctified by the truth. His sanctification is that sort of holiness common to him and the pope, and those little Babylonish innocents, he says Christ *can raise* if he will by putting his spirit into them. Christ's own and the devil's own are classes of humanity whose characteristics are altogether diverse and opposed. The devil takes the flesh with all its ignorance, superstition, and sin; and Christ the spirit with all its intelligence, obedience, and truth. "*The flesh profits nothing*." Infant nor suckling, ox nor ass, have any claim to immortality because they are flesh, or because they are or have been related to flesh. Immortality is predicated upon doing the commandments of the Deity. A right to the Tree of Life, and to enter into the City, is based on this exclusively; and any theory that gives this right or privilege upon any other basis, or affirms a principle that nullifies it, is nothing but "the thinking of the flesh," which characterizes the devil's own. Christ's own is that glorious company of men and women sanctified by the truth, who will have attained to immortality and the kingdom through the much trib-

ulation of the present evil world. There is not one will shine in that galaxy of intelligences, who has not walked in the obedience of faith according to the word. The thief will be in Paradise, but whether he will be permitted to eat of the Tree of Life there, or be driven out as Adam was, no man can tell, for it is not yet revealed. Resting upon his case is mere presumption; and he that would be satisfied with such an example, is not fit for the kingdom of God.

But alas for our divine friend and his vagaries! We see clearly that the root of the matter is not in him. The world, past, present, and to come, is still a hidden mystery to him. He is so bewitched with his own fiddling, that he is quite insensible to the music of the spheres. He sees not "that the world to come" is based on spirit, not on flesh. This conception is beyond his genius. He would establish it upon flesh without regard to faith and obedience, which he nullifies by immortalizing the faithless and the characterless. He is afraid boldly to assume the truth, and abide by all consequences. He knows that it is written, "Without faith it is impossible to please the Deity;" but he will not accept it. He denies it in affirming that he will confer immortality on faithless babes. In asserting this tradition he says in effect, "Paul, you are a liar and deceiver in so saying; it is possible to please God without faith, for he is pleased with "little children" who cannot believe; and will put his Spirit into them that they may live forever. It is blasphemous, the position you assume." Alas, poor Paul! he fares as badly at the hands of our divine friend as Peter, whom he charges with acting "without divine authority," in commanding Cornelius and his friends to be baptized!

No, dear reader, the world to come is not based upon flesh, but upon spirit—upon knowledge, faith, obedience, character; the basis of which is constituted of the ideas of the Deity revealed in the word. These ideas understood and believed become spirit in a man, working in him to will and to do. They become "the law of the spirit of life," as opposed to "the law of sin and death," which is "the law of nature." This law impels us to do what we feel like doing, and is blind to the other law. He that thinks in harmony with God, and obeys the law of nature only so far as God permits, and conforms to his positive institutions, is a righteous man. He is a character; a divinely generated character; a character, the nucleus of which was the first truth scripturally comprehended. The immor-

tal of the future world is based upon, or rooted in, this character. The man may die and be dust four thousand years, it matters not; his character is written in the remembrance of God; and when he is re-fashioned from the dust, his sensorium will be so exactly similar to what it was, that being set into living action by spirit, all things will be brought to remembrance thereby. The resurrected will then be able to give an account of himself; and if approved, will be immortalized; but if not, will be condemned to the second death. Thus immortality is based upon character developed by the truth: and such only are the immortals required for the purpose of God. He intends to conquer the nations and rule them by such in righteousness, for a thousand years, to his own glory. There is no place in this purpose for friend Storr's pickaninics. There will be babies enough in the world when this glorious work begins, without raising an additional crop out of the earth. There will be vastly more in the world than will be profitable for the Master's use. Hence sword and pestilence will sweep them as the sword of Israel on the judgment of the Canaanites. Rachel has wept for her children, but Jezebel will wail with the howl of irremediable despair.

Feb. 14, 1861.

EDITOR.

"Hebrew Christianity."

The way of transgressors is hard.—Proverbs.

OUR attention has been recently called to a periodical entitled "*The Israelite Indeed*." It is a small 8vo of twenty-four pages of long primer, "edited and published by an association of Hebrew Christians," all of whom are hidden in the obscurity of "the unknown," except one who announces himself on the title-page as "*G. R. Lederer, Editor*." From these premises, then, we may fairly assume that Mr. Lederer and the "association of Hebrew Christians" are the same. It is true that the association is affirmed of a plurality; but there is no real difficulty in this. Mr. Lederer is constituted of "body, soul, and spirit, the whole person"—the body, for the world that now is, with all its loaves and fishes; and the soul, for the dust in disembodied rest from editorial and missionary labors; and the spirit, for bliss among the clouds, upon which with "sister spirits" thick as gnats, it may sing "glory hallelujah!" We do not say that these are Mr. Lederer's own particular notions; but they are those, or not very unlike those, of the "Dear Brethren and Friends," whom he styles "Christians;" and the parsons he calls brothers, in his

notices and “Macodonian Cry” for their dollars to prevent the fulfilment of the prediction of “Nathanael’s” demise.

The triune Mr. Lederer, then, we may assume, is the “association of Hebrew Christians” which shouts forth “from Tenth street, New York,” saying, “Christians! shall the cause of Christ suffer for want of your dollar? Christians! once more we cry, ‘Help us!’”—that is, Mr. Lederer and the printer, in whom “the cause of Christ” is made *flesh*.

Having identified the “association,” that it consists of a Hebrew body, a Hebrew soul, and a Hebrew spirit.—three Hebrew Christian entities in one Hebrew Christian man.—we proceed to inquire what sort of christianity it is this association of Hebrew Christians rejoices in. In this inquiry, then, we remark, that as the editor of “The Israelite Indeed” is both type and substance of the christianity, we cannot so certainly and satisfactorily arrive at a true idea of the thing as by viewing it as it is illustrated in his practice. This is absolutely necessary, because he presumes to identify “the good cause,” or the “cause of Christ,” as he expresses it, with himself and his printing speculation, a specimen of which is now before us. If his is the cause of Christ, the cause we are engaged in is the cause of the devil and Satan. The causes are totally different, and between them there is no middle or neutral ground. If Mr. Lederer is serving the Jesus whom Paul preached, and not his own lusts, we accept the alternative, that we are not co-working with him in the same cause. It is absolutely necessary, therefore, that the issue between Mr. Lederer and ourselves should be definitely and definitively known.

But the reader may inquire, why so necessary that our relative position towards Mr. Lederer should be accurately defined, rather than ours towards H. W. Beecher, or any other of the same species? We reply, that there can be no confounding of the cause we advocate with that of the clergy. The clergy are neither christians nor apostates, though chiefs of the apostasy. The clergy do not know what the gospel is; hence they can neither believe nor obey it; and not having obeyed it, they cannot fall away or apostatize from it. They are simply LAODICEANS, whose predecessors in the days of Constantine “the Great,” as they term him, the Spirit spued out of his mouth. Rev. iii. 16. Mr. Lederer, though paid and patronized by the Laodiceans, we regard in a far worse condition than his employers. We refer him to 2 Pet. ii. 21, where it is written of certain whose class is not yet extinct, “it had been better for them not to have known *the way of righteousness*, than after they have known it, to

turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them. But it has happened unto them according to the true proverb, The dog is turned to his own vomit again; and the sow that was washed to her wallowing in the mire.”

