HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NO IMMORTALITY, NOR ENDLESS LIFE, EXCEPT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST ALONE.

VOL. VII. PHILADELPHIA, JANUARY, 1852. NO. 1.

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
At No. 52 Vine Street, below Second.
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

TERMS.—Single copy, for one year, $1; six copies, $5; thirteen copies, $10; always in advance.

THE QUESTION OF QUESTIONS.

BY WM. GLEN MONCRIEFF, SCOTLAND.

"For what is a man advantaged, if he gain the whole world and lose himself, or be cast away." Luke ix. 25.

The question of questions is here presented for our consideration by the Lord Jesus. It is eminently a practical one—a question that demands a solution even before any worldly or speculative problem can lawfully occupy the attention for a moment. And yet, though of confessedly mighty magnitude, how often it is thrown aside! How often the merest trifle in comparison engrosses the mind: the present rules despotically over millions; the future—the momentous, the God-illuminated future—solicits consideration in vain. Will the reader condescend to remain by our side for a little till he learns a few of our thoughts regarding the problem in the text? It concerns you more than any question in the wide range of thought; and loving you with much affection, we desire to aid you in arriving at a correct apprehension of its terms, and of the only rational and scriptural solution it can receive. We have, you will please to observe, in the passage, a statement of gain, of loss, and a question as to the profit over the loss. In this order we shall endeavor to analyze and explain its contents:

I. THE GAIN.—"If he gain the whole world," or the greatest reachable amount of property and enjoyment. Our Lord knew that the desire of possessing property is a strong propensity in men generally; and here, to give his question effect, he supposes the utmost wish realized—all got that is within the conceivable grasp of a human being. What more could any one gain than "the whole world?" Our Lord imagines even it acquired; and then pushes into view his great life-problem, asks his hearer to solve it with the judgment-seat rapidly approaching, and the doom of the ungodly sounding in his ears.

We have said the phrase "the whole world" not merely, in our judgment, represents the greatest attainable amount of property, but also the largest quantity of enjoyment. We do not mean simply the greatest quantity of enjoyment arising from the owning of such a boundless estate; we refer also to every kind of pleasure that such an amount of property could command—pleasure for the eye, the ear—pleasure, in a word, for every sense, every passion, every power. Of worldly enjoyment, wealth stands as the acknowledged symbol; hence the heaviest store of gold or longest rent-roll, express in conventional language, the idea of exhaustless or varied enjoyment. Indeed, the most of men understand that the pleasure of possessing soon loses its zest and pungency; and were it not the power over unnumbered fountains of happiness (such as the happiness may be) that gold brings, its attraction would in many eyes speedily decline. The gold of California and of Australia is eagerly desired, and to grasp it, thousands toil amid privations and suffering; it is coveted not so much, however, for itself as for what it can bring, what it can obtain in the mart of nations, and in the domain of luxury and bewildering enchantment.

It is obvious that our Lord's words are designed not to be viewed in their narrow import in the problem he mentions; they are certainly to be generalized by us, and indeed it is only then that the real force and universal bearing can be rightly appreciated. Some one may say, "What to me is the whole world!" "Yea," he may be able to add, "I would scarcely toil a few months to be lord of all I survey." We admit the case, and yet the problem has a demand on such a person, though different in constitution from the most of his fellows. Something to him, however, is as "the whole world" to another. He has his chief desire, whether it relates to the inward or the outward of his being; to the acquisition of fame, of learning, of refined artistic execution; to the advancement of his children in prosperity, or even to the triumph of liberty and the downfall of despotism, or whatever the master and moving desire of his nature may be. Conceive you had this desire, or all that you desire sustaining a relation to the now, and life, and time granted to the full, and maintained in ever-outpouring enjoyment while you breathe, the question of Jesus has a claim on your intellect and conscience, and it would be foolish for you to refuse an hour longer to answer it.

Suppose, then, you set before your mind a Godless and a Christless man, and let him have all he can possibly obtain, or accomplish all that he can possibly achieve, according to the utmost measure of his unsanctified heart's desire, and you behold the gain side of the Saviour's problem, you are qualified so far to apprehend the weight and spirit of his inquiry. Verily, it amounts to this—it is present gain, and let it be what you please; it is present enjoyment, and let the enjoyment be what it may, it is the having the appetites and passions and members gratified as the flesh wills; a life now measured up to the largest wish in reference to its qualities and ministering circumstances, without the subjection of self to high principle, without the reception of the blessed Christ as the nurse and nutriment of our hearts, and the source of rules and peace and hope to us on earth's green floor. Such is the profit—the gain. We now advance to consider—

II. THE LOSS.—"Lose himself, or be cast away."

1st. *He loses himself.* Not his happiness, not his "whole world" which he previously gained, not the pleasant angel of hope in his breast, but himself—his very being in the universe. He might lose all the properties and acquirements that render life agreeable, and yet retain himself—continue in consciousness; let him, however, lose himself, and he is immediately as if he had never been. The language before us is of a popular kind, for, strictly speaking, a man cannot lose himself, as he can lose a bank bill, or any of his enjoyments; and, though the matter is

75375 v. 1-8 185253

very plain, this whole subject has been so mystified and misrepresented, that we do well to look into every corner and chase away the last atom of darkness. The loss, be it observed, is the *man himself*, which, without controversy, the man cannot feel, cannot be conscious of; because, if he could have feeling in any degree, that would be demonstration that himself—the man—was not flung into non-being, or was not lost. The dominant theology would have us to believe the man penally lost, and to feel the loss; that is, to be lost and not lost at the same time—to have parted with every attribute of being and yet to retain them, which is gloriously absurd; for which let us be thankful. Losing himself then just means ceasing to be; returning to non-existence, whence he originally came.

The same idea is expressed in Mark 8: 36, "What shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" Viewed side by side with our text, this language "lose his own soul" becomes very plain; even alone, it most emphatically conveys the idea that the unholy shall ultimately cease to exist. "Lose his own soul"—what does that mean? The man is represented as losing his soul—not his happiness, nor hope, nor the Divine smiles, but his *own soul*. Now, what is a man without a soul? Nothing, for the idea of a man and a soul are substantially one. To make a man, you must produce a soul, for there cannot be a man without a soul, and to make a human soul is to make a human being, capable of all responsible functions as a moral agent, and susceptible also of suffering and pleasure. For a man, then, to lose his soul, is, in other words, a soul losing itself, or, as it is in the text, a man losing himself, his being, departing from conscious existence. A man might lose happiness, and yet keep his soul; a man might lose heaven and the mercy and favor of God, and yet retain his soul; but he cannot lose his soul, and yet continue a soul, for that would be losing a soul and keeping a soul at the same moment! Losing consciousness, an essential attribute of a living soul, or of a living *self*, and yet preserving it! Losing self and yet preserving self, which is utterly impossible.

In the passage from Mark, the Greek word rendered "soul" is the same that in the context of that verse, and in the parallel passage in Matthew, as well as in many other parts of the New Testament, is translated "life;" and the verse from Mark may most properly be rendered "what shall it profit a man, if he shall gain the whole world and lose his *own life?* So rendered it conveys the idea which is given in the text. The man is to lose his life, and when a man loses his life, is he not as if he had never been? Can he lose life, and yet in any sense be alive? Can he be conscious of having lost that which is essential to consciousness itself? To lose the life, then, is to cease to be, not here, but anywhere in space, and losing life—losing his soul—and losing himself, are only different modes of expressing the same awfully solemn thought, that the doom of the godless is that they shall be finally swept from conscious existence, as unfit for being.

The prevailing theology teaches that the unholy are to be visited with ceaseless torments in hell, as the reward of their evil ways. Now, just imagine a poor sinner in that agony; an agony waxing, at a fixed ratio, more and more intense. Tossing there on the boiling flood, has he lost himself? What think ye he would say, were one to exclaim in his hearing, "O! mad sinner! you have, being Christless, lost yourself at last." Mocked—would he not feel in the midst of his burning woe? Lost himself! Lost himself! and every moment producing a more intense consciousness of himself; for pain augments the sensitiveness of consciousness, and makes a being terribly alive to the fact that he *is*, and also to what it is to be. Lost his life! and yet living in agony! Lost his soul, and he—the man—the soul, tormented! O! mockery of truth! O! insult to language! O daring perversion of his threatenings, who is ordained to be the judge of quick and dead. Popular theology affirms the wicked man shall not lose himself, but shall last perpetually condemning himself, and enduring the vengeance of sulphurous fires; God says, the unholy shall lose themselves, they shall cease to be capable of pain or pleasure; in a word, they shall die. "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." Ps. 37: 20. How great the contrast! How mournful to think that millions are believing a lie, and that myriads are preaching it from day to day.

2d. We have now to consider the remaining words "*or be cast away.*" This is the same idea under a slightly different aspect; for you notice the man is to "lose himself," "*or*" (not *and*) "be cast away." To lose himself is to be cast away, and he loses himself by being cast away. Now we do not think the idea is that he loses himself by casting himself away, or by rushing on to death in Gehenna; but that he will lose himself, his being, when he is cast away by the Omnipotent Judge—not cast away from hope, but from being itself. In one sense, he casts himself away; in a higher acceptation, he does not, since life is to be withdrawn from the impenitent by the divinely appointed agents of destruction; God will burn them up root and branch.

To our view the verse perfectly harmonizes with the alarming passage in 2 Thess. 1: 9, "Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord," that is, a destruction to issue from the Lord, or a destruction of which he is the Author.

3d. This loss of self is to be irrevocable—hopeless. A man may lose himself for a while, or forever; in other words, a man may pass into the unconsciousness of death for a day, for a thousand years, or for an eternity. Now the self-loss here spoken of is eternal; they are to be punished with an everlasting destruction, not an everlasting preservation in torment, but destruction, and one that is never in the lapse of ages to be repaired. No resurrection follows the second death; the *end* is destruction; they shall never see life. Some have lost themselves voluntarily, or resigned their present life for Jesus and his gospel, and now they rest in the silence of the grave. But they will find themselves again—they shall ere long awake to a new and glorious state of being—to the crown of martyrdom likewise, and the songs of salvation before the enthroned Redeemer. Alas! for the apostates who preserved themselves here, or preferred life to the honor of Jesus and the purity of their consciences; they and all the godless shall be reduced to ashes, and no eye shall ever see them more. They shall be blotted from the roll of being—from the page of life. They had their portion in this life, and of this life, they preferred the now to the after—present enjoyment to immortal being and felicity. Streams may be dried up, and again murmur along their ancient channels; trees that have been long reckoned dead, may send forth green shorts to wave in the sunshine; the land that has apparently been cursed with sterility, may anew bloom like Paradise; stars that ceased to shine in the high places of the firma-

ment, may afresh be kindled, but no forth-putting of Divine reviving energy shall restore the condemned and consumed to being; the long moonless and morningless night of forgetfulness is their unalterable portion.

