and definite transition from one state to another, and without the intervention of any miraculous agency.

With regard to the second opinion, I must define what I understand by the expression, "The coming of the Lord;" as also the "expecting," or "looking for," that event; and lastly, the entire expression, "Expecting the coming of the Lord at any time."

By the expression, "the coming of the Lord," I understand the removal of the Lord, in his bodily presence, from the heavens to this earth. When the angel declares that the same Jesus who was taken into heaven, should so come, in like manner as the apostles had seen Him go into heaven, we must understand "going" and "coming" in an analogous sense, namely, the removal of the Lord's bodily presence from one place to another. If, then, it undoubtedly sometimes has this meaning, why should not the word "coming," when applied to Christ, be as uniformly understood in its simple meaning as when applied to others? If any other than the common and natural sense of the words be affirmed, that uncommon meaning must be an exception, and it rests with those who maintain the peculiar view, to prove each particular instance.

When it is said, "certain came to Antioch *from* Judea," it is not thought necessary to prove that this denoted the removal of men in their bodily presence from one place to another. So in saying "we look for Christ *from* heaven," it is not necessary to prove that this expression implies a removal of his bodily presence from heaven to this earth.

Paul gave directions to Silas and Timotheus to come to him, and he *waited for* them at Athens; it would be unnecessary to set about proving that he expected their bodily presence; so, when it is said that we *wait for* God's Son *from* heaven, we need not prove that we mean the removal of his bodily presence from heaven to this earth.

I must next define what I understand by the expressions "expecting," or "looking for," and "waiting for." They do not only imply loving the appearing, but they embrace something more; we might say, by way of illustration, that Rhoda loved the appearing of Peter, but she did not expect him, therefore she opened not the gate for gladness; but "the people [gladly] received Christ, *for they were waiting* for him."

That this is the natural and proper meaning of the expressions, may be gathered from their use on other occasions. The impotent folk around Bethesda were *waiting* for the moving of the waters; doubtless they wished for the appearance of the angel, but had they known that he would not have descended for a thousand years, they would not have been waiting. St. Paul, in like manner, "looked for," or expected Timothy to come with the brethren.

Nor are we to suppose the sense of these expressions altered when applied to the advent of Christ. When Simeon *waited* for the consolation of Israel, it is clear that he supposed the advent was possible at any moment. In like manner when "all the people were *in expectation*, and mused in their hearts whether John was the Christ," surely it implies they were in expectation, because they supposed that the advent of Christ drew near. John sent to ask Jesus whether he was the Christ, or whether they should *look* for another; John looked for the Messiah, knowing that the time of his advent was at hand. So I understand, with respect to the second coming, the expressions "waiting for," and "looking for," do not admit of a meaning which would put the possibility of Messiah's return beyond the period of a natural life; but "expecting" implies not only a possibility, but a probability within that time.

When it is said, "We may be expecting the coming of the Lord at any time," I conceive we must distinguish "the coming of the Lord" from expressions denoting the moment of the revelation of Jesus Christ, or of the rapture of the saints; doubtless these events are part of the coming, but they are momentary. The coming, I apprehend, embraces a series of events.

This may be illustrated by the circumstances of the first advent. From what day should we date that event? Either from the annunciation to Zacharias, or to the Virgin: from the birth of John, or the day in which the Saviour was born; from the commencement of John's ministry, or the time when "Jesus himself began, being about thirty years of age?" Some might urge the time of the conception, or, at any rate, of the birth of Christ, and they might quote in support the prophecy of Isaiah, "Behold the Virgin shall conceive and bring forth a son." And surely they would say, when embraced by Simeon in the temple, according to revelation, and worshipped by the magi as true-born king of the Jews, it must be acknowledged that the Lord Christ was come. Yet against this it might be advanced that the advent could not be dated before the ministry of John, because John was to "go before him," that is, in his ministry; for it was to be "in the spirit and power of Elias to turn the hearts of the fathers, &c." John, therefore, in his ministry, speaks of Christ's advent as yet future. And as to the prophecies, it appears clear that when Daniel speaks of Messiah the Prince, he refers to his entrance upon his public ministry.

How are we to reconcile these things? I think the fair answer would be, that the whole series of events must be embraced in "the coming of Christ." The first of them cannot be excluded from that category, yet the advent was not complete before the last. In some instances one event might be referred to, as when our Lord said, "The law and the prophets were until John;" that I apprehend related to the commencement of John's ministry; on other occasions there seems a delay until after the ministry of John was concluded; as, for example, when it is said, "Now, when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison, he departed into Galilee," in order to fulfill Isa. ix. 1, 2.

In like manner, with respect to the second advent, it need not be limited to the moment in which the Lord shall be revealed as a flash of lightning, but may embrace a series of events issuing inevitably in that awful and glorious result. When that series shall commence is uncertain and contingent, and therefore known to no one but the Father; but this much negative information we may have: until the series does commence, we may know that the brightness of Christ's presence is not impending; and, on the other hand, when that series shall begin, we may expect that all will be quickly accomplished, although the particular hour when the elect shall be caught up to meet the Lord will even then be unknown. When, therefore, it is said that we are to expect the coming of Christ at any time, I conceive the commencement of a series of events, having relation to the progress of the Lord, and terminating in the revelation of Jesus Christ, is intended.

Now to revert to the two opinions as thus defined, the former has the advantage of not militating directly against any article of our creeds; but this arises rather from ambiguity than from correctness; for though probably there is error in both of these

seizing the spirit of a passage which is superior to any rules that can rigidly be laid down.

The question of spiritual interpretation is more complicated; its advocates should more rigidly define its nature.

Often there is a covert assumption of superiority in the claim for spiritual interpretation, which surely is not correct; for if the literal be the mind of the spirit, that undoubtedly is the most spiritual: our invention is not more free from dross than God's truth. There is also an injustice in the assumption: 'spiritual' is ostensibly opposed to "literal," but the real opposite to "spiritual" is "carnal;" thus the claimant of spiritual views, whilst apparently opposing "literal," does covertly and unconsciously to his opponent, fix the stigma of "carnal" on that which is "literal."

Sometimes *spiritual* appears opposed to *material*, upon which I will quote some excellent observations of Mr. Brown; he speaks of "some tincture of that morbid spiritualism which shrinks from the very touch of materialism, as though separation from it in every form would be the consummation of happiness. May not," says he, "the gnostic element—of the essential sinfulness and vanity of matter—be found lurking beneath it? Certainly, the glorified bodies, both of the Redeemer and the redeemed, derive their elements from the dust of the ground." And if it be no degradation for the Son of God to take it into his own person * * * if the dust of this ground is capable of becoming a *spiritual* and *glorious* meet vehicle for the perfected and beautified spirit, the sharer of its bliss in the immediate presence, and the instrument of all its activities in the service of God and the Lamb, there can be no essential sinfulness and vanity in matter.

I wish I could always approve as fully of Mr. Brown's sentiments; but among the many fallacies which lurk under the term *spiritual*, as describing a peculiar mode of interpretation, one of its most dangerous forms is, as far as I know, peculiar to Mr. Brown. He supposes that the inspired prophets use an expression in one sense, but that the equally infallible apostles apply another meaning to the passage. If this be a sound canon of interpretation, instead of deriving any aid from the New Testament in fixing the direct and immediate scope of the old, it would be calculated to mislead us; instead of the context in the Old assisting us in discovering the recondite sense of the quotation in the New Testament, it would blind us.

Sometimes the *spiritual* amounts to nothing more than the undefined. "A spirit passed before my face" * * * "it stood still, but I could not discern the form thereof: an image [was] before mine eyes." Sometimes the spiritual means the allegorical, analogical, or anagogetical. The spiritual principle is, in fact, multiform, for its real intention and object is evasion. If the literal system is adopted, certain interpretations must be admitted: and this constitutes the essential difference between the two modes; in the spiritual method, the preconceived ideas form an ingredient in fixing the meaning of the words, instead of the words being the means of suggesting, or channel for conveying, the ideas.

Thus the real intention of spiritual interpretation, and that which is its essential characteristic, is its real danger, for the same principle may be applied to the setting aside of any truth. There is, in fact, an end put to "the assurance of understanding," for the certainty of interpretation is derived from some necessity of signification, and the necessity of signification in words consists in the connection between the words and ideas which has been fixed and established by usage and custom.

"There cannot be a doubt, that, in proportion as sacred hermeneutics come to be more severely studied, and perversions of the word of God hereditarily kept up under the specious garb of spirituality and a more profound understanding of Scripture, are discovered and exposed, the necessity of abandoning such slippery and untenable grounds will be recognised, and the plain, simple, grammatical, and natural species of interpretation adopted and followed." —*Henderson, Minor Prophets*, p. x.

Definitions.—The study of unfulfilled prophecy is divided into two distinct heads. One, the doctrine concerning the future; the other, the order and series of those events which occur during this dispensation, as introductory to the next.

Passing events leave a very different impression upon the mind according to what the expectation of the final issue may be; they receive their hue from the clouds in the distant horizon. Those who expect the prevalence of the Gospel, see in the efforts of Missionary and Bible Societies, as in the rosy streaks of morn, the dawning of a day, lovely and serene; whereas, others, who believe the year of the redeemed will be ushered in by the day of vengeance of our God, discern that the sky is not only red but lowering, and they expect "a day of darkness and of gloominess, of clouds and thick darkness, as the morning spread upon the mountains." Hence, as the development expected has so great an influence upon the aspect of events which are in progress, the consideration of the end should be the first in order, as it is in importance.

It would be difficult to state all the different shades of opinion which are entertained respecting the future, but they may be classed under two principal heads:—

Some expect a universal spread of the Gospel for a thousand years before the close of this dispensation, at the expiration of which they place the general resurrection and the day of judgment, when Jesus will come and cast the wicked into hell, take the righteous back with Him to heaven, and annihilate the earth.

The opposite opinion is that we are to expect the advent of our Lord at any time; that when He comes, He takes the throne of David, and reigns upon earth for a thousand years; that the saints rise and reign with him; during which time the power of Satan is entirely controlled; though at the end of the thousand years, the evil one will be loosed for a short time; after which the wicked shall be raised and judged; the saints removed to heaven, and the earth destroyed.

