BIBLE EXAMINER.

VOL. VII. NEW YORK, OCTOBER AND NOVEMBER, 1852. NOS. 10 and 11.

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

GEORGE STORRS, EDITOR AND PUBLISHER.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY,
At No. 140 Fulton-street, (Up Stairs.)

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

METHODIST QUARTERLY.

"THE INTERMEDIATE STATE AND PUNISHMENT OF THE WICKED."—Such is the title of an article in the Methodist Quarterly Review for April last. The writer opens by saying:—

"It has been recently urged with much confidence, and with some show both of argument and of critical learning, that it is the doctrine of the Bible that human beings are entirely unconscious between death and the resurrection; and that the punishment of the wicked will be annihilation."

The writer goes on in an attempt, as a "preliminary," to "prove that the soul has an existence distinct from that of the body, and that it may have a separate existence." His argument on this point is so much like that of Luther Lee, which has been met and abundantly refuted by "Anthropos," in the "Unity of Man," that we let it all pass by, referring our readers to that work.

We next come to his argument "to show that the soul is conscious between death and the resurrection." The discussion shall now take the dialogue form, and METH. will stand for Methodist Quarterly Review; and EXR. for Examiner. METH. will lead and the EXR. will respond.

METH.—"The Bible teaches that the dead, both righteous and wicked, are conscious. This has been the nearly universal belief of Christians from the days of the apostles."—p. 241.

EXR.—Here are two mistakes. The Bible teaches no such doctrine; and we venture to affirm, it was not the belief of Christians till the church was corrupted by the introduction of pagan philosophy sometime *after* all "the apostles" had "fallen asleep."

METH.—"They who oppose this doctrine [the consciousness of the dead] refer to a number of passages, contained, with a single exception, in the Old Testament."—p. 241.

EXR.—Not quite correct. We have the doctrine of no future life without a resurrection clearly taught in *many* texts in the New Testament. The whole apostolic teaching, touching a future life, goes to show that they nowhere held the doctrine you contend for. They never comfort believers with the idea that their deceased friends were now *conscious*, or in heaven, as modern theologians do. A strange defect, truly, had they believed it.

METH.—"The writers of the Old Testament generally speak of death as to its effects on the physical organization, and its results in relation to the concerns and interests of this world. They speak just as we frequently do of death and the grave. We admonish our fellow men to work while the day lasts, because the night cometh, and that in the grave there is no knowledge or work; and so did those writers."—p. 242.

EXR.—Then you speak truth, and speak scripturally.

METH.—"But neither they nor we, in these expressions, assert any thing for or against the unconsciousness of the soul."—p. 242.

EXR.—Is not "knowledge" a "*function* of the soul"? So you maintain, page 240, when you say, "reasoning, conception, volition, &c.," are "among its functions;" and are *not* functions of the body; which you there affirm are "respiration, circulation, motion, &c." If then "knowledge" is a "function of the soul," as you have said; and *you*, in common with the Old Testament writers, "admonish men ** that in the grave" [*sheol*—the state of the dead] "there is no knowledge," as you say you do, is it not fair to conclude that you "assert the unconsciousness of the soul"? I regard your dilemma to be an inextricable one, if you mean what you say of the functions of soul and body.

METH.—"We do not believe, and we suppose that they [the O. T. writers] did not believe, that the soul is buried with the body in the grave."—p. 242.

EXR.—Whether *you* speak what you mean or not is not for me to say: but "holy men of old, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit," undoubtedly, did so speak: and they affirm, not of a dead body merely, lodged in a hole in the earth, that *it* has no knowledge, but that in *sheol*, where dead *men* go, "there is *no knowledge*." The Old Testament writers did believe the *soul* went into *shoel*, which is the word translated "*grave*"—Eccl. 9: 10, from which you quote. Thus the Psalmist saith—"Thou wilt not leave *my soul* in *sheol*": Psa. 16: 10. Again—"Thou hast brought up *my soul* from the *grave*"; Psa. 30: 3; that is, he "kept" him "alive" and did not suffer him to die; for if he had died his *soul* would have gone into the same "grave," *viz. sheol*, in which it is affirmed "there is *no knowledge*"; and, of course, the souls which

enter there are "unconscious." Such was the faith of the O T. writers, whatever you may believe or disbelieve.

METH.—"Eccl. 9: 5, 'For the dead know not anything,' is a text, perhaps, quoted more frequently and with more confidence than any other, by those who deny the consciousness of the soul after the death of the body, but they always stop at the end of this clause. The wise man adds, 'neither have they any more a reward.'"—p. 242.

EXR.—We do not always stop where you say: we have frequently, both in writing and preaching, dwelt upon the expression, "neither have they any more a reward," as additional evidence of the unconscious state of the dead; because, if conscious they *have* some sort of reward. The wise man does not affirm they never *will* have a reward. He uses the *present* tense; indicating the state they are *now* in: "neither *have* they any more a reward;" and immediately assigns the reason—"for, the memory of them is forgotten." We understand this last expression to refer to the memory of the dead ones; and the tenth verse confirms this view, for there he reaffirms the doctrine of the fifth verse of the entire destitution of knowledge among the dead ones; and the Psalmist is equally as explicit when he saith—"In death there is *no remembrance* of" God: Psa. 6: 5. Thus our position is doubly fortified, and your attack upon it has only served to make it more apparent that it is invulnerable.

METH.—"The passage in the New Testament referred to above" [as the only one in the N. T. that those who oppose the conscious state of the dead use] "is Acts 2: 34, 'David is not ascended into the heavens.' We do not know that it is necessary to suppose that the souls of the righteous dead, if conscious, have 'ascended into the heavens.' They may exist in a state of consciousness elsewhere, which sufficiently answers the argument from this passage."—p. 243.

EXR.—That is cool, *very cool*, truly, Bro. Meth. What then becomes of all the Methodist and "orthodox" fancies of flying off to heaven at death! Truly you have given your fanciful brethren a thrust which will make you suspected of beginning to be a little tinctured with our views. Our arguments, which you appear to have read in part, it seems, have brought you down from the fancy heaven, and so clipt your wings that you even use an expression implying doubt as to the *consciousness* of the dead: you say, "*if* conscious;" not, *though* conscious. Well, as you have done soaring to heaven with disembodied souls, through the power of the light that has been poured on your mind in reading our works, I trust you will yet be made to see that, as it is *not* "necessary to suppose that the souls of the righteous dead ascend into the heavens," so it is not necessary to suppose they are conscious till they are raised from the dead. Christ has "ascended into heaven;" this the Scriptures plainly affirm: see Luke 24: 51; Acts 1: 9–11; Heb. 1: 3; 8: 1; 9: 24, &c. Now, as Christ has ascended into heaven, it is very "necessary" that you should not only "suppose" but prove that "the souls of the righteous dead have ascended" there also, in order to be "*with* Christ." Is it not a part of your argument against us that Paul desired to depart and be *with* Christ?

METH.—Yes: "That Paul refers to himself, [as gain to die,] and what would be desirable in relation to himself, is evident from the 23d and 24th verses, 'I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart, and to be with Christ; which is far better.' *** For himself, it was more desirable that he should die, and more desirable, because he should then be in a state of conscious existence with Christ."—p. 245.

EXR.—And yet you have just said that you "do not know that it is *necessary* to suppose that the souls of the righteous dead have ascended into heaven"! If they have not ascended into heaven, they are not "WITH *Christ*"; for I have proved that Christ has ascended. If these two legs of your theory are equal I cannot see it; and you may find yourself shut up to the *necessity* of proving that dead saints have ascended; in which case you will not find it so easy to dispose of Peter's affirmation, while under immediate and divine inspiration, on the day of Pentecost, that "David is not ascended into the heavens." Try again, Bro. Meth. There is nothing like effort to lay open one's eyes; and I hope a few more plunges, such as you have made, will help you to see the truth, that the dead are asleep, and will sleep till Christ returns from heaven to wake them up to consciousness and life.

METH.—"It is clear, that Moses, though his body had not been raised from the dead, was conscious at the time of the transfiguration."—p. 244.

EXR.—It is equally "clear" if Moses was there in reality, and not in *vision*, that he was there "*in glory.*" If not raised from the dead he was not there except in vision; for saints will *not* "appear in glory" till Christ "*changes* the vile body" and appears himself in glory: see Col. 3: 4, and Phil. 3: 20, 21. But Moses did "*appear in glory;*" see Lk. 9: 30, 31. It is "clear," then, that Moses had been raised from the dead, or that he appeared in vision of what he should be when Christ shall *actually* "come in his glory" to raise his saints, and fashion them like to his own glory. As I judge your other arguments and texts quoted, to prove the dead do know more than all the living, have been sufficiently met elsewhere, we will pass on to the subject of the eternal existence of all souls whether righteous or wicked. What admissions have you to make on this question?

METH.—"It is generally conceded that we cannot,

apart from the Scriptures, prove conclusively the immortality of the soul—neither the metaphysical nor the moral arguments in favor of its immortality amount to demonstration. But none who believe in the Bible will admit that the soul is essentially indestructible, in such a sense that it exists by a necessity of its own nature. It exists because God created it; and he who created, can, if he will, annihilate it. After all our metaphysical and moral reasoning upon the subject, if it can be shown that the Bible clearly asserts that God will annihilate the souls of the wicked, the question will be entirely settled in the minds of all who believe that it teaches what will be the destiny, in the future state, of the righteous and the wicked.

"We turn then to the Bible for entire assurance on the great question of the soul's immortality; and here is assurance found. Yet, in the Bible, we think, there is no passage which can be strictly said to declare that all human souls are immortal. Some have supposed that the account of the creation of the soul, given in Gen. 2: 7, contains an intimation of its immortality. If there be in this verse such an intimation, it must be found either in the expression, 'the Lord God .... breathed into his nostrils,' or in the phrases, 'breath of life,' and 'man became a living soul.' If it be in the former phrase, then the idea is that God infused a portion of himself, of his own divinity, into the human body at that time.—But few will admit this idea. Most of us think that there is more poetry than truth in the line of one of our hymns: 'Our souls are his immortal breath.' If the proof is sought in the phrases, 'breath of life,' and 'living soul,' these do not prove anything; for both of them are applied, in the first chapters of Genesis, to brutes, and prove the same thing concerning them. Thus the words in Gen. 7: 15, and in Gen. 1: 20, rendered *life*, are the same with those rendered in Gen. 2: 7, '*a living soul.*'"—pp. 247-8.

EXR.—We thank you for these admissions: they show clearly that our arguments, in the works you have read, have not been lost upon you. Such admissions are a blow at the root of the whole theory of immortal-soulism.

METH.—"The only passages in the Bible which clearly teach the endless existence of all human beings, are those which speak of the endless happiness of the righteous and the endless misery of the wicked. If then the Bible does not teach that the punishment of the wicked shall be endless, it does not teach that they shall exist forever, and the question is resolved into this, 'Shall the wicked exist forever in misery?' The Bible answers this question, we believe, affirmatively."—p. 249.

EXR.—"We believe the Bible answers this question" *negatively*. The Bible does teach the endless existence of *some* human beings in plain and positive terms; and does not leave it to be *inferred* from expressions relative to their "endless happiness." They who are accounted *worthy* to attain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, *cannot* "*die any more.*" See Luke 20: 35, 36. That is plain; and there are many texts of like character, which may be noted in another place. Not one such assertion have you, in the Bible, in relation to the wicked.—We do not question but that "the punishment of the wicked will be endless;" but we do deny that it is endless *misery*.

METH. "It is said, 'that we have proof from various passages in the Bible that the immortality of the soul is only through faith in Christ.' John 10: 28, 'I give unto them eternal life.' 1 John 5: 12, 'He that hath the Son hath life,' are instances. John 3: 15, 36; 5: 40; 20: 31; Rom. 6: 23, and numerous other passages, are to the same purpose. If it is admitted that the phrases '*life*' in some, and '*eternal life*' in other of these passages mean only the existence of the soul forever, the question is settled. But this, the very point to be proved, is assumed by Mr. Storrs."—p. 249.

EXR.—"Mr. Storrs" has *not* "assumed" it. He has demonstrated that those phrases in many important passages mean *primarily* the existence of *the man* forever; and they cannot have any other construction put upon them without corrupting the testimony of the faithful and true witness. Take the first text in your list, in John 10: 28, "I give unto them eternal life." Does not this text clearly express eternal *existence?* What follows shows that it does; for, adds the Saviour, "they shall *never perish.*" Here it is plain that *life*, *being*, in its obvious signification is what is promised, and is explained by our Lord as the opposite of perishing, or *death*. Just read it as our opposers usually explain it, and it is stript of all its beauty and force. It then reads, "I give unto them eternal *happiness*, and they shall never be *miserable.*" Who, unbiassed by a preconceived notion, could believe that our blessed Lord used *figurative* language when the *literal* could have been so easily expressed? I regard it as an impeachment of his honesty and sincerity to say that he used, so uniformly, the phrases, *life*, *eternal life*, when he intended to be understood to mean *happiness*, and not life proper. But take another text—"As sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 5: 21. What is "eternal life" here? Do those on your side of the question say it is eternal *happiness?*—Then its opposite, "*death*," in the text, means *misery*. Then it would read, "as sin hath reigned unto misery, even so might grace reign *** unto eternal happiness." But will the context allow any such interpretation? What had the apostle said? "By one man sin entered into the world, and *death* by sin:*** death *reigned* from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression:" verses 12 to 14. Here the point is settled as to what Paul means by the phrase *death*; and he concludes his argument by affirming—"as sin hath *reigned* unto *death*, so might grace *reign* through righteousness unto *eternal life* by Jesus Christ our Lord." Man dies by the first Adam:

man lives again, if he ever lives at all, by the second Adam; and that life, to the righteous, is an *eternal* one. It clearly means here *existence* in conscious being. That such a life will be a happy one is true; but the phrase itself *expresses* the idea of life, or conscious *existence*, and of that "*only*." These examples are sufficient till our opponents shall do something more than *assume* that our Lord and his apostles do not mean what their words express.

METH.—"It is said, 'that the penalty of Adam's transgression was "*death*," and that death is equivalent to "extinction or cessation of being," or annihilation. We remark in reply, that *death* does not mean *extinction*, or *cessation of existence*, but *of life*. The whole force of this part of the Scripture argument of the advocates of annihilation depends upon the confusion of the two ideas, *existence* and *life*."---p. 250.

EXR.—There is no such "confusion" as you speak of in our arguments. It is only a creation of your own. We understand perfectly the difference between "existence and life;" and you, had you carefully examined what we have said on that point, would not have made the statement you have: it is only your *inference*. We may say of *man*, however, he ceases to exist *as man* in death; meaning only that he ceases to be a *living* man; not that the materials of which he was composed are out of existence.

METH.----"All will admit that the penalty of Adam's sin was '*death*:' but the point to be settled is this, Does 'death' mean 'extinction, or cessation of existence?' Mr. Storrs assumes that it does; we deny it. Life and existence are essentially different."----p. 250.

EXR.---"Mr. Storrs assumes" no such thing; but he does affirm that death is the cessation of *conscious* existence. If this were not so, it would not be death, but merely another mode of life; and could not, if there is any meaning in language, be called death. Life and existence may be essentially different; but life and *conscious* existence are not, in relation to any creature; though a living creature may not at all times be conscious.

METH.----"What was the penalty inflicted on Adam? The authors under review take the position that it was the loss of 'soul-immortality,' meaning thereby annihilation. There is not a passage in the Bible which sustains this position."---p. 252.

EXR.—We do not take the position that it was the loss of 'soul-immortality;' but that it was the *loss of life*—the life of *the man*. If any part of the man was exempt from the penalty of death it is for our opponents to prove it, and not *assume* it, as they uniformly do: and you have admitted that "there is no passage which can be strictly said to declare that all human souls are immortal:" p. 248. But the testimony is abundant that the life of *the man* was forfeited and lost by sin; and that the man is now in a perishing condition. If the soul is a part and parcel of the man, and without which he would not be man, then it must be included in the threatened death.

METH.—"We object, also, that the penalty of the law could not have been annihilation, because that penalty was not, in any sense or degree, inflicted on Adam 'in the day' of his sin. The denunciation, the penalty was, 'In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die.' Mr. Storrs thinks that he finds relief from the pressure of this objection in the idiomatic form of expression used in the original.—He says, 'The penalty was not, "In the day thou eatest thereof thou *shalt surely die*," but as the Hebrew language has it, "dying thou shalt die." That very day the whole man commenced dying.' Those who are but slightly acquainted with the Hebrew idiom, very well know that our version conveys precisely the meaning of the original, and Mr. Storrs' attempt to answer this objection entirely fails. The same phrase is used by God to Abimelech, in Gen. 20: 7; by Saul to Jonathan, 1 Sam. 14: 44; by Saul to Abimelech, 1 Sam. 22: 16; by Solomon to Shimei, 1 Kings 2: 37, 42,—in each of which cases it is manifest that certain and not lingering death was threatened."--pp. 252-3.

EXR.—"The penalty of the law" was *death:* and that it was *literal* death the texts you quote demonstrate: for, it was not a *spiritual* death God threatened to inflict on Abimelech; or Saul on Jonathan and Abimelech; or Solomon on Shimei: in each of these cases, and in every other where the phrase *surely die* occurs in Moses' or the prophets' writings, it means a literal death of the man; and does not include a moral or spiritual death in a solitary text, unless this in Gen. 2: 17 is an exception: and if it is an exception it is for our opponents to *prove* it such, and not *assume* it, as they uniformly do, and as you have done. While I do not admit that "Mr. Storrs' attempt to answer" the objection, that the "penalty was not in any sense or degree inflicted on Adam in the day of his sin," if that penalty was "annihilation"—as you please to call it, but which I call *death*—"entirely fails," I do admit that Mr. Storrs might have found a better explanation of the subject had he known ten years ago, when he first published his exposition, what he now knows about the Hebrew, viz.: that the Heb. preposition translated *in* has the sense of *after* and *against*, as well as *in*. The Heb. preposition is *be*, and is prefixed to *ium*, day. The text is, *be-ium: be* being the *prefix* determines as to the use of *ium, i. e., what day is meant.* The context shows *be* is used in the sense of *after:* and the text reads, "*after* the day thou eatest thereof *thou* shalt surely die." It does express *certainty*, as you say: but the certainty is not as to the *particular* day on which the penalty would be inflicted, but that it would, without fail, follow eating the forbidden fruit. God's own explanation of the threatened penalty, chap. 3: 19, shows that the whole man was embraced in it, and

that it was a return to the state he was in before his creation—"*Dust* THOU art, and *unto dust* shalt THOU return." Not, "dust *thy body* is;" but, *thou—the man.* No exception here of an *entity*, which our opponents call an *immortal soul:* a most important exception, if true, our opposers themselves being judges; for they insist upon it, though Adam's Maker is silent on the subject.

METH.—"The penalty inflicted on Adam consisted in physical and spiritual death, the former affecting the body, the latter the soul or spirit; not annihilation in either case, but a cessation of their appropriate functions."—p. 253.

EXR.—Where is your proof of this two-fold death? No where in the Bible, most assuredly. Besides, you have just said, it was "certain and not lingering death that was threatened:" and you have said, also, that the penalty could not have been what Mr. Storrs contends, "because that penalty was not, in any sense or *degree*, inflicted on Adam *in the day* of his sin." Now you contend that "the penalty inflicted on Adam was *physical* death"—the very thing Mr. Storrs contends for; but you add, "and spiritual death;" thus *adding* to the law and testimony of God. But, as you admit physical death to be a part of the penalty, was it "*in any sense or degree* inflicted on Adam *in the day* of his sin"?

METH.—"We may regard physical death as a part of the penalty, though it was not at once fully inflicted."—p. 253.

EXR.—If it was not at once *fully* inflicted, then it was a *lingering* death, which you just now said was not threatened. Thus you are compelled to eat your own words, and take precisely the ground as to physical death that you condemned Mr. Storrs for taking! Truly, "happy the man that condemneth not himself" for that which he condemneth others! He is a privileged character. Mr. Storrs said the Hebrew was, "*dying thou shalt die*"; importing a period elapsing before the penalty would be "fully inflicted"; you affirmed the Hebrew would not allow such a construction of its language, and therefore Mr. Storrs' argument "entirely fails"! Now you come forward and take the very ground you condemned in him, and say that "physical death, as a part of the penalty, was not *at once fully* inflicted"! What more, or different, had Mr. Storrs said?