"Appalling end, most melancholy—sad,
To be expelled existence hopelessly;
To be unconscious when the saved are glad
Before the throne, throughout eternity;
Numbered with things that were for age to be
Unworthy of a name, a place, a rank,
In this fair universe by Heaven's decree;
O direful doom! but better far a blank
Than wretches ever scorched on Tophet's brimstone bank.
O direful doom indeed! but why forget
It is their choice? for men may live or die;—
On wings of faith escape the penal threat,
Or with the last in condemnation lie.
And when at length the hours of mercy fly,
And God apportions each his chosen lot,
Whom can the sinner blame? when on his eye
Oblivion's night descends, to vanish not—
Whom can the sinner blame?—what he decreed he got."

III. The question—"what is a man advantaged, if he gain the whole world and lose himself, or be cast away?"

The humblest capacity can discover that the proper answer is, it will advantage him nothing. The price of his present enjoyment and impiety is the loss of being itself. In the recent exhibition in London, there was one diamond, 'the mountain of light,' as it was called, of immense value. Now, suppose it cast into the deep, and that a man dives for the treasure, and finds it, but expires with it in his grasp, just as he reaches the surface of the wave—what would it profit him to have gained the diamond and to lose his life? So here, the present enjoyments of a godless life consume in the end being itself; the reward of sin is the darkness of non-existence. An infinitesimal gain, and an infinite loss; a straw, gathered from the flood of time, prized beyond the glory and gladness of interminable duration; a drop preferred to an exhaustless ocean; a grain to a kingdom, and a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God; a worm-like being to one kindred with a seraph's, yea, approximating his on whom all existence hangs as his robe and his shadow.

What, then, beloved reader, will it avail you to gain all you can desire now, and be thus impoverished, thus cancelled from being at last? You may understand the calculation before us, the loss and the gain; you may admit the accuracy of our development of the two sides of the balance sheet, and yet you may refuse to act on the discovery that the loss will inexpressibly transcend the gain, that in fact all comparison between the two is imperiously debarred. You may shun the momentous theme, we cannot exclude this possibility from our thoughts; will you, in mercy to yourself, disappoint our fears? Will you yield to our most ardent wish, and henceforth renounce the profitless service of sin and Satan. In the end it is unqualified loss; sometimes in this scene, we admit, it has the semblance of gain. You may have a godless life in time, but there shall not be for any a godless eternity; it is enough for God to be mocked for a period; he will not be slighted and blasphemed by creature tongue forever. Now, the great Redeemer implores you to calculate the problem of being; a godless present and no eternity; a holy, grateful, self-denying life here, and everlasting duration in the company of the Lamb and his angels. Think, that a life of sin—a life out of Jesus—is nothing else than a toiling for death; a hurrying from night to night; a long prayer, if I may so express myself, that the gates of existence may at length be shut upon you by an omnipotent arm; and that prayer will be answered when the penal-destroying elements come forth to burn up the moral chaff and vile corruption that shall be found in the Universe at the end of time. Man must be renewed by love, or removed by power; conquered by grace or consumed by fire. At present the angel of love waits and beckons the guilty to the Saviour's side. The compassion of the Eternal has appeared in a thousand forms to your view; its fairest and richest manifestation was in the person of his Son, who was sent into the world that we might not perish, but have everlasting life. He is the brightness of his Father's glory. Have you seen him? You have seen the Father. Jesus was love—love was Jesus—the friend of man, the revealer of heaven, the conquerer of hades, the bringer of immortality. With him you have the pledge of being; because he lives, his disciples shall live also; without him, without his grace, his transforming power, his lovely image, his indwelling spirit, you are an heir of ruin, and angels will yet weep over your end, as they are now deploring your progress in sin. He desires your love, and that you may yield him your heartiest homage and affection, he unfolds to you the greatness of his compassion for you as you are; assures you of his desire for your recovery to righteousness, your reconciliation to his Father, your enrolment among the heirs of immortality. Lose a world, rather than lose Jesus; gain a whole world, and what will it avail when the horrors of destruction are thickening around your being, when Gehenna demands you as fuel for its quenchless flames? My brother, think; the text appeals to you as a reflecting being. One is filled with horror and unspeakable disgust in contemplating the popular hell: the bible revelation as to the doom of the wicked imparts an awfully solemn feeling to the heart. The one unhinges or excludes consideration; the other awakens reflection, and it does not outrage reason, nor remorselessly harrow the sympathies of humanity. The nearer you come to the one you are the more disqualified for the exercise of your intellectual capacities; the other—the further you penetrate its enclosures and chambers, makes you the more intensely thoughtful, and the more alive to the hopelessness of men disconnected with Jesus. To him, therefore, when serious thought is, as we fondly trust, excited in your mind; to him we would affectionately conduct you, and the while tell you of his tears, and groans, and agonies, and triumphs in the sublime effort he made to redeem you from sin and its fruits. Behold thy Saviour! He died for you; will you not begin to live for him? Will you not taste his love that flows like a soft stream from his heart; its taste is sweeter than nectar; its healing and reviving virtues pass an angel's description. Be wise, and count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus your Lord, and strive to attain unto the resurrection from among the dead, and the kingdom whose splendor and blessedness shall not pass away.

———o———

Deal gently with those who stray. Draw them back by love and persuasion. A kiss is worth a thousand kicks. A kind word is more valuable to the lost than a mine of gold. Think of this, and be on your guard, ye who would chase to the grave an erring brother.

PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

[Communicated.]

UNIVERSALISM.

BY MRS. C. C. WILLIAMS.

To the Editor of the Ambassador, J. M. Austin:

Sir:—I am not a subscriber to the Ambassador, but I am an interested reader of it, for which privilege I am indebted to one of your subscribers, George French, an inmate of our family—not that I am a Universalist for various reasons, which will appear hereinafter. I was taught to believe the doctrine of eternal misery by my father, who was a Baptist Minister, and I sincerely believed it to be true and taught of God in the Bible till about four years ago, being a member of that order. Were eternal misery or the views entertained by Universalists the only alternatives, reasoning as both do, from common ground, as to man's nature, I should not hesitate to decide in favor of the God-honoring system of the latter in comparison with the former. But by being led to doubt the truth of eternal misery, by presuming to read some of the writings of George Storrs, I commenced studying the scriptures as one entirely ignorant of what was taught therein, with an intense desire, which time does not abate, to find out what was true—to see what relation we sustained to God—what end he had in view in creating man, and allowing him the freedom of choice, together with the design of government—and as fast, and far, as I have succeeded in fathoming the meaning of the sacred writers in relation to these points, and others connected therewith, so fast, and so far, I have renounced my former absurd and contradictory imaginings for a comprehensible can-be-told system—and am now prepared to follow the injunction, to be always ready to give a reason of the hope I entertain with meekness and fear—emphatically so. In the Ambassador for Oct. 11th, I saw a notice calling the attention of all who would read, to a sermon on the first page. Time was when my prejudices would have so blinded me, that if I had read anything that I knew was from a Universalist, it would have been of little use, for I should not have been able or competent to have appreciated any argument, however well founded. But a better and happier state of feeling has obtained, and Truth, wherever found, is now lovely to me, though there is so much that is called truth afloat, it is rather staggering to a looker-on; yet, in the full confidence that Truth is one, and that all truth is capable of being clearly demonstrated, I will not despair. It argues well for the adherents of any system, when they covet investigation, as truth can lose nothing thereby, and if it should chance to be error that is entertained, and truth is the object sought after, certainly a good exchange would be made if error could be bartered for truth. I have lived, formerly, where I could have almost daily friendly converse with Universalists, and I have tried to become acquainted with their views, so that I could see and appreciate the ground of their belief, and I think with the additional light of the sermon spoken of above, which is alleged to be an expose of Universalism, I have a tolerably correct view of the doctrine. Now, you have solicited the attention and criticism of religious editors and writers of all denominations to this sermon, and if you included females amongst the writers, then I may write. You ask to have objections candidly pointed out, and that is due and meet. Jesus was candid. And you have said, "there shall be no offence on our part"—urging a thorough investigation. This assurance leads me to think I shall be heard while I attempt to show some of the errors of your system. I have long had it in my mind to do so, but have been waiting to get a better understanding of the case, and also to see an open door, or chance to be heard. This seems to be the proper occasion. I well know it is a nice business to get round this sermon, or in other words, to make the nice distinctions that are necessary in the case, and make those distinctions clear to the understanding. I must confess, however, I do not see how you can well avoid such conclusions respecting the final destiny of all, with such views of the nature of man—the paternal character of God—the end or design of punishment—as I see are entertained by you as a body, from this sermon, and other articles of the Ambassador, with the general tenor of the policy. I should think both must stand or fall together. So that my objections will not be so much objections to this sermon as they will be objections to that which leads to such a view as is indicated herein in giving *we* such a latitude. There is one part of the sermon, that has my cordial sympathy, and that is from where he commences to tell what is necessary to be efficient laborers in the moral vineyard onwards to its close. But as to the former part, I must confess I fail to see any very good reasons why we should be very much engaged to labor for others here, this side of the grave, just for what more would be enjoyed by them in the interim; seeing it is so difficult to be heard, amidst the din of conflicting passions, as it is also difficult to stem the tide of selfishness, and if the wicked are so much better circumstanced hereafter and the means necessary to reform them, so much more available there, it does seem to me that the best and easiest way is, so far as others are concerned, to let the matter rest till then—for as the wicked shall not live out half of their days, they will pass through what you call the resurrection state the sooner into this favorable situation, and in that case it seems as though we should be ungenerous to attempt to stay them. I cannot see how such conclusions can be avoided, if you are right, and I should like to know how you can keep from thinking so and acting accordingly. I think, however, the key to all this is given in the sermon of Rev. J. B. Sap, at the funeral of Br. L. A. Wright, when he says that "if Jeremiah, David and Christ knew nothing about an endless hell, the dogma is false which teaches that there is one; and if that is not true, the doctrine of the final holiness and happiness of all mankind is true." That they knew nothing of such a place, and taught nothing of it, is, I think, sure, and if I can understand them, they taught as little respecting the other extreme, which extreme was and is adopted, as it seems, by the above declaration, as a matter of course, on finding out the falsity of eternal misery, without once thinking there can be any other alternative. Much is due your body for being instrumental in exposing this dire dogma in all its depravity. Your system seems far more honoring to God in many respects. But there is a superlative degree, and I find the scripture writers advocating neither of the above views, if I can understand them; but this system, superior to either, inasmuch as, viewed in whatever light it may be, it seems liable to no objections save what may arise from unenlightened and uninformed sympathy, so I call it the superlative degree. In and of myself, I shrink at the thought of meeting such strong confidence as is expressed in regard to the truth of your position. Nothing but the desire that Jesus and his followers' views should be understood, relative to these all-important topics, nerves me up to take my pen in their vindication. Otherwise the task had been left to

abler minds and hands which have less to do than mine. As it is, however, (God by his spirit, without which none can do anything, being my helper,) I will do the best I can in redeeming my pledge, hoping that my humble efforts to justify the ways of God to man, will be accepted and blessed. As Jesus said, so say I, "my doctrine is not mine," so I assume no responsibility, but leave that to its Author—my only care being to speak on good authority.