The "universal spread of the Gospel" corresponds with the language of the prophet, who says, "The earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea." When it is said, this shall be for a thousand years, I do not believe the advocates of this view insist that it shall be for that exact time, neither more nor less; for some make it to mean much more, others perhaps comprise the progress of the Gospel in this period. By saying it will be "before the close of this dispensation," I understand it to be supposed that this state of things will be brought about by means similar to those at present in operation; such as the preaching of the word and the distribution of the Scriptures; but that these efforts will be more enlarged, and probably much more extensively blessed, by an increased outpouring of the Holy Spirit; the change, however, being more or less gradual, not marked by a sudden

and definite transition from one state to another, and without the intervention of any miraculous agency.

With regard to the second opinion, I must define what I understand by the expression, "The coming of the Lord;" as also the "expecting," or "looking for," that event; and lastly, the entire expression, "Expecting the coming of the Lord at any time."

By the expression, "the coming of the Lord," I understand the removal of the Lord, in his bodily presence, from the heavens to this earth. When the angel declares that the same Jesus who was taken into heaven, should so come, in like manner as the apostles had seen Him go into heaven, we must understand "going" and "coming" in an analogous sense, namely, the removal of the Lord's bodily presence from one place to another. If, then, it undoubtedly sometimes has this meaning, why should not the word "coming," when applied to Christ, be as uniformly understood in its simple meaning as when applied to others? If any other than the common and natural sense of the words be affirmed, that uncommon meaning must be an exception, and it rests with those who maintain the peculiar view, to prove each particular instance.

When it is said, "certain came to Antioch *from* Judea," it is not thought necessary to prove that this denoted the removal of men in their bodily presence from one place to another. So in saying "we look for Christ *from* heaven," it is not necessary to prove that this expression implies a removal of his bodily presence from heaven to this earth.

Paul gave directions to Silas and Timotheus to come to him, and he *waited for* them at Athens; it would be unnecessary to set about proving that he expected their bodily presence; so, when it is said that we *wait for* God's Son *from* heaven, we need not prove that we mean the removal of his bodily presence from heaven to this earth.

I must next define what I understand by the expressions "expecting," or "looking for," and "waiting for." They do not only imply loving the appearing, but they embrace something more; we might say, by way of illustration, that Rhoda loved the appearing of Peter, but she did not expect him, therefore she opened not the gate for gladness; but "the people [gladly] received Christ, *for they were waiting* for him."

That this is the natural and proper meaning of the expressions, may be gathered from their use on other occasions. The impotent folk around Bethesda were *waiting* for the moving of the waters; doubtless they wished for the appearance of the angel, but had they known that he would not have descended for a thousand years, they would not have been waiting. St. Paul, in like manner, "looked for," or expected Timothy to come with the brethren.

Nor are we to suppose the sense of these expressions altered when applied to the advent of Christ. When Simeon *waited* for the consolation of Israel, it is clear that he supposed the advent was possible at any moment. In like manner when "all the people were *in expectation*, and mused in their hearts whether John was the Christ," surely it implies they were in expectation, because they supposed that the advent of Christ drew near. John sent to ask Jesus whether he was the Christ, or whether they should *look* for another; John looked for the Messiah, knowing that the time of his advent was at hand. So I understand, with respect to the second coming, the expressions "waiting for," and "looking for," do not admit of a meaning which would put the possibility of Messiah's return beyond the period of a natural life; but "expecting" implies not only a possibility, but a probability within that time.

When it is said, "We may be expecting the coming of the Lord at any time," I conceive we must distinguish "the coming of the Lord" from expressions denoting the moment of the revelation of Jesus Christ, or of the rapture of the saints; doubtless these events are part of the coming, but they are momentary. The coming, I apprehend, embraces a series of events.

This may be illustrated by the circumstances of the first advent. From what day should we date that event? Either from the annunciation to Zacharias, or to the Virgin: from the birth of John, or the day in which the Saviour was born; from the commencement of John's ministry, or the time when "Jesus himself began, being about thirty years of age?" Some might urge the time of the conception, or, at any rate, of the birth of Christ, and they might quote in support the prophecy of Isaiah, "Behold the Virgin shall conceive and bring forth a son." And surely they would say, when embraced by Simeon in the temple, according to revelation, and worshipped by the magi as true-born king of the Jews, it must be acknowledged that the Lord Christ was come. Yet against this it might be advanced that the advent could not be dated before the ministry of John, because John was to "go before him," that is, in his ministry; for it was to be "in the spirit and power of Elias to turn the hearts of the fathers, &c." John, therefore, in his ministry, speaks of Christ's advent as yet future. And as to the prophecies, it appears clear that when Daniel speaks of Messiah the Prince, he refers to his entrance upon his public ministry.

How are we to reconcile these things? I think the fair answer would be, that the whole series of events must be embraced in "the coming of Christ." The first of them cannot be excluded from that category, yet the advent was not complete before the last. In some instances one event might be referred to, as when our Lord said, "The law and the prophets were until John;" that I apprehend related to the commencement of John's ministry; on other occasions there seems a delay until after the ministry of John was concluded; as, for example, when it is said, "Now, when Jesus had heard that John was cast into prison, he departed into Galilee," in order to fulfill Isa. ix. 1, 2.

In like manner, with respect to the second advent, it need not be limited to the moment in which the Lord shall be revealed as a flash of lightning, but may embrace a series of events issuing inevitably in that awful and glorious result. When that series shall commence is uncertain and contingent, and therefore known to no one but the Father; but this much negative information we may have: until the series does commence, we may know that the brightness of Christ's presence is not impending; and, on the other hand, when that series shall begin, we may expect that all will be quickly accomplished, although the particular hour when the elect shall be caught up to meet the Lord will even then be unknown. When, therefore, it is said that we are to expect the coming of Christ at any time, I conceive the commencement of a series of events, having relation to the progress of the Lord, and terminating in the revelation of Jesus Christ, is intended.

Now to revert to the two opinions as thus defined, the former has the advantage of not militating directly against any article of our creeds; but this arises rather from ambiguity than from correctness; for though probably there is error in both of these

statements, the latter appears to be nearer the truth than the former, because the whole difference may be resolved into the order of events; and in this respect I conceive the second view to be correct. The advocates of both opinions expect glorious things in the latter days; they both acknowledge that Jesus Christ will return to this earth some time or other; but the one party are "waiting for the coming of our Lord"—they are, in the first place, "expecting the glorious appearing of our great God and Saviour," and a restitution of all things consequent upon that event; whereas the others are expecting that the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord for a thousand years before the day of the Lord: they, therefore, deny the pre-millennial advent of Christ; for one cannot believe two things which are essentially opposed to each other. It would be an abuse of the rational intellect to suppose a man could be in constant expectation of the Lord's advent, and, at the same time, be looking for a thousand years of blessedness to precede that event. A man could not sincerely contemplate the probability of both hypothesis being correct, for one expectation is utterly destructive of the other. We will then assume, as a matter of course, that one who looks for a spiritual millenium is not waiting for the appearing of Jesus Christ.

There are, therefore, two great heads of inquiry—is a spiritual millennium consistent with the character of this present dispensation?—or, on the other hand, is the speedy coming of our Lord a scriptural expectation?—*Finished Mystery.*

UNIVERSALISM.

BY MRS. C. C. WILLIAMS.

[Continued from page 6.]

As to wherein God is impartial shall be next considered. Paul gives the Prophet's description of mankind as a whole, naturally, or while under the law, or sin. Rom. 3: 9–18; and in view of it, he asks, are we (who call ourselves Jews) any better than the Gentiles? No—in no wise; for we have before proved both, under sin, (Rom. 3: 9;) and he tells what he means by being under sin, or the law, by describing the state all are in naturally; and the law (inasmuch as it prohibits the indulgence of these vicious propensities) saith these things to them who are under the law, that every mouth may be stopped and all the world become guilty before God. 19. Here is common ground—a levelling doctrine—universal brotherhood. Paul said true when he said the animal or natural was first. 1 Cor. 15: 46. Here, and thus, the grace of God finds man. God neither asks nor expects any of his creatures to please him in this state, because the animal or carnal mind inherited from the first Adam is enmity against God, it is not subject to his laws, neither indeed can be, so that they that are in the flesh cannot please God. Rom. 8: 7–8. But if we are led by the spirit we are not under the law, (and if not, we are of course,) Gal. 5: 18; so that everything that is past is freely and impartially remitted through the forbearance of God to all that believe on Jesus Christ or receive the love of the truth, and they are justified fully by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. Rom. 8: 23–25. Here at this point, viz: when accountability and responsibility commences, we can cast ourselves on the free grace of God, and can do no other way. For what can any one say of themselves more or better than Paul said of himself and companions when speaking of their past course of life, when he said, For we ourselves also (as well as you) were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceiving, and being deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice, and envy, hateful and hating one another. Titus 3: 3. Needing parental authority and restraint, and when, out of the reach of that, the law to keep them within bounds, just as all do now, else the earth would soon be one vast field of violence, riot and hate, as it was before the flood, before the law was given with the power to enforce them. Rom. 5: 13. Hence the great advantage every way in having the oracles of God committed to us, (Rom. 3: 2,) to teach unerringly the right way, and bring us to Christ, (Gal. 3: 24;) for when any one comes to love God, and submits to be led by his spirit, they can govern themselves. Thus he says, After that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy, he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost. Titus 3: 4–5. Now man can be righteous in the sight of God, and God can be just in justifying the believer—boasting is excluded, (Rom. 3: 25–27,) because no one can do anything to merit this grace, for nothing but faith gives access into this grace wherein we stand and rejoice in hope of the glory of God. Rom. 5: 2. This faith in the promise of eternal life, which was promised before the world began, (Titus 1: 2;) and its attendant blessings will kindle a hope which will do for those that exercise it what the law cannot, viz: it makes perfect (Heb. 7: 19) by enabling them to purify themselves as God is pure, (1 John 3: 3,) so as to be fit ultimately for this glory.