METH.—"Adam, doubtless, understood the denunciation of the penalty to refer to physical death, and Paul teaches the same thing in 1 Cor. 15: 20, 22, where the statements in the 20th verse, that Christ is 'become the first-fruits of them that slept,' is conclusive proof that the death referred to in the 22d verse, 'as in Adam all die,' is physical death; else Christ was the subject of spiritual death, and a spiritual resurrection, that is, of depravity and the new-birth."—p. 253.

EXR.—Thank you, Br. Meth.; it is refreshing to hear you appeal to the law and the testimony; and that which is conclusive too, and so completely demolishes your whole fable of a *two-fold death.* "Adam understood the penalty to refer to physical death, and Paul teaches the same thing." Truth, *truth*, Br. Meth.; may the light shine more and more upon your mind.

METH.—"The other, and, as we believe, the chief part of the penalty, that which affected the soul, was inflicted in the day and at the very moment of Adam's sin. Some call this 'original sin;' others, 'native depravity'; we have called it 'spiritual death.' This Adam suffered in the day of his transgression."—p. 253.

EXR.—Do you say "Adam understood the penalty to refer to "*spiritual death?*" If so, where is the evidence of it? *Where?* Does "Paul teach" it? You have shown to the contrary conclusively in your appeal to his argument, 1 Corth. 15. Your whole position of the penalty of the Adamic law being a spiritual death is an unfounded assumption. To use your own words, p. 252, "There is not a passage in the Bible which sustains this position."

METH.—"The functions of Adam's spiritual life at once ceased; his soul was at once alienated from God. This condition he transmitted to his posterity; . . . young children exhibit, not perversity only, but depravity, long before they can understand the nature or the results of their conduct."—p. 254.

EXR.—And young pigs manifest the same. Did Adam transmit his spiritual death to them? But you are, on this point, at war with God. Listen:

"The word of the Lord came unto me again, saying, What mean ye, that ye use this proverb concerning the land of Israel, saying, The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge? As I live, saith the Lord God, ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb in Israel. Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine: the soul that sinneth, it shall die."—Ezekiel, 18: 1–4.

Here God declares he will not allow any such imputation as you have cast upon him. And any text from which you *infer* the doctrine of transmitted moral death, or depravity, is perverted by such *inference.* As to the exhibition which you suppose young children make of moral depravity, you might as well conclude that Adam was created morally depraved, because, so far as we know, his first moral act was one of disobedience. Children are born into the world under the law of physical death, and commence their course in pain; no wonder they manifest uneasiness, and what you denominate moral depravity; but which can have no such character till they arrive at years to understand the nature of their acts. But this subject cannot here

be fully discussed; we will only add that the Scriptures, everywhere, represent the moral depravity and sins of men as *their own*, and not as the result of an act of Adam. But physical corruption and death are, uniformly, ascribed to "the offence of one," *viz.*, Adam the first. This shows plainly enough what was the penalty of Adam's sin, and its *only* penalty. The adding of "spiritual death" is of human invention; and has its foundation in the traditions of men, by which they have made void the law of God, and filled men's mouths with excuses for their sins. Hence, God has plainly expressed his will, by Ezekiel, that such language should no more be used. Let all beware how they persist in using it, lest they be found fighting against God.

METH.—"Our opponents claim that *many passages in the Bible teach the annihilation of the wicked*, and we claim that many passages teach their endless punishment. These two ideas are plainly contradictory, and cannot both be taught in the Bible."—p. 254.

EXR.—Why "cannot both be taught in the Bible"? Is not an eternal deprivation of life "eternal" punishment? Most assuredly it is. You, and all on your side of the question, *assume* that pain and punishment are of necessity identical. This we deny. "*Capital* punishment"—the greatest of all punishments known under human tribunals—is not the greatest because it is the greatest infliction of pain, but because it is the deprivation of life. The *capital* punishment under the law of God is the eternal deprivation of life, and is therefore eternal punishment.

What the Methodist Quarterly Review saith further on this topic, we regard as having been so often met and refuted in our publications, that we let it pass, at least for the present. What it has said on the term *aionios* is contradicted by most commentators, who are nearly unanimous in their admissions that the terms eternal, everlasting, forever, and forever and ever, are uniformly used in the Scriptures to denote the longest period of which the subject or object is capable to which they are applied. Hence they prove nothing as to the duration of the existence of wicked men or devils, unless it is first proved that they are immortal, and cannot die, or cease from conscious existence. That point our opponents *assume*, and we deny. We demand the proof. But that they have not and cannot produce. We may at another time take up the topic of the sense of *aionios* in a separate article.

———o———

MORE TRACTS.—The articles "The Gospel Benefits," and "The Gospel Faith," in this Examiner, will be issued shortly in Tracts of 10 or 12 pages each. *Price* 75 cts. per 100.

THE GOSPEL FAITH.

BY THE EDITOR.

Earnestly contend for the faith once delivered to the Saints.—JUDE, 3.

THE Syriac version reads, "Maintain a conflict for the faith," &c. It will be our object first to determine what is *the faith* spoken of; and then note the importance of the apostolical exhortation, earnestly contend for it. "*The faith*," we apprehend, is expressed in the previous part of the verse, under the appellation of the "*common salvation*." It is "the faith" of salvation by or through our Lord Jesus Christ. But what is the distinctive feature of that salvation?

In answering this question, we wish to avoid the looseness which seems to pervade most men's minds when they speak of salvation, or being saved. The terms save, saved, and salvation, have a great latitude of meaning; and hence the sense of these terms will accord with the fancy, prejudice, or judgment of different individuals, according to their preconceived notions, unless we can show that they have a *definite sense*, when used in relation to man as the object of God's favor. Such a sense we believe the New Testament writers have in the use of those terms. To assist us in determining that sense, we shall bring to our aid the Syriac New Testament, as translated by Prof. Murdock, late of the Theological Institution of Andover, Mass.

Of the "Peshito Syriac Version of the New Testament," Prof. Murdock says—It "is very generally admitted to be the *oldest version* that has come down to us, of the New Testament *in any language*. It is called by the Syrians the *Peshito* version, on account of its style or character. The Syriac verb signifies to *unfold* or *spread out* that which was folded up, so that it can be seen in its true form, dimensions, and character. Hence the participle signifies *spread out, not involved or folded up, simplex* and *not duplex;* or as applied to a translation, *explicit, free from ambiguities, direct, simple, and easy to be understood.* And precisely such is, in fact, the character of this venerable version."—P. 489.

Among the principles which Prof. Murdock adopted in his translation of this version, the "5th" is, "In general, to avoid using technical theological terms, when good substitutes could be found, in order to call away attention from the *word* to the *thing*." In his illustration of this principle, he says—"*Saviour* is rendered *Vivifier*, as being more literal, for the verb properly signifies *to make alive, to vivify;* and its derivatives properly signify *life, life-giver*, or *vivifier*. These are the usual terms of the Syriac version, denoting that *salvation* which Christ bestows on fallen men."—Preface, p. 7.

In the foregoing quotation we have from necessity omitted the Syriac words, as we have no type of that character. In accordance with the principle here laid down, the Professor gives us "*life, Life-Giver*," or "*vivify* and *Vivifier*," throughout his translation, where it is *save, Saviour*, &c., in the common English version. In following his translation, we shall use the term *Life*, and *Life-Giver*, where he, in some instances, has inserted *vivify* and *Vivifier*, &c.; as these last terms have

a Latin cast, and do not as clearly express to the mere English reader the sense of the text.

With the light shed on the Scriptures by this venerable Syriac version, we shall be able to satisfy our own mind, at least, as to what "*the faith*" is, of which Jude speaks. In the first part of the verse from which our text is taken, Jude says—"My beloved, while I take all pains to write to you of our *common life*" : *Syriac*. The great theme of Jude and all the apostles was, that of "*Life*"—"*Eternal Life*," through Jesus the "*Life-Giver*." This was *the faith, the doctrine*, the great matter *to be believed*, the truth *to be preached*, the faith for which they were "*earnestly to contend*."

In further presenting this subject, we shall pass over, for the present, the multitude of texts in the common English version which express the same great and glorious truth, and call attention directly to the Syriac version, where *life, Life-Giver*, &c., occur in place of *save, saved, salvation*, and *Saviour* in our version. We begin the examination with Matthew 19: 25; where, after our Lord had spoken of the difficulty of a rich man entering into the "kingdom of God," the "disciples wondered greatly, and said: Who then can *attain to life?*" Here, attaining to *life* is the *salvation* looked for. Our version reads—"Who then can be *saved?*" *What* the salvation is, might be a matter for dispute, as that term is more or less indefinite: but *life* is a definite term, and brings us at once to the *nature* of the salvation. It is a salvation *from death, into life.*

Again, Matt. 27: 42; when Jesus hung upon the cross, our translation reads—"He *saved* others: himself he cannot save." The Syriac has it—"He *gave life* to others; his *own life* he cannot *preserve*." This version is truly *open*, and easy to be understood. He gave *life* to several during his ministry; and that which determined the Scribes and Pharisees to put him to death, at all hazards, was the fact that he *gave life* to Lazarus, who had been dead four days: see John 11: 48–53. He was a *Life-Giver.*

In John 3: 17, our translation reads, "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be *saved*." The Syriac—"That the world *might live* by means of him." Here the nature of the salvation is clearly expressed, and no doubt is left on the mind as to its real character. It is *life*—that's what the world, the *dying* world need; and Christ came that they *might live.*

Acts 2: 21, reads—"Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be *saved*." The Syriac—"*Shall live*." Thus showing that *Life* is the great proffered blessing to the human race; and that the doctrine of *life*, through Jesus, is "*the faith* delivered to the saints," and which they are to maintain, earnestly contending for it.

Acts 4: 12, reads—"There is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be *saved*." The Syriac—"There is not another name under heaven, which is given to men, *whereby to live*." Here, as in the previous texts, there is a definiteness that forms a firm basis for faith. The salvation is *life*. Who is it that gives this *life?*

Acts, 5: 31—"Him [Jesus, who was raised *from the dead*] hath God exalted to be a Prince and a *Saviour*." Syriac—"Him hath God established as a head and *Life-Giver*." Jesus, Messiah, *died*—God raised him from the dead and made him "*head*" of another *life*, even an endless life, and constituted him the *Life-Giver;* he is to bestow that life of which he is now the fountain. It is not in ourselves, but in him who *was dead*, but is *alive again*, and lives forevermore; who also has "the *keys* of death and hades."

When the angels directed Cornelius to send for Peter, as related Acts 11: 14, he said—"Who shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house shall be *saved*." The Syriac reads—"He will utter to thee discourses, by which thou *wilt live*," &c. Here again the nature of the salvation is definite: it is *life*. And our translation so construes the salvation, verse 18, when those who heard Peter's relation of the matter said—"Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance *unto life*."

Acts 13: 26, Paul in addressing the "children of the stock of Abraham," &c., saith—"To you is the word of this *salvation* sent." Syriac—"To you is *this word of life* sent." Again in the same chapter, v. 47, Paul saith—"That thou shouldest be for *salvation* to the ends of the earth." Syriac—"That thou shouldest be for *life*," &c. In the previous verse, he had said to the blaspheming Jews—"Seeing you judge yourselves unworthy of *everlasting life*, lo, we turn to the Gentiles." The salvation, then, is "everlasting *life*."

In corrupting the Gospel, Acts 15: 1, some said, "Except ye be circumcised, ye cannot be *saved*." Syriac—"Ye cannot have *life*." And when this matter was under discussion in the council of apostles and elders at Jerusalem, at verse 11, Simon said, as the Syriac reads—"We believe that we, as well as they, are to *have life* by the grace of our Lord Jesus Messiah." The great theme was *life*. Well did Peter answer Jesus, when he asked the twelve, John 6th, "Will ye also go away?" "Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of *eternal life*." That was "*the faith*"—the doctrine "once delivered to the saints."

When the maid possessed of a spirit of divination followed Paul and Silas, Acts 16: 17, she said—"These men are the servants of the Most High God, and they announce to you the *way of life*." She understood what they preached; it was about *Life*. Though this spirit, on this occasion, spoke the truth—as "rapping spirits" sometimes do in these days—yet "Paul was indignant" [Syriac] and refused to suffer such *liars* to testify, and commanded it to depart. For this act, Paul and Silas were whipped and cast into prison. But happy in the hope *of life*, they praised God in their chains and dungeon. The jailor was convicted, and came trembling before the apostles and said—"What must I do that I may *have life?*" *Syriac.* How came his first inquiry to be about *life?* Clearly, because he understood that was the grand theme of the apostles' preaching. They answer him—"Believe on the name of our Lord Jesus Messiah, and thou wilt *have life*," &c. Here is clearness, beauty, and force. There is no vague and indefinite something, under a general term, but a specific one is used, which brings us at once to the nature of the Gospel salvation. It is, obtaining *life.*

Rom. 1: 16, Paul says—"I am not ashamed of the gospel, for it is the power of God *unto life*, to

all who believe it." *Syriac.* Again, chap. 10: 1, he saith of Israel—"The desire of my heart, and my intercession with God for them is, that they might *have life.*" And in the same chapter, verse 9, he states the conditions of the proffered blessing, thus—"If thou shalt confess with thy mouth our Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thy heart that God hath raised him from the dead, *thou shalt live.*" And at the thirteenth verse he saith—"Every one that shall call on the name of the Lord, will have *life.*" In speaking of the stumbling of Israel, chap. 11: 11, he saith—"By their stumbling, *life* hath come to the Gentiles." *Syriac.* In chapter 13: 11, Paul, exhorting to wakefulness, saith—"For now *our life* hath come nearer to us, than when we believed." Eternal life is only actually bestowed at the resurrection unto life, at Christ's return from heaven. Every day brings it nearer; and that consideration should arouse us from all stupidity, and excite us to diligence. All these expressions, as found in the Syriac, go to show the great idea of *salvation* as it lay in the apostle's mind—it was the "*one idea*" of *Life.*

We now proceed to his other epistles. 1 Corth. 1: 18—"Our discourse concerning the cross is to them who *perish* foolishness; but to us who *live* it is the energy of God." In chap. 10: 33, speaking of his course as a preacher, he says—"I do not seek what is profitable to me, but what is profitable to many, that they *may live.*" Chap. 15: 1, 2, he saith—"I make known unto you, my brethren, the gospel which I preached to you, and which you received, and in which ye stand, and *by which ye have life.*" 2 Corth. 1: 6—"Whether we be afflicted, it is for your consolation, and for *your life.*" Chap. 2: 15—"Through the Messiah, we are unto God a sweet odor, in them that *live*, and in them that perish," &c. Chap. 7: 10—"For sorrowing on account of God, worketh a conversion of the soul which is not to be reversed, and a turning *unto life:* but the sorrowing of the world worketh death." To the Ephesians, chap. 1: 13, Paul saith—"In whom [Messiah] ye also have heard the word of truth, which is the gospel of *your life.*" The good news, or gospel, is that of *life* to dying men. To the Philippians, 1: 28, he saith—"In nothing be ye startled by those who rise up against us; [which is] an indication of their *destruction*, and of *life* for you"; and in chap. 2: 12, he saith—"My beloved, as ye have at all times obeyed, not only when I was near to you, but now when I am far from you, *prosecute the work of your life* more abundantly," &c. The great work we have to do is to work *for life.* In chap. 3, Paul having spoken of the conduct and *end* of the wicked, and said "whose thoughts are on things of earth," adds—"But our concern is with heaven; and *from thence* we expect our *Life-Giver*, our Lord, Jesus the Messiah; who will change the body of our abasement, that it may have the likeness of the body of his glory," &c. This is a *life-giving* work: a work which "the Father, who hath *life* in himself," hath entrusted to his Son to accomplish for all that *obey* him.

1 Thess. 2: 16, Paul says the Jews "forbid us to speak to the Gentiles, that they may *have life.*" Chap. 5: 8, 9, he thus speaks—"Let us who are the children of the day be wakeful in mind, and put on the breast-plate of faith and love, and take the helmet of the *hope of life:* for God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to the acquisition *of life*, by our Lord Jesus the Messiah." The *hope* of *life* is that which sustains the Christian in all his conflicts; and is the great gospel motive to labor and suffer for the Messiah's cause: it is *life* God has set us to *acquire.*

2 Thess. 2: 10, Paul saith that the Evil One will by signs and lying wonders deceive them that perish; "because they did not receive the love of *the truth*, by which they might have *life.*" He adds—"We are bound to give thanks to God.... brethren:...that God hath....chosen you unto *life*, through sanctification of the Spirit, and faith in the truth." *Life* is kept prominent as the great gift of God and object of pursuit, as well as that for which the spirit of God works in us.

Paul opens his first epistle to Timothy with the announcement that God is "*our Life-Giver.*" As he proceeds, verse 15, he says—"Faithful is the declaration, and worthy to be received, that Jesus the Messiah came into the world *to give life* to sinners." He adds, that Messiah displayed on him "all his long-suffering, for an example to them who were to believe on him unto *life eternal.*" In the next chapter, he exhorts to prayer, &c., for all men, "for this is good and acceptable before God our *life-giver*, who would have all men to *live*, and be converted to the knowledge of the truth." In chapter 4: 10, he uses this language—"We toil and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is the *life-giver* of all men, especially of the believers." He directs Timothy, verse 16, "Be attentive to thyself, and to thy teaching, and persevere in them: for," saith he, "in doing this thou wilt *procure life* to thyself and to them who hear thee."

Thus the testimony is uniform in regard to the great end of the gospel; it is to call men to *life*, and bestow it upon them. The language, by this translation of the Syriac, is divested of all vagueness and speaks out to the comprehension of all minds. We will, however, present a few more places where *Saviour, save*, and *salvation*, in the common English version, are in the Syriac *Life-Giver* and *life.*

2 Tim. 1: 10, "The appearing of our *Life-Giver*, Jesus the Messiah, who hath abolished death, and hath made manifest life and immortality by the gospel." How forcible and plain is this language.

Chap. 2: 10—"Therefore I endure everything for the elect's sake, that they may *obtain life* in Jesus the Messiah, with eternal glory." *Life* is still the theme; and the glorious object set before us.

Chap. 3: 15—"From thy childhood thou wast taught the holy books, which can make thee wise *unto life*, by faith in Jesus the Messiah."

Chap. 4: 18—"My Lord will rescue me from every evil work; and will give me *life* in his heavenly kingdom." One theme still—one end in view, viz.: *life—life* in the kingdom of God.

To Titus Paul writes, on opening the epistle, "In hope of eternal life....grace and peace from God our Father, and from our Lord Jesus the Messiah, our Life-Giver." Chap. 2: 10, 13—"For the *life-giving* grace of God is revealed to all men; and it teaches us to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to live in this world in sobriety, and in uprightness, and in the fear of God, looking for the blessed hope, ["hope of eternal life;" see chap. 1:

2] and the manifestation of the glory of the great God, and our *Life-Giver*, Jesus the Messiah."

Chap. 3: 4–6—"When the kindness and compassion of God our *Life-Giver* was revealed.... according to his mercy....by the renovation of the Holy Spirit, which he shed on us abundantly, by Jesus the Messiah, our *Life-Giver*, that we might...become heirs in the *hope of eternal life*." Thus the author and *giver of life* is clearly set before our minds; and in a manner that cannot fail to make an impression of our obligation, and of God's great mercy.

Paul, in writing to the Hebrews, speaking of angels, asks, chap. 1: 14—"Are they not all spirits of ministration, who are sent to minister on account of them who are *to inherit life?*" He asks, chap. 2: 3—"How shall we escape if we despise the things which are *our life*." &c. Again, verse 10—"It became him...[who] bringeth many sons unto glory, to perfect the *prince of their life* by suffering." How forcible are right words? All the commentaries in the world cannot make plainer the work of Messiah, and the blessing he came to give the perishing.

Chap. 5: 7–9—"When he [Jesus] was clothed in flesh, he presented supplication and entreaty, with intense invocation and with tears, to him who was able to *resuscitate* him from death; and he was heard. And tho' he was a son, yet, from the fear and sufferings he endured he learned obedience; and thus he was perfected, and became the cause of *eternal life* to all them who obey him."

