BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. III. PHILADELPHIA, SEPTEMBER, 1848. No. 9.

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. III.

MENTAL DISEASE AND DEATH.

In our last article on the constitution of man, we promised to take up the subject of *Mental Diseases*, and to apply our reasonings on the subject to the doctrine of immortality and eternal life; and we now proceed to the execution of the work.

1. Let the reader remember the position of our opponents that, *when the man is dead, and his brain resolved into dust, he still thinks and feels.*

Our inference, or deduction: *If the above be true*, no disease or injury of the brain should interrupt the manifestations of the mind.

But disease and accidents do destroy the manifestations of the mind; and now for the proof:

2. A number of persons are born idiots, and never manifest any mind at all. Why is this, if the mind—the intellect, be independent of *cerebral organization?* If men can think and reason without any brain, (that is, when they are dead,) what should hinder them from thinking with an *imperfect brain?* And if they cannot reason with an *idiotic* or imperfect brain, how are they to do so *without any brain at all?*

3. Again:—In childhood, the mind is as feeble as the body; in youth we find that, as the physical powers are developed, expanded and enlarged, so are the mental; and when manhood arrives, we discover those gigantic intellectual faculties, which are the combined result of a sound, well matured, and well developed organization and education.—In childhood, we behold these faculties in an embryo state. We see them gradually unfolding, like the rose, up through youth, until manhood presents us with a *full blown* intellect, all fragrant with wisdom and knowledge! But in old age, the mind is again as feeble as the body. The whole system, including the brain, becomes shrunk and enfeebled—the limbs totter, and fancy's fires decay.

Why is this, if the mind be immortal? If this were so, should not the mind be as strong, as brilliant, and as profound in childhood and old age, as in the prime of manhood? Upon the hypothesis, that it is immortal, it certainly should.

4. Even the state of the atmosphere will affect the mind, either *elevating* or *depressing* it. Is an immortal mind subject to atmospheric changes?

5. When the *body* is diseased, *weakness* and *imbecility* of mind are the consequences. What then must be the consequence when the *body is dead?* Let revelation answer: "In that very day their thoughts perish."

6. When the skull is fractured and pressure is made upon the brain, all consciousness is suspended; while no such phenomena takes place with any other organ. We will state a few cases in proof of this subject. M. Richerand had a patient whose brain was exposed in consequence of disease of the skull. One day, in washing off the purulent matter, he chanced to press with more than usual force, and instantly the patient, who, the moment before, had answered his questions with perfect correctness, stopped short in the middle of a sentence, and became altogether *insensible*. As the pressure gave her no pain, it was repeated thrice, and always with the same result. She uniformly recovered her faculties the moment the pressure was taken off. He, also, mentions the case of an individual who was trepanned for a fracture of the skull, and whose faculties and consciousness became weak in proportion as the *pus* so accumulated under the dressings as to occasion pressure of the brain.

A man at the battle of Waterloo had a small portion of his skull beaten in upon the brain, and became unconscious, and almost lifeless. But Mr. Cooper having raised up the depressed portion of the bone, the patient immediately arose, dressed himself, became perfectly rational, and recovered rapidly. Professor Chapman, of Philadelphia, mentions in his Lectures, that he saw an individual with his skull perforated and the brain exposed, who used to submit himself to the same experiment of pressure as that performed on Richerand's patient, and who was exhibited by the late Professor Wistar to his class. The man's intellect and moral faculties disappeared when pressure was applied to the brain: they were literally held under the thumb, and could be restored at pleasure to their full activity. A still more remarkable case is that of a person named Jones, recorded by Sir Astly Cooper. Jones was deprived of consciousness, by being wounded in the head while on board a vessel in the Mediterranean Sea. In this state of insensibility he remained for several months in Gibraltar, whence he was transmitted to Deptford, and subsequently to St Thomas's Hospital, London. Mr. Cline the Surgeon, found a portion of the skull depressed, trepanned him, and removed the depressed portion of the bone. Three hours after the operation, he sat up in bed, sensation and volition returned, and in four days he was enabled to get up and converse. The last circumstance he remembered, was the capture of a prize in the Mediterranean thirteen months before.

Will any Christian, or Christian Philosopher, reconcile these phenomena with consciousness *in*, and *after*, death? If thought and consciousness can be suspended by pressure on the brain, during life, what becomes of thought and consciousness after death? Are they in full exercise? Let the Bible answer: "The dead know not any thing."

7. In a swoon, blood is rapidly withdrawn from the brain, and total *unconsciousness* is the result. This should not be the case, if the mind were immortal.

8. The phenomena of *sleep* furnish another proof that mind is developed by the *cerebrum*. In profound sleep all consciousness is suspended, which is incompatible with the idea of the mind being altogether independent of the brain; for we cannot conceive of an immaterial principle asleep and unconscious.

9. To sum up all the diseased states of the mind during life, we would ask, how are they compatible with the possession of an incorruptible and deathless mind? Only upon the hypothesis that the intellectual powers are *totally independent of the immortal soul*? And if all the intellectual powers are independent of the immortal soul, and thus become subject to disease, *what is the soul which is left*? A perfect *blank*—A NONENTITY.

10. But *death* closes the scene: "In *death*," says David, "*there* IS NO REMEMBRANCE OF THEE!" "In *sheol* who shall give thee thanks?" None! No, not one!!

"BORN OF WATER."

However others may differ on the subject of being born of water, to me it is clear that it has not the most remote allusion to our *natural birth*. In the 1st chapter of John the natural birth is spoken of as the product of the "*will* of man, the will (or lust) of the flesh," and "*of blood*." And, hence, in the conversation with Nicodemus, Jesus said to him. "*That which is born of the flesh* IS FLESH." That is, it is like its origin—*fleshly*—*not* SPIRITUAL. Thus, "The first man was of the earth —*earthy*"—animal, fleshly. NICODEMUS predicated his *hope* upon his *fleshly* birth—upon his being a son of Abraham, according to the flesh. And the object before the Lord's mind at the time, was to correct this fatal error. John the Baptist taught the Jews:—"Think not to say within yourselves *we have Abraham to our father*, for God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham." In our Lord's conversation with Nicodemus, we have this subject presented and illustrated in the clearest manner. "Except a man," says Jesus, "*be born again*, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Nicodemus having his whole mind pre-occupied by his fleshly birth, exclaims, "how can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter the second time into his mother's womb and be born?" Nicodemus does not comprehend the subject. Now, what did Jesus do? HE EXPLAINS the truth he had previously announced to Nicodemus, by saying "except a man be born of water, and the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." "That which is born of the flesh, is flesh," (and *not water*.) "And that which is born of the spirit, is spirit, (or spiritual.) "Marvel not that I said to thee, ye must be BORN AGAIN," (the very proposition which he had at first announced.) To be "*born again*," then, is to be "born of water and spirit." Not "of water and 'or' spirit," but "*of water and the spirit*"—TWO *agents*, but only ONE *birth*. This "new birth," then, is a perfect anti-type of the natural birth. The first animal, the second moral or spiritual. Generation involves a *process*. Re-generation involves the same. It is a law of nature, and of nature's God, that nothing can be born without "*emerging*" from that of which it is born. Now the saints are born from above —"born of God." *He is their* FATHER; and they, as his children, are "*begotten* unto a lively hope." His word—his truth—indited by his Spirit, is the instrument—the "seed," and an "emergence" from the water completes the *one birth*. And thus it is that we are "born again, not of corruptible seed," (as in the *first* case;) but of incorruptible by the *word of God*, which liveth and abideth forever." There is not *one* birth of water, and *another* of spirit; consequently, no "*coming up out of the spirit*;" but it is a process in which the *Spirit of God, the word, and water*, are concerned as agencies, concurring to produce the *one result*—A NEW BIRTH, of a holy, moral, and heavenly character. And this view of the subject harmonizes with what Paul says in his Letter to Timothy, concerning "the *washing* of *re-generation*, and the *renewing* of the *Holy Spirit*."

Making *two* births of one, has introduced all the confusion which we find on this subject. For, whoever severs what Jesus united in the production of the new birth, will make sad havoc of his teaching, and, also destroy the decorum of the figure. It is impossible to be born of water, in the Scriptural sense, without first being "*begotten* of God." A man may be immersed a thousand times, and if he be not previously begotten by the truth, he will be a spurious offspring—a bastard, having no divine paternity! That which is born of flesh, *is* flesh; and that which is born of *water* ONLY *is water*!

HOMO.

REMARKS ON HOMO'S POSITION.

If we understand "Homo" he makes literal *water* just as essential to the new birth as the Spirit of God. Without the water the Spirit could not produce a new birth. He says the "Spirit and water are TWO *agents* producing ONE birth;" and that "this new birth is a perfect anti-type of the natural birth;" and that "Regeneration involves the same process." That is, there cannot be a birth without a father to beget and a mother to bring forth. In the new birth he makes the Spirit the father and the *water* the mother; if so, we confess we cannot see how a person can be "*begotten*" except *in* the water. But, if we understand "Homo," he says a man must be *previously* begotten," or by immersion he is only "a bastard." If he is "previously begotten," that is while *out* of the water, then "the process" is not a perfect anti-type of the natural birth:" certainly a child was never begotten *out* of its mother's matrix—that is the mould in which it is "begotten." But "Homo" seems to admit that "truth" is that by which the new man is "begotten." If so, is not the man's own heart the matrix in which the "*seed*" is deposited? and not in literal water. In the "natural birth" the child "emerges" from the place where the "seed" is deposited. If so, and the new birth is a perfect anti-type of the natural birth, must not the new birth be effected by an "emergence," of some sort, out of the heart of man, or, in other words, be a purely *spiritual* work, and not a *material* one? as it would be, at least in part, if it is an emergence from literal water.