Here I want to be understood. It will not do to come down on a death-bed and then cast ourselves on the free grace of God, though I would not limit his mercy. Yet it can only safely be done while capable of bearing arms against the foes of right: for after entering the ranks under the captain of our salvation, our fidelity must be tested, our faith must be tried, temptations must be encountered and overcome before one can expect to be promoted to the dignity of being admitted into the society of the pure—and there is no chance for either when past all opportunity. The crown of righteousness, which is eternal life, is promised only to those who have fought well, (2 Tim. 4: 8,) or endured temptation. James 1: 12. We must, like our captain, be made perfect through suffering, not for our sins, which were freely remitted at the outset of the race, but for the sake of right, if need be. No questions are asked any one, who sues to Jesus for mercy, as to the nature of his offences beforehand; his word to supplicants, however vile, is "go sin no more." So we see an impartial administration of favors to any one who will deign to accept them.

A third error is in making no distinction between the transgressions under the first and second, or new testament, or covenant; or in other words no distinction is made between what defiles man and what condemns him to death.

Paul says, because the blood of Christ who through the eternal spirit offered himself without spot to God, purges the conscience from dead works, (or works which, if persevered in, would bring us to death, for sin, when it is finished, brings forth death,) to serve the living God. For this cause (viz: because it cleanses from all sin) he is the Mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions under the first testament, that they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. Heb. 9: 14. Now the

question is, in what does transgressions under the first testament consist? We see it cannot be applied to anything exclusively Jewish, from the language, "they which are called," for Gentiles as well as Jews are called, and will receive an eternal inheritance. Jesus tells what these transgressions are when he tells what defiles man, viz: evil thoughts, adulteries, &c. Paul also tells when he quotes the Prophet's description of mankind naturally, or while under sin or the law, (Rom. 3: 10–18,) as he does also in describing his own condition formerly. Titus 3: 3. Jesus said, "whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin." Paul says to his Roman brethren, who were converted Gentiles, Rom. 1: 13, "Sin shall not have dominion over you, because ye are not under the law, but under grace." Rom. 6: 14. Here let me observe, much confusion and difficulty arises to prevent an understanding of much of the scripture teachings by imperfect and incorrect notions about the law which is so much talked of, and by not understanding what it is that is done away, and when. The priesthood was then changed, and the laws connected therewith were changed necessarily (Heb. 7: 12) at the same time, viz: when our great High Priest ascended into the heavens, and was honored of God by having the everlasting Priesthood conferred upon him. These carnal ordinances, &c., imposed on thom till the time of reformation, or changing of the priesthood, (Heb. 9: 10,) were blotted out—nailed to the cross. Col. 2: 14–16. They were no longer needed. Christ being come, such shadows and illustrations were senseless. But none of these obselete things were parts or parcels of the royal law, (James 2: 8,) which is the basis of the moral code. Matt. 22: 30. And it is confounding these laws of commandments contained in ordinances (Eph. 2: 15) with the moral code or ten commandments and the principles of right which they involve, which are binding on all his creatures, (inasmuch as love to God and our neighbor can require nothing less,) that does the mischief, for all seeem to be included and swept away together.

To resume. It seems, then, according to Jesus' teachings, we are either servants of sin, or free—or according to Paul, all are under the law or sin, (Rom. 3: 9,) till they submit to be led by the spirit, when they are no longer under the law. Gal. 5: 18. So that it is an individual doing away, Christ being the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. Rom. 10: 4. It is "faith that gives access into this grace," and there being but two alternatives or conditions, every individual must be in one or the other of these two cases. In the one case, restraint of some kind, amounting to law, is necessary to keep one in subjection, and the law was added with power to enforce it for this purpose. Gal. 3: 19. The royal law which bound man to love God and his neighbor, (individuals being then amenable to God alone,) was found insufficient except in a few instances to tame man and secure order, as all experience had proved before the introduction of the moral code—hence the necessity of having the royal law defined, and its obligations specified and enforced, Rom. 5: 13; so that those who would not fear, love and obey God, might fear man, and thus society be preserved. The faith that works by love purifies the hearts of those who are led by the spirit, so that laws are not needed to keep them in order, there being no law against the fruits of the spirit. Jesus said all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost or Spirit of Truth shall not be forgiven unto men, neither in this world, neither in the world to come, Matt. 12: 31–32; and he has so distinguished the two worlds that none need make any mistake as to what he means. In this world they marry and give in marriage, and in the world to come they do not. So it is this world yet, though Jerusalem be destroyed. Furthermore, he said, those that did not believe on him were condemned already, and the wrath of God abideth on them, for they thereby reject the only means which will enable them to cleanse themselves from those things which Jesus says defiles, and, as a matter of course, would be dangerous members of society if restraint should be removed. In Heb. 10: 26–31, we may learn what transgressions under or against the second covenant we have to fear. Hence we see that the works of the flesh (Gal. 5: 19–21) are transgressions of the first class, and rejecting light and truth those of the second class.

A fourth error is mistaking the danger from which Jesus died to deliver us. Mr. Ballou says, "by the work of salvation we mean entire gradual process, by which, under God, the human mind or soul emerges from a state of imbecility, ignorance and error, sin and guilt, into an exalted state of knowledge, holiness, and happiness."

To say nothing of the fallacy of thinking to save the mind of man without the man—mind being the result of the "inspiration of the Almighty, giving man understanding"—I always thought salvation implied deliverance from some apparent and impending danger, but in this most important of all cases, I see none, without virtually admitting eternal misery, for I see no possible danger of the wicked continuing long in their sins—and the more wicked the less the danger, for they come to their end the sooner. Neither can I see any chance for the wicked to be workers together with God, unless Satan is employed to cast out Satan, because, that nothing remains to be done, if they, too, are raised and are then as the angels, as Jesus said those would be who were worthy to obtain that world and the resurrection from the dead. But Jesus said, "This is the will of him that sent me, that every one that seeth the Son and believeth on him may have everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day." John 6: 40. The same idea is again expressed in the 54th verse. John said, "The Son of Man was lifted up that whosoever believeth on him might not perish, but have everlasting life. For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life;" and again, "He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him." John 3: 15–16, 36. Here I see danger, and this more than anything else has kept me heretofore from being a Universalist, though I thought perishing meant eternal life in misery. Death, perishing, is to be shunned. And how? Jesus says, if any man keeps my saying, (wherever that man may be found, for God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness, is accepted of him,) he shall not see death; and when he talks of death, it is in opposition to the life he came to bestow on the righteous. The righteous sleep. Natural death is not the wages of sin any more than natural life is the reward of righteousness. Let us learn and remember that by means of death on the part of Jesus, the race of man is redeemed from the transgressions under the first testament, seeing they cannot help their nature, which subjects them to death, which amounts to a virtual resurrection for all, else Jesus has not abolished death, or made it null, as Paul said, 2 Tim. 1:

10. So that there remains nothing about natural death now to arouse our fears, seeing Jesus has the keys of death and the grave, and so far as that is concerned, there is nothing about it that is any bar to any one enjoying future life. It being something which can neither be controlled nor averted, as we are descended from him who was of the earth, earthy—from corruptible seed, (1 Peter 1: 23,) and as a matter of course are corruptible—all are freely redeemed from it by him who came for that very purpose, (Heb. 9: 15,) else that would have been the end of all, both good and bad. 1 Cor. 15: 18. In this or natural death none have any choice no more than they had of natural life. But every intelligent being is called upon to choose life and good, and to shun death and evil. Christ is "the light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world." Follow that, and it will lead to life—reject it, for the short-lived pleasures of sense, and their end will be like the lower creatures that take the same course, only they follow nature's dictates without choosing their course like man. 2 Peter 2: 12. And the life promised, which is eternal, and death threatened, which is its counterpart, are dependant on our own choice, else language is unintelligible. What fruit, asks Paul, had ye then in those things, whereof ye are now ashamed? for the end of those things is death. Rom. 6: 21. Death unto death. 2 Cor. 2: 16. Or death natural resolved into death eternal. For the resurrection of the wicked being the resurrection of condemnation, and "the wrath of God" abiding on them. Jesus having declared that such shall not see life, there remains no other alternative for the wicked but the blackness of darkness forever. Jude 13.

O! that these two most powerful motives, viz. love of life and fear of death, might occupy their proper place, and be used as levers to help move the ponderous weight of ills that exist towards their eradication. For who can do away with so salutary a restraint to vice as the sacred writers regard death to be, (else they would not warn the wicked to forsake their evil ways to shun it,) and be guiltless? Or who shall presume to add to or change the judgment, which God considers the wicked to be worthy of, (Rom. 1: 32,) into eternal life in misery, and his skirts be clear?

The fifth and last thing I shall notice is mistaking the penalty or confounding those evils which transgressing the laws brings on the transgressor, with the wages of sin, or else confounding the crime with the penalty, by threatening morally dead men as you regard the wicked with moral death.

God loves the world, and giving his Son is proof of it. Infinite wisdom made mankind capable of knowing and choosing good from evil, right from wrong. God says he does not want the wicked to die, but rather they would turn from their evil ways and live. Ezek. 18: 23–32. And as a proof of his sincerity, he has told us plainly what to do to shun it; and his Son told one who asked him what he must do to inherit eternal life, that he must keep the commandments; and in his sermon on the Mount, he told how they must keep them. It must be heart-work, for dishonest purposes, if concealed, the law can take no cognizance of, but God does. Matt. 5: 28–34, 39–44. If, when children, our parents did not restrain us, or if, when we come to act for ourselves, we went astray, ills betided, but these ills though corrective discipline, instead of being the penalty, were loud notes of warning, saying, "turn ye, turn ye, for why will you die? For when lust is conceived, it brings forth sin, and sin, when it is finished, brings forth death." James 1: 15. So that however much may be suffered before death, it is not the penalty or curse, for the wages of sin is death—not moral death, or a continued state of sinning and suffering, for being thus, is why they die.

Now, I leave this with you, and, as an apology for errors, I will just say my study is in the midst of a family of little children, and my time for writing is moments snatched from the time almost exclusively employed in caring for them. If I have not met, or attempted to meet, any fancied objections, it is because I have misapprehended; and if I have said anything that looks reproachful, I have no such feeling. I should be glad, did propriety allow, to notice objections, and also those texts on which your doctrine mainly rests. But I fear to tax your forbearance further. All I ask for this is, the same candor and honesty of interpretation which was evinced in explaining the 6th chapter of Romans, with the exception of your definition of the wages of sin. It being the opposite of eternal life, your explanation of it does not make a very good contrast in point of duration without making eternal misery of it. So it seems to me.

