BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. III. PHILADELPHIA, MARCH, 1848. No. 3.

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

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 21 N. SIXTH 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.

PHILOSOPHY OF MAN.—NO. III.

By J. T. WALSH.

Import of the term soul.

We shall now turn our attention, exclusively, to the term soul as found in the Holy Scriptures, and try to learn its true import. But, before we commence the work before us, we will call attention to an acknowledged rule of interpretation, viz: 'All words are to have their primary and obvious meaning, unless there is a clear necessity for departing from it.' With this rule before us, we ask, what is the first, primary, and obvious meaning of the term soul? We answer, its primary meaning is life. Let us now examine the Bible upon this subject. And,

1. The term soul signifies life. 'And God said: Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life,' [Heb. soul,] &c. Gen. 1: 20. Again in the 30th verse, 'And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every animal that creepeth upon the earth, in which is life,' &c. [Heb. a living soul.] A. Cruden says, the term occurs in the 24th verse, where we have the phrase 'living creatures,' and means living soul. Lev. 17: 11, 'For the life [Heb. soul] of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls; [lives;] for it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul.' See also the 14th verse. Ps. 33: 19, 'To deliver their soul from death,' [to save them alive.] Ps. 7: 5, 'Let the enemy persecute my soul [my life,] and take it; yea let him tread down my life [soul] upon the earth.' Gen. 35: 18, 'And it came to pass as her [life] was in departing, [for she died,] that she called,' &c. 1 Kings 17: 21, 'Let this child's soul [life] come into him again.' Job 12: 10, 'In whose hand is the soul [life] of every living thing, and the breath of all mankind.' Job 31: 29, 'If I caused the soul of the owners to expire,' or have caused its owners to lose their life. Rev. 16: 3, 'And every living soul [every thing that had life] died in the sea.' Job 17: 8, 'For what is the hope of the hypocrite, though he hath gained, when God taketh away his soul,' [his life.] Job 33: 18, 'He keepeth back his soul from the pit, and his life from perishing by the sword.' The Lord kept him back from the pit of corruption, and saved his life from perishing, &c. Is. 53: 10, 'When thou shalt make his soul [his life] an offering for sin.' In the 12th verse, 'Because he poured out his soul [his life, his blood] unto death.' 1 Sam. 24: 11, 'Yet thou [Saul] huntest my soul [life] to take it." 26: 11, 'Because my soul [life] was precious in thine eyes.' Thus we have given a few cases where the term soul, evidently signifies life. Many more could be given, but this is unnecessary, as, in those referred to, we have a fair specimen. The most illiterate can see that to substitute the term immortal soul, in the above texts, would make sad havoc of the word of God.

2. The term soul signifies the person, being, man, the whole man or person. Gen. 2: 7, 'And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the earth, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and he became a living soul,' a living person or being. Gen. 14: 21, 'Give me the persons [Heb. souls] and take the goods to thyself.' Gen. 12: 5, See the place. Lev. 4: 2, 'If a soul [person] shall sin through ignorance.' In 27th verse: 'And if any soul [person] of the common people sin,' &c. Chap. 5: 1, 'If a soul [or person] sin, and hear the voice of swearing.' And in the 2d verse: 'Or if a soul [person, man, or woman] touch any unclean thing,' &c. Besides the souls, or persons, that went down into Egypt—the souls that were saved in the ark—the three thousand souls, or persons, who were saved on the day of Pentecost, &c., &c. There are hundreds of other places where this term is, undoubtedly, used in relation to the whole man, or person. 'Thou wilt not leave my soul [wilt not leave me] in hell, [the grave,] nor suffer thy holy one to see corruption.' Ps. 16: 10. With this quotation we pass on to the third proposition.

3. The term soul is used to signify a dead body, or dead person. Num. 9: 9, 'Some were defiled by the dead body [Heb. dead soul] of a man.' Num. 6: 6, 'He shall come at no dead body,' [dead soul.] Let none, then, ridicule the idea of dead souls, for it is a fact, that the term is so used in the word of God. Was not the soul of the Messiah dead when it was in the grave? But this is not all: every person will admit, that if a living person is a living soul, a dead person must be a dead soul. This must suffice for the third proposition; and more particularly as our object is to state them, and show their correctness without bringing forward a superabundance of testimony.

4. It is used in relation to the affections and the mind of man. David says: 'Why art thou cast down, O my soul? and why art thou disquieted within me? hope in God, for I shall yet praise him,' &c. Ps. 43: 5. See, also, several other places in the Psalms. Why am I cast down? Why is my mind within me dejected? hope in God, &c. As it is used in reference to the mind, it sometimes expresses the emotions, desires, and affections of the mind. Gen. 23: 8, 'If it be in your mind;' in Heb. if it be your soul, your wish, or desire. See,

18: 1, 'The soul of Jonathan was knit with the soul of David; he had a great love and affection for him.' Prov. 27: 7, 'The full soul;' that is, a man whose desire or appetite is fully satisfied.

5. It is used as a figure of personification. Rev. 6: 6; 20: 4, 'I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God and for the testimony which they held,' &c. 'And I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God, and who had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they [the souls] lived [they then were dead once] and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection.' 5th verse: 'John saw these souls as he saw the hundred and forty and four thousand, having their Father's name written on their foreheads.' And as he saw the sea of glass, and those who had gotten the victory over the beast, &c., standing on it praising God. He was in the isle of Patmos, and saw spread out before him the history of the future fortunes of God's church and people. He saw that many of the saints would be martyred for the testimony which they bore to the truth and for the word of God, and represents them, by the figure of personification, as being under the altar, upon which, no doubt, they had been immolated, crying for vengeance upon those who had put them to death. The same figure is used when the blood of Abel is represented as crying to God from the earth. God said to Cain, 'the voice of thy brother's blood cryeth to me from the ground.'

6. The term soul is used for being or existence. Perhaps some will think that this proposition is embraced in, and established by those to which we have already directed your attention. This, in fact, is true; but my object in making it a distinct one now is, to answer an objection upon this subject, which is based upon the words of Christ in Matt. 10: 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.' Here the term soul signifies being, or existence. This is one of the meanings of the original term, as given in the Lexicons. Christ then said to his disciples, 'And fear not them who kill the body, but are not able to put an end to your soul or existence; but rather fear him who is able to destroy, or put an end to the existence of both soul and body in hell.' Mark 8: 36, 37, 'For what shall it profit a man if he shall gain a whole world [illegible] and lose his own soul,' [illegible]

WITCHCRAFT UNVEILED.—NO. III.

What can be said in favour of the phraseology of Samuel, on the supposition that JEHOVAH sent the spirit of the departed prophet to commune with Saul, and to announce to him the consummation of the predictions of offended Heaven? Saul's application to this infamous and impious woman, *praying* her to assume the attribute or power of the Deity, and to *coerce* the spirit of the pious dead to come at her bidding, for his pleasure, or in obedience to his will, because he considered himself forsaken by Heaven, and would employ Sorcerers, or resort to any thing in his desperation, and in open defiance to all authority, whether human or divine—this new and impious crime of Saul would have been the theme of Samuel, and would, most certainly, have been placed in the list, and at the top of his offences. Burning words, indignation, tribulation and wrath, for so high-handed and heaven-daring an offence, as Saul's last act must be branded, would have burst from the lips of the prophet, and an appeal to Saul's reason followed; instead of the recital of an old prediction, and a *whining* inquiry, to learn the *cause* of being thus *disquieted!*

WOULD THE SPIRIT OF A DEPARTED PROPHET, SENT BACK TO THE WORLD BY THE DEITY, ON AN ERRAND FROM HEAVEN, AS MUST HAVE BEEN THE CASE IN THIS INSTANCE, IF SAMUEL REALLY APPEARED, CALL IT BEING DISQUIETED, AND TACITLY CONSENT TO THE EFFICIENCY OF THE POWER OF AN INFAMOUS WITCH, A MISCREANT TOO VILE TO BE PERMITTED TO CUMBER THE EARTH? No! THE BARE IDEA IS ABSURD.

I affirm, most unhesitatingly, that the Witch of Endor needed no other auxiliary qualification, although it is probable that she possessed a very powerful one, to effect her purpose of deceiving Saul, than the very common one of modulating her voice, and addressing Saul when she *personated* Samuel, in a different tone from that used by her during her previous interview with the *mad* King of Israel.

JOSEPHUS, however, says, that the orders of Saul to his servants signified, "That they should seek out for him one of those women that could speak out of their bellies, and call forth the souls of the dead; that by this means he might know if his affairs should succeed. For this sort of *belly-speakers* can bring up the souls of the dead, and by their help can foretell futurities." In plain English the *Witch of Endor*, in *modern parlance*, was a Ventriloquist, and practised her art only in a private and mysterious manner, to further and aid her deceptions.

The whole machinery of imposition, stripped of its mystery, is very simple. The Witch has succeeded in her incipient manoeuvres; and Saul, her [illegible] dupe, is bowed to the ground, in the [illegible] presence of the [illegible] of the departed prophet Samuel. The bold and impudent woman, [illegible]

am sore distressed; for the Philistines make war against me, AND GOD IS DEPARTED FROM ME, *and answereth me no more, neither by prophets, nor by dreams*—therefore I have called thee, that thou mayest make known unto me what I shall do." The Witch is now qualified to end the farce, and knowing the prediction, which, it was *notorious* throughout all Israel, hung over the head of Saul, and over his house, she tells over again an *old story* THAT EVERY MAN, WOMAN AND CHILD IN SAUL'S DOMINIONS WERE PRIVY TO. Therefore, again personating the spirit of Samuel, she continues the farce—"Wherefore, then, dost thou ask of me, seeing the LORD has departed from thee, and is become thy enemy?" And in her malicious triumph, she calls to her aid her well-tried impudence, and, without waiting for a reply from Saul, proceeds: "AND THE LORD HATH DONE TO HIM, AS HE SPAKE BY ME; for the Lord hath rent the kingdom out of thine hand, and given it to thy neighbour, even to David; because thou obeyedest not the voice of the Lord, nor executedst his fierce wrath upon Amalek, therefore hath the Lord done this thing unto thee this day."

