BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. IV. PHILADELPHIA, NOVEMBER, 1849. No. 11.

GEORGE STORRS, Editor and Publisher.

Published Monthly, at 18 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.

FUTURE STATES.

By Rev. Reginald Courtney, A. M.

(Continued from page 162.)

ON THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

St. Paul's declaration that "we are come to the New Jerusalem, to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born, and to the *spirits of just men made perfect*," has sometimes been held to indicate an intermediate consciousness. Thus Dr. Watts argues in his "World to Come." "The Gospel or the Christian state brings good men into a nearer union and communion with the heavenly world and the inhabitants thereof, than the Jewish state could do. The inhabitants of this upper world, this heavenly Jerusalem, are here reckoned up: God as the prime Lord or Head; Jesus the Mediator as the King of his Church; the innumerable company of angels as ministers of his kingdom; the general assembly of God's favorites or children, who are called the first-born;—which may perhaps refer in general to all the saints of all ages past, and to come, whose names are written in the Book of Life in heaven; and particularly to the spirits of just men who are departed from this world, and are made perfect in the heavenly state. * * * * It has been objected," continues Dr. Watts, "that the spirits of the just are *not yet* made perfect in heaven, because the apostle says, 'These all,' i. e. the saints of the Old Testament, 'having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promises; God having provided some better things for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.' Now these had been dead for many generations, yet they received not the promises, nor were made perfect. Thus saith the objection. But the evident meaning is, that they lived and died in the faith of many promises, some of which were to be fulfilled, after their days, here on earth, but were not fulfilled *in their lifetime*: they did not enjoy Gospel blessings in that perfect manner in which we do since the Messiah has come, and, by offering himself, 'perfected for ever them that are satisfied.'"

In the sense which Dr. Watts has here given to the word, just men now on earth are as truly "perfected" as those spirits which he imagines to be so in an intermediate state. When it is said that they who are sanctified are "perfected," it is plainly meant that (though they are still required to go on unto a further "perfection,") yet in as far as their redemption depends on, or rather *consists in*, the shedding of the blood of Christ, it is a work perfectly accomplished. But in general they are said to be "perfected," who have received their "perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in God's eternal and everlasting glory," who have obtained *all* that God has promised to bestow. In this sense, as the context proves, the spirits of the just will be found to be perfected, when we, who are now emulating them on earth, are admitted, at the Last Day, into their joyful society. For the *promises*, which they are not to receive without us, are as yet future; are *not* to be realised, as Dr. Watts maintains, either on earth, by those who live under the gospel dispensation, or by disembodied spirits in the intermediate state; but by the saints of the old, not without those of the new dispensation, in heaven itself, after the Great Judgement-day. For St. Paul is plainly referring to that *rest*, (in the heavenly Canaan, the New Jerusalem,) which yet "*remaineth for* the people of God;" a rest, promised to the Jews, but to them in common with the whole Christian community of believing children of Abraham. In this view he says, shortly after, "Ye have need of patience, that after ye have done the will of God, ye might receive the *promise*. For yet a little while, and *he that shall come will come*, and will not tarry." We then who are now living by faith, under the Gospel dispensation, have not received the promises, nor are as yet made perfect, nor shall be perfected until Christ comes.

It is indeed *abundantly* plain that the "promises" spoken of in the epistle to the Hebrews are all to be realized at the resurrection. The thing promised is "a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." And this city does *not* mean, as Dr. Watts supposes, that Christian Church, or that Gospel dispensation, which was established by the Messiah at his first advent. For they who died in faith, not having received the promises, sought (not merely spiritual privileges such as might be enjoyed in common by just men made perfect in earth, with just men made perfect in heaven, but) emphatically, a "*heavenly* country." Their hope was "to obtain a happy *resurrection*:" to enter and enjoy "a kingdom which cannot be moved" *after* the removal of the present heavens and earth. Here they had not, nor have we, any continuing city; but we are still to seek, even as they sought, one which is "*to come*."

In the same view said St. Paul, I sacrifice all things, "if by any means I might attain unto *the resurrection of the dead*. Not as though I had already attained, either were already *perfected*." But he pressed forward, that he might obtain the prize, even that crown of righteousness which the Last day should bring him.

We are come to the spirits of the just made perfect, and to the other concomitant blessings, in this

sense—that we are invited now to realise faith by and hope, as far as we may, the blessedness to be experienced in the future world. Even now we are to act as if in the visible presence of our Judge, and of the myriads of attendant angels; as if the heavenly Jerusalem had already come down from God; as if in the society of all those blessed spirits who shall by regeneration receive their perfect consummation and bliss. In the same sense also are we come to Jesus the Mediator, and to the blood of sprinkling. The benefits of his mediation and atonement are as yet received by us only in part, as far as we may receive them by faith and hope; for we have not yet obtained our promised joint inheritance; our "crown of *righteousness*" is as yet laid up; our "kingdom that cannot be moved" still awaits the promised shaking of the earth.

It is remarkable that St. Paul mentions both the church of the first-born, and the spirits of the just made perfect. He appears to be viewing the same persons under two conditions, first, as members of the invisible church *on earth** in all ages; and secondly, as perfected in heaven. To the former we are already come in part; our communion with the latter is reserved for another world.

"To this end," says St. Paul, "Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living." Hence Calvin argues, that the dead must be in a state of consciousness; —"for he cannot be Lord except of those who are in being." But God is not the God of the dead; and St. Paul's words point rather to the resurrection. Christ is Lord of the dead, just as He is Lord of Death. He has the keys of Hades and Death, but has *not yet* unlocked their dark gates, nor disenthralled the souls in bondage to their power. "All power is given unto Him in heaven and earth;" but He has not yet "taken unto Himself His great power and reigned." We must not judge our brethren, says the apostle; seeing that we are to live and die unto the Lord alone, before whose judgment seat both quick and dead shall stand.

"A testimony against them [who hold the sleep of the soul] is borne," says Calvin, "in heaven, before God and His angels, by the souls of the martyrs, who with a loud voice cry from under the altar, 'How long, O Lord, dost Thou not avenge our blood on the inhabitants of the earth. And white robes were given unto them; and it was said unto them that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow-servants also and their brethren that should be killed as they were, were fulfilled.' What, O slumbering spirits, are white robes to you? Are they cushions on which you may repose in sleep? The white robes suit not sleep. They must needs be awake who are clothed thus. Doubtless the white robes signify the commencement of that glory which Divine Goodness confers on the martyrs, while they await the judgment-day."

Probably Calvin is perfectly right in this. And these martyrs are the same with "those that came out of great tribulation, and had washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb; and the same as "the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus and for the word of God; * * who sat on thrones, and had judgment given unto them, and lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." And Calvin is probably correct also in his opinion, that St. John "sets forth a twofold resurrection; one of the soul, before judgment, the other when the body is raised." For it is expressly said that "*the souls* of them which were beheaded, etc, *lived* and reigned with Christ;" and that "the *rest of the dead*" (*souls* surely?) "*lived not* until the thousand years were finished." And what is a resurrection of the soul before judgment, or a soul's living with Christ while the rest of the dead *live not*, but a restoration to life and consciousness?

Some have maintained that "the first resurrection" is corporeal: but even admitting this, it cannot be admitted, that when souls are said to live, it is meant that *bodies only* are restored to life, and that the souls were alive before: and also that, when it is said, "the rest of the dead lived not," *corpses only* are intended. But in order to obtain from the above passages a proof of intermediate consciousness, continuing from the time of death, we must further believe that the first resurrection includes *all* the dead, who die in the Lord: whereas the Scripture speaks of martyrs alone.* *They* will live, i. e. their souls will live for a thousand years before the rest of the dead are restored to life: but there is no ground for supposing that the souls and *bodies* of *all* the redeemed will enjoy a millennial reign; supervening upon an indefinite period of hopeful consciousness. It is appointed unto men once to die, and after this *the judgment*; —not two protracted states of intermediate life. The martyrs indeed shall be in a state to cry unto God, and receive white robes, *for a little season before* that judgment on their persecuters; on which, as it appears, the millenial reign of Christ shall ensue. But we need not expand this little season even in their case, much less that of others, into untold thousands of years.

Strange it is, seeing that death and judgment are in Scripture brought so near each other, that there are many who have familiarized their minds to the belief that two states must be passed through, and each of great length, before the deceased Christian encounters the final judgment seat, to "receive the things done in the body, whether they be good or bad." Many expect to be in great bliss and glory, emancipated from the bondage of the flesh, and with Christ, immediately on their departure from this world; and hope to exchange this wholly spiritual state for a Millennial reign with Christ upon the present earth, before the second resurrection. And this their millennial state, in which the body is, as they suppose, re-united to the soul, is of course expected to confer on them an addition of happiness and glory. But let them consider well, what *further* bliss they reserve, in their imaginations, for their fourth state, after the judgment, when heaven and earth have passed away. In truth, they practically reserve none: but appropriate to themselves, in their second or third state, every particular form of blessing which God has

* Else why does St. Paul say that their names are enrolled in,—or, as it were, *booked-for*—heaven?

