BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. IV. PHILADELPHIA, OCTOBER, 1849. No. 10.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.
JOHN T. WALSH, ASSOCIATE EDITOR.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY, AT 16 CHESTER STREET, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, one dollar; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; ALWAYS IN ADVANCE.

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

IMMORTALITY.

REVIEW No. IX.

Mr. Lee's article, No. 11, is devoted to "the well known opinions of the Jews," in reference to the state of the dead.

In the opening sentence of this article, Mr. Lee says—"The Jews *have* ALWAYS believed in the conscious existence of the soul after the death of the body, and in its immortality."

This is not a fact—it is not true—and his evidence has failed to prove it, as we shall see.

1. We have before shown that, *before* the Babylonish captivity, the Jews observed the most profound silence in relation to the dead; and spoke of their state as one of darkness, silence and inactivity.

2. That *after* the Babylonish captivity, and the Macedonian and Roman conquests, they adopted their language and ideas, on such subjects as those upon which their oracles were silent. *Let these facts be remembered*, for they disprove the assertion of Mr. Lee, that "the Jews have *always* believed in the conscious existence" of the dead, and the "immortality" of the soul. Let the reader, also, notice, that Mr. Lee's testimony does not extend back *to*, much less *beyond* this period. He has failed, then, to prove his *first* point.

Mr. Lee quotes from Josephus; and here let me state a principle in giving testimony. A witness, in deposing to a fact or truth, is required and expected to speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Josephus tells us what the Jews believed in his day; but he does not tell us they "*always*" so believed. He gives us to understand that they believed in the immortality of the soul, in a restricted sense; but he does not stop there, and, if his testimony upon the subject is to be received as evidence of the *truth* of the doctrine, we must receive it all or none. Josephus says—"the Pharisees believe that souls have an immortal vigor in them, and that *under the earth* there will be *rewards* and punishments." This was the great "national doctrine," to use Mr. Lee's words. Let Mr. Lee, then, be a Pharisee in all this, as the doctrine was not *specially* condemned by our Lord! This testimony proves *too much*, and what proves too much, proves nothing. This is all in harmony with Mr. Lee's pagan witnesses. They also proved too much for Mr. Lee's cause.

While it is admitted then, that the mass of the Jews believed in the pagan doctrine of immortality, Mr. Lee gains nothing from the admission; because we have seen from whence they derived these ideas—ideas upon which their oracles were silent. And the fact, that they placed "*rewards* and *punishments* UNDER THE EARTH," clearly enough indicates their pagan origin.

According to the testimony of Josephus, the Pharisees did not believe in the resurrection of pagans: for he says "they believe that souls have an immortal vigor in them; and that under the earth there will be rewards or punishments, according as they have lived virtuously or viciously in this life: and the vicious are to be *detained in an everlasting prison*, but that the *virtuous* SHALL HAVE POWER TO REVIVE AND LIVE AGAIN." Antiq. B. xviii. C. 1. 3. In another place he says—"they say that all the souls are incorruptible, but that the souls of *good men* only are *removed into other bodies*"—that is, they are transmigrated. In a word, from all the testimony of Josephus, we come to the following conclusions: 1. They believed the heathen would not be raised from the dead. 2. That the righteous children of Abraham only would rise. 3. That his *unrighteous* children would not rise, but be detained in the prison house of the dead forever. 4. That the souls of good men passed into other bodies, or were transmigrated. So that Josephus' testimony proves more than Mr. Lee desires; and, if it be good on one point, it should certainly be received on collateral points. But the Lord has put the seal of condemnation upon the doctrines of both Sadducees and Pharisees. He said to his disciples—"BEWARE OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE PHARISEES AND OF THE SADDUCEES." They were both wrong; the Sadducees occupied one extreme, and the Pharisees another. And, as we have before seen, these views were Babylonish in their origin; and are not supported by the Jewish Scriptures.

Mr. Lee refers to the "Jews' Service Book;" and in reference to this I will only quote the language of Christ—"In vain do ye worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." And again—"Ye make void the law through your traditions."

Mr. Lee also goes into the Apocrypha; and for what purpose does he go there? To prove that "the Jews *always* believed in the immortality of the soul?" If so, his evidence fails, because the Apocrypha, according to his admission, was "written before the Christian era;" but not before the Babylonish captivity! But, were I disposed, I could show from the very passages Mr. Lee has quoted from Esdras and the wisdom of Solomon, that he totally misapprehends and misapplies all the quotations he makes. But I do not deem the document of sufficient importance to do so. I will, however, proceed to show that the most authoritative parts of the Apocrypha, those bearing the names of some of the authors of some of the books

composing the Bible, teach a very different doctrine from Mr. Lee's.

First, then, as a specimen, read 2 Esdras vii. 31, "And after seven days the world, that yet waketh not, shall be raised up, *and that shall die that is corrupt*." If this refer to the resurrection, which it appears to do, from the context, then it proves the "second death" of the "corrupt," which Mr. Lee denies. Again, at the 15th verse—"Now therefore, why disquietest thou thyself, seeing thou art but a CORRUPTIBLE MAN? and why art thou moved, whereas *thou art but* MORTAL?"

But let us examine the "Wisdom of Solomon," which has a much higher claim than the Book of Esdras, and see what he says on the question of death and immortality. Chapter i. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16—"*Seek not death in the error of your life*: and pull not upon yourselves destruction with the works of your hands. For God made not death: neither hath he pleasure in the destruction of the living. For he created all things that they might *have their being*: and the generations of the world were healthful; and there is no poison of destruction in them, nor the kingdom of death upon the earth: (FOR RIGHTEOUSNESS IS IMMORTAL;) but *ungodly men* with their *works* and *words* called it to them: for when they thought to have it their friend, *they* CONSUMED TO NAUGHT, *and made a covenant with it*, because *they are worthy to take part with it*." This certainly does not teach the natural immortality of the soul. Again, in the 2d chapter, "*For God created man* TO BE IMMORTAL, and made him to be an *image of his own eternity*; nevertheless," notwithstanding this purpose on the part of God, "through envy of the devil came death into the world; *and they that do hold of his side* DO FIND IT." Here it is clearly taught, that God, when he created man, designed his immortality—his eternal life, but that through the envy of the devil, death came into the world, and those who hold of his side, find death their portion. The passage Mr. Lee quotes from the 3d chapter, he totally misapplies. "In the sight of the unwise they seemed to die," in the Sadducean sense of not living again, "*but they are in peace*." "This hope is full of immortality," which it could not be, if they already possessed it, for "hope" relates to the future—"*the time of their visitation*," which is spoken of in the 7th and 8th verses. The reader is requested to turn to the 7th chapter of the Wisdom of Solomon, and read the five first verses, and compare it with what we have already quoted here; and, also, what we have elsewhere said on the nature of man.

I will quote one passage more from the Apocrypha; it is found in Ecclesiasticus xvii. 27–32. "Who shall praise the most high *in the grave*, instead of them which *live* and give thanks? *Thanksgiving* PERISHETH FROM THE DEAD, AS FROM ONE THAT IS NOT: the living and sound in heart shall praise the Lord. *For all things cannot be in men*, BECAUSE THE SON OF MAN IS NOT IMMORTAL." Again, he says—"*All men are but earth and ashes*." The Wisdom of Solomon was doubtless written *before* the Babylonish Captivity, and Ecclesiasticus appears to have been written about, or a little *after* that time. Thus we have proved, first, that the Jews did not "*always*" believe in the immortality of the soul; and, secondly, that, even after their return from Babylon, one of their principal writers, the author of Ecclesiasticus, did not teach it; all of which is in harmony with the Bible. Mr. Lee's cause has gained nothing, I apprehend, by going into the Apocrypha!

He next appeals to the Bible; but, alas! for his theory, he crucifies it afresh, and puts it to public shame! He quotes Math. xiv. 26, and Luke xxiv. 36–39, Mark vi. 49.

In Matthew and Mark the original word is *phantasma*, a phantom; and such is also the marginal reading in Luke. In the cases recorded by Matthew and Mark, the disciples thought they saw a *phantom*, but they were *mistaken*, as all other persons have been ever since. Let the reader notice, then, that in the only cases recorded, where the disciples supposed they saw a *phantom—ghost*, they were deceived; and that there is not a case differing from this on record!

In the case referred to by Luke, we have the subject presented in all its power and force. The Lord Jesus had arisen from the dead; his Father "had shown him the path of life," and "demonstrated him as his son, by his resurrection from the dead"—"death" now "had no more dominion over him,"—he was immortal—and as such he appears in their midst! "They were terrified and affrighted and supposed they had seen a spirit—*a phantasma*, or phantom—ghost. And now he proceeds to *correct* their ideas of such things by asking, "Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts! Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I, myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit—*a phantasma*—hath not flesh and bones, as you see me have. And when he had thus spoken, he showed them his hands and his feet." Thus *correcting* their errors on the subject of spirit, or *phantoms*, and at the same time, *demonstrating the* MATERIALITY OF SPIRITUAL BODIES!

Here is "a quickening spirit," as Paul says, with "*flesh* and *bones*, *hands* and *feet*." Here we have a glorious specimen of a spiritual, immortal body—not "immaterial," but *material*—real—tangible; something which could be "*handled*" and "*seen*!" What becomes of Mr. Lee's "immaterial soul" in the light of this fact? His theory is exploded! his foundation demolished! his superstructure crumbled into dust, and his theology a thing of nought! the *ignis fatuus* of a day! This fact, I repeat it, sweeps away Mr. Lee's whole theory of "immateriality," demolishes Mr. Drew's logic, and nullifies all the rhetoric of Pythagoras, Plato, Socrates, and Zoroaster. It eclipses all the philosophy of Babylonia, Egypt, Media, Persia, Greece and Rome! It swallows up all the traditions of the Jewish Service Book, Josephus, and the Apocrypha! It casts into the shade all the learning of Pharisees and Sadducees, ancient or modern! *because it is* LIFE AND IMMORTALITY BROUGHT TO LIGHT!"

Mr. Lee refers to Acts xxiii. 8. Mr. Brewster made a better use of this than Mr. Lee has done; and as we have fully responded to his arguments on this point, we must refer the reader to our discussion with Rev. Wm. H. Brewster. Mr. Lee's logical *reputation* is greater than his *philosophical* and *scriptural* STRENGTH. Truth is mighty above all things, and will prevail!

