BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. III. PHILADELPHIA, JULY, 1848. No. 7.

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

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

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, fifty cents; five copies, $2; eight copies, $3; or thirteen copies, $5; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY;

OR, THE CONSTITUTION OF MAN IN RELATION TO IMMORTALITY AND ETERNAL LIFE.

BY J. T. WALSH.

No. II.

THE INSTRUMENT OF THOUGHT.

Thought has been ascribed to various organs of the body, by different nations, as well as authors. The Hebrews ascribed *thought* to the "reins" or kidneys; and *feeling* to the heart. Some authors have located the soul in the spine; others in the heart; others in the bowels; and others, again, in the pineal gland. But the researches of Physiologists have long since exploded these vulgar hypotheses, and established the proposition that the *brain is the instrument of thought, feeling, and moral emotion;* and, that the other, *viscera*, are only affected sympathetically.

The simple statement of this proposition is sufficient to convict one of infidelity, in the estimation of the *orthodox* of this age! Talk to them about the brain being the organ of the mind, and they will shrink from you with holy horror, and exclaim, "*infidelity! materialism!!*" For, while they deny that the *brain* is the instrument of thought, they have *brains* enough to know, that the proposition does not favor *immortal-soulism*. And, hence, they deny its truth, not because they can disprove it; but because it is opposed to *their theory* of immortality! And, to sustain this theory, they would sooner deny that man thought by any material instrument, than admit that his *brain* manifested mind!

Such men, though they may possess *brains*, do not properly exercise them. They do not *think* for themselves: they not only "commit the keeping of their souls" to their spiritual leaders; but they, also, "commit the keeping" of their *minds* and *consciences* to them. They *think* not with their *own brains*, but with the *brains* of others—by *proxy*! And, as they do not *think* with *their brains*, perhaps they ought to be excused for denying that, the *brain is the organ of thought!*

There is, however, these *thoughtless thinkers* to the contrary, notwithstanding, an abundance of evidence in proof of our proposition. The brain is the instrument of the mind. It is the grand *sensorium* of thought, the fountain of intellect and emotion.

But we shall doubtless be told, that, although the brain may be the instrument of the mind, nevertheless *it is not the mind;* and that, therefore, our argument fails. This objection introduces another question, *What is the mind?* The objector replies, "*The mind is the spirit*, the agent which operates *upon* the brain, developing thought and reason." Thus the mind is defined to be an independent and separate *entity*, possessing all the attributes of intelligence; and manifesting all the phenomena of an intellectual and moral character. According to this view of the subject, all the *human faculties* have their seat in this independent mind or spirit, and merely hold intercourse with external objects, by means of the brain, and its organs. There is, therefore, no intelligence, reason, judgment, or perception apart from this "immaterial spirit," or "soul." Consequently no being, unless possessed of this immortal soul, can manifest mind or intelligence in any degree whatever! A man, then, can think, reason, compare and judge, according to this principle, as well without a brain as with it! And, accordingly it is maintained that *dead men think—that dead men are happy in heaven, or miserable in hell!*

In this "philosophy falsely so called," then, we have the following principles:

1st. That the "immortal soul," spirit, or mind, is the *seat* of all the *human faculties;* and gives rise to all the evil passions, vile motives, and hellish designs of men.

That this is no misrepresentation is evident, because *mind*, according to their theory, is not an attribute of the brain—this being merely its instrument. And these various *mental functions* belong, not to the *instrument* but to the *mind itself*.

Here we have a philosophy, then, which makes *immortality*—"the immortal soul,"—the deep and deadly fountain of every base passion, and every unworthy motive! Well may the advocates of the popular theory talk of "converting the immortal soul;" for, if they are as corrupt as this, they ought to be "converted!"

2. The second principle is, that thought, and all the phenomena of intellectual life, can be manifested independent of the brain, thus rendering the existence of that organ unnecessary in the economy of man. For, surely, that mind which can hold intercourse with all worlds, when out of the body, does not require the intervention of the brain, in this life, in order to hold intercourse with external objects! But, in opposition to this "vain philosophy," we affirm, that the *brain* is as necessary to thought as the eye is to sight, the ear to sound, or the nerves to the sense of feeling. And that it would be just as logical, and just as philosophic to suppose a man could see without the optic nerve, and hear without the auditory apparatus, as it would be to suppose he could think and reason without a brain.

3. A third principle is, that the possession of an "immortal soul" or spirit, *that* being the mind, is essential to the existence and manifestation of the

intellectual faculties. And that, consequently, where there is no "immortal spirit," there is no *mind*.

Upon this hypothesis the "beasts" possess "immortal spirits," for they certainly *think*! What will the advocates of the "*immortal-soul-system*" do with this dilemma? What disposition will they make of this *Brute-immortal-soul*? Will they take the position of Mr. Wesley, that the beasts will be raised from the dead!

Here they are certainly in a strait; for they must take one or the other of the following positions:

1st. Either that the possession of an "immortal spirit" is *not* necessary to the manifestation of mind: or,

2d. That, if it be, the beasts are "immortal:"

3d. And that they will be raised from the dead: And,

4th. That they are, also, in as much as they are "immortal," *conscious* in death.

We hope the advocates of the popular theory will meet these difficulties, and look them fully in the face. For, we feel confident, that they are here stranded, and must either yield to the omnipotence of truth, or maintain a position utterly subversive of revelation, philosophy, and common sense.

Now we put the emphatic question, "*Is the possession of an immortal-soul essential to thought?* Will the advocates of the popular view take this position? If they do, we repeat it, they will be forced to the conclusion that, *the beasts have immortality*. And, if they possess immortality, what disposition will they make of this brutal soul, when the brute dies? Will it not be conscious? And, if conscious, will it be happy or miserable? Let not our opponents evade these questions, for these are the legitimate consequences of the teaching that an *immortal soul* is essential to the production of mental phenomena. Either answer them, or admit the truth we advocate.

But we are not reduced to this dilemma. We deny, and challenge our opponents to the proof, that an immortal soul or spirit is necessary to thought. The *function* of an organ depends upon its *vital chemical organization*. This gives character to the muscles, the tendons, the ligaments, the nerves, brain, and all the various organs and *viscera* of the body. These organs, thus chemically constituted by that Being who understands every law in his vast universe, being acted on by the positive and negative electro-magnetic forces, develop the peculiar *function* of each organ. It is thus that the muscles contract and expand; the liver secretes bile; the stomach digests food; and that all the various organs perform their respective functions.

Now, we might as well assume that the function of every living tissue depended on an "immortal principle," as to maintain that *immortality* is essential to the manifestation of the functions of the brain and nervous system generally. The grand argument of our opponents is, that *thought is not an attribute, or function of matter*, no matter how organized. This, as we have seen, leads to the conclusion that the beasts possess immortal souls, for they certainly think. We all agree that man thinks, but by what means does he think? Does he think, feel, and reason because he has an immortal soul? Does he not think and reason by means of his brain? Are thought, feeling, and sentiment attributes of immortality *only*? Then it follows that all animals, not possessed of an immortal mind, are incapable of thought, reason, and sentiment; consequently all the lower animals, as well as all idiots, simpletons, or fools, have no immortality about them; because they are incapable of displaying these mental phenomena! This argument, therefore, proves too much for the advocates of the immortal-soul system. It proves that *some men* have no immortality! Here the opposition are certainly in a dilemma, from which no rules of logic on earth can deliver them! While it may be, however, that idiots think, their thoughts and sentiments are not such as we should expect from a mind endowed with the principle of immortality and incorruptibility. Does it not follow, then, if some men, such as idiots, &c., display no trace of incorruptibility, that this principle is not congenital? For, if it were congenital, or hereditary, all men would be in possession of it.

Matter, organized, refined, and endowed with life is capable of thought in the *ratio* of its perfection of organization. That this is true we see demonstrated before our eyes by observing the organization of different genera, species, and varieties in the animal world, from the smallest animalcule up to man, the noblest work of God. Every link we mark in this great chain of organization, bears upon its face the degree of intelligence it possesses, and establishes the proposition, that intellect, other things being equal, is always in proportion to the perfection of its constitution. Unorganized matter is incapable of thought. Moreover, it is not enough that matter should be organized in order to produce mental phenomena, but it must also be endowed with life, as we have already stated. And to those who deny that organized matter, endowed with life, can think, we will put a few questions. If matter, organized, refined, sublimated, and endowed with life, is incapable of thought, *by what means do the beasts think?* Thought, you affirm, is not a function of matter, and yet *the beasts that perish* THINK! Is thought a function of matter in this case? Again, we would ask, seeing they are all endowed with *instinct*, if this is an attribute or function of matter? Will you affirm that *sight, hearing, tasting, smelling*, or *feeling* are functions of matter, when moulded and fashioned by the hand of God? Is it not preposterous to say that matter can *see*? That matter can *taste*? That matter can *smell*? That matter can *feel*? *And yet you are bound to admit this, or else be driven to the conclusion*, THAT EVERY LIVING THING IN THE UNIVERSE OF GOD HAS AN IMMORTAL SOUL! Are you prepared for this? Or do you shrink back from this position? If so, you must admit that your views of the subject are unsound, and consequently untenable. And if all the functions of the five senses are manifested by matter, why may not *reason, perception, judgment*, and *imagination* also be developed by matter still more exquisitely organized? If the stomach can digest food, the liver secrete bile, and the heart propel the blood, why may not the brain, acted upon by electro-magnetism, secrete thought? Is there any thing more incompatible in the one case, than in the other? We come, therefore, to this conclusion, that matter, organized as we behold it in man, and endowed with life from God, is capable of manifesting moral and intellectual functions.