This is our indictment against the peculiar Hebrew Christianity before us, of which the Modern Israelite Indeed is both shadow and substance. Its body, soul, and spirit was Jew-born, and for many years a rejecter of the claims of Jesus to be Son of David, Son of the Deity, and King of Israel. For some reason or other, however, he came to admit his claims, to turn his back upon the traditions of the rabbis, and to embrace some form or other of Bohemian or Hungarian Protestantism. So far as admitting the claims of Jesus to the Messiahship was concerned, this was well; but as to turning Protestant, he might just as well have remained a member of the synagogue of the Jews, seeing that the Protestant church is but the “synagogue of the Satan” in the more modern phase; “the Mystery of Iniquity.” Rev. ii. 9: Thess. ii. 7. Modern Judaism and Protestantism are but two phases of one and the same thing. The “carnal mind,” or *σφύνημα της σαρκος*, the *thinking of the flesh*, unenlightened by the teaching of the law and the testimony, is the parent of them both. They are both fleshly absurdities, as far from the law and the gospel as the poles asunder. The Protestant abomination is an evil; nevertheless, out of the evil good has been educed: death and destruction are evils, yet out of these even much good has accrued to the family of man. Protestantism is a more rational form of error than Modern Judaism, Mohammedanism, or Popery. These are odious and pestiferous tyrannies; while under Protestant institutions there is scope for fee-simple proprietorship in one’s own soul.

The foundation and origin, then, of the Hebrew Christianity of this Modern Israelite Indeed was *modern Judaism protestantized*. Friend Lederer, like all other Jews, with only here and there an exception, mistook this for Bible Christianity. He imagined that in becoming a Protestant he had become a Christian, and in this “strong delusion” continued until some time after he had become acquainted with us. He was embedded in the mire of Protestantism for several years, and found no one able to put him in “*the way of righteousness*” by which he might be washed from the mire and dirt with which his inner man was blinded and begrimed. When he arrived in England, some Baptists there, as he informed us, tried to persuade him to be washed, or, according to their formula, to be baptized, or immersed. But they could

never succeed; nor indeed if they had would it have availed him any thing, seeing that he did not understand "the truth as it is in Jesus," and, consequently, could not believe it. He would have been an immersed Hebrew Protestant, or a Modern Baptist, nothing more. Still, it would have been better for him to have been this, than to occupy the relation to the truth he does now. A man had better be a poor blind Mohammedan, than a traitor to the truth for any present advantage whatsoever.

When our Hebrew Protestant friend arrived in New York city, somehow or other he came to be appointed a city missionary at so much per annum. His mission, we believe, was to distribute tracts among the Jews, to persuade them, we suppose, that Jesus was their Messiah; and that, confessing this, they might become Protestants as they happened to be led by the missionary that proselyted them; and obtain the salvation of their "precious immortal souls in kingdoms beyond the skies." We do not think that he was "set apart" by the imposition of the hands of any "divines," like our friend Storrs when transformed from a layman into a Methodist "divine." If we are correct upon this point, there was no more divinity in him than he had picked up by the wayside. He was primed with a certain amount of Rabbinism, could read the Hebrew Bible, professed faith in the Jesus of Protestantism, and could talk piously; but had never become an ordained preacher and administrator of ordinances. He was, therefore, only a missionary friar, but of what order of brethren we do not now remember, if we ever knew.

While engaged in the unprofitable craft of mesmerizing Hebrew immortalities into a profession of Protestantism—unprofitable to all but the missionary, and to such Israelites of easy virtue who would as soon live by Gentilism as by any other trade; while thus engaged, our missionary in his wanderings found his way into our meetings at Knickerbocker Hall. There he heard the gospel of the kingdom and name of Jesus Christ for the first time; and there also he began to learn all he knows about Bible-Christianity worth mentioning. Since he has "gone out from us" even, he has said, that "we were the only one in New York that preached the truth." There is much in this admission highly condemnatory of him who makes it. But let this pass for the present. The effect of our teaching upon Mr. Lederer and a companion Israelite, who has proved himself under trial a worthy man, was to bring them to a public confession, and to the obedience of faith in immersion. We cannot tell whether Mr. Lederer received what he then professed to believe was the truth in simplicity

of heart or not. We had convinced him of the necessity of being "washed" as a part of the righteousness to be fulfilled; so that, if he confessed the truth with an honest and good heart, which is known only to God and himself, he became what Peter terms "a washed hog," otherwise not; for an effectual washing by immersion depends upon an honest and affectionate belief of the truth.

We were greatly pleased at the accession of these two Israelitish brethren to our community, and sincerely hoped that they would both prove to be "Israelites indeed, in whom there would be no guile." We believe this is true of the one who has never proclaimed himself in word or print to be such; and we wish we could say as much of Mr. Lederer, who has been for nearly four years past proclaiming to the public his *Israelite-indeedship* in double great primer condensed. We entertained fond hopes, which, in his case, were doomed only to disappointment. We hoped that, being now, as we trusted, enlightened in "the way of righteousness," he would be useful in bringing his fellow-countrymen to some extent under the instruction that had enlightened him. Nor did we interfere with his missionary operations among them. He had before been a sham missionary; but since he had come to know the truth, he might now have become, as we hoped he would, a missionary indeed. He might convince the Jews of the Messiahship of Jesus, and have shown them that the way to life was neither by Rome, Wittenburg, nor Geneva, but by "Jerusalem, the mother of us all." This, however, required more courage than to be a soldier under Kossuth's administration. Any animal man of the lion and tiger species of humanity would do for this; but to stand up for the Christianity of the Bible, which repudiates the Romish and Protestant superstitions as much as it does modern Judaism, at the risk of being turned adrift by the Laodiceans that paid him for his services, required more faith and moral courage than our unhappy brother could command. We say *unhappy*; for unhappy indeed is he who, when he shall appear before "the Great White Throne," shall have to testify against himself, that he turned his back upon the truth, and went over to the enemy to preserve a stipend; and so sold his birthright, like Esau, for a mess of pottage.

It was in the early part of 1855 that our self-styled "Israelite Indeed," and the Israelite whom we believe to be really such, applied for, and received, immersion. The reader is referred to the March

number of that year for a notice of the case, under the caption of "Aaron and Christ." For a few months matters progressed without any particular ground of disquietude as to Mr. Lederer's loyalty to the truth. From conversation with him we knew that he had no more real respect for the sects of Protestantism than ourselves. This was his private opinion, which, however, did not square with his public demonstrations. We hoped, however, as he came to increase in knowledge, he would increase in faith and courage; and be able to take a bold stand with his countrymen for the truth he had confessed, and, as we hoped, obeyed. We were anxious to see him occupied in some honest way of living; considering that, if he had turned into a pedlar of small wares, he would be more honestly and respectably engaged than as a hireling of the Laodiceans. But his tendencies proved to be downward and grovelling. Obedience to the gospel had given him an exalted position before the Deity, which he failed duly to appreciate. It had placed him among the Sons of God—the Elohims of Israel—the future consociate rulers of the world with Jesus; but of this "high vocation" he was unmindful, not being willing to hazard any thing for the glory to be revealed.

It is probable that when he united with us he was not aware how *ultra* we were—how far *beyond* the vulgar religious notions of the day. Yet, if he did not know, it was his own fault; for he had often heard us urge upon our hearers and readers, that the so-called "orthodoxy" of the day is not Christianity. If his mind be not changed, we think we may safely say, that he *knows* it is not. We do not believe he is ignorant upon this point; and therefore we regard his case as desperate. He addresses the Laodiceans as "dear brethren" and "Christians;" while, on the premises he occupied with us, he believes them to be neither. We call this hypocrisy; but he denominates it "Hebrew Christianity;" and himself, as represented by his periodical, an "Israelite indeed, in whom is no guile!"