1st. I will notice your view of the nature of man. I gather from this sermon, and the general tenor of the articles of your paper, that the spirit, or soul, (as I see they are used synonymously,) is regarded as the man proper, or that which is saved—that the body or house which holds the man, dies, and thus the hitherto fettered and clogged soul wings its way to the skies, or enters on a higher life, or a second and better disciplinary state, to fit it for its ultimate destiny. The Bible says that the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground. Gen. 2: 7. The spirit is not formed thus, so that the spirit is not the man to begin with. But of what use is such a grand piece of mechanism without some power to set and keep it in motion? None at all. So He that made him, "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul;" and it should be borne in mind constantly that beings made of dust become living souls just in that way now. Men and women, beasts, birds, and fishes, are living souls alike. Gen. 1: 30, and 7: 22, (margin.) The spirit is not a living soul, it is the spirit of God in our nostrils that makes living souls of us, and all. Job. 22: 3; and the difference is in the variety of structures, and not in the spirit or power, (Gen. 7: 22,) by means of which all act; and if he (God) sets his heart on man and gathers to himself his spirit and his breath, all flesh shall perish together, and man shall turn again to his dust. Job 34: 14–15. That is, where he came from, and what God defines death to be. Gen. 3: 19. And he says, too, his spirit shall not always strive with man, because he is flesh, yet his days shall be 120 years, and during that time, it would strive with them—thereby justifying Paul's assertion to the Corinthians, that they were temples of the living God, and if any man defiles the temple of God, him will God destroy. 1 Cor. 3: 17. For those to whom this was spoken gave little heed to the spirit of Christ in Noah, 1 Peter 3: 19, warning them to forsake their pollutions, and by means of this spirit to mortify the deeds of the body, through and live; so they were destroyed that they might no longer curse the earth. David says his (man's) breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth, in that very day his thoughts perish.

I have quoted these texts above to show what man is—and by these we see that man is one thing, and the spirit is quite another. Man, it is true, as well as every other creature, is dependant on this spirit for all he knows, wills, and does. What though a man should gain the whole world and lose his life or soul? (Matthew, Mark, and Luke, to say nothing of the others, use the terms life and soul synonymously.) What good would possessions do a dead man? When the spirit goes, the life or soul (which the Bible says is the blood, though used ambiguously,) must die; for James says "the body without the spirit or breath (margin) is dead." But man has no control over the spirit when it is demanded of him. Eccl. 8: 8. Nor after it has left him. His only care should be to make a good use of it while permitted to retain it, seeing the manifestation of the spirit is given to every man to profit withal, dividing to every one severally as he wills. 1 Cor. 12: 7–11. The inspiration of the Almighty gives man understanding. Job 32: 8. He would know nothing without it, and can know nothing without it, for the dead know not anything. Eccl. 2: 5. Hezekiah of old was very glad to have his soul kept back from the pit or grave fifteen years longer, for he wanted to praise the Lord; and he knew the dead could not do that. But he says, the living, the living, they shall praise thee as I do this day. Isaiah 38: 17–19. David, too, said he should be satisfied when he awaked with his likeness. It seems that the same or similar opinions prevailed in the Apostles' time about the state of the dead as are now prevalent, for Peter found it necessary to assure those who were witnesses of the wonderful manifestation of the outpouring of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, that David had nothing to do with it, because he was dead and buried, and his sepulchre was then with them—and more convincing still, he told them David had not ascended into the heavens. Acts 2: 29–34. Job said, the dead would not be raised nor waked out of their sleep till the heavens be no more; and he wanted to be hid in the grave, and have a time appointed, to be remembered, and to be called and he would answer. Job 14: 10–14. Jesus died and was buried, but his soul was not left in hell or the grave. Acts 2: 31. He committed his spirit to his Father, and God restored it to him again, and thus raised him up from the dead. It was impossible for death to hold him, being sinless. Acts 2: 24. Paul says if the spirit of him that raised up Christ from the dead dwell in you, (and it will dwell in those who do not defile the temple so as to be destroyed,) he that raised Jesus from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his spirit that dwelleth in you. Rom. 8: 11. Not to particularize further, Paul says, all the ancients, from Abel down to his time, who had faith in the promise of eternal life and its accompanying blessings, thereby becoming heirs of the righteousness which is by faith, died, not having received the promises. These promises, viz: the possession of the land where he lived, or rather the world, (Rom. 4: 13,) and in thee shall all nations be blessed, every one that has the faith he had being blessed with him, (Gal. 3: 8–9,) and that he should be the father of many nations, were made known to him (Abraham) before he died, and he with all the others, saw them afar off, and being persuaded of them, (Heb. 11: 13,) they were not afraid to trust God, but fell asleep in full confidence that what God had promised, he was able also to perform in due time; and even Moses showed that the dead are raised, when he called God, or the Lord, the God of Abraham, &c. Luke 20: 37. Some of these ancients were tortured to death, and would not accept deliverance, that they might obtain a better resurrection; (Heb. 11: 35,) for they well knew that if they loved their lives so well, that, for the sake of staying here a few years longer at most, they should betray their trust, they would forfeit their claim to eternal life. Paul thought thus too. He counted everything but dung that he might win Christ and be found in him, &c.; he was content to share his sufferings, and felt it cheaply won, if by any means he might attain unto the resurrection of the dead. Phil. 3: 9–11. In keeping with these sentiments he told the Thessalonians they must not sorrow about those that were asleep (in Jesus) as those did who had no hope, (of a resurrection,) for God would bring them again from the dead as he did Jesus, and that they would eventually meet the Lord together; and that they must comfort one another with these words. 1 Thess. 4: 13–18. We look in vain in scripture for

HOLDEN LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

survivors comforting bereaved ones with the assurance that the departed were happy in heaven.

There are three points I want to prove by the above:—

1st. That man dies, and his work ceases, and unless made alive again, he is as though he had never been, because, if there be no resurrection, or if Christ be not raised, then they which are fallen asleep in him are perished, too, to say nothing of those out of him, who die in Adam. 1 Cor. 15: 15–18.

2d. That none enter into eternal life at death—for, notwithstanding the spirit we had from God, returns then to the Giver, yet man is not benefitted thereby, unless restored to him again; and further, let it be what it may, it needs to go but a little way to go to God, for Paul says, he is not far from every one of us. Acts 17: 27. Which is not as your poets sing, as well as myself in former days.

3d. That the prevalent notions and anticipations about the spirit are baseless. And let me say to mothers, that it is our children we should try to train, that they may be fit habitations for this pure spirit. The spirit we have nothing to do with, any further than to make it subservient to the purposes designed, while permitted to retain it. We neither gave it to them, nor are we to take it. And can parents cast off the fear of God themselves, and forbear to teach it to their children, which fear is the beginning of knowledge, (Prov. 1: 7,) and neglect to train them in the way they should go, and then empty them into the world, to cast a blight wherever they may go, (unless they chance to learn from other sources to love righteousness and the benefits and blessings of obedience,) and then complain that it should go ill with them, or that their end should be destruction? Here, before proceeding further, allow me to ask two questions. What is the purgatory of the Roman Catholics but a state or place of discipline for the purification of souls? Does not the prevalent opinion of the nature of the soul lead to all these various and conflicting theories about its welfare and whereabouts at death, since imagination is the only guide in the case?

To resume. 2d. The paternal relation and the ground of God's impartiality is misapprehended.

That God is the Father of the spirits of all flesh is readily allowed, and the former of all in one sense, (though I should hardly be willing to charge him with making all the miserable, degraded specimens of humanity that breathe his air and live on his beneficence—their being here, and thus degraded, being better accounted for on Paul's theory, Rom. 1: 21–31,) but he is not the Father of all flesh, because he has made all, nor of man, because he has made him, more than of any other creature; but man is the only creature which of his good pleasure he has endowed with a capacity "to will and to do"—consequently man alone can be tempted with evil, and voluntarily yield to it, or manfully resist and overcome temptation. So that he alone of all the creatures God has made, can obtain a knowledge of Him that hath called us to glory and virtue, by means of which he can escape the corruptions that are in the world through lust, and thereby become a partaker of the divine nature. 2 Pet. 1: 3–4. Those that believe on his name, John says, have the power to become the sons of God. John 1: 12. To man alone is held out the unspeakable honor of attaining the rank of becoming sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty, by coming out from the world, &c. 2 Cor. 6: 18. Jesus taught his disciples to say, Our Father, &c., and they had a right to, on the ground of their discipleship, for as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God by anticipation only, because, by submitting to be led by the Spirit of God, they had received the spirit of adoption, whereby they could cry Abba, Father, and every believer may do the same. Rom. 8: 14–15. But the adoption itself is an object of hope, and what must be waited for till the redemption of the body, when the sons of God will be manifested. Rom. 8: 19–23. The unbelieving Jews claimed God as their Father, and unbelieving Gentiles have the same right, for Paul says he is God of one as well as the other. Rom. 3: 29. The heathen poets claimed the same, and Paul asserts to have assumed their position for the purpose of showing them the absurdity of worshipping senseless idols. Acts 17: 28. Jesus told those unbelievers that if God was their Father, they would do the works of God, or would love him. John 8: 42. And in the 44th verse he told them that they were of their father the devil, and his lusts ye will do. In the 21st, 23d and 24th verses, he tells them, if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins, and where I am ye cannot come, and because ye are of this world, or beneath, and I am not. This shall suffice to establish the ground of the parental relation.

[To be continued.]

PROPHETIC PERIODS.

BY THE EDITOR.