It should be borne in mind, that impostors of this class are very particular in acquiring a readiness of utterance, in appropriate terms, of their oracular speeches; and that this woman would be particular in her imitation of the prophets of Israel, in any repetition that she should attempt of their prediction. The conclusion of the Witch's speech, in the character of Samuel, was undoubtedly dictated by her *cunning* and resentment. Her impudence was quite sufficient to enable her to risk all consequences. Therefore she adds, "Moreover the Lord will also deliver Israel with thee into the hand of the Philistines; and to-morrow shall thou and thy sons be with me; the Lord also shall deliver the host of Israel into the hand of the Philistines." This woman must have known one thing, which stood prominently conspicuous in the dealings of God with the Israelites, viz:—That, IN ALL CASES, when the Lord signifies through the agency of his prophets or the priesthood, his disapprobation of the people or their rulers, they were *sure to be defeated* in their battles with their enemies. Her prediction, therefore, of Saul's defeat and death, was not only sanctioned by the old prediction of Samuel, but, in her opinion, rendered *certain*, from the information she had just received from Saul. The opportunity, therefore, for avenging herself on Saul, by her denunciations, which he was duped to believe were fresh from the mouth of Samuel, would facilitate the destruction of her enemy, Saul, by increasing his panic, and depriving him of his remaining courage and prudence. However, the Hebrew word rendered "*to-morrow*," which the Witch used, is so indefinite, as to time, that Saul's subsequent defeat and death, in any battle with the Philistines, would have fulfilled her prediction.

ADDITIONAL REMARKS.

By J. T. W[illegible].

There are certain facts and circumstances connected with this case, which we shall briefly state. [illegible]

1. [illegible]

2. God had commanded their extermination—"thou shalt not suffer a Witch to live."

3. In the *practice* of their art, they *professed* to consult the dead; and were in the habit of "*peeping*" and "*muttering*."

4. JEHOVAH had forsaken Saul, and become his enemy; so that he *answered him not*—neither by prophet, nor by priest, nor by dreams.

5. Saul, in a perfect state of desperation, goes to the Witch, as the *last resort* to "*seek from the living to the dead*."

6. He visits her in "the night," a time most favourable to the practice of her imposture. And, lastly, she professes to bring Samuel up, where he was *not buried*. He was, we believe, interred at *Ramah*, some forty or fifty miles from *Endor*, at which place the Witch resided.

Now, is it reasonable to suppose, that God, who had refused to answer Saul in any way whatever, would, by the hands of a Witch, make known Saul's destiny to him—a destiny which he had previously fully and explicitly announced to him by Samuel the prophet? God had said, "thou shalt not suffer a Witch to live;" and, if they were too *vile* to live, would God make use of them as instruments of communicating with Saul, with whom he had refused all communication by prophets and priests? This is not reasonable. Will the reader turn to Isaiah, and read the following: "And when they shall say to you, *Seek to them that have familiar spirits and to wizards that peep and that mutter:* SHOULD NOT A PEOPLE SEEK TO THEIR GOD—FOR THE LIVING TO THE DEAD?" Chap. viii. 19.

Here two questions are propounded.—1st, "Should not a people seek to their God"? 2nd, "For the living to the dead"? The last question is elliptical, and the *two*, when paraphrased, would read thus: "Should not a people seek to their God? Will you seek for the *living* to the *dead?*" Thus the Jews, in the days of Isaiah, were rebuked for consulting wizards and witches. They were taught the folly, the idolatry, the blasphemy, of "seeking unto the dead," for the benefit of "the living." And the reason of this is obvious; for "*the dead know nothing*," and, therefore, it is impossible to learn from them. And this *fact* is not sufficiently *guarded* by the Witch of Endor in her *personification* of Samuel; for she makes *him ask* Saul, "Why he had disquieted him?" when, in fact, upon the popular supposition, Samuel knew without asking the question!

May we not conclude, then, in the language of Isaiah, "To the law and to the testimony, for if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them?"

In conclusion, we hope the articles on this subject, which precede these remarks, will be read attentively; and if any friend, or foe, can give a better exposition, an exposition more consonant with the character of God and his Word, we hope they will enlighten the world on the subject.

IS ERROR CONSISTENT WITH SALVATION?

We give place to the following strictures and reply growing out of an article in the December number of the Examiner, wherein the author expressed the opinion that [illegible]

...understood the expression not in an absolute sense, but in its tendency. We certainly think such belief has a tendency to ruin more men than any one error ever introduced into the church. Not that it necessarily results in the death of those who embrace it, but, its natural and legitimate tendency is to sap the foundation of the whole system of gospel truth. We wish it distinctly understood that we do not endorse all that is said in either communication. We let both speak, and others must judge what is truth. With present light, we do not at all assent to the doctrine that "the Scriptures teach the *non-resurrection*" of any one.

Strictures by H. Grew.

Br. Storrs:—In your December number you have verily given us a notable example of the fact that "man is prone to extremes." It is found in the article from the "Her. Future Age," in which the learned editor reasons himself out of reason by coming to the conclusion that "believing in the immortality of the soul is a *damnable* heresy!" Thus he consigns millions of true penitent believers on the Son of God, and followers of the Lamb, to the lake of fire, which is the second death. Do you really believe, that if you had died previous to your present view of the subject, that you would have been condemned to eternal perdition? Such extravagant representations injure the cause of truth, as they tend to prejudice the mind against what we advocate, which is true.

This preposterous conclusion of the writer is traceable to two errors. First, confounding the importance of the existence of a fact, with the importance of a correct belief *in* the fact. Secondly, confounding the belief of an error with the belief of every other error with which that error is logically connected, or with the denial of every truth of which that error is "logically destructive."

The fact of the Son of God being what he really is, in respect to his nature, and of his doing what he really has done, *i. e.*, dying for us and rising from the dead, are of such importance as to be essential to the salvation of perishing men; but it does not necessarily follow that a correct belief in these facts is thus essential. To sustain this conclusion, it must be proved, either that God has made the correct knowledge and belief of what his Son is, and of what he has done for us, *without exception*, thus essential, or that he has made the correct knowledge and belief of these particular facts thus essential.

Paul wrote to the Corinthians, "If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain, and ye are yet in your sins." This proves that *the fact* of his resurrection is essential to salvation. But in the dialogue, in the "Her. Future Age," he is made to say, "If you maintain this (i. e. 'that there is no resurrection of the dead saints') you are in your sins." Paul does not say this. We have no authority to make the belief of any particular truth essential to salvation which the word of the Lord does not plainly declare to be so.

The writer's argument is, "that these Corinthians seem to have believed all the truths but this one truth; yet the belief of the whole is regarded as valueless, because they affirmed a proposition, which, in its logical bearing upon those truths, rendered them vain, or of no practical use."

Now, I affirm that it is not true that if a man believes all the truths of the gospel, but this one truth of the resurrection of the bodies of the saints, that his unbelief in respect to this truth, renders other truths "vain, or of no practical use," *in fact*. Whatever may be the "*logical bearing*," or the inconsistency of his unbelief respecting that truth, he is, *in fact*, influenced to penitence, to a reliance on the Son of God for salvation, and to practical holiness, by the belief of other truths, and will consequently be saved.

It is also remarked—"You (Corinthians) say you believe that Christ was raised, as I preached; but this will avail you nothing, for in saying that there is no future resurrection, you affirm a principle which overturns the fact of the resurrection of Christ, *as far as you are concerned*."

There are persons who erroneously believe the body to be the mere present tenement of the soul, which they believe is immortal. Their principle, therefore, theoretically overturns the fact of the resurrection of Christ, only so far as the resurrection of their body is concerned. The connection of the resurrection of Christ and their immortal bliss may be fully believed, notwithstanding their error concerning the dead body. To affirm that their belief in the resurrection of Christ and other important truths, will avail them nothing, is assuming the unwarrantable position that our Father in Heaven will condemn and reject the "weak in the faith," although he has commanded his church to receive them.

Such is the imperfection of the human mind that it really embraces principles which are theoretically inconsistent with each other. Therefore, I cannot admit the correctness of what the writer considers "an important truth," viz:

"A man may believe all things, but if he holds a principle which in its nature is subversive of what he believes, it is tantamount, in his case, to not believing at all."

Error in the human mind is often modified, and, in various degrees, neutralized by truth. The Calvinist believes the truth that men are blameable for their evil deeds. The Arminian says that in believing that all moral actions are decreed by the Almighty, he holds a principle which in its nature is subversive of what he believes. Now, whether the doctrine of the divine decrees of moral actions is true or false, in the mind of the Calvinist, it is not subversive of his belief of moral accountability, therefore it is not 'tantamount, in his case, to not believing at all" in such accountability. The Arminian believes that God foreknows all things. The Calvinist says, that in denying the doctrine of divine decrees, in reference to moral actions, he holds a principle which in its nature is subversive of what he believes, for nothing which is uncertain can be foreknown, and nothing can be certain without decree. Be this, however, as it may, the doctrine of the divine prescience is not subverted in the mind of the Arminian by the principle that moral actions are not the subjects of decree, consequently it is not "tantamount, in his case, to not believing at all" in foreknowledge.

One more illustration. A man believes in the Lord Jesus Christ as his Saviour. He believes that his obedience unto death is the adequate foundation of the sinner's hope and eternal salvation. Yet he believes that *in his highest nature as the divine Son of God*, the Saviour never died or suffered at all. Now, I affirm that he holds a principle which, *in its nature*, is subversive of what he believes; a principle which theoretically renders the means of atonement or reconciliation totally inadequate. Far be it, however, that I should affirm that this imperfection of his faith "is tantamount to his not believing" in the Saviour "at all." He has faith in the Son of God which works by love and overcomes the world.

We know that there are Christians who believe in "The Immortality of the Soul," whose minds and daily practice are influenced to holiness and the love of God and man, "by the truths they profess to believe." It is not true that by all, or even by much erroneous belief, men "place themselves in a *state of alienation* from the truth of God, by which they prevent themselves from being benefitted by the truths they profess to believe." They lose the present enjoyment and holy influence of the truths they do not believe; they may, however, believe important truths, and be benefitted by their sacred power and influence, in respect to their present holiness and comfort, and eternal salvation.

Henry Grew.

Dr. Thomas' Reply to Br. Grew.