That we may be led into all truth is my earnest desire,

Elmira, N. Y.

PROPHETIC PERIODS.

BY THE EDITOR.

The chronology generally received, and found in the margin of our Bibles, makes the time of "Darius, son of Ahasuerus," to be 538 B. C. In the book of Esther, where we have an account of Ahasuerus, the chronology of Esther's marriage is put at 457 or 458 B. C., and the decree which Haman procured for the destruction of the Jews, is made to be 453 B. C.; that would make it *four years after* the decree of Artaxerxes to Ezra, to "restore and to build Jerusalem," according to the received chronology! Can any man, in his senses, believe that? Look at it. The common chronology necessarily makes Artaxerxes and Ahasuerus the same identical king, for they were both reigning in 457 B. C. Then, according to that chronology, this king marries Esther 457, issues his decree to restore and to build Jerusalem the same year, and in 453, issues another decree, by the instigation of Haman, to have all the Jews in his kingdom destroyed! We ask, if such a combination of events is likely to be true? or, what is still more marvellous, Townsend makes all three of these events to happen in 457! Now mark: Darius of the 9th ch. of Daniel is son of Ahasuerus; and yet, strange to tell, his chronology is put at 538 B. C.; that is, 80 years before Ahasuerus married Esther; thus, if we reckon from this marriage, making the son at least one hundred years older than his father, if we allow Darius to be twenty years old when he came to the throne!

It must be manifest to all, that Ahasuerus reigned *before* the Darius of Daniel 9th, and hence Darius, son of Ahasuerus, was not and could not possibly be "Darius the Median," who "took the kingdom" of Babylon; and therefore, Darius, Daniel 9th, must have been Darius Nothus, who, according to Taylor's Manual of History, p. 66, came to the throne about 424 B. C., and fixes the chronology of Daniel 9th at that period, or 114 years later than the present chronology for that chapter. If this be so, it is equally clear there must be an error in the chronology given to the Cyrus of the Scriptures; for Darius Nothus' reign could not have been 112 years after the first

year of the Scripture Cyrus, as it would be if 536 B. C. was the true chronology of Cyrus. We cannot suppose that Ahasuerus of Esther reigned *after* Cyrus, for several reasons: first, it is not likely that a king immediately after Cyrus' decree to restore and to build Jerusalem, to lay the foundations of the temple, and for the Jews' *return*, would have issued the decree for the Jews' destruction; or, if he had, if that decree did not include the Jews in Judea, it seems improbable that there would have been such mourning and resistance, when they might have removed to Judea under Cyrus' decree and been safe. But again, we find *Mordecai* among those who returned from captivity under Cyrus' decree, Neh. 7: 5–7: "I found a register of the genealogy of them that *came up at the first*," says Nehemiah. In that list he names Mordecai as one "who came with Zerubbabel," (see also Ezra 2: 1–2.) Zerubbabel laid the foundation of the temple under Cyrus' decree, (see Ezra 3: 8–11, and Zech. 4: 9.) Under the decree of Darius Nothus, or the son of Ahasuerus, the temple was finished. Ezra 6: 15. The true state of the matter seems to be this: the Ahasuerus of Esther reigned *before* the Cyrus of the Scriptures, and is possibly the same as "Darius the Median." Artaxerxes I., who *hindered* the work going forward at Jerusalem, reigned next *after* Cyrus; he was succeeded by Darius Nothus, son of Ahasuerus, at which time Daniel had his interview with Gabriel, as recorded Daniel 9th; the next year after that, Darius put forward the building of the temple, according to Cyrus' decree, (see Ezra 5th and 6th,) and the house was finished in the sixth year of his reign, or about 418 B. C. If this be true, then the common chronology makes the decree of Cyrus nearly a century too early; for, at the longest, that decree could not be more than "forty and six years" (see John 2: 20) before the temple was finished, so that Cyrus' decree could not have been earlier than 464 B. C., and probably it was some time later.

It is possible the seventy years *captivity* in Babylon commenced in the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, (see Jer. 25: 1, 11, 12.) The "desolations of Jerusalem" in the nineteenth year of the same king, (see 2 Kings 25: 8–10.) The difference between the commencement of the captivity of the Jews, and the commencement of the desolations of Jerusalem in that case, would be 18 to 20 years; the termination of these two events would therefore be equally distant. The 9th of Daniel speaks of "seventy years *desolations of Jerusalem*," corresponding with the 70 years *indignation* against Jerusalem. (Zech. 1: 12.) This latter Prophet shows that indignation was then *ended* (v. 16) in the second year of Darius, (v. 7.) This corresponds with Dan. 9: 2, where it is evident the 70 years desolations of Jerusalem were *ending;* hence, the decree or command to restore [thy people] and to build Jerusalem, had gone forth about 20 years previous, at the termination of the *captivity;* or, in the first year of Cyrus. Now, as the first year of Darius, son of Ahasuerus, or Darius Nothus, was about 424 B. C., the decree of Cyrus must have been about 444 B. C., if the first year of Nebuchadnezzar is the true date of the commencement of the captivity.

In Dan. 9: 25, Daniel is commanded to "*know* and *understand* that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem," &c. Now, if this communication was made to Daniel B. C. 538, according to the common chronology, that is, before *any decree* had been issued, Daniel did neither "know" nor "understand" "the matter;" for he was just as ignorant "where to begin his reckoning" now, as before Gabriel came, and Gabriel still "fails to accomplish his commission." But if we take the first year of Darius Nothus, then the decree of Cyrus, and no other, had gone forth previously; and Daniel had a definite point of time to commence his reckoning for his 7 weeks and 62 weeks, and would therefore "understand the matter," as Gabriel had enjoined upon him to do. Any other view of the chronology leaves Daniel just as much in the dark as before Gabriel's visit. Archbishop Magee, of Dublin, says—"The decree of Cyrus is obviously the command referred to in Dan. 9: 25."

Dr. Wall says of Archbishop Magee—"In strength of intellect, no writer that ever engaged in the investigation has been found his superior," (in endeavoring to reconcile the language of prophecy with the received chronology.) Yet, his mighty intellect found the reconciliation impossible, and so will every other man who has but one object, viz: *to know what is truth*, without regard to theories.

The decree was to restore [thy people] and to build Jerusalem, therefore it must have been before the first year of Darius; for Jerusalem was at that time inhabited. (See Hag. 1: 4.) In Ezra 4: 12, also, which was before Darius, the building of the city is mentioned. Daniel knew of the decree of Cyrus, and he knew of no other, as we have before remarked, and he had witnessed the return of the Jews, under Zerubbabel, and knew that the "foundations of the temple were laid" by Zerubbabel, and the rebuilding commenced; he must therefore have supposed that the decree of Cyrus was the one Gabriel spoke of. If Gabriel had meant some future and unknown decree, Daniel was rather deceived than informed. When it was demanded of the Jews by what right they proceeded to build the temple, they appealed to the decree of Cyrus, and to no other human authority. (See Ezra 5: 3–16.)

Tertullian, one of the christian writers of the second century, commenced the 70 weeks of Daniel with the first of Darius Nothus, and so did Sulpitius Severus in the fourth century, and both maintained that "Darius, son of Ahasuerus," was Darius Nothus; and the great Joseph Mede dates the 70 weeks from the third of Darius Nothus. Scalliger, Dr. Parry, and Hales, all commence the 70 weeks with Darius Nothus.

How are we to extricate ourselves from the difficulties in which we are involved by conflicting opinions and dates? We are of opinion there is "a way of escape" out of all this confusion, which the *learned* and *unlearned* have thrown around us. We conceive it has arisen from three causes:

First—Making Darius, the Median, and Darius, son of Ahasuerus, to be the same person.

Second—From confounding Cyrus the Great (or *Khosrau*) with the Scripture Cyrus, (or *Coresch.*)

Third—From making the 70 weeks and the 7 weeks and 62 weeks to have a common beginning, as though the 7 and 62 were only a subdivision of the 70. All three of these positions, we think, are erroneous, and we trust to be able to make this appear before we have done with the Prophetic Periods.

Much confusion also has arisen from not observing that there are *two* periods in Babylon and Media, one the 70 years *captivity;* the other the 70 years *desolations of Jerusalem.* We have already spoken of the *possibility* of the captivity commencing with the *first of Nebuchadnezzar*, but are more inclined to the belief that it commenced in the *eighth* year of that king; and that instead of eighteen or twenty years intervening from the captivity to the *desolations* it was only *eleven.*

Ezekiel 40: 1, shows us that the period at which the *Desolations of Jerusalem* commenced is *eleven years* later than the *Captivity;* thus he says—"In the five and twentieth year of our captivity, in the beginning of the year, in the tenth day of the month, in the fourteenth year after that the city was smitten." Compare this with Ezek. 33: 21, where he says:—"It came to pass in the *twelfth* year of our captivity—one that had escaped out of Jerusalem came unto me, saying, *the city is smitten.*" Here then we have demonstration that the time that elapsed from the commencement of the captivity to the desolation of Jerusalem was *eleven* years. But this is not the only proof. In 2 Kings 24 chapter, we learn that "Jehoikim became *servant* to Nebuchadnezzar three years," and "then turned and rebelled against him." Jehoikim died and was succeeded by Jehoiachin, who reigned but *three months*, before he was taken captive by Nebuchadnezzar, in the *eighth year* of the reign of the king of Babylon. (See also Jer. 52: 28.) At this time Nebuchadnezzar "carried away all Jerusalem. and *all the princes* and *all the mighty men of valor*—none remained save the poorer sort of the people of the land." Here. manifestly, is the commencement of the 70 years *captivity* in the *eighth* year of Nebuchadnezzar. Then, in 2 Kings, 25th chap., we have an account of the *desolation* of Jerusalem, and it is stated thus, verses 8 to 10—"In the fifth month on the seventh day of the month, which is the *nineteenth year of king Nebuchadnezzar*, king of Babylon, came Nebuzaradan, captain of the guard, a servant of the king of Babylon, unto Jerusalem; and he *burnt the house of the Lord*, and the king's house, and all the houses of Jerusalem, and every great man's house burnt he with fire—and brake down the walls of Jerusalem round about." Here, then, is a further demonstration that *eleven years* intervened between the captivity and the desolation of Jerusalem; and as 70 years were allotted to *each* of these, we shall find a corresponding termination to the captivity and *desolations.*