Chap. 7: 25—"He is able to *vivify* [*give life*] forever, them that come to God by him, for he always *liveth*, and sendeth up prayers for them." And chap. 9: 28, Paul saith Messiah will "a second time..appear *for the life* of them who expect him." What is Messiah coming a second time for? The answer is clear—*for the life* of his followers: to give them the "*crown of life*."

James, chap. 4: 12, says—"There is one Law-Giver and Judge, who can *make alive* and [can] destroy."

Peter, in his 1st epistle, chap. 1: 9, 10, says—"That ye may receive the recompense of your faith, *the life of your souls;* that *life* about which the prophets inquired," &c.

We now come back to Jude, the point from which we started. He calls this life, which we have been tracing out, "the *common life*" of the "*beloved*." This is that which so deeply interested them all—which the saints were exhorted to lay hold of; for which they labored and suffered; for which they *hoped, believed*, and *fought;* and in the firm persuasion of possessing it, when called to lay down their lives, met death without terror, knowing that God, who cannot lie, had promised it to all who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for it.

If such, then, is "*the faith*" of the gospel, the *importance* of "*contending earnestly*" for it can hardly be magnified. The *necessity* of such a course is as apparent as that nearly all Christendom have departed from "the faith," and perverted the very *words* in which the Bible presents the subject, to mean "*happiness*" instead of *life;* thus corrupting the testimony of God, and affirming that it is not *life* that man needs, but something else: yea, insisting that all men have endless life in themselves; so that he who would maintain the Bible truth on this subject must *contend earnestly* for it, and is in danger of being denounced as an "*infidel*" for believing that God, his Messiah, and the apostles, *mean what they say, and speak what they mean.* Surely, there never was a subject or topic that Christian men needed apostolical authority more to sustain them in their work, than the one we have been contemplating. "Fight the good fight of faith," said Paul to Timothy, "*lay hold on eternal life*, whereunto thou art also called." And he adds—"I give thee charge, in the sight of God....that thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ." 1 Tim. 6: 12–14. Can a subject of such importance be magnified above its just claims? We think not. Let us, then, "*earnestly contend for*" *it*, as "*the faith once delivered to the saints.*" Let those be admonished who *assume* that man has immortality or endless life in himself, that they are not by such a course, contending for the faith once delivered to the saints, but for a fable imposed upon them by tradition and the corruption of the words of God. May they quickly have their eyes open to see the truth, and be able to defend it.

GOSPEL BENEFITS.

BY THE EDITOR.

"God will render to every man according to his deeds: *To them who by patient continuance in well-doing, seek for glory and honor, and immortality, eternal life.*"—Rom. ii. 6, 7.

Our object in the remarks we make upon this text will be, just to examine the nature or character of this cluster of benefits presented for our attainment, and then point out the means by which we may make them our own.

I. THE NATURE OR CHARACTER OF THE BENEFITS PRESENTED IN OUR TEXT.

1. "*Glory.*"—Greek, *Doxan.* The term *glory*, is one often used, and generally includes in the mind the ideas of excellence and happiness: or something splendid, connected with much enjoyment. As the glory spoken of in our text is something to be attained in the future, and after effort on our part in the present time, it is worth while to endeavor to get as clear a conception of it as may be.

We regard it as that "*change*," of which the Scriptures speak, to be experienced by the saints at the second advent of Christ. Or, in other words, that change to be wrought at the resurrection from among the dead, *viz.:* the resurrection of the just. Paul informs us, 1 Cor. xv. 43: "They are sown in *dishonor*, they arise in *glory.*"—Syriac.

The present state of man is one of dishonor, because one of *corruption.* Great pains are now taken to adorn our persons—to make ourselves look beautiful; i. e., *glorious.* But after all the labor and toil, corruption prevails—the most beautiful form and countenance is changed, its appearance becomes offensive, and we willingly lay it away from our sight. "They are sown in *dishonor.*" But the followers of Christ will be raised *in glory.*

How shall we obtain an idea of the glory to be

attained? Paul informs us, Phil. iii. 21, that "Our *Life-giver*, the Lord Jesus Christ," will come "*from* heaven;" and that *then* he shall *change* our vile body, (or, body of our abasement—Syriac) that it may be fashioned like unto his *glorious* body," (or the body of *his glory*.—Syriac.) But how can we get an idea of that glory which Jesus possesses? Paul has, in this text, given us the *pattern* of the glory, and Peter shall give us the clue to its full discovery: 2 Peter. i. 16–18. Peter says,—"We have not followed cunningly devised fables, when we made known to you *the power* and coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, but were *eye-witnesses* of his *majesty;* for he received from God the Father, honor and *glory*, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son in whom I am well-pleased; and this voice which came from heaven we heard, when we were with him in the holy mount." Another eye-witness of the same manifestation, *viz.*, John, says,—"We beheld *his glory*, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father." John i. 14.

We will now turn to the manifestation of that glory, as recorded by Matthew, chap. xvii. 1: "Jesus taketh Peter, James, and John his brother, and bringeth them up into a high mountain apart, and was *transfigured* before them, (Syriac — was *changed* before them,) and *his face did shine as the sun*, and his raiment was white as the light." Here, in this *vision*, was the manifestation of "his *glorious* body," *like unto which*, Paul tells us, "our vile bodies shall" be "*changed*" when Christ "comes *from* heaven." Surely here is *glory* enough to satisfy our largest desires. The sight of it in *vision*, made Peter say, "Lord, *it is good for us to be here.*" O, how satisfying the sight, and how much more so the realization when "vision" will be swallowed up in the *reality*. Such is the *glory* presented as one of the benefits of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

2. "*Honor*"—Greek, *Timeen.* "A state of honor, *dignity:* a distinguished mark of favor." Such is the state to which the followers of Christ are to be exalted, "*A Royal Priesthood*;" to be "*kings and priests unto God and the Lamb*," to "*reign* on *the earth*," and "over the nations." This is what Christ has promised those who obey him; and the Scriptures everywhere confirm the same thing. "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me on my throne, even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father on his throne." Rev. iii. 21. Christ's *own* throne is "the throne of his father David," which Jehovah has sworn to give him, and which will be bestowed upon him when the judgment is executed, or in a process of execution upon the "*fourth*" dynasty of rulers on earth, symbolized by a "dreadful and terrible beast." That beast is to be slain—the body of rulers overthrown and destroyed; then one is seen coming in the "clouds of heaven," who is "like the Son of Man;" and he "came to the Ancient of days, * * * and there was given *him dominion*, and *glory*, and a *kingdom*, that all people, nations, and tongues, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." Dan. vii. 13, 14. This dominion and kingdom is that in which Christ has promised his followers a share: and "judgment" is to be "given to the saints of the Most High," when the "*time*" has come "that the saints possess the kingdom;" verse 22: then "the kingdom and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom, (or the greatness of the kings—Septuagint,) under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him;" verse 27.

Such is the *Royal Honor* presented to our faith, as one of the grand motives to a right course of action in our present state of trial. Men are amazingly influenced by what they call "a sense of honor;" and to occupy some important post of trust where their honor can be conspicuous, is the ambition of many minds. No sacrifice, no suffering, no effort is spared, if they have evidence of the possibility of attaining the desired eminence. What an honor, in their estimation, to be President of the United States, though the term of office is a few short years, and though they may die before even that short period terminates; while the honor proffered the followers of Christ, is an honor never to pass away, nor to be changed into other hands, or to cease by death, as we shall shortly see. Let us suppose that all the honor ever possessed by Kings, Emperors, Governors, and Presidents, could be concentrated on *one man*, and that his life could be prolonged to a period equal to the combined years that have been occupied by the entire race of Adam; even then in splendor and duration it would fall infinitely short of that of *one* saint who shall become a king in the Empire of Jesus Christ! Let then the men of earth, or *worldly men*, seek their dying honors, which so soon fade away; the Christian has a "*far more exceeding*," even "an eternal weight of honor," *reserved* in store, soon to be conferred upon him, if found possessing the required characteristics. Here then is motive sufficient to stimulate the most desponding child of God. Take courage, brother: you are shortly to wear a kingly crown, and wear it for ever and ever. Lift up thy head, then, and faint not at any trials or sufferings you may be called to endure now.

3. "*Immortality.*"—Greek, *Aphtharsian.* "*Incorruptibility:*" a state opposed to our present state, which is corruptible, mortal, dying. This incorruptible state, proffered in our text, is essential to *confirm* us in the glory and honor previously noticed. Without this, that glory might fade away—that honor have an end. With this, they are both made *eternal*.

The apostle here clearly shows that men are not possessed of immortality by creation, or birth; and he shows also that it is a favor to be conferred on those only who pursue a defined course. He had stated in the previous chapter, that men "professing themselves wise, became fools, and changed the glory of the *uncorruptible God* into an image made like to *corruptible* man," &c. Little did he then know of the folly which was to be developed in after times, by an attempt to make it appear that man is *incorruptible*, like God. Such "changing the truth of God into a lie," by which "the creature" *is* "worshipped and served more than the Creator," remained to be developed as the Man of Sin should begin to be manifested. Now, men affirm that they are "immortal"—incorruptible like God! True, they admit their *bodies* will die; but the *essential man*, they affirm, is "immortal, and can never die; thus making "void the word of God through their tradition."

Man is not inherently immortal, or incorruptible,

in whole or in part. Not one solitary text in the Bible affirms any such thing, but the reverse. Let that fact satisfy the believer in the Scriptures. Immortality is a gift, dependent on the will of the giver—God, and on the *action* of him who shall partake of it. Paul informs us *when* it will be conferred, and *how;* viz., "At the last trump," and by "the resurrection," for, saith he, "the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised *incorruptible*" —*aphtharsian;* the same word employed in our text. "So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, *then* shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory." 1 Cor. xv. 52–54. And this victory, which "God *giveth*," is "*through* our Lord Jesus Christ." Here is the true source of immortality, and the time when it will be attained. Let all remember this and lay aside that pride which possesses men's hearts from a fancied notion of inherent immortality.

4. "Eternal life," *zoeenaionion:* "life eternal." This is the climax of the whole, and securing the whole. What corruptible, dying man, most of all needs, is life—an unending life. That is here promised to such as accept the conditions of the offered benefit.

We understand *life* here, in its most obvious sense, of conscious being—or that state of being appropriate to a sentient creature—a being that has the faculty of perception. To give to the term life a *figurative* sense without a shadow of reason, except that which originates in the traditions of men, who affirm that *all men*, irrespective of moral character, are in possession of existence that shall never end, we regard as a corruption of the word of God —a making void the testimony of the faithful and true Witness, who saith, "I am come that they might have *life;*" John x. 10; and who furthermore declares, "I am the way, the truth, and *the life;*" John xiv. 6; all of which is confirmed by John, who saith, "He that believeth not God, hath made him a liar, because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son: and *this is the record* that God hath given unto us *eternal life*, and *this life* is *in* his Son;" not in ourselves, as the theory of man's natural and essential immortality affirms it to be. "He that hath the Son hath *life;* he that hath not the Son of God *hath not life.*" 1 John, v. 11, 12.

To suppose that the inspired authors of the Bible almost uniformly speak in *figurative* language, when presenting the great crowning benefit of the work and mediation of the Son of God, is a position of fearful presumption, and an unfounded assumption. If the Holy Spirit, who inspired holy men to speak, had intended *happiness* as the natural immortal-soul theorists maintain, as the crowning blessing, it would have been equally easy to have used the terms *makarioi*, *makarismos*, as Paul does, Rom. iv. 6, 7, 8, 9; where these words are translated "*blessed*," and "*blessedness*," and have the proper signification of *happy* and *happiness*. But *zoee* is the emphatic term selected by the Holy Spirit as expressive of that glorious reward God has *promised* to those who obey him. This fact is sufficient to condemn forever, the perversion resorted to in keeping up the theory that man is an immortal being. Man is a *dying, corruptible* creature; God offers him eternal *zoee*, life; not merely *makarismos*—happiness; though having eternal life, he will be eternally happy—that follows as a matter of course.

Let learned and unlearned perverters of the testimony of the Spirit of God, cease making "God a liar," by saying he does not mean *zoee*, but *makarismos*, when he uniformly employs the former term in presenting the great climax of proffered benefits, for the encouragement of dying men, and to stimulate them to suffer, if need be, even unto death now, that they may attain unto *zoee aionion*—'life eternal.' Let the simplicity in which the Gospel approaches us, with its offered benefits, stand in all its purity and plainness, and darken no longer the counsel of God by perverting his words and making them void by traditions. *Life—eternal life—to live forever—not die any more*, is the grand theme with which the Gospel salutes our ears. Joyful sound to dying men. Let them heed it.

Having presented as clearly as our limits will allow, the glorious cluster of benefits presented by our text, we proceed to notice,

II. THE MEANS BY WHICH WE MAY MAKE THE BENEFITS OUR OWN.

This we shall do only so far as suggested by the text. That teaches us they are to be *sought for;* and informs us *how* to "*seek for*" them.

1. *We must "seek for" them.* Men do not *seek for* that which they have already in possession. Immortality, equally with the glory and honor, is in the future, and is to be attained only by those who *seek for* it. The idea of the original is—*to acquire by labor*, or *work*. It is not an idle *wish*, that will give us possession of those glorious benefits, but earnest *application*; which leads us to notice,

2. *How we are to seek for them.* (1.) By "*well-doing.*" It is not all doing that will give us a title; it is a *specific* kind of *effort:* it is working "*the work of God;*" or that which he has assigned to us, and not the work which our fancy or imagination has pictured out. The first step in the work is "to believe on him whom God hath sent," viz., Jesus: John vi. 29. Believing on him he becomes the source of that *energy* by which we labor; he becomes the *pattern* after which we are to labor, and by which all our work is to be tested. This makes *faith* not that unmeaning and indefinite matter which seems to characterize much of the theology of the religionists of this age. Their faith is, in fact, a *do-nothing* faith: a faith which gives them license to live as they list, or according to their worldly desires. It includes little of daily self-denial and study, to possess the mind of Christ —walking as he also walked—who spent his life in doing good; and for the joy that was set before him, endured the cross—or death by crucifixion—despising the shame. A religion whose greatest study is to be respectable, and to make an appearance that shall divest it of reproach, is not the religion of Jesus the Messiah. His heart was set on doing good to *men:* not as the cant is—"to their *souls;*" but to men *as men*. Their present wants and sufferings moved his compassionate heart, and invariably called forth his exertions for their relief. His life was spent in *doing good*. Let us, in like manner, labor to benefit *men*, by instructing them, and ministering to their necessities, both of body and mind. Only in this way can we be engaged in "*well-doing*" or doing the work God demands of us, and to which the proffered benefits are promised.

(2) There must be a "*continuance* in well-doing." It is not doing well *now* and *then*, or under

some exciting sermon or missionary speech, when talent is enlisted to *force* out, as it were, *action!* No: a dead body may show signs of life under the action of a galvanic battery; but the life-principle must have a permanent existence in the man who works the work that God requires and will accept; and such a principle *continues* its life-motions in well-doing.

(3.) But there must be a "*patient* continuance in well-doing" to secure the proffered benefits. A disposition of mind that does not faint at discouragements, nor cease efforts because left to struggle *alone*. The idea conveyed by the original, is that of "remaining or staying behind when others have departed." It imports that there are discouragements—that most have passed on in their pursuits of profit, pleasure, or sensual gratification; and no longer heed the calls of injured or suffering humanity; then he who is seeking for glory, and honor, and immortality, eternal life, remains behind to do good; even tho' left of all, and though tempted with the strong current that has passed him, to join in their pursuits. Yes, though he may be ridiculed as being over-scrupulous, and too nice in his discriminations, he heeds the voice of God which falls on his ear above the foaming waves that rush by him, and hearing that voice he remains behind the multitude to do the work of God—that he may be Christ-like; and so attain the proffered glory. Worldly-minded professed Christians, and sensualists may count him a fool, but he has learned, "if any man will be wise" he is to "become a fool that he may be wise." "*Patience*" characterises his course, and he has the approbation of God, which outweighs all the censures of men. Shortly will he be exalted to this promised inheritance he has so earnestly and perseveringly sought for.

We see that there is an ample *motive* set before us to induce any thoughtful and reflective mind to lead a *Christ-like* life. If this motive fails we can conceive no other which could be effectual. The exhaustless store-house of God is opened before our minds, and we are permitted to gaze on glory, honor, immortality, and endless life, to arouse us to patient continuance in well-doing. "*Glory*" that is *unending*—"*honor*" that is "*unfading*"—incorruptibility, "*immortality*" never to be succeeded by corruption—a life to the utmost bound of which thought can never fly, because it is absolutely boundless! O, what a prize is here! Stop, poor, dying, careworn, and disappointed man: *stop*, and contemplate this boon, which High Heaven offers for your acceptance! What are all the sensual enjoyments after which you now pant? What are all the honors and treasures of earth, which now so command your energies, compared with the glory, honor, immortality, eternal life, we have endeavored to set before you on God's authority: Stop, poor disappointed worldling, stop, and think on these things.

Christian, does thy zeal and activity correspond with the amazing mercy and glorious prize set before thee? O, how much reason have we to humble ourselves, that such amazing benefits no more command our thoughts, our time, our talents, and our energies in doing the work of God; and now, especially, when the prize is manifestly so near. A few days, or months, at most, and Christ will come "*from* heaven" to crown his followers with all these glorious benefits; and life's toils, trials, sufferings, and woes, will all be passed; and *glory, honor, immortality, eternal life*, be entered upon by you! O, how comforting, how invigorating the thought while we are yet struggling in the mighty conflict. "Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly," and may we "be found of thee in peace, without spot and blameless." *Amen.*

FROM SCOTLAND.

To the Editor of the Bible Examiner:

Dear Brother—I send you the following paper, humbly supposing that it may be useful to some of your readers. The circumstances in which it originated are these: A small religious magazine, called the "Evangelist," is issued monthly in this city, by a section of the Baptists, which in this number (April) contains a letter from some person signing himself "Minimus," obviously in favor of the life-views, and on this letter the editor has published some remarks, to which my attention was called by a friend. My paper concerns some statements in the Editor's portion, and I deemed it proper to read it publicly to the audience in our chapel last Sabbath afternoon, after having given a fortnight's intimation of my intention to do so, and after recommending my hearers to get the periodical and examine it, in the meantime, for themselves. I just send you the Reply, as it was read to the congregation. As I make quotations from the Journal, it seems to me unnecessary to trouble you with the whole of the Editor's remarks; I only deal with the main points, and his words given are faithfully transcribed.

W. G. Moncrieff.

Edinburgh, Scotland, April 24, 1852.

Before proceeding to offer some remarks on the statements of the editor of the "Evangelist," let me make a few observations of a preliminary nature, and which seem to me needed in the circumstances.

1st. Of the person who signs his brief letter to the Editor "Minimus," I have no knowledge whatever. I am even quite unacquainted with his real name; and, while I am thankful that the writer of the letter has suggested for consideration most important questions to the Editor and the readers of the "Evangelist," it appears necessary to mention that I had not any hand in urging him to the step he has taken in penning the communication referred to.

2d. I would also note it as a sign having no small significance, that the letter of "Minimus" was admitted into the pages of the "Evangelist." The Editor, who is esteemed and loved, I believe, by all who know him, deserves and receives my admiration for having displayed so much liberality as to admit it into his periodical, and I also humbly judge that his giving it admission indicates a growing anxiety concerning what, for the sake of distinction, we are in the habit of styling the "Life-Views," among his readers; for surely had he not felt the question to be waxing into importance—the water, as it were, beginning to approach him and the system he upholds—he would scarcely

have so prominently put forth an effort to turn back the flood, or tried so early and so publicly to scare his readers from the views which, along with many others, I am endeavoring to evolve, establish, and extend, believing them to be of the greatest moment for the welfare of men, and the honor of our Lord Jesus Christ.

3d. While I thus openly, and without reserve, comment on the "Remarks" of the Editor, I wish it to be understood by all my hearers that it is not with him I have any quarrel, but with his affirmations. His statements are assailed by me because they are wrong, as far as I judge, and it is my duty, as much as it is his, to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints. It is not of controversy in itself that I ever possess any horror, but of the spirit in which it is too frequently conducted; out of controversy truth is evolved, like light from the concussion of flint and steel, and there are not better specimens of its utility and of the right temper for carrying it on, than in the epistles of Paul, on which we set most properly such an incalculable value. The periodical in which the "Remarks" stand has a circulation among many who, I have reason to believe, are anxious for truth—who are searching into the questions remarked upon in the "Evangelist," and I feel it to be my duty to render any little assistance in my power to those who attend on my ministrations, in discovering the fallacy of the statements about to engage our attention, and the scripturalness of the life and death views which are assailed.