The following points in Mr. Grew's strictures, seem to demand a little attention. In the preceding critique he says:—

1. That, in the article alluded to, Dr. Thomas consigns millions of true penitent believers on the Son of God, and followers of the Lamb, to the lake of fire, which is the second death.

2. That he confounds the importance of the existence of a fact with the importance of a correct belief in the fact.

3. That he confounds the belief of an error with the belief of every other error with which that error is logically connected, or with the denial of every truth of which that error is "logically destructive."

4. That the fact of Jesus being what he naturally is, and of his dying and rising again from the dead, are essential to the salvation of men; but a correct belief in these facts is not essential.

5. That Paul does not say, that men are in their sins, if they maintain that there is no resurrection from the dead.

6. That we have no authority to make the belief of any particular truth essential to salvation, which the word of the Lord does not plainly declare to be so.

7. That it is not true, *i. e.* Mr. Grew is of opinion that it is not true, that, if a man believes all the truths of the Gospel, but this one truth of the resurrection of the bodies of the saints, that his unbelief in respect of this truth, renders other truths "vain, or of no practical use."

8. That the belief that the body is the mere present tenement of an immortal soul, is erroneous; this principle, therefore, theoretically overturns the fact of the resurrection of Christ, as far as the resurrection of *their* body is concerned. Such are "weak in the faith."

9. That God will not condemn the "weak in the faith," because he has commanded the church to receive them.

10. That error in the human mind is often modified, and, in various degrees, neutralized by truth.

11. That, to say that the *Divine* Son of God never died or suffered at all, is to hold a principle which theoretically renders the means of atonement or reconciliation totally inadequate; yet, Mr. Grew will not affirm that such a man's faith is vain.

The foregoing items seem to constitute the "pith and marrow" of our venerable friend's strictures. I shall now proceed to remark briefly upon them, one after the other, numbering my paragraphs according to the numbering of the points.

1. It does not necessarily follow, that if a man be not saved, he is therefore consigned to the lake of fire, which is the second death. *It is written*, "Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world (*aion*, age or dispensation) nor in that to come"—*Matt.* xii. 32. Does not this imply that there are some offences, whether of omission or commission, that will be forgiven in the Future Age? Without discussing this point, doth not the reader see the probability of men rising from the dead, who, though not saved in the sense of *possessing the Kingdom*, may yet not be consigned to the flames of the second death. We do not affirm that it will be thus; we state the idea hypothetically, by way of illustration.

Is there no alternative to the resurrected between possessing the Kingdom and being destroyed in the lake of fire? The Scriptures teach the *non-resurrection* of "millions." The Scriptures do not teach that the destiny of *mortal* men is either to be saved or burned in fire; these are not necessary alternatives. The Scriptures speak of "*times of ignorance*," and of God "*winking at*" the things done by men in such times; but they do not therefore teach that ignorant men are "blessed" and shall "inherit the Kingdom prepared from the foundation of the world." Though men boast in the present times as "the glorious and enlightened nineteenth century," the age is less enlightened *in the gospel* than was the age of the apostles. These are emphatically times of gospel ignorance; and whether God will "wink at" them as he did at the ignorant doings of the old Pagan world, I am not prepared to say; be this as it may, with the Scriptures in hand, I see no ground to believe that such "true penitent believers" as our venerable friend indicates, will ever possess the Kingdom, unless they believe the gospel concerning it; nor does it necessarily follow that they will be consigned to the lake of fire.

2. We do not make the confusion expressed in No. 2; it is our worthy friend, who doth not perceive the essentiality of a "correct belief" of important facts, to the obtaining of the Kingdom of God. Salvation is not predicated on the belief of *mere past facts*. We invite Mr. Grew's attention to this, that a man may believe all important *historical* facts concerning Jesus, but he cannot be saved, in any sense, unless he also believe the *prophetic truths* concerning the Kingdom of God. One of these truths is, that the saints shall arise bodily to "possess the Kingdom." This will come to pass whether we believe it or not. But if we deny it, or hold to that which subverts it, we theoretically overthrow the *doctrine* of the Kingdom, and therefore cut ourselves off from salvation in that Kingdom; for we are saved by the mindful belief

of that doctrine, as well as, or in connection with—inseparable connection with—belief of the important facts alluded to. A correct belief of an important fact, is not only to believe that the thing happened, but also the meaning, doctrine, or truth, affirmed in connexion with it. That Jesus rose, is a fact; that he rose for the justification of believers in the Gospel of the Kingdom, which Gospel teaches the bodily resurrection of the dead saints, is the true doctrine of that fact; to believe the fact, and to be ignorant or infidel of its doctrine, is to have no part in that resurrection, into the hope of which the enlightened believer is immersed, and of which the Son of God is the "First Fruits."

3. I do not perpetrate the confusion indicated in No. 3. One error is as fatal to a man's salvation as a multitude of errors believed; and the belief of a multitude of truths is impotent to save, if the vital truth of the whole be omitted, or denied, or if an error be held which demolishes them. "A little leaven leavens the whole lump;" therefore, beware of the leaven of the Scribes and Pharisees, who say that "the soul is immortal and goes to glory at death;" for if it is so, there is no "resurrection unto life," or Kingdom of God to come. The doctrine is destroyed, and the gospel hope is gone.

4. There is a very fatal and universal error expressed in item 4. All "Christendom" supposes that belief in the "MESSENGER" is the matter of faith alone essential to salvation. Hence, "every one believes" that Jesus is the Son of God; that he died for sins and rose again. Yes, they believe after a fashion. Some piously believe; while multitudes believe in Jesus, as Turks believe in Mohammed—because every one believes in him in Turkey. But while they cry "Lord, Lord," how few believe his doctrine or obey his voice! Mankind do not believe his MESSAGE. He says he was sent to preach the Gospel of the Kingdom of God. Belief in God's Messenger alone will not save a man, no matter how pious he may be. *We must believe in his Messenger* AND *in the Message he has sent by him, if we would be saved.* The Gospel of the Kingdom, spoken of in Daniel, and the other prophets, is the Message. "He that believes the Gospel and is baptized shall be saved." The Scripture does not say, he that believes "the Son of God is what he really is in respect to his nature, and of his doing what he really has done," and is baptized, shall be saved; it does not state this as *the* matter of faith, but the doctrine of the Kingdom and the things pertaining to the Messenger. Hence, when the Samaritans believed Philip preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God AND the name of the Lord Jesus, they were baptized—Acts viii. 12. Baptism, or immersion, is of no value, unless the subject believe these "things," and be brought to repentance by the belief of them. "We are renewed by *knowledge*," says Paul; ignorance is death. But alas! with Paul we may exclaim, "Who has believed *the report?*" Isaiah foresaw how few would believe the Report or Message of the Messenger of the Covenant when he should appear; and because of their unbelief in this report, Paul says a branch of Israel's olive was about to be cut off; and that, *for the same cause*, the Gentiles would be separated at the coming of the Lord. Every one believes in Jesus, but scarcely one believes in the Gospel of the Kingdom. This may be termed *the* sign that the Lord is at hand, and that the times of the Gentiles are about to close. We differ, therefore, from Mr. Grew, and maintain that a correct belief of doctrine and facts, with repentance, immersion, and holiness, are indivisibly essential to salvation in the Kingdom of God.

5. But Paul says, that the Corinthians were in their sins if they did not *keep in memory* a certain word he preached to them, which is the same thing. He preached the resurrection of the dead saints as a part of the word. Hymeneus taught that there was no future resurrection of the dead. Some believed it; of whom Paul says, "their faith was overthrown." "By grace," says he, "are ye saved *through faith*"—but if a man's faith is overthrown or shipwrecked, how can he be saved by grace through faith? A shipwrecked faith can no more save a man from death, than a shipwrecked vessel its crew from the briny deep. "We walk by faith,"—we must believe the whole truth, or we shall walk over a precipice and be dashed to atoms.

6. Granted; but the word of the Lord declares, that he that believes not the Gospel shall be damned. This Gospel is made up of "particular truths," and no one has any authority to say, that any one of them may be dispensed with. It is a "particular truth" of the Gospel, that "some who sleep in the dust of the earth shall wake to everlasting life;" it is a "particular truth" of the Gospel, that these persons "shall take the Kingdom and possess it for ever, even for ever and ever;" it is a "particular truth," that when they possess this Kingdom they "shall reign on the earth" as kings and priests; it is a "particular truth," that when this kingdom exists, they shall have "power over the nations and rule them;" it is a "particular truth" of the Gospel, that they shall rule them with Jesus for 1000 years;—these are all a few particular truths, not facts, of the Gospel, which are demolished and scattered to the four winds by the principle, or error, that the saints are not bodily raised, the direct and inevitable conclusion resulting from the absurd dogma of inherent immortal-soulism, &c. Which of these particular truths have we authority to dispense with as unnecessary to salvation? If we dispense with one, why not with all? which the world has done in fact, and yet maintains that a man may be saved! But the word of the Lord plainly declares against it.

7. Our previous remarks show, that to believe all truths but the truth of the resurrection, is not to believe "The Truth." Strike out the resurrection from "the truth," and other truths become the mere baseless fabric of a vision; or send "the soul" to glory at death, and the truth of God is rendered of none effect by the tradition.

8. This item admits the doctrine we contend for, but apologizes for the believer on account of his weakness.

9. True; God will receive the "weak in *the* faith," but not the "*weak in faith.*" It is by faith that men are able to overcome the world, the flesh, and the devil. A weak faith cannot accomplish this: it requires a strong faith to do it. A man who could not conscientiously eat meat offered to idols, though an idol was nothing, was weak in the faith, but his faith was so strong in one only living and true God, that he could have nothing to do with idols in any form without feeling defiled; and on the other hand, also, his faith was so strong in the gospel of the kingdom, &c., that

he would have gone to the stake rather than have surrendered an iota of that truth, or have apologized for faithlessness in it. No where in the Word, has the church been "commanded to receive" men who are "weak in faith;" but, on the contrary, to "rebuke them sharply that they may be *sound in the faith.*" Weak faith is the plague of this generation. The reception of such has swamped "the church," which has become faithless, disobedient, and ready to fall in the wilderness, like Israel of old. "Because of unbelief they shall not enter into my rest."