That great confusion exists with regard to the commencement and termination of the prophetic periods must be manifest to every reflecting and impartial mind. Historians and chronologists are anything but united on the exact *time* of many important events which are necessary to define with accuracy the time of the beginning or ending of most of those periods. The chronology of some of the events noted in the scriptures is based upon these conflicting and discordant materials; and too much reliance upon profane chronology and popular mistakes as to the reigning king of the times in which the scripture event happened, has led into great errors in the interpretation of the prophecies. This, we conceive, is especially the case with the *ninth* chapter of Daniel.

Let us take a view of the generally received chronology in the Bible in a few particulars. The chronology put against Ezra 1: 1, or the Decree of Cyrus, is B. C. 536. Haggai 1st commences with the second year of Darius, and the chronology is put down at 520 B. C., when the house of God or temple was put forward to its completion by Haggai and Zerubbabel at God's command; that is, just sixteen *years* after the decree of Cyrus; and Ezra 6: 15, tells us "this house was finished in the sixth year of the reign of Darius the king:" that is, according to the common received chronology, within *twenty-one* years after Cyrus' decree; and yet, strange to tell, commentators and chronologists have fixed upon the decree of Artaxerxes II., B. C. 457, or *fifty-eight years after the temple is finished*, according to their chronology, as "*the* commandment" that went "forth to restore and build Jerusalem!" Also, according to their chronology of Dan. 9th, B. C. 538, the "seventy years desolation of Jerusalem" (ending at that time, Dan. 9: 2,) ended *eighty-one years* before the commandment went forth to restore and build Jerusalem, i. e., if 457 B. C. is the true point from which to reckon that commandment; and Daniel must have been dead at least *seventy-five years* before Ezra went up to restore and build Jerusalem!

It has seemed to be taken for granted that the Darius of Dan. 9th is the same as the Darius who

took Babylon. From a careful examination of the subject, we are fully satisfied this is a great mistake. In consequence of this mistake, that chapter has been thrust in between the 8th and 10th chapters, and thus led into inextricable confusion all who have based their calculations upon that theory.

Daniel himself, if carefully examined, shows that these Dariuses were two different and distinct persons. Chapter 5: 31, tells us, "Darius the *Median* took the kingdom;" the 9th chapter says, "In the first year of Darius the *son of Ahasuerus* of the seed of the Medes." The Scriptures give us Ahasuerus as the husband of Esther, Esther 2: 16, and the chronology in the margin of our Bible gives this event B. C. 462. Artaxerxes I. reigned between Cyrus and Darius king of Persia, "son of Ahasuerus." Any one must be satisfied of this, we think, who, with an unprejudiced mind, carefully reads the 4th chapter of Ezra. Artaxerxes I. died B. C. 424. See Taylor's Manual of History, p. 66. Says Taylor—"On the death of Artaxerxes, his only legitimate son, Xerxes, ascended the throne; but within forty-five days was murdered by his natural brother, Sogdianus; and he again was deposed by another illegitimate prince, Ochus, who, on his accession, took the name of Darius II." This king was surnamed Nothus, that is, "*illegitimate.*" He was called illegitimate because not the son of Artaxerxes, but of Ahasuerus, and was most most likely born of Esther, a Jewess, and therefore would be accounted as not legitimately heir to the throne of *Persia.* It seems to us clear that Darius Nothus is the Darius of Daniel 9th, and he came to that throne about 424 B. C., instead of B. C. 538, as would seem by the chronology now found in the margin of the Bible. If this be so, then all the other chronological dates in the margin of the Book of Daniel are equally erroneous.

Darins Nothus reigned at a later period than Cyrus (whose Persian name is Coresch,) king of Persia. The communication, therefore, made to Daniel, chap. 9, was at a later period than that of the 10th, 11th, and 12th chapt's; and its chronological position in the Book of Daniel is *after* the 12th chapter. Darius Nothus, or "Darius the son of Ahasuerus," is the same, we judge, as Ezra's "Darius king of Persia." Ez. 4: 5; and cannot therefore be identical with "Darius the Median," but corresponds with the Darius of Haggai 1: 1, and Zech. 1: 1; and what further confirms this idea is, that in the "second year" of this Darius, the *seventy years'* indignation of the Lord against Jerusalem ceased. See Zech. 1: 1, 12. The seventy years' indignation which the angel here declared was completed, in the second year of Darius, is identical with the seventy years' desolations which were terminating in "the first year of Darius, son of Ahasuerus;" for the desolations ceased when the work of rebuilding the temple had such a putting forward as resulted in its completion; that was from the "second year of Darius king of Persia." See Ezra 4: 24, and 5: 1–2; therefore, it follows conclusively that Darius the son of Ahasuerus, (Dan. 9: 1,) is the same as the Darius of Ezra, Haggai, and Zechriah; and hence reigned at a *later period* than the Scripture Cyrus (Coresch,) king of Persia, and king of Babylon, and therefore was not "Darius the Median," who reigned *before* Cyrus. If these things are so, it follows that *the chronology relied upon in fixing the dates of the prophetic periods is erroneous, and will forever delude those who follow it.*

Again, as Cyrus reigned before Darius Nothus, or "Darius son of Ahasuerus," and as Daniel's seventy weeks, seven weeks, and sixty-two weeks, were given him under this latter king, it follows that the decree unto of Cyrus, to restore and build Jerusalem, was previous to the 9th chapter of Daniel; and it is abundantly evident that the *decree of Cyrus*, and not that of Artaxerxes, is the decree spoken of by Gabriel to Daniel. This we know will be startling to some who have labored to make the generally received chronology harmonize with the facts in history and prophecy; and yet it is demonstration, to our mind, that the decree of Cyrus is *the decree* of which Gabriel speaks, Dan. 9th.

Let us turn to Isa. 44: 28, and we shall see what the Lord saith concerning Cyrus. "Cyrus is my shepherd, and shall perform all my pleasure; even saying to Jerusalem, *thou shalt be built*, and to the Temple, *thy foundation shalt be laid.*" This language exactly tallies with Gabriel's annunciation—"Know, also, from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to *build* Jerusalem," &c. Here is a distinct reference to some prophecy on the subject; no other prophecy can be found that so exactly corresponds as that which relates to the acts of Cyrus; and if we are correct as to the chronology of Dan. 9th, that decree of Cyrus had been issued prior to Gabriel's announcement of the time at which to commence the seven weeks and sixty-two weeks, so that Daniel had a definite point at which to begin his reckoning, viz: at the decree of Cyrus. As Cyrus is the only person *prophesied* of as issuing such a decree for the specified object, we have a right to conclude *that* is "the commandment" intended by Gabriel. The question arises, *did Cyrus issue a decree exactly corresponding with the prophecy in Isaiah and the declaration of Gabriel?*

In examining this point, we have nothing to do with profane chronology, or the chronology of historians. The Bible must settle the question, and if profane chronology does not tally with it, we have a right to conclude that such chronology is false, and not to be trusted.

Let us now examine the foregoing question. Cyrus did issue just such a commandment as agrees with Isaiah and Gabriel. See Ezra 1: 2, "Thus saith Cyrus king of Persia, The Lord God of heaven HATH CHARGED ME TO BUILD HIM A HOUSE AT JERUSALEM. Who is there among you of all his people? his God be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem, which is in Judah, and build the house of the Lord God of Israel (he is the God) which is in Jerusalem. And whosoever remaineth in any place where he sojourneth, let the men of his place help him with silver, and with gold, and with goods, and with beasts, besides the free-will offering for the house of God that is in Jerusalem. Then rose up the chief of the fathers of Judah, and Benjamin, and the priests, and the Levites, with all them whose spirit God had raised to go up to build the house of the Lord which is in Jerusalem."

Let us next see how this "commandment" was attended to. In the 3d chapter, after noticing the offerings made by the people when they arrived at Jerusalem, it is said, verse 7, "They gave money also unto the masons, and to the carpenters; and meat, and drink, and oil, unto them of Zidon, and to them of Tyre, to bring cedar-trees from Lebanon to the sea of Joppa, according to the grant that they had of Cyrus king of Persia." Then verses 10 and 11 say, "And when the builders *laid the foundation of the temple* of the Lord, they set the priests in their apparel with trumpets, and the Levites the sons of Asaph with cymbals, to praise the Lord, after the ordinance of David king of Israel. And they sang together by course in praising and giving thanks unto the Lord; because he is good, for his mercy

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

endureth forever toward Israel. And the people shouted with a great shout when they praised the Lord, *because the foundation of the house of the Lord was laid.* But many of the priests and Levites and chief of the fathers, who were ancient men, that had seen the first house, *when the foundation of this house was laid before their eyes*, wept with a loud voice, and many shouted."

Thus we have an exact fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy; and that the building *the city* was included in Cyrus' commandment is clear from the letter which the enemies of the Jews afterwards wrote to Artaxerxes I., Ezra 4: 12; "Be it known unto the king, that the Jews which came up from thee to us are come unto Jerusalem, *building the* rebellious and the bad *city*, and have *set up the walls thereof*, and joined the foundations." Here, then, we have also a clear sight of the point of time to which Gabriel pointed as "the *going forth* of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem." The decrees of Artaxerxes and Darius were only an *approval* of the decree of Cyrus, and not "the going forth of the commandment" to have the work done. See Ezra 6: 14, "And the elders of the Jews builded, and they prospered through the prophesying of Haggai the prophet, and Zechariah the son of Iddo. And they builded and finished it, according to the commandment of the God of Israel, and according to the commandment of Cyrus, and Darius, and Artaxerxes king of Persia." "According to the *commandment* (singular) of Cyrus, Darius, and Artaxerxes," &c. The commandment was *one*, originating with Cyrus, but confirmed by Artaxerxes, who finally revoked his *approval*, Ezra 4: 17–24; the decree itself was *unalterable*, according to the laws of the Medes and Persians, but it was renewed by Darius king of Persia, in the second year of his reign, which was the next year after Daniel's prayer, chap. 9, who having examined the ancient records at Babylon, (see Ezra 4: 24,) found the roll containing the decree of Cyrus, Ezra 6: 1–5; and confirmed that decree in strong language, as may be seen, Ezra 6: 6–12; which concludes with saying, "Let it be done with speed." From that time, the Jews under the prophesying of Haggai and Zechariah, [see Ezra 6: 14; and Haggai 1st and 2d chs.,] carried forward the work so rapidly that "this house was finished in the sixth year of Darius," Ezra 6: 15; or, within five years from the time Daniel so earnestly entreated God to "cause" his "face to shine upon the sanctuary that is desolate." Thus was the prayer of this man of God speedily answered, though he, possibly, did not live to see it, as he must have been about ninety-five years old "in the first year of Darius, son of Ahasuerus."