The presumption is, that Daniel was among the captives that were carried away with Jehoiachin, in the eighth year of Nebuchadnezzar. We will suppose that he was then *fourteen years* old. If so, he must have been 84 years old in the first year of Cyrus, king of Persia, for that year ended the 70 years *captivity.* (See Ezra 1: 1.) This proclamation is expressly said to be made "that the word of the Lord by the mouth of *Jeremiah* might be fulfilled;" which prophecy related, specially, to the *time* of Judah's captivity. In the first year of Cyrus, then, the 70 years captivity ended—Daniel lived to see it, and to witness the promulgation of Cyrus' proclamation; though being at that time at least 84 years old, he did not go up to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel, Joshua, and their associates. Daniel is alive in the third year of Cyrus, as we learn from Dan. 10: 1, which was the next year after "the foundation of the house of the Lord was laid, (see Ezra 3: 8–11,) "in the third year of Cyrus," probably, the news reached Daniel, in Persia, that "the adversaries of Judah and Benjamin" (see Ezra 4: 1–5,) were plotting to prevent the work going on, which led Daniel to the "mourning" and fasting for "three weeks," recorded in Dan. 10th ch.

Daniel not only lived to see the end of the 70 years captivity, but also to see the end of the "70 years desolations of Jerusalem," [see Dan. 9: 2,] which must have been eleven years later than the first of Cyrus, or the end of the captivity; so that when the desolations ended, which was in the first or second year of Darius, son of Ahasuerus, or Darius Nothus, [compare Daniel 9: 1–2, with Zech. 1: 7, 12, 16,] Daniel must have been at least 95 years old.—The temple, or house of God, was finished in the sixth year of the reign of Darius, at which time Daniel, if living, was 100 years old; it is probable, however, that he had gone to rest before that time.

At the time Daniel had the communication from Gabriel, chap. 9, the *foundation* of the temple had been laid, but the work had been hindered, so that it was still unfinished. And Dr. Townsend, in his chronological arrangement of the Bible, makes this prayer of Daniel, 9th chap., to be during the *suspension* of the rebuilding of the temple; and yet, strange to tell, he falls into the common error of placing that chapter 538 B. C., that is, *before* the temple began to be built, and consequently could not be during the *suspension* of the work.

BIBLE EXAMINER.

PHILADELPHIA, FEBRUARY, 1852.

APPEARED AGAIN.—We sent the Examiner for January to the Spirit World, as we had done regularly before, and it brought us *eight* numbers of vol. 3, with the words, "*All I have*," on the margin. Certainly, that is all we could ask. The Spirit World can't do impossibilities, though we would have been glad to look into all the numbers issued by our old friend Sunderland. We feel deeply interested for him; and shall look, till despair sets in, which we hope may never be, for him to return to the "foundation of the apostles and prophets," and to "Jesus Christ the chief corner-stone" of all hope of a future life. Most sincerely do we pray that he may once more realize that Jesus Christ is "the *way*, the *truth*, and THE LIFE," and that "no man cometh unto the Father but by" him. John 14: 6.

—o—

"BANEFUL DOCTRINES."—The Baptist Association of Philadelphia, held in this city in October last, sent out a "*Circular Letter*," prepared by "H. G. Jones." The Association say:

"We may not close this address without referring to a sentiment or moral opinion of recent birth which seems struggling for existence in Europe, and in our own country. It is called 'the destruction or annihilation of the wicked after death," and should it gain increasing vitality or favor, we presume its results may possibly trouble weak and unstable minds, and throw open sluices of infidelity, irreligion, and ruin. Its baneful doctrines are presented to the public in a pamphlet of nearly 300 pages. Yet the view is so entirely unfounded in the Holy Scriptures that we do not believe it can gain many adherents among orthodox Christians. It would doubtless delight the outlawed spirits of darkness to have satisfactory evidence of their entire destruction; though the great Milton is of a different opinion. And Satan himself seems to 'tremble' at the view of his endless woe, and is helped by the Prince of poets to say as evidential of his hopeless case—

> 'Will he so wise, let loose at once his ire,
> Belike through impotence, or, unaware
> To give his enemies their wish, and end
> Them in his anger, whom his anger saves
> To punish endless?"

"Now, if there was any show of evidence for the annihilation of the wicked, it must appear rather strange that the Christians of the first ages never mentioned, or in the least noticed this novel dogma, so pompously ushered to our view in our day, with Hebrew, Greek and Latin criticisms, and learned quotations. But the Bible is so explicit and solemn in its teachings—it so fully sets the endless sufferings of the finally impenitent before its readers, that it does not seem possible that any ground is left for any person to question or mistake."

The "pamphlet of nearly 300 pages" is the work of "H. H. Dobney, Baptist Minister, England;" the reprint of which we have circulated widely in this country, and with good effect. We wish the Association had given the name of the work and its author. Perhaps Mr. Jones did; but we understand the "Circular Letter" was trimmed by the Committee before it was adopted.

The letter gives some three or four of the "*so explicit*" texts of "*the Bible*" which leave *no* "ground for any person to question or mistake" the doctrine of "the *endless sufferings* of the finally impenitent." Among these texts is the following, which is put down "Rev. 22: 21," and made to read thus: "*We that are unjust and filthy now, will be after death unjust and filthy still, and ever will remain so.*"

How an intelligent body of ministers could vote upon and sanction such an *addition* to "the Bible," we cannot comprehend—and especially to a book that ends with this awful note of warning—"If any man shall *add* unto these things, God shall apd unto unto him the plagues that are written in this book." Rev. 22: 18. Now, the language which this Association *pretends* to give from "Rev. 22: 21," is not only not there, but is nowhere else in the Bible. *Some* of the words are in Rev. 22: 11, and the reference may be a typographical error; but the *pretended* text, as a whole, is an *addition* to, and *corruption* of, the word of God; and if done knowingly, they ought to hope the doctrine of destruction is true; as every one of those who sanctioned such *addition* are exposed to the plagues written in that book. We will not press this point, though it is painful to think that perishing men should be fed with such corruptions of the word of God. Do men call themselves ministers of Christ, and yet feed his flock with falsehood? and condemn others as preaching '*baneful doctrines*,' because they insist that God means what *he says*, and saith what *he means*? They may attempt to screen themselves by saying, as some do, "That's the *sense* of the text." That may be *their* sense of it, but it is not the *letter* of the text, nor do we believe it is the sense of the Spirit of God. Whether it is or not, they cannot know it is so, and their responsibility as corruptors of "this book" remains.

"Satan himself seems to 'tremble' at the view of his endless woe," says this Baptist Association, "and is helped by the Prince of Poets, as evidential of his hopeless case. Will he so wise, let loose at once his ire," &c.

Here are points *assumed*, which are not true. Satan is to be *destroyed:* and the devils understand this; else why did they ask our Saviour, "Art thou come to *destroy* us?" Mark 1: 24. That their destruction is preceded by torment is true; but the Son of God took flesh and blood * * that * * "he might *destroy him* that had the power of death, that is, the *devil*"—*ton diabolon*. Heb. 2: 14. "His head" is to be *bruised*, which imports *death*—utter destruction, not endless woe.

The Association are not correct in their reference to the "Prince of Poets." If they had quoted David they would have been right: *he* was the Prince of Poets; but then David would not answer their purpose, because he testifies plainly against their assumption. David saith, "All the wicked will God *destroy*." Psa. 145: 20. "*All* the wicked" includes the wicked one, or Satan. Again, *this* Prince of Poets, speaking by the Spirit of God, saith, "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*." Psa. 37: 20. This does not look like *endless woe;* but it does look like turning them into their original elements, so that "the wicked shall not be; yea, thou shalt diligently consider his place, and *it* shall not be." Psa. 37: 10.

But the Association cry out, "*Annihilation*," and they affirm, "There is no reason to believe that throughout all the worlds which are dispersed through the immensity of space, a single atom has ever yet been, or ever will be, annihilated!" Marvellous, truly! They go on to say, "No instance has as yet occurred of any system, or portion of matter, either in heaven or in earth, having been reduced to annihilation!" Truly, here is a vastness of knowledge with which few men, besides this Association, have ever been favored! They know what has not been done in "*heaven* and earth!" We would like to put a question to men of such extensive attainments; and it would be as follows:—Gentlemen, did the Almighty God create "all things out of *nothing*," as the creed saith? If so, has he lost His *power*, by that mighty effort, so that He *cannot*, if he please, reduce all things to their *original state?* Now, do not evade the question. One of two things is certain, either God did not create, as the Creed saith, or He can uncreate, if He please. We care not which ground you take; your own theory is exploded, which ever way you turn. With us it is only a question of what God has *said* he will do. That point settled, we would lay aside all claim to the christian character if we doubted his *ability* to do whatever He saith. Hence if God had said he would *annihilate* the wicked, we would not doubt but what it could and would be done. God has said "all the wicked he will destroy;" and that does not mean he will *preserve* them; for, in the same verse it is said, "God *preserveth* all them that

love him." Thus the saints are to be preserved and the wicked destroyed—yea, "annihilated," if you please.

Another specimen of the profound and astonishing knowledge of the Association is the following sentiment, viz:

"The most ancient historians, such as Berosus and Herodotus, have never mentioned, or even noticed, annihilation, or the extinction of any thing or being which possessed vitality, and especially intelligences as being utterly destroyed."