J. T. W.

The Editor of the Examiner, in his late visit east, had a good time with friends in Boston and Cabotville, Mass.; and preached three times in the latter, and five times in the former place, to good and attentive congregations.

IMMATERIALITY.

The following communication is from a Methodist Minister; who, though not with us on all points, says, in a private note,—"On the great question—'What will be the doom of the wicked?' I am fully with you; and intend ere long to give public utterance to the truth of God on this awful subject." He adds—"I feel thankful to God that I have seen your Sermons and Dobney's book. For years my mind has been painfully perplexed with the doctrine of interminable suffering. I have thought and read of hell as a world of immortal woe, where countless millions curse themselves, each other, and the Almighty, until I have been confounded: but I have done with the doctrine and all its perplexities. The wicked shall be burnt up with unquenchable fire; and afterwards every creature in heaven and on earth shall ascribe blessing, &c., to Him that sitteth on the throne and to the Lamb for ever."

The name of the author of this communication has never appeared in the Examiner: he is therefore a new accession to this side of the question: but he alone is responsible for the sentiments of his article. We hope to hear from him again.

If the Human Soul be Immaterial, how can we account for the origin of its existence?

BR. STORRS:—I have recently been much interested in this question. The following article is submitted to your consideration, which you may print if you think proper to do so, and if not, you may return it at my expense.

Admiting the human soul to be immaterial, there are four ways, in any one of which we may suppose it to have originated. 1st. We can suppose it to have been created out of previously existing immaterial substance. 2d. We can suppose it to have been created out of the immaterial substance of one or of both the parents who were the means of its existence. 3d. We can suppose it created out of the Divine substance. 4th. We can suppose it to have been created out of nothing. These include every possible mode of accounting for the origin of the soul, if the soul be an immaterial essence. Assuming this view of the nature of the soul, I propose to show that it could not in any of the above ways come into being, and therefore there is no such immaterial soul in existence.

1. Did God create the soul out of previously existing immaterial substance? I answer, 1st. The existence of such substance is hypothetical. I do not know of any immaterialist of the present day, who maintains such an opinion respecting the origin of the soul. 2d. If such immaterial substance did exist previous to the creation of our immaterial soul, it either possessed the essential properties of spirit, or it did not. If it did not, then immaterial substance is not necessarily spirit. Suppose then this substance did possess the essential properties of spirit. In this case, according to immaterialists, it must have had thought, consciousness, and all the elements of personality. In other words, it must have been an intelligent, spiritual being; essentially one and the same; immutably and eternally incapable of multiplication or division. Immaterialists themselves being the judges, our immaterial soul could not be created out of the essence of such a being.

Let us suppose this immaterial substance to have been impersonal, unconscious, and unintelligent. Still it must have been essentially *one*, or it must have been *multifarious*. If essentially *one*, then it is plain it could become the subject of only *one* consciousness and personality. No more than *one* soul could be created out of it. If there were different kinds of such substance, then each kind might become *one* soul, and only *one*. There must then have been as many different immaterial substances as there have been human souls in existence. Such a notion is surely too absurd to be maintained by the advocates of immaterialism.

If, however, any should incline to adopt this method of accounting for the origin of the soul, we have other difficulties to suggest to them. How came this previously existing immaterial substance into being? How could immaterial substance exist, and yet be utterly destitute of moral and intellectual properties? How could an unconscious and unintelligent substance be rendered conscious, intelligent, and the subject of personality? Immaterialists tell us that what is not matter is spirit, and that spirit is essentially conscious, intelligent, and active. Of course, if this be so, there could not be any unconscious, unintelligent, immaterial substance, out of which human souls were created.

II. Does God create the souls of children out of the immaterial substance of one or both of their parents?

Suppose the soul of a child to be created out of the immaterial substance of its father. But here we are in difficulty again. The soul of the father, we are told, is essentially an unit; it is indivisible. It cannot, then, be divided. It cannot furnish from its own essence the elements of a new existence. Passing over this difficulty, we will still suppose the soul of the child created from the soul of its father, and another difficulty is presented as formidable as the last. The father having parted with a portion of his immaterial essence, no longer has a soul, *whole and entire*. The second child of the same father must be supposed to receive another portion of his spirit, and so of all the succeeding children. Thus the father, after communicating, at different times, portions of his own essence to a score of children, can hardly be supposed to have any soul left. It is also evident, that before he became a father he must have had twenty times more immaterial substance, or soul, than any one of his children. Thus souls are diminishing in quantity, or amount of essence, every generation. In the course of ages, souls may become as small as immaterialists affirm them to be,—without extent, having no size, in other words, they exist nowhere.

The idea that the soul of a child is created out of the soul of his father, is evidently absurd, and must be abandoned. And if we suppose the soul of the infant to be created out of the immaterial essences of both parents, absurdities are increased and multiplied. In this, as in the former case, we have indivisible spirits divided, which is a contradiction. Neither father nor mother has a complete soul after the production of the child. And as the child is supposed to have a soul, which is compounded of

the substance of two immaterial, conscious, and immortal spirits, he must have in himself a double life, a double consciousness, a double identity; he must be the subject of a two fold immortal existence. Such are the contradictions and impossibilities in which we are involved, by supposing the soul of a child to be created out of the immaterial substance, of one, or both of its parents.

III. Does God create souls out of his own essence?

This cannot be, according to immaterialists, for they tell us God is one, and indivisible for ever. But if souls be created out of the divine essence, God is divided into as many parts as there are human souls in existence.

If the human soul be a part of the essence of God, it must be a partaker of the attributes of God. The attributes of God inhere, essentially and eternally, in the divine substance. If, then, human souls are portions of the divine essence, they must share in the divine perfections, many of which are said to be incommunicable. In reality, God is the only intelligent Being. Every human mind is a ray of the infinite light; a drop of the eternal ocean. In the language of Pope:

> "All are but parts of one stupendous whole,
> Whose body nature is, and God the soul."

It either follows, then, that whatever is, is right, or if there be such a thing as moral evil, the Divine Being, in his innumerable individualizations, is the only transgressor of moral law. Every false opinion, every evil passion, every wrong action, is thus charged upon that great and glorious Being who is Light and Love, and in whom there is no darkness at all.' Now, no immaterialist will contend for such absurdities. We are thus forced to the conclusion, that God does not create human souls of his own essence.

IV. Does God create human souls out of nothing?

I formerly entertained the common opinion of the origin of the Universe, that it was produced out of nothing. But I have been compelled to abandon that idea, as involving an absolute impossibility. None will pretend that finite immaterial minds can create something out of nothing; while many do maintain that the Almighty did, from nonentity, call all things into being. Let me ever speak of God with the deepest reverence. I believe he can do whatever in the nature of things is possible; but there are some things which are beyond the limits of omnipotence. God cannot annihilate his own being. He could not create a being equal to himself. I doubt whether God could compress all the matter in the Universe, so that it would occupy no more space than a grain of sand. According to immaterialists, God cannot divide a soul into parts, nor destroy a soul by the action of matter upon it. I do not accuse them of irreverence for holding such opinion, nor shall I be rashly censured by candid men, when I assign the following reasons for not believing in the production of something out of nothing.

1st. I cannot find that the Bible anywhere teaches the creation of anything out of nothing.

2d. If something was produced out of nothing, it must have been so produced by the action of Deity. But action necessarily implies two things: 1st, an actor; 2d, an object acted upon. The actor may act upon himself, or upon something which is not himself. Let us try both cases.

1st. Does God produce immaterial souls by acting on himself?

This brings us to view the subject again, very nearly in the light in which it is presented in our third supposition. Now, if we answer the question just proposed in the affirmative, we must maintain that God has divided his indivisible essence into parts, and of these parts constituted human souls. Here we have a contradiction and an absurdity,—a contradiction, because an indivisible essence cannot be divided; and an absurdity, because, according to this view, every human soul, and every devil, is a part of God.

Again: These separate parts of the divine substance, which are supposed to be individualized in different souls, either have their original properties or they have not: if they have, then the consciousness of every soul is the consciousness of God; the will of every soul is the will of God; and the errors of every soul are the errors of God. This will not be maintained by immaterialists. Let us, then, suppose that these portions of the divine substance have *not* their original properties. Here are two difficulties: 1st. These parts of the divine essence could not exist for a moment, after being deprived of their essential properties. 2d. New properties in the abstract could not be created and made to inhere in these parts of the divine nature. It is therefore impossible for human souls to be created out of the essence of God, by the action of God upon himself.

I may here remark, that if God could produce souls by acting on his own nature, these souls would not be created out of nothing, which is the point now under consideration.

Does God, then, create souls by acting on something which is not himself?

This could not be, according to most immaterialists, for they tell us there was a period when only God existed. Besides himself, there was neither matter nor spirit. Of course, then, out of himself there was no object to act upon. Now, as an exercise of power necessarily implies an object to be acted upon, it follows, that if there ever was a period when nothing besides God existed, nothing but God could have existed to all eternity.

All will admit that the creation of something out of nothing is an impossibility with finite beings; but many will maintain that such a creation is possible with God because he is omnipotent. I believe in the divine omnipotence; but what can omnipotence do without materials to work upon? What can it effect when set in operation (if this were possible) on boundless nonentity? In the arithmetic of mortals, a thousand times nothing amounts to nothing, and this is an absolute and immutable truth in the multiplication table of God Almighty. The fact that our power is limited, and God's power is infinite, does not touch the question. No being, finite nor infinite, can think without a subject of thought. No being can exercise desire or love without some object to be desired or loved. None will pretend that God could exercise his benevolence upon nonentity. So neither can power act upon nonentity. Hence the production of souls out of nothing is an infinite and eternal impossibility.

I am thus led to the conclusion that an immaterial soul could not be created out of previously existing immaterial substance, nor out of the souls of parents, nor out of the divine essence, nor out of nothing. And as an immaterial soul could not be produced in any other way, I am compelled to believe there is no such thing in existence.