Having delivered these observations, I proceed to remark that it was the closing words of the Editor that led me, more particularly, to think of requesting attention to his "Remarks" in this public manner. He says, "We recommend our worthy brother (Minimus) to a more correct definition of terms, when he will undoubtedly find it to be a cruel deception to teach men that death is dissolution, annihilation, or a ceasing to be." Of course all who in any way propound such a doctrine are cruel deceivers, and you will allow they could scarcely have a heavier charge laid at their door. The assertion is not even softened, as one might have expected it to be, by some such words as "in our view," "in our opinion," or by a hint that they are unconsciously perpetrating this cruel deception; it stands boldly and nakedly forward, and summons us who are necessitated to appropriate it to ourselves, to consider what we are doing, and also the grounds on which the Editor has rested his accusation, as far as they may be exhibited in the foregoing part of his note on the letter of his correspondent.

"Cruel deception" is a sore judgment, more particularly when sent forth, as it stands, against parties whom the writer has reason to believe are just as anxious to know God's mind, and to seek the salvation of men, as he is himself. Let me observe that such condemnations are easily pronounced; they are unfortunately too common among Christian controversialists occupying both public and private stations, but at all times, and especially in an age like this, there are always not a few who, after perusing a hasty deliverance of the kind, will be inclined to turn back and see if it is warranted by the evidence which the accuser has employed to back it and give it confirmation. Our design is to do this at present, and we do it reverentially and meekly. Just let us consider for a moment that the Editor is young in controversy, as he is not far advanced in years; that he partakes of the frailty of our common humanity, and that it is our privilege to forgive and forget the unkindness of a brother in the Lord, and we will come up in a right calm, and truth-loving and Christian spirit, to weigh and discuss the remarks he has given us.

"It is," says the Editor, "a cruel deception to teach men that death is dissolution, annihilation, or a ceasing to be." Of course, then, it follows that a man may be really dead, and yet not dissolved, annihilated, or ceased from being; at once we grant this to be true, and shall in a few words endeavor to prove that is scriptural doctrine. In Gen. 2: 7, we read—"And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Here then we have Scripture, very clear and very satisfactory. Man, not a part of him, was made of dust; "the Lord God formed *man* of the dust of the ground." This man made of dust was for a short while unalive, and of course he saw not, heard not, felt not, thought not. He was truly a dead being as yet, in the sense not of having lost life, but of having never possessed it. Yet he was a man—a perfect human being; for "the Lord God formed MAN of the dust of the ground." But the Creator not merely resolved to make a man, but a living man; therefore we read, he "breathed into his nostrils the breath of life (life-causing breath) and man became a living soul." When made to breathe, the dust-formed man began for the first time to live. Moreover, he became not merely alive; he also *became* a living soul. He became this, or he grew into a living soul, or a living person, or a living human being. Such is the divine record of man's creation; it shows us his origin—from dust; the manner in which he was made alive, by being caused to breathe vital air; and finally, instead of getting a soul, in the common sense of the word, we learn that the dust-formed man when quickened grew into a living soul—he became soul alive, or just living man. Now what would be the death of this living human being, or living human soul? Just his returning to the state out of which he passed when he was divinely caused to breathe, and so to live. Stop the breathing, and you bring life to an end; the breathing process made him alive, the non-breathing will result in death, or then life will depart, *it* will be dissolved, annihilated, *it* will cease to be. Thus, then, the Editor is right in affirming that death is not necessarily the dissolution, the annihilation, or the ceasing of a man to be; for the man can be dead, and yet as a man remain neither dissolved nor annihilated. Life is not the man; to be alive, is man in a particular state. Adam was a man before he was alive; he could be a man after ceasing to live. But his state after death must necessarily be the same as it was before he was made alive; the unliving man could nor see, nor hear, nor feel, nor reflect, nor put forth any activity whatever. He has lost, in a word, what he received when the process of living commenced, at the moment when his Maker caused him to begin to inhale vital atmosphere. He, then, does not of necessity in death cease to be a man, but he is a

man without breath; and without breath, he is a man, a soul, without life; and whether he shall ever be really dissolved, or annihilated as a man, or as a soul, is a different question, and one we apprehend that has not much importance attached to it. To return to the state in which Adam was before he breathed, is death enough; it will gain the same ends that might be effected by a perfect dissolution of the organization, and it will matter therefore very little whether the man should be preserved an everlasting mummy, or have the elements of his being scattered by decomposition to the winds and the desert. Let him expire, let his life decay, and he is done entirely, till God Almighty shall restore him to life, and its functions and experiences. So far from disputing the Editor's doctrine on this point, we adopt it, and find in his own words an ample and most satisfactory admission, on the one side of the controversy, of all that we contend for; we find him delivering to us the very doctrine which he obviously wishes to condemn. Near the commencement of his Remarks, he says, "Life or vital existence stands opposed, not to the dissolution of vegetable or animal structure, but rather to their existence in their (or rather *as*, we think he means to say) merely material structures. Things though void of life, still exist—they are not dissolved in the loss of life. A slaughtered animal is not dissolved by being killed; it may be dissolved by after process, but so may it be preserved, and so with every living creature. It is therefore contrary to all experience, fact, and reason, to teach that the loss of life is dissolution." He affirms that "it is a cruel deception to teach men that death is dissolution, annihilation, or ceasing to be." Well now, grant all this; what does the Editor teach us death is? This most assuredly—that the living form, that the being man shall be deprived of life, but he shall not be dissolved, annihilated, or caused to cease from being. He shall, or may be, preserved entire, but without life; he shall, or may be, in existence as a man, but a man void of life! We see no call to push forward in the meantime the fact that the man himself, as we shall yet demonstrate, shall be dissolved, or annihilated, as the *result* of death; grant that he shall, as the Editor says, exist, but void of life, and of course deprived of all its functions, and capacities, and experiences, and everything we demand is conceded—the man to all intents and purposes is done, is obliterated from being. The man, if you please, still is, but he lives not; the being, if you please, is there yet, but he is like a clod or a stone.

In the garden of Eden, the Tempter said to our parent Eve, "Ye shall not surely die." Did he mean, ye shall not surely be dissolved or annihilated? Did he mean, ye may lose your life, but ye will not be dissolved as a human being? He certainly meant, ye shall not—ye cannot lose your lives; as to the after possible or impossible results of life-losing, he had not occasion to give himself much concern, neither surely had Eve who listened to his fatal words. Without life, what mattered it whether our first parents remained forever undissolved or unannihilated? When God says, "the soul that sinneth it shall die," or, the man that sinneth he shall die, the doctrine of the Editor is, that it is a cruel deception to tell sinners that death to them is dissolution, though they assuredly will cease to be alive; that they shall cease to be, though they may depart from living being. Might we not turn round and tell this good man, "Brother, you are concerned about a trifle; you are turning the attention of your readers from death to its ordinary consequences; you are, we fear, giving sinners encouragement to misunderstand God's word, which threatens death, or life-losing, as the penalty of persevering impenitence, by leading them to see nothing real, or to see what is not the truth, in the threatening, simply because death is not necessarily the dissolution of a human being; if it shall be the dissolution of the sinner's life—the annihilation of him as a quickened, thinking, feeling agent, what will be the difference to him whether he shall be dissolved or annihilated as a man or no? if he is a *living* man no more, what though he should continue miraculously preserved a man—an undecomposed corpse—forever?"

Take, for instance, the Editor's own illustration, and the force of our reasoning, if yet necessary, may be a little more clearly discovered. "A slaughtered animal," he says, "is not dissolved by being killed; it may be dissolved by after process, but so may it be preserved; and so with every living creature." An animal, say a lamb, is deprived of life when it is slaughtered or killed—this is its death. Is not, we ask, the lamb as effectually to all intents destroyed in its sensations, consciousness, desires, pains, and pleasures, when lying stiff after the fatal blow, as it would be if it were dissipated by corruption or consumed in a wasting furnace? So with man, who in constitution and mode of life is essentially like the inferior organized tribes, for "all are of the dust;" death deprives him of life, and all its voluntary powers, and to himself it can matter nothing what becomes of him, after the vital energy has been withdrawn. Death quenches the vivifying spark; posterior corruption may devour the frame, the human organization which is moved and vitalized so wonderously while the breathing process is maintained.

The common idea, no doubt held by the Editor as well as many others, that man can die and yet be perfectly alive, that he can perish and yet be preserved to all intents as entire as if he had not perished, is sadly at variance, as we judge, with a sound view of his nature as given by his Creator in Gen. 2: 7, and with multitudes of passages of the plainest order in the sacred volume, such as "man"—not a part of him merely—"man dieth and wasteth away, man giveth up the ghost (or expires), and where is he?" "man lieth down and riseth not till the heavens be no more;" "the dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence;" "the dead know not anything;" and "his breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth, in that very day his thoughts perish." If death is the extinction of life, then after death men are lifeless; if in any sense they remain alive, they have not died. It is a perversion of terms, in our view, to say so, and the resurrection of men to life is more of a delusion than a reality; it is a returning to life when life has never been lost; the rebuilding of a fabric that has never in fact been laid prostrate!

But the argument would be left incomplete, were we to pause with what has been adduced for consideration. We shall therefore show that not merely is life to be withdrawn, but that the man shall be dissolved, annihilated, or made to cease

from being. This will sweep away the last refuge, and give us a clear insight into the doom of the ungodly—"the wages of sin is death."

1st. Mark how the Eternal describes the doom or the death. "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Gen. 3: 19. Observe it is THOU—the entire man: unto dust shalt thou return. Here is no promise that the human organization, or the dust-made man, shall be preserved; on the contrary, there is an explicit intimation that the very elements of his being shall be separated and scattered after death. *The dust after dissolution, is no more of man than the dust was before the Almighty former made it into our first parent.* When dust only remains, and dust only shall, where is the man?

2d. We read also in Ps. 37: 20—"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." When a lamb is burned up on an altar, are the smoke and ashes the lamb? No, the lamb is gone, dissolved, annihilated; smoke and ashes only now remain. Who would call the smoke and ashes a lamb? The animal indisputably is as truly out of existence as if it had never been. And so shall it be with the enemies of the King of heaven; "they shall be as the fat of lambs; they shall consume, into smoke shall they consume away."

3d. We read, "He will burn up the chaff (the ungodly) with unquenchable fire." Matt. 3: 12. Put a handful of chaff into a furnace, and where is it in a moment or two? As chaff, it is destroyed. It is mere trifling to tell us the ashes remain, for we reply the ashes of chaff are not chaff. In like manner, we are here taught, sinners are to be consumed, and burnt up like chaff in resistless flames. The condemned are not unquenchable, for they are compared to chaff, which is most burnable and destructible; the fire, not the men, is unquenchable, and its action is resistless. When the miserable sons of guilt are thrown into the final devouring flames, where will they soon be? Preserved? no; but dead, and dissolved; the men will cease to be, though their ashes may remain, silent monuments of the displeasure of Heaven. Their end is destruction, and it cannot be more fully and awfully described than in these words in Isaiah 41: 11. "Behold all they that were incensed against thee shall be ashamed and confounded; they shall be as nothing, and they that strive with thee shall perish. Thou shalt seek them and shalt not find them, even them that contended with thee; they that war against thee shall be as nothing, and as a thing of nought."

It is not, therefore, we respectfully suggest, "a cruel deception to teach men that death is dissolution, annihilation, or ceasing to be." They shall cease to live, who continue to oppose the Lamb; they as men shall be utterly destroyed, burnt up, as the prophet says, root and branch; they shall vanish like the blossoms of the last spring, or the leaves of the last autumn.

Were we to assure men they will not be dissolved, or that they will not cease to be, we might be uttering what was certainly unscriptural, yet the deviation from truth would only be trifling in its nature; were we, however, to affirm that they shall be dead and yet alive—destroyed, and nevertheless preserved—that they will perish and yet remain—be killed and continue in conscious activity—be consumed by fire and yet be perfect in being after all, we would assuredly be guilty of uttering what seem to us great absurdities, and melancholy perversions of the word of truth. Having a desire to see men enlightened as to the result of a course of sin ("the end of these things is death") and to see them look up to the life-giving Redeemer as their only hope, we proclaim with a loud voice, that unless men eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of Man they shall not live forever. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish, but have everlasting life."

The conductor of the "Evangelist" is a Baptist, and to him, and to all who agree with him regarding the duty of immersion, I feel that our views of life and death ought to have an interest, and that they ought in consistency to be received by them at once. Why do beloved Baptist brethren practice and contend for immersion, in opposition to sprinkling and pouring? Simply because the Greek words bapto and baptizo mean literally to immerse, or plunge, and never to sprinkle or pour. They insist on the literal, the primary sense of the terms, and so do we in regard to such words as life, death, perdition, and destruction. When it is said the blessed Redeemer came to give life to the world, we understand by life, not happiness, but just what it naturally means; when we find it recorded, "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him might not perish, but have everlasting life," we understand that we were exposed to a literal and hopeless perdition of being, and that now through Jesus, we may obtain a literal eternal duration of being. And why? Just because the word perish is the opposite of preserve; and everlasting life is literally a ceaseless duration of conscious existence. Life no more means happiness in its radical sense, than baptizing means sprinkling a few drops of water on a child or any other object; death no more means life in misery, than pouring some water on a man means dipping him in that element. We, like the Baptists, insist on the literal, since we are never warned to refrain from understanding the words in any other way than their ordinary sense. We demand that life shall be life, and death death, and we have no better reason than this—the language means what we affirm, just as the Greek word bapto, for example, signifies to plunge, as they correctly affirm it does. If there is a Baptist here who is not in favor of the life-views, I presume to say to him, "Friend, if you are an advocate of immersion because the Greek words describing the act in the ordinance signify to immerse, and I know of no other safe ground you can occupy, why not begin and understand the terms life and death in the same proper manner? Why change the meaning of life into happiness, when that is not the radical meaning of the word, and when your common sense will teach you that so far from life and happiness being exchangeable terms, we every day speak of happy lives, and of miserable lives? Why change death into life in misery, when the very idea of death excludes suffering entirely? Why deny the honor to Jesus of being the life-giver, the only immortalizer—as as well as the fountain of happiness to his disciples? Why affirm that his opposers shall live forever in misery, when he declares that they are to be burned up like chaff, and like withered vine branches Act on Baptist principles of interpretation, and I advise you to do so because I judge

them sound; and in doing so, I humbly believe you will find a satisfaction to your mind which you would not exchange for continents of gold.

There is only one other part of the "Remarks" which seems to call for any observation from us, and that is this: "We remind our friend that the Scriptures in many instances predicate death of men when actually living in sin, as in Eph. 2: 1–5; and if in face of this our correspondent still holds that it 'has never been shown that death stands for a state of misery or sinfulness, apart from what he calls the idea of literal destruction, we cannot help him." We solicit attention to this passage, in order to meet a difficulty arising out of the fact mentioned by the Editor, that men living in sin are in the Bible sometimes spoken of as dead. His idea, and a common objection is this—since men now are spoken of as dead, while confessedly alive in sin and perhaps in misery, the Scripture may by "death," when applied to the end of the wicked, describe not a state of cessation from being, but merely a condition of conscious existence similar to the present one of sinful men, though more intensified in guiltiness and wretchedness.

1st. Since "death" is the term descriptive of the final doom of sinful men, it seems unaccountable that that term should have been employed at all, if its real and natural meaning is to have no fulfillment in their case hereafter. The term is popularly interpreted to mean misery or torment, not what we generally understand it to import, a state in which misery is perfectly impossible; and if misery or torment is to be the end of the wicked, we confess ourselves at a loss to tell why the words death, destruction, and perdition were ever used in the threatening announcements. The Greeks had terms as powerful as ours to express suffering—awful, increasing, and prolonged; and it appears worthy of note that the sacred writers, if they intended to express misery as the doom of the godless, have universally chosen language which, when accurately explained, never conveys that idea, and have universally selected terms such as death and destruction, which must be understood to express, when explained in their natural sense, the very opposite of what they were intended to intimate, and all this, moreover, without having even so much as once guarded us against understanding them differently from their common and universally known acceptation. How are we to explain this? Shall we say they were misled? Far be it from us to harbor such a thought, even for a moment. Shall we say they were mistaken? No, we cannot do this any more than the former. What shall we declare, save this? that they used death because they meant death, and destruction because it was their design to threaten, not a state of lasting and awful misery, but cessation from being itself in the most terrible circumstances.

2d. It is worthy of inquiry whether the description of sinners as "*dead*" does not rather have a *prospective* reference, than afford any delineation of their present state. In other words, does the Bible mean that to be sinful and unhappy is to be dead? or rather does it not describe persons in this condition as dead, inasmuch as they are going on to death;—they are working for the wages of sin, they are as good as dead, for they will certainly expire at last, for "the end of these things is death"? When two interpretations are presented, the one attended with least difficulty and best supported by the mode of using language in the Scripture is undeniably to be preferred; and on this ground we choose the second exposition, because it is attended with least difficulty, and helps us to discover a greater beauty, simplicity, and propriety in the holy records. Wicked, Christless men are called dead, because they are toiling for that issue; they are already under condemnation to death; they are thus dead in (rather, *by*) trespasses and sins. Dead they are in law, and they will ere long be dead, destroyed, in fact; their names are not in the book of life—that is, they are on the list of the condemned; they are heirs of irremediable perdition. Thus we understand the designation "dead," in our judgment *looks forward*, so that from it we may learn prophetically the close of a sinful career. Language similar to this is not unknown in the Bible, where its import can scarcely be disputed, as for instance, Gen. 20: 3—"But God came to Abimelech in a dream by night, and said to him, Behold thou art but a dead man, for (or on account of) the woman which thou hast taken, for she is a man's wife." Exod. 12: 33–"And the Egyptians were urgent upon the people, that they might send them out of the land in haste, for they said, we be all dead men." Rom. 5: 15—"For if through the offence of one many be dead," *i. e.* doomed to die. Rom. 8: 10—"If Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin," *i. e.* it is mortal and will ere long decay in death.

Since those of the living who are heirs of the second death are pronounced "dead," we may naturally expect the word to be used in reference to those who are living, but were dead. In the first instance it had a *prospective* force; in the instances we are now about to adduce, it has a *retrospective* import. Acts, 10: 42—"It is he who was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead"; dead here means those who have been dead. So also in 2 Tim. 4: 1—"I charge thee, therefore, before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom." 1 Cor. 15: 35—"But some men will say, how are the dead (those who have been dead) raised up, and with what body do they come." Rev. 20: 12, 13—"And I saw the dead (those who had been dead) small and great stand before God, and the books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the book of life; and the dead (those who had been dead) were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead (those who had been dead) which were in it; and death and hell (margin, the *grave*) delivered up the dead (those who had been dead) which were in them, and they were judged every man according to their work."

This simple method of expounding the reference of dead, when applied to the living in two different circumstances, that is as being sometimes *prospective*, and sometimes *retrospective*, saves us from many difficulties attending the interpretation which the popular creed regarding the end of rebellious men, founded on the dogma of immortal-soulism, demands from its supporters, and shows us the perfect consistency of the different parts of the record, when announcing the doom of the impenitent, or describing their present condition as persons advancing to hopeless ruin. "Thou shalt seek them, and shall not find them." "If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die." "To them who by patient continuance in well doing *seek for* glory and honor, (God will render) eterna llife."

BIBLE EXAMINER.

NEW YORK, OCTOBER AND NOVEMBER, 1852.

BIBLE EXAMINER.—We thought best to send out the Examiner for October at an early day, as many of our readers have expressed an anxiety to have it forth coming. When we concluded to put it to press, we found such an accumulation of matter on hand which must lie by till November, that we finally concluded to issue the Oct. and Nov. numbers on one sheet. By doing so we shall, also, be more at liberty, during those months, to meet the calls upon us for lecturing, where we are already under obligations to go.

The large amount and variety of matter in the sheet here presented our readers, we think, cannot fail to interest them; though it is not expected that every one *can* approve all found therein.