* It has been observed that to those that were slain for the witness of Jesus are added those "which had not worshipped the Beast:" or *as many as (ὀίτινες)* had not worshipped. But these also are martyrs; for "as many as would not worship the image of the Beast were killed." Rev. xiii. 15.

promised to confer *at, and not before* that time when the "blessed of the Father," having been finally judged, "inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world." Nay, in too many instances, they actually apply to their supposed third state all the magnificent language in which the closing chapters of the Apocalypse describe the *new post*-millennial heavens and earth! * * * * * * *

There yet remains one important passage, which is commonly held to convey the most direct proof, not of consciousness merely, but of peculiar happiness and glory, during the intermediate state. To the believing robber on the cross, who prayed, "Lord, remember me when thou comest in thy kingdom," our Saviour replied, "*To-day* thou shalt be with me in Paradise." Beyond dispute, the reward promised was *not* one that might be conferred at the general resurrection; for thus Jesus would merely be remembering the suppliant "when he came in his kingdom;" though in what it actually consisted is less evident. But be it what it may, nothing can be more presumptuous and unwarrantable, than to expect the same reward, or even any reward like it, for all believers in Christ. As well,—nay, *less* presumptuously—might we expect that all who "walked with God" should be translated with Enoch and Elijah, and never see death. For as far as we can judge, the faith of the penitent robber exceeding theirs; as it exceeded that of the apostles, and probably of *every* follower of our Lord. When the enemies of Jesus, to all appearance, prevailed, when he submitted to stripes, insults, and finally the most ignominious death, the triumph of the unbelievers was complete; and the last hopes of his followers seem to have faded away. One of them had betrayed him, another repeatedly denied him; the rest forsook him and fled. His enemies exulted in the proof which, to their minds, his degrading death afforded, that he could not be the anointed of God; saying, If thou be the Son of God, come down from the cross and we will believe: that he should save himself was the only way they could imagine of his making good his pretensions. And accordingly one of his fellow sufferers reviled him in the same terms, "If thou be the Son of God, save thyself and us." Then it was that the other malefactor not only rebuked his companion, and bore testimony to the innocence of Jesus, but acknowledged him as a triumphant sovereign about to enter upon his kingdom. * * His faith stood a trial before which that of all the other disciples was shaken. Having once, on good and sufficient grounds believed on Jesus as the Christ, he remained unshaken in his trust, even at the moment when the enemies of the crucified King were filled with triumph, and his disciples with doubt or despair. * * Whether any of us does actually possess faith equal with this man can be known only to the All-wise God. But we may be sure that none of us can *display* equal faith with his, because the circumstances are such as can never occur again. To those therefore, who do not claim for all Christians a faith equal to that of the penitent robber, it must be a matter of comparatively small moment to attempt to determine what is meant, by being with Christ in Paradise.

In all probability however the Paradise intended is *the same as is mentioned elsewhere* in the New Testament. "To him that overcometh," our Lord declared by St. John, "I will give to eat of the tree of life, that groweth in the midst of the Paradise of God." This is evidently a promise of a reward after the general resurrection, when the redeemed shall be permitted to eat of the precious fruit mentioned in the last chapter of the Apocalypse.

The same place of bliss was beheld in vision by St. Paul, whowas "caught up into Paradise," and there heard unutterable words. Into the same place the believing robber was probably admitted as soon as Jesus himself entered it. But notwithstanding the weight due to the expression "to-day," it may be questioned whether our Lord entered Paradise before his ascension, or at the earliest, before his resurrection. For was he in the place to which St. Paul was "caught up,"—in a region belonging to those new heavens which are eventually to "*come down* from God,"—at the very time of his descent into Hades? Was he,—was his human soul,—at once above earth and below it, of whom St. Paul says that he who ascended "*first* descended into the lower parts of the earth?" This seems improbable; and therefore, if a strict interpretation of the expression "to-day" be contended for, there is no alternative but to place Paradise below, in that *Hades*, into which our Lord's human soul most certainly descended. But this alternative would probably be found no less inconvenient: for it is hard to believe that our Lord's human soul was in Paradise *both* when he was in Hades, and also when he left it; or to place it in the Hades which shall eventually be "cast in the lake of fire." Paradise is *probably above*, and was entered by our Lord at his ascension. The question is certainly obscure; but whatever may be understood by Paradise, it can never be shown, that Christians in general have a better claim to be admitted to the privileges of the robber, than they have to be translated or transfigured with Enoch, Elijah, and Moses.

Questions may perhaps be raised,—whether the condition of souls in Hades was not *changed for the better* by the first advent of Christ? or whether the partial victory over death, obtained through His death and resurrection, *operated before the event*, so as to render the conquest of death, over the souls of those who died before our Lord's coming, less complete than it would otherwise have been? Both inquiries are important in reference to the question of an intermediate consciousness. If such consciousness be, as has been maintained above, altogether anticipatory of resurrection, not necessarily or naturally consequent on death, they who died before Christ's coming must have been unconscious, (at least *until* His coming,) unless His resurrection operated by way of anticipation. And that it did so operate is more than can be proved from Scripture. To Adam was given the promise "Thy seed *shall* bruise the serpent's head." The victory was ordained, but not accomplished; the Old Serpent Satan did not immediately feel his deadly wound. The liberation of the souls which were to pass into Hades was also ordained; but it does not follow that the power of the grave was then impaired, and "the gates of hell" shaken, and that the fetters forged by Death for souls yet unborn were then wrested from his hands.

And if Christ's resurrection did not operate *before* the event, neither did it immediately after-

wards.* "The whole creation," says St. Paul, "groaneth and travaileth in pain together *until now*:" that is, "up to this present time," long after the ascension of the Lord. It groaneth thus, every creature groaneth, waiting for the "manifestation of the sons of God," at the resurrection. "As in Adam all die, even so in Christ *shall* all be made alive. Christ the first fruits, afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming." Certainly this passage is unfavorable to the belief, that the death originally introduced through Adam is in *any wise* removed, through Christ, excepting at his second coming, at which the "dead men shall live."

Again: it deserves to be considered, that since our blessed Lord himself, as has been argued above, "tasted death for every man, and through death overcame him that had the power of death," he must, as it appears, from the very nature of the case, have partaken of the full unmitigated penalty of death;—tasted of death, such as, but for His coming, it *would have been* to the soul of every child of Adam. If this be so, it follows that death is, to the soul of every Christian, what it would have been, but for Christ, to the souls of all men; unless we prefer to believe that the faithful followers of our Lord have, as we are nowhere informed, a *better* passage through the dark valley than their Lord himself!

But rejecting this supposition, we must needs conclude that death is now both such as it ever has been, and such as (allowing the supposition) it would have been, but for the Advent of Christ: not being changed *as yet*, in any degree, either in its nature or power, by his first coming, either at the time of his resurrection, or before that event: but still reigning over every deceased soul, forbidding it,—since the God in whom we live and move, and have our being, is not the God of the dead,—to live, to move, or to be.

* Except perhaps in the case of the comparatively few "saints which slept," who arose and came out of their graves after Christ's resurrection, manifesting *thus*, (and not by any mere change in their disembodied souls,) His power who now *hold* the keys of Hades: and who, as there is reason to *conjecture*, never returned to the tomb.

BAPTISM.

The following communication was received too late, last year, to be inserted in the December number, where we thought best to terminate a discussion which we had reason to think our readers did not care to have continued. Br. Magruder, however, thought it due to him that we should publish his "*final*" reply to Br. Grew. We have concluded to let them both speak once more, which will be considered the end of that controversy in our columns, for the present. All will understand, that these brethren are equally strong in the belief of *immersion* being essential to baptism: they differ only as to its necessity to salvation.

ESSENTIALITY OF BAPTISM DEFENDED.

REPLY TO MR. GREW. No. II.

In the hope that the reader will keep in view *the question in debate* between myself and Mr. Grew, I proceed to offer some reply to his "Response" (in the October number of the Examiner) to my first article.

It is not advisable to expend time and space in combating minor arguments, and seeking small advantages, in such a discussion as this. If *triumph*, instead of *truth*, were the object of our pursuit, such acts might subserve the purpose, but as I hope and believe the discovery of *truth*—that "pearl of great price"—and the vindication of God's ways to man, to be the great object of both, I shall not be tempted to turn aside from the plain and direct path before me. What, then, is the simple issue before us?

I maintain that the baptism or immersion of a believing and penitent subject, *is one* of the conditions of salvation from sins—pardon—regeneration—remission of sins—adoption as a child of God, &c. This Mr. Grew *denies*. Holding the affirmative, of course, the burden of proof devolves on me, and I accept the task, and appeal to the only infallible standard—the word of God—either directly expressed, or clearly implied. Here there can be no mistake. What, then, saith the Scripture? "How readest thou?" I cite the following passages from the sacred record, reserving comment for the present.

1. Mark xvi. 16. "Preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth *and* is baptized *shall be saved.*"

2. John iii. 5. "*Except* a man be *born of water* and of the spirit, he *cannot* enter into the kingdom of God."

3. Acts ii. 38. "Repent *and be baptized*, every one of you, in the name of the Lord Jesus, *for the remission of sins.*"

4. Acts xi. 13, 14, in connection with Acts x. 43, 47, 48. The angel said to Cornelius, *Peter* "shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house *shall be saved.*" And Peter said, in fulfilment of this promise, the "words"—"to him give all the prophets witness that, *through his name*, whosoever believeth on him shall receive *remission of sins;*" adding, (when he witnessed the descent of the Holy Spirit on these *Gentiles*) "Can any man forbid *water* that these should not be *baptized?*" . . . . . and commanding "them *to be baptized* in the *name of the Lord;*" by all which "words" or commands (baptism included) he and "*all his house*" were *saved*, as promised in the 14th verse of the 11th chapter.

5. 1 Cor. xv. 2, in connection with Acts xviii. 8. "The gospel I preached unto you—by which also ye are *saved*," &c. Read 1 Cor. xv. with Acts xviii. 8: "Many of the Corinthians *hearing* believed *and were baptized.*" Thus, they were "*saved*" by belief *and* baptism.

6. Acts xxii. 16. Ananias to Saul. "And now, why tarriest thou? Arise *and be baptized*, and *wash away thy sins*, calling on the name of the Lord."

So far the testimony of the "Gospels" and "Acts," the historical records of the sayings and acts of our Lord and his apostles in the progress of their proclamation of the gospel "for the *obedience* of faith among all nations." I shall now cite the testimony derived from another part of the same record, addressed to persons differently situated, viz: that contained in the "Epistles," which, we know, were letters addressed to those who were *already* Christians. I shall show, from this authority, that these were addressed as those who *had been* baptized, and were thus recognized as "*saved*," "*washed*," "*regenerated*," "renewed," become "the children of God," &c., with direct, plain, and undeniable citations and allusions to *baptism* as *one* of the means *by which* they had changed their state before God. "To the law and to the testimony" again!

1. Rom. vi. 2—5. "How shall we (Christians) that are *dead to sin*, live any longer therein? Know ye not that so many of us as *were* baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him *by baptism* into death, that like as *Christ* was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so, *we* also should walk *in newness of life;*" i. e: *after* baptism the "*newness of life*" begins, and *not before.*

2. 1 Cor. vi. 10, 11. "The unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God—nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, &c. &c. And such *were* some of you: but ye are *washed*, but ye are sanctified, but ye are *justified* in the name of the Lord Jesus," &c. Now these *very Corinthians*, we have seen, were "*saved*" by belief and *baptism*, according to 1 Cor. xv. 1, 2, and Acts xviii. 8.