As my sheet is not full, I will suggest whether the notion, that the soul was created by God out of nothing, is not utterly inconsistent with the doctrine of man's constitutional depravity. Here let me quote Wesley, who represents the thoughts of millions on this subject. "In Adam all died, all human kind, all the children of men who were then in Adam's loins. The natural consequence of this is, that every one descended from him comes into the world spiritually dead, dead to God, wholly dead in sin; entirely devoid of the life of God; void of the image of God, of all that righteousness and holiness wherein Adam was created. Instead of this, every man born into the world now bears the image of the devil, in pride and self-will, the image of the beast, in sensual appetites and desires. This, then, is the foundation of the New Birth,—the entire corruption of our nature." Such is said to be the state of a human being "when he comes into the world." This is affirmed of the immaterial soul, and of it *only*; for immaterialists tell us the body possesses no quality of an intellectual or moral nature: every such quality belongs to the soul. Now, if the soul be made out of nothing, a human father can have no more to do with the production of the souls of his children, than with the creation of so many worlds. How, then, can a father's acts affect the moral nature and condition of the souls of his children, and the relation of these souls to God? To me this seems impossible. If the soul alone develops thought and volition, and if it be created by God out of nothing, then we must refer the first moral state of the soul to God, and not to Adam. If the soul is naturally destitute of holiness, God made it so. If the soul has in itself the germs of pride, malice, envy, bitterness and blasphemy, God put these germs into it. If the soul go astray from the womb, speaking lies, God interwove a principle of falsehood in its constitution. Whatever is natural to the soul must be referred to the being who gave the soul its nature, and not to the beings who were merely the instruments of providing for it a house of clay, in which it might pass a short term of existence.

THETA.

MASS., *September 14th*, 1849.

DR. I. F. LEE, AND THE BAPTISTS.

TO THE BAPTISTS *scattered throughout the bounds of the Moriah Association, and elsewhere, greeting:*—

Whereas the Meadow Branch Baptist Church has charged the undersigned with the promulgation of sentiments heretical, and subversive of the Christian system, thereby justifying themselves in his exclusion from their body, hoping that no church will receive the letter of dismission granted him upwards of two years ago, and which they are led to think he still retains, contrary to the wish of said church: Be it known unto you, 1st. That the sentiments, which the undersigned has promulgated, are not contrary to Scripture. 2d. They are not therefore either heretical, or subversive of the Christian system. 3d. As to the letter of dismission, he neither retains it still, nor holds it contrary to the wish of the Church, and therefore cannot present it to any other church whatever. The letter then of the Meadow Branch Baptist Church is a misrepresentation from beginning to end. The undersigned might, in strict propriety, let the matter here rest, and demand the proof of their assertions, but he prefers an exposure of the misrepresentation, believing it will be acceptable to his friends, serviceable to his enemies, and instead of subverting the Christian system, establish the truth of those sentiments, and prove hermeneutically that they are the Revelation of the Almighty, and not the *inventions* of man.

The Meadow Branch Baptist Church was apprised of the fact, that he was not a member of their church at the time (Feb. 1849,) nor for upwards of twelve months previous; that he had disposed of the letter of dismission in the summer of 1847. What then, dear brethren, can you think of a church, who wilfully, and deliberately publish that which they know is a misrepresentation? What could have prompted them to such an act? It has been said that it was *slavish*, servile fear—the fear of man—the fear of the Moriah Baptist Association! That if they did not exclude Dr. Lee, the Association would exclude them!! That is, if they did not exclude an individual who was not a member of their church at the time—an impossibility—aye, if they did not commit an impossibility, the Moriah Association would sever them from her sisterhood!!! And this egregious folly was premeditated by a very few, (it is feared, not some of *that few* who are saved;) while the majority, an overwhelming majority, of the Association knew nothing of the plot. How strange! to bear false testimony against a neighbor, to indulge in wilful misrepresentations, to take fiction for fact, and fact for fiction; to take Scripture for heresy, and Bible sentiment as subversive of the Bible; and call all this orthodoxy! Strange as it may seem, it is nothing more than the Meadow Branch Baptist Church has done, under the penal law of the Moriah Baptist Association. Two or three very active agents in the plot believe that the *soul of man is the essence* of God! And that the wicked will be raised incorruptible, immortal—spiritual bodies. Glorious! For, saith one of these essences of Deity, Paul, in the 15th chapter of 1st Corinthians, is speaking of the resurrection of the wicked as well as the saints! Is this orthodoxy? It may be the Moriah Baptist Association sentiments, but not surely the declaration of God. But what are these sentiments which the Meadow Branch Baptist Church, in common with the Association of which she is a beloved and pliant sister, believe to be *heretical* and *subversive* of the Christian system, and a renunciation of which would be a great recommendation to an ordained minister of the glorious gospel of Jesus Christ? Let us look into that gospel, and examine and see if it contains such sentiments as Dr. Lee has openly promulgated. And if, after impartial and thorough examination according to the *sacred canon*, we find sentiments verbally, *hermeneutically* such as Dr. Lee believes and has promulgated, it must necessarily follow that they are scriptural, not heretical; and instead of subverting Christianity, they are in verity a part of that Divine system itself, *how subversive soever of the sentiments of those who reject the word of God*, and prefer the blasphemous idea that the soul of

the wicked is the essence of Deity, and therefore is undying, and must live forever!

To the law and the testimony. 1st. Dr. Lee believes and has promulgated the following sentiments, which the Meadow Branch Church pronounces heretical and subversive of the Christian system.

Gen. 3: 22: 'And now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever: Therefore,' &c. 23. The sentence of death is passed, and, *in mercy*, God expels Adam and Eve from Paradise, or the garden of Eden; for he did not wish them to live for ever in a state so wretched. The penalty of *mortality* was not remitted, for "dust thou art," &c., and the penalty of the law, death, *eternal death*, were it not for the interposition of mercy, through a Saviour, would have been inflicted on Adam and Eve.

Ezekiel 18: 40. 'The soul that sinneth, it shall die.' Rom. 6: 23. 'For the wages of sin is death.' 21. 'The end of those things is death.' 2: 12. 'For as many as have sinned without law, shall also *perish* without law'—16—'in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel.' 1: 32. 'Who, knowing *the judgment of God*, that they which commit such things are worthy of *death*.' This, then, is the judgment of God, that the wicked are worthy of death—that they shall *perish* in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ, according to my gospel. What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul, his life? Or what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul—his own life?

Job 21: 30. "The wicked is reserved unto the day of destruction—they shall be brought forth to day of wrath"—*death—eternal death*. Ezk. 18: 18, 24, 31, 32, 26. 33: 9 13, 18. Matt. 3: 10, 12. 5: 29, 30. 7: 13, 16, 19. 10: 28. 13: 40, 50, 16: 25, 28. 18: 8, 9. Acts 3: 23. 8: 20 2 Peter 2: 1, 17. Here it is declared that the wicked shall be destroyed—shall lose their life—be burnt up—shall perish—utterly perish. Again, John 3: 36. 'he that believeth not the Son shall not see life.' And again, Malachi 4: 1. '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*.' From the foregoing passages it is evident that the final destiny of the wicked is destruction, everlasting destruction, death, eternal death. And we think we have the mind of the Lord when we say, that eternal death, and not eternal life in misery, is the judgment of God against the wicked. This we believe from the force of testimony more numerous and overwhelming, in one sense of the word, than that in favor of baptism being immersion. We have one solitary word to prove immersion, i. e. baptizo. This, with the phrase, going down into the water, &c., in Jordan, and buried with him in baptism, &c., constitutes all the proof we have, and all that we require. Let us now return to the future punishment of the wicked, and what hermeneutically is the testimony in its favor, and who is the author of that testimony or evidence by which we believe? Consume, devour, destroy, destruction, perdition, die, death, perish, utterly perish, everlasting destruction, eternal death, are the words chiefly employed, when speaking of the future and final punishment of the wicked, &c. We would request then that you study them *hermeneutically*, and consult a Latin Dictionary. Look carefully and critically at the words, *consumo, destruo, devoro*, destructio, *pereo* (from *per* and *eo* literally, to depart wholly,) perditio (from *perdo*, entire loss, utter destruction,) and then turn to Webster's large, and enlarged Dictionary, last published, 1848—and say whether these sentiments are heretical and subversive of the Christian system? But the public mind, says Mr. Forcible Feeble, is against the doctrine, aye, and the overwhelming prejudices of the churches. Yea, verily, adds Deacon S.; and then how are we to alarm sinners, if *we* take away the fear of undying torture in eternal and *devouring* fire? Alas! the man who will yield to public opinion or the prejudices of the whole religious world, when that opinion and prejudice is contrary to the word of God, is not fit for the Church of God, and is a dishonor to the ministry. We know we have the mind of the Lord when we say, that it is not the fear of undying torture, but the goodness of God, that leadeth man to repentance.

All the classic Greek writers, all Lexicons, have been sifted and examined, minutely, thoroughly, to prove what? That *baptizo* means to dip, plunge, immerse. Must a man, then, renounce his reason, his knowledge of other words besides baptise—deny the import and meaning of the words used in speaking of the punishment of the wicked—declare that the judgment of God relative to the wicked is heresy! and that the doctrine contained in the word of God is contrary to the word of God; and that God, therefore, does not mean what he says;—must a man do all this before he can be received again into full fellowship and fellow feeling with the Meadow Branch Baptish Church? The import of words must first be changed; all Dictionaries and Lexicons altered essentially—nay, even then the judgment of God remains immutably the same. Think you, brethren, that all the proofs in favor of the punishment of the wicked being that of utter destruction and not eternal life in misery, have been enumerated? Throughout the whole Bible there is not one passage, not one solitary phrase, that favors the common notion of immortality in sin, or eternal life to the wicked. No, not one text to show the soul is in its present condition undying or immortal. True, that immortality is promised to those who, by patient continuance in well doing, are seeking for honor and glory and immortality, eternal life. These great and glorious blessings are promised to the saints, through Jesus Christ. They are not inherent in man—not even in the righteous, much less in the wicked. Nor are they conferred on mortals, before the resurrection. Corruption must put on incorruption—mortality, immortality; the natural body must be raised a spiritual body. When does this take place? At death? Nay, but in the resurrection.

Christ was manifested in the flesh, that he might *destroy* the works of the devil. This the devil himself believes. Art thou come to destroy us before the time? The belief of the Meadow Branch Church, then, is not so correct on this point as that of the devil. He knows the truth in this respect, believes it, and trembles. But the Meadow Branch Baptist Church denies the truth of God, and neither fears nor trembles, but unblushingly publishes to the world that the truth of God is heresy! Would to God that they had the wisdom of the serpent, and the harmlessness of the dove.

Meltonville, N. C. I. F. Lee.

LETTER FROM BR. J. B. FRISBIE.