———o———

A WORD TO SUBSCRIBERS.—One number more will complete the present volume. *All our subscribers* will bear in mind that we have but *one rule, viz.*, "*Payment in Advance:*" and "no subscription received *for less than one volume.*" When a volume is closed, therefore, unless the subscription is *renewed*, by *pre-paying* for the next volume, the Examiner is *discontinued.* So that *we* are saved the *trouble*, and our readers the *mortification* of the *dunning* system, which cannot be avoided where papers are not paid for in advance.

It is for our friends to say whether the Examiner shall still be sustained; and their voice will be heard and felt by early remittances for the next volume. Will not each of our present subscribers renew their subscription, and send us at least *one* new *paying* one? You can easily do it if you *determine* to. *Shall it be done?* The December number will probably be issued early.

Any person remitting us *one dollar*, current money, free of expense, for volume 8, (or 1853) before the first of December next, shall have a copy of each of the two double numbers, containing J. Panton Ham's works, *without charge*, except they must pay the *postage* on them. The weight of the two copies is 4 *oz.*

———o———

"BIBLE AGAINST TRADITION."—This is the title of a manuscript work originally written by Br. Aaron Ellis, New Richmond, Pa. It has been Revised and Enlarged by Br. Thomas Read, New-York, and very carefully examined by the help of Prof. Pick's Bible Students' Concordance and other works, so that it is likely to be one of the very best works that has been published on the Life and Death question, and will constitute a book of Reference of immense value to those who wish to see the whole subject presented in a connected form, and have a help at hand in all controversies on the question. Br. Ellis spent years in collecting and arranging the work, and Br. Read has spent months in Revising and Enlarging it.

In April last we gave a small portion of the first part of the work; and in this number we give another and larger portion of it, commencing where we terminated in April, taking the work in course; so that the parts presented are not *selections*, but the work as it commences and progresses. We do not think the parts given are the most interesting; but they will give an idea of what the work is to be. We should be glad to give the whole in the Examiner, but this will be impossible, as it would fill six or seven numbers. The whole ought to be published together in a permanent form; and would make a book about the size of Dolney's, as near as we can judge, if published in that form; or the size of our Miscellany, if issued 18mo.; which we think would be the most convenient. The cost of one thousand copies would vary from three to four hundred dollars; perhaps exceed, if stereotyped.

Shall it be issued? It is for those to decide who have the money to pay the expense. We have it not. If any see fit to advance the amount we pledge ourself to return it to them as fast as the sales are made, till the money is all refunded. The work would be sold, *bound*, at about *fifty* cents, as near as can now be ascertained. Let those who wish for it say at once how much they will advance immediately to have it go on; and others say how many copies they will take and pay for on delivery. Till this is done we cannot move further with it.

———o———

NOTES BY THE WAY.—We have visited and preached in several places since the last Examiner was issued; some of them with great satisfaction, and we trust with much profit to ourself and others. We shall now speak of only two or three.

PATERSON, N. J.—There has long been a work of investigation going on in that city in relation to the Life and Death question. A number of the first men in piety and respectability have had their minds exercised on the subject for a long time; mostly from reading various works that have been issued on the subject. There had been very little preaching on this doctrine till the present season; yet the truth has been steadily advancing by means of efforts of one or more who have scattered freely various works among them; and some eight or ten copies of the Examiner have been taken from the commencement of its publication. Light has been continually advancing among that people till the flame could be no longer suppressed. Some of the most active members of the Methodist E. Church openly avowed their belief that immortality was *only* through Jesus Christ, and that utter destruc-

tion is the doom of those out of Christ. This was too much for "the powers that be." Yet they hated to lose pious, official, active, paying members, and only asked the *small favor* that they would keep their views to themselves, and not promulgate them publicly. That was a price, however trifling it might appear in the eyes of men who were blessed with only small conscientiousness, the brethren spoken of could not and would *not pay*. Then no alternative remained but they must *withdraw* or be proceeded against in a formal manner by the ruling heads of the church. One brother, Wm. Ridgeway, chose to withdraw; and others sent in their class papers, declining longer to act in an official capacity in the church if Bro. Ridgeway was to be pushed out for the same faith and practice they themselves were in. The "powers that" *were* took the alarm, and entreated them to remain, and did not presume to threaten a procedure against them.—Those powers had learned by Br. Ridgeway's firmness that these brethren were not to be frightened out of their honest convictions of truth by threats of *expulsion* from the church. Hence *policy* was the "better part of valor"—a new preacher is appointed—all is smooth, Br. Ridgeway is permitted to come to the communion table! Poor *heretic* as he is! How merciful! Perhaps they would not object seriously to his "*going to heaven*." Br. R. cannot be a member of that church, but he may come to the *Lord's* table: and of course is not excluded from the kingdom of God, in their estimation, though he is from *their church!* "Your brethren *** that cast you out for my name's sake, said, Let the LORD be glorified; but he shall appear to your joy and they shall be ashamed." Isa. 66: 5.

Matters were in this state when we were invited to visit and preach there in July. Our first appointment was duly notified by hand bills, issued by Br. Isaac Van Blarcome, an independent believer, who does up his work in his own way. These bills were calculated to arouse attention; and as the meeting was appointed to be held in the grove, on an island in Passaic River, of easy access, many were out to hear and see during the day: we judge, more than a thousand; most of whom heard with deep attention, and eagerly sought for works on the subject, which Br. Ridgeway had taken care to supply himself with. In the evening we proclaimed *life*, through Christ *alone*, in the Odd Fellows' Hall, to a full audience.

The first day of the week following we again preached in the same Hall in the morning, and in the grove in the afternoon, to a congregation as numerous as before, we trust with good effect; but of that the day of the Lord will make manifest.—We left another appointment to be filled in four weeks.

Br. Wm. Swinburne was one of the first, if not *the first* in the Methodist E. Church there to embrace and scatter our views on the immortality question. Our interview with himself and family, Br. Van Blarcome and family, Br. Ridgeway, family, and brother, with others of like character, were happy indeed; and our heart was truly cheered on in the work of proclaiming *Life in, through, and by Christ alone.*

CANANDAIGUA, N. Y., has also been visited by us, by the special request of our brother Dr. Hahn, of that city; at whose house such as love the Lord and christian simplicity cannot but feel at home; and his wife's heart is happily with him in the work of spreading the truth. In that city we spent eight days, and preached eleven times, in a convenient Hall, which was usually well filled with deeply attentive hearers. We have never felt greater freedom and enlargement of mind than in those eleven discourses. Not one of them was to us a barren season; nor can we but believe the Spirit of God sealed the truth on some, yea many minds.

In the first part of this meeting, Elder Jesse Briggs, recently of the Baptist church in Elmira, was with us. He is an old man, of more than three score years; forty of which he has been in the ministry of the gospel. This interview was the first we had ever seen or heard of him. From himself we learned his history. When he first commenced preaching, forty years ago, he held and preached the views on immortality and the end of the wicked we now hold and preach; and for some seven or eight years openly promulgated them. Then he was blessed and happy; revivals attended him in nearly every place where he preached; which was in the now State of Maine. After awhile his ministering brethren over persuaded him not to preach *directly* on those topics; and he began to think perhaps he might get along easier just to use scripture language, and not urge his peculiar view of its sense. He tried that course for thirty or more years, still believing his first views, but not preaching them as in his first love. The consequence was, to use his own language, "I got into an awful backslidden state, and have been in *bondage* for years." At the Tent Meeting in Elmira, in June last, under the preaching of Br. Bywater and others, he heard the sound of immortality through Christ *alone*, as he received and preached it in his first love. To use his own language again, "I jumpt the Baptist walls, and feel once more *at liberty*, and have had more enjoyment in a few weeks than during many years past." Of Br. Briggs' preaching talents we know

nothing. He chose to be a *listener* while he remained with us at Canandaigua, and seemed highly delighted. May the Lord bless him, and enable him to redeem the time he has lost by so long putting his light under a bushel. Many others, we fear, are in a backslidden state from the same cause, *viz.:* hiding or denying the truth, on Life and Death, to please men, or to avoid reproach.

LETTERS.

FROM PRES. J. P. WEETHEE.

Chauncey, Ohio, August 17, 1852.

Br. Storrs:—As you are engaged in the spread of a great truth, concerning the nature and destiny of man, every item of information which involves that subject, and especially its progress, will be interesting to yourself, as well as to your readers.

I have been familiar with your writings on the Second Advent of Christ, since 1843. I then received a copy of your Six Sermons on "Life and Death:" but not regarding that doctrine a vital one, or in any way particularly connected with the coming and kingdom of our Saviour, I laid those publications aside, and applied myself to the study, and explanation, of the prophecies. I read but little on the subjects of "natural immortality," or "eternal life through Christ." Not examining these disputed points, I did not change my former views on those points, any further than to deny man the possession of natural immortality.

In 1850, my attention was called to the subject of the state of the dead, by reading of the phenomena exhibited by the "Rapping Spirits," as they were called. I had come to the conclusion some years previous, that we were between the 6th and 7th vials, when the three unclean spirits (of Rev. 16: 14), were to go forth for the deception of mankind. I saw that those spirits would profess to be the spirits of demons, or dead men. They were to work miracles, and by these wonders, draw many away from Christ.

I was satisfied that these were lying spirits, that they were not the spirits of dead men. But why not, if the souls of the dead are conscious, and are permitted to revisit the earth? This thought led me to question the consciousness, or even the existences of a disembodied spirit. I then began to examine the bible on the subject, and read your views with those of others, and became satisfied that the "dead know not anything," in the fullest sense of the term; and also that the punishment of the wicked will be DEATH, not endless life in misery. Since I have been convinced of the truth of these doctrines, I have not been silent, but have proclaimed the views wherever I have travelled.

I see a beauty in the resurrection, and the advent which did not before appear. Many scriptures now seem full of meaning, which were formerly mysterious.

I have travelled very extensively among the advent believers, and my impression is, that more than three-fourths of them are persuaded of the truth of the views you are promulgating on "life and death." The two discourses I delivered last spring, at Beavertown, Ohio, had their effect.

An eminent physician, embraced the views, and on my return on the 8th inst., I learned that half of the church had come out fully on the doctrine. Dr. Rieves is an elder in the church of disciples, a man who loves his bible, and is resolved to follow its teachings. A number in the church at Chauncey also believe the same doctrines. The field is large. The doctrine of "life and death," has never been preached in this region, except the few discourses by myself. *I intend to proclaim the sentiments as opportunities are afforded.*

Yours in hope.

J. P. WEETHEE.

FROM FREDERICK WRIGHT.

Spencerville, C. W., 7th month, 1852.

Br. Storrs:—Seeing in the last Examiner a hint that those late publications of thine have entailed an extra expense upon thee, the accompanying "widow's mite," is sent to help to pay postage. I wish from my heart I had more. I have read very many works, on very many subjects—from childish folly, up to the highest flights of man in philosophy and science—and I can truly say, I have never read anything that pleased so well as those *two Double Examiners*. Since reading the first, I have asked myself, I know not how often, *can anything more be said?*—Here is plain common sense, fair and candid reason, backed up by an amount of bible evidence, morally impossible to be overthrown—enough to satisfy any mind not desirous of being *willingly ignorant*—and now comes the climax of all, by the same individual. Br. Storrs, to me at least, those two expositions of all-important truth are of more worth than all the combined volumes of theology the world can produce. Thy time is precious, I know; but I could not refrain from expressing my gratitude for thy labor of love. May God, who only can reward thee aright, do so, in His own time, and own place; even in his kingdom, and that right speedily, is the fervent prayer of thy personally unknown friend, and loving brother in Christ.

FROM S. S. BREWER.

Wrentham, Mass., 1852.

Br. Storrs:—I wish to say to the lovers of truth, that read your paper, that among the multitudinous blessings and favors of our heavenly Father, next to the gift of his dear Son, do I praise him for a knowledge of the true source of immortality. O how plain repentance, and faith in Jesus; obedience, patient continuance in well doing in order to obtain glory, honor, immortality, eternal life, at the resurrection of the just. Then the poor sinner, instead of "wailing, howling, writhing in liquid fire—the moment his deathless spirit leaves his body"—sleeps in the dust of the earth till the heavens be no more, after all the horrors that imagination can clothe the papal, Christian, or heathen hell with—in order to frighten some into heaven—they sleep; and as the word of God tells the truth (which I most assuredly believe it does), those in hell don't know anything about their suffering: Job xiv. 12; Eccl. ix. 5th. So you see, dear reader, the dead saint and sinner sleep in the dust of the earth—in hell—in the grave—*hades*—where the Saviour slept: Psa. xvi. 10; Acts. ii. 31: in hell, where Paul now sleeps;

in *hades*. Just turn to the 15th chap. 1st Cor. 54 and 55 verses, where the apostle is speaking of the resurrection: "*When this mortal* shall have put on immortality—THEN shall be brought to pass the saying, Death is swallowed up in Victory—O Death where is thy sting? O Grave, [margin of the English bible; *O Hell.*] *where is thy victory?*" Clark, in his note on Math. xi. 23, admits the word *hell* comes from the Anglo Saxon *helan*—to *cover*, or *hide:* hence the *tiling*, or slating a house is called in some parts of England, (particularly Cornwall) *heling*, to this day. And the *covers* of books (in Lancashire) by the same name. One word, dear brother, ere I close, for the encouragement of all those that are engaged in holding up Christ as the *Life-Giver*. The leaven of God's truth is at work, and is *working* its clear, glorious, sanctifying influence among the different sectarians in despite of all their opposition: praise the Lord. Death, Hell, and the Devil *must die*.

FROM PARKER SAWYER.

Br. Sawyer ordered, early in April last, $100 worth of books, and sent *the cash* with his order. The following will show that he is not asleep, but at work, not laboring in vain. Let others who have the means go and do likewise. How many who have more means than Br. Sawyer has, and who profess to believe the same glorious truth, are doing next to nothing to spread the truth abroad. Shall there not be a waking up to the work?—ED. EXR.

Batavia, Kane Co., Ill., Aug. 20, 1852.

Br. Storrs:—Some valuable minds here have already been obliged to admit the force of arguments in your publications against the *natural* immortality of man, and are embracing, one after another, the Bible view of "Immortality and Eternal Life alone in Christ." Elder ———, Baptist preacher of this place is "on the way," and has ventured to preach the *destruction* of the wicked, and no immortality out of Christ, but has some difficulties on the "intermediate state" of the "dead in Christ." I have presented him with the Exr. for '50 and '51, "Dobeny," and "Miscellany," which he is reading with *great interest*. He is about 50 years of age---intelligent---pleasing in his address, and quite an influential and acceptable preacher. Distrust as to his "Orthodoxy" is awake, and he is now being proscribed by his brethren; so much so that he has now commenced an *independent* effort, aside from the church. All eyes are upon him to see what will be the result. I am giving away more books than I sell; but the sacrifice is not *in vain*. I see no cause for discouragement. "Truth is mighty and will prevail." While I have an influence to exert and the means to use, I expect to labor for the spread of those works, and efforts which, instead of *Deifying man*, will exalt *Jesus* as the "resurrection and the life." Most truly yours,

PARKER SAWYER.

FROM NATHAN HORNADAY.

Cleremont, Ind., 1852.

Br. Storrs:—This will inform you that life and immortality through Christ has been, and now is, being taught in the central part of Indiana; although I am the only man that teaches it publicly in these parts: but there are several believers in the doctrine. Since the truth on this subject has been dug out from among the traditions of men, it has caused a great deal of light to spring up on many passages that were entirely obscure before; therefore, through the aid of your paper, and other witings, to which I have had access, I have been able to throw off the old sectarian spectacles, and look at the scriptures with my own eyes. I am a seeker after truth: opposition runs high in this country: people are taking strange positions against the doctrine I teach; and some meeting house doors have been closed against me. I have had several discussions, and expect another with a Lutheran preacher.

COMMUNICATIONS.

REPLY TO MACKNIGHT.

The following should have been inserted before now, but it was overlooked in our removal.—ED.

BR. STORRS:—With your permission, I will give a few thoughts in answer to Macknight on Luke 20: 34–37. I presume he wants to know if the resurrection of the wicked is taught in the Scripture of truth. If the doctrine is there taught, the Saviour's words in Luke 20: 34–37 will not disagree therewith. Let us examine the texts under consideration. The Sadducees thought and believed that there would be no resurrection of the dead. Hence the question, whose wife of the seven brothers would the woman be in the resurrection [33d verse], for all had her to wife. The Savior, in answering them, taught that there would be a great difference in that age to come, whereof we speak, and the present age. In this age, the children thereof marry and are given in marriage; in that age there will be no marrying or giving in marriage. In this age they die; in that age they will not die. He teaches that to obtain that age there must be a worthiness; also, to obtain that age there must be a resurrection from the dead. This I think was an answer to them so far, concerning the resurrection of the dead; for there is an age to come, and God's children, the worthy ones, who are dead, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and most of others will attain to that age; hence must have a resurrection from the dead, for "God is not a God of the dead;" they must be made immortal, "to die no more," for "He is the God of the living"; for these worthy ones lived unto him, hence worthy. They will be "equal unto the angels," for they shall "die no more." They will obtain to that age which is intended for all the righteous; amen.

It is certain that the Saviour with as much plainness spoke of the "resurrection" of those "that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation," as he did of the "resurrection" of those that "had done good" to life; the latter will die no more, being worthy to obtain that age. If one part of John 5: 28, 29 is figurative, so may the other be; for as sure as some rise to life, the rest will rise to damnation---for "*all* that are in the graves shall hear his voice and *come forth*." The wicked will be brought forth to the day of wrath, to which time they are reserved. [Job 21: 29, 30; 2 Pe-

ter, 2: 9, 10, 12, 13, 17. See Jude also.] When the Saviour was on earth, a few were raised from the dead; but he told the people not to marvel at what they saw him do, for the time would come when *all* that are in their graves *shall hear his voice, and come forth*, &c. He said he had "received power from the Father to *execute* judgment also, because he is the Son of man." The Saviour, in Matt. 26: 64, assured the persecuting "high priest," who conjured him to confess whether he was Christ, the Son of God, that hereafter ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven; which would not be if there was no resurrection of the wicked, unless the priest was afterwards converted to Jesus Christ. Those that pierced him shall mourn because of him. This looks favorable to their resurrection.

When Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob shall sit down in the kingdom of God—in the age to come—with those who come from the east, west, north, and south—the worthy ones—the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness; for they will see them in the kingdom of God, and themselves cast out; hence must have a resurrection. If there be no resurrection of the wicked, where is the use of the expression, "the resurrection of the just"? Why not the resurrection? But there is a resurrection of the unjust: and Paul assures us that he had a conscience void of offence towards God and man in making the confession that there is a "resurrection of the dead, both of the just and the unjust."

In addition to the above, I send you a few thoughts on Eph. 2: 12, in answer to "Querist." In my opinion, the text quoted above has no particular reference to the resurrection of the dead. It appears to me that Paul is teaching that the Gentiles, who are the uncircumcision, had, previous to conversion to Christianity, no association or citizenship with the Jews, who were the circumcision. They were strangers from the *covenants* of promise, which were made to Abraham and his seed; Acts, 3: 25. Heb. 8. They were without hope of eternal life (Titus, 1: 2), which the Jews professed to have in the Scriptures. John, 5: 39. The Gentiles were without God; God had not manifested himself to them as he had to the Jews. But now, God having sent his Son into the world, and by him spoken to us, in these last days; by whom also life and immortality have been brought to light by the gospel—the middle wall of partition has been broken down, so that the Gentiles can become fellow-heirs with the Jews, who have the faith of Abraham their father. Christ is therefore our peace, or made peace between us; so now we are reconciled to each other, and to our Father and his son Jesus Christ, and are one in Christ Jesus. One new man is now formed. So now the Gentiles are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, &c., of the household of God; grafted into the true olive tree. These are the other sheep brought in, to be with the Jews one fold, and to have one shepherd. It is a matter of rejoicing that the unsearchable riches of Christ was preached to the Gentiles. O, how full of instruction is this portion of sacred truth. "Querist" will see a difference between being strangers from the covenants (plural) of promise, and "being outside of the covenant" (singular.) It is my opinion, with present light, that the wicked that shall be alive at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, will by the judgments written be destroyed from the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power. 2 Thess. 1: 9; Matt. 13: 30, 42; Rev. 16. But those of the wicked that are dead will have a resurrection, be judged and punished at the end of the thousand years, or the day of the Lord. How can these texts be fulfilled if the wicked rise not? Matt. 3: 12. This was spoken to those wicked Sadducees, and shows that they were in danger of said punishment. Mal. 4: 1; Matt. 7: 13, 19, 23; 8: 11, 12; 12: 36, 37; Mark 9: 43–48; Acts 17: 30, 31; Rom. 2: 6–9; 1: 32; 2: 16; 2d Peter 2: 3–7; Jude 14, 15. "To execute judgment upon *all*," &c. Fire shall come down from God out of heaven, upon all the rest of the dead and devour them. Rev. 20: 4, 9. There appears to be two destructions: the first on those that are alive at the coming of Christ, who will receive at the hands of God the punishment described, and the wicked dead will rise to be punished; for every man will be rewarded according to the deeds done in his body—in other words, for his own sins, not for Adam's transgression.

