BIBLE EXAMINER.

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

VOL. IV. PHILADELPHIA, SEPTEMBER, 1849. No. 9.

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

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

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

☞ This paper is subject to newspaper postage only.

IMMORTALITY.

REVIEW NO. VIII.

"The common sentiment of mankind."

Gentle reader! I am glad, for your sake, that Mr. Lee has introduced the subject of, and based an argument on, *"the common sentiment of mankind"!*

He has proved, overwhelmingly and incontestably proved, the PAGAN ORIGIN *of the popular doctrine of immortality!* He has triumphantly sustained the very position we have long maintained, viz.: *That "the immortality of the soul" is pagan in its origin, and was generally believed among pagans.*

But, strange to say, while Mr. Lee has sustained the above point, he makes use of it for the purpose of proving the soul immortal! His argument amounts to this:

The ancient Egyptians, Persians, Phenicians, Scythians, Celts, Druids, Assyrians, &c., believed in the immortality of the soul—it was "the common sentiment" of all these nations. *Therefore*, the soul *is* immortal!

Or, to state it differently:

That which is "the common sentiment of mankind," is true;

But the immortality of the soul is "the common sentiment of mankind;"

THEREFORE, the immortality of the soul is true!

By this logic Mr. Lee's proposition stands or falls! Mr. Lee says—"If destructionists can prove that the doctrine in question had some other, or if some other sentiment can be named, manifestly false, and equally common in the world, of the origin of which no account can be given, we acknowledge they will evade the force of this argument; but until this is done the argument must prove ruinous to their theory."

1. We are called upon, by the above, to prove that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul had some other origin than the Bible. And, on this point, Mr. Lee, himself, has helped us to a considerable amount of evidence, as we before remarked; but we shall examine the question more closely than he has done. What if the Babylonians, Medes and Persians believed the soul immortal? What if Zoroaster, Pythagoras, Socrates and Plato, taught it? What if the sentiment abounds in Homer, Ovid and Virgil? Do these facts prove the doctrine all divine? If so, the prevalence of other "sentiments," held by these nations and distinguished persons, upon the same principle of reasoning, must also be divine. If Mr. Lee's logic will prove conclusive in one case, it will in another—yes! in all others! If he receive the pagan idea of immortality, he must take along with it the pre-existence of souls—the transmigration of souls—and the rejection of the resurrection of the body! He must not divide the dose, though bitter! but swallow the whole like a man!

The oldest hypotheses of the Oriental World, upon this subject, resolved themselves into the doctrine of *emanation* and *imanation;* issuing from the "*soul of the universe*" at birth, and reabsorbed at death. They regarded the soul as a part of the Deity; thus making him *divisible*, which is one of Mr. Lee's "essential properties of matter"!

DR. GOOD says—"If we turn from Persia, Egypt, and Hindostan to Arabia, to the fragrant groves and learned shades of Dedan and Teman, from which *it is certain* that Persia, and highly probable that Hindostan, derived its first polite literature, we shall find the entire subject" (*of the immortality of the soul,*) "left in as blank and barren a silence, as the deserts by which they are surrounded; or, if touched upon, only touched upon to betray doubt, and sometimes disbelief. The tradition, indeed, of a future state of retributive justice seems to have reached the schools of this part of the world, *and to have been generally*, though perhaps not universally, accredited; BUT THE FUTURE EXISTENCE IT ALLUDES TO IS THAT OF A RESURRECTION OF THE BODY, AND NOT OF A SURVIVAL OF THE SOUL AFTER THE BODY'S DISSOLUTION"! Here, then, is an exception to Mr. Lee's universal "consent of mankind." We have one place—one country—where the popular dogma of immortal-soulism was "blank and barren;" and where the opposite view was "*generally*" believed. And we find this, too, just where we might expect to find it, *viz.: where the light of revelation shed its illuminating beams!* That country is Idumea! Here JOB, that venerable patriarchal saint, who held communion with the Living God, and not with the *Buthos* or *Demiurgus* of the Chaldeans, Egyptians, Assyrians, &c.—here, I say, Job lived; and from this quarter we have, as Dr. Good expresses it, "that astonishing and transcendent composition" called "the Book of Job;" "a work," says he—although on Mr. Lee's side of the question—"that ought assuredly to raise the genius of Idumea above that of *Greece*," &c., and, may I not add, the *knowledge* of *Job* far above that of Zoroaster, Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, Dr. Dick and Mr. Lee—all combined!

Dr. Good continues—"Yet in this sublime and magnificent poem, replete with *all the learning and wisdom of the age, the doctrine upon the subject before*

ns is merely as I have stated it, a patriarchal or traditionary belief of a future state of retributive justice, NOT BY THE NATURAL IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL, BUT BY *A RESURRECTION OF THE BODY*"!

Dr. Good makes this belief "patriarchal or traditionary;" but this is unnecessary, as Job was doubtless an inspired man. Dr. Good's testimony is the more valuable, because he believed in the popular doctrine of immortality.

Whether, therefore, the dogma of natural immortality originated with the old serpent, who said, "Yeshall not surely die;" or whether it originated in Egypt, Persia, Media, Babylonia, or elsewhere, it matters not. One thing is certain, it did not originate from God, else Job would have been in possession of it; and I will put Job's knowledge and wisdom against all the Babylonians, Persians, Medes, Assyrians, Zoroasters, and Platos on earth! Again, this is doubtless the oldest book or document extant, and on that account demands the attention of the sincere inquirer after truth on this subject.

"*The Hindoo philosophers*," says Dr. Good, "TOTALLY *and* UNIVERSALLY *denying a resurrection of the body, and supporting the doctrine* [of future existence] *alone upon the* NATURAL IMMORTALITY *of the soul, and the Arabian philosophers* (among whom was Job) *passing over the immortality of the soul, and resting it alone upon a* RESURRECTION OF THE BODY."

The Hindoo view of this question, is the legitimate tendency of the modern dogma on the same subject—*it leads to a denial of the resurrection.*

Mr. Lee, then, is welcome to his Babylonian, Medo-Persian, Assyrian, and Hindoostan associates, and their authority! He is welcome to the company of Zoroaster, Pythagoras, Orpheus, Socrates, Plato, and a host of others! He is in *learned!*—but superstitious company! But, to be consistent, he should go all the way with them: he should believe in the pre-existence and pre-intelligence of the soul—that it is a part of God—that it *may suffer* in purgatory—and that it may be transmigrated!

The Grecian philosophy was imported by Pythagoras from India, whose philosophers reprobated the doctrine of a resurrection. So, when Paul preached through Jesus the resurrection of the dead, in the Argora of Athens, the Athenians declared he brought strange things to their ears, and inquired what the new doctrine was.

Here, then, we have the whole subject before us. On one hand we have Mr. Lee's long array of nations, composing "the heathen world, believing in the natural immortality of the soul, with its kindred appendages. On the other hand, we have the light of truth, concerning the resurrection of the body, pouring its steady rays from the days of Job, through the dark ages, down to the present time.

And, now, I shall turn Mr. Lee's argument against him, by affirming that the "common sentiment of mankind" is wrong! *Truth* has always been in the minority, and it always will be, until the Lord comes and takes the kingdom, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven! Error, in some, or all its forms, is "the common sentiment of mankind." And if Mr. Lee were to carry out his rule, he would be compelled to add to the *eternity of matter*, although he seems to have such an abhorrence of it, for his "heathen" witnesses depose to *its* truth! Let us now state this argument in form:

That which is "the common sentiment of mankind" is true;

But *error* is "the common sentiment of mankind;"

Therefore, *error* is *true!*

But why should we take "mankind" as the standard of truth? Why not take a nation? A "heathen" nation, to follow Mr. Lee's example? Why not take Europe? or one of the nations of Europe? Why not take Italy? Why not take the Pope? Why not take the most enlightened nation on earth? Will Mr. Lee submit his faith to such a standard? If he were to submit his faith to the "common sentiment" of any nation on earth, he would be weighed in the balance and found wanting. Go to the "heathen world" to learn the doctrine of immortality! Go to Babylon—to India—to Egypt—to the Eastern Magicians, Soothsayers, Astrologers and Philosophers, to learn the doctrine of eternal life? Place these in the collegiate chair, and let the venerable Job, of the land of Uz, sit at their feet, and learn? Place the wisdom of Zoroaster and his associates, which is "foolishness with God," in opposition to the spirit of wisdom divine? A man must be hard pressed for evidence to sustain his faith, when he leaves the oldest and most venerable document on earth, and seeks to the Vedas of the Brahmins and the Zendavesta of the Parsees for light on the question of immortality!

Here, then, is a fact to which we call special attention, viz.: *That the denial of the resurrection of the body was as much "the common sentiment of mankind," as the doctrine of the soul's immortality.* Among all Mr. Lee's witnesses, only one—*Zoroaster*—believed in, or taught, a resurrection. Now, I can find as many exceptions to Mr. Lee's "common consent of mankind," in relation to the immortality of the soul, as he can find on the subject of a *non-resurrection.* Will Mr. Lee give me the "*origin*" of this "sentiment?"

Mr. L. says—"If the doctrine of a future existence be an error, it is the most general one that ever entered the world," &c. Mr. Lee here makes a false issue; for it is not the "doctrine of a *future existence*" that is denied; but it is the predication "of a future existence" on the "natural immortality of the soul," instead of the resurrection of the body.

Mr. Lee says—the doctrine of the immortality of the soul "prevails most where the Scriptures are most known and read." But, alas! for Mr. Lee's cause, *his* evidence is all on the other side of the question! If he had said—that the doctrine in question "prevails most where the Scriptures are *least* known and read," he would have spoken the truth; and his statement would have harmonized with his "heathen" testimony! For surely he will not contend that the Scriptures were "most known and read" by the men and nations of whom he has spoken!