3. Gal. iii. 27. "As many of you as have been *baptized* into Christ, have *put on* Christ." How, then, of those who have *not* been baptized into Christ? Have *they* "put *on*" Christ? Mr. Grew will hardly say so, I think. If not, *then* baptism *is* an *essential condition* of putting *on* Christ.

4. Ephesians v. 25, 26. "Husbands love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the *washing of water* by the word." A plain allusion to baptism as a means of sanctification.

5. Coloss. ii. 12. "Buried with him in *baptism*, WHEREIN also ye are *risen* with him;" to that "*newness of life*" spoken of, under the same figure, in Rom. vi.

6. Titus iii. 5. "According to his mercy he SAVED US,"—(*How?* I ask;)—"by THE WASHING OF REGENERATION and the renewing of the Holy Ghost," &c.

Is not the "*washing of regeneration*" baptism? If *not*, *what* is it? Will Mr. Grew accept the learned Dr. McKnight's rendering—"According to his *own* mercy, through the *bath* of regeneration" (adding in a note, i. e: "THROUGH BAPTISM!") "he *saved* us," &c.

7. Hebrews x. 22, 23. "Let us draw nigh with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies *washed* with pure water." Is not here an allusion to that preparation—*baptism* being a *part* of the process—which is essential to acceptable worship, "in the full assurance of faith?"

8. 1 Peter iii. 18—22. "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit: by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were *saved by water*. The like figure whereunto *even baptism doth also now save us* (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

I pause here, and I submit it to Mr. Grew and the candor of the reader, if this testimony from Holy Writ does not establish the position, beyond doubt or question, that *baptism is essential to salvation?* Peter declares above, that Noah was "*saved by water*,"—and immediately adds, so, too, *baptism*, of which the flood was the type, "doth *also* now *save us.*" Yet Mr. Grew insists it does *not* save us. That we are saved without it. Well, I only reply again, Mr. Grew and Peter are directly *at issue*, and it is vain to escape this dilemma by his reply, "the question is, is Mr. Magruder's *construction* of the passage correct?" for it is not a question of construction. I offer *no* construction. I cite Peter's plain and positive declaration, "*baptism* DOTH *also now save us;*" and it is *that* Mr. Grew combats and denies. I hope he will candidly acknowledge the error, and not impeach the apostle's veracity. In any other than an unkind spirit, I beg my respected and intelligent correspondent to remember the solemn injunction in Romans iii. 4.

It would require more space than the "Examiner" can spare, to present a commentary on the several passages of scripture which have been cited above. I regret that the time fails me to show how they *all*, when fairly and intelligently construed, harmonize, and sustain the general conclusion.

In religions, as well as in all other controversy, extremes are apt to beget each other. Thus has it been with baptism. The Roman Catholics, the earliest apostates and corrupters of the truth—by administering the rite to infants and idiots—by the absurd practice of *clinical* baptism, and similar mummeries, drove the Reformers to the opposite error of undervaluing the ordinance, and denying its essential efficacy, even when properly administered to a fit subject; so that while the Romanist yet upholds its necessity, and even superstitiously magnifies its virtue, the Protestant, concluding the *very* opposite must be right, argues that it is wholly unimportant, and therefore either neglects it altogether, like the Quaker, or contents himself with the Paido-baptist *apology* of SPRINKLING, whilst the *Baptist* sectary, afraid of his orthodoxy, invents a *compromise*, by holding it important *enough* to be made a test of fellowship at the Lord's table, but not so essential as to interpose a barrier to fraternal relations in any other respects. This last, with strange inconsistency, rejects those whom the Lord has received; for if *Christians*, though unbaptized, and on that account denied his fellowship, is it not clear that, in his zeal for his sectarian badge, he has been driven to the *exclusion* of those who (being *in Christ*, as he allows,) have been recognized and adopted by the Master! Such are the consequences of a blind adherence to sectarian tenets, rather than the "word of the truth of the gospel."

Mr. Grew will pardon me, I trust, for presuming to say, in conclusion, that I think I discern the source of his error in regard to the subject in debate. It is of easy discovery, and belongs to all that class of disputants whose minds have reached a foregone conclusion, and, instead of following out the testimony to its legitimate results, look around for authority to support an opinion already embraced. He argues that baptism cannot be essential, because salvation is so often associated with *faith* as its instrumental cause. This is granted. But it is not thence to be inferred that baptism is *excluded*, any more than repentance,

holiness, the love of God, the blood of Christ, good works, &c. The truth is, that *all* these *together*, and no one or two *alone*, are so many *means* to an *end*. In the scriptures, we are said to be saved by faith, by grace, by hope, by baptism, by works, by the blood of Christ, by holiness, by the word, by the spirit, &c. Now, while Mr. Grew would exclude some of these—baptism, for example—I would insist on *all* as essential to the grand consummation. What *God* has joined together, *I* would not put asunder. To quote passages to show that salvation is by faith, and thus argue that baptism was a non-essential, would be as wise and pertinent as to cite authority from a work on architecture to prove that a foundation was a necessary part of a house, and therefore the walls and the roof were *non-essentials*.

A. B. Magruder.

H. Grew's Reply.

By reference to my former articles, my friend will find my arguments to disprove his construction of some of the texts he has adduced in the present communication. I shall not repeat all these arguments. I submit it to his intelligent consideration, whether or not, as "an ally" to Dr. Thomas, he ought to show, if he can, the fallacy of my arguments, instead of re-quoting the texts and repeating the objectionable constructions. Other passages, however, are now quoted, which demand our impartial consideration. Far be it, that any of us should seek "triumph instead of truth." I desire to bring every theological opinion to the test of that word which abideth for ever: even the opinion, which consigns thousands of the holiest and most devoted servants of the Lord Jesus, since the days of the apostles, to the lake which burneth with brimstone and with fire, which is the second death! We must not shrink from the scriptural investigation of a tenet, although it clearly implies that such men as Martin Luther, Philip Melancthon, John Knox, George Whitefield, Philip Doddridge, and a host of holy men, who have willingly gone to the stake for the truth of the Lord Jesus, because they did not understand their duty to be immersed in water, will be "punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power!!"

Mark 16: 16, and John 3: 5, I have already considered.

Before commenting on other passages, I beg leave to call attention to a scriptural fact which may aid us in coming to the knowledge of the truth on the question at issue. We find two classes of passages in the holy volume. One class teaching us all Christian duties, and another teaching us what will certainly exclude us from the kingdom of God. These must not be confounded. Our Lord makes this distinction, Mark 16: 16, between faith and baptism. Many true Christians "suffer loss" by their prejudices against, and misapprehension of, some truths; yet they shall be saved. A man suffers inconveniences and delay, by not choosing the very best road to the place of his destination. This, however, is no proof that he will never arrive there.

Acts 2: 38 connects repentance and baptism with "the remission of sins." In the case of Paul, washing away of sin (in some sense) was connected with baptism. Col. 2: 12, rising with Christ is connected with it. Peter, 1 Epis 3: 21, connects it with salvation. Are we not, by other passages relative to the subject, to ascertain *in what sense* baptism is to be understood in these texts? Now it is a remarkable fact, that in every one, baptism is connected with something else, without which it would be worthless? In one it is connected with faith, in another with repentance, in another with "calling on the Name of the Lord," and in another, with "the faith of the operation of God." Yea, in the *only* passage which declares that the *figure* of baptism *saves* us, the inspired apostle precludes the idea of this "*figure*" saving us, in any other sense than *figuratively*, by saying, "*not the putting away the filth of the flesh*, but the answer of a good conscience towards God." Were Simon Magus, Ananias and Saphira, Demas, &c., saved by immersion in water, in any other sense than *figuratively* or *professedly*? I ask my opponents whether a "figure" (1 Peter 3: 21) saves *really* or *figuratively*? Mr. Magruder's comments and inferences on this passage are as unworthy of his good sense as of his christian charity. He remarks, "Mr. Grew and Peter are directly at issue." What does Mr. Grew say? I say that baptism is a figure of our salvation, and that it does not really save us, nor is it absolutely essential to real and eternal salvation. What does Peter say? He says that baptism is a "*figure*," and saves us, but that it is "not the putting away the filth of the flesh (i. e. by water) which saves us, but the answer of a good conscience towards God." My friend objects to my question, "Is Mr. Magruder's construction of the passage correct?" adding, "I offer no construction." Is it no "construction," to say that the passage imports the essentiality of immersion to eternal salvation? Does Peter say this, or any thing which necessarily implies it? Let every candid reader judge. Mr. M. further remarks, "I cite Peter's plain and positive declaration, "*baptism* BOTH *also now save us*." "and it is *that* Mr. Grew combats and denies." Mr. G. does *not* deny this. I admit it *in the sense which Peter explains it in the entire passage*. Mr. M.'s citation is partial. Why did he not fairly quote the whole of it? I deny my friend's inference that the passage implies that no man can be saved without immersion in water. *For this* he is pleased to represent that I "impeach the apostle's veracity!" Suppose that I misapprehend the apostle, in understanding him that the "figure" of baptism saves us only *figuratively*; is this *impeaching his veracity*? I ask, with christian meekness, that Mr. M. would consider the fact, that, on a *mutilated* passage, *withholding that part which supports my view*, he bases, not only the above serious charge, but implicitly (by referring me to Rom. 3: 4) the more awful one, of being a *liar* against God! "Judge not that ye be not judged," &c.

Acts 2: 38. The plain and numerous promises of pardon to penitent believers in the scriptures refute my opponents' construction of this passage. I have examined their reply to this declaration, and endeavored to show the fallacy of it. It remains for them to prove that I have not done so.