"Homo" has a criticism on the word "OF;" and says, it is "not of the water, and 'OF' the Spirit; but, '*of water* AND *the spirit*.'" Though the word "*of*" is not in the 5th verse, in *immediate* connection with the "Spirit," yet in the next verse our Lord expressly says, "That which is born OF the Spirit is spirit;" so that we confess, we do not see the force of the criticism: and "Homo," himself, afterwards says "The Saints are 'born of God.'" To be born OF God and born OF the Spirit we cannot suppose differs essentially; so that he, in fact, admits all that we contend for. If a man is "born of God" we cannot conceive that an "emergence from the water completes the one birth." If so—How was the dying thief born of God? if such a thing ever happened. Or, how were Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and all the prophets born again? No such *completion* of the new birth is recorded of any of them. Does the new birth now and the new birth in the days of patriarchs and prophets differ essentially? If not, and they did not have an "emergence from the water" to "complete the one birth," how can it be shown that in order to the new birth a man must emerge from water? Let us not be misunderstood: we believe baptism is an ordinance of our Lord; and one that should not be neglected; but, is it a part of the new birth? or, essential to that birth? If so, it was always essential. It was just as essential to the patriarchs and prophets as to apostles and other christians. There may be *duties* essential to be attended to in one age that are not in another; but this is not to be viewed in the light of a duty that depends on positive law, in this controversy. The question here is not so much about baptism, itself, as whether *literal water* is essential to the new birth. We know that without the new birth a man cannot enter into the kingdom of God: Is an "emergence from water" essential to "the one birth?" If so, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, so far as we have any knowledge, did not experience it; and yet we know that our Saviour hath said—"Ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets in the kingdom of God;" Lk. 13: 28.

"*Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God*:"

"*Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets*" *shall be in that kingdom*:

ERGO: *Then* THEY *will have been* "*born again*." Yet we have not the slightest evidence that they "emerged from water:" Therefore: Water is *not* essential to the new birth. We repeat what we have said before: we believe baptism to be an ordinance under the latest development of grace, and that all who embrace the Lord Jesus Christ should attend to it: but we consider it appointed for a very different purpose than that of *completing* the new birth.

INTERMEDIATE STATE.

BY ELDER P. M. WAY.

"Then shall ye return, and discern, between the righteous and the wicked."—Malachi 3: 18.

This text affirms that clearer light shall be reflected on the character and blessedness of the righteous, under the gospel dispensation. By the gospel of Jesus Christ, "life and immortality are brought to light." "Adam was made a living soul," Jesus Christ "was made a quickening spirit." Man, though lost, may be "created anew in Christ Jesus," may "pass from *death* unto life;" *which* "*life is in Christ*." All, then, who obtain the righteousness which is by faith of Jesus Christ, are restored to the divine image and favour, constituted sons of God, and have secured to them all spiritual blessings, and a deliverance from all the evils which shall finally fall upon the wicked. Among these blessings, is not the least, that the righteous, soon as physical life ends, shall enter upon scenes of conscious blessedness, in the society of "the spirits of just men made perfect." There are many arguments in proof of the above proposition, but I shall confine my remarks to a very few, which, if I possess the power to "discern," are uncontrovertible. Prov. 4: 18. "The path of the just is as a shining light, which shineth more and more to the perfect day." And when the perfect day breaks upon the soul, does it sink into a dark, unconscious sleep? No, verily; the wicked may go into darkness, but the righteous shall be "light in the Lord." Hear the great teacher, Jno. 11: 26, "Whosoever liveth and believeth in me *shall never die*." Physical death does not interrupt our "life in Christ." "For none of us liveth to himself, and no man dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord's." *Death cannot separate us from Christ*.

The Saviour has illustrated, and given us positive assurance of this precious truth, Matt. 22: 31, 32. "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. *For all live unto him*." i. e., all those who have died in the Lord, are alive still, and subjects of God's kingdom. But how plainly is this taught in Christ's transfiguration, Matt. 17: 1—3, when "Moses and Elias appeared, talking with him." Surely, Moses and Elias, though they had been dead more than a thousand years, were not slumbering unconsciously! Again, the promise of Christ to the repenting thief, "To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise," is so plain, as not to require a comment. What some are pleased to call a parable, (Luke 16: 19—31,) of Lazarus and a certain rich man, must carry conviction to every conscience, that the spirit of man exists, consciously, separate from the body. 2d Cor. 5: 1—10, can never be construed, by fair interpretation, to sustain the notion that the soul of the pious, when "this earthly tabernacle is dissolved," ceases its consciousness. It was that assurance, that his spirit should dwell in conscious happiness, when free from its present "house," that inspired in the bosom of Paul (Phil. 1: 21) "A desire *to depart and be with Christ*, which is far better." There are many other proofs from the Bible, but, to my mind, the above texts establish the doctrine beyond successful contradiction. I have not commented on the above texts, for the simple reason, there is no necessity. I have seen attempts to explain them away, but never read anything but what a biblical scholar ought to be ashamed of.

I know it is said, though there are difficulties in the above passage, yet the scriptures do teach that "The dead know nothing"! Now, I appre-

head, the mistake lies in not "discerning between the righteous and the wicked;" and applying, indiscriminately, those passages of scripture, to the righteous and the wicked, which lie exclusively against the wicked. To notice a few of the most prominent which are thus misapplied, (I shall not controvert, here, the meaning of the term death, but will meet the argument on the supposition that all is implied that the destructionist claims, reserving the privilege of holding my own opinion.) It is said, "*The Bible teaches that* MAN, THE SOUL, *as well as the body, dies.*" Gen. 2: 17; "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." "On what authority," it is asked, "do we affirm that *this* is inapplicable to the *entire* man? On what authority do we affirm that the main part of man, *the very part which is chiefly guilty of transgression*, shall escape the penalty, and never die at all?" I answer, from the very good authority, a promise, which was subsequently made, that though life was forfeited by sin, "Life and immortality" should be brought back and offered to man through Jesus Christ, so, that, all who believe in him "shall *never* die." But it is said, "man was not created immortal." And will you affirm, that he was not created *conditionally* immortal? Will you affirm, "though he had obeyed God, yet he must have died"? Nay, do you not affirm, that, after his fall, if he had access to the tree of life, he would "become immortal in sin"? Is it not clear, then, that spiritual life and spiritual death were involved in the penalty, "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die"? And that physical or temporal death followed as a consequence? "The creature was made subject to death, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope." If so, then, God "told the truth," and "the serpent" lied.

Again, it is said, "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." Ezek. 18: 4. "Why, then, do any speak of the *never dying soul?*" I answer; for the very good reason, that God added Ezek. 18: 21—23; "If the wicked will turn from his wickedness—do that which is lawful and right, *he shall surely live*, HE SHALL NOT DIE." How my good brother Storrs, or any lover of truth, could overlook this plain, positive assurance, is beyond my comprehension. "Ye shall discern between the righteous and the wicked." Again, we are referred to Ps. 146: 4, and Eccl. 9: 5, 6, 10. "*The dead know not any thing, neither have they any more a reward—also their love and their hatred and their envy is now perished.*" I answer, does this apply to the righteous and the wicked alike? or, can "we discern between them"? By reading the third and fifth verses of Ps. 146, in connexion with the fourth verse, you will see that this language is affirmed of a wicked prince, in whom the righteous are forbidden to trust, because, when he dieth "his thoughts perish." So of Eccl. 9. Though the same event, physical or temporal death, happen to the righteous and the wicked, whilst the wicked perish, "The righteous, and the wise and their works, are in the hand of God." Eccl. 9: 1. Surely, then, there is a difference "between the righteous and the wicked." "The wicked is driven away in his wickedness, but *the righteous hath hope in his death.*" Prov. 14: 32. Ps. 6: 5, is quoted, "In death there is no remembrance of thee;" and also Ps. 115: 17, "The dead praise not the Lord." And, as though the question was settled, it is said, "The pious poet said, 'And when my voice is lost in death, praise shall employ my nobler powers.'" "The pious psalmist said, 'The dead praise not the Lord.'" Your quotation from Dr. Watts, is as one-sided as from the Bible. Speaking of the wicked, the Doctor says,

> "Like brutes they live, like brutes they die,
> Like grass they flourish, till thy breath,
> Blasts them in everlasting death."

So, in quoting from the Bible. It is the wicked "who go down into silence! that praise not the Lord. But we will bless (*or praise*) the Lord *from this time forth, and for ever more*"!! And that, too, without a space of several thousand years cessation. The wicked do not "remember and praise God." No, verily, "Like sheep they are laid in the grave—but the upright shall have dominion over them in the morning." Let the wearisome hours of darkness and gloom press down the righteous here, and let the wicked triumph, death changes the scene. The light, shining in the distance, becomes clearer and clearer, till the light of the spirit world breaks upon his enraptured vision! Well did the psalmist say of the "ungodly who prosper in the world," "Surely thou didst set them in slippery places: thou castedst them down into destruction. How are they brought into desolation, as in a moment! O Lord, when thou awakest, thou shalt despise their image."

But, how different with the righteous; "Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory. My flesh and my heart faileth, but God is the strength of my heart, and my portion forever." I consider the question, "Is the soul of the righteous conscious between death and the resurrection?" one which does not necessarily involve other questions generally appended to it, and have thus considered it; but, as Brother Storrs affirms, that life is only attained at, or by the resurrection, I may hereafter devote an article to that subject. I will close the present, already too long, by a "reply" to your exposition of John 14: 1—3. "If I go and prepare a place for you, I will COME AGAIN and receive you to myself." Now, all is made to turn on the time when Christ "*will come again.*" Does it mean at the resurrection, "at the last day"? How prove you this? By begging the question. Let me state the argument. Christ *will come* to raise the dead at the last day: therefore, whenever the Scriptures speak of Christ's coming, it must *always*, necessarily, mean at the resurrection. Pardon me, brother; your argument certainly reads thus to me. In the 18th verse of the same chapter, Christ said, "I will not leave you comfortless, I *will come* to you." And in the 23d verse, "We *will come*," i. e., I and my Father "will come unto him," &c. Now, no sane man will affirm that Christ here means, in the resurrection. Again, Matt. 18: 20, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, *there am I in the midst.*" And Rev. 3: 20, "If any man hear my voice, and open the door, I *will come* in to him," &c. Was Stephen mistaken, when in death he said, "I see Jesus," and cried, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit"? No, verily. Christ did come and take his redeemed spirit to "a place prepared." Was Paul mistaken when he said, "We know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens"? "To depart and be with Christ is far better"?

"Then shall ye return and discern between the righteous and the wicked."

Yours, for truth,

Syracuse, August, 1848. P. M. WAY.

REMARKS ON BR. WAY'S LETTER.

Br. Way's leading and concluding text—"Then shall ye return and discern between the righteous and the wicked,"—declares a blessed truth, but we dissent from its application to the "gospel dispensation," if he means by that phrase the dispensation under which we now live. "THEN shall ye return," &c. *When*? Answer. "IN THE DAY when I make up my jewels:" *then* will God "spare them that feared the Lord," &c., "as a man spareth his own son that serveth him:" Mal. 3: 16, 17. In that day "ye shall return and discern between the righteous and the wicked," &c., "for, behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and *the day* that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of hosts, that IT SHALL LEAVE THEM NEITHER ROOT NOR BRANCH." Br. Way will not pretend *that* day has come yet; but *that* is the day in which ye shall "discern between the righteous and the wicked."

