BIBLE EXAMINER.

"PROVE ALL THINGS; HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD."

VOL. III. PHILADELPHIA, OCTOBER, 1848. No. 10

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.
J. T. WALSH, RICHMOND, VA., ASSISTANT EDITOR.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 18 CHESTER STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, fifty cents; five copies, $2; eight copies, $3; or thirteen copies, $4; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

"MENTAL DISEASE AND DEATH."

STRICTURES—BY WM. H. BREWSTER, MINISTER IN THE METHODIST CHURCH.

BR. STORRS,—With your permission, I will offer a few remarks upon an article, on "*mental disease and death*," by J. T. Walsh, Assistant Editor.

I understand him, in common with the deniers of the separate conscious existence of the soul or mind of man, and its immortality, to assume that the brain and soul are *identical*.

His whole reasoning proceeds upon this basis. The growth of the brain, is the growth of the mind, its disease, the disease of the mind, its death, the death of the mind. He says—"the position of our opponents, is, *when the man is dead, and his brain resolved into dust, he still thinks and feels.*"

"OUR (his) INFERENCE, OR DEDUCTION: *If the above be true,* NO DISEASE OR INJURY OF THE BRAIN SHOULD INTERRUPT THE MANIFESTATIONS OF THE MIND."

He then states facts to prove what all believe, that injury of the brain does, usually, more or less affect the manifestations of mind. But these facts fail to establish an *identity*, and only prove that "while at home in the body," the brain is the organ of the mind; and hence, with a diseased and feeble organ, the manifestations of mind are therefore feeble.

Was the mind and brain identical, the mind would be affected precisely in the same manner, and to the same extent of the brain. But this is not true. It is now put beyond dispute, by the testimony of eminent men, that in different persons, every part of the brain has been *diseased* and *destroyed*, without perceptibly affecting the manifestations of mind. Now, while all he states can be explained, —on the ground of a *connection* between the brain and mind,—such facts as I have referred to, cannot be, on the supposition of *identity*.

He assumes, in this article, that the mind grows and decays with the body. That in old age, as well as childhood, the mind is feeble, and feeble because "the whole frame, including the brain, becomes shrunk and enfeebled."

Here, again, dependance, connection,—not *identity*—is proved. The supposition of identity would oblige us, in *every* case, to show that the weakness of the mind, corresponds exactly with the feebleness of the body;—but while the latter is "all *weakness* and pain," the former is full and *powerful* to reason," and triumphs, amid the pains of dissolution not unfrequently.

Were they *identical*, there could be no increase of mental power, after the physical organization had reached maturity. It would grow while the body grew, and stand still when it stood still.

The largest brain and the greatest mind would be interchangeable terms—a position contradicted by a thousand facts. In a few cases, even in childhood, while the frame is feeble, the countenance pale and deathly,—the most astonishing powers of mind are developed. Such is the case with the remarkable "Vermont boy',' who has lately attracted so much attention. Though a little, feeble, sickly-looking boy, yet at the age of ten, he was wiser than all his mathematical teachers,—had calculated and published an almanac,—invented a new mode of calculating eclipses,—and was master of the whole field of science.

Thus God vindicates the truth of the soul's inherent, transcendent powers, when the body is feeble.

But Mr. Walsh is a Christian, and willing to bring his philosophy to the test of inspiration. Let the idea be borne along by the reader, that on the ground assumed by him, it is the *brain* that thinks and reasons—hopes and fears—loves and hates—repents and believes,—is redeemed, enlightened, regenerated, and saved.

Man is wholly physical: and hence, the convicting and converting power of the Holy Spirit, is confined to matter: and "that which"—the thing which—is born of the spirit, is *flesh*, and not spirit, as the Saviour declares it to be.

Mr. W. tells us "that which is born of the spirit" is the *brain*, or, at least, matter, (*flesh*). Christ declares "that which is born of the spirit" is not flesh, but *spirit*.

If the brain and mind are *identical*, then may we read brain, where the words soul, mind, spirit, heart occur in the Bible, in application to the thinking power of man.

Num. 21: 4: "And the (soul) brain of the people was much discouraged." "The law of the Lord is perfect converting the brain." "What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world and lose his own" —brains? "My brain is exceeding sorrowful."

"Fear not them that kill the body, but cannot kill the brain:—but fear him who can destroy both brain and body in hell."

I will not pursue this: but if it seem trifling, I am not the trifler—I only follow where he leads. If he does not believe the mind and brain identical, he should say so, and tell what the mind is: and if it be a distinct essence, how he knows it cannot exist separate from *this* material frame. And if the brain thinks, reasons, hopes and fears, worships and adores, —does it take the *whole* brain to perform these offices? and if a part, *what part?* and if *each part*, how can the size of the brain have anything to do with the power of mind? If it be the *whole*, then the destruction of any part destroys the power to think

which is not true. If it be a *particular part*, then the destruction of the other parts should not affect the manifestations of mind, while the destruction of *that part* destroys the mind.

If this power belong to every part of the brain, considered separately, then every part of the brain must be destroyed, in order to destroy the power of thought, and there would be as many minds as there are parts or particles of the brain, when divided and sub-divided to the utmost susceptibility of division.

But if the brain and mind are not identical, but distinct entities, then the destruction of the brain does not involve, of necessity, the destruction of the conscious, thinking power, and for ought that he has shown, after death, "and the brain is resolved into dust," the man thinks and feels. If the brain does not think or will, any more than the heart, its destruction does not, of itself, destroy the power to think, any more than the destruction of the heart.

I have pursued this, perhaps, too far already, but there is something so repugnant to my feelings, opposed to *my* reason, and *my* interpretation of God's word, in the doctrine set forth, that I cannot look upon its propagation without deep feeling.

> There live, alas! of heaven directed mien,
> Of cultured soul and sapient eye serene,
> Who hail thee, man, pilgrim of a day,
> Spouse of the worm, brother of the clay,
> Frail as the leaf, in autumn's yellow bower,
> Dust before the wind, or dew upon the flower.
> For this bath science searched on weary wing?
> By land and sea, each mute and living thing?
> Launched with Iberia's pilot from the steep?
> To world's unknown, and isles beyond the deep?
> O! star-eyed science! hast thou wandered there
> To waft us home the message of despair?

Such are my involuntary exclamations on reading such articles as that I am reviewing.

Lowell, Mass.

—

Reply to William H. Brewster.

However well the gentleman may understand himself, it is evident that he neither understands me nor the subject before me. Of course Mr. Brewster will allow me the same liberty with his article that he has taken with mine. He will, therefore, excuse me, if, while I am *respectful and kind to him*, I should be a little severe with *his arguments*.

1st. He says: "I understand him," (myself) "in common with the deniers of the separate conscious existence of the soul or mind of man, and its immortality, to assume that the brain and soul are *identical*." Now, whatever others may "assume" on this subject, I "assume" nothing. I neither believe nor teach, that the "*brain and soul are identical*." Consequently, my "whole reasoning" does not "proceed upon this basis." And he will search in vain for any such information. If Mr. Brewster will turn to those numbers of the Bible Examiner, in which my articles on the "Philosophy of Man" are published, he will see the various applications of the term "soul," as used in the Scriptures. He will there see, that I do not predicate mind of the soul, in the ordinary acceptation of the word; although the term soul is used in many places in the Scriptures to embrace, or include, the mind. Man is defined by the Scriptures to be "a living soul;" and the primary meaning of the term soul, is *life*: it would, therefore, be unscriptural, unphilosophical and absurd to say that the "brain and" life "are identical;" although it be not possible for *life* to survive the dissolution of the brain.

"The growth of the brain, is the growth of the mind; it's disease the disease of the mind; its death the death of the mind." Yes; the healthy "growth of the brain, is the growth," or increased development, "of the *mind*," but *not the soul!* For, an idiot, without mind, has as much *soul or life*, as the most intellectual. But the "*disease of the brain, is the disease of the mind*." Yes; is it not so? Can there be disease of one without implicating the other? And is there any manifestation of mind after the brain is dead? Mr. Brewster says there *is!* "It is now put beyond dispute, by the testimony of eminent men, that in different persons, *every part of the brain has been* DISEASED *and* DESTROYED, *without perceptibly affecting the manifestations of mind*."

Now, while the above statement, *in Mr. Brewster's opinion*, may have been "*put beyond dispute by eminent men*," I am compelled, by facts and principles within my knowledge, to deny its truth, and to class it with hundreds and thousands of other "*false facts*," published to the world by medical charlatans to sustain an antiquated theory, and save their sinking orthodoxy! The proposition bears upon its face the strongest improbability. What! EVERY PART *of the brain diseased, without* PERCEPTIBLY *affecting the manifestations of the mind?*" "EVERY PART DISEASED!" All involved in disease down to the *medulla oblongata*, "in every part," "without perceptibly affecting the mind!" Astounding! But this is not all. "Every part" is not only represented as "*diseased*," but actually "DESTROYED without perceptibly affecting the manifestations of the mind." Friend Brewster may rely upon it, he has been imposed on by "false facts," facts which are nothing more than loose statements, made by men without regard to proper observation, and in utter violation of the laws of physiology. Such a state of the brain, as that represented by Mr. Brewster, is absolutely incompatible with *life!* No man could live after his brain was "*destroyed in every part*."

If Mr. Brewster's "facts" be "true facts," how will he be able to reconcile them with the position, that there is any "*connection* between the brain and the mind?" His "facts" not only upset my theory, but his own also! Like Samson, while he slays the Philistines, he, himself, perishes in the general wreck! But there is a "connection between the brain and the mind," even in the estimation of Mr. Brewster. What is that "*connection?*" My position is, *that the brain developes mind*; and that, consequently, "when the *man* is dead, and his brain resolved into dust," he ceases "to think and feel." My friend, however, thinks differently.

When I stated in a former article *the relations* between the body and the mind, in infancy, manhood, old age, disease and death, I only submitted a proposition which every physiologist in the world, of any note, is prepared to admit. Nor has any fact stated by Mr. Brewster, upon this point, disproved it. The body may "be all weakness and pain," to use a strong expression; and still the person may be able to "reason;" but he who affirms that such a man, in such a case, is "full powerful to reason," "and triumphs amid the pains of dissolution," has certainly observed to no purpose. It may be, that there are a thousand degrees of mental vigor; and

it is possible, that a dying man, when death has not yet invaded his brain, may be able to manifest some degree of intellect; but to suppose that because he can do this, that, therefore, his brain is not the organ of his *mind*, would be to make sad havoc of all logic.

As it respects the intellectual boy, of whom Mr. Brewster speaks, I will remark, that the *nervous temperament*—that temperament which embraces the *brain and nervous system* generally—gives rise to *precociousness* of intellect. It imparts to such children a sprightliness, a vivacity of mind, incompatible with long life; and, also, positively incompatible with the possession of a deep, profound, and philosophic mind. But, let my friend remember, that this very *precociousness of mind*, in connection with an *undue development of the brain and nerves*, is but another proof of the *inseparable connection* which obtains between the *brain* and the *mind*; and that this *undue development*, or *predominance* of the *nervous system*, is, in fact, *the* CAUSE of that *precocity*. But, even if it were otherwise, such cases are rare; and they would only be exceptions to the rule.

