BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. III. PHILADELPHIA, DECEMBER, 1848. No. 12.

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, $5; always in advance.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

THE MIND.

Second Reply to J. T. Walsh.

Dear Sir—I wish to call your attention, and the attention of our readers, to a few points now settled.

1. You admit that it is not the brain that thinks. That none of the mental or moral powers are to be ascribed to it. That the "aggregate of powers" you call the mind, cannot be said to be powers of the brain,—that it would be ridiculous to say that the brain reasoned, hoped, feared, loved or hated.

2. Hence the destruction of the brain does not in itself destroy that which thinks, and puts forth mental power.

3. That mind is not a thinking, reasoning power. That these exercises are not the exercises of the mind, but they *constitute* the mind.

4. That these powers are to be referred to man as an organized being, and result from his *organization*, and are put forth in consequence of, and by *virtue of* the brain.

5. That there is no such *essence*, *entity*, or *substance*, as mind, to which we may justly ascribe mental or moral power, action, or affection.

And hence you must admit, and maintain, that thought is a necessary, mechanical result of an organized, living, physical machine, called man, and when the organization is *disturbed* or destroyed, thought, the result of organization, ceases, or is deranged. I hope I have not misunderstood you, and do not intend misrepresentation of your views.

The conclusion seems inevitable, to me, that thought is a mechanical result, and man an irresponsible machine, on the ground assumed by you in this discussion. Organization and cerebral motion produces thought, and if there is no mind presiding over this organized being, or machine, then man is no more free than the solar system; he moves on and thinks and purposes by reason of his organization, till the machine is out of repair, and then ceases to think, and is no more. I have been led into this inadvertently, and will here state, that one of the chief objections to the material view, is, that man is made an irresponsible machine and not a *moral* agent.

On the ground I maintain, the mind controls, by its free volitions, the movements of this organized body, in which it resides; and the senses are only windows through which it looks out of its prison upon the world of matter.

6. When you affirm that the mind cannot think without a brain, you put assertion in the place of proof. Do angels think by reason of a brain? Does God, whose image man is, think by reason of a brain? To say that man cannot *manifest* thought, and hold connexion with the outward world, when the senses are locked up, is saying very little indeed.

Most persons believe that God can commune with, and influence the human mind, without addressing any of the senses.

Facts show that there *can* be perceptions without the *use* of eyes. With the eyes closely bandaged, in a dark room, persons have been known to read a book they never saw, and tell the time of day by a watch.

It is now perfectly settled, that what are termed idiots can be educated. A school is soon to be started in Massachusetts; a teacher has been selected, and is now abroad preparing himself for his task.

I have before observed, that mental power continues to increase long after the whole physical organization has reached maturity.

What are we to understand by the term *man*, as used in your articles, and to whom you ascribe all mental and moral phenomena. What is that man that thinks? Not any part of his physical system. Is it intended to embrace simply the whole physical frame? *I* see with my eye, hear with my ear. Now what is it that sees and hears? Not the eye nor ear, any more than the telescope or trumpet.

By a figure of speech, we say that the eye sees, the ear hears, the hand writes, but clearly they are only agents. Agents of what? Of the man; which being interpreted means—*the other parts of the physical organization*: that is, the organized man destitute of any property but matter, having nothing but a body, sees out of the eye, one part becoming the servant to all the others, and changing work, to to keep the bargain even.

Thus "the eye cannot say to the foot I have no need of thee," for when this organized being wishes to change localities, he uses his feet—when he wishes to speak, he uses his tongue, and so on: thus in turn each is the servant of the whole; a very important lesson to organized society is thus wrought out.

Man's identity resides not in his ever changing body, but in the mind. Paul says, he knew a man caught up to the third heavens—but whether in the body, or out of the body he did not know. Again, in another place, he speaks of being absent from the *body*, and present with the *Lord*, as co-existing facts. Clearly, the organized body is not the man, but something that can leave the body—be out of the body.

I have asserted, and again repeat, that according to your views it is the physical man that is born again, for this good reason, that man is wholly phy-

ed. You think that my position approaches the absurd, because you understand *me* to say that it is the *mind* that undergoes the change called the new birth. This would make the Lord say, "that except a *mind* be born again, it cannot see the Kingdom of God." Again, "except a mind be born of water and spirit, it cannot enter into the Kingdom of God."

"A *mind* born of water! What an idea!! So Mr. B's *mind has been born again*, but Mr. B. *himself has not*!"

Now, as you ridicule the idea of the *mind* being born again, it follows, of course, that you believe the body undergoes this change. You make this mistake in *respectable* company, for Nicodemus had the same opinion.

I grant, at once, that this change of mind, produces a new application and use of the physical organs, but I have yet to learn, that the change is not wholly a change of mind, "making a new heart and spirit," and in consequence of the control of the mind over the whole man, "the body is presented," &c.

But what is this, I am again tempted to ask, that presents the body? Not the mind. You reply at once, the man. But on your theory the *body is the man*, the *whole* of man—and hence *man*, the body, is to present the body "a living sacrifice."

But we need have no controversy as to what it is that is born again, for much as you ridicule the idea, your ridicule hits not me but the Bible.

Turn to John, 3d chapter, 3d and 6th verses.—Nicodemus is astonished to hear it said that a *man* must be born again. Christ replies and adds, "that which is born of the spirit is SPIRIT." A spirit born again! A spirit born of water and spirit! What an idea!! But hold, these are the words of Christ, and here he tells us what he means by *man*, that must be born again.

I have no desire to burden the columns of your paper with long articles, and therefore omit many things. The challenge contained in your last, is accepted, in so far as to be perfectly willing to rest the whole question—Does the soul—mind—outlive the body—upon that text, but I cannot confine myself to that text on the main question. Now to the text.*

1. Observe that "body and soul," are in opposition to each other, and both substantives.

2. It is declared, that while men *can* kill the "body," they *cannot* kill the "soul," which is not true if the soul dies when the body dies.

3. It is declared that God can destroy both in hell, or, as Luke says, "hath power to cast into hell" *after death*.

We must understand by *hell* a place, and state of punishment after death. Now, on your interpretation, that the body means the *present* life, and the soul the *future* life, the text would read—"Fear not them that kill the *present* life, but fear him, who after he hath killed, (the present life) hath power to destroy both the present and the future life in hell. Thus the *present life* is destroyed *twice*.

If this is your logic, it is not mine. I have only to say in conclusion, that leaving you to manage your side of the controversy as you please, I shall do the same on my part, always intending to be respectful in language.

Respectfully
WM. H. BREWSTER.

* Matt. 10: 28. Luke 12: 5.

RESPONSE TO MR. BREWSTER.

DEAR SIR—In your "points now settled" you make the same incorrect "inferences," which you made in all your previous articles. I now despair of any thing but misrepresentation on this subject, though, I doubt not, it is unintentional on your part. The "points" which you regard as "settled," are far from being so in my estimation; one or two of them, however, are not so objectional as the others. Imitating your example, I will also state certain "points" which I consider "settled" in previous articles, and "*post up*" the controversy to the present time.

1. *Man thinks, reasons, reflects, judges, compares, loves, fears, hopes, venerates and adores by means of his brain. The brain is the seat of those* ORGANS, *whose* FUNCTIONS *are above indicated.*

This meets your first "point."

2. "*The mental and moral powers,*" *while they are attributes of the* MAN, "*are to be ascribed to*" *the brain —they being* FUNCTIONS *of that instrument.* "*That the aggregate of powers,*" *I* "*call the mind,*" *are* "*powers*" *of the* MAN, *and* FUNCTIONS *of the brain; and that it would be ridiculous to say the brain reasoned, hoped, feared, loved or hated,*" *seeing that* THESE, *while they are* FUNCTIONS *of that organ, are in reality* ATTRIBUTES *of the* MAN—*organized and living, and not of his brain abstractly or when dissected out.*—"*Hence, the destruction of the brain does*" "*in itself destroy that which thinks, and puts forth mental power; because the* "*destruction*" *of the brain—the instrument of thought—involves the destruction of the* THINKER—MAN.

This meets your second "point."

3. *Your third* "*point,*" *while it is not expressed in my language, may pass current without further notice.*

4. *Your fourth* "SETTLED *point*" *is an* ADMITTED *refutation of your first, and part of the second* "*point.*" *That these powers are to be referred to man as an organized being, and result from his organization, and are put forth in consequence of, and by virtue of the brain.*" *Of course, then, the* "*destruction*" *of the brain, is the* "*destruction*" *of that* "*which thinks!*"

So much for your fourth "point."

5. *Your fifth* "*point,*" "*that there is no such* ESSENCE, ENTITY, OF SUBSTANCE, *as mind, to which we may justly ascribe mental or moral power, action or affection,*" *must be received with a qualification.* In relation to *Man* it is true; and it may be true of *angels*, and of *Christ*; but we do not affirm it of "Him who dwells in light inaccessible." I apprehend that there is much error in the world, in relation to *spiritual bodies*; and I cannot conceive of any being *thinking* without an *instrument* of some sort; but Him who is *uncreated, unorganized*, and *self-existant!*

Thus far we have "posted up" this controversy. The inference you draw from the "settled points" is utterly at variance with the premises. I neither "admit" nor "maintain," "that thought is a necessary, mechanical result of an organized, living, physical machine, called man. "Moral and mental" *functions* cannot be ascribed to "mechanical" laws. Electro-magnetism, modified by the laws of the living organism, of which the brain may be styled the "battery," and the nerves the "*conductors*," contains the principles by which this question is solved. *There is not a single faculty of man, moral, mental, or animal, which cannot be made to manifest its function,* WITH INCREASED POWER, *by means of electro-magnetism!* This has been done a thousand times! *I have both witnessed and performed it!* MAGNETIC VIBRATION, PRODUCING "CEREBRAL MOTION" EXPLAINS IT.

Will Mr. Brewster tell us how these effects are produced, if the brain be not the seat of these functions? If they be attributes of the "immortal soul," why are they influenced by magnetism? Is immortality governed by magnetic laws?

As it respects "human responsibility," it is abundantly established by what you are pleased to call "the material view." The brain, as the *sensorium* of man, is made up of various *organs*, each organ possessing a distinct *function*. These functions are *moral, mental, and animal*. The moral and mental should govern the animal. Man, possessing the power of *will*, is "responsible" for the right use of all these faculties. They have a legitimate, and an illegitimate use. They are to be *used*, but not *abused*. Every moral law in the Bible is directed against their abuse. As this is your principal objection, I will enlarge upon it. Man possesses an organ—cerebral organ, I mean,—which prompts him to adore. Combining its influence with his *will*, he determines to worship something. If he is not enlightened, he will worship idols; but if the light of Truth has illuminated his understanding, he will *respect* men and "*worship* God," which is its legitimate function. Hence its unlawful exercise is forbidden—"Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve."