Br. W. says,—"The righteous, soon as physical life ends, shall enter upon scenes of conscious blessedness, in the society of 'the spirits of just men made perfect.'" If this text, Heb. 12: 23, proves any thing in favour of the theory of Br. W., it proves too much, for Paul says—"Ye *are* come," &c., not you "*shall*, soon as physical life ends." Br. W. says—"*Death cannot separate us from Christ.*" He doubtless refers to Rom. 8: 35—39; though he does not give it as a quotation. If any one will examine the text, they will see, at a glance, that Br. W.'s conclusion is not quite correct. Death, indeed, "cannot separate us from the *love* of Christ," nor "from the *love of* God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord;" *therefore* he will raise his saints from the dead; for *that* redemption Paul groaned; see verse 23. The saints "*sleep*" at death, "in the dust of the earth:" not separated from the love of Christ, but *in* his love and remembrance; and when he "*descends from heaven*" they shall awake, and no longer be separate from *him*.

If they are not separated in the sense of being "absent" from Christ, by death, so neither are they separated by "life," or while they live; for Paul affirms the same of *life* that he does of *death* in Rom. 8th. The text has nothing to do with the saints' consciousness when dead, but to the *constancy* of Christ's *love*, which is not shaken even though his saints *sleep* one thousand or ten thousand years "in the dust of the earth;" but if there is no resurrection of the dead, "they *are perished*;" even though they "fell asleep in Christ." See 1 Cor. 15: 16—18.

On the text Matt. 22: 31, 32, Br. W. says: "The Saviour has given positive assurance—that those who have died in the Lord are alive still," &c. Tell us, then, thou "Master in Israel," how our Saviour's argument with the Sadducees proved the *resurrection* of the dead? the very point in debate. Does proving that "disembodied spirits" are alive demonstrate a future resurrection, "at the last day?" or, has "Swedenborg" convinced you there is no *such* resurrection? Br. W. next gives us a list of texts on which he does not "comment"—"for the simple reason, there is no necessity;" and says, he has "seen attempts to explain them away, but never read any thing but what a biblical scholar ought to be ashamed of." We, of course, do not know what Br. W. has "*read*," but *we* have read and written much against *his view* of those texts that we do not even *begin* to be "ashamed of;" nor shall we, till we can find better arguments on the other side than we have ever "read."

If we understand Br. Way—he maintains that it is the *wicked dead* that "know not any thing," and that when the Psalmist said, "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence," he meant the "*wicked* dead." Surely! And did the wicked *living* "praise the Lord?" When Hezekiah had recovered from sickness, which he was told, at first, should result in *his death*, and he was praising God for preserving his life, he says,—"The grave cannot praise thee," &c. Now, if we can "discern," he does say that if he had died, when dead, *he* could not have praised the Lord; but he adds,—"The living, *the living*, he shall praise thee as I do this day," &c. Isa. 38: 18, 19.

Hezekiah was a RIGHTEOUS *man.* Isa. 38. 3.

But if he had died he could not THEN *have praised the Lord.*

THEREFORE, *the* RIGHTEOUS "*dead praise not the Lord.*"

The Psalmist is equally as conclusive. Let any one read the sixth Psalm; David is there complaining, as the whole Psalm shows, of sickness and disease which he feared would result in death; and he piously and pathetically entreats the Lord to deliver his soul, i. e. *himself*; and adds as a reason for his prayer, "For in death there is no *remembrance* of thee; in the grave *who* who shall give thee thanks?"

David was a RIGHTEOUS *man.*

But, if he had died he would THEN *have had no* REMEMBRANCE *of God.*

ERGO. *The righteous dead are unconscious.*

Again. "*David is not ascended into the heavens.* Acts 2: 34.

Jesus Christ has ascended into the heavens. Heb. 8: 1.

THEREFORE, *David is* NOT "*with Christ.*"

Thus, "in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word is established," that Christ does not receive the *saints* to the conscious enjoyment of *his presence* AT DEATH.

Br. W. understands us to say—"Whenever the Scriptures speak of Christ coming, it must *always*, necessarily, mean at the resurrection." We are sorry if we gave our good brother any occasion to understand us so; we surely did not intend it; and if he will read our remarks again, we think he will be undeceived. The point in discussion there was the meaning and application of the phrase, "*come* AGAIN." To come *again* implies a *previous* coming; we showed that previous coming was *personal*—that the going *away* was *personal*, and hence to *come* AGAIN was to do so in the same *personal* manner; and not in some *hidden, secret* manner, altogether unlike the previous. Should we "state the argument" for our opponents as Br. W. has for us, we might say "Christ will come to receive the souls of his people at death; therefore, whenever the Scriptures speak of Christ's coming, it must always, necessarily, mean at death; therefore, he will never come again *personally*." Would that be a fair version of my opponent's views? Not one of

Br. W.'s texts in disproof of our position affirm that Christ comes *again* at the time spoken of. *Spiritually* he never went away, and therefore spiritually does not come *again*; but *personally* he once came—personally he went away—and personally he will "come *again*;" then, and not till then has he ever promised to receive his followers unto *himself*; though Br. W. affirms he "did come and take Stephen's redeemed spirit to a place prepared." But the Bible affirms, Stephen "FELL ASLEEP," yes, he *sleeps*, Br. W., and when the Lord comes *again* he will "*wake him out of his sleep*," and Stephen will not be conscious that he has slept a moment, if it is "thousands of years." Not one of the texts that Br. W. has quoted says that Christ ever came *again* at any man's death; or, that he came *at death* at all. We asked "for a single text of Scripture that says, Christ *comes again* at the death of his saints." Has Br. W. produced one? Let the reader judge.

THE SON OF GOD.—NO. V.

By Henry Grew.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE DIVINE TESTIMONY RESPECTING THE IMPORT OF THE TERM SON OF GOD, AND WHETHER IT IS, OR IS NOT EXPRESSIVE OF THE HIGHEST CHARACTER OF OUR BLESSED LORD.

It has long been a sentiment of very general belief in the Christian church, that the terms *Son of God, only begotten Son of God*, are expressive of that divine relation to the Father in which his *highest character* consists. These terms are now considered by some, who are to be respected for their talents and piety, as referable to the humanity of Christ peculiarly begotten; and not as importing his most exalted nature.

In relation to this interesting and important subject, we may consider the following truths derived from the divine testimony.

1. It is in the character of the SON OF GOD, that the Saviour is presented to a lost world, as the great object of faith, and with the belief of this truth salvation is connected.

2. It is in this character, he is an object of worship.

3. Jesus Christ during his ministry on earth never claimed a higher title.

4. The highest title ever given him in the Scriptures of truth, even that of God, is given to him as the *Son of God*.

If these propositions are clearly supported by the word of God, can we possibly avoid the conclusion, that the terms under consideration import the highest character of our Redeemer?

1. That "the Lord from heaven," is presented to a perishing world as the great and glorious *object of faith* in the character of the Son of God, with the belief of which truth salvation is connected, appears from the following passages. Matt. 3: 17; 17: 5; John 1: 34; 3: 18, 36; 6: 69; 9: 35; 11: 27; Acts 8: 37; 9: 20; Rom. 1: 4; 1 John 4: 15, &c.

2. That it is in this character he is worshipped, plainly appears from Heb 1: 6, When he bringeth in the *first begotten* into the world, he saith, and let all the angels of God worship him. See also John 5: 23; Matt. 14: 33; John 9: 35, 38.

3. No passage can be found in which "the faithful witness" ever claimed a higher title. On this high claim, the charge of blasphemy by his opposers was founded. John 10: 36. This claim excited their utmost rage. John 5: 18.

4. That it is as the Son of God on the throne of the kingdom, he is called *God*, is evident from Heb. 1: 8. Ps. 14: 6, But unto the *Son* he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, &c.

The first chapter to the Hebrews illustrates this important truth. It is manifestly the design of the inspired apostle in this chapter, to set forth our adorable Redeemer in his highest dignity and most glorious character. He represents him, verse 2, as the maker of the worlds. Verse 3, as the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of his person. Verse 4, as being much better than the angels. Verse 6, as the object of their worship. And verse 8, as God. But it appears from verse 3 and 3, that it was in the character of *Son* that he made the worlds. If, then, his creating the world, if his being "the express image" of the invisible God, denotes his divine nature, the title of Son must denote the same. Why is he made so much better than the angels? Because he hath by inheritance obtained a more excellent name than they. But what is this excellent name? It is the *Son of God*. This is evident from verse 5, For unto which of the angels said he at any time, thou art my *Son*, &c. But if this name is applicable only to his humanity, it must rather signify that he was made "*a little lower than the angels*;" and the inspired apostle appears wholly to have failed in his proof, verse 5, which he evidently considers as conclusive.

Mr. Fuller, in his essay on this subject, justly remarks, "The glory of the only begotten of the Father, and the glory of the Word, are used as convertible terms, as being the same: but the latter is allowed to denote the divine person of Christ, as antecedent to his being made flesh: the same therefore must be true of the former. The word was made flesh, and we beheld his glory; that is, the glory of the Word, the glory of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." John 1: 14.

John 3: 16, For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, &c. Here our Lord exhibits to us the great love of the giver by setting forth the excellence of the gift. But all this excellence is comprised in the phrase, "his only begotten Son." This phrase must, therefore, include the highest character of our blessed Redeemer, or it is totally inadequate for his purpose, to set forth the amazing love of God towards us in "his unspeakable gift."

Heb. 4: 14, We have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God. "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." If, then, there is any divinity in his priesthood, to give virtue to his sacrifice and intercession, that divinity is in the name of the Son of God.

So also, when he is exalted as King on the holy hill of Zion, the decree is declared, "Thou art my Son," &c. And when we are required to be reconciled to his government, we are commanded to "kiss the Son." Ps. 2: 7, 12.

John 17: 5, And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was. The obvious truth in this passage is, that the Son possessed glory with the Father "before the world was," and, consequently, that these relations then subsisted. But if the term "Son of God," is not expressive of the Redeemer's highest character, it follows that the Son of God, so far from possessing glory with the Father before the world was, has not yet existed two thousand years!