We have now shown, that *immortality* is not essential to thought, reason, &c., or that, *if it be*, every living thing, possessing the *five senses*, must be in possession of it: and having made these general remarks, we shall proceed to examine the *mind* and some of its *attributes* in detail. And,

1st OF PERSONAL IDENTITY. A great many singular ideas prevail on the subject of Personal Identity. Those who hold the doctrine of "hereditary immortality," suppose that the soul, or spirit of man constitutes his identity. Supposing then, for the sake of argument, that the soul or spirit, in the popular sense, constitues man's *personal identity*, what is it that speaks when the language "*my* soul," "*my* spirit," "*my* body," or "*my* mind" is used? A man speaks of himself, and says *he* has a mind, a soul, a body, a head and a heart, &c. What is it that possesses all these? Is it not that which is the *representative* of them all? In other words, is it not that which supplies the *I* of consciousness—that which gives rise to the sentiment of personal identity? To affirm the contrary would be to represent the soul or spirit as saying *my* soul, or *my* spirit. Has the soul possession of another soul? Does the spirit possess a spirit? This view of the case, then, is at once reduced to an absurdity. The scriptures do not thus trifle with the understanding of man. It is utterly beneath the dignity of the spirit of wisdom and knowledge thus to speak. Moreover, if the soul constitute the personal identity of man, what becomes of its *immortality* when the feeling of *self-consciousness* is deranged so that the person shall imagine himself to be a very extraordinary personage, a king, an emperor, and even God himself! Can this derangement be affirmed of an immortal soul? Again, as we have organs for the manifestation of all our other feelings and faculties, it is certainly reasonable to suppose that there is an organ, the manifestation of whose function would give rise to the sentiment of I, MYSELF. And when that organ is diseased, its function becomes the subject of that kind of derangement of which we have spoken. While, therefore, it is clear that man has a material organ, whose office it is to create the feeling of personality, or self-consciousness, it is also evident that man is not to be dissected and examined in that state; but that he is to be the subject of a sound, rational, and philosophical analysis, in order to arrive at the truth upon this subject. We would ask one question—if the spirit, mind, or soul, in the popular sense of these words, does everything of a moral and mental nature, by means of material organs, what is left for *the* MAN *to do*? for it is evident that the *spirit* is not the man! These acts, to which we have referred, should be affirmed of *man*, as such, IN THE AGGREGATE, and not of his mind, soul, or spirit. Therefore, when a *man* (not spirit) *sees*, he sees by means of the optic nerve; when *he* hears, it is by means of the ear; when *he* thinks, reasons, reflects and perceives, it is by means of his brain. And as he has organs by which to operate on the world, and by which external objects operate upon him, so it is fair to conclude that every feeling, every moral sentiment, and every intellectual faculty, has its appropriate organ, or instrument, in the brain; and that of personal identity among the number. There is nothing in personal identity, then, to favor the popular view of immortality. Let us now turn our attention,

2d. TO THE MEMORY. It is said, man has such powers of mind—such vast intellectual faculties—such a comprehensive judgment, *and such a prodigious memory*, that his mind must be immortal. If this be so, why is it that all men do not possess these noble powers of mind, seeing that they all have immortal souls, if the popular hypothesis be true? Why is it that we have youthful idiots? adult simpletons, and the dotage of the evening of life? Why is it that these incorruptible fires of mind do not kindle, blaze and burn with equal brightness in youth, manhood, and old age, seeing the same immortal genius-inspiring agent breathes its life-giving spirit upon the strings of the exquisitely tuned instrument, at each of these stages alike? If the mind be essentially immortal, why are its fortunes through life so variant? Ah! the answer is, that the instrument is imperfect in childhood, and out of order in old age. So it appears that every thing depends upon the perfection of the instrument at last, and thus the immortal mind, as our opponents will have it, is cast into the shade, and is made only of secondary importance in the manifestation of intellect! But more of this, when we come to speak of *mental diseases*. We grant that the memory of a cultivated mind is very comprehensive, but, alas! how little is remembered of one's history and of the history of the world! The mind of man is exceedingly treacherous. The most important facts, the most startling truths, and the most overwhelming considerations are soon forgotten, vanished like the baseless fabric of a vision, leaving not a wreck behind! Reason declares that FORGETFULNESS is not an attribute of an incorruptible mind or memory. An incorruptible mind must have an incorruptible memory. The impressions made upon a mind that is mortal or corruptible, will be like those made upon the sand, while those made upon an immortal mind, will be like those engraved upon the solid marble, and will never be effaced. The Angels are not forgetful. There is no forgetfulness in Heaven—this is an attribute of "dull mortality," and not of incorruptibility! Impressions made upon an immortal mind, are stereotyped by Jehovah, and will remain indelible through the eternal ages! Memory, then, affords no proof of man's immortality here, but the reverse. So long as impressions fade from the tablet of his mind, just so long will that mind prove itself corruptible. Besides, it is a remarkable fact, that the memory is more treacherous upon some subjects than upon others. This is incompatible with the notion that memory is an attribute of an incorruptible principle in man; for, in that event, every fact and circumstance would be retained alike.

In concluding this article, we will add a few words on the *Love of Life*, which, as Plato is made to say, causes "the soul to shrink back on herself, and startle at the *idea* of destruction." In that popular soliloquy to which we have alluded, we have the following: "It must be so, Plato, thou reasonest well." "It must be" what? Why the soul "must be" immortal. But why "must it be" immortal? Here is the answer—"Else whence this *fond desire*, this PLEASING HOPE, *this* LONGING AFTER IMMORTALITY?" "Plato, thou *reasonest* well!" Because man has a "*fond desire*," a "pleasing hope," and a "*longing after immortality*," therefore, *he is immortal!* Because a man "*desires*," "hopes," and "longs" for a thing, therefore *he has* that thing!! Truly, "Plato, thou reasonest well!!" And, then again, if the soul be not immortal, why should "she shrink back on herself," at the approach of death, "and startle at" the very idea of "destruction?" The Platonic answer is, "'tis the *divinity* that stirs within us." The "divinity shrinks back on itself, and startles at destruction!" Cogent reasoning! Profound logic! But although the soul has such a horror of death and destruction, yet, "secure in herself,

she *smiles* at the drawn dagger, and *defies* it's point?" And, though the moon and stars may fade from the heavens, "and the sun himself grow dim," the soul shall flourish in immortal youth, unhurt amid "the wreck of matter and the crush of worlds!" This is pure Platonism, as well as the essence of *modern* Christianity. But we shall reverse Plato's reasoning, although it is said he "reasoned well." The very truth, that there is in man a "fond desire," a "pleasing hope," and "a longing after immortality," is good evidence that *he is not* in possession of it. Why should a man desire, hope, and long for an object already in his possession? There is an *innate dread* of "shrinking into nought," and a longing after life implanted in every man; and no person, unless deranged, will commit suicide. A poet, whose name I have never known, has given a very different description of the soul's exit from the one indicated in the above allusions. Speaking of a death scene, he says: "At that dread moment the soul *races* round the walls of her clay tenement; runs to each avenue and shrieks for help, but shrieks in vain! Her very eyes weep blood, and every sigh is big with horror." Here we have the monstrous doctrine of an *immortal soul raving round the walls of her clay tenement*, running to each avenue and shrieking for help, but shrieking in vain! This immortal soul, too, can *weep tears of blood*, and utter sighs big with the horror of prospective damnation! And yet, this is the "divinity" that stirs within us, smiles at the drawn dagger, and defies its point!" What a libel upon the truth of God!

But let us turn from the contemplation of this damnable heresy, to the glorious truths of the Apostolic proclamation. And let the reader remember, that God will only render eternal life to those, who, by a patient continuance in well doing, SEEK FOR GLORY, HONOR, AND INCORRUPTIBILITY.

In our next article, we shall take up the subject of *mental diseases*.

[For Bible Examiner.]

BR. THOMAS' REJOINDER TO BR. GREW.

"LOVE," OR "CHARITY."

Having been requested to make some remarks on "*H. Grew's Response*" in No. 5, p. 68, I proceed to observe that friend Grew attributes to me inferentially "an opinion" which I do not entertain, namely, that *men dying in impenitence will in some cases be forgiven*. On the contrary, I believe, that men dying in impenitence will in *no case*, and under no circumstances be forgiven. I believe further, that no man's sins, will be forgiven, however "pious" he may be, or however "sorry" he may be, if, before he die, he has not believed and obeyed the Gospel of the Kingdom in the name of Jesus, and walked worthy of the high vocation to which he has been called. It is no business of mine to build up a wall of casuistry around this impregnable position, by which to mask its formidable appearance. This frowning fortress of the truth may dismay the timid heart of ignorance and unbelief, and cause it to apostrophize the air with lack-a-daisy exclamations about "love" and "charity"! This is no affair of mine. The truth belongs to God, not to me; and godlike love and charity consists in plain, unvarnished exhibitions of that truth in such unmistakable and intelligible terms, that men may be able to comprehend it, and be saved by it. It is a godlike charity to pluck men like brands from the burning, though you rescue them by violence; it is the cheat of hypocrisy and infidelity—it is to put the poisoned chalice of deceit to their lips, to soften down the asperity and sternness of the truth lest it should hurt the feelings or morbid sensitiveness of the "carnal mind," which is "enmity against God," and rebellion against his law. I have no sympathy with that sort of "love" which leaves men to die in error, which "knowledge" teaches is damnable. John Wesley is no authority with me. He was doubtless a very pious, a very sincere errorist. His system proves him to have been ignorant, and therefore, faithless of the Gospel of the Kingdom; so that his opinion of how many truths we may die in ignorance of, and be saved, weighs not a feather, in my estimation, however potent it may be with others. Knowledge will avail us nothing without *that* "love" of which Paul speaks; but then, that charity, or love, "rejoiceth in *the truth; believeth* ALL *things;* and HOPETH *all things*:" hence, much as "charity" or "love" are *on the lips* of men, he who is ignorant of the truth, believeth not and hopeth not in all things of that truth, is utterly destitute of the true love and charity so highly extolled by the Apostle. Men mistake a *natural* amiability of disposition, decorated after a certain fashion with sectarian piety, for love, for charity, for godliness! But this is a mere substitute for scriptural love, a maudlin, spurious affair. Gospel love is the fulfilling of the law in the faith and disposition of Abraham, the father of the faithful and the friend of God. No, no; he that believeth THE GOSPEL, and is baptized, shall be saved; there is no evading this: "charity," "piety," "penitence," without this, are but the righteousness of filthy rags.

MEN DYING IMPENITENT, NEVER FORGIVEN.

The proposition then before us is, that *men dying faithless or impenitent, or both, will never be forgiven*. This we believe the scriptures teach. But whathas that to do with *men of faith, dying in sins "not unto death?"* Paul saith, "WE must all appear at the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive *the things in body*, according to that he hath done, whether good or bad." The "we" referred to in this text, are not all mankind, but all of *a class*, and that class the aggregate of believers. Now, by way of illustration, let us suppose a case.