This illustration is applicaple to every animal and moral faculty of man, so that he is, in the fullest sense, a "responsible agent." He is responsible for the right use of all the powers, with which God has endowed him. But if man has an "immortal soul," or if his mind be a distinct "essence," "entity" or "substance," capable of life, consciousness and intelligence, when separate from the body; then this "soul" or "essence," which you call the mind, is *alone* "responsible," and the *man*, as such, has no "responsibility." If a man were to strike you, or slander your character, would you hold his "immortal" part "responsible," or the man himself? Am I to understand that your "immortal mind" is "responsible," for what you write, and that the *man*—Mr. Brewster—has no "responsibility" at all? Why hang a man, for the sins of his "immortal soul?" This is punishing the innocent for the guilty! Either let a man go free, or punish the real offender. But, sir, so sure as God is just, he, as well as men, will hold *the* MAN, and not his body, his mind, or his "immortal soul," "responsible" for his evil deeds! *The Man*, THE WHOLE MAN, AND NOTHING BUT THE MAN, *is responsible before God!*

You say that "on the ground" you "maintain, the mind controls, by its free volitions, the movements of this organized body, in which it resides: and the senses are only windows through which it looks out of its prison upon the world of matter." Here, for the first time, you have given us a synopsis of your theory! Let me analyze it:

1. "The mind controls, by its volitions, the movements of this organized body."

2. It "resides" in the body, as in a "prison."

3. "The senses are only windows, through which it looks out upon the world of matter."

According to what you "maintain," then, the "immortal mind" *only*, has "free volitions;" and this "*mind*" "controls" the "movements of this organized body." *Immortality*, then, "controls the movements" of that which is *mortal*. Why is it, Mr. Brewster, that these "movements" are so irregular, eccentric, defective, deranged and insane? "God only hath immortality," and he only bestows it upon his creatures. He is the fountain of this attribute in *angels*, and will be its source in *men*. But it "resides" in the body. Where is its location?—This was asked in my last article, but you gave no answer. Does it "reside" in the brain? If so, what is it? What is it like? Again, it is in "prison!"—Pythagoreanism to perfection! Immortality in "prison—looking through windows upon the world of matter!" But suppose all these "windows," the "senses," are closed, then it cannot see out "upon the world of matter." All is blind, all darkness, all "confusion worse confounded!" Again, you say, "when" I "affirm that the *mind* cannot think without a brain," I "put assertion in the place of proof." Now, I have not said that "the *mind* cannot think without a brain;" but I have said that *man* cannot; the proofs of which have been given abundantly in previous articles,—proofs which you have failed to invalidate. When you have answered the arguments already submitted, it will be time enough to advance others.

You ask—"Do angels think by reason of a brain?" I answer angels are not the subject of discussion; but so far as we can judge from analogy, and from what is revealed concerning them, they certainly think by means of some instrument. They have an immortal and incorruptible organization, but this does not preclude the possession of an organ of thought. But, be this as it may, it has nothing to do with the question before us.

Again, you ask, "Does God, whose image man is, think by means of a brain?" I have already answered this question, but I repeat, that God is unorganized, uncreated and self-existant, and the laws of thought, which govern *mortal man*, are not applicable to the uncreated God. Man was created in the image of the *Elohem*—the *holy ones*—the angels; and all we know of them, as taught in the scriptures, confirms the account given by Moses.

Once more, you observe, that, "To say that man cannot *manifest* thought, and hold connection with the *outward world*, when the senses are locked up, is to say very little indeed."

Ah! a while since you told us that the "mind looked out upon the world of matter, through the *senses*—the windows" of the soul, but now you tell us the mind may "hold connection with the outward world, when" these "windows"—the "senses are *locked* up!" Do you mean the "five senses," or the moral and mental which are within the brain? "Most persons," you say, "believe God can commune with, and influence the human mind without addressing any of the senses." If you mean the five external "senses," I grant its truth; but if you mean the moral and intellectual, I deny it.

"Facts show that there can be perceptions without the *use* of eyes. With the eyes closely bandaged, in a dark room, persons have been known to read a book they never saw, and tell the time of day by a watch." True; but this does not favor your views of the subject. Cataleptic patients can do this; so can magnetic subjects. In the first case, it is a *diseased* state of the nervous system; in the latter, it is superinduced by magnetic influence. The brain is *magnetic electric* and *pla-*

particles. These make it *luminous*. When the magnetism of the atmosphere and the brain are in *equilibrio*, the *electro-magnetic light*, "the eyes being closed," passes through the *cranium*, excite the *optic nerve* to *vibration*, and thus the person can see through a *magnetic medium*. Destroy the *optic nerve*, however, and you destroy *all* sight. We now come to a most astounding development! Here it is. "It is now perfectly settled, that what are termed idiots, can be educated. A school is soon to be started in Massachusetts, a teacher has been selected, and is now abroad preparing himself for his task."

Well, reader, I thought I had investigated this subject; that I had learned *something* concerning the constitution of man; but, really, if Mr. Brewster be right, I am in worse than Egyptian darkness!

"*Idiots to be educated!*" *Then* they will be "*idiots*" *no longer!* Let the earth rejoice! Let the inhabitants of the earth shout! and the heavens echo back the sound, for the world is now to be rid of all "idiots!" I would smile, but the subject is too grave!

But, seriously, I regard the scheme as utopian and "idiotic." You might as well try to teach a monkey to be serious, a horse to adore, or an ass to pray, as to teach a *congenital* "idiot." I speak not of those who are *partial* "*idiots*," but of those who are completely so. Those who are *merely idiotic* may be educated, in a limited sense, to the extent of their *educability*. But *congenital* "idiots" are hopelessly doomed to ignorance. When a man is educated his *moral* and *mental* powers are brought out, trained and properly directed. Before you can educate a man, he must possess powers to be educated. The "idiot" has them not, and education cannot *create* them. Before you can educate an "idiot" you must *re-organize* him physically. No system of training can do this.

"A school is soon to be started." And a "teacher is now abroad preparing himself for his task!" A mighty "task" it is! He may go "abroad;" he may travel all over Europe, and the world; he may visit those ancient seats of learning in Greece, Rome, and Egypt; he may consult the eastern magi, astrologers, soothsayers and diviners; he may wade through the ponderous volumes of antiquity, and consult the wisdom of all ages, and even then he will not be qualified for his "task."

You ask, "what are we to understand by the term *man*, as used in your articles?" I thought I had been sufficiently explicit, but as you seem not to understand me, I will, *for the last time, in this discussion*, define man. Man is an organized being, composed of bones, muscles, tendons, nerves, veins, arteries, brain, &c., &c. He is made up of body, limbs, abdominal and thoracic viscera. All these are chemically organized. The organization being complete, it is put in motion, and kept in motion by *electro-magnetism*. Life is thus developed. Thus *electro-magnetism* is modified by a *vital* chemical action, and is then termed "*nervo-vital fluid*." The *brain* is its "battery," the *nerves* its "conductors." The brain is "a *congeries of organs*. They manifest *animal*, *moral*, and *mental functions*. "The life of the flesh," which is *electro-magnetic*, "is *in the blood*." Man breathes electricity, light, oxygen, &c. All these *elements*, physically, electrically, magnetically and chemically combined, *by a process known only to God*, he calls *man*. "The first man was *of* the earth—*earthy*"—*animal*. This is all I can say now on this point; it would take a volume to elaborate it.

But you ask, "What is that man that thinks?" I have answered this question several times; why put it again? Time and space are too precious for such repetitions.

In the remainder of your philosophical argument there is nothing new. You go over the same ground again and again. 'Tis true you vary the questions—you change your language, but they are the same still. Like one in a "tread-mill," you continue to step without advancing. When you present a new argument, I will notice it; but until you do, I must be excused from travelling over the same ground every month.

With these remarks, I leave the *philosophical* part of this subject, to attend to your *scriptural* allusions.

Paul teaches a lesson which you seem not to have learned, although you quote him. In 1 Cor. xii. he says: "For the *body*," (the *man*) "is not one member, but many. If the foot shall say, Because I am not the hand, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? And if the ear shall say, Because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; is it therefore not of the body? If the whole body were an eye, where were the hearing? If the whole were hearing, where were the smelling? But now hath God set the members every one of them in the body, as it hath pleased him. And if they were all one member, where were the body? But now are they *many members, yet but* ONE BODY." Thus "God hath tempered the body together." The *man* is *made up* of the *body* and its *members*, as I have before explained. There is no "*schism*" in it, but it is a perfect whole. It is not "one member," but many. All the parts of the body and man are perfectly adapted to each other. I thank you for referring to this illustration of the Apostle. It is just the thing.

"Man's identity," you say, "resides not in his ever-changing body, but in the mind." If this be so, how is it that personal "identity" is deranged? "Identity resides in the mind," and that "mind" is "immortal;" how then does it become destroyed? Is an "immortal mind" susceptible of any sort of derangement? But the "body" is no more "changing" than the mind. What in common *parlance* we call the mind, is as "ever-changing" as the "body." "Identity," then, according to your theory, cannot "reside in the mind." The truth is, there is a cerebral organ which gives rise to *personal* "*identity*," and supplies *the* I *of consciousness*. This can, and sometimes does become diseased and deranged, producing *double consciousness*, &c.

Your allusion to Paul's vision is too slight and vague, for me to notice it at present. When you make it the basis of a regular argument, I will give it a full reply.

Your assertions concerning the new birth, may pass for what they are worth. He must be extremely ignorant of the truth, who does not know that the new birth is a moral or spiritual change. The Lord Jesus taught this in the very quotation which you have used to sustain your theory. "That which is born of spirit, is spirit," or *spiritual*; not fleshly or carnal. Jesus did not say, "that which is born of the spirit," is the *human spirit*, mind, or soul: but *spiritual*. You might as well say that that which is "born of God," is God, as to affirm what you have, concerning being born of the spirit. You again repeat the misrepresentation of a "change in the body," when a "man is born again." This you have done so often, while I have as often refuted it, that I shall not pay further attention to it, other than to observe, that you, yourself, are "in *respectable* company" in misunderstanding, like Nicodemus, the *nature* and *process* of the new birth.

In your next paragraph you grant me that, which in the one just noticed you deny me—*that is the moral change in the whole man*, when he is "born again."