Again he says—"The doctrine must have had its origin." Of course, Mr. Lee, it had its origin; but was that origin divine? If it was, you have failed to prove it, for your witnesses are *pagan.* Taking the *non-resurrection of the body* as a sentiment running parallel with the doctrine of the soul's immortality—among the nations and tribes

referred to, I will adopt Mr. Lee's mode of reasoning, thus: As the NON-RESURRECTION OF THE BODY prevails in the heathen world, "and as no account can be given of its introduction, it follows that it must have sprung from some one of the following sources:—It must be instinct, the result of natural reason, from the light of nature, the impression of God's spirit on the mind, or the principle of revelation contained in the Bible. Now, if it be instinct, it must be from the Creator; if it be the result of natural reason, it cannot be unreasonable; if it be from the light of nature, it is a revelation from God; if it be the impression of God's spirit on the mind, it is no less a divine revelation; and if it be the sentiment of the Bible, none but infidels will deny it"! Thus Mr. Lee's logic will work both ways! It will alike apply to every prevalent sentiment, true or false! It will apply especially to many of the appendages of the immortality of the soul. But Mr. Lee makes a bad use of his own logic; for, will he tell me what sentiment has not sprung from one or the other of the sources he has mentioned? I apprehend he will find that every sentiment extant proceeded from one or the other of those sources. What, then, has Mr. Lee gained by this flourish? Absolutely nothing! What is "natural reason"? If Mr. Lee mean by this *unenlightened reason*, then I affirm that it has given birth, not only to *his* favorite doctrine, but a thousand other vagaries and absurdities which revelation repudiates, and *enlightened reason scouts!*

2. Now, let us look at this subject from another point.

In perfect harmony with what we have said, concerning the origin and prevalence of the popular view, I will remark, *that before the Babylonish captivity, and the Macedonian and Roman conquests,* the Jews observed the most profound silence upon the state of the dead. They spoke of it as a place of silence, darkness, and inactivity. This fact speaks volumes as to the "heathen" or pagan origin of the doctrine we are calling in question. They knew nothing of natural immortality till they were carried captive to Babylon, and mingled with some of Mr. Lee's witnesses!

Again, "after the Hebrews mingled with the" Babylonians, "Greeks and Romans, they insensibly slided into their use of terms, and *adopted some of their ideas on such subjects as those on which* THEIR ORACLES WERE SILENT." Hence the peculiar views of the Pharisees, many of whom not only believed in the pre-existence of souls—but, also, their immortality and transmigration. This is the reason why the question was put to our Lord, concerning the man who was born blind. They supposed it possible for the man to have sinned in a previous state, which was the cause of his being born blind. They also thought that Jesus Christ was in possession of the soul of John Baptist, or one of the prophets. Let us now sum up the whole argument:

1. We have seen that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, the pre-existence of the soul, and its transmigration, together with a reprobation of the doctrine of the resurrection of the body, was in its origin pagan or heathenish. Mr. Lee has given us ample proof of this. I have given additional proof.

2. That in Idumea or Arabia—the country of Job, who is the author of the oldest document extant, we find the opposite doctrine prevailing; and a future life predicated on the resurrection of the body.

3. That the prevalence of a sentiment is no proof of its truth, or correctness; but, if anything, affords presumptive evidence against it. Truth has always been in the minority.

4. That previous to the Babylonish captivity, the Jews were silent on the state of the dead, regarding it as a state of silence and darkness.

5. But that *after* the Hebrews mingled with the Babylonians, Greeks and Romans, they adopted their *ideas* on such subjects as those on which their oracles—the Old Testament—was silent. (See Appendix to New Version.)

6. And that reason unenlightened, has given birth to a thousand vagaries, and among them the dogma of "natural immortality."

But, we are not done with this subject yet; we wish to place it where the hand of mortal disinterment can never reach it! And I now affirm, that revelation has placed the seal of condemnation on the oriental science, of a part of which Mr. Lee is the special advocate.

First, then, in reference to the very nations whom Mr. Lee has convoked as witnesses, Paul says—"Professing to be wise men, they became fools; for they changed the glory of the immortal God into the likeness of an image of mortal man, of fowls, of four-footed beasts, and of reptiles." This will apply to Mr. Lee's Egyptian, Babylonian, Persian, Greek and Roman witnesses. Idolatry was as current among them as the idea of the soul's immortality; so that even in Athens, at that time the most enlightened city of the oriental world, they had *thirty thousand gods,* and held the *natural immortality* of the soul; but *rejected* the resurrection of the body. In the above quotation I have not followed the common version, though I have no objection to it; but have given a better rendering of the language, which is sanctioned by Campbell and McKnight. Here is another: "For this doctrine (the preaching of Christ) is, indeed, foolishness to the destroyed; but to us, who are saved, it is the power of God. Therefore, it is written, "I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to naught the knowledge of the prudent. Where is the wise man? Where the Scribe? Where the disputers of this world? Has not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?" Again, Paul says—"The world by wisdom knew not God." The Greeks sought after wisdom—the wisdom of the Platonian school, and consequently, the preaching of life and immortality, through Jesus Christ, by a resurrection from the dead, was "*foolishness*" to them. Paul did not teach "the wisdom of this world"—he did not speak the theological dialect of Greece and Rome. And here we are reminded of an important fact, that, although the words and ideas, concerning natural immortality, are found scattered through the works of pagan philosophers, *we have neither the one nor the other in all the revelations of God!* Why this singular *omission*, if it be the doctrine of the Bible? "O!" says Mr. Lee, "it is taken for granted." Taken for granted, indeed! This is a mere *evasion* of the argument. There is not a particle of truth in it. The Bible does not take one doctrine "*for granted,*" and then *teach an opposite one!*

"The theological dialect of the oriental and occidental schools is a compound of foolish words

and phrases, which make a foolish language," the product of confusion, mythology and ignorance. They taught "a vain philosophy;" the philosophy of Greece and Rome, which Paul justly avers is "falsely so called." Hymeneus and Philetus appear to have been professors of this oriental science. What this science is, we have already seen; and I would here only remind you, that the dogma of a *translation to heaven or hell at death, is one item of that profane science by which they overthrew the faith of some in the resurrection.* It was upon this hypothesis that "some" among the Corinthians said there was "no resurrection;" and this, I repeat, is the legitimate tendency of the philosophy and theology of my friend Mr. Lee.

In concluding this long review of Mr. Lee's, No. 10, I will, without arguing them, present the legitimate tendencies of the view we are opposing. It is furnished to my hand by an intelligent living author.

1. *The dogma of "immortal souls" contravenes the Mosaic account of the Fall.*

2. *It reduces the Mosaic account to an absurdity.*

3. *It necessitates a change of the words of the Spirit from their proper to a figurative signification.*

4. *It is subversive of the resurrection and the judgment.*

5. *The pagan tradition of the soul's immortality, not only renders null and void the resurrection to life and judgment,* BUT IS EQUALLY SUBVERSIVE OF THE PERSONAL APPEARANCE OF MESSIAH ON EARTH AGAIN.

6. THE HYMENEAN GNOSIS *of immortal soul-ism, and ethereal translation at death, abrogates the reign of Messiah on David's throne for a season and a time.*

I pledge myself to make good every item in the above indictment, when it is demanded by counter-evidence. J. T. W.

THE ENGLISH DISCUSSION.

"ATHANASIA: OR, FOUR BOOKS ON IMMORTALITY. *By John Howard Hinton, A. M.*"—Such is the title of a book that we have received from England, and of which Dr. Lees, of Leeds, speaks in his letter found in the Examiner for March last. We sent for this book immediately on the receipt of Dr. Lees' letter, but it has been delayed in coming to hand. For the contents of it we refer our readers to Dr. Lees' letter above referred to. We have had time only to glance over that part of the work which relates to his remarks "*On the argument as conducted by Rev. George Storrs.*" If we *must* be converted back again into the old theory, we should like to be so by such a writer as Mr. Hinton. His *manner* is kind, christian-like, and well calculated to win our esteem and affection: we certainly feel that he has a brotherly heart, and that, to us, gives great weight to his argument. He is far removed from the narrow bigotry which characterizes most who defend the same side of the question. From the hasty examination we have been able to give his remarks on our "Six Sermons"—for that is evidently all he has seen of our writings—we are much pleased, and may probably be led to *modify* some of our *expressions*, while at the same time we are greatly strengthened in the truth of our *general position* of the sinner's final doom. On a remark of ours in Six Sermons, page 75, that men in the days of our Lord "were not looking for eternal happiness merely, or an escape from eternal misery, but *simply for eternal life*," Mr. Hinton, quoting the words which we have italicised, says: "Now the author here affixes the idea of conscious being to the word life, as its literal or primary meaning, and so insists upon it. To this I reply, that this is *not* the primary meaning of the term. Life is a word having primary reference to organized substances in which its organic functions are maintained:" p. 364. We let this definition pass for the present. And then it follows that Death is a word having primary reference to *disorganized* substances in which the organic functions are destroyed; and this, in fact, Mr. Hinton admits, for he says, p. 363: "The primary meaning of the word death is the cessation of the functions of an organized substance; and when we speak of the death of a man, we mean to denote the fact, and nothing more, that the functions of the organized substance which entered into his constitution have ceased."

This definition we will not now object to; and think in the issue it will help us greatly to fortify the *general position* of our Six Sermons. Our friend —for we truly feel that he is such—has given us a firm foot-hold; but we have neither time nor space to notice him further this month.

The foregoing was written just as the Examiner for August was going to press, and intended to to have been inserted in that number, but we were compelled to leave it out. Since that, we have had time to examine the work generally, and commence giving our readers some notes upon it in this number of the Examiner, which are designed to be continued.

NOTES ON HINTON'S "ATHANASIA."—No. I.

The first thing we notice is Mr. Hinton's definition of *immortality*. He says—"The idea conveyed by this word in relation to man is that he is *adapted* to live for ever, or that he is not liable to the cessation of conscious being from any natural cause;" pp. 8 and 9. Again, p. 72, he says—"I take the proper immortality of a creature to be his non-liability to death (here understanding the term death of a cessation of its proper being) by natural causes, or by causes proper to itself." On the same page he says of the orthodox party—"Among the evangelical dissenters of the present day I know of no evidence that they, or any considerable number of them, conceive man to be immortal in the sense that he '*positively shall* live for ever.'"

We are glad to hear Mr. Hinton affirm this, and hope he is not mistaken in it; because, if true, it shows that orthodoxy, at least in England, has undergone a radical change in "*the present day*:" for, we conclude, even Mr. H. will not and cannot deny but the popular orthodox sense of immortality *has been*, before "the present day," that all men "*positively shall* live for ever;" and if that is not *the sense* in which all the orthodox party in America use the term in the present day, except so far as they have been compelled to modify it in the controversy now going on, then we acknowledge that we ourself preached twenty years, and was in constant intercourse with ministers, without ever once hearing or suspecting but that they held the definition of immortality to be, in relation to man, that all "*positively* shall live for ever." But it seems a new era has dawned in England, and we hail it with joy, and hope it may spread its light on the pagan land this side the Atlantic. The point, in "the *present day*," in England, that they use immortality to signify that man "*positively shall* live for ever," is given up.