One of the Corinthian disciples committed a great crime. Paul, though absent, judged his case from the report laid before him. He commanded the Elders to put in force the sentence he pronounced in the name of the Lord, to wit, that they should *deliver the criminal to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, and keep no company with him, nor even eat with him*. This sentence they executed and persisted in, until they heard from the apostle again. After a certain time had elapsed he wrote, and sent the offender a pardon; and because the punishment had brought him to a deep conviction of the enormity of his sin, and a sincere contrition for it. This was the object of the chastisement, namely, that when the offender shall appear at the judgment seat of Christ in the day of the Lord Jesus, "the spirit may be saved." To this person it might be said, "in being thus judged, you are chastened of the Lord, that you should not be condemned with the world." If the chastisement had failed to bring him to such a state of mind as the Lord will acknowledge, in the Future Age he would be condemned with the world. But seeing the happy effect produced, the apostle wrote, saying, "sufficient to such a man is this punishment, which is of the many;" forgive him, therefore, and comfort him, lest perhaps he be swallowed up of overmuch sorrow: their forgiveness the apostle recognizes as his, and his own as forgiveness from the Lord; *therefore, when he appears in the day of Christ he will no more be called to account for this sin*. This is one view of the case before us; let us now look at the other side.

A disciple in the 19th century, as really a disciple in faith as the Corinthian, commits, we suppose, precisely the same offence. A committee of brethren adjudge him to Satan *for the destruction of the flesh*. They have pronounced their sentence; they no more keep company with him, nor eat with him—turn him out of the Body of Christ they cannot do; this is beyond their ability, no matter how many thunders of excommunication they may hurl against him—but still *Satan does not destroy his flesh;* and, if he were to become "weak and sickly"—1 Cor. 11: 30—and this painful wasting of his flesh were to bring him to the same penitence as his Corinthian parallel, the committee not having the power of healing and forgiving sins, he might "fall asleep" in utter despair, and Satan get the advantage. Now the offender before us would die unforgiven in this age; the question therefore is, *would he be forgiven in the next or Future Age?* And as then "we" are to receive in body according to what we have done;" and seeing that our modern disciple did not receive in body according to his deed as the Corinthian did, we ask further, will he not in the Future Age receive in like manner for his crime, and afterwards be forgiven, but have no part in the honour and glory of the Kingdom, though he may without dying again live for ever, a saved man upon earth, after the Kingdom is delivered up to the Father? This we think is the scope of the word; but that there are some offences, commissible by believers, which "are unto death," and for which there is no forgiveness in this world, nor in the age to come. For sins unto death, committed by believers, it is no use asking or expecting forgiveness; for it will not be granted; of this class are "speaking against the Holy Spirit," and murder, and "treading under foot the blood of the Son of God," &c. But, John says, there are sins not unto death; for these there is forgiveness for the faithful, *with chastisement according to the offence*, in the age to come. Hence, the necessity of a Future Age to afford scope as to time, place and circumstances, for a recompense appropriate to the viciousness as well as the virtues of those upon whom the name of Christ is named. There is much to be said upon this topic which cannot be said now. The reader must follow out the train of thought suggested for himself.

NON-RESURRECTION OF MILLIONS.

Friend Grew asks, *where do the scriptures teach the non-resurrection of millions?* This question can be answered in the twinkling of an eye. When "the Lord shall spread forth his hands in the midst of Israel, as he that swimmeth spreadeth forth his hands to swim, * * * in that day shall this song be sung in the Land of Judah." Now in this song the Israelites sing, "O Lord our God, lords beside thee have had dominion over us: by thee only will we make mention of thy name. They are *dead*, they SHALL NOT LIVE; *they are deceased*, THEY SHALL NOT RISE: therefore hast thou visited and destroyed them, and made all their memory to perish. Isa. 25: 11; 26: 13, 14; From this we learn the non-resurrection of millions of lords, who have tyrannized over Israel—Egyptians, Philistines, Midianites, Assyrians, Chaldeans, Medo-Persians, Macedonians, Romans, Russians, Turks, &c., &c. The text is so striking and emphatic, that no sane man can misunderstand it. Those who are not to live nor rise again once lived; for it styles them "dead" and "deceased," which are only affirmed of the once living. It also teaches us the meaning of "*destroyed*," to wit, *that which shall not live by a resurrection unto life*—this is to perish. But, as to the faithful, it says, "thy Dead shall live, as my Dead Body shall they arise;" therefore, "Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust; for thy dew (O Son of Righteousness) is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the (Lord's) dead.—*Verse* 19.

The foregoing is quite in harmony with "the literal import of John 5: 28." The "all" in this verse is defined in the next. ALL *who?* "They that have done good" and "they that have done evil." But, this does not include all mankind; for there are multitudes who come into and go out of the world, that do neither good nor evil. "Just" and "unjust" are terms of relation, not absolutes; and are predicable only of those who live under times of knowledge. Sinners are just or unjust relatively to the Gospel of the Kingdom; absolutely, they are "sinners," and "the wicked." It no where teaches in the word that all "sinners" and "all the wicked" shall be raised from the dead; yet it doth teach the resurrection of the just and unjust. "Every man according to his deeds," "every soul of man that doeth evil," and "every man that worketh good," are all phrases of relation, and embraced in the "WE" who are to appear before the judgment seat of Christ *as limited by the subject* of which the apostle treats. He is not speaking about *all mankind*, but of Jews whom he apostrophizes from *Rom.* 2: 1—29. As to the Gentiles who had "sinned without law," they perish; while those, both Jews and Gentiles, who are under law, *shall be judged by the law* in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to Paul's gospel." How would friend Grew judge Cossacks, Hottentots, Caffres, Hindoos, Chinese, &c., by Paul's gospel, or Moses' law, who had never heard of the one or the other? To declare them just or unjust by these, would be as reasonable and fit as to justify or condemn the Irish sedition-mongers by the law of the United States. Cannot the reader see that a Russian is neither just nor unjust, innocent nor guilty, virtuous nor vicious, whatever may be his absolute or real character, according to the law of England or these States? And why? Because there is no relation subsisting between him and these constitutions. He is not under law to Britain, therefore he will perish without that law speaking for or against him. "Where no law is, there is no transgression;" and "without faith it is impossible to please God." These two principles decide the fate of millions. "Where there is no vision the people perish."

That little monosyllable "*all*," or its ghost, so haunts the lucubrations of our venerable and respected friend, that he sees it dancing before his eyes like a will-o-the-wisp, on whichever side he turns his vision. He quotes Heb. 9: 27, and there he thrusts it in as if the apostle had really placed it there! "It is appointed *unto* ALL *men* once to die, but after this the judgment." Paul does not say so;

he says, "it is appointed *unto men* once to die," &c. If he had said what Mr. Grew makes him tesify, he would contradict himself; for in another place he saith, "We shall not all sleep," or die, "but we shall *all* be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last (seventh) trumpet; for the trumpet shall sound, and the righteous dead shall be raised incorruptible, and *we* (all) shall be changed." But, we will not press our friend too hard in this place, for he makes an admission immediately after which concedes to us all we demand. "*If, indeed,*" saith he, "*we have any plain, positive declarations that some of the human family will never be raised from the dead, we must understand these universal terms in a limited sense, but not otherwise.*" "Will the Doctor favour us with the chapter and verse?" Yes; this we have already done.

FAITH IN PROPHETIC TRUTHS NECESSARY.

Mr. Grew doth not like my position, that "a man cannot be saved in any sense, unless he also believe the *prophetic truths* concerning the Kingdom of God." Now the subject matter of these truths is the Kingdom, and the Kingdom is the subject of the Gospel. No KINGDOM, no GOSPEL. My proposition, therefore, is convertible into this: that *no man can be saved without faith in the Kingdom.* Mr. G. in disputing my position, necessarily affirms the contrary; I call upon him, therefore, as he calls upon me elsewhere, to adduce "chapter and verse" in proof that man or woman, infant or suckling, can be saved in any sense without faith in the prophetic Kingdom.

"TO THE LAW AND THE TESTIMONY, IF THEY SPEAK NOT ACCORDING TO THIS WORD, IT IS BECAUSE THERE IS NO LIGHT IN THEM." It will save time and space to adhere to this exclusively, and not to introduce the Johns of any sect. They are of no value in any question at issue between the searchers after truth in this century. They belong to the darkness of times bygone.

REPENTANCE, IMMERSION, AND HOLINESS, INDIVISIBLE.

"A correct belief of doctrine and facts" is a belief of the truth; an incorrect belief of doctrine and facts is a belief of error. Mr. G. places himself in opposition to the principle, that a belief of the truth with repentance, immersion and holiness, are indivisibly essential to salvation in the Kingdom of God, and affirms, that "we have scriptural truth and fact to the contrary." Now we invite the reader's attention to this, namely, that Mr. Grew cannot adduce a single case from the New Testament of Jew or Gentile being recognized as a Christian after the day of Pentecost (see Acts 2,) who did not believe the Gospel of the Kingdom as promised *in the word*—the things concerning Jesus—whose repentance was not evinced by turning from a justification by law to that of Christ; and who was not immersed. He has doubtless selected the strongest evidence he could find. Hence he sends us to I Cor. 8: 11. But this is no case in point. The individual was already in a saved state, and he was put into that state as the rest of his brethren in Corinth were, namely, by "hearing, believing and being baptized." What did they hear? Luke says they heard "THE WORD." What is the Word? "The Law and the *Testimony*," both of prophets and apostles. Hence Paul reminds them that he preached the Gospel to them, which he styles *tis logos*, A CERTAIN WORD, "by which ye are saved IF *ye keep it in memory.*" But the man referred to had been long a pagan worshipper. The word preached laid hold of him with such power, that the least approximation to idolatrous observances on the part of any brother, defiled or wounded his sensitive conscience exceedingly. This was a laudable Christian weakness on the right side. He had still what Paul terms "the conscience of the idol," but not an idolatrous conscience. The meat offered to an idol always reminded him of the worship connected with it; and that as an idolater, the eating of such meat was esteemed by him a part of the idol worship. Now, although he knew an idol was nothing, and that all meats were eatable by Christians, save blood and things strangled, yet he could not get rid of the original impressions; so that when he saw a brother eating such meat, the eating would force itself upon his conscience as idolatry, while the eater ate of it with contempt for the idol. The apostle commands the latter to forbear eating, lest it might become an occasion of stumbling to the brother of tender conscience. His "views of the unity of God and of idols were" not "incorrect." "We all have knowledge" on these things, says Paul. It was, as shown, the accuracy of his knowledge which made him so unhappy when he saw brethren too much at home in idol temples and festivals.

NOT WEAK IN FAITH.

We need not repeat here what we have said before about *weak in faith*, and *weak in the faith*. He of Rom. 14: 1, was not weak in faith. He was not "erroneous or ignorant in respect to" the word of the truth of the gospel. He was "in the faith," which he could only be by believing the Gospel and being baptized; but he was "weak," or sensitively conscientious, as to eating all things indiscriminately. If he were a Jew, he still had *the conscience of the law*; or, if a Gentile, he still had *the conscience of the idol*, in relation to meats and herbs. He was not weak in faith, but strong; for it is not persons of weak faith that brave death in turning from Judaism to Christ, or from dumb idols to serve the living and true God.