But passing over all minor points, I come now to the text upon which I proposed to rest this controversy. You say my "challenge" is accepted, but you are not willing to rest the "main question" on that text. Well, sir, let it be as you will. But to the text itself. Matt. x. 28: "And fear not them who *kill* the body, but are not able to *kill* the *soul*; but rather fear him who is able to *destroy* both *soul* and *body* in *hell*."

The parallel of this is found in Luke xii. 4, 5. "And I say to you, my friends, be not afraid of them that *kill* the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom you shall fear: Fear him, who after he hath *killed*, hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say to you, fear him."

1. "And fear not them who *kill* the body." The word "kill," in this sentence, in the original, signifies to "*murder*," to *put to death* with an *evil purpose*. "But are not able to *kill* the *soul*." In this sentence it signifies to "*destroy*," "*to bring to nought*."

"But rather fear him who is able to *destroy* both *soul* and *body* in hell." The word "*destroy*," in this sentence, signifies to "*dismiss from life*,—to bring to *nought*." Is it not evident, then, that the Lord exhorted his disciples not to fear those who merely had the power to commit "*murder*," or to "kill the body;" but had not power to "*dismiss from life*," or "*to bring to nought*," in the sense of precluding the possibility of *timing again*?

2. This is clear from the fact, that he commands them "rather to fear him," who not only had the power of life and death here, but who also had power to "*destroy*," "*dismiss from life*," or "*bring to nought*," "both soul and body in *gehenna*."

This view is confirmed by the passage from Luke, where the Lord says: "Fear not them that *kill*" or "*murder*" "the body, BUT AFTER THAT HAVE NO MORE THAT THEY CAN DO." They cannot preclude the resurrection to *eternal life*; "for our *life* is hid with Christ in God."

I could say much on this topic, but must wait another month, as this article is already too long.

In conclusion, I would suggest the propriety of narrowing down this discussion to a few prominent points, in order to save time and space.

With much respect, I am yours,

J. T. WALSH.

"PRIDE OF OPINION."

We clip the following excellent sentiments from the editorial department of the "True Wesleyan," of New York city, a paper we are as well pleased with as with any of our exchanges, though we differ from it on many points.

"Men are often too proud to confess their errors or to change when they are convinced that they are wrong. There is nothing more absurd than man's pride of opinion. For men to persist in an error, after they are convinced, lest, by giving it up, they should show themselves to have been mistaken, is madness. There is one thought that should humble this pride of opinion. It is this: all men have been and still are more or less mistaken in many important matters. To this we should add the fact that wherein we are in error, if we do not correct ourselves, others will be sure to correct us, as human society progresses towards its higher destiny. When we look at ourselves as individuals, we see that we have arrived at our present position by a succession of changes, and yet we are ashamed to change. The whole path of life, from the cradle to the grave, is strewed with cast off ideas and opinions. We have taken up an idea and brought it on with us for a time, and cherished it as truth, but after bringing it for some time, we threw it down and picked up another, or picked up two in place of it, for most men increase their ideas. These were retained for a time and then cast off for others, and in this way we have arrived at our present positions, changing at every step, and yet all the time ashamed to change, lest the world should know that we had been mistaken. The same is true of society in general, for the changes of individuals effect changes in society, and all the changes of society are but the changes of individuals that compose society. The present state of the arts and sciences has been arrived at by a succession of changes. The principles of the several sciences which have been settled by one generation, have been rejected and exploded by the next, and yet men are proud of their opinions. All improvement involves change, and yet men are ashamed to change. If men will change from bad to good, and from good to better, the more rapid their changes, the better will it be for themselves and the world."

REPLY TO C. B. HOTCHKISS.

"QUERIES ON BAPTISM."

"QUES. 1." It is admitted by learned pedobaptists that the Greek word imports immersion. See G. Campbell's dissertation on the word. He admits that it ought to have been so translated. John could not well *immerse* by *sprinkling*. Surely he need not have gone to Enon "*because there was much water there*," if he only wanted to wet "a bunch of hysop." The sprinkling "described by Paul, Heb. 9: 19, is a sprinkling of *blood*, typical of the atoning blood of our blessed Lord. Our immersion in water is an appropriate emblem of our *burial* with Christ and and rising with him to newness of life. See Col 2: 12. "*Buried* with him in baptism," &c.

"QUES. 2. John not only preached repentance, but the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Mark prefaces his record of John's ministry with the words. The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ." Mark 1: 1 Paul confirms the same, Acts 19: 4. "John verily baptised with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him which should come after him, *that is on Christ Jesus*. "Behold (said John) the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world!" I wish that all modern preachers preached the Gospel as

we as John. Surely the baptism of Christ and his apostles, Acts 1: 22, was connected with the preaching of "the Gospel of the kingdom."

QUES. 3." I will not only do to read it (baptized) "were immersed," but the fulfilment of the prediction, Acts 2: 2 to 4, requires it. When they were "all filled with or in the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost they were immersed in the holy element, for "it *filled all the house where they were sitting*." "In a *literal* fire" they were neither immersed or sprinkled. The prophet is not to be so understood.

"QUES. 4." Peter's hearers in the house of Cornelius were indeed baptised with or in the Holy Ghost. I see no objection to our friend's supposition that this *was* the baptism of *fire* and the Holy Ghost". But the record of this whole case is fatal to his sentiments; giving in fact a clear affirmative to his question, "Is there any other baptism left for the christian dispensation but the baptism of the fire and of the Holy Ghost?" *After* they were baptised with the Holy Ghost, Peter said "can any man forbid WATER that these should not be baptized, *which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?* And he commanded them to be baptised in "the name of the Lord." Acts 10: 44-48. To suppose then that the baptism of the Holy Spirit supercedes the ordinance of immersion *in water* under the christian dispensation is to "be wise above what is written" by the Spirit of Truth.

"QUES. 5." Baptism is not "the antitype" of Moses sprinkling with blood. The blood of Jesus is the antitype of this. John never "*sprinkled* all the people." He did not *sanctify* them. He baptized (i. e. immersed) them. As the sound like a rushing wind, and the cloven tongues fell on the disciples on the day of Pentecost when they were baptised with or in the Holy Ghost, it is proper to say of Peter's hearers, Acts 10, that when the Holy Ghost "fell on them," they were baptised in the same.

"QUES. 6." I agree with our friend on this question and think that John 3: 5, may be understood in a sense different from literal water."

"QUES. 7." To suppose that the new birth insisted upon by our beloved Savior, refers to the time of our entering the kingdom at his second appearing, is to suppose that we are not the children of God until that period. We are not his children until we are begotten and born of him. John writes of those who received Christ, when on earth, as persons who were *then* born of God. John 1: 13. This phrase is not used in reference to our entering into the joy of our Lord at his glorious appearing.

"QUES. 8." With all due respect for the judgment of my friend, I really think the "probability" of his being "mistaken," is quite as "strong," as that he is correct; he so, who were so inspired by the Holy Spirit to teach those things, and only those things which Christ commanded them. (Matt. 28: 20. "*He that knoweth God heareth us.*") 1 John 4: 6. In respect to my conclusion, "as touching the Gentiles which believe, we (said James) have written and concluded that they observe no such things" &c. Acts 21: 25. In respect to the Gentiles it was no command for them to observe circumcision or at any particular time. The only case we have of any apostolic practice of it, is Paul's circumcising Timothy whose mother was a Jewess. He "counted circumcision nothing, and uncircumcision nothing," and his circumcision is nothing." He taught those who depended on it, that Christ would profit them nothing.

"QUES. 9." Whether there is, or is not "salvation" without immersion," it was "benevolent in Paul to thank God that HE had baptised but two or three" *of the Corinthians*, so long as they were glorying in men, and saying "I am of Paul and I of Apollos." Paul did not thank God that he had baptised no more *of that particular church*, because baptism was not a duty, or because it is unimportant, but "lest any should say that (he) had baptised in his own name." 1 Cor. 1: 15. He preferred the honor of his divine Master to his own. By the declaration "for Christ sent me not to baptise, but to preach the gospel:" we must understand the annunciation of the glad tidings of salvation to a dying world, was the *principal* and *great* object of his mission. If he had no commission from Christ to baptize he could not have baptised at all; for that only which he "received from the Lord Jesus," he taught. See 1 Cor. 11: 23, Matt. 28: 19, 20.

"QUES. 10." The true answer to this question is found in the practice of the apostles. This practice proves that Matt. 28: 19 means immersion *in water*, which (as is evident from Acts 10: 44—48,) was not superceded by the baptism of the Holy Ghost. See also Acts 8: 36, 38. Acts 2: 38. This could not be the baptism of the Holy Ghost for this was promised them as a *subsequent* favor. Acts 8: 15 to 17 proves the same. The Samaritans were not baptised with the Holy Ghost by the laying on of the apostle's hands until some time after they were immersed in water by Philip.

Paul's act in Acts 19: 6 is not explanatory of the baptism mentioned in the 5th verse, but a *subsequent* act. Strictly speaking, neither the baptism of water nor the baptism of the Holy Ghost (in the scriptural sense of that phrase,) can save us. *The bestowment of miraculous gifts*, and not *the conversion of the soul to God*, is the true import of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. The apostles were converted long before the day of Pentecost When they were then baptised with the Holy Ghost, they were furnished with miraculous gifts "and spake with other tongues." Acts 10: 44, 46, confirms this. It was *water* baptism which *emblematically* washed away Paul's sins. Acts 22: 16.

HENRY GREW.

As the foregoing article will probably close, for the present, the discussion on the subject of baptism, we take the liberty to dissent entirely from Br. Grew's position that the baptism "with the Holy Spirit" was being "immersed in the holy element;" for, if the house was "filled" with it, it was filled by the spirit being "*poured out*, or *shed forth*" upon them, and not by their being "*immersed in*" it. We wish not to protract the discussion, and therefore say no more at present.—*Ed. Ex.*

"SAINTS REIGN IN THE AIR."

In the Examiner of September, we gave a brief communication from Dr. Smith, of Hallowell, Me., on the above subject, which the reader is requested to look at again, page 142. We appended a single remark " by way of dissent in the following language:

"We do not see how the devil and his hosts, by going 'up on the *breadth of the* EARTH,' are to 'compass the *camp* of the saints about, and the beloved city,' which are '*in the* AIR;' nor how the saints are to 'REIGN with Christ a thousand years in the air' with nothing to reign over."