The writer of the following letter has been a minister, and traveling elder, we believe, in the Protestant Methodist Church, for a number of years. Some months ago our Six Sermons were put into his hands, if we recollect right, by Br. Catlin of Kingsbury, Ind., which he has examined with Dobney on Future Punishment, comparing them with the Scriptures, the result of which will be learned from his letter. Our Br. Catlin and other brethren in the west are doing their work faithfully in scattering the doctrine of immortality only through Christ, and that by a resurrection from the dead; thus showing the *importance* of the "second advent," as our only hope for a future life. We trust they will abide in this good work and not *compromise* it to please men.

Sylvan, Mich., Sept. 7th, 1849.

Brother Storrs,—It is with pleasure I now inform you that I have closely examined your Six Sermons, and also Mr. Dobney on Future Punishment: able works, the truth of which nothing but prejudice, and a blind zeal for creeds, sects, and parties, can gainsay or resist. With much interest I have perused your valuable paper, and have been delighted with the discussions therein, and have faithfully compared them all with the Bible.

About seven years since I was fully convinced that the idea of the natural immortality of the soul was a heathen doctrine; but have believed that immortality was in Christ, by virtue of the atonement, for all, but am now ready to acknowledge that the Bible does not teach the immortality and eternal life (which I consider synonymous) for any but those, "who, by patient continuance in well doing, seek for glory and honor and IMMORTALITY, ETERNAL LIFE." It appears that Christ, by his obedience and death, *abolished death*, and brought *life and immortality* to light through the gospel: 2 Tim. 1: 10. It is strange, that some should labor to prove that life and immortality should be brought to light through the light of the impress of the heathens, or reason, or the light of nature. To "put on immortality," (1 Cor. 15: 53, 54,) does not look much like an immortal soul's putting on an immortal body, or a mortal body's putting on an immortal soul, but "this *mortal* shall put on *immortality*," in the resurrection. Under this I will place, "The soul that sinneth it shall die." Ezek. 18: 4 and 20. Also, "Let him *know* that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a *soul* from *death*. James 5: 20, does teach that a sinner's soul may die. Solomon says, "Man hath no pre-eminence above a beast" at death: Eccl. 3: 19. "The dead know not anything." David says, man without redemption is "like the beasts that perish:" Ps. 49. "While I live I will praise the Lord—while I have any being"—"his breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish." Ps. 146: 2 and 4. I am not so clear on the intermediate state as I could wish. One reason why, I suppose, is, I had imbibed the notion that demons were the spirits of the wicked dead, according to Josephus, W. B. 7, sec. 6.

As to the destruction of the wicked after death, I feel very well satisfied on that point, at present. As sure as eternal life means future and endless life, so sure the opposite must be future and endless death, perish, and destruction, which are the common terms in contrast with life, eternal life, &c. Nowhere can I find that the wicked are to have eternal life, or that they are immortal, or are to put on immortality in the resurrection. For this is spoken only of brethren or Christians, who have sought immortality: Rom. 2: 7; they put on immortality in the resurrection. 1 Corth. 15: 50—54. "He that hath sown to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption." Now this I see is not the first death that we inherited in Adam. For, this is for our own deeds, and contrasted with life everlasting, which places it in the future, viz., the second death—"Death unto death"—"Utterly perish"—"End destruction"—"Destroy both soul and body in hell"—"punished with everlasting destruction." A word as to the resurrection, then I close this article. I came to the firm conclusion that if I could find proof in the scriptures that the wicked might rise *mortal*, that assuredly they would die again. No sooner had I come to this conclusion than this text came to my mind, satisfactory to the point—"Women received their dead raised to life again: and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance that they might obtain a better resurrection:" Heb. 11: 35. The contrast is between the women's children raised by the prophet back to this mortal life, and the better, or immortal resurrection. If these worthies had accepted deliverance, it appears they would never had a better resurrection than a mortal one, and die again. This is in exact agreement with the text, "He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in *this world*, shall keep it unto *life eternal*." Here the contrast is between the life in this world and life eternal; which makes its loss one with death eternal. See Mat. 10: 39, Mar. 8: 35. Yours in the hope of immortality.

J. B. Frisbie.

"INFANTS—SOUL AND BODY."

Under this caption, the True Wesleyan, for Sept. 1, takes exceptions to a sentiment of some of its exchanges, which is this, "the body of the *infant* is corrupt or fallen, and depraved. This depravity is hereditary; *but the soul is a new creation of God*, not derived from the earthly parent." The Wesleyan uses up this notion very handsomely, and says, "The Bible affirms that God is the Maker of the body as clearly as it does that he is the Maker of the soul." It adds, "'Abraham begat Isaac, and Isaac begat Jacob.' But if souls are not begotten as well as bodies, Abraham did not beget Isaac, or else the term Isaac does not include a soul. If men are not begotten, then souls are no part of men."

The Wesleyan overthrows its exchange in the argument, but demolishes itself along with it, for the doctrine of the Wesleyan is, that the soul is "immaterial, uncompounded, and indivisible."

Now if it is "*immaterial*," how does the action of *matter*, in generation, communicate it? And if it is *indivisible*, how could Abraham give or communicate a soul to Isaac? It could not be an offshoot from his own, for that would make his soul *divisible*, and the Wesleyan says it is "indivisible." We cannot see, if Abraham communicated Isaac's soul to him, but what it must still have been Abraham's soul in Isaac, if the soul is not divisible; and then we do not see how there can be more than *one* soul for the whole human family; and as that is "indivisible," it is a *family* soul: hence it follows that the action of any one man must be the action of the *family* soul; so if one man sins, it is a *family* sin, or if one man acts virtuously it is a *family* virtue. Again, as the soul is "indivisible," all men must have the same common destiny: say, for example, that if Abraham should be lost, Isaac must be lost, for the soul can't be divided; and so, whatever is the fate of the first man, Adam, must be the fate of all the men of his race, or else the soul must be divisible; and then, what would become of the Wesleyan's theory of its indivisibility? Happy for man, however, we have the assurance that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are saved, and that proves Adam and Eve were, and that all their posterity must inevitably be so too—for "*the soul is indivisible.*" Truly the Wesleyan has helped our opponents to a short and certain route to universal salvation. Can you get out of that dilemna, Br. Wesleyan, without abandoning your theory? The Examiner is open for your answer, and we will show you how we can equal you in "courtesy."

We see Br. Lee's difficulty. It all grows out of the assumption that the soul *is* an *entity*—a real being or existence—and not an *attribute*. The soul of man is an attribute of man, an inherent quality, that which pertains to man as man, as *an organism*. To use one of Br. Lee's own expressions, "The soul, whose very existence is *thought*." Never did a theologian better define the soul than he has done, fatal as it is to his entire theory, which he has labored to sustain in "22" articles in the True Wesleyan.

The question between the Wesleyan and its "exchange" stands thus: Are the souls [thoughts] of men, or of *infants*, a new creation of God, or are they propagated by generation from father to child?

According to Br. Lee, (see last Examiner) the soul is a "living consciousness," and "is known to exist only from its thoughts;" now, how little "living consciousness" does an "infant" manifest? and as the soul "is known to exist *only* from its thoughts," how will Br. Lee prove that "infants" have any souls at all? Does he know anything of their thoughts? He has said that "animals do not think;" that what appears to be the result of thought in them is only *instinct*. There are very few animals but what are quite equal in this respect to infants just born. After all, then, Br. Wesleyan, may it not be, according to your theory, that *infants* have no souls at all? So that you and your exchange may both be wrong.

The matter now seems to stand thus:—

The soul is thought, and can be known only by its thoughts:

But the infant is not KNOWN *to think:*

THEREFORE, *the infant has no soul, so far as known.*

Is this position true? And if not, how will our Br. Wesleyan disprove it, without abandoning some of his main arguments? Again, we say, the Examiner is open for Br. Lee's answer, with this *proviso*, viz., if we can possibly get funds to continue our paper. Now is a chance to prove our *generosity*.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, OCTOBER, 1849.

ENDLESS LIFE ONLY IN CHRIST.

"He that hath the Son hath life: he that hath not the Son of God hath not life."—*1 John 5: 12.*

BIBLE EXAMINER.—The present number of our paper has been delayed from two causes; first, absence of funds; second, our own absence from the city. Since our last we have visited New England, and conversed with numbers of our friends, all of whom express the desire that we should continue to issue the Examiner; and are unanimous that the subscription price *ought* to be increased to one dollar per year; they assure us they will cheerfully pay that sum. Several persons have pledged themselves to be responsible for subscribers to the amount of the following sums for the coming year; *viz*:—

Adam Warthman, Philadelphia,	$15.00
Jacob Johnson, Millville, N. J.,	10.00
P. Dickinson, Boston, Mass.,	10.00
R. E. Ladd, Springfield, Mass.,	25.00

Br. Wm. Swinbue, Patterson N. J., writes, that we may calculate upon six or eight subscribers there for next year, where there were only four the present. Here is a good and encouraging beginning. Let us now hear from all our friends at once; because, we wish to be able to determine how many papers we shall print monthly before we commence the new volume. To print more than are called for is a loss to us, and not printing enough we shall fail to supply new subscribers. Cannot our friends say at once for how many dollars they will be responsible *during* the coming year? They need not remit to us only as they obtain subscribers, but let us know how much we may *certainly* depend upon from you to help us through the next volume. A monthly issue is all we can promise at present. We have no funds on hand for the November and December numbers of the Examiner, yet we shall issue them during those months in full faith that the expense will be met.

THE TERMS of the Examiner hereafter will be one dollar per year. For five dollars six copies will be given; and for ten dollars thirteen. Having made this arrangement it is thought advisable to withdraw the offer of a "premium" made in the August number. The back numbers for 1848 and '49 will be furnished at the same price as heretofore. All communications and remittances relating to the Examiner should be directed "GEO. STORRS, Philadelphia, Pa."

THE NEW HYMN BOOK.—We invite the attention of our friends to this work. We believe it to be at least equal to any other: modesty perhaps forbids us to say more; but, we should be glad to have it compared in the matter it contains and its neatness of execution with any other. It is free from sectarianism, and we believe can be used by "all christians." It contains 205 choice Psalms and Hymns; *selected*, but altered and abridged, of such character, we think, as are fitting to be sung in public assemblies. Lighter hymns may be used at other times; and a plenty such can be found in every place without our contributing to multiply them. Several congregations besides ours in Philadelphia have procured our "Christian Psalmody." For price see last page.

MORE ENCOURAGEMENT.

FROM BR. WM. SWINBUE.

PATTERSON, *Sept.* 10, 1849.