It is remarked by the respected author before quoted, that "God is frequently said to have sent his Son into the world." John 7: 18; 10: 36; 1 John 4: 9, 10. But this implies that he was his Son antecedent to his being sent. To suppose otherwise, is no less absurd than supposing that when Christ is said to have sent forth his twelve disciples, they were not disciples, but in consequence of his sending them, or of some preparation pertaining to their mission."—"Moreover, to say that god sent his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, is equal to saying, that the Son of God assumed human nature: he must therefore have been the Son of God before his incarnation. Christ is called the Son of God antecedent to his being manifested to destroy the works of the devil: but he was manifested to destroy the works of the devil by taking upon him human nature: consequently he was the Son of God antecedent to the human nature being assumed."

"It has been frequently suggested that the ground of Christ's sonship is given us in Luke 1: 35, and is no other than his miraculous conception. It is true that our Lord was miraculously conceived of the Holy Spirit, and that such a conception was peculiar to him; but it does not follow, that by this he became the Son, or only begotten Son of God. Nor does the passage in question prove any such thing. It may be a reason given why Christ is called the Son of God; but not why he is so. Christ is called the Son of God as raised from the dead, and as exalted at the right hand of God. Acts 13: 33; Heb. 1: 4, 5. Did he then become the Son of God by these events? This is impossible, for sonship is not a progressive matter. If it arose from his miraculous conception, it could not for that reason arise from his resurrection or exaltation: and so on the other hand, if it arose from his resurrection or exaltation, it could not proceed from his miraculous conception. But if each be understood of his being hereby proved, acknowledged, or, as the Scriptures express it, 'declared to be the Son of God with power,' all is easy and consistent."

Rom. 1: 3, 4, is an instructive passage. Our Lord was "made of the seed of David according to the flesh, and declared to be the Son of God with power according to the spirit of holiness," &c. It is admitted by learned Trinitarians that "it is not the third person in the Trinity that is referred to here." (See Barnes, Poole, &c. on the passage.) It is Christ's spirit in contrast with his body. He was of the seed of David in respect to his flesh or body. Observe, not according to his flesh and human soul, but simply in respect to his flesh or body. "A body, (not body and soul,) hast thou prepared me." "The Word was made flesh," not flesh and soul. But "according," or, in respect, to his spirit, he was "the Son of God." The passage proves that he was so before his incarnation. Mr. Barnes observes, "The expression according to the spirit of holiness does not indeed of itself imply divinity. It denotes that holy and more exalted nature, which he possessed as distinguished from the human." The distinction, however, in the passage, is not between two spirits of different natures, but simply between the nature and origin of his one holy spirit and the nature and origin of that flesh or body which that spirit assumed.

We have, then, sufficient proof from the divine estimony, that the term Son of God is expressive of the highest character of our Saviour. The reflecting reader will discern that we have equal proof that he is, in his highest nature, "the only begotten of the Father," and must, therefore, be necessarily dependent on him for all things, agreeably to Christ's own words: "all things are delivered unto me of my Father." Mr. Fuller, although a Trinitarian, acknowledged in the conclusion of his essay on the sonship of Christ, that "in the order of nature, the Father must have existed before the Son."* He indeed supposed the Son to be "properly eternal," as well as the Father. But to reconcile this idea with the above concession, is, to me at least, absolutely impossible.

Is this with any of us a subject of mere speculation? God forbid; In this name, my brethren, is concentrated all the glory of God ever viewed by mortal minds. In this name centers all our hope, and peace, and joy. It is this dear name that draws forth our souls to Jehovah, in wonder, love, and praise. This is the blest name that comprises all those glorious "things the angels desire to look into," And it is in the knowledge, love and adoration of this name that the saints shall be "filled with all the fulness of God."

"Oh, may I live to reach the place,
Where he unveils his lovely face;
Where all his beauties you behold,
And sing his name to harps of gold."

BR. HENRY HAYES writes from Worcester, Mass. :—

BR. STORRS:—I perused with interest the articles by Br. Walsh on the Kingdom of God, which appeared in several numbers of the Examiner: I was not aware, however, that he had finished them when the last appeared. I looked for more from him upon the subject. The last three numbers contain nothing more from his pen on that subject. I would enquire, if he considers he has completed it *in the main*, not to say *the whole*? If so, I think it will be easy to show, there is much he has left untouched, and much too that is important to be considered.

With the articles of Dr. Thomas and Br. Grew, I have also been much interested. If Dr. T. be correct in the belief that the unimmersed are, without exception, excluded from the kingdom of God, I think he is bound to show to the candid seeker for truth, however limited his intellectual powers may be, that immersion is the only true mode of baptism, in so clear a manner, as to leave no room for an honest doubt. On the supposition that Dr. T. be wrong, what a stand it is for a man to take—to allow a person may be prayerful, pious, sincere, Bible searching, truth seeking, &c. &c., and yet, because he has not conformed to a requirement he did not know of, must necessarily be excluded from the saint's inheritance! Bless God, there are some who know too well the enjoyment of communion with God, to be driven to doubt and despair by men's notions, however positively and emphatically they may be published. Notwithstanding I speak thus, I view immersion to be the correct mode, to which I conformed several years ago: yet I know such a person as a Christian man, exemplary, bible-loving, whose arguments in favor of sprinkling, I feel unable fully to refute. Shall I say to him, your piety, your spiritual enjoyment, your consistent works will all be fruitless—you

* Dialogues, Letters and Essays, on various subjects, page 134. Hartford edition.

have not been immersed—although you don't see this your duty, no matter, you have no reason to expect inheritance with the saints in the kingdom? No, indeed, unless by greater light through D. T., or some other means, I see more manifestly the correctness of the Doctor's position. But I may have more to say on this at a future time.

I am interested with the Examiner. I read each number from beginning to end. I had apprehensions of a want of *advent spirit* in its editor: but of late I have been in a measure relieved from such feeling. That while it is published it may be fully worthy its name, is the hope of your feeble, yet truth-seeking brother. HENRY HEVES.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, SEPT., 1848.

ARE THE WICKED IMMORTAL?

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

BIBLE EXAMINER.—The present volume is drawing to a close, and we are disposed to say some things thus early, that both our subscribers and ourselves may understand the position we occupy. We have given our patrons more matter, and a neater paper, than we at first promised. In consequence of this, the expense of publishing has been at least one hundred and fifty dollars more than was contemplated at the beginning, while we have made no charge, and received nothing for our services, and the Assistant Editor has not only given his services, but has actually contributed more funds than any other ten of our friends, since the monthly issue commenced.

We are satisfied from what we hear and know, that the Examiner is needed, and will be sustained, so far as paying the *printer* is concerned, and *we* never contemplated any *pecuniary* advantage to ourselves in publishing it. Though we are poor, and have nothing of this world's goods, we ask nothing of the friends of the Examiner, save that they see to it, that we are preserved from becoming indebted to the *Printer*. This can now be easily done if our present subscribers continue for the next volume, and send us only one new subscriber each.

Our purpose is, to continue the Examiner in the same form as at present, and at the same price; published monthly. Our terms are low, and we must insist upon *payment in all cases in advance*. We have no idea of doing as some do, that is, to be dunning our subscribers all the year, and telling them how much they *owe us*, and how much we are suffering for the want of it. We shall have but one rule, viz: PAY IN ADVANCE, or the paper *will not be sent*, either to *old* or *new* subscribers. No person will have a *bill* sent with a *charge* for the passing year if they have not paid, and no one will receive the Examiner, after the present volume, who has not paid for it as above stated. We give this notice thus early, that all who design to continue as subscribers, may have ample time, before the first of January, to save *fifty cents* and forward it, which must be done *free of expense to us*, but may be sent by mail at our *risk*.

We have taken and are taking much pains to secure an amount of matter for the Examiner, in future, which we doubt not will give new interest to the paper. DR. LEES, Leeds, England, has promised to contribute to the Examiner. The article in our January and February Nos., on "Future Punishment," signed "PATHFINDER," was from his pen. In the present number, we have the first communication, direct from him, "for the Examiner," and we expect it will be followed by many others. Dr. Lees is "*Doctor of Philosophy of the University of Giessen*; F. S. A. Scotland, or Edin." His letter, found in this number of the Examiner, will prepare the way for what is to follow. We have a considerable amount of matter on hand, from his pen, of much interest. Some of his views differ from ours, at present, but, we are in search after *truth*, and if convinced of the correctness of his positions, we shall embrace them fearlessly. This getting into a stagnant pool, never to have a "new notion," as some are pleased to call every new thought that is at all ahead of the walls of *their* theological prison, we abhor. The great body of so called *Protestant* religionists are as much bound by the superstitions of Paganism and Romanism as Romanists themselves; they hug their chains, and denounce those who strive to set them free, and vainly suppose that *they* have all the light that can be elicited; hence they hate the light, and will not advance one step.

We are not of those who are ready to adopt every new thought that may be suggested, but we do hold to *proving all things*, not by the creeds or inventions of men, but by the Truth of God, whether that truth be found in the *works or word* of God. God's works and word must and do agree, and they can no more be found at disagreement than He can "deny himself." When men, therefore, ask us to throw away our *reason*, the noblest faculty with which our Creator has endowed us, or the noblest WORK of God in man, to follow *their* creeds, under the pretence that we must exercise *faith*, yea, a *blind faith*, in the doctrines of their own inventions, we pray to be excused. God himself has placed, in his *word*, the broad seal of his unqualified condemnation on all those who lightly esteem the reason He has given us: "Come now," saith the Lord of all, "let Us REASON TOGETHER:" Isa. 1: 18. And we are to give "a REASON of the hope" that is in us: 1 Pet. 3: 15. And Paul "*reasoned*" with his hearers, both from the Scriptures and "the things that are made," or the *works* of God. None but bigots demand implicit assent to their *dogmas*, and none but bigots,

and such as "know nothing as they ought to know," think that *they* have attained the *acme* of knowledge. The command to "*grow in knowledge*," is as imperative and binding as the command to repent, or believe. But there can be no growth in knowledge, while men refuse to admit a doubt as to their previous theories. The admission of doubt does not imply an abandonment of the views, but only leaves the mind open to investigate: the investigation may result in the full confirmation in previous views, and in that case we shall be able to give a reason to every man that asketh us. Most religionists, at present, can give no better answer for their faith or practice, than that their church, or fore-fathers, believed and did so. We pity all such. May they attain unto that freedom which the word and works of God giveth, through his Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

"THE CHRISTIAN SUN," AND IMMORTALITY.—Some of the correspondents of "the Christian Sun," are discussing the subject of immortality. Mr. Alexander McCaine is on the side of immortal-soulism. He reminds us of the "mountain in labor," which, after all its travail, "brought forth a mouse." We would ask Mr. McCaine a few simple questions, which, we hope for the truth's sake, he will answer.

1st. Is there any thing "*good*" in man by nature?