This is a great advance towards the truth: and as immortality, according to Mr. H. and his coadjutors, in relation to man, is only an "*adaptation* to live for ever, or a non-liability to death by natural causes, or causes proper to" himself, we may fairly conclude that man *may not live for ever* if some cause foreign to himself shall intervene to bring about his death, or to cause the "cessation of" his "proper being." This Mr. Hinton's theory will not allow him to deny; hence we think he and his coadjutors in England, if they do not stop in their search after truth, will be brought to see, that though man has an adaptation to live for ever, yet he "*positively shall*" NOT "live for ever" irrespective of moral character; and that is precisely the ground we occupy. Why is this shrinking, in England, from admitting that immortality has the sense of positive endless continuance in being? Is it not clearly because the truth, from some quarter, whether by the operations of their own minds or otherwise, has pressed upon them, that the orthodox, or popular theory, which till "the present day" has given the sense of positive, eternal, uninterrupted existence to the phrase immortality, is a ground untenable and without foundation in the revelation of God? We believe that is the fact; and the abandonment of such a position in "the present day" shows *advance*, which gives us much pleasure.

But we now proceed with Mr. Hinton's definition of immortality "in relation to man." We suppose, of course, that it is universal in its application to man. From this word, then, he cannot show that *any man*, whatever his moral character is, "*positively shall* live for ever:" all he can do from it is to show that when the righteous put on immortality by a resurrection from the dead, they put on an "*adaptation* to live for ever," or a "non-liability to death by natural causes:" that is all that can be gained from the word; they stand in the same position that Adam stood prior to his sin. That we are correct in this view of Mr. Hinton's theory, we infer from pages 89 and 90 of his work, where he says—"I speak of man antecedently to sin, and of the adaptation of his nature as a creature of God. I affirm that according to his nature man is immortal * * * * * that, but for sin, man's existence would never have ceased."

That man by creation was "*adapted*" to live for ever—that is, the circumstances in which he was created were adapted to perpetuate his existence without end, we as fully believe as Mr. Hinton. But what were those circumstances? Were they in *his nature*? They must be, if Mr. H.'s definition of immortality be correct. But we deny that such was the fact. The perpetuation of his existence depended upon the *circumstances* with which he was surrounded; and hence "lest he put forth his hand and take of the tree of life and eat and *live for ever*" he is removed from those circumstances upon which his *continued* existence depended. This certainly does not look as though man by creation was endowed with "non-liability to death by natural causes, or causes proper to" himself. So far from it, it seems as if the natural cause of death was in himself, which could only be stayed or averted by circumstantial causes, and when he was removed from them he naturally fell back again to the dust from whence he came.

If we are correct in these views, Mr. Hinton's definition of immortality, though it may convey *his* meaning, does not convey the scripture sense; or if it does, we can derive no comfort from Paul's declaration that "this mortal shall put on immortality;" as that, according to Mr. H., necessarily implies nothing more than Adam possessed before he sinned; and hence, for all that phrase teaches, saints may after the resurrection meet with a like disaster to that of Adam, and experience another death. From the phrase *immortality*, according to Mr. Hinton, we cannot show that man "*shall positively* live for ever" after the resurrection. Where then shall we look for this assurance? Can we find it in the phrase *life*?

MR. HINTON'S DEFINITION OF THE WORD LIFE.

He maintains that "Life is a word primarily used to express the active or living condition of organic substances; and it is not," he says, "in its strict or literal sense, applicable to any thing but organic substances, vegetable or animal. When applied to any other objects," he adds, "it is on the ground of some analogy or resemblance; that is, consequently, not literally, but figuratively." pp. 28, 29. Here is some truth and some error. It would be true with regard to created things if we were to amend his definition by saying—"Life is a word primarily used to express the active or living condition of *the* organic substances *of sensitive creatures, whose general condition is one of consciousness;* and it is not, in its strict or literal sense, applicable to any thing *else*." The italic words are our corrections of Mr. Hinton's definition. His definition is an *assumed* one; but the law and the testimony shall settle ours. We have no need to travel far to sustain our position; the first chapters of Genesis will suffice to give us the *primary* use of the word *life*. In the account of creation *life* is not predicated merely of the "living condition of organic substances." It is not affirmed of the *earth* after its *organism*—it is not affirmed of the *waters*, nor of the *grass*, nor of the *herb*, nor of the *fruit trees*, nor of *any of the trees* which the Lord God made: no, nor of the sun, moon, stars, or any of the lights of heaven. This fact is fatal to Mr. Hinton's theory. But it is affirmed of all the *sensitive* creatures, whose general state is that of *consciousness*. Thus—"God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that *hath life*, and fowl that may fly above the earth," &c. "And God created great whales, and every *living* creature that moveth," &c.: chap. 1: 20, 21. God said to man—"have dominion over the fish

of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every LIVING *thing that* MOVETH upon the earth:" v. 28. Again, to man, "God said, Behold, I have given you every herb bearing seed, which is upon the face of all the earth, and every tree, in which is the fruit of a tree yielding seed, to you it shall be for meat: and to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that *creepeth* upon the earth, WHEREIN THERE IS LIFE," &c. Here, we must think, is abundant evidence of the *primary* use of the word *life*: and though the trees, herbs, &c.] were an "active or living condition of organic substances," the "strict or literal sense" of the word is not applied to them at all; and hence we may safely conclude it was *not* "applicable to any" of them, except "on the ground of some analogy or resemblance, that is, consequently not literally, but figuratively."

That the *primary* sense of the word life, in the Bible, is not applicable to organic substances without sensation, or without the capacity of consciousness, is further evident from the account of the flood, in which the phrase "every *living substance*" is employed, and is immediately explained to signify "both man, and cattle, and the creeping things, and the fowl of heaven," while nothing is said of "vegetable life," or of vegetables having life. The Lord said, "the end of all *flesh* is come before me—I will destroy *man* whom I have created from the face of the earth; both man and beast, and the creeping things, and the fowls of the air—I do bring a flood of waters upon the earth to destroy *all flesh* wherein is the *breath of* LIFE—every thing that is in the earth shall *die*." The Lord then gave Noah the following direction—"Of every LIVING *thing* of *all flesh*, two of every sort shalt thou bring into the ark, to keep them *alive* with thee: they shall be *male* and female—fowls—cattle—creeping thing—two of every sort—to keep them *alive*—and they went in unto Noah into the ark two and two of *all flesh* wherein is the breath of *life*"—that is, clearly, all sensitive or conscious creatures. Then it is added of those out of the ark—"*All flesh* DIED that *moved* upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing—and every man; all in whose *nostrils was the breath of life*, of all that was in the dry land *died*—Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the ark."

Thus we see, that "*life* is a word *primarily* used to express" the "active condition of" creatures, and of those only, who have sensation, or are endowed with senses, which distinguish them from the "active condition of" mere "organic substances," or "living *vegetables*." When the word is applied to vegetable organization it is used in a figurative or *analogical* sense, not in its *primary*.

The creation of man is equally in point in proof of the position we take on this subject; but we think we do not need to press that point on Mr. Hinton's attention: he cannot fail to see that the word life in the Scriptures has its *primary* application, not merely to the "active or living condition of organic substances," but "is a word *primarily* used to express" created things whose peculiar characteristic is, in general, consciousness, or sensation. Whatever may be its definition in the schools of "philosophy," we think it clear we have the Scripture definition, as given by the Creator himself: and we cannot but think, from the general candor of Mr. Hinton in his work, that on reviewing this point he will be led to acknowledge his mistake. It is true, such an acknowledgment is fatal to his whole argument against us, which can only be maintained by saying that the term life *primarily* does not express a creature whose peculiar characteristic is, in general, *conscious existence*. If we are right in the definition we have presented, of the primary meaning of the word, Mr. Hinton cannot claim its uniform application in a *figurative* sense when spoken of the reward of the righteous. It is not, as he maintains, "a choice between two analogical significations" of the word life, but a choice between its literal, *i. e.* its *primary* sense and a figurative or analogical one. We maintain that the word *life*, in the Bible, has its primary and literal sense, generally; if there are exceptions, and we freely admit there are, it is to be shown that the text, context, or other Scriptures require the exception; and we think it not difficult to determine when that is the case. Mr. Hinton, therefore, nor any one else, is to assume that when *life* is promised and proclaimed, as it is throughout the Scriptures, that the word is used figuratively; that is, for "*happiness*." We do not admit it. We consider such a view, however undesigned in its advocates, as subversive of the very ground work of faith, and as launching us into the regions of fancy. Life is one thing, and distinct by itself; happiness is another and different matter. As, however, there could be no happiness without life, life is the first and great gospel promise and proclamation—*life*, ETERNAL LIFE. Such a life must inevitably draw after it happiness: all misery imports decay, and unless arrested must sooner or later result in the extinction of life. That point, however, we shall not argue now.

Page 95 Mr. H. says—"Since the only value of animated, or conscious existence, lies in the happiness derivable from it, life comes in some cases to denote happiness." Again he says—"Life is an expression for THE BENEFITS of Christ's death, that is for the WHOLE of them:" p. 33. In a qualified sense we may admit, that it is thus used sometimes: that is, none of all the other benefits could be possessed without life, and therefore to give eternal life is to bestow all other benefits communicated by Christ—they all follow in the train as a necessary result. But if life is by nature, and *not* one of the benefits, yea, the primary one, upon which all the others depend, then the phrase life must signify, when applied to the benefits by Christ, *happiness*, as Mr. H. contends. If so, then by a substitution of the term happiness for life we shall have the sense of the word. Mr. H. thus substitutes it in 2 Tim. 1: 1, "The promise of life in Christ Jesus;" and reads it—"The promise of happiness in Christ Jesus;" and says—"I do not see why this should not afford satisfaction in all cases in which life is used to express the benefits of Christ's death, inasmuch as these are all of the general nature of happiness, and readily conceived of as included in the term:" p. 32.