10. True. Now look on the other side:—truth in the human mind is often modified, and in various degrees *neutralized by error*, as in the case before us.

11. The Apostle John forbid the true believer to wish such a person God speed, or to show him hospitality; yet, so charitable is our venerable friend, that he will not venture to "affirm that such a man's faith is vain!"

In relation to faithlessness in one particular truth neutralizing faith in all other truths, I would cite the following example, which is indeed intimately connected with the resurrection of the saints. Paul says, "unto *them that look for Him* shall Christ appear the second time without a sin-offering *unto salvation.*" After this affirmative declaration, is it necessary for the Apostle to say negatively, that He will not come and save those who do not look for his coming, before we can venture to affirm that to believe in and look for the coming of the Lord is necessary to salvation? When a thing is affirmed, the negative is implied; but weak faith is afraid to make the implication. A man may believe all about the history of Jesus, but if he believes not in the resurrection of the dead saints, or in the coming of the Lord to salvation, "preposterous" as it may seem to our venerable friend, on the faith of the apostle's doctrine, we hesitate not to proclaim upon the house-tops, that "he cannot enter the Kingdom of God."

EDITOR OF THE HERALD OF THE FUTURE AGE.
Richmond, Va., Jan. 15th, 1848.

PROPHETIC PERIODS.—NO. V.

THE SEVEN AND SIXTY-TWO WEEKS.

Having shown that the seventy weeks bring us down to the time when Jerusalem was "compassed about with armies, when the "trangression" of Daniel's people was to be no longer "restrained," and the iniquity of that people was "filled up," we now proceed to give our opinion of the sixty-two and seven weeks of Dan. 9. We have said in a previous number that we consider this a distinct period from the 70 weeks, and not a subdivision of it. If our view of the 70 weeks is correct, it is clear the lesser period must be another, and given for another purpose, *viz: To give the time of the first advent* of "*Messiah.*" We freely admit, at the outset, that there are difficulties on this point; nor do we promise to make this topic as clear as that of the 70 weeks.

After Gabriel had given Daniel the "70 weeks upon thy people and *thy holy city*, to restrain transgression," [margin] &c., referring to events that would come within that period, he proceeds to give him another period for the coming of Messiah. Our translation reads "Know *therefore*," &c: some students of Scripture translate the original word "*also.*" Thus the Duke of Manchester, on the "Times of Daniel," reads the verse—"*Also* thou shalt know and understand from the going forth of the word to cause to return and to build Jerusalem, until Messiah the Prince [are] seven weeks, and sixty-two weeks." He remarks—"Our translators seem to have been influenced in the rendering of the verse by what they supposed must be the connexion and meaning, and they turned a mere copulative into an illative, and the future into an imperative." That is, they made an adverb, which is a mere connecting link in the discourse, to be an inference from that previously spoken. Whereas, Gabriel having given the period allotted to the further trial of Daniel's people and his holy city, next calls his attention to another measure of time which was to bring to pass an event that was to precede the final giving up of Jerusalem, the holy city, to be desolated, and trodden under foot of the Gentiles; and he says—"Know *also*," or likewise, &c.: in addition to what has been told you, understand how long it will be "*to* Messiah."

Mr. Greswell in his Dissertations, vol. 4, page 329, speaking of this prophecy, Dan. 9: 24, 25, says —"Two classes of events, which are neither the same in themselves, nor in their beginnings and their endings respectively, are connected together in the scope of its disclosures * * * * to one of these classes we may give the name of the facts of the Christian ministry, and to the other that of the facts of the Jewish war."

If then the 62 and 7 weeks are a distinct period from the 70, where did they begin? If the view we have taken in a previous number is correct, *viz.* that the decree of Cyrus [*Coresch*] is the true decree for restoring Daniel's people, and to build Jerusalem —and if we have the true date of the 70 weeks, i. e. B. C. 423, or the second year of Darius Nothus, at which time the 70 years desolation of Jerusalem ended, (see Dan. 9: 2, and Zech. 1: 7, 12; 16,) then the decree to restore (thy people) and to build Jerusalem, could not have been more than eleven years previous, or the year B. C. 434. We have in this view taken the ground that the captivity in Babylon commenced in the eighth year of Nebuchadnezzar; (see 2 Kings, 24: 12.) If, however, as some suppose, the captivity commenced in the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, (compare Dan. 1: 1, 2, with Jer. 25: 1,) then the 70 year captivity would terminate about twenty years prior to 423, or about 443–4 before Christ. If this last period be taken as the true date of the decree of *Coresch*, or the Scripture Cyrus, then the "7 weeks" counted as allotted to the completion of the Temple, or "46 years," (see John 2: 20,) which, though not exactly 7 prophetic weeks, yet, may be considered under the general term of 7 weeks, being 6 full weeks and 4 years into the 7th, then the 7 weeks would end about 398 B. C. Then add 62 weeks, or 434 years to that, and we have A. D. 36. If this view be correct the crucifixion could not have occurred as early as is generally supposed: but the exact year of our Lord's birth has never yet been fixed with certainty; neither has the year of his crucifixion. Different writers divide on the time of the first advent from seven years or more before the common, or vulgar era, to *eleven* years after. With this uncertainty about the birth of our Lord, it would not be strange if the crucifixion should also be found to be at a later period than has generally been supposed.

If however we should take another view of the subject, we might possibly be extricated from some of these difficulties, though we might encounter others perhaps equally as great. If we were to suppose the 62 weeks are the *whole* period given from the decree to restore, and to build Jerusalem "to Messiah;" and that the 7 weeks are only the first part of the 62, mentioned with special reference to the work to be accomplished in the first part of the 62, then we should find the 62 weeks, or 434 years, covering the entire period "to Messiah." In that case again, making the termination of the captivity *eleven* years, (as is evidently most in accordance with Scripture) before the end of the 70 years "desolations of Jerusalem," we should be brought back, for the decree of Coresch to B. C. 434, making just 62 weeks to the birth of Messiah, according to the vulgar era. Why should we not understand the language of Gabriel—"*to* Messiah the Prince," to mean to his birth, or first advent? Certainly he was proclaimed the Messiah at that time. It was revealed to old Simeon, "by the Holy Spirit, that he should not see death, before he had seen the Lord's Christ"—Messiah. When the old man took the child Jesus in his arms, he blessed God and declared that the promise had been fulfilled to him. When Jesus was born "the angel of the Lord" proclaimed him as the Messiah in these remarkable words, Lk. 2: 11, "Unto you is born this day in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Christ (Messiah) the Lord."

Surely here is evidence strong as the "Holy Spirit" that was upon Simeon, and "the angel of the Lord," that came to the Shepherds, could make it, that "Messiah" had come; and, hence, that the specified time, given by Gabriel to Daniel, "to Messiah the Prince," was now accomplished. The expression, in Dan. 9th, "*after* three score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off," does not define the exact period of that event; it may as well be 30 years after, as three years and a half after, as to any impropriety in the language.

The only difficulty in our mind to this last view of the 62 weeks is, that the language, in Dan. 9: 25, seems to indicate that the 7 weeks and the 62 are a period of 69 weeks: if this is really so, then this last view cannot be correct. But the expression "after three score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off," seems also to indicate, that the 62 weeks are the whole period given to bring us "*to* Messiah." And may it not be possible that the 7 weeks are the first part of the 62, specially noted, because of the work to be done in that period? If this is the case, then the decree of Coresch, B. C. 434, brings us, in 62 prophetic weeks, 434 years, exactly "to Messiah's" birth, when he was proclaimed the promised Messiah, as we have already seen. While we are satisfied that the decree of Coresch, the true Cyrus of the Scriptures, is "the commandment" spoken of by Gabriel, Dan. 9th, we are not satisfied whether that decree was issued B. C. about 444 or 434: one of those points, with present light, we believe is the true date.

We are not entirely alone in the suggestion that the 7 and 62 weeks commence at the same date. The great Joseph Mede, says:—"If we must have some limited time of forty-nine years, (7 weeks) I would date it from the same epoch as the sixty-two weeks, and make the times concurrent and not consecutive." He saw at least the possibility that these two periods might begin together.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, MARCH, 1848.

ARE THE WICKED IMMORTAL?

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

The Cause is onward, and the truth is spreading. We have received more than three hundred new subscribers since the December number was issued. We give a few extracts of letters, in this number, to let our friends see the feeling there is abroad in reference to the Examiner and its objects. Our friends will excuse us "this once," for publishing these tokens of their satisfaction, and others will do the same for not publishing all their expressions of favour. Since our last, the friends in Millville, N. J., have established a meeting where they can worship the living God through His Son, without being subjected to sectarian lordships. In that place, eight months ago, we believe, there was not an individual that sympathized with our views on the sleep of the dead and the destruction of the wicked. Now there are two who were Methodist preachers, at that time, and many more, who being crowded out of the churches for their avowal of these truths, that meet together "in their own hired house," and utter the convictions of their own minds untrammeled. The commencement of this work was a *single* copy of the "*Six Sermons.*" Within the past two months, one hundred copies of those Sermons have been scattered, by the brethren in Millville, in that part of the State; and they have subscribed freely for the Examiner. Let all the friends, in every place, see that they do not enjoy the light alone. Make one more effort, and let that be a *continual* one, to help us on in the great work of vindicating God's truth and His blessed name from the reproach which men have heaped upon them in their hot zeal for the traditions of the Pagans, which appeared to them like jewels; and for the defence of which, they have seemed to think, like Jonah, they "do well to be angry." Most sincerely do we pity such, and earnestly desire that they may yet come to the truth, and be made "free" by it.