After stating the case of the boy, to which I have just referred, Mr. B. remarks:—"Thus God vindicates the truth of the soul's inherent, transcendent powers, when the body is feeble." My friend forgot that this *juvenile intellectual giant*, who "was master of the whole field of science," had a predominance of the nervous temperament, which gave rise to his brilliant mind; and that his "soul" was not the "inherent" power in the case.

But, if this "feeble little fellow" is really "master of the whole field of science," all I have to say, is, that he surpasses all his predecessors. He has left Newton, Solomon, and my worthy friend himself, far behind, toiling after him in vain!

Mr. B. is continually arguing on the assumption, that I maintain the "*identity*" of the brain and mind. This I have previously denied. And now, let me enquire, does *he* consider the *soul* and the *mind* "identical?" "His whole reasoning proceeds upon this basis," as he said of me.

Let us examine this view of the subject. "The soul that sins shall die;" but the mind and the soul are "identical;" therefore, the *mind* shall die! What becomes of its immortality in this case? In the same manner I can prove the *mind* and *soul* to be *distinct*; Thus:

The *mind* can become *deranged*:

But derangement is nowhere affirmed of the soul:

Ergo: The mind and soul are not the same.

"The *life* of the flesh is in the blood." Jesus "poured out his *soul*," or life, "unto death. He did not "pour out" his *mind*. "His soul," or life, "was made an offering for sin." But it is nowhere asserted that his *mind* "was made an offering."

The *brain* and the *mind* stand in the relation of *cause* and *effect*. They are not "identical," but the one developes the other. Consequently, the following remark of Mr. Brewster, is out of place: "Let the idea be borne along by the reader, that on the ground assumed by him," (myself) "it is the *brain* that thinks, and reasons, hopes and fears, loves and hates, repents and believes, is redeemed, enlightened, regenerated, and saved." I am really at a loss to know, how any person could so pervert what I have written! Be it known, then, to Mr. B. that, when a *man* thinks, *he* thinks by means of his brain: that, when a *man* reasons, he reasons by means of the same instrument: and so of his hope, fear, love, hate, repentance and faith. All these mental and moral acts are performed by means of the brain. And there are appropriate organs in the brain for the manifestation of all these functions. It is THE MAN who is "redeemed, enlightened, regenerated, and saved," by motives, arguments, facts and principles addressed to him through his brain; or, if you please, through those mental and moral powers which are developed by that instrument.

But let me apply my friend's principle of reasoning to his own position, and then see how the case stands:

It is the immortal soul that "thinks and reasons, hopes and fears, loves and hates, repents and believes, is redeemed, enlightened, regenerated and saved:

But some men, such as *idiots*, *monomaniacs*, &c., cannot reason:

Ergo: They have no immortality, and cannot be the subjects of "redemption, enlightenment, regeneration, and salvation.

Again: It is the immortal soul that "*thinks*," &c.

But the beasts "think:"

Ergo: The beasts are immortal.

Again: "Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might; for there is *no wisdom, nor knowledge, nor work*, nor *device in sheol* whither thou goest." "Also, their *love* and their *hatred*," as well as "their thoughts have *perished*:"

But these *attributes* are affirmed of the "soul."

Therefore, the soul is not conscious in the intermediate state.

"Man is wholly physical," while, at the same time, he possesses *effective, moral and mental* faculties, which put him in relation with the universe, *physically, morally* and *mentally*. And it is his *organization* which makes him superior to "the beasts that perish;" and not the possession of an "immortal soul."

Mr. Brewster speaks of the "new birth" as though it were a *physical* production. "The Holy Spirit" operates on *men* as MEN, and not merely on what he pleases to call "an immortal soul." The spirit operates through the gospel, and moves to action by its motives and arguments, addressed to the reason and moral sentiments of men. It is not "an immortal soul" that is "born again," but *the* MAN, THE WHOLE MAN. Jesus said—"Except a MAN be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God."

But, let us look at this from another point. Jesus says: "That which is born of *spirit* is *spirit*," not "soul." Now, *man* has a *body, soul, spirit* and a *mind*; will Mr. B. inform me which of these is the "immortal" part? Which of these is the subject of the "new birth?" Thus Mr. B.'s *reductio ad absurdum* recoils upon his own head.

I affirm, on the contrary, that it is the MAN, composed of soul, body, spirit and mind; composed of flesh, blood, bones, nerves, and brain, who is the subject of a *moral* or *spiritual birth*, in contradistinction to his first birth, which was *purely animal*.

Again, Mr. B. says—"If the brain and mind are "identical," then may we, &c., &c. "If!" This "*if*" is well put in, for we maintain no such absurd position. And it is a pity Mr. B did not take its kindly admonition; for it would have saved him the trouble of writing at least half his letter!

But let me try him by his own rule, and see how his "immortal soul" will stand the ordeal. "And the (immortal) "soul of the people was much discouraged." "*Immortal souls discouraged!*" Now, it is evident that the text means nothing, but that the people became *dispirited*—desponding. And was not this *feeling* produced by impressions made on them through the brain? I cannot conceive of an "immortal soul" discouraged! Discourage "immortality?" 'The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the (immortal) soul." Do "immortal souls" require conversion? "What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own (immortal) soul?" And, seriously, "what would it profit a man, if he should gain the whole world, and lose his" brains? This would not profit him! But what did the Lord mean? He asked the question—"What would it profit a man, if he should gain the whole world and lose his *life*." "My" (immortal) "soul is exceeding sorrowful." Is *sorrow* an attribute of *immortality?*

"Fear not them that kill the body, but cannot kill the (immortal) soul—but fear him who can destroy both (immortal) soul and body in hell." Now, in the last text but one, quoted by Mr. B., he did not quote it all. Jesus said—"My soul is exceedingly sorrowful, even unto *death*." Now, if a soul can be "sorrowful even unto *death*," I should suppose it could be "killed." And, accordingly, we find the very "soul" that was "sorrowful even to death," actually put to death on the cross! Yes, that "soul was poured out unto death"—it was "made an offering for sin." Again: Does immortality go to "*hell?*" Can immortality be "*destroyed?*" I had thought that immortality was *indestructible*—deathless!

The Lord taught his apostles and disciples not to fear those who only had the power of "killing" in the *present life*; but whose power extended not to the *life to come*; but to fear him who not only had the power of life and death *here*, but who also, had the power to "*destroy* both *life* and *body* in hell"—to put an end to your existence.

Mr. B. says—"If this seems trifling, I am not the trifler, I only follow where he leads." The gentleman is mistaken: he has not "followed" me, but an *ignis fatuus* of his own creation; and, consequently, he has fallen into a dilemma from which he will find it difficult to escape. And if he has not trifled, he has at least the appearance of it. But I trust better things of him in future.

Mr. B. says: "If he (I) do not believe the mind and brain identical, he (I) should say so, and tell what the mind is." Well, I have said so, I do not believe the mind and brain *identical*. The mind is an *effect, an aggregate of powers, or functions, developed by the brain*. These powers are *perceptive* and *reflective*. They embrace the five external senses. In a more general sense, the mind is used to express not only the *mental* powers, but, also, the *moral*. All these *functions* have their corresponding organs in the brain; and when those organs are diseased their functions are deranged; and when they are destroyed, the mind is no more. A man think without a brain? When he can hear, see, feel, and smell, without the appropriate *apparatus* belonging to these functions, *then*, but not before, will he think, reason, and perceive without a brain! A portion of the brain may be diseased, involving the function of that part only, as in *monomania*. But if the whole brain be involved, the man will be *completely deranged*.

My friend is not a *mental philosopher*. Let him be wide awake, or the Philistines may surprise him. We have not said the hundreth part of what we have to say, but this may suffice for the present. If Mr. B. should desire to continue the discussion, I shall be happy to aid him in the matter, in all candour and truth. Wishing him all happiness, I subscribe myself,

His friend, respectfully,
J. T. WALSH.

DR. THOMAS' POSITION DEFENDED.

In our last we published so much of Br. Magruder's article as related to ourself, with his introduction. We now give that part of it which is a defence of Dr. Thomas' position in reply to Br. Grew, the latter having consented to accept Br. M. as "an ally" to Dr. T.

Mr. Grew's article in the August No., and the editorial endorsement of some of the positions he assumes, deserves a courteous and candid notice from those who think that Dr. Thomas is *right* in the main ground he takes in the argument. The Doctor is now in England. The period of his return is uncertain. His reply will be necessarily delayed. Mr. Grew and the Editor are both in the field against him. It is but fair to permit an ally, in his absence, to enter the list in behalf of the truth he advocates. I propose, therefore, briefly and as clearly as I can, to offer some scripture testimony on the question at issue, by way of

REPLY TO MR. GREW.

Dr. Thomas maintains that "repentance, immersion and holiness, are indivisibly essential to salvation in the Kingdom of God." To this Mr. Grew objects "as unscriptural and absurd," and adds—"Now, I say, it is absolutely necessary in order to stand complete in all the will of God, but *not to salvation*." When Mr. G. says the proposition of Dr. T. is *absurd*, he means to point his objection at "*immersion*" as an essential to salvation. He answers, that "without *holiness* no man shall see the Lord;" and that "except ye *repent*, ye shall all likewise perish." Now, how stands the *Bible* testimony as to the essentiality of immersion to salvation? Let us premise, however, that there is no dispute here as to the mode or action of baptism. On that point the disputants agree that *immersion* is *the* baptism of the Bible. Now, is immersion essential to salvation? What say the Scriptures? Let Mr. Grew turn to 1 Peter 3: 20, and read: "When once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah while the ark was a preparing wherein few, that is, eight souls, were *saved by water*—the like figure whereunto even baptism (i. e. *immersion*) *doth also now save us*."

Mr. Grew asserts, baptism is *not* essential to salvation. The Bible declares "baptism doth *also* now *save* us." Which is right?

Again Does Mr Grew believe that *faith* is an essential of salvation? Yes, undoubtedly, for it is written, "He that *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved." But why make faith any more than *baptism* an essential from this text? What *God* hath joined together, let no man put asunder.

Again. "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus;" but it is immediately *added*, as descriptive of the *mode* of our having become children, "for as many of you as have been *baptized* into Christ, have *put on Christ*," Gal. 3: 27.

It is easy to multiply quotations to the same effect, almost indefinitely. See Acts 2: 38; Rom. 6: 4, 5; Acts 8: 12; Titus 3: 5; &c. &c.