BORN OF WATER.

Mr. Grew says: "In the various passages, which state particularly the characters which have no inheritance in the Kingdom of God, the *unimmersed* are never mentioned." Does Mr. Grew regard Jesus as authority in the case? He says, "except a man be BORN OF WATER and of spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God. Some one may possibly be rash enough to say, that to be "born of water" is not baptism! Does water mean water here? Some say yes, some no! According to these, *water* means *spirit*, which makes nonsense of the passage; "except a man be born of spirit and of spirit" is a perfect *reductio ad absurdum*. Such critics are either above reason or below it; and as we claim to be reasonable, we leave them to their vain imaginings. Some have sense enough to admit, that *water*, in this text, means that compound of oxygen and hydrogen upon which Noah's Ark floated. With these, then, we talk. The metaphor connected with water is *a being born*. What does being born of any thing consist in? Is it not an emergence from a place in which the subject was previously out of sight? Admitted. If then earth be the matrix of which a thing is born, would

not a being born of earth, consist in coming up out of the ground in which the subject had been previously concealed? And doth the substitution of water for earth make any difference in the idea of birth? To be born of water, then, is also to come up out of water in which the person had been *deposited*, for there can be no emergence without previous *immersion*. No man who hath any regard for his intellect, will venture to say, that baptism is not a birth of water, and a birth of water, baptism. Jesus then saith, that except a man believe the gospel, which is to be begotten of the spirit; and be baptized, or born of water, he cannot be saved, or enter the Kingdom of God. As to "the characters," Mr. G. refers to, the apostle addresses himself to immersed believers, and therefore it would have been superfluous to have told them "the unimmersed should not enter the Kingdom." He had told them that *before they became Christians*, as we have shown; it was unnecessary to repeat then what nobody in that age, Jew or Pagan, ever dreamed of omitting to do.

Immersion is not "*the duty*," but *a gracious privilege* granted to every believer of the things of the Kingdom of God, and the name of the Lord Jesus. Immersion submitted to as a mere duty, is worth nothing. It is a privilege to which no one is intitled who is not a true believer; that is, an Abrahamic believer of the Truth. It is the last thing that ought to be preached; and thousands are preached into the water that are utterly and astoundingly ignorant of "the word of the truth of the gospel." The one thing needful to this generation is faith, without which immersion is a mere form of godliness, devoid of all efficacy and power.

"It is an undeniable fact," says Mr. Grew, "that there are many real Christians who are unimmersed," &c. No doubt the unimmersed will be highly delighted with Mr. Grew's "charity," and proportionally indignant at the man who has hardihood enough to deny Mr. Grew's "undeniable fact." An "unimmersed Christian" in New Testament times, was a phenomenon as extraordinary as a white crow, or a black swan! I have never discovered one yet among all the cases on record in the Scriptures since Pentecost. I have heard of multitudes of such Christians in the dominion of Rome; but I have never yet seen one in the Body of Christ; nor do I expect to see such a one in the Kingdom of God, if the words of Jesus were spoken in the soberness and simplicity of truth.

NECESSITY AND USE OF KNOWLEDGE.

"The eyes of your understanding being enlightened in the hope of the calling, and the riches of the glory of the Inheritance in the Saints," *is one thing*; and to "discern accurately all things which all the prophets have foretold concerning the Kingdom of God, and the true periods of their fulfilment," *is another thing!*

I am very far from saying, that such a discernment is necessary to entitle a man to entrance into the Kingdom of God; but I do say, that illumination in the one thing is essential, not as a mere matter of knowledge, but that this knowledge may effect a renewal unto life through a participation in the divine nature. "Grace and peace be multiplied to you *through the knowledge* of God and of our Lord Jesus Christ, according as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain to life and godliness, *through the knowledge* of Him that hath called us to glory and virtue: whereby are given to us *exceeding great and precious promises:* that BY THESE ye might be *partakers of the* DIVINE NATURE." This is the necessity and use of knowledge, without which we are the sport of every wind of doctrine, and vain conceit, and assimilate to the demon of ignorance and superstition, and become an easy prey to the things which are earthly, sensual and devilish. Without supposing that "*I only am left*," I am deeply penetrated with the conviction, that of this generation, they are few who will find eternal life.

THE UNIMMERSED AND FEARFUL EXCLUDED THE KINGDOM.

"The unimmersed," says Mr. Grew, "are not excluded from the Kingdom of God." Wonder if Mr. Grew believes, that *the fearful* are excluded? Why doth our venerable friend turn special pleader for the unimmersed, and not extend his labour of "love" and "charity" to the timid? There is a vastly greater number in jeopardy of damnation from their cowardice, than from their non-immersedness. A man may have a correct theory, be duly dipped, and very "pious," but fearful withal; one, of whom it cannot be said, in spirit or fact, that "he overcame by the blood of the Lamb, and by the word of his testimony; and loved not his life unto the death." Such an one may deceive himself, but he cannot impose upon God: unless God repeal his law, it is impossible he can be saved. Let then, our venerable friend, beware! An advocate may be "fearful," while he is the apologist for error, ignorance, and disobedience. The Apostle Peter says; "Repent and *be baptised*, EVERY ONE OF YOU, in the name of Jesus Christ;" it is not absolutely necessary, says Mr. Grew, for "the unimmersed are not excluded from the holy kingdom of God." Hence, instead of "every one" doing the command, some conform, and others do not. Such is the effect of Mr. Grew's teaching. Well, if he effect an entrance for himself, let him bear in mind the word, that "whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them the same, shall be called great; for I say unto you, that except your righteousness shall exceed that of the Scribes and Pharisees, you shall in no case enter into the Kingdom of God"

JOHN THOMAS

Richmond, Va., May 15, A. M. 5934.

"It is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing."—Gal. 4: 18.

RELIGIOUS ZEAL.—"Zeal, says a celebrated writer, 'is a passionate ardour for any person or cause. There are various kinds of zeal; as, 1, An ignorant zeal, as in Romans 10: 2, 3, where some are said to have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. 2. A persecuting zeal, as in Philippians 3: 6, where Paul recounted his former earnest endeavours to destroy the Church of Christ. There is also a superstitious zeal, a hypocritical zeal, a party zeal, &c. But the zeal which the Lord approves is a genuine zeal in a good cause. Such a zeal as seeks for the Glory of

God and the good of man. It is founded in knowledge, faith and perseverance, and will manifest itself in love and constancy toward a good cause, and generally results in final success. Such is the certain result where pure religion is the object it seeks to promote, and wisdom and knowledge its attendant guides."—*Selected.*

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, JULY, 1848.

ARE THE WICKED IMMORTAL?

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

TRUTH SEEKERS.

We have no sympathy for that spirit which, having attained a certain point in theology, or any other investigation, requires that all who are recognized as brethren, or fellow-laborers, should refrain from further investigations, or from a calm and fearless expression of the result of their labors in search after truth. All new sects have commenced with professions of liberality and denouncing the illiberality of others for not allowing them to express, among them, new truths, or new light upon old truths, which they believe they have discovered. They avow their determination never to organize a sect; and sometimes declare—"If *we* ever become a sect we shall be the *youngest daughter* of the old MOTHER OF HARLOTS." A few years pass away and the leaders in these movements find persons among them that think they have discovered further light on important subjects, and who *dare* to give utterance to the convictions of their own free thoughts. Then those, who professed they never would be a sect, find it necessary to take counsel together, and, lest they should be suspected of being tinctured with the heresy, they must make a formal declaration of principles; "not a *Creed*," to be sure; that would be too bare-faced an act for the "youngest daughter" just yet; but, some standard principles, by which, gradually, they can, under the pretence of *harmony*, persuade most, who have been tinctured with the views they wish to suppress, to fall back on the "*important* point" of their theory, and give up the free expression of other things, even "if they are truth," well knowing if they can only persuade men to "put their light under a bushel" it will go out; or, which is the same thing, it will give light to no one, and so prove harmless. When all things are thus well arranged, then all that do not come into this organization are "*disorganizers*;" and anything else that will tend to destroy their influence may be said of them; and, in all that, be doing "God service." Then they, the "youngest daughter," must take good care to let it be known that they occupy the true apostolic ground, and are persecuted with the approbious name "Pope," and as having gone into "Popery." The sect, now, have only to pass resolutions expressing the fullest confidence in every thing their Leaders have done and are doing, and the work is complete—the sect is organized; but they don't "know it" themselves, and are not likely ever to see it; or if they do, it will not do to own it—for the leaders must never "*confess*;" if they do they will be suspected of lacking "*infallibility.*"

It is the *intention* of the conductors of the Bible Examiner to strive to avoid such a shipwreck; and to exclude no theological subject from their columns merely because it is new, unpopular, or in opposition to their own views or the views of a portion of their patrons. We intend to make the Examiner a medium of thought for all who deal in *argument*, soberly expressed; and who do not employ *personalities*. All writers for the Examiner will be responsible for the sentiments they express, and *they only*. The editors are not to be understood as assuming it, merely because they give place to the article. We choose to give our readers a chance to judge for themselves, without having an editorial *veto* on every thing that differs from their present views. Our object is to elicit *Truth*. How is that to be done if no doubt must ever be permitted to arise as to any point we now hold as truth? That is *the sin* of all the sects: not that they have no truth, but they are determined that no new truth, or light, shall be elicited that might conflict with their stereotyped declaration of principles, or creeds.

We cannot better express our object and aim than in the language of the Editor of "THE TRUTH SEEKER AND CHRISTIAN THINKER," published in Leeds, England, by DR. FREDERICK R. LEES, F. S. A. He says:—

1. "By 'TRUTH-SEEKER,' we do not signify that no truth is *found*, nor have we reference to *our own* opinions exclusively. The title is rather intended to express the character of the Work, as an *organ* for the discussion and discovery of Truth, than the position of any individual writer. In the spirit of the Jewish sage, we exhort all men, everywhere, to 'get wisdom,' and 'get understanding;' not implying thereby that they are destitute of all wisdom and intelligence, but that wisdom is a fountain, and knowledge a stream, of which all men may drink forever—living and inexhaustable waters flowing from the throne of God—upspringing from the INFINITE DEPTHS of His everlasting being. In the words of the same inspired thoughtsman, we say—'Buy the truth and sell it not;'—not meaning by these words that we have *no* truth now, or that in a coming day we shall have acquired *all* truth, and then cease to be truth-seekers; but, on the contrary, we mean to affirm, that of all commerce, that in wisdom is the richest and noblest; that 'Truth' is a treasure more precious than fine gold, 'a pearl beyond price'—an *infinite treasure*, the splendor and beauties of which it is the sphere of the *infinite ages* to unfold to the growing and progressing faculties of man. It must be purchased by toil and thought, and, even then, it will not be revealed, save to its sincere worshippers; it is a sacred treasure forever hidden to the gaze of purblind prejudice.