2d. If "God only hath immortality," by what means do his creatures possess it?

3d. If man be born of "corruptible seed," whence his immortality?

4th. Is immortality an attribute, or an entity?

5th. What is life?

6th. What is death?

When Mr. McCaine has answered these questions, we have a few more to propound for his solution. J. T. W.

P. S. Will the "Christian Sun" copy the above?

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.—As we come to make up our paper for this month, we see that the subject of baptism occupies a larger space than some may think desirable. If the subject is to be further discussed, we suggest if it would not be best to confine the remarks, till that point is sufficiently examined, to this one question:

Is baptism, with water, EXCLUSIVELY *by immersion?*

We received an article, some months since, in defence of baptism by sprinkling, but thought not best to publish it, and were willing that every person should "be fully persuaded in his own mind;" but as Br. Magruder thinks that wont do for "a Bible Examiner," we are willing the discussion should go on, but, let us have a definite point. This remark is not designed to interfere with Dr. Thomas's and Br. Grew's controversy. Let them finish as they please.

PROGRESS OF THE TRUTH IN BRITAIN.

We have received a communication from the Editor of the *Truth Seeker and Christian Thinker*, DR. FREDERIC RICHARD LEES, of Leeds, England, from which we have pleasure in quoting the following extracts. They evince that the Truth is travelling far and fast over the world—that the days of the Fraud and Falsehood of misnamed "*Orthodoxy*," are indeed numbered—and they prove, once again, the justness of the old persuasion, that "Truth is stronger than all things: it liveth and conquereth for evermore."

LEEDS, July 15th, 1848.

"MY DEAR MR. STORRS:—I respond with pleasure to your request for information as to the state and progress of '*the Immortality question*,' in England and Europe; and gladly furnish you with such as I am in possession of. Of Europe generally, or rather of its profoundest scholars and Divines in Sweden, Germany, and France, I can affirm that their closer acquaintance with the machinery and organization of the Divine developments *in nature*,—and the perception of the want of clearer and better definitions than an effete orthodoxy can furnish,—have led to the abandonment of those old *idea-less* phrases concerning 'Mind' or 'Spirit,' which represent *Thought* as existing without a *Thinker*, and a '*Mind*' without a '*Man*.' The influence of SWEDENBORG's philosophy has been very considerable on this subject, for, taking its stand-point in the great principle that 'Man is an *Organ* of God,' it legitimately asserts, that neither in this life nor the life-to-come, can there be any *action*, any *life* or *movement*, without an *organization* of action, movement, or manifestation—i. e. a BODY of some kind, no matter whether we *call* it 'material' or 'spiritual.' Hence there *must* be—(according to all the processes of God's providence)—a RESURRECTION before there be a future LIFE—a *standing-again* (anastasis.) The Thinkers of Europe are also fast repudiating the distinction-of-opposition set up between 'Matter' and 'Spirit'—disavowing the notion of a *double substance*, and maintaining unity of atomic Substance, in variety of Manifestation. BERKELEY said—'There is but *one* substance—Mind.'—PRIESTLEY said—'There is but *one* substance—Matter. WE are now saying—'There is but *one* substance—*no matter* what we *call* it.' On the Continent, however, while the false form of the doctrine of *Immortality* is giving way in favour of the true one of *Resurrection* through Christ, I know of no eminent writer who advocates the Truth in the *precise form* which it assumes in America. Further, while many are *Restorationists*, there are a few who are *Perditionists*, (i. e. believers in the *loss of the Life* of the Wicked, by the *destruction* of that 'organization' through which alone *life* is possible.) The whole tribe of fallacies arising from viewing *Life, Mind, Personality, &c*, as THINGS instead of STATES—and as *self*-existing instead of existing by and through *means*—are fast vanishing away with the *childishness* of the past age.

"Of Britain I can speak more specially and

in detail, both of the *Persons* entertaining these views of *Life*, and of the *Literature* they have given rise to. In the first place, I will give you the History of my own Thoughts and Efforts, and, in the second, an account of the Controversies with which I have since become acquainted, conducted by others, with a partial list of the *works* which they have occasioned.

"Some ten years ago I read Dr. Law, the Bishop of Chester's 'Theory of Religion,' and 'Essay on Death,' which rid me at once of *my faith* in the current doctrines of Methodism on the subject, though the half-dozed texts on which they are based, prevented me arriving at satisfactory conclusions on the whole question. I was subsequently led to apply my knowledge of Chemistry and Physiology to this topic,—to look at the *law of the procession of life and consciousness as God evolves it in Nature*,—and then I found, for the first time, firm foothold. Nowhere did I behold *Life* and *Mind* except in connection with a specific *Organization*, while every where I beheld *Life decease*, and Mind *disappear*, with *the ruin* of the organ. Everywhere I beheld an exact *Correspondence* between the *Organ*—manifesting, and the *Mind* or Life manifested. Everywhere, I beheld this law inscribed upon nature—'Use, and you shall secure Profit and Increase;—neglect or mis-use, and you shall suffer *Loss* and *Decease*.'—I then appealed to Scripture, and commenced my studies by a careful examination of *every text* bearing on the future life, or referring to Soul, Life, or Death, to Heaven and to Hell, by which alone I could gather the real opinions of the ancient writers. I compared the English version with the originals, always having my Hebrew and Greek Concordances before me, for the sake of readier reference to parallel Text and Context. The issue *you* will have anticipated. It opened out another volume of priestly frauds and forgeries, to be added to an already crowded catalogue. I rose up from my perusal perfectly satisfied that the doctrines of the Fire-Hell and its *Eternal Torments*, of the *self-subsisting* Soul and its *Immortality, were senseless fictions*, totally discountenanced by the Scriptures, at any rate. This was to me a mighty relief—and I felt, for the first time, *fully* competent to defend Christianity, both from the fangs of Infidelity and the corruptions of Priestcraft. I had now the highest assurance of the Truth—Creation and Scripture were in harmony. In Leeds, and the neighborhood, I preached these Scriptural Truths. In January, 1845, I started, singlehanded, the (*Manx*) *Truth Seeker*, in opposition to the priests, who, throughout England and Scotland, were denouncing me as an '*Infidel*' for opposing their corruptions and their craft. I now thank God that they *did* denounce me: for it has shown me, more clearly, *my duty*. From that period I renounced all care for wealth and worldly success; I devoted all my energy, influence, and power, to their overthrow—and, by God's help, I will persevere unto the end. In the first No. of the (English) *Truth Seeker*, (a post Magazine of ninety-six pages, which I started the same year,) I assailed the fatalities of *Immortal-Soulism* and *Eternal Torments* in a sermon on 'Profit and Loss.' This sermon, and a series of six others on the Future State, I preached in Leeds, Bramley, and elsewhere. Many converts were made. It was then published, and everywhere, throughout the country, from John O'Groats to the Land's End, it awoke thought;—the seed quickened, and the young plant of Truth took fast and lasting root. A discussion of the subject commenced in the second volume of the *Truth Seeker*, which was continued over two years. I send you some of the articles.

"In 1846 I began to find that other and influential persons in Britain, had also had their thoughts turned to this topic. My friend, Joseph Barker, (now of Wortley, near Leeds,) formerly a celebrated Methodist Minister, but expelled for 'heresy,' had republished your 'Six Sermons' in a cheap form, and circulated them amongst his friends—'The Christian Reformers'—throughout the North of England. The late Thomas Foster, the author of 'the Evils of popular Ignorance,' and the greatest writer amongst the modern Congregational Divines, had given up the notion of Eternal Torments, and within his circle of correspondents, produced a great influence. Archbishop Whately, also, had favourably noticed our views. In the West of England, the 'Destructionist heresy' grew apace. M. Doeney, of Maidstone, published his 'Notes,' which drew down some severe critiques from the monthly organs of the body. These he logically replied to, in a second and enlarged edition. In 1847, Mr. White, a popular congregationalist at Hereford, sent forth his 'Life-in-Christ,' which excited the wrath of a disappointed rival priest (a Dr. Redford) in the *Eclectic Review*, who grossly misrepresented the work. Matters grew so serious, at last, that the Congregational Union, in order to put down, at one blow, the double heresy of Restorationism and 'Destructionism,' engaged the services of R. W. Hamilton, D. D., of Leeds, to deliver the annual 'Congregational Lecture,' in opposition to the heretics. The Lectures were delivered, and published and puffed in the handsomest style. They are equally eloquent and illogical: in fact, viewed as an instrument for putting down the stern *logic* and *criticism* of your school, the book is a dead failure. In a recent article in the *British Quarterly Review*, (a dissenting organ edited by Dr. Vaughan,) this is tacitly confessed. This writer admits Dr. H.'s deficiency of logic, and starts himself a quite novel canon of criticism. *Christ's language*, as he contends, is not to be interpreted by that of the Prophets, whom he is quoting,—but by the opinions of the later Jews, and of the *Pharisees* whom he was reproving and threatening,—and by their opinions as gathered from some fragments in the *Apocrypha* and *Josephus*! In other words, THE BIBLE IS NO LONGER TO BE ITS OWN INTERPRETER!!! How hardly put to it must the priests be, to be compelled to devise and adopt such a theory!

"This reminds me of a still newer theory, put forth by J. H. Hinton, M. A., of London, in a tract entitled 'Who will live for ever?' He answers, '*All*'—and founds his assertion on Luke xx: 27—38. The declaration, '*neither can they die any more*,' he applies to ALL the dead, arguing that as the seven husbands cannot be assumed to be *all good*, they must be representative of *all* men, of whom, therefore, Christ predicates *immortality in the future life*. The phrases which he admits to have always been viewed by commentators *as limiting the declaration to the good*, do not, he argues, *really* do so, while the full scope of the reply requires that there *should* be no limitation as to *character*. At all events, it is unfortunate that no one before, either in ancient or modern times, ever read the Greek text as he does. Nevertheless, he *may* be right, the fact is only a *presumption* against him. I therefore give an analysis of his work in my Magazine for your consideration.

"There are many able and excellent men, (as the eloquent H. Melville, B. D., of London,) who incline more or less to our views. Foremost amongst these, we may place Dr. Whately, the Archbishop of Dublin. In Exeter, quite a controversy has been lately got up on the subject; J. N. Darby, the Plymouth Brother, taking the *Hellish* side of the question, (as you would see from *Truth Seeker*, No. 2, new series,) and several others the *opposite side*.