Mr. Grew says, "as Dr. T. excludes from salvation all the unimmersed, I hold him to adduce one passage which necessarily implies their exclusion from the kingdom of God." I answer by citing the words of Jesus in Luke 7: 29, 30. Speaking of John the Baptist, he says, "All the people that heard him, and the Publicans, *justified God*, being *baptized with the baptism of John*. But the Pharisees and the lawyers *rejected the counsel* of God *against* themselves, *being not baptized of him*." Does not this passage "necessarily imply their exclusion from the kingdom of God?" Let truth and candour dictate the reply.

Mr. Grew says "Men are born of the spirit *previous* to their being qualified for baptism." This is true, if he means by "born of the spirit," *belief*—that *faith* is a qualification for baptism; but if he means, as he probably does, that men become *Christians* before they are qualified for baptism, he cannot object to being asked to *prove* what he affirms—for it is denied. If it be so, then baptism is not an ordinance for *sinners*, but for *saints*. Why, then, did Peter say on Pentecost, to those who *already* believed—"were pricked in their heart"—"Repent and be baptized—*for the remission of sins*." They were *Christians* when addressed by Peter, says Mr. Grew. But hold! *Christians*, and yet their sins unremitted? They were told to be baptized in order to get the remission of sins! If Christians, they were "*saved*," 1 Cor. 15: 2; and yet Peter says, "*baptism* doth also now *save* us." Still, they were unbaptized. If saved *without* baptism, as Mr. G. says, then Peter is not to be believed! The Corinthians "hearing, believed and were baptized." It was *thus* they became "saved if they kept in memory" the things they had heard. 1 Cor. 15: 2.

I pass over Mr. Grew's criticism on the phrase "*being born of water*," in John 3: 5; for while indulging his strictures on Dr. T.'s construction, he does not favour us with his *own*. In his zeal to repudiate a literal application of the passage to baptism, he brings himself to the conclusion that a "man may be metaphorically born of *water*," and thus, it seems to me, stultifies the whole passage.

I should be glad to pursue the subject in detail, and give the scriptural testimony at large, to show that "baptism is *one* of the conditions of salvation"—"remission of sins"—regeneration and adoption into the family of God—all of which, indeed, are synonyms, and express that "*newness* of life," the *rising* to which, (after the burial of baptism of 6th chap. of Romans,) constitutes a leading feature in the "form of doctrine" which we are commanded to *obey* from the heart, in order to obtain the glory, honour and immortality which is promised to the patient in well-doing.

A. B. MAGRUDER.

BR. GREW'S RESPONSE TO THE FOREGOING.

BR. STORRS:—As the manifestation of truth is our object, I cheerfully accept of Mr. Magruder as "an ally" of his absent friend.

Mr. M. has not attempted to refute my argument founded on Rom. 14: 1, which imperatively requires the reception into the Christian church of the weak (*i. e.* erroneous) who are "in the faith" of Jesus Christ. It is admitted that we must be in this faith *previous* to immersion, which is admitting that immersion is not essential thereto, for if it were essential, we could not be in the faith until we were immersed. The sentiment that baptism is essential to salvation, is therefore refuted by a numerous class of bible passages which connect salvation with faith. Luke 7: 48, 50; John 1: 12; 3: 14, 15, 16, 18, 36; 5: 24; 11: 25, 26; Acts 10: 43; Rom. 5: 1; &c. &c. It may be said that these passages no more prove that we can be saved by faith without baptism, than they prove that we can be saved by faith without repentance or holiness. The truth or fallacy of this affirmation depends on the question, whether or not faith is as necessarily connected with immersion in water, as it is with repentance or holiness? Most certainly it is not. No man has the faith essential to acceptable baptism without repentance Faith indeed is itself reformation of principle. "How can ye believe that receive honour one of another and seek not the honour which cometh from God only?" But faith can and does exist without baptism. See Luke 7: 50; 23: 42, 43. Mr. M. offers 1 Peter 3: 20 to 22, as proof of his position. The question is not, "which is right," Mr. Grew or Peter? The question is, is Mr. M.'s construction of the passage (part only of which he has quoted) correct? It appears to me that the inspired apostle put in the parenthesis ("not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God") to preclude the very conclusion that Mr. M. adopts! The parenthesis shows that he uses the word "baptism" metonymically, in respect to salvation, and that the act of immersion in water will not save us. In conformity with this view of the subject, he told Simon, who had been baptized, that, so far from being saved, he had "no part or lot in this matter." Acts 7: 21. He was not saved with it. The thief was saved without it.

Mr. M. quotes Mark 16: 16, and asks, "Why make faith any more than baptism an essential from this text? I reply, because my blessed Saviour has done so by saying, "he that believeth not, shall be condemned;" but he does not say this of him who is not baptized, either in this passage or in any other. "What God hath" "put asunder," "let not man" join together. Faith and baptism are joined together in the passage *as duties*, but not *as equally important and essential*. In this respect Christ makes a difference.

Gal. 3: 26, 27 is also quoted. "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus;" but, Mr. M. observes, it is immediately added, as descriptive of the *mode* of our having become children, "for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have *put on Christ*." This appears to be contradictory. If faith is the "mode" by which we become children, as the apostle declares, then we are children *before* we are baptized, and baptism is no more a mode of our *becoming* children than any other act of obedience. The phrase, "have put

ce Christ," refers to the general obedience of those who have been truly baptized into Him, which obedience proves that they are children.

I have asked for one passage which necessarily implies the exclusion of the unimmersed from the Kingdom of God. Mr. M. gives me Luke 7: 29, 30, and asks, "Does not this passage necessarily imply their exclusion from the kingdom of God?" I reply, certainly it implies the exclusion of those Pharisees who rejected the counsel of God by John, to bring forth fruits meet for repentance. This, however, is far from implying that those who repent and believe will be rejected without immersion. The phrase, "being not baptized of him," does not, with the connection, necessarily imply anything more than their not being baptized of him with penitence, as he required, (for many of them were willing to be baptized, Matt. 3: 7,) proved their rejection of the counsel of God.

I am asked to prove "that men become *Christians* before they are qualified for baptism." Mr. M. admits that we *believe* before, and, with the apostle, that we are *the children* of God *by faith*," "and if *children*, then heirs; heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ," &c. Will Mr. M. abandon his position, or will he affirm that we may be the children of God by faith in Christ, and joint heirs with Christ to eternal glory, and yet not be Christians? I affirm that when the Eunuch said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, believing this with all his heart, as Philip required, he was a Christian before he was baptized. It is objected, "If it be so, then baptism is not an ordinance for *sinners* but for *saints*." I reply, baptism is not an ordinance for sinners until they repent and believe, and thus become the children of God. If the children of God are not "*saints*," I should be glad to be informed who are. Mr. M. quotes Acts 2: 38, and exclaims, "Bold! *Christians*, and yet their sins unremitted!" Nay, verily, I protest against a construction of the phrase, "baptized—for the remission of sins," that subverts scriptural facts and innumerable passages of divine truth, which connect pardon with repentance and faith. It is a fact, Jesus Christ being judge, that the believing woman in Simon's house was "*forgiven*" and "*saved*" *before* she was baptized. Luke 7: 47, 50. So was the man sick of the palsy. Luke 5: 20. That Christian baptism was instituted previous to these cases, and at the commencement of our Lord's ministry, (if not before, by John,) is evident from John 4: 1, 2. "Though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples," yet, as they baptized by his authority and direction, it is written verse 1, that "Jesus—baptized." Surely it will not be denied that *Christ's* baptism is *Christian* baptism. Baptism is but the *symbol* of remission. Thus understanding it, the declarations of scripture, relative to the subject, perfectly harmonize. I would remind my friend of the importance of examining *all* the passages relating to a particular subject to ascertain the truth. Acts 18: 8, "hearing, believed and were baptized" proves the latter to be a duty, but not that it is essential to eternal salvation.

In conclusion, I present to the serious consideration of my intelligent friend another insuperable objection to his view. It excludes from the kingdom of God some who, *on the whole*, are more holy than some who are admitted

HENRY GREW.

QUERIES ON BAPTISM.

In some of the late numbers of the "Bible Examiner," the subject of baptism has been introduced, and some of the correspondents have taken a very strange position, viz: that there can be no salvation without immersion. With your permission I will give the readers of the Examiner a few interrogatories, which may lead some minds to further thought on the subject, while no doubt, others may reject the whole as visionary and fanatical. It is assumed, without at this time attempting the proof, that John's baptism was under the Law, and was a type or "shadow of good things to come," and that the substance or antitype, was *not*, and *could not*, in the nature of the case, be identically the *same thing* as the type; or as Paul says, "not the very image of the things." As an example, the Lamb in the type was the sacrifice, which pointed to Christ as the antitypical sacrifice.

QUES. 1. Was not the probable mode by which John administered baptism to the multitudes who flocked to him from the whole country, according to the Law described by Paul, Heb. 9: 19, using a bunch of hysop or other bitter herbs, as the multitudes from Galilee and beyond Jordan flocked down *to* or *into* the water, John did at Jordan the same as Moses did at the *brazen laver*, when the tribes passed on before him, "*sprinkled all the people?*"

QUES. 2. Was not that also the typical baptism which Christ's disciples administered, John 3: 22—24, and 4: 1, 2, from the fact that then, John was not cast into prison, before which the *time* was not *fulfilled* for the gospel of the kingdom to be preached, beginning first at Galilee?

QUES. 3. When John says, "I indeed baptise you with *water* unto repentance, but He that cometh after me shall baptise (Greek *Baptizo*—will it do to read it here immersed) you with the Holy Ghost and with fire," are we to understand that the subjects were to be baptized or immersed in a literal fire?

QUES. 4. Will any one say that John's words were not fulfilled when Peter began to speak the words of eternal life to Cornelius and those that were with him, when the Holy Ghost *fell* on them as it did on the Apostles at the beginning? See Peter's sermon, or the word preached to them, Acts 10: 34, 44,—("MY WORD IS A FIRE,") and then his comment, chapter 11: 15, 16. Was not this the baptism of *fire* and the *Holy Ghost?*

QUES. 5. Does not the mode in the antitype correspond with the mode in the type, when Moses and John sprinkled all the people? and would the truth be conveyed, and would it be proper to say, that Cornelius, and they which were with him were *immersed in the Holy Ghost*, rather than the Holy Ghost *fell on them?*

QUES. 6. If Christ, or his people through or by Christ, were not to come *after* John and baptise with *literal fire*, then upon the same principles of interpretation, may not the words of Christ to Nicodemus be something different from *literal water*, when he says, "except a man be born of water and of the spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God?"

QUES. 7. If there is any doubt in answering the last question, can the objector show that the *time* when this being reborn takes place, *is not* at the time when they enter the Kingdom of God, which most will admit is set up when Christ judges the quick and dead at his appearing and kingdom?

QUES. 8. Is there not a strong probability that Peter and the other Apostles, in the early part of their ministry, were as much mistaken and influenced by Jewish prejudice, when they applied water baptism after the subjects had been baptised with the Holy Ghost, as when they circumcised the uncircumcised?