2. "Truth, we contend, must be to every man *subjective*—that which to each seems best to express the Facts of Nature and the Truths of God. Whatever may be *the sense, the impression*, left on any individual soul, by unbiased contact with the word or the works of God—THAT must be *his* truth, calling for sacred reverence as the revelation of God to him, and for constant or consistent obedience. If party, or passion, or power, or pelf, or fear, or favor, shall urge him to let it go, see that he do it not! Rather, bind it fast round his heart of hearts; it has been bought of God, and is a sacred deposit. '*Sell it not.*'

3. "The *impression* on our God-made intellect is the result of God-made Laws: it is the most sacred law and the highest rule of life Hence, *the great duty of every man to prepare himself conscientiously for the calm reception of that truth by which he must live.* This is the primal duty—but how despised! Let us learn, then, to seek God and Truth—let our spirits lie in reverential silence before Him, so that, no disturbing passion or prejudice intervening to refract the rays of truth, we may receive the right impression. Let the soul be daguerreotyped in the sun light of the Eternal. Thus, and thus only, can we worthily worship the Highest in the highest way—'in spirit and in truth.'

4. "With such opinions we necessarily discard all *one-sided views* of truth, and insist on each writer standing on his own responsibility. We shall afford to truth-seekers, therefore, a fitting medium for tolerant exposition and unshackled enquiry, apart from all sect or party. The claim of *infallibility*, by Pope or Protestant, we utterly despise. We stand or fall by these principles—*that the duty of truth seeking is paramount to all others*—that it is a crime against God and against man to hold out hope or fear, reward or loss, with the view of determing the judgment of men on this side or on that—that it is a vice of the worst kind, leading to spiritual death, to give up the use of your own talent, the exercise of your own reason, to priest or sect—that truth is *subjective* to every one, and, therefore, that it is the duty of every individual, to put by all who dare presumptuously to step in between the soul and God, and solemnly to determine for himself, according to the value and weight of the evidence before him, *what is Truth* and what is Error. The Reformed Churches have hitherto equally denied these great principles—they have overlooked the fact, that hope and fear are no instruments of discovery. The only difference is this—that once Rome had a *monopoly* of infallibility and swayed the sceptre of spiritual despotism over willing slaves and undivided empire, whereas Protestantism is a *competition* of infallibilities, exhibiting the partial union of sects in conjunction with universal warfare. It is mere fiction to call the Reformed Churches a Republic, as contra-distinguished from the mighty monarchy of the Church of Rome. A Republic involes *equality of claim*, and negatives all separate, distinct ascendancy. But is it so among the sects? Nearly all claim 'divine right'—not merely to *judge for themselves*, but for others; each speaks of the rest, not as citizen of citizen, but as *prince* speaks of *pretender*. Accordingly, each sect aspires to be Pope—mimics the spiritual policy of the triple-crown, and echoes with its tin trumpets the thunder-voice of the vatican! But it shall not be so amongst 'truth-seekers:' they shall unite in bringing about a wiser and worthier reformation, in enforcing the *morality of enquiry*, and of achieving the downfall of *sectarian intolerance*. To this grand object we shall devote our work and consecrate our powers. This Reformation will discard the angry intolerance with which men look upon doubt, and consecrate it as a mental state necessary and natural in passing from a lower to a higher point of intellectual progress. It will affix to all *wilful favoritism* in the treatment of evidence, a sentiment of stern disapprobation, and direct the feeling of *moral responsibility* towards keeping the process of enquiry perfectly free from partiality or bias. *Really believing* in the truth, and that true religion is indeed reasonable—'the LOGOS, or *reason* of God, which, in the beginning, was with God'—men will cease to hoodwink the faculty within them, and fearlessly look truth in the face! He who does not will be branded as coward and criminal—traitor to truth, infidel to faith."

Such sentiments we ardently hope may animate us in our work. We beg our readers to ponder well the extract we have given them; especially the paragraphs 2 and 4. We heard the sound of such a Periodical as the "Truth Seeker" last winter for the first time, and gave our readers an able article, second handed, from that paper in our January and February numbers. We knew not where in England it was published; but we ventured to send two numbers of the Examiner, directed to London, soliciting an exchange. A few days since we received the following letter from DR. "F. R. LEES," dated

"LEEDS, (*England,*) May 20th, 1848.

"MY DEAR SIR,—I have this week received, in my London parcel, two copies of the BIBLE EXAMINER, (viz. the numbers for *March and April,*) and shall be glad to *exchange* with you. * * * I rejoice to see an organ devoted, like my own, to *free* and *fearless* discussion, confident as I am, that TRUTH *must* prevail; and especially glad to see you so ably demolishing the pernicious absurdity of the natural-immortality-dogma. You will find articles on *that* subject occasionally in the TRUTH-SEEKER. Please direct to me here, and send me the back numbers, as I should like my set to be complete.

"Wishing you success in your efforts at a Reform of Thought, and every blessing in Christ Jesus our Lord,

I remain,
Youre, truly,
F. R. LEES."

DR. LEES may be assured his expression of sympathy for us is like "cold water to a thirsty soul." We hope soon to be further enabled to enrich our paper not only by extracts from the Truth Seeker, but by the writings of able men in England, direct for the Examiner.

Now, friends of the Examiner, shall we be sus-

tained in continuing and enlarging this paper? We feel very little doubt we shall be able to accomplish the present volume without any other pecuniary loss than that of our time; though, as yet, we have not funds to complete the year. Shall we continue and enlarge the paper? Let us hear from all our friends soon on this subject. The field of thought and matter widens before us. Shall we have a paper that has *room* for it?

"NOBILITY OF THE SOUL."—A preacher, not long since, in expatiating upon the "nobility of the soul," saids "*It is the Essence of Deity.*" And he concluded he had "demolished [annihilated!] Geo. Storrs!" No wonder he should think so; for instead of a *trinity* Deity, his Deity's "name is *Legion*,"—yea, "*Legions*;" and as he has thus, to the extent of his power, demolished "the Lord our God," who "is *one Lord*," it was an easy matter to demolish so small a fragment of him as "George Storrs."

But seriously. The immortal-soulists are hard pressed when they are so manifestly driven back on Paganism to maintain life. Let us see what this theory comes to. First.—If the soul is the essence of Deity, then God is not *one* and indivisible; but a *multitude*. Second.—On that theory, either there is no such thing as sin, or a part of God sins; if a part of God sins, then some parts of him are opposed to other parts of him, and thus God is divided against himself; "How, then, shall his kingdom stand?" Third.—As the soul is sometimes unhappy, it follows, on that theory, that a part of God is sometimes unhappy; and if the "endless misery" doctrine be true, then many parts of God will be endlessly miserable. That is not all: as those in endless torment are represented, by the immortal-soul theorists, as eternally cursing God and blaspheming his name, then many parts of the "essence of Deity" will be eternally cursing the other parts of the "essence of Deity!!" unless those theorists can make out, some how, that these immortal souls get so wicked that they cease to be of the "essence of the Deity!" But if so, a part of the Deity is annihilated; or, which is the same thing, a part of the essence of Deity is converted into that which is not a part of himself; and so when God swore by himself as "*I live*," his oath is not to be depended on, because a large part of his "essence" is *not to live as* his "essence."

The preachers who undertake to show the "nobility of the soul," and maintain that it is a part of God, had better remember that our first parents, in seeking to "*be as Gods*," fell into corruption and death; and there, without repentance, all their posterity will fall, and "perish forever," the "essence of Deity" though they may think themselves, and say like their father of old,—"I will be as God." This pride of heart will bring them down to the dust of death, and they "*shall be no more*." Please read 28th chapter of Ezekiel, to the 19th verse.

MORE FANCY SKETCHES.—We have concluded to devote a corner of the Examiner as a refuge for immortal-soulists; where the sayings peculiar to that theory, shall have a resting place. One of our *Exchanges* gives an account of three deaths in one city. Concerning the first, the correspondent says:

"His removal was felt to be a great loss to the Church; but we would not recall him from the glorious sphere of being and action, to which he has gone."

The Bible declares "there is *no work, nor knowledge* in *sheol* whither" men "*go*" when they die, see Eccl. 9: 12. The next account, or the second death spoken, is that of a sister. The writer says: "She appeared to enjoy perfect victory over death."

Paul supposed the victory over death would be at the *resurrection;* Cor. 15: 53, 54. But immortal-soulists make the victory over death at the time death conquers. A certain General in Mexico claimed the victory when he was sadly defeated. The soldier and the immortal-soulists are alike—they conquer, but it is by defeat! But the climax is to come; the third death was that of another sister; and of the three together, the writer says:

"*Consumption* was the AGENT of the KING OF TERRORS, employed in each case to sever life's tender ties, to send the body back to dust, and to TRANSLATE THE SOUL TO ITS ETERNAL BLISS." He adds: "It (consumption) is an insidious deception, and *mortal foe*."

We have placed the emphasis on the words of this writer. A "mortal foe" act as "agent" to send three souls to eternal bliss!! "Employed," too, by the "king of terrors!!" Tremendous! Where are we? Have we gone back to Babel? What "confusion" of language! The king of terrors employ a "mortal foe" to translate the soul to eternal bliss"!!! "All the world wondered after the beast," &c. Well they might, if he performed such miracles as is here ascribed to the king of terrors.

The reader will pardon us for inserting the following effusion of an immortal-soulists' *poetical* fancy. It was composed on the death of a child "*three* weeks and five days old."

"Farewell, dear babe, a short farewell,
From father and mother;
You have gone with angels to dwell,
When there you will see your grandmother."

PSALM 16: 10—It is argued from this text, "For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption," that there is a distinction in death between the destiny of the soul and body; and that the soul must be conscious when the person is dead. But we ask. Was the *body*, merely, the "Holy One? Or, did not that expression include the entire being of the person? We think it did. "Thou wilt not leave my *soul in hell*." What is hell, in this expression? Do you say it is not the *grave* but the invisible state of departed spirits. Well, have it just which way you please; we care not which; and then we will prove the soul was unconscious in that state. What is the Hebrew word here translated hell? It is "*Sheol*." It is the same word used in Eccl. 9: 10, Now let us put the two texts together. "Thou wilt not not leave my soul in *sheol*," "For there is no work, nor *knowledge*, nor wisdom in *sheol* whither thou goest." If we can understand words, then, here is demonstration, strong as the Bible can make it, that while under the power of death the *soul* has *no knowledge;* hence there must be a resurrection of the dead, or the person is perished for ever.