If the term life is to be understood as another phrase for happiness, in relation to benefits received by Christ, it cannot be relied upon to prove future life at all, save by *inference*: that is, its proper meaning in this relation is *happiness*, and we infer that to be happy we *must* be *alive*. The term, then, according to Mr. Hinton, cannot be urged as *direct* proof of future life. Then the matter stands thus—To say that man is immortal signifies only that he has an *adaptation* to live forever, though it does not prove that he "*positively shall* live for ever." To say that God has promised us life in Christ Jesus, does not prove that we positively shall consciously exist for ever, or that we shall live at all, only by implication; it only proves that we shall be *happy*: so that neither of these phrases assure us certainly that our conscious existence shall be perpetuated without end. And if the *phrase eternal* is brought in to help out of this difficulty, it gives no relief; for that phrase has an "*analogical*" meaning as well as life; and as life is used in its analogical sense in the case before us, according to Mr. H., it is but reasonable to conclude eternal is also, and therefore signifies only while the subject to which it is applied continues; while the saint continues to be conscious he shall continue to be happy: but, for all the phrase "eternal life" proves, God may at any time blot him out of life proper, provided it only be done without *unhappiness*; and all evidence from either the phrase immortality or eternal life, that we "*positively shall* live for ever," is given up and lost, if Mr. Hinton's view is the true one.

Having virtually given up all dependance upon the phrases immortality and eternal life in proof that any one "*positively shall* live for ever," or even live at all hereafter, Mr. H. must find some other mode of argument to establish those points. Indeed, he has not only virtually given up this point, but has *plainly* done it so far as it relates to endless conscious existence being a gift of Christ. His words are—"There are no texts that teach never-ending existence to be the gift of Christ to his followers." p. 123. Surely, that is true, if he defines the phrases immortality and eternal life correctly. He adds—"The phrase everlasting life 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. On the previous page he says—"The phrase, eternal life, ought to be taken for one idea—happiness." Hence we repeat it—that all dependence on this phrase to prove that the righteous "*positively shall* live for ever" is abandoned. We must keep this position in view as we proceed in our examination of Mr. Hinton's theory; and at another stage of our notes, we shall see on what ground, if any, he can establish the eternal conscious existence of men.

"BEARING THE CROSS."

Much is said, among professed Christians, about "bearing the cross;" but we fear little is understood or really practiced in this matter. Some seem to think *speaking in meeting* is the cross they must bear; and when they have done that they think little more about the cross. We apprehend that is a very small item in bearing the cross. Men are all naturally in love with this present world. To this world we must become *crucified*. Crucifixion is a *hard death*; but few persons are willing to die such a death; there is, however, no other way of entering into the kingdom of God. We must be "crucified unto the world, and the world unto" us. Most professed Christians, it is to be feared, have made a covenant with the world, not to part with it; and the tempter satisfies them if they speak in meeting some times, and give something to support the gospel, they may keep their covenant with the world: but, "If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him." 1 John 2: 15.

How then are we to be separated from the love of the world, and be crucified unto it? *First*—By a believing view of the Lord Jesus Christ, who became poor—was despised of men—a man of sorrow, acquainted with grief—endured reproach—resisted temptation, though he "*suffered* being tempted"—when he was reviled, reviled not again—*murmured not*, though wounded, bruised, put to grief, and his soul made an offering for sin, scourged, spit upon, his hands and feet pierced with nails, his *soul in agony*—all this he bore, and no lisp of *impatience* ever escaped him. Would you be crucified unto the world, go learn of him: contemplate his poverty—his life—his sufferings—his resignation—his patience—his loving and forgiving spirit, till the whole mind is humbled within you: and then realize this truth—"If so be we *suffer* with him, that we may be also glorified together." Rom. 8: 17. Do you ask what it is to suffer with him? We answer—To suffer with the same meek, patient, forgiving, resigned spirit that he had. This leads us to say—

Second—If you would bear your cross and be crucified unto the world, REMEMBER, every trial of your life—whether *temporal* or *spiritual*, *personal* or *family*, from *friends* or *enemies*, *direct* or *indirect*, *great* or *small*, of *short continuance* or *long*, or *whatever* be the nature or character of it, is by the *appointment* or *permission* of that God who willeth not the death of the sinner, but who is seeking by all these trials to crucify you unto the world, and fit you to be glorified with His Son Jesus Christ. How shall this design of our heavenly Father be accomplished? It cannot be, unless you "*bear your cross*." Do you ask again—What is it to bear my cross? We answer—It is to suffer all the trials of which we have spoken, *patiently*. You are not to quarrel with the *instrumentality* God may employ, nor indulge in *fretfulness* under it. If you do, you do *not* "*bear the cross*." And though you should speak like an angel in meeting, yet if you *fret* and *complain* under any of the trials of life, by which God is seeking to crucify you unto the world, it is *hypocrisy* for you to talk about your "bearing the cross"—you are but deceiving your own soul. God has assured us, "*all things work together* for good to them that love him." Rom. 8: 28; yet, you can *murmur*, *fret*, and *complain* at those things which God has permitted or appointed!! Alas, *alas!* Do not dream you are ripening for the kingdom of God while this is the case. No, you are ripening for death—for perdition. Saith our Saviour—"In your PATIENCE *possess ye your souls*." We shall learn soon, or when it is too late, that those words are words of solemn and awful import. If you indulge in murmuring, complaining, or *impatience* at any trials, insults, sufferings, or injuries, from whatever instrumentality they may come, and that spirit is *increasing* upon you, you are just as surely travelling in the road to perdition as God has said—"*The soul that sinneth it shall die*." We speak not now of one "overtaken in a fault," to which all are *liable* in the hour of temptation, but we speak of him upon whom this spirit is not *abating* but increasing—and it is increasing, except we bear our cross *daily*: for *every day* will bring some

cross, in some form. Happy the soul who is constantly looking to God for grace to bear every cross. We may pray to have the cross removed; but we may not pray for it only in submission to the will of God. "If it be possible let this cup pass from me; nevertheless not my will but thine be done." That is our *example*; and we cannot safely follow any other. "My grace is sufficient for thee," will often be the answer; and did we know *now* what we *shall know hereafter*, we should praise God for every trial and every cross we have to bear: yea, a *living faith* will praise God even now, that he does not leave us to our own way, lest we should be like the children of Israel, whose impatient murmurings were answered by giving them "flesh," but "leanness" was "sent into their souls." "*Be patient in all things*:" that is *bearing thy cross*; then, when Christ appears you shall have a CROWN.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, SEPTEMBER, 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.—When our paper went to press for August, we had exhausted all our funds, and were about ten dollars in arrears. Through the generosity of a few of our friends, that is cleared off and the present number nearly paid for also; though we are two weeks behind our regular time of issue. We have not asked *donations*, but they are none the less acceptable on that account. It would, however, be more agreeable to us to receive the amount necessary to complete this volume from new subscribers. We shall put the October number to press immediately on the receipt of funds sufficient to pay for its issue. However the Examiner may be delayed in appearing, our enemies need not exult, nor our friends despair, for it is not *dead* nor *unconscious*.

LETTERS OF ENCOURAGEMENT.

From Elon Everts.

Vergennes Vt., August 5, 1849.

Dear Bro. Storrs:—I wish that my anxiety for your prosperity, in all the blessings of our heavenly Father commensurate with the stand you have taken on the side of truth, was transmissible. I would quickly diffuse it among the brethren, and incline them to do what is necessary to sustain you in publishing the "Examiner."

I deeply feel the necessity of such a paper, that fearlessly, independently of consequences, diffuses such a broad ray of light, while the popular mass are with all their sophistry trying to darken counsel, preaching fables and deceiving the innocent.

Dear brethren: I will ask you, as I often ask myself,—where were you, some six year ago? How came you to embrace such a clear light of revelation? Did your salaried preachers teach it to you? Did your sectarian creeds guide to your present faith? Did you, of your ownselves, dare to think of the Bible truths as you now do? Do you not often exclaim, Oh! how great was my darkness; how traditionized I was? Did you not try your utmost to prove your former theory to be the truth? Yea, did you not wish, that, Brother Storrs would keep such doctrines to himself? O! may the Lord forgive us.

Brethren, seeing what you now see, what would tempt you to wrap that old heathen fable about you again? What would induce you to have the "Examiner" stopped?

I will ask one question more. Are you willing that Brothers Storrs and Walsh, should willingly for OUR sakes, put their time, talents, reputation, living and all, upon the altar of our faith, and be sacrificed there, by suffering the opposition and prejudice of the popular religionists, and poverty and want? Their families need common comforts, as much as ours. Brethren, will you take this into candid consideration? While our brethren may feel it duty to preach the gospel, may it not be ours to sustain them? So reasons Paul.

I have repeatedly said, I would not, for $50,00 be deprived of the "Examiner." Not, that I can see everything as clear as our brethren that edit it: but, in it, we get a free discussion on both sides, of very important bible doctrines, and by the best talents, of Europe and America, so that the honest enquirer is readily assisted to judge.

Brethren, a word to the wise is sufficient. Are there not enough, of a willing mind, to contribute a small amount each to disembarrass the "Examiner," that it may speak to our comfort, and to lead others to the truth? Oh! how great may our responsibility be.

Are there not fifty, who will give five dollars each, and as many more, who will give less, and then have more than the "poor widow?"

[Brother Everts letter contained five dollars, thus giving works as well as words.—Ed. Ex.]

From Br. "W. F. F."

Pittsburg, August 12th, 1849.

Dear Bro. Storrs:—I was very sorry to see by the last Examiner, a prospect of it not being continued regularly monthly, when it should be published every week, or at least once in two weeks. I trust the friends of "*truth*" have spoken out "*substantially*" before this time, and that we may be greeted by its bright beams on the 1st of next month and every month, until it shall come offener.

A friend of mine (an Old School presbyterian) loaned me a few weeks ago "Dick on future punishment." I had said a few words to him on the subject of the destruction of the wicked which he received as though tending toward infidelity. I read Dick, and returned it to him with Dobney: he read Dobney and is reading it again, and says he can scarcely believe his own senses, that his eyes have been so long closed to that truth—that there shall be "no place" found for the wicked after their judgment: that they shall be "*burned up root and branch*;" nothing of them left—be as a thing that "*was*" and "*is not*;" he can love his God better, and see a glory in his justice and holiness which before he could not see. I enclose you a trifle [$2.00 Ed. Ex.] to support the Examiner and only regret that it is not in my power to do more.

From Br. Wm. P. Lemmon.