QUES. 9. If there is no salvation without *immersion*, would it be benovolent in Paul to thank God that he had baptised but two or three; and would it not be in opposition to the command of Christ, as most understand his words to be to his disciples, "Go teach all nations, *baptising them*." &c., when Paul says, "for Christ sent me *not to baptise*, but to preach the Gospel?"

QUES. 10. After Christ's resurrection he directed his disciples to teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Was this baptism to be performed with water after the manner of the types, or was it done by the Apostles when they preached the word, and then laid their hands on their hearer's heads, and they received the Holy Ghost, and thus through them as instruments baptised with fire and the Holy Ghost?

Paul, in Acts 19: 4, contrasts John's baptism with the baptism of the Holy Ghost. In the fifth verse it is declared, that the twelve men were baptised, and in the sixth verse the manner in which it was done is declared to be by laying on of Paul's hands. The enquiry is now made, is there any other baptism left for the Christian dispensation, but the baptism of the fire and of the Holy Ghost—called elsewhere Christian "washing of regeneration;"—washing of water by the word"—&c. &c?

Peter says the eight souls saved by water in the days of Noah, was a figure of baptism which doth also now *save us by* (or, because of, Greek DIA,) the resurrection of Jesus Christ. This baptism was not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God. Let every Bible reader answer whether it was water baptism, or the baptism by the Holy Ghost, that saved us; for Peter speaks of but one in the singular number! Which of the two baptisms washed away Paul's sins referred to in Acts 22: 16? Was it the one when he was filled with the Holy Ghost by the laying on of the hands of *Ananias* upon the head of *brother Saul*; or was it *water baptism* after he received his sight? Does not Ananias say that he was sent by Jesus to do the first, and says nothing about being sent by Jesus to wash away the Sins of Paul by *immersion*, as your brother Magruder supposes in the last Examiner?

AUBURN, N. Y., Sept. 2d, 1848.

C. B. HOTCHKISS.

THE DEAD UNCONSCIOUS;

OR OBJECTIONS ANSWERED.—No. I.

Truth is what we desire, and it cannot be purchased at too great a price. Truth makes us free; and truth sanctifies us. Whatever else we have, if we have not truth, we shall "suffer loss;" even though we may "be saved," it will be "so as by fire."

The first text to which attention is called, is Matt. 10: 28. "And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." We will approach this text calmly, remembering that "no scripture is of any private, or self-interpretation." That is: no scripture is to be interpreted without making a harmony of all the scriptures relating to the same subject. Now, as this text does not affirm that the righteous *are conscious* when dead, it can only be *inferred* from the language. If other scriptures do positively affirm that the righteous, even, are without knowledge when dead, then we must seek such an interpretation of Matt. 10: 28 as will harmonize. David deprecates death in thi strain—"Return, O Lord, deliver my *soul*: oh save me for thy mercies' sake: for in death there is *no remembrance* of thee: in the grave who shall give the thanks?" Psa. 6: 5. Again, the Psalmist, mourning over his afflictions, declares that his "life draweth nigh unto the grave;" and then adds—"Wilt thou show wonders to the dead? Shall thy loving kindness be declared in the grave? or thy faithfulness in destruction? Shall thy wonders be known in the dark? and thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness?" These texts show clearly what view the Psalmist had of the state of the righteous dead. They do *not have any* "*remembrance*" of God—they are in a "*land of forgetfulness*." Peter tells us, respecting "*David*," that he is *not ascended into the heavens*." Acts 2: 34. David himself declares, "I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness:" not when he sinks into the "land of forgetfulness," where there is "no remembrance of God," but when he "awakes"—*then* he shall be satisfied: not before. Psa. 17: 15. He tells us, Psa. 16: 11, "In God's presence is fulness of joy." Then he did not go into that presence at death; because, if he had he would not have to wait till he awaked in the likeness of God to be satisfied: unless we suppose that the dead saints have *fulness of joy* and yet are *not satisfied!!* It were easy to increase the testimony as to the fact that the righteous dead are unconscious, as well as the wicked.

Now we may return to Matt. 10: 28. Let us paraphrase this text. "Fear not them that kill the body, [or take away your present life or consciousness] but are not able to kill the soul: [are not able to reach you to harm you afterwards] but rather fear him which is able [after the resurrection] to destroy both soul and body in hell"—"gehenne." That the construction we put upon this text is not forced, is evident from the fact, that our Lord speaks of what God is able to do *after* the resurrection. He does not say, fear him who, after *man* has killed the body, is able to destroy *the soul* in hell—but *both* soul and *body*." Showing that our Lord speaks of the *resurrection state* and *not the intermediate*. Man can take away our *temporal* life, but he cannot reach our *eternal life*: God can deprive us of both by destroying both body and soul in *gehenne*. We repeat it—In order for God to destroy *the body* with the soul, after man has killed the body, there must be a resurrection first; and hence it is clear our Lord is not, in this text, making any statement that the soul is conscious when the body is dead; but assures them there is a power, beyond that of man, that can make a final and total end of their life or being. This interpretation harmonizes with the other inspired testimony. "*In the Psalms*," quoted above. The testimony of Luke 12: 4, 5, confirms the interpretation we have here given. "Be not afraid of them that kill the body [take away your present life] and AFTER THAT *have no more that they can do.*

But —fear him, which, after he has killed [taken away your present life] has power to cast into hell" —*gehennan*. But, as remarked above, to cast into *gehennan*, hell, the resurrection must first take place. But let us give still another view of Matt. 10: 28. The same word—"*Psuche*," translated "*soul*" in this verse is used in the same discourse at the 29th verse, and is there translated "life." Let the 28th verse now be read thus, understanding it as addressed to the righteous; "Fear not them which kill the body [take away *temporal* life] but are not able to kill [or destroy] the *psuche—life* [because *your life* is hid with Christ in God:" so that if men take away your *temporal life, after that* they can do no more. Luke 12: 4; for "when Christ who is *our life* shall appear, *then* shall ye also appear with him in glory") but rather fear him who is able to destroy [after the resurrection] both *life* and body in *gehenka*." "*Our life*" is in Christ; *men* cannot reach that; but "*God*" can "take away" our "part out of the Book of Life;" therefore fear him and not man.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, OCT., 1848.

ARE THE WICKED IMMORTAL?

"*The soul that sinneth it shall die.*"—*Bible.*

BIBLE EXAMINER. THREE OFFERS.—I. Any person sending us $1, current money, free of expense, shall have the Bible Examiner for 1849, and seven copies of the "Six Sermons," 18mo.; or 20 copies quarto. This offer is made to accommodate single subscribers in sending money; but we will do the same on any amount, for each dollar any one will send us. Please state distinctly which form of the sermons you will have, and how they shall be sent. The 18mo. shall have added, to each copy, the article on the "Rich man and Lazarus," 12 pages, from the August number of the Examiner. Our price for the "Six Sermons," 18mo., in all cases, is 15 cents single copy; or $1 for ten copies when not ordered in connection with the above offer. Our friends can see how much to their advantage it will be, in ordering the Sermons, to send us one or more subscribers at the same time.

II. Any person, or company of persons, who will send us *five dollars*, current money, at one time, free of expence, shall receive *five* copies of the Bible Examiner for 1849, and *forty* copies of the Six Sermons, 18mo. (pamphlet;) for *ten dollars, ten* copies of the Examiner, and *ninety* of the Sermons: for *twenty* dollars, *twenty* copies of the Examiner, and *two hundred* of the Sermons. The two above offers extend only to the first of January next.

III. Any person, or company of persons, sending us $5, current money, free of expence *before* the 20th of December next, shall have 15 copies of Bible Examiner for 1849; for $10 they shall have 32 copies; and for $20—75 copies. We make these offers *now* to see how many subscribers we shall have to begin the next year.

BR. HENRY HEYES—Is respectfully informed, that I do not "consider" that I have "completed in the main" or "whole," the "things concerning the kingdom of God." But, for the sake of *variety*, I had "intermitted" the articles on that subject. At some future time, opportunity permitting, I intend to finish those articles. Every thing in the Bible is "important;" and I am persuaded that the time is not far distant when every thing recorded on its pages will be so considered; and that the distinction between "essentials," and "non-essentials," will be forgotten. J. T. W.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—The articles by Homo and Br. Magruder, were both too late for the present number; other matter was set up and could not be laid over; and besides, we think there is as much in the Examiner on the subject of baptism, this month, as is desirable in one number. They shall have their place, one or both, in our next. Nearly all our extracts from letters are crowded out this month, besides much other valuable matter.

POLLUTION AND VOLITION.—A correspondent of one of our exchange papers says: "It appears to me that man's moral pollution depends, or rests, upon his voluntary acts, and, consequently, that mankind are not morally polluted, sinful, or guilty, previous to moral action."

The Editor of that paper, one of the most *logical* ministers in the country, "*replies* as follows:

"All men, from Adam to the present time, have, without exception, commenced their responsible career, by putting forth wrong voluntary acts.

"There can no effect exist without a cause—there must, therefore, be a cause for the fact that the first volitions of all men are wrong.

"Evil volition, as an effect, can result only from an evil cause,—there must, therefore, be something evil in, or associated with, the man, prior to his volitions, which is the cause of his doing evil voluntarily."

ERGO: There must have been "something evil in" Adam, "or associated with" him "prior to his volitions, which" was "the cause of his doing evil voluntarily."

Can the *logician* point out the fallacy, if there be any, in our deduction from his premises? We believe he cannot without denying his first proposition. *Adam* did, so far as there is any evidence to the contrary, "commence" his "responsible career, by putting forth wrong voluntary acts." Our logical brother *seems* to admit that fact; though, we suppose, he did not intend it; but, can he prove the contrary? But, if he can, he has another point equally as difficult to prove, viz.: that "all men, *without exception*, commenced their responsible career, by putting forth wrong voluntary acts." Job says: "I have guided the widow from my *mother's womb*." That was not a "wrong act." See Job 31: 15–18. If this be true, our brother's *logic* is *false in the premises; hence, his conclusion fails.*

CLERICAL MISREPRESENTATIONS.

LETTER FROM DR. LEE.

Meltonsville, N. C., August, 1848.

BR. STORRS:—In the fluctuations of opinions, and imaginations purely human and heathen; amid the revolutions of doctrines and speculations, one bright, true light continues still to enlighten, benefit, and dazzle mankind. It is a glorious light. It will ever retain its transforming influences, while gratitude and admiration shall swell the voice of praise; while freedom shall prompt to deliberations, or equity hold her balance upon earth. If there is one place where this light should shine more effulgently than in any other, it is the Pulpit. But when the Pulpit becomes the vehicle of gross, palpable prejudice and ignorance—of unintelligible jargon and unfathomable mysticism—of furious fanaticism and rabid falsehood—it is an instrument most destructive of the peace, the interest, and the happiness of mankind. And has it ever been thus prostituted to purposes so vile and execrable? the gratification of unmixed malice, unbounded prejudice, and unmitigated hatred?