Acts 11: 13, 14, in connection with 10: 43, 47, 48. Peter "shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house *shall be saved*." What words? "To Him (i. e. Jesus Christ) give all the prophets witness that through his Name, *whosoever believeth on him shall receive remission of sins*." Thus do "all the prophets witness" against my opponents, who teach that there are thousands who believe on the Savior, who *never* "receive remission of sins." The apostle indeed "commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." May we justly infer from this that no man can be saved without baptism? What are the premises from which this inference must fairly flow? That the knowledge of, and obedience to, ALL the commandments of the Lord is essential to salvation. This is a false principle, for it is in manifest contradiction to scriptural precept and to scriptural fact. It is opposed to the imperative requisition to receive the "weak" (or ignorant) who are "in the faith" of the Lord Jesus. Rom. 14: 1, 3. It is opposed to the fact of the believer being recognized as a christian by the apostle who, like modern trinitarians, had not a correct knowledge of the divine unity, (1 Cor. 8 chap.) a subject of much more importance than a correct knowledge of the figurative ordinance of immersion. The argument proves too much, and, consequently, proves nothing. You may as well quote Acts 2: 42, to prove that the christian, who conscientiously declines the literal breaking of bread in commemoration of the death of Jesus Christ, understanding it (erroneously) merely in a spiritual sense, cannot be saved. On the same principle we must make the correct knowledge and practice of all things pertaining to the order of the christian church essential to salvation.

1 Cor. 15: 20, in connection with Acts 18: 8, proves that we are saved by the truth of the Gospel. The declaration that the Corinthians "hearing, believed and were baptized," certainly does not necessarily imply that baptism is essential to salvation. Indeed if the declaration was, that they were *saved* by hearing, believing and being baptized, it would no more necessarily imply that they could not be saved without baptism, than the declaration that A. was saved from drowning by B. C. and D. necessarily implies that he could not have been saved without D.

Acts 22: 16, must be understood figuratively. The sins of Simon Magus were not really washed away by baptism. To have our sins cancelled or washed away and to be justified, are synonymous expressions. We are justified by faith, which *precedes* baptism.

Rom. 6: 2—5. It is preposterous to understand this passage otherwise than figuratively. The allusion is indeed to our literal baptism, but were we literally "baptized into his (Christ's) *death*?" Our immersion in water is figurative of our holy change, we die to sin and rise to "newness of life." So far from the figurative ordinance being essential to this holy "newness of life," it is an undeniable fact that among *real* christians, we find some unimmersed more holy in their habitual walk than some of the immersed.

1 Cor. 6: 10, 11. Here are the persons enumerated who shall not inherit the kingdom of God. Alas! for our opponents, the *unbaptized* are not among them. It is well for the penitent believing thief and many others of the godly. It is for Mr. M. to inform us the reason of this important omission from this and every similar passage in the oracles of truth.

Gal. 3: 27. The question, "Have they (who

have not been baptized) put on Christ?" I not only answer in the affirmative, but affirm that some of this class do so, *more* than some real christians who are immersed. They are indeed in fault, neglecting, through ignorance, to put on Christ in the ordinance of immersion. I ask my friend if he will deny, that those put on Christ, who "put off the old man" and "put on the new;" who "put on, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering, forbearing one another and forgiving one another?" I pray that he may put on Christ by forbearing his weak brother.

Eph. 5: 25, 26. I admit that baptism is, to believers, "a means of sanctification." This, however, is no proof that all other means, *without this*, are inadequate to that sanctification which is essential to salvation.

Col. 2: 12, I have answered.

Titus 3: 5. I have no objection to McKnight's rendering, "The bath of regeneration." I admit the allusion to be to immersion. But I ask, was their immersion *real* "regeneration," or was it a figure or profession of their previous renewal? Was Demas really regenerated by baptism? No man is qualified for baptism who is not previously regenerated.

Heb. 10: 22, 23, admits of a similar answer. Baptism is an important part of that worship which is "acceptable" to God; but this is not proof that it is so important that no worship can be acceptable without it.

1 Peter 3: 18—22, is answered.

You think that the Romanist "superstitiously magnifies (the) virtue" of baptism. Surely he may say, "Physician heal thyself."

I cordially unite with you in your charge of inconsistency against those baptists who make immersion "a test of fellowship at the Lord's table," but not "to fraternal relations in any other respect."

In my remarks on the term "born of water," B. Ex., Vol. III., page 116, you will find a reply to some of your closing remarks. You should have proved the fallacy of this reply, if you can. "I would insist" on obedience to *all* the holy principles, and also to *all* the ordinances of the Gospel, as *essential to the perfect christian*. Blessed be God, he does not reject, or allow his children to reject, the "weak in the faith," because they are not thus perfect. You say, "what God has joined together, *I* would not put asunder." To this my inmost mind responds. The question is, Has God joined together, faith in his Son, &c., and baptism, *not only as duties*, but as duties *essential to salvation*? What is the fact? What has *Jesus Christ* done in relation to this matter? In the great Commission, when he sent forth his disciples for the salvation of a lost world, he *joined* faith and baptism *as duties*, and *separated* them *as essential to salvation*, resting final and eternal condemnation on unbelief *only*. Mark 16: 16. You therefore, I think, *join what Christ has separated*, which is no less objectionable than to put asunder what he has joined.

I hold that God's promise of salvation to the believer in Jesus excludes every thing, *as essential to salvation*, but what is essential to faith in his Son. If not, his promise fails. Faith and love, i. e. obedience to all his known commands, are inseparably connected. Baptism is not so con-

nected. This is an important truth, overlooked in your argumentation. The pertinency of your final illustration depends altogether on the question, whether or not baptism is as essential to salvation, as the walls and roof of the house are to the existence of the house? "To quote passages" which show that baptism is a duty and essential to *a perfect christian*, and argue that without it no man can be saved, "would be as wise and pertinent, as to cite authority from a work on architecture, to prove that" a variety of things are necessary to a *perfect* house, and then conclude that if one of these is lacking, it is *no house at all*.

In the commencement of his article, my friend expresses his "hope," that "the discovery of truth" is "the object of both." I regret to perceive that, in the close, his charity takes wings. He sits in judgment on my motives, and traces my supposed error to a disposition "to support an opinion already embraced," instead of "following out the testimony to its legitimate results." I pray the Lord to grant us both a single eye to his holy truth.

HENRY GREW.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, NOVEMBER, 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.—Our absence has prevented the appearance of the Examiner sooner this month; and now we have not half funds enough to pay the printer. Still we will redeem *our* pledge to issue the November and December numbers to complete this volume, trusting that the expense *will* be met. So far as we have conversed with the readers of the Examiner, there has been but one expression in regard to its continuance, and their willingness to pay *one dollar* per year for it, just as cheerfully as they have paid fifty cents heretofore. We expect to be able to interest our readers the coming year not less than the present, but of that they will be able to judge as we proceed. The greatly increasing interest on the immortality question in England will furnish us, we expect, with much matter of instruction.

Terms of the Examiner, for 1850, *one dollar*. For $5 six copies will be sent, and for $10 thirteen, to any address that may be ordered.

All communications and remittances designed for the Examiner, should be addressed, "GEORGE STORRS, Philadelphia, Pa."

LATE VISIT NORTH.—Since the last Examiner was issued we have visited Albany and Utica, N. Y. We spent about one week in each place, and had good and attentive congregations. Albany is where we originally preached our "Six Sermons." In our visit there, now, we dwelt mainly on the prophecies. At Utica we had never preached on the question of immortality. We were residing at that place in 1837, when our attention was, for the first time, drawn to contemplate the possibility that wicked men might utterly perish, though we did not become settled in that view till 1840, some two years after we removed from there. We now felt a satisfaction in visiting that place; and the reception we met with from some of our old friends was truly comforting and refreshing. We know not when we have passed a few days with so much satisfaction. For the first time, in that city, we opened our mouth on immortality, eternal life, as no part of man's inheritance by creation or generation; but only a gift bestowed by God through Jesus Christ on those who by patient continuance in well doing SEEK FOR it. Truly, never did we realize more of the presence and blessing of God, for a few days, than in our ministrations at Utica; and we cannot but believe that the word spoken will prove a savor of life unto life to some who heard it. Two evenings, after our discourses, we gave full liberty for any who chose to question us; and about half or three-quarters of an hour was thus occupied each of those evenings, which, we trust, gave satisfaction to all, and tended much to give interest to the subject, as many questions were asked and answered.

VOLUMES OF THE EXAMINER BOUND.—We shall have the volumes for '48 and '49 bound in one immediately after the next number is issued. Those who may wish the work must send their orders soon, as it is only a limited number that we can now furnish for *both years*. The *price* will be $1.25 single copy, or five copies for $5.00.

"WHO WILL LIVE FOREVER?"—We have just received "A Reply to the Rev. John Howard Hinton's Criticism on Luke xx: 36, with an Appendix on the Signification of the terms Life and Death. By Edward White, Minister of the Church of Christ at Hereford," England. We presume we are indebted to the author, or Dr. Lees, Leeds, for the favor. Whichever it may be, he will please accept our thanks. We shall give a part if not the whole of it in future numbers of the Examiner.

We have yet much matter by the English writers on the immortality question, which has been necessarily crowded out this year, that may be expected in our next volume, and new matter is multiplying by the discussion in England.

TO THE READERS OF THE EXAMINER.—Two years ago I became associated in the editorial department of the Bible Examiner. I have now deemed it best to withdraw my connection, and, in doing so, I desire to bid a kind farewell to all its readers. It is not necessary to enumerate the reasons of my dissolving this connection; and I will therefore detain you no longer, but most devoutly pray, that "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit may ever be with you." JOHN TOMLIN WALSH.

November 1st, 1849.

DONATIONS since our last to complete this volume.

John Stetler, Philadelphia,	$1.00
Capt. Bloomer, Jersey City, N. J.,	1.00
William Mayell, Albany, N. Y.,	3.00

NOTES ON "ATHANASIA."

No. III.

Mr. Hinton maintains that "There are no texts that teach never ending existence to be the gift of Christ to his followers." "The phrase everlasting life," he says, "is unquestionably used to express the entire felicity of the redeemed; and it cannot, therefore, when so used, be understood according to a different analogy, that is, of never-ending existence." p. 123.