Yours, in the hope of eternal life at the resurrection of the just, through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. W.

RESPONSE TO MACKNIGHT.

BY VERITAS.

Br. Storrs,—Our friend Macknight's last article closes as follows:—"Now if the *wicked* get loose from this law of death, and get the wrath of God removed from them, and get a resurrection from the dead, they can sing, 'O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory?' Will Veritas inform us to whom or what power this victory will be ascribed."

Here it is assumed that deliverance from the condemnation of the law and "the wrath of God," is necessarily connected with "a resurrection from the dead." Both reason and holy scripture appear to me to be plainly opposed to such a sentiment.

Whether or not a resurrection from the dead is a blessing or a curse, depends entirely on the purpose or end for which man is raised. He may be raised a thousand times without being raised either to eternal life or to a momentary happiness. After all, he may die forever. Surely if he rises "*to shame and everlasting contempt*," "*to condemnation*," to be "*cast into the lake of fire*," which "is *the second death*," as the immutable word of the Lord plainly and positively declares, he can have no part in the triumphant song of the redeemed, "O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory."

Reference to *all* the divine testimony concerning the doctrine of the resurrection is necessary to our understanding of the truth. Two resurrections are plainly revealed as the purpose of the Judge of all the earth. They are different both in respect to character and time. One is "to life" eternal, the other "to condemnation," and "the second death;" from which there is no deliverance. This "destruction" will be the "END" of the wicked: See John 5: 28, 29. Rev. 20: 14, 15. In respect to time, "a thousand years" will intervene: Rev. 20: 5.

M. remarks, "we being in the loins of our father Adam, died with him: this is the first *death*." He also remarks, "If a man refuse to eat of this tree, (Christ) he perishes, or dies the second time; if you will have it, the second *death*, or loses life." According to this view of the subject, the first death was our representative death in Adam; the second death is our actual death at the close of mortal life; consequently the saints, as well as the wicked, die the second death!

Our friend's theory may require such a construction, but will it stand the test of the word which abideth forever? Let us see. What is the scripture representation respecting the second death?

Among all the innumerable accounts we have in the scriptures of truth of human deaths which have occurred, do we find a single instance in which such death is denominated the *second* death? Not one. Moreover, if M. is correct, the second death has power, for a time, over the saints; which is certainly *some* power; but the word of truth declares that "on such the second death hath *no* power." Rev. 20: 6.

Again, the plain representation in Rev. 20th chap. is, that the second death will be subsequent, not only to the first, but to the general, or second resurrection, and also subsequent to the final judgment. Nor is this all the objection to our friend's theory. The casting into *the lake of fire*, not casting into *the grave*, is plainly and positively declared to be the second death. Rev. 20: 14.

M. thinks that Adam "was permitted to bring forth his seed by the justification of that seed to *life* through Jesus Christ." The term justification to life appears to me to import nothing less than *eternal life;* and that M.'s view would imply universal salvation. I see no necessity for the mediation of the Son of God for the mere temporal existence of Adam's seed. Such mediation is necessary for their deliverance from the penalty of the law, which is eternal death; all having sinned and come short of the glory of God. God hath set forth his Son to be a propitiation, or mercy-seat, not that he might be just in permitting Adam to bring forth his seed, but "that he might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." I think that Rom. 5: 18, must be understood, either as importing, that through the righteousness or mediation of Jesus Christ, the free offer of salvation is made to all men on condition of repentance and faith; or that as all united to the first Adam are under condemnation, so all who are united to the second Adam, by faith, are justified to life eternal. Be this as it may, the doctrine of the "resurrection" to "condemnation," of those who die in their sins, rests upon the rock of His word who has declared, "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away." John 5: 28, 29.

VERITAS.

ANOTHER INQUIRY.

Will those who died in the wilderness for rebellion, have a resurrection?

Our Lord Jesus saith, John 6: 49, "Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and *are dead*."

God had said of the rebellious Israelites who came out of Egypt, "*They shall surely die in the wilderness*." See Numbers 26: 65. This seems to be the same class our Lord speaks of, John 6th. The threatening to those rebellious ones seems to be without qualification; and it is said, "there was not a man of them left," when Moses and Eleazer numbered Israel just before Moses' death.

Paul, speaking of those who came out of Egypt, says, "With many of them God was not well pleased: for they were overthrown in the *wilderness*. Now these things were our *examples*, to the intent that we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted." 1 Corth. 10: 5, 6. The apostle then enumerates a number of particulars in which they sinned, and the judgments that followed, and adds: "All these things happened unto them as ensamples (or *types*) and they are written for our admonition, &c.

Jude says, "The Lord having saved the people out of the land of Egypt, afterwards destroyed them that *beliered not*." v. 5.

Paul saith, Heb. 3: 16–19, "Some when they had heard did provoke: howbeit not all that came out of Egypt by Moses. But with whom was he grieved forty years? was it not with them that had *sinned*, whose carcasses fell in the wilderness? And to whom swear he that they should not enter into his rest, but to them that *beliered not?* So we see they could not enter in *because of unbelief;*" and he adds, chap. 4: 6, 11, "Seeing therefore it remaineth that some must enter therein, and they to whom it was first preached [the rest] entered not in because of unbelief.... Let us labor therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of *unbelief*."

These texts go to show that it was the *rebellious* ones that are specially spoken of as *falling*, being *destroyed, dying* in the wilderness; so that they "*are dead*." And this phrase (*are dead*) seems to be an emphatic one; for, *first*—It is in contrast with "*not die*," v. 50; and with "*live forever*," v. 51. If "*not die*" means shall not be holden by death; and if "*live forever*" does not exclude the death that has come "upon all men," and the phrase "*are dead*" is in contrast with these, as seems evident, then it would appear that the expression "*are dead*" is used to denote their final state, and that they were then in it; and hence imports their *non* resurrection.

This view is further strengthened from the words of our Lord, in his discourse with the Sadducees on the resurrection. Luke 20: 38, he saith, God "is not the God of the dead"; that is, as the text and context clearly indicates, he is not the God of such as shall have *no resurrection;* for "*all*" who are spoken of in this text to have a resurrection. God *is* their God, and *they* are to be "*as the angels of God in heaven*." See Matt. 22: 30. It cannot be said of the "fathers in the wilderness" who "are dead" for rebellion, that God is *their God*, and that they shall be "as the angels of God in heaven"; therefore it does appear to look as if *that class* of sinners were excluded from a resurrection altogether. This may not be so; but without further light on the subject this view seems conclusive. I would like to see what could be said for and against it by some of your correspondents.

INQUIRER.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—We are sorry to be obliged to lay over a number of articles which we intended to insert. We hope to do justice to all, though we may fail of it. Our friend L. Butler, of Mich., is not forgotten.

From Elon Everts.

New-Haven, Vt., *July* 4, 1852.

Bro. Storrs:—I receive your valuable paper regularly. I hold dear to me those truths that it advocates. I saw the truth that man, natural, is *mortal;* that he has no soul separate from his body; and that his body with its material parts is his soul; and when his body is locked in death's inactivity, he is unconscious, his thoughts perish, he knows not anything. This I saw, and that man unregenerated, or unresurrected at Christ's second coming "riseth not; till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their sleep." Job. xiv. 12. But I did not see the full beauty of it, at first. Although David says, "his truth shall be thy shield and buckler," Psalms 91: 4; yet I saw not what it would shield us against, so fully, till "that wicked began to be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming. Even him whose coming is after the *working of Satan*, with *all* power, (that must be great,) and *signs* and *lying* wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in *them* that perish: *because* they *received not* the *love* of the truth, (that man is unconscious from death, till the resurrection of the body,) that they might be saved. And for this cause, (because they rejected the truth) God *shall send* them *strong delusion*, that they should *believe* a lie: that they *all* might be damned who believed not the *truth*, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." 2d Thes. 2: 8–12. Now that wicked is revealed by rapping and writing. Many lying signs and wonders, purporting to be the spirit of good or bad men, murderous warriors, or followers of the Prince of Peace: transforming himself into angels of light, to deceive, if possible, the very elect. O, how much we need the truth to shield us in this time of peril. Still I wish to mention one more truth that Paul is dwelling upon in this chapter, that we need heed in the love of it; that when this satanic spirit is thus revealed, it is, that the next event is, the coming of the Lord. And this is one great truth that many do not receive the love of. Let such pause when they read these awful warnings, before the delusion blinds them beyond recovery. "It is the last time, and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there *many antichrists;* whereby *we know* that it is the *last time*." 1st John 2: 18.

Brother Storrs: I wish to hold fast on all those truths that we have learned; and grow in knowledge of Bible truths, as fast as in the dispensation of the opening providences of God, his prophecies and truths are revealed. Is not this right? Is it not our privilege? yea, is it not duty? Does not the Word say, "the pathway of the just is as the shining light, which shineth *more* and *more* unto the perfect day?"

I feel a deep interest in an increase of light. Still, I behold with interest the progress of the great truths that you are promulgating. But, brother, do you not pass a glance over the questions that agitate the Bible students of this day? I trust that you do, and have long expected that you would speak out. Dear brother, I sent you some pamphlets last summer, I know not that you ever received them or the accompanying letter. I would be glad to hear from you on the Seventh day Sabbath, whether you think it is binding upon man now. You say in July No. of Examiner, page 108, that you spent two Sabbaths with the brethren in Philadelphia. I ask what do you mean to be understood by Sabbaths? what day of the week do you wish to be understood? Please inform.

Brother. I am aware that I am interrogating a brother that has waged an uncompromising war upon the traditions of men, therefore I take great liberty, and trust that I shall not injure your kind feelings. No, dear brother, that I would not do; but my heart is in deep solicitude on the subject, and I feel anxious to hear from you. I doubt not but you are perfectly familiar with the history of that Horn that (Dan. 7: 25), should think to change times and laws, (of God, of course.) Is it not of importance enough to enlist a short campaign from you? May our Lord direct, as it will be for his praise and our peace. Amen.

Reply by the Editor.

Bro. Everts may be assured he does not *injure* my *feelings* by his plainness. So long as a brother manifests the *kind* spirit he does, it matters not how much he may differ from me in opinion. In answer to his interrogations, I reply, First—I use the term "Sabbath," in ordinary discourse, in the sense it is usually understood: i. e., just as I would the term "Sunday." These are the usual names by which the first day of the week is designated. But I have no favoritism to these appellations of that day. I do not insist that the first day is the Sabbath—but I do not conceive there is anything in the commands of God to prohibit my calling any day in the week by that name, if it is the known name of the day it is used to designate. As to any binding *authority* to call one day in seven *the Sabbath*, or to observe one as such, in the ordinary idea of such a day, I have no evidence that Christ or his apostles have given any. To attempt to fix the seventh part of time upon the followers of Christ as a Sabbath, and a binding institution, whether it is done by a Roman Pope, Protestant Pope, or *any other* Pope, is to usurp the authority of Christ, and thus take the *mark* of the Man of Sin. No authority for any such thing exists under the administration of Jesus the Messiah. The attempt to fix the Seventh-day Sabbath upon the followers of Christ, as of binding obligation, is of the same character as the attempt to fix upon them circumcision; and is usually accompanied with the same spirit that is recorded Acts 15: 1. That is—"Except ye keep the seventh-day Sabbath, ye cannot be saved." All are doomed to perdition that do not believe and act as they do on the subject. We are happy to know there are exceptions, and especially that Bro. Everts is an exception.

When the apostles and elders came together, at Jerusalem, to consider the matter in regard to observing the law of Moses, the decision was unanimous, that those who were "*turned to God from among the Gentiles*" were "not to be troubled"

with any such thing. See Acts 15th. Let us give the words of that memorable council, they are as follows:—

"Forasmuch as we have heard, that certain which went out from us have troubled you with words, *subverting your souls*, saying, Ye must be circumcised *and keep the law;* to whom we gave no such commandment; it seemed good to us, being assembled with *one accord*, to send chosen men unto you with our beloved Barnabas and Paul, men who have hazarded their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have sent therefore Judas and Silas, who shall also tell you the same things by mouth. For it seemed good to the *Holy Ghost*, and *to us*, to lay upon you no greater burden than *these necessary things:* that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication; from which, if ye keep yourselves ye shall do well. Fare ye well."

Here is no recognition of the *Law Sabbath*, or Seventh-day Sabbath. A very strange omission if of such obligation as the advocates of that institution now maintain. But the "apostles and elders" do here affirm, that the converts "from among the Gentles," were *not* commanded to "*keep the law*," verse 24: and of course were not commanded to keep the Sabbath of the law. And Paul, who was a principal actor in that council, and in the controversy thus settled by *authority*, admonishes the Christians at Colosse "Let no man judge you * * * in respect of a holy day * * * or *of the Sabbath*," and adds—"Which are *a shadow* of things to come but the *body* is of *Christ*." He asserts that Christians were "dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world;" which latter phrase signifies "*elementary*" principles—the lowest parts of knowledge. Such was the *law* economy, as given by Moses, and which Paul affirms, in this same chapter, Christ "took out of the way, nailing it to his cross;" and also affirms that one of those things taken out of the way and nailed to the cross, was "*the Sabbath*."

Not one writer in the New-Testament countenances the idea that the Sabbath had any sanctity above any other day of the week. A Christian's whole life, and *every day* is to be consecrated to God. "Whether ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do *all* to the glory of God."

When Paul wrote to a church composed of both Jews and Gentiles, as that at Rome was, he settles this question, thus, chap. 14, he says:—"One man esteemeth one day *above* another: another esteemeth *every* day;" and he adds:—"Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." In the result, he says,—"Why dost thou judge thy brother? or why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for ye shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ."

Here was one portion of a Christian community who were Jews, and had been brought up under the law commanding the observance of the Sabbath; and though now converted they could not at once overcome all their Jewish prejudices; particularly the observance of one day above another, and Paul decides it was not necessary they should; while on the other hand, another portion of that church had been brought up Gentiles, with no observance of one day above another, and Paul affirms it was not necessary they should esteem one day more than another. Here is the true New-Testament ground to stand upon—the ground of charity and forbearance, and caution against judging one another in these matters.

We forbear entering at length into this subject, but must content ourself, at this time, with mere hints. A few words more shall conclude our remarks. If the Sabbath as given by Moses, is binding now, it is so in *all its claims and denunciations*. Let those who strenuously contend that it is *now* of binding obligation, see whether they themselves are not condemned by the Sabbath law. "Whosoever doeth *any work* in the Sabbath-day, he shall surely be put to death." Ex. 32: 15.

The Sabbath was, and still is binding on all who are *under the law*. They who are under the law, will "be judged by the law;" Rom. 2: 12. All the curses of a broken law and violated Sabbath fall upon them. "But ye," believers in Christ, "are not under the law, but under grace." "The law was given by Moses, but *grace* and truth (or the *substance*) came by Jesus Christ." John 1: 17. The law was the *shadow:* Christ is the *substance*. Hence "We which have believed do enter into rest," &c., Heb. 4: 3; we have *the substance* in distinction from the *shadow*, which was by the law of Moses.

"Tell me," saith Paul, "ye that *desire to be under the law*, do ye not hear the law?" Galatians 4: 21. He then says, "Abraham had two sons, one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. But he of the bondwoman was born after the flesh, but he of the freewoman by promise." He then adds: "Which things are an allegory, (an illustration;) for these (two women) are (an illustration of) the two covenants; the one from mount Sinai which gendereth to bondage, which is Hagar * * * and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children." And why are they "in bondage?" Because they adhere to the Sinai law as a covenant. But "Jerusalem which is above (represented by the freewoman) is free, which is the mother of us all" who believe in Messiah. "But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him after the Spirit even as it is now." Those who will continue under the Sinai law, or return to it after once being made free, manifest the same spirit,

sooner or later, that the bondwoman's son did, viz: a persecuting spirit, showing a departure from the spirit of the Gospel of Christ and his apostles. Let them beware lest they are "cast out" with "the bondwoman and her son."

We wish Bro. Everts to understand, distinctly, that all we have said is not designed to apply to him. With him, while he continues to manifest the same spirit that is breathed in his letter, we can differ on this question and still love him as a brother. But in others who have been led under the *law Sabbath*, we have seen and been made to feel, that there is a lack of honesty and integrity, which might justly be ascribed to the Ishmaelite spirit of the bondwoman's son. If Bro. Everts, or others, sincerely think the law Sabbath binding on them, I shall be the last to condemn them; at least, so long as they manifest the spirit Bro. E. now manifests. May the God of truth and love guide him and all of us in the way of truth and life.

On the Sabbath question I have heretofore said nothing; and should still have remained silent but for Bro. Everts' appeal. I have been content to abide the apostolic injunction, "*Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind.*" I esteem it a great mercy that the providence of God has so ordered it that one day in seven is observed as a day of rest. The influence of it is good, both physically and morally. But as to any *positive* law for its observance, there is none under the Gospel economy. So I believe.

—o—

BIBLE vs. TRADITION.

BY AARON ELLIS, REVISED AND ENLARGED BY THOMAS READ, NEW-YORK.

Proof from the Bible of the Corporeal Nature and Mortality of the Soul of Man, and the Nature of his Spirit.

"I will not contend forever, neither will I be always wroth: for the spirit should fail before me, and the souls which I have made." Isa. 57: 16.

In tracing the word *soul* through the authorized version of the Bible, we find it occurs 532 times—476 times in the Old Testament, and 56 times in the New. God is represented as having a soul 16 times. "Your new moons and appointed feasts my soul hateth." Is. 1: 14; Lev. 26: 11, 30; Judges 10: 16; Job 23: 13; Ps. 11: 5; Isa. 1: 14; 42: 1; Jer. 5: 9, 29; 6: 8; 9: 9; 12: 7; 14: 19; 32: 41; Zech. 11: 8; and Heb. 10: 38.

The word *soul* occurs five times in the Old Testament, where *nephish* is not the original term; for the word *nedivothee*, which the margin calls *darling*, is rendered *soul* in Job 30: 15; it probably means munificence; and in 2 Saml. 13: 39, and Ps. 16: 2, the word soul is added by the translators, there being no corresponding word in the Hebrew text.

The word *neshomoh*, or *nesme*, is once rendered *soul* in Is. 57: 16, the text we have chosen for our motto. Taylor, in his Hebrew Concordance, says, that "*neshomoh*, or *nesme*, signifies the Chameleon, a kind of lizard, which has its mouth always open, gaping for the air, on which it was once supposed to live. *Nesme* is rendered *breath*, *spirit*, and *life*."

It is rendered *breath* and *spirit* in the following texts, and expresses the idea of *natural life*, whether in *man* or *beast*. Gen 2: 7; 7: 22; Deu. 20: 16; Jos. 11: 11, 14; 1 Kings 15: 23; 17: 17; Ps. 150: 6; Isa. 2: 22; 42: 5.

But *nesme* cannot ever mean an abstract intelligence, or soul, or spirit; for it would be absurd to translate Jos. 11: 11, There was not any (*nephish*) *soul*, left to (*nesme*, to soul, instead of to) breathe. Here *nesme*, undoubtedly means breathe, and is so rendered. And in every other place where it occurs it either means breath, or a breather, or life sustained by means of breathing the breath of lives; that is, it signifies the chameleon or any other creature that lives by breathing. Our motto then should be understood thus, "lest the (*ruah*) spirit, or living creature, should fail before me, and the *nesme*, *breather* that I have made." And so in Psa. 150: 6; "Let every *nesme*, breather, praise the Lord." We conclude, therefore, that *nesme*, nowhere means soul, independently of our bodily organization.