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, JANUARY, 1852.

"A RAP."—Our readers will remember the inquiry we made in our last, after "*The Spirit World.*" We said it had *disappeared*—that we had "continued to send the Examiner directed to" it, &c. The Examiner containing our remarks we again directed to the Spirit World, and asked, "Shall we hear a *rap?*" Sure enough, we had *a rap;* for back came the Examiner with a note "in its mouth." May it prove "an olive leaf"—an omen that the flood is over, and *terra firma* is once more in sight. The note was in pencil mark on the margin of the returned Examiner as follows:—

"*Have* sent you each No. and the whole of the volume. 'Examine' and see. Notice, some of the numbers were double. You must take that back."

We had *to take* it *back*, anyhow, for the returned Examiner brought it. That is one way to take a thing "back." That is a new idea, for which we acknowledge ourself indebted to the *invisibles.* We say "invisibles," because we cannot say the Spirit World sent it back, or that friend Sunderland did, as the note has no initials to guide us. The last tidings we had from the Spirit World was last June. It was a "*double* number;" and the close of volume two. We continued to senc the Examiner regularly, directed to it, and hoped to have a friendly response; we heard no more from it till the returned Examiner brought the foregoing note Now, if the Spirit World is not dead, let us know by its appearance once more. Our office is open for its entrance. The June number, the last we have seen, had the following announcement:

"We ask for no remittances of money for the third volume, until the first number is issued. And that number will not appear till we receive what is equivalent to three hundred pledges of five dollars each."

From this announcement, and not seeing it any more, we knew not but the Spirit World had become defunct. We intended, by our notice last month, to see if it was yet numbered with the things *that are.* The result is before our readers.

We sympathised with our old friend Sunderland, when he said in the last number of volume 2:—

"I solemnly declare that my connection with this cause has cost me over one thousand dollars, to say nothing of my time and labors for the past year, which have been given gratuitously, as my friends in this city [Boston] know, and will testify, if need be." And when he added—"Shall the good I would do, be prevented by the slanderous representations of thoughtless people, who know nothing of these facts, and who feel no sympathy for the cause to which I have devoted my time, my talents, and my all of this world?" we responded, "That's too bad."

We repeat it now—*it is too bad,* when a man gives evidence by worldly sacrifices of the sincerity of his devotion to what he believes is truth, even though he may be mistaken, to accuse him of money-making, if it is not so. And we believe Mr. Sunderland's declaration in his case till it is *proved* untrue. While we thus sympathise with him in any wrong inflicted upon him, and in his sacrifice of his "all of this world," we cannot but regret that he has been drawn, as we conceive, to the verge of a more fearful loss, viz: his *all in "the world to come."* For we regard the system of spirit manifestations, in itself, as developed in the "*rappings*" in this land, as a Satanic development and delusion that will prepare thousands for perdition and destruction. The developments are calculated to deceive unwary souls, and to draw men from dependance upon God to trust in im-

aginary deities, called *"their loved ones,"* who "have *departed into the spirit world.*" These imaginary deities are consulted, prayed to, appealed to, and more earnestly sought after than the Almighty and His Son Jesus Christ our Lord and Redeemer. This we have abundantly shown in the Examiner the year past. It is *"another* gospel;" concerning which an apostle has said, if "an angel from heaven preach" it, "let him be accursed."

The system is evidently *"devil worship."* A person in order to a full manifestation to him, must consent to yield himself, "soul, body, and spirit," entirely up to the control of the spirits. In other words, he must be submissive to them; "fall down and worship me" is the spirit of their demands. This point it is easy to prove, though some may deny it. Their mandates must be obeyed, or the penalty is a refusal to hold intercourse with you. But we drop the subject here for the present, or till some further development is made.

———o———

"THE TRUE WESLEYAN."—It is months since our old friend Luther Lee, the editor of the Wesleyan, has noticed us. We expected, however, that Bro. "Tate's Defence" would wake him up, and we have not been disappointed, though he has not mentioned that defence. In the Wesleyan, Dec. 13th, he comes out with a column and a half under the caption of *"To Save that which was Lost,"* and *"The Immortality of the Soul proved from the Atonement."* It might have been our remarks on Prof. Finney's sermon that aroused him; but it matters not what did the work; his slumber is broken. He opens his battery upon us in the True Wesleyan, Dec. 13th, as follows:

"The position has been taken by Rev. Geo. Storrs that as man forfeited his existence by sin, involving the death of the soul, in the sense of the loss of conscious existence, immortality can be obtained only through faith in Christ, the great restorer, and of course, that impenitent sinners who do not believe and receive the benefits of atonement, cannot have immortality, continued being, but must cease to exist. Mr. Storrs opened his first great effort on this subject some years since, as follows:

'To commence, I call attention to what man lost by the fall. In order to understand this, let us look at man prior to the fall. He was a *probationer*. For what? Not for *happiness*—for he had that in *possession*. Nor for *life*, merely, as he was in the enjoyment of that also. I conclude, it was for *eternal life*, figured and set forth before his eyes, by the *"tree of life"*—as *death*, the opposite, was set forth by the "tree of knowledge of good and evil.'

In noticing the remarks of Br. Lee that follow this quotation from our Six Sermons, we will take the form of a *dialogue*. The Wesleyan shall take the lead and the Examiner respond:

Wes.—"The position that man could not have been a probationer for happiness because he was already happy, is unsound."

Ex.—The argument does not say "man *could not;*" but that man *was not* a probationer for *happiness*. We admit, however, that the *reason* assigned is not strictly correct; for man, though happy, *might*, if his Creator pleased, have been on probation for *continued* happiness; but as a matter of *fact* that was not the case; at least, so far as the Mosaic account states.

Wes.—"But Adam may have been a probationer * * * for a higher sphere, and a greater degree of happiness. He was doubtless a probationer for the happiness of heaven, in contradistinction from the happiness of the Garden of Eden."

Ex.—The question is not what he *may* or *might* have been, but *what was it* he was on probation for? Mr. Storrs said, it was not *life merely*, and yet it was *for life;* and this is evident from the fact that disobedience was threatened with the loss of life, or with *death*. Hence it was argued that it was *eternal* life, or a *confirmation* in life, that he was *actually* on trial for. Do you not admit that to be a fact?

Wes.—"He could be in possession of life, while he was a probationer for its confirmation."

Ex.—So you are compelled to admit the principle. When Mr. S. said man was not on probation for life *merely*, we think he spoke intelligibly. Life merely and eternal life are two distinct things. All animal creation has life, but have all animals eternal, unending life? Clearly not.

Wes.—"Life *merely*, means life only, or life and nothing else or besides life. To say that man was not a probationer for life merely, is to say that he was a probationer for life, and for something more than life."

Ex.—Yes, for *eternal* life. That is something more than life merely; and we are glad you see it. This position, then, is not so *unsound* as you had seemed to think.

Wes.—"By life, Mr. Storrs must mean simple existence, or the life which all men possess in common with animals."

Ex.—We are glad you understand that point also.

Wes.—"This is what we believe, viz: that man was a probationer for life in contradistinction from the death which we all die, so that if he had proved faithful, he would never have died. 'Sin entered into the world by one man and death by sin."

Ex.—Exactly so; thus far you have scripture testimony, and it sustains fully Mr. Storrs' position, that an uninterrupted or *eternal life* was the probationary prize.

Wes.—"He was also a probationer for a higher state of existence, in the spirit world, to which he would have been translated at the end of his probation, had he proved faithful."

Ex.—Where is a "Thus saith the Lord" for all this *assumption?* Not a solitary text have you in the Bible for it. No, it is the mere offspring of immortal-soulism, and, like its parent, is a creature of *fancy*.

Wes.—"Mr. Storrs cannot say that he means continued existence, by eternal life, in contradistinction from happiness, and life merely, for he denies that he was a probationer for happiness, because 'he already had that in possession.' For the same reason, then, he could not have been a probationer for existence, because 'he was in possession of' that also."

Ex.—If God had said to Adam, "In the day thou dost sin, thou shalt be *unhappy*," then Adam would have been a probationer for *happiness*, though at present happy; i. e., he would have been a probationer for uninterrupted or *eternal* happiness. Instead of this, his Maker informed the man if he disobeyed, he should *surely die;* hence he was a probationer for an uninterrupted or eternal life; that fact is clearly *expressed;* but it is nowhere thus expressed as to happiness, and that is reason sufficient for Mr. Storrs' position as to what man was on trial for.

Wes.—"The theory of Mr. Storrs is, that man was a probationer for immortality, and that he fell and lost it, or lost the privilege of becoming immortal by sin, and consequently is not immortal, and can never become immortal, in the sense of endless existence, only by being regenerated and saved, through faith in Christ."

Ex.—We are glad that you see "Mr. Storrs'" view is a tangible and intelligible one. What have you to say further of this view?

Wes.—"By this argument he involves the souls and bodies of the wicked in a common death, or loss of existence."

Ex.—Instead of "loss of existence," just say, *loss of life;* for it is clear a thing may *exist* without life. Man did so exist at his creation; for "the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground;" but though he was "man," he had not life till afterwards, when his Maker imparted it, "and *man* became a [*nephesh ha-yah*] *living* creature." By sin man lost all claim for conscious existence, or for the continuance of that life his Maker endowed him with at creation; he became subject to death, and so lost the prospect of eternal life.

Wes.—"What Mr. Storrs means by eternal life, more than life and happiness continued endlessly, he must explain, we cannot."

Ex.—You have explained, when you say "life continued *endlessly*," and "that man was a probationer for *immortality*." Is not immortality something *more* than "life *simply*." All animals have life, but there is no evidence that any animal has immortality, or an inherent life, so that they *cannot* die. Why should you darken counsel by words? Mr. Storrs has never said eternal life was something "*more* than life continued endlessly"—that is *immortality*—"neither can they die any more." Is not that something more than the "life *merely*" with which Adam was endowed?

Wes.—"Mr. Storrs denies that man was a probationer for happiness and life merely, and asserts that he was a probationer for eternal life. Eternal life, then, according to Mr. Storrs' theory, does not include happiness, and eternal life and eternal misery, may exist together, and his theory is overthrown by his own statements."

Ex.—Mr. Storrs maintains that man was a probationer for just what the law under which he was placed specifies; and that is clearly *life* without end, or endless life; this is evident from the fact that the penalty of disobedience was *death*. Endless life and endless happiness are manifestly inseparable; for in the very nature of things there can be no pain where there is not a liability to dissolution or death; and we may defy the philosophy of the universe to demonstrate the existence of pain in any living creature where that creature is not liable to death. Eternal life, then, or immortality, *is* something *more* than mere life or happiness, but it cannot exist without the creature is delivered from all liability to pain; therefore, "Mr. Storrs' theory does include happiness," though happiness does not necessarily include eternal life, and "Mr. Storrs' theory is" *not* overthrown by" your misapprehensions. Have you anything more to say about Mr. Storrs' views?