Baltimore, August 15th, 1849.

Brother Storrs:—I note with regret your want of means to carry on the Examiner, as stated in the last number, and hope the friends of truth will sustain you as they ought. I don't agree with you in all you write, but I think the spirit of candor and kindness that characterises the Bible Examiner, is eminently fitted to correct your errors or mine, as the case may be; and, moreover, I think your paper is intrinsically worth double, at least, what you receive for it; I hope, therefore, that many, if not all your subscribers will agree, not only to double their subscriptions for the *coming year* but for the *present*, say one dollar in lieu of fifty cents per annum. Enclosed I hand you ten dollars with my best wishes for the truth's sake.

From Br. Henry E. Carver.

Cincinnati, *Aug. 23d*, 1849.

Bro. Storrs,—Some of your friends here were pained to observe by the August number of the "Examiner" that you had become embarrassed in your efforts to disseminate *light* by want of funds to pay the printer.

Now for one I have been conscious for some time past that the price of the paper, *as it is*, is too low, and am willing to pay the advanced price, even with no alteration in the issue. It would be a source of much regret to me to see the Examiner discontinued; for I regard it as the medium of communicating to the world one of the most important, grand and glorious truths ever presented to the mind of man.

The enclosed five dollars is hereby sent by Bro. Royce, Bro. Wibel, and myself. In return, you will please send three copies of "Dobney." The balance of the money you will consider a free-will offering to aid in finishing the present volume. We consider that we have received full benefit for all we have invested in such a paper as the "*Examiner*."

Your brother in hope of Immortality.

From Br. A. A. Jayne.

New York, *Aug. 20th*, 1849.

Brother Storrs,—On opening the Examiner, I learned that, for want of funds, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to issue the paper for the balance of the year. I at once determined to cast my vote for its continuance; and for this purpose I enclose five dollars. If the following numbers of the paper are never issued, I shall not feel that you are indebted to me (or to any of your subscribers) one farthing; for the light which you have been instrumental in shedding upon my mind, on many disputed doctrines of the Bible, is abundantly more precious than the small sacrifice I have made in obtaining it. I read the paper for August with great satisfaction. I think almost every unprejudiced mind would accord to Bro. Walsh the best of the argument, even if they hesitated to admit that he stands firmest upon the rock of truth. The article upon the "Signs of the Times" deeply interested me. I trust you will be enabled to send the following Nos. in due season.

Yours, looking for glory, honor, immortality, eternal life, only through Jesus Christ, our Lord.

Back Numbers.—We can furnish the Bible Examiner to any who wish, from January, 1848, but no further back. We cannot break volumes, except to supply subscribers who have failed to receive their papers. Any such we will supply if they will give us notice of the number or numbers missing. As we shall make no charge for supplying missing numbers to subscribers, they will send us word free of postage.

Definite Time of the Advent.—If the author of an article on this topic, recently sent us, will read our editorial remarks on that subject, in the Examiner for June, he will see our reasons for not publishing his *calculation*. We cannot give currency to views on that subject which we are sure will result in no good, and can only add to the number of disappointments calculated to shake confidence in the reality of the advent itself; which we believe to be a glorious truth, and an event nigh at hand. Blessed is the man that watcheth and keepeth himself unspotted from the world, "for in such an hour as ye *think not* the Son of Man cometh."

Fallen Asleep.—Sister Sarah Blynn, daughter of Br. James Blynn, of this city, fell asleep in Jesus, July 18, aged 25. For nine years, she endured the

most intense suffering from a spine affection. Her spasms were almost unremitted. In '44 and '45, she had a temporary relief, and was enabled to walk a little by the aid of crutches. We felt to praise God for this truly wonderful mercy; but it was of short continuance. Her sufferings since have been indescribable. For near three months before her death, she was unable to speak at all, or scarcely to be moved; and, though sensible, did not open her eyes. From the first year of her sickness to the last hour of life she was never known to murmur or complain; nor did she in any way manifest impatience. She was a firm believer in the second advent of Christ, of eternal life through him by a resurrection from the dead, and of the non-immortality of the wicked. A few moments before she fell asleep in death, she opened her eyes, and with a smile on her countenance, seemed to say *farewell* to her father and mother, who had watched by her bed side day and night. Unable to utter a word, she could only by signs say: "all is well." Then she fell asleep without a struggle or a sigh, and in glorious hope of a "resurrection at the last day." We might add more, but our limits forbid. We have said this much in praise of that grace which sustained her to the last, and for the information of the many christian friends and ministers who have seen and visited her during her long sickness. She *rests* from her sufferings, and will soon, we trust, enter into *life eternal* according to her faith.

EDITORIAL GENEROSITY.

The following communication, with the "Editorial Notes," we copy from the "True Wesleyan," of August 18th. We thank Br. Lee for his "editorial courtesy," and are glad to find that he "always calculates to be a little more generous than some of" his "neighbors." We will assure him, however, that he shall not outdo *us* in that respect; and we will be most happy to receive a like letter from him at any time, in answer to inquiries, and it shall find place in the Examiner, if we are so fortunate as to be able to continue our paper, which we feared we should not at the time we wrote the following letter to Br. Lee; this fact is our apology, if we need one, for sending our answer to him. That's not all; we will beat him in "generosity" if he will send us an answer to our inquiries to his article "No. II." on Immortality, in the Examiner for May last. We will exceed him in generosity by letting him finish his article without interrupting him by filling it with notes: we will say all we have to say after he has done speaking. We do not complain that Br. Lee placed his figures from "1" to "12" in our article, thereby interrupting us; if that is his taste he has a right to it; we practiced in that way once ourselves till we came to the conclusion that it was *bad* taste, to say nothing more. Try the principle in a public oral debate and see who would tolerate it. We say again, we will exceed Br. Lee in generosity, at least in this respect, if he will try us with a reply to our queries in the Examiner for May. And we claim that we have already exceeded him in generosity, for we have copied two of his articles, *entire*, from the True Wesleyan, on Immortality, while he has copied none of the articles from the Examiner in reply to his, nor *noticed* that any replies were being made to him by our Associate Editor.

Br. Lee, it will be seen, finishes his *notes* on our letter "by repeating the questions which," he says, "we insist have not been answered." We are perfectly willing, the readers of the Wesleyan and Examiner should judge whether we have answered the questions or not; and there we shall leave that point after a few words at the close.

"ANNIHILATION—DEATH."

BRO. LEE:—Under the above head, in the Wesleyan of the 4th instant, you have noticed some remarks of mine, relating to my objection to the use of the term "annihilation" in the immortality discussion. You conclude with the following questions: "Will Brother Storrs tell us, what he understands by the word death, and by the word annihilation, and what, in his view, is the difference between them."

By this inquiry, I presume you wish me to give my answer through the Wesleyan, which I will cheerfully do. (1.)

In your article, to which this is a reply, you said —"we mean by annihilation, what is expressed by the words, 'cease to exist,' or 'a state of non-existence:'" and you inquire—"Does Mr. Storrs mean the same thing by death?"

My answer to this inquiry, turns on what definition you give to the term "exist." (2.) For it seems that you, as well as others, have your own definition of terms. (3.) Mr. Hinton, an English writer on the same side of the immortality question with yourself, in a late mighty effort against the view I advocate, says that "death involves no cessation of existence either body or soul;" p. 449. (4.) It is manifest, however, that the "body" becomes entirely unconscious: (5.) that is "death" when the term is used in relation to the cessation of the life of sensitive beings; but it is not "annihilation:" for, as Mr. Hinton affirms, it "involves no cessation of existence" of the "body." (6.) It is for you, Mr. Hinton, and others, on your side of the question to prove that a man only half dies. (7.) I agree with Mr. Hinton, that in man's death there is "no cessation of existence in either body or soul:" [using the term soul in your sense, of a distinct entity, without adopting that sense;] (8.) Hence, your question is answered, according to the language you employ in defining what you mean by annihilation, viz.—"ceasing to exist, or a state of non-existence:" neither body nor soul "cease to exist" either in the first or second death: (9.) and it is perfectly in "the power of God" to call them up to conscious existence after the first or second death, if he will: the only difference in this respect is, God wills to call all men back from the first death, but he wills not to call any back from "the second death;" yet neither the bodies nor the souls of the wicked "cease to exist" in the second death: but they do sink into a state of eternal unconsciousness by the will of God. (10.) But, be it remembered, not beyond His power to awaken them if he chose—such a state would be "annihilation"—their living again all turns on His will. Lest you should think I have given you a new definition in answering your questions, I beg to be permitted to give the following remarks, which I published in the Bible Examiner, June, 1844; and they may close what I have to say to you in reply at this time:

"The term annihilation, as usually understood by common people, means an absolute reducing to nothing. Now, in that sense I am no believer in annihilation, and I never use that term in speaking of the end of the wicked. (11.) I think there is a clear "distinction" between total unconsciousness and annihilation. It is evident to all, that the body is totally unconscious at the first death; but, it is very far from being annihilated. It returns to, and mingles with its mother earth. In the second death the entire man is reduced to his original elements, whatever they were; but the elements to which he is reduced are not annihilated; and God could call him back to consciousness again if he chose. Hence I reject the term, because it makes a false impression. I maintain that when the second death takes place there is a final and eternal unconsciousness of the wicked; or as it is expressed in the 37th Psalm, 20th v.—"The wicked shall perish, and the enemies of the Lord shall be as the fat of lambs: they shall consume: into smoke, shall they consume away." Call that 'annihilation' if you will; I reject the term in this controversy. It has nothing to do with it." (12.)

Yours in hope of eternal life, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, GEORGE STORRS.

Philadelphia, August 6th, 1849.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

(1.) It may have been a very natural and very modest presumption, but still we intended no such thing. The article was not written for our columns. Bro. Storrs wrote about us in his own paper, and we replied in ours, and asked of him an explanation, which we supposed he would give through the same medium through which he had made the attack upon us. Had not Bro. Storrs been an editor, and had we called on him for an explanation, we should have expected to have loaned him the use of our columns, but as he commenced the attack upon us in his own columns, we supposed it most reasonable to look for the explanation to reach us through the same source, as we specified no other channel. The view Bro. Storrs takes of the subject is this: when one editor attacks another, and the assailed party replies and asks an explanation, he invites his assailant to overlook his own columns, and occupy his whom he assailed. We have not so learned editorial courtesy. Nevertheless, we publish the article, as we always calculate to be a little more generous than some of our neighbors.