"Receive the assurance of my sincere sympathy with you in your warfare against Error. You *have*, my dear Sir, and *will* have, your 'reward.' It is a noble thing to be *active* in the cause of Truth—a true life, this battling against Falsehood. I also, have found God to be with me. Though only thirty-three years of age, broken off from *all* sects and parties, and denounced by most, I have, by God's help, raised up a noble army of *Truth-Seekers*—fearless and faithful men—who from John O'Groat's to the Land's End, are everywhere lifting up their voice for the *Truth*. Let us take courage, and persevere—and, at any rate, we can *die* in the battle! The more the enemy rage, the more reason is prevailing.

"My space and time are now both exhausted, you will therefore please accept this hasty letter as a token of my good will. I have no time to copy it, and must either send it as it is, or delay to a future time; the pleasure of communicating with you; on the whole, therefore, I conclude to neglect the mere *form* of respect, in order to fulfil the true *spirit* of it.

Faithfully yours,

"Frederic Richard Lees."

REPLY TO MORE QUESTIONS.

Question 1. "*Will there be probation after the Lord comes?*" c. o. t.

Answer. The answer to this question is so plain that, with present light, we cannot see how an unbiased mind can hesitate in an affirmative reply. See Zech. 14th. All attempts to make that chapter tally with the doctrine of "*no probation*, after the advent," in our opinion, have only shown how vain the effort is to establish such a theory. In the 4th and 5th verses it is plainly said, in that day "His feet shall stand upon the mount of Olives"—and that, "The Lord my God shall come, and all the saints [or holy ones] with thee." In the 9th verse it is further affirmed—"The Lord shall be King over all the earth: IN THAT DAY shall there be one Lord and his name one." Then it is stated in what manner the Lord will cut off many wicked, and concludes, verse 16, in this *unanswerable* answer to the question to which we are replying: "And it shall come to pass *that every one that is left of all the nations* which came against Jerusalem shall even go up from year to year to worship The King, the Lord of hosts, and to keep the feast of tabernacles." Here it is clear, that in the cutting off at the advent, there will be those besides "*the saints*," who are "*left* of the nations." That those left are in a state of trial, or "probation" is equally clear, as the threatening of judgments upon those that "go not up" is distinctly set forth in the 17th, 18th, and 19th verses. These threatened "plagues" certainly are not for the "saints" who are changed to immortality at the advent; nor can we assume the fearful position towards which some have seemed to lean, *viz.* that "if those left do not come up they will be cut off, and *if they do come up they will be cut off!!* All the attempts of Mr. Miller and his followers to get over this chapter have but involved them in the greatest absurdities. We once favored his views, for a time, of "no probation to any soul of man after the advent," and tried every possible way to harmonize this chapter with that view; but, could never satisfy ourself, nor offer an argument in favor of his position, but what we felt shame whenever pressed with, Zech. 14; till at last, in the winter of '43 and '44, we determined thoroughly to investigate the whole subject for ourself, and follow the best light we could find wherever it might lead us. We did so, and gave our mind wholly to that topic, for a time, with prayer for light and aid. We went into the investigation with the full understanding that if we were led to a different result from that we had previously favored we were to meet with the displeasure of those whom we loved as the apple of our eye; but at the same time under the solemn conviction if we were "*ashamed*" of Christ's "words" he would "be ashamed" of us at his coming. The examination resulted in the deep and abiding conviction—clear to our mind as the advent itself—that there will be left of the nations, after the advent, men in the flesh, who will be probationers for God's favor unto eternal life, though never to attain, so far as we can see, unto the high honor of "*kings and priests* unto God and the Lamb;" nor "to sit down with Christ on his throne," as those will who are accounted worthy of immortality at his coming. The texts of Scripture in proof of probation to some, after the advent are so numerous and clear, to our mind, that we can no more doubt it than we can question the advent itself. We cannot, however, enter more fully on that topic now.

Ques. 2. "*Who will be the probationers?*"

Answer. Those "left of the nations;" for—"All the ends of the world shall remember and turn unto the Lord; and all the kindreds of the nations shall worship before thee; for, *the kingdom is the Lord's*; and he is governor among the nations. A seed shall serve him; it shall be accounted to the Lord for a generation; they shall come and shall declare his righteousness unto A PEOPLE THAT SHALL BE BORN, that he hath done this;" Psa. 22: 27—31. Comment on this Scripture will not be entered upon in this place.

Ques. 3. "*How long will probation last after Christ comes?*"

Ans. We do not know—"Secret things belong unto the Lord our God: but those revealed unto us and to our children forever." Deut. 29: 29. We repeat, however, what we said in the Examiner for August—"We see no evidence in the Scriptures to limit *probation time* to any period whatever." That it is limited with regard to each individual we cannot question; but, that it is so with respect to the race of man we consider a *mere assumption*. That the time will come when the trial of moral beings will be uniformly successful we think highly *probable*, and then there will be no more death or sorrow. We have light enough now to guide us into the fact that a more perfect age will succeed this than any previous one; and that be followed by another of a still higher order. But that ages will

not stop even then, is more than intimated by Paul. Eph. 3: 21, which reads in our translation, "*all ages*, world without end:" but, which Mc Knight translates—"throughout *the endless succession of ages*." Not one solitary age and then an eternal monotony; but, age after age, each rising higher in glory and richer in the displays of God's wisdom, power, and love; and yet unexhausted and unexhaustible, eternally. For men to pretend that they *know* there will be no probation to any body in any or all these ages, in some form or under some circumstances, we think is being "wise above what is written;" for, we challenge the proof of one single text in the Bible where there is a "*Thus saith the Lord*" for any such *assumption*. It will not be enough to show that *many* have ended *their probation*: let it be shown that all have, if it is possible to do it. We ask, *Where is the proof?* WHERE?

QUES. 4. "*Will the wicked dead be raised before the thousand years are finished?*"

ANS. Our opinion, with present light, is—they will not. We confess, however, that we have but one text in support of that view, and that is in Rev. 20; and when we consider the highly symbolical character of the Book of Revelation we would not quarrel with any who think that a part or all the wicked dead will be raised at or near the time of the advent; and we must further confess, that such a view *seems* more in harmony with the general tenor of the Scriptures than to suppose the wicked dead are not raised till the close of the millenium. The future, or millenium age, is to be different from any that has gone before. If it were not for the 20th of Rev. we should be compelled to the conclusion, from the other Scriptures, that the wicked, who are dead at the time of the advent, would then be raised, judged, and "punished with everlasting destruction;" and that in the future age, or next dispensation, it being characterized by the personal reign of Christ, the sentence against transgressors will be executed *fully* and *finally* on all who sin under that dispensation, *at the time of their sin*, as indicated in Zech. 14, Isa. 65: 20, and Rev. 20: 9. But, this part of the subject we must leave for further light; for, each new dispensation developes some new truths which were only seen "through a glass darkly" in the previous one.

BAPTISM:—We have received a communication from Br. Magruder, of Charlottsville, Va., touching the discussion between Br. Grew and Dr. Thomas, going on in the Examiner, with some remarks on our Editorial, in the last Examiner. Br. Magruder's article is written in an excellent spirit, and so much of it as relates to ourself, we give in the present number, with our own reply. We would inform our readers, however, that the article from "*Homo*," on being "born of water," was received, and, with our reply to it, put into the hands of the printer, before Br. M.'s article was received. Br. M. will excuse us for omitting, in this number, his "Reply to Mr Grew."

He says—Dr. Thomas is now in England, and the period of his return is uncertain: and asks the privilege to enter "the field in behalf of the truth" the Dr. "advocates." We have no objection to it, whatever, provided the parties concerned assent. But Br. Grew is now in *New* England, and where, exactly, we know not, and hence, cannot consult him to know if he is willing to accept a new controversialist in room of Dr. T. If he is, we bid Br. M. welcome to the work. We do not think Br. Grew will object, but we wish to treat both parties fairly, and therefore defer so much of Br. Magruder's article as relates to Br. Grew, till we can hear from him.

The following is Br. M.'s introduction, and so much of his article as relates to ourself.

MR. GREW AND DR. THOMAS.

I have watched, with deep interest, the progress of the discussion between these able disputants, in the pages of the "Examiner." The introduction incidentally, of the subject of *baptism* in the August number, has imparted additional interest to their good tempered and well-conducted controversy. The question needs discussion at this time. The diverse views and practice in regard to baptism among those who are animated by a common hope of the speedy and glorious advent of our blessed Lord, ought, if possible, to be harmonized, provided it can be effected without a sacrifice of truth and honest conviction. I trust the present discussion will tend to produce satisfactory results. If conducted with moderation and candor, it cannot fail to elicit light, and advance the claims of truth.

EDITORIAL STRICTURES.

"What truth was ever elicited without controversy," well remarks the Editor, and I applaud the sentiment. Truth never, but error *only*, fears investigation. The first has everything to gain, the other everything to lose, by free discussion. The present discussion, I trust, will exemplify the truth of these observations.

The Editor says, "We have been repeatedly urged to give our views on the subject of baptism. We will do it in a few words: '*Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.*'" Indeed? Is that the position and the province of a "*Bible* Examiner?" Surely it was not in reference to so grave and responsible a question as obedience to a *divine command*, that Paul laid down this rule. See the connection: Romans 14: 5—"One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." Many bigoted sectaries decry and denounce the editor because he raises the cry "Behold the bridegroom cometh." Does he agree with them that the subject should not be discussed; that it is a non-essential, and urge again "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind?"

The Editor denies that baptism, administered to a penitent believer, is "for the remission of sins," although Peter says so expressly in Acts 2: 38, and asks—"How sins committed after immersion are to be pardoned without being immersed again," &c. Paul answer in the words of 1 John chap. 1: 9, "If we (Christians) *confess* our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and cleanse us from all unrighteousness." It is then by *confession in prayer* that the *Christian*, having obtained the forgiveness of his *old* sins in baptism, is to obtain pardon for those he may commit afterwards. *Baptism* then, is for the believing and penitent *sinner*; confession and prayer is for the erring *Christian*.

Again, the Editor asks how the "penitent thief obtained remission of sins." If the penitent thief had sought remission *after* Christian baptism was instituted, the interrogatory might present some difficulty. It was not until *after* our Lord hung upon the cross—until *after* his resurrection indeed, that baptism was ordained by Christ—that the declaration "*to all nations*" was made, "He that *believeth* and is *baptized*, shall be saved." The thief was not therefore under *our* dispensation. Saul of Tarsus was, however. How did he obtain remission? Did Christ *speak* his pardon, as he did the thief's? No. Read Acts 22: 10. Saul asked "What shall I *do*, Lord?" The answer is, "arise and go into Damascus, and *there* it shall be *told* thee," &c. Accordingly he goes to Annanias, at Damascus,—"a certain disciple,"—who replies to his question: "The God of our fathers hath chosen thee," &c.; 14–16 verses, "and now why tarriest thou? Arise and *be baptised, and wash away thy sins*, calling on the name of the Lord." We see then *how* Saul "washed away" his sins. Shall we not "go and do likewise?"