Wes.—"To do him justice, he must mean by life, the life of the body, in contradistinction from the life of the soul, as held by those who believe the soul lives after the body is dead, he holding that man was a probationer for the continued life of his soul as well as body, so that by the fall he has lost the life, that is, the existence of both; that, as the body and soul possess one common life, so both were involved in one common death by the fall.

Ex.—Here is a little confusion, from which, if you were extricated, you would have a true view of Mr. Storrs' position. Substitute the word "*man*" for "*body*" in the first two places where it occurs, so as to make it read *the man;* and then strike out the words "that is, the existence," and let it read, "lost the life of both," and you would "do him justice;" for that is what Mr. Storrs maintains, viz: that man by sin lost his life AS MAN; and not that he was left half alive, and that the largest half—the *sinner* himself—thus escaping the threatening of death.

Wes.—"But waiving all this, we will take Mr. S. at his own word. He says, 'To commence, I call attention to what man lost by the fall.' This is the right place to begin, and the right question to ask, and if it can be proved that man lost the *existence* of his soul by the fall, we will give up the whole argument. But to come soberly to the point, what did man lose by the fall? It cannot be assumed that he lost the existence of his soul, because this is the main point to be proved."

Ex.—We are glad to hear you say a thing "cannot be assumed." Mr. Storrs has never *assumed* that "man lost the *existence* of his soul by the fall;" but he has *affirmed*, and maintained it by "the law and the testimony," that man lost *life*—the life of *the man*—so that whatever was included in the creature man, and went to constitute him *man, died,* or was subjected to death. If the *creation* was that of *the man*, so his death was the death of *the same man*, and his Maker made no exception of any part of him. But what do you say he lost by the fall?

Wes.—"He lost his spiritual or moral life, consisting in the favor and image of God, and with this, of course, he lost his happiness. In this sense he died a moral death, and of course he must experience a moral resurrection to be restored; and this death he died without losing the existence of the soul, as all sinners are now dead in this sense; and,

hence, their regeneration does not imply a restoration of the existence of the soul."

Ex.—Remember, Br. Wes., *'it cannot be assumed.'* Where is it said, in the law or testimony that the penalty annexed to the Adamic law was "moral death?" No *assuming* these points. Where is the proof? Go to the Assembly's Catechism and you may find the assumption, and along with it the assumption that "God fore-ordained whatsoever cometh to pass;" but is that proof? Give us a "Thus saith the Lord" for your assertion. Not in one solitary instance in "the law and testimony," by Moses and the prophets, does the phrase "*surely die*" signify a moral or spiritual death, unless this in Gen. 2: 17, is an exception; and if it is an exceution, it is for you to *prove* it—"it cannot be *assumed.*" In every other instance this phrase clearly has the meaning of death literally, and not a moral death. Hence, to talk about "a moral death" and "a moral resurrection," in this relation, is to "speak not according to this word," viz; "the law and the testimony;" of such the Lord saith, "It is because there is no light in them." Isa. 8: 20.

Wes.—"That man did die a moral death is evident from the language of scriptures. St. Paul says to Christians, 'You hath he quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins.'"

Ex.—What has this text to do with the penalty of the Adamic law? If Paul had said to Christians, You were made dead in trespasses and sins by Adam's transgression, it would have been to your purpose; but there is not the most distant allusion to any such thing. Adam's offence was *one*—his sin was *one;* but the persons spoken of by Paul were dead in trespasses and sins, (plural;) and it was clearly their own and not Adam's of which Paul speaks. Mr. Storrs does not deny but what there is a moral death; but he does deny that being the *penalty* of the Adamic law, and challenge the proof. Where is it? *Where?*

Wes.—"There can be no such thing as a restoration of the soul to existence in regeneration, as Mr. Storrs contends, and his doctrine that annihilation is the negative of a regenerate state, is exploded."

Ex.—"Mr. Storrs contends the soul is restored to existence by regeneration!" "that annihilation is the negative of a regenerate state!" Well, now, Luther, or Br. Wesleyan, you ought to be sent immediately to Rome and take out a patent, for the Pope can't beat that! Such a change of an author's words and sentiments! Will Luther tell us where he finds the sentiments he attributes to Mr. Storrs? When he can find such statements in anything Mr. Storrs ever wrote, we will pledge ourself to find the phrase "immortal soul" in the Bible, a more Herculean task than to build Babel.

Wes.—"If the death by sin, with which Adam was threatened, was the loss of existence, including both soul and body, and involving them in one common death, then the death of the soul in the sense in which sinners are dead in trespasses and sins, would carry with it the death of the body, which is not true, for their bodies live while the soul is dead, in the sense in which it dies by sin, or is dead in sin."

Ex.—Here your logical powers have come short of demonstration. Insert "life" for "xeistence," and you would make a fair beginning. But man lost *life* by sin, and as a *penalty* of law. It does not, therefore, follow that "the death of the soul in" sin "would carry with it the death of the body," even if "loss of existence, including both soul and body" was the penalty of the divine law; because "death in sin" is but a figurative expression to describe *a state* of mind, and is *not* the penalty of law. True you have *assumed* that moral death was that penalty, and thus have contradicted both fact and testimony, for God said to man, "*Thou* shalt die"—"dust *thou* art, unto dust shalt *thou* return," and He has charged you and all others not to say "*any more*, The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge." Ezek. 18: 1–4. The moral death, of which you speak, is the state into which men plunge themselves by personal transgression; and is a distinct matter from the penalty of law. But this is a point we will not stop to discuss now, but we are fully prepared to meet you on that point whenever you wish to do so.

Wes.—"If the life and death of both soul and body are so linked together that the body cannot die without carrying the death of the soul with it, and that the soul cannot live without holding the body in life with it; and if it also be true, as Mr. Storrs' theory teaches, that the soul is rendered immortal by regeneration, through faith in Jesus Christ, then a regenerate person could not die."

Ex.—Another pure *assumption.* Mr. Storrs never taught "that the soul is rendered immortal by regeneration;" nor does his "theory" *imply* any such thing. He holds that the life of believers is in Christ; and when Christ is revealed from heaven, the saints put on immortality, and not till then, yet by a moral regeneration *now*—they are rendered meet to receive immortality, eternal life, at Christ's *return.* When a man is *regenerate* in the full and scripture sense—which is not complete till the resurrection, in the last day—he *cannot "die* any more." Luke 20: 35–36.

Wes.—"Man lost his animal existence by sin; that is, the death of the body is one of the consequences of the fall."

Ex.—Man lost *life* by sin. At his creation he was an "animal," nothing but an animal; though of the highest order, and capable of a moral development, which, however, he never made—so far as the law and testimony guide us—till he partook of the forbidden fruit. You talk of "the death of the body" as "one of the consequences of the fall." It was *the man* to whom God said "*thou* shalt die." He did not say the *body* shall die: but *thou—the man.* Whatever went to make up or constitute *man,* was the subject of the penalty, or of the death. If the soul was no part of man, then the soul was not subject to

the penalty, and therefore the soul did not sin, and hence was not and is not "morally dead," as you say.

Will you now just give us your argument to overthrow Mr. Storrs' views, which you draw from the atonement of Christ?

Wes.—"Christ suffered and died, and it took both the suffering and death to make out the atonement. * * * Now, as his suffering was in the place of our suffering, and his death in the place of our death, that we might be called back from the grave, it follows that if our souls are exposed to the loss of existence through sin, so his soul should have lost its existence, or have been annihilated, to have been a ransom to redeem us from annihilation; but his soul was not annihilated, and therefore annihilation is no part of the penalty of the law, for 'Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.' Now, as Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, '*being made a curse for us*,' it follows that annihilation or the loss of the existence of the soul, is no part of the curse of the law, for in this sense Christ was not made a curse for us. It appears to us that this one consideration settles the question, that the soul did not forfeit its existence by the fall, but only its happiness."

Ex.—Now, we have only to use your own *logic* to show that the doctrine of endless misery is false. To do this, we will use your language except the substituted words in brackets, and all will see at once that, in trying to eat up Mr. Storrs, you have devoured your own theory of endless misery. Thus:—

"As Christ's suffering was in the place of our suffering, and his death in the place of our death, that we might be called back from the grave, it follows that if our souls are exposed to [eternal misery] through sin, so his soul should have [eternal misery] or have been [eternally tormented,] to have been a ransom to redeem us from [eternal torments,] but his soul was not [eternally tormented,] and therefore [eternal torment] is no part of the penalty of the law, for 'Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.' Now, as Christ has redeemed us from the curse of the law, by '*being made a curse for us*,' it follows that [eternal misery] or [endless torments] of the soul, is no part of the curse of the law, for in this sense Christ was not made a curse for us. It appears to us that this one consideration settles the question, that the soul did not [become liable to endless torment] by the fall, but only [to death.]"

If this argument is not as *logical* and *conclusive* against the doctrine of endless misery as yours is against "annihilation," then your logical powers will enable you to show its fallacy. Moreover, if the soul is immortal, and eternal misery was the penalty of the law, redemption would have been *impossible*, unless the Redeemer himself suffered eternally, if *substitution* is the true notion of atonement, as your theory maintains. Good bye, friend Wesleyan.

DEATH CESSATION OF LIFE.

BY REV. EDWARD WHITE, ENGLAND.

The positive argument for interpreting the threatening of death held out to Adam, in the absolute sense of cessation of all life, has not been noticed by those who have hitherto appeared in this controversy. It is chiefly derived from the language of Paul in the fifth chapter of the epistle to the Romans, and from considerations on the compound nature of man, and on the sense which Adam himself would probably have attached to the terms of the menace.