The question is not whether the phrase is *sometimes* used to express the entire felicity of the redeemed, but—Is that its *general* or uniform use? We maintain that it is not; and that it is not its *primary* use. And we appeal to Mr. Hinton, himself, whether that phrase could *alone*, or by itself, without other texts of Scripture, prove the *happiness* of the redeemed at all? and whether we are not dependant upon more explicit declarations as to the happiness of saints beyond this state? The saints *live* now, but they are far from being always happy. Eternal life, then, for all that phrase alone can determine, may not be always happy. To quote a solitary text, in which Paul says, "Now we *live* if ye stand fast in the faith," to prove the phrase life is sometimes used analogically to signify happiness, and then come to the conclusion that "The phrase everlasting life is unquestionably used to express the entire felicity of the redeemed," is truly a summary way of coming to the conclusion that in the multiplied times in which the phrase occurs, it does not mean "never-ending existence." But to do Mr. H. justice, we say, his language is very guarded here; yet to us it seems strangely contradictory. He says, "the phrase is used to express the entire felicity of the redeemed, and *when so used*, cannot be understood of never-ending existence:" which language implies an admission that it is *not always* "so used." Pray, then, what does it mean when not so used? for he says—"There are no texts that teach never ending existence to be the gift of Christ to his followers:" yet the phrase eternal or everlasting life is either directly or indirectly used uniformly to teach *something* that is the gift of Christ, or the gift of God *through* Christ, to his followers. Pray what is it, if not never-ending existence, when *not used* for happiness? On this point Mr. H. has left us in the dark, and we must wait for light.

We now join issue with Mr. Hinton on his assumption that "There are no texts that teach never-ending existence to be the gift of Christ to his followers." We begin with Rom. 5. Here the apostle "is unquestionably" speaking of death in the primary sense of the term. And for the sake of meeting Mr. H. fairly, we will let him have his own definition of the term. "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. Rom. 5: 12,—The apostle says—"By one man sin entered into the world, and *death* by sin; and so death passed upon all men: * * * * Death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression: * * * If by one man's offence *death* reigned by one; MUCH MORE they which *receive abundance* of grace and of the gift of righteousness [*followers of Christ*] shall *reign* IN LIFE by one, Jesus Christ: * * * *as* by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation [*to death*—"dust thou art unto dust shalt thou return:" see Gen. 3: 19, the only condemnation Paul could have referred to:] *even so* by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of LIFE; [the exact opposite of what came upon all by Adam's sin, *viz.* a resurrection from the dead;] *as* sin hath reigned unto *death*, [in the primary sense,] even *so* might grace reign through righteousness unto ETERNAL LIFE by Jesus Christ our Lord."

Here is plainly life and death contrasted. That the word death is here used in its primary sense, we presume Mr. Hinton will not call in question: life, then, must also be used in its primary sense. Let Mr. H. have its primary sense according to his liking, *viz:* "the active or living condition of organic substances;" and then it follows that the future active or living condition of the organic substances entering into the resurrection organism of the followers of Christ is a free "*gift*," bestowed "by Jesus Christ:" and that organism is said to be [eternal" to such as "*receive*" the grace of God, and the "*righteousness*," or holiness which is essential to ensure the ETERNAL *life* promised. Here then, to our mind, nothing can be plainer than that the phrase "eternal life" is used to signify "never-ending existence" in a conscious state. If this were the only text to prove this point we should think we have fairly shown that Mr. H. is mistaken in his assumption: or, at least, it forms an *exception* to the *uniform* use of the phrase in the sense of "happiness," and leaves us at full liberty to use it generally, yea, uniformly, to denote eternal conscious existence, unless it can be shown that there are exceptions, and then these particular cases will not affect the general use of the term to express "never ending existence."

Thus far we have proceeded on the ground that Mr. Hinton's definition of the primary sense of the words life and death is the correct one, and have met him on his own ground: but we dissent entirely from him in the definition of those words. Our previous articles give our reasons for doing so on the word life; and as he, after defining what is the primary sense of the term death, p. 38, says,—"Life is no doubt its opposite," we do not judge it necessary to spend labor to show what is the primary meaning of the word death. We have attempted to show, in our first article, what is the primary meaning of the word life; if we were suc-

cessful in that attempt, as he has admitted death and life are opposites, we have equally established the point that his view of the *primary* meaning of the word death is erroneous: it is not merely the disorganization of organic substances, but the cessation of *conscious* existence. This being lost by the first death, is restored to men by Christ through a resurrection, but is *eternal* only to those who have become *righteous* under whatever dispensation they may have lived. Though they have never heard of Christ, their future life, by a resurrection from the dead, comes through and by him; and whether that life shall be eternal, depends upon whether they have "feared God and worked righteousness" according to the light they had. Christ came that men "might have LIFE, and that they might have it more abundantly:" even an ETERNAL LIFE. See John 10: 10.

THE "TRUE WESLEYAN" AGAIN.

The editor of that paper, in his article which we copied into the August number of the Examiner, says:—

"If the soul is not immortal in its own nature, it must cease to exist by the operation of the laws of its being, just as the body does, and can need no destruction from the Almighty, any more than the body, to cause it to cease to exist. To argue that God can destroy the soul, as Mr. Storrs does, implies that it will not die of itself, without the direct exertion of Almighty Power to do it. The body is mortal, is a compound, an organism, and by the operation of the laws of its elemental and organic nature, must wear itself out and cease to exist, without being destroyed by the direct operation of external force, as is implied when Mr. Storrs affirms that God can destroy the soul. On the other hand, if the soul is a simple spiritual essence, immaterial, uncompounded, and indivisible, it must be immortal in itself, and must exist forever, unless actually destroyed by the Almighty Power that gave it existence."

There are several points here to which we wish to call attention. Br. Lee admits the *body* is *not* "immortal in its own nature;" and that "by the operation of the laws of its elemental and organic nature, must wear itself out and cease to exist, [be "*annihilated*? ED.] without being destroyed by the direct operation of external force," &c. Br. Lee here affirms too much. What is it but a plain declaration that the "body" "must cease to exist"—be "annihilated"—whether man had sinned or not! So Br. Lee fully gives up the natural immortality of man's body; for, the body would "die of itself, without the exertion of Almighty Power to do it," he says. According to this logic, "death" did not "enter the world *by sin*," as Paul tells us it did; for our logician plainly affirms that "the body must cease to exist [be "*annihilated*"] by the operation of the laws of its being." So it turns out that Paul was mistaken, and man's body would have died—"ceased to exist"—been "annihilated"—if sin had not entered into the world. Thus, after all, man was only *half* immortal at creation; then our opponents admit *half* we contend for; that's something gained in the argument, though we do not hold ourself responsible for the position on that point Br. Lee has assumed. But as man naturally was only *half* immortal, let us see how Br. Lee disposes of the *other half*, viz., the soul.

He says—"The soul is a simple spiritual essence, immaterial, uncompounded, and indivisible." We ask, where is the proof of this assertion? Of course it is in his *logic*, for it is not in the Bible. He says the soul is an "essence." What does he mean by "*essence*?" The essence of a thing is "the nature of a thing." Sometimes it signifies "existence." We do not know in which sense he uses the term; nor does it matter. He admits that the soul is created. If it is created, it is something that has "organism:" for the very idea of creation is *organism:* if it has organism it must be compounded; if it is compounded it is divisible, and Br. Lee's assumption falls to the ground. There is no way that we can see to avoid this conclusion but to deny that the soul is created; and we hope for the honor of Christianity he will not assume that pagan fable. We state the matter thus—If the soul is created it is an organism: if it is an organism it is compounded: if it is compounded it is divisible: if it is divisible it is not in itself immortal. And, if Br. Lee's reasoning is correct about the body, it follows that the soul will "die of itself—wear itself out and cease to exist," unless causes out of itself prevent it.

But, says Br. Lee in another part of his argument, if the soul dies with the body there can be no resurrection—it must be a new creation—it is another man. But we ask him to stop and look at his statement that the "body must cease to exist [be "annihilated"] by the laws of its being." Then at death, according to his own theory, and to use still his own phraseology, the body is "annihilated." If so, then on his theory, *its* resurrection is impossible—it must be a new creation—another body which the soul had never seen before, and for aught its own consciousness could determine might be entirely a new one; and thus his theory is as fatal to the resurrection of *the body* as he would try to make it appear ours is to the resurrection of *the man*.

But his entire blast so far as aimed at us, or our Six Sermons, to use a phrase of brother Hinton, was "discharged into a sand bank." In other words—a creature of his own imagining. Br. Lee says—"Mr. Storrs affirms that God can destroy the soul by the direct operation of external force." His reasoning against us is all based on this expression, which he says, "is implied" in our position. If he had quoted us a little further his argument might have been saved. We add—"God can, if he will, destroy, or CAUSE *to cease* to have existence the souls he has made." Now God can "cause to cease" from conscious existence any creature he has made by a direct act of power, *or* by withholding that power by which he upholds living beings. Does Br. Lee doubt this? We presume not. Our argument which he quotes, and labors to destroy the force of, had reference to only one point, *viz.* the assumed position of our opponents that "Nothing can be destroyed:" *i. e.*, "*no* power can *destroy* any thing, and especially the soul." Without stopping at first to reason out the case that every created thing would go to destruction of itself if not upheld by its Creator, we dashed at once in the face of our opposers *the power of God*. "He is ABLE to destroy both soul and body." Remember it is what our Lord "affirms," not "Mr. Storrs" only, as Br. L. insinuates. This blast, it seems, near put Br. Lee's eyes out; for to the end of his chapter, on that topic, he could

see nothing but the *power* of God *must* be used to destroy the sinner, if destroyed at all; which we did *not* "affirm." But we can excuse Br. Lee for not seeing it: the first bolt we threw from the Bible against the favorite theory he was trying to prop up, closed his eyes to all that followed.

But Br. Lee says:—

"If God should annihilate the human soul, it would require a simple withdrawal of that Almighty Power which he put forth when he created it, and which not only sustains every human soul, but the universe of both matter and mind. This mode of annihilation forms no part of the creed of destructionists; they argue their doctrine from the Scriptures, which threaten and describe the punishment of the wicked; and represent the loss of existence as a part of, and end of this punishment, and as the result of positive infliction and suffering; and hence, they rely upon the words, destroy, burned up, consumed, and other like expressions."