To this Br. Smith has replied at some length. We intended to insert his reply in the last Examiner, but it was crowded out; and, as we are hard pushed for room still, he will excuse us for giving only that part of his article which is a direct reply to our objections. Br. Smith, after enlarging on his previous article, and speaking of the wicked dead being raised out of *this* earth, (in opposition to the *new* earth, as Mr. Miller's theory maintains,) at the close of the Millennium, says:

The New Jerusalem is in the air, and in plain sight. This must be, else every eye could not see him, (Jesus) and they also which have pierced him, and all kindreds of the earth could not wail because of him. Also they are to see those that have come from the east, west, north, and south, in the kingdom with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and they themselves thrust out. Hence you see the saints must be in the air with Christ, and the whole host of the wicked must be raised from the dead in order to see their great loss, and know their final doom. Satan will now deceive them—then they compass the camp of the saints about. See Webster's Dictionary, where the sixth definition of the verb "*compass*" is, "to purpose—to intend—to imagine—to plot—to contrive," as we may say, to go about to perform in mind only. Thus you see, that to compass, is to plot, plan, contrive, imagine, &c. Thus they will do *while the saints are in the air*.

Paul says we are compassed about with such a cloud of witnesses. Hence, to compass about, denotes an array of evidence. Webster says, when this is the meaning, "it is in mind only." Thus it will be with this miserable company for the word says: "Fire came down from God out of heaven and devoured them." The heavens and the earth which are now, are reserved for this very purpose. Peter tells us "the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also, and the works therein shall be burnt up." This, I believe, as an honest man, will be the literal "lake of fire, and brimstone," and will be the hell of the *Bible* into which "the wicked will be turned with all the nations that forget God." "The ungodly and the sinner will be *rewarded* in the earth;" Ps. 11: 31. And in this pool of liquid fire the devil and all wicked men and women will be "burnt up, root and branch," so that there will be no *wicked man, woman or devil* in the universe of God. See Psa. 37: 9, 10, 20, 34, 38; also, 101: 35: Prov. 2: 22, and 11: 31; Isaiah 1: 28, and a host of others.

But "we according to his promise look for a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." After the above scene of the resurrection of the saints, the melting of the earth, the destruction of the devil and the wicked passed upon John's mind, in vision, he says he saw the New Jerusalem while it was *coming* down, and after it was down, and the glory connected with the seed of Abraham, and David's royal sons entering the Kingdom, under the whole heavens in which they will reign "for ever and ever," and not merely for a thousand years, as some suppose; that time will be then, in the *past*; occupying the period while they reigned *with* Christ in the air.

Hence you see, the heavens will retain Jesus till the restitution of all things spoken of by the mouth of all the holy prophets since the ago began:—till all things are subdued under him—his enemies destroyed and made his footstool, and he takes the kingdom under the whole heaven.

"Who will they reign over?" ANS.—the Bible does not say they will reign *over* any one; but, "they *lived* and reigned *with* Christ a thousand years."

I expect that when "the Lord shall take to himself his great power and shall reign," they will reign *with* him. After the saints were raised and were heard praising God in heaven, Rev. xix. 1, &c. they gave glory to God "for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth," verse 14th. We might infer that they reigned with him who was styled "the King of kings and Lord of lords." In the Psalms it is written that "the upright shall have dominion over them in the morning;" again, "he shall subdue the people under us and the nations under our feet." Paul says, "know ye not that the saints shall judge the world," (not decide the cases;) John says, "he that overcometh and keepeth my word unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations, and he shall rule them with a rod of iron." From the above we believe that this reigning with Christ must be after his saints meet him in the air, and before he decends in the New Jerusalem with all his saints, to take possession of the redeemed earth which he purchased by his death and sufferings: see Eph. 1: 14.

May our Heavenly Father by his word, and the influences of the Holy Spirit, lead us all into the truth as it is in Jesus.

To "reign *with* Christ" is to reign *over* something. To talk of reigning with nothing in subjection is beyond our conception. The Queen of England and her Lords *reigning* without a subject would *seem* a contradiction. But Br. Smith has a right to his views; others must judge of their correctness.—*Ed. Ex.*

A CONTEMPLATED GREAT WORK ON THE MILLENNIUM.

THE AGE TO COME.—It is proposed to publish, if sufficient encouragement is offered, a work of 600 pages, entitled THE AGE TO COME.

It will present a full and entire History of all Theories touching the great question of the predicted Millennium, both Ancient and Modern. It will seek to show what is TRUE, and what is FALSE, in these Theories. This will constitute Part First of the Work. These are the leading Theories:

1. MILLENNARIAN THEORY.—Ancient Views.
2. LIGHTFOOT'S THEORY.—Revised by Bush.
3. THE FIFTH-MONARCHY THEORY.—An English Heresy.
4. MILLERISM.—Hopes, Fears, Facts.
5. SECTARISM.—Features, Causes, &c.

6. MILLENNIUM.—The Popular View.

FIRST SECTION of the Work will contain an Examination of the lectures of *The Age to Come*, as they appear connected in the Scriptures.

The book will be of the size and general style of Dowling's History of Romanism. It is intended to be a Work for the Age—a work for the Clergyman, the Theological Student, and the Common Christian.—PRICE TWO DOLLARS.

BY A CLERGYMAN,
Who has devoted much time to the subject.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, DEC., 1848.

ARE THE WICKED IMMORTAL?

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

BIBLE EXAMINER.—We have never supposed that we could give that variety in a *monthly* issue which could not well be given in a weekly paper. Our object has been *mainly* that of presenting the immortality question, and the topics naturally growing out of it, which, if the support would warrant it, and our friends desire it, gradually advance to a semi-monthly or weekly. But while we publish only monthly and at the low price that we charge for the Examiner, we know our readers will be likely to become subscribers to some weekly paper which will allow a little variety on the *common* religious topics. We are willing to furnish them such matter did our limits admit it. If our friends wish us to publish weekly, let them devote one half, or more, of the Examiner to *general* religious topics, and passing events, and we will do so when fifteen hundred shall please themselves to send us two dollars each per year. A religious paper issued weekly ought to employ at the time of, at least, one Editor so closely that he could scarcely be expected to be engaged in any secular business, and he must therefore look to the subscribers to sustain him in a pecuniary view. We are of opinion, however, that our present course is under the best; that is, to let our readers talk to each other by weekly papers they have been in the habit of examining for general matters, and let us [illegible] investigations to which, it seems to us, we have been specially called.

TO OUR READERS.—According to previous notice, we send this to all subscribers who do not send pre-paid "THANKS" of "*payment always in advance.*" We shall be very sorry to part with any of our friends or patrons for trifles. A few have [illegible] thing who have had the Examiner sent [illegible] on the commencement of the *New Series*. A [illegible] paid us nothing who have taken the Examiner [illegible] of the present volume. [illegible] never in both cases, is sent [illegible] to forgive [illegible] all, and take our [illegible] of them with none other than the kindest wishes for their present and eternal welfare. Those who have paid for the Examiner up to the present time, we hope have felt themselves benefited sufficiently to determine to continue. From all such, and as many more as are minded to become our patrons, we shall be glad to hear before our January issue. Unless we do hear from them, or find them *credited* beyond this number, we shall take it as an expression of their wish to *discontinue* the Examiner. It will be painful to blot out any name from our books; but, we wish not to send the Examiner to any who do not value it worth *fifty cents* per year, and we have no means of knowing that they do thus value it unless they send us that amount. We must treat all alike in this matter. Let none, then, think we slight them if we do not send them another number. The reason will be, we do not find them credited for 1849. If, however, any should not receive it who know they have sent us payment in advance, beyond the present number, if they will inform us when they sent, and how much, we shall take pleasure in sending the paper, even if we find that the money never reached us. In any *mistake*, of this kind, the information may be sent at *our expense*. We earnestly solicit all to continue their subscriptions, and send, at least, one *new* subscriber each. We will do the very best we can to make our paper interesting and instructive.

THE SERMON on "Profit and Loss," in this number of the Examiner, we hope, will not merely be read, but *studied*. We do not agree with every expression it contains, but we have received much "profit" from the study of it. We have read it some half dozen times since we received it, and shall not fail to read it again; and we must say, our interest in it increases the more we examine it. May the Lord make it a blessing to all who read it.

FUTURE PUNISHMENT.—BY H. H. DOBNEY.—In the list of works sent us by Dr. Lees, Leeds, England, is that of the "*Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment*, by H. H. Dobney." This work we had heard of before we received Dr. Lees' communication, and had sent to England for it. It was the only one in his list we had any knowledge of prior to his favor.

The work of Dobney we have received, since the last Examiner was issued, and find it exceedingly interesting and instructive. It is a 12mo. of 278 pages, in "*two parts*." The first part is divided into four chapters, in which the author takes up the Reasons for Discussing the Subject—the Relation God sustains to Man—the True Idea of Sin—the Moral System—Excellency of Law—Propriety of Punishment—Punishment Essential—Punishment not Corrective, but Penal, &c. The second is about [illegible] seventy pages.

In the second part he takes up the question of the nature and character of the punishment; which is handled in a very kind and conciliatory spirit, but still in a manner that is calculated, all but irresistibly, to carry the mind to the conclusion that the popular notion is an error, and that the wicked will be "*miserably destroyed*;" and "be as though they had not been." This part of the subject is treated of in *eight* chapters of over 200 pages. We sincerely wish the whole book could be *reprinted*, and circulated over the United States. Had we the funds we would do it ourselves; but we have them not, and so fear we shall have to content ourself by giving portions of it in the Examiner. Reprinted it should sell for about seventy-five cents. The cost of the copy we have caused to be imported from London has been *one dollar and seventy cents*.

Dobney, we believe, is a Baptist minister, though no statement of his ecclesiastical relation is given in the book. Those who wish to see large extracts from the work will be gratified if they subscribe for the Examiner for 1849.

We will cause the work to be reprinted if one thousand copies are ordered within six months, and the money pledged to be forwarded when the work is ready for delivery; and to all who buy to sell again, 33 per cent discount will be made.

P. S.—Since writing the above, we have loaned the book to a friend, who, having read it, pledges to take *fifty dollars* in the stock necessary to republish it. The probable amount necessary to publish the first thousand copies will be $500. Any amount pledged shall be refunded in the books *at cost*.

PROSPECTUS.

CHRISTIAN PSALMODY;

Or, Hymns, Psalms, and Songs, suitable to the worship of God and the proclamation of his truth.

BY J. T. WALSH.

We propose publishing a cheap edition of Hymns, &c., free from the errors which obtain so extensively in every Hymn Book *extant*. The work will be suited to the *Christian worship*, and adapted to the faith of a people expecting the Messiah, and the establishment of his kingdom. In a word, it will *melodiously* set forth the views advocated in the *Bible Examiner and other periodicals devoted to the same objects*. The work will be published so soon as the author can do it with safety to himself. Any person feeling a disposition to aid in the enterprise, can do so by forwarding their contributions to BR. STORRS. J. T. W.