A few months after he united with us he cooperated with some Laodicean Jews of the Satan's synagogue to get up an exclusively Jewish Association, which would have formed a sort of church distinct from "all the sectarian formula of the present day." Had this succeeded, "the middle wall of partition" would have been reared again. We were sorry to see Mr. Lederer in such company, and for such a purpose. A Christian has no business to be cooperating with sectarian

reverends in the promotion of any religious enterprise whatever. Whatever they touch is defiled, and all their schemes defiling. Mr. Lederer already belonged to a "Hebrew Association," in being united with us. We are "Hebrews of the Hebrews" by adoption, through Jesus the King of the Jews. We are citizens of the Commonwealth of Israel, though Gentiles by the accident of birth. Had he been loyal to this polity and to its King, he would not have sought association "with them who say they are Jews, and are not, but liars of the synagogue of the Satan."

—Rev. ii. 9, iii. 9. He knew that we had "set aside all the sectarian formula of the present day;" and as he has confessed even since he apostatized to the enemy, we only held and taught the truth in New York city. He ought, therefore, loyally to have accepted our association already formed to hand, as a substitute for every other that could have been devised; but no, he preferred association with mere Jews outwardly, who Gentilized in all the superstitions of the heathen round about. See *Herald*, vol. v. p. 12

The following quotation from an address published in the *Herald*, vol. v. p. 206, will show the current of Mr. Lederer's thoughts while a member with us. There are several weak points in said address, but the following is plain and to the point:

"Jesus the Messiah of Israel and Lord will soon appear again on earth in power and great glory to judge and rule over all in justice and in righteousness.

"And this, my beloved brethren, is our hope, that the same Jesus who died on the cross for our sins, and arose from the dead for our justification, and ascended to the right hand of the Majesty in heaven, will descend again upon the earth to renew the fallen tabernacle, the overturned throne of his father David, to reign in the midst of the again gathered, again favored people, Israel, in Jerusalem, the capital of that land of which we Jews are the legitimate heirs,* according to God's own promises.

"That hope of Israel has been preached by our blessed Messiah himself, as well as by all his apostles; and for the sake of that hope Paul was summoned before the tribunal of Cæsar. It is true that that most important part of the gospel of Jesus Christ—the glad tidings of the restoration of Israel as a nation in Palestine under the personal government of their king, Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of David, has been long ago forgotten entirely.

* On the supposition that they be of faith.—*Editor Herald.*

Our Gentile friends, in spiritualizing the Word of God, have deprived Israel of their hopes, and interpreted all those precious promises given exclusively to Israel, for a spiritual Israel. They have fitted all to "the Church," though it accords with the testimony no better than "the fist upon the eye." Yet, notwithstanding the already mentioned circumstances, and also, that until this very time there is a great multitude of pious ministers and doctors who are continually spiritualizing away the inheritance of Jacob, and evaporating the hope of Israel, we, we Jews, who, by the grace of God, have become the co-heirs with the Lord Jesus—we Jews know that all the promises of God are yea and amen. The God of Israel is faithful, and will carry out his purposes in the due time.

"My dear brethren, glorious things are in store for us who are of Israel; but if we would have a share in Israel's kingdom—if we would be partakers with Christ our King—we must then walk in the light of the gospel; we must believe what Moses and the Prophets, Jesus and his Apostles, taught; and we must also do according to the commandments of Jesus! We must be obedient to our glorious King, and we must show to the world the fruits of our faith—kindness, benevolence, and meekness towards every man, and truth, sincerity, and faithfulness in all our doings. Yet the sweetest and most costly fruit of faith is love—loving kindness toward all, especially to the brethren.

"But, my dear friends, you must not misunderstand me, as if I would imply that we have any prerogatives over and above our adopted brethren of the Gentiles. No, by no means. All they who become true Israelites by adoption are the children of Abraham, like ourselves; because before God "there is no respect of persons"—there is no difference between Jew or Greek, slave or free; all are equally guilty, and *can only be saved on the same terms*, by Jesus of Nazareth, the Messiah. Yet this I would say, that there are testimonies in the Word of God, speaking of promises in particular to Israel, the literal Israel, consisting of flesh and blood, *not of gas*, that must be also fulfilled in the literal, and not in all spiritual Israel."

Now, in this extract Mr. Lederer affirms—

1. That Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah;
2. That he will return to the earth in power and great glory;
3. That he will come to reestablish the

tabernacle and throne of David his father;

4. That he will reign in Jerusalem in the midst of Israel over them and all other nations;
5. That Jews, who are such by the grace of God, are his co-heirs, and will reign with him in righteousness;
6. That this same Jesus died for their sins, was raised from among the dead for their justification, and ascended to the right hand of the Majesty in heaven, where he is now for an appointed time;
7. That the teaching contained in these six items was set forth by Jesus and all the Apostles;
8. That if any Jew or Gentile would be saved, or share with the Christ in Israel's Kingdom, they must believe what Moses and the Prophets, Jesus and the Apostles, taught; do according to the commandments of Jesus, and walk in the light of the gospel—Jew and Gentile can be saved only upon the same terms.
9. That Gentile spiritualizers (the clergy) have entirely ignored the most important part of the gospel of Jesus Christ, or the restoration of Israel as a nation in Palestine under the personal government of their king; and,
10. That the clergy spiritualize away, and evaporate the hope of Israel, and the inheritance of Jacob.

All this is true and indisputable; but unfortunately much of it is made ineffectual by Mr. Lederer's practice. How can we regard him as honest and sincere, in view of items 8, 9, and 10? Does he "walk in the light of the gospel" in cutting himself off from his brethren, in turning his back upon them; in embracing the spiritualizers of the Laodiceans, who have destroyed the gospel in ignoring its most important part, as his "dear brethren" and Christians? Does he walk in the light of the gospel in recognizing them as Christians, who, he knows well, neither believe, nor know, nor care what Moses and the Prophets, Jesus and the Apostles, taught; and which he says they must believe if they would be saved? Does he walk in the light of the gospel in fellowshipping pious Laodiceans, whose doctrine is that of the Nikolaitans which the Spirit says he hates; and who do not according to the commands of Jesus? Does he walk honestly and in gospel light in recognizing all sorts of sprinkled spirituals of wickedness in high places as baptized believers in Christ, seeing that he condemned his former self in coming to our community to be immersed, that he might "fulfil all righteousness" after the

type of Aaron and the example of Jesus Christ? Is he not rather a traitor to the truth? Is he not reenacting the part of Judas, who sold the incarnated truth to his enemies for thirty pieces of silver? The anointing spirit said, "I am the truth." What essential difference is there between Judas betraying "the truth," and Mr. L.'s betraying it for what he can get? Is not that man a traitor, who says we are the only one in New York city that teaches the truth; and nevertheless, goes and joins a Laodicean immersed community, as we are informed Mr. L. has done, where the truth is not and would not be suffered in its "sacred desk;" and, in what he untruly calls a "Macedonian cry," exclaims to Protestant sectarians of all sorts, "Dear brethren and friends, we are in great need of your helping hand, and we pray you, for the Lord's sake, help us!" *Christians!* shall the cause of Christ suffer for the want of your dollar? Shall the only Hebrew Christian Magazine in this country cease to exist for want of your patronage? "Precious "brethren," precious "Christians," precious "cause of Christ" are these, in the estimation of one who has no more real respect for the things so designated than we.