Be Courteous.—We are sorry the Bible Advocate should be so excited with Dr. Thomas for a simple *illustration* which he used in reply to Br. Bell in the last Examiner. We hope that paper will keep cool for the time to come. We will only say, it has amazingly perverted both the Doctor's words and his meaning, and built upon that perversion a tirade of abuse ill becoming one who thinks "the Judge standeth at the door." We would like to know where the man is that has no error in his theory? Let him cast the first stone at his brother who differs from him. We certainly differ from Dr. Thomas

in several things: and we equally differ with the Advocate. If we believed to constitute a man a real Christian, he must be perfect in knowledge and judgment, we should never hope to find a Christian on earth, till the next age shall come. If men are sincerely inquiring after truth, and using the best light they have, and do fall into some error, they are no more blame-worthy than they would be for having a fever, or breaking their bones, or being destitute of daily food. We might just as well fall into a passion with our fellow-men for suffering with hunger, being sick, or breaking their bones, as to get out of humor with them for their errors in doctrine, if they manifest the spirit of Christ in their lives, and are using their best endeavours to inform themselves as to what is truth. To be sick, or to be in error, are both misfortunes, and both cause loss and pain to a greater or less extent. The subject of these calamities is to be pitied not abused. We would think him a tiger that would fall upon a man with a broken bone and abuse him. Surely error is worse to the individual than broken bones; and we all have more or less; let us never forget that. Least of all has the Advocate occasion to complain of Dr. Thomas' "absurdities" while it maintains that the "millennium *is past*," and that it covered the darkest ages of Papacy!!

The Advocate, and some others who get "impatient," "dream" dreams, and "interpret" them, in our zeal for "the cause," may possibly be benefited by the following story:

"When Bulstrode Whitelocke was embarking as Cromwell's envoy to Sweden, in 1653, he was much disturbed in mind as he rested in Harwich on the preceding night, which was very stormy, while he reflected on the distracted state of the nation. It happened that a confidential servant slept in an adjacent bed, who, finding that his master could not sleep, at length said, 'Pray, Sir, will you give me leave to ask you a question?' 'Certainly.' 'Pray, Sir, don't you think that God governed the world very well before you came into it?' 'Undoubtedly.' 'And pray, Sir, don't you think he will govern it quite as well when you are gone out of it?' 'Certainly.' 'Then, Sir, pray excuse me, but don't you think you may trust him to govern it quite as well as long as you live?' To this question Whitelocke had nothing to reply; but turning himself about, soon fell fast asleep till he was summoned to embark."

TENDENCIES OF IMMORTAL SOULISM.

In the "Mysteries of Romanism," exhibiting the "Demoralizing Influences of Popery," we find a Chapter on "The Tendencies of Romish Literature," one paragraph of which is the following:—

"Among the late perverts to Rome of high degree, we find chronicled the name of *Lady Georgiana Fullerton*, sister to Lord Granville, and authoress of "Ellen Middleton." After reading this exciting novel, and observing the peculiar cast of thought and train of remark when adverting to religious exercises and duties, we were not surprised to learn that our authoress had become a full convert to superstition, and at last entered the mystical precincts of Rome. When we see Alice bowing in her closet before a picture of our Saviour, and then holding up the crucifix before the eyes of her dying husband; when we see what sacredness, awe, and efficacy, are attributed to the act of confession to a priest; when we hear Mrs. Tracy, heretofore the deadly enemy of Ellen Middleton, kneeling at her bed side, in hardly articulate tones saying to her, '*Pray for me when you are in heaven;*' finally, when we hear Ellen's speech to her husband, in which she says: 'There is a blessed communion in which we both believe, between those who rest in heaven, and those who struggle on earth; you will pray for me when I am gone; and I will pray for you where I go:' who can doubt that the writer's mind was already enslaved to Romanism?"

And cannot this Protestant Editor, "Rev. C. Sparry," see, and "*who can doubt*, that the" immortal soul theory was what led Lady Fullerton straight down the gulph to Romanism; where thousands and tens of thousands more have gone and are going? Had Lady Fullerton fully believed the bible truth, "the dead praise not the Lord"—"the dead know not anything," does the "Rev. Editor," himself, believe she would have found an open door into "Romanism?" She honestly followed out the immortal soul theory. Its legitimate landing place is Romanism or Restorationism. Lady Fullerton landed in the former, and Bishop Newton in the latter. Will Mr. Sparry, or any one else, show us, if they can, the impropriety of asking a dying saint to "pray for" us when they "get to heaven"—or, for that dying saint to say "I will pray for you where I go," on the supposition that the dead do know "more than all the world," and are alive in the presence of God? Are they less holy there than while here? Are they less interested for friends left behind when they get to heaven than while they were with them on earth? Have they less access to God there than here? If it is answered—"Christ is the intercessor there"—We answer—He is no more the intercessor after saints die than before; and we are commanded to pray for one another; and we know of no Protestant that hesitates to ask a Christian to pray for him. Paul himself said—"Brethren, pray for me." It may be said—"True; we should pray for each other while here." We reply—Paul said, "I will that men pray *everywhere*." It may be said again,—"Paul did not mean when they were dead." He said, "Everywhere;" and from that obligation it is for our opponents to show they are released by death, unless they are *unconscious*, and therefore incapable of the act. But the objector may say, "We have no Scripture example of living saints asking dying ones to pray for them when they get to heaven." We answer—"Thou hast said truly:" and the reason is obvious—the Bible saints understood that there is *no knowledge* in *sheol*, the invisible state, where their dying friends

were going; their hope, their *one and only hope* was in the resurrection; the pagan fable had not obtained among them, that the soul is immortal: they understood their friends were "silent in the grave." But when the heathen superstition of "disembodied spirits"—"the soul immortal"—"the dead know more than all the world," stole into the church, then her communicants, who embraced this "vain philosophy," were fully prepared to slide into praying to saints—from that to a purgatory—and then into "Romanism" fully developed, or the "man of sin" large as life. No wonder Protestants have made so poor a stand against Romanism. Ever since Luther, by the persuasion of his brother Reformers, was tempted, and fell by the temptation, and gave up, or consented to hide his light on the subject of the *non*-immortality of the soul, Romanism has marched onward and "prevailed," and will prevail till the doctrine of man's natural, or inherent immortality is once more firmly placed where Luther placed it at the commencement of the reformation, among the "Roman *dunghill of decretals*." It has no higher authority. The council of Lateran, under Pope Leo X. passed the following "Canon:"—

"Some have *dared* to assert concerning the nature of the reasonable soul, that it is mortal; *we* with the approbation of the *sacred council*, do *condemn and reprobate all such*, seeing, *according to the canon of Pope Clement the Fifth, that the soul is immortal*: and we strictly inhibit all from dogmatising otherwise: and we decree, that all who adhere to the like erroneous assertions, shall be shunned and punished as heretics."—*Caranza*, page 412—1681.

This canon shows that the doctrine of an "immortal soul," that lives when the man is *dead*, was supported in those days, as it generally has been since, by the authority of Creeds, rather than by the truth of God. Bishop Tillistou says, in his Sermon, Vol. 2, printed 1774, "*The immortality of the soul is rather supposed, or taken for granted, than expressly revealed in the Bible.*"

Do we not well say then—The tendencies of the immortal soul theory, is to lead men to reverence the creeds of men more than the Bible—their declaration of sentiments—their priestly domination, and hence directly forward into Romanism? The author of the work, "Mysteries of Romanism," tells us, p. 23:

"A court-lady, daughter of the Earl of Devonshire, having embraced the catholic religion, (in the reign of Charles I.) was asked by Laud the reason of her conversion. 'It is chiefly,' said she, 'because I hate to travel in a crowd.' Being desired to explain her meaning, she replied: 'I perceive your grace, (Laud) and many others are *making haste to Rome*, and therefore, in order to prevent being crowded, I have gone before you.'

Multitudes of Protestants, in England and elsewhere, have gone to the Romish religion, because the Reformers did not maintain the principle of Luther when he first saw clearly the light, that the doctrine of an inherent immortal soul was only a "Roman dunghill decretal:" and multitudes more, in this country, will land there, if this age continues much longer, some of whom make great displays of zeal against her at present. The reason is, they hold substantially with Rome in her pagan fable of the consciousness of dead men.

WOULD YOU INHERIT THE KINGDOM?

Math. 6: 33. "*Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you.*"

To understand this text we must view it with its connection. Our Lord had assured his followers "No man can serve two masters—Ye cannot serve God and mammon:" or, ye cannot serve God and a mind bent on the things of this world—such as riches, &c. "Therefore, I say unto you, take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for the body what ye shall put on." This verse and the following have been amazingly perverted by some minds, by not considering that it is common in Scripture to speak of a thing of less importance than another as if it were of no importance. Many examples of this may be given. Our Saviour said, Luke 14: 26, "If a man *hate not* his—wife—and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." How are we to understand such an expression? By no means in an absolute sense. The apostles are the best commentators on the meaning of our Lord's words that we can have. Do they countenance the absolute sense of these words? See Eph. 5: 25, 28, "Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it." "So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife loveth himself." And in the 29th verse the apostle says,—"No man ever yet hated his own flesh," or himself—his "life." The thing, in an absolute sense, is impossible. Again, our Lord, John 6: 27, says, "Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life." This is a text of the same character as the other; not to be explained so as to contradict inspired expositions of man's duty as to the things of this life. When man was placed in Eden, and in innocency, he was placed there "to dress and to keep it." Paul to Timothy, 1 Tim. 5: 8. says—"But if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel." And again, 2 Thes. 3: 10—12, he says—"For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat. For we hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busy-bodies. Now them that are such we command and exhort by our Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness they work, and eat their own bread."