(2.) Bro. Storrs knows what definition we put upon the word exist, when we speak of the human mind; there was no occasion for his creating fog where there is none. For a soul to cease to exist, is to cease to be a soul.—With us to cease to think is to cease to be a soul, for we know little about the human soul, more than what we gather from its thinking operations; with us a thought is the mind thinking, and this Bro. Storrs knows, if he has read what he found fault with. A body ceases to exist when it ceases to be a body—when it ceases to be an organism. Throw a human body into the fire and consume it, and the organism ceases to exist, but there will be the ashes left, and the fluid will exist some where, but they are not the body or the organism. But in relation to the soul, whose very existence is thought, which is never known to exist only in connection with thought, and is known to exist only from its thoughts, we know nothing of the ashes or vapor left when it ceases to be a soul, or ceases to think.

(3.) We always use terms in their commonly received sense, unless we give notice to the contrary. We introduced the word annihilation into our articles on the immortality of the soul, with such explanations as preclude almost the possibility of being misunderstood, and what we asked of Bro. Storrs was, to give a like explanation of the sense in which he uses the word death. Had he been disposed to give a frank answer, he could have so answered as not to had his meaning depend upon our definition of words, but upon his own definitions, which he might have appended.

(4.) We did not ask Bro. S. what Mr. Hinton believes concerning death, but what he, Rev. George Storrs, believes; why could he not have answered? We are not responsible for Mr. Hinton's views, nor do we hold Bro. Storrs responsible for them, but only for his own, if we shall succeed in finding out what they are.

(5.) This implies that the body is conscious, for unless it be conscious, how can it become "unconscious?" This is new doctrine; we maintain that consciousness does not pertain to the body. The body is never conscious, and Bro. Storrs is the first philosopher we ever heard talk about the consciousness of the body. Consciousness is purely an operation of the mind.

(6.) We differ from Mr. Hinton and Mr. Storrs both. When we speak of the human body, we speak of it as an organism, and when it is decomposed, we maintain that the body, the organism ceases to exist. The solid part may be blown about by the wind, and the fluid may ascend in vapor and fall in dew, or be lost in the ocean of waters, but we deny that these are the body, a human body; the body has ceased to exist, the organism is annihilated, though the elements of which it was composed may exist somewhere in wide nature.

(7.) We did not ask Mr. Hinton to prove anything; we only asked Mr. Storrs what in his opinion is the difference between annihilation and death, and our readers will not fail to see how he talks about Mr. Hinton to get rid of answering.

(8.) We did not wish Bro. Storrs to answer on the ground of our understanding of the soul, "without adopting that sense," but we wished him to answer in view of his own understanding of the soul.

(9.) For the soul to exist in our sense of the soul, is to be conscious, for with us the soul is a living consciousness, and when it ceases to be conscious, it will cease to be a soul. Bro. Storrs believes the soul dies, and yet continues to be a soul if we understand him.—Do the souls of Adam and Abel still exist? and are they human souls still? and have they maintained a distinct existence separate from all other souls that have existed since? We would like to have Bro. Storrs answer this, yea or nay. He claims to have answered our question, but we do not consider it an answer, but an evasion.

(10.) What does Bro. Storrs understand by the soul of a man? What is it? Is it a spirit, breath, life, bone, flesh, blood, solid or fluid? If it be life, as some affirm, does life die, and still exist after it is dead, so that there is such a thing as dead life? These are queries which his pretended answer naturally suggests.

(11.) Bro. Storrs knew that we did not use the term in this sense, when he complained of us for employing it. If a soul "sink into a state of eternal unconscious-

ness." it will be annihilated in the sense in which every one must know we used the term, who has read our articles.—Why then did he complain of us?

(12.) This whole extract is a mere declamation, and proves no part of any answer to our questions. If Bro. Storrs really thinks it proves his point by the text which says. "into smoke shall they consume away," he must understand it literally. If so, human souls are converted into smoke, and still they are souls in the shape of smoke. When the smoke settles down in our annual Indian summer, who can say that it is not the return of the souls of martyrs, according to this theory. We have no more idea that the text literally describes the end of human souls, than we believe the end of God's people is literally described, when it is said, "they eat up my people as they eat bread."

We close our remarks by repeating the questions, which we insist have not been answered. They are as follows: "Will Bro. Storrs tell us what he understands by the word death, and by the word annihilation, and what, in his view, is the difference between them."

The question is, "what is his opinion," &c." No matter what other people believe; they will take care of their own opinions.

NOTE BY THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

Br. Lee, in his note "2" says—"With us to cease to think is to cease to be a soul, for we know little about the human soul, more than what we gather *from* its thinking operations; with us a thought is the mind thinking," &c.

Men "cease to think" when sound asleep: then the soul "ceases to be a soul." Men have been in a state of total insensibility for days, months, and, in some instances, for years; for these periods, longer or shorter, according to Br. Lee, the soul "ceases to be a soul." Suppose then this "ceasing to think" should last from the death of Abel to the resurrection at the last day; of course, as Br. L. will have it, the soul has "ceased to be a soul;" but the *power* of God has not "*ceased*" to be omnipotent; and he can as easily revive the soul in the last case as those previously noticed. "With us," says Br. Lee, "a thought is the mind thinking." But in each of the foregoing cases there is no "thinking;" *then* Br. Lee "knows little about the human soul," as it has no "*thinking operations*." He has said in his articles on immortality, that "the soul is a simple essente, immaterial, uncompounded and indivisible:" that seemed to imply that he knew a *great deal* "about" it; but now he "knows little about" it "more than what" he "gathers from its thinking operations." There are times when it does *not think*, and we judge that Br. Lee is now approaching the truth, *viz.*, that theologians, on his side of the question "*know little about the human soul*:" the soul, according to them, is, after all, only *thought*: a glorious soul indeed; and it "ceases to be a soul" generally, once in every twenty-four hours. Br. Lee says expressly, in note "2," "the soul, whose *very existence* IS THOUGHT;" and he adds—"which is never known to exist only in *connection with thought*, and is known to exist *only* from *its thoughts*." We will not call this "creating fog," for we think foggy as it is, it is pretty *clear*: THE SOUL IS THOUGHT, according to this definition. We are almost ready to say *Amen*. Perhaps Br. Lee would accept it as an answer to his inquiries in note "10." But he says, note "9," "For the soul to exist in our sense of the soul, is to be conscious, for with us the soul is a living consciousness, and when it ceases to be conscious it will cease to be a soul." Br. Lee has, doubtless, seen persons perfectly unconscious under the influence of chloroform, and their "thought" ceased; hence, according to him, the soul "ceased to be a soul:" there was not a "living consciousness:" cut and mangle the body as you would, there was no consciousness; and the lack of consciousness was not in the *body*, for Br. Lee says, note "5"—"Consciousness does not pertain to the body. The body," he adds, "is never conscious;" and concludes by affirming, "Consciousness is purely an operation of the mind." This authority, of course, is good in this argument. The matter then stands thus:—

"*When the soul ceases to be conscious it will cease to be a soul*:"—

But the soul ceases to be conscious by the use of chloroform:—

THEREFORE *it then "ceases to be a soul."*

But again, note "2," Br. Lee says—"For a soul to cease to exist, is to cease to be a soul." Suppose we put this together with the foregoing, thus:

To cease to exist is to cease to be a soul:—

But, under the influence of chloroform the soul ceases to be a soul, inasmuch as it "ceases to be conscious:"—

THEREFORE, *it "ceases to exist" at such times.*

In regard to Br. Lee's affirmation, at the close of his "notes," that his "questions have not been answered," we will put our answer together as may be found in our letter. It is as follows:—

"Death involves no cessation of existence in either body or soul; it is manifest, however, that the *body* becomes entirely *unconscious*: THAT is *death*, where the term is used in relation to the cessation of the *life* of sensitive beings, but it is not annihilation: it involves no cessation of existence of the body: it is for you to prove that a man only *half* dies. Neither body nor soul cease to exist either in the first or second death: and it is perfectly in the power of God to call them up to *conscious* existence after the first or second death if he will. God *wills* to call all men back from the *first* death, but he wills *not* to call any back from the *second death*—they sink into a state of eternal* *unconsciousness* by the *will* of God. But not beyond his *power* to awaken them if he chose—such a state would be annihilation."

The reader can now judge whether we did not answer Br. Lee's questions distinctly. We think we clearly stated what we understood by death, what by annihilation, and the difference between them; and if Br. Lee had not put "(5.)" in our mouth before we were suffered to finish the sentence, it seems to us he must have seen, and his readers too, that we did expressly answer his *first* question, *viz.*: "What do you understand by the word death?" In our letter, which we sent him, our words were made emphatic as in the quotation above; but he chose to remove the emphasis: of that we do not complain, for the reader would not have been likely to stumble without it, if the "(5.)" had not called off his attention before we finished the sentence, so that after reading the "note" he would not be likely to observe our reference in the expression "THAT is *death*," &c.; especially as the emphasis was removed from it.

*Not "*external*," as erroneously printed in the True Wesleyan.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

No. II.

We expressed the opinion, in our previous article, that the scarlet colored beast, Rev. 17th, is a symbol of the Papal civil power just prior to its final destruction; or, the last form of that power; and that which it took after it recovered from the "deadly wound" received, by which it was sent into the bottomless pit for a time. Having ascended out of that condition, it is presented in the 17th chap., under the seventh vial, just as the judgment is to be executed upon its rider, or the power that had managed it. The rider of this beast is described as a corrupt woman, distinctly named, "BABYLON THE GREAT," &c., and marked as a power that had shed the blood of the saints, and martyred the followers of Jesus. She is described, at verse 18, as being "that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth." It is manifest, however, that the walls, streets, bricks, and mortar which go to make up a city, never reigned over any body. When it is said, therefore, that the woman is that great city that reigneth over the kings of the earth, it is clear the meaning is, the power symbolized by this corrupt woman has its seat in that great city, or in Rome. This power is, mystically, *Babylon*; and takes its name from Babylon of the Old Testament. In order fully to understand this prophecy, we must compare it with the prophecies of the Old Testament concerning Babylon.