But why does our self-styled "Israelite indeed" profess one thing and practice another? This is a question, we believe, not difficult to answer. While he is indebted to us for the knowledge of the truth as far as he understands its system correctly, he tries to make us the responsible cause of his treachery. This is the usual policy of traitors. When they wish to do evil under a cloak, they unite with fleshly, pious adversaries in their hue and cry against the advocates of the truth most obnoxious in their advocacy to the hypocrisy and pietism of the flesh; or they pretend great zeal for some virtue they have the least possible affection for, or delight in. In this course, they get credit for what they are not entitled to, and hide their real purpose. Jesus was the alleged cause of the apostasy of those disciples "who walked no more with him." They attributed it to the hardness of his sayings. He was not charitable enough for them. He called pious men "hypocrites" and "serpents," and consigned them in his teaching to "the damnation of hell;" and allowed that only a very few could be saved. Paul was abandoned for the same cause. They treated him as an enemy because he told them the truth. Paul and Jesus were no compromisers; but knowing what the truth was, and is, and ever will be, until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled, they taught it though the teaching brought

with it the direst consequences to all their friends and brethren. Some who passed for these had no objection to the salvation preached, but they did not like the persecution and temporal hazards they had to incur on its account. They had no objection to the theory in all its exclusiveness and severity, and were willing privately to confess that it was all true; and that the scribes, Pharisees, and lawyers were all a set of hypocrites, who made long prayers for a pretence, and devoured widows' houses for the satiation of their own greediness; but then they disapproved of saying this publicly, seeing that these persons had the respect of the people; and that, as some of them lived by their patronage at so many shekels a year, it might cause them to lose their stipends if it became known that they belonged to an association holding such ultra and unsocial views as these. They therefore counselled prudence, which they called "love" and "charity." They celebrated these in their own peculiar sense, as the sum of all virtues; not that they loved their neighbors more than the apostles did; but they loved their own dear selves better than the truth. They could philosophically behold their friends in the bondage of tradition, in subjection to designing knaves, who were the blind leading the blind into perdition, and privately admitted the certainty of their condemnation if not awakened from their dream of security, and not utter a word to convince them of what they really believed to be their true condition, on the plea that it would "do harm." This they called *charity*; and he that did not operate upon this mean and dastardly principle, they denounced as "*uncharitable*" and not to be endured. Not that they considered it would "do harm" to the victims of delusion; because, if such a one came to obey the truth through said uncharitable instrumentality, they would pretend to rejoice greatly and perhaps truly, if he was only convinced and immersed in a quiet and private way, and would keep his convictions to himself. This would do no harm; but to prove that Satan in passing for an Angel of Light was nothing else than Satan, such a demonstration would "do harm," seeing that all the loaves and fishes of the Laodicean Apostasy are in his gift. If a missionary to the Jews were paid by him several hundred shekels of silver per annum to proselyte them to the Laodicean Jesus, and Satan were to hear that said missionary was converting them to the Jesus Paul preached, and belonged to a society whose members were none of them ignorant of his devices; and did

not hesitate to enlighten all they could, and to emancipate them from his snares, he might discharge such a missionary, and tell him to go preach for the love of the truth he believed, but without the shekels. Now this would "do harm," not to the truth, but to the cash account of the party concerned; and if the missionary loved his own ease and position conferred officially by Satan better than the truth, or was afraid to hold on to this and trust in God and his honest efforts in a secular way of life, it would put him in a great fright. Such a Christian would be panic-stricken; and if he belonged to our ecclesia in New York, he would cease to meet with us, exclaim against Dr. Thomas for his uncharitableness, take refuge in a Baptist conventicle, and proclaim himself to the world as an "Israelite indeed," the only true exponent of Hebrew Christianity!

But to return to our Macedonian crier. The reader can turn at his leisure to our article on "*Christianity the True Judaism*," in Vol. vii. No. 9. He will there see an account of a meeting got up by Messrs. Lederer and Epstein, styling themselves "Christian Jews," for discussion with non-Christian Jews, on Christianity. If Mr. Lederer had been loyal to the truth, he would not have consented to be associated with Mr. Epstein as a Christian Jew, being nothing else but a Congregationalist Protestant. But let this pass. At the first meeting they found an unmanageable opponent in Dr. de Lara, who was too strong for Protestant Congregational Christianity. Mr. Lederer perceiving this, brought us into the arena, where, of course, we stood to defend Bible-Christianity against infidelity and modern Judaism; and to vindicate it from all responsibility for Romish and Protestant Laodiceanism, which all sorts of Jews of the synagogue of Satan term Christianity. This was doing more than was wished or expected. But that mattered not. We did not go there to be the echo of the timid policy of time-servers; but to defend the truth without regard to consequences. In doing this, we showed that the popular religion was only an apostasy from the truth, and not the truth itself; and that Jews and Gentiles had yet to learn what Christianity was, before the former could assail or the latter defend it. This line of argument made our "Christian Jews" tremble for the craft. There were clergy there whose "orders" we identified with Paul's "seducing spirits," much to the alarm and indignation of our "Israelite

Indeed," who privately protested against their being called "apostates." But, as before explained, we did not so style them, although the chiefs of the apostasy. He was afraid it would be known by them that he belonged to our society, and held responsible for our doctrine; and as a consequence he reported to his employers, and by them cashiered. Under this apprehension they amended their rules, by which we were of necessity silenced as narrated. From that day to this we have only seen Mr. L. once, passing in the street. He has gone over to the enemy, whom he serves for what he can get.

Such, then, is the "Hebrew Christianity" illustrated and defended by the "Israelite Indeed." Had its editor remained obscure in private life our policy would have been to sorrow for the dead, the "twice dead," and to be careful not to unbury him. This is the fate to which we leave private irreclaimables as far as we are personally concerned. To confer notoriety upon such is to give them power for evil, which we are careful not to do. We fight such by letting them alone — by leaving them to their own native insignificance and imbecility. But this course is inapplicable to Mr. L. He has become a public man; and has set himself up as a champion of Hebrew Christianity; and in so doing invited all the world to investigate his claims. We thought he had long since become editorially defunct; but, on our attention being called to his periodical, we found him still alive, though evidently convulsed, and crying for help out of "the depths of the Satan as they teach." Considering the relation he formerly sustained to our society, we thought it our duty to bestow upon him this notice; and in so doing to rend away the veil that prevents his christianity from appearing in its native deformity, that some of the simple may be preserved from its imposition. A Christianity such as he now advocates can benefit neither Jew nor Gentile. He knows that a sprinkled Jew or Gentile is not a Christian. Under this conviction he came himself to be immersed; yet he calls all that come to his mill "Dear brethren" and "Christians!" He once knew "the way of righteousness," but he has ceased to walk in it. He was washed, but like the creature of Peter's proverb, he prefers to wallow in the mire, or to lick the vomit ejected from the Spirit's mouth for mere temporal advantage and behoof.

EDITOR.

Feb. 23, 1861.

The Faith" at Messiah's Apocalypse.