I told you in a former letter that a certain class of would-be-preachers were rabid in their denunciations, &c. I said the truth. Their madness has reached its *crisis*. It is no longer difficult, from the diagnostic symptoms, to prognosticate its termination—the lake of fire—*unless they repent*.

One of these giants in prejudice, presumption and foul misrepresentation, asserted, on the third Sabbath in this month, that he saw a letter by I. F. Lee, in the Bible Examiner, wherein he (I. F. Lee) denied "*the dissolution of the soul and body*," &c. I arose, denied the assertion, and assured the congregation that Dwight Hays had asserted a palpable falsehood, and that he who would deliberately utter so foul a calumny, could hardly be credited, even when he told the truth. I procured the pamphlets immediately, and then observed, that if any doubted my word, I would read the extracts after dismission. Other equally unfounded assertions he made, manifesting as clear a case of mania a stultitia as that of the fool, who said in his heart there is no God. Will you have the kindness, my dear Brother, to inform your readers, whether or no: I have ever made such an assertion in any letter addressed to you, either *published* or unpublished. Have I ever either affirmed or denied the dissolution of the soul and body. I hope you will ever prove a true witness. Out then with the truth. I now call upon you to testify the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, in this case, for the sake of truth, and the *edification* of such friends as the calumniator, Dwight Hays, may have. The readers of the Bible Examiner, in this county and elsewhere, should know that I. F. Lee is not deranged, but understands too well the import of words to deny the dissolution of the soul and body. I believe with Adam Clark, that "the *first death is the destruction* of the body through time—the second death the destruction of the soul and body through eternity."

In hope of eternal life at the appearing and kingdom of Jesus Christ, I am truly yours,

I. F. LEE.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

DR. LEE has never written us anything of the character attributed to him by his *clerical* [we suppose] accuser. Clerical opponents, who misrepresent us, are the most unprincipled of all opponents: because they either *do know* better, or they stand in a position where they *ought* to know better than to misrepresent what we have done, or than to attribute words to us which we never uttered: they are, however, the last men who have the Christian principle frankly to acknowledge that they were even mistaken. We have been the victim of this unprincipled conduct, more than once, from some of that class of men. The principle upon which they act is,—"The end sanctifies the means," or,—"Let us do evil that good may come." One of this class accused us publicly, some year ago,—in a paper of which he is editor and publisher,—of having expressed a sentiment which we never uttered; and he further charged us with saying that the statement was true, "when" we "*knew*" it was not: that is,—he charged us with telling a *wilful falsehood;* and, when he was shown that we never made such a statement as he attributed to us, he entirely neglected to correct his mistake, but has left his readers under the impression to this day, that we were guilty of the charge. That same clerical leader, through his paper, lately made the following scurrilous attack upon Dr. Lees, of Leeds, England;—manifestly, having reference to that gentleman's letter in the last Examiner.

"An English writer says, that when he came to believe there was no 'fire-hell and its endless torments,' it was to him 'a mighty relief.' No doubt it was!—

'No rogue e'er felt the halter draw
With good opinion of the law.'"

Thus this clerical gentleman, and his amanuensis attempt to stab Dr. Lees, of England, in the dark, and make the impression that he is a "*rogue*" that deserves a "fire-hell and *eternal torments*." Yet, this same clerical character can get his *sect* in their "Conferences," to pass resolutions approbating all he does, and expressing unbounded confidence in him; and some of those who voted for those resolutions, *profess* that *they* do not believe in "endless torments;" so their leader now judges *them, publicly*, to be "*rogues*" who have no "good opinion of the law" of God. We think, at this time, the readers of that paper might study to profit the parable of Jotham, Judges 9.: 7-15.

The words taken from the "*English writer*" are a garbled extract. Dr. Lees had been describing the careful and thorough manner in which he had investigated the subject of *immortality*, and its connections; his mind having been previously perplexed on the question. He says:—

"I compared the English version with the originals, always having my Hebrew and Greek Concordances before me, for the sake of readier reference to parallel Text and Context. The issue *you* will have anticipated. It opened out another volume of priestly frauds and forgeries, to be added to an already crowded catalogue. I rose up from my perusal, perfectly satisfied that the doctrines of the Fire Hell and its *Eternal Torments*, of the *self-subsisting* Soul and its *Immor-*

rabies, more senseless fictions, totally discountenanced by the SCRIPTURES, at any rate. This was to me a mighty relief—and I felt, for the first time, *fully* competent to defend Christianity, both from the fangs of Infidelity, and the corruptions of Priestcraft. I had now the highest assurance of the Truth—Creation and Scripture were in harmony."

It will thus be seen, that the "mighty relief" Dr. Lee experienced, was from the difficulty of "*defending* christianity," while he admitted the "*immortality and endless torment*" FABLE. That once proved to be a falsehood is a "mighty relief" to any man who undertakes to defend a pure christianity.

In conclusion, we would say to Dr. Lee, of North Carolina, that Priests have always been the greatest enemies to any truth that endangers their fine creeds and disciplines. With few, and rare exceptions, they are the last to engage in the investigation of any subject that may render them unpopular. "How can ye believe who receive honor one of another?" Many of them will misrepresent whatever we do or say: and the people have had such blind confidence in them, that they repeat any such slander as if it were true. We must bear these things as patiently as we can, tho' we may refute their slanders.

PROPHECY OF ZECHERIAH.

One of our exchange papers says: "Perhaps none of the prophecies have occasioned so much embarrassment in the student's mind, as that of Zecheriah, particularly the 14th chapter."

We know it is very *embarrassing* to all those that attempt to establish a theory that is at war with that chapter—such as that there is no probation to any body after the second advent of our Lord, and that all not then converted, will immediately be destroyed from the earth. Mr. Miller, and those who still adhere to his theory, have tried, and are trying in vain to harmonise not only Zech. 14th, but a multitude of other prophecies to their *scheme*.

The paper referred to, wishes to overcome the embarrassment by asserting that Zecheriah is a very "allegorical" writer, though his "similes and figures are so connected with undoubted matter of fact, as to be distinctly apprehended;" and it says, "the clear and distinct must govern and explain the figurative." Very well: and what then? Why, says the editor of the aforesaid paper, "We venture to affirm that Zech. 14 presents no scenery beyond the coming of Christ and the judgment." In reply, we venture to affirm that it does "present scenes beyond the second *coming* of Christ"—the judgment is another matter. But we shall see how that paper makes out its theory. It says, "This prophecy was uttered before the second building of Jerusalem and the temple." We deny that Zech. 14th was written before the building of the second *temple*. The difference in the chronology between Zech. 1st and 14th is twenty years. Zech. 1st is placed in the *second* year of Darius, and the temple was finished in the *sixth* year of the same king; see Ezra 6. 15, so that Zech. 14th was *fourteen years* after the temple was finished. The aforesaid paper says: After preaching the rebuilding of Jerusalem, together with the deliverance of Israel, the prophet's eye descries in the distance the first Advent of Christ, and presents him under the symbol of a branch." Yes, brother, and the "prophet's eye" reached a long way beyond that, to the time when, "*Saith the Lord of Hosts, I will* REMOVE THE INIQUITY *of that land in one day*:" an event which has never yet taken place, but which the "prophet's eye" saw, though the eyes of the enemies of the return of Jacob's posterity cannot see.

The writer next says: "In Zech. 4, Christ is evidently presented between the two dispensations—between the Jewish and Gospel church—the two houses of Israel proper under the name of Zerubbabel:" and adds, "Before him (or the church, if you please so understand it,) is a mountain, that shall become a PLAIN." *We* do not "please so understand it," and consider it an unwarrantable *assumption*: nor is there any evidence in that chapter that "Christ is presented between the two dispensations;" that, in our "opinion," is all pure *fancy*; nor is that all of this writer's fancy; the most marvellous is still to come: he says—"This mountain can be none other than the kingdom of Israel; that theocracy must be demolished, or the gospel can never be advanced." If he will carefully examine the *history* with the prophecy, he will see, we think, that his theory, and the theory of Mr. Miller on Zech. 4 is all pure fancy. Zerubbabel was the Governor sent to Jerusalem by Cyrus to rebuild the temple; and is the same person called Sheshbazzar in Ezra 1: 8, 11, which compare with Ezra 2: 2 and 3: 2, 8; and with Haggai 1: 1, 14. Zerubbabel commenced building the tempel, under the decree of Cyrus, soon after his arrival at Jerusalem. Please read the whole of Ezra 3. After the work had gone forward a while, the "adversaries of Judah and Benjamin" set themselves to work to weaken the hands of Zerubbabel, and to prevent the accomplishment of the work; and in this they were, for some years, too successful; and after a time the work was "made to cease," for a while: see Ezra 4, throughout. But in the second year of Darius the work was again put forward: see Ezra 4: 24, and 5: 1, 2; Haggai, throughout; and Zech. 1: 1, 7, 12, 16. By the hindrances [*mountain*, brother,] that Zerubbabel had experienced, it seems he felt great discouragement; and now when he was directed to commence the work anew, the Lord was pleased to encourage his heart by a message from the prophet Zecheriah, chapter 4, in which the prophet had first represented to his mind the completion of the temple by the candlestick of gold with its bowl, pipes, &c., which was an indication of the opening of the temple service, and hence showed that it was completed. Then, when the prophet had seen this, he was directed to speak to Zerubbabel, the Governor, to encourage his mind, and assured him that the work should be accomplished by the special intervention of the Lord himself, so that what was to Zerubbabel a "great mountain" should "become a plain:" and "the word of the Lord came unto" Zecheriah saying, "The hands of Zerubbabel have laid the foundations of this house; [see Ezra 3: 8–13] his [Zerubbabel's] hands shall *also* finish it," &c. This is God's own interpretation. To make Zerubbabel "*the church*," and the mountain "the *kingdom of Israel*" is spiritualising with a vengeance.

That writer next says—"Whatever else the prophet teaches, from chapter 4 to 7, he still dwells upon the first advent, as appears in verse 12." He does not tell us in what chapter "verse 12" is. If he means verse 12 of chapter 6, then the 13th verse shows that the prophet looks *beyond* the first advent; for he says, "The man whose name is The BRANCH, shall *sit* and *rule upon his throne*," &c., which he has not yet done; and he does not sit upon it till he comes the second time—"*Then* shall he sit upon the throne of his glory:" then "shall the Lord God give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever," &c. Yea, brother, "and he shall be a *Priest* upon his throne;" Zech. 6: 13; so you see it looks as if the dreadful thing, "probation after the second advent," might be continued to *some body*.

Our friend says, the prophet has not "left the scenes of the first advent in chapter 9, as appears from verse 9." We reply, neither has he left the scenes of the second advent as appears from the 10th verse of the same chapter: "His dominion shall be 'from sea to sea, and from the river [Euphrates] to the ends of the earth." Has that prophecy its fulfilment this side the second advent? We are satisfied it has not; and that is the day, remember, where the scenes of Zech. 14 are laid, when "the Lord shall be king over all the earth;" 14: 9.