With such a commentary on our Lord's words, we cannot be in doubt as to their meaning; and as we before said, he spoke in accordance with the custom of those days, in which, things of less value when placed by the side of those immensely more valuable are spoken of as of no value—to be hated—not to be regarded; that is, comparatively speaking. So the words "take no thought," &c., we are not to understand in an absolute sense. Paul did not so understand them, when a prisoner at Rome; and at a time, too, when he declares "I have finished my course—I am ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand." In the same chapter, immediately after, he tells Timothy—"The cloak that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou comest, bring with thee, and the books, but especially the parchments." Pray, Paul are you not taking "thought what you shall put on"? Why think about that "*cloak*," when you are just going "to be offered"? Paul cannot help thinking he shall want that cloak to keep him warm while here. He had learned, it is true, in whatsoever state he was to be content, but not so content as not to use lawful means to make his condition more comfortable when in his power. So when our Lord says, take no thought, he only prohibits such thought as is implied in *serving mammon*—such thought as rules and absorbs the mind to the exclusion of the service of God, the superior and most important of all thoughts and service; or such thought as implies distrust of God's fatherly care over us while we make his service the great, grand and absorbing business of life. We may paraphrase the verse and connexion thus: "You cannot have a mind devoted to God, and at the same time bent upon and absorbed by the riches of this world; therefore I say unto you, be not anxiously careful for your life about food and raiment, lest you serve mammon, and make a treasure laid up on earth your portion, and thus depart from God. To guard you against this anxious care consider the fowls of the air, though they lay up no stores, yet your heavenly Father feedeth them," &c. "Therefore be not anxiously careful, saying—What shall we eat? or What shall we drink? or Wherewithal shall we be clothed, (for the Gentiles, who know not God, make these things the all absorbing objects of their pursuit) and your heavenly Father knoweth that *ye have need* of these things; therefore, seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, or that righteousness which he requires, and all these things shall be added unto you, while diligent in business, but without distracting thoughts; take therefore no distracting thoughts about the future: the future, if it comes, will bring its own cares, but you should not anticipate them, and burden your minds by adding them to those of the present time; sufficient unto the day is the evil it brings." Such, we believe, is the true sense and meaning of our Lord's discourse. And he calls our minds to the immense value of an inheritance in the kingdom of God, in comparison of which, food, raiment, and life itself, are of no value.

God has a kingdom to be established. It is called "the kingdom of God;" and this by way of distinction from all the kingdoms that have gone before it. The kingdoms, or reigning governments of this world are emblematically set forth as dreadful beasts; savage, oppressive, warlike; and doomed to destruction: but another is to succeed them entirely dissimilar; mild, equitable, peaceable, and everlasting. We are required to pray—"Thy kingdom come." We are bound to pray understandingly: not to do so is to mock God. How can we pray understandingly for that of which we are in ignorance? How can such a prayer be sincerely offered? If we know not what it is we are praying for, how can we desire it? If there is no desire for that we pray for, our prayer is hypocrisy. Paul tells us, 1 Corth. 14: 15, "I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also." We may safely say—All prayer must be thus offered if acceptable to God. If so, then it is essential that we have knowledge in regard to the location and nature of the kingdom of God, else we do not pray with the understanding. These remarks are equally applicable in view of the command to seek first the kingdom; or, make it the first object of our attention. How can we seek it at all, if we are ignorant of its nature and location? How can the injunction have any weight with us, if we know not what it is we are to seek, or where it is to be found? It is vastly more important than most professed Christians suppose that we have clear and distinct ideas about this kingdom, if we would not pray about it hypocritically, and seek for it as one that beateth the air. Let us then inform ourselves on these matters.

1. *Its Location:* The prayer our Saviour taught us states distinctly where we are to expect the kingdom of God to be established. "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done *on earth*," &c. It is on earth we are to pray for this kingdom to be established, or set up. Daniel, also saw in vision, chap. 7, "one like the Son of man" have "given him dominion and glory, and *a kingdom*;" and "all people, nations, and languages, should serve him." And the explanation of that vision shows that "The kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom *under the whole heaven*" is that to be possessed by the saints, including Christ, the first and chief of the saints, or holy ones. Our Saviour also declares—"The meek shall inherit *the earth*:" thus settling the point, that the kingdom of God is to be on earth.

2. *Its Nature:* Its King is immortal—he can die no more; "death hath no more dominion over him." He will reign personally and visibly. "This *same Jesus*, that is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven:" Acts 1: 11, "The Lord *himself* shall descend from heaven," &c. 1 Thes. 4: 16. Also Jer. 23: 5, "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth." These texts are a sample of many that go to show that the King is personally and visibly to reign, and to do so "on earth." The saints, those "that are Christ's at his coming" to establish his kingdom or set it up, whether they are asleep or awake, *i. e.* dead or alive, "will sit down with" Christ on his "throne," or become Rulers with him, as heirs through him, in the kingdom. It is common with the men of the present age, after political campaigns, to promote their friends, who have laboured, suffered, and expended funds in their cause; and they do it by bestowing profitable and honourable offices upon them. The King of kings, when he takes the kingdom, will, according to his covenant engagement, bestow a crown upon every one, who has faithfully adhered to his cause, while his enemies have had the kingdoms of the world in their possession. That will be the reward of immortality, or to have their vile bodies changed and fashioned like their King's most glorious body; and, with him, to be established as Rulers in the Everlasting Kingdom. This kingdom will be the same throughout the endless succession of ages; but it will undergo various modifications, each age rising higher in glory than the preceding. The

next, or coming age, which commences this kingdom on earth, will be a *mixture*: that is, The *rulers* of that age, or thousand years, called the millenium, will all be immortal: the *subjects*, or those "left" from the overwhelming judgments upon the earth, with which that age will be ushered in, will be liable to corruption with their posterity who will be born during that age: and though the nations will be subjected to Christ and his "Joint Heirs," during the thousand years, or whatever the length of that age may be, so that no national demonstration of hostility to the government of Christ will be made, yet when that age closes a mighty combined effort will be made to overthrow His Government, but it will be signally and totally defeated; and, probably will be the last demonstration of hostility ever made to Christ's reign. Having now briefly noticed the nature of the Kingdom of God, we proceed to some remarks on the injunction to "*seek first*" this kingdom, and "His righteousness." The term "*first*" often signifies, "*chief*." If so in the text before us, then we are commanded to make this object the *principal* concern of our life; it is to stand out in our minds as *the* great business for which we now live: it is to have a prominence in our affections and actions, that no other is entitled to. But, how can this be the case so long as there is no definite idea in our minds as to the nature and location of this kingdom? Without this, how can the mind be made to realize its value so as to give it that attention for which the demand is made? How can we obtain the knowledge necessary to give such importance to the subject as shall lead us to obedience to the command to make that kingdom the first, or chief object of our pursuit? To secure this end, must there not be somewhere a *description* of the Kingdom of God? Where can we find that description if not in the Bible? It certainly is not contained in the fancies of men, nor the creeds they have invented. If it is described in the Bible, how shall we learn what it is unless we "Search the Scriptures?" How then can any man be said to be seeking that kingdom who neglects this examination, and makes it not the most anxious study of his life? It is not *reveries*, or a few flights of fancy, that makes a man an understanding seeker of the kingdom of God. We must serve God *in truth*, as well as in spirit, or we "beat the air." Let us, then, most earnestly and prayerfully seek this kingdom by a careful study of the words of God, as spoken to us by the Holy Spirit through holy men of old.

To be Heirs of the Kingdom of God we must not only seek the kingdom but "His righteousness;" that is—The righteousness which God requires. Not some fanciful, undescribable, and undefinable operation unknown except to a diseased imagination, but that holiness, or purity of mind and life, taught by Patriarchs and Prophets, but especially brought to view in the teachings of him who "spake as never man spake;" and who exemplified it in his life, so that he became the living embodiment of all he taught; and left us in no doubt as to what constitutes holiness, or what that righteousness is which God requires to prepare us to be "joint heirs with Christ" in the Kingdom of God. It is "the righteousness of faith;" or, that righteousness which is produced by a believing reception of the Son of God, and a constant contemplation of his *holy life, conversation, and tempers*; which by "beholding we are changed into the same image, from glory to glory;" or honour, "even as by the Spirit of the Lord;" which Spirit works by the *truth* of God, that being its "sword," and the *instrument* of sanctification—"Sanctify them through thy truth—*thy word* is truth." Christ as we have said, was the living embodiment of the truths he taught, and left us an "example" that we should "walk even as he walked:" 1 John 2: 6, and 1 Peter 2: 21. Let us then, carefully look at him—*his humility—his patience—his forgiving disposition—his resignation—his love of enemies—his love to God—his hatred of sin—especially, his spirit and practice of obedience*; so that he could say "*I delight to do thy will, O God.*" Here is a lesson for us to learn. Whoever lays it to mind, and believes it essential that he should learn this lesson, in order to an inheritance in the Kingdom of God, will see the propriety and importance of making it his "first" and principal, or chief object. It is not learned in a day; though we may form the resolution at once to commence the work, and make a beginning; but we shall find that the longest life is none too long to accomplish a work of such magnitude and importance. The doctrine and commandments of men have set up a lower standard, even that of fallible men, whose memoirs are sought and read, the standard of all their attainments. Whatever value there may be in such memoirs, they are worthless, if not pernicious, when compared with that standard given us by the Son of God.

Let us then, set the Lord Jesus before our minds for constant contemplation. If we find ourselves coming short let us not faint nor be discouraged; but renew our effort depending upon the aid of that Spirit which our Lord promised before he went away, and which he assured his followers our heavenly Father is more ready to give to them that ask him than we are to give good gifts to our children. Our Lord and Master watches over us, not to find occasion against us; but, to "help our infirmities." Thus, if we find we come short, we are to increase our "diligence" that we may grow up into the likeness of Christ, even "the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ;" and thus "grow up into him in all things, who is the head." Eph. 4: 13—15.

The Kingdom of God lies before us; we are called to give it our highest attention and efforts. Consider its value—its glory—its high privileges—its exalted honours—its endless durability. Consider, it was that which filled the Saviour's heart—"the joy set before him"—the Kingdom of God, where he would sit with his followers on the throne of his glory. It was that which occupied the minds of Patriarchs—Prophets—Apostles, and all the faithful martyrs. Shall we then neglect it? Shall we not heed the command of our Lord, who is soon to return to earth, and establish this kingdom? Where are our sympathies? Are they with the "kingdoms of this world;" or, with the "Kingdom of our God and his Christ"? And let us remember—"*The unrighteous shall not inherit the Kingdom of God.*"

BISHOP NEWTON—ETERNAL TORMENTS.