BR. STORRS:—Enclosed you will find $2 from Br. Isaac Van Blarcom and myself, to be appropriated for the continuance of the Bible Examiner, to aid you through the present year. We think your valuable paper is worth one dollar a year, and we would prefer giving $2 per annum if the paper could be issued weekly or semi-monthly. We think some six or eight subscribers could be obtained here another year, at $1 monthly or $2 published oftener. Your article in the last number, on the "signs of the times" was rich, and well worth attention. We should like to hear more on the same subject. My own opinion is, that the sons of Judah will not start for the land of their fathers until after the first resurrection. I feel fully satisfied that the battle of the great day has already commenced.

FROM EDWARD TURNER.

BLACKWOODTOWN, N. J., *Sept.* 21, 1849.

MR. STORRS:—*Dear Sir.*—Enclosed I send you $1 to be added to what I paid for the 'Examiner' the present year, being satisfied all the while you were publishing too low by one half or more. I should be sorry not to have the pleasure of reading the 'Examiner,' at even four times its present cost, and think a large majority of your subscribers would be of the same opinion.

I, therefore, would suggest, that you should at once make an estimate of the cost for publishing the 'Examiner,' together with a sufficient sum to pay all labor, expenses, &c. Then make a division of the deficiency amongst your subscribers, and I think there would not be one who would be dissatisfied with the amount extra they would have to pay, and would most gladly do so, rather than have the paper discontinued.

ADDITIONAL DONATIONS since our last to finish the present volume.

Adam Warthman, Philadelphia,	$5.00
C. Thompson, Harrisburg, Pa.,	5.00
A friend in New York City,	3.00
Henry Harris, Free Union, Va.,	1.50
Joseph White, Heath, Mass.,	1.00
J. Simpson, and R. Malone, Richmond, Va.,	5.00
Various other friends.	2.00

IMMORTALITY.

A REVIEW OF REV. LUTHER LEE.

This work is now being stereotyped, and will make about 120 pages. The subject of immortality is philosophically and scripturally discussed. The work discusses the immortality of the soul, the consciousness of the dead, and the destiny of the wicked. It will be ready for delivery about the first of November, at 25 cts. per copy, or five copies for a dollar in paper covers, and mailable. About one half the matter has appeared in the "Bible Examiner," but the remainder *will not* be published in the paper as that course would very much delay the appearance of the book. Persons desiring the work will please address their orders *immediately* to JOHN T. WALSH, 63 Ogden street, Philadelphia, Pa.

J. T. W.

ALBANY AND UTICA, N. Y.—The Editor of the Examiner designs to spend Lord's day, the 21st inst., in Albany, and remain there till the latter part of that week; then go to Utica to spend Lord's day the 28th, and continue there a few days. He will be glad to meet in either place those who desire to see him.

NOTES ON "ATHANASIA."

No. II.

Mr. Hinton uses Luke 20: 36, "Neither can they die any more," as a positive declaration of the immortality of all men. He makes the question our Lord answers to be one about the "future life," excluding its exclusive application to the resurrection. If so, the text does not prove a resurrection at all on his own principles, elsewhere laid down, that a word cannot have its literal and analogical meaning at the same time. Hence this text is fairly given up by him as proof of the resurrection, the term being used analogically for "future life," [see p. 427.] there may be no resurrection of the dead at all for all this text proves. Again, as the term "die" has an analogical signification, it may be, for all Mr. H. can prove from the text or context, on his theory, used to signify *misery*, or *unhappiness*. Then the text means, "Neither can they be unhappy any more;" and as he supposes he has proved its applicability to all men, or all the human

race, has he not proved all a universalist could desire? Thus all men shall be possessed of a future life—then they cannot be unhappy any more, "but are as the angels of God in heaven;" *Matthew*. This expression of Matthew, Mr. H. endeavors to avoid by saying it does not relate to their moral character or holiness; p. 437. If it has no relation to a resemblance in holiness, it has the appearance of excluding wicked angels from the possession of that which these men possess, or there would have been no need to say angels of God *in heaven*. But Mr. H. says, p. 436, "The point of similarity intended . . . is only that they will 'neither marry nor be given in marriage since they cannot die any more.'". Still we ask—Why contrast good and bad men with the angels *in heaven*? If all men are included, as Mr. H. contends, irrespective of character, why not all angels be the pattern without selecting the good only?

By Adam came death, by Christ came the resurrection from the dead: hence it follows—if the death of Adam was literal, the resurrection is literal; "not die *any more*" refers to a LIKE *death*, and Mr. H. admits die in this text has "the sense of extinction;" p. 479: then the first death must have been "extinction;" for the text plainly has reference to the first death by the words "*any* MORE." Further: if resurrection in this text is to be understood only as a "future life," as Mr. H. contends, and the soul does not die at all with the body, then the phrase neither can they die ANY MORE is without any obvious sense or force; for the words "*any more*" import that those of whom they are spoken had died *once*; but according to Mr. H., their souls had not died at all. Then these words are a *redundance*; and to prove Mr. H.'s view should have been *omitted*. But if they had been, it would still make the expression quite useless; for, it might as well be said of men in THIS *state* they CANNOT DIE, as the *future*; for death cannot touch the soul *now* according to his theory. There would have been much more force in the words, if Mr. H. is correct in his theory, to have predicated that *future existence* itself upon the deathless nature of the soul *now*; but as our Lord did base his argument for a future life on *resurrection*, as is evident from his adding the words "*any more*" to the expression, we are safe in concluding that Mr. H.'s exposition of the text is erroneous. Nor will Mr. H.'s definition of death help him here. Let us look at it. "Death," he says, "in its strict and primary import, signifies nothing more than that condition of an organized substance in which the organic functions have ceased;" p. 38. This then cannot be the death of which our Lord speaks, if Mr. H.'s theory be the true one, for the soul is necessarily spoken of according to him; and yet he admits that our Lord uses the term *die*, in this text in "the sense of *extinction*." Yet, he says, p. 448-9, "A dead man" is "a man in whom the functions of the animal organization are no longer performed . . . but the man still exists . . . nothing has occurred but the stoppage of certain organic functions, entailing a change in the condition, or mode of existence, of the being concerned. This is death," he adds. Such a death surely, Mr. H. will not pretend our Lord spoke of if he was talking of the *future life* before the resurrection, as he maintains; and yet it is most evident our Lord speaks of a like death to one previously experienced, when he adds the words "*any more*." Let us take still another amplification of the meaning of death. Mr. H. says, "In the case of man, the cessation of the animal functions terminates his connection with this world, because it reduces him to a mode of existence to which this world is not adapted; but it involves no cessation of existence in either body or soul:" p. 479. Such a death as this then our Lord did not speak of Lk. 20: 36; for Mr. H. has admitted that the term "*die*," there, is used in "the sense of extinction." In Mr. H.'s expression that the "cessation of the animal functions" in death "involves no cessation of existence in either body or soul," he makes an admission which will put him to the proof that the soul does not become equally unconscious as the body. Thus the body *exists*, though the animal functions have ceased: the soul also *exists*, but where is the evidence of its consciousness?

Again, Mr. H. says, "Death is a change in the mode of human existence, affected by the cessation of the organic functions, but one not interrupting the conscious being of the individual;" p. 136. Then we remark once more, that our Lord could not have been speaking of the future state prior to the resurrection, Lk. 20: 36, when he said "Neither can they die *any more*;" because, if the soul has any *organism*, IT has not died *once*, if Mr. H.'s theory be true; hence, the expression "neither can they die *any more*" is inapplicable to the soul; therefore our Lord was not speaking of a "future state" *prior to the resurrection*. If Mr. H. chooses to take the ground that the soul has no *organism*, it does not help the matter; for that which has no organism is without beginning—is eternal—uncreated; consequently cannot be spoken of as though it was not "*any more*" subject to death, because it never did die, never was subject to death; and hence it would be useless to say neither can it die *any more*. Thus, whatever view we take of the subject, *we* are irresistibly led to the conclusion that our Lord spoke of the dead subsequently to the resurrection, and not prior to it; and therefore our friend Mr. Hinton loses all countenance from this text, that the dead are conscious, though they "exist"—and we readily grant that both soul and body exist after death—and he also fails to establish that all men will live for ever; or, to use his borrowed pagan sentiment, he has failed to prove that "Those who die are immortal, since they will not die any more." From this sentiment we appeal to the Scriptures, and especially to Luke 20, that it is the children of God, in the restricted sense of the phrase, and they only—and that after the resurrection—that cannot die any more, and therefore are immortal. For God calls himself "the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob," as quoted by our Lord, Lk. 20: 37, we apprehend, in the same sense that Paul uses it when speaking of the faith of ancient worthies, Heb. 11: 16, and says—"Wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God; for he hath prepared for them a city." In this connection Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are specially mentioned, and Paul evidently refers to the same passage in Moses' writings as does our Lord in Lk. 20. Here is certain evidence from Paul that God called himself the God of these patriarchs in special reference to their faith and obedience. Did not our Lord assert the same truth? If so, the point is settled that he did not speak of all men. Luke 20.

Mr. Hinton says, p. 425-6, "The question framed by the Sadducees must, in all propriety, be held to relate generally to the subject of a future life, rather than the fact of the resurrection of the body." And he adds—"This view is not at all inconsistent with either the etymology or the use of the term *anastasis*, which, when it relates to a future state, is by our translators uniformly, but sometimes unhappily, rendered *resurrection*."

We cheerfully admit that "our translators" have "*unhappily*, uniformly rendered *anastasis* resurrection." But "unhappily" for whom? Why, of course, for all who hold that "soul and body both exist" after death, and that the soul has a *conscious* existence. Truly our translators have done an *unhappy* thing for them; and left them no ground for the pagan notion before spoken of, that, "Those who die are immortal, since they will not die any more." That "the question framed by the Sadducees must be held to relate to the subject of a future life" BY A RESURRECTION *from the dead*, we trust is now sufficiently manifest; yet, lastly, we call attention to *the fact* that the question of the Sadducees expressly binds down the "*future life*" about which they inquired to the resurrection state. The question is thus stated by Mark 12: 23. "In the resurrection, therefore, WHEN THEY SHALL RISE, whose wife shall she be of them?" Now, if Mr. Hinton's theory be correct, this language certainly does not favor it; and of this it seems he must have been aware, as he takes no notice of it.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES—NO. III.

"THE BATTLE OF THAT GREAT DAY OF GOD ALMIGHTY."