This notice makes all the beasts of the field, fowls of the air, fishes in the waters, and every crawling worm and reptile immortal! Perhaps the Association believe that is the case. However that may be, a more "ancient historian" than those named records that Joshua took a certain city and "smote it with the edge of the sword, and all the souls that were therein he '*utterly destroyed.*'" Joshua 10: 35. Another still more "ancient historian" has "mentioned" the "extinction of beings" who were "intelligent," even their being "utterly destroyed." That the Association may not plead ignorance we will put down chapter and verse, where it reads thus: "So the Lord God delivered into your hands Og also, the king of Bashan, and all his people, and we smote him until none was left to him remaining; and we took all his cities at that time * * * and we *utterly destroyed* them * * * *utterly destroying* the men, women and children of every city." Deut. 3: 3–6. It were easy to multiply instances of utter destruction, but these may suffice, remarking only, that Peter saith some men, "as natural brute beasts, * * * shall *utterly perish* in their own corruption." 2 Peter 2: 12.

The Circular Letter of the Association concludes with this affirmation:

"The Lord assures us in his holy Word, that wicked men are not destroyed at death, or ages after, 'but are turned into hell, with all the nations that forget God.'"

Here the letter makes an effort to sustain their hostility to the destruction of the wicked by an appeal to the Bible; but, as is usual in such cases, are exceedingly unfortunate in their selection. We have shown by the testimony of Moses and Joshua, that *some* wicked men were "utterly destroyed at death;" and of course did not survive "for ages after." In the next place the term "hell," which they quote from Psa. 9: 17, is *sheol* in the original, and never signifies a place of torment, but is expressly affirmed to be a state in which "there is *no knowledge.*" See Eccl. 9: 10, where the same word occurs, though translated *grave;* it is *sheol* in the original. It is a state of darkness, silence, and inactivity, where there is no work, nor wisdom, nor knowledge. See again Eccl. 9: 10. The wicked and "nations," therefore, which are turned into hell, (*sheol,*) are, when that state is *final,* eternally and *utterly destroyed;* yea, "*annihilated,*" as nations and *as men;* that is, they cease to be nations—they cease to be men. We care not whether "their primitive elements" are preserved or not; they are not nations—*they are not men;* and therefore they are utterly destroyed, and cease; or are "as though they had not been." See Obadiah 16.

Here for the present we leave our Baptist Association of Philadelphia, begging them all carefully to read their brother Dobney's work on "The Scripture Doctrine of Future Punishment," a copy of which we will *give* each of them if they will call at our house 52 Vine street.

STATE OF THE DEAD.

Will the Bible Examiner please examine the following scriptures, and expose, by the Bible, the views I entertain, if they are unscriptural?

"For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit. By which also, he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which sometimes were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water, * * * who shall give account to him that is ready to judge the quick and dead? For, for this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit."—1 Pet. 3: 18, 19, 20, and 4th ch. 5th and 6th v.

Now for the *meaning* of this passage—says Peter, "Christ once suffered for us the just for the unjust." When? How? "Being put to death *in the flesh.*" But how "put to death?" How did, how could Christ die? "In the flesh." And what is the import of this? Does "in the flesh" here mean *in sin* or *in a carnal mind?* Had we never seen or heard of the testimonies of the Evangelists, of the life, suffering, and death of Christ, we might understand the import of "put to death in the flesh" here to be "*made a sinner*;" but, with the light which has beamed on us from the sacred testimonies above referred to, we understand that Peter here speaks of the crucifixion of our Lord Christ on Mount Calvary—that "in the flesh" means in the body—the same in which he dwelt among us, and displayed his glory. The death Peter speaks of Christ's suffering for us, we understand the same as Job speaks of in the destruction of his body. It was a putting off of the tabernacle—he expired, he yielded up his spirit.

If such be the import of the Apostle Peter's teaching here by "put to death in the flesh," of the death of Christ; "dead" and "in the flesh" must have the same import in the following 4th and 5th verses, chapter 4. By the "quick," or living, "and the dead," is meant the *living in* the flesh, and the dead *from* it; and by "to them that are dead," is meant persons who have departed this life and are disembodied spirits. Hence it follows that the spirits in

prison, to whom our Lord went and preached the gospel, were not unbelieving Jews nor Gentiles of the Apostles' times; but the antedeluvian dead, who "were formerly disobedient, when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was preparing, in which few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water." They were in hades—the unseen world—the receptacle of all the dead, and in prison there. Christ being put to death in the flesh, because then like them, a disembodied spirit, and then conducted by the spirit which afterwards quickened him—made him alive again in the flesh, by reuniting his soul to the body he left on the cross—he visited their dark abodes—he preached deliverance to the captives, the opening of the prison to them that were bound. Why he did so is plainly declared in the words following: "For, for this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit." Now for the import of this. "To be judged according to men in the flesh," we understand was, as living men in the world, possessed of a body, soul and spirit, after hearing the gospel, are to be judged, justified, or condemned, as they believed and obeyed, or disbelieved and rejected it; and "to live according to God in the spirit," was obeying the gospel and living a life of holiness, as disembodied spirits could obey and live, till the general resurrection, when the souls and bodies of all the just are to be re-united and glorified.

That the above is the true exposition of this passage in Peter, I am confirmed in my convictions by the following additional *proofs:*

1. To the thief, who believed in Christ and confessed and prayed to him on the cross, our Lord said, "To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." Both died that day.

2. The Patriarch David uttered a prediction, which Peter quotes and applies in his discourse on the day of Pentecost, thus: "Being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before, spoke of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in *hades*, (the unseen world, not hell,) neither did his flesh see corruption." It hence appears that the soul of Christ was to go, and went to *hades*.

3. On the morning of the first day of the week, the third after the crucifixion, in the recorded appearance of our Lord to Mary, he said: "Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my Father." From Friday till Sunday morning, the body of our Lord was a lifeless lump of clay, and his soul was in the unseen world. It was not dead. What was it doing there? This we suppose to have been the question which was asked by the primitive disciples of Christ, for they were not Sadducees—they believed in the existence both of angels and of departed, *living, conscious*, disembodied human spirits. And this question was answered to them. The passage in Peter which we have been considering, tells us what that answer was.

E. H. W.

Fairfield, Huron Co., Ohio.

[Remarks by the Editor.—We have given place to the foregoing, from a minister who has recently been investigating the immortality question, and who has embraced the view of the destruction of the wicked, but has difficulties in regard to the *unconscious* state of the dead. We wish of course to give a candid examination to all candid objections.

To be "put to death in the flesh," we think, cannot mean simply "putting off" the flesh, or body. Christ was first "in the flesh:" in other words, "the Word was made flesh." John 1: 14. In this state he (viz: the same who was made flesh) was put to death. "*Christ* died" (1 Cor. 15: 3,) not, Christ escaped *out* of the flesh; and thus, in fact, *escaped* death, or did not die at all, only took his leave for a short time of an assumed tabernacle. But "*Christ* died"—not a *part* of him only; for in that case *he* did not die; yet he did die, "according to the scriptures," (1 Cor. 15: 3.) According to that testimony, "his *soul* was made an offering for sin—he poured out his *soul* unto death." Isa. 53: 10–12. Jesus saith, "*My soul* is exceeding sorrowful *even unto death:*" Matt. 26: 38. Again he saith, "I am he that liveth and was dead." Rev. 1: 18. There was a time, then, when he *was not alive;* but now, he adds, "I am alive forevermore." Surely such language is inconsistent with the idea that the essential Christ did not die, or sink for a time into a state in which he was not alive. "*Christ died,*" not *half* died: he "was dead," and therefore was unconscious, for "there is *no knowledge* in sheol." Eccl. 9: 10. *Hades*, in the Greek New Testament, corresponds with *sheol* in the Old Testament, and one *positive* testimony that there is no knowledge in that state, viz: in *sheol or hades*, the state of the dead, must outweigh all *inferential* conclusions to the contrary. As to becoming "disembodied spirits," the phrase is an *unscriptural* one, yet we do not urge that point, only we affirm, if dead men have such spirits, they "*know not anything.*" Eccl. 9: 5–10. And that "in death there is no remembrance of God." Psa. 6: 5. Hence there is no talking or *preaching* while in that state. If such is or has been the case, we need stronger proof than what is afforded by the texts in Peter's first Epistle. The texts, whatever may be their sense, cannot be construed to contradict the *positive* testimony we have presented of the *ignorance* of the dead. Christ did not preach the gospel *in hades;* yet the spirit of God, which raised up Christ from the dead, did preach the gospel *of life* "while the ark was preparing, *in the days* of Noah," to those

who were, in Peter's day, "in prison;" or, as Milton saith, according to the Syriac, "in *sepulchro*," in the sepulchre—i. e., who were now dead. While alive, and God's long suffering of 120 years lasted, the Spirit of God strove with them; but God said, "My Spirit shall not always strive with man." Gen. 6: 3. When the ark was finished, "the gospel" *of life* was no longer "preached to them," but God withdrew it and gave them up to death, and they are now dead.

As to the notion that the soul and body is to be "*re-united* by the resurrection," we will now only say, the expression is unscriptural and subaersive of the scripture doctrine of the resurrection, which is, that *the man* is raised from the dead. It is *the man* that is dead, not one-half of him. Jesus did not say "Soul and body" of Lazarus *come together again!* No, he said, "*Lazarus come forth.*" If only one-half of Lazarus was in the grave, our Lord called him to come from a place where he was not. But he did not make a mistake, for Lazarus came forth bound hand and foot, in his grave clothes.

On the case of the thief we have written so much, and spoken so often, we shall pass it now by merely remarking, the account of the crucifixion clearly shows that the thief did not die the *same day* that Jesus did; and that, in our mind, if there was nothing else, is sufficient to show that the common notion of his entering Paradise that literal day is erroneous.

As to the "primitive disciples of Christ believing in the existence of departed *living conscious* disembodied human spirits," no scripture evidence of that idea appears to our mind; especially after our Lord's death. During his life they on some occasions manifested a belief in the *embodiment* of human departed spirits, or in the Pharisaic notion of the transmigration of souls. Our Lord has warned us all to beware of the doctrine of the Pharisees as well as of the Sadducees: they were the two extremes; the Pharisees believing in the conscious existence of the dead, and the Sadducees denying all future life: both were in error, and both condemned by our Lord for their heresies.

SCRIPTURE EXPOSITION.

BY THE EDITOR.

[Continued from page 175, vol. vi.]