The following extracts are from the *Sixth* Vol. of Bishop Newton's Works, London Edition, 1787, and show the inextricable dilemma into which a powerful mind was plunged by the belief of man's natural immortality. We believe that nearly all

immortal-soul theorists are, though unconscious of it themselves, Restorationists. The Bishop's topic, in "*Disertation*" No. 60 is—"*On the final state and condition of man.*" He is really a very great "*heretic.*" "*Hell,*" he says, "as a place of torment, is no where mentioned in the writings of Moses," &c. He then goes on to tell us that—

"GEHENNA is the more usual name for the place of torment, and better known among the Jews; but the origin of this name is of a later date. Gehenna, or the valley of Hinnom, the name of the old proprietor of the land, was a place in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, where the worshippers of Moloch offered and burnt in the fire their sons and daughters to that grim idol; and that part, where these sacrifices were made, was called TOPHET, from TOPH, a drum, drums and such like noisy instruments being employed to drown the cries of these miserable children. The good king Josiah defiled the place, cut down the groves, brake down the images and altars, and filled it with dead men's bones, the bones of the priests who sacrificed there, and henceforth it became a kind of common sewer, where all the carrion, garbage and offals of the city were thrown, and to prevent any infection a fire was kept continually burning to consume them. This valley was further signalized by two memorable occurrences before and after this time. For here it was that Sennacherib, the king of Assyria's army, consisting of 185,000 men, were all slain in one night, and their bodies consumed by fire, according to the prophecy of Isaiah 30: 31, 33, 'For through the voice of the Lord shall the Assyrian be beaten down, which smote with a rod. . . . For Tophet is ordained of old; yea, for the king it is prepared; he hath made it deep and large: the pile thereof is fire and much wood; the breath of the Lord, like a stream of brimstone, doth kindle it.' Here also was a great slaughter and massacre of the idolatrous Jews by the Babylonians, and their carcases, more than could be buried, were left a prey to the birds of the air, and the beasts of the field, according to the prediction of Jeremiah 7: 31—33, 'And they have built the high places of Tophet, which is in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire; which I commanded them not, neither came it into my heart. Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that it shall no more be called Tophet, nor the valley of the son of Hinnom, but the valley of slaughter: for they shall bury in Tophet, till there be no place. And the carcases of this people shall be meat for the fowls of the heaven, and for the beasts of the earth; and none shall fray them away.' Such a horrid place as this, so deservedly execrated both by God and man, the stage of such destruction, the scene of such continual burning, was fitly considered by the Jews as a type and figure of hell-fire, and the name is adopted and repeated several times by our Saviour himself in the gospels. One other name is used in the Scripture for the place of torment, THE LAKE OF FIRE AND BRIMSTONE, which is a manifest allusion to the lake Asphaltites, where Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities of the plain were overthrown by brimstone and fire from heaven, and as St. Jude saith, 5: 7, 'are set forth as an ensample suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.' For men have no other way of expressing the invisible things of a future state but by some sensible objects, such as they have seen or known, or been accustomed to in this world."

"We cannot in the least discover, in what part of infinite space will be the mansions of just men made perfect. Neither can we learn with any more certainty which is the place of hell. Some have imagined, that the fire at the centre of the earth is the fire of hell: but it hath never been proved that there is any such central fire: it contradicts all our notions of philosophy. If there be any such fire, it may be prepared ready for the general conflagration; but after the general conflagration we are assured, there will be a 'new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness,' and consequently there can be no such place as hell. Others have conceived that a comet, and others again that the sun will be the place of hell. There the fire is already kindled; but the Lord of the universe can easily kindle any star or planet, that it shall immediately become a furnace of fire for the punishment of rebellious creatures against their Creator."

Such endless conjectures are men, great men, led into, who depart from the plain Scripture testimony, that "the righteous shall be recompensed *in the earth; much more the wicked and the sinner;*" and that the portion of the sinner is to be burned "*up root and branch;*" &c. But Bishop Newton had adopted the *Pagan philosophy* that the soul is immortal; which, as Martin Luther once said, is among the "*monstrous opinions* to be found in the Roman *dunghill* of decretals." *Defence*, prop. 27, published 1530.

The Bishop next speaks of the *duration* and different *degrees* of rewards and punishments. As to the *nature* of these things he follows exactly in the so called "orthodox" strain of reasoning—dwelling upon the same texts on which they rely, and states his opinion that "the *fire of hell* is not metaphorical but real." After having dwelt upon the different degrees of bliss and misery, he says:—

"But the greatest difficulty of all yet remains to be considered, which is the duration of the happiness of the blessed, and of the misery of the damned. Mat. 25: 46, 'And these shall go away into everlasting punishment: and the righteous into life eternal.' That the righteous should be rewarded with everlasting happiness is readily admitted; it is what every one wishes, and what every one therefore easily believes: but that the wicked should be punished with ETERNAL MISERY, is of a harder digestion; it is not perhaps for men's interest that it should be true, and therefore they are willing to hope and believe that it may be false. And this article, I believe, hath not only stuck with infidels, but hath also raised scruples in the minds of many serious Christians. For indeed *it is one of the most knotty points of divinity, and the hardest to be reconciled to our reason.* Some assert in the strongest terms the eternity of hell-torments, others as peremptorily deny it, but for my part, I cannot entirely approve either the arguments usually urged in support of this doctrine, or the objections usually made against it. The truth may possibly lie in the mid-way between both," &c.

The Bishop then examines the subject, and attempts to disprove the doctrine of "annihilation." After quoting the usual texts to prove the doctrine

of the eternal torments of the wicked; he says:—"But the words 'everlasting,' 'eternal,' 'forever,' and the like are sometimes used in a limited sense, and do not always signify an endless duration; and therefore though the punishment of the wicked be called 'everlasting,' 'eternal,' yet may it not for all that be of endless duration. . . . When Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities about them are spoken of, by Jude, as suffering the vengeance of ETERNAL FIRE; the fire continued no longer than till it had reduced them to utter destruction. The sense therefore is limited by the nature of the thing: but when the nature of the thing doth not limit and restrain it, the words should certainly be taken in their proper and genuine signification. . . . . It must be admitted that God has threatened everlasting misery to the wicked as plainly and positively as he hath promised everlasting happiness to the righteous. . . . . You cannot complain of injustice, for the rewards and punishments are equal: and it was really necessary that the rewards and punishments should be declared EVERLASTING. . . . You cannot then complain that the sanction of eternal penalties is unreasonable, for you see plainly that it is no more than is absolutely necessary; but possibly you may think, though it may be necessary in the government of this world for such things to be denounced by God and believed by men, yet there may not be the like necessity for inflicting them in the world to come. God is not obliged to execute his threatenings, as he is to make good his promises. But why is he not obliged to perform the one as well as the other? . . . . If God will not execute as well as threaten, why does he threaten at all? . . . . There is then sufficient reason to conclude that God will fully execute his threatenings as well as make good his promises, and the rewards and punishments consequent thereupon will be REALLY AND TRULY EVERLASTING; . . . . . and as long as they retain the same qualities, so long they will keep the same station; as long as they remain righteous or wicked, so long they will remain happy or miserable even to all eternity."

The Bishop then proceeds with a long and laboured argument to show that it is *possible* for the righteous in heaven to "commit iniquity," and asks, if "he should still continue in glory?" So "if the wicked *should* turn away from his wickedness" he "should be plucked as a fire-brand out of the fire?" And the Bishop adds—"This I conceive is the true notion and representation of the eternity of rewards and punishments." After labouring to show that such changes may take place in the world to come, he adds:—

"Repentance, therefore, is not impossible in hell; but yet you may ask—What reason is there to think it possible? and I answer—Because IT IS IMPOSSIBLE FOR ANY CREATURE TO LIVE IN ETERNAL TORMENTS. Who among us can dwell with the devouring fire? who among us can dwell with everlasting burnings. . . . . Nothing can be more contrary to the divine nature and attributes, than for a God all-wise, all-powerful, all-good, all-perfect, to bestow existence on any beings, whose destiny, he foresees and foreknows, must terminate in wretchedness and misery, without recovery or remedy, without respite or end. . . 'God is love;' and he would rather have not given life, than render that life a torment and curse to all eternity. . . . Imagine a creature, nay, imagine numberless creatures produced out of nothing . . . delivered over to torments of endless ages, without the least hope or possibility of relaxation or redemption. IMAGINE IT YOU MAY, BUT YOU CAN NEVER SERIOUSLY BELIEVE IT, nor reconcile it to God and goodness. . . . God . . could never make any [creature] whose end he foreknew would be misery everlasting. . . . The LETTER of Scripture may indeed sound forth everlasting punishments, but the SPIRIT of Scripture intimates the contrary. . . . . The Lord proclaims himself, Exodus 34: 6, 7, 'The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin;' but how can such attributes consist with a system of irrecoverable vengeance for thousands, transgressions never to be forgiven, and torments never to have an end?"

Thus Bishop Newton was driven into the doctrine of the final restoration of all men and devils, as the remainder of the article shows, from which we have made these few extracts. How came he plunged into Restorationism? Because he set out with the false theory that all men and devils are immortal, or have eternal conscious being: there was the foundation of his error. He has proved, in the first part of his article, conclusively, that the punishment of the wicked is eternal; he then has, virtually, to deny his own position on that point, as well as deny the plain Scripture testimony of the endless duration of the sinner's punishment: and why all this? Because he adopts the Pagan and Papistical notion of "immortal souls," and makes the punishment of the wicked to consist in *torment* instead of *Death*, as the Scriptures affirm; for, "*The wages of sin is death*:"—and that death is *everlasting, eternal, for ever and ever*—no recovery—no *restoration*. The Bishop, to establish his point, has placed the righteous in a position that they may fall from glory, and thus come under the power of death, in direct contradiction of our Lord's plain words, that they who are accounted worthy to attain that world and the resurrection from the dead, can *die no more*. Luke 20: 35, 36. All this is the *fruit* of the common theory of endless being in undescribable torments. Man has no immortality *in himself*. Out of Christ he is *dying*: and he finally dies the *second death*, because he would not come to Christ that he might have life: he is consumed like the "fat of lambs; into smoke shall he consume away." See Psalms 37: 20. How long will men preach heathen philosophy and popish superstitions, instead of the plain testimony of the God of truth? They will do it till they cast off the traditions of men, and lay aside their "*Standard Authors*," which they are now *deifying*, and trust *alone* in the Lord's Truth and Spirit to guide them. When they thus honour God, they may expect that he will honour them. But while they trust in man, they are "cursed" with blindness. Bishop Newton's entire article shows a powerful mind, in a mighty struggle to extricate itself from a dilemma into which it had been cast by adopting the notion that the soul out of Christ is immortal. He cannot deny but that the "*letter* of the Scriptures" plainly "*declares*" the sinner's punishment to be *eternal*; but then, having fixed upon a false theory as to what that punishment is, viz: eternal *torments*, he starts back with "the *spirit* of the Scriptures intimates the contrary." Thus setting the "letter" and "the spirit" of the Bible at war with themselves. It is true, that while the Scriptures plainly declare that the punishment of the sinner is *eternal*, both the letter and the spirit of that blessed volume agree that the punishment of the sinner is *not endless torment, in conscious being*, but DEATH. To this fact there is the most perfect harmony and agreement throughout the book of God. By not perceiving this truth, the great mind of the Bishop was swamped in confused and unscriptural notions of Restorationism. He had, however, more courage than many modern ministers of the gospel, who lean strongly towards that doctrine, but have not courage enough to avow the workings of their own minds, lest it should make them unpopular. We do know that some of the ministers of the present age, in the "orthodox" churches, are at heart Restorationists, but dare not own it, and, perhaps, denounce us for believing that "*all the wicked will God destroy*." They have been driven and chafed in their minds by Universalists and Restorationists, till they no longer preach eternal torments in the strains they used to do, and are leaving their flocks to slide into Restorationism by insensible degrees, so that the "orthodox" churches are fast filling up with *real* infidelity, while their pastors occasionally denounce the true doctrine of the end of the wicked as "Destructionism" or "Annihilationism." Let them cry out still, if they will, or sleep, lie down, and love to slumber; the Judge of men will soon show by what principle we have all been actuated; and then shall every man receive according to his deeds—"To them who by patient continuance in well doing, SEEK FOR glory, and honour, and *immortality*, eternal life." But, if we have been ashamed of Christ, or *his words*, he will be ashamed of us in the day of his coming in his own glory and the glory of his Father, with the holy angels—then shall such "be *punished* with EVERLASTING DESTRUCTION *from* the presence of the Lord," &c.