The ancient Alexandrian and Augustinian figurative sense attached to the term *death* in its application to the soul has been frequently insisted upon of late: and the attempt to evince the necessity of rejecting altogether the system of interpretation which is founded upon the technical distinction between temporal, spiritual, and eternal death, has been received by the learned critics of the Evangelical Magazine, even with mirth and derision. In support of the former argument, it may be observed that theologians are much divided as to the number and kinds of deaths which passed upon Adam and his posterity as the result of the fall. The ancient orthodox writers contended for the descent of a triple death upon the head of Adam and of his posterity also. The more lenient critics of modern times have strenuously asserted that only two kinds of death, temporal and spiritual, have been brought upon us by Adam's transgression; while sinners incur the *third* description of mortality, termed in scripture the *second death*, through their own sins. By what canon of interpretation the latter class of theologians, amongst whom may be reckoned Mr. Hinton and Dr. Payne, withstand the assaults of such an assailant as Mr. Haldane, does not clearly appear. *He* asserts that the triple death descended on mankind; *they* firmly pronounce for a twofold mortality as the fatal inheritance. But it seems obvious that by whatsoever canon they at pleasure, for moral and theological reasons, reject one description of death, in discussing the scripture language on man's fallen condition, we are at liberty, and indeed are obliged by that same canon, to reject both the *spiritual* and the *eternal*. If they have a right to say that, although death threatened to Adam signified death temporal, spiritual, and *eternal*, (i. e. everlasting misery,) the death which descended as the inheritance was only temporal and spiritual, the same single term being employed in both cases, surely they have established for us a right to advance a step further, and say, that this whole system of distinctions is arbitrary, is based on no solid foundation, and that wherever we read of death as the result of sin, we are to understand the term in the physical sense of dissolution of man's composite nature. We are of course acquain-

ted with those passages of scripture by which this idea of a *moral death* is supposed to be established; but no attempt has been made to encounter in detail the reasonings in favor of a physical interpretation of the term. "You hath he quickened, (*to you hath he given life,*) who were dead in (or, as Macknight correctly gives it, *dead by*) trespasses and sins." Eph. ii. 1. "She that liveth in pleasure *is dead* while she liveth." 1 Tim. v. 6. In this last passage the original is *zoosa tethneeke*, living, is dead. In both cases, the figure, it is submitted, is in the tense, not in the meaning of the verb. An event yet future by a very common form of speech, is vividly described as already present: just as, contrarily, a past state is described by a term having a present application, in the words. "I saw the *dead*, small and great, stand before God." Exactly in the same manner, I humbly conceive, Paul speaks in the epistle to the Romans: "For I was alive without the law once, but when the commandment came, sin revived *and I died.* And the commandment which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it SLEW ME," (*apekteinen,*) Rom. vii. 11. "The letter KILLETH," says the same apostle: (*to gramma apokteinei.*) 2 Cor. iii. 6. Now, are our opponents prepared to affirm that the verb *apokteino* (translated *slay* and *kill* in these two passages, and evidently employed by the apostle in explanation of *death* in each case, is capable of being tortured into several significations, physical, spiritual, and eternal? Can we say of a wicked man that he is morally *slain*, spiritually *killed*, as a descendant of Adam, and that he will be *slain* and *killed* to all eternity in the miseries of hell? But if our opponents are not prepared to defend these extravagances of diction, it is necessary to abandon the entire theory of distinctions in the meaning of the term, and to adhere, throughout the canon to a physical interpretation of the threatening of death. Again, it is urged, that to suppose a figure in the tense rather than in the meaning of the word will satisfy the requirements of every passage in which sinners are asserted to be dead in, or by, their trespasses.

Some light may perhaps be thrown upon the nature of the death threatened to Adam and to the wicked, as "the wages of sin," by adducing considerations derived from our Lord's discourses on the life which he came in infinite mercy to bestow. These discourses will be found extending as a galaxy through the heaven of the gospel of John: and it is somewhat singular that reference to them has been generally avoided by one party in this controversy. In order to economize space, the reader is recommended to peruse this gospel at one sitting, from the first chapter to the end of the twelfth. The most prominent feature in these discourses is the promise of EVERLASTING LIFE. Are there any internal indications which may enable us to determine in what sense this phrase is to be understood?—Strangely enough it is the very phrase selected by Mr. Hinton to denote the idea of endless existence. He asks, "Who will *live for ever?*" and the answer which he returns is, the whole human race. In these divine discourses, however, every impartial reader will admit that our Lord limits the bestowment of "*life eternal*" to the righteous.

If now we take as an example the passage commencing with verse forty-seven in the sixth chapter, "*Verily I say unto you, he that believeth on me, hath everlasting life,*" we may say that the term *life* signifies either the literal bestowment of immortality on body and soul, in the sense by us contended for, and to be conferred exclusively on the saints; or else it signifies one of these three things: first, the gift of immortality to the bodies of the righteous; or, secondly, the gift of *holiness* to their souls; or, thirdly, the gift of eternal *happiness* to a nature already possessed of immortality in the soul. That it cannot be intended to signify the communication of immortality to the bodies of the righteous in any peculiar sense, is asserted by our opponents, who hold that this awful bestowment belongs equally to the wicked, and here without doubt the gift of life is spoken of as the special inheritance of the godly. Besides, the idea of the immortalizing of the body alone, by no means fills out the majesty and reiterated urgency of our Lord's expressions. It is something besides the resurrection of the body which the Redeemer here so frequently attributes to his merciful intervention. The "unjust" as well as "the just" are to be raised from their graves, but only those who have "done good" shall obtain the "resurrection of life." John v. 28, 29. Neither, secondly, can it be that the gift of *holiness* and divine virtue is here intended. Many passages will offer no sense whatever on this supposition. The continual reference to physical ideas of resurrection "from the graves," and to the privilege of "not dying," as the fathers in the wilderness "died," in connexion with the promises of *life eternal* here repeatedly offered, shows that something far more tangible than the theological conception of *moral life* was designed by our Lord. See John v. 25–29; vi. 40–44, 47–58; viii. 51, 52.

Neither, in the last place, can it be that eternal *happiness* was designed here, *apart from the gift of eternal existence* to the compound nature, for as has been alleged above, many passages are deprived of all congruous signification by such a hypothesis. "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead. This is the bread which came down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof *and not die,*" v. 47. "This is the will of him that sent me, that every one that seeth the Son and believeth on him, may have *everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last*

day." John v. 40. To what purpose are these physical references, if the *life* intended were solely the happiness of a nature already immortal, "an heir of indestructible existence?" Will it be said that the life spoken of is resurrection of the body, *and* eternal happiness of the soul already immortal? then how shall we understand the words, "Except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man, ye have *no life* in you?" vi. 53; for according to our opponents, *the wicked* WILL *be raised from the dead* to an eternal existence in the body, and this is quite sufficient to show the inadequacy and inconsistency of the proposed interpretation.

Indeed there is no interpretation which will carry us simply and easily through the gospel of John, except that which affixes to the phrase *eternal life*, the meaning of indestructible *existence* in the compound nature of body and soul; of course a happy existence, for it is the sole privilege of the saints in glory. In vindication of this interpretation, let it be permitted in conclusion to adduce afresh several passages which have received no attention from the advocates of natural immortality, but which appear to be destructive of the popular theory.

John v. 26, "As the Father hath life in himself, (*zoeen en eauto,*) so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself." Here *life* must signify the possession of *eternal existence*, the property of "Him that liveth for ever and ever." Now it is added by our Lord, in chap. vi. 53, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, *ye have no life in yourselves;*" (*zoeen en eautois;*) where surely the same phrase stands for the same idea—the idea of immortality. This conclusion is supported by the terms of verse 57, where the Lord says, "As *the living Father* hath sent me, and *I live by the Father*, (*zoo dia ton Patera,*) so he that eateth me, even he *shall live by me*, (*di eme zeesetai.*)

Again, in chap. viii. 51, we find our Saviour engaged in conversation with the Pharisees in the temple, and he assured them that "if a man kept his saying, he should *never see death.* Then said the Jews to him, Now we know that thou hast a devil. Abraham is dead, and the prophets," &c. The fact that these Jews did not understand Christ's promise of escape from *death*, through him, metaphorically, but literally and physically, shows that whatever the word may have signified at Alexandria, or within the sphere of the Alexandrian influence, it did not steadily signify in the popular language of Palestine, eternal existence in misery: for, had such been the case, they might easily have understood our Lord's discourse. At all events, it is probable that he would have afforded them that explanation had it been true, instead of permitting them to rest in the literal acceptation of his words. Far from removing the impression as to the meaning of the terms which he had used, he immdiately proceeds to affirm the eternity of his own nature, "Before Abraham was I am," an affirmation which he elsewhere conjoins with the assertion of his power to bestow the "resurrection unto life" upon whomsoever he would.

Once more: in chap. xii. 24, our Lord is represented as thus addressing the Greeks who came up to worship at the feast. "He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal." For a more extended criticism upon this passage the reader is referred to that work which has been already presented to the public: here it shall suffice to demand of the contrary part a reply to two questions. First, what was it which a man is here represented as "loving?" and secondly, what was it which he would lose if he loved it below, and keep unto life eternal if he hated it here? The straightforward and obvious answer to these questions, carries with it a superabundant defence of the main argument of *Life in Christ.* That main argument, cumulative and complex, has not, I think, been approached, either by the lamented Dr. Hamilton, who is said to have admitted that he had not read the recent productions which advocate opposite opinions, or by any of the minor writers who have appeared on the same side. In the future treatment of some of the details of the scheme there is much advantage to be derived in the way of correction or amendment, from the compositions both of vehemently hostile and of friendly critics. But regarded as a whole, it has not, in my opinion, been shaken, simply because it has not been assailed. If for the future the truly benevolent spirit displayed by Mr. Hinton, and by the writer in the British Quarterly Review, be manifested by all who take part in the controversy, the church of Christ will have no reason to regret the inevitable discussion.

———o———

KOSSUTH AND HIS MISSION.—That Kossuth is a wonderful man none will doubt; and that he has a mission to perform is clear. We are disposed to say but little now. That he is one of a class of agencies to gather the nations, *we* can have no doubt. We have seen the man, and who has not felt the influence of his stirring eloquence? That he is one of the "*knowing ones*" must be admitted by all. His *knowledge* of men, principles, and matters pertaining to governments, is truly amazing. His frankness in expressing his wishes is well calculated to win him popular favor; and averse as our leading politicians are or may be to doing anything governmentally in aid of the cause he advocates, they are too selfish to dare to oppose its being done, if that seems to be the popular will. The masses are moved and will be moved; and this nation can scarcely avoid a collision with some of the European powers who are adverse to Kossuth and his objects.

Our present conviction is, that Rev. 16: 14, points out the work in which he is engaged, "The spirits

of *daimonon*"—not "devils," as in our translation—"*knowing ones*" are to "*go forth* unto the" *basileis*—"*kingdoms* of the earth and of the *whole world*, to gather them to the *battle of* THAT GREAT DAY OF GOD ALMIGHTY." The spirits of *knowing ones* is not an unmeaning expression. We should expect that just such talents and knowledge as is possessed by Kossuth would be brought to the work here prophesied of, and that the effect would be just what appears in this movement.