It will be our object in this article to bring together the points in Revelation relating to that battle, with some remarks upon the events introduced. The first place where it is alluded to is in chap. 11, under the sounding of the seventh trumpet. That trumpet in our opinion commenced about 1789, at that convulsion in France which was followed by the career of Napoleon Bonaparte, and has continued to the present time. It contained the seven last plagues, which constituted it a "woe" trumpet. The last verse of the 11th chapter has these words, under this trumpet—"*The temple of God was opened in heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament:* and there were lightenings, and voices and thunderings, and an earthquake, and a great hail." This subject though interrupted by the three following chapters, is resumed distinctly in the 15th chapter 5th verse, in these words, which show the connection.—"I looked, and behold, *the temple of the tabernacle of the testimony in heaven was opened*." Then the seven angels are seen coming "out of the temple, having the seven last plagues," &c. These plagues were to "fill up the wrath of God" on the anti-christian powers; or, to "destroy them which destroy [corrupt] the earth," or land: that is, the inhabitants of those countries where the anti-christian powers, now to be destroyed, had carried on their abominations. Under the seventh trumpet, and during the time of the pouring out of the seven vials, "*the nations were* ANGRY." This we regard as the first intimation of the battle of the great day. The next direct presentation of it is in chapter 16: 13—16, or the work of the unclean spirits which go forth to gather the kings of the earth to the battle; and it is said they are gathered together to a place called in the Hebrew tongue Armageddon. Here we may as well remark on the *place* before we pass to the other connecting points in the prophecy.

"Armageddon"—the mountain of Mageddon; or Mageddo, a city situated in a great plain at the foot of mount Carmel. Here king Josiah was slain in battle, (see 2 Chron. 35: 22—26:) here Barak and Deborah overcame Sisera and his great army, (Judges 5: 19.) It was a noted place for scenes of carnage; and hence is used, Rev. 16, *symbolically* for the place of the battle of that great day of God Almighty. Europe and western Asia have been the places where the blood of Jews and Christians has been shed like water. Europe especially has been the Papal slaughter-house. Europe then is *the place* symbolized by Armageddon—that is the valley of slaughter and judgment.

Having now connected two points concerning this battle, as presented in chapters 11 and 16, we are again interrupted by a view of the judgment of the great whore on the scarlet colored beast; but in that description, chap. 17, we are once more presented with some of the elements that go to make up the army of anti-Christ; *viz.*, The ten horns—or kingdoms under Papal influence—which give their power and strength unto the beast, or papal civil power for a time; "These," all combined, "shall make war on the Lamb," &c., v. 14. Then our direct view of the battle is again interrupted by a presentation in a separate form of the judgment of Babylon, or the great whore, and with the joy that arises to the holy ones at her fall. Passing all this we come once more to an open view of the gathering and battle field with its result.

The scene opens at chap. 19: 11, and continues to chap. 20: 3. The whole is a symbolical representation. Let none forget this fact. From verse 11 to 16, is a representation of "The Word of God;" or, in other words, Christ. We have in a previous article expressed the belief that the armies opposed to Christ do not actually see him, or know that they are really fighting against him. Here we call attention again to chapter 16, where it is expressly said—"Behold I come as *a thief*." Come to what? Evidently, to the battle of that great day. Look at that text again in its connection. A description is given of the working of the unclean spirits, preparing the kings of the earth for that conflict. At this point the language, "behold I come as a thief," &c. is uttered; showing that it is something connected with the battle, and is accompanied by a caution to saints not to be drawn into the corrupting influences which will be everywhere in operation to turn off men's minds from a constant preparation for the final result. They are to keep their garments—keep far removed from the *war* spirit that will go forth from nation to nation, so that whoever shall allow themselves to fall into its current will become defiled and be stript of those garments of meekness which characterise a christian; and thus stript, his shame will appear; because he will be manifested to be destitute of the peaceable spirit of Christ, and thus demonstrated not to belong to him. "Blessed is he that *watcheth* and keepeth his garments" pure from the spirit of war, and the love of the world.

We now ask, how does a *thief come*? Not openly, but secretly; unseen and unsuspected by

those who are to be the victims visited. So Christ will come to that battle, and cause these angry nations to be gathered to the terrible conflict which is to result in their overthrow and ruin. "In righteousness does he judge and make war." These anti-christian powers have "made war on the saints" and on the truth for centuries; and done it in a most unrighteous manner: but the Lamb, now "King of kings," maketh war on them in righteousness, and in just judgment for their violence to his truth and his people. He now "treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God;" a full description of which had been prophecied of in Isa. 63: 1 to 6, and now the time has come; but Christ comes to it as a thief—unseen—unknown by his enemies, while they will be made the instruments one upon another of executing the wrath. We may illustrate this secret presence of Christ in this battle by the case recorded in 2 Kings, 6: 15—17. The king of Syria had sent an army to seize Elisha the prophet. They came, "horses and chariots, and a great host; by night and encompassed the city about. And when the servant of the man of God was risen early, and gone forth, behold, an host compassed the city, both with horses and chariots: and his servent said unto him, alas, my master! how shall we do? And he answered, fear not; for they that be with us are more than they that be with them. And Elisha prayed, and said, Lord, I pray thee, open his eyes, that he may see. And the Lord opened the eyes of the young man: and he saw, and behold, the mountain was full of horses and chariots of fire round about Elisha."

Here we see a great army from heaven, "even more for" Elisha than they were against him; but they were there "as a thief"—invisible to the opposing army—exerting an invincible power which made the victory sure. Thus we apprehend it will be in the battle of that great day. Christ, with "the armies of heaven" will be there, though invisible; but the war so far as physical power is brought into the conflict, will be that of the hand of every man "against his neighbor;" or, one nation will be the instrument in executing judgment against another; and so in turn destroying each other. The scenery of calling the fowls of heaven to "the supper of the great God" indicates the greatness of the slaughter of that awful period. Then the fact is stated of the actual gathering of the kings of the earth and their armies to make war against Christ and his army. Next the "beast was taken;" by which we understand the scarlet colored beast, which we regard also as the "*image* to the beast which had the wound by the sword," chap. 13; being as we have said in a previous article, only another aspect of the same beast; or, the aspect given it a short time before it goes "into perdition;" and *with him* is taken "the false prophet which wrought miracles" or wonders—"before"—or in the presence of—the beast.

Before proceeding, it will be necessary to inquire, what power is symbolized by the false prophet? A false prophet is one who speaks in the name of the Lord when God has not commissioned him; see Deut. 18: 20–22. The character of a false prophet is accurately described in Acts 13th chap, in the case of "Elymas the sorcerer." He is "full of all subtlety"—withstands the truth—seeks to turn men from the truth—full of all mischief—an enemy to all righteousness—a perverter of the right ways of the Lord, consequently a "child of the devil." See Acts 13: 6—10. This power corresponds well to the "two horned beast," Rev. 13: 11—18. We regard this two horned beast and the false prophet as identically the same power under two aspects. They both wrought miracles or wonders, before the beast. We are of the opinion that the Pope and Cardinals in the exercise of civil power are, or constitute the beast with its two horns like a lamb—a mild, Christ-like power, by profession, but speaking with its mouth like a dragon. The time was when the clergy generally had a voice in the choice of the Popes, and the emperors confirmed the choice; but some where in the twelfth or thirteenth centuries the Cardinals assumed the sole power to elect and constitute the Pope, and have held that power to the present time, or over 600 years, how near "666" we do not know. This *dragon-lamb*—this Pope and Cardinal beast, has "exercised all the power of the beast before him;" and has had all the characteristics of the false prophet described Acts 13th. This power, we think, is the false prophet taken *with* the beast, in "the battle of that great day of God Almighty," and "these both are cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone;" corresponding with "eating her flesh and burning her with fire," chap. 17, and denotes their utter and irrevokable destruction, so that they shall never recover; it is a final overthrow of that anti-Christian power with all its abominable delusions and superstitions; and then it follows that "the remnant," viz. "the kings of the earth," &c., "were slain with the sword," &c. These were made instruments, first, through hatred to the whore, of destroying her with all her appendages, and then are the sword, or agents in one another's destruction, till both the Papal power is ruined, and those nations overthrown, and their governments destroyed, who had been corrupted by her sorceries and abominations.

Having thus briefly noticed the fate of some of the powers engaged in the battle of that day, we must not pass by an other power concerned in the same conflict. This is liable to be done by separating the 19th and 20th chapters, which should be regarded as inseparable. The *dragon* power is most assuredly engaged in that war, though not mentioned in chap. 19; yet the 16th chap. clearly shows the dragon as a principal actor in the scenes of that day. It was out of his mouth one of the unclean spirits came that was to gather to the battle. We may depend, therefore, that that power will not be overlooked. The account of the battle in Rev. 19th should be read to the close of the 3d verse of the 20th chap. without interruption; thus we shall get the fate of all the powers engaged in the conflict.

We are now, then, to inquire what power is symbolized by the *Dragon*; after which we will notice its fate. In introducing this power, chap. 20, it is called "The Dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil and Satan." The whole description here we consider symbolical; and not designed at all to represent a personal being usually denominated "*the devil*." This remark, however, is not to be construed into a denial of the existence of such a personal being: we only say, that in *this text* he is not the power spoken of. Dr. Eadie, in his Biblical Cyclopedia, a new English work, on the word "*Dragon*," says: "In the Apocalypse it

seems to be a symbol of the *dark, malignant spirit of Evil*, either in himself or in those human influences with which he inspires or employs." On the "*serpent*," the same author remarks: "In Egypt and other nations the *serpent* was a common symbol of *power*. Idolators regarded it as a *personification of all evil*." Kitto, in his "Cyclopedia of Biblical literature," another English work of great merit and reputation, says: "They anciently represented all great destructive agents under the form of a *Dragon, or monster serpent*." He further remarks that there were temples built to Dragons, some of which were several miles in length, and built in a serpentine form.