Justin Martyr, in his dialogue with Trypho, the Jew, affirms that, "at the time of Judgment, those *souls* that appear worthy of God, die no more, but the rest shall be punished as long as God shall please to continue their *existence*, and their punishment." This passage Bishop Newton quotes, as favouring his views of Restorationism. But, if he quotes the language correctly, it appears clearly to favour the idea of the final *non*-"existance" of the souls who are found wicked; but, whether it does or not, the Bible positively declares, "THE SOUL THAT SINNETH IT SHALL DIE." Ezek. 18: 4, 20.

LETTERS.

THE COMMENDATION WE LIKE: Br. H. C. Hutman writes.: "HARRISBURGH, Pa: It is impressed on my mind, the most forcible manner of expressing my favourable opinion of your Bible Examiner, would be by forwarding new subscribers, with the money for the same. I therefore take pleasure in telling you that by asking * * * * this morning, they requested me to write you to send them a copy, commencing No. 1, Vol. 3."

Just let all our friends go and do likewise. If you get your Examiner worn out in showing it, we will send you another in its place.

BR. R. T. HARMAN writes:—

BAINBRIDGE, Pa.

BR. STORRS:—I must say, that I take much pleasure in reading your paper. The reason of it is, that it advocates the doctrine of the unconscious state of the dead, and end of the wicked. And to me there appears to be such a glory connected with those doctrines that it illumines the sacred page, and enables me to see from the word of God the whole plan of His dealings with His creatures from the time Adam was placed in the garden of Eden, down to the setting up of the kingdom of God. Adam lost his life by transgression; Christ came to ransom. All, therefore, who come unto Him shall have eternal life, and dwell in the kingdom of God forever; and those who refuse to come to Christ for life must die the second death, and "be no more,"—"be as though they had not been." How simple, how clear, how plain that view makes the Word of God. Before I embraced this view, the whole plan of salvation seemed dark and mysterious, but now it appears plain, clear, and glorious.

BR. RANSOM HICKS writes:—

PROVIDENCE, R. I.

BRO. STORRS:—The "Bible Examiner" is gladly received by me. It is truly a welcome messenger indeed. And not to me only, but to others in the vicinity who also receive it. Go on—declare the whole council of God; and especially that portion which some intimate as being of minor importance, non-essential, &c., viz: "The dead know not anything—All the wicked will God destroy."—They shall be "burned up root and branch." "They shall be (not annihilated) but ashes under the soles of their feet who fear God's name."

Men who will not acknowledge their errors, but choose rather to cloak them, must always expect to be in error.

Thirty copies of the Examiner, for one year, are paid for by Br. Hicks. That is right, brethren, help us scatter the light.

BR. R. E. LADD writes:—

CABOTVILLE, Mass.

BROTHER STORRS:—Set me down for twenty copies of the Examiner. I admire it more and more. It is just what is wanted, and it will be more and more appreciated by the candid and honest minded advent believers, as one after another of their props give way under them. "Timeists" must have their race—Spiritualists must come to the *truth*, or go into actual fanaticism—"Endless misery" believers must embrace Universalism, Infidelity, or the "word of the Lord," on that subject. I shall labour, pray and preach, as far as in me lies, for the spread of the truth on these subjects, and the Examiner is exactly suited to this end. God bless you and our beloved Br. Walsh, whose writings have proved a great blessing to me, in your labours of love, so thankless to the mass of the professors of the religion of the cross.

BR. W. G. PROCTOR writes:—

RAYS HILL, PA.

Let me express an idea that I have long entertained, viz: that every truth to be believed, as necessary to salvation, is expressed in the Bible; so that it is unnecessary to coin words to express our views—and furthermore, it is dangerous to do so, for often the language applied is absurd and contradictory. I am happy to inform you, that, by the presentation of plain Bible truth, we are changing the state of things faster than we expected; for those who have, and who still continue to oppose us, are becoming more particular in their public communications. We have even succeeded in changing their manner of prayer, and instead of an immediate transition from earth to Heaven, their expressions intimate a hope in the resurrection. "Immortal, never dying soul" is seldom used in prayer, or otherwise; and the reason is, we have been bold in calling for their proofs, which has wakened up a spirit of investigation, and the community begin to see that much has been proclaimed for Bible truth that is not in the good book, and so they begin to require the Bible proof for what their clergy present for belief. If the love of party and popularity could be lessened, and moral honesty increased, we could be certain to succeed beyond all precedent.

—

THOS. P. HEDRICK writes:

LAUREL, INDIANA.

BRO. STORRS—I take pleasure in sending you the names of new subscribers to the Examiner. Your paper is certainly calculated to do good, if the presentation of truth can affect it. What is truth if it is *not* presented in the word of the Lord, which all Christians agree is contained in the Bible? Now, can any child of God believe for one moment, or can they entertain the thought, that in speaking to us he would use duplicity? And is it not *deceit* to make a revelation, in which the mind or purposes of the speaker does not appear in the language employed? Would not all pronounce such a course, "*hypocrisy*?" And yet how many good meaning Christians thus charge *God* foolishly every day. When God declares the sinner shall die (lose life) if he continues to sin, they declare he shall not die, but live, and drag out a miserable existence forever;—and "yet a little while and the wicked shall not be; yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and it shall not be;" they reply, he shall always be, and his place shall always be in hell. When pressed with the question, whether a thing can exist and not fill space, occupy place, &c., the reply is—That means on the earth. I am thankful that I have been differently instructed. I wish to do all in my power to disseminate the light; but how many there are that prefer darkness rather than light.

Three "*once*" Methodist preachers, in this neighbourhood, are now sent out of the Lord to proclaim the sleep of the dead, and that "all the wicked will God destroy."

—

BR. N. M. CATLIN writes:

LA PORTE, IND.

BR. STORRS:—You have some warm friends in this section, who feel a deep interest in your "Bible Examiner," and your own welfare. Having had a knowledge of your trials from the time of No. 1, Bible Examiner, old series, to the present; and feeling indebted to you, under God, for much light in the Scriptures, they would tender their sympathy and support to the Examiner, as they wish still to continue an investigation of the "Truth as it is in Jesus." It matters not that we do not agree with you in all the details of the Future Age, as held and advanced in the past. We have not a disposition to "pick out your eyes," nor to destroy your glasses. We hold that when the Lord shall bring again Zion, "His watchmen (will) see eye to eye," who now see through a "glass darkly." Relative to the themes of Life and Death, which are made prominent in your paper, we feel the fullest confidence that they have their foundation in the living words of God's living Son. And further, we feel confident that your recent prediction will be verified—"That a paper which advocates these truths will meet a support." Men who have been enlightened by the truth will not barter it for "pottage," nor regard what some deem treading on *their* "precious jewels."

—

BR. DANIEL B. ELDRED writes:

HOMER, MICH.

BR. STORRS:—I am much pleased with the present form of the Examiner. I think the change is a good one, as it forms a very convenient tract to lend about the vicinity, and thereby continue to point to the record that God has given of his Son. "And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." How true it is that men are unwilling to have eternal life through the Son of God. They will not come to him that they might have life, but climb up some other way; looking to the Platonic teachers, instead of the word of God for the truth. Notwithstanding all this, there is here and there one that will believe the record God has given of his Son. Brother E. Miller, Jr., is a faithful minister of the word. He is travelling a kind of circuit in this State, and a part of Indiana; and we think it important to have your Examiner in circulation as much as possible. We can point to several prominent conversions through its instrumentality.

—

E. W. KNIGHT writes:

GLEN'S FALLS, N. Y.

BROTHER STORRS:—You may be surprised at not receiving subscriptions from this place. The cause is this: the people have been, and are yet, very much opposed to "Millerism"—myself as much so as is the Bible; and have been from the first knowledge which I had of his calculating particular time; not from prejudice, but by applying the sure test; that is, the teaching of Christ. I have but one way of examining the Bible. My way is to test all by the teachings and spirit, or acts of Christ. Deut. 18: 15. Acts 3: 22, 23. Matt. 17: 5. These passages, with several others, prove that Christ is to be heard in *all* things. "Watch ye, therefore, *for ye know* NOT," said Christ, the Son of the living God. "Watch, *for ye know*," said Mr. Miller. The people of this place generally shun the very appearance of every thing that even appears like Mr Miller's doctrine; and it is hard to make them believe that the Examiner is not a "Miller paper," as they call it.

MERRIHEW & THOMPSON, PRINTERS, 7 CARTER'S ALLEY.