The next attempt of our brother is to fix Zech. 12th all at the first advent, or immediately after. A strange undertaking, truly. "*In that day*," the Lord says, not only that he "will make Jerusalem a burdensome stone for all people," but, that "all that burden themselves with it shall be cut in pieces," &c. Surely that did not take place at the first advent; for the Romans were not only not "cut in pieces," *in that day*, but they cut Jerusalem and its people in pieces. "The Governors of Judah," *in that day*, did not "devour all the people round about," &c.; and "Jerusalem" was not inhabited again in her own place, even in Jerusalem," *in that day* of, at, or near, the time of her "siege" by the Romans. *In that day* "the Lord" *did not* "save the tents of Judah first," nor at all. *In that day* "the Lord" *did not* "defend the inhabitants of Jerusalem." *In that day*, of the *first* advent, "the Lord *did not*, "seek to destroy all the nations that come against Jerusalem." Now, as this writer says, "The same day or season is constantly kept in view throughout this chapter," we further affirm—*In that day*, of the first advent, there was not *the* "great mourning" spoken of in that chapter; for, that mourning is to be in the "day or season" when the "Lord shall seek to destroy all the nations that come against Jerusalem," verse 9, and when he "shall defend the inhabitants of Jerusalem;" and that is *in the day* when he "shall go forth and fight against those nations," &c., and when "the Lord my God shall come and all the saints with thee," Zech. 14: 3, 5; THEN *in that day* of his second coming, shall the remnant of the Jews, who remain after the awful calamities with which *that day* is ushered in, "look on" him "whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn," &c. "*In that day* shall there be a great mourning in Jerusalem," &c. Not the mourning of despair, but after the "*pattern*" of Saul of Tarsus when he fell to the ground on *seeing* the Lord Jesus on his way to Damascus, and was three days sorrowing, mourning, and praying, till Ananias was sent to him with the message to "arise and be baptised, and *wash away* thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord;" *in that day* was "*opened*" to Saul of Tarsus, the blaspheming Jew, "a fountain for sin and uncleanness;" *then* opened to him because he had not previously seen it—he had been blinded—and in the same way will there "be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem" *in that day* in which they, as Saul of Tarsus did, shall "see the Lord," and "mourn" for their past rejection of him and blasphemy against him. Saul "was a blasphemer, a persecutor, and injurious; but," says he, "I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly in unbelief;" 1 Tim. 1: 13. In the same way, and for a similar reason, will the remnant of the Jews, Paul's "kinsmen, according to the flesh," [Rom. 9: 3] obtain mercy. Paul adds, 1 Timothy 1: 15, 16, "Of" sinners "I am chief. Howbeit for this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first [the type] Jesus Christ might show forth all long-suffering for a *pattern* to them which should *hereafter* believe on him to life everlasting." So far as the manner of Paul's conversion is concerned none will pretend he is a pattern to any soul of man that ever has yet been turned to the Lord: he "saw the Lord," and was as "one born out of due time;" 1 Corth. 15: 8. So will God magnify his grace in Judah's conversion "at the appearing of Christ;" and they, like their prototype, Saul of Tarsus, will "wash away their sins" in "a fountain opened" to their minds, for the first time, *in that day*. Who ever "imagined" there was to be "*another* fountain opened at the close of the present age" than the one opened by Christ? Can our brother Editor tell us? The opening the fountain *by* Christ is one thing; the opening it *to* the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem is quite another matter. When they come to see it, it is *then* opened or made manifest to *them*.

Our exchange paper says—"That in all the foregoing chapters [from the 13th backward] the church are not carried beyond the scenes of the first advent," &c. Let the reader judge if we have not shown clearly the contrary.

The Editor of that paper seems shocked at the idea, as a strange "anomoly," that "redeemed immortals" should ever be "preaching to mortal-dying heathens," &c. Does not the brother believe that angels visited Abraham, Lot, and others, and conversed with them? Still more—does he not believe that the only begotten Son of God, by whom he made the worlds, came down to this earth and dwelt among mortal beings many years? that he even laid down his *life* among, and for mortal beings—and after his resurrection still remained among mortal beings forty days teaching and instructing them? All this he believes, we presume. Is the *disciple* above his Lord? If our Saviour has done these things, is it either impossible, improbable, or unlikely that his immortal saints may be *among, teach*, and *rule over* mortal beings? Shall we say, "any thing" is "too hard for God?" If God has said it shall be so, is not that sufficient to satisfy faith? And what, we pray, are the saints, when made immortal, to be "*kings*" over, and "*priests*" to, during their reign with Christ on the earth? Who, if not those that are "*left* of the nations," *after* the "Lord my God shall come and all the saints with" him?

The idea that mortal and immortal beings *cannot* dwell together is founded in prejudice—is unscriptural, and subversive of the Christian faith. It limits the power of God—and makes our weak judgements the rule to determine what God *can*, or *will* do. If he pleases to have it so, it can be

done. The only thing that faith asks is the *proof* that God has said it. That point settled, *faith* "staggers not," but is "strong, giving glory to God."

Communicated by Dr. Lees, Leeds, England.

ON THE RESURRECTION.

The following is Dr. Lees' Reply to a request to give his opinion on Matt. 22 : 31, 32, which some suppose conflicts with the view of the *sleep* of the dead

'With pleasure I give my opinion on the Resurrection—the grand and astonishing peculiarity of Christ's reward—first placing before me the record of the *three* evangelists. In order to puzzle our Lord 'the Sadducēs, who say *that there is no resurrection*, questioned him, concerning the wife of the seven brethren.' The following was Christ's answer, which 'put the Sadducēs to silence.'

(1) "Ye err, not knowing THE SCRIPTURES, NOR THE POWER of God, Matt. xxii. 29.

(2) "The children of *this age (aiones)* marry, and are given in marriage: but those who *shall be accounted worthy* to obtain *that age*, EVEN THE RESURRECTION FROM OUT THE DEAD, neither marry, nor are given in marriage: *nor can they die any more*, for they are angelic, and children of God, being sons of the resurrection. *anastaseos*, Luke xx. 34-6.

(3) "But concerning *the resurrection* of the dead [Matthew],—[or] as touching the dead *that they rise*, [Mark],—[or] that the dead *are raised, egeirontai*, [Luke].

(4) "Have ye not read, in the book of Moses, how in the bush God spake unto him, saying, 'I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?' Mark xii. 26.

(5) "Now he is not the God of *the dead*, but of *the living*: for all live *unto Him*. Luke xxi. 38.

(6) "Ye therefore do greatly err. Mark xii. 27.

(7) "And when the multitude heard, they were *astonished* at his teaching." Matt. xxii. 33.

The present circumstances of the world are, in many points, similar to those which existed at the *first* advent of Christ. On the one hand, we have a large class of Pharisēs believing in the separate existence and immortality of some mysterious *part of man*, 'not knowing the Scriptures,' which refute their false philosophy; and, on the other hand, we have a large class of skeptical Sadducēs, who can conceive of *no future state*, or resurrection, 'not knowing *the power of God*.' Hence, when we attempt to revive the exact doctrine of Christ—which is neither that of the Pharisēs nor Sadducēs—'the multitude are astonished.'

There is nothing in the preceding narrative which, rightly considered, conflicts with the doctrine of *the sleep* of the dead.' Sleep implies an *awakening*—a resurrection, or *anastasis*—a standing again. Hence, when the power of God is to be *connected* with this resurrection, *literal* Death is appropriately called '*a sleep*,' for then the sleeper really does 'live unto God.' Thus our Lord spoke of Lazarus—'our friend Lazarus *sleepeth*: but I go, that I may *awake him out of sleep*.' John xi. 11. It is in this sense alone that the promise can be understood—'Whosoever believeth in me *shall never die*,' for all the good 'live unto God' who will 'raise them out of their sleep' at the last day. In this sense, therefore, the patriarchs are in *covenant* with God. Like those who have 'fallen asleep in Christ,' they shall not die forever; God will do for them what he did for Lazarus, *awake them out of sleep*. Hence, also, the language of Paul's exhortation—'That whether we *wake* or *sleep*, we may *live* together with him.' 'Your *life* is hidden with Christ, IN GOD.'

God, 'who quickeneth the dead, and CALLETH THOSE THINGS WHICH BE NOT [yet] AS THO THEY WERE,' Rom. iv. 17, views the patriarchs, therefore, as the heirs of the covenant, '*the children of the resurrection*'; and as Christ is called '*the Lord* both of *the dead* and living,' Rom. xiv. 9, as being their sure and appointed Judge, so Jehovah is styled 'the God of the living, *for* all live [really] UNTO HIM [not unto *creatures of time*, but *unto Him*] to whom a thousand years is as one day.' Thus, too, when the object of faith rests upon the promise of the Divine Being, *future* events are spoken of as *present*. Paul speaks of *having* 'a tabernacle not made with hands, eternal *in the heavens*,' before he actually possest it; hence, also, the Hebrew Christians are said to '*have* a better and an enduring possession in *heaven*,' Heb. x. 34, and to '*have come* unto the heavenly Jerusalem,' etc., xii. 22. Because God's promise is certain and steadfast—and because his kingdom is one 'that cannot be shaken'—it is expresst by *present time*, which to us is the most *certain* of all things, Gen. ii. 17; Deut. ix. 1; xxix. 13; Psalm ii. 7; Acts xiii. 33; Heb. v. 5. *To-day* is sure—hence selected as the symbol of sureness. God 'has *prepared for* the good *a city*,' it is said; and Christ went to *prepare a place* for his disciples; but Christ has not *actually* come again to receive his disciples, nor has the heavenly Jerusalem seen by John *actually* descended. In truth, it does not exist *yet* to Man—for he lives in the *present* only—but it *does* exist UNTO GOD, for with him the future is open as the present—it is sure, because he has *decreed it*.

Having made these general observations, I observe that there are *three* modes of interpreting the gospel narrative before me. Let me consider each separately.

I. The common interpretation supposes that *the dead* are NOT THE DEAD any longer, because they live *unto God*,' who is not 'the God of the dead.'

Many fatal objections may be urged to this interpretation. As, *first*, that it does not follow, that because the patriarchs 'live *unto God*,' therefore they live *unto each other*: any more than it follows that *the dead* are *living*, because Christ is declared to be *their Lord*, [Rom. xiv. 9,] i. e., *judge*.

Second, it is opposed to the clear statement that the dead are to *live, by virtue of the Resurrection*, FROM OUT THE DEAD,' and by that means *only*: they are to assume *life then*, and not before—a future period ('*that age*') being referred to, both in this passage and many others. Abraham, then, *was dead*, and needed therefore a *resurrection* to show God's power: but if he *already* lived, he did not.

Third, the *object* of our Saviour, and which he accomplisht, was to prove '*the resurrection from out the dead*.' But if he asserted that Abraham lived *before*, and *without* a resurrection—or that a *part* of Abraham was living in 'Adēs—how could *that* 'put the Sadducēs to silence'?