It will be seen by the foregoing that Br. Walsh intends to furnish a "Hymn Book" such as many of us have felt is much needed. We rejoice that he has made up his mind to undertake it, and hope he may be abundantly sustained in that labor. If any of our friends have *good* hymns, suitable to such a work, will they favour the object by sending them to our office? And do not forget to let us know at once your wants in regard to such a hymn book, and what you will do to aid in its issue.

BIBLE ADVOCATE.—The apology our brother of the Advocate has given us for the "tone of" his "reply" to our article on Zech. 14th is perfectly satisfactory. On our part we are glad to correct the "sad mistake" we made, in saying the present editor of that paper "had not copied an article from the Examiner." Our brother says:

"If you will turn to volume IV, number 8, page 62, you will find two articles selected from the Examiner, and duly credited. Also, same volume, number 15, first page, you will find a very lengthy article, duly credited: and we were thankful for the opportunity of making each and all these selections."

We are truly glad, brother, to receive this information; and by our "mistake" we did *you* injustice, for which we are sorry: we *thought* these articles were selected by Dr. Crary, in the absence of the editor: we are glad to find it otherwise, and trust you will forgive us the error.

We certainly "intended no wrong" in any of our remarks; but we did think there *seemed* to be an air of *positiveness* in the articles of our "*exchange*" which needed some reproof; we regret if we were not as "*courteous*" as the gospel requires in giving it, and will try to do better in future.

EXAMINER FOR 1848.—The volume is now completed. Any wishing to avail themselves of all the numbers, can have them at the subscription price, if they send their order and money soon. We are satisfied that new subscribers will regret it if they do not order the paper from January, 1848. Let all persons ordering the Examiner *write the names of persons and places plain*; for we have no means of "*guessing*" them out. For *terms* and *address* see first page.

LETTER FROM THOMAS SMITH.

BR. STORRS.—I am very much interested in the "Bible Examiner," especially in that part which so fearlessly and ably discusses the "Immortal Soul" question. It appears that men are beginning to think for themselves on the trans-Atlantic shores, as well as on our continent; and the result seems to be an abandonment of those long established notions that men have "immortal souls" naturally. I was struck recently with a little occurrence in the State of Massachusetts, while on board a packet. An intelligent *Sea Captain*, a fellow passenger, and a professor of religion, were on board, to whom I proposed the following question: "What, sir, do *you* suppose will be the *nature* of the punishment of the wicked in the future world?" Said he, "Why, I suppose it will be a *horror of conscience*, or something of that kind." I then quoted numerous Scriptures by which to show him that the Bible taught they would be cast into a lake of fire burning with brimstone, [illegible]

of God,—that we would "burn them—*burn them* up. Not knowing my faith, he very readily concluded. "Why, sir, if that be the nature of your punishment they will be annihilated, will they not?" I then gave him some Bible testimony, and the result was that he acknowledged that their *destruction* was the most Scriptural and reasonable. To this conclusion, it appears to me, men must come, in order to admit a harmony in the attributes of the *Father of mercies*. Numbers of strong minded men of my acquaintance, are merging, and have merged into universalism, because of the so-called orthodox creed of *eternal life in misery*; and they will increase more and more unless the true light upon this important subject is brought to bear upon their minds, and then I trust, if they are candid, they will readily exchange their error for the truth.

I cannot, for myself, see either reason or Scripture in your ideas of probation after the coming of Jesus. In fact, if such a thing should be,—and men are of the same nature as they are now, and the claims of Jehovah the same—I cannot see that but very few, if any, would be benefitted by it; and should the Lord in any way afford them a superior opportunity to what men now have, He would in that case show *himself* a respecter of persons—which idea the Scriptures contradict.

Still praying to be led into all truth, I am your brother in tribulation, hoping for eternal life at the appearance and kingdom of Jesus Christ the Son of God.

JOHN ESTY. September, 1848.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

We are not offended that Br. Smith cannot "see either reason or scripture in our ideas of Probation after the coming of Jesus." Our old prejudices do not give way at once. Will Br. Smith admit, that we, in this age, or last 50 years, have had "any means afforded" us "superior to what men" had in the 12th, 13th and 14th centuries, when it was death to read the Scriptures in the language of the common people? If he does admit this—Is God therefore a respecter of persons? The "respect of persons" the Scriptures speak of, as not in God, is always spoken of his character in relation to *the account* he will call men to for the improvement or non-improvement of means granted them, whether Jews Christians, or Gentiles. That some have had in all ages, and in different ages, more means and advantages to know God and bear fruit, is undeniable. The one two, and five talents clearly teach this doctrine. Did not Abraham have a "superior opportunity to what" many had, both before him and in the age in which he lived? Did not the posterity of Jacob have superior advantages for centuries? Paul says they had "much every way—chiefly because unto them was committed the oracles of God." Rom. 3: 2. Do not we, under the gospel, "enjoy superior advantages" to what the Jews did in their best days? And may not the NEAT age confer still greater advantages without an impeachment of God's dealings with men? Is our "eye evil because" God is "good"? May He not do what He will with his own? May He not give to some "superior advantages" to that of others, and yet not be a "respecter of persons" in the Scripture sense? Facts show that he has thus distinguished men in all ages. But in *judgment* he is no respecter of persons: greater privileges lay us under superior obligations; and if we fail, the greater will be our condemnation. We can "see neither reason nor scripture in" the *objections* made to the idea of probation, to some, after the advent; but we do not condemn others, who think differently, so long as they manifest an honest desire to know what truth is.

BR. ELON EVERTS, Vergennes, Vt., writes:

BR. STORRS:—I find once and awhile one who dares read the Examiner, and after trying its "heresy" by the balances of the sanctuary of truth, they find (although widely different from the popular theology of the age,) that it agrees so well with the sealed weights, that they want more of it. Many are inclined to cast their old weights (heathen traditions, endorsed by the creed making sectarian, honoured and endorsed however much,) "to the moles and bats." I send enclosed three dollars to be appropriated for the Examiner.

I am glad to see that you propose to speak occasionally on the reign of David's rightful heir and his kingdom. Will it not be profitable to say something on the unfulfilled promises, made by God to a people that suffered over 400 years in Egyptian bondage, and brought out with a high hand, and placed in a goodly land, and had wholesome laws, but they broke them, and then were carried away captive into all nations, their city destroyed, and their land made desolate and trod down by the Gentiles? All this has taken place literally, to a literal Israel, and upon a literal land and city. And God that has done this just precisely and literally, according to his threatening, previously made, for their iniquity; also has, by many of his prophets, declared, as by Ezk. 39: 26–28, "Now will I bring *again* the captivity of *Jacob*, and have mercy on the *whole house* of *Israel*, and will be jealous of my holy name; AFTER that they have borne their shame, and all their trespasses whereby they have trespassed against me, when they dwelt safely in their land, and none made them afraid. When I have brought them again from the people, and gathered them out of their enemies' land, and am sanctified in them in the sight of many nations: Then shall they know that I am the Lord their God, which caused them to be led into captivity among the heathen: but I have gathered them unto their own land, and have left none of them any more there." This all to be about the time of the great slaughter of the wicked, and supper for the fowls and beasts, as shown in said chapter; being parallel with Mal. 4, and Rev. 19. Not parallel with the slaughter of Rev. 20th, and Ezk. 38th. Now this gathering of Israel can't be fulfilled upon a spiritual Israel.

BR. N. SMITH, Hallowell, Me., writes:—

BR. STORRS,—We have some reformation in this place: several have been converted and others reclaimed, so as about to double our numbers. We are all of one mind: we say the same thing: and consider your paper good, and if it were not for your Millennium on the earth—probation after Christ comes, and the return of the Jews, it would be the best paper printed. If you have the truth on these points, may the good Lord enable you to make it so plain that we may see it by your bringing the plain testimony, and not merely inference. But if we have the truth, may you speak and embrace it in the love of it.

Communicated for the Bible Examiner.

PROFIT AND LOSS—A LAY SERMON.

BY FREDERIC R. LEES,

Doctor of Philosophy of the University of Giessen, F.S.A., Edin., Editor of 'The Truth Seeker,' etc.

Preached at Leeds, England, A. D. 1845.

'Godlikeness profiteth for all things.'—Paul.

'What is a man profited, if he gain the whole world, and lose his soul?'—The Christ.

'For a recompense—be ye enlarged.' Paul.

The principle of Profit and Loss, as embodied in the startling question of the Great Teacher, contains at once the seed, the sum, and the substance of that divine gospel, which it was the mission of the Messiah to declare and develope.

Tho' a problem in heavenly arithmetic lying at the basis of all Life, He was the first to give it a full and living solution; to exemplify the *ideal* principles of his sacred Ethics in real and vital being. In *words*, indeed, he has broadly and beautifully shadowed out the interior principles of his Father's government, but in *works* he has declared them with a depth and distinctness which none can mistake. From the first and fearless utterances of the Spirit, which ensured the hate and persecution of the Priesthood, to the hour of his crucifixion on Calvary, when the false triumph of his foes opened wide to him the Gates of Glory, his life was one long and illustrious commentary on the principle expressed by his Apostle—'Whatsoever a man sows, even this shall he reap; therefore the sower to his *flesh*, shall of the flesh reap *corruption*, while the sower to the *spirit* shall of the spirit reap *life* everlasting.*

THE GRAND LIFE-PROBLEM.†

MAN, spiritually, was appointed in the divine image—in other words, he was both designed and adapted to become an ORGAN OF LIFE AND OF GOD. His nature is two-fold—*animal* and *spiritual*, of which, in the order of development, individually and historically, the animal is first: the spiritual second. 'The first Adam,' is therefore, 'of the earth earthy;' it eats dust until spiritualized and purified—it tends to the nothingness of self; therefore he who regards the selfhood of the flesh as his vital centre, must reap corruption. But 'the second Adam,' the fleshly organ of life purified and 'made *perfect*' thro' trials, temptations, and sufferings—in short, the incarnate Word or Wisdom, EMMANUEL or 'God with *us*'—is the 'Lord from Heaven'—the divine humanity—MAN, 'the temple of God.'

Thus man, tho' *liable*, by the mal-administration of his faculties, to sink into corruption and nihility, is also *capable* of rising into the similitude of the Messiah—'GOD manifest in the *flesh*'—and of inheriting the eternal glories. This all to be no longer an ideal theory—a vain speculation—for 'the Lord of us, Jesus Christ, gave himself for our sins, *that he might deliver us from the tendency of a malignant spirit*, according to the will of God.'‡ 'I do say, therefore, walk in *spirit*, and you shall not perfect a desire of the *flesh*. The flesh certainly wars against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh.'§ 'But the fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, forbearance, usefulness, goodness, truth, gentleness, temperance; against such there is no law (of death). They, in short, who belong to the Christ, have crucified—and still crucify the flesh, with the propensities and selfish dispositions. If we are *alive* in spirit, we may also perform the rites-and-ceremonies in spirit.' These

* Here, and elsewhere, we shall translate the Greek or Greekish technicalities. Much has veiled the revelation of the Gospel by mystical words which have their own proper roots.