THE time of the coming of the Son of man is to be a time of exceeding small faith, inasmuch that he makes it a question whether he shall find "the faith" upon the earth. That there will be an elect people, we know. There will be a people looking for, and by their prayers hastening, the coming of the Son of man: but they will be a poor, despised remnant, who, like Lot and Noah, shall testify to the saving of their own lives, and to the condemnation of the apostate and anti-Christian aggregation of "Names of blasphemy" which fills the world. Those things which the gospel sneaks, it speaks to those who are under its dispensation. It is "the church," not the heathen world, which is described in such terms as are proper to express the state of *Sodom*, and the world before the flood. How different is this account of the state of "the church" from that which they are daily looking for. They are looking for a great increase of the faith, a great outpouring of the Holy Spirit, a great conversion of the world!!! They pretend they see the signs of it all around them, and to be daily waiting for a wonderful day of grace, a millennium of holiness, without one act of judgment to prepare the way of it; as if there were no tares to be burned up; no bad fish to be separated, and cast into the furnace. The nature of the kingdom, and the very existence of it as a purpose of God, is gathered from those scriptures which speak of the condition of the world after the Son of man is come, and this coming is described to be with judgment upon a secure and faithless church. But this generation says "No!" And why? Because they are lulled asleep into a fatal security, and are given up, as Paul predicted, to "believe a lie." But, say they again, the coming of the Lord cannot be near at hand, because there is still much faith upon the earth; there never was a time, they say, when there was such a spread of religion in all ranks and classes of the community: and it is the favorite theory of some of them, that religion has been gradually increasing in the world unto this day, and has never been for a moment retrograde. These things would appear incredible if we had not had them stated by the leaders of the "religious world" themselves. Now to all this we answer, What proof would you desire that a wife's affection had fallen away from her husband, and that her faithfulness had also perished, than that she never desired his presence, nor hoped for his coming again to her any more? Can there be good faith in Christ, the Saviour and Husband of the true church, when a church pretending to be that church de-

sires not his coming, and, when it is spoken of to her, disbelieves, derides, or howls with violent indignation? Can there be any faith, or any love from a wife to her husband long separated, whom she wishes not to see again? Whence arises this instinctive revulsion against any discourse of the Lord's coming? Whence this aversion to the whole subject? Whence this unwillingness to examine the documents? Whence this hatred and derision of those who do? It is not as if they had studied the subject, and been rooted and grounded in another opinion concerning it: they are indifferent to it altogether. This is a sure proof how little faith there is in Christ. Moreover, ask them what they do believe? They will tell you, that they believe he died for sinners. But ask further, Did he die for your sins? They reply, they *hope* so. But do you *believe* so? It is not about your *hopes*, but about your *faith*, we inquire. Either no answer at all, or a doubting one. Are they at peace with their God, or do they stand in doubt? They stand in doubt! What then, have they believed? Nothing that can be seen, even in that personal reference to which they exclusively devote themselves. Have they peace of conscience, or joy in the Holy Spirit? Do they believe with Abraham that they are heirs of the world as the consequence of obeying the truth as it is Jesus? Are they striving, like Paul, that if by any means they may attain to the resurrection of the dead? They have not even heard of a resurrection from among the dwellers in the dust, unto which it is any difficulty or any prerogative to attain. What then, we ask, is the faith of this throng they call "the church?" We ask this: for we can find nothing but a mixture of *opinion* and *doubt*. Men are surely *convinced* of nothing. But opinion is not faith, nor is doubt faith; nor is the belief of Christ's birth, life, and death, faith: which Paul defines to be "The substance of things hoped for, the conviction of things unseen." So that it is manifest that this day is a day of very little faith, when nothing is believed concerning the future. Now, when nothing is believed concerning our own personal benefit in Christ, but is left in doubt; when nothing is believed concerning the ordinances: every doctrine is held only according as it can be demonstrated to the intellect, and discipline observed only as its usefulness can be seen, or the sanction of public opinion obtained for it: where the hope of the Lord's coming is put off to an indefinite distance; the mention of his kingdom reverently wrapped up in the deepest obscurity,—verily, verily, if the Son of man were to come this day, would he find the faith upon the earth?

Beware of Whited Sepulchres.

"Woe unto you, scribes, Pharisees, hypocrites; for ye keep up the kingdom of the heavens against men: for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye those that are entering to go in." These men resisted the preaching of Jesus, whom the common people heard gladly, as he went about teaching in the synagogues, and proclaiming the good news of the kingdom. But the scribes and Pharisees, who were the ecclesiastical rulers, withstood him at all hands, waylaid him, perverted the people with their vain traditions, and in every other way did their utmost endeavors to prevent the people from receiving the Gospel of the Kingdom. So that it was like storming a city for any one to obtain an entrance; the opposition and the strife were so great, that it is written, "From the days of John until now the kingdom of the heavens is sought with great zeal, and the ardent take it by force"—Matt. xi. 12. To this obstinate resistance, and effectual also, which the men of name, and influence, and reputed piety, offered to the preachers, and to the preaching of the kingdom, our Lord refers in the words quoted.

Now, how perfectly parallel is this with the conduct of the scribes and Pharisees of our own times. The ecclesiastics, however divided among themselves they may be, are well agreed in this, to oppose with all their might us who preach the gospel of the kingdom; and for themselves they utterly throw the subject away from them as an abominable thing; and the people who hear it gladly, they resist and repudiate, and with all their might, hinder from believing. In the absence of right knowledge on the subject, and of sound argument, they much misrepresent, falsify, and by all modes of injustice seek to depreciate us with the people. Let the people take heed lest they prevail. To a great extent they are prevailing, and as those Pharisees brought Jerusalem low by hindering her from knowing the day of her visitation, so the clergy will prostrate the people by preventing them from knowing the day of their visitation. We apprehend they will be effectually deceived by such hypocrisy; for hypocrisy it is for any man to take upon himself to judge and condemn that whereof he is ignorant. Now observe how these same men are shown to be hypocrites, in that very thing upon which they pride themselves. They pride themselves upon what they call their spiritual mindedness; and they accuse us of preaching an outward and temporal kingdom merely. Now God, to prove how false they are in their pretensions to spiritual-mindedness, has raised up men who preach fully and freely unto every sinner, justification by faith, and the consolations of the divine

testimony, and straightway they have flamed against these men as violently as against us; so that the assurance of faith, the peace and joy in believing, are as much the objects of their imminent and ignorant attacks as are the coming and Kingdom of the Lord. Beware of such calumniators of the truth. This is the day of your visitation; take heed unto it lest it be hid from your eyes.

This opposition to the Kingdom of God, and to the preaching of it, prevails so much in men, otherwise pious and honorable, because they love the honor which comes from men, and not the honor which comes from God only." They love the unpermitted places in the feast: and the most honorable seats in the synagogues. They are wedded to some "names," or "denominations," and cannot hear to hear of the abolition of these things. They would have the house patched up, but this cannot be; for it is a ruin, and ready to fall. They would rather not endure the scoffings and violent oppositions directed against this subject. But we would have men to stand up stoutly to it, like men storming a walled city, and take it by force, through the opposition of fathers and mothers, and brothers and sisters, at the risk or loss of life also.

A Wild and Frantic Speculation.

In the days of Jesus, the spiritual guides and rulers of the people hungered and thirsted greatly after precious gifts, and they did not scruple to set aside the most binding of natural obligations, and the most solemn of divine commandments, in order to gain their end, as our Lord expressly charges upon them in Mark vii. 9.

Now that which gave this extraordinary stimulus to the desire of gifts, to the hunger and thirst of golden ornaments to the temple, was that for a long season of years they had been adorning the temple, and enriching it, until it had become the wonder of the world. The sums of money expended in the time of Herod, who was king of the Jews when Jesus was born, are not to be reckoned up, and they were levied of the people by a system of deception and delusion; by giving to these acts of pecuniary bounty a value and an importance, which neither the obligations of nature, nor the commandments of God, nor the ordinances of religion, could stand against. This false morality and false religion, the Scribes and Pharisees had brought to such perfection, that the people seem to have given with great liberality, as we are taught by an incident in the life of the Lord Jesus, recorded in Mark xii. 41: also that the moral guilt attached to these gifts, was a chief cause of the downfall of the temple and Jerusalem,

is manifest from Luke xxi. 5. It seems to be a constant progressive corruption to communicate itself in the love of gathering and hoarding money, and making everything sacred in religion, venerable in government, and dutiful in the relations of life, to bow unto this the lowest and basest passion of the human mind.