If the time has come, as *come it must*, for the "Battle of Armageddon," then will the earth see no more quiet or peace till the kingdoms of *this* world shall become the kingdom of our Lord and his Christ. Then will all "oppressors be broken in pieces;" the adulterous *woman* of Rev. 17 will have her flesh eaten and she be burned with fire; for this waking up of nations will be in part from *hatred* to that woman who has corrupted the earth with her abominations.

We shall wait for further developments, and watch the movements with interest, knowing as we do that the time is at hand for Jesus our Lord to have the throne of his father David, and for his dominion to be extended over all the earth. That reign is to be a *personal* one, beyond a doubt in our mind.

—o—

STORY OF A DOG.—Theologians claim for man an immortal soul; and part of their argument is based on the fact that man manifests moral qualities which brutes do not possess. Let them read the following and judge whether a dog may not have something that looks very much like what they term a moral quality in man: and if man is immortal on this account, why not the dog also?—at least some of them? We confess that the following account not only shames man as a species, but many professed Christians who do not manifest half the moral, nor half the Christian principle of this dog and his companion: for many of them not only rejoice at the calamities that may befall those whom they regard as their enemies, but "bite and devour" those who have extended to them a helping hand. Let such read and learn, from the fact here related, to humble themselves for that pride of heart which leads them to boast that they are immortal, and for the revengeful spirit they have so often indulged.

"One day a Newfoundland dog and a mastiff, which never met without a quarrel, had a fierce and prolonged battle on the pier of Donaghadee, and from which, while so engaged, they both fell into the sea. There was no way of escape but by swimming a considerable distance. The Newfoundland dog being an expert swimmer, soon reached the pier in safety; but his antagonist, after struggling for a time, was on the point of sinking, when the Newfoundland, which had been watching the mastiff's struggles with great anxiety, dashed in, and seizing him by the collar, kept his head above the water, and brought him safely to shore. Ever after they were most intimate friends; and when, unfortunately, the Newfoundland was killed by a stone-wagon passing over his body, the mastiff languished and evidently lamented his friend's death for a long time."

—o—

FROM S. A. CHAPLIN.

Br. Storrs:—The doctrine of Life and Immortality through Christ alone, obtains comparatively good reception in many localities where I visit. A large church near Plymouth, Marshall county, almost unanimously receive the truth on this subject. I preach for them once a month. The little church in Oswego, where I also labor, rejoice in the gospel faith and hope. Other localities are raising the Macedonian cry. I expect to make quite an extensive tour through the central parts of this State soon, and hope to be made instrumental in disseminating the truth. What a glorious subject for contemplation is the Christian's hope in its constituent objects. Contemplating that the mediatorial work is to abolish sin and death, exterminate evil, destroy every vestige of rebellion from God's universe, and save with an everlasting salvation all those who comply with the overtures of redeeming grace. The coming of the Lord, the resurrection of the dead, the restitution of all things, and eternal life in the kingdom of God, upon the Earth renewed, are set before the child of God, as objects on which he is to rest his desires and expectations, should be subjects sufficient to thrill the emotions of every believing heart. Be of good cheer, Br. Storrs. Continue to show the world that *death comes by Adam*, and *Life and Immortality by Jesus Christ;* that we do not *die* into eternal life, but are resurrected into it; that its form or principle is not from the flesh and blood of corruptible man, but from the Spirit of the incorruptible God, which raised Jesus from the dead; that the home of the Saints is not "beyond the bounds of time and space," but in the "new *earth*, wherein dwelleth righteousness." In hope of that better country, let us labor to be found of Him in peace without spot and blameless.

Summit, Ind., Oct. 22, 1851.

—o—

TATE'S DEFENCE.—The remainder of that document we have not yet received. Will Br. Tate forward it soon?

—o—

"PROPHETIC PERIODS."—We have concluded to republish a few articles on this subject, which appeared in the Examiner in 1847. The Examiner was then in *quarto* form, and all the numbers containing the articles were long since used up.

For much of the historical information contained in these articles we are indebted to "*The Times of Daniel*, by George Duke of Manchester," published in London in 1845.

We hope our readers will carefully examine the subject, not as a matter of speculation, but for practical purposes.

Br. Jacob Blain suggests the idea of calling on those who have the means, to furnish funds to send *two thousand* ministers of the different denominations a copy of the "Bible Examiner Extra." The cost of that number of the *Extra* will be $50; but the postage having to be *pre-paid*, at *two* cents per copy, would amount to $40 more; and if sent a distance over 500 miles, the postage would be *four* cents per copy. The cost of *enveloping* and *directing* will be an additional item; so that $100 at least would be necessary. If the friends are disposed to meet the expense, we will do the *labor* without charge. Those who approve the object can send the funds, and also give a list of ministers to whom they would like to have it sent.

Address "*George Storrs*, Philadelphia, Pa." There is no necessity for any one to put the name or number of the street on any communication to us, unless sent by private hands. Anything by mail goes into our Box at the Post Office, and we call there every day. The place of our office is given for the benefit of friends who may wish to call on us.

———o———

"The Gospel Hope."—The Sermon on this subject, by the Editor, in the Examiner for December, we have been requested to issue in a pamphlet. We have concluded to send it out as a *Tract*. In that cheap form it will be likely to be more widely circulated. It will be about 16 pages 18mo., and sold at $1.50 per 100, or $10 per thousand copies. Let us have your orders. One brother has already ordered $10 worth.

———o———

"Our Israelitish Origin."—See list of Books. Whatever any person may think of the *conclusions* in that work, the information it contains is worth double the price of the book. As to ourself, we are unshaken in the opinion that the Anglo-Saxons are the literal *descendants* of Ephraim, and a part of the "*Lost Tribes of Israel.*"

———o———

Notices.—"*Odd Numbers*" of the Examiner we cannot furnish for 1848. We have only *six sets* for that year left *in sheets*, and about as many more bound with '49, in one volume, the price of which is $1.50.

R. P. Grant.—The letter was received. *H. Halstead*, C. W. Sent you *Storrs' Miscellany*, and bound *Hymn Book* per mail, pre-paid.

———o———

Errata.—In Examiner for May, 1851:—On page 67, left column, 5 lines from bottom, for "*revelating*" read *revelations*. Same page, right column, 11 lines from top, for "*insinuation*" read *instruction*. On page 68, right column, 35 lines from top, for "*manifest*" read *manifested*.

———o———

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, TRACTS, &c.
FOR SALE AT BIBLE EXAMINER OFFICE.

The Postage on all these works we have to *prepay* when sent by mail. That amount must be added to the price by all who order them sent in that way. The postage is *one cent* for *each* ounce, or a fraction of an ounce, for any distance under 500 miles: over 500 and under 1500, two cents: over 1500 and under 2500, three cents. We affix the weight to each work, that all may see what the postage is, and send accordingly:

1. "Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment, by H. H. Dobney," Baptist Minister; an argument in *two parts*. This is a work of great power, showing the *Righteous only will live Forever*. 286 pages, 12mo. Price 37½ cts in paper covers. Weight 9 oz.

2. "Dobney Abridged."—Or, the *Second Part* of the Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment, in an edition by itself. It contains all that is really essential in the controversy, to enable the reader to decide whether *endless torture*, or *destruction of being*, is the true teaching of Scripture. We put it at the extremely low price of 25 cents. Weight 8 oz.

3. "Dialogues on Future Punishment, by Rev. Wm. Glen Moncrieff," Scotland. A pamphlet of 60 pages, 12mo. It is a familiar examination of the question of Immortality conducted in a spirit that cannot fail to interest. Price 15 cents. Weight 3 oz.

4. "The Unity of Man, or Life and Death Realities. A Reply to Rev. Luther Lee, by Anthropos." This is a thorough refutation of Mr. Lee's position of the natural immortality of man. Price 15 cents. Weight 3 oz.

5. "Six Sermons, by George Storrs. An inquiry, *Are the Wicked Immortal?*" To which is *added* a dissertation on the "State of the Dead;" and *prefixed* Archbishop Whately's remarks on "The Second Death." Price 15 cts. Weight 3 oz.

6. "Can you Believe? By Wm. Glen Moncrieff," Scotland. A tract of four pages, showing the absurdity of the notion of immortality in sin and suffering. Price 30 cents per hundred.

7. "Second Death, by Archbishop Whately." A Tract of 8 pages. Price 60 cents per hundred.

8. "The Rich Man and Lazarus." A Tract of 12 pages. Price 75 cents per 100.

9. "The Two Thrones, Or, The Throne of God and the Throne of Christ. By George Storrs." This tract goes to show the present position of Christ, and what it will be in the Age to come. Price 2 cents.

10. "True Source of Life, by George Storrs." A Tract of 12 pages. Price $1 per 100.

Of the Tracts it takes about 40 pages to make one ounce.

11. Storrs' Miscellany." New edition. It contains the foregoing Nos. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, & 10, bound in 1vol. Price 50c. Wt. 9oz.

12. "The Immateriality of the Soul, or, Man entirely dependant upon his organization for all his mental and moral powers: By Thomas Read, New York." Price 7 cts. Weight 1 oz.

13. "Our Israelitish Origin, or Lectures on Ancient Israel, by J. Wilson," England. This work is designed to show that the modern inhabitants of Europe, and the people of the United States, are the literal descendants of Jacob, and of the lost tribes of Israel. Price 75 cents bound, or 50 in paper covers. Weight, bound, 14 oz.; in paper. 9 oz.

14. "Truth Against Fiction," or the three last chapters of Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment. Price 12c. Weight 3 oz.

On all the foregoing works, one-third discount will be allowed to those who buy to sell again; but in all cases the purchaser *must* add to the price the amount of postage, if ordered by mail.

15. "Bible Examiner, Extra." New Edition. It contains Bishop Whately's remarks on "Second Death"—"Endless Misery," by Bishop Newton—Our "Six Sermons," &c. 16 pages, quarto, and sold at the extreme low price of $2.50 per 100, or 5 cents single copy. Weight 2 oz.

16. "Bible Examiner" for '48 and '49, bound in one volume. Price $1.50. No discount. Weight 32 oz.

17. "Bible Examiner" for '50 & 51, bound in 1 vol. Price $1.50. 25 cts. off to paying subscribers for '52, if ordered soon.

18. "Christian Psalmody," bound in plain morocco, 20 cents; in plain gilt 25 cents. No discount, but will be sent free of post age if $1 worth are ordered. Weight 3 oz.

All orders must be addressed

GEO. STORRS, Philada, Pa.