Fourth: neither can the Pharisaic and foolish teaching, that *the soul lives without* a body (as an immaterial principle and by natural consequence,) demonstrate '*the power of God to raise the dead*,' which the Sadducēs called in question. But this was demonstrated, and the Sadducēs *were* silenced; and therefore we cannot admit the common interpretation, which represents Christ as silencing the sturdy Sadducēs by an irrelevant and fallacious argument!

II. Professor Bush holds that the Dead experience *the resurrection* at death, without any *sleep* or *interval* of repose; that they live *in spiritual bodies* without intermission.

Now this is a much more consistent and plausible view than the preceding, tho not satisfactory to my mind. It seems clear from the literal teaching of Christ and his apostles, that *the resurrection* denotes some general, simultaneous, and future event, and implies an *intermediate state* of Rest, Sleep, or temporal Death and Unconsciousness.

The context of the passage, par. 2, represents the *anastasis*, or *Renewed State*, as one not to be experienced in THIS AGE, but in A FUTURE AGE;—in that age the *good* are [to be] *raised* to incorruptible life. 'They can *die no more*.' Eternal life—an *immortal* organization—is the peculiar reward of '*the worthy*' alone; it is '*a gift*' of 'life in Christ,' not the necessary activity of something *inherent* in our nature; not a *continued* existence of a spiritual body, by *natural* law, but a miraculous and astonishing demonstration of 'the *power* of God,' to be manifested upon those who 'die in Christ,' as it was upon Christ himself.

The Swedenborgians have sometimes placed stress upon the *present tense* of the phrase—'*are* raised.' This, however, can have meant no more than the two other phrases employed by Matthew and Mark, which are *not* in the present tense. The *essential* idea cannot have been omitted in their record. In par. 2, the transition first occurs from the future to the present, and is easily accounted for—the *antecedent* being 'THAT AGE.'

Professor BUSH, however, in translating *anastasis* by 'future life,' clears his theory from one objection alleged against the common interpretation. Christ, he argues, demonstrated from Moses *another state of life*, which the Sadducēs denied, and hence, by implication, of some *living apparatus* for its display. Defeated in their *great* point—that there was *no life beyond the grave*—they would not care to argue about the *sort of bodies* which the dead possest.

III. Putting aside all pre-formed theories, however, the following seems to me the natural meaning of the narrative:

'Ye err,' Sadducēs, in denying a Renewed State of life to the dead, neither '*knowing the Scriptures*,' which promise life to the good, nor estimating aright '*the power of God*,' who is able to raise up children to Abraham out of the very stones.

Ye misconceive the *nature* of that future state, when ye question me of marriage: it is not a kingdom of 'flesh and blood,' which requires that institution for filling up the population which perishes. Where creatures *die*, they must be *born*. Therefore, 'the children of *this age* marry and are given in marriage; but those who shall be *accounted worthy* to obtain *that age*' whereof I speak, 'even the standing up of the Dead,' neither marry, nor are given in marriage,' for '*they cannot die any more*, because they are' IN THAT AGE 'like the angels in heaven.'

'As touching the dead, *that they rise*! again, why should ye, the profest followers of Moses, doom that *incredible*? 'Have ye not read in the book of Moses, how God spake unto him, saying, I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob?' He has declared himself to be their God—that is, their Rewarder, even after their death; but he cannot be the rewarder—the God—of the finally dead and everlastingly unconscious, but of the living and conscious only. *Now* these patriarchs are as yet numbered with the dead—with those who 'go down into silence'—with 'the dead' who 'cannot praise' God; but they still 'live *unto God*,' and THEREFORE MUST RISE AGAIN to receive their reward, for 'God is not the God of the dead,' *as such*, 'but of the living.'

And, in truth, 'God is not ashamed to be called *their God*, FOR he hath prepared for them a city.' The patriarchs sank to *sleep*, in hope of the realization of this wondrous promise; but whether this sleep was one day, or one thousand years, altered not *the fact* that God was *their God*, who had *prepared* for them a Reward, to be manifested in due time. *Then*, and not *while* they are dead, 'God himself shall be with them; AND BE THEIR GOD' (REV.) xxi. 1, 2, 3.

FREDERICK RICHARD LEES,
Editor (British) Truth Seeker.

EUROPE AND THE JEWS.

In our humble opinion, the convulsions in Europe are not only the commencement of "the seventh vial" of "the seven last plagues," but mark the closing of "the times of the Gentiles"—the deliverance of the posterity of Jacob—their return to Palestine, preparatory to the invasion of that land by Russia and the northern powers, who are the "Gog" &c. of Ezekiel, 38th and 39th,—and the second personal advent of our Lord. But, we are waiting for further developments, before we speak with *positiveness*.

We give our readers the following *extracts* from speeches delivered at the "fortieth anniversary" of the London Society for the Jews, held at Exeter Hall, May 5th, 1848; taken from the "Jewish Intelligence."

The CHAIRMAN said,—Those very convulsions of Europe, that throw all the rest of the world into disorder, only methodize and forward the great work in which you are engaged. If there are kingdoms to be overturned, are there no kingdoms to be restored? And if the times of the Gentiles are drawing to a close, is it not possible that the times of the Hebrews are about to be revived? There is one other matter of rejoicing on this present occasion, and it is an important matter. You have obtained the recognition, by the Ottoman Porte, of Protestants as a distinct and constituent part of the subjects of the Ottoman Empire. They now stand upon the same footing as the Greek, the Armenian, and the Latin Churches. And this is one of the first fruits that you have derived from the appointment of a Protestant bishop; because, such is the rule of the Ottoman dominion, that they will recognize no sect or body that is not represented by some responsible head. You have obtained that responsible head in the present Bishop of Jerusalem. You have obtained the full, complete and absolute recognition of the protestants as a distinct, separate and acknowledged portion of the Ottoman empire.

The Hon. W. Cowper, M. P. said.—I find great reason for encouragement in the cause which we are met to speak of to day, from the present aspect of the Continent of Europe. In the Report it was mentioned, that the Austrian government had been able to prohibit one of our missionaries from continuing his exertions in that part of Poland which is under the dominion of Austria. The Austrian government has always been a great opponent of missionary efforts among the Jews, as well as of all Protestant efforts. But that proud government has found that it is a hard thing to strive against the Lord's work. That government is now shivered and shaken, and may at any moment fall asunder into a variety of parts; and the statesman, so renowned for sagacious policy, who has been so long at the head of that government, directing this severe, arbitrary, exclusive and persecuting policy, is now an outcast and refugee, finding an asylum in this city in which we are assembled. The state of Europe gives freer access to the missionaries of this Society, wherever they may wish to seek out the lost and benighted Jews. And at this moment, when we see so much gloom hanging over all the nations of Europe—when they are shaking with apprehensions of civil discords, wars and tumults; when they scarcely know what to look for on the coming day; when in all directions "men's hearts are failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming upon the earth,"—when, over all the nations of Europe, I say, this gloom is hanging, I see that the prospects of one nation, and that the despised nation of the Jews alone, are brightening. While the sun of prosperity appears to be setting over so many other nations, it appears to be rising over the Jewish nation. In Germany, already, we see Jews occupying high stations. The prejudices that have hitherto ground down the Jews into the dust, are now fast dissipating. In France, we see every career opening to the Jews. We see them filling the most distinguished positions. Among that small cabinet that has been governing France, there were two Jews. Even at Rome itself, the prejudice against Jews, and the persecution of them, are passing away. Even in that strong-hold of persecution, where alone the Inquisition still raises its gloomy head, and by the instrumentality of the Pope himself, there has been indulgence extended to the Jews.

The Rev. Hugh Stowell said,—I feel great pleasure, my Lord, in seconding the resolution Mr. Tottenham has submitted. You will have been struck with the manner in which the minds both of the speakers, and of the hearers, seem to have been profoundly impressed, as to the critical position in which our christian land is placed, and the fearful and emphatic character of the signs of the times in which we live. It has been brought against the Exeter Hall agitators, for such they are reckoned, that they have been needless alarmists, and have been crying out "The wolf! the wolf!" till they have disturbed nervous persons; but the wolf has never come. We would retort, not in the spirit of uncharitableness or anger, but in the spirit of brotherly love—we would retort upon those who have so charged the speakers of Exeter Hall, "when they shall say, Peace and safety; then sudden destruction cometh upon them, as travail upon a woman with child, and they shall not escape." In the metropolitan of the national assembly, the cuckoo note was resounding full and clear, "Peace, peace and safety!" when all at once, with the suddenness of the lightning's flash, Europe was shaken to her centre, and the dynasty of France was crumbled into dust. My Lord, it is a dangerous thing to be needlessly alarmed, but it is a no less dangerous thing not to be alarmed when it is needed. It does not do for the seaman to set about studying his chart, when his ship is getting among the rocks, or to reef the sails when the tempest is rushing into her shrouds. And very much the same would be the conduct of the Christian mariner, if he were to look into the chart of unfulfilled prophecy only, when its fulfilment has taken place; and if he were to begin to look for the breakers and the reefs and shoals, just when his vessel was grounding on the shoals, or dashing to pieces amongst the rocks. My Lord, if prophecy is given us, as assuredly it is, to be, after its accomplishment, one of the firmest buttresses and pillars of our Christian faith, it is no less given us to be the light shining in the dark distant future, and to which we do well to take heed. And though it shines in the darkness, and discovers not the surrounding features of the scenery, yet are we therefore not to fix our eyes upon it, as the ancient mariner did upon the polar star that was to guide him safe to his haven? Are we not to mark that bright light shining far off—a herald and pledge of the "dayspring from on high" that shall illumine and visit us? My Lord, I conceive that an attentive and calm view of unfulfilled prophecy, is admirably calculated, when taken in conjunction with the stirring signs of the times, to give us counsel on the one hand, and comfort on the other; for those things which make the people of this world afraid, make the Christian look up and lift up his head, because his redemption draweth nigh.