Here we wish to state a principle which we believe will be found true of many of the prophecies of the previous dispensation. It is this—That those prophecies frequently embrace events which in their fulfilment are at a distance from each other; or, a part of the prophecy has its accomplishment in events near, and another part at a more distant period; perhaps centuries after. Or, we would distinguish them thus—*near* and *remote* events, yet combined in one prophecy without, perhaps, any notice of this distinction; leaving the developments to settle that point. None can doubt but this is the case in those prophecies relating to Messiah's sufferings and reign, or the first and second advents. Nor had the Jews, or Disciples, at first, any idea that Messiah must have *two* advents to accomplish all that was written of him. It is easy to illustrate this point by several prophecies which have had a partial fulfilment, but we do not deem it necessary now to go into the evidence further.

In examining the prophecy concerning Babylon in Rev., we shall need constantly to refer to the prophecies of Babylon in the Old Testament, which will be found to contain parts which either never have had a fulfilment at all, or only a partial one, and that mainly as a "figure of that which was to come." If this fact is kept before our minds it will help us much in understanding Revelation.

We will, before going on directly, make a more minute enquiry as to what power is symbolized by Babylon, designated as a corrupt woman. We begin with Rev. chap. 17: 1. It is there called "the great *whore*." The original word is *pornees*, which signifies one that prostitutes herself for gain, —an idolatress—*figuratively*, a corrupt and idolatrous church. It is used frequently in the Old Testament in reference to the departures of the Jewish church from God, her husband, by her idolatries. The very first idea, therefore, in the Revelation, is that of a corrupt and idolatrous church, prostituting herself for gain; a "*great*" church worshipping idols, and multiplying gods, for the sake of gaining money and power. Again, in verse 5, she is called "*the mother of harlots*." She is therefore the *chief* church—"the great" church. There is but one such church to be found on the earth; and it seems almost useless to argue the case. No church can answer to the description except the "*Roman* Catholic Church." She has multiplied gods, from the virgin Mary down through the whole catalogue of real and imaginary saints, and worshipped them, or prayed to them who are dead, and "know not anything;" and hence is just as guilty of *idolatry* as if she had done homage to wood or stone. She has also multiplied "*images*" innumerable, and thus shows herself the prostitute church designated "the great whore." She is indeed "*the mother church*"—but she is "the mother of *harlots*"—*pornon*—unchaste females, prostituting themselves and the gospel for gain. It is not difficult to see who are the daughters. If you see money-loving churches, conforming to the world for gain or popularity, you cannot fail to know they are of the mother of harlots. But our object being now to speak of the "judgment of the *great* whore," or *mother*, we shall not, at present, dwell upon her daughters. She is first described as a corrupt woman—then as the mother of other corrupt women—then riding and managing a corrupt civil power, symbolized by a scarlet colored beast, full of the names of blasphemy, with which she is in union. Next she is shown as a bloody persecutor; drunken—intoxicated with the blood of saints, &c. She is then presented as conducting herself in such manner, when God's words are about to be fulfilled upon her in judgment, that she is hated by the horns, or civil powers who had given their strength and power to the beast with which she was in league, and which had "carried her," (verse 7,) and they "eat her flesh and burn her with fire;" i. e. destroy her. The 18th chapter gives a detailed account of the judgment upon her, the reasons for it, some of the means by which it is inflicted, and the feelings of those interested in her continuance, and who had enriched themselves by her. All this is done under the symbol of a great and prosperous city suddenly destroyed, and the consternation and terror of such an event. A great part of the scenery here is drapery, thrown in to heighten the effect of the picture, but not to be understood as literally taking place; we speak of that part particularly from the 9th verse onward, which describes the *feelings* and *sayings* of those in the interest of this corrupt church, or Babylon.

In the 17th chapter, John was shown the beast, that this woman rode, in such circumstances as called for the "*intervention*" of the "power" of the horns, or governments, that were under the *woman* power, or ecclesiastical influence of this corrupt church. It was the woman that "reigneth over the kings" or governments "of the earth," or old Roman Empire, that invoked those governments to interfere to sustain the scarlet colored beast, or civil government the woman had ridden and controlled, and which had "carried" her in all her bloody course. After noticing that "intervention," by which the horns "agreed and gave their power and strength to the beast," it is said, "these shall make war upon the Lamb," &c., thus

intimating that this combination with the beast, at the bidding of the woman, was to constitute one of those agencies that should be specially engaged in "the battle of the great day of God Almighty." Having thrown out this hint, at verse 14, the prophecy, before proceeding directly to an account of the battle, stops to take a particular notice of the judgment on the woman, or Babylon, which is briefly noted, verse 16, but given in detail, chapter 18; though that chapter, chronologically, we think, synchronizes with the 20th verse of the 19th chap.; but being an event of such vast importance, a particular description is given of it by itself, and of the rejoicing at its fall, before arriving at the general account at the close of chap. 19. Here also we may as well remark, we think in the order of events the narrative, Rev. 19: 1—10, of the rejoicing at Babylon's destruction, follows Rev. 20: 3, and forms the introduction to Rev. 20: 4, and onward.

We are now prepared to proceed to notice the particular account of the judgment on Babylon. It is introduced as a special and separate *scene*, and therefore an angel is represented to come down from heaven, to open it and declare the reasons for this terrible judgment. He first announces that Babylon is fallen—*epesen*—one sense of the Greek word is, *to fall in judgment*. She had been tried and condemned, and the sentence is now about to be executed. This judgment is righteous, or just; she has "become a habitation"—a place of, a dwelling of—devils—*daimonôn*—deities, idols, or "knowing ones;" the character of whom is next spoken of, viz. "*foul spirit*"—*pneumatos*—"foul" tempers, dispositions, feelings, affections, inclinations; all these were the result of her idolatries; as the worship and sincere service of the true God is productive of *holy* tempers, dispositions, feelings, affections, and inclinations, so Babylon's worship of images, dead saints, &c., had made her "a hold"—*phulake*—a den "of every foul," impure temper, disposition, &c.; "and a cage of every unclean and hateful," detestable, loathsome "bird"—birds that feed on carrion, putrid flesh. What a description! But answering exactly to Roman Catholic christendom. We preached on this subject a few weeks ago in this city; a secular paper here, without any knowledge of what we had said, had an article the next morning on "THE CURSES OF EUROPE," in which it said, "Most of Europe, especially the Catholic portion, is demoralized. Jesuitism, Fourierism, fanaticism of all kinds, have made it a moral chaos . . . distracted by extremes, either of superstition or infidelity, despotism or anarchy." It added, speaking of the various causes—"All, operating together, have converted all Europe into Pandemonium. This Greek word signifies *All the Devils*, or *The Place of all the Devils*" When we read this, we were half inclined to think the editor of that paper had been listening to our sermon the day previous; or at least been looking at the prophecy; but the former we presume he never does, and the latter we think not often, for he is still dreaming of the *ultimate* triumph of republicanism in Europe. Even politicians can see that "Catholic Europe" is the "*Place of all Devils*," but they do not see its doom.

A further reason announced by the angel for the judgment to be executed on Babylon is—"For all nations have drank of the wine of the wrath of her fornication"—she has spread her corrupt and idolatrous religion every where; and hence if she is not soon destroyed she will make "all nations" as corrupt as "Catholic Europe." "And the kings of the earth"—*tees ges—the land, i. e.* where she holds sway, or the old Roman empire, otherwise, "Catholic Europe"—"have committed fornication with her"—have joined in her idolatries and sought her protection; thus casting off reliance upon God, and becoming as black in idolatry as herself; hence we shall find in the sequel, chap. 19: 19—21, that they are destroyed with her, though the description of her fate is separately and at large presented in this 18th chapter; we shall find, however, that those countries that have been under her power will be prominent actors in her destruction, as represented chap. 17: 16, which work they will do in "the battle" as set forth chap. 19: 20, corresponding with chap. 17: 16, those two verses synchronizing together.

We may as well say, in this place, that we regard "the battle of the great day of God Almighty" as *now going on;* and as having commenced with the seventh vial of the seven last plagues, which we think began either with the French revolution of 1848, or within a few years previous to that time. That battle is made up of a *series of events*, passing over several years; we pretend not to say how many—time will reveal that. We are not to look for that battle in one event, but in a protracted conflict, made up of various events, or conflicts both of principles and of physical force, which we cannot doubt are now in progress. The scenery of that battle in chap. 19 we regard as all symbolical; and have no idea that "the kings of the earth, the beast, and the false prophet," &c., in that battle are to see Christ or his army, or will know that they are fighting against him, any more than the Jews knew they were "crucifying the Lord of glory." But let us not be mistaken in these remarks; we do believe that battle is to be followed with the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth, and the *personal* reign of Christ on the throne of his father David, with his dominion over all the earth.

Let us not then be bewildering our minds about a battle *literally* to correspond with the symbolical representation in Rev. 19. As we presume no one supposes that a *literal* "sword out of Christ's mouth" is to be employed in that battle, so let us not blind our eyes to the truth—solemn, awful truth—that we are now actually living in the time when that battle has begun, even "*the battle of* THAT GREAT DAY *of God Almighty*," which is to close up *this age*, and bring in *the age of Messiah's personal reign*. But the children of God who expect that reign may have need of patience; for most likely it will be several years before the battle will terminate; for aught we can tell, however, God may take up his saints to meet Christ "in the air" *before* the battle is over; we are inclined to the opinion that he will, yet we have no positive assurance of it. If not so, then there may be several years of trial still awaiting them here; and they will need to heed their Lord's admonition—"*In your patience possess ye your souls.*"

We shall say more of the battle, chap. 19, when we come to explain that part of the prophecy: and give our reasons for the suggestion we have thrown out, that the armies and powers engaged in it, opposed to Christ, will be ignorant of what they are doing.