As a sign of *power*, Moses seems to have used it when sent to Pharaoh; see Exodus 7: 9, where the Lord told Moses his rod should become a serpent—a *dragon*—before Pharaoh. The word here translated serpent is the same that is rendered *dragon*, Isa. 27: 1. It was the *sign* of Moses' *power*, received from God, to deliver Israel. The words devil and satan are the Greek and Hebrew words expressing the same thing; and literally signify "*adversary*," leaving the connection to determine what particular adversary is spoken of. The expression, "the dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil and satan," therefore, signifies *a dark, malignant power*, which is to act a prominent part in the transactions of "that great day of God Almighty;" and which is to be the last disposed of in the conflict, and is not to be utterly destroyed at that time, but reserved for another period, hereafter to be spoken of. The question now returns—*What power is it?* We have said that the symbols by which it is represented only signify a malignant and destructive power. We now add, that we are not to suppose, because we find these symbols employed in regard to one destructive power, that that is the power always intended. If this were the case, we should have to confine its application wholly to the Imperial power of Egypt; for, in Ezekiel 29, the Lord expressly calls "Pharoah king of Egypt, the *great dragon*." This passage goes to confirm the position that it is a symbol to denote an extraordinarily malignant or destructive power, and a power too that has specially been an oppressor of Jacob's posterity. Such was the Imperial power of Egypt; such was the Imperial power of Rome, and hence symbolized by a dragon, Rev. 12th; but in Rev. 16th and 20th we have come to a period where the symbol cannot apply to Rome Imperial, nor to Rome Papal; the latter is described by other symbols, and the former had passed away. The Dragon, then, in chapters 16 and 20 is another power. To find this power, we shall again have to revert to the prophecies of the old Testament; we shall there find more in detail, a description of a part of this same battle of the great day of God. We turn then to Ezekiel 38 and 39. Let us examine some of the powers here introduced.

The 38th chapter commences thus—"Son of man, set thy face against Gog, the land of Magog, the chief prince of [*Rosh*] Meshech and Tubal." We have inserted "*Rosh*" on the authority of the Septuagint. The 6th verse speaks of "Gomer, and all his bands; the house of Togarmah of the *north* quarters," &c. These powers are among those that are found in the conflict described in that prophecy. These are all descendants of Japheth, as may be learned from Genesis 10: 1—5. They peopled Asia Minor and nearly all *Europe*; called "The isle of the Gentiles," in the time of Moses: see Gen. 10: 5. "Gog," then, is to be found some where in Europe, and the Septuagint gives us the clue to the power intended, *viz.* "Rosh," or Russia. Gog was in ancient times the name of *the king* of the northern country, as Pharoah was the common name of the kings of Egypt. Hence Gog is the name of a *Dynasty* of kings or emperors; and, if the Septuagint can be relied upon, it seems it is the Russian Dynasty. Russia has been a great oppressor of the Jews, and is still their greatest scourge; and, in this respect, is entitled to the appellation of "*the great Dragon*." Whether that power is literally to invade the land of Israel, as indicated, Ezk. 38 and 39, or whether the scenery is laid there only because the legal inheritors of that land are the subjects of Gog's malignant operations, we need not now decide—time will soon determine that point—but that Gog, the chief prince of Rosh, or Russia, is one of the most active and malignant powers engaged in the terrible conflict immediately to precede the establishment of the reign of Christ on the throne of his father David, is clearly evident. It is not our design now to give an exposition of this prophecy in Ezekiel, but only to introduce it so far as to identify the power with that denominated the Dragon, Rev. 16 and 20. In further confirmation of this view, we have in Rev. 20, the fact that when this power is loosed at the end of the 1000 years, the same powers are introduced into the scene as in Ezekiel, viz. "Gog and Magog." We are led, then, to the conclusion that the Dynasty of Russian Emperors is symbolized by "the Dragon, that old serpent, which is the devil and satan." The Russian Imperial power began to assume its present importance and form under Peter the Great, in the commencement of the last century. It has steadily marched on to its present greatness, and its dark, malignant character; and most unquestionably has a part to act in the battle of the great day of God Almighty, which is not to be passed over under the general name of "the kings of the earth"—*tees gees*—of *the land*, or Roman Catholic earth, or territory where that Romish power had held sway. Russia is not, and never was, of that land; but is, and always has been, a separate and distinct power, and also is of the Greek religion, which is hostile to the Papal authority and religion. The difference between the two religious systems may be seen by consulting the "Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge," but we have not space to note it now.

If we are correct, then, in fixing upon the Russian Imperial power as the Dragon power, we are now prepared to contemplate its fate. The other powers, let it be remembered, are utterly destroyed in the battle; and the symbols employed denote a destruction from which there is no revival—their destruction as organized powers is *final*. Not so with the Dragon power; and this forms a sufficient reason for introducing its fate in a distant scene as found at the commencement of chap. 20. An angel is represented as coming down from heaven. By this expression, however, we are to understand nothing more than that the angel is a symbol of the agency that God shall choose to employ in accomplishing the work to be done. It is quite useless to speculate as to what agency precisely it is, that is symbolized by the angel, or that God will employ—time alone can certainly determine that. This

power is represented as being commissioned to bind and imprison the dragon—that is, to cut off and curtail his power so that it can perform no organised work of evil for a specified period: but the dragon is not to be *destroyed* now as the other powers are; and it will have a revival, after which comes its final doom.

The work now to be accomplished is represented by symbols easy to be understood. The dragon is *bound*—*i. e.* deprived of all *his power*; then he is *shut up*; *i. e.* kept securely: in the "bottomless pit"—*abusson*. This Greek word occurs only twice out of Revelation, and seven times in that book. It may be proper here to inquire as to the meaning of it. One thing is certain, it never means *hell*, in in the popular sense of that term. The first place where it occurs is in Lk. 8: 31; and is there translated "*the deep*." Dr. Eadie, on this word, in his Cyclopedia, says—"Rendered in our version sometimes DEEP, and uniformly BOTTOMLESS PIT, either by itself or in connection with another term, in the book of Revelation. A deep without a bottom—a very deep pit, referring often to that vast body of water which in Jewish opinion was laid up in some carverneous receptacle within the earth. It refers sometimes to the dark sepulchres of the east, which, hewn out in the rock, and descending far beneath the surface, formed a kind of under world. In the Apocalypse, it symbolises the abode and the doom of those powers which are hostile to Christ and his Church."

This definition may help us in further examining this point. In Rom. 10: 7, Paul uses the word thus, in speaking of our Lord—"Who shall descend into the deep"—*abusson?* "That is," says the apostle, "to bring up Christ again from *the dead*." Here the word is used for the sepulchre—the tomb—the state of the dead. The other places where it occurs are in Rev. 9: 1, 2, 11; and 11: 17; and 17: 8; and 20: 1, 2. In the last place, which we are at this time considering, it is used to indicate, that as in a state of death a man is deprived of all power to accomplish anything, so the Dragon should be placed in such circumstances that he can accomplish nothing against those who had previously suffered from his malignity; and the world, under the reign of Christ and his associates in government, will remain unmolested till the end of the period specified; after which the Dragon power will revive for a short period, and then share the same fate that the beast and false prophet had done at the battle of the great day; which is symbolized by being cast into the lake of fire, and being tormented day and night for ever and ever; which language implies no more than the awful nature of the destruction of that power, and the perpetuity of its overthrow. Whether there be a personal devil, yea or nay, this text and context has nothing to do with his final destiny. It is an anti-Christian organism, national in its character, whose fate is here brought to view. In another article we may say more of the signs that "the battle of that great day of God Almighty" is now going on.

RESPONSE TO B. B. JACKMAN.

BR. STORRS.—I noticed in the Examiner of July an answer from B. B. Jackman to my question in the number for May. As it is clearly seen that he has failed to prove when and how Christ is to accomplish the great object of his coming into the world, that is to destroy the devil and his works, I consider the question unanswered.

Friend Jackman, according to his article, believes that devils and sinners, or they that are filthy, will exist in a conscious state as long as God exists. Now he will not deny but that as long as these beings exist, the works of the devil remain also. He may say that the devil would be destroyed if confined. But, would that destroy his works while sinners were eternally sinning? Certainly not. John the Baptist speaks thus concerning the workers of iniquity, Mat. 3: 12, "Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor and gather his wheat into his garner, but the chaff (filth) he will burn *up* with unquenchable fire." And St. John says, 1 John 3: 8, "For this cause the Son of God was made manifest that he might destroy the works of the devil."

He also speaks of the meaning of the words eternal and everlasting, and seems to believe that they are to be understood strictly literal throughout the bible; but if he will turn to Gen. 17: 8, and chap. 49: 26, he will find there, and in other places, that they are applied to things that have an end: and to make it still plainer to his mind you will please send him a copy of your Six Sermons, and charge to my accoun; which I think he will gladly and with much profit peruse. Yours for the truth,

E. W. KNIGHT.

ON THE COMING OF THE LORD.—Too little, alas! are we affected by the anticipation of the glorious appearing of our Redeemer and of our participation in that glory. Where is the praise, the gratitude, the joy, the holiness, that this anticipation ought to inspire?

Where the grateful praise to our Father for his wondrous love to sinners who deserved everlasting destruction, in making us "joint-heirs" with his best beloved Son to such an inheritance? Expecting soon the thrilling welcome to enter through the gates into the city, how should the incense of praise to the Rock of our Salvation ascend perpetually from the altar of our hearts! Hoping so soon to enter into the joy of our Lord; to see him as he is and be like him forever; why are our acknowledgements of obligation to him who has loved us and given himself for us, so cold and infrequent?

Where is the joy which the assurance of awaking from the dust, in the perfect image of our Saviour, to reign with him in the everlasting kingdom, is so well adapted to excite? Do not the felicities of the Holy City eclipse all the glory of this present world? Why then are we so much affected by the things which are seen and temporal and so little enraptured by those which are eternal? Can we not reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us? Why then are we so cast down in the hour of affliction and adversity? Why do we not rejoice in tribulation also?

Where is the holiness; the victory over the carnal influences of this world, and the powerful examples of holy living becoming the candinates for immortality in the presence of God and the Lamb? "What manner of persons ought we to be in all holy conversation and godliness" who expect soon to inhabit the city where nothing that defileth can enter?

H. GREW.

THE CROSS OF CHRIST.

Christ's cross is the sweetest burden that ever I bare; it is such a burden as wings are to a bird, or sails to a ship, to carry me forward to my harbor. Hold fast Christ, but take his cross and himself cheerfully; Christ and his cross are not separable in this life, however they part at Heaven's door.

To be crucified to the world is not so highly accounted of by us as it should be; how heavenly a thing it is to be deaf and dead to this world's sweetest music!

Make others to see Christ in you, moving, doing, speaking and thinking; your actions will speak of him, if he be in you.

Go where you will, your soul will find no rest but in Christ's bosom: Inquire for him, come to him, and rest you on Christ the Son of God; I sought him, and I found in him all I can wish or want.