A KNOTTY QUESTION.—A man puzzled himself with the following question—"What will be the consequence if an irresistable force should come in contact with an immovable body?" To this question he answered—"I suppose it would knock a hole in it." A wit replied—"Knock a hole in what?—the irresistable force, or the immovable body?" and added—"It is impossible to do such a thing to a *force;* and if the hole is knocked in the *body*, some part will give way, which will show it is not immovable."

We could not help thinking that immortal-soulists are puzzling themselves in precisely a similar way. We will state the puzzle for them—"What will be the consequence if an unquenchable and devouring fire should come in contact with an indestructible, or, which is the same thing, an immortal soul?" Would it burn "a hole in it?" or, what would it do? You know "the fire can't go out," and it is a *devouring* fire: but it can't devour itself, if it did it would "go out;" it can't devour the soul for "that is indestructible;" and if it should produce any effect upon it, that would prove it not immortal, or indestructible! Pray, Mr. Immortal-Soulist, what will you do? Had you not better own the truth, *viz*:—"*The soul that sinneth it shall die*." Ezek. 18: 4, 20; and the "*fire shall consume both soul and body*." Isa. 10: 16, 17; and, therefore, the theory that the soul is immortal, by creation, or inherently so, is a fable?

WE have not judged it necessary to give any detailed account of the foreign news in the Examiner, as we presume all our readers have access to those papers which publish it immediately on its arrival. As our issue is but once a month, we can merely find place for such remarks upon events in the east, as we think will serve to illustrate prophecy, and show us the position we occupy in the history of this age, as shadowed forth in the word of truth. We have kept our eyes on the east for the last three years, watching with deep interest all the movements there, and expecting the breaking to pieces of European Monarchies prior to the second advent. We are not of those who say—"Nothing remains now to be done before the advent." We are confident, that unless we greatly mistake the prophecies, there are several things yet to transpire prior to that glorious event. We look for a *confederacy* between France and Italy; also, for a large *emigration* of Jews, from various parts of Europe, "to the land wherein their fathers have dwelt," *viz: Palestine*. We look, after that, that Russia, who is the Gog of Ezek. 38 and 39, and the Emperor thereof, the "king of the north," Dan. 11: 40, and onward, "shall overflow and pass over" Constantinople, Palestine, and Egypt; but, making a stand in Palestine, with his mighty and overwhelming army, will be there overwhelmed and destroyed with all his hosts. Then at that time—while the hosts of Russia are in Palestine, we think the advent will occur. Such are the events we are looking for. Time will soon determine whether we are right; for that we wait.

DEATH THREATENED TO ADAM.

NOT MORAL, NOR SPIRITUAL, BUT LITERAL.

Some contend, that death was a moral death. Such a view involves the greatest absurdity, and confounds language. We shall see this by an examination of those texts in Moses and the Prophets, where the phrase "*surely die*" occurs. If we find it is never employed by them to signify moral death, but invariably a literal one, then we shall have no right to give Gen. 2: 17, any other interpretation than that of dissolution, or a disorganization of man, so that he shall be resolved into the elements from which he was produced by his Maker. "*Ye shall surely die*," said the Creator. The next place in which we find this phrase, from the mouth of God, is Gen. 20: 7, in his language to Abimeloch, when he commanded him to restore Abraham his wife, and added—"If thou restore her not, know thou that thou *shalt surely die*, thou and all that are thine." Surely, this was not "a moral death" that was threatened. We next find king Saul using the phrase, 1 Sam'l. 14: 39, 44. He had prohibited the people from eating any thing till evening on the day that God had wrought by the hand of Jonathan, a deliverance to Israel, and a discomfiture to the Philistines. Jonathan, not hearing his father's curse, had eaten honey. Saul having suspected that some one had disobeyed his order, declares that even though it should prove to be Jonathan, his son, "*he shall surely die*!" When the lot was cast, Jonathan was taken, and Saul says—"*Thou shalt surely die*, Jonathan." Was it "a moral death" that Saul threatened? Surely all see that it was no such thing. Again, 1 Saml. 22: 16, king Saul told Abimebech, the priest of the Lord—"Thou shalt *surely die*, thou and all thy father's house." This sentence the wicked Doeg executed, as we learn in the 18th verse, and "slew

four score and five persons that did wear a linen ephod." No moral death here. In 1 Kg. 2: 37, king Solomon told Shimei, who had cursed David in his life time, that he should "*surely die*" if he went out of Jerusalem; but Shimei violated this command; Solomon called him to an account, and questioned him whether he had not stated definitely to him that he should "surely die on the day" that he should leave Jerusalem to go "any wither;" verse 42. "Benaiah then fell upon Shimei that he died:" verse 46; not "a moral death."

Again, when Jeremiah, in the days of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, had declared the words of the Lord against Jerusalem, &c., "the priests and prophets and all the people took him, saying, Thou shalt *surely die*." Were they about to put Jeremiah to "a moral death?" See Jer. 26: 8.

We will now turn to Ezk. 3: 18—"When I say to the wicked, *Thou shalt surely die*, &c.," is that a moral death? If so, it may read thus—When I say to the wicked [that is, to the *morally dead*] thou shalt surely die a moral death, &c. Is that sense? Are not the *wicked* already morally dead? Are there two moral deaths? It is undoubtedly a "second death" that is threatened in this text, because the connection shows it is a death from which the wicked man may escape if he will turn from his wickedness. The same language is twice repeated chapter 33: 8, 14; and there it is added, "If he turn from his sin, he shall surely live, he shall not die." Here then, it is evident, it is a *literal* death that is spoken of, and not a moral one. Also, in chapter 18: 13, the Lord, in speaking of a vile sinner, says—"He shall surely die; his blood shall be upon him." This threatening has nothing to do in inflicting a moral death—it is a literal death—an extinction of life: "*he shall not live*." Thus far, then, in Moses and the Prophets, we find nothing to give countenance to the notion that the Lord ever used the phrase "Thou shalt surely die," to mean a moral death. But we have not done with the examination.

Numbers, 26: 65. Just before the Israelites entered into Canaan, they were numbered, and "not a man of them whom Moses and Aaron numbered in the wilderness of Sinai", was there, save Joshua and Caleb. "For the Lord had said of them, *They shall surely die* in the wilderness." Not a moral death, but a literal one, as the event demonstrated. When Manoah and his wife had seen "the angel of the Lord," and knew he was an angel, Jud. 13: 22, "Manoah said unto his wife, We shall *surely die*, because we have seen God." Was it "a moral death" that he spoke of? 1 Samt. 20: 31, king Saul commanded Jonathan to send and fetch David, "for he shall *surely die*." No moral death in this matter. When David's anger was kindled against the man who had taken his neighbor's ewe lamb, 2 Samt. 12: 5, he said—"As the Lord liveth, the man that hath done this thing shall *surely die*." The Lord told David on that occasion, verse 14, "the child that is born unto thee shall *surely die*;" and the child did die, not a moral death, but literally, actually returned to dust. In 2 Kg. 1: 4, the Lord, by Elijah the prophet, told king Ahasiah, "*Thou shalt surely die*," and repeats the same language to him, verse 16; and it is added, verse 17, "So he died according to the word of the Lord which Elijah had spoken." One more instance and we have every place where the phrase occurs in Moses and the Prophets. 2 Kg. 8: 10, the reply of Elisha the prophet to Hazael, who came to inquire of him about Ben-hadad, king of Syra, who was sick. The Prophet said—"The Lord hath showed me that he shall *surely die*." We are not left in doubt as to what this death was, for Hasael smothered Ben-hadad "so that he died."

Thus, then, we see there is not a solitary example from Moses or the Prophets, to give countenance, in the slightest degree, to the notion that the phrase "surely die," means "a moral death;" but always and invariably a literal death or disorganization of the man, by which he ceases to live in any condition. The context to Gen. 2: 17, shows conclusively *that* was the death to be executed on Adam for his sin. "DUST THOU ART, AND UNTO DUST SHALT THOU RETURN."

Those who maintain that moral death was the penalty—"In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die," and that the penalty followed in that twenty-four hours, are involved in the necessity of denying that literal death, or the death of the body was any part of the penalty, as the man did not *actually* die that day. If the penalty did not include the body, or the physical man, its death is an *arbitrary* act, without any reason, and contrary to all ideas we have of justice; because it was inflicting upon man that of which he had no notice, and did not therefore suspect any such danger. If a law was enacted that a man holding a *political office* who should act in a certain manner should suffer a political death, I ask if all civilized nations would not cry out against us as a barbarous, wicked, and unprincipled people if we not only removed that man from office, but actually put him to death by hanging or otherwise?

The threatening, Gen. 2: 17, was a plain expression of the purpose of God, in case man sinned, to deprive him of that life he had given him at his creation: the phrase is never used in any other sense, as the Bible plainly shows. We will, however, add one more argument on this point. Compare Gen. 2: 17, "Thou shalt surely die," with the following texts. In Gen. 6: 7, God said to Noah, "I will *destroy* man whom I have created," &c Verse 13, "The end of all flesh is come before me—I will *destroy* them with the earth." Verse 17, "Behold I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to *destroy* all flesh, wherein is the *breath of life*, from under heaven; and every thing that is in the earth *shall die*." Chap. 7: 4, "Every living substance that I have made will I *destroy* from off the face of the earth." Then the Lord brought the flood he had threatened. Was a moral death the result? Read verses 21-23. "And all flesh died that moved upon the the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man: all in whose nostrils *was* the breath of life, of all that *was* in the dry *land*, died. And every living substance was destroyed which was upon the face of the ground, both man and cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowl of the heaven; and they were destroyed from the earth: and Noah only remained *alive*, and they that *were* with him in the ark."

Here, then, is God's definition of *death*. It is to take away, not moral life, but man's "*breath of life*" out of his "nostrils"—that which he gave at man's creation: [Gen. 2: 7.] it is to "destroy" him, so that he is literally—*physically dead*. Such is the death the Lord threatened to Adam. Under this death he and all his posterity would forever remain but for the resurrection by the second Adam. Such a death will be the wages of personal sins; or, a second death, to all who will not come to Christ that they may have life. Though recovered from the death experienced through Adam, a "second death," *like the first*, will be the lot of all impenitent and unbelieving sinners: a death from which there is no resurrection: IT IS ETERNAL.

PROPHETIC PERIODS.—NO. VIII.