Without going into a labored argument, we will show the inconclusiveness of the remarks by supposing Abraham to have said concerning Sodom and Gomorrah—"If God should destroy those cities it would require a simple withdrawal of that Almighty Power which he put forth when he created them—therefore it is folly to talk of their destruction as the result of positive infliction and suffering." Because "it would require a simple withdrawal of Almighty Power" to destroy Sodom and Gomorrah, must God therefore have his hands tied so that he cannot bring about their destruction by "positive infliction and suffering?" Is this our brother's *logic*? If so, it *is not* ours. We believe as fully as he can, that "it would require" —*necessarily*—only "a simple withdrawal of Almighty Power" to affect the destruction of the sinner; neither would it have required any more to destroy Sodom, or the inhabitants of the old world; but is God shut up to this method to destroy men? or, *may* he do it with *open* marks of his abhorrence of sin by effecting the destruction of the ungodly by "positive infliction and suffering?" And if he has said he will do it in this latter way, shall our opponents say he "cannot do it?" Shall Br. Lee, or any one else, say—"God cannot annihilate [destroy] in *this way*?" But adds Br. Lee—"If God himself has made the soul immaterial, he cannot destroy it by bringing material agents to act upon it." Suppose we were to admit that, would that prove that HE who "*made*" it could not "act upon it" to *destroy* as well as to "make?" But we reply again, as in our previous remarks, to talk of *immateriality* being "*made*" is talking a palpable contradiction. Br. Lee further says—"God cannot dissolve that which is uncompounded, or divide that which is indivisible." In this we are agreed. But the soul [using the term soul in Br. Lee's sense of a distinct entity] being "made" is neither uncompounded nor indivisible.

Again he says:—

"The reader is requested to bear in mind that the question at this point, is not—would the soul fall back into non-existence, should God withdraw his creating and sustaining power? but—can the soul be burned up, or be annihilated by the exertion of power upon it?"

Thus he seems to admit that "the soul would fall back into non-existence should God withdraw his *creating* and sustaining power." *Power* then brought the soul into existence, by its "*exertion*;" but he affirms that God its Creator "by the exertion of power upon it" cannot send it back to "non-existence." Has Br. Lee learned in the schools of immortal-soulism to limit the Power of the Almighty! Or, did the dreadful text we shot in our Six Sermons—"God is *able* to destroy both soul and body"—so completely *bewilder* him that he knew not what he was doing? But we will not press him any further now, "lest he should be swallowed up with over much sorrow:" for sure we are he has made a fearful plunge towards Atheism in his attempt to save immortal-soulism, and has denied what he at first seemed to admit; for he said in the first quoted paragraph the soul "must exist forever, *unless* actually destroyed by the Almighty Power that gave it existence."

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.—NO. IV.

LUKE 21: 23 to 36 CONSIDERED.

In this portion of Scripture our Lord speaks of things future relating to the Jews—their city—the Gentiles—signs to be witnessed—his own second coming—the redemption of his people, and concludes with solemn admonitions and cautions. To these things we "do well to take heed." A large portion of what our Lord here utters in prophecy, has since become *history*. The fulfilment of so large a part makes it certain, that whatever may remain unfulfilled will assuredly come to pass. This prophecy, in the part accomplished, is demonstration of the truth and divinity of our Lord's claim to be the Messiah, and establishes the truth of revelation beyond any attempt to overthrow it; and infidelity is as powerless for evil, to a sincere inquirer after truth, as the foaming waves dashing against the rocks of Gibralter. Said the Saviour; "There shall be great distress in the land and wrath upon this people"—the Jews. Did it not happen exactly as prophesied? Will any one pretend to deny but that unparalleled distress fell upon that people? Let them read the history of the Jews, particularly from the time Jerusalem was "compassed about with armies," in A. D. 67, to the seige and fall of the fortress of Masada, A. D. 74.

Luke 21: 24, "And they shall fall by the edge of the sword, and shall be led away captive into all nations; and Jerusalem shall be trodden down by the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."

"They," the Jews, "shall fall by the edge of the sword;" that is, in war, many of them; not all. Hundreds of thousands of them did thus fall. The remainder of them were "led away captive into all nations:" thus the prophecy has had an exact fulfilment; and the Jews are a standing and perpetual monument, that Jesus, whom their nation abhorred and rejected, is in truth the Messiah of whom Moses and the Prophets spake. They bear an unwilling testimony to this great gospel declaration, that Jesus of Nazareth was approved of God, and is the anointed Saviour. But the prophecy goes on to say,—"Jerusalem shall be trodden down, [*i. e.* be made subject to, or be under the government] of the Gentiles, [*i. e.* other nations, as distinguished from the Jews,] until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled." So it has come to pass. From the days of the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans, no Jew has held power or authority there, and much of the time has not been permitted even to approach the city; or, if there at all, only in the most abject condition. "The times of the Gentiles," of course, is an *appointed* time,

indicated in some other prophecy; most likely in the book of Daniel; but of that we shall not now inquire; it is sufficient for us to know, that the time of Gentile rule over Jerusalem has its bounds beyond which it cannot pass. Our Lord next proceeds to give *signs* which were to indicate to the watchful and sincerely inquiring mind, that this treading under foot was about to terminate. These are as follows:

Luke 21: 25, 26, "And there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations, with perplexity; the sea and the waves roaring. Men's hearts failing them, for fear and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth; for the powers of Heaven shall be shaken."

The signs in the sun, called in other places the sun being darkened, are supposed by some to have had a fulfilment in the dark day of 1780. We cannot, with present light, assent to that view. The darkning of the sun on that day was not on the *prophetic* land at all. It was confined mostly, if not wholly, to the United States, and was witnessed only by a small part even of these. The phenomenon, or signs, according to the analogy of prophecy, must appear in the prophetic earth, or land. This, at most, embraced only the old Roman empire, which was in its imperial glory when this prophecy was uttered. If then, these signs in the sun and moon are to be witnessed in those literal orbs, we are compelled to the belief that they are future. We suggest, however, a different interpretation; which, if not correct, is at least very remarkable.

We learn from Genesis 1: 14—18, that the lights in the firmament of heaven were not only to divide the day from the night, but "*for* SIGNS;" and that the sun was "*to* RULE *the day*," and the moon and stars *to* RULE *the night*." Hence, in very early times, the people of God used them as *signs* of authority and dominion. Thus, we find Jacob interpreting Joseph's dream of the sun, moon and eleven stars, making obeisance to him, as an indication that the father, mother, and his other sons were to do him homage, or become subjects to Joseph. Whence this conclusion, but from the well known fact, that these heavenly bodies were signs of power and authority? The sun was the sign, or symbol of the highest authority; which, in the case before us, pointed out Jacob the head and supreme ruler of his house, or tribe. The moon denoted the next in authority, *viz*, the mother of the family; then came the stars—the sons, or rulers of an inferior class. This use of the sun, moon, and stars is seen throughout the Jewish prophets, and we may therefore conclude such was the design of our Lord in the text before us, Luke 21.

We now proceed to an inquiry as to what ruling powers are denoted by these luminaries in this prophecy. We conclude we are to look for them in the Roman empire; and that which most naturally presents itself, as symbolised by the sun, is the *imperial* power of Rome, which was holding its sway at the time the prophecy before us was uttered. That the sun is used as a symbol of that power, by the "faithful and true witness" Rev. 8: 12, is admitted, so far as we know, by all commentators. This point established, then, in symbolical language, the darkning of the sun, or signs in the sun, will signify signs of its decay and extinction. Centuries ago there were signs of the decay of the imperial power of Rome, but its extinction did not occur till the present century. That power was removed by Constantine to Constantinople. There it continued till 1453; when, in the eastern empire, it gave place to the *moon* power, of which we shall soon speak. Before the imperial power was displaced in the east it had been restored in the west by Charlemagne, A. D. 800. In the western Roman empire it continued down to the days of Napoleon Bonaparte. The earliest date that can be given to its extinction is 1806, when Bonaparte overthrew the Emperor of Germany, or Austria, in whom resided this power at that time. It may, however, be doubted whether that time is the proper point at which to date its extinction, as Napoleon claimed and exercised this power as the "*successor of the Cesars.*" If then, it was continued in him, as seems most likely, it was not finally extinguished till the battle of Waterloo, 1815, which sealed the fate of Bonaparte, and put an end, as we believe, forever to the imperial Roman power. If this view of the subject be the true one, we have the first and most prominent sign of the times of the Gentiles being about to end directly before us, and in our generation. Let it not be forgotten, that the signs given us in this prophecy were to be marks of the end of Jerusalem's bondage to other nations, and the signal of the near approach and reign of David's son on David's throne.

We now proceed to inquire after the power symbolised by the moon. Let it be remembered it must be found in the old Roman earth, or land; and it must be second in magnitude to the Imperial. Thus situated, we are at no loss to designate the power, *viz*, the Mohammedan. It is remarkable, that the "Crescent"—*the increasing moon*, is the *standard* of that power. And further, that this power has held possession of Jerusalem ever since A. D. 636, with the exception of about one century that it was in the hands of the Crusaders. This power *waxed* stronger and stronger for a long period; but within the last century it has given "*signs*" of *waneing*—and what is remarkable, in about six years after the extinction of the Roman imperial power, in 1815, the Mohammedan, or Ottoman power began to wane and fall with a rapidity that made even her enemies afraid. From the commencement of the Greek revolution, 1821, a series of calamities fell upon this moon power, that marked her certain and speedy downfall. She now gives "signs" of soon being turned to blood, or, of having her light, as a ruling power, extinguished. Here, then, is another sign of the end of "the times of the Gentiles," and of the establishment of the kingdom of God.

Having thus prepared the way, we can have no hesitation in saying, that the various monarchies of Europe are the powers symbolized by "*the stars.*" Just prior to the times of the Gentiles ending, and the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth, under the reign of David's son, on the throne of his father, there would be "signs in the stars"—or indications of these lesser monarchies being extinguished. Here we need hardly enter into any details. The late convulsions in Europe, though they seem at times to be at an end, proclaim, with a trumpet tongue, that this part of the prophecy is being fulfilled before our eyes, which leaves us in no doubt as to the point in earth's history which we now occupy. Every throne in Europe has been shaken within the past two years in a manner that indicates they are soon to fall, like stars from heaven, to rise no more; but more on this point as we proceed.