If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God; if any man minister, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth; that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ, to whom be praise and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.—1 PETER, 4: 11.

"If any man speak"—*labei*—recount, narrate, recite, declare, teach, or preach—"let him speak as"—according to—"the oracles"—revelation, word—"of God; if any man minister"—distribute, or communicate—"let him do it as"—according to—"the ability"—or power—"which God giveth; that God in all things may be glorified"—praised, or, his excellency may be made known, acknowledged, and so he be honored by others—"through Jesus Christ"—who, having ascended on high, has shed down upon his true disciples the Holy Spirit, whereby they are led into an understanding of the word of God, through, or by, the personal teaching of Christ while he was on earth—"to whom be praise and dominion"—power, government—"for ever and ever"—for the ages of the ages; or, for *ever being*—"amen"—so let it be, truth.

Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial which is to try you, as though some strange thing happened unto you. But rejoice inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy.—12 and 13

"Think it not strange"—surprising—"concerning the fiery trial which is to try you"—the burning trial, by which they and their faith are *assayed*, or tested, as we have remarked on chap. I: 7: it is because they are "beloved"—*dear* to God, that he suffers them to be thus tested; for whom he loveth he chasteneth, therefore be not surprised at the burning trials that you may pass through whatever their character—"as though some strange thing happened to you: but rejoice inasmuch as"—*katho*—according as, in proportion as—"ye are partakers of"—*koinoneite*—sharers in, participators in—"Christ's sufferings." This truly is more strange than the fiery trials themselves; that in enduring them we should be participators, or *sharers in*, the sufferings of Christ. How high the honor; for, "if so be we suffer with him, we shall be also glorified together." Rom. 8: 17. This expression of Peter shows also that the sufferings of Christ were not "*in our room and stead*," as the common dogma has it; but suffered on account of men, and by their wickedness; but not as a substitute for their sins, or to *pay their debts;* and for such an object none of the followers of Christ do or can suffer; and yet they are partakers of Christ's sufferings; and in proportion as they suffer with him, or participate in his sufferings they have reason to "rejoice;" because—"that when his glory shall be revealed"—at the *unveiling* of his glory (see chap. 1) ye may be glad also with exceeding joy"—that ye may rejoice and leap for joy, or exultation.

If ye be reproached for the name of Christ, happy are ye; for the Spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you; on their part he is evil spoken of; but on your part he is glorified.—14.

"If reproached"—censured, inveighed against, reviled, scoffed at—"for the name of Christ"—for bearing the name, or being called by the name of Christ, i. e., for being Christians—"happy"—blessed—"are ye; for the spirit of glory"—*because* of the

glory (spoken of in the previous verse) which is to come upon you—"and the Spirit of God resteth"—abideth—"upon you" now, if you are suffering for the name of Christ. "On their"—your persecutors—"part he is evil spoken of"—blasphemed; for, saith Jesus, "inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it *unto me*"—"but on your part he is glorified:" while you suffer for Christ and after his patient example you honor him, bring credit to his cause, and praise to his name.

But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief, or as an evil doer, or as a busybody in other men's matters. Yet if any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God on this behalf.—15 and 16.

"Busybody"—one who meddles in other men's affairs; or a seditious person, one that stirs up strife. "But if as a Christian," any man suffer, "let him not be ashamed"—confounded, disconcerted—"but let him glorify"—praise, extol, magnify—"God on this behalf"—in this respect.

For the time is come that judgment must begin at the house of God; and if it first begin at us, what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God? And if the righteous scarcely be saved, where shall the ungodly and the sinner appear?—17 and 18.

The first point to be determined here is, what is the meaning of the phrase "*house of God?*" The first time it occurs in scripture is Gen. 28: 17. On a careful examination of the connection, it seems to signify *the place* where God manifests himself in a special manner—where He makes and receives peculiar communications. Hence the Tabernacle, before the building of the Temple, was called "the house of God." Compare Joshua 18: 1 with Judges 18: 31. In Judges 20: 18, it is said, "The children of Israel went up to the house of God, and asked counsel of God," &c. After the Temple was built that went by the name of the house of God: there God was sought, and there he gave answers. This phrase in the Acts and Epistles occurs but three times, viz: 1 Tim. 3: 15, thus—"That thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God." Here there is no ground for dispute as to its meaning. Next it is found in Heb. 10: 21, "Having a High Priest over the house of God," &c. Here is very little ground for doubt as to its meaning, viz: the church. It next occurs in the text before us; and it is not easy to see how any other construction can be put upon the words here than in the language of Paul; and the construction of the verse shuts us up to that conclusion that Peter means the church, by the house of God, viz; those who *obey* the gospel; as they are contrasted with those who *obey it not.* We now proceed with a direct exposition of the passage. "For"—*oti*—because—"the time"—the appointed time, the fixed definite period—"is come:" the period spoken of by Daniel, viz: the 70 weeks, which were to terminate on "the holy city"—when that should be given up of God, and not at any point in our Lord's ministry, death, resurrection, or ascension. No language can be plainer than that the 70 weeks of Dan. 9th carry us down to the period when the holy city should be delivered up of God to her enemies, at which time the church was to cease her connection with it and flee out; so that a definite time was also marked by our Lord; that time Peter had said, v. 7, was "at hand;" and as it drew nearer the Christians, who testified of that coming judgment and desolation, would be made to suffer more and more, as the wickedness would increase; so their Lord told them it would be—that they should be hated and betrayed by parents, brethren, kinsfolks, and friends; and some of them they should cause to be put to death. These sufferings and trials Peter calls *judgment—krima*—separation; that is, the sufferings that Christians would endure as the final catastrophe drew on would test them to the utmost and separate all from them who could not endure the trial; and hence called a judgment, because it would be a season that would bring out their real character; "and if" such trials await us at this time, "what shall the end be of them that obey not the gospel of God?"—"obey not"—will not suffer themselves to be persuaded, obstinately reject the good news of *life*, or will not suffer God to evangelize them. His reference, we cannot doubt, is to the coming fate of the Jews, who had continued to harden themselves, till God was now about to give up their city and themselves to that fearful and awful destruction which befell them within six years after Peter wrote his Epistle, when "wrath came upon them to the uttermost." See 1 Thess. 2: 16. Peter next refers to the fact that the Christians would suffer much prior to that dreadful calamity, yet, as Jesus had given sufficient caution and warning for those who believed his words, such would escape, "be saved," or *preserved*, though they would "scarcely," or but *just be* saved; yet preserved they would be by obeying his word, and fleeing at the given signal, viz: "When ye see Jerusalem compassed about with armies, then know its desolation is nigh;" &c. But if that signal of our Lord was all that saved or preserved the christians, and they had but just time to escape—"where shall the ungodly"—*asebes*—impious—"and the sinner"—*amartolos*—vicious person, one who deviates from the path of virtue—"appear?"—that is, they shall appear nowhere; they shall be *destroyed*, blotted out, disappear.

Though we have given this passage such an interpretation as we believe the truth demands, let us recollect the language of Paul, that "Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning;" and again, 1 Cor. 10: 11, "Now all these things happened unto them for *ensamples;* and they

are written for our admonition upon whom the end of the ages are come." "If God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee." Rom. 11: 21. If the Jews were guilty for not obeying the gospel, and as a consequence their entire national polity, civil and ecclesiastical, broken up, their city destroyed, and an awful destruction overtook them, let all of us, who live under what we affirm to be a clearer light than they ever enjoyed, beware that we are not the subjects of those more awful judgments that are, as prophecy clearly unfolds, to be visited on the Gentile nations who have had the gospel, and professed to believe it too, but who, with all their professions, have profaned the name of Christ by unholy living, iniquitous decrees, enactments, and laws which have caused the inhabitants of christendom to groan under civil and ecclesiastical oppression; and which has caused their cries to come up into the ears of God, as did the oppression of Israel in Egypt, and will as surely be visited with judgment as Pharoah and Egypt were destroyed. The time—the age, the period—has come, for those prophecies to have their fulfilment; and judgment has begun at the house of God—the ecclesiastical organizations—and they are being broken; and the righteous will scarcely be saved, or preserved, from the desolations that are coming, and to come, on the wicked rulers in church and state, and the breaking up of all their organizations, preparatory to the kingdoms of this world becoming the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ. Rev. 11: 15.

Wherefore let them that suffer according to the will of God, commit the keeping of their souls to him in well-doing, as unto a faithful Creator.—19.

This is an important exhortation to all who are called to suffer on account of attachment to Christ, and obedience to his injunctions, following his example. Let such "commit"—intrust—the keeping of their souls"—their persons, themselves, their lives—"to God in well-doing, as unto a faithful Creator," thus perfectly imitating their blessed Saviour, who, while expiring on the cross, committed his life into the hands of his Father-

———o———

"Deep Distress."—An old and highly esteemed friend, writing us from a distant part of the country, says: "If you feel for one in deep distress, remember me in your prayers." He gives us no information as to the nature of the distress. Another writes us, that he is sorely tried as he never was before; and we may add, as to *ourself*, the exercises of our mind, for some time past, have been the most severe of any period for many years; and we had concluded, before we received the notes from the two brethren above referred to, that there is now or soon would be, a *personal* trial of the faith and reliance upon God, of all who are truly looking for the return of our Lord from heaven, more severe than usual "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth: * * * if ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards and not sons." Heb. 12: 5–8. Again, when was our Lord's greatest suffering and agony? When was his soul exceeding sorrowful even unto death? When did he sweat, as it were, great drops of blood falling down to the ground? Was it not at the closing up, or *near* the closing up, of his state of trial? Was it not a short time previous to his being glorified? May it not be, then, as his saints draw nearer to the period of their glorification, that they also shall be called to *drink* of his cup and be baptised with the baptism wherewithal he was baptised? Would it be strange if their Master and Lord should thus give them practical and experimental knowledge that they must sympathize with him in his humiliation before they can be prepared to share in his glory? Sufferings and distress will show to ourselves and demonstrate before our Lord whether we love Christ, and his coming and kingdom, more than we love *this present world.* From the latter we must be weaned before we are prepared for the glory of Christ's fellow-heirs. Many of us may painfully find that we were more joined to the world, and the things of this present time, than we were aware. Happy shall we be if the distress and trials *crucifies* us unto the world and the world unto us. No matter from what source the trials come, let us give ourselves to God and we shall be purified by them. But if we fret, murmur, and repine under them, we may suffer loss; or if we do not lose ourselves, the merciful God will have to keep us under the rod all the longer or more severely, to save us from perishing with the ungodly. Yet, we have need to sympathize with one another as *members* of Christ, and to pray one for another. Most sincerely do we say in the language of Paul, "*Brethren, pray for us;*" never did we more feel the need of the prayers of praying souls. May God, the Lord, keep his tempted, tried ones, and guide them safe to life eternal.