† The Italic Lines were inserted by us. ED. EX.

‡ Gal. i. 4.

§ Gal. v. 17.

¶ Gal. v. 22. &c. *Stoicheuein*, true are ceremonies—is Gal. vi. 16.

...sion upon the Law of Life and Death—or in other words, upon the law which regulates *Progression* and *Retrogression*, known in old-fashioned phrase as Reward and Punishment. We have chosen, however, to discuss it in the most important of all Institutions, under a new denomination.

Firstly, because the old terminology is confused and undefined. 'Reward' is not, either in actual usage, or according to its etymology, the logical antithesis of punishment, since it denotes either the return of good or the return of evil. 'Punishment' is also ambiguous and indefinite. It signifies, according to the savageness or civilization of the people who employ it, any suffering or privation from the most trifling penalty to the most terrible visitation of vindictive torment—anything from the irrevocable punishment of death, down to the slightest chastisement or smallest privation inflicted with the merciful intent of warning or reclamation. In itself it sometimes denotes mere privation or loss—privation of means, loss of liberty, faculty, or Life—while it may connote in the mind of the magistrate or parent, the purest or most merciful emotions. At other times it may denote torment the most intense, while it connotes, in the mind of the inflicter, feelings of the fiercest rage and vengeance.*

Secondly, therefore, we avoid the ancient terminology, because we wish to discriminate the pure and essential elements of this institute of Reward and Retribution, from its mere accidents and accompaniments.

Thirdly, to exclude from the consideration of *Divine* punishments, which are the results of wisdom and love, the remotest idea of vindictive feeling or of vain torment—ideas, alas! but too commonly associated with the subject, and which as we *can* truly worship only what we love, tend to darken the Divine Aspect, and to destroy our deepest feelings of reverence towards God. Indeed we think with Lord Bacon, that it is better to have no opinion of God at all, than one which is dishonouring to Him and degrading to us. And all misconceptions of Deity are degrading. As is the God we have framed to ourself, so will be our Life and Soul: an image of a gloomy and partial deity fills the spirit with kindred gloom and littleness, while, conversely, a morose and jealous temper will reflect an image of God corresponding to itself.

> Thus the moon-struck Sophist stood,
> Watching the whale from his own wool upthrown
> To heaven and darken Earth, and in such mood
> *The Form he saw and worship'd was his own.*
> He dreamt not of the world's vast elsewhere,
> And 'twere an innocent dream, but that a faith,
> *Nurst by fear's dew of poison*, grows thereon.'

Indeed, there is far too much cause for the poet's complaint. The lovely truths of Christianity are hidden by the clouds of darkness which, continually ascend from the diabolical regions of man-made Theology, and the holy and happy heaven of the Great *Good* is transformed into Tartarus—

> 'Hate is throned on high, with Fear her mother,
> Above the host of heaven.'

Verily, those perverters of Christianity are guilty of half the Infidelity of the world.

CONDITION OF THE MORAL AND SPIRITUAL CHARACTER OF AN AGE.

The Consummation of any age is an unerring criterion of its moral and spiritual character. For this reason is the Christ divine; he *must* have come from the bosom of the Father, else he could not have revealed Him. His sublime life-declaration of the eternal and the invisible—'God is Love!' the most comprehensive generalization that philosophy has ever reached, and expressing at once the end and aim of the immeasurable universe, far transcends in its power of spiritual demonstration, the literal logic of the schools, and in itself vindicates the claim of Christianity to be considered the highest and most perfect form of ethical philosophy—the Philosophy of Benevolence. It penetrates at once the secret of the universe—it *reveals the law of life and felicity*. God is love; but all nature, *our* nature is constructed by Him. It is, therefore, a mechanism of Love, designed to move and be moved by that principle. He, then, as St. John says, who abides in love, abides in God. He is in *harmony* with himself, with God, and with the world. He is happy.

> Hence 'vainly seek
> The selfish for that happiness denied
> To aught but virtue! Blind and hardened, they
> Who hope for peace amid the storms of care,
> Who covet power they know not how to use,
> And sigh for pleasure they refuse to give,
> Madly they frustrate still their own designs;
> And, where they hope that quiet to enjoy
> Which virtue pictures, bitterness of soul,
> Piercing regrets, and vain repentances,
> Disease, disgust, and lassitude, pervade
> Their valueless and miserable lives.'

This is the grand lesson of life. Let us hope it is becoming better understood, and that the Poet is a true Prophet.

> 'Hoary-headed selfishness has felt
> Its death-blow, and is tottering to the grave;
> A brighter morn awaits the human day,
> When every transfer of earth's natural gifts
> Shall be a commerce of good words and works;
> When poverty and wealth, the talent of fame,
> The fear of infamy, disease and woe,
> War with its million horrors, and fierce hell,
> Shall live but in the memory of time;
> Who, like a penitent Hermite, shall start,
> Look back, and shudder at his younger years.'

We have only to expand John's definition a little, in order to arrive at the most important of all our religious sentiments—the distinct, steady, and constantly operative conception of what is implied in the words, 'Almighty and Omnipresent God.' Of a truth, God is Love, and Love is God. This idea of Deity alike excludes from our conceptions, vindictive and purposeless visitations of pain. Pain itself, in this view, assumes a divine appearance—becomes an aspect and apparition of love. Even what has been figuratively called 'the frown of God,' is to be traced to the same source: it is an eclipse of the Divine Countenance arising from some passing cloud of Sense, and the pain and darkness which we feel is designed to *warn* us of some transgression of the divine laws by which the radiance of the spiritual sun would become more completely intercepted. Pain is intended to bring *repentance*—i. e. to notify us that we have strayed out of the straight path, that we may *turn back*. This is the doctrine of Paul. 'O man!' says he, 'Dost thou consider the riches of His goodness and forbearance, and long-suffering, foolishness?—ignorant, as thou art, that the *goodness* of God leads thee to repentance? In *proportion*, however to thy *hardness* and *impenitent* heart, thou dost treasure up to thyself wrath in the day of wrath, and the uncovering of the just retribution of God, who will render to each *according to his doings*.'† Pain, here, is referred to the 'goodness of God'—and happy may he be deemed, who possesses unimpaired the *moral sensitiveness* which informs him of the impending evil! On the contrary, the *loss of feeling*, which indicates the real punishment of sin, the *seared* conscience, the *hard* heart—these procure the death of the spirit, the ruin and destruction of the temple itself! These, then, are the only things the heroic Christian need fear; not trials, afflictions or persecutions.

> 'Let clouds be ne'er so much dreaded,
> And storms with horrors overspread,
> Let them break upon our heads.'‡

*Romans i. 5, &c.

Without the ideas of Wisdom and Goodness—and their correlative punishment apart from passion—there can be no real Religion, for there can be no respect and no love. Priestianity there may be, but not Christianity; a contrivance of priests for priestly purposes, but not an inspiration from heaven. God dwelleth not with lies. When the people give up their souls to the keeping of others, to do whatsoever the priests prescribe to them, they may have Superstition enough, but no true Piety; they depart from the ever-present God to lean upon Man; they doubt the goodness of Deity, and therefore hire a man to entreat Him!

As the conception of an Omnipresent and Almighty Being of Love and Wisdom, is the essence of Religion, and the sole source of *all* the good impressions it is capable of producing, it follows, that every idea instilled into us, implying *imperfection* in Deity, is a perversion of religion,—a debasement of the purifying ideal we aim at—which, so far as it goes, transforms our spiritual food into poison, the good into evil. It is evident, then, that just in proportion as men set up for the object of their imitation or worship a being of *limited* wisdom and goodness, do they manufacture for themselves a motive for the practice of what is contrary to *perfect* wisdom and goodness. Let us beware, therefore, in discussing divine punishments, that we do not permit ourselves to think ill of God by associating the notion of punishment with those vindictive feelings which so often tarnish the judicial proceedings of earthly courts. There is still, to some extent, a language current on this question which we hold in the utmost abhorrence. It is the relics of a barbarous age, when the human and the Divine natures were equally misunderstood.

Men who themselves, in earthly matters, would never think of pain, save as an undesirable means to a desirable end, and therefore to be inflicted to the smallest possible extent required for reformation, will yet, from the mere force of phrase, ascribe to the Deity the infliction of torment in the most cruel excess; and even represent the un-proud God as administering pain, not like a wise and virtuous being under the direction of benevolence and with a view of correction, but in the spirit of personal revenge, to 'satisfy,' as the cant runs, '*Offended Justice*'—an abstraction made for the occasion—and to '*vindicate his outraged dignity!*' Now this is simply to speak evil of God, i. e. to blaspheme; it is one of those misrepresentations of the Divine procedure which have reacted in the production of our prevalent Infidelity—the ascription to God, not of the character even of an amiable man, but of a vain and vengeful savage.*

No wonder that such representations should be useless and inefficient in *reforming* character, however profitable in creating a demand for the vicarious services and ceremonies of Priests. Even the abstract representation of Justice, in the Law, could only 'condemn wickedness in the flesh'—it could not conquer and regenerate the flesh. 'For if a law, capable of creating life, had been given, justice would most assuredly have been by the law.'—† Hence the law has become itself our schoolmaster for Christ, since we should be justified by the truth. The TRUTH, however, having come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster. For you are all sons of God, thro' the truth in Christ Jesus.'* Thus we see that men's hearts are to be touched and transformed, not even by the Law, much less by pictures of a partial and fear-inspiring Deity—but by the magic influence of Love, exhibited in harmony with the highest forms of Philosophy and Truth. The incarnation of the Eternal REASON (*logos*) of God, whose 'Life was the light of Men,' alone can revive and regenerate the race. 'It existed in the world, and the world made itself thro' It, and the world did not know It.'—'As many, however, as *received Him*, He gave to them an existence to make themselves Sons of God, to those that have truth in his DIVINITY,‡ who were born, not of bloods, nor of a will of flesh, nor of a will of man, but of God.'—Truly says John: 'Of his fullness we all have received, and grace for grace; *because* the Law was given by Moses'—the Law which could not save, because it gave no true insight into the nature of God: therefore, 'Grace and Truth came thro' Jesus Christ.'‡ Thus, we perceive, that the ordinary representations of Divine-punishment, virtually blot out the revelations of the Messiah-Redeemer, and exhibit a view of Deity which neither informs nor *reforms*.