"And upon the earth, [*epi tes ges—in the land*—same words used in verse 23—signifying same territory ruled by sun, moon, and stars,] distress of nations, with perplexity." This prophecy is being fulfilled in the history of the nations occupying the old Roman Empire. The cause and effect of those things is next spoken of. "The sea and the waves roaring." We have no idea that this language has any reference, as a sign, to any literal commotion of the ocean; but, like the sun, moon, and stars, is a symbol which we will try to search out and apply. By turning to Isa. 17: 12, we read thus: "Wo to the multitude of *many people*, which make A NOISE *like the noise of the sea;* and to the rushing of nations that make A RUSHING *like the rushing of mighty waters!*" [That is, "the waves" of the sea.] "The nations shall rush like the rushing of many waters." So the destruction of Babylon is represented by the figure of the sea coming up upon her; see Jer. 51: 42. So also of Tyrus, Ezek. 26: 3, see Psa. 93: 3, 4; and particularly Rev. 17: 15, where "many waters" are expressly declared to signify "peoples, and multitudes, and nations, and tongues."

Thus then, "the sea and the waves roaring" is a symbol of an uprising of the people, who have long been the victims of lordly, kingly, and imperial misrule and oppression. When they rise up like the waves of the sea, lashed to fury by winds, their despotic rulers will find themselves, like a time worn and dilapidated ship, unable to stand the storm; yet there may be, for a short time, a calm; but the storm will gather strength. If we cast our eyes over Europe and mark the events of the past two years, have we not beheld a rising up of the people—the multitudes? And, what has been the cry of this rising mass? Has it not been *republicanism!* Self-government? No more despots? Down with thrones! And, what is the effect of this uprising of the masses? "Men's hearts failing them for fear," &c. What men's hearts are these? Not all men's; but a specified class, viz: The great men—kings, nobles, lords, despots of every class. This is evident from what follows, which is the reason assigned for the fear, *viz:* "*For* [*gar*—a causative conjunction—*because,*] the powers of heaven [the sun, moon, and stars,] are shaken." The sea and wave-like convulsions of the people shake down those symbolic powers, and overturn them, carrying consternation and horrible fear among the tyrannical dynasties of Europe, who have revolved in their political heavens so long as to think the people only lived for them, and not they for the people. And while they found the political heavens so convulsed that their power seemed ready to come to end, their hearts failed them for fear. At this moment they are far from feeling assurance of quiet: they "are like the troubled sea."

We now ask our readers, whether the signs in the sun, moon, and stars, the sea and waves roaring, are not being manifested before our eyes? And may we not know with certainty, that the times of the Gentiles are ending? Ought we not to enquire what is to come next? Or, what is before us? This, however, will be the subject of future remarks.

TRUTH ALWAYS IN HARMONY.

When our Lord stood before Pilate he made this glorious declaration: "To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear WITNESS UNTO THE TRUTH. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice."

Truth is always in harmony; men's opinions are often discordant. That view of revelation which makes harmony must be the correct one; and the correct view of revelation will equally harmonize with the known works of God as manifested to the understanding, or reason of man. If this were not the case it would not be revelation, but the very reverse—darkness—mystery—secret.

To harmonize the Scriptures we should always remember, that there are *two agencies*—God's and man's—or *God's free grace*, or favor, and *man's free will.* In all that pertains to our deliverance from sin, and ultimate salvation, God's free favor lays the *foundation*, without which there could be no deliverance from sin and death. That foundation being laid, men must build thereon, or their free will must co-operate, else they will fail to attain unto the salvation offered. In the common affairs of life all men see and acknowledge these truths: all understand, if God had not given soil, the sun, rain, and suitable seasons, no effort of man could fill store-houses and barns: and they are equally sensible, that with these gifts of the God of providence there would still be a failure if men refuse to co-operate with God in bringing forth the fruits of the earth. The works of God and man in the common affairs of life have their counterpart in the work of salvation, or deliverence from sin, and the attaining unto eternal life: and he who does not bear this in mind will be ever erring in regard to *what is truth*, and may err fatally. There is a Covenant of Grace. God is one, and the primary party; but, in order to the full establishment of that covenant, man must become the other or second party. Each has a part to act: both are *essential* to the full accomplishment of salvation.

Dividing truth, and magnifying one part to the neglect or denial of the other, is injurious, if not fatal. This has always been the policy of the adversary. "Cast thyself down; for it is *witten*, [a truth,] He shall give his angels charge concerning thee; and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy food against a stone." Here is an artful attempt to *magnify* God's faithfulness and care, so as to cover up the *obligation*, of the confiding party, to be always found in *the ways* of obedience. This promise of protection could only be claimed in the path of obedience to God, or in the performance of that part he has assigned us to act—in other words, God's grace and man's agency are essential and *inseparable;* and he that does not understand this and practice upon it will never attain deliverance from sin, nor gain eternal life.

We may contemplate this subject in relation to the remission of sins. The Scriptures represent, that we have remission of sins through the blood of Christ: Eph. 1: 7. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace. And other texts of like import: particularly Revelations 1: 5—"Unto him that loved us and *washed* us from our sins in his own blood." Baptism, also, is represented as being "for the remission of sins;" see Luke 3: 3 Acts 2: 38, &c. Some men exalt

one of these truths to the neglect or denial of the other: at least, they so magnify one or the other, as to obscure the opposite, and thus "divide the living child," by not understanding the *object* either of Christ's blood or our baptism

By not understanding the object of Christ's "shed blood," they magnify it into the "*paying our debts*," or "*dying in our room and stead*;" and by not understanding the design of baptism, it is made the point on which hangs all our salvation, and as the only means by which to *wash away our sins*. The blood of Christ and baptism are both important; but, we apprehend, for a very different reason from that assigned by the magnified views attached to them by those partizans of whom we are speaking. They are both important, because they are both *seals*; one on God's part, the other on our part, of the Covenant of Grace; ONE *of the promises* of which, is "REMISSION OF SINS." Does any one ask, for what did Christ come into the world? And for what did he shed his blood? The answer is—"To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should BEAR WITNESS UNTO THE TRUTH." And again, "Jesus Christ was a *minister of the circumcision*, FOR THE TRUTH OF GOD, TO CONFIRM THE PROMISES made unto the fathers;" Rom. 15: 8—that is—to confirm, on God's part, the *Covenant of Grace;* for the promises made unto the fathers, referred to, were *gospel* promises, and circumcision was the seal, on the part of the fathers, of this gospel covenant; this, however, we shall not attempt to show particularly now; but we will here refer to the language of Peter, Acts 3: 25, 26. "Ye [Jews,] are the children of the prophets, and of *the covenant* [singular, *i. e. one*] which God made with our fathers, saying unto *Abraham*, and in thy seed shall *all the families of the earth be blessed*:" [surely that is the Gospel Covenant]—"unto you, [Jews] God having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." Here, then, it is plain what covenant and what "truth of God," Christ came to confirm. Christ died, or shed his blood, to confirm that covenant that was made with Abraham, in its now still more ample development. Thus, the Saviour saith, Mat. 26: 28, "This is my blood of the new testament, [covenant] which is shed for many, [all the families of the earth] *for* the remission of sins." This blood *sealed*, on God's part, the new covenant—the covenant of grace—which contained the promise of "remission of sins." This was *one* of the grand objects of Christ's coming into the world: other objects we may notice at another time. When we are baptised we set *our seal* to that covenant, and confirm our faith in the truth of all the promises God has made in that covenant; one of the first of which is, "I will be merciful unto their unrighteousness: their sins and iniquities will I remember no more," Heb. 8: 12.

Another grand object of Christ's advent is expressed in the text we have quoted from Acts 3: 26, "God having raised up [brought into the world, or raised up unto David, see Chron. 17: 11; raised up to manhood] his Son Jesus, sent him to BLESS YOU, in *turning away* every one of you from his INIQUITIES." God sends his Son to do what? "*Pay our debts!*" Is that the way he was to "*bless*" men? Was he sent to bless men by dying in their "*room and stead?*" No. How then, did God send him to bless men? By turning them away from their iniquities. That is the only way in which God can bless any man permanently. *Sin is a curse*—the way of sin is the way of "death" by an unchangable law of nature's God. Sin is violence done to the order infinite wisdom, goodness, and love has established; and must necessarily result in death. No sober, reflecting man doubts this, so far as his physical nature is concerned. A constant violation of our physical constitution tends certainly to dissolution, or death. The repeated and continued violation of the law of our moral nature tends to its insensibility—to brutalizing it—consequently, to its extinction, or death. We can only be blessed by being turned away from our iniquities.

What is iniquity? Every thing that is contrary to *love*: "GOD IS LOVE;" the opposite to love is opposition to God, or, is iniquity. The love which is the fulfilment of the law, relates to God and our neighbor, or fellow men. Jesus Christ is the great *example* of both. Every departure from his example is a departure from love, and hence a departure from God, who is love; and it is iniquity. Our Lord, Jesus Christ, not only taught love to God and man by precept, but example; and we are taught to "walk even as he also walked," 1 John, 2: 6.

Any violation of the principle of love—the God-like principle—tends to death or extinction of being. Do you ask how? We answer; by benumbing or deadening our moral sensibilities and searing the conscience, till the man sinks down to the state of a mere brute; governed by no other law than that of the flesh, or animal nature, which has now so completely mastered him, that, like a brute he lives; his moral nature having become so near extinct that it has no control over his animal nature, and he is "carnal, sold under sin," which, "when finished, bringeth forth death," or extinction of being—he shall "be as though he had not been," Obediah, 16:—or, "be destroyed forever," Psa. 92: 7.

On the other hand, if our moral nature predominates, and we "keep our bodies under," [See 1 Cor. 9: 27,] by patterning after the example of love set us by Christ—or, learning of him who was meek and lowly in heart—our moral nature rises—becomes the all controling power of our being; and thus we are brought to life eternal, by being turned away from our iniquity. But this life eternal is not of *debt;* it is "the *gift* of God through Jesus Christ, our Lord."

AN INQUIRY.

Jeffersonville, Ind. Oct. 8, 1849.

BROTHER STORRS,—HOW do you reconcile Matthew 25: 31—41, with your views of probation after the advent? I am am inquirer after truth, and am desirous of more light on this subject.

N. FIELD.

REPLY TO BR. FIELD.