The next thing we notice in the account of Babylon's destruction is the cry—"Come out of her, my people, that ye receive not of her plagues." We remark, in the first place, that Babylon has *territory* as well as power and seat. It is therefore to be surveyed as a whole; the judgment falls off her and on those occupying the territory over which she has held ecclesiastical sway, as all together go to make up Babylon. The people here called to come out of her reside on the territory under her sway, but are not as a body of her religion—they are clearly a distinct people, though some of them, from various causes, may have been ecclesiastically connected with her. Again we remark, it is a people that have been oppressed by her, and suffered severely from her; for they are directed to "reward her even as she rewarded" them, &c., verse 6. To find out who are this people, we must have reference to the unfulfilled part of the prophecy concerning Babylon in the Old Testament; or those prophecies that had only a partial accomplishment in events relating to Babylon in Chaldea. "For Israel hath not been forsaken, nor JUDAH of his God, of the LORD of hosts; *though* their land *was* filled with sin against the Holy One of Israel." FLEE OUT OF THE MIDST OF BABYLON and deliver every man his soul; be not cut off in her iniquity; for this is the time of the Lord's vengeance; he will render unto her a recompense." Jer. 51: 5, 6. The facts here presented, and the exhortation given do not correspond with the facts of the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity, nor with any events prior to the Christian era. This truth is so obvious that it does seem really unnecessary to spend time to prove it. The most that could be claimed with any show of truth is, that there was a *partial* fulfilment. But the first proclamation in favor of the Jews, at that time, was by Cyrus king of Persia; and they left the seat of their captivity not to escape judgment *coming* on Babylon, or to escape her plagues. Here then is a part of the prophecy that is to be carried forward for its *full* accomplishment to the time of the New Testament Babylon, or the Babylon of Rev. 18. Again, Jer. 51: 41—45, it is said—"How is Sheshack [a *mystic* name for Babylon] taken! and how is the praise of the whole earth surprised! how is Babylon become an astonishment among the nations! the sea is come up upon Babylon; she is covered with the multitude of the waves thereof." [that is, with the waters where the whore sitteth," which "are peoples, multitudes, nations and tongues"] . . "My people, go ye out of the midst of her, and deliver ye every man his soul from the fierce anger of the Lord." Here is an exact correspondence with the language, Rev. 18: 4, and which had no correspondence in any facts relating to the return of the Jews from their captivity in Babylon of Chaldea. We cannot but think, therefore, that the people called out of Babylon, Rev. 18, is that people so long oppressed and crushed by the idolatrous Mother of Harlots who has heaped upon the offspring of JUDAH such untold wrongs and sufferings. We are the more inclined to this view from the prophecy of Isa. 51, where we have the following language—"Awake, awake, stand up, O Jerusalem, which hast drunk at the hand of the Lord the cup of his fury; thou hast drunken the dregs of the cup of trembling, and wrung them out. . . . Thus saith thy Lord, the LORD and thy God that pleadeth the cause of his people, *Behold, I have taken out of thy* HAND *the cup of trembling*, even the dregs of the cup of my fury; *thou shalt* NO MORE *drink of it* AGAIN; but I will put it into the hand of them that afflict thee," &c., verse 17—23. That this prophecy relates to the posterity of Jacob none, surely, ought to deny; and it shows that a time should come after a long season of cruel oppression when the hand that had crushed them should be taken off, and the cup should NO MORE AGAIN be put to their lips, but their oppressors shall drink it. What do we see in these days? The Catholic nations of Europe have been and are removing their hands from off this long oppressed people, and at the same time judgments fall thick and fast on those nations; indicating that the hour of Mystical Babylon's judgment has come; and that the people so long oppressed by her are called by the "*voice*" of Providence "from heaven" to "come out of her; that ye receive not of *her* plagues." Before leaving the territory and dominion of mystic Babylon, however, they will try to sustain the Catholic nations where they reside, denominated by Jeremiah an effort to "*heal*" her; but this effort will prove abortive. It is thus expressed by the prophet, Jer. 51: 8, 9, "Take balm for her pain, if so be she may be healed. We would have healed Babylon, but she is not healed;" which effort being unsuccessful, it is added—"forsake her, and let us go every one into his own country, for *her judgment* reacheth unto heaven," &c. At this very hour the Jews are trying to heal the Catholic nations of Europe, or to prevent their utter ruin, by fighting in her battles, and loaning large sums of money to the governments to save them from bankruptcy and ruin. True, all this may be but a selfish principle in them, that they may save the millions of dollars before loaned to those governments, and which must probably be a total loss if those governments crumble to pieces. Hence the effort to heal Babylon; but she will not be healed; and when the monied Jews clearly see this, the next effort will be to seek a refuge elsewhere before they wreck all in the useless effort to sustain that falling power. Such a discovery will be to them as "a voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her my people," and it will be obeyed. This constitutes, in our opinion, one of the events of the battle of the great day of God Almighty; and will be one of the most mighty engines in breaking Babylon and all Catholic Europe in pieces—producing entire bankruptcy, and annihilating their power, bringing in a state of anarchy, fitly described by "doubling unto her double according to her works; in the cup which she hath filled fill to her double"—producing "torment and sorrow" in all her borders. So the prophecy of Jeremiah, Jer. 51: 20, says—"Thou art my battle-axe and weapons of war; for with thee will I break in pieces the nations, and with thee will I destroy kingdoms." The removal of that people out of Catholic Europe, with what wealth is yet in their power, would be indeed the death blow to Babylon and her adherents; literally "breaking in pieces the nations, and destroying kingdoms." These things happen immediately after a time that Babylon had exultingly said—"I sit as a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow;" the exact state of that power two years ago, when almost all the world were ready to extol the head of Babylon to

heaven, and her praises were in every land; but already the hisses of *hatred* to the whore begin to be heard on every side, and indications increase that the period is just at hand when her flesh will be eaten, and she burned with fire. Then will the wailing described in the remainder of Rev. 18, be heard from those who have been in her interests, and who have enriched themselves by her idolatries and corruptions. The joy of the saints at that event, chap. 19: 1—9, we shall consider in another article.

LETTERS.

Sister C. C. Williams, Beaver Dam, N. Y., writes:

Br. Storrs:—I know not how it is with others, but for myself I can say it is a great satisfaction as well as pleasure to be able to do a little towards disenthralling the mind of the mass, which the Man of Sin has so long kept enchained. I rejoice that his hour seems near, and his destruction certain. The invincible sword, the Word of God, I feel will triumph. Truth will and must prevail. Man will find out what he is, and what he needs, and those who learn that, cannot but adore the Being who planned and executed such a work as has been wrought for them, to secure to them something worthy of being brought into being, and for undergoing here a course of trial—viz.: eternal life. I love to think, talk or write upon it: yes, and work too, to spread the light abroad. I think it must be truth, it looks so light. Error does not thus, but blinds, looks mysterious; and the more one tries to extricate themselves the more entangled they become. But this, to me, seems a potent way of combating self-styled Orthodoxy: and is cheap, too: to put these works on immortality into the hands of all who will read them. And I think they can hardly fail of exciting a spirit of inquiry to know whether or not these things are so. I wish more would feel the importance of doing so, as well as the comfort of it, and we should soon see the battle raging and volunteers enlisting; either on the side of Truth or Error, a stand would be taken. I desire to see the work go on.—[$3 enclosed.—Ed. Ex.]

Br. Parker Sawyer, Hampton, N. Y., writes:

Br. Storrs:—It gives me pleasure to be instrumental in extending the circulation of the Examiner, Dobney and the Six Sermons, for I believe they are and will be productive of great good, founded, as I firmly believe, upon the Eternal truth of God, as revealed in his word. They are full of life and comfort to the Christian, and contain a rational appeal to the sincere Universalist, who, on new ground to him, is met and refuted; whilst the Infidel listens with almost profound silence. I am with you with all my heart, now and ever in the fearless defense of *Gospel truth*, though foes may deride and friends forsake. Yours truly.

Br. J. B. Tiler, Lockewack, N. Y., writes:

Br. Storrs:—By the smiles of a good Providence, two months past I have had comfortable health, after a tedious afflictive five months under a chronic inflammation of the bronchia. I have enjoyed the monthly visits of the Examiner, and often think how little the earthly compensation you have for the care and responsibility of its publication. Will you send me eight or ten copies of your Six Sermons, quarto? I think to circulate them among my neighbors. Enclosed is one dollar for subscription and sermons; I wish it were $10 for the same; or that I could help you in your labor more. I hope to help you more in future. From your well-wishing and praying brother.

Br. Geo. W. Burleam, N. Y., writes:

Dear Br. Storrs:—Your works are in considerable demand, the people *will* investigate the question—the *Bible* question of their final destiny.

"Behold, I come quickly and my reward is with me"—says Christ. The question arises *who* is to be rewarded, and *what* is that reward. God has spoken who shall not fear? *We* are interested in the investigation of this subject.

Our late tent meetings have been the means of good to the people. New ones, and men of influence, have stepped into our thinned ranks. Present movements among the nations are rousing up the lovers of the Bible to inquire what of the night? what do these things indicate? Our faith is unwavering in the speedy advent of Zion's Deliverer.

May God preserve you, and the Saints with you and us, in the truth, until that day. Yours, in the hope of Eternal Life in the Kingdom of God.

Br. James Donaldson, Detroit, writes:—

Br. Storrs:—May grace, mercy and peace be with you and all the Israel of God. Amen.

I was sorry on receiving Examiner No. 5, to hear that you were embarrassed with your paper. I sorrow to think that you should be devoted to the dissemination of truth, and in return be encumbered with debt. This must not be; no, no. I hope your readers will comply at once with your request, to furnish new subscribers, and thus relieve you from embarrassment. Not only so, but express their readiness to pay one dollar or *two* per year. I hope a determined effort will be made to secure the weekly or semi-monthly publication of the Examiner. I am glad you have noticed objections to the Examiner. Many of your readers, so far as I am acquainted, say, we are with Br. Storrs on the immortality question, but want more on the advent: we wish to hear more from Brs. Storrs and Walsh on the Kingdom, and don't agree with you that the advent papers make up what is wanted. We desire an exposition of the Prophets, to enlighten the heads and warm the hearts of those watching for Christ from Heaven. My prayer is, that you may be abundantly blessed in your labors for truth. Yours, in hope of eternal life.—[$2 enclosed.—Ed. Ex.]

☞ Books.—D. Roberts, P. M., Tremont, Ill., sent us a letter dated Aug. 18th, stating that there is a package of nine copies of our Six Sermons in the Post Office at that place, addressed to "J. G. Yarick, Bloomingville, Ill." He says, "We know of no place of that name in this State," &c.; and states they will be retained at Tremont until he hears from us. We have no knowledge of sending the above named "package," and presume it must have been sent from Rochester, N. Y., or from some of our friends in Michigan. We give this notice, hoping that whoever forwarded the package will attend to it, and write to the Post Master of Tremont on the subject. Mr. Roberts will please accept our thanks for his attention to the matter.

☞ For Price of Books, Depositories, &c., see Examiner for July.