If we cast up in our memory the instances of God's judgments upon kingdoms, as for example, the judgment of Cræsus by Cyrus, of Darius by Alexander, of India by the Sultans, we shall ever find that the judgment is brought upon them in the midst of great wealth; and if we make the same account of the destructions of temples, as of Apollo at Delphi, of Diana at Ephesus, we shall find that immense treasures were amassed in them at the time. And so it was with the temple of God at Jerusalem, in the which our Lord warned them. The same has been often observed of the Papacy, that the building of St. Peter's,—“the temple of the god of guardians,” at Rome, together with the luxury of the “Lord God, Leo X.,” as they styled him, was the proximate cause of the Lutheran rebellion, by driving on at such a rate all manner of exactions and imposts under religious pretences, as brought the papal system into shame and contempt, and made the kingdoms weary to bear it. They forgot, if indeed they ever knew, the sacredness and spirituality of every christian ordinance, and sold it openly for money to the highest bidder.

Now the same thing is maturing in Protestantism everywhere. An object, the wildest, the maddest, the most frantic, and most opposite to God's word, which ever deluded the minds of men; to wit, the conversion of the whole world, has been started within these sixty years, and to the attainment of this end, it is openly avowed that money is the great desideratum. It has been proclaimed and published for the information of all, that the Lord had expressly forbidden money as a requisite to, or condition of, the apostolical missionary to the heathen. But it was rejected with scorn, bitter sarcasms, and cruel insinuations; and since that time the pursuit of money, as the chief, or rather the only means (for it is nearer the truth to say only, than chief,) of attaining this mighty impracticable object, has been going on with hotter haste and diligence until this day. Every means is taken that human sagacity can desire to increase the contributions of the people; so that in many places, the laws both of God and man have been made void, under the sense of duty to the “benevolent institutions of the day.”

If in these same societies, where a subscription of twenty-five dollars is announced with thunders of rapturous applause, you

were to announce the benevolent purpose of God to establish a glorious kingdom upon the ruins of all names and denominations, which he will give to those poor who are rich in faith, at a time when he will send the rich empty away; you would receive the sneers, and haply, the hisses, of the assembled philanthropy and piety of the house. If this be not forgetting the temple for the gold of the temple; if this be not undervaluing the altar for the gift that is upon the altar, we know not what can be. There is in the working of the great religious system extant, a vanity, an ostentation, an avarice, an idolatry of gold and silver, which is as great now as ever was the abomination of the Pharisaical system in Judea, or the mendicant system in old Rome. But the time is at hand when there will not be one stone of the system left upon another. It is a grand folly for these ecclesiastics and their disciples to think they can convert the world, whose iniquity God is shewing only by their rejection of his gospel, for which in due time, he will come to judge them. And this great stalking error, which is propagated by ten thousand methods, has introduced all sorts of misconceptions, accommodations, means, and actions, which, with out it would not be tolerated. But the object is so grand and brilliant, that men are dazzled, as were the Jews, when they looked at the gaudy stones and dazzling splendor of the temple. Its very brightness blinds them!

Ecclesiastical Affairs.

A Few Last Words.

On this sixth day of March, 1861, we opened and read for the first time, a document entitled “Reply to Miss Hayes' Vindication.” Though in possession of it before this date, we could not abstract our attention from certain literary necessities connected with *Eureka* and the *Herald*, to attend to it. We have always, as Miss Hayes and others well know, been reluctant to have any active concern in the matter; first, because when people fall out by the way, we would rather they would settle their own difficulties; and secondly, we had reason to apprehend that our motives would be misconstrued. We did not wish to be judge, jury, or witness, in the case, and therefore, if our friend at Adaline offered to take us to Geneva free of expense to look into the affair, we refused.

And so it has turned out. Our motives have been misconstrued. The editor of the *Dinner* charges us with denouncing him and his brethren on *ex parte* testi-

mony. This is a mistake. He alludes to testimony *ex parte* Wilson by Mr. Whitehead, which he says we did not receive. There was much other testimony from the same party sent to Newark, and some to us. Why did we not believe this? Because none of it altered the fact, that the money was in jeopardy, and in our judgement, only nominally secured. Miss Hayes affirms one thing, her opponents another, who was to be believed by us afar off? We looked to what seemed to be the palpable facts in the case, independently of the sayings of one side or the other. Still, though urged to speak, we remained long silent in hope.

On our return from Illinois we went to Virginia. We think it was there we first saw Miss Hayes' excommunication in the *Banner*. Brethren there reprobated it exceedingly, and urged us to notice it; and even offered to write their condemnation of it, and of other things they disapproved, and to send it to the *Herald* for publication, subject to any alteration we might think proper. The *Banner* by giving currency to crotchets about Joseph being the father of Jesus, tobacco, abolition, pork, and so forth, had disaffected their minds toward it. They saw growing up around it the machinery of a sect, which they did not approve. Whether they were wrong or right in this is not now the question. We allude to them, to show that the *Banner's* unpopularity with the brethren is referable not to us, but to *its own course*.* As far as we know the mind of the brethren, they do not want the Gospel of the Kingdom sectarianized, or identified in any way with collaterals. Still they do not dictate. If others differ from them they can use their own liberty. The world is wide with ample room for the development of both views.

On our return we found letters from the region of trouble that seemed ready to fall upon us, if we did not speak for Miss Hayes, who had taken refuge in the Home of the Friendless. Under all this pressure we opened our columns. Her case seemed to be desperate. Her money was gone, and she was living on charity. This appeared to be the broad fact in the case, which no talk could set aside. Now what appeared to be justice in the premises? We think, that those who had undoubting confidence in the borrower, should have come forward spontaneously,

* We saw a copy of the *Banner* in Norfolk, Virginia, with its abolitionism scoured through; and the brother signified his determination to have no more to do with it. They wanted no such questions mixed up with the Gospel of the Kingdom.

and have made her safe. Was this justice? This is what they have done (leaving out the spontaneity,) and it is regarded as a just and conscientious settlement; therefore we may say, it would have been justice. But, *was this justice done before the Herald uttered its voice?* The answer is simply and emphatically, "No!"

Now we should not trouble our readers with the matter any further, but for the document before us, which we are asked to circulate—with all its perversions respecting ourselves: not that we care very particularly about them, only that it would entail upon us the necessity of refuting them, which would only put others in the wrong without affording any gratification to us or our readers.

The document consists of two pages and a half, of the report of a committee appointed to enquire into the charges made by the party aggrieved. Then follow nine pages called "B. Wilson's Reply" and endorsed by Mr. Innes. After this are nearly four pages of replies from Messrs. Joseph, Thomas, and G. D. Wilson, and H. B. Pierce; then a reply of "The Church" signed by the same, with the substitution of J. & B. Wilsons for G. D. Wilson; and lastly, the reply of "The Committee of Three," or the same who signed the excommunication; with a postscript. In all twenty pages.

The whole of this, we conceive, is reducible to very few items.