Nephish is rendered *soul* 454 times; and *psuche* is so rendered 57 times, making 511 times that *nephish* and *psuche* are rendered soul, when applied to man; and 17 times in the original we find these terms applied to beasts. There are more than 300 other places where the same terms are rendered life, person, or body, &c: for, had they been rendered soul, in all such places, then the reader must have perceived that the word soul never could mean a something that could live separately from the man himself, neither as an "*immortal soul*," or "deathless spirit." Parkhurst says, that "*nephish* as a noun, hath been supposed to signify the spiritual part of man, or what we commonly call his soul. I must confess," says he, "that I can find no passage where it hath undoubtedly this meaning."

We say the true meaning of soul is, a creature that lives by breathing; and as the essential endowment of such a creature is life, so life will stand often as a correct meaning of soul. When soul is applied to man, it may be translated life, soul, man, you, yourself, person, myself, thyself, &c., according to the text.

But some of our translators a little more honest than the rest, have ventured in a number of these places to insert the true word *soul*, in the margin; but none of them were honest enough to give us the word soul in every place where *nephish* and *psuche* occur. We shall endeavor to supply their deficiency.

In pursuing this subject we shall give the Bible answer to the following questions:

1. *Is the soul as great as theologians assume it to be?*

2. *What is a soul?*

3. *Is the soul immortal so that it cannot fail, cease to exist as a living being before God?*

4. *What is a spirit?*

4. *Is the spirit immortal, so that it cannot cease to animate the man?*

6. *We shall show that every text in the Bible will harmonize with our answers; even the very*

texts from which a contrary inference has been erroneously drawn.

Our motto most certainly implies, that if God were to contend forever, or to be always wroth, that the spirits and souls of men would fail, die, cease to exist as living beings before him. But waiving this, we proceed to answer the first question:

1. Is THE SOUL AS GREAT AS THEOLOGIANS ASSUME IT TO BE?

To this question we give an unqualified *negative.* For, 1st. *The word soul does not mean a ghost or independent entity when applied to man.* Because man and beast would in this respect be on a level with God. For if a man's soul is a ghost, or spirit, because the soul of God is a ghost or spirit, as Luther Lee argues, then we say that a beast's soul is a ghost also. Now, if the allowing the beasts to possess souls, as Mr. Lee admits, then upon this reasoning, surely all are up to a level with God, as all have souls: "For in his hand is the soul of every living creature, and the breath of all mankind." Job 12: 10.

Again, if a man's soul is a ghost, because it goes by the same name as the soul of God, then, not only beasts and every creeping thing being souls, are ghosts; and then, too, the soul of *sheol* (the grave, or death,) is likewise a ghost, because it goes by the same name, Isa. 5: 14, "Therefore *sheol*, (the state of death, or grave,) hath enlarged her *nephish*, (soul or being,) and opened her mouth without measure." The same reasoning would show that man himself as existing in this life, is a *ghost*, for God is called a man, Exo. 15: 3, "The Lord is a man of war." The same principle of false reasoning would convert a man's heart and eyes, as well as the heart and eyes of beasts into so many ghosts, for they are called by the same name as the eyes and heart, hands, and feet of God. And a tree must have sense and feeling, because it is said to have *life* as well as men. But what sort of theology is this? Cannot God possess an attribute that may be entirely spiritual, yet called by the same name as one in man that may be entirely corporeal? If he cannot, then how shall he be able, out of these stones, to raise up children unto Abraham. Matt. 3: 9. Surely the souls of these children would be corporeal, if made out of stones.

Again, God's soul cannot be separated from himself; for if it can, then is he *two Gods.* "But to us there is but one God." 1 Cor. 8: 6. Allow God's soul to be *himself*, as *nephish* when applied to God, is twice translated. Jer. 51: 14, "The Lord of hosts hath sworn by his *nephish*," (by himself). Also in Amos 6: 8; or him, as in Pro. 6: 16. "These six things doth the Lord hate, yea, seven are an abomination of his (*nephish*,) of him;" and we obtain the correct idea. As *nephish*, *the soul*, comprehends the whole being of God, so does the same term comprehend the whole being of man; and never means a principle that can live independently of the man or beast, to which the term *nephish* is indiscriminately applied; and is 25 times correctly translated "themselves." Let two examples suffice for the present. "He teareth (his *nephish*) himself in his anger." Job. 18: 4. Did Job tear his immaterial and immortal ghost? "Backsliding Israel hath justified herself, (her *nephish*) more than treacherous Judah." Jer. 3: 11. Has a nation a ghost?

Nay, but every nation has a being. Here, then, the arguments of Luther Lee, and those of like ("*precious*") faith, are overthrown by the translators themselves, though they were believers in the immortal-soul theory. It is vain to endeavor to array the soul, which is the man himself, with the attributes of independent conscious existence, spirituality, immateriality, and immortality, against the plainest declarations of God's Word.

2dly. *The soul of man is no part of God.* Because if every soul is a part of God, or if of the essence of Deity, as some theologians contend, then God is not *one* and indivisible, but is a multitude, and these multiplied millions of parts sin and die. "For the soul that sinneth IT shall die." And if so many parts of God sin, then these sinning parts are opposed to other parts of him; and thus this absurd theory divides God against himself; "How then shall his kingdom stand?"

Again, as the soul is sometimes unhappy, it would follow upon this theory, that God is sometimes unhappy. And if the dogma of the endless misery of the wicked were true, then millions of parts of God would be tormented forever; and, as some theologians represent, these souls of the wicked, as parts of God, will be eternally cursing the other parts of God!!! unless these wicked shall cease to become parts of God. But if so many parts of God can be annihilated, or converted into that which is not a part of God, then when God swore by himself—"As I live," the stability of his oath is overturned, because if one part of God may die, all may die!! Into such absurdities does this vain philosophy lead its professors.

Again, it is presumed that all will admit, that God, and all that constitutes his being, is *uncreated*, for he did not create himself, and there was none before him to create. If any part of God was created, then that part had a beginning, and is not eternal. But man, soul and spirit, was created, "as the Lord liveth that made us this soul." Jer. 38: 16. "Lo, he that formeth the mountains and createth the spirit' (*ruah*). Am. 4: 13. "The Lord which formeth the spirit (*ruah*) of man that is in him." Zech. 12: 1. The last two examples, refer to the *ruah*, as the principle of life. As soul and spirit were created and had a beginning, therefore they are not parts of an uncreated and eternal God.

Again, the soul is not only created, but created of the dust; for the same man that is called *a living soul* was made of the dust of the ground: "And God said, dust *thou* art, and unto dust shalt thou return." Gen. 3: 19. And Paul says, that the same living soul is of the earth, earthy. 1 Cor. 15: 47. Words cannot make it more plain than do these texts, that the whole man is a soul, and is corporeal. But should any contend that the name "man," does not include the soul, and insist that the soul was a something added to man, by the breath that was breathed into his nostrils, then man is only a body, and his body became a living soul. And this is true, for the creature, man, or body, or soul, that was made of the dust of the earth, and was lifeless, by the simple inspiration of the breath of lives, of *all* lives, became a *living soul.* That is, the lifeless soul made of dust, became a living soul, or creature. See Job's account of this matter, 10: 8–12, how God made him or his soul.

8. "Thy hands have bound me, (or my soul,) and formed me altogether, joining *me* together on every side, thou didst also finish *me.*

9. Remember, I beseech thee, as clay didst thou form me; and wilt thou return me to dust?

10. Was it not as milk thou pouredst *me* out, and as a cheese concreted me together?

11. With skin and flesh thou didst clothe *me*, and interwoven *me* with bones and sinews.

12. *Life* and *sensation* thou didst produce in *me*, and thy superintending care hath preserved *my breath.*'—*Fry.*

Here the same "*me*," that is clothed with flesh and skin, and platted together with bones and sinews, and receives life and the conscious faculty from the Lord, is the same "*me*," that was moulded as the clay, and must be brought into dust again. Life and sensation are here made to depend upon the preservation of his breath, and to preserve his breath is equivalent to the preservation of his life and consciousness. Dan. 5: 13, "God in whose hand thy breath is, and whose are all thy ways;" and Paul, Acts 17: 28, "In him we live, and move, and have our being." "No man hath power to retain the spirit" of the breath of lives. "Man does not live by bread alone;" and, if "God gather unto himself his spirit and his breath," then "man shall turn again unto dust;" and "his thoughts perish." Job 34: 14, 15; and Ps. 146: 4. So in Job 30: 23. "For I know that thou wilt bring *me* to death, and to the house appointed for all the living." Job says that "*me*," (himself,) should be brought to the sepulchre. If the soul does not enter there, then the soul does not live, or the house is not appointed for all the living. In the first version of the Scriptures, the Syriac, the sepulchre is called the "home of the dead." Theologians tell us that it is the soul that seeks God, and that follows after righteousness. Very well. Read then Isa. 51: 1, 2. "Hearken to me, ye that follow after righteousness, ye that seek the Lord; look unto the rock whence YE *are hewn*, and to the hole of the pit whence *ye* are digged. Look unto Abraham your father, and unto Sarah that bare you." The holiest part of the Christian then proceeds from the earth, and is born of earthly parents. Abraham sets his seal to this truth, for he says, Gen. 18: 27, "I am but dust and ashes." If Abraham was an immortal soul, with the exception of a thin, outside shell—the body, how could he say that he was but dust and ashes; nay, he could not have said that he was an immortal ghost, while any part of him was dust. Ps. 78: 39, (God) "remembered that they were but *flesh;* a wind that passeth away." But if a part of man was a ghost or spirit, would not God have remembered that they were but part flesh, and that the principal part of them was an immortal ghost? But all of man and of beast are of the dust, and all shall alike turn to dust again. The very highest nature that man has, irrespective of Christ and the resurrection, is flesh, an evanescent wind.

Again, theologians tell us that the soul is the essential part of man: we say, it is the man himself; they say it was created separately from the body. If so, why did not Moses, in recording the history of the creation of man, give us some account of this matter? And why did he exhaust his description, by giving us an account of the formation of the body? and why call this body the man, even before the living principle which they term the great "immortal soul," was imparted? Why use a phraseology that precludes the idea that any such soul was given? Will our current teachers please inform us?

Again: If souls are a part of God, or if they are immaterial spirits, then they are not *begotten* by their fathers, but are separately originated. But yet the Bible 14 times expressly declares that "souls came out of the loins of their fathers," and "that they were born of their fathers in the land;" not in heaven. Gen. 12: 5, "And Abraham took Sarah his wife, and Lot, his brother's son, and all their substance that they had gathered, and the *souls* that they had *gotten in Haran*, and they went forth to go into the land of Canaan." That "souls were born in their father's house." Exodus 12: 19, and Num. 15: 30. In Gen. 46: 18, "These are sons of Zilpah, and these she *bare unto Jacob*, even 16 souls." Verse 26. "All the *souls* that came with Jacob into Egypt, which came *out of his loins*." Exo. 1: 5. "All the *souls* that came *out of the loins of Jacob* were 70 souls." See also Gen 46: 15, 22, 25, 27. Now I ask, did Abraham, Lot, and Jacob, beget these souls? Or if those 70 "immortal souls," came down from heaven, how came they in Jacob's loins? Say rather, that Adam was created with a pro-creative faculty, and as God caused the "earth to bring forth grass and herb yielding *seed after his kind*, and the tree yielding fruit *whose seed was in itself*, and after his kind," so man was made with the power to produce his like. Could these 70 souls that came out of the loins of *mortal* Jacob, be immortal ghosts? For how can flesh beget spirit? For "that which is born of the flesh is flesh," and not spirit, therefore to possess that spiritual, incorruptible, immortal nature, the *peculiar* privilege of the righteous, "Ye must be born again," of the Spirit, and by a resurrection from the dead, or ye cannot inherit an everlasting kingdom.

Again; the soul is not a spirit; for soul and spirit are separate things. 1 Thes. 5: 23, "I pray God your whole spirit, and soul, and body, (or your whole person,) be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." This cannot mean that man has two ghosts. Perhaps it may mean your whole disposition, life, and person, the whole compound nature of man, for spirit sometimes means person. Heb. 4: 12. "The Word of God, as a sharp two-edged sword, divides asunder soul and spirit;" separating the soul-like or animal nature of man, from his higher intellectual and moral qualities. See also Isa. 57: 16; Luke 1: 46, 47. 1 Cor. 6: 20, "Glorify God in your body." All the M.S.S. close the paragraph here. The clause, "and in your spirits which are his," is undoubtedly spurious. 1 Thes. 5: 23, may have been a little amended by some officious copyist.

The word *psuchikos*, an adjective, derived from *psuche*, a soul, occurs six times. Strictly rendered it would be *soulical* or *soul-like*, or animal; and is kindred to what Paul designates the flesh, or animal nature of man, in opposition to the spiritual, or higher moral and intellectual nature; as in Rom. 8: 5. "Now, they who live according to the flesh, mind the things of the flesh, and they who live according to the spirit, attend to the things of the spirit. For the thinking of the flesh is (or produces) death, and the thinking of the spirit is (or produces) life and peace." Here are two thinking principles contrasted with each other; the animal or soul-like principle, called flesh, producing, if allowed to predominate, death; and the reasonable, intellectual, and moral principle, called spirit, producing, if controlling, life and peace.

In 1 Cor. 2: 14, and 15: 44, 46, *psuchikos*, soul-like, soulical, or animal, is translated *natural;* but in Jude 19, and in James 3: 15, it is rendered *sen-*

sual. In all these places the soulical nature is put in direct and strong opposition to the spiritual nature. And the spiritual nature, be it remembered, does not naturally belong to man, but is superinduced as a subsequent and peculiar development in the cases of those who have submitted themselves to Christ. Of those under the control of the soulical nature, Jude 19th verse, says, "These be they who separate themselves (*psuchikos,*) soulical men, or animal men, *not having the Spirit.*" And James 3: 15, "This is not the wisdom which cometh from above, but is earthly, (*psuchikos,*) soulical, or animal, devilish." Paul says of such, 1 Cor. 2: 14, "Now, (*psuchikos,*) a soulical, or animal man, receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him; neither can he know them, because they are (*pneumatikos*) spiritually examined;" that is, they are intellectually and morally examined. So much for the soul-ghost invention! Theologians tell us that the soul is a spirit or ghost, that receives and transacts all spiritual matters. Yet Christ says, "If a man hate not his own (*psuche*) *soul*, he cannot be my disciple." Luke 14: 26. All agreeing with Paul's well-known expression, "To be carnally-minded is death." The mere possession of a soul nature then so far from implying superiority, is conspicuously marked as the lowest animal nature, incapacitating those who possess nothing more, from receiving or appreciating the higher intellectual and moral communications and endowments. Therefore, says Paul, 1 Cor. 3: 1, "Now I, brethren, could not speak to you as to *spiritual* (men,) but as to fleshly men, even as to babes in Christ." As unto men governed by your soulical or animal natures, and not by your intellectual and moral. Nearly the whole of Paul's reasoning through 1 Cor. 15, is to show that the soul nature which we now possess, even with the accompaniments of spiritual graces, altogether unfits us for inheriting an everlasting kingdom, and is likewise emphatically incompatible with the separate existence of either soul or spirit; for he affirms, 16 and 18, "If the dead are not raised . . . Certainly also those who have fallen asleep in Christ have perished." That their hope has ended with the life they have lost. They are utterly blotted out of existence for the present and all future time; for, he argues, "if there be no resurrection from the dead," the dead in Christ live not now, nor will they live in the future. If there be no resurrection, there is no future life even for Christians, after this. He proceeds strongly to contrast the *soulical* nature of the first Adam and his descendants, with the *spiritual* nature which the second Adam possesses, subsequent to his resurrection, and the spiritual nature which his disciples will possess, who will live again through him, subsequent to their resurrection. The whole nature derived from the first Adam, he affirms to be corruptible, mortal, (*psuchikos,*) soulical, or animal and earthy. But the nature to be possessed *afterwards*, by the righteous at the resurrection, he contrasts with this, and affirms of that nature, that it will be incorruptible, immortal, (*pneumatikon*) spirit-like, or spiritual and heavenly.

It seems there were some in Paul's days who denied the resurrection of the dead, the fundamental doctrine of Christianity, which rendered the sufferings of Christ, his death and resurrection of no avail, and the sufferings of his followers was likewise useless; their faith was vain, their hope was vain. They had predicated all upon a resurrection from the dead, and the rewards and the glory to be then revealed, and these doubters denied that it would ever take place. But alas! this same doctrine is practically and absolutely denied, by all who believe in the immortality of the soul!! For if the soul, or essential man, does not die, as modern theology affirms, how can he be raised again to life? Paul's language to one of these would be, 36 verse, "Foolish man! The seed which thou sowest, is *not re*-enlivened, *unless it die.*" We will paraphrase his words from the 44th verse.

The *soma psuchikon*, soulical body, or present animal, or soul nature of the Christian, is consigned to the grave; but he will be raised again, *soma pneumatikon*, a spiritual body, a real, tangible, yet heavenly nature, of which Jesus Christ is the first-fruits, being the first who has manifested this life and incorruptibility promised in the Gospel, by rising again from the dead, with a nature that cannot now be subject to corruption. This is the pattern after which we shall be fashioned. Thus hath Christ made death ineffectual to his followers, and hath illustrated that life and incorruptibility that he requires us to seek for. (2 Tim. 1: 10; Rom. 2: 7.) For there is not only a *soma psuchikon*, a soulical nature, which we at present possess, but there will likewise be a *soma pneumatikon*, a spiritual nature, with which Christians shall be invested at the resurrection. And so also it is written in Genesis 2: 7, The first man Adam was only made a *psuchen zosan*, a living animal, or a living creature, and therefore had nothing about him, but what was mortal and corruptible, but the second Adam was made into *pneuma zoopoioun*, a life-giving spirit, who will again impart life unto his followers, by a resurrection from the dead, connected with an incorruptible or spiritual nature not subject to death. 46th verse. But we do not possess this *pneumatikon*, spiritual nature, "AT FIRST," or in this present state, but only that which is *psuchikon*, soulical, or animal, and AFTERWARDS, when Christians are raised from the dead, we shall put on for the first time, our *pneumatikon*, spiritual nature. The first man was wholly made of the dust of the earth, and must, therefore, be of an earthly nature, unfitted for eternal life, and hence the necessity for the tree of lives being placed within his reach, that if he maintained his innocence, he might eat and live forever; but the second man, the pattern of the nature we Christians are to possess, is the Lord from heaven. 48th verse. As the first man, from whom we have descended, was made of dust, so we possess no other nature from the first Adam, but an earthly nature, and those that do not believe and obey Christ, will possess no other nature, and even if they should be raised from the dead, not having the germ of the spirit of Christ, they would not possess this spiritual or incorruptible nature, and would therefore naturally die again, without any positive infliction of the judgments of God; as did the widow's son, the nobleman's daughter, and Lazarus; who were only restored to Adamic or mortal life. But as the second Adam, or the second great head of all who will continue to live, was from heaven, we Christians who possess his spirit will possess his likeness, a heavenly, incorruptible, and therefore an immortal nature at the resurrection, when Christ, who is our life, shall appear. v. 49. And, as Christians have borne the likeness of the earthly and mortal Adam, so at the resurrection shall Christians bear the

likeness of the heavenly man, Christ Jesus. v. 5. For this corruptible, decaying nature, which we now possess, and which necessarily unfits us for an everlasting inheritance, must put on a something we do not at present possess; that is, an incorruptible body—we must put on immortality. 54 v. When this mortal nature shall have put on immortality, *then*, and not tlll then, will death be swallowed up in victory. The dominion of Death over the whole being of the righteous is complete; they sleep in unconciousness till the resurrection. But as the "gates of hades" will not prevail over the church, when Christ shall appear, then will his followers appear with him in glory, and the dominion of death over the righteous will then cease forever. See also verse 17, 18, 19, 29, 30, and 32.