We gave our readers in the Examiner for May, our views of the commencement and termination of the 1260 days, or years, of Dan. 7th. If that period commences with the decree establishing the bishop of the *city* of Rome as "Universal Bishop," then we can see no reason for fixing the commencement earlier than A. D. 604 to 607. We stated the fact, in that article, that "The Emperor Mauricius assembled a Council of the Patriarchs, all the Senators of the Imperial city, [Constantinople] and the Metropolitans," in the year 588, and that, "By this great Council was confirmed to John of Constantinople, the Title of Universal Bishop, to be enjoyed by him and his successors in that See." Bower's History of the Popes, Vol. 2, p. 459, London Edition, 1750. We expressed the opinion, that it was "not probable" that that was the date of the Papal Supremacy. One reason of that doubt was, that we supposed it necessary to look to the *city* of Rome for its appearance. On further reflection, however, we are not certain but that we are to look to the *Imperial City* of the *Roman Empire* for its date. If so, then 588 may be the true date of the Papal Supremacy. It is also true that the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, conferred by Phocas 604 to 607, was but the TRANSFER of the title and authority of Universal Bishop from the Bishop of Constantinople; and hence, *possibly*, the true date of the Supremacy may be from the *act* of the Council of the Imperial City. If that is the case, 1848 will witness its final overthrow or destruction. But that settles not the question of the year of the advent; for, a careful examination of the prophecies will show, that the little horn or man of sin is to be *destroyed* BEFORE the "coming" of "the Son of Man in the clouds of heaven;" and its destruction is one of the most prominent signs of that coming, as the departure of darkness is the sign of the approach of the sun in the morning of day. Paul, in 2 Thes. 2: 8, speaking of that wicked man of sin, says:—"Whom the Lord shall *consume* with the *spirit of his mouth*, ["The *words* that I *speak* unto you," saith Jesus, "they are *spirit*, and they are life,"] and shall *destroy* with [what? his *coming*? no—but with] the BRIGHTNESS of his coming." The destruction is *before* the coming, and the *infallible* precursor of the advent itself. Then it may as certainly be *known* that the advent "is nigh, even at the doors," as the light that precedes the sun, scattering the darkness, testifies that the orb of day is about to appear.

The truth, the words, the spirit of Christ's mouth was first to "consume" the man of sin: this has been going on since the Reformation: then, as the time came nearer for the appearing of the Son of Righteousness, "*the brightness*" of that coming, even before his actual appearance, would "destroy" that power which had so long kept the world in darkness. Even while the judgment was sitting on the fourth beast, Dan. 7: 10, 11, which commenced A. D. 1789, and is still progressing to its conclusion, even during this period, the "little horn," the Papal power, was to be speaking "great words:" but "the beast" was to be "slain:" which slaying took place between 1789 and 1815; then its "body" was to be "destroyed;" which has been going on since 1815, by the spread in Europe of those principles which are destruction to despotism; and only one thing remains relative to that fourth beast, that is, to give its body "to the burning flame;" which is either now going on, or soon to be done, as it is accomplished under the seventh vial of the seven last plagues: with that beast is destroyed the little horn, the man of sin—the Papal power, and all other ecclesiastical despotisms which bear the character of "daughters" of that "Mother of Harlots."

The judgment, Dan. 7th, is not the same as that Rev. 20: 11—15: though some of the language is borrowed from the scenes of the judgment of the great day. In Daniel 7th, there is no mention of the heaven and earth fleeing away, nor of the judgment of dead or living men in their individual capacity: and it is not till after that judgment that one like the Son of Man is seen coming in the clouds of heaven. From the whole chain of prophecy we conclude—the fourth beast, the despotic governments of Europe, which are the horns of that beast, are to be destroyed; and the little horn is to be destroyed at the same time, and at a time, too, when it was expecting to "sit as a Queen and see no sorrow," and be speaking "great words;" and this not by the actual advent of our Lord, but by the increasing light, or "brightness" of his near approach; and is to be the sure and unmistakable "sign of the Son of Man in heaven;" being the completion of that chain of signs, the seven last plagues, which were designed to notify the watchful of the certain approach of their Lord, to take "the kingdom under the whole heaven."

CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP.—NO. II.

IV. HUMAN CREEDS REND THE TRUE CHURCH OF GOD AND ENSLAVE HIS FREE-BORN CHILDREN.

In illustrating this position, we will suppose, that now, for the first time, the gospel is preached in a city; a great turning to God takes place, and hundreds of souls are born of the Spirit: they are of one heart and of one soul—they *all love one another*, and thus give the very evidence by which Jesus Christ our Lord said "All men shall know that ye are my disciples." Will any one dare to say, that these loving souls do not constitute the *true* church of God in that city, and that, too, without any of that human arrangement called "gathering into the church"? We think the position is too plain to need argument. These persons all continue in this loving communion and fellowship till there come in a Baptist, a Methodist, a Presbyterian, an Episcopalian, &c—What is the work of these different sects? Not to kindle the flame of love higher; no, it is to gather the converts into *their* church! "They have not yet united with *the* church?" So out of *kindness*, to be sure, each sect sets itself to work to show its creed; or which is the same thing, to prove their peculiar views are right, and all the rest are wrong. Each party salutes the young converts' ears in this way, and is careful to keep up an impression that they are not yet in the "visible church," but that they

ought to join somewhere. This process is continued till, the first we perceive, the revival stops. What's the matter? The minds of the converts have been diverted from the unity of love to contemplate the discordant doctrines, or creeds, that have been presented for their consideration, in order to their uniting with some church!—They lose sight of the fact, that they all belong to the church of God: and the question is, whether they shall unite with the Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, or what church they shall join. At first they think they *cannot be separated*—they must all go *together some where*. They have no fear of quarrelling because they may not think exactly alike on doctrine; "we must go together," is the spontaneous feeling of every new-born soul. But the strong efforts of the sectaries are kept up day and night, 'till some converts begin to lean *this way* and some *that*. Now a painful sensation, indescribably painful, is felt; they find they *must part*; they still resolve, it may be, that they will love one another; but it seems as though their hearts would be rent in pieces. It *must be done*, however, for they *must* unite with some *visible* church.

The work now goes on, and they are gathered hither and thither: this is not all, they must learn the vocabulary of their sect or party, that they may know how to make proselytes. When they meet those who have not gone with them, their conversation is not on the love of Christ to their souls, but the time is spent on these doctrinal points which separate them; and that, not to weigh candidly for information, but to *proselyte*: to make it appear that our creed is right, and yours wrong. If they fail in making the person a convert to their sect, "evil surmising" creeps into the heart—the person is stupid, or ignorant, or proud, or something else. Thus a death-blow is struck to the "first love," and, most likely, the disappointed person becomes a bigoted sectarian. Thus the Church of God, the true Church, is rent in pieces; brotherly love is broken up; and those who were born free are enslaved by the "doctrines and commandments of men." Now, the speech that is heard, when you meet many of them, is as opposed to the pure language uttered by them, in their first love, as the language of the dark pit is to the language of the New Jerusalem. What has done all this? The introduction of man-made creeds to divide and rend asunder what God had joined together. If this state of things is not perpetual, it is because there are temporary revivals, in which, for a time, all parties keep their creeds, or peculiarities, out of sight; but the leaders begin to grow jealous lest an opposing sect should secure the greatest number of converts; then the revival stops, and the *drama is acted over again*.

V. HUMAN CREEDS BEGET HATRED INSTEAD OF LOVE, EVEN AMONG THOSE WHO WERE FRIENDS BEFORE THEY PROFESSED RELIGION.

It is impossible fully to describe the mischievous effects of man-made creeds in this respect. We have, in part, anticipated, under the previous head, the proof of the above proposition. To enter into a full expose of the truth, on this point, would be to write the history of the professed churches for the last fifteen or sixteen hundred years—it would be to give an account of the persecutions, wars, and bloodshed, which have disgraced the name of Christianity; all engaged in, of course, to put down heretics? Or, in other words, to defend *human creeds*; the work of *fallible* men; who had the arrogance to assume that they had the right to dictate to their fellow-men how they should interpret God's blessed Word.

Who has not before his eye, within his own knowledge, exhibitions of the most unjustifiable hatred and bitterness towards those of a different creed from themselves? A minister, not a thousand miles off, in high standing in one of the largest denominations in the United States, manifested such a hatred to the ministers of another sect, that he would not so much as speak to them when he met them. Multitudes of others, who have shown, to the faces of their opponents kindness, have indulged in the most bitter language behind their backs; and all because their *creeds differed*. We have known men, Christian men, that spoke with extreme doubt whether one of another denomination could be saved, but finally concluded, that it was POSSIBLE *some of them might be*. Why this spirit? Human Creeds had blinded their minds; and this is the natural result of separating the children of God by such tests.

Now look at that neighborhood where harmony and union prevails; yet, none profess religion. God visits them in mercy, and their love and attachment is made stronger by the strong bonds of love to Christ. Presently human creeds are introduced among them—distraction and division follow; shortly there is less brotherly love and good-will than before any of them professed religion: the happiness that was once enjoyed in that community has departed. What has done this deed? Will you say—it was necessary in order to be agreed in some *plan* of operations! Alas! for that religion, that must *divide* what God has joined together to carry out *its plans*.

THE SON OF GOD.—NO. IV.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE DIVINE TESTIMONY RESPECTING THE NATURE AND ORIGIN OF THOSE PERFECTIONS BY WHICH THE SON OF GOD CREATES, GOVERNS, SAVES AND JUDGES THE WORLD.

BY HENRY GREW.

We have seen in Col. 2: 9, that in Jesus Christ "dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." A few verses before this, chap. 1: 19, the inspired apostle informs us, "*it pleased the Father*, that in him should *all fulness dwell*." Here then the divine testimony teaches us that it is by *the pleasure of the Father*, that the Son possesses this divine fulness. It ought to be particularly observed, that this last passage is in immediate connection with the 16th and 17th verses, which declare him to have created all things, and to be before all things. This must refer certainly to his *highest character*. It consequently teaches us, that he possesses his *highest and most glorious perfections* by the pleasure of the Father. The apostle represents even saints being "filled with all the fulness of God," Eph. 3: 19. This, indeed, must be understood as vastly inferior to the fulness which Christ possesses. The creation of the universe is ascribed to the Son. John 1: 3: Col. 1: 16, &c. But do the Scriptures of truth teach us that he created all things by his own *independent* power, or that he was the glorious *agent* of "the only true God?" Eph. 3: 9.—God, who created all things BY Jesus Christ. Heb. 1: 1, 2, God—hath in these last days spoken to us by his Son, BY whom also HE made the worlds.