1. That there was *no conspiracy* between Messrs. B. Wilson and P. Innes, to swindle Miss Hayes;
2. That there is *no evidence of any intention* on the part of either of them to swindle her;
3. That *it appeared* to the sub-committee that the mortgage on the Hall at the time of the transfer was adequate security;
4. That B. Wilson had money in his possession at the time of the loan, that he was about to return to Mr. Innes, but which he does not consider a debt;
5. That *since the voice uttered from the Herald*, five brethren have become responsible to Miss Hayes for the \$1,500 among whom is B. Wilson; to be paid in two years with legal interest;
6. That Thomas Wilson denies being secretary to the Wide Awakes;
7. That G. D. Wilson admits the statement about the New Jerusalem;
8. That H. B. Pierce also admits and tries to justify his Lincoln Wide-Awake-ship; and retaliates upon one of the signers of the "protest" that he was "*jiſor*" to the club;

9. That the "protesters" are a company of black sheep; and
 10. That the excommunication was right.

These are the salient points of the case, stripped of all superfluous talk of which there has manifestly been very much on both sides, but little creditable to either. In proof of this, the "shameful scene," and "scene of uproar" at which all parties are testified to have figured, is sufficient attestation, p. 3, col. 1. We see no proof that either party is immaculate; and we will charitably presume that the intentions of all have been better than their manifestations. The five brethren have done well in proving their confidence in bro. Innes, by making themselves responsible to Miss Hayes; but they, or some other confidential friends, would have done much better if they had acted spontaneously. If they had done what they have now done before our columns were opened, there would have been no occasion for us to speak, and the "extra" would have been unnecessary. We trust this will be the last of it; and that the by-gones may be by-gones, and remembrance had only of the excellent and true.

EDITOR.

March 4, 1861.

☞ If the reader wish to see the evidence in support of the foregoing items, he can make application to B. Wilson, Geneva, Illinois; who will, no doubt, furnish him an extra gratis, and without delay.

☞ Since writing the previous "Last Words," we have received a communication respecting foreign, or "conference" intervention in their church affairs, from Mr. O. Baird, of St. Charles. The letter consists of about six pages and a half. He says, "The present trouble here with that Geneva church, has been one heart-sickening thing; and I wish that I were out from under its influence. The spirit that they have set forth in their vindication against you and others, is beneath the notice of every true hearted Christian. I have written you somewhat about it, which I intended to send to you before now. I thought to take no notice of them, but to let them go their own way, for they will have it.

"I protest again, against the action of this committee. And the reader can see where the oneness is in them. Who chose them to act as arbitrators with one party to the exclusion, and without the knowledge of the other? Taking upon them the responsibility to make assertions without our knowledge which they had no right to make. For where a party of men sit to investigate certain diffi-

culties in harmony with one, and without the knowledge, or consent of the other, any one that will do it, is taking upon them what is not right or just; in one sense you might term it fraud. Now if said committee had been members of this church, and knew all the proceedings of the church, then I should not have objected to the sitting, provided that both parties could have had access to the selection of them. Why did they not summon us there to learn the truth of this matter? This convention was not called to settle the difficulties of churches. It convened for the purpose of coming together in brotherly love, for the happy enjoyment of one another. They, therefore had no right to make any selection of persons to investigate the affairs of this church, without all of the members being present. Let existing evils be corrected in view of the condition of the church for the last two years—discords and contentions about questions which have nothing to do with the faith and hope of Israel."

Under all circumstances, we have thought it right to let Mr. Baird say so much. As far as we know, he stands as well with his fellow-citizens as any other in the land of trouble. We are aware that very hard speeches are in circulation against us. But knowing they are undeserved, we leave it to time to cure all that sort of thing. We have already lived down harder sayings, and at a time when we were less able to bear them. In a letter recently received, Miss Hayes says, "on reading their reply against me, I saw the falsehoods so palpably that I thought they must appear equally so to others; but perhaps they may not; and therefore, I feel that the cause of truth calls for a reply to it; and also that in justice to yourself and Mr. McDonald, I ought to try to correct their wicked and false statements. True it is a great undertaking, they are so many; but will do it, if you think as I do upon the subject." But we say no, let the matter drop. The end is gained—salvation from temporal ruin. We will accept our fee with all possible meekness and endurance—abusive misconstruction of our intent.

March 7, 1861.

EDITOR.

Ænacta Epistolaria.

A True Testimony

DR. THOMAS.—Dear Brother:—I can scarce give a reason for never addressing you before, but the reason, if I have any, is due in part to a natural reluctance which I have felt to intrude myself upon

your time and attention. I have made myself acquainted with you in a very quiet way, which has given you no extra trouble, though the advantage has been all on my side, as would have been the case, doubtless, had the acquaintance been made in any other way. I have read attentively several volumes of the *Herald of the Kingdom*, etc., and others of your works, and among them the fourth volume of the *Apostolic Advocate*, so that I may say I have been acquainted with you since 1837. In the last named work, as well as in the others, I have found much to admire, and much in which I now rejoice. Your sincerity, decision, and loyalty to the truth, in those early days of inquiry and investigation, are, no doubt, the qualifications which, through divine providence and protection, secured you from the seductions of error. Why, my dear brother, were you allowed to pursue, in spite of the universal prevalence and power of ignorance and deviation, the way that led to the development of the faith of apostles and prophets—a faith so simple and easy, and yet so hard to find? so plainly revealed, yet so hard to see? which lies on the surface, and yet must be dug for and searched after? The time had arrived, in God's plan, in which some instrumentality must arise to unfold his truth, for so many centuries almost lost to the world. He never lacks means or agents to accomplish his work, and therefore, as God did not design that the light of truth should always be concealed, as "under a bushel," the entanglements of Campbellism were not competent to hold you. Sectarianism could not bind you, though it has bound thousands of intellectual Sumpsons. Why did not God make use of A. Campbell to open his sealed book? He who was, to all appearance, in the road to the true gospel of the kingdom once. Once it is evident he was an earnest seeker after truth. Did he refuse to take it after he came within reach of it? So it seems.

But your condition portended, to appearance, nothing but defeat and disaster. Your friends who knew and prized the truth, few, weak, in some instances, and vacillating; your opponents many and powerful, with that singular and temporizing genius, A. Campbell, at their head. But that weapon in your hand, of truer temper than any old *Damascus* blade, which you wielded so persistently and stoutly, proved too much for them all—more than they could stand. It proved to be "the sword of the spirit," and it "put to flight the armies of the aliens." The truth, as revealed by divine inspiration, apprehended and held by a simple

and reliant faith, and faithfully used, is a most formidable and invincible weapon indeed. And this weapon, faithfully used by you, rendered you, though in humble attitude, more than a match for the magisterial bearing and subtle sophistry of the power-loving A. Campbell. And for this work, which God has wrought by you, though you have not been able to operate, "through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the spirit of God," (Rom. xv. 19.) many are moved to thanksgivings to God, and to esteem you highly for your work's sake. The Apostles received the ministry of the New Covenant, and were able expounders thereof, (2 Cor. iii. 6.) but confess that their ability or sufficiency was of God, (ver. 5.) who revealed direct to them the principles and provisions of the covenant, whose spirit ministry they had received, (ver. 8; iv. 1.) and uttered to the men of their time those things in which the holy Spirit taught, and which conveyed the ideas of the Spirit's ministration (1 Cor. ii. 13.) Hence Paul could say, "We know." (2 Cor. iv. 14, v. 1.) They could say, "We are always confident, knowing, etc." (ver. 6, 8.) Dear brother, you have but followed Apostles in what they *knew*, and as you have followed them, you *know* what you could not have known, had not they preceded you, and written what they *knew*, and had not the ministration of the Spirit been committed to them, they could not have "believed and therefore spoken," for the "mystery," the "hidden mystery which God ordained before the world unto" the saints' "glory" (1 Cor. ii. 7) is "the unsearchable riches of Christ." (Eph. iii. 8.) Excuse me for mentioning these things, known so long and so well to you. The ministry of the Spirit given to the Apostles, by which they were made "able ministers of the new Covenant," included their inspiration, and that inspiration which in them uttered the truths of the new Covenant, as we find them written, affords the "light of the knowledge of the glory of God." It has been your inspiration. It is ours. It is the inspiration of "as many as are led by the Spirit of God." But other spirits have had dominion over us. Yes, and "other lords," as the prophet confesses for Israel. (Isaiah xxvi. 13.) And another gospel blinded us, so that we believed not. Paul's gospel was "hid" to us. (2 Cor. iv. 3.) We were both hoodwinked and kidnapped. We had eyes but we saw not, ears but heard not. But thank God, we had some reason and judgment left, some discretion and prudence enough, at least, when certain things were presented, claiming support

from holy writ, to set our wits and judgment at work to compare, to judge, to discriminate, to search, and a little decision and firmness, sufficient to make the needed sacrifice. And now, you, the very report of whose fame was once odious, because "everywhere spoken against," we, I, hail as a brother beloved, a teacher in Christ.