. . . Allow me to say, that though the Jew's Society is merely a Society for promoting Christianity amongst the Jews, yet it is scarcely possible not to throw round the Jewish cause a little of that halo of splendour which prophecy ever associates with Jerusalem. It is impossible for us not to do so; because it is impossible for us to study closely the Jewish subject, and not see that it *is* as clear that Israel shall be restored, as it *was* clear that she should be dispersed. The prophecies will be as literally fulfilled in the last case, as they have been in the first. If you ask a child in our schools, where is the country without a people, and the people without a country? he will answer, the country is Judea, and the people are the Jews. Judea is the lodging-house of all nations. There you may meet, as in the great centre of the world, the wandering Arab, the classic Greek, the whiskered Turk, and the fair-faced European: and there you may meet a little band of Jews, with their bishop at their head. You may meet all these; but none can say, We are the inhabitants of this land. They are all, as it were, tenants at will, waiting for their notice to quit. And if the land is thus waiting for its people, the people are waiting for their land. Wherever the Jews are to be found, they are a distinct people—they are everywhere found as oil upon the waters—nowhere combined. And God, who has preserved them, will bring them again to their land, and will unite Judah and Israel together, as one, for ever. My Christian friends, and is it not deeply interesting, at the present juncture, to look to Jerusalem and to the Jews? I, for one, look upon the present events but as the "beginning of the end." I look upon those wars, and rumours of wars, that have filled Europe with alarm,—I look upon those earthquakes of nations—but as the first distant moanings of the tempest that is gathering and thickening, and that will break upon us with all its terrors. I look upon all these events that are taking place around us, but as the first outpourings of the seventh vial. Then, assuredly, Jerusalem must be the beacon to which we are to turn our eyes, and the Jew the star to which we are to direct our expectations. I am looking, with deep and earnest desire, to see the first heaving and moving of the scattered Jewish people, preparatory to their returning to their own land. And I believe the missionaries can already see, as in Ezekiel's vision of the bones, bone beginning to come to its bone. And already we may hear some distant sound shaking among the bones, in the mighty valley of vision. And I believe that as the outburst of judgment has been sudden, so the outburst of hope for Judah will be sudden, too. Who can tell that by the time we shall assemble here to commemorate another anniversary of this Society—who, I ask, can tell whether the Jews may not be gathered together as a mighty army, and be setting forward on their journey to their own land, conveyed, perhaps, by the ships of Shittim, our own wooden walls. O, that England may be the favoured instrument in this great work, instead of America, her daughter, or any other youthful competitor for the prize! I have good hope for England. I believe we are doing what the prophet was bid to do, to go forth in spite of the sneer of the worldly wise, and the contempt of the unbeliever, and to prophesy on the mighty outspread multitude of dry bones, until a mighty army shall arise. And let us remember the words we heard last night, from one of our most eloquent and most energetic bishops, that "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

We commend the following fable to the attention of those who seem to think, no one has any right to do or get good, unless it is done according to their sectarian organisation; and especially to those who would prevent us from drawing consolation and truth from the pure stream,—the Bible,—without their *growling*, as if they were the only "authorized expounders" at that fountain.

THE LAMB, THE WOLF, AND THE DOG.

A FABLE: BY G. S. PHILLIPS.

A little lamb once left its mother and went down the mountain, to drink at a stream which ran below. At the same moment, a wolf came out of the neighboring wood, and faced the lamb, on the opposite bank.

'What right have you to drink here,' quoth the wolf; 'Don't you know this stream belongs to me?'

'Am I doing wrong?' askt the innocent lamb; 'I thought the stream was free to all, and did not know that you were the owner of it.'

'Don't stand lying there,' said the wolf, pretending to be very angry.

'I do not tell a lie,' answered the little lamb; 'I was very thirsty when I came down the mountain, and am sorry if I have offended you by drinking of the stream.'

'Your sorrow won't prevent me from killing you,' replied the wolf; 'so prepare yourself to die!'

'I have no preparation to make,' said the lamb. 'All my life has been as innocent as that of the flowers in the meadows.'

'So then,' said the wolf, 'you will make a dainty meal for me'; and he jumpt over the stream, whilst the lamb lifted up its eyes to heaven, and stood ready to be sacrificed.

At this instant, the faithful sheep-dog came bounding down the mountain, and confronted the wolf. 'How now, old rascal!' quoth he: 'Do you seek to kill one of my master's stray lambs, by pretending to own the stream wherein he has slaked his thirst? This is one of your ancient tricks, which you must now answer for without loss of time.'

'Pardon me,' quoth the wolf, crouching with a vulpine smile; 'I meant the little lamb no harm, I merely wanted to try her courage.'

'Try thy own courage against mine then,' answered the brave sheep-dog; and with that he fell upon the cowardly wolf, and tore him to pieces.

The little lamb uttered sorrowful cries, like the wailing of an orphan in some alien world, and again lifted up its meek eyes to heaven, and saw the face of Jupiter looking out of the clouds, smiling and well pleased.

Then the dog and the lamb walkt up the mountain together towards the fold.

INTERPRETATION.

Dear to heaven is innocence.
Ever ready its defense.

Tho a moment, seems the Wronger
Over Right to triumph stronger,

There are angels evermore,
At the theshold of God's door;

Swift to fly, and strong to do
Justice, all the wide world thro.

Thou art safe in self-possession.
Innocence needs no confession.
Guilt lies only in transgression.

Hold thy heart in quiet keeping;
Evil sowing, evil reaping;
The master's eyes are never sleeping.

Fear not therefore, tho there be
No sign of ready help for thee;
But in thy peril and distress,
Trust the master, questionless.

FROM DR. LEES.—THE "ADDENDA."

In 1833 Mr. Thom, of Liverpool, formerly minister of the Scotch Church, published a strange book, entitled "Calvinism identified with Universalism," which found some disciples. He is a man of learning and talent, but, as I think, led away by an idealess crotchet, viz.: that the *human nature* is *totally and eternally destroyed* first, and yet somehow the *consciousness is finally restored!* This was afterwards elaborated in various works, but chiefly, as regards your topic, into "the three questions."

In 1840, Mr. Carmichael, of Dublin, published his "Disquisitions on the Theology and Metaphysics of Scripture," which display great ability and research, and which, I believe, were somewhat influential in spreading views not dissimilar to your own. I refer particularly to the six chapters of the 7th Disquisition.

LIST OF WORKS ADVOCATING THE DESTRUCTION OF THE WICKED,

SENT US BY DR. LEES, LEEDS, ENGLAND.

1. *Three Questions, Proposed and Answered*, concerning the Life forfeited by Adam, the Resurrection of the Dead, and Eternal Punishment. By *Rev. David Thom*, second edition, enlarged.

2. *The Philosophy of Man*, by *John Osborne*.

3. *Scripture Revelations*, by a *Country Pastor*.

4. *The Future States*: their nature and evidences considered, on principles physical, moral, and Scriptural. by *Reginald Courtenay*, M. A. Rector of Thornton Watlass, Yorkshire.

5. *Scriptural Doctrine of Future Punishment*, by *H. H. Dobney*, second edition.

6. *Life of Christ*, by *Edward White*, Hereford.

7. *A Tract on Future Punishment*, Chapman, London.

8. *The Evangel of Love*: interpreted by *Henry Sutton*.

9. *Human Nature*: or, the Law of Reward and Punishment, illustrated on Philosophic principles.

10. *Disquisitions on the Theology and Metaphysics of Scripture*, by *Andrew Carmichael*, M. R. I. A. [Member of Royal Irish Academy.] Two Vols.

Some of the above works we have sent for, and from their pages hope to be able to enrich the Examiner, and give our readers matter on these topics which they are not likely to obtain from any other source. In thus seeking matter for our columns, our expenses are increased. Will our friends see that we are sustained by increasing the circulation of the Examiner.

DR LEE, OF N. C.—The Sermon on "*Profit and Loss*" we shall publish in the Examiner just as soon as we can find room. At present, we have none to send you; much obliged for your favour.

LETTERS.

SALUTATION FROM BR. ALVEST ANDERSON, ATHENS, VA.:—

TO THE BRETHREN BELOVED, GEO. STORRS AND J. T. WALSH, Editors of Bible Examiner:—The Bible Examiner is to *me* a paper both *interesting*, on account of the *kindly* spirit of its communications, and *edifying*, because it sustains a *character* in harmony with its *name*; I do not mean to say, that it is perfect; but, I mean to express myself pleased with it, *generally*. If it continues its noble and independent course of *investigation*, we have many and strong reasons for *believing* that God Almighty will bless *it*, and make it a *blessing*. It appears to me, admirably calculated to increase the *love* of *Bible study* where it exists already, and to produce *it* where it has not hitherto existed.

Please accept the assurance of my Christian regard and love; and believe me yours in the hope of the *Son of God* from heaven.

The "S&S" is received, and the *Sermons* are sent. Thank you, brother.—[ED. EX.

BR. JONATHAN WILSON, under date of Sept. 20th writes:—

BR. STORRS:—I fully endorse your views of the state of the Dead—the Destruction of the Wicked, &c.; the Soonship of Christ.

I have been travelling among the Advent believers for four months. In which time I have visited Buffalo, Lockport, Rochester, Victor, Canandaigua, Utica and Albany, N. Y.; North Adams, Springfield, Three Rivers, Worcester, Wrentham and Attleboro, Mass.; Providence, North Situate, Coventry, Warwick and Bristol, R. I.; New Bedford, Boston and South Reading, Mass. With the exception of Boston and South Reading, from the information I have obtained in these places—and I have preached in all of them—there are 18 out of 20 who are with you in sentiment on the above named points.

BR. JOHN C. LOTZ, Shippensburg, PA., writes:—

BR. STORRS:—I love the Bible Examiner. It uproots the foolish notion of immortal-soul-ism. One of my Christian neighbours undertook to convert me from my "error" about the sleep of the dead. I lent him your pamphlet on that subject, and that "converted" *him* from all the foolery of going to judgment at death and a world unknown.

SISTER REUBAR STOW, Weybridge, VT., writes:—

BR. STORRS:—I read the Examiner with interest. It comforts and refreshes my soul; and stirs me up to seek more earnestly for *immortality, eternal life*; and to escape (*not* "that death that never dies," but) "everlasting destruction" of "soul and body," which, I firmly believe, will be the doom of all those who "obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." May the Lord give success to your labours in scattering light and truth through our land.

SISTER CATHARINE C. WILLIAMS, Beaver Dams, N. Y., Sept. '58, writes:—

BR. STORRS:—Though strangers to you, yet claiming fraternity, on the ground of unanimity of sentiment, we address you, thinking it must be a matter of encouragement to you, to know what your little messenger, in the form of "Six Sermons," is accomplishing, and has been instrumental of accomplishing for us. I am writing for myself, and in behalf of a sister believer, who, with me, was led to searching the Bible for ourselves, by means of your Sermons, to see whether those things were so. By submitting to the guidance of the Spirit, instead of creeds, we were led to renounce immortal-soul-ism, and embrace the Bible doctrine of immortality, as being the gift of God, attainable through Christ alone.

Some little time since, a friend presented us with two numbers of the "Bible Examiner," and, as they exactly met our views, we were anxious to take them, and to aid in their circulation.

BR. ANSON WALKER, New York City, writes:—

BR. STORRS:—I think I will in no case be without the Examiner so long as I have money for any other purpose, besides buying bread, after which time I will beg it. It is a most welcome visitor. In my judgment its influence to convince those who read it, of the power of prejudice and sectarianism is mighty; for, the scriptural, incontrovertible, and vita. truths that are presented, and scripturally defended in the Examiner, palsy and deaden their force against you. I have to look to some other cause why the opponents of those truths do not embrace them than *scripture, consistency* or *reason*; and when you have taken from them these three, what excuse have they for continuing to oppose, except it be the power of sectarian influence and prejudice. * * * * * * * * * *