FURTHER DEFECTIVE VIEWS OF THEOLOGY.

But the common doctrine of Divines is exceedingly defective on another ground. They equally mistake the nature and administration of punishment. Not only do they render it arbitrary, dependent on mere will, and disconnected with the principles and processes of God's perpetual Government, but they also *postpone* it to an undefined and distant period. One might have thought that legislative experience, and the progress of mental philosophy, would long since have excited the suspicion of serious error in the *pseudo* 'orthodox' views on this subject; but, alas! for the influence of creed, experience and philosophy are not permitted to aid in the development of sectarian 'divinity.' *Its* dogmas are all stereotyped—and its prophets all infallible! The sects, little and big, have all some 'Pope' or other, or some final 'council' or 'creed,' to act as an extinguisher upon reason and evidence. If there *be* any essential difference between Roman 'orthodoxy' of one sort, and British 'orthodoxy' of all sorts, it is only that slight one remarked by Steele—namely, that the Roman Pontiff is always in the right, and the Protestant Parson never in the wrong! The Roman Pope is un-*fail*-able—the Protestant Bigot un-*err*-able.

Whether we regard punishment, for the present, as consisting in pain, or in privation, what, we ask, are those principles of its administration which political experience has now rendered indisputable? Firstly, that the CERTAINTY, and, secondly, that the PROXIMITY of punishment, is necessary to its efficiency.

But Theologists weaken the belief in the *certainty* of punishment, by opening out vicarious sources of escape from the consequences of sin, and thus make the actual infliction a doubtful matter. True—Prophets and Apostles have warned us against this pernicious doctrine, and taught us that the consequences of Sin cannot be counteracted—but where 'divines' fail to pervert prophets and apostles, they contrive very conveniently to forget them. Nevertheless, reader 'Be not deceived! Whatsoever a man soweth, even *this* shall he reap.' 'The soul that sinneth, *it* shall die.' Paul in his exordium to the Romans, inculcates this doctrine expressly. They who *de*-formed themselves, *did* reap corruption. 'God delivered them over to the very desires of their hearts, *receiving in themselves the retribution for their wickedness which was needful*—seeing that they did not feel

*'These Theologists may not consciously believe or really mean what they say. A verbal faith is mere talk, unmeaning rote, not true belief. Belief signifies to cleave together, being a softened form of the Teutonic *Ghe-louh*; of which cliff, cleave, club, and glove, are hardened forms. Thus, to 'believe with the heart unto righteousness,' is to cleave to it, to desire, love, live, or choose it. Intellectual belief also implies a cleaving: it consists of propositions perceived to be in rational union. But there is no consistency between the vulgar notions of future punishment, and a proper conception of Divine Love and Wisdom. To think about them is to discard them. 'Strictly speaking,' says Bishop Berkeley 'to believe that which has no meaning in it, is impossible. Men impose upon themselves, by imagining that they believe those propositions which they have often heard, tho' at bottom they have no meaning to them.' (Principles of Human Knowledge, S. 84.)

*Gal. iii. 9:-27.

†To σνομα, = *Name*; i. e. the sacred 'Ja'—I am: St John adds:—'And the Word made itself a flesh, and dwelt in us, and we have beheld ourselves its glory, a glory as of an only beg-iven from [the] Father, full of Grace and Truth.' v. 14

‡John i. 10-13.

disposal to practice the Good according to knowledge. God recovered them over to *the unfeeling* mind, to do things which are not *harmonious*."

Emerson, in his admirable essay on 'Compensation,' enforces the same truth. '*Crime and punishment grow out of one stem.* Punishment is a fruit that, unsuspected, ripens within the flower of the pleasure which concealed it.' 'The dice of God,' said an old Grecian, 'are always loaded.' True, every law has its sanction, every act its effect. There is *no chance*—and therefore no evasion of consequences—in the universe of God.

Again: the 'popular preachers' represent punishment not only as dubious, but as DISTANT. It is not viewed as an *effect* certainly and necessarily following transgression as its *cause*, but as a mere arbitrary accident, which may or may not ensue, just as the sinner succeeds or fails in propitiating his judge. But the stern fact is, that a miracle alone could effect the severance of Crime from its true Punishment—and that miracle will never be wrought. Nevertheless, the ideal postponement of the penalty of crime to a dim and distant future, deprives the fear of its due force, and renders the conception of the consequences faint and ineffective. Now, as it is the grand law of Love to conserve as much as may be the Being it has created; and therefore to be as sparing as possible in the employment of pain, the work and warning of its decay—in other words, to inflict the smallest amount which will serve the purpose—it follows, that benevolence will be ever seeking to connect the conception of crime *as closely as possible* with that of punishment, in order to render the smallest pain, in degree and duration, sufficient. And this conclusion will be found to harmonize with facts. If the first painful intimation of organic or moral disorder and decay, be not heeded—and, as a rule, the *first* is the most acute—the voice of the warner grows weaker not stronger, *in relation to the same act and injury*—the susceptibility less and less—until, finally, body and mind become *unfeeling*, dead. Pain, we see here, is the protest of Vitality against whatever will violate its integrity, and, of necessity, as repeated transgressions subtract from the sum of its energies, its protests become more few and feeble, until they finally terminate in mortification or death. Thus step by step, the *pain* diminishes, while the *loss*—the true punishment and lasting consequence—increases. But the vulgar and anti-scriptural notions of future punishment are the very reverse of all this: for they represent the *pain*, and therefore the *faculty* of feeling—the life—as gradually augmenting! Pain, here, *ceases* when it can answer no purpose, and 'corruption' follows. But there, it is attached to disorder, 'without decay'—to life, without hope of amendment!! to being, without aim or use!!! This is not only absurd; it is

'Horrible most Horrible!'

What, too, ought to be thought of the wisdom of any human legislator, who should decree that the pains and penalties of murder should be *postponed* till twenty or thirty years after the perpetration of the crime?—thus violating the second condition of efficient punishment—the nearness of the penalty to the crime. Or what should we think of his attempt to mend the matter, by ordaining, in opposition to all the analogy of nature, that the lapsed interval of ease should be *then* made up by the infliction of intense torment in his '*prison-house*'—where he could do neither good nor ill? Yet such is the atrocious government which many Theologists have daringly imputed to 'the blessed God!' Is it not, in fact and in substance, the theory of all who set forth the pains of *the future* life as intended for the prevention of vice in this?

But in truth, O brothers, this vile and cruel theory is not drawn from the pure well of Scripture undefiled: but, as might be anticipated, *a priori*, it is a fiction and forgery of priests.

IMPORTANT PRINCIPLES AND RESULTS.

God's laws are not marked by startling and sudden transitions—all is gradual and progressive. We entirely accord in the opinion of Bishop Butler, founded on analogy, that we have no reason to suppose that the change from the present to the future life, will be greater than the change from the condition which precedes birth to that state into which it ushers us. In fact, we believe that the individual's revived or resurrection-consciousness, will exactly *represent* the consequences of past *action*, neither less nor more; and therefore that he will be found in possession of all the dispositions and habits formed by his previous career—either adapted for *progress* in the Divine life, or fitted for *destruction*. In short, we believe again with St. Paul, that 'whatsoever a man sows, *even this* shall he reap: Therefore he who sows to *the flesh* shall of the flesh reap *corruption*, and he who sows to *the spirit* shall of the spirit reap *life everlasting*.' In other words, if we depend on our own defectibility, or on our fellow worm, equally defectible—we shall err and perish. But if we cherish the Divine Logos—'the light that enlightens every man coming into the world'—the *Divine* Spirit manifested in *our Spirits*—we shall depend upon His perfection, and partaking of it, we shall *live*.

The Rewards of heaven are unlike those of this world, which, in strictness, are equivalents and exchanges only. Heaven's rewards are properly matters of *profit*—of increase, produce, growth. 'The fruit of righteousness—is a tree of life.' You have not to *give* in order to *get*, but to *do* only, to work. Action secures addition; and you have simply to *use* your capital, and it is straightway increased, sixty or a hundred fold. We live under a dispensation of Grace, which excludes merit but grants reward.* Reward is God's Royal Rule of dispensing grace; he who uses the one favor, shall have more *added* to it, while from him that uses it not, shall be taken away even what he hath. Walk a little, and you shall be *able* to walk more; work a little, and you shall have *strength* to work more; think a little, and you will have *power* to think more; love a little, and, bye and bye, you will love more *largely*. The universe is one grand system of USES. All our powers are given for enlargement by the *means* of use. All faculties and forms are summed up in Life, in *Being*: but this *being* differs in degree and developement in every individual. Viewed as the first gift—as the ground and cause of enjoyment and action, and as capable of indefinite developement—this CAPACITY of becoming useful and happy in an endless life, the SOUL and *substratum* of existence, assumes a value which transcends all worlds. What indeed, shall a man give in exchange for *this soul*? This life, this soul, however, is but *lent*. The awful judgement-question will be—'What hast thou done with thy soul?' It is designed for culture and developement, and if not developed, it must deteriorate, decay, and die.

Christ preached this universal doctrine to his disciples: self-developement was the reward held out. 'Verily I say unto you, there is no man that hath left house, or parents, or brethren, or wife, or children, for the kingdom of God's sake, *who shall not receive many-fold more in this present time*, and in the world to come, life everlasting.' Thus, as nothing can arrest the consequences of evil, so nothing can frustrate the rewards of the good. The reason is obvious; the true rewards are *internal* and *spiritual*, consisting of a continual extension of the spirit's *capacities*; the kingdom is spiritual—it cometh not with observation, 'FOR BEHOLD! THE KINGDOM OF GOD IS WITHIN YOU'—and therefore its treasures are incorruptible, and beyond the reach of rust or robber. Thus has God placed man's happiness in his own keeping, and enabled him, by the humble submission of his spirit to the influences of the Divine, to 'lay hold of eternal life'—to grasp the glories, and realize the rich rewards, of the spiritual realms.

As 'Reward' signifies, in its essential use, positive *possession*—*increase* of faculty, capacity, or means—in short, ACCESSION OF LIFE: so 'Punishment,' as its logical antithesis or negation, denotes *loss* of faculty or means—or, in brief DECESSION, DECAY, DEATH.