May God help us to follow you, but only as you follow Christ. We have seen too much of human frailty to suppose that perfection can be found in any man. The sun, even, that enlightens the entire earth, through all time, has its dark spots, and the most beautifully polished steel may be easily defaced by the corrosion of dark spots of rust. Therefore, while we love, and must always deeply respect those by whose labours we have been blessed, and to whom for this cause we are debtors, while we obey the "new commandment" of Jesus Christ, which is, that we "love one another," and give honor, not grudgingly, to whom honor is due; we may not, nevertheless, "glory in men."

"But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away," and then it will no more be necessary that we should exercise that kind of charity towards each other described in 1 Cor. xiii. 4-7, the imperfections, which now demand its vigorous exercise, then being removed. Till then may we be patient, and love as brethren, and imitate the Lord Jesus, who loved the true Church, and gave himself for it. Dear brother, no man will understand these allusions better than you. Let me not be esteemed as over bold or officious in making them.

I am, dear brother, yours in that "lively hope," which is, "by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead,

A. W. BURTON.

West Northfield, Cook Co., Ill.,
Feb 12, 1861.

The Gospel Believed.

Dear Sir:—I arrived in Canada from Scotland three years ago last fall. While in that country, I received the *Herald* for some years, but having more money then than judgment, I did not appreciate it as I do now. I have read the old numbers I possess often, and am now convinced that the promises made to Abraham shall be fulfilled: for as yet they have not according to Heb. xi. 8, the whole of which chapter, indeed, proves that it is upon a

principle of faith and obedience that the promises are to be obtained.

I am also convinced that the Old Testament scriptures are the testimony for Christ. I believe also, that the New Testament scriptures are the testimony for Jesus that he is that Christ, or the Seed that is to possess the gate of his enemies promised to Abraham. And when Jesus preached "the gospel of the kingdom" before his crucifixion, it must have been that kingdom spoken of by Daniel, and all the rest of the prophets, for there is no other future everlasting kingdom spoken of.

I am certain I must believe this gospel of the kingdom, as well as a crucified and risen Jesus; for without the gospel of the kingdom, I have never been able to see what was in store for me beyond the grave in simply believing that Jesus was crucified, buried, and rose again. Truly, they say "you will inherit eternal life;" but where, I have never been satisfactorily informed by such, and am sure never can.

Dear Sir, I am very ignorant and unlearned, but can it be much wondered at? I have never enjoyed the society of a single believer in the gospel; or ever heard a lecture on the gospel of the kingdom beyond the perusal of your writing and the Bible; and am surrounded by stubborn, unscrupulous, opponents, regret exceedingly not having the privilege of the society of some faithful believer, in order that I might be baptized in the name of Jesus for the remission of sins, that I might henceforth walk in newness of life. I have a brother-in-law in Quebec much in the same position as I am myself in spiritual matters. We have frequent communications upon the subject, and are both alike anxious.

Fearing that I have encroached upon your valuable time, I subscribe myself very truly yours in the behalf of the gospel of the kingdom.

Canada West, }
Feb. 18, 1861. }

ROBERT BUIST.

If our friend will communicate with Mr. J. Coombe, Druggist, corner of Richmond and Yonge streets, Toronto, he will obtain all the information his case may require.

EDITOR.

LORD BACON says "the end of science is to fill society with arts and useful inventions."

It may be affirmed that the end of religion is to fill society with divine principles and righteousness.

Envy

"Who is able to stand before envy?"—Prov. xxvii. 5

"ENVY is an evil affection of the heart, which makes men grieve and fret at the good and prosperity of others. Joseph was envied of his brethren, because his father loved him. The Jews envied Paul and Barnabas because they preached Christ. Envy at the good of others, and malice, wishing them evil, is a deep pollution of spirit. This absolutely alienates men from the nature and life of God: for the Deity is good, and doth good. It is contrary to natural conscience, and turns a man into a devil. This vice is immediately attended with its punishment. The envious man is his own tormentor. Envy slayeth the silly one. Envy is the rottenness of the bones. Besides, this stops the descent of divine blessings, and turns the petitions of the envious into imprecations against themselves."—*Selected.*

Rome, not Jerusalem, for the Pope.

A correspondent of the Liverpool *Mercury*, writing from Rome, states that French officers have latterly been very busy in obtaining information respecting Jerusalem and the state of things in that quarter. He adds that they had been taking measurements in several localities, particularly the ground that lies about the Mosque of Omar on Mount Moriah. From Jerusalem they had gone on to Hebron, Gaza, and other points, for the like purpose. It was also currently reported that a body of French troops was shortly to come to Jerusalem, while another would be stationed at Jaffa, and a third on Mount Carmel. At Beyrout, he says, the French officers openly affirmed that their government had no intention of withdrawing the force sent out, but were about to employ them shortly on a new and very different errand to that for which they ostensibly came. The French were also actively employed in making a road from the Holy City to Damascus, along which they were erecting houses at certain intervals. It is said that such a scheme as this intelligence shows to be in course of development, points to the realizing of *Pio Nono's favorite plan of removing the seat of the Papacy to Jerusalem.*

Pythagoras.

THIS philosopher flourished about five hundred and fifty years before Christ. He travelled extensively, and spent twenty-five years in Egypt in quest of knowledge. He opened a school at Croton, in Italy,

which was much frequented by Grecian and Italian youths. He was the first man that called himself a philosopher, and gave currency to the name. He inculcated on his pupils the austerities of the Egyptian priests. He obliged them all to put their property into a common stock, and thus to have all things common. He used the three sorts of style adopted by the Egyptians in teaching their mysteries: the simple, the hieroglyphical, and the symbolical. He preferred the last. He first called the world *Kosmos* from its order and beauty; and became famous for his skill in geometry, astronomy, and arithmetic.

He taught that all mankind lived in some preëxisting state, and that for the sins committed by them in that state, some of their souls were sent into human bodies, and others into brutes, to be punished for, and to be purged from their former sins. Viewing the whole brutal creation to be animated by human souls, he held it unlawful to kill any animal, and to eat animal food. In order to purge themselves from sins committed in a preëxisting state, he taught his disciples to practice long fastings, and other severities, to subdue their bodily appetites, and to subordinate all desires to the soul. These were the peculiarities of his fleshy system.

THIS DAY IS PUBLISHED

EUREKA,

AN

EXPOSITION OF THE APOCALYPSE.

[470 pages, &c.]

WHILE the mail is conveying this number of the *Herald* to its destination, EUREKA will be also wending its way to its expectant friends. We have written to SECESSIONDOM to be informed if it will be possible to transmit the copies subscribed for through that territory, under the postage stamps of the ORIGINAL UNCLE SAM? Having received no answer, we conclude that letters are intercepted. We perceive from the papers, that there is a new postal law in the "Southern Confederacy" which disturbs everything. We do not, therefore, know if the *Herald* arrives. This uncertainty causes us to pause, being in doubt what to do. Will our friends in Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, tell us what to do with theirs?

March 16, 1861.

EDITOR.