We have merely amplified the arguments of the apostle. The immortal nature to be derived from Christ is strongly contrasted with the mortal nature derived from Adam. But if all men possessed this immortal nature through natural birth, then there is no contrast, and the apostle's strong argument is converted into nonsense!! The apostle's argument is plain enough as it stands, without our paraphrase, to convince all candid persons that man, in his present state, is not *immortal;* nay, that there is no principle of immortality, or perpetual conscious existence, naturally inherent in him. Can a soul that is now immortal put on, for the first time, at a future period, immortality? Paul says, 1 Tim. 6: 16—"God only hath immortality," and consequently, no other being but God is naturally immortal.

The word *apsuchos*, without a soul, that is something not intended to live by breathing, occurs once in 1 Cor. 14: 7, translated *without life*—"things without life, giving sound." The word *soul* is likewise applied thirty times to beasts, creeping things, and fish.

We therefore conclude that the soul and spirit are not identical, but two things, as much so as body and breath are two things; and that the soul of man is not what modern philosophy assumes it to be, but is the man himself, a mere mortal creature.

THE SOUL IS NOT A LIVING THING INDEPENDENTLY OF THE BODY.

We now quote a few Scriptures to prove that the man, or his body, actuates the soul, which could never occur if the soul were an independent ghost, and the body only *one* of *many* modes by which the soul could manifest life. Deut. 4: 9,—Only take heed to thyself, and keep thy *soul* diligently. Deut. 24: 15—For he is poor, and lifteth his (*nephish*) soul unto it. Jer. 44: 14—That they should return into the land of Judah, to which they lift up their nephish (*soul*). Ez. 24: 25—The desire of their eyes, the lifting up of their (*nephish*) soul. Hosea, 4: 8—They lift up their (*nephish*) soul to their iniquity. In these places, nephish is rendered heart, desire, or mind. The man lifts up or controls the nephish or soul, and not the soul controls the man. In Ps. 24: 4; 25: 1; 86: 4; 143: 8, David lifts up his soul to God. But he presented not his ghost, but himself to God to be protected and blessed. In Daniel 5: 23, "But hast lifted up thyself against the Lord of heaven." Ezk. 31: 10, "Because thou hast lifted up thyself in height." Here and in many other places thyself is used, instead of thy soul. Then soul and self mean the same thing. When Ahithophel and Judas hung themselves, we suspect something more than ghosts were hung. Luke 12: 4, "Be not afraid of them that kill the body." Then the body itself lives. And thus we read of living, dead, or mortal bodies. How can the body be said to die, if it never lives? To affirm that the soul is the essential man and *never* dies, and yet to use the phrase a dead man, is a glaring absurdity. Deceived man argues that the soul, considered as an independent, ever living thing, is the life of the flesh; but God had eight times said, the blood is the life of the flesh; and once, that a sound heart is the life of the flesh." Prov. 14: 30.

Life, in the abstract, cannot be called the soul, or a ghost. Let the word life be substituted for soul in the following texts—Job 3: 20, Wherefore is light given to him that is in misery, and *soul* unto the bitter in soul. Ch. 7: 15, My soul chooseth strangling, and death rather than my *soul*. Ps. 66: 9, Which holdeth our soul in *soul*. Prov. 3: 22, So shall they be *soul* unto thy soul. Jer. 52: 33, He did continually eat bread before him all the days of his *soul*. Those who choose to follow this further may try the following texts—Job 10: 1; 24: 22; Ps. 66: 9; Isa. 38: 12; Lam. 3: 53; Rom. 11: 15; 2 John 5: 12; Gen. 23: 1; Judges 16: 30; Luke 21: 31; John 6: 53; Ps. 21: 4.

But the terms indicating life, such as *alive*—living, liveth, &c., occur 950 times; and yet 40 places cannot be found among them, where it would not be manifestly absurd to call them either soul or ghost. The word heart occurs 970 times, which sometimes indicates life.

THE SOUL IS NOT THE MIND.

There are but few places where it would not be absurd to call the mind the soul, and more absurd to call it a ghost. Deut. 30: 1, The blessing and the curse which I have set before thee, thou shalt call them to *soul*. Gen. 23: 8, If it be your *soul* that I should bury my dead out of my sight. Isa. 46: 8, Bring it again to *soul*, O ye transgressors. Ps. 31: 12, I am forgotten as a dead man out of *soul*. Jer. 51: 50, Let Jerusalem come into your *soul*. Acts 28: 6, They changed their *souls*, and said that he was a god. Col. 2: 18, Vainly puffed up by his fleshy *soul*. Tit. 3: 1, Put them in *soul* to be subject to magistrates. James 1: 8, A double *souled* man is unstable in all his ways. Ch. 4: 8, Purify your hearts, ye double *souled*.

These are selected from 70 places where it would be absurd to call the mind, the soul. If a few places occur where soul and mind can be used interchangably, so mind and person may be so used; but if mind and soul were synonymous expressions they could with propriety be *always* interchanged.

Now substitute the word mind for soul.

Gen. 2: 7, And man became a living *mind*. 1 Sam. 24: 11, I have not sinned against thee, yet thou huntest my *mind* to take it. Ch. 25: 29, Yet a man is risen to pursue thee, and to seek thy *mind;* but the *mind* of my lord shall be bound in the bundle of life; but the *mind* of thine enemies shall be slung out. Ps. 40: 14, Let them be ashamed and confounded together, that seek after my *mind* to destroy it. Ps. 17: 13, Deliver my *mind* from the wicked, which are thy sword. Ps. 22: 20, Deliver my *mind* from the sword, my *mind* from the hand of the dog. Ps. 54: 3, Oppressors seek after my *mind*. Josh. 11: 11, He took Hazor, and smote all the *minds* that were therein, with the edge of the sword, utterly de-

stroying them, there was not any *minds* left to breathe. Isa. 38: 17, Thou hast in love to my *mind*, delivered it from the pit of corruption. Isa. 53: 10, When thou shalt make his *mind* an offering for sin. 12 v., Because he hath poured out his *mind* unto death. Jer. 2: 34, In thy skirts is found the blood of the *minds* of the poor innocents. Rev. 16: 3, And every living *mind* died in the sea.

But enough. There are more than 300 places where it would be absurd to call the soul the mind. And if a few places can be found where the words are interchangable,—so,

The eyes may be used to signify the mind or person, in 190 cases. Gen. 6: 8, But Noah found grace in the (eyes) mind of the Lord. Job. 22: 29, He shall save him that hath low eyes, or the humble person. Prov. 26: 5, Answer a fool according to his folly, lest he be wise in his own eyes, or mind. Deut. 7: 16, Thy eye or mind shall have no pity on them. Ch. 28: 26, Her eye, or mind shall be evil towards the husband of her bosom.

But the eye is not the mind, because it can be used in a figure for the mind, nor is the mind the soul, nor the soul the mind, because in a figure the one may be sometimes used for the other.

The neck is used for the mind, or heart, or person. Exo. 33: 5, Ye are a stiff-necked, or stiff-minded people. Deut. 31: 27, I know....thy stiff-neck, or mind. Prov. 29: 1, He that being often reproved, hardeneth his *neck, mind, heart*, or *himself*, shall suddenly be destroyed. Twenty times the neck is used for the mind. The head can ten times be called the mind. Ps. 83: 2, They that hate thee have lifted up the *head, mind*, or *person*.

The face is 38 *times used for the mind.* Prov. 21: 29, A wicked man hardeneth his face, or mind, or heart, or himself. Ez. 14: 6, Turn away your faces from all your abominations; that is your minds, or selves.

The hands are 48 *times used for the mind*, or *person*. Jud. 7: 11, Thou shalt hear what they say, and afterwards shall thy *hand* be strengthened.

The ear can be 17 times called the mind, or person: the mouth six times: the tongue five times: and the feet four times. Here are 320 passages of scripture where the members of the man can consistently be used for the man himself; and therefore it ought not to be thought surprising that the soul, though it means the man, may sometimes be called the mind.

In 76 places flesh can be called the soul, or a ghost, with as much propriety as the mind. Gen. 6: 12, "For all *flesh* had corrupted his way upon the earth." Ecc. 5: 6, "Suffer not thy mouth to cause thy flesh to sin." Isa. 49: 26, "All *flesh* shall know that I am thy Saviour." Rom. 12: 1, "Present your bodies (that is yourselves) a living sacrifice." Gal. 2: 16, "For by the works of the law shall no flesh (or souls) be justified." Eph. 5: 28, "So ought men to love their wives as their own bodies," (or souls.) 1 Sam. 18: 1, "For Jonathan loved David as his own soul." Mat. 19: 19, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." These last places make the body, the soul, and self one thing.

The word heart occurs 970 times in the bible; yet in four places only is the fleshly organ meant: and in almost all the other places, 955, it truly means the mind. Now it would be just as logical to call the heart an independent living thing, because the functions of mind and action are ascribed to it, and miscall it the "immortal soul," "the deathless spirit," or "the immortal mind."

—o—

AN EXPLANATION.

Lewiston Falls, Me., July 7, 1852.

Br. Storrs:—We observe, in the Bible Examiner for the present month, your publication of my letter of the 31st of March, as Secretary, making known to you the formation of the "*Reformed Protestant Society of Lewiston Falls, Maine.*" You have our sincere thanks for the interest you take in these our early efforts.

There is a point, however, in respect to which you labor under a misapprehension. And to set you right on this point, the Society has directed me to communicate with you.

Ours is *not* a *Church* organization. We have *never* called ourselves, or considered ourselves, as thus associated, to be a church. On reference to my letter, it is indeed clear enough how you came to receive such an impression. But the phraseology of the passages there quoted from our discussions in Conference, is such as naturally came to be used in the course of the *most general reflections* on the procedure of believers at various epochs, when setting out to make a new beginning in the Lord's cause, with the desire and the determination to secure themselves against any future introduction of error. Because we had occasion to speak of "Ecclesiastical Bodies," we used those terms; and because we perceived it to be necessary in our outset, to lay down and clearly define the objects of our association, and the principles upon which we designed to act:—and therefore, in the first place, to establish a mutual understanding in respect to what we believe, and by consequence, in respect to the "*Rule of Faith*," we of course looked back to the examples of the old Reformers, and were led to remark on the "*Fathers of the Church*" as unwisely followed by some.

The very circumstance of our laying down a Rule of Faith, may have confirmed you in the supposition that we had *organized a Church*. But our object—though perhaps every one of us looked beyond this—yet our *immediate object* was only to establish a clear mutual understanding, and adopt an unerring, unmistakable *guide* as to our own course, as united in this Association for certain limited specific purposes. If we had, *in fact*, united for Church purposes, not one of us would ever have thought of designating our union a "*Society*." Our object is quite distinct from such. The Association in respect to whose formation we communicated with you—requesting at the same time, among other things, that you would favor us with your opinion of the name adopted—is merely a *society of men*, who are *believers*; and it has been "instituted for the *purpose of meeting* for *conference and prayer*." And as regards the nature of our Conferences, as stated on our Record, "we have it in view to promulgate correct views of the Gospel plan of salvation; to expose the popular errors; and to aid and encourage one another in the work."

In respect to your remarks on names of churches, we have only to observe, that, as we have never hitherto discussed such points, we shall not enter

upon them now. The explanation here given will be sufficient to enable us to appear as we are. Had the idea of any such misapprehension occurred, we might have guarded against it, and thus have saved you some trouble. But I must protest that such oversight did not proceed from "*haste*." I rather avoided making my letter very long. But certainly I had time enough to attend to matters of such importance. Your printer makes me say, in concluding, "*Yours in haste*." There is no "haste" in my letter. I have a copy on my desk. My words are—"Yours in the Lord." In my signature, you have an R. before "Sec. Ref. Prot. Society"; but there is no such R. in my letter, nor ought there to be.

We continue to enjoy the Examiner, for every month we have a feast of good things. We cannot just now enter into any particular comment. But such is the general excellence of these works that we are constrained to cry, *more! more! give us more!*

Wishing you an increased circulation, and many advantages in your new location, with abundance of Christian unity and love to comfort and encourage you in your labors, I am, dear brother,

Yours, in the Lord,

HENRY BALDWIN, JUNR.,

Sec. Ref. Prot. Society, Lewiston Falls, Me.

SPIRIT RAPPERS.

Br. Storrs.—At the request of an acquaintance, I went last night to a meeting held for the *pious* purpose of inculcating the theory of "Spiritual Manifestations," so much talked of.

It was held in the Methodist Church in Sixteenth Street, where they have been regularly held for some six weeks. The pastor of the church was present, and opened the meeting by reading the 90th Psalm, after which he prayed. Among other things, he prayed that they might be guided by the counsel of the Lord, &c. What connection the counsel of the Lord has with spirit rappings, unless he lead men away from them, I cannot tell.

After this came experiences, speeches, &c. Their arguments seemed to me to be as weighty as feathers and strong as ropes of sand. As an instance, I can only refer you to the argument of one of the speakers against the idea that these manifestations were of Satanic origin. He said, we must judge by their fruits; and as they sent a woman in Auburn out with a loaf of bread to feed a poor woman and her hungry child in the street; and also told a rumseller in Springfield, Mass., to stop selling grog and send his children to Sunday school, therefore, they must be good spirits!! I will not weary you with farther remarks only to say, that any lawyer might have told the man to stop selling liquor there, especially as the "Maine Law" is in force throughout Massachusetts. H. S. H.

New York, August 25th, '52.

REMARKS BY THE EDITOR.—We insert the foregoing just to let our readers see the madness to which the natural immortal-soul theory will lead men, otherwise wise and intelligent. Here is a "Pastor" of a church, meeting with, and opening by prayer the meeting of a company of men who assemble to consult "familiar spirits," which God abhors; and against the practice of which he has denounced the judgments of heaven. Yet steeped in the false notion that dead men are conscious—because immortal—and can communicate with the living, this Pastor can profane the name of Jehovah by using it to sanctify this jumble of folly, deception, madness, hypocrisy, and wickedness. For all this is "Spirit Rapping." Their professions of regard for goodness or the Bible, have just as much truth in them as any other transformation of "Satan into an angel of light." Touch them with the spear of God's truth, *viz:* "The dead know not anything—there is *no knowledge* in *sheol*"—the state of death: that "the dead praise not the Lord;" and a multitude of scriptures of like character, and you will quickly see their reverence for the Bible and good things changed for the "cloven-foot," and the belching out of the *hate* they feel for that blessed volume of inspiration which condemns them and their wicked consultations of familiar spirits.

We say these things not expecting to benefit or reclaim those who are clean gone into this snare of the devil; but to warn those "who have not known the depths of Satan, as they speak;" Rev. 2: 24: and to put men on their guard lest they are taken in this "strong delusion, that they should believe a lie," and so "all be damned who believe not the truth" of *life only through* Christ: for "this is the record, (or testimony) that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is *in his Son;*" not in *ourselves*, as the lying rapping spirits affirm; and thus like their prototype---the Serpent---give God the lie. They love goodness! They love the Bible!! They good spirits!!! Just as good as Satan himself and no better. Beware of the natural immortal-soul theory---its the road to spirit rapping, and hence the road to death.

TRUTH AND FICTION.----The corrospondent of an exchange paper, speaking of the death of a sister, says---"Who entered into life, most triumphantly * * *, and whose death was noticed in the ———."

The *truth* of this notice is, that "*death*" was her lot. The "*fiction*" is, that she "*entered into life*," at death, "most triumphantly"! We think she will "sleep in the dust of the earth" till Christ returns "*from* heaven;" at which time we trust she may *enter* "into life most triumphantly." *Then*, and not till then, does the Bible teach that any saint will enter *into life*, or *triumph* over death. *Then*, when "death is swallowed up in victory"----when "this mortal shall put on immortality," and this corruptible shall have put on incorruption----*then* shall be brought to pass the saying *that is written*. Death is swallowed up in victory;" 1 Cor. 15: 53, 54. This, let it be observed, *is not at* "*death*," but "*at the last trump*:" 1 Cor. 15: 52.

"The Thousand Years Past."—We have been asked, "Why don't you say something on the thousand years past question?"

Answer.—Because we have really regarded that theory as so *palpable* an absurdity that it was unworthy a notice. We really think its manifest contrariety to *fact* and *Scripture* is so self-evident that it would be as useless to reason on the subject, with a believer of the theory, as an attempt to prove that midnight darkness was not noonday. We can no more believe the thousand years are in the past, than we can believe the reign of Satan and that of Christ are identical; or that the largest portion of the prophecies have utterly failed. Therefore, we have no controversy with any man about it. We trust the "second thoughts" of the *unpledged* ones will set them right. We have witnessed the anguish of spirit some of the "*pledged*" ones have felt when the truth of God has forced them to see their favorite theory of the millennium past, shaken to its foundation. But we spare them.

———o———

Postage Reduced.—We are glad to be able to announce that the National Legislature, at the close of its last session, modified the Post Office law, by which the postage on all *printed* matter is greatly *reduced*. All newspapers weighing less than *three ounces*, will pay only *one cent* each, when sent to any part of the United States; and, if pre-paid by the year or quarter, at the office where they are mailed, they will be sent at *half* this rate. The yearly postage on the *Bible Examiner* is hence reduced to *twelve* cents; and to any part of the State of New York to *six* cents.

Any *single* printed article, or pamphlet, not weighing over *three* ounces, can be sent to any part of the United States for *one cent*. "Pamphlets not containing more than sixteen octavo pages each, when sent in single packages, weighing at least *eight* ounces, to *one address*, and *pre-paid* by affixing postage stamps thereto, shall be charged only *half of a cent* for each ounce or fraction of an ounce."

If we understand this last item of the new law, all our *Tracts* are now subject to *one cent* postage each, unless at least eight ounces are ordered to one address at one time; in that case the eight ounces will be subject to only *four* cents postage if pre-paid.

"The postage on all transient matter shall be pre-paid by stamps or otherwise, or shall be charged *double* the rates first above mentioned."

"Books, bound or unbound, not weighing over four pounds . . . shall be chargeable with one cent an ounce for all distances under 3000 miles, to which fifty per cent shall be added in all cases when not pre-paid."

The *pamphlets* and *tracts*, it will be seen, when not pre-paid, are charged double the pre-paid rates; books only *one-half* more. The law goes into effect October first, so that all who now send to us for books, pamphlets, tracts, &c., can do as they please about sending the amount of postage to have it pre-paid. It is *cheaper* to send and have the postage pre-paid; but *safer* to leave it to be paid on being delivered. Our friends can take which course they please. They have already the weight of each of our works on the covers of the double number for May and June, also August and September.

———o———

Ham's Works.—Those excellent Examiners, containing Ham's works, can now be sent to any part of the United States for *one cent* postage per copy, if pre-paid; or for two cents, if not. We, therefore, offer to send *eight* copies of either of those works, and pre-pay the postage ourself, for one dollar, current money, sent us free of expense. Let them now be scattered; they are doing, and will do, a glorious work. We have just issued a second edition of the "Generations Gathered and Gathering, or the Scripture Doctrine of Man in Death." It's just the work to stop the mouths of the lying "spirit-rappers," and arm honest minds against the soul-ruining "manifestation." There is no time to sleep, if we would save men from "believing a lie," to which many are being given up, that "they all might be damned who believed not the truth" of *life only in Christ;* for "this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and *this life is in his Son.*" John, 5: 11. It is not in man himself; and any "spirit" that saith it is, is convicted of being a *lying one.* Touch the "rapping spirits" with the spear of God's word, and you will quickly see their "cloven foot," or their entire contempt of the Bible.

———o———

"Ancient Teetotalism." Such is the title of a work just received from Dr. Frederick Lees, Leeds, England, author of various works on Temperance, of great value. The work before us is one of deep research, and proves, "without contradiction, in every age of the world there has been a total abstinence movement." It should be republished by the friends of Temperance in this country, and widely circulated. It contains 16 pages octavo.

Dr. Lees is about issuing his Works, Original and Collected, with a Portrait of the Author. The entire edition, in 3 vols. post octavo, bound and lettered to subscribers, 16s. Vols. 1 and 2 will form the first, or Temperance Series, including the Discussions and Essays on Diet, Temperance, Physiology, and the Scriptural Wine Question. Price to subscribers, 10s. The second, or "Truth-Seeker" Series, containing the Philosophical and Exegetical Essays, and a Popular System of Logic, or the Method, Means, and Matter of Argument, will form Vol. 3, price 6s. After the Works are issued, the three volumes will only be obtainable *together*, price 21s. Will Dr. Lees send us the "Second, or Truth-Seeker Series" in Parts, as they are issued?