If our theory, that the age of Messiah's reign, to follow the present order of things, is inconsistent with the text of which you speak, the theory of the non-resurrection of the wicked, till the end of that age, is equally irreconcileable with it. But, in our mind, Mat. 25: 31—41 indicates the entire period of Messiah's judging or ruling the world on "the throne of his glory" till he has finished the work of judgment, by a demonstration of the equality of his government, in the reward of his followers and the destruction of his enemies; which will not be accomplished in a day or year; nor, probably, in a "thousand years." One of two things is certain to our understanding," viz: Either there is to be a state of trial to those "left of the nations" after the advent, or the second advent will not occur for a very long while to come. The latter we do not believe, and therefore we are shut up to the former: and if that point is not capable of demonstration, we confess we despair of demonstrating any truth of the Bible—to us nothing is clearer.

"GOG AND MAGOG."

DEAR BR. STORRS.—I have for some time had in my possession a manuscript copied from the "Hebrew Archives," which I had intended sending you for publication some time since, but neglected it until now. I have had it re-copied, thinking at this particular juncture of affairs in Europe, it would prove highly interesting to your readers, especially so as coming from a Jewish source.

Respectfully,

Philada., Oct. 25, 1849. A. B. WOOD.

Translated from the French.

THE EMPEROR OF ALL THE RUSSIAS—GOG AND MAGOG.

Extract from a discourse delivered by Rabbi Carrillon, of the Reformed Synagogue of Spanishtown, in the Island of Jamaica.

"There is but little ground for debate, but that the prophecy of Ezekiel, relating to Israel's last enemy, points conclusively to Russia, unless a radical change, from which, may God preserve us, takes place in the mind and in the political constitutions of Europe, we need not fear that any other nation than Russia will oppress the Hebrews. On the contrary, indeed, the Hebrews are continually making new advances in the esteem and friendship of all other people, both Christian and Mahommedan. Gog is pictured to us as a man filled with the ambition of subduing the whole world, and we do not know, in the existing state of affairs, any nation of Asia or Africa which conceives a project so bold. America is out of the question, and the power is equally balanced among the other nations of Europe, the majority of them friends of peace, they hold in horror every species of warfare and of conquests; even those who are not actuated by religion, public opinion and the arts and sciences. Russia is the single empire which has the disposition, and can command the means of undertaking a like campaign; and it is worthy of remark, that a prophecy is in vogue in Russia, its origin I know not, predicting that at a certain future period the Russians will become Lords of the Universe. True or false, this prophecy has a tendency to fortify them with courage, and of itself already bears witness into what extremities they are inclined to plunge in this gigantic struggle In addition to these, there are several other reasons which induce us to believe that Russia is the empire predicted by Ezekiel, and the chief reason is drawn from the description of the country itself. In the tenth of Genesis we find the children of Japheth to have been Gomar, Magog and Madai—Javan, Tubal, Mesech and Tiras; and the sons of Gomar, Ashkenas, and Riphoth and Togarmah—from them the Japhetical nations are descended, that is to say, the Chinese, Tartars, Greeks and Persians; the Germans of the North, Muscovites and other Sclavonian races; and these are the very people whom Ezekiel names as forming the sources, or as being the tributaries from whence Gog is to issue. In chapter 39th the Prophet says, 'turn thy face towards Gog, of the country of Magog, the prince of Rosh, Mesheck and Tubal.' The general name of the country in Scripture is Magog, and the name of its prince is Gog; but the country itself is divided into three principalities, Rosh, Mesheck and Tubal. The Prophet afterwards tells us that the prince described will be accompanied with a powerful army, composed of divers nations, of the same names as those which are mentioned in Genesis, as being descendants of Japhet and Gomar; and the most of these nations the subjects, or allies of the prince of Rosh, Mesheck and Tubal, are represented to us as coming from Northern countries. We remark that the name of Rosh is not to be met with anywhere among the sons of Japhet. We know, however, that the first Czar of Great Muscovie was called Rosh, and that it was from him the empire derived the name it now bears. We know also that in former times Russia was divided into three independent States—Russia proper, or, according to some authors, Muscovie in Europe—Muscovy proper, or Russia eastern and southern—and Tobolsk, or northern Russia. The three States were finally united under the common name of Russia, and they held in subjection several nations of the Tartar and Sclavonian origin. Persia itself may be considered as a dependency of Russia, or the Emperor of these three States united of Rushy, Muscovy and Tobolsky, this being the true pronunciation, and of the tributary and independent countries, is called in Scripture Gog, and his empire Magog. It is very probable this name has been given to the State because the population descends in a great measure from Magog, and Gog seems to be an abbreviation of the name of Magog, and is applicable to the chiefs of this empire. The names of the three States that compose this empire are mentioned in Scripture word for word—'Son of man, turn thy face towards Gog, of the country of Magog, the Prince of Rosh, Mesheck and Tubal;" Rosh is *Russia*—Mesheck *Muscovy*—and Tubal Tobolsky. Another combining circumstance is, that no other country is made up of so many other different nations. The prophet further tells us that these diverse nations which will march under the colors of Russia, will be armed after the fashion of the ancients, with shields, bows and arrows, and with javelins and lances, for as we are aware, notwithstanding her wide extent, Russia cannot raise an army exceeding 5 or 600,000 men in number, who are drilled according to the tactics of modern warfare, while the great mass of her troops still use arms of various kinds of darts, which were only in use among the ancients. Under still another aspect, the prophecy may be applied to Russia. It is, moreover, foretold, that of a sudden

such revolts will burst forth from the numberless army of Gog, that, using the expression of the prophet, *every man's hand will be raised against his brother*. This portion of the prophecy is eminently applicable to Russia; for it is almost certain that Russia, engaged in a universal war, on the first reverse will witness Poland and all the portions she holds under the yoke turning their arrows against her. It is thus almost established by evidence, that Russia is the country of Magog, and that Nicholas or one of his successors is the Gog announced by the prophet, and that there is reason to believe that the latter days are not far off; let us, therefore, be on the watch and in continual prayer, that we may not be overwhelmed by a torrent of events, as a thief taken in the night!"

LETTERS.

Br. R. L. Patridge writes:—

Marysville, Ohio, Oct. 9th, 1849.

Bro. Storrs,—For the edification of ourselves and the furtherance of the cause of Christ, we trouble you again for books. Our brethren in the distance have persuaded us out of those volumes of Dobney that we received, even before we had read them, and consequently we now send for more. I am very sorry that my present circumstances will not permit me to make a donation to the Examiner; but you may look for a subscription from me and some others for the next volume at $1.

Br. John Heichhold writes:—

Oshkosh, Wis., Oct. 7th, 1849.

Br. Storrs,—I would say for your encouragement, that through your Six Sermons and Dobney on Future Punishment one Congregational Minister, John Ingersal, in Milwaukie, has been brought into the truth. He has preached two sermons on "No immortality out of Christ." Truth is at work on this great and important subject in this region I believe, with you, in the return of the Jews and probation after Christ sets up his everlasting kingdom. To me these truths are as clear as the sun at noon-day.

Henry St. Clair writes:—

Lafayette. Ia., Oct. 8th, 1849.

Mr. Storrs—*Dear Sir*:—Enclosed you will find two dollars, the amount due you for one copy of "Dobney," five copies of Six Sermons, and Bible Examiner for 1848 and '49. I am very much pleased with the Examiner. It has thrown a light on some passages of the Bible, and altogether strengthened my belief and faith. Myself and wife have been believers in the doctrines [*of the Bible*] as taught by you for more than three years;—not without opposition you may well believe;—we have read the Examiner faithfully, and I trust with some profit. I have circulated your Sermons, since I received them, to the best of my ability, and I think the truth is spreading; people are investigating the subject. You may count on me for the *subscription* for *three copies* of the Examiner from the beginning of volume three. I do sincerely hope that you will be able to sustain the paper.

Br. N. Bond writes:—

Cleaveland, Ohio, Oct. 7th, 1849.

Br. Storrs:—I have read the Examiner a part of the time since its first publication; but moving from place to place, I have not seen all you have published—but have read sufficient, comparing it with the word of God, to fully establish the truth to my mind that the great principle you are endeavoring to establish and defend in the Examiner (viz: the doctrine of life and death,) with kindred doctrines are second to none taught in the word of God, and show to my mind most clearly the wisdom, benevolence and justice of God. The personal reign of Christ with his Saints on the earth is a doctrine which stands out very prominent and clear in the word of God. I have been a confirmed believer since 1840 that the Kingdom of God was near, even at the *door*. The great battle I believe is commenced; and events will thicken and hasten until no doubt will be left. As a snare shall it come on all them that dwell on the earth.

Dr. N. Field writes:—

Jeffersonville, Ind., Oct. 8, 1849.

Br. Storrs:—We are much pleased with the Examiner, and wish you success in its publication. I hope it will be liberally patronized and that it will become the organ of a growing and intelligent body of people scattered abroad who are advocating the true doctrine of immortality. It should be made a medium of an interchange of views, around which the friends of truth should rally. The principles we advocate are rapidly extending.

Examiner for 1850.—Our friends will please bear in mind that one number more completes the present volume. We have decided on continuing the paper another year; but we shall adhere to our terms of *payment in all cases in advance*. If any, therefore, do not receive the Examiner for January, 1850, they will understand the reason is—we have not received the subscription price for it. We invite all our present subscribers to continue their favors to us. Agents should not fail to remit money in their hands before January. The following pledges have been made to the Examiner for 1850, since our October issue:

Henry F. Johnson, New York,	$5,00
J. B Frisbie, Sylvan, Mich.,	5,00
Henry Grew, Philadelphia,	8,00
Wm. Mayell, Albany, N. Y.,	3,00

Business Notices.—For price of books see the Examiner for October.

Br. Joseph Cherry 402 Washington St., New York, is acting as Agent in the sale of Dobney on Future Punishment.

Br. C. Sweetwood, Utica, N. Y., is Agent for the Examiner in that city, and has for sale Dobney—our Six Sermons, and the Christian Psalmody.

Dr. Perkins, Albany, N. Y., has Dobney and the Christian Psalmody for sale, and will act in receiving subscriptions for the Examiner.

Br. Henry Grew, of this city, has published a new edition of his pamph et "On the Intermediate State of the Dead"—a very valuable work, of 24 pages, 12mo. Price, five cents single copy, or $3 per hundred. He can now supply any amount ordered.

Br. Henry Hayes wishes us to say, that his Post Office address is Springfield, Mass: care of H. K. Judd.

All orders for Walsh's Review of Luther Lee must be addressed to John T. Walsh, 63 Ogden St., Philadelphia. Price 25 cents, or five copies for $1.