An obvious inference from these definitions is, that *pleasure*, as pleasure, is no more the real and abiding Reward, than *pain*, as pain, is true and permanent Punishment. That pleasure is no further 'reward' than as it *indicates* right action, will perhaps be admitted by considering, that the act of Sin is *frequently* productive of intense *temporary* pleasure. But can we say that sin is 'rewarded?' At least, its performer is not *profited*: reversely, he *loses* some portion of the power for re-experiencing lawful pleasure; the premature bloom is followed by premature blight. All pleasure out of time, or out of place, is inevitable *loss*—not loss of present pleasure, perhaps, but loss of *faculty* for further excitement—loss of the GROUNDWORK of pleasure and pain. This is as much worse than the other, as the loss of a fruitful tree is worse than the loss of its year's fruitage. In trade, the loss of Capital must be the capital-loss: in Life, the loss of *power*, of soul, or capacity, the 'capital punishment.'

These views of Reward and Punishment will be found pregnant with many important consequences. They not only tear off the dark and vengeful mask with which a vile and daring anthropomorphism has concealed the radiant countenance of the everlasting 'Father of Lights,' but point to *pain* itself as supplying as true a demonstration of Divine benevolence as the most exquisite felicity. The sum is this:—

All the movements and mechanism of the universe are manifestations of Wisdom and Grace, for 'God is love.' Pleasure and pain are but varied *indications* of His will—the two pointers on the Dial of Life, marking respectively, the steady or oscillating movements of the vital machinery. The Divine Physiologist designs to teach us by means of pleasure, *if we will*, that 'His ways are ways of pleasantness, and all his paths are peace!'—but if, like stubborn, ignorant children, we *will not* be taught this lesson of wisdom, He adopts the other method of instruction, and, by means of pain, he demonstrates that 'the ways of transgressors are hard.' Thus pleasure and pain are but the radiant outflowings of one Divine Aspect, reflected on different paths, and assuming diverse appearances. In 'the path of Holiness' the Divine lustre descends in the form of 'the Dove,' bringing to the heart perpetual peace and joy;—in the 'way of Death' it gathers into the apparition of 'a burning Bush,' symbolically signifying that sin is 'a consuming fire' the end whereof is death. But behind and beneath all, there is Love. Pain is not the real loss, the true Punishment, but merely the *indicator* of injury—the warning voice of God in nature, raised when we stray into the path of danger and death, that we may hear, turn back, and live. It for ever repeats the touching question of the Lord—'Why will ye die?' 'As I live, saith Jehovah, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked.'

These are our views of the great life-problem of Profit and Loss; and, we think, such a consideration of God's all-wise and almighty government, by refining and exalting our conceptions of the Divine character and requirements, by rendering our ideas of responsibility at once more rational and more rigid, and by showing us that we must inevitably reap the reward of our own works or eat of the bitter fruit of our own doings, cannot possibly fail to deepen all those salutary convictions which tend to wise and worthy conduct; to give force and fixedness to the kindliest affections of our nature; and to strengthen and stimulate the desire of doing good, by exhibiting virtuous action as the parent of power for ever enlarging in the might and majesty of its consequences.

Such views, also, would put men on their guard against the misleading and baser affections; would explain, not only how much is *gained* by progression in virtue, but how much is *lost* by giving way to selfish and sensuous seductions.

We should learn ourselves, and teach our children, to *always associate crime with punishment, and virtue with reward*, thereby inducing an instinctive avoidance of the one, and a spontaneous performance of the other. Even Selfishness itself would at last discover its best interests to consist in having its propensities supplanted by those higher faculties which lead us to rejoice in being the instrument of another's felicity: and, finally, on closing the Ledger of Human Life, we should find a vast balance of Profit standing to our credit, consisting in enlarged capacities of Being and of Action, in augmented faculties of enjoyment and of use, ready to be transferred to our account and favor in God's 'Book of Life.'

Solemn, indeed, is the question which returns to us: 'What is a man *profited*, if he gain the whole world and *lose* his own soul?'

BUSINESS NOTICES.—Wm. Algire, the money sent in October was not received; but we have sent you the sermons since yours of November 6th.

C. B. Hotchkiss. Yours on "Symbols" shall have a place soon.

Thomas Smith. We sent you 20 copies of Six Sermons, quarto, to North Truro, Mass., the fore part of October; we sent, to the same place, 17th of November, 12 copies of the 18mo.

Adam Dixon. We have none of the "Tracts" except what are bound up with the Six Sermons. How shall we apply the money intended for them?

To all persons. The fact that you receive from us what you send for, is evidence your money is received.

THE "THREE OFFERS" AGAIN.—1. 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., and our views of the State of the Dead, including the tract "Rich man and Lazarus," with each copy of the Sermons; or 20 copies of the quarto edition, which does not include the tract.

2. Any person, or company of persons, who will send us *five dollars*, current money, at one time, free of expense, shall receive *five copies* of the Bible Examiner for 1849, and *forty* copies of the Six Sermons, 18mo. (pamphlet, including same as previous offer); 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.

3. Any person, or company of persons, sending us $5, current money, free of expense, shall have 15 copies of Bible Examiner for 1849; for $10 they shall have 34 copies; and for $20, 75 copies.

We make these offers *now* to induce our friends to act at once in sending all the subscribers they can, that we may be able to form a judgment of the number of copies we shall print for 1849. The offers extend, therefore, only to January.

THE EDITOR of this paper preaches every Lord's day at COMMISSIONERS' HALL, Third street, below Green, east side; at 10½ A. M., and in the evening at 7 o'clock.

---

* Rom. i. 24-32.

* The *wages* of Sin is death, but the *gift* of God is eternal life.

THE "SIX SERMONS" on the End of the Wicked, &c., can be had of the Author, 18 Chester street, between Race and Vine, 8th and 9th. Price, in Pamphlet, 15 cents, or ten copies for $1. The pamphlet includes the views of the author on the question, "Have the dead knowledge?" The Sermons advocate the doctrine, that "All the wicked will God *destroy*," or cause them to cease from life, after the judgment. The work full bound in morocco, with Grew's thoughts on the Intermediate State, 37½ cts. Cash in all cases with the order.

THE ASPECTS OF PHRENOLOGY ON REVELATION; or, *Materialism, Fatalism, Regeneration, Creeds, Atheism. The operation of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of men*; and HUMAN RESPONSIBILITY, *Philosophically considered in a series of Lectures*, By J. T. WALSH." Such is the Title of an Octavo pamphlet of 74 pages, published by Br. Walsh, Richmond, Va., 1846. For sale at 18 Chester street, Philadelphia, Pa., and by the Author. *Price, 25 cents*, or five copies for one dollar, or thirty copies for five dollars. Cash always with the order.

INDEX TO VOL. III.

Annihilation—La Roy Sunderland, . . 20
Age to Come, —Bell's Letter.—Dr. Thomas' Reply, 27
" " " " " 53
Angels, ... 73
An Anti-Destructionist, ... 107
A Knotty Question, ... 109
A Fable,—Lamb, Wolf and Dog, . . 159
Addenda, by Dr. Lees, Leeds. . . . 159
Anderson, H. T., Study of Prophecy, . . 173

Be Courteous, ... 40
Bishop Newton,—Eternal Torments, . . 44
Born of Water—Editorial, . . . 130
" " Homo, . . . 130
" " Magruder, . . . 165
Baptism, Queries by H. B Hotchkiss, . . 150
" Reply to Hotchkiss, . . 181

Christian Philosophy, . . . 81, 97, 129
Christian Fellowship, . . 92, 109, 117, 143
Creed Power, ... 93
Controversy, ... 120
Christian Sun.—Immortality, . . . 137
Clerical Misrepresentations, . . . 153

Death by Adam, ... 56
Dash them in Pieces, Psa. 2: 9, . . 73
Dr. Thomas' Rejoinder to H. Grew, . . 100
Death Threatened to Adam, not moral, &c., . 107
Dr. Tyng and the Truth, . . . 113
Dead Unconscious.—or Objections Answered, 151, 172

Europe and the Jews, . . . 157

Future Punishment,—from Truth Seeker, 14, 29
Fancy Sketches, ... 90, 106

Grew's Response to Dr. Thomas, . 68, 114
Grew, Thomas, and Magruder, . . 140, 148

Is the Devil a Friend, . . . 24
Is Error consistent with Salvation, . . 35
Is Annihilation the Penalty of the Law—L. Lee and H. Grew, ... 52
Intermediate State,—Letter of P. M. Way, . 131

John Quincy Adams, ... 63

Kingdom of God, . . 1, 17, 49, 50, 65

Letters,—Charles Fitch, . . . 11, 55, 94
" From others, 47, 48, 77, 78, 79, 80, 94, 95, 96, 112, 127, 128, 160, 175, 185, 186.

Mental Diseases.—Strictures,—by Wm. H. Brewster. 145
Mind,—Reply to J. T. Walsh, by W. H. Brewster, ... 161, 176
Mortal and Immortal together, . . . 169

Nobility of Soul, ... 106

Phrenology.—Mr. Fowler,—Spiritualism, . 21
Prophetic Periods, . . 5, 39, 57, 70, 109
Paganism in the 19th century, . . . 56
Philosophy of Man, . . 6, 22, 33, 67
Power of Churches, ... 25
Poetry, ... 80
Psa. 16: 10, ... 106
Progress of Truth in Britain, by Dr. Lees, . 137
Prophecy of Zechariah, . . 154, 169
Penalty of Adam's Sin, . . . 170
Profit and Loss,—Sermon by Dr. Lees, . 187

Revolution in France, . . . 74
Rothschilds—Signs of the Times, . . 75
Raising of Samuel, . . . 88
Renouncement of Sectarianism, . . 93
Religious Zeal, ... 103
Reply to Questions, . . . 122, 139
Rich man and Lazarus, . . . 123
Resurrection—by Dr. Lees, Leeds, . . 156

Son of God—by H. Grew, 31, 62, 85, 110, 134
Signs of the Times, . . . 58, 122
Scarlet colored Beast, ... 88
Strictures on Dr. Thomas, &c., by Dr. Smith, . 142
" . . . 143
She'ol, by Dr. Lees, Leeds, . . . 164
Scripture Psychology, . . . 167
Second Death—Bishop Whately, . . 182
Saints Reign in the Air, . . . 182

To be Remembered—Phrases, . . . 24
The Cause, ... 40
Tendencies of Immortal Soulism, . . 41
The Three Battles, ... 87
The Leaven at Work, . . . 94
Truth Seekers, ... 104
The great Earthquake—another shock, . 121
Twenty-three Hundred Days, Dr. Foudey, . 175

Universalism, ... 23

Visit to Millville, ... 72

Wonders! Book of Eccl., . . . 9
Would you inherit the Kingdom, . . 42
Witchcraft Unveiled, . . . 5, 18, 34
" By Henry Jones, . . . 83
Why will ye Die, ... 93
Works advocating the Destruction of the Wicked, 160