———o———

An Unanswerable Argument.!—A copy of the Bible Examiner was presented to a Minister of one of the sects in this vicinity a short time since. A few days after he was asked how he liked it. His reply, as we were informed, was, "I looked at the *title*, and put it into the fire where it ought to be!"

Surely, that is an unanswerable argument against the contents of the Examiner! "The Bible Examiner" in the *fire!* Only think of that! It can't speak now! Who can doubt its being a heretic! The ugly thing would *burn!* Did you *burn it up*, neighbor? or is it only *burning and never to be consumed?* If the latter, it's more than a match for you! You can't *annihilate* it, it seems. If you did burn it up, then it is a witness against you, for your puny hand *destroyed* it by the help of fire; and think you the Al-

mighty God cannot "destroy all the wicked" as easy as you can burn a Bible Examiner? Yea, "*all the wicked will he destroy*;" and none so wicked as those who hate light, and refuse to come to the light lest their deeds should be made manifest. Wedded to their traditions, the very name of *Bible Examiner* puts them in anguish. Happy for its editor that these self-styled orthodox men have not yet the power to do to him what the spirit manifested in burning the paper shows they have the will to do. Such arguments are unanswerable; yet from the *ashes* of that martyr paper the world may be more benefitted than from any other labor its destroyer ever put forth, inasmuch as it speaks in thunder tones to certain men who dare not meet an appeal to the Bible.

———o———

Elder Jacob Blain writes from *Pownal, Vt.*, Jan. 12, 1852:—As soon as I can get a list of one hundred ministers in the State of New York, I will send $5, and have the "Bible Examiner Extra" sent them. I hope others will look up lists and do likewise. I am more and more encouraged to believe we shall not have to work in a *corner* much longer; but like the effects of Pope's pebble, circles will enlarge. But Pope's principle of self-love will not stir the stagnant lake. It must be the principle of *benevolence*, and a benevolence strong enough to make a sacrifice of *money* instead of *wishes*. Are there not nineteen brethren more able than myself, to thus supply one hundred ministers with the lectures? Might we not hope that five out of the one hundred would get their eyes open to the truth, and have conscience and moral courage enough to defy popular opinion and persecution? If fifty or one hundred ministers should now come out in the churches, it would make a noise, produce discussion, and unavoidably spread light, which would, in a few years, root up the horrible tradition of endless torment.

"It's a monster of such frightful mien,
That to be hated, needs but to be seen."

Who else will give $5, so as to send four hundred in New York? And who will move for other States? I will look up names and address for New York in the different denominations. Let gratitude to God, for the joyful light he has given us, inspire us with zeal to dispel the darkness which has spread gloom over the Christian world for "forty and two months," and a little longer. We honor Wilberforce, Delavan and Howard for their perseverance and sacrifices, and we must perceive that we have a much more glorious object to accomplish and a better prospect of success than they. A reproach cast upon our God is to be removed, as well as an evil from our *fellow-men*. The bible (as well as sympathy and reason) is our weapon in the war, and that is mighty to the pulling down of strongholds.

Note by the Editor.—Our readers will see that Br. Blain is determined to do his part in carrying into effect the scattering of *two thousand* of the "*Bible Examiner Extra*" among ministers of different denominations. The whole cost, as we stated last month, will be about $100, or $5 per hundred copies, including the *postage*, which will have to be pre-paid in all cases. Shall Br. Blain's proposition be carried into effect?

———o———

A Question.—We received the following from an unknown hand, and give it place in our columns. We have concluded to let our *correspondents* answer the question. If several of them will write us on the subject, we will either give all the answers or that which in our judgment is the best; but in any event we shall withhold the name of the respondent; though we must have it in our possession. We shall take this course to avoid personalities and an undue influence from names.—[Ed.

—

Philada., Jan. 20, 1852.

Br. Storrs:—Will some of your correspondents give me an explanation of Luke 20: 34–37, with the doctrine of the destruction of a portion of the human family *after* the resurrection? The text reads, "Jesus answering, said unto them, The people of this world marry and are given in marriage. But among them that shall be honored to share in the resurrection and the other world, there will be neither marrying nor giving in marriage, for they cannot die any more; because, angel-like, they are children of God, being children of the resurrection. But that the dead are raised, even Moses hath suggested, calling the Lord, who appeared in the bush, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. Now, he is not a God of the dead, but of the living; for they are all (though dead to us) alive to him."

There are some spoken of here that are denominated *dead*, of whom God is *not* their God. But of those that attain unto the resurrection, they cannot die any more. Can these texts be harmonized with the destruction of the wicked after the resurrection?

Macknight.

———o———

An Inquiry.—*Br. Storrs*:—Can any one of your correspondents favor me with the correct view entertained by the Sadducees and Pharisees on the resurrection? By so doing, and adducing their authority, it will oblige yours, respectfully,

Correspondent.

Will some of our correspondents respond to the above?—[Ed.

———o———

From William Roworth.

New York, Jan. 14, 1852.

Br. Storrs:—I have been very much interested with the Examiner the last year, and hope you may be supported by the friends in holding up the impor-

tant truths it advocates, for I consider the subject of Life and Death equally as important to be preached as the coming of the Lord—the way man is to attain life and escape death; for these are the two prominent truths held up throughout the Scriptures. It is, do this and thou shalt live, refuse and thou shalt die. I am surprised to find so many professing to love the Saviour and his appearing, startled at this doctrine, and think it ought not to be preached, as it tends to divide and scatter the flock of Christ, and, as a ministering brother told me, it was one of the most egregious errors ever preached, and had been the principal means of dividing and scattering those who are looking for the coming of Christ! I say, if preaching the truth divides, amen—so let it be; it shows there is something wrong when preaching the truth has this effect. The Apostle says, "Preach the word," and I suppose he means the whole of it; for all scripture is given by inspiration of God, and the Apostle says it is all profitable, &c.; then, as the Lord says to the prophet Ezek., "thou shalt speak my words unto them whether they wilt hear or forbear." I do rejoice that these truths are being more and more investigated, and many are beginning to see their beauty and harmony. I once fought against them myself, and stood up to support the heathen notion of the immortality of all men, and the endless duration of the torment of the wicked. But I do rejoice the Lord showed me my error, and I trust he has forgiven me for preaching such lies; for God says: "The soul that sinneth *it* shall die." But the popular theology says it shall *not* die, but live in conscious torment forever and ever. My prayer is that the Lord may still support you in this blessed work until he gives you a discharge.

Yours, &c.

———o———

"The Question of Questions, by Moncrieff," in the last Examiner, we ought to have stated, was *original*, written for our paper. We hope the author will give us more of like character; and we again invite Brn. *Dobney* and *White*, of England, to write for the Examiner. And where is our old friend and first acquaintance in England, Dr. Lees, *alias* "Path-finder," of Leeds? We should be glad to see more on the immortality question from him.

———o———

"The Gospel Hope, *by George Storrs.*"—We have now issued this work in a Tract of 16 pages, 18mo. Price $1.50 per hundred, or $10 per thousand copies.

———o———

Elder Tates's Defence, the remainder, is not yet received.

———o———

Dr. Fondey.—Your article shall appear in the Examiner for March. It came too late for this month.

For the Bible Examiner.

ACROSTIC.

Ordain'd of God, to vindicate the truth,
Nor less to justify His ways to man;
With firm and steady pace pursue the track
Assign'd. Arm'd with all-conquering Love—the
Routed foe, with Gideon's sword beat down—
Despoil'd and vanquish'd—glad to quit the field.

Dauntless go on—the victory is sure;
Expect and brave the scoffing jeers of men;
A few short days will terminate the strife,
Rewarded with the crown of *Endless Life.*

Bedew with tears the seed—the harvest will
Repay with rich and more abundant sheaves.
Onward—ten thousand kindred spirits cry
The truth of God is mighty to prevail:
Heaven's blessing hath and will attend your efforts,
Extend the triumphs of long-hidd'n truths,
Reveal'd in plainness—but for men made *creeds!*

Onward—in fearless contest urge your way,
No weapon form'd against you can prevail;
What though sectarian bigotry may rage,
And labor to evade the force of truth?
Rejoice to know your mission from on high
Demands these efforts till your work is done.

Go on, dear brother—arm'd with power divine—
Omnipotence your safe, your sure defence.

Not many links of the prophetic chain,
Or days of toil and conflict, now remain;
Rejoice in hope—our King is at the door;
His weeping saints ere long shall weep no more.
Eternal Life!—how infinite the prize!
Exchange of suffering—for immortal joys!
Despis'd, rejected—joyful onward go,
Till *He the crown of Endless Life bestow.*
His chariot wheels, not distant far, we hear,
Echo'd in sounds that speak his coming near;
Sweet is the hope, the joy, our triumph soon!
To hear the welcome plaudit, of well done;
Our absent Lord will come, nor long delay,
Restore lost Eden, and his sceptre sway.
Moulded and fashion'd like our glorious Head,
No spot or stain of sin, no cause of dread;
Our light afflictions pass unheeded on,
Resign'd to suffer till the prize is won.
Fill'd with the Spirit of our conqu'ring Lord,
Exulting in his strength and promis'd word,
As giants girded for the fight, we go,
Resolv'd through Him to vanquish ev'ry foe.

These scenes of conflict hasten to a close,
Hush'd to a calm—the ruthless storm shall cease,
Exalted far above the reach of foes,
For transient ills, reap endless joy and peace:
O'er all the past our raptur'd thoughts shall range;
Exult and triumph in the mighty change.

Philada., Jan. 3, 1852.