The thief may indeed enter Paradise without baptism, just as Abram, Noah, Job, and Daniel will. Not, however, because that is not God's appointed way to salvation, but because in their day and *generation* there was *no such* command. But can those under the dispensation of a risen Christ and his apostles, claim their entrance "through the gates into the city," who have presumed to "refuse him who speaks from heaven," and to "neglect so great salvation?" Has not Paul said of *all* such, "How shall they escape?" As to the supposed obstacle arising from "circumstances which prevent immersion,"—the answer to all such objections is simply, that no such "circumstances" can exist, for man cannot live without water, and where water is, there enough may always be procured for the immersion of the person; and even if health is so delicate as to peril life, it is better to *die* in the road to *obedience* than perish with those who are "out of the way," by disobedience to him who "has done all things well." The Editor well says, "it is rejecting light and sinning against it, that will be the condemnation of men 'at the judgment seat of Christ'"—Amen, even so. How transcendently important then, to one and all of us, to see that on a subject so plain and obvious as *Christian baptism*, we do not "sin against the light" of Holy Writ, and thus seal our condemnation "at the judgment of the great day."

A. B. MAGRUDER.

REPLY TO BR. MAGRUDER.

In our remark—"Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind," we did not intend to be understood as having any *objection* to the whole subject of baptism being discussed in the "Bible Examiner," if the friends desire it. We have some reason to think that nearly all the patrons of the Examiner are *immersionists*; and we suppose it is also known, to nearly all our readers, that the *Editor* of the Examiner, with all the light that he has been able to gain hitherto, is *not* an *exclusive* immersionist; but, is willing that every person should act in that matter according to their own convictions of truth. He has always listened to the arguments of those who are exclusive immersionists, he trusts, candidly. With our present views, would even Br. Magruder desire that we should labor to disseminate the principle that "baptism is the *answer of a good conscience* toward God," and "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh?" 1 Pet. 3: 21. If, however, our brethren desire us to give our reasons for not being an *exclusive* immersionist we will do so: we are not ashamed of our faith in this respect; and if we find we have been wrong on this subject, we shall most certainly *confess* it. Truth we want, and nothing but truth, so far as is possible.

Br. Magruder is not quite correct in saying—"the Editor denies that baptism administered to a penitent believer is for the remission of sins." We said that the "Christian Magazine is strenuous for immersion as *essential* for the remission of sins;" and remarked that it "could probably tell us how sins committed after immersion are to be pardoned without being immersed again," &c. Any proof that sins could be remitted except *in* and *by* immersion we had not seen, in their argument. We are obliged to Br. M. for his explanation, but shall reserve our remarks on that topic for another time.

In reply to our indirect question, how the penitent thief obtained remission of sins if it is *essential* to such remission that a person be baptized, Br. M. says—"If" he "had sought remission *after* Christian Baptism was instituted" there would be "some difficulty" in "the interrogatory."

We respond,—It was *after* Jesus said, "Except a man be *born of water*," &c. "he cannot see the kingdom of God:" and that was the foundation of all we said. If it was true, in the day Jesus spoke those words, that a man must be born of water (meaning *immersion*,) then it was true in the day he hung upon the cross; so that the "*difficulty*" is not removed by Br. M's reply. The thief was *under* that "dispensation" which made being "born again," as stated John 3d, *essential* to see the kingdom of God. But Br. M. says "*Christian* baptism was" not "instituted until *after* our Lord hung upon the cross." In this we are agreed. Let us put the subject in the form of a *syllogism*.

Christian Baptism was not instituted till AFTER *Christ's death and resurrection.*

BUT, *it was some three years* BEFORE *that time our Lord solemnly declares, "Except a man be born of water," &c. "he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."*

THEREFORE, HE *was not speaking of Christian Baptism.* HENCE, *being "born of water" is* NOT *immersion for the remission of sins.*

If here is any fallacy Br. M. can show it. But let it be remembered, the question here is not whether Christian *baptism* is for the remission of sins; but, *Is being born of water*, John 3: 5, *Christian baptism?* We confess, with present light, we see no way to avoid the conclusion, that *It is not*: and this conclusion we arrive at from Br. M.'s own premises.

Br. M. says—"Abraham, Noah, Job, and Daniel will enter Paradise without baptism—because in their day there was no such command."

Will Br. M. undertake to prove they will enter the kingdom of God without being "*born again?*" Our Saviour saith "*Verily, verily* I say unto thee, Except a man [that is, *any man*: not under "*our* dispensation" merely: not a man in a dispensation *after* Christ's death and resurrection *only*, but any man] be born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God."

Br. M. asks—"Can those under a dispensation of the risen Christ, claim their entrance through the gates into the city who have presumed to refuse him who speaks from heaven," &c. We answer—No. But that does not touch the question. We may have a different view of what *is* spoken from heaven: we may think, and do it honestly too, that the *interpretation* that is given by another is not the *sense* of what is said from heaven; and yet we may do exactly what we sincerely believe is spoken from heaven: that is precisely the point in dispute between Br. Grew and Br. Thomas; and in their hands we, at present, leave that part of the discussion.

Br. M. says "That no such circumstances can exist" as would "prevent immersion—for man cannot live without water, and where water is, there enough may always be procured for immersion," &c. Why then, brother, did John go to the "wilderness" of Jordan to baptize?

STRICTURES ON DR. THOMAS AND OURSELF.

By Dr. Nicholas Smith, Hallowell, Me.

Br. Storrs:—I have been amused to see you and Dr. Thomas, men who have the Bible before them, come to the conclusions you do in regard to "being born of *water*. Note, *his* "being born again of *water*." I suppose Dr. T. has M. D. attached to his name: if so, he knows there never was a child born in any other way than by water; and there is no other way designed by nature for any animal to be born.—Is not this an "emergence" by the "compound of oxygen and hydrogen such as Noah's ark floated on?" I never have analyzed this water, but suppose it is composed as above. You quote 1 Peter 1: 20 to support your positions; but, you must see that the translation is incorrect; man is never *born* of seed, any more than he is *begotten* by water; "being *begotten* again, not of incorruptible seed," as at the first *begetting*, "but, by the incorruptible, by the word of God," &c. Now let us see if we can get simple enough to understand what Jesus meant when he said, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." "That which is born of the flesh is flesh:"—"That," what? Why, that infant—that child is flesh "which has emerged from a place out of sight;" water being nature's assistant to bring about the "emergence," or birth. Can we get simple enough to believe Jesus meant what he said, "except a man be born of the *water* and of the Spirit" he meant just what he said? "That which is born of the Spirit is Spirit:" "that," what? that disposition, mind, temperament? Oh! no, not character, but a *state*; that man that is born of the Spirit is spirit; his whole being is spirit. You see the word is a noun, a *state;* if a *character*, it would be an adjective. You are aware that before a child can be born, it must be begotten, and from a "*fetus*" become a child perfect in all its parts; and at the fulness of time it is born into this *state* of existence, (not *character*;) and is sustained by the aliment God has designed, and the breathing of the vital air, or breath of life—it becomes a man. Now, in order for this man to be "born again" he must be "begotten again," not by corruptible seed, as before the birth by water, but by the incorruptible, by the word of God that liveth and abideth forever. If there is not an *ab ortion*, but he becomes a perfect man in Christ, he will have a *birth* or be "born of the spirit," or "from above;" and will enter the kingdom of God and this will be as much a *state* as the first was; but the sects have made the *substantive* an *adjective;* and of course made void the word of God by their *traditions*."

If the above view is correct, you and Dr. Thomas must be wrong, and if wrong, will you correct?

The Millennium.

Your millenium here on the earth—the return of the Jews—and probation after the Lord comes, the more I look at it the darker it appears. I see no place for a millenium, but in the air—in the city Abraham looked for, and Paul said was "above;" and, that "God has prepared for us a city;" and the moment the sixth millenium ends the seventh will begin, and will be ushered in by the Lord himself being revealed from heaven—the saints raised and changed and caught up to meet him in the air. This is "entering into my rest," as Paul quotes, and "there remains a *rest* for the people of God," or the keeping of a sabbath. Is not the seventh millenium or seventh thousand years God's *rest?* Will not the saints remain at rest, or reign with Christ in the air, till they descend in the New Jesusalem on the new earth? It must be so.

Is not "the earth that now is, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men?" For "the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, *in the which*,—in the which, what? why, in the day of the Lord that he spoke of in the verse before, which was a thousand years. You will here see that the earth will not be melted when the Lord first descends from heaven; but it will take place in *that day*. Can an unclean thing be brought out of a clean? Will corruptible and wicked men be raised out of the earth after it is filled with the glory of God? Note—"the whole earth shall be filled with my glory," not a part of it no! This melting will take place after the wicked are raised, or come up on the breadth of the earth, and will be as the sand of the sea shore. The devil and his company will then plan to hold the possession he has now got; but fire will come down from heaven and devour them; or, as Peter has it, "the heavens will pass away with a great noise, the elements melt with fervent heat, the earth also, and the works therein will be burnt up." This will be a literal lake of fire; or the hell into which the wicked will be cast, with all the nations that forget God, and will all be destroyed together; Isa. 1: 28. After this, the new heavens and new earth appear, and the New Jerusalem comes down, with all the saints who have entered into God's rest, or kept a Sabbath. They now enter the kingdom under the whole heaven; and now will have something to do; see Isa. 65: 21, 22; and will reign on the earth forever, even for ever and ever. Amen.

From the above, where will there be a chance for the Jews to return, or probation after the "Lord descends from heaven" and meets the saints in the air?

The heavens must retain him till all the foregoing takes place, or the restitution of all things. Where do we find in the New Testament, which is a comment on the old, a promise to the Jews, any more than the descendants of Ham, after they crucified their king? The only chance for probation after Christ comes, and the saints are with him in the air, is while the seven last plagues are pouring out, and while they drink blood, and the sun is burning them; then they will blaspheme his name instead of repenting.

Nicholas Smith.

A single remark on Br. Smith's view of the millennium, which is this: We do not see how the devil and his hosts, by going "up on the *breadth of the* earth," are to "compass the *camp* of the saints about, and the beloved city," which are "*in the* air;" nor how the saints are to "reign with Christ a thousand years in the air" with nothing to reign over. We shall give our views at large on the future age when we can find room in the Examiner. —Ed. Ex.

For the Examiner.

THE HEBREW SH'EOL, 'HELL.'

By Dr. Lees, of Leeds, England.

A most powerful—and to the Priests, profitable—association of ideas, has been connected with the word Hell. By means of this association, they operate upon the fears of the fearful, and render them mental slaves and cowards, who *dare* not *think* for themselves, but accept their opinions *vicarially* and *pastorially*. Thus the Divine government becomes frightfully misrepresented, Christianity maligned, and infidelity engendered.

The vulgar, physical, and contradictory notions attached to the word 'Hell'—as a place gleaming with *flame* yet utterly *dark!* where *bodiless and immortal souls* are made to *suffer* misery *without disorganization, injury*, or *death!*!—find, indeed, a partial correspondence in Milton's Paradise Lost, but none at all in the Jewish Scriptures. The slightest collation of texts will show, that men have no authority for transferring the modern-made meaning of the *Fire Hell*, with its pains and penalties, to the *one* Hebrew word, trifoldly translated *Pit, Grave* and *Hell*.

Sh'eol means something dug or *hollowed out*—literally *shooled* or *shoveled*—i. e. a pit or grave—what is *grooved* or *grubbed* out. Hence also, what is *covered*—a '*sheading*' or '*hovel*'—a *hole* or *hollow*. All these words are kindred. In the Bible it *never once* stands for a *place* of torment. The modern quibble that the *place-Hell* is a figure for the *state-Hell*—is pure moon-shine. A 'state' *implies* a 'place;' and has, and can have no more meaning, or sense, than the *taste of a tart* without either *Tart* or *Taster!*

When Sh'eol *is* personalized, or localized, it is always represented as *within the present earth*, and, in regard to time, during, or at the boundary of this mortal life. In two or three texts it is used *antithetically* with Shamem, 'heavens'—i. e. the upper parts of the air, or *the heights above*, in contrast to the lower parts of the earth, or the *depth beneath*; but it is not in one solitary instance put as a place of *roasting* in opposition to one of *rest*—or as a place of *suffering* in opposition to one of *bliss*. The ancient Hebrews were complete strangers to the abominable conceptions of the modern Hell-mongers.

CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP.—NO. IV.

VII. What Then Is To Be Done?

Let no other test be used, in receiving to *fellowship*, than that the person give evidence, satisfactory to the church, that Christ has received him; or, that the individual is born from above, and is thereby of "the Lord added to the church." Such persons are entitled to *continued fellowship*, so long as their tempers and practice correspond with the precepts of the Holy Scriptures.

The apostle says, Rom. xv. 7, 'Receive ye one another, as Christ also received us to the glory of God.' How did Christ receive us? Was it because we had a faith that was *unmixed* with any error?—This would be to claim that every new-born soul is *infallible*, and that his *judgment is perfect*. A position, we presume, no Christian is prepared to take. Then how did Christ receive the soul? He received him because the sinner was *penitent*, and because that penitent soul fled to him for refuge: and we are to receive him when the evidence of these facts is clear to our minds, and have no right to demand any thing more at his *reception*, or in order to receiving him.

He is to be received to *fellowship*, not to membership. No man, nor body of men can receive a person *to membership in the Church of God:* 'the Lord' alone has *power* and *right* to receive, and *'add' members* to his church; all his church can do is to extend the hand of fellowship; and this they have no right to withhold, if the person give evidence of his acceptance of God: to withhold it is an act of rebellion against God. The Scriptures apply the *name* "Church of God" to the children of God in any particular place as, also, to the church universal. See 1 Cor. i. 2, "*The Church of God* which is at Corinth;" and x. 32 verse, "Give none offence to the *Church of God*:" also, xv. 9, "I persecuted *the Church of God*." See Acts xx. 28. "Feed the *Church of God*." 2 Cor. i. 1. "The *Church of God* which is at Corinth." Gal. i. 13. "Beyond measure I persecuted the *Church of God*." 1 Tim. iii. 5, "How shall he take care of the *Church of God?*" And lastly the Apostle uses the plural, and says, 1 Thess. ii. 14, "Ye become the followers of the *Churches of God*." Thus we find the most common appellation given to the Church was the Church of God, for this evident reason, it belongs to him. If it belonged to the Methodists, it would be proper to call it the *Methodist* Church; or if it belonged to the Baptists, it would be proper to call it the *Baptist* Church; and so with respect to all other names. But as the Church of God belongs not to any of the sects, as such, nor to any man, or body of men, it is manifestly improper to call it by any name of *human invention* and all such appellations, voluntarily accepted, and used, by a body professing to be a church, seem like a renunciation of their connection with the Church of God. We, therefore, call them just what they call themselves, viz: *Baptist* Church, *Methodist* Church, *Presbyterian* Church, &c. They, evidently, feel it more important to be thus designated than to be simply the *Church of God:* and they receive persons into their churches, not because the applicant is born from above, but because he is a Methodist, a Baptist, a Presbyterian, &c. We do not say they would receive him if they knew the individual *was not* born from above; but that is not *the* reason why they receive him; he must give them evidence not only that he has experienced the new birth, but that he is sound in their creed, or discipline, or whatever it may be that *divides* them from other professing Christians: nor does it help those sectarian churches at all, who profess to keep "open communion," in inviting "all persons in regular standing in other churches" to commune with them. Look at it. You offer yourself, for example, to the Presbyterian church; you are rejected, because, you find

some one article in their creed, to which you cannot consent. You now unite with the Methodist church. Next Lord's day you are at the meeting of the Presbyterians, and it is "Communion:" and they invite you, being a "member in regular standing in another church," to *commune* with them! They would not receive you into their church, though they admit you are a christian brother by inviting you to their communion! Is it not thus evident, that these sectarian churches have set up a standard or test of membership in *their bodies*, which they admit, by their invitations to communion, to be above the standard that God has given?

Such churches can, indeed receive to *membership*: and they only can do the work; for 'the Lord' never 'added' anybody to a sectarian church; *that is man's work*; and what is most of all to be regretted, *such adding*, too often, *disconnects* the person from the church of God, by begetting in his mind the sectarian jealousy and party zeal which is opprosed to the law of love.

We will here call attention to Acts ii. 47: '*The Lord added* to the church daily such as should be saved.' See also, Acts v. 14, 'Believers were the more added to the Lord,' &c. Also, Acts xi. 24. 'And much people were *added unto the Lord*.' These texts show that being added unto the Lord, and being by 'the Lord, added to the church,' is one one and the same thing; and that though ministers and other christians may be instrumental in this work, yet, the *act of adding* is the act of the Lord himself; and men have no negative in this matter, nor right to withhold fellowship when it is done.

As no man nor body of men can receive a *member into the Church of God*, so, they are not competent to '*excommunicate*' from the church.—That, also is the prerogative of Him who has 'the key of David, that openeth and no man shutteth; and shutteth and no man openeth.' Rev. iii. 7. We may, and ought, to *withdraw fellowship* when the individual's *temper* and *practice* indicate that the Lord has '*rejected*' him; or, that he is no longer a member of the Church of God; but, let him understand that *we* do not *excommunicate—that* is an *act* of the Lord; and that 'it is a fearful thing,' for one who has been a member of the Church of God, 'to fall into' his 'hands,' as a traitor to his cause. But while his *temper* and *practice* correspond with the Scriptures, he is entitled to fellowship by the church. 1 John i. 1, 7. 'That which we have seen and heard declare we unto you that ye also have *fellowship with us*, &c. 'If we *walk* in the light, as he is in the light, we have *fellowship one with another*.' Acts ii. 42. 'And they continued steadfastly in the Apostle's doctrine and *fellowship*,' &c. Gal. ii. 9. 'And when James, Cephas, and John perceived the grace that was in me, they gave to me and Barnabas *the right hand of fellowship*,' &c. To keep and promote this fellowship, where there will be a difference of opinion, on many points, in the same body, let us heed the apostle's exhortation, Eph. iv. 1—3. 'I beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long-suffering, forbearing one another in love; endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace:' and also, 'avoid doubtful disputations;' that is, such matters as do not tend to promote purity, the knowledge and love of God; leaving all, in such matters, to judge for themselves, answerable to God alone. But if temper or practice are unholy we are to obey the apostle's injunction, Eph. v. 11, 'Have *no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness*, but rather reprove them:' Such are the principles upon which we conceive the church of God is established, and by which all the children of God ought to govern themselves.

Such are the *Principles* of the church with which the Editor of the Examiner is connected in the city of PHILADELPHIA, Pennsylvania. Let all who read these numbers ask themselves whether they *owe to God and men any duty to sustain these principles*, and then act as they can answer to God at the Judgment.

Dr. Lees, Leeds, England:—We are greatly obliged to you for the Nos. of the "*Truth Seeker*" received. Only one has come to hand that contains anything from "Archbishop Whately," and that article is on "Universal Restoration and the Second Death." Will you send us No. 1, Vol. i, New Series?

P. S.—The "*addenda*" is received, but too late for insertion this month. We have sent you all the Nos. of the Examiner for this year: if they are not received, let us know, and we will send them again.

The Six Sermons, Quarto, we will sell at the following extremely low prices, that our friends may have a chance to scatter the truth abroad. For $1, *thirty* copies; $3, *one hundred* copies; and for $5, *two* hundred.

"Rich Man and Lazarus."—The article on this subject, in the last Examiner, will be published in a *Tract* of 12 pages, 18 mo., corresponding in size with the Six Sermons in pamphlet, at one dollar per hundred copies.

Back Numbers of the Examiner.—We still supply them for 1848, or Vol. 3. We are satisfied that any who may subscribe hereafter will regret to be deprived of those numbers. The matter furnished us by Dr. Lees, much of it, has a connection with the article in Nos. 1 and 2 of the present volume of the Examiner.

☞The Editor of this paper preaches every Lord's day at Commissioners' Hall, Third street, below Green, east side; at 10½, A. M., and in the evening at 7½ o'clock.

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

The Aspects of Phrenology on Revelation; or, *Materialism, Fatalism, Regeneration, Creeds, Atheism, The operation of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of men*, and Human Responsibility, *Philosophically considered, in a series of Lectures*. By J. T. Walsh." Such is the Title of an Octavo pamphlet of 70 pages, published by Br. Walsh, Richmond, Va., 1845. For sale at 18 Chester street, Philadelphia, Pa., and by the Author. *Price 25 cents*, or five copies for one dollar, thirty copies for five dollars. Cash always with the order.