Lose not sight of Christ in this cloudy and dark day; learn not from the world to serve Christ, but ask himself the way; the world is a false copy, and a deceitful guide to follow.

All come not home at night who suppose they have set their faces heaven-ward: it is a woful thing to die, and miss heaven; how many a mere professor's candle is blown out, and never lighted again. Many, now, take Christ by guess; therefore, I say, be sure you take Christ himself; his sweet working in the soul will not lie, it will soon tell whether it be Christ indeed whom you have met with.

'The day of the Lord is at hand, when all men shall appear as they are: there shall be no borrowed colors in that day; men borrow the lustre of Christianity, but how many counterfeit masks will be burned in the day of God.

I wish our thoughts were, more frequently than they are, upon our country! heaven casteth a sweet perfume afar off to those who have spiritual senses.

Go on in the strength of the Lord, and put Christ's love to the trial, and put upon it burdens, and then it will appear love indeed; we employ not his love, and therefore we know it not.

More I can neither wish, nor pray, nor desire for you than Christ, 'singled and chosen out from all things, even though wearing a crown of thorns. I am sure the saints are at best but strangers to the weight and worth of the incomparable excellence of Christ. We know not half of what we love when we love Christ.

I would not have believed that there is so much in Jesus as there is. It is little to see him in a book; but to draw nigh to Christ is another thing.

That Christ and a sinner should be one, and share heaven between them, is the wonder of salvation; what more could love do?—*Rutherford's Letters.*

SINNERS AND THE ATONEMENT.

We find the sermon preached by Rev. B. I. Lane, of Cambridge, before the Massachusetts Conference of Baptist Mini-ters, in the Evangelical preacher. It deserves well the place it there occupies. Though we gave at the time an outline of this discourse, the following extract on pointing sinners to the atonement, will interest the reader.—*Reflector.*

Threatening may awaken fear and force submission, but it cannot beget love—it cannot reconcile the heart to that from which it has been estranged. It is not in its nature to do so. We repeat, that we are not speaking against alarming the sinner, and pointing him to the coming wrath. It is important that we do so. The doctrine of the resurrection from the dead, and the final judgment, together with other great truths, must be often and carefully insisted upon. But we must go further. And, the point on which we are insisting, does not, it appears to us, hold that prominent place in the ministry of most preachers, that it does in the Bible. It may be coldly stated, and a few passages of scripture in relation to it indifferently repeated; but it is not earnestly and affectingly dwelt upon in its place. When the sinner stands trembling upon the brink of wo, when he is appalled in view of the fearful miseries that await the wicked, it is not the time to point him to Sinai's lightning, or to a burning hell; but, the love and compassion of God in the atonement should be exhibited, as the arm of God stretched over the pit of ruin to catch the helpless penitent. This is the top-stone of the spiritual temple, 'brought forth with shouting, crying grace! grace unto it!' This truth, clearly stated, understood and embraced, will complete the work of truth, and reconcile the sinner to God. He may be awakened, he may be convicted, but he will not, he cannot be converted—the affections of his heart cannot be won to the love of God by any other means than the melting tenderness of the gospel. 'God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them;' this is the word of reconciliation committed to us. In this word, illustrated and enforced in ten thousand ways, we have the grand instrument of genuine *revivals*. With this word, you may successfully assail the citadel of the 'strong man armed.'

When, my brethren, everything else fails to change the affections of sinners, and bring them to a cordial love and obedience of the gospel; when the ordinance of reason fails to make an impression; when the weapons of terror fall upon sinners' hearts as pebbles upon the shield of Achilles; when the battery of a coming wrath fails to bring one sinner upon his face, then, in 'burning thought and breathing words, 'charge upon them from the humiliation of Bethlehem, the groans of Gethsemane and the deeper agonies of Calvary. Let

It come over their ears like the sweet breath of heaven,
That breathes upon the flowers of Paradise,
Gathering and giving odor,

that 'God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them,' and you shall presently see the mighty effect of it in the inquiry, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?"

LETTERS.

FROM DR. FIELD.

JEFFERSONVILLE, Ind., Sept. 6, 1849.

BR. STORRS:—I have had a desire for some time to hear from you, but have had so little time for writing, that I have hitherto neglected to open a correspondence with you. If you are publishing a paper I wish to become a subscriber, and would be glad to have one of your books containing your Six Sermons, and some small essays on immortality.

Would it be possible to induce you to come west

on a missionary tour, and spend some time with me? I am exceedingly anxious to have the aid and co-operation of brethren who hold my views. Perhaps you know that I have been forced to constitute a new church here, on free and independent principles, which has been in existence now two years, and is in a prosperous condition. We number about one hundred. What say you to a tour West? If you cannot come, can you send a young man of good talents and character, to aid me in my labors? I need assistance very much. A preacher or two West, of bold and persevering character, could be sustained.

Yours, in the hope of immortality,
N. FIELD.

If the Lord permit, we will endeavor to visit you and others, in the West, before many months. It has been on our mind to do so, if health and pecuniary circumstances would allow. We hope to answer the calls of old friends there before long.—ED. EX.

—

FROM BR. WILLIAM ONGLEY.

TOWN OF THORALD, C. W. Sept. 22, 1849.

DEAR BR. STORRS:—My wife joins with me in love to you and your family, praying the God of all grace to keep and preserve you all in perfect peace and blameless, unto his coming kingdom; we hope you will be made a blessing in preaching the *word* to the people in these last days. The subject of Life and Death, it seems to me, is the last truth to stir up the people; *get them to see this*, and they are ready to hear on the second advent of our Lord, and other Bible truths. It appears to me it was the first preached to Adam in the garden, by God himself and it will be the last, connected with other truths. Myself and wife are holding meetings in Canada West, for the present, and are expecting our King before 1850 runs out. I suppose you think we shall be disappointed; if we should, we will continue to wait, but with earnest expectation, and would say come, Lord Jesus, and come quickly. Amen.

I remain yours, waiting for eternal life, when JESUS comes, to change these mortal bodies, and make them like unto his most glorious body.

—

FROM BR. ANSON WALKER.

NEW YORK, Oct. 1849.

BR. STORRS:—I read the welcome Examiner with interest and profit; and was pained to learn that there was any probability that it might be discontinued. I need not express my satisfaction as to its spirit, and the "exceeding great and precious promises" and blessings it is bringing to light from the darkness of sectarianism, together with the fearless and able manner they are set forth and defended; and it must, I think, carry conviction to every unprejudiced mind who will carefully read it. What but the spreading power and force of truth, the glory and consistency of the doctrines advocated in the Examiner, and their influence on the minds of men, has called out the True Wesleyan into the field against you? Others, less capable than the Editor of the Wesleyan, and more firmly bound in sectarianism, seem unwilling to lend a helping hand to sustain the downward tendency of immortal-soulism; but seem to choose to let it quietly wreck, as the "orthodox" of England have done, by assuming that immortal does not mean "*positively shall* live forever." From what I see here, I judge that the arguments of the Examiner are too conclusive to allow of many venturing into the field against you, lest they meet the fate of others who have made the trial; for surely the Examiner is conducted with ability enough to merit the attention of wise men.

—

TRIALS OF THE WORLD.

"This world is full of suffering; along the mournful air
The notes of sad complaining are ringing every where.
Love shieldeth not its idols from death's unsparing darts,
And the whole wide earth is teeming with crushed and broken hearts.
Yet were no clouds of sorrow along our pathway driven,
This world would be a Paradise we scarce would change for Heaven.
"This life is full of trial, yet we know that One above
Looks ever down upon us with a sympathizing love,
And pitieth our infirmities, though others may deride,
For the heart hath not a sorrow with which *His* was not tried.
Oh let us then be patient, be meek and murmur not,
Though clouds and gloom and shadows surround our earthly lot,
And when the heart repineth, think of that Holy One
Who meekly bore and suffered to win for us a crown.
Then let us place the anchor of our confidence and trust
On the might of the Creator, the Omnipotent and Just,
Whose will we may not question, nor His hidden motives tell,
Yet rest in His assurance that 'He doeth all things well.'"

BUSINESS NOTICES.—Wm. Ongley. Money received.
Thos. C. Crane. Hymn Books sent according to order.
Henry Harris. Dobney and Hymn Books sent as you directed.

DEPOSITORIES OF BOOKS.—Dobney on "The Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment," reprinted from the English edition, may be had in

BOSTON, Mass., of Geo. T. Adams, 27 Hanover St., Hat and Cap Store.

ALBANY, N. Y., at Christian Palladium Office, No. 344 Broadway, and H. R. Holmes, 16 S. Pearl St.

NEW YORK CITY, of Dr. John Burdell, Dentist, No. 2 Union Place, and of Henry F. Johnson, No. 327 Hudson St.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., of Eld. Joseph Marsh, Advent Harbinger Office.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., of Ransom Hicks, No. 275 Pine St.

HARTFORD, Conn., of Dr. D. Crary, and Eld. J. B. White.

ONE "Six Sermons" can be had, as above, of Eld. Marsh, Geo. T. Adams, Dr. Burdell, Dr. Crary, Eld. White, and Ransom Hicks.

PRICE OF BOOKS, ETC., AT THE EXAMINER OFFICE.

CHRISTIAN PSALMODY, (New Hymn book,) 128 pages, 24mo., paper covers, 13 cts. each; ten copies for $1.00; for $8.00, one hundred copies.

SIX SERMONS, Quarto, 16 pages, (newspaper postage, only, when sent by mail,) $1.00 per forty copies. No further discount can be made on either of the above works.

DOBNEY ON FUTURE PUNISHMENT, bound, *seventy five* cts.; in paper covers, *fifty*.

SIX SERMONS, 12mo., 120 pages, bound, *twenty five* cts.; in paper covers, *fifteen*.

CHRISTIAN PSALMODY, bound in plain morocco, *twenty-five* cts.

On the three last named works *one-third* discount will be made to those who buy to sell again: and we will make a still further discount of *twenty per cent.* to those who send us twenty dollars, current money, at one time. This offer is designed to enable those who may wish it, to keep a depository of these works, and to cover their expense for transportation. The names of such we will place in the list of depositories, in the Examiner.

☞We cannot make the "twenty per cent" discount unless our terms are *strictly* complied with; as we are subjected to an additional charge to our printer if we have credit for his work; and a less sum than $20 would not help us much in obtaining discount with him.