These passages certainly teach us that it was by *the power of the Father*, that the Son created the worlds. His creating all things, therefore, affords no proof that he is omnipotent.

In Heb. 1: 3, Jesus Christ is represented as "upholding all things by the word of his power." Certainly this must be in his *highest character*. Yet the apostle explains this by informing us that he was *made* so much better than the angels.

In Acts 2: 22, all the miracles which the Savior wrought on earth are ascribed to *the power of the Father*. "Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles, and wonders, and signs which *God did by him* in the midst of you. In Matt. 28: 18, and John 17: 2, All power in heaven and in earth is ascribed to Christ. Is not this descriptive of *the highest* power he possesses? Does he possess it *independently*? Let us hear and believe "the faithful witness." "All power is GIVEN unto me," &c. "As thou hast GIVEN him power over all flesh, that he should give *eternal life* to as many as thou hast given him." Here we are plainly taught that the whole power, by which the Son of God accomplishes the redemption of his church, is *given* him by the Father. Shall we then continue to say, that no *given* power, that nothing less than independent omnipotence can qualify him for such a work? Is not this to say, that the means divine wisdom employs for the redemption of men are *inadequate*?

Prof. Stuart, of Andover, Mass., remarking on the character of Christ as *Judge*, observes, "*omnipresence* and *omniscience only* can qualify him for the duties of that station." He admits that, "he *does* indeed *act* as judge by delegated authority. Let John 17: 2, be again considered. Does not the giving eternal life to the saints, include his *judging them and the world*? Or, if this should be denied; does it require any *more* wisdom, or knowledge, or power to *judge the world*, than it does to give *eternal life* to his people? Most certainly it does not. Here, then, it obviously appears from the divine testimony, that he is not only appointed to "*act* as judge, by delegated authority," but that the very *qualification* by which he acts, not only in the single office of judging the world; but in the arduous and glorious work of *giving eternal life* to his sheep, is *given* him by the Father. I do not perceive how Mr. Stuart can reconcile the above observation with the following remark of his, in another work: "I can conceive it possible, that a derived being may have such an unlimited communication of power, and knowledge, and wisdom, that he may govern worlds." He who governs worlds is surely competent to judge them.

We have seen from the words of the Lord, that our divine Redeemer is qualified for the important work appointed him, in respect to wisdom and knowledge. Col. 2: 3, "In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." John 2: 25, He knew what was in man. Rev. 2: 23, I am he which searcheth the reins and hearts.

He is worthy to take the book of the divine counsels, and to unloose the seals thereof. He only reveals to us, and to the powers of the heavenly places, the purposes of Jehovah, unfolding to our admiring view, the works of grace and love and holy vengeance of "the only true God." And how doth he obtain this knowledge of all things? What saith the Scripture? "The Revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto him." Rev. 1: 1.

Titus 3: 4—6, But after that the kindness and love of God our Savior toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness, which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly THROUGH Jesus Christ our Savior. This passage, and many others prove that the Son saves us by the appointment and power of the Father. It also proves how erroneous that common idea is, that wherever the word Savior occurs in a text, the Son of God must be intended.

John 8: 26, he that sent me is true, and I speak to the world those things which I have heard of him. John 12: 49, 50, For I have not spoken of myself, but the Father which sent me, he gave me a commandment what I should *say*, &c. John 3: 31, 32, He that cometh from heaven is above all, and what he hath seen and heard that he testifieth.

It appears equally evident from "the oracles of God," that Jesus Christ will judge the world, by the power and appointment of the Father. Acts 10: 42, It is he which was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead. Rom. 2: 16, God shall judge the secrets of men BY Jesus Christ. John 5: 22, For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son.

Jer. 23: 6, it is said of the Son of God, "and this is his name whereby he shall be called, the LORD our righteousness. Jer. 23: 16, it is said of Jerusalem, "this is the name wherewith she shall be called, the LORD our righteousness," not because either the Son or people of Jehovah are literally Jehovah, but because, in them, Jehovah is pleased to accomplish his gracious purpose of salvation. "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself," &c. Even places where God displayed his power and goodness were called by his name, "Jehovah-jireh." "Jehovah-nissi."

When we contemplate the holy Son of God in the endearing character of the "one mediator between God and man," what a glory do we behold encircling him in all his offices!

As our PROPHET, he "spake as never man spake." His doctrine distilled as the dew. "Grace was poured into his lips." Psa. 45: 2. Blessed teacher! The knowledge thou dost impart is life to our souls. Oh, may we never turn away from "him that speaketh from heaven."

As our PRIEST, how precious is his offering and intercession! We have the "remission of sins through his blood." He "ever liveth to make intercession for us." He is "made higher than the heavens;" "a great high priest, Jesus the Son of God."

As our KING, he is "fairer than the children of men." He is, "King of kings and Lord of lords." By the power of his grace he conquers the hearts of men, and subjects them to his righteous government. O blessed Prince of peace! O precious reign of grace! He will present his redeemed church before the presence of his glory with exceeding joy. He shall triumph over all his foes. Those who will not have him to reign over them he will punish "with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power." Then shall he "be glorified in his saints, and admired in them that believe."

Let it, however, be remembered, that it is the Father who is "the only true God," that has exalted him, and upholds him in this high station. Deut. 18: 18, I will raise them up a prophet, &c. As a priest he is "made higher than the heavens." So Christ glorified not himself to be made an high

priest; but he that said unto him, thou art my Son, to-day have I begotten thee. Heb. 5: 5; Psal. 2: 6. Yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Zion.

The case of Joseph, who appears to have been a striking type of Christ, may serve to illustrate, in some manner, the Scriptural representation of the glorious dignity of the Son of God, and also his dependence on the Father for all his authority. Gen. 41: 39--44, And Pharaoh said unto Joseph—thou shalt be over my house, and according to thy word shall all my people be ruled: only in the throne will I be greater than thou. And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, see I have set thee over all the land of Egypt. And Pharaoh took off his ring from his hand and put it on Joseph's hand, and arrayed him in vestures of fine linen, and put a gold chain about his neck. And he made him to ride in the second chariot which he had, and they cried before him, Bow the knee; and he made him ruler over all the land of Egypt. And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, I am Pharaoh, and without thee shall no man lift his hand or foot in all the land of Egypt.

Such was the high authority with which Pharaoh invested Joseph: in consequence of which, he was, in a sense, honoured even as they honoured Pharaoh; for it was said to him, "Thou art even as Pharaoh;" Gen. 44: 18, Joseph was exalted to the government of Egypt; and was indeed more actively ruler, than Pharaoh himself. Yet Pharaoh was greater than Joseph. From Pharaoh he derived all his dignity, and on his sovereign will he was dependent for all his authority. Pharaoh governed Egypt by Joseph. Pharaoh saved Egypt during the famine by Joseph. He gave him a name, said to signify a Saviour, and commanded all to bow the knee to Joseph.

So "the eternal Spirit," who is and ever must be the alone God, creates, upholds, governs and saves by his Son, "whom he hath appointed heir of all things," whom he hath "made better than the angels;" and whom, on account of all judgement being committed to him, he requires us to honor even as we honor the Father. I have no idea that the case of Joseph, or any other, can present to the mind an adequate parallel of the incomparable Immanuel.

"Nor earth, nor seas, nor sun, nor stars,
Nor heaven his full resemblance bears;
His beauties we can never trace,
Till we behold him face to face."

Far be it from us to rob the Saviour of his true glory. Far be it from us to deny his own testimony. Let us not be found uniting with the Jews in charging "the faithful witness" with advancing claims to a character he never assumed: a charge which Jesus himself immediately repelled in the plainest language. John 5: 19. How delusive is the impression, that we are honoring the Son of God while we deny his own testimony?

Let none, however, imagine, that we can have too exalted views of the sinner's friend, that we can adore him too highly, or love him too ardently, while in accordance with the inspired testimony, we behold him as "the image of the invisible God;" and worship him "to the glory of God the Father." Let our minds expand to the utmost stretch of thought in the contemplation of his divine beauty and glorious dignity: still our conceptions of his incomparable excellence will be vastly too limited and inadequate. Let our hearts glow with the most fervent love, and our bosoms heave with the warmest gratitude to his dear name, still we must acknowledge that our affections towards him bear no proportion to his charms or his love. With our highest notes of praise, we must mingle the sigh of lamentation, that we admire and love and praise him no more.

"Had we a thousand lives to give,
A thousand lives should all be thine."

Dr. J. P. Lee, Meltonsville, N. C., writes:—

Br. Storrs:—Please send me two hundred copies of your Six Sermons, quarto form. The tone of some has changed already, while others are *rabid* in their denunciations. "When fortune smiles, distrust her; when she frowns, defy her," is a sentiment uttered by some writer. And while I regret and deplore the *insane wisdom* of some, instead of ceasing to excite their excitability, by the circulation of the doctrines contained in your six sermons, &c., which to them is so offensive, I intend to spread said doctrine as widely as I possibly can. Engaged in extensive practice, you know that my time is not my own. Necessity as well as duty compel me to attend to the sick, and since I cannot daily preach the word, I will endeavor to distribute your sermons, so that they may sound in the ears of thousands, who, perhaps, might never in any other way hear the truth upon the same subject. What I fail to do in point of preaching, your sermons will more than fulfil.

Walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of his Holy Spirit, I shall fear no evil. I could, if I had time, tell you many interesting and amusing, and at the same time, saddening, if not humiliating circumstances, arising from a misconception of the doctrine in your sermons. A sermonizer, in endeavouring to unfold the *Nobility* of the soul, said "it is the Essence of Deity." Oh, what an idea! The soul of the wicked is the Essence of Deity!! Into what *unmixed* blasphemy will error lead men who are esteemed for their piety.

"Dum insanientis sapientiæ consultus—erro."

Well may such exclaim,

"I missed my mark and lost my way
By crack-brained wisdom led astray."

This same preacher imagined that his definition of the soul would demolish Dr. Lee and George Storrs.

I wish to sustain you, my dear Brother, as far as I possibly can, trusting that God in his unbounded love will abundantly bless you and yours, and prepare you for every good work, that you may be instant in season, and out of season.

Br. D. B. Ellsrad, Homer, Mich., writes:—

Br. Storrs:—I have more good news to give you relative to the spread of the truth. Some new ground has been broken up by the aid of a copy of the "Six Sermons" which I sent to a brother of my wife, in Nankin, Washtanaw Co. A Conference has been appointed there, which I shall try to attend, after which I will write you again.

Yours, waiting for the *Restitution*.

MERRIHEW & THOMPSON, PRINTERS, 7 